

# Absolute and constitutional monarchy

[History](#)



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

## Absolute and Constitutional Monarchy

### Introduction

The distinction between absolute monarchy and constitutional monarchy is that, absolute monarchy allows the sovereign to have absolute or supreme authority. Conversely, in the constitutional monarchy, the sovereign is an elected or hereditary monarch. The rules in an absolute monarchy may be dissimilar from the rules within a constitutional monarchy. In addition, constitutional monarchy may be referred to as liberal monarchy while absolute monarchy may be referred to as undemocratic monarchy. In the absolute monarchy, the queen, king, or ruler has complete powers.

Conversely, in a constitutional monarchy, the queen, king, or ruler has restricted authority because they govern side by side with another governing unit (Davies 699). This paper will be a comparison between absolute monarchy and constitutional monarchy while highlighting several historical contexts, actors, and ideologies shaping the political movements and why they developed in France.

### Body

An absolute monarchy and a constitutional monarchy are two dissimilar structures arising from the monarch form of administration. A monarch form of government is where the appointed sole leader controls the entire nation. Distinctions between an absolute monarchy and a constitutional monarchy arose in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when a large number of European nations were experimenting with constitutional monarchies and absolutism. They were established with the demise of the church and in part because of holy conflicts (Davies 699). Absolute monarchies are governed by a ruling dynasty or person that has total authority over their empire, for <https://assignbuster.com/absolute-and-constitutional-monarchy/>

example, Russian leaders asserted extreme autocratic authority by divine entitlement, and that the people did not have the right to regulate their authority. In a number of instances, the rulers permit advisors to work for them. The leader can also give or take concessions as he desires.

The constitutional monarchy was developed when the rulers begun misusing their authorities. These people started presuming that God selected and gave them the authority. This outlook proved to be detrimental for the safety of their empires and their integrity. Moreover, constitutional monarchies have restricted authority (Davies 700). There is a chosen representative unit which develops a constitution that the ruler cannot evade, for example, England, which was constrained by the Act of Settlement 1701 and Bill of Rights 1689. Absolute monarchy occurred in France where the King of France focused in his person judicial, executive, and legislative authority. The King was the ultimate judicial power. He had the authority to prevent and deal with offenses. Moreover, Napoleon perceived himself as a manifestation of France; this understanding of monarchy is relevant to constitutional monarchies.

### Conclusion

From the illustrate assertion, it is evident that undemocratic or absolute monarchies give complete authority to the ruler who operates as the head of state or dictator. Also, liberal or constitutional monarchies bestow restricted authority to the leader, for example, the monarchy of England. Absolute monarchies were established with the demise of the church and in part because of holy conflicts. In addition, the constitutional monarchy was developed when the rulers begun misusing their authorities (Davies 700). Finally, both structures arose in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries <https://assignbuster.com/absolute-and-constitutional-monarchy/>

when numerous European nations were experimenting with constitutional monarchies and absolutism.

Work Cited

Davies, N. Europe: A History. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. Print.