Why I Chose a Constitutional Monarchy

By: Amira Boucher

I chose a constitutional monarchy because as much as I like the idea of being in control of everything and everyone, realistically every system needs a device to where everyone is held responsible for their actions so no one can construct a dictatorship; because everyone knows dictatorships only last so long before the people unify themselves and destroy it (Hitler for example; though at least he knew what was happening and got himself before the torture could happen). A few more reasons as to why I choose a constitutional monarchy are: in theory is supposed to create a higher level of neutrality, a monarch provides a unifying symbol for the people, it provides continuity, and a constitutional monarchy costs less to uphold.

In theory constitutional monarchies create a higher level of neutrality because the Monarch isn't part of any specific party. The monarch, while still ruling on their own personal beliefs regarding what is best, isn't influenced by any specific party unlike your average federal government where they have democratic and republican parties independent parties and all those in between. They are supposed to be neutral, and are supposed to run based on what is best for their whole country rather than what's best for their political party.

A monarch can provide a unifying symbol for the people. Which is completely accurate seeing as they have this one person ruling until they are unable to rule, are overthrown by some extremist group, or don't wish to rule anymore. A monarch to my "country" would be like the bald eagle to America because the bald eagle is always around. The bald eagle to Americans symbolize their country, their freedom, their wishes and dreams. To the people of my country, and other countries ruled by Monarchs, Britain for example, the monarch is their bald eagle. The monarch is supposed to embellish all that the people of the country represent.

A constitutional monarchy provides governing continuity, which is the primary benefit of a constitutional monarchy. By not changing superiors every four years, countries with constitutional monarchies can create stronger bonds with other countries. In other words, my country has a better chance of creating allies, and keeping them allies because there wouldn't be a constant change in ideals and personalities. The rules and regulations also wouldn't be changing as much, and as often as countries without constitutional monarchies. Rather than relying on a peaceful transition of power between different political parties, there is comfort in knowing who the next monarch will be when the current monarch decides to retire.

A constitutional monarchy costs less than most other forms of government; England for example. The Palace where the Queen resides (not the Queen herself) receives a "Sovereign Support Grant" each year to fund any and all expenses related to official duties. The sovereign support grant" allows paid state visits; pays the royal staff's wages; allows the Queen, the Duke of Edinburgh, and working royal family to travel; covers the cost of the "royal wardrobe"; and pays for the upkeep of royal and historical buildings such as Windsor Castle, Buckingham Palace and Frogmore at Windsor. However, this grant does not cover any non-working royal family members or running costs for Balmoral nor Sandringham. The sovereign support grant takes 15% of the profits from the crown estate. The other 85% goes to the treasury. In other words the

queen gets allocated about 42.8 million dollars a year, most of which goes back into the great country of Britain.

In regards to federal government; President Trump's continued all expenses paid visits to Mar a Lago and golf courses average to about \$1-3 million **per trip**, The French President costs about £103.5 million per year, and the president of Italy costs about £193 million per year. In regards to other constitutional monarchies; Canada averages \$50.5 million per year, and the Dutch average about 47 million.

Anyone in their right minds can see that financially a constitutional monarchy is a superior choice.

England is a fine example of a well working constitutional monarchy. In England the monarch is considered "servant to the people" to reflect an egalitarian point of view, in other words a view where everyone should be equal. Figures like Elizabeth II or the late King Olav V are seen as beholding of an abundance of relative knowledge of their state's recent history, maintaining and passing on an understanding of lessons learned through past errors of past governments that can be used by their surpassers to improve their future governments.

In my country I want to work with the people, for the people. I want to be top of the top, but I don't want to get power hungry like a full monarch. However, I also don't want to give full power to the people as all votes are not equal, as many of them aren't educated; plus if you think about it democracy is one, big popularity contest. This is why I chose a constitutional monarchy.

19 Advantages and Disadvantages of Constitutional Monarchy. (2018, February 12). Retrieved October 8, 2018, from

https://brandongaille.com/19-advantages-disadvantages-constitutional-monarchy/

Lombardo, C. R. (2016, September 11). 6 Advantages and Disadvantages of Constitutional Monarchy. Retrieved from

https://connectusfund.org/6-advantages-and-disadvantages-of-constitutional-monarchy

Crystal Lombardo. (2018, January 25). Retrieved from https://vittana.org/13-key-constitutional-monarchy-pros-and-cons

Constitutional Monarchy. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.monarchist.org.uk/constitutional-monarchy.html

Howard, V. (2017, April 14). How is The Queen paid? The 2015/16 cost of Monarchy • The Crown Chronicles. Retrieved from

https://www.thecrownchronicles.co.uk/explanation/how-is-the-queen-paid-201516-cost-monarchy-royal-finances/

Royal family to cost Dutch taxpayers €41.4 million in 2017. (2017, April 28). Retrieved from https://nltimes.nl/2017/04/28/royal-family-cost-dutch-taxpayers-eu414-million-2017