

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/2592-8813-2026-1-35>

ELIZABETH II AND THE NEW GLOBAL POLITICAL ARCHITECTURE: BETWEEN TRADITION AND NETWORKS OF INFLUENCE

Yevhen Nikolskiy,

*Doctor of Divinity, Professor, Professor at the Department of Theology,
Carpathian University named after Augustyn Voloshyn (Uzhhorod, Ukraine)*

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3585-4781

eugenius-09@ukr.net

Abstract. The article is devoted to the analysis of Queen Elizabeth II's role as a specific global political actor in the 20th–21st centuries. The study aims to examine the transformation of the British monarchy from a classical imperial model to a networked architecture of influence centered around the Commonwealth of Nations. It is shown that, under conditions of constitutional neutrality, the Queen exercised significant symbolic and informal influence on international processes, combining Christian tradition, historical continuity, and modern diplomatic mechanisms. Special attention is given to the Christian symbolism of the monarchy, particularly in the context of Elizabeth II's death and funeral ceremony, which emphasized the immortality of the monarchy as an institution and the limits of human power. The article also analyzes the significance of Commonwealth policy in fostering international solidarity, particularly regarding Ukraine. The study concludes that the figure of the Queen embodies a new type of global politics in which connections, legitimacy, and symbolic authority play a central role, rather than territorial control.

Key words: Elizabeth II, British monarchy, Commonwealth of Nations, symbolic power, global politics, post-imperial transformation, Christian tradition, political symbolism, international solidarity, networks of influence, geopolitics, constitutional monarchy, Ukraine, historical continuity, legitimacy.

Statement of the Research Problem. The death of Queen Elizabeth II became an event that was not only symbolic but also deeply political in the broadest sense of the word. It marked the end of the longest reign in the history of the British monarchy and, at the same time, drew a line under an entire era of world politics that developed in the twentieth century and transformed at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Yet, behind the scale of the Queen's personal notoriety and public presence lies a paradox: her actual political influence, mechanisms of action, and role in shaping the global political architecture remain insufficiently analyzed in a strictly scholarly context. Mintah (2024)

Despite a substantial body of journalistic, memoir, and popular literature, Queen Elizabeth II's figure rarely becomes the subject of systematic political science analysis. This is particularly true for studies that go beyond a formal description of the constitutional role of the monarch and address informal, symbolic, and network mechanisms of influence. In this perspective, the monarchy appears not as an anachronism but as a specific form of political stabilization and long-term governance of relationships.

In Ukrainian political science, this issue remains even less developed. Scholars' attention focuses mainly on republican institutional models, security, war, and post-Soviet transformations. At the same time, the phenomenon of the British monarchy, particularly during the reign of Queen Elizabeth II, is rarely analyzed as an independent factor in global politics and international solidarity, including its relevance to Ukraine.

This gap determines the relevance of the present study. The Queen's figure allows for a renewed understanding of the interaction between symbolic power, Christian tradition, and contemporary geopolitics in a world where formal borders are increasingly giving way to networks of connections and trust.

Review of Key Publications. In the contemporary world, the British monarchy continues to function less as a political institution and more as a symbolic one, capable of shaping both domestic and

international perceptions of the state. Research by Cook and Searle (2020, 2022) demonstrates that Elizabeth II employed mechanisms of soft power, combining traditional ceremonial practices with the personalization of the monarchy, which helped to foster a positive image of Britain globally and maintain internal stability. Similarly, Twomey (2020) emphasizes that female monarchs, particularly Elizabeth II, could influence international politics and public opinion without exceeding the boundaries of formal political authority.

Comparative contemporary studies by Ginsburg (2020) and Taylor (2024) confirm that the monarchy remains a stabilizing element in European democracies, providing the state with symbolic legitimacy even amid media and social transformations. Taylor notes that under the reign of Charles III, the monarchy retains its adaptability, combining traditional elements with new media narratives, thus ensuring the institution's "intelligible" legitimacy.

At the same time, public perception of the monarchy is heterogeneous and depends on age, cultural context, and media factors. Greenstein et al. (1974) demonstrate how perceptions of monarchs are formed in childhood, influencing later views on authority and state institutions. Contemporary studies by Gellwitzki et al. (2024) and Mintah (2024) show that the death and end of Elizabeth II's reign elicited varied reactions among societies and media, reflecting conflicting narratives and ambiguous global perceptions of Britain, particularly within Commonwealth countries.

Elizabeth II's legacy encompasses both a direct influence on the political and cultural stability of the Commonwealth and a broader symbolic effect worldwide. Rotaru (2023) highlights that her role within the Commonwealth involved maintaining unity and stability, while Markovich (2022) emphasizes the symbolic aspect of the British monarchy, which allows balancing tradition with modern societal expectations.

Thus, Elizabeth II left a unique legacy combining stabilizing symbolic functions, diplomatic soft power, and the capacity to shape public opinion in a global context. Her reign demonstrates that a monarchy can remain relevant and influential without being politically active, while providing the cultural and symbolic foundation for the continued development of British statehood and the international image of the United Kingdom.

The aim of this article is to provide a comprehensive political science analysis of Queen Elizabeth II's role as a global political actor amid the transformation of classical empires and the formation of a new world political architecture. Special attention is given to the symbolic, informal, and network mechanisms of influence of the British monarchy, as well as their significance for Ukraine and the international system as a whole.

Main Content. Elizabeth II's coronation took place in 1953, a landmark moment not only for the United Kingdom but also for the entire Commonwealth of Nations. Her reign lasted 69 years, a period of exceptional stability and continuity in a rapidly changing world. Only Louis XIV of France exceeded this record, ruling for 72 years. Officially, Elizabeth II held the title of Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. However, her influence extended far beyond a single country. She was also queen of fourteen Commonwealth countries, a status that emphasized not only formal authority but also her symbolic role in maintaining the unity of numerous independent states historically emerging from the former British Empire.

The length of her reign allowed her to witness numerous global transformations: the dissolution of empires, the rise of new states, the emergence of modern international politics, and the global economy. Elizabeth II remained a constant symbol of stability, moral authority, and consistency. Her role was not merely ceremonial but essential for understanding the evolution of modern monarchies.

It should be noted that her biography is intertwined with twentieth- and early twenty-first-century world history. The nineteenth century was the era of global empires. The British, French, German, Austro-Hungarian, Portuguese, and Russian empires shaped the world order and divided continents among themselves. These countries were small in territorial size but controlled vast overseas colonies, determining the fate of millions of people.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, most empires began to collapse. This was a natural historical process that could not be stopped. Yet, despite these challenges, the British Empire proved to be exceptionally flexible. It survived the period of decline and transformed into a new political architecture that held strategic significance for the world. Instead of completely severing ties, the Dominions maintained connections with the United Kingdom. This process culminated during the reign of Queen Elizabeth II, who emerged as a symbol of unity and stability (Gellwitzki et al., 2024).

Thanks to her, the British Empire acquired a new dimension—the Commonwealth of Nations, uniting 54 countries. Queen Elizabeth II not only formally presided over these states but also subtly facilitated their interaction, demonstrating an ability to combine tradition and modernity. Her role was not overtly political, yet it was highly influential. Through her wisdom and perceptiveness, these countries were able to remain within a cohesive system, preserving cultural, economic, and political ties (Rotaru, 2023).

Queen Elizabeth II transformed the empire's transition into a masterful act of diplomacy and symbolic authority. She embodied the principle that true leadership does not always mean direct control, but always entails the ability to unite, shape, and sustain mutual understanding. Her reign provided living proof that a monarch could be the soul of a state even when their powers were formal.

Elizabeth II occupied a unique position. As a monarch, she formally refrained from daily political intervention, yet her symbolic power was extraordinarily potent. She demonstrated that influence could be exercised even without direct authority. The Queen's diplomatic skill was evident in her ability to maintain the stability and unity of the Commonwealth of Nations (Markovich, 2022).

Collaboration with British politicians and diplomats served as an invisible but highly effective instrument. Elizabeth II possessed a keen sense of timing, knowing when to make a symbolic gesture and when to leave space for political processes. Her tours of the Dominions and meetings with state leaders fostered trust, strengthened the moral authority of the United Kingdom, and promoted the development of partnership relations.

The political architecture of the Commonwealth was among her greatest achievements. She supported the independence of the Dominions while maintaining a unified political and symbolic space. Through ceremonial functions, speeches, and diplomatic gestures, the Queen influenced international politics without exercising direct administrative power. Her role consisted of moderating relationships, sustaining connections, and ensuring the harmonious coexistence of states within the Commonwealth.

Particularly important is Elizabeth II's stance toward Ukraine. Although her formal powers were limited by protocol, she indirectly contributed to strengthening international relations that supported Ukraine. Her symbolic presence, diplomatic gestures, and coordination through the Commonwealth demonstrate how a single monarch, situated on a small island, could exert influence on global processes.

Thus, Elizabeth II left a legacy that fused tradition and modernity. Her authority was invisible yet effective. She showed the world that the power of symbol, moral authority, and wise presence can shape political and cultural architecture on a global scale, even from a small territory (Twomey, 2020).

To better understand her role in world politics, it is necessary to examine the major milestones in the history of the British monarchy in the twentieth century.

The 1920s and 1930s represented a period of strategic transformation for the British Empire. Politicians at the time were the first to fully realize the crisis of the classical imperial model. Long-standing practices of purely military control proved insufficient for sustaining global power. Recognizing the inevitability of the collapse of classical empires became a key factor in developing new strategies. Already then, approaches emerged that later enabled Queen Elizabeth II to effectively exercise symbolic and diplomatic leadership, combining tradition with modern challenges (Greenstein et al., 1974).

In response to the crisis, Britain adopted a flexible policy toward its colonies and Dominions. This policy combined different instruments: military intervention where necessary, gradual withdrawal from certain territories, and support for the independence of new states. Recognition of independence became a managed process rather than a defeat, demonstrating London's political prudence. Symbolically, it was Queen Elizabeth II who later became the guarantor of the stability of these relations. Her presence during ceremonies, meetings, and diplomatic visits across the Dominions showed that a single monarch could unite nations without exercising direct administrative power.

The final transition from empire to the Commonwealth of Nations occurred under Elizabeth II. She became a symbol of unity and moral authority, maintaining interaction among 54 independent states within a single political space. This transformation established a new global political architecture, where mutual respect and cooperation became guiding principles rather than control and coercion. The Queen demonstrated that effective leadership lies not in direct authority but in the ability to unite, model, and sustain stability on a global scale.

The shift from military imperial methods to diplomatic and ceremonial instruments created the conditions for the modern structure of the Commonwealth. Thanks to the wisdom and perseverance of Queen Elizabeth II, this transformation became organic, harmonious, and lasting (Rotaru, 2023).

Within the Commonwealth, the monarch served as a symbol rather than a direct administrator. Elizabeth II never interfered in the domestic affairs of member states, yet her symbolic presence was critically important. She embodied the idea of fraternity and historical continuity, connecting the present with centuries-old traditions. Through her personality, the Queen demonstrated that influence could be exercised not through orders but through moral authority and cultural ties.

One of the Queen's most important functions was her informal participation in resolving economic crises and political conflicts. She acted as a "neutral moderator," remaining outside direct political influence while simultaneously ensuring stability and coordination among states. This capacity for subtle influence demonstrates her profound understanding of diplomacy.

The transition from the imperial hierarchy to the Commonwealth of Nations showed that Queen Elizabeth II created a unique mechanism for global stability. Her influence was simultaneously invisible and powerful, demonstrating that symbolic authority can have tremendous practical significance.

Before examining the specific mechanisms of Britain's global influence, it is important to understand its strategic concept. Here, the key factor is not territory, but a network of connections that sustain stability and political order in the world. This approach distinguishes the British model from classical empires.

British policy deliberately moves away from the traditional understanding of borders as the main source of influence. It demonstrates that control over land alone does not guarantee global stability. This sharply contrasts with Russian imperial logic, where territorial acquisition has always been regarded as the primary instrument of power. Queen Elizabeth II exemplified that true influence is formed not through coercion, but through symbolic and diplomatic ties.

For Britain, the development of political, economic, and cultural-historical links is decisive. Political contacts ensure stability and consensus among Commonwealth states. Economic integration, trade agreements, and joint projects strengthen interdependence. Cultural and historical connections—including ceremonies, symbols, and shared history—create an invisible yet strong fabric of cooperation. Queen Elizabeth II always served as a living symbol of this unity, emphasizing the importance of tradition and moral authority (Ginsburg, 2020).

Granting independence to Dominions and former colonies did not signify a loss of influence. Britain demonstrated that it is possible to release a state into formal independence while maintaining its loyalty and partnership without coercion. This makes the political system flexible and resilient. Elizabeth II showed that a monarch's authority can shape global processes even from a limited territory, and that symbolic leadership can be more effective than direct administrative rule.

Before considering the specific mechanisms through which the Commonwealth influences global politics, one must appreciate its scale. It is not merely a network of states with shared traditions, but a powerful geopolitical actor. Through this system, Britain and Queen Elizabeth II were able to exert indirect influence on world events, leveraging the symbolic and practical weight of the Commonwealth.

The Commonwealth covers an area of approximately 31.5 million km², which represents a significant geographical resource. Its population numbers several billion, giving it a global impact on economic and political processes. This network of states demonstrates that the authority of the monarch and symbolic ties (Cook & Searle, 2020) can significantly amplify traditional instruments of international influence.

One of Britain's most effective instruments of influence is its sanctions policy. When the United Kingdom imposes restrictions, it signals all Commonwealth members. Many countries automatically join these sanctions, creating a disproportionate effect on the targeted economies, including Russia. This mechanism illustrates how the symbolic role of Queen Elizabeth II and the institutional structure of the Commonwealth enable the shaping of global events without direct control.

After considering the geopolitical scale of the Commonwealth and Britain's influence concept, it is natural to turn to the specific role of Queen Elizabeth II in the contemporary world. Her position demonstrates how symbolic power and a prolonged presence on the throne can shape global processes even in the twenty-first century. The Queen emerges not only as a head of state, but also as a coordinator of a network uniting dozens of independent countries.

Queen Elizabeth II developed a new type of politics, in which territorial borders cease to be the main factor of influence. The primary focus became maintaining connections between the independent states of the Commonwealth, ensuring stability and predictability in international relations. At the same time, the Queen's influence remained predominantly informal yet highly effective. Through diplomatic, symbolic, and ceremonial mechanisms, she could indirectly shape the domestic and foreign policies of countries, emphasizing that the authority of a monarch can substitute for direct power on a global scale (Cook & Searle, 2022).

After analyzing the Commonwealth's global role and the symbolic influence of the Queen, it is natural to examine her specific impact on Ukraine. Despite constitutional neutrality, Queen Elizabeth II was able, through symbolism and indirect action, to create conditions for significant political processes. Her strategic position demonstrates that even limited formal authority can have a global effect.

Queen Elizabeth II was not permitted to openly support political parties or express specific political positions. Nevertheless, her indirect signals and ritual gestures carried deep symbolic meaning. Through participation in ceremonies, visits to the Dominions, and diplomatic contacts, she communicated her stance on important events while simultaneously upholding the authority of the Commonwealth and the unity of its member states.

A key moment was the referendum of December 1, 1991, which confirmed Ukraine's independence. Poland was the first country to officially recognize it; however, the role of Commonwealth countries, particularly Canada, proved critical. Under the leadership of Queen Elizabeth II, Britain formally recognized Ukraine on December 2, 1992, with the United States joining later. This process underscores that the Queen's influence was not direct, but structural and symbolic, shaping international consensus.

In the following decades, Canada remained an active ally of Ukraine. By the time of Russia's large-scale aggression in February 2022, Commonwealth countries oriented toward Britain and guided by the Queen's symbolic signals were already prepared to provide rapid military, instructional, and economic support. Thus, the continuity of Commonwealth policy and the invisible but powerful influence of Elizabeth II helped create the conditions for a swift and coordinated response to global crises.

Through her symbolic actions and diplomatic levers, Queen Elizabeth II emerged as a "symbol of a new type of global politics." She demonstrated that even in the twenty-first century, a monarch,

while formally neutral, could indirectly influence the destinies of states and shape international coalitions, ensuring the effectiveness of Commonwealth mechanisms.

It is important to recognize that the late period of Elizabeth II's reign was characterized not only by formal authority but also by a powerful symbolic influence. The Queen was able to transform traditional rituals and monarchical practices into a modern instrument of global politics. Her activity demonstrates that symbolic power can be even more significant than direct administrative authority.

After decolonization, only the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland remained, along with a few small overseas territories, mostly uninhabited islands. In this context, Queen Elizabeth II became a symbolic "fabric" that maintained the unity of former colonies, notably Canada and Australia. Through her authority and example, a new model of global politics was formed. Her influence combined symbolic power with the network of the Commonwealth, completing the formation of a new political architecture in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

The Queen conducted regular visits to the Dominions, demonstrating a civilized process of decolonization. During these trips, her activity combined official protocol with direct contact with citizens. The Royal Household adapted to societal changes, maintaining authority through openness and attention to people's needs. This approach allowed Elizabeth II to maintain leadership and inspire respect for traditions without coercion.

The Queen skillfully combined traditional rituals with contemporary cultural manifestations. The awarding of British Empire honors to figures such as The Beatles or J.K. Rowling became a symbol of support for modern culture while preserving historical context. Participation in cultural and sporting events, including the 2012 Olympic campaign, emphasized her openness and adaptability. This combination of tradition and modernity ensured the monarchy's sustained influence and highlighted Elizabeth II's uniqueness as a leader of a new type.

Gradually, the twenty-first century demonstrated that even the most resilient institutions face pressures of modernity. The British Royal Family was no exception. Despite personal crises and public scandals, Queen Elizabeth II remained a symbol of stability and moral authority. Her ability to maintain distance while simultaneously upholding the family's prestige minimized the consequences of public scrutiny.

The marriage of Prince Charles and Camilla in 2005, and the associated formal procedures, illustrated that the Queen participated only at the level of protocol, remaining above family intrigues. Scandals involving Prince Harry and Meghan Markle further demonstrated the complexity of managing the monarchy's reputation in an open media environment. Public coverage of these events highlighted that even in challenging situations, the Queen's symbolic distance allowed the institution to retain its authority (Taylor, 2024).

These familial crises did not weaken the monarchy; on the contrary, the combination of modernity and tradition created in the public a sense of a living institution. The Queen's presence in public life, even at an advanced age, demonstrated the continuity and inviolability of monarchical values. This strategy strengthened the legitimacy of the monarchy and maintained deep public loyalty.

The gradual process of aging and health issues inevitably affected Elizabeth II's activity. The death of Prince Philip and the COVID-19 pandemic led the Queen to miss important events, including the State Opening of Parliament. At the same time, some of her duties were delegated to her son, Prince Charles, demonstrating a thoughtful approach to ensuring succession.

The development of a detailed plan since the 1960s attests to the monarchy's high level of organization. Coordination among the government, police, church, and family members ensured flawless implementation in the event of the Queen's passing. The code phrase "London Bridge is down" served as the signal to initiate this plan, demonstrating a strict yet elegant protocol in which the Queen played a direct role in determining the sequence of actions.

The British monarchy, despite criticism over state funding, provides significant economic returns to the country. Its operation not only preserves historical traditions but also generates a powerful cultural and financial resource, particularly evident during public events and tourism.

The Royal Family, funded by the state budget, brings tangible revenue. In 2021, direct income to the state amounted to approximately half a billion USD. Indirect revenues through tourism—such as visits to Buckingham Palace, souvenir purchases, and participation in various ceremonies—further enhance this economic contribution. This demonstrates that the monarchy serves not only as a symbolic but also as an effective state resource (Cook & Searle, 2020).

In parallel with its financial aspect, the monarch plays a stabilizing and neutral role in the complex political system of the United Kingdom. The formal ruler stands “above party intrigues,” does not intervene in internal party conflicts, yet sets the tone of stability and moral authority. This combination of symbolic leadership and neutrality supports political equilibrium, which is particularly important for a country with a multidimensional governance system.

Throughout her long reign, Elizabeth II became not merely a political leader but a true symbol of England for contemporaries and future generations. Her image embodies continuity of tradition, stability, and national unity, particularly in times of crisis. During wars, economic shocks, and frequent changes of prime ministers, the Queen acted as a continuous “anchor” of national interests, capable of maintaining the country’s moral and political resilience.

Elizabeth II became the center of the British collective imagination. Her image and activity united the nation, creating a sense of stability and continuity of state institutions. She demonstrated that a monarch can be more than a formal head of state; the Queen represented a symbol of brotherhood, moral resilience, and cultural heritage. This symbolic status allowed the country to navigate social and political changes without losing internal cohesion (Ginsburg, 2020).

Despite the significant workload and her advanced age, Elizabeth II carried out formal state functions even under difficult circumstances. She demonstrated impeccable discipline and dedication to duty, maintaining the authority of the monarchy. Her public persona—smiling, polite, attentive to prime ministers and citizens—emphasized her ability to combine humanity with the high status of a state leader. This combination of discipline, devotion, and symbolic presence shaped the perception of the monarchy as a stable, continuous, and morally strong institution.

The death of Elizabeth II became a landmark event not only for the United Kingdom but for the entire world. After seventy years of flawless reign—the longest among British monarchs—the Queen passed away on 8 September at her Balmoral Castle in Scotland. This event marked the end of an era that defined the modern political architecture of the Commonwealth. Eleven days later, on 19 September, her funeral was held at Westminster Abbey, a symbolic act uniting history, religion, and state tradition (Cook & Searle, 2022).

The funeral ceremony was rich in profound symbolism, reflecting the core principles of the Christian faith—death and resurrection. On the Queen’s coffin were placed the crown, scepter, and orb—classical symbols of monarchical authority that signify the divine origin of power. At the same time, after the burial, these symbols were “returned to God,” demonstrating that Elizabeth II, as an individual, had passed to the Lord, while leaving the institution of the monarchy alive and intact. This underscores the principle that the death of a specific monarch does not entail the cessation of the monarchy itself; the institution remains immortal.

The religious context of Elizabeth II’s life and reign was deeply manifested throughout her tenure on the throne. Her annual Christmas messages, participation in ceremonies, and symbolic gestures reflected the Queen’s faith as an integral component of monarchical service. The funeral ceremony became the culmination of this spiritual dimension: it simultaneously testified to Elizabeth II’s deep Christian faith and confirmed the significance of the monarch’s symbolic authority for society.

Thus, the funeral of Elizabeth II combined tradition and spirituality with political symbolism, demonstrating the Queen’s unique role as a person who embodied Christian faith in state service,

while leaving the institution of the monarchy alive and immortal. This aspect of her reign confirms that the British monarchy is not merely a formal institution but also a bearer of the state's spiritual and moral continuity, fostering in society a sense of eternity and stability (Mintah, 2024).

The monarchical nature of the British crown was formed not only as a political institution but also as a deeply symbolic system rooted in the Christian worldview of Europe. It derives from the notion of the sacredness of authority, which is not self-sufficient but received "from above" and therefore always constrained by a higher moral order. In this sense, the British monarchy preserves the continuity of the medieval Christian understanding of authority as service rather than possession.

The idea of Christ's eternal reign—a central tenet of Christian theology—is reflected in monarchical symbolism. Coronation, oaths, and the use of sacred objects are not merely archaic rituals; they serve as a reminder of the transcendent dimension of authority. The monarch, and specifically the Queen, is not an absolute ruler but a temporary bearer of service within earthly history, subordinate to a higher, divine order.

In this context, the monarchy performs an essential existential function. It reminds society of the limitations of human life, the transience of political structures, and, at the same time, the existence of spiritual values that are not subject to electoral cycles or ideological fashions. The death of a monarch does not destroy the system—it merely emphasizes its metaphysical dimension.

From the perspective of state theory, the monarchy is one of the few institutions capable of demonstrating temporal continuity. It remains stable even after the death of a specific officeholder because its significance lies not in the individual but in the institution. Therefore, the succession of a monarch occurs without political vacuum, without a legitimacy crisis, and without the need to reestablish the state.

In the symbolic and spiritual dimension, the king or queen functions as a "representative of God on earth." This concept should not be understood literally or theocratically; rather, it signifies the representation of a moral order that stands above politics, party struggles, and temporary interests. In this sense, the Queen was not the source of power but its ethical limitation.

The stabilizing function performed by the monarchy lies precisely in symbolizing the continuity of the state. It embodies the connection between generations, between past and future, and between tradition and modernity. Governments, political courses, and even social structures change, but the monarchy remains a point of reference—a kind of "anchor" of historical memory.

In the modern world, attitudes toward monarchy differ significantly depending on civilizational tradition. American republicanism, shaped in the context of the anti-monarchical revolution of the eighteenth century, fundamentally rejects monarchy as a form of government, viewing it as an anachronism or a threat to equality. This is a logically consistent position within the framework of the American political myth, but it is not universal (Ginsburg, 2020).

European monarchies, by contrast, have preserved their Christian foundations and ceremonial significance, combining spiritual symbolism with political prestige. They do not compete with democracy but coexist with it, performing a different function—a metapolitical one. It is in this combination of sacred, historical, and contemporary dimensions that their viability is found.

Queen Elizabeth II became perhaps the purest embodiment of this model. She demonstrated that monarchy can be simultaneously traditional and modern, Christian in spirit, and globally influential. Her role thus transcends British history, remaining a critical reference point for understanding twenty-first-century politics.

Conclusion. The study of Elizabeth II and the transformation of the British Empire into the Commonwealth of Nations suggests that in the second half of the twentieth century and the early twenty-first century, the very nature of global political influence underwent a qualitative change. Power increasingly relied less on territorial control and more on networks of connections, symbolic authority, and the ability to cultivate trust among formally independent states.

The British monarchy, embodied in the Queen, did not act as a relic of an imperial past but as an instrument for overcoming it. Under her reign, the transition from a classical empire to a new political architecture was completed, wherein former colonies were not lost but transformed into partners. The Commonwealth of Nations became a unique example of a “post-imperial space,” preserving influence without coercion and loyalty without subjugation.

Elizabeth II played a key role in this transformation not through formal political decisions but through symbolic presence, stability, and personal dedication to duty. Her constitutional neutrality did not imply a lack of influence; on the contrary, it allowed her to act as a moderator of complex processes, a guarantor of continuity, and a moral guide for the Commonwealth states.

The Ukrainian context acquires particular significance. The positions of Commonwealth states, notably Canada and Australia, and their rapid responses to events after 2014 and especially after February 24, 2022, demonstrate the long-term continuity of a political line established during the reign of the Queen. In this sense, Elizabeth II emerges as a symbol of a new type of global politics, in which geographic distance does not diminish responsibility, and historical ties are transformed into practical solidarity. The Christian dimension of the monarchy, vividly manifested in the Queen’s funeral ceremonies, underscored another fundamental characteristic of this institution—the recognition of the limits of earthly power. The monarchy reminds society that political order is not absolute, that life is fleeting, and that institutions must serve higher values. The death of a specific monarch does not destroy the system; it only confirms its metaphysical continuity.

Thus, Elizabeth II can be considered one of the key figures in twentieth- and twenty-first-century global politics, not in the conventional sense of authority, but in a civilizational sense. She embodied the transition from imperial dominance to symbolic leadership, from power to influence, and from borders to networks. Her reign marked the conclusion of the “long twentieth century” and simultaneously laid one of the foundations for the new global order.

Further study of the British monarchy and the role of Elizabeth II opens a broad interdisciplinary field for scholarly research. First, a detailed analysis of the monarchy as a form of “soft power” appears particularly promising. It functions beyond classical instruments of political governance yet exerts long-term and structural influence on international relations.

The Commonwealth of Nations deserves focused study as a unique model of post-imperial integration. Comparative analysis of its effectiveness with other post-colonial formations will allow a more precise assessment of the role of the Queen’s symbolic leadership in maintaining political loyalty, coordinating positions, and establishing shared value frameworks among formally sovereign states.

Another important research direction concerns the Christian dimension of monarchical authority in a secularized world. In particular, it is worth examining how religious symbolism, rituals, and the concept of the “divine origin of authority” preserve their legitimizing function in modern democracies without conflicting with constitutional principles.

The analysis of political continuity between Elizabeth II’s reign and the current phase of British foreign policy is also promising. In this context, it is appropriate to trace the extent to which the model of global networks formed under the Queen continues to influence Commonwealth states’ decisions regarding security, sanction policies, and the support of international law and order.

The Ukrainian dimension constitutes a separate research block. Future studies could focus on the role of Commonwealth states in forming an international coalition in support of Ukraine, as well as on the long-term symbolic and institutional consequences of policies initiated during the Queen’s reign. This will allow for a deeper understanding of the mechanisms for rapid mobilization of solidarity in crisis situations.

Finally, a promising theoretical avenue lies in conceptualizing the monarchy as a form of political memory. In this regard, Elizabeth II emerges not only as a historical figure but also as a bearer of continuity, linking different eras, political regimes, and civilizational shifts. Analysis of this phenomenon may contribute to a broader understanding of the role of tradition in shaping the future global order.

References:

1. Cook R. J., Searle A. (2020). The Exercise of Soft Power by Female Monarchs in the United Kingdom. *Royal Studies Journal*. Vol. 7, no. 2. P. 31–48.
2. Cook R., Searle A. (2022). Queen Elizabeth II's Soft Power and Britain's Place in a Post-Elizabethan Age. *Royal Studies Journal*. October.
3. Gellwitzki C. N. L., Houde A.-M., Rogers L., Rosher B. (2024). Keep Calm and Carry on? Fissure, Perception, and Narrative Contestation Following the Demise of the Crown. *International Political Sociology*. Vol. 18, no. 4. Article olae042.
4. Ginsburg T. (2020). The Role of Monarchy in Modern Democracy: European Monarchies Compared. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*. Vol. 18, no. 4. P. 1535–1538.
5. Greenstein F. I., Herman V., Stradling R. N., Zureik E. (1974). The Child's Conception of the Queen and the Prime Minister. *British Journal of Political Science*. Vol. 4, no. 3. P. 257–287.
6. Markovich S. G. (2022). Legacy of Queen Elizabeth II: The Symbolism of the British Monarchy and the Challenges It Faces. *Politički život: časopis za analizu politike*. no. 23. P. 7–17. DOI: 10.18485/fpn_pz.2022.23.1
7. Mintah K. C. (2024). An appraisal study of Ghanaian media's attitude towards Britain on the death and burial of Queen Elizabeth II. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*. Vol. 10. Article 100911.
8. Rotaru M.-C. (2023). Queen Elizabeth II and the Commonwealth – Her Role and Legacy. *Polis. Journal of Political Science*. XI, no. 1(39). P. 5–23.
9. Taylor M. (2024). "Intelligible government": rethinking the meaning of monarchy in the age of King Charles III. *History of European Ideas*. P. 1–16.
10. Twomey A. (2020). The Exercise of Soft Power by Female Monarchs in the United Kingdom. *RSJ: Gender and Monarchy*. Vol. 7, no. 2. P. 31–48. DOI: 10.21039/rsj.266