

Chapter 15 : The Torekov compromise

It is not the monarchy as such I have problems with, it is the king personally I want to get at.

Red Top, the chronicle "Things we seldom hear".

In 1918 Gustaf V was forced to accept parliamentarianism & universal suffrage, but during the 1920 & 1930 "unity governments" continued to have an important role by proposing candidates & persuading them to participate. This was needed because of the difficulty of securing support in both chambers. In 1933, the 1st Chamber was "democratized" by the abolition of the property requirements, which led to a gradual levelling. In 1971 the party representation in the chambers was almost identical and there was no opposition to merging them. Two investigations into parliamentary democracy were carried out: 1954-1963 (the review) and 1966-1972 (the draft). The review investigated the current practice. The draft changed it.

* * *

A. THE CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW (1954-1963)

The constitutional review included a section on "The General Status of the Head of State":

"The General status of the Head of State

As regards defining the role of the Head of State within the system of government, the general approach has been as follows. The investigation has found it natural to put this question of principle first: What tasks should be assigned to the Head of State in a modern parliamentary democracy? In order to examine this question, the question of who is the head of state, a monarch or a president, does not in itself have to be decisive.

The Head of State traditionally has certain representative functions. Outwardly, he appears in some contexts as a representative of the kingdom. In relation to various ministries in a parliamentary democracy, he can represent the principle of continuity within the national government. The Head of State's position as the prime representative of the nation also includes some ceremonial duties.

The functions of the Head of State in modern democracy vary widely. The powers of the President of the Swiss Confederation are thus very limited, having been elected for a year and essentially acting merely as the chairman of the Government. The opposite extreme is represented by the President of the United States, the leader of his country's policy with extensive autonomy in decision-making, with a government whose members are regarded as his personal aides and endowed with a right of veto over the decisions of Congress.

The fact that a country is very large, that different peoples are brought together within a state, that there are strong divisions within the population are some of the circumstances, which can be invoked as a reason for the Head of State to be given special duties as political leader or as arbitrator between conflicting interests. As to Sweden, on the other hand, applies that our country is a small unitary state with comparatively very moderate regional differences, that the country has a population

that is unusually homogeneous in terms of descent, language, culture and religion and that therefore the minority problems mentioned above do not exist and follows that political life and the societal organizations are characterized by uniformity and a remarkable degree of undisturbed operation. Against this background, it is difficult to argue that there is a need to add any extensive powers to the Head of State. Therefore, in view of this investigation, the specific tasks of the Head of State, other than those of a representative and ceremonial nature, should be limited to those of the functioning of the parliamentary system. In relation to the current form of government, this means a strong limitation of the powers of the King. However, in the light of current constitutional practice, the proposal of the inquiry on this point can essentially be regarded as a codification and clarification of how it actually operates.”¹

Thus, the position of the constitutional inquiry was that as long as Sweden lacked separatists and troublemakers, neither the king nor the president were important for the cohesion of the country. Nor was his tasks in the everyday operation of the parliamentary system particularly burdensome. There are a couple of depictions:

After breakfast it was time for signatures. At that time [1951-1972], the king would sign a variety of papers. Government bills, constitutions, proxies, etc. All these documents came every day in a large, black and locked bag to the adjutant. The King wanted them arranged by department with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs first and within the departments with propositions and constitutions first and then proxies or other letters. It could sometimes be hundreds. Normally about twenty-thirty. ... The King first read the summary before signing. At some point, he could become extra interested and read the whole text. Then he wrote his characteristic signature.²

The councils themselves [1958] usually go very fast - 35, 40 minutes of swinging the gavel - but they have been preceded by a lot of effort also for Mr. Bernadotte's part. All the more important matters he has familiarized himself with in advance; The Prime Minister or the Departmental Head - or both - have presented them to him, for example, on a visit to his reception room or after a Council. And should he discover during the councils that something has passed him by, he will stop the gavel and ask for an orientation; No confusion here.³

On the council table stands the collected Swedish constitution. On a table at the window facing slottsbacken a red wine bottle and some glasses. Some people drink wine mixed with water. They pour themselves after a servant uncorking the bottle. Formerly the red wine was specially imported - Chateau Lynch-Bage's vintage 1954, now [1963] it is a simple Burgundy, brand Macon. Clothing is optional but it is customary to dress discreetly. King Gustaf VI sometimes asks about the matters, especially if it concerns higher appointments, but mostly nods. When the Council is over, the king usually stays for a while to deliberate with some or other councillor. When he returns from Sofiero or abroad he signs the Minister of Justice's decree that he has retaken the government of the kingdom.⁴

¹ SOU 1963:17, ss. 137-138.

² Björkman 1987: ss. 16-17.

³ Strömstedt, Bo ”Han sköter sig mönstergillt.” Expressen 1958-12-28.

⁴ Vecko Revyn 1963:26.

The average number of signatures per year was 7,000. Gusty also hosted 3000 guests and protected 200 associations (=attended annual meetings or granted them an audience): military, non-profit, scientific, sporting & artistic. The wine under the Council seems a step upwards, since Gustaf V only offered beer.

The proposal was that the 1809 constitution should be rewritten so that the map conformed to the terrain and be politically neutral in the sense that it did not in any obvious way mention the king's social position.

*

The Republican reaction to the proposal was unexpectedly vehement. Herbert Tingsten's book (1964) "Should the royal power be strengthened? : criticism of the draft constitution" argued that the inquiry's proposal through its many diplomatic (=succinct, ambiguous & non-binding) formulations could be interpreted as:

- The King is given the right to dismiss the government and individual ministers.
- The King is given the right to reject the Government's proposal in a number of important government matters.
- The King is given the right to refuse the Prime Minister and the government to dissolve the Parliament and announce an early election.

Tingsten also included a chapter on the people's opinion about the monarchy, where he relies heavily on British research (see chapters 19-21).

A number of older notions of the monarchy have been abandoned or at least weakened in connection with the emergence of rationalism and the victory of the people's government. The kingdom of God's grace is practically purged from the debate. Only a few people believe that the lineage of a house of princes or the tradition of possession of a throne would give a monarch any special capacity or talent; This surrogate for the idea of God's grace, still expressed a few decades ago in serious political works, is discredited by research and experience. Even the idea that a king's special upbringing and education forms a good king is now to be found only in the ignorant and the addlebrained. It is clear to most people that a defect in character, talent or judgment trumps decades of the most perfect upbringing - however one imagines it - and that goes for even far less demanding positions than the monarch's (caretaker, agency manager, business leader). Even an appropriate training is never a guarantee for anything.

Yet in many there is still a residual sense of royal magic, shaped by history, fairy tales, conventions. "The king", like "God", is a term so loaded by early associations that many reasonable people say but do not really believe that the king is "an ordinary person" or "God is something within us". This magic can be seen in how royal is treated, in the interest for them as people, in the very way of talking about them. In England in particular, realism and illusion have been reconciled through the use of religious and psychoanalytic terms; It is said that the Queen incarnates the people, that she is a mother symbol and such, and although no one denies the monarch's "commonality" or "humanity", it thus becomes something mysteriously inaccessible, something "higher", surrounding the royals. A number of sociologists have

emphasized that the traits of myth and magic remain alongside insight and vision. There is still a psychological climate for royal action.⁵

In the terminology of this book: The fact that the monarch was still perceived by the people (or at least in crisis situations) as a more legitimate representative of the state than the elected representatives threatened the entire parliamentary system. The fears were not snatched out of thin air. In 1978, 16 percent of the population still considered that the King had the right to intervene personally in serious crisis.⁶

* * *

B. THE CONSTITUTIONAL DRAFT (1966-1972)

The Constitutional draft committee's directive included a review of the role of the Head of State (=monarch), which greatly alarmed many monarchists:

In 1966, the sawmill owner Gottfrid Carlsson in Tutaryds parish in Småland felt obliged to do something and in May began receiving expressions of interest for a citizens' march in support of Gustaf VI and express their concern that "The basic pillars of our society, the Christian heritage and the Swedish form of government are discussed in a way that we in Finnveden in Småland as well as in countless other places in our country can not share".⁷ Carlsson expected up to 100 thousand participants. King Gustaf VI replied very firmly that he did not want to know of such a thing. The constitution was decided on by investigations and parliamentary decisions, not by the "Parliament of the street". It ended with a small audience.

*

The draft committee delayed the discussions about the monarchy's future for as long as possible. The decision, the so-called Torekov-compromise, was negotiated at the Hotel Kattegat in Torekov August 16-20, 1971, by Bertil Fiskesjö (s), Allan Hernelius (m), Birger Lundström (fp) & Chairman Valter Åman (s). In the most dramatic descriptions of the outcome, it is said that the monarchy there & then was betrayed, stabbed in the back & died. Hernelius - the royal house's "leading defender" - was said to have been so compromising that both sides named him "kingslayer".⁸ According to Åman, however, this is how it happened:

"The most intricate question, which was put to the very last deliberations, concerned the position of the monarch. It was quite clear, without any intrusive debate, that neither a republic nor an unaltered monarchy would be our final proposal. In addition to the Social Democratic Youth League [SSU], there were also "Republicans" among the youth wing of the People's Party [the liberals] and the Center. It may have had a marginal effect. It was clearer that during his reign, Gustav VI Adolf has clearly rejected a political role, including the proposed Tutaryd march. In fact, it can be said that the monarch himself has shown an unconditional acceptance of the people's power. He would probably have liked some more decorative formulations of the king's

⁵ Tingsten 1964: ss. 64-65.

⁶ Sifo, 1978-04. I: Aftonbladet, Dagens Nyheter & Svenska Dagbladet, 1978-05-30.

⁷ Gottfrid Carlsson. Svenska Dagbladet, 1966-07-11.

⁸ Mårtensson 2000: s. 201.

position. That was not to be. Among the more difficult questions was how to appoint the government if the monarch was deprived of this task. It was resolved by giving the task to the Speaker, who had to comply with the rules. In the event of a total failure, the resolution of Parliament was included as an emergency measure. Finally we agreed on the king no longer chairing the government's decision-making. On the other hand - and this was new - the King as Head of State would be informed by the government not only of its actions but also of its plans – in order for him not being ignorant in contacts with representatives from other countries. When I at one point was asked to come up to King Gustaf VI and explained this, he said: "That's what I would have wanted too!"

Why did we finally agree there in Torekov? We sat in the open air, one party at each table, drinking our coffee. My task was to walk about and seek approval for the final proposal on the position of the monarch.

The longest to hesitate was Allan Hernelius, which was understandable with the traditions of his party. On the socialist side, it was clear that the republican demands had already been abandoned. Personally, I was convinced that its implementation in the Parliament would result in demands for a referendum, which we Social Democrats could not oppose and which we would lose.

In my conversation with Hernelius, I pointed out that a referendum after the social-democratic concessions in the constitution would not apply to or against monarchy as such but for or against the modified monarchy which was now proposed in our investigation. I think that Allan thought himself surrounded by old-fashioned literal-minded monarchists who sought his (somewhat thinned) scalp, but that he still realized what Per Albin Hansson once said: Democracy is perhaps ultimately a compromise! We got unity!"⁹

Bergman (1992) describes how both the Torekov-commission and the political parties were far more interested in compromises than in discussing the role of the monarchy within the parliamentary system. The royal court assumed that the willingness of the Social Democrats to compromise was due to its uncertain position in the Parliament and the willingness of the Moderates (the right) also to compromise was due to they wanting to avoid a bourgeois split.¹⁰ The Swedish Conservatives were not happy with Hernelius' compromise - they would have liked to give the monarchy greater symbolic weight - but succeeded in retrospect in pushing through a few minor changes: The Regent was allowed to retain his immunity from prosecution and he received the highest military rank, albeit no corresponding authority. Hernelius wanted to retain the right of the head of state to appoint senior officials, but had to back down.¹¹ Arne Gadd (s) wanted to abolish the monarchy by giving the Speaker the task of representation, but had to back down he too.¹² The compromising ended February 21, 1972. Gadd later joked that Torekov had reduced the monarchy to "an exclusively heraldic phenomenon".

*

The official Torekov text was very brief. The King's task was to open the Parliament and to keep himself informed of affairs of state. That the king would have additional representative and ceremonial duties, must be inferred. The press release was:¹³

⁹ Åman 1982: ss. 176-177.

¹⁰ Herbert Tingsten. Göteborgs Handels- och Sjöfartstidning, 1971-09-03, ss. 1-2.

¹¹ Dr Besk: Leve Konungen! Leve Parlamentarismen! Kvällsposten, 1971-08-21.

¹² Bohman 1984: ss. 48-58.

¹³ Stjernquist 1971.

Status and powers of the Head of State under a new Constitution:

- The King is the head of state of the nation.
- The governments decision-making meetings are called governmental meetings or Councils. The Cabinet meeting is a meeting between the Head of State and the Government. The Cabinet meeting shall take place at least once every quarter. At the Cabinet meeting, which is chaired by the Head of State, the Government reports on current decisions and measures. It is the Prime Minister's responsibility to keep the Head of State informed about the affairs of the nation. When necessary, the Prime Minister calls for an extraordinary Cabinet meeting.
- When forming a government, the Speaker deliberates with the Deputy Speaker and the party leaders and then appoints the government leader. His proposal is submitted to the Parliament and is considered approved if not more than half of the members vote against. If the proposal is approved, the Parliament is as soon as possible notified of the governments composition. Subsequently, the change of government takes place at a special Cabinet meeting with the Head of State.
- The Head of State chairs meetings of the Foreign Affairs Committee.
- Military authority is exercised by the government.
- At the opening of the Parliament, the Head of State is present and declares on the Speakers request that the Parliament is opened.

In an interview afterwards, Hernelius explained that the King's presence when changing the government and at the Foreign Affairs Committee meetings was to emphasize their importance.¹⁴ The proposition was slightly but not much more detailed: "In his capacity as a unifying representative and symbol of the country as a whole, he performs an important function. ... Otherwise, the representative tasks of the Head of State are largely determined by custom. Certain [diplomatic] functions are included according to international law."¹⁵

*

Initially, popular support for constitutional change was very moderate: *The National Committee for Support of the King* gathered 140,000 protest votes.¹⁶ 80 percent wanted to retain the king's powers as they were. Seven percent wanted to reduce them. 12 percent wanted to reinforce them. 2 percent were uncertain.¹⁷ There was also a vote during the Social Democratic Party Congress in 1969 that the "monarchists" won by 300-50. This & other things have been interpreted as the Torekov-decision was pushed by a small group of party activists and republicans and over everyone's heads according to the motto we are elected - thus we have the mandate to make any decision we feel for:

The investigations of 1954-1973 have confused posterity. "Exactly 20 years were spent resolving problems that most of the assembly agreed on did not exist, where the discussions were about hypothetical situations concerning the relations between the head of state, the ministers and the parliament that had not been relevant since the mid-18th century, gradually paired with a total fixation on realizing the written constitution's role as in every detail descriptive and not in any part weighed down by

¹⁴ Stephan Wagner. Sverige förblir konstitutionell monarki. Helsingborgs dagblad, 1971-08-21.

¹⁵ Prop 1973:90, ss. 170-176.

¹⁶ Svanberg 2010.

¹⁷ Sifo dec 1973. Expressen, 1974-01-10, s. 7.

tradition or forward-looking ideals. It is not yet clear at this stage how the outcome of this whole political process should be interpreted.”¹⁸

One can sum up the Swedish attitude as that political scientists (probably Sweden's most politicized profession) considered a new democratic age dawn, while historians were quite reserved. According to them, the Torekov-compromise was not as unique as the political scientists would have it, but the Age of Liberty in replay. Even then, the royal powers were weak but fulfilled an important constitutional function.¹⁹

* * *

C. ON THE SPIRIT OF THE (BASIC) LAWS

June 4-5, 1975, the State Council for Social Research organized a symposium on the political science & constitutional law forming the basis of the constitutional work.²⁰ As regards the role of the Head of State, the answer was that the Constitutional Committee had compiled several memos on the position of the Head of State in the monarchies of Northern Europe and how they in modern times handled their government formations. However, a memo on the representation of Heads of State has not been found, which seems to have been because the members of the two committees felt such things fell outside the scope of the investigation. Moreover, most members seem like Tingsten to have shared the values of Uppsala School, that ideologies, ceremonies and the like did not belong in the political and legal sciences. The secretary of the constitutional inquiry, political scientist Jörgen Westerståhl, rejected the Torekov-compromise as an intellectual breakdown. Either the monarchy would have a role within the parliamentary system or it would be abolished. The proposed compromise was impossible to defend.

*

The politics

The Torekov-compromise has caused a great deal of interpretation problems with its concise and cryptic wordings. It is often interpreted as a gagging law and a call for complete inaction. However, this is not the case. The bill states: ”The Head of State's entire conduct in public must be characterized by his role in representing the nation as a whole. As elaborated in detail²¹, his representation within the country and in relation to other states must not be such as to indicate a contradiction or tension between the Head of State and the political leaders²² This is usually interpreted as the regent representing the position of the government and thus the majority of the people, which was the background to the Brunei criticism. An alternative interpretation is that as long as he does not comment on party politics, he is free to have views. The monarchist and member of parliament Gunnar Biörck (1916-1996) summarized the position of the royal court in 1974 as: ”No morally healthy person can in the long term take wages on condition that he abstains from having a meaning.”²³ One related conflict is that the Torekov-compromise allows the regent to vote in general elections which is contrary

¹⁸ Svanberg 2013.

¹⁹ Lagerroth 1975; Nordin 2009.

²⁰ SVT 1976: s. 10.

²¹ SOU 1972:15. (Avsnittet ej lokaliserat. Möjligen har det uteslutits.)

²² Prop 1973:90, s. 174.

²³ Per Ahlmark (fp). Allmänpolitisk debatt. Fredag 1974-02-01. Riksdagens protokoll, 1974:18, s. 16.

to the position of the monarchy "above the parties". King Carl Gustaf has never used this right.

*

The nation

If the Head of State is not allowed to engage in (party) politics, it remains to concern himself with the nation as a whole. Political scientist Cecilia Åse has devoted a research project to the matter: "Monarchy and democracy in Sweden 1970-2000".²⁴ Her conclusion is that Sweden, through the Torekov-compromise, has an officially sanctioned monarchy which, although based on an older literature, lacks political context. The Torekov-monarchy has no history of ideas. However, Åse seems to discern a line of thought:

"My point is that while the function of Head of State has been regulated in the constitutions in such a way that it has been emptied of political content, it has at the same time been able to be powerful with respect to the nation. These two processes are linked: Creating a political head of state is a way of making the national symbol strong, it is to enshrine democracy in the nation, to place differences and political conflicts of interest under equality and political unity. From a position over the political - from a position where "we" agree - the head of state's task is to affirm and bestow national legitimacy on Swedish democracy and parliamentarism in the name of the nation."²⁵

Which she later elaborated on:

The frequent reiterations and reassurances of political agreement on the monarchy serve to establish, in terms of Benedict Anderson's (1983) famous thesis, an imagined national community that transcends political processes. Several political theorists have argued that the nation has solved the boundary problem and served to delimit and legitimate "the people", or demos, in much theoretical thinking (Canovan 1998; Yack 2001; Näsström 2003; Bartelson 2008). It is precisely to the idea of the nation, Bernard Yack suggests, that we are to look for a pre-political basis for political community. The idea of the nation transcends the specific individuals who constitute it, he argues, and thus the nation can grant (national) legitimacy to democratic institutions and practices. The nation "allows us to imagine the evolving community that precedes our existence and survives our death" (Yack 2001: 521). A hereditary order of succession fits well with representations of the nation as a transcendental entity that is independent of historical time and stands above the individual lives that we lead at this moment. In the Swedish constitution, the idea of the transcendental nation is attached to the genetic heritage and future of a specific family.²⁶

*

²⁴ Åse 2008, 2009 & 2013.

²⁵ Åse 2008: s. 61.

²⁶ Åse 2013: ss. 179-180

The idea

It's not entirely clear what Åse means. Possibly, it is as simple as that an apolitical king can better represent the country as a whole. This is a common monarchic argument.

Another interpretation has been that political conflicts can be accepted as long as they do not threaten the existence of the nation state. Everything that strengthens the nation state, including the monarchy, therefore strengthens democracy. This, however, presupposes a unified government. The Swedish double command is a constant concern. This too is a common monarchic argument.

A third interpretation is that the Social Democrats preferred a system with a strong Prime Minister and a weak Head of State, which the Torekov-compromise guaranteed. In a republic, the Head of State could become powerful at the expense of the Prime Minister (=the Parliament). Not so in the Swedish monarchy.

In fact, there is also a fourth interpretation: That the social democratic youth organization (SSU) through its government contacts (read Ingvar Carlsson) affected the outcome. In 1967, for example, Leif Andersson on the SSU Federal Board summarized the congress debate about the function of the head of state as:

It is quite clear that a Head of State must exist; The Prime Minister cannot, of course, lead the work which is to culminate in the appointment of a new Prime Minister if there is a government crisis. Then you have to have a Head of State who is above the political parties. In all countries except Switzerland, there is also, as far as I know, a distinction between Head of State and Head of Government.

In addition, the Head of State undoubtedly has many representative tasks, and a Prime Minister has more important things to do than opening bridges, opening exhibitions, etc.

Now I have spoken with Asp [Ivar Asp, Dalarna district], and what he refers to [in his speech] is that the government decisions should formally not be taken by the king but by the government. It is therefore a de facto and de jure ministerial government which he is after, and the Federal Board has no objection to that. It cannot be right to take all decisions in go at a cabinet meeting. You know that every week 700 to 800 cases are decided at a cabinet meeting in half an hour - that means 3 to 4 seconds per case. Such a procedure is quite pointless - the power of decision should also formally be transferred to the government. There is no difference of opinion on this point between Asp and the Federal Board.²⁷

[Now instead the Speaker of the Parliament was also given the task of forming a government. The criticism has been that he or she could not ignore his or her party affiliation, but that has not been a problem so far. What has been a problem, however, is that the Royal Court had a broader definition of representation than the investigations. The investigations defined representation as attendance and inaugurations. The Royal Court also included municipal, county and international visits, to administer its activities, pay attention to efforts and in various ways act for Sweden's best interests. At the 20th anniversary of the formation of the government Carl Gustaf received praise for having succeeded against all odds in "filling his office".]

²⁷ SSU protokoll 1967: s. 138.

And finally, a fifth interpretation: That the monarchy by its very existence would prevent the State & the party organizations from completely taking over. This had since John Stuart Mill's book (1859) "On Freedom" been a lively Swedish topic of discussion with slogans such as "minority & majority oppression are both abhorrent" & "freedom from bureaucratic oppression". In Mill's view, parliamentary majorities were as great a threat to freedom as absolute monarchy, priesthood and nobility. Currently Sweden based V-Dem has reclassified India & Hungary to "electoral autocracy" rather than "parliamentary democracy".²⁸ There is a certain affinity to revolution. The revolution eats its children. Democracy the competition. The king is supposed to be protection.

* * *

D. SYSTEM CHANGE

In parallel with the constitution, the Order system was also investigated. Since the Order of the Seraphim, the Order of the Sword, the Order of the North Star, and the Order of Vasa as rule only were awarded to senior state officials and the like, they had become politically contentious. The solution was an Alexandrian cut. Proposition 1973:91 abolished them completely as a reward to Swedish citizens. The Order of the Seraphim was later reinstated for the members of the Royal Family. In 2018, it was also discussed to reintroduce the Orders of Vasa and the Sword as a reward for extraordinary civilian and military efforts, which 2021 is on proposal.²⁹

There was speculation that the abolition of Orders was yet another belated social democratic revenge on the conservative Swedish officials' state which, by being inalienable for a long time, was immune to political pressure. After 1974, however, there was an end to both immunity and rewards. Based on the self-image of the conservative officials as defenders of the rule of law, one can probably call it a Swedish equivalent of "the deep state", which in 1974 was thus replaced by its more openly politicized social democratic counterpart.

*

In 2000 the church was separated from the state and in 2003 the nobility was abolished as a legal concept. From 2003, king, prince, queen, etc. was legally only a "professional title". The Republicans obviously hoped that the monarchy should suffer the fate of the nobility and: (1) Lose its political role. (2) Become a cultural heritage. (3) Unravel. (4) Disappear.

"In the mid 19th century, at the beginning of the investigated period [1869-1976], the differences in social standing between the nobles of the time [2 per mille of the population], and the famous ancestors they sought to emulate, was not yet very great. However, as the old social order unravelled it widened and the nobles' collective identity shifted towards the notion that through their activities, their very existence, although they did not accomplish much, they still preserved a heritage. Thus even in the new society of the 20th century, the nobility defined itself on the basis of its past rather than its current status."³⁰

²⁸ V-Dem 2022.

²⁹ SOU 2021:74.

³⁰ Bergman 2021: s. 320.

This has not (yet) happened to the royal house: (1) The monarchy still has a political role. (2) As a common cultural heritage, it is supported by at least half of the population. (3) Marrying into the royal house still means submitting to monarchic law & tradition.

Referenser

- *Bergman, Magnus. (2021.) Att höra det förflutna till : adlig minneskultur och kollektiv identitet efter ståndssamhällets upplösning, 1869-1976. Malmö: Malmö universitet, fakulteten för lärande och samhälle.
- *Bergman, Torbjörn. (1992.) Multiple Goals and Constitutional Design: How the Swedish King Lost His Formal Powers. I: Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift 1992:3, ss. 209-233.
- *Björkman, Ulf. (1987.) Kungens adjutant. Stockholm: BNL förlag AB.
- *Bohman, Gösta. (1984.) Maktskifte. Stockholm: Bonniers.
- *Lagerroth, Fredrik. (1975.) Vår nya författning och frihetstidens. Lunds universitet: Statsvetenskapliga institutionen. 1975:1.
- +Lundberg, Urban & Tydén, Mattias. (red.) (2008.) Sverigebilder. Det nationellas betydelser i politik och vardag. Institutet för framtidsstudier, Stockholm.
- *Mill, John Stuart. (1859.) On Liberty. <gutenberg.org> (2011-01-10).
- *Mårtensson, Jan. (2000.) Att kyssa ett träd. Memoarer. Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand.
- *Nordin, Jonas. (2009.) Frihetstidens monarki – Konungamakt och offentlighet i 1700-talets Sverige. Stockholm: Atlantis.
- *Prop 1973:90. Kungl. Maj:ts proposition med förslag till ny regeringsform m.m. <riksdagen.se> (2018-01-01).
- *Prop 1973:91. Kungl. Maj:ts proposition angående ändrat belöningsystem för statsanställda m. fl. <riksdagen.se> (2019-01-01).
- *SOU 1963:17. Förslag till regeringsform. Författningsutredningen : VI. Sveriges statsskick. Del 2. Motiv. Stockholm: Justitiedepartementet. <kb.se> (2020-01-01).
- *SOU 1972:15. Ny regeringsform. Ny riksdagsordning. Betänkande avgivet av grundlagsberedningen. Stockholm: Justitiedepartementet. <kb.se> (2020-01-01).
- *SOU 2021:74. Betänkande av kommittén om det offentliga belöningsystemet, de allmänna flaggdagarna och utformningen av anslaget till hovet. <riksdagen.se> (2021-10-01).
- *Stjernquist, Nils. (1971.) Grundlagberedningskompromiss i statschefsfrågan. Statsvetenskaplig tidskrift nr 4, ss. 377-379.
- *Svanberg, Mikael. (2010.) Den svenska revolutionen : Några frågor kring tiden när Sverige blev ”en form av republik”. Karlstads universitet: Fakulteten för humaniora och samhällsvetenskap. Politiska och historiska studier, 2010:1.
- *Svanberg, Mikael. (2013.) Demokratisyner på kollisionkurs. Debatten inför författningsreformen 1974. Karlstads universitet: Fakulteten för humaniora och samhällsvetenskap. Politiska och historiska studier, 2013:1.
- *SVT 1976. Statsvetenskaplig och statsrättslig forskning kring den nya grundlagens tillkomst. Ett symposium anordnat av Statens råd för samhällsforskning. Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift, 1976:1.
- *Tingsten, Herbert. (1964.) Skall kungamakten stärkas? : kritik av författningsförslaget. Stockholm: Aldus aktuellt.
- *V-Dem. (2022.) Democracy Report 2022. Autocratization Changing Nature? University of Gothenburg: V-Dem Institute.
- *Yack, Bernard. (2001.) Popular sovereignty and nationalism, Political Theory, 29(3), ss. 517-536.
- *Åman, Valter. (1982.) Repor i färgen : memoarer. Stockholm: Timo.
- *Åse, Cecilia. (2008.) Vi är överens: Om monarki och demokrati. I: Lundberg & Tydén red. 2008: kap 3, ss. 49-66.
- *Åse, Cecilia. (2009.) Monarkins makt : Nationell gemenskap i svensk demokrati. Stockholm: Ordfront.

*Åse, Cecilia. (2013.) Monarchical Manoeuvres: Gender, Nation and the Boundary Problem in Post-War Swedish Constitutional Development. *NORA – Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 2013, Vol. 21, No. 3, 172-186. <[dx.doi.org](https://doi.org/10.1080/08980101.2019.1611111)> (2019-01-01).