



Marcin M. Wiszowaty*

Uniwersytet Gdański

RETURN OF THE KINGS. INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF THE ROYAL FAMILIES IN THE REPUBLICS OF ROMANIA AND MONTENEGRO IN THE 21ST CENTURY

1. In my latest book I took note of the phenomenon which I defined as a “republican paradigm in the research on the political systems of modern states”. This trend is very often encountered in the process of analyzing political systems. On one hand, it consist in omitting or marginalizing all characteristic elements of the monarchy, which do not have their republican equivalent, and on the other hand it focuses on democratic aspects of political system, ignoring its monarchic or republican character. This trend mainly results from a commonly-accepted assumption, that the so-called constitutional monarchy is only a stage on its way to the inevitable transformation of a political system from the absolute monarchy into the pure republic, which makes it only a transitional form. It brings about the fact that in case of monarchic states, the only subject of political system analysis is usually the monarch himself, as the last remnant of the past monarchy, whereas the other institutions of the monarchic system are ignored in the belief that they constitute insignificant relics, or even that they have already turned fully into the “republican” character.¹ One of the consequences of the above-mentioned interpretation is a gradual replacement of a traditional categorization into “republics” or “monarchies” by classifying the states as “democratic” or “undemocratic”. As a result, the two categories will encompass both monarchies and republics, ultimately reducing the fundamental differences between political systems. In my opinion this trend is harmful to the quality of the research on the political systems of modern states, due to the fact that it results in *a priori* ignoring many processes within the system, particularly those of monarchic character. The detailed examples and arguments in support of my thesis can be found in my book. The solu-

* mwiszowaty@konstytuty.pl

¹ M.M. Wiszowaty, *Zasada monarchiczna i jej przejawy we współczesnych ustrojach europejskich i pozaeuropejskich monarchii mieszanych. Studium z zakresu prawa konstytucyjnego*, Gdańsk 2015, p. 29 and 39.

tion that I suggested as optimal is classifying the systems into “pure” (complete) and “mixed”. The pure forms, very rarely met, do not contain any or contain only trace amounts of elements of another pure system, while the mixed forms consist of typical of both monarchic and republican institutions. Depending on the level of domination of either monarchic or republican institutions (especially, those of primary importance) in a given system, we can talk about mixed monarchies or mixed republics, respectively. A unique version of a mixed republic is a “monarchical republic.” In such system, although the monarch appears, he is deprived of any ruling competence (e.g. Sweden, Lesotho or Japan).

Thesis about the decadency of the so-called constitutional monarchy is hard to refute, which makes it gain much more supporters than opponents. Admittedly, there is no conclusive evidence of its correctness but the fact of a constant decreasing amount of monarchic states in the 20th century is indisputable. Whereas before the World War I these countries constituted the majority in Europe, after the World War II they became the minority. In the past half a century, there has been only a single case of restoration (more precisely: establishment) in Europe – of the Kingdom of Spain (1975). In 2003 a referendum that took place in Lichtenstein *de facto* strengthened a systemic position of the Prince. Referendum of 2011 confirmed his powerful position as a legislator. At the same time, in 2009 the constitutional status of the Grand Duke of Luxembourg was weakened by amendment, and he lost the authority to enforce pragmatic sanctions. It is hard to defend the opposite thesis, according to which constitutional monarchies (more correctly: “mixed monarchies”) are not merely transitional and decadent forms but they will survive and even new monarchies may come into being. Thesis that the monarchies can still serve as a political inspiration for the republics is even harder to acknowledge. In recent years, however, we have faced unprecedented events which may confirm the claims, hitherto taken with a pinch of salt. In two states of Central Eastern Europe - Montenegro and Romania, steps were taken towards the official recognition and institutionalization of the old home royal families within the system of public organs. In Romania, the initiative has been so far limited to the official presentation and the ongoing consultation on the government’s relevant act proposal, while in Montenegro the intention has been executed and the law regulating the status of the royal family ruling within the republican system became binding, after its enactment and implementation.

The purpose of this Article is to present the above-mentioned political initiatives. It also attempts to assess their impact - both on the systems of these two states and on the firmly-established classifications of political systems.

2. On 8 June 2016 the Chamber of Deputies of Romania decided to modify the image of the state coat of arms. Golden eagle, the main emblem of the coat of arms of Romania, regained the crown. The present image comes back from 1921. It had been abolished and replaced by another emblem after the dissolution of the Kingdom of Romania and the establishment of communist regime in 1948.

After regaining independence in 1992, the pre-war Romanian coat of arms was restored but it was subjected to modifications – e.g. in the field of color and by depriving the eagle its crown. Pursuant to Art. 12 Para. 4 of the Constitution of Romania of 1991, the image of the coat of arms is determined by the organic law.² The appropriate changes were initiated in the Senate (Upper Chamber of Parliament), where on 15 February 2017 by the ratio of votes: 101 in favour, 1 abstaining and 2 against, it was decided to bring the crown back to the eagle. The initiators of the decision claimed that in this symbolic way the communist era in Romania was finally ended. By 31 December 2018 the public authorities are obliged to enter the new coat of arms into the public circulation to the documents, on the official buildings, as well as on banknotes and coins.³ Allegations about the monarchical provenance of the crown were rejected, referring to the coat of arms' emblems of the republican states – e.g. Poland or Czech Republic, where the crown constitutes a symbol of sovereignty and state independency but not its monarchical form.⁴ It is worth mentioning that the so-called “heart shield” (escutcheon) with the emblem of the dynasty - a typical element in the coat of arms of monarchic states', has not come back to the one of the Romanian state. In case of Romania, it was a shield with the coat of arms of Hohenzollern family (black and white checkerboard), whose ancestral line of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen had been ruling the Kingdom of Romania between 1866 and 1947. This is the family of origin of Michael I of Romania (born in 1921), the last reigning King of Romania, who was forced by the communists to abdicate in 1947. Michael returned to Romania with his family a few years ago. The Hohenzollerns regained from the state numerous non-movable properties which they had owned before the communist era.

Another systemic initiative presented by the Romanian authorities in 2016 referred directly to the monarchical system. It provided for the inclusion of strictly monarchic institutions into the republican system. The former reigning family of Romania was to obtain the official legal status under a special act of the Romanian Parliament. On 23 June 2016 the General Secretariat of the Government of Romania submitted to public consultation a draft bill on the Royal House of Romania (*Lege privitoare la Casa Regală a României*) with the justification (*Guvernul României, Expunere de motive pentru Legea privitoare la Casa Regală a României*). The consultations lasted until 22 of July and the first reading on the bill was scheduled for autumn. The reason of such fast pace of work was caused by the 95th birthday of the former King of Romania, Michael I, falling on 25 of October 2016. Proponents of the new law used the fact of deteriorating health conditions of the ex-King to encourage the deputies to work faster and to support the project. Eventually, the bill did not go beyond the consultation stage and was not introduced in Parlia-

² Lege nr. 102 din 21 septembrie 1992 privind stema țării și sigiliul statului, (Monitorul Oficial Nr. 236, 24.09.1992).

³ L. Provia, Camera Deputaților a adoptat proiectul care modifică stema țării, Mediafax.ro, 8.6.2016.

⁴ Senatul a aprobat modificarea stemei României. Cum va arata noul simbol, Stirileprotv.ro, 16.2.2016

ment. In December 2016, the Social Democratic Party (PSD) won the parliamentary elections.⁵ As a result, a coalition majority government, consisting of the PSD and the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats (ALDE) was formed. The future of the bill became unpredictable. On one hand - there has been a change of government and its political configuration, which reduces a chance for the continuation of the political predecessors' projects. On the other hand, however, the governmental bill on the Royal House of Romania bore the signature of Vasile Dancu's, the Deputy Prime Minister of the then government of "experts" and a member of the currently ruling party (PSD).

3. The law proposal consists of 12 Articles divided into five chapters: (1) The Royal House of Romania (2) The Head of the Royal House of Romania (3) The Property (Heritage) of the Royal House of Romania, (4) The Executive Office of the Royal House of Romania and (5) The Transitional and Final Provisions. In the explanatory memorandum to the law proposal we read *inter alia* that the Royal House (*Casei Regale a României*) continues the values and traditions of the Crown of the Kingdom of Romania, as a symbol of the independence and sovereignty of the state. It serves as a proof of the continuity of the state and makes an important element of the Romanian society as a symbolic public institution.

The Romanian government, justifying its proposal, also stated that the Royal House is very active in promoting Romanian culture and values, has numerous achievements in cooperation with the central and local authorities as well as social organizations in the promotion and accomplishment of various initiatives and events. However, the Royal House, with its current legal status, does not have a legal personality, which makes it significantly difficult to establish and maintain cooperation with public and private partners. It finances its activities mainly from its own revenues and thanks to the generosity of private donors. Furthermore, the Royal House members and personnel, working in the Elisabeta Palace in Bucharest, do not have any rights towards it.

The main objective of the law is to change the above-described current status by introducing several important solutions:

- granting legal personality to the Royal House of Romania,
- granting the Head of the Royal House of Romania a status of a public authority with the appropriate legislative powers in the field of competences required to amend and execute the Reigning House Statute, as the legal basis of its activities,
- providing the Royal House with the necessary administrative support in the implementation of public tasks,
- subsidizing the Royal House's activities from the state budget and preserving a possibility of financing from private sources,

⁵ Biroul Electoral Central, Proces-Verbal privind rezultatele finale ale alegerilor pentru Camera Deputatilor, http://parlamentare2016.bec.ro/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/4_RF.pdf, 10.2.2017.

- granting the right to free of charge use of the Elizabeta Palace⁶ in Bucharest, as the official residence of the Royal House of Romania.⁷

In its justification, the authors of the bill emphasize the expected positive results of its adoption, such as establishing a close cooperation between the Royal House and the state, in order to continue and expand the House's public activities for Romania and its society, including the valuable initiatives in favor of civic society. Another positive result would be stabilizing of the status of the Royal House of Romania in modern Romanian society. At present, the House is in a state of "legal uncertainty, despite the wide support, which is against its traditional role as the state institution." The authors of the law also expect positive effects for the economy and business environment thanks to the House's involvement in the public promotional actions, which would support Romanian producers, service providers, craftsmen and their products. They also count on the positive results of the broad commitment of the Romanian royal family in respect to the charity and ecology, as well as their promotion in the society.

The law provides the Royal House with a legal personality as well as with an independent, apolitical and non-profit status of a public entity, which exists in order to preserve present Romanian traditions and values and to support the state development (Art. 1). The detailed organization of the House is to be defined by a special legal act named the „Statute of the Royal House of Romania” (*Statutul Casei Regale a României*), which will be issued (and in the future may be also a subject to change) individually by the Head of the Royal House (*Şeful Casei Regale a României*) - another rare institution in the republican systems. The first Head of the Royal House, under the aforementioned law, shall be the person performing this function at the moment of the statute's entry into force. In other words: the person who would be appointed according to the rules of succession existing in the Romanian royal family.⁸ However, the law contains an additional formal requirement, which does not allow to state that there has been an automatic recognition of the existing rules of succession, as the official source of Romanian constitutional law. The proposal states that the first person who will be appointed as the Head of the Royal House in the meaning of the statute, must be previously recognized as such, under a special act (a statute? a resolution?) adopted by the joint chambers of the Romanian Parliament. The decision must be taken within a short period of 10 days from the entry into force of the statute. This is another institution of strictly monarchic character, unknown in the republican constitutionalism – a statute (or a resolution) recognized by the Parliament. This require-

⁶ Michael II lived in the *Elizabeta Palace* in Bucharest between 1944 and 1947, until his abdication and leaving the state. At this time the Palace belonged to his aunt, Princess Elizabeth, daughter of King Ferdinand I – Michael's grandfather.

⁷ *Expunere de Motive* (Lege privitoare la Casa Regală a României), p. 1–2.

⁸ C. Popa, *Reacția Familiei Regale a României la proiectul de lege privind Casa Regală, „România Liberă”* 23.6.2016, <http://www.romanioliberal.ro/actualitate/eveniment/reactia-familiei-regale-a-romaniei-la-proiectul-de-lege-privind-casa-regala-420668>, 10.2.2017.

ment weakens the legitimacy of the Head of the House, by making it depended on the Parliament's recognition, thus indirectly on the people as sovereign.

The Statute of the Royal House and its amendments shall be published in the Official Journal of Romania (*Monitorul Oficial al României*). Therefore, this Statute would become a new source of constitutional law. Until now, this type of legal act has been recognized only in monarchic states (e.g. in the Principality of Liechtenstein⁹). The Head of the Royal House is obliged to issue the Statute within 3 months from the date of the law's entry into force (Art. 12 Para. 2).

Among the examples of the Royal House's activities desired by the legislature, the following can be pointed out: promoting traditions and symbols of sovereignty and national identity, customs and values as well as outstanding individuals, achievements of science, culture, education, sports, administration, military and economy; integrating of regional projects related to the urban and rural areas, development programs in cooperation with the public institutions and civil society representatives; honoring public and private entities as well as non-profit organizations, in the form of royal diplomas and other appropriate methods of recognition, for the achievements and roles played in the society, in the field of charity, culture, education and military; appreciating the quality of products and service companies, operating on the Romanian market; charity activities; rewarding outstanding students and teachers; foreign promotional activities concerning cultural relics, tourism, investment potential and Romanian products (Arts 3-4). These tasks and powers are typical for the families reigning in monarchic states. Privileges granted to the entities are very similar to the institution of a life nobility and knighthood.

The Statute defines the Bucharest Elizabeta Palace as the official headquarters of the Royal House which will be used free of charge for 99 years. The Head of the Royal House shall receive a monthly pay in the amount corresponding to the remuneration of the former Presidents of the republic¹⁰ (this allowance has been already granted personally to the former king Michael). First and foremost, the Head of the Royal House shall obtain an official legal status and competences similar to a public authority. The duties of the Head of the House shall encompass, among the others: issuing and changing the Statute of the House, performing tasks specified in the future legislation, appointing members of the administration supporting the Royal House and determining its structure and responsibilities. An important duty, being at the same time a privilege of the Head the House, is submitting to the Parliament an annual report on the activities of the House for

⁹ Hausgesetz des fürstlichen Hauses Liechtenstein 26.10.1993 (Liechtensteinisches Landesgesetzblatt No. 100/1993, 6.12.1993).

¹⁰ In accordance with the Law No. 406 of 10 July 2001 on granting those who served as the head of the Romanian state, it is 75% of the salary of the current President of the republic. According to data of 2016 the amount per month is approx. EUR 3200 (according to: *Romania Recognizes & Finances the Royal House*, 30.6.2016, Liberties.eu: European Liberties Platform, <http://www.liberties.eu/en/news/romania-recognizes-and-finances-royal-house>, 10.2.2017).

the past year (Art. 8). According to the public opinion poll, conducted in March 2016, around 93% of Romanians are aware of the existence of the Royal Family, 61% has high or very high trust in it, whereas only 23% could give any examples of its activity. It is thus expected that the annual report on its activities, publicly delivered to the Parliament, will improve the last result.¹¹

According to the proposal, the Royal House Heritage (*Patrimoniul Casei Regale a României*) shall be extracted and separated from the private properties of its members, including the Head of the House. The Heritage shall be made up of donations, bequests, legacies, publishing activities and all the other legitimate sources. The House's operational costs shall be financed from the state budget (Art. 9). The public projects and programs shall be financed both from the state budget and the House's own revenues. However, the statute does not specify the share of each of the source (which has been emphasized by the critics of the proposal). The Executive Office (*Serviciul administrativ al Casei Regale a României*), headed by its Director, shall assist the Head of the House in the House management. This administrative machinery, being part of the Office, shall count up to 20 persons, whose salaries shall be paid from the state budget.

The proposal met with a positive response from the royal family and the main political powers. In the official statement, the Royal House announced that the work on the bill had been conducted on the initiative and with the participation of the Royal Family. The proposal was enthusiastically received only by part of the Romanian monarchists, who were of the opinion that this would be the first step towards the restoration of the monarchy. In the open letter to the new parliament they appealed to restore the monarchic constitution of 1923 or to adopt a new one, in a similar vein.¹² The other monarchists claimed that the Statute would limit the freedom of the royal family. They also stated that it would prevent restitution of the monarchy because of the inclusion of the royal family into the republican system. There were also voices of severe criticism. Shortly after disclosing the bill and passing it for consultation, a collection of signatures for a petition to the government started, aiming to force the government to withdraw the further work on the proposal.

In the public debate, some commentators and supporters of the republican system expressed their doubts regarding the compatibility of the Statute's provisions with the constitution. The government stated that the project did not violate the Constitution of the Republic of Romania, because it neither granted any regulatory powers to the Royal House nor its provisions referred to the form of

¹¹ *The Romanian Parliament may vote a law regarding the Royal House of Romania in Autumn 2016*, „Monarhia Salvează România”, 5.7.2016, <https://monarhiasalveazaromania.wordpress.com/2016/07/05/the-romanian-parliament-may-vote-a-law-regarding-the-royal-house-of-romania-in-autumn-2016>, 22.6.2016.

¹² *Romanian monarchists, call to restore the Kingdom after legislative elections in 2016*, „Monarhia Salvează România”, 17.6.2016, <https://monarhiasalveazaromania.wordpress.com/2016/06/17/romanian-monarchists-call-to-restore-the-kingdom-after-legislative-elections-in-2016/>, 22.6.2016.

government.¹³ The republicans' concerns regarding a potential restitution of the monarchy were calmed by the constitutionalists, who reminded that pursuant to Art. 152 Para. 1 of the constitution, the rules determining the republican system are unchangeable.¹⁴ This means that introduction of the monarchy in Romania would require a complete change of the constitution into the new one, which at this moment is impossible. The public opinion poll, conducted in March 2016, proved that support for the restoration of the monarchy in Romania was not strong and amounted to approx. 21%.¹⁵ In the justification of the proposal it was also highlighted that democratic nature of the political system was secured by establishing the principle of control by the Parliament (so the people's representative) over the Head of the Royal House. Firstly – he/she must be approved by both Chambers of Parliament, and secondly – he/she must submit an annual report to the legislature. Fact that the approval of the Head of the House must take place before the adoption of the Statute was indicated as an additional protection of democracy and the constitution.¹⁶ For the meantime, it is exactly this institution (the Statute) that might arouse the greatest reservations due to the fact that the proposal contains very general provisions on its content. The Statute is to determine, among the others, the principles of appointing the Head of the Royal House, and so the rules of succession. This is a factor of crucial importance because the Head receives specific rights and competences. The Statute and its amendments can be adopted independently by the Head of the House, without having to obtain the approval of the Parliament, government, or any other public authority. In addition, the Statute is to define additional obligations of the Head and the Executive Office. It is not clear from Art. 146 of the Constitution of Romania whether the Romanian Constitutional Court has the power to examine the constitutionality of the Statute of the Royal House and the right of invalidation of its unconstitutional provisions. It is also doubtful what would be the place of the Statute in the hierarchy of the Romanian sources of law. The current rules on the functioning and organization of the Royal House are defined by so-called, Fundamental Rights (*Normele fundamentale ale Familiei Regale a României*¹⁷) octroyed by Michael in 2007. It can be thus assumed that the future Statute would duplicate many, if not all provisions of these Rights. One of the important provisions of this document is

¹³ C. Popa, *Reacția Familiei Regale...; Expunere de Motive...*, p. 3.

¹⁴ Constitution of Romania of 21 November 1991, Parliament of Romania: Chamber of Deputies, <http://www.cdep.ro/pls/dic/site.page?id=371>, 9.2.2017.

¹⁵ T. Vișan-Miu, *Reinstituționalizarea Casei Regale: întrebări și răspunsuri*, „Monarhia Salvează România” 30.06.2016, <https://monarhiasalveazaromania.wordpress.com/2016/06/30/reinstituționalizarea-casei-regale-intrebări-si-răspunsuri/>, 9.02.2017.

¹⁶ *Expunere de Motive...*, p. 3.

¹⁷ *Normele fundamentale ale Familiei Regale a României. Statutul complet al Casei Regale a României Promulgat prin semnatura Majestății Sale Regelui Mihai I al României Pentru a succede tuturor celorlalte Statute și Legi ale Casei*, începând cu 30 decembrie 2007, <http://familiaregala.ro/familia-regala/norme-fundamentale-ale-familiei-regale-a-romaniei>.

a change of the succession rules, from the Salic law principle (*Lex Salica* - allowing only male succession) into the semi-Salic. This decision was justified by the will to fulfil the binding European Union rules and standards defined in the European Convention on Human Rights (Annex 1, Section B of Fundamental Rights). Now, the right to the throne of Romania can be also inherited by women but on condition that the outgoing "king *de-iure*" has no male heir. The pro-European stipulation does not apply to several other provisions of the Rights, which may cast doubts on their compliance with the constitution. They include provisions relating to the necessary consent of the Head of the House for marriage, as well as for a possibility of beginning divorce proceedings by a member of the royal family (Art. 8). Illegitimate descendants of the House members are deprived of membership in the House, without any possibility of redefining their legal status (Art. 4). Also, a person adopted by a member of the House, as a rule, does not obtain the rights entitled to the members. The Fundamental Rights also contain regulations on the powers of the monarch as the *fons honorum*, such as conferring orders and honorary titles (Art. 11). The compatibility of this issue should be also checked with the binding legislation and the Romanian Constitution, respectively.

The comments of the legal researchers also refer to the unusual legal form of the Reigning's House, suggested in the governmental proposal. It was harmoniously agreed that neither a form of an association nor of a foundation is suitable for the Reigning House. It should be pointed out that the House's various forms of activity include both: foundations (The Princess Margareta of Romania Foundation, established in 1990,¹⁸ The Romanian Royal Family Collection Foundation, established in 2010) and associations (e.g. The Association of Royal House Suppliers and The Association for Supporting Sustainable Development, established by members of the Royal Family), and other entities.¹⁹ On 30 December 1997, Michael the King (he is officially named by this title nowadays) established internal regulations on the status of the Royal House as an "autonomous community of the family". Within the function of the head of the family, he modified its policy and decided on the Royal House membership of each individual family member. The biggest controversy aroused in consequence of the above-mentioned change of succession rules and breaking the Salic law, which had been in force in the House of Hohenzollern, traditionally excluding women from inheriting the throne. In 1997, Michael, who has no sons, eventually rejected the suggestion of the previous head of the Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen family to appoint his successor from one of the male descendants of the family. Instead of this, he entrusted this function to his oldest daughter, Princess Margaret. In 2007 he confirmed

¹⁸ The Princess Margareta of Romania Foundation brings a significant contribution to restoring the civil society in Romania. The Foundation finances educational, social (relating to children, youth and seniors) projects, as well as promotes development and local initiatives. Foundation webpage <http://fpmr.ro>.

¹⁹ T. Vișan-Miu, *Reinstituționalizarea...*

his decision and established the new rules of succession in the Romanian Royal House. In subsequent years, he decided to exclude from the line of succession one of his daughters, Irene (after her conviction by a court for the participation in conducting illegal cockfighting in Oregon). In 2015 he also excluded his grandson Nicholas (Nicolae). It was a surprising decision and its reasons have been never announced (except a vague statement that the future monarch must have the appropriate character and be distinguished by the right way of being).²⁰

Dr. Alexander Muraru, a Romanian political system expert, described the governmental proposal as re-institutionalization of the Royal House.²¹ Republican state authorities officially recognize existence of the institution derived from the monarchical tradition as a part of the republican system. The Royal House officially existed as a political system institution between 1866 and 1947, so until the abdication of Michael the King and the overthrow of the monarchy during the communist coup. Since then it has operated as a symbolic institution. The first part of the royal family's return to Romania took place in 1997, when Michael came back to the state and actively supported Romania's accession to the NATO and the European Union. At this point in time, the official cooperation of state authorities with the former King and his family began. Thanks to the King's wide international connections, the collaboration proved to be very fruitful and brought numerous benefits to the country. Romanian authorities restored citizenship of the ex-King and granted him the powers vested in the former Presidents (under the Act of 2001 on the Privileges of Serving as Head of the Romanian State²²) and returned part of the non-movable property belonging to the ruling family before 1947. The Elizabeta Palace in Bucharest received the status of residency of the former head of state. Thus, the fortune of the Royal House is quite impressive. It consists of several palaces and castles, non-movable property in Bucharest and various parts of the state, including approx. 20 thousand hectares of forest. Not all of its components have been granted by the state voluntarily and willingly. In 2005 the Constitutional Court declared that the law entitling the King to receive compensation for the property lost after the war, in a total amount of EUR 30 million, was unconstitutional. The damages were to include, among the others, a nationalized palace-castle complex in Sinai (castles: Peleş, Pelişor i Foişor, together with the surrounding buildings).²³ In this way, the former King of Ro-

²⁰ Born in Switzerland in 1985 and raised in the United Kingdom, Nicholas Medforth-Mills, son of the king's younger daughter Helena. Enjoyed widespread popularity in Romania, where he settled in 2012. In 2007 Michael announced his grandson as the third in line of succession (after his aunt and mother) and on the occasion of the 25th birthday he gave him the title of His Royal Highness the Prince of Romania. (E.Graham-Harrison, *Prince Nicholas, Romanian royal with the common touch, cut from succession*, The Guardian, 11.08.2015).

²¹ A. Muraru, *Casa Regală a României, în drum spre instituționalizare*, Sinteza, 27.04.2016.

²² Lege nr. 406 (10.07.2001) privind acordarea unor drepturi persoanelor care au avut calitatea de sef al statului roman (Monitorul Oficial nr. 386, 16.07.2001).

²³ *Romanian court rejects bill on compensation to ex-king*, 10.11.2005, http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2005-11/10/content_3759681.htm, 8.2.2017.

mania was to join the monarchs Alexander of Yugoslavia and Simeon of Bulgaria, who had received back their properties or had been paid compensation by the states. King Michael was to obtain the possibility of occasional use of former royal residences. Although the Court found the law unconstitutional, *inter alia* due to the breach of the principle of equality of all before the law, latterly the King won the right to the royal palace in a civil procedure. Not without significance was the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights of 2001 on a similar dispute that found decision of the Greek authorities of 1994, about the confiscation of the King Constantine's property unlawful, which is why it ordered its return.²⁴ In practice, the Romanian state still uses many of the historic buildings, officially belonging to the Royal House. For the use of one of the biggest tourist attractions of Romania - the royal castle in Peles - the state pays the royal family a monthly fee of 6000 lei (equivalent of approx. EUR 1300), equal to the rent of two apartments in Bucharest.²⁵

The Royal House has never regained the formal legal status in independent Romania.²⁶ This fact, according to the Statute's supporters, causes certain difficulties in cooperation with the central and local authorities. At the same time, the Royal House, granted with a legal personality, may successfully serve as an institution supporting the young Romanian democracy, which is needed by this state in the face of weak trust in politicians and waning support for the democratic system.²⁷

The most controversial issue was the question of financing the activities of the Royal House from the state budget, salaries for the Head of the House and supporting 20 persons of administrative staff. Supporters of the project argue that this number is 10 times lower than the presidential administration and 20 times lower than the staff of the government administration officials. The critics claim that although King Michael himself is widely respected by Romanians, after his death, the state budget will be financing activities of his family, which is variously valued by the citizens, and certainly does not enjoy such a great authority. Thus, the currently low percentage of the royal family critics (approx. 5%) might increase. To spice the case up, it is worth mentioning that the King lost another lawsuit against the state for the unpaid taxes, for an amount which together with the interest has grown to EUR 900 thousand (the judgment is not final).²⁸ Sociologist Mircea Kivu drew attention to the fact that although the expenses to be borne by the budget, in connection with the Royal House's activities, are relatively small, it

²⁴ E. Tomiuć, *Romania: Former Monarch Wins Restitution Claim*, „Radio Free Europe”, 30.06.2005 <http://www.rferl.org/a/1059599.html>, 8.2.2017.

²⁵ A. Muraru, *Casa Regală...*

²⁶ T. Vișan-Miu, *Reinstituționalizarea...*

²⁷ A. Muraru, *Casa Regală a României...*

²⁸ Taxes were related to the amount received from the sale of timber from the royal forests. *Romania's King Michael loses trial with Tax Agency*, „Romania Insider”, 27.6.2016, <http://www.romania-insider.com/romania-king-michael-loses-trial-tax-agency/>, 8.2.2017.

seems that imposing of these expenses on the state had been the main objective of the Statute. The activeness of the Royal Family members, in the areas indicated by the proposal, already takes place, so does performing functions determined by the draft. Therefore, the statutory regulation in these fields was not necessary. Kivu stressed another important fact. In the circumstances of a ruthless political struggle and a sudden decrease of trust in politicians and political institutions, the Royal Family should continue to stay away from the official politics and maintain a neutral, symbolic status. Achieving this may be prevented by the statute.²⁹

It was underlined in the comments that the initiative of the Romanian government is not isolated and similar proposals have also occurred in Bulgaria and Serbia,³⁰ although they have not brought any substantial results so far. Steps taken by the Montenegrin authorities turned out to be much more efficient, though. There not only was the proposal issued but the statute granting the former royal family an official status was also adopted. The Montenegrin solutions do not provide the reigning family with such a broad autonomy as the Romanian proposal. Nevertheless, they already entered into force and have been binding since 2011.

4. Montenegro is the last state, excluding Kosovo, created after the breakup of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY). Two of its republics, firstly remained within the reconstituted Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (28 April 1992), which became a federation called "Serbia and Montenegro" on 4 February 2003. On 3 June 2006, as a result of the earlier independence referendum of 21 May, the state became divided, which resulted in establishing two independent states: Serbia and Montenegro. Under their mutual agreement, Serbia became the successor of the previously existing Serbia and Montenegro.³¹ In subsequent years, Montenegro successfully applied for admission to the UN (2006), the Council of Europe (2007) and the NATO (2009). Moreover, in 2010 it became a recognized candidate for future member of the European Union.

Montenegrin sentiment to monarchy revived already at the beginning of the process of regaining the full sovereignty. The scenario was similar to that known from Romania but it had been accomplished earlier. In 2004 the Parliament of Montenegro (still functioning in the federation with Serbia) established the coat of arms of the state that referred to the traditional national symbols. Some of them, headed by the crown, scepter and royal apple in the paws of the double-headed eagle, were generally accepted (not without controversy) as symbols of monarchic traditions of the state.³²

²⁹ M. Kivu, *Casa Regală – o instituție republicană?*, „România Liberă” 28.06.2016, <http://www.romania-libera.ro/opinii/comentarii/-casa-regala---o-institutie-republicana--421224>, 9.2.2017.

³⁰ A. Muraru, *Reinstituționalizarea Familiei Regale și „noua monarhie”*, „Revista Timpul” 11.03.2016, <http://revistatimpul.ro/view-article/3019>, 8.2.2017.

³¹ *Montenegro Country Review*, Country Watch, 2008, <http://www.countrywatch.com> Chapter 2: Political Overview, p. 24–28 and next.

³² *Coat of arms of Montenegro*, Symbols.com, 2017, <http://www.symbols.com/symbol/1802>, 11.02.2017.

A small nation of Montenegrins, consisting of a number of warlike clans, led by the elective princes, experienced a turbulent history typical for the southern Slavs. Despite the fact of being constantly threatened by its influential neighbors, primarily by Venice, Ottoman Turkey and Austria, the nation managed to maintain a relative independence, and a unique autonomy within the Turkish Empire. Since the end of the 17th century, Montenegro was ruled by the Serbian bishop-princes (Vladikas) from Petrović-Njegoš's dynasty. Under these rulers, in the 19th century the Montenegrins started to succeed militarily over the Turks, which led to enlargement of their state and eventually to obtaining independence recognized by international community (1878). The last ruler of the Petrović-Njegoš dynasty, Nicholas I (Nikola I) occupied the throne after his murdered uncle, Daniel I (Danilo I). He was ruling between 1860 and 1910, firstly as the Prince and then as the first - and, as it turned out afterwards - the last King. Under his rule, Montenegro won a spectacular victory over Turkey, regained many territories and gained full independence. He had several talents and was successful in the field of literature and military. He was a proud father of twelve children. In 1905 the first constitution was adopted and in 1910 Montenegro became a kingdom. During the World War I, Montenegro stood on the side of the Triple Entente. After the war, in 1918, the so-called Podgorica Assembly decided to join the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (from 1929 Kingdom of Yugoslavia) under the rule of the Serbian Karadjordjevic dynasty (*Karadžorđević*).³³ After being deprived of the throne, Nicholas I went to France, where he died three years later (1921). 5 out of his 9 daughters married members of the ruling families, pretenders to the throne or Kings (King of Serbia, King of Italy, pretender to the throne of Bulgaria and members of the Romanov family).³⁴

Currently, the *de iure* King of Montenegro is Nicholas II, a great-grandson of Nicholas I, using the title of Crown Prince. He was born and raised in France and is an architect by profession.³⁵ He came to the country of his ancestors in 1989, accompanying the last remains of the royal couple, Nicholas I and Milena, and their daughters. Since that time he has been involved in the numerous projects promoting Montenegro in the world.³⁶ He was supporting the state's efforts on its way to join the international organizations and supported the separation of the federation with Serbia. Prince Nicholas became prominent in 2010, when he publicly addressed the Karadjordjevic family, demanding them pleading guilty for depriving the throne of his great-grandfather, after the forced annexation of Montenegro to the future Kingdom of Yugoslavia, ruled by this Serbian family (the last King of Montenegro was banned from entering his kingdom). The statement of

³³ K. Morrison, *Montenegro: a Modern History*, London–New York 2009, p. 27.

³⁴ B. Jelavich, *History of the Balkans*, Vol. 2: *Twentieth Century*, p. 36–37.

³⁵ *Almanach de Gotha*, Volume I, Part 1, London 1999, p. 242–243.

³⁶ *Fondacija Petrović Njegoš: Royal Family*, <http://fondacija-njegos.org/en/fondacija/kraljevska-porodica-crna-gora/>, 28.1.2017

Prince Nicholas II was harshly commented by the Karadjordjevićs' spokesman (he said that Prince Nicholas should think before saying a word). The official position of the Serbian court is based on the premise that the integration of Montenegro into the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes in 1918, was not a coup or any illegal action but a result of the referendum, therefore an implementation of the will of the uniting nations, including the Montenegrins.³⁷ Prince Nicholas explained afterwards, that he did not demand an apology, as had been suggested by the media but only the public acknowledgment of the harm done to his family. He said he did not blame the present Karadjordjević family members for their ancestors' acts but he waited for a gesture of goodwill. Such attitude brings him many supporters in Montenegro, which laboriously builds its own identity, unrelated to the Serbian influences. On the other hand, Serbian public opinion considers these attempts as artificial. The most radical Serbs consider Montenegrins to be Serbs, and their language - Serbian. They even claim that there is a "Montenegrin conspiracy" - Serbia suffered losses and defeats always when it was ruled by the people of Montenegrin origin (like Milošević or Karadžić).³⁸

It is worth mentioning that the ancestors of Prince Nicholas were not so critical towards the Karadjordjević family. King Nicholas I married his daughter off to one of this family members. Father of Prince Nicholas' II, Prince Michael (Mihajlo), officially recognized the family's monarchical rights and renounced his claims to the Montenegrin's throne. Serbian King Alexander granted Prince Nicholas with a fixed salary. Under the ruling of Yugoslavian King Peter II, Prince Nicholas became a member of the Crown Council and vowed his loyalty to him. After the World War II, Prince Michael supported Tito, hoping that he would restore independence of Montenegro. He also acted as a chief of diplomatic protocol at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In 1948 he realized the true intentions of the communist leader, then he gave up a career of a Yugoslav diplomat and emigrated permanently to France, where his son - Prince Nicholas - was born.³⁹

In 2010 it was officially announced that the Montenegrin government began working on the law proposal on the status of the former Montenegrin royal family. This seemed rather surprising, because the coalition government was formed by two left-wing parties, including a post-communist one. The proposal was not consulted with the Prince. After receiving it, the Prince expressed a very critical opinion in the open letter to the authorities of Montenegro, in which he explained why he had categorically rejected the government's proposal in the suggested shape. Consequently, he said that he would not take part in the celebrations of the 100th

³⁷ T.N. Đaković, *Srpski princ neće da se izvinjava crnogorskom*, <http://www.blic.rs/vesti/tema-dana/srpski-princ-neece-da-se-izvinjava-crnogorskom/zbsymd1>, 28.1.2017.

³⁸ M. Bozinovich, *The "Montenegrin Conspiracy"*, 30.7.2010, <http://serbianna.com/blogs/bozinovich/archives/768>, 30.1.2017.

³⁹ M. Eilers Koenig, *Montenegro gets a prince ... sort of*, <http://royalmusingsblogspotcom.blogspot.com/2011/07/montenegro-gets-prince-sort-of.html>, 21.7.2011, 28.1.2017

anniversary of the establishment of the Kingdom of Montenegro in 2010, where he was supposed to be the most important guest. In the letter, the Prince also disclosed that since 2005 there had been negotiations between the royal family and the state authorities concerning the conditions of the family's return to Montenegro. He was even more surprised by the fact of being provided with the finished proposal, without prior invitation to the participation in the editorial work. He also presented his expectations regarding shape of the statute that he could accept.⁴⁰ The letter was widely commented. All of these resulted in the meeting of both parties and reformulating the suitable provisions of the draft. This issue divided the Montenegrin political scene. Politicians of the opposition party were strongly against the idea of institutionalization and financing the royal family from the state budget, Prime Minister and Minister of Justice found the proposed solutions optimal, while according to the President of the Parliament, working on the project should have been carried out in consultation with Prince Nicholas.⁴¹

Eventually, the government sent the proposal version agreed with the Prince to Parliament and the Montenegrin legislature adopted it on 12 July 2011 by the majority of the ruling coalition and with the objection of the opposition. The Prince, at the state authorities' invitation, came to Montenegro to thank for this important gesture. Especially for the fact, that the law found the seizure of power by the Karadjordjević dynasty and annexation of Montenegro to the Kingdom of SHS illegal and harmful to the Petrović-Njegoš dynasty. He considered it as an act of historical justice and expressed his hopes for improving relationship with the Serbian royal family.⁴²

The Law of 12 July 2011 on the Status of Descendants of the Petrović-Njegoš Dynasty (*Zakon o statusu potomaka dinastije Petrović Njegoš*) consists of 18 articles. It starts with introductory provisions, which clearly correspond to the appeal of Prince Nicholas. Art. 1 states explicitly that the purpose of the Law is the moral and historical rehabilitation of the Petrović-Njegoš family and that their dethronement occurred in a manner inconsistent with the constitution of 1905 and by the act of the forced annexation of the state in 1918. Arts 2 and 3 of the document contain provisions not encountered in the republican political systems. The Law officially recognizes the existence of "Petrović-Njegoš dynasty" and its continuation in the persons of the male descendants of King Nicholas I and their wives, defined as "descendants of the dynasty" (*potomci dinastije*). The Law sets an exception to the general rule of exclusive Montenegrin citizenship, defined in the Act on Citizenship (the exception applies to cases arising from international

⁴⁰ *Le Monténégro fête les 100 ans du royaume sans l'héritier de la dynastie Petrović Njegoš*, 30.8.2010, <http://www.courrierdesbalkans.fr/le-fil-de-l-info/le-montenegro-fete-les-100-ans-du-royaume-sans-l-heritier-de-la-dynastie-petrovic-njegosh.html>, 30.1.2017.

⁴¹ V. Radojević, *Princ Nikola na svadbi u Londonu*, „Večernje Novosti“, 30.8.2010, <http://www.novosti.rs/vesti/planeta.300.html:298141-Princ-Nikola-na-svadbi-u-Londonu>, 30.1.2017.

⁴² *Признање, а не извињење*, РТС-Радио-телевизија Србије, 24.7.2011, <http://www.rts.rs/page/stories/ci/story/3/region/929702/priznanje-a-ne-izvinjenje.html>, 30.1.2017.

bilateral agreements). Descendants of the dynasty have the right to multiple nationality (Art. 8). However, in order to retain their status and privileges, they must not engage in any political activities. Descendants of the dynasty are entitled to use the non-movable properties specified by the Law. For the purpose of official activities, they were given part of the Kruševac palace in Podgorica. For their personal use, they received a house in Njegoš, formerly belonged to King Michael I, along with a garden and meadows, a 120-meter apartment in Podgorica and a house that will be built in Cetinje within two years (according to the design of Prince Michael), financed by the state budget.

Art. 3 of the Law determines that the right and duty of the dynasty's descendants is to guard and maintain dynastic traditions in the following activities: cultural, humanitarian and other non-political in nature, in order to strengthen and maintain Montenegrin identity, culture and tradition. This role that the royal family has been appointed to, relates to the role that the reigning families play in the monarchies themselves. The clause included in Art. 4, obliging the descendants of the dynasty to respect the integrity of the state and to abide by its constitution, is important in the meaning of Art. 1 of the Constitution of Montenegro, which determines the republican form of the state. Therefore, in this way the monarchic element has been clearly limited.

The objective of maintaining and developing the dynastic traditions in the public interest of Montenegro is to be achieved mainly through the activities of the Petrović-Njegoš Foundation. The Law specifies that the Foundation will receive for its statutory activities, within seven years, a total amount of EUR 4.3 million from the state budget. The residence of the Foundation is Montenegro. Members of the Foundation (descendants of the dynasty) shall manage its assets independently. Detailed regulations on the activities of the Foundation are defined by the Act on Foundations.

Art. 5 is particularly interesting, because it states that an institution of the "Representative of the Descendants of the Dynasty" shall be fulfilled by the oldest male descendant of the ruling family. At the same time the Law defines rules of this function's succession, which takes place in a natural way (inheritance) by passing on the oldest male heir. This solution is absolutely unique in the democratic-republican world and it allows to classify the system of Montenegro as falling into the mixed republics with monarchic elements. The "Representative" has not been named a king or a prince but according to the Law he has the right to use the heraldic symbols of the Petrović-Njegoš dynasty, which represents another monarchical privilege.

The scope of activities and tasks of the Representative has been only partially determined. He is *ex officio* (thus in a sense also by birth) the Chairman of the Family Foundation Board. He can be also appointed by the President of Montenegro, the Prime Minister or the President of Parliament, to perform other functions of protocol or formal nature. In case of entrusting him to additional functions,

the Representative has the right to use the means and resources, including non-movable property, remaining in state ownership. The Law also provides him with adequate administrative support. "The Representative" also has numerous privileges. He is expected to receive a state subsidy to conduct his tasks. The grant will be spread over six years starting from 2011. Moreover, after the effective expiry of the aforementioned deadline for the transfer of the full amount of subsidies by the state, he shall receive a monthly salary from the state, equal to the salary of the President of Montenegro (approx. EUR 1885⁴³).

Evaluation of the Law in terms of its general and specific provisions varies. Even the opinions of the supporters of the monarchy restoration are divided. Some believe that Prince Nicholas made a first important step on the long and arduous road to the restoration of the monarchy, while the others consider him as a person who sold his ideals for several million euros.⁴⁴ The monarchists' hopes remain unabated and many of them believe that there is still a chance for the restitution of the monarchy in Montenegro. This might be the beginning of a larger movement in South Eastern Europe. Strong monarchist sympathies have been seen for many years also in Serbia. There is no doubt that the solutions implemented by the Law on the Status of Descendants of the Petrović-Njegoš Dynasty, have neither a precedent nor equivalent in the world. There is no other state of the constitutionally defined republican system, which has the institutions typical for the monarchic system. The manifestation of the monarchical principle is represented first and foremost by the institution of the hereditary "Representative of the descendants of the dynasty" – being passed on exclusively in the male line. Additional example is another institution of the ruling house, in this case, bearing euphemistic name of "Descendants of the Dynasty". Next feature typical for the monarchy is financing the dynasty from the state budget and a possibility, or even a recommendation, to engage its members ("descendants") in the official state activities - of internal and foreign (but not of party-political) nature. For some commentators the above-mentioned facts prove that the foundations of the monarchical system in Montenegro have been already introduced. These opinions are strongly exaggerated. Undoubtedly, Montenegro still remains a republic, as follows from the constitution in force, though there are certainly symptoms of monarchical principle in its system. This makes it a case without precedent in the 21st century Europe. According to the government reports and press releases, implementation of the act's provisions has been proceeded without any interference so far.⁴⁵

⁴³ R. Mateos, *La República de Montenegro rehabilita a su antigua Familia Real con los mayores honores*, 24.7.2011, <http://extraconfidencial.com/noticias/la-republica-de-montenegro-rehabilita-a-su-antigua-familia-real-con-los-mayores-honores/>, 31.1.2017.

⁴⁴ Montenegro, *What Royalist Progress Looks Like*, MadMonarchist, 1.10.2014, <http://madmonarchist.blogspot.com/2014/10/montenegro-what-royalist-progress-looks.html>, 30.1.2017.

⁴⁵ According to the government's report on the implementation of the Act of 2015, the budgetary resources for its execution are secured. In addition, the Representative of the Descendants of the Dynasty requested, on behalf of the family, a modification of one of the provisions relating to the

5. South Eastern Europe seeks its political identity. This process has been always strong because of the complicated history and continuous attacks on the sovereignty of the states and nations of this part of the world. Recently it has been additionally intensified by the refugee-migration crisis. Not surprisingly, more states of this part of the continent begin to appreciate their monarchical traditions, especially that in retrospect they take a slightly idealized form.

The initiative launched in Romania and implemented in Montenegro received a diverse evaluation. It is certainly an interesting and original solution towards a political system. The republican form of the state, hitherto existing in Montenegro, approached the mixed form with clearly defined monarchic elements. The same could and still may happen in Romania. The state system continues to be republican and democratic, in accordance with the constitutional provisions, but it gains a valuable monarchic supplement. To consider a state as a monarchical republic, the institution of the hereditary and lifelong ruling monarch should be officially restored. Montenegro is very close to this solution.

In case of this state, any further steps towards the establishment of the monarchy would require a constitutional amendment. In Romania, this establishment would be possible after adopting a new constitution in order to abolish the ban on the liquidation of the republican form of state, which currently is not likely to happen. Then, what is the purpose of such manoeuvre? It has been written a lot about a huge promotional potential of the monarchy and the royal family, in terms of values and culture but also economy and diplomacy. Native monarchies play significant role in strengthening the sense of unity and national identity. It also happens, and perhaps more often, when monarchs no longer exercise the ruling functions. The examples of Romania and Montenegro prove that in states with republican systems, this role may be also played by the former monarchs (monarchs de jure).

At this point it is worth quoting a Romanian political scientist and supporter of the monarchy Dr. Alexander Muraru: "The Royal House of Romania, just like the other royal houses in Europe, constituting family communities (both - ruling and removed from power), found themselves in a similar situation today. It persists in the approach that neither corresponds to the challenges of the present nor to the expectations and needs of the Romanian society. The significance of the Eu-

dynastic immovables (zob. *Predlog informaciji o realizaciji obaveza proisteklih iz Zakona o statusu potomaka dinastije Petrović-Njegoš*, Vlada Crneje Gore, <http://www.gov.me/ResourceManager/FileDownload.aspx?rId=233889&rType=2>) The Foundation of the royal family carries out programs supporting state authorities' actions, among the others in the field of culture, health care and foreign policy. (see *Realizovati obaveze iz Zakona o statusu potomaka dinastije Petrović-Njegoš*, CDM.me, <http://www.cdm.me/politika/realizovati-obaveze-iz-zakona-o-statusu-potomaka-dinastije-petrovic-njegos/> 27.3.2015, 10.2.2017; *Princ Nikola Petrović i predstavnici Fondacije Petrović Njegoš i Fondacije „Coeur de la Tour“ posjetili Ministarstvo zdravlja*, 19.1.2017, <http://www.gov.me/pretraga/168567/SAOPsTENJE-Princ-Nikola-Petrovic-i-predstavnici-Fondacije-Petrovic-Njegos-i-Fondacije-Coeur-de-la-Tour-posjetili-Ministarstvo-zd.html>, 10.2.2017).

ropean Union Member State depends nowadays primarily on its ability to build bridges inside and outside, to unite the society and elites, to depoliticize state institutions and to fill the gaps that exist between the center and the periphery of society. The aim is to tame the political Leviathan by the citizens and to improve social relations. Romania, in the current, post-accession period, needs institutions and organizations that will enhance public confidence in the political system, understood not as a form of power but rather a set of rules and regulations aimed at developing the society, freedom and democracy". According to Dr. Muraru, the Royal House fits to the role of so-called supporting institution, which according to Swedish political scientist Prof. Bo Rothstein, aims to resolve, prevent and mitigate problems arising during the development process of democratic societies. It can also significantly support building the social capital (trust) based on the good evaluation of public institutions, personal happiness of citizens, their optimism and tolerance, as well as economic growth and democratic stability.

The characteristics outlined by the Romanian political scientist can also be related to Montenegro. The cases of these two states represent unique examples of an attempt (Romania) and a successful attempt (Montenegro) to introduce the monarchic elements into the republican regime. Interestingly, in case of Montenegro, this project seems to be a complementary, successfully ended political process rather than a step towards restoration of the monarchy, as some commentators think – some with hope while others with fear. In this way, a group of mixed political systems (next to the mixed monarchies) expands by the mixed republics, where there is no King but there are para-monarchical bodies, including the para-monarch. Even if it does not lead to the initiation of the Montenegrin political system's evolution on the way to the monarchy, at this stage we can still expect further, tiny but important complementation, for example a separation and institutionalization of the spouse of "Representative of the descendants of the dynasty" and his temporary deputy (thus the regent). Further expansion of the "fons honorum" function, performed by "Representative", can lead to the restoration (at least partially) of the institution of nobility and the development of personal heraldry. All these institutions, typical of a monarchic system, can simply arise under the conditions of the dominant forms of republican political system.

Time will tell whether the Romanians follow the example of the Montenegrins and give a legal personality and the official status to the former royal family. Time will also show whether the Montenegrin experiment succeeds. It seems that in this mild form it has a good chance of success. Following the Montenegro's footsteps by Romania and perhaps also Serbia and Albania, can strengthen the described political processes and increase the presence of monarchic principle in the mixed republican systems in South Eastern Europe. It is certainly worth looking at this process with attention.