

The Nation State

An Essay

by Anthony C. Pick

Dedication

This essay is dedicated to the memory of Irene Pick (1939-2007).

Acknowledgements

The author acknowledges with gratitude the help that he has received from Simon Pick and Matthew Pick, without which many errors and omissions would have occurred.

March 2011

| | |
|---|----|
| Summary | 3 |
| The Nation State | 5 |
| The Significance of the Nation State: International Peace | 5 |
| The Significance of the Nation State: The Growth of Democracy | 7 |
| The Significance of the Nation State: Social and Economic Development..... | 9 |
| Precursors of the Nation State | 15 |
| The Personal State | 15 |
| Theocracy | 18 |
| Oligarchy | 21 |
| City State | 23 |
| Territorial Empire..... | 26 |
| Trading Empire..... | 31 |
| The Military State..... | 33 |
| The Tribal State | 34 |
| Development of the Nation State..... | 37 |
| Phase I: Consolidation of the Personal or Imperial State | 38 |
| Phase II: Transfer of Legitimacy to the Nation | 41 |
| Phase III: Establishment of Constitutional Legitimacy | 43 |
| The Development of Individual Nation States: 15 th to 18 th Centuries: | 47 |
| Switzerland, Netherlands, Scotland, England, United States, France..... | 47 |
| The Development of Individual Nation States: 19 th Century: | 49 |
| Sweden, Spain, Norway, Portugal, Greece, Belgium, Hungary, Denmark, Romania, Italy, Canada, Japan, Germany, Iceland, Bulgaria..... | 49 |
| The Development of Individual Nation States: 1900-1933: | 54 |
| Australia, Finland, Iran, Argentina, Russia, Uruguay, Czech Republic, Poland, the Baltic States, Mongolia, Ireland, Turkey, Thailand, Mexico, Colombia..... | 54 |
| The Development of Individual Nation States: 1934-1966: | 61 |
| Philippines, Chile, Ecuador, Jamaica, Austria, Brazil, Jordan, Malaysia, New Zealand, India, Sri Lanka, Korea, Indonesia, China, Bolivia, Egypt, Morocco, Vietnam, Peru, Tunisia, Venezuela, Ghana, Algeria, Kenya, Singapore | 61 |
| The Development of Individual Nation States: 1967-1999 | 72 |
| Nigeria, Honduras, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Guatlamala, Uganda, Paraguay, Nicaragua, South Africa, Yemen, Slovenia, Croatia, Ethiopia, Ukraine, Cambodia, Eritrea, Tanzania, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Haiti..... | 72 |
| The Development of Individual Nation States: 2000 Onwards | 80 |
| Senegal, Iraq, Lebanon, Serbia, Sudan, Côte d'Ivoire..... | 80 |
| Non-Nation States | 83 |
| Afghanistan, Bosnia Herzegovina, Burma, Kazakhstan, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Syria | 83 |

Summary

A state is a territorial political community for which there is an independent organised Government. A nation state is a state whose primary loyalty is to a cultural self-identity, which we call a nation or nationality, and is now the predominant form of state organisation. Nation states possess sovereignty and legitimacy. The significance of the nation state is that, once consolidated around a particular nationality, it is a stable form of state organisation. It is the sole form in which the growth of democracy is possible and which does not have a tendency to expand its territory. This stable environment proved to be essential for the emergence of modern financial, industrial and technological civilisation in Western Europe in the 17th and 18th centuries. The only historic competitors were imperial China, which was technologically highly innovative but did not become an industrial society until modern times, and the early Islamic Caliphate, which was also technologically and culturally innovative but was conquered by military and tribal states and then declined.

Until nation states appeared in the 16th and 17th century, government was by rulers whose authority did not derive from the people whom they ruled, who were termed their “subjects”. States ruled in that way had seven different forms, personal rule, theocracy, city state, oligarchy, military state, tribal state, and empire. The principal function of such a ruler was to achieve peace and order, by judging disputes and enacting laws by which disputes could be avoided. This could only be performed if his (rarely, her) authority did not derive from his subjects, and to reinforce that authority the concept of legitimacy arose, which defined a right to rule independently of any constitutional system. Legitimacy had to be certain in order to be effective, and a disputed legitimacy was undesirable and might give rise to civil war.

Personal rule was the usual first form of state organisation, almost always realised by a hereditary dynasty. It was generally supported by a religious sanction, historically the normal source of morality. Theocracies arose when religious authority became stronger than personal rule, although the two might be combined. City states arose in Europe, also when personal rule was weak, in order to exploit the added value obtainable by trade. Before the added value from trade and industry was available to states, the only form of wealth was the surplus obtainable from agriculture. Personal states therefore had an inherent tendency to seek to extend their territories, by conquest, inheritance, or other means, and in this way territorial empires arose. In some states, the army gained control of its own recruitment and promotion and set up an independent military caste, which we call military rule. In some states with a pastoral hinterland, pastoral tribes established a form of tribal government, also generally supported by a religious sanction. Although the core of most territorial empires were personal states, they have also been theocracies, city states, military states, and tribal states. All such pre-national forms of government were inconsistent with constitutional rule.

The establishment of a nation state entailed the transfer of legitimacy from a ruler not accountable to those he ruled to one accountable to the nation. This arose as the development of wealth from improved agriculture, trade, and industry created a civil society. The civil society sought a communal identity, through language, religion, common social organisations, and shared experiences and interests, and thus became a nation. We can identify three phases in the development of each nation state. Phase I was the development of a nationality within a clearly defined pre-national state. Phase II was the transfer of legitimacy from the ruler to the nation, by some form of rebellion against the ruler or assertion of nationality. Phase III was the expression of that legitimacy by a legal process called a Constitution, under which the government can be appointed and removed, its powers can be debated and approved, and both the government and private litigation are subject to law. Most present states have made the transition to Phase II and of these an increasing number, perhaps a majority, have made the further transition to Phase III.

Each of these three phases can be identified to a particular datable event in each nation state. Each phase had to overcome potential obstacles, sometimes painfully. In many countries the realisation of each phase requires several attempts, so that it is only in hindsight that we can be sure that a particular phase has been passed. Dynastic failure may prevent formation of a clearly defined national framework. A national identity in one state may imply the exclusion of other identities. National accountability may be resisted not only by rulers but also by interest groups with special privileges which had been negotiated with the ruler. Traditional institutions may fail in their responsibilities to the nation. Civil society may be insufficiently influential to represent the whole nation, so that state

institutions are captured by one or more minority elites which contend with each other for supremacy. The same minority elites may then compromise with each other to the exclusion of other interests, or power may be handed over to the military, which sets up a military ruler to perform the functions that personal rule has failed to do. When a state is very weak, a theocratic faction may seek to seize power in the name of its religion, or an imperial faction may pursue the dream of supranational hegemony. However, provided that social and economic development continues, civil society eventually becomes strong enough to establish a stable and effective Constitution, and eventually to extend it to the whole population.

Nation states first emerged in the 16th and 17th centuries in the countries on the western edge of Europe, apparently for four reasons. First, the Holy Roman Empire¹ was too weak to interfere with the states to the west of it, but strong enough to protect them from states to the east of it. Secondly, West European states, otherwise dependent on low-productivity agriculture, benefited from the wealth of city states on the edges of the Holy Roman Empire which were engaged in long-distance trade. Thirdly, the long-lived ruling dynasties of these states provided sufficiently stable and effective government. Fourthly, the same states themselves undertook long-distance trading endeavours. These conditions did not prevail with states in Central, South and East Asia, even though they developed many advanced technologies. This may have been because the agriculture of Asian states was more productive, so that city states did not have an opportunity to develop, or because conflicts between the Asian empires and personal states inhibited the stable conditions necessary for nation states to appear, or because some Asian states were afflicted with ephemeral tribal and military dynasties.

When nation states arose they increased their national wealth by engaging in more widespread trade, and had a natural desire to acquire trading outposts. In this way, trading or colonial empires arose, which competed with each other as new trading opportunities appeared. There were therefore two sorts of empire, territorial and trading. From the point of view of the subject peoples, trading empires were also not constitutional although the core state might be. Although at the start of the 20th century the world's richest states were nation states, they were few in number and the majority of the world's population were subject to empires, either territorial or trading, all of which have now been divided into states of which the great majority are nation states.

Since the purpose of nation states is to enable each nation to increase its wealth, the incentive for pre-national states to extend into the territory of other states ceased when they became nation states. Wealth now comes from trade between states and is diminished by competition between them. The wars of the 20th century were not wars between nation states but wars between empires and between empires and nation states. The US and China made the transition from an empire to a nation state which encompassed their component peoples. Some of the last of the historic states to achieve nationality were the centres of large territorial empires: Austria, Hungary, Turkey, Russia, and Iran, for which the loss of empire released their national self-identity. Three empires in particular have caused problems during the last century. Germany and Japan, having become nation states, failed to make the transition to constitutional rule and became subject to military regimes which diverted the national effort in order to seize a local empire; a constitutional state had to be forced on them. Russia extended its previous empire under the guise of an anti-constitutional ideology, until finally its system collapsed. In this century, an extreme Islamic group is attempting to establish a theocratic empire in defiance of nationality.

States arising from territorial empires generally did so by means of a national revolt, and so came into being with a sense of national identity although often unclear borders; the same is true of many Asian and North African states which had been subject to a trading empire. States arising from trading empires in Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America were often the creations of the imperial power, and so had to construct a national identity within their borders, often from disparate social, tribal, or religious components; in the absence of a legitimate national government they generally experienced phases of military, personal, tribal, or oligarchic rule while a national sense developed. In a few states, this process has not yet occurred. When a sufficient national identity existed to support constitutional government, the transition might occur relatively peacefully.

Our analysis examines first these ideas in greater depth, then the nature of the various pre-national states, then the three phases of the nation state. The phases are illustrated by the constitutional developments of individual countries.

The Nation State

A state is a territorial political community for which there is some form of independent organised Government. Such a government can only operate if it is to some degree literate and numerate, and its relations with its subjects are to some extent stable and include respective responsibilities. Our definition therefore does not include tribal peoples without a defined territory or written legal system, even though they may have a tribal chief.

A nation state is a state whose primary loyalty is to a cultural self-identity, which we call a nation or nationality. Because a state is the expression of a nation, there is in general only one state for each nation and only one nation for each state². Since a common language is essential for effective communication, nations are usually identified with one language, but there are many nations which speak the same language, such as Britain and Ireland or Spain and Mexico, but are quite distinct. Where several languages are spoken in a nation state, one is generally predominant. In addition to language, a nation is created by shared memory of historic events and by cultural factors of all sorts, such as sports contests, literature, media, political parties, social organisations, educational and political systems. Above all, the citizens of each nation have a general sense of what it is to belong to it and what it requires of them.

Whatever makes up the world's nations, there is no doubt of their reality. The United Nations currently has 193 members, almost all a nation of some sort. However, this system is the product only of the last 100 years, and substantially of the last 50 years. The 1815 Treaty of Vienna, which represented the international community as then understood, had eight signatories, of which only five (Britain, France, Spain, Portugal, and Sweden) were nation states as we have described them. The remainder were two empires (Austria and Russia) and one personal state (Prussia). The 1878 Treaty of Berlin, which was equally far-reaching, had seven signatories, comprising four nation states (Britain, France, Germany, and Italy) and three empires (Austria-Hungary, Russia, and Turkey). Only in the twentieth century did nation states proliferate to any extent. The 1919 Treaty of Versailles had 32 signatories, of which only one (India) was not an independent nation state³. In 1920 42 states founded the League of Nations, which had 58 members at its maximum size. 51 countries, all nation states, founded the United Nations in 1945.

In addition to a sense of nationality and the social and cultural underpinning which supports it, a nation is characterised by a single political system or Government and an administrative structure which executes the instructions of that Government. The political system comprises an executive, legislature, and judiciary, which may operate well or badly, may or may not conform to clear legal rules, may be entirely centralised or partially devolved to provinces, and their authority may or may not be accepted throughout the nation's territory. However, they are present in all nations except for those very few which are in a state of civil war, anarchy, or political subjection, and in general have two fundamental characteristics: they are sovereign and legitimate.

The concepts of sovereignty and legitimacy are necessary to a nation state because, by its nature, the primary loyalty of a population is to its nation. Since there is only one state for each nation, one nation cannot be politically subject to another. We therefore have the legal concept of sovereignty, whereby a nation state is not under the legal authority of any other body. Since loyalty is to the nation as a cultural abstraction, the Government must be accepted by the population as the proper source of the nation's authority. We therefore have the political concept of legitimacy, which such a properly constituted Government possesses. Legitimacy is realised through legal processes generally termed a Constitution. The minimum requirements of a Constitution are that it indicates how a Government is nominated and dismissed and what powers it possesses. If as is usual the Government comprises many bodies such as an executive, legislature, and judiciary, and central and provincial Governments, the Constitution delimits their respective competences. In addition to the identity of the governmental bodies, each of their respective powers and competences must also be legitimate.

The Significance of the Nation State: International Peace

The significance of the nation state is that, once consolidated around a particular nationality, it is a stable form of state organisation. It is the only form of state organisation in which the growth of democracy is possible, and the only form which does not have a tendency to wage war with its

neighbours. This last statement is contrary to much received opinion, which attributes major wars to excessive nationalism and the demagoguery which expresses it. It is supposed that national sentiment induced a country, such as Hitler's Germany, Napoleon's France, or Charles V's Spain to attack its neighbours and attempt to dominate them. Nationalism may be present in such conduct, but it has not been the normal behaviour of nation states. An alternative and more plausible explanation is that the major wars of the past were not between nation states, but between empires or between empires and nation states, and that an empire is an alternative state organisation to a nation state. If we consider the major 19th and early 20th century wars, they all involved an empire which either existed historically such as the Russian Empire, Austro-Hungarian Empire, or Ottoman Empire, or was attempting to come into being, such as Hitler's, Napoleon's, Mussolini's, or the Japanese Empire, or was recently formed, such as the Hohenzollern German Empire which collapsed in 1918.

All these empires are now gone, and those remaining after 1945 did not survive the 20th century. The British and French empires were largely dissolved by 1970, and the Soviet empire (the Soviet Union and its satellite states) continued until 1990-91 only because it was sustained by Marxist-Leninist ideology. The last major threat of global conflict was the Cold War between the Soviet Union and the nation states of Europe and North America, led by the United States. Empires are a defunct form of state organisation, replaced by the nation states of which they were composed, and their demise has removed the principal threats of global conflict which had earlier existed. Some attempts to form an empire have unfortunately continued. Serbia sought to prevent the break-up of Yugoslavia, and its failure was recorded in the Dayton Accords in 1995. Al-Qa'ida, based on the Afghanistan-Pakistan border, aims to re-establish a theocratic caliphate.

Two empires have historically transformed themselves to become a nation state: the United States and China. Each possessed a strong cultural identity which became the basis of a modern nationality. This cultural identity was extended to its outlying provinces as it conquered and absorbed them, so that the provinces became part of the founding nation rather than subordinate to it. Both have been able with ease to absorb outside influences, the United States through immigration and China from dynasties of foreign origin. The United States' political identity had to be confirmed through its Civil War of 1861-5, but after that it developed rapidly to become the world's richest nation.

Armed conflicts between states arise because political or diplomatic means are not sufficient to resolve competing ambitions of rulers or states. Empires were not founded on any principle of nationality, and therefore there was no rule which stated where their boundary should be and which provinces they should contain. As soon as one empire found itself competing with another one for territory, war was the normal means to settle the outcome. When a nation wished to be independent of an empire, as the Netherlands did from Spain in 1581, war was the only means to achieve it. When a state wished to form a new empire, as Germany, Japan, and Russia did in the 20th century, they found themselves opposed by the nation states which surrounded them, and in the resultant destructive conflicts the nation states ultimately prevailed. During much of the 19th century there was a hiatus in this otherwise incessant sequence of imperial wars, because two outstanding diplomatists saw the problems that empires bring and tried to resolve them: Metternich in the first half of the century and Bismarck in the second half. Both eventually failed: Metternich's Austrian system was destroyed by the 1860's wars of Italian and German national unification. Bismarck provoked a series of limited wars, against Denmark, Austria, and France, in order to secure German unification, but his military successors destroyed his system in their attempts to achieve a greater German empire. The principal 19th-century European conflict after 1815, the Crimean War 1854-56, was waged to prevent Russian encroachment on the Ottoman Empire.

Turning back to previous centuries, the principal conflicts all involved empires. The 1812-14 war between Britain and the United States was waged primarily to confirm the eastern Canada-US border. In the 18th century, Britain, France, and the Netherlands fought over the formation of world trading empires, Austria and France fought over the domination of Europe, and Russia, the Ottomans, and Persia fought over what is now Southern Russia. In the 16th and 17th centuries, France and the Hapsburgs again fought over the domination, first of Italy and later of Germany, the Netherlands fought to be free from the Spanish empire and then seized many of the Portuguese colonies. Many of these earlier imperial wars were as destructive as the 20th century imperial wars have been. Germany took many decades to recover from the Thirty Years' War (1618-28), which destroyed what little legitimacy remained to the Holy Roman Empire. Korea was devastated in 1592 when a Japanese

invasion attempted unsuccessfully to displace the Chinese suzerainty of that country. The population of Iran (which then included Iraq) fell by more than half after the 13th-century Mongol invasion.

In contrast to the condition of war which characterised relations with empires, relations between stable nation states have been generally peaceful. It is striking to note that the states which remained after the collapse of empires have generally accepted the boundaries that they found themselves with, provided that these coincided with a nationality. There have of course been exceptions. After the final expulsion of Ottoman Turkey from Europe in 1912, there was a war in 1913 to determine whether Macedonia would be part of Bulgaria. A war in 1923 between Greece and the new nation state of Turkey resulted in the mass transfer of populations between the countries. In 1864-70 and 1932-35 wars occurred involving Paraguay and its neighbours, but it can be argued that at that period Paraguay was still a personal state or an oligarchy, ruled by irresponsible dictators. In a war 1879-84, Chile captured from Peru and Bolivia valuable nitrate-producing territories. India and Pakistan went to war several times over Kashmir, a boundary dispute left over from their 1947 independence. Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990. Armenia and Georgia still have boundary disputes. With these infrequent exceptions, almost all external wars by nation states have been to establish their independence from a state with another nationality, such as Eritrea from Ethiopia, Bangladesh from Pakistan, or east Timor from Indonesia. Whichever empire we consider, the British, French, German, Russian, Austro-Hungarian, Ottoman, Iranian, Japanese, Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, or Belgian, their disappearance has left behind states with largely stable boundaries, which either already possess a nationality and so are a nation state from their foundation, or are willing to develop their own nationality within those boundaries.

As we have noted, before 1815 nation states which were establishing world trading empires sometimes came to blows over the borders of those empires, but not over the borders of their respective nation states. After 1815, disputes between trading empires were generally resolved peacefully.

Many nation states have or had the misfortune of a civil war, but this has been to establish the legitimate source of authority in that state, as in England in 1642-8, in Spain in 1936-9, in the USA in 1861-5, or now in Libya. The formation of nation states have themselves involved civil wars, as part of their transformation from either a personal state, theocracy, oligarchy, military and/or tribal state, which are competing models of state organisation to a nation state which we will discuss.

At the start of the 20th century, the most powerful and wealthiest states in the world by far were the nation states of Western Europe and the United States. However, the majority of the world's inhabited surface was not ruled by nation states but by empires, which as we have seen are all now dissolved. The triumph of the nation state is therefore the outcome of the last 100 years. The nation states of Western Europe are themselves only a product of the last 500 years. Before then, other forms of state existed whose character was different from that of a nation state.

The Significance of the Nation State: The Growth of Democracy

Until nation states appeared in the 16th and 17th century, all forms of government were by a body whose authority did not derive from the people whom they ruled, who were termed its "subjects". Such a body possessed the sovereignty and legitimacy which now characterise nation states. If its subjects considered the rule legitimate, they accepted it. If they did not consider it legitimate, they might rebel, but would then seek to be the subjects of another ruler, for example another dynasty. In each case, the test was, as it is for every form of rule, whether the government was legitimate or not. There were several forms of what we may term pre-national rule: (i) Personal rule, meaning rule by a single person who generally inherits the right to rule from his or her predecessor. The form of inheritance is a dynasty. This is generally termed "monarchy", but we avoid this term, as it is also used for historic institutions in a constitutional state. (ii) Theocracy, meaning rule by the exponents of a religion, organised in the form of a Church. We include Marxist-Leninist regimes in this category. Some but not all historic theocracies have also been dynastic. (iii) City states, meaning rule by the commercial oligarchy of a city which is effectively independent. Oligarchy also occurs more rarely among larger states. (iv) Military rule, meaning rule by an military caste not subject to outside control. (v) Tribal state, meaning rule of a state by a tribe or federation of tribes. (vi) Empire, meaning rule by one state of another. The ruling state of an empire may be any of the other categories: personal rule, city state, oligarchy, theocracy, military, or tribal rule, or it may be a nation state.

In pre-national systems, the ruler exercised and was expected to exercise powers of government, legislation, and adjudication without consideration of the relation between these functions. The main requirement was that he (or they, or rarely she) should rule effectively: deal with internal disputes, promote the welfare of his subjects, issue a stable currency, defeat rebellions or external attacks, and prevent oppression. If he could extend the wealth of his subjects by acquiring more territory, that was usually desirable. His right to rule generally had a religious sanction, since religion was considered as the main source of morality and hence of obedience. If the Church was well-organised, a non-theocratic regime might still have a theocratic element. There was no requirement for a limited term of office. When the right to rule of dynasts came to be questioned, the religious sanction was rationalised as “monarchy by divine right”, but the more usual rationalisation of pre-national rule was “loyalty to the ruler” or “loyalty to the dynasty”. The rights of the ruler’s subjects did not take the form of a Constitution, but of immunities and privileges which belonged to particular groups, such as landowners, cities, the Church, provinces, guilds, or tribes, and which defined each group’s relationship with the ruler. Where a particular group considered that its privileges or immunities in relation to the ruler were insufficient, it was considered quite compatible with loyalty to the ruler to rebel in order to improve them. In the late stage of personal rule, many rulers came to realise that these privileges and immunities were an obstacle to the development of the state: they prevented free trade which was necessary for prosperity, or the advancement of persons outside privileged groups, or freedom of thought which was needed for intellectual advance, or the increase and collection of taxes, or the ability of the ruler to be served by the most able people. Personal rulers therefore tried to break down the immunities and privileges, using the power which they believed that their legitimacy gave them, often against fierce opposition. Such rulers were called “enlightened despots” at that stage in history⁴.

Such a state is evidently incompatible with democracy, since democracy implies that legitimacy derives from popular consent and that there exists a legal process whereby that consent can be expressed. These two conditions exist only in the nation state, and we attempt to trace how they are realised. The first requirement, which we call Phase I, arises before the nation state is formed, and is that there exists a state with clear boundaries under a secure and legitimate government. At Phase II, the legitimacy of the government of that pre-national state breaks down and is replaced by a government accountable not to an external body but to the nation. At Phase III, this accountability comes to be expressed by a legal process whereby the government can be appointed and removed, its powers can be debated and approved, and both the government and private adjudication are subject to law. We call this third phase a Constitution. As part of Phase III, the accountability of the government is extended, often from a small elite, to all adult citizens. Since citizens all have equal rights, the concept of rebellion in order to obtain superior rights than other citizens becomes abhorrent.

In this essay, we seek to show that each of these phases can be identified with a particular datable event in each nation state. The events were driven in part by the growth of shared culture, language, experiences, institutions, and ideas which are the basis of nationality, but in addition by the growth in added value in the economy of each state, which brought to social groups within it the intellectual and material confidence to think and act independently. We call these groups civil society. The added value of an economy is the difference between the value of its costs and the value of its output. For historic economies there is often insufficient information on it, probably because of the difficulties of the research. However, the importance of economic added value in the development of each country has been critical. We may speculate that in ancient and early medieval times, it was very low, so low that there was no means of paying a large proportion of the workforce, who scarcely earned their own subsistence or were employed as sharecroppers, serfs, or slaves. Civil society therefore remained limited to a tiny ruling and landed elite. When an ancient state became sufficiently well organised, it would seek to extend its added value by conquering neighbouring territory, which often contained no state at all. In this way, the ancient empires were founded. Conversely, in adverse circumstances the added value of the empire or state could fall to a point at which it could no longer defend itself from neighbouring tribal peoples.

Later in the medieval period, city states arose in Western Europe. These discovered that an enormously greater added value could be obtained by trade, especially trade over long distances and between countries of varied resources, skills, and economies. The civil societies of the city states were small oligarchies of the leading landowners and merchants, too small to develop a nationality. In due course, certain personal states in Western Europe became sufficiently well organised to share in the benefits of trade and developed a strong enough cultural identity to have the basis of a nationality. Their added value also grew through improved agriculture and small-scale industry, and in this way

both the taxes available to the ruler increased and a civil society developed. At a particular time in each state, the civil societies of these West European states found the terms of the personal rule to which they were subject no longer acceptable. They rebelled, demanded a government more responsive to their interests, and set up institutions to enforce that accountability. It is this transition which we call Phase II. As the institutions settled into a defined legal relationship, the states entered Phase III. At first, the limited added value of the economy restricted civil society to a small elite. However, industrialisation and increased prosperity extended civil society first to a middle class, then to a skilled working class, and finally to the bulk of the population. As each section joined civil society it demanded and achieved rights to participate in the choice of government and Parliament, until what we term democracy was achieved.

In states east of Western Europe, rulers remained sufficiently strong to prevent any form of accountability, mostly until the start of the 20th century, and followed the normal policy of extending their territory as occasion arose to do so. In this way, large territorial empires arose. The only significant early attempt to create a nation state in Eastern Europe was the Hussite rebellion in Bohemia 1420-34 against the Holy Roman Empire, which was defeated. We have noted how these empires had disintegrated by 1918, by which time their subject peoples were ready to establish separate nation states. The former imperial powers Iran, Hungary, and Turkey each formed nation states at the same time, and Austria in 1945. Three former imperial states did not follow this path. In Germany and Japan, the transition to national accountability of the government did not occur, and the formally constitutional institutions which they had set up failed. The governments pursued a policy of imperial expansion which had to be defeated by America, Britain, France and Russia, at great material cost. Effective constitutional government was imposed on these countries by the victors. In Russia, a Marxist-Leninist regime from 1917 governed what are now a large number of nation states under a fraudulent constitutional structure. Its collapse in 1989 freed these countries, and also released Russia to follow the normal constitutional path of a nation state.

At about the time that the states of Western Europe became wealthy, they became strong and well-equipped enough to plant colonies overseas of their surplus population, trading with the mother country. These colonies assumed control of local societies and eventually grew into large trading empires which covered much of South and East Asia and Africa and all of Australasia and America. Only Persia (Iran), Afghanistan, China, Japan, Siam (Thailand), and (except 1936-41) Ethiopia escaped. We have noted that these trading colonies achieved independence as nation states, mostly by 1970. The colonies where the population was predominantly of British origin formed their own nation states, starting with the United States in 1776. The Latin American states were independent by 1825.

In many countries, the transition to constitutional government has proved difficult. The main problem arose in those countries with well-established institutions, which they had to adapt to constitutional processes. Often the established institutions were drawn from a narrow elite and proved unequal to the transition, resulting in weak and short-lived governments with limited legitimacy. The country might then turn to a form of autocracy which claimed to represent the nation, which ruled until civil society was strong and prosperous enough to re-establish a constitutional structure. The next stage may be that several relatively narrow elites coalesced to form a constitutional system, which continued to be weak and unstable until civil society was strong enough to represent the nation as a whole.

The Significance of the Nation State: Social and Economic Development

The transition from a pre-industrial to an industrial and technologically advanced economy, with all the social changes that it entails, is as marked an event in the history of each country as the change to the nation state. It has occurred at different times in each state, depending on its circumstances. These circumstances included the availability of sufficient transport infrastructure, educated population, wealthy market, accessible raw materials and sources of power, and technological innovation. We suggest that they also included a benign state framework, which could only arise after the transition to a nation state has occurred. In a pre-national state, the need to maintain the ruler's authority and collect sufficient taxes led each ruler to create and maintain a centralised administrative control of as many of the country's assets as he could, and also to enforce the religious and cultural orthodoxy on which his authority was believed to depend. To help his revenue collection, a pre-national ruler might also promote transport infrastructure. Such methods of rule could be brought to high degree of efficiency, but were not consistent with the development of a modern economy. The development of nation states in Western Europe, in the Netherlands and Britain, and later in France, Belgium, Germany, the United

States, and other countries, replaced the authority of the pre-national ruler with that of the nation expressed through its legitimate rulers. The nation state empowered its citizens to engage in economic activity without the need for endorsement by the ruler, and it became instead the function of the ruler to facilitate this activity by ensuring free markets and personal movement, property rights, observance of contracts, and a legal framework for banking and commerce. The greater legitimacy that the nation state possessed enabled it to overcome the obstacles to market liberalisation by guilds and other special-interest groups and the often painful social disruption that market liberalisation entailed.

This essay is not concerned with the detailed history of modern economic development, only with the role of the nation state in facilitating its commencement. Industrialisation has gone through several stages depending on the sources of power available, from water and steam power to electricity and the internal combustion engine, and has taken on new forms with modern electronics, computers, and telecommunications. It also has been subject to periodic disruption caused by problems in the management of capital movements and credit and by technological change. As industries have globalised, they have relocated between countries. We are concerned here only with the fact that at a certain stage in each state's history, it has undergone a transition from a primarily rural society with relatively low economic added value to a largely urbanised one with all the added value and technological innovation which makes a modern society possible.

Industrialisation is intimately connected with the development of international trade and the capitalist economy, both of which originated in West European city states and then were adopted by West European nation states. They remain the foundations of industrial development today, most recently in the rapidly developing economies of the nation states of China, India, Brazil, Russia, and elsewhere. Unfortunately, international trade and capitalism have been subject to periodic obstacles. In the late 19th century, early industrialising nations sought to protect their nascent industries from British competition by means of tariffs, and at intervals since then, protection has been seen as a means of softening or delaying the rapid social changes that the industrial economy sometimes requires. This problem became most acute in the period after the First World War 1918-39, when dislocation arising from failures in the management of international trade resulted in widespread protectionist measures. These measures were ineffective and caused a major depression, which the promotion of free trade since 1945 has sought to avoid.

More seriously, following the 1917 Russian revolution a few countries attempted a non-capitalist model of economic growth based on centralised planning in disregard of the market. In addition to the countries on which the Soviet Union imposed that system, it was adopted voluntarily by India, China, and other countries. It is only since about 1989 that the failure of this alternative model has been almost universally recognised and largely abandoned. Both centralised planning and protectionism can be seen as a continuance of the pre-national system of economic management, in which the state attempted to administer and control the state's assets and so to prevent the transition to a market-based economy.

The transition to a modern market economy does not depend only on the establishment of nationally-based legitimacy, but also on a stable constitutional system capable of effecting that legitimacy. In many states, the sources of national legitimacy were disputed for a considerable period before stability was established, for example with regard to the role of religion in national life. Other countries misunderstood the nature of industrialisation by interpreting it, not as participating in a world economy, but as a national competition for industrial hegemony, and these imperial attempts had to be defeated at great cost. In other states, the social pressures caused by industrialised were beyond the power of the early national constitutions to cope with, and the constitutions failed. In the confusion caused by the failure, the delusion of an alternative centrally planned economic model was particularly disruptive. However, in all cases, these obstacles to constitutional and social stability were overcome and rapid economic growth became possible.

We shall now consider these historic processes in greater detail. We have described how, in a pre-national state, the ruler exercised in his (or rarely her) own person the often undifferentiated powers of government, legislation, and adjudication. He generally did this through a Council or set of Councils, nominated by himself, which gave him advice and often then administered the decisions taken. As government became more complicated, Ministers were appointed for particular functions such as finance and taxation, war, justice, foreign relations, weights and measures, forests, mines, and roads and waterways. So far as the independence of religious bodies permitted, there was a Minister for

religious affairs. A competent ruler would ensure the stability of the currency. An efficient pre-national government such as that of Imperial China would also appoint censors to check on the efficiency of government ministries, and would possess a mechanism for handling complaints against maladministration⁵.

The tendency to centralised control of administration was inherent in the nature of personal rule and its military or theocratic equivalents. The function of the ruler was to maintain his legitimacy, as from that his ability to rule depended. To do that, he would exercise and be seen to exercise as many powers as he could. The king of England would grant the right to hold fairs or send representatives to Parliament, or immunity from certain taxes, or ownership of certain lands, so implying that without such grants the rights or immunities would not exist. Important legal cases were handled at the king's courts. It was also in the interests of the ruler's Councillors and Ministers to emphasise the royal legitimacy, as that confirmed their own power. However, such a system was not self-maintaining and needed constant attention. The king had to ensure that his Councillors and Ministers were his own nominees and not that of an aristocratic faction, were adequately trained, and fulfilled their roles competently and honestly.

Ministers and Councillors had the same task with respect to local officials. Domestic policies being set centrally, two approaches were possible to administer them locally. In Imperial China and France from Henry IV (1589-1610), an official was appointed centrally to enforce the royal or imperial will in each Province. The Chinese system trained these officials and required them to pass an examination. Alternatively, in England from Elizabeth I (1558-1603) and in Tokugawa Japan (1603-1867), domestic policies, including justice, were administered by local landowners under a formal commission from the royal government, supervised by centrally appointed officers. In the English system, the central officer (Lord Lieutenant or High Sheriff) was himself a senior local aristocrat. The English justice system was under the supervision of centrally appointed professional judges who administered the English Common Law.

Either system of local administration was subject to potential abuse. Given that funds were generally not sufficient to provide adequate salaries for royal servants and that complaints handling was weak or ineffective, corruption and favouritism were always a risk whatever the degree of local devolution, although usually a general sense of administrative competence and fairness would eventually prevail. Nevertheless, as with central government functions, continual effort and vigilance to maintain the system were needed.

The principal obligations of a pre-national state were to keep law and order, defend the realm, raise enough taxation, and take a paternal interest in its subjects' welfare⁶. With regard to taxation, the state had three sources of income. Since the primary economy of all states except city states was agricultural, that was the principal source of taxation. Much attention was therefore given by governments to promoting agricultural prosperity: bringing waste land into cultivation, maximising the yield from productive land, and improving the means to transport grain. In most circumstances, rights of private property limited the state's power to improve agricultural revenues, but in some circumstances the ruler could invade those rights. The second source of state revenue was generally commercial. For a maritime state such as England this meant external customs dues, but for others there might be internal customs barriers or sales taxes. To increase commercial revenues, the state might promote particular industries, a practice which occurred particularly with countries such as France or China which possessed a centralised administrative system. The French mercantile system under Colbert (1665-83) promoted the production of industries such as luxury textiles, protected them against foreign competition, and encouraged internal trade by building roads and canals. The Chinese Empire, especially under the Song dynasty (960-1126), encouraged the iron industry, shipbuilding, printing, paper-making, and salt processing, to a greater extent than any other pre-industrial state⁷. The third source of state income came from its directly owned assets: royal lands, mines, and forests and state monopolies such as tobacco or salt.

With an efficient administration, large population, and productive agriculture, the larger pre-national states initially dominated the world economy. It is estimated that China, India, and the Persian and Turkish Empires provided about half the world's gross domestic product until about 1500 CE. It is therefore a striking feature of the nation as a state organisation that it reversed this relationship. From 1500 these states' share of the world economy gradually declined, until by 1870 it was about 30% and by 1913 it was about 18%⁸, being overtaken first by Europe and then by the United States. The

precursors of this development were the growth in seaborne trade by the Italian, German, and Flemish city states from the 12th to the 16th centuries. By 1500, Italy, Flanders, and the Netherlands were the economic centres of Europe⁹, trading in Baltic supplies, spices via Byzantium, grain, wine, fish, metal goods, and textiles. They also became the centres of Europe in banking, insurance, and commodity futures. In 1487 a Portuguese navigator rounded the Cape of Good Hope, setting the example of trade with East Africa and Asia, before Portugal lost its political independence to Spain 1580-1640. Other city states arose at about the same time in East Africa and Indonesia, but for some reason neither region engaged in long-distance trade nor became commercially or financially preponderant.

While the European city states of Italy and Northern Europe achieved by 1500 a prosperity per capita considerably greater than the Asian states, Europe did not start to dominate the world economically until the formation of the Netherlands nation state after 1581 and the English (later British) nation state after 1689. The new opportunity available to the Netherlands, Britain, and other states was trade in spices and other goods such as tea, silk, and porcelain directly with East Asia, and in sugar, cotton, and tobacco with West Indies and North America¹⁰. The profits from such trade to the participating countries were very large, and stimulated a huge growth in the banking, insurance, and commodity services which the city states had pioneered. It also stimulated technological innovation, for example in ship design. The nation states, instead of being largely concerned with tax collection and policing, realised that they also had a primary responsibility to facilitate manufacturing and trade. Each state established the legal framework for private banks to finance this new economic development and to lend money to the state itself, notably the Amsterdam Exchange Bank founded in 1609 and the Bank of England in 1694. The states also established the legal framework for the private national trading companies, such as the Dutch East India Company in 1602 and (British) East India Company in 1708.

Since the legitimacy of nation states no longer depended on a religious sanction, its rulers could cease to regard enforcement of religious conformity as a primary duty and no longer felt under threat from religious diversity. This pattern had first been shown to some degree by the Italian and Flemish/Dutch city states, and was then applied on a national scale by the European nation states. The free flow of people regardless of their religion aided trade, industry and banking. It did not arise in pre-national states, which continued to be religiously based. The Chinese Empire followed a Confucian ideology throughout its existence, and from 1705 curtailed the activities of Jesuit missionaries when they refused to continue to conform to Chinese rites. The French revocation of the edict of Nantes¹¹ in 1685 resulted in the emigration of around 200,000 skilled Protestants from that country.

Although as we have noted nascent city states arose in East Africa and Indonesia, the principal non-European powers did not exploit them in the same way as did the Netherlands, Britain, and later other European states, and did not draw the same conclusions on the benefits of international trade and commerce. A possible break in this approach arose through the seven voyages of Admiral Zheng He (1407-33) during the Chinese Ming Dynasty (1368-1644), who travelled and traded to Indonesia, Sri Lanka, India, Iran, Arabia, and East Africa. However, such voyages depended on imperial sponsorship, and when this ceased so largely did the long-distance voyages. The Ming Emperors became distracted by a major Mongolian invasion in 1449 and concentrated instead on national defence. Imperial China never permitted entrepreneurial activity, overseas trade, or banking on a major scale independent of the Government, let alone the laissez-faire capitalism characteristic of modern economies¹². Its contribution to economic development lay with the building of canals, political stability, and the management of the currency. Trade with the West developed rapidly after Guangzhou¹³ was established as the principal trading port in 1683, becoming one of the world's leading cities, and the silver with which Chinese exports of porcelain, tea, and silk were paid for stimulated the Chinese economy. Nevertheless, these developments were insufficient to open up the Chinese economy and society. While the 1794 decision of the Qianlong Emperor (1735-96) not to respond to the Macartney trade embassy from Britain has been criticised as a lost opportunity, it seems that such a development would not have been possible within the imperial Chinese bureaucratic structure. The extensive development of capitalism in China had to await the foundation of the modern Chinese nation state in 1949 and the adoption of market economics by Deng Xiao-Ping (1978-92).

The gradual economic ascendancy of the west European states, commenced through their development of global trade, led to political influence in their principal overseas markets in order to protect that trade. As we shall see later ("Trading Empire"), political influence led to colonial ascendancy in those non-European countries that were not strong or united enough to defend themselves. Having achieved its independence by about 1585, Netherlands became the world's leading economic power throughout

the 17th century and displaced Portugal as the leading colonial power. The constitutional settlement in Britain in 1689-1707 enabled that country to outpace the Netherlands as a trading power, and to accumulate sufficient funds to finance the world's first mass industrial development over the period 1770-1820. This industrialisation was aided by large resources of coal and iron ore and certain inventions which made possible the mass production of textiles and mass rail transport, and enabled Britain to establish the world's largest colonial empire and become the world's leading economic and financial power through much of the 19th century.

In a similar way, each of the other principal countries in Europe and then elsewhere developed industrially as they became nation states. Those industrialising in the 19th century acquired colonial empires, which continued until decolonisation after 1945. However, industrialisation was delayed or affected in those states where there was a contested constitutional system, or where national identity was distracted by imperial or theocratic ambitions, or where obstacles were placed in the way of capitalism and free trade. In the pre-revolutionary French monarchy, Colbert had attempted to match the success of Netherlands and Britain by founding an East India Company in 1664, but it remained a royal rather than a private enterprise and had failed by 1770. After the 1789 Revolution had laid the foundation of a French nation state and Napoleon's Empire had been dismantled in 1815, French industrialisation could begin and continued until the Second Empire 1852-70. Unfortunately, the Revolution was so abrupt a break with the previous monarchy that it failed to establish a fully legitimate constitutional system, and the resultant political divisions within the Third Republic 1871-1939 delayed necessary social and industrial legislation and so inhibited further rapid economic growth in France until after 1945.

The first state to catch up with and then overtake Britain was the United States, which independence in 1776 and a Constitution in 1787 had given a national identity but not yet constitutional stability. It was only after the US civil war 1865-8 had confirmed the supremacy of its Constitution that rapid industrial development began, leading to world economic leadership by 1945. Belgium's national identity was established when it seceded from the Netherlands in 1830. Its large iron ore deposits enabled it to commence industrialisation immediately thereafter. Germany became a unified state with a strong national identity in 1871, and thereafter industrialised very rapidly, catching up with Britain by about 1913. However, its economic and social strength was diverted into military objectives, resulting eventually in the catastrophic defeat and occupation of 1945. Only after the formation of the Federal Republic in 1949 did Germany advance to be Europe's largest economy. Italy was unified in 1866-70 but in 1922-43 its weak national identity and constitution came under the control of Mussolini's autocratic regime, which invested in infrastructure but whose highly protectionist policy held back Italy's economic development. The rapid development of the Italian economy within the European market became possible on the establishment of a constitutional Italian state in 1946. Spain's national identity, triggered in 1812 by the Napoleonic invasion, was delayed by the need to convert from a long tradition of theocratic monarchy, and was threatened by anarchism, Communism, and regional separatism, culminating in the civil war 1936-39. The Franco authoritarian regime finally provided a stable framework for economic development, which occurred rapidly after constitutional government was finally established in 1975.

The first nation state to form in Asia was Japan, which having overthrown in 1868 its nominally feudal government, the shogunate, rapidly adapted its society to Western capitalist conditions and began to industrialise. The previous shogunal administration had prepared the country by promoting a stable government, large population, and literacy. However, the Constitution of 1890 was unable to prevent a seizure of power by the military, which sought to conquer raw materials and markets across East Asia¹⁴. To control its subject peoples the military absorbed almost all Japan's surplus resources until its defeat in 1945, after which the capitalist economy was re-established and Japan became, until recently, the world's second-largest economy.

As with other former colonial countries, Latin American states only achieved rapid economic growth when they had developed firm national and constitutional traditions. As they started with neither of these, the process generally took about a century from their independence in the 1820's (described below under "Transfer of Legitimacy to the Nation"). Unfortunately, most countries went through a phase of protectionist policies and encouragement of exaggerated economic expectations before this stage was reached, but the larger countries are now among the most rapidly expanding of the world economies.

Omitting the many other countries to which a similar pattern applies, we shall end with the largest developing economies of the modern world. India became independent in 1947 and adopted its present Constitution in 1950. However, it also adopted a method of bureaucratic and protectionist economic control derived from the Soviet Union until 1991, when changes were made to bring in an open market economy. Since that time, the Indian GDP has multiplied by seven and is continuing to grow rapidly. China achieved constitutional stability, but not democracy, as a nation state with the victory of the Chinese Communist Party in 1949. Until the death of Mao Zedong in 1976, it pursued variations of the command economy system, and in consequence the standard of living of the Chinese people stagnated or fell. With the advent of Deng Xiaoping, free market and capitalist reform were introduced in agriculture and industry in the 1980's and 1990's, with the result that China is a now net exporter of foodstuffs, its GDP has multiplied by at least 20 and it has recently become the world's second largest economy.

Russia became a nation state in 1917 with the fall of the Tsar, but with the Communist seizure of power reverted to a pre-national state. The Communists invested in infrastructure, science, and education, but as we have seen established a command economy in which economic value had no meaning. Its collapse in 1991 and the establishment of market pricing demonstrated that the true GDP of Russia, after elimination of products of no market value, was about that of Belgium or Switzerland. The Russian nation state was re-established with the 1993 Constitution, but the chaos caused by the transition to a market economy held back economic development until 1998. Since then, its GDP has doubled and this growth is expected to continue.

Precursors of the Nation State

We now describe in greater detail the eight pre-national forms of government: personal state, theocracy, oligarchy, city state, territorial empire, trading empire, military state, and tribal state. After that, we consider the process of transition to the nation state. Finally, we illustrate how these developments have taken place in particular countries.

Precursors of the Nation State: The Personal State

Personal states were those in which the primary loyalty was to a person, the ruler, called a king, sultan, or the equivalent, with those owing the loyalty being his (or rarely, her) subjects. Since an entire population cannot have a personal relation to one individual, the task of the ruler was to maintain the loyalty of a small aristocracy, who maintained the support of those below them in the social hierarchy. The loyalty had to be sufficient to impose order on the state and to organise its defence when attacked. This was the usual form of state which emerged from the first form of social organisation, the tribe, as the territory of each tribe became fixed and its rulers started to govern by written systems.

In their early stages, the societies of personal states tended to be chaotic and violent, in which leading aristocrats would feud, seize each others' territories, or oppress their inferiors. The central functions of the personal ruler were therefore to mediate effectively between his subjects, judge disputes fairly, maintain order, and punish misconduct. For this purpose, the identity and authority of the ruler had to be undisputed, and the only practical way to achieve that was by a hereditary dynasty. Starting originally as a warlord or by election by leading aristocrats, dynastic rulers succeeded each other by an agreed system of inheritance, and the right to rule was considered to be held in their family alone. In this way, the king or dynast acquired and retained the necessary legitimacy to rule, and might have a title such as "Sovereign" to indicate that he had no superior¹⁵. It was found that any dispute in inheritance, for example in England during the reign of Stephen (1141-54)¹⁶, resulted in an outbreak of anarchic violence, and dynasties therefore took great care that no dispute in succession should arise. It was also considered inappropriate for a dynast to marry one of their aristocratic subjects as this would compromise their impartiality, and they therefore married wives from other dynasties, producing an elite of ruling families whose inbreeding would often cause dynasties problems. When the inheriting ruler was a child, the regent might be the ruler's mother from the dynasty of a potentially rival country, but so strong was the hereditary concept that this apparent anomaly was accepted. In some countries, such as Ancient Egypt 1505-1482 BCE, Spain 1474-1504 CE, England 1553-1603, Austria 1740-80, or Russia 1762-96, a female ruler succeeded and ruled with full legitimacy, despite the strongly male orientation of their respective societies. It was generally considered perfectly proper for a foreign ruler to inherit a kingdom, as a king of Spain (Philip I, 1506) in 1504 inherited the Dukedom of Burgundy and so became ruler of the Low Countries. A later king of Spain, Charles II (1665-1700), a man wholly unfitted to rule, was considered competent to will his vast territories to his great-nephew Philip V in 1700.

Alternatively, an unpopular personal ruler could be replaced by another, but only when the new ruler had a good dynastic claim. The revolt of Portugal against Spain in 1640 succeeded because a member of the Portuguese royal family seized power as King John IV (1640-56). In 1388, Queen Margaret I of Denmark (1375-1412) was accepted as ruler of Norway by marriage and was invited to become ruler of Sweden on grounds of her personal competence.

Personal states of this general type arose in Europe, Byzantium, Egypt, North Africa, the Middle East, Persia, India, China, Japan, and in pre-Columbian America. Given the difficulties and slowness of communications, it was felt necessary to stress the authority and dignity of the ruler by magnificence and display, and to treat rebellion or treason as the most serious of crimes. The institution was also inextricably linked with the state's prevailing religion. Since the ruler did not and could not report to his subjects, he was considered to be accountable only to God. This idea was in no way anomalous. Before the arrival of modern science, general values and principles were not justified by theoretical reasoning but by religious sanction, whose authority lay with a Church and its holy liturgies and texts. The same religious sanction was considered to apply to government by a ruling family. A ruler could only function effectively if he protected and was endorsed by the Church and supported the Church's doctrines and liturgies. When Cyrus II (558-530 BCE), founder of the Persian Achaemenid Empire whose official religion was Zoroastrianism, conquered Babylon in 539 BCE he secured legitimacy by

supporting the cult of the local god Marduk, and when his son Cambyses (530-522 BCE) added Egypt to the Empire (525 BCE), he obtained acceptance by honouring the local goddess Neith¹⁷. Similar, the Roman conquerors of Celtic tribes and the Greek conquerors of the Achaemenid Empire (330 BCE) identified the local gods with their own.

As time progressed, and religious doctrines and liturgies became more fixed, they appeared to acquire an authority nearly as great as that of the hereditary principle. Religious nonconformity or heresy was regarded as a threat to the state, and might be punished in a cruel manner comparable to that for treason to the ruler. When monotheism took hold in Christian and Islamic states, the syncretism which was possible in among polytheistic peoples disappeared. Since these religions, and Judaism, are each based on sacred texts, the single God of one religion could only be identified with the single God of another insofar as the various texts permitted it. These religions therefore became less tolerant, and this lack of tolerance extended to the legitimacy of rulers. Christianity was in general particularly intolerant. Islam was historically tolerant of both Christianity and Judaism, but at the cost of a special tax (the Jizya). Islam was tolerant of Hinduism and Buddhism in India where Islamic rulers were strong, but not in Malaysia or Indonesia where they were weak and divided.

Personal states had the advantage that they could be run with a very low economic added value. In the state's least advanced form, the personal services on which it depended could be exacted directly, without transfer of money, often supported at the bottom rung of the social hierarchy by slavery. It was therefore suited to an agricultural economy close to subsistence level, such as that in Western Europe in the early Middle Ages. As the economy advanced and money began to circulate, the ruler was able to commute the personal services for taxation, which eventually enabled him to hire officials outside the aristocracy and build up a central administration. By various means – inheritance, marriage, conquest, or the dispossession of disloyal aristocrats – each ruler built up substantial assets in land in his own ownership. This system of personal dynastic rule proved effective and durable over a long period. It evidently depended on the capacity of the ruler. In the early stages, the task of bringing order to the state and personally repelling invading armies was so onerous that it required leaders of bravery, judgement, and charisma. However, when these difficulties had been largely overcome dynasts of ordinary abilities and character, such as will generally be produced by the chance of heredity, were often equal to the task. Problems arose if the hereditary principle produced an incapable ruler, such as Charles VI of France (1380-1422) or Henry VI of England (1422-61), or one whom his aristocracy did not trust, such as Richard II of England (1377-99), or one not capable of defending the realm, such as Charles III of France against the Vikings in 922. In such cases there was no simple solution; an assassination or civil war might be required to install a competent ruler with dynastic legitimacy.

Historically, personal rule had no regard for nationality. Successful personal rulers who had established control over their inherited territories sought to extend their lands by war, inheritance, marriage, or treaty into the territory of neighbouring peoples, since land and its resources was the only realisable form of wealth until the advent of trading cities. As the only constraining factor in the expansion of a personal state was the wealth and competence of the dynasty and ease of communication, some were able to develop into large empires, such as the Austrian, Russian, and Ottoman empires before the First World War, or the Spanish empire in Europe before 1713, held together by loyalty to the dynasty and by the empire's bureaucracy until they were broken up by the nationality of their component provinces, or in the case of Spain by the weakness of the dynasty.

Other personal states later became part of a nation state, such as the princely states of Germany or the provinces of France. In both these countries the local dynastic rulers were not kings, but aristocrats owing nominal allegiance to an overlord (the Holy Roman Emperor or the King of France). Unification of these countries eventually subjected their power to a national ruler. In the case of France this had largely taken place by 1491, but in Germany it awaited the German empire of 1871. At that time, the Kingdom of Prussia had genuine autonomy as a personal state ruled by the German emperor, but under the influence of German nationality it was gradually absorbed within Germany, becoming a land or province of the Weimar Republic in 1919 and being abolished in 1945. The present nation of Spain started as separate kingdoms which were conquered from the Moors or joined by marriage, and only gradually were unified under a single dynasty.

Only in the 19th century did a break appear between dynastic rule and religious sanction. Dynasties founded in that century, such as Serbia (1817), Belgium (1831), Greece (1832), Italy (1861), Romania (1866), Germany (1871), Bulgaria (1887), Norway (1905), and Iran (Pahlevi) in 1925 did not claim it.

Since they were not accountable to God, they were held to be accountable to their subjects and, as nationality developed, to their nations. All but two of these dynasties have now failed in that regard.

Before the 20th century, India, China, Japan, and Iran were both personal states, but with different profiles. India was unified in whole or part by different dynasties at various periods, such as the Delhi Sultans (1208-1388 CE), Bahmani Sultans (1347-1518), Vijayanagar (1336-1684), Mughals (1526-1802) and Marathas (1653-1802). Each of these dynasties eventually failed and, despite having a common culture, their states dissolved into smaller states, ruled by local dynasties founded by a provincial governor or warlord. The successor states of the Mughals were conquered piecemeal by the British to form their Indian colony, which became the framework for the Indian nation. China was also unified by a series of dynasties from 221 BCE. As each Chinese dynasty dissolved it was replaced by a set of competing personal states until a successor arose capable of restoring a unified empire. That unification could be repeatedly achieved was due to a common culture and administrative system, supported by a state religion, which proved strong enough to resist colonial conquest and establish the framework for the present Chinese nation. Chinese nationality is now represented by the People's Republic.

The Chinese imperial dynasties did not have the advantage of neighbouring royal houses of equal standing with which they could intermarry, and were therefore obliged to take wives from aristocratic families. This resulted, as the European royal houses had foreseen, in endless struggles for succession between the families from whom a bride had provided the emperor with a son¹⁸. The solution adopted in China and among many Asian royal houses was to replace the principle of primogeniture with the harem, in which the ruler would take many wives and concubines of low social standing and would bequeath the succession to the son who seemed most capable. Although this might produce capable rulers for several generations, it eventually failed, and power might fall into the hands of a determined Empress Dowager (Cixi in China, 1861-1908), or war might break out between sons on the death of their father (the Mughal Emperors in India, 1526-1802). Another undesirable consequence was that when a son eventually succeeded, he tended to murder all those relations who might become a threat, as occurred in the Ottoman Empire 1432-1603.

The ancient Japanese monarchy established a national administration from 593 CE, but after 1195 CE fell under the control of military commanders-in-chief (Shogun), who exercised political power in the emperor's name through a series of shogunal dynasties. From 1467, shogunal authority was destroyed in civil wars between feudal rulers (daimyo) with private armies. However, beginning in 1568, a reaction against this anarchy induced the daimyo to pledge allegiance to a series of successful generals, climaxing in the establishment of the Tokugawa shogunate by Ieyasu (1603-1616). Under the stable regime of the Tokugawa dynasty, the about 250 daimyo became feudal vassals of the Shogun, accepting his authority and supervision, and were obliged to supply military and civil assistance when required. In return, the daimyo became local administrators of their own domains (han). Society was classified into the four classes of warrior (samurai), farmer, artisan, and merchant¹⁹, within which social and economic development were possible. This shogunate and class system survived until the commencement of modern Japan in 1868.

Iran (Persia) founded the world's first substantial empire in 559 BCE and subsequently developed a durable language, culture and administrative system which survived conquest by the Moslem Caliphate in 637-51 CE. In addition, its economy benefited as the principal route of trans-Asian trade. However, after the Moslem conquest the country suffered from its central position, experiencing 23 dynasties in the period 661 to 1502, mostly founded by Turkish or Mongol tribal leaders. The longest of these dynasties only lasted about a century before they were overthrown, which compares with the several hundred years typical of a Chinese dynasty. The country was refounded by the Iranian Safavid dynasty (1502-1736), followed by the Qajars (1779-1925), each of which produced only one or two capable rulers. Nevertheless, in 1906-7 Iran was the first Asian country to attempt to limit the power of its rulers by a national Constitution²⁰.

The generalisation that territory represented the sole form of wealth for personal states has an exception in the pre-colonial coastal states of West Africa. In that area, the land is of little economic value and wealth lay in its mineral and other resources: iron, salt, gold, and also palm-oil, gum, hides, and ivory. The strength of a ruler was therefore measured by his ability to accumulate client kinship groups and slaves capable of extracting and transporting these assets for trade, first with the savannah empires to the north and then with Europeans who arrived at the coast, who offered in exchange manufactured

goods, cloth, guns, tobacco, and spirits.²¹ Since the local kings had surplus population it was natural that they should also offer slaves for exchange to the Europeans, giving rise to the notorious slave trade which shipped about 11 million people to the Americas between about 1600 and 1850 when the trade was finally eliminated.

Although the above examples are historical and mainly dependent on religious sanction, personal rule still exists in some states, including some secular ones. Dynastic rulers govern Saudi Arabia and its Gulf neighbours. In Libya, the personal rule of Gaddafi from 1969 to 2011 derived his claim to legitimacy solely from his seizure of power, disguising under a pseudo-populist ideology. In Syria and North Korea, son has succeeded father as President, and in Cuba, a brother has succeeded. In Pakistan members of the Bhutto family have governed intermittently²². In modern conditions, the risk of succession by an incapable ruler which strict heredity can bring is overcome by the concept of government by a family, so that the most capable family member succeeds. However, the advantage of personal rule in these countries remains: once a family is considered fit to exercise power, it acquires legitimacy and legitimacy is therefore continued by appointing another family member to succeed.

In some countries hereditary rule failed, but personal rule continued in the form of a self-appointed dictator. Examples are Mussolini in Italy (1922-45), Salazar in Portugal (1932-68), Vargas in Brazil (1930-45), Franco in Spain (1936-75), and in Paraguay for much of the period 1814-1989. In the absence of another source of legitimacy, self-appointed personal rule can be effective and provide a framework for national development. However, the absence of any evident rule of succession causes instability when the ruler's time in office is seen to be coming to an end, usually by death. If a nationally responsible form of government has not developed (as it did in Italy, Portugal, and Spain), a chaotic oligarchy may follow until the next dictator emerges. The distinction is evident from 2011 events in Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya. The Tunisian and Egyptian autocrats reluctantly accepted that their period in office had expired, and were succeeded by elected presidents. The Libyan dictator considered that the country was his personal property which he was entitled to bombard into submission.

Precursors of the Nation State: Theocracy

A theocracy is a state whose primary political loyalty is to the central religious authority of a Church. The primary functions of a religion and therefore of a Church are to provide a framework of social and moral rules and to assist the individual's sense of identity by giving emotional support. Their authority is held to be derived from God and from those spiritual intermediaries through whom God can be approached. The Church's function is realised through doctrines and texts in which its members believe and liturgies in which they take part.

Theocracies have been rarer in history than other forms of rule, and have been established at the high point of the power of a particular Church. To understand how they arise, we need first to consider their function in personal states and dynastic empires. We have noted that all historic dynasties before the 19th century have had a religious sanction. Dynasties could not be accountable to their subjects if they were to perform their functions effectively, and therefore called on the same sources of authority as those for social and moral rules, namely the prevailing religion of their subjects. This religion was then interpreted to justify the ruler's hereditary right. Dynastic rulers accordingly supported the doctrines of the religion and participated in the liturgies of the Church which proclaimed and interpreted them. The authority of the Church could not be questioned, and it was a function of the dynastic ruler to endow and protect it. Competing religions and Churches were considered to be very dangerous, as illegitimate and menacing the whole basis of personal rule, and were violently suppressed. The efforts of Catholic missionaries in the Confucian states of China, Japan, Korea, and Vietnam resulted in the partial or complete closure of those countries to external influence and trade until the 19th century.

Many early societies, such as Pharaonic Egypt from about 3100 BCE, the Aztecs of Mexico (1325-1521 CE), the Khmer Empire (802-1431 CE), and the Nri Kingdom in Anambra State, Nigeria (1043-1911 CE) made no distinction between the king and the head of the priesthood. Later, and with the exception of Islam, state and Church have generally been separate from each other in doctrine and personnel. Every religion has a set of founding stories and texts which are independent of political authority. The Church as a body of men (never women) was in general separate from political administration, though closely connected with it. As the principal or only source of social and moral authority, the Church tended to regard itself as distinct from and superior to the non-religious element

of society, and even to the source of political authority itself. Once a Church ceased to need the physical protection of a personal ruler, the ruler might find himself called to account by it. To retain their independent authority, personal rulers might need to take direct action against the Church. In 794 CE, the capital of Japan was moved from Nara to Kyoto to escape the influence of Buddhist clergy, and in 1571, the Japanese ruler Oda Nobunaga destroyed some of the principal Buddhist monasteries in order to consolidate his power. In 1721, Tsar Peter the Great of Russia replaced the Patriarchate of Moscow with a Holy Governing Synod reporting to himself.

In Western Europe, the relation between religious and political authority was distinguished by the fact that the religious power resided in a single authority for all West European states, the Papacy, located in an independent state in central Italy and in Avignon in France. The origins of the Roman Catholic Church lie in its adoption by the Emperor Constantine in 313 CE. When the Western Roman Empire collapsed, the Church survived. The states which subsequently arose in Western Europe converted to Christianity as an evidently superior religion and the repository of Roman culture, and recognised the Papacy as the Church's central legitimate authority. To provide it with a secure base, the Papal State around Rome was donated to the Pope by the Pepin, king of the Franks, in 756, and Avignon was purchased by the Papacy in 1348. Thus endowed, and having arranged for a reliable system of succession from one Pope to another, the Papacy became a theocracy which sought to extend its power throughout Western Europe. In 1000 CE, Pope Sylvester II elevated Stephen I to be the first king of Hungary. Gregory VII (1073-85), Innocent III (1198-1216) and Innocent IV (1243-54) claimed and exercised the right to depose and nominate the Holy Roman Emperor. In 1493, Alexander VI divided South America between Spain and Portugal. In 1570, Pius V claimed the power to depose Queen Elizabeth I of England.

These theocratic claims over Western Europe gradually declined. The states of North-West Europe were lost to the Papacy in the 16th-century Reformation. The remaining European states supported the Papacy in resisting the Reformation, but in return claimed effective control over their local Roman Catholic hierarchies. In addition to the Papal State, a number of other theocracies survived from the high point of Papal power. The Patriarchate of Aquileia in North-East Italy and Western Slovenia continued from 1077 to 1421, when it was conquered by Venice. The Holy Roman Empire contained 25 independent bishoprics which lasted until 1803. All these were nominally theocracies in that they were governed politically by bishops appointed by the Pope, but in fact their mode of rule was indistinguishable from the neighbouring personal states. Similarly, in the 16th century, the Papal State engaged in local diplomacy and wars with other Italian states. Theocratic rule survived until 1791 for Avignon and 1871 for the Papal State in Italy, and still continues formally in the Vatican State.

Islam was established as an empire in the Middle East and North Africa through the conquests of the Prophet Mohammed and his four elected successors, from the foundation of the religion in 622 until 661. Since the empire was conquered under the impulse of Islam, its rulers were considered to derive their legitimacy from their religious authority as successors to the Prophet, with the title of Caliph ("Successor"). In 661, the office of Caliph was assumed by a dynasty called the Umayyads, which expanded their empire to its greatest extent in the Arab world, Iran, Afghanistan, Tajikistan, Spain, and Portugal. In 750, it was assumed by a second dynasty, the Abbasids, which ruled from Baghdad until 1258.

The Caliphate was therefore a theocracy on our definition. Unlike in Christian states, Islam provided not only legitimacy to political rulers but also a complete legal system, the Shari'a, by which Islamic states could be governed. The Shari'a was constructed by Islamic scholars from the Qur'an and sayings and practices of the Prophet Mohammed in the Sunnah, which they welded into a coherent legal structure. Some scholars have also incorporated in the Shari'a the consensus (Ijma) of Mohammed's companions. In contrast, the law in Christian states was based first on local custom and then on Roman law, codified by the Byzantine Emperor Justinian (527-65 CE) and rediscovered during the Italian Renaissance, and in England on the Common Law founded in the 12th century. Islamic theocracy accordingly had two elements, the Caliphate and Shari'a law, while Christian theocracy was only a type of rule.

As a system of Government, the Abbasid Caliphate lasted until about 950, when their non-religious authority in Baghdad was taken over by a Persian dynasty, the Buwayhids. In 1055 the Seljuq ruler Toghril Beg, who had conquered the Iranian Empire, adopted the title of sultan or "king" to indicate complete political independence while he recognised the Caliph's religious authority, and this title was

used by subsequent dynasties in the region. In this way, theocracy was replaced by personal rule in the Islamic world, some parts of which (Northern India and Indonesia) were never ruled theocratically. However, the concept of a Caliphate as the proper form of Islamic government continued with the Fatimid Caliphate in Egypt (909-1171) and the Umayyad Caliphate in Spain (929-1031). The Abbasid Caliphate in Baghdad was destroyed by the Mongols in 1258, but was retained as a nominal institution by the Egyptian Mamluks until they were conquered by the Ottoman Empire in 1517. In 1517 the Ottoman sultans assumed the title of Caliph and retained it until 1924, when it was abolished. The Safavid rulers of Iran adopted the title Shahanshah (emperor) in 1502. Shari'a law survived these political changes as the legal system of Islamic states, although in states subject to European control or influence it has had to compete with European systems. It is evidently a major element in the thinking of the Islamic revivalism which started in the late 19th century, whether or not its protagonists wish to restore the Caliphate.

The Islamic Republic of Iran (founded 1979) can be described as a theocracy as its Supreme Leader is the head of Shi'a Islam in that country. However, there are also a President and Parliament elected by universal suffrage, which formally defer to the Supreme Leader but possess the mandate granted them by their election, and therefore the authority of the Iranian nation state. The relationship between these two sources of legitimacy has still to be worked out.

Other historic theocracies have been the rule of the Dalai Lama in Tibet, firstly under Chinese (Qing) suzerainty (1641-1911) and then as an independent Tibetan state (1912-50), and the parallel rule of the senior Tibetan Buddhist lamas in Mongolia, under Qing suzerainty (1759-1911) and as an independent Mongolian state (1911-19). During the final period of Calvin's life he rules Geneva theocratically (1555-64). In most dynastic states or empires under dynastic rule, the function of the Church has been to support the legitimacy of the ruler, not to supplant it.

We have so far classified theocracies in terms of the rule of traditional religious authorities. It would perhaps be consistent with our definition to include the rule of Marxist-Leninist ideology in Russia, the Soviet Union, and its satellite states in the period 1917-91. Marx and Engels propounded their theory of Communism in the period 1848-94 as an explanation for the condition of the industrial working class and its relation with the employing class, a forecast of how that condition and relation would change in the future, and a programme of how to bring that change about. By the beginning of the 20th century, it was evident that Marx's forecasts were not being realised, and Lenin produced a development of Marxism which explained the discrepancy in terms of European exploitation of colonies. More importantly for political events, Lenin produced a theory that Communism would be delivered by a small dedicated Communist elite, which would expropriate the employing class and install a dictatorship.

This Lenin and his colleagues proceeded to do after the 1917 Bolshevik revolution in Russia. All the industrial and agricultural producers and retailers were expropriated, and power was monopolised by a Communist party under tight central control. The Constituent Assembly called in 1918 after the fall of the Tsar was forcibly dispersed²³, and from the start of their regime, Lenin and later Stalin ruled by terror, murdering first hundreds, then thousands, and subsequently millions of their opponents. Despite these sacrifices, it became clear that Marxism-Leninism was based on an entirely false view of industrial society and the cultural and legal norms which existed within it. Its effects on the development of Russian industry and agriculture were disastrous. It is doubtful whether at any time (except possibly during the Second World War) the Russian Communist regime would have survived a test of its legitimacy, and it is certain that none of the Communist satellite states in Eastern Europe had popular consent.

Communism therefore fulfils most of our criteria for a theocracy. It was based on doctrines derived from ancient texts, expounded by an elite which had the monopoly of interpreting them. These doctrines were expected to be believed as a matter of faith and not of rational demonstration, which they would not have survived. Opponents of the doctrines were regarded and treated as political traitors. The elite which interpreted the doctrines and texts claimed and exercised a monopoly of political power. The doctrines were held to be universally true, and were used to justify imperial control over neighbouring states, ending only with the collapse of the entire Soviet system and empire in 1989-92. The difference from earlier theocracies was that the doctrines were founded not on any supernatural or divine inspiration but on observations of society, which claimed to be but were not rational and scientific.

Precursors of the Nation State: Oligarchy

Oligarchy was a distinct form of government which occurred in historic city states and a number of territorial powers. It is defined as rule by a group of persons who all knew each other and agreed that they alone had the right to rule, and whose rule was accepted as legitimate. The oligarchy appointed a chairman to co-ordinate their activities and execute their decisions. The oligarchic group had to be small enough for the process of decision-making to occur. Since membership of the oligarchy almost always depended on wealth it was usually hereditary, but new members might be co-opted if they became sufficiently wealthy to qualify, or if they were so capable that the oligarchy needed their participation.

The advantage of an oligarchy to its members was that they were free from the arbitrary interference with their property, households, opinions, and persons which a personal or imperial ruler was inclined to practice. Historic oligarchic rule was therefore often described as “liberty”, although mainly for the oligarchs. They were also able to make commercial and property deals with each other without outside interference. However, despite these advantages to the oligarchs, oligarchic rule could be competent and have due regard for the interests and ambitions of its subjects, who would accept it so long they agreed that great wealth gave the right to govern. The oligarchs considered that they constituted civil society (although another term might be used), which widening of its social base of government would disrupt. The experience of the rule of Savonarola in Florence (1494-98) was considered one of many warnings of the risks arising.

Oligarchies in historic city states arose on the overthrow of a personal ruler, the group which overthrew him then assuming rule as an oligarchy. This was the usual sequence in the city states of ancient Greece and Italy and those of medieval Italy and Northern Europe, all of which were small enough for a stable oligarchy to be possible. The chairman was not a personal ruler and had few independent powers. Eventually, the conditions which enabled these city states to flourish passed and they were absorbed into personal states. In addition, some larger states were capable of functioning as oligarchies if the leading citizens were sufficiently wealthy to identify themselves and sufficiently few to form a ruling group. Examples are the Netherlands (“the United Provinces”) 1650-72 and 1702-47 and Venice 1204-1797. The Netherlands Republic was a federation of city states led by Amsterdam. The city states sent representatives to a States General whose orders were carried out by an official, the Grand Pensionary of the States of Holland. When not an oligarchy, the Netherlands were ruled by the head of the House of Orange as Stadtholder. Venice, a city state from 810, acquired a Mediterranean empire in 1204 and conquered the neighbouring Patriarchate of Aquileia (Friuli) in 1421, but retained its oligarchic government until overcome by Napoleon in 1797.

A remaining oligarchy of this type is the United Arab Emirates, founded in 1971 upon the independence of its member states from Britain. The Government comprises the autocratic emirs of the seven member states, who appoint the ruling Federal Supreme Council. The emirs also appoint one-half of the advisory Federal National Council, the other half being elected by 6689 nominated citizens. The 800,000 citizens of the UAE are themselves only 19% of the whole population. The President and Vice President of the country are the emirs of the two largest states, respectively Abu Dhabi and Dubai which together have over 50% of the population. A capitalist and open economic policy have been adopted which is successfully developing the country.

A similar type of oligarchy arose in former colonies of trading empires when the colonial power did not leave behind a ruler or institutions with legitimate authority, or a functioning political system to provide such institutions. In the absence of an alternative source of authority, an oligarchy of wealthy families and army officers tended to assume control. Unlike the historic city states, this type of oligarchy was not a distinct form of government but a substitute for a democracy. For that reason, legitimacy would arise not from the oligarchy itself but from a formal Constitution, which was altered or manipulated to preserve the oligarchy in power. Because respective rights and responsibilities were never accurately defined, the ruler (President or Prime Minister) functioned as a dictator until it was decided to replace him, often by unconstitutional means. A successor dictator would then be appointed. These circumstances prevailed in the majority of Latin American states for many decades after they became independent, for example Chile 1833-1925, Argentina 1853-1916, Peru 1872-1956, Bolivia 1880-1982, Brazil 1889-1930, and Ecuador 1895-1963. A type of political plurality was achieved by the principle of rotation of office (“prorroguismo” in Bolivia). No man could succeed himself as president, giving to each leading personality a chance of political power, although he could become

president again after an interval. Eventually, economic and social development produced a civil society which replaced the oligarchy with a democratic nation state, and a Constitution established the rule of law.

A oligarchic system also arose in Japan (a monarchy) 1868-1937, Thailand (a monarchy) 1932-73, Iraq (a monarchy) 1932-58, Syria (a dictatorship) 1944-1964, Lebanon 1926-2005, and Pakistan 1947-2010. The reasons were largely similar, except that in these countries there was no principle of rotation of office, and in the case of Japan, Iraq, and Syria the oligarchy developed not into a democracy but a military state. In Japan, the oligarchy comprised former aristocrats closely allied with the armed forces, who eventually seized control despite there existing a strong national sense. In Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon, the oligarchs were the leaders of the various religious communities (Islamic and Christian) whose roots went back much further than the state. In Iraq and Syria, the national sense was so weak that the ruler used his support from the military to impose a personal and potentially a dynastic government. Only in Thailand is a movement to democratic rule, although unstable, evidently discernable.

A further variety of oligarchy occurred in former provinces of territorial monarchies which fought for their freedom but in which the independence struggle did not produce a civic society with sufficient cohesion to realise an effective nation state. Such circumstance existed in Italy from 1860 until it achieved near universal male suffrage in 1912²⁴, or perhaps the establishment of the republic in 1946. They also prevailed in Greece from independence in 1929 until the fall of the dictatorship in 1975. In France, the fall of Napoleon III in 1870 left a gap which was occupied by an oligarchy from 1875 until the Fifth Republic in 1958²⁵. It is significant that the legitimacy of the French state was questioned throughout that period, in a way that the legitimacy of the Fifth Republic from 1958 has not been.

An oligarchy in a larger state could only be effective if it possessed sufficient cultural conformity to achieve consensus. Unfortunately, differences of religion or ideology often disrupted this consensus. The Latin American oligarchies suffered civil wars over the issue of Roman Catholic influence, the Italian regime was not recognised by the Church, France was divided over the issue of secularism, Moslem states were divided by Islamic sects, and Greece suffered a crisis of political legitimacy over its monarchy. A further problem was that the oligarchy rarely possessed the coherence necessary to adapt the country to the modern world through infrastructure, education, and economic and social development. This lack of coherence showed itself in political instability, as factions of the oligarchy with different political programs and groups of supporters struggled with each other to nominate the ruler. In some cases, the instability was resolved temporarily by appointment of a dictator. In other cases, such as France and Italy, despite the formal dominance of a Constitution the frequency of Prime Ministers was so great that consistent government was not possible.

In this essay, we use the term "oligarchy" only in the above sense of a ruling oligarchic group. However, it is often used in a wider sense, of any self-identified ruling group accountable to the ruler but not to his subjects, and we may call this a "subordinate oligarchy". The majority of historic personal states comprised a personal ruler and an oligarchic group of aristocrats and wealthy merchants with whom he shared the tasks of governing and military campaigns. This partnership might remain stable so long as the ruler gave good rule and respected the property, households, opinions, and persons of the aristocrats, and found that the aristocrats functioned as good and loyal administrators. In fact, such conditions often broke down. Eventually, most European dynastic rulers became sufficiently prestigious, wealthy, and militarily strong that they could hire persons of lower birth to carry out government, and the aristocrats lost their power if not their status. In the Netherlands, the dynastic ruler was deposed. In England and Scotland, following the civil war 1642-48 between King Charles I and the aristocratic Parliament, and the 1660 restoration of Charles II, a stable partnership was established on legal principles between the king and the aristocracy and leading merchants, which laid the foundation of the British Constitution until the widening of the franchise to the middle and working classes in the 19th century.

Outside personal states, almost all pre-national or non-national governments have a subordinate oligarchic element. In a theocracy there is an oligarchy of senior priests, in a military government of senior army officers, in a tribal state of tribal elders (the latter two forms of rule are discussed below). In the Communist regimes of Russia, Eastern Europe, and China 1917-89, the senior Communists formed an oligarchy except during the worst phases of Stalin's and Mao's reigns of terror. The present Chinese Communist Party, while pursuing capitalist policies, remains an oligarchy which is careful to

renew itself and its leadership on a regular basis. The difference between these subordinate oligarchies and oligarchic rule as we have defined it is that the subordinate oligarchies are not in final control of their own membership.

Precursors of the Nation State: City State

A city state is a state whose primary loyalty is to the ruling government of a city. Until recently, they occurred only in Europe and the Near East. As small settlements grew into what we would now regard as small towns but are conventionally called cities, they became literate and acquired their own economic added value and political organisation. At certain stages in the history of the Near East and Europe, this economic productivity and the political power that it paid for were much stronger than those of the surrounding personal states or empires, and often in ancient times no surrounding state existed. The cities therefore acquired their own sense of self-identity. They also found themselves under threat from neighbouring city states, personal states, or tribal peoples and accordingly built up their own military strength.

Cities arose primarily for the manufacture and exchange of commodities and goods. With the exception of ancient Rome, they found that further wealth and prosperity came from extending their trading activities with other cities, tribes, and states. Raw materials such as metals, precious metals, wood, ivory, spices, amber, pigments, salt, and resins only occurred in certain regions, and there was a readily satisfied demand for them in others. To these commodities were added manufactured items in which one region specialised, such as pottery, papyrus, textiles, metalware, jewellery, and glass. In ancient times, the surplus population of some regions was traded as slaves to other areas which required them. As agriculture increased in productivity in some regions, they provided a tradable surplus in products such as grain, olive oil, and wine. To protect this trade from pirates, city states constructed large navies which often dominated the neighbouring seas. Trade produced large profits, which paid for the navies and armies to protect the city states on land, a protection which often extended to domination of the surrounding territory.

At two points in the history of the Near East and Europe, a combination of the absence of strong personal states or empires, large commercial opportunities, and a population sufficiently literate and well-organised to take advantage of them favoured the growth of city states: (i) in ancient times, before the development of strong personal states and empires; (ii) in North Italy, North Germany and the Netherlands after the decline of the Holy Roman Empire, mainly from the 11th to the 17th centuries. These city states dominated their respective hinterlands, and only declined when their trading opportunities declined or when the neighbouring personal states or empires became sufficiently strong to overshadow them. In other political and economic conditions, trade developed in cities sponsored by dynastic states, such as Constantinople, Alexandria, Baghdad, Tabriz, London, Paris, and Canton, and no city states arose.

The ancient city states around the Mediterranean were the cradle of Western civilisation. For some reason, they did not arise in ancient Central Southern or East Asia, whose civilisations developed in a different framework. It is speculative to say so, but this may have been due to the possible greater productivity of rice to wheat at the early stages of agriculture. At first, wheat agriculture in Western Europe had low productivity and provided an insufficient basis for the early development of strong territorial states, allowing city states to grow and thrive. In contrast, early rice agriculture appears to have been sufficiently productive to support dynastic states^{26,27}. However, the wheat agriculture of ancient Egypt and Persia²⁸ was sufficiently productive to support strong personal states there, as it was for other countries later.

As we shall note²⁹, the medieval city states of Italy and Northern Europe played an essential role in the development of the trading nation states of Western Europe. City states also arose rarely in medieval South or East Asia (discussed below), but when they did, they did not have the same historical effect. It may have been that the circumstance of the Holy Roman Empire was unique to Europe, but there have been many periods when the empires of South and East Asia were weak or divided. The alternative argument has been advanced that in Asian countries such as China, Japan, Korea, and Vietnam, the landowning and bureaucratic class was sufficiently strong to inhibit the growth of a wealthy merchant and trading class which might have challenged its authority³⁰. In addition, these four countries closed their borders in the 17th century and later, in reaction to the efforts of Portuguese,

Spanish, and French Catholic missionaries which the rulers saw as undermining their religious sanction to rule.

The most usual government of city states was a self-perpetuating oligarchy³¹ of rich merchants or their descendants. Ancient city states may have started with kings but these were displaced early on by these oligarchies, which possessed the economic and political power. City states were never theocracies, with the sole exception of Florence under Savonarola in 1494-48. However, like all states before the advent of the nation state they each had an official religion, which was necessary to support the political authority, fulfil the emotional needs of the inhabitants, and provide a framework for people's lives. This religion was generally the same for each group of city states we shall consider, so giving them a degree of cultural unity. Individual city states before the Protestant period generally had a patron deity or saint.

The first city states known to history were in Mesopotamia: Ur (c. 2600-1950 BCE), Assur (c.2000-1830 BCE) and Babylon (c. 2300-1700 BCE)³². However, these did not follow the pattern described, and became the cores respectively of the kingdoms of Sumeria, Assyria, and Babylonia.

The first city states to base their prosperity on trade were the Phoenician Tyre and Sidon (both c.1350-64 BCE), which became major commercial centres for all the products of the Eastern Mediterranean. Unlike their Greek successors, they seem to have been ruled by kings³³. A major cultural achievement was the invention of the alphabet. Tyre's daughter colony Carthage (814-146 BCE) established a trading empire covering the whole Western Mediterranean, and including about 40 of its own daughter colonies. From 480 BCE, Carthage was governed by an oligarchy. It built up a large fleet and army and naturally found itself in conflict with the rival city states of Syracuse and Rome, which finally defeated and destroyed it. Tyre and Sidon were also eventually conquered by the Roman Empire.

Ancient Greece in the historic era was not a single state, but divided into many city states (776-146 BCE).³⁴ Their number in Greece and Ionia (Western Asia Minor) grew eventually to about 66³⁵. The literacy, commerce, coinage, and stable organisation of these states resulted in their becoming the world's most productive economy, sufficiently strong militarily to defeat invasions by the Persian Empire in 490 and 480 BCE. About 84 further daughter colonies were founded to take their surplus population, especially around the Black Sea and Southern Italy and also all round the Mediterranean. These cities became the home of a literate and artistic culture which was one of the foundations of Western civilisation. Although sharing a common language, culture, and religion, they saw themselves as in competition for land and wealth, expressed by regular wars between them. Eventually they coalesced into four alliances led by the largest cities, Athens, Sparta, Corinth, and Thebes, of which Athens and Sparta were the leading military states and Athens and Corinth the leading commercial ones. Athens imposed political control over its allies, forming the Athenian empire (478-404 BCE). Athens and Sparta fought the highly destructive Peloponnesian War 431-404 BCE. Of the daughter cities, the most powerful were Syracuse (734-212 BCE) in Sicily and Massilia (Marseilles) (600-49 BCE) in Southern Gaul.

Greek city states were generally originally governed by oligarchies of landowners. A revolt by economic interests not represented in these oligarchies often resulted in their overthrow by personal rulers called "tyrants", who themselves might be overthrown in due course. Athens and later other cities then experimented with a democracy of all citizens (excluding the majority population of foreigners and slaves), assembled in the public square. Greece was eventually conquered by Alexander in 323 BCE and by the Roman Empire in 146 BCE.

The city state of Rome (509-27 BCE) followed a different path from this general pattern. It sought wealth not through trade but through military dominance of other territories. By 281 BCE it had conquered Italy and by 27 BCE the whole Roman Empire, comprising Europe west of the Rhine and south of the Danube and the whole Mediterranean area including Greece, Asia Minor, and Egypt. This empire therefore took over all the Greek city states, which retained their internal self-government, the Carthaginian city states which were destroyed, and the East Mediterranean monarchies. As a city state, Rome ("the Senate and People of Rome") was governed by magistrates reporting to popular assemblies. Its military ambitions were driven by a landowning class represented in the Senate, with the principal objective of acquiring landed estates or territory which could be taxed. As this strategy succeeded and the empire expanded, the influence of the popular assemblies disappeared and government was taken over by the Senatorial aristocracy. The small farmers who manned the Roman armies naturally also

expected their share of these landed estates. When this did not happen, the army turned to successful military leaders to enforce their demands: Marius (107 BCE), Sulla (81 BCE), Pompey (52 BCE), and Caesar (47-44 BCE)³⁶. On the assassination of Caesar, a series of civil wars brought Augustus to power (27 BCE-14 CE) as the first Roman Emperor.

After the ancient city states had been absorbed into the Roman Empire, the next appearance of the institution was in the power vacuum which arose in Northern Italy in the 11th and 12th centuries. Lombard power in Italy was destroyed by the Frankish kingdom and empire, which disintegrated after the death of Charlemagne in 814. The revived Holy Roman Empire under the German ruler Otto I (936-73) and his successors was countered by a rise in the power of the Papacy under Gregory VII (1073-85) and his successors. The Papacy, in turn, was unable to assert theocratic rule outside the Papal States. However, this power vacuum did not prevent and may have assisted economic growth in North Italy, based on its central position between Europe, North Africa, and the Byzantine Empire. To give themselves the freedom to realise this commerce, about 30 North Italian cities³⁷ (plus Amalfi in South Italy) threw off political control by the Papacy (via the local bishop) and the Empire, and declared themselves “communes” or “republics”. All these cities recruited armies, which proved strong enough to repulse attempts by the German Emperors Frederick I (1152-90) and Frederick II (1215-50) to assert control. Five cities also founded navies, and became rich on trade with the Byzantine Empire: Venice, Genoa, Pisa, Amalfi, and the Dalmatian city of Ragusa (now Dubrovnik). Whilst the other cities of the Dalmatian coast became subject to Venice by 1420, Ragusa remained autonomous from 1358 until seized by Napoleon in 1808.

The Italian city states were founded by oligarchies of rich merchants and local landed families, and their success was aided by a high rate of literacy and legal competence. The landed families feuded with each other and were often overthrown by confederation of artisans’ guilds, who might rule via a Constitution or appoint a dictator (or *podestà*) to lead their armies. Local feuds often related to their respective support for the Pope (Guelfs) or Emperor (Ghibellines). Despite all these variations in political control, the Italian city states became the most populous and richest in Europe, and hosted the brilliant revival of civilisation which we call the Renaissance. They also developed the European banking system. Almost all the city states eventually either fell under the control of a single local dynasty or were conquered by one of those dynasties, so that by the 16th century they had mostly been consolidated into seven personal states: Florence, Milan, Mantua, Modena, Ferrara, Urbino, and Parma, and three republics, Venice, Genoa and Lucca. Except for Venice, they all fell under Spanish political control after 1559. Their dominance in trade also declined as that of Northern Europe revived. In addition, Savoy-Piedmont had never entered the city state system, the Papal State remained independent, and South Italy was always a personal state.

The next major grouping of European city states originated in the power vacuum which arose in Northern Europe after the failure of the Holy Roman Empire to become a viable state on the death of Emperor Frederick II in 1250. The trading cities of the Baltic and Rhineland formed a union called the Hanseatic League³⁸ to protect their local commerce in grain, manufactured products, and Baltic supplies. The basis of the union was a monopoly which excluded non-Hansa trade, providing the cities with sufficient wealth to impose their terms on customers from England to Poland and to protect trade by suppressing piracy, building lighthouses and training pilots³⁹. The core membership was about 70 cities, although it sometimes rose to 100. The League operated by means of trading agreements and had its headquarters in Lübeck, where its assembly or Diet met intermittently from 1356. Other leading Hansa cities were Hamburg, Bremen, Cologne, Brunswick, Magdeburg, Dortmund, Deventer (Netherlands), and Danzig. Large trading posts were established in London, Bruges, Bergen (Norway), and Novgorod. Each member city had to supply a quota of armed men on its ships, and the League was sufficiently strong to defeat Denmark in a trade war in the 1380’s. Lübeck founded daughter cities in what are now the Baltic states. For a time, it exercised a monopoly of shipbuilding. Although none of these cities were legally sovereign and most were theoretically subjects of the Holy Roman Empire or Teutonic Knights, their local and international trading policies were quite autonomous and in this way they conform to our definition of a city state. As the territorial states surrounding the Hansa cities became stronger, they found that the disadvantages of the monopoly outweighed the benefits of a secure trading system. The League was expelled from Novgorod in 1478, from England in 1598, and from Antwerp in 1593. Its monopoly was broken in Sweden and Denmark, and was challenged by Amsterdam (which did not belong to the League) with increasing success. It finally closed in 1669.

During the Hanseatic period, the Flemish and Brabant cities of Ypres, Ghent, Bruges, Brussels, and Antwerp became wealthy manufacturing and trading cities in their own right and achieved and maintained a large measure of autonomy within the 17 provinces which were acquired by the Burgundian Dukedom (1363–1477). In particular, they became Europe's leading entrepôt for the manufacture and trading of textiles. The most prosperous of these cities was Bruges, which also traded in spices shipped from the Italian city states, opened a stock exchange, and provided banking services. However, late in the 15th century the silting up of Bruges' harbour resulted in the transfer of its merchants to Antwerp, which then acquired leadership of the Flemish economy. Antwerp became the principal commercial and financial centre of Northern Europe under Hapsburg rule from 1482 until the 1568 revolt of the Netherlands against Spain. The conquest of Antwerp by Spanish forces in 1585 resulted in the departure of its leading merchants and financiers, mainly to Amsterdam, and the decline of Antwerp was reinforced by the blocking of the Scheldt by Dutch ships.

After 1585 the commercial and financial success of Antwerp was exceeded by Amsterdam, founded as a city in 1306. Through its own enterprise, Amsterdam became the world's largest city and commercial and financial centre, from capturing most of the trade and shipbuilding of Antwerp and the declining Hansa, including trade in grain, wine, and Baltic naval supplies, from the foundation of the Dutch East India Company in 1602, and from banking and insurance services which the Hansa never supplied. This predominance lasted until the rise of Britain as the leading world trading and financial power in the 18th century. From 1581, Amsterdam was legally subject to the States of Holland, one of the seven sovereign States making up the United Provinces of the Netherlands. However, in this federation Holland was economically and politically preponderant, and within Holland the city of Amsterdam, represented by its oligarchy of Regents, had a controlling influence. It is in this sense that Amsterdam in this period qualifies as a city state, until the formation of the Batavian Republic in 1796.⁴⁰

The Swiss Confederation achieved effective independence from the Holy Roman Empire in 1499. It then consisted of 11 cantons, of which six (Bern, Zurich, Luzern, Zug, Fribourg, Solothurn) were city states. The Confederation was joined in 1501 by the city states of Basel and Schaffhausen, in 1803 by St Gallen, and in 1815 by Neuchâtel and Geneva. St Gallen was earlier a monastic city, Neuchâtel a Prussian principality and Geneva a Calvinist republic. The Confederation now comprises 26 cantons.

Along the coast of East Africa, about 13 cities functioned as independent trading states from the 13th century, as entrepôts for exchange of products and materials from the Mediterranean, Africa, and Asia as far as China. The largest cities were Kilwa, Mombasa, Malindi, Zanzibar, Pate, Lamu, and Mogadishu. The common language was Swahili ("coast language"). Their rulers were generally of Arab and Muslim origin until the early 16th century, when the cities were captured by the Portuguese. In the late 17th century, the Portuguese were displaced by Omani rulers who settled in Zanzibar from 1840. The Sultanate of Zanzibar continued to rule the East African coastal cities until colonial times.

In each Asia, Ayutthaya (1341-1767 CE) in what is now Thailand became the core of a personal state. Maleka (Malacca) (1403-1511) in what is now Malaysia, and Aceh (1514-1641) in what is now Indonesia, achieved growth and prosperity for short periods from trade in spices (pepper, cloves, nutmeg, and mace) from the Moluccas, sandalwood, and gold. This trade was mainly conducted by Arab, Indian, and Chinese traders, but was disrupted by the arrival of trading companies from Portugal and then the Netherlands, seeking to impose a monopoly. Both Maleka and Aceh were ruled by Islamic sultans and there were no potential nation states nearby for them to enrich. Maleka fell to the Portuguese and Aceh declined with the decline in the ruling dynasty.

Modern city states include Hong Kong, an autonomous region of China, and Singapore, a sovereign Parliamentary republic.

Precursors of the Nation State: Territorial Empire

An empire was a territorially extensive state which included several, often many, peoples or provinces owing loyalty to a single central government. Historically, this government was usually a ruling dynasty, but empires have existed which owed loyalty to a city state, an oligarchy, a theocracy, a military state, or a tribal state. The principal function of an empire was to provide for its subject peoples internal and external peace and security, within which economic and cultural life could develop. To support this, a system of law and justice would be maintained. To aid development, it would

promote transportation projects such as roads, waterways, and ports, and issue a stable currency. In return, the empire would levy taxes, rule through provincial governors, and conscript troops. Such at least was the ideal situation. In practice, empires found themselves fighting wars with rival empires and other states or peoples on their frontiers, either defending themselves against attack or seeking to extend their territory. Empires were also at risk from rebellion by subject peoples or ambitious provincial governors.

So long as the general concept of good government was limited to the functions that empires were supposed to perform and a ruling dynasty was considered a legitimate form of government, they were a viable and often successful state system. We have seen that when other state systems were weak in Western Europe, city states provided a successful framework for economic and cultural development. However, city states' spheres of activity were necessarily constrained, and as territorial states became stronger and better organised they took over the governance functions which the city states had exercised. We have also seen that in the absence of a nationality the extent of a personal state was often ill-defined. Before modern industrialisation, the principal assets of a state were its land, population, mineral deposits, and seaborne trade, which could be either exploited or taxed. It was therefore the natural aim of any state ruler to enhance these by extending his territory as far as possible. Originally, this was by conquest, but in later centuries marriage to the heiress of a dynastic ruler or cession by a dynastic ruler were also common.

If a state ruler or dynasty was successful in these expansionary endeavours, he (more rarely, she) might find himself the sovereign of an increasingly larger territory, eventually becoming an empire. Empires initially took the form of formal submissions and tribute payments by tribal or feudal chiefs, but they soon developed into a form of administration by provincial governors. When consolidated, they became stable systems which survived under successive dynasties, as each dynasty failed and was replaced. Two empires – the Western Roman and Abbasid – collapsed under pressure from barbarian tribes. Many other empires were ruled successfully by a minority people who accepted the culture of the empire they had conquered. Others – Byzantium and Sassanid Persia – were replaced by empires of a quite different culture. Despite all these vicissitudes, until the arrival of nation states empires and city states provided the principal form of effective state organisation, and the great majority of the world's population lived under one or other of these jurisdictions. The original empires in Europe and Asia were formed by conquest of tribal peoples, who obtained thereby their first experience of a state structure. Later empires were formed by conquest or absorption of neighbouring personal states, or seizure of territory from neighbouring empires, and these lasted until the 20th century. Of the last territorial empires, the Hohenzollern, Ottoman, and Austro-Hungarian Empires were destroyed in 1918 by the First World War. The Russian Empire lasted until 1989 under the impulse of Marxism-Leninism. As we have noted, the Chinese Empire is now a nation state. Territorial empires no longer exist.

The world's first empires were formed in Mesopotamia, that of Assyria (911-612 BCE)⁴¹ and later Babylon (626-539 BCE). The Babylonian Empire was replaced by the Achaemenids (550-330 BCE), a Persian dynasty which ruled Persia (now Iran), Mesopotamia, the Levant, Asia Minor, Afghanistan, and Egypt. The Babylonians had adopted Aramaic as the language of imperial communication, and this was continued by the Achaemenids. After its conquest by Alexander in 330 BCE, the Achaemenid empire (other than Egypt and Afghanistan) came to be ruled by the Greek Seleucid dynasty (312-164 BCE). The Seleucids were replaced in Iran and Mesopotamia by the Parthian Arsacids (141 BCE-224 CE), a hellenised dynasty from Persia. The Sassanids (224-651 CE), a Persian dynasty which promoted the Persian language and advanced Persian culture, then took over the whole of Iran, Mesopotamia, and Afghanistan until their conquest in 637-51 by the Moslem Caliphate.

At its greatest extent, the rule of the Umayyads (661-750) and their successors the Abbasid Caliphate (750-950) covered Mesopotamia, Egypt, North Africa, the Levant, Iran, Afghanistan, and the Islamic heartland of Arabia, all of which converted to Islam. All parts except for Iran and Afghanistan eventually adopted the Arabic language. Although theocracies on our definition, they were governed by dynasties similar to other dynastic empires and promoted an advanced Islamic culture. Around 950, the various parts of the Abbasid empire became politically independent while respecting the Abbasids' religious authority. Political control in Iran and Mesopotamia fell to a Persian dynasty, the Buwayhids (950-1062). The Asian Islamic territories came under increasing pressure from nomadic Turkish peoples, one of which took over Mesopotamia, Iran, Afghanistan, the Levant, and Asia Minor. This Turkish dynasty, the Seljuqs (1064-1157), supported the Persian language and culture which had

survived Arab rule. Successive Iranian dynasties aspired to imperial status over the surrounding lands until Iran was limited to its present borders in the 19th century. A dynasty founded by Saladin, the Ayyubids (1171-1250), ruled in Egypt, the Levant, and Arabia. The Almoravids (1073-1147) and Almohads (1130-1269) were Berber Islamic empires in central Maghreb and Muslim Spain.

The final imperial dynasty to govern this area was the Ottoman (1299-1918), whose rule eventually covered Asia Minor, Greece, the Balkans, Hungary, the Levant, Mesopotamia, Arabia, Egypt, and North Africa. The Ottomans ruled through a system of confessional communities, called *millet*, namely Muslims, Greek Orthodox, Armenian Orthodox, Syriac Orthodox, and Jews. This meant that they abolished the autonomous Bulgarian Patriarchate and placed it under Greek control, and appointed Greek governors for Moldavia and Wallachia. Under their Ottoman government, the population of Asia Minor became Turkish in language, culture, and Islamic religion. During the 19th century, the European territories divided into nation states, and after 1918 this also occurred to the Asian territories. The North African territories became European colonies, and then independent nation states in the course of the 20th century.

The origins of Chinese language and civilisation lay in North China around the Yellow River, where the first Chinese dynastic states were founded. As these states spread throughout China, they incorporated peoples speaking many other languages: Tibeto-Burman, Tai, Hmong-Mong, Manchu, Mongol, Uyghur, Korean, etc, although the imperial language remained Chinese. The present Chinese constitution recognises 56 minorities. We can speak of a Chinese Empire when a Northern dynasty, the Qin (221-206 BCE), conquered South China, then mainly peopled by Tai-speaking tribes. Later imperial dynasties which governed the whole of China were the Han (202 BCE-220 CE), Jin (265-420 CE), Sui (589-618), Tang (618-860), Song (960-1276), Yuan (1276-1368), Ming (1276-1644), and Qing (1644-1911). In the later Song period (1115-1264), North China was governed by the Jin, a dynasty of Tungus origin. At other times, political control in China was divided between warring states.

Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism were introduced into China as state systems of philosophy and religion. Chinese civilisation, culture, currency, law, and methods of government were established on a firm foundation early on, and invading barbarian peoples took them over without significant alteration. The Yuan dynasty was Mongol and the Qing were Manchu. China became a republic in 1912 and is now a nation state.

India is similarly occupied by peoples of many different languages, but unlike China has never been dominated by one of them. It was unified by Hindu culture, and after the Islamic invasion of 1192 CE by Islam in those areas now constituting Pakistan and Bangladesh. In addition, Buddhism, Sikhism and Jainism arose in India, and it is the home of the Zoroastrian Parsis. 180 BCE to 10 CE, there were Greek kingdoms in North-West India. States which occupied a large part of North or South India or of the subcontinent as a whole can therefore be classed as empires. Before the Moslem invasion, the principal empires were the Maurya (322-185 BCE), Satavahana (230 BCE-196 CE) (South), Kushans (30-225 CE) (North), Gupta (280-550 CE) (North), Chalukya (543-753) (South), and Chola (848-1279) (South). Each of these empires made its own contribution to Indian culture, economy, and administration. In other periods, India was divided into smaller dynastic states.

After the arrival of the Moslems in 1192, the principal Indian empires were the Moslem Delhi Sultanate (1206-1526) and the brilliant Mogul empire (1526-1707), both of which dominated the subcontinent. The official language of the Moguls was Persian and the early Mogul emperors patronised Hindu as well as Moslem culture. The Hindu Vijayanagar empire governed the South 1336-1646. In 1707 the Mogul empire disintegrated and was subject to devastating Persian and Afghan invasions. The Hindu Marathas (1674-1772) conquered most of the subcontinent for a time. British rule over the subcontinent was established following the battles of Plassey (1757), Buxar (1764), Seringapatam (1799), Assaye (1803), and Koregaon (1818). India and Pakistan achieved independence in 1947, and Bangladesh in 1971.

We now turn to the Roman Empire, founded by the city state of Rome. As we have noted, this included by 27 BCE Europe west of the Rhine and south of the Danube and the Mediterranean area including Greece, Asia Minor, North Africa, and Egypt. A state structure was brought for the first time to Spain, Gaul, Britain (excluding Scotland), what is now Switzerland, and the Balkans. The Emperor Augustus and his successors ruled the Roman Empire as commander (“Imperator”) of the Roman army,

but cloaked his legitimacy by assuming many of the offices of the former city state. His rule was autocratic, with powers of legislation, administration, and adjudication. His successor emperors for the following centuries were either proclaimed by the army or admitted by the army as related to or nominated by the previous emperor, and this process of succession was accepted by the Roman state. The majority were also murdered by the army. Roman emperors were therefore a rare example of rulers whose legitimacy over a long period depended on military nomination. The Roman Empire was culturally divided into the western part which adopted Roman (Latin) language and culture and the eastern part which retained Greek language and culture inherited from the empire of Alexander (326-323 BCE). Both parts of the Empire adopted the Roman legal system and converted to Christianity in 313 CE. A single political system continued until 395 CE, when the Empire split finally into Eastern and Western halves.

The Western Roman Empire was not able to survive attacks by “barbarian” German tribes in 407 CE which effectively destroyed it. This is unlike the record of most empires, which successful barbarian invaders took over and ran as an existing state structure, and unlike the Eastern Roman Empire which repelled or defeated external attacks for many centuries⁴². The reasons for this failure have been much debated, but probably lie in the relative lack of added value of the Western Empire economy, which was insufficient to support an adequate state administration and army, especially since the decline in incidence of slavery. The only cultural elements of the Western Empire to survive (except in Britain) were the Catholic Church, which possessed extensive lands donated by emperors and aristocrats, and the Latin language. The German peoples who had conquered the Western Empire founded their own dynasties, of which the most successful was that of the Franks in what is now France and the neighbouring territories.

The Eastern Roman Empire, known to history as the Byzantine Empire, was founded on the transfer of the imperial capital to Byzantium (Constantinople) in 330 CE. Byzantine emperors relied for their legitimacy on hereditary descent, nomination by their predecessor, or acceptance by the army, the Christian Church, and the people of Constantinople, and thus were personal rulers of the usual type⁴³. Constantinople was by far the largest city in Europe and the Byzantine economy was by far the most advanced. It also acted as buffer to Moslem empires to the East. After it lost its territories in Egypt, the Levant, and Mesopotamia to the Islamic caliphs in 640, its core was in Greece, the Balkans, and Asia Minor. It ceased to be an empire except in name after much of Asia Minor was lost to the Seljuq Turks at the battle of Manzikert in 1071 and Constantinople fell to a Crusader army in 1204. Constantinople was captured by the Ottomans in 1453.

The first attempt at empire creation in Western Europe was by the Frankish king Charlemagne (768-814), who was crowned Roman Emperor by Pope Leo III in 800. His empire included France, Western Germany, Bavaria, and North Italy. He converted the Germans to Christianity and introduced a literate state system, Church institutions, and monetary economy in their territory. The empire depended on the personality of Charlemagne, and had collapsed by 887.

In 963 the German king Otto I (936-73) was crowned Roman Emperor by Pope John XII. His empire included Germany, the Low Countries, Austria, Switzerland, North Italy, and Bohemia (now the Czech Republic), but not France. Burgundy was later added by inheritance. Otto’s territorial base was in Saxony. Having established the empire largely by conquest, he sought to consolidate his power by marriage alliances and control of the Catholic Church in Germany. Unfortunately, this strategy was not sufficient to lay the foundations for a strong imperial monarchy. Otto and his successors reformed the papacy, which under Gregory VII (1073-85) and his successors claimed a right of obedience independent of the Empire, so removing one of the principal tools of imperial control. Otto’s immediate successors did not succeed in establishing a central imperial administration, and after the end of the Saxon dynasty their territorial base in Germany was inadequate. Meanwhile, the many rulers of subordinate German states established hereditary dynasties and acquired the right to coin money, levy taxes, and fortify strongholds. A series of quarrels between Emperors and Popes had largely destroyed the power of the Empire by the death of Frederick II in 1250.

This Empire came to be called the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. Two territorial dynasties within it, the Hohenzollerns in Prussia and the Hapsburgs in Austria, acquired large domains outside the Empire’s Eastern borders and became effectively independent personal states. The Empire continued to exist formally with the Hapsburg dynasty as Emperors, but the 1517 Reformation and the wars which followed it eliminated the cohesion of a common religion. By 1648 it was reduced to 300

autonomous territories in Germany, Austria, and Bohemia, of which the larger ones were independent for most purposes. The Empire was formally abolished in 1806, and in 1815 Germany was reorganised into 39 nominally sovereign personal states, including Prussia and Austria⁴⁴.

The territories possessed by the Hapsburgs included Austria, Bohemia, Hungary, Croatia, and Transylvania⁴⁵, which formed the basis of the Austrian Empire which was proclaimed in 1804. The dominant languages of this Austrian Empire were German and Hungarian, and in 1867 it was divided into two halves called "Austria-Hungary". It survived until 1918, when it divided into what are now nation states. The parts of Italy acquired by the Hapsburgs in 1713 were unified as the independent kingdom of Italy in 1860.

Another branch of the Hapsburgs became by inheritance kings of Spain. Again by inheritance, the Spanish dynasty acquired a European empire which included the Netherlands from 1521 to 1581, what is now Belgium from 1521 to 1713, the Franche-Comté from 1521 to 1678, parts of Italy from 1504 to 1707, and Portugal from 1580 to 1640. The dynastic link with the Netherlands was lost when that country changed its religion from Catholic to Protestant. Portugal was lost when a local dynasty rebelled successfully. The remaining European territories were lost to the Austrian Empire through Spain's increasing economic and dynastic weakness.

The Russian Empire was declared by Tsar Peter I in 1721. Russia acquired by conquest the Ukraine, Belarus, Finland, a large part of Poland, and the present republics in central Asian, the Caucasus, and the Baltic. The dominant language was Russian. Excluding Finland and Poland, this empire was continued as the Soviet Union after the fall of the Romanov dynasty and the establishment of Communist rule in 1917⁴⁶, but dissolved into independent nation states on the collapse of Communism in 1989-91. In 1945, the Soviet Union established protectorates over the neighbouring countries in Eastern Europe, which regained their independence when the Communist state failed.⁴⁷

By 1871 the 39 states which constituted Germany, other than Austria, had been incorporated into a German nation state dominated politically and militarily by Prussia and ruled by the Prussian king as German Emperor. This German Empire included also parts of what are now Poland, Denmark, and France, and its objectives in the First World War were to acquire more non-German territory, such as the iron-bearing Longwy-Briey area of France and protectorates over Belgium, Poland, the Baltic States and the Ukraine⁴⁸. The German Empire was therefore partly a nation state, partly a military state, and partly a dynastic empire, and the uncertainty as whether the Emperor was accountable to the German people or to the dynastic principle was arguably one of the reasons for his dynasty's downfall and the Empire's collapse in 1918. The Second World War was largely caused by Hitler's unsuccessful attempt to re-create a German empire in Europe by military means.

Some historic attempts at empire failed, for example the various attempts by England to conquer France over the period 1337-1453 and Napoleon's attempt to conquer Europe in 1804-14. In the last century, the empires of Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese Empire in East Asia all failed to establish a stable system, and the Soviet Empire of 1945-89 outside the historic Russian borders never possessed any legitimacy.

The Athenian Empire (478-404 BCE) and the Venetian Empire (1000-1797 CE) were two examples of empires founded and ruled by city states.

The three largest African empires before the arrival of Europeans were Ghana (c.830 until c.1235), Mali (c.1230-1559) and Songhai (c.1420-1591). All were in West Africa and their prosperity derived largely from trade in gold and salt. The second two were Islamic.

In pre-Columbian America, the Aztec empire flourished in Mexico 1325-1521 and the Incas ruled in Peru and the surrounding countries in 1438-1533.

The term empire is generally applied to Japan because its head of state has the title Emperor. However, on our definition Japan was a personal state and is now a nation state. Except for a short period before and during the Second World War, Japan was not an empire as we have described it. The Vietnamese ruler also employed the title Emperor until 1945.

Precursors of the Nation State: Trading Empire

The above are many examples of empires which were formed when a state, usually a dynastic state, expanded its political control to neighbouring territories. We have seen that the desire to do so arose because land with its agricultural and mineral resources was the principal form of wealth. Such an empire was a natural action of a successful personal state. Although many empires were formed by conquest, the conquered territories often benefited from the imperial structure, through improved administration, security, currency, trade, and culture. Problems might arise when the imperial dynasty attempted to override the language, culture, or religion of the subject peoples, and later on when the subject peoples developed their own nationality.

A second and different form of empire was founded by the nation states of Western Europe in territories outside Europe. In these empires, a diverse range of colonies owed loyalty to a ruling nation. As we shall discuss, certain states in Western Europe provided a framework for economic prosperity, technical innovation, and population growth which were not achieved by other personal states and empires which existed at that time. The surplus population and energies of these countries found an outlet in travel to areas outside Europe, with three principal objectives. Historically the first objective was the same as that of earlier empire formation, to exploit the territory economically. This was especially the case in South and Central America, largely colonised by Spain searching for precious metals (1492-1825)⁴⁹. Portugal occupied Brazil (1500-1822). Spain, Britain, and France occupied the West Indian islands with the intention of growing sugar, tobacco, and other crops, for which they employed slaves imported from West Africa. Extension of European colonies in the Americas after 1823 was prevented by the Monroe doctrine of that year. All the West Indian islands became independent states by 1962, except for certain small islands and French Guiana which remain voluntarily under British or French sovereignty. A Dutch plantation colony, Suriname, became independent in 1975.

The second objective of colonisation was to protect trade routes. The West European states found that seaborne trade with Asia and Africa provided a great variety of goods which had previously either not been available or had been available at much greater cost by an overland route. Examples from Asia were spices, dyestuffs, drugs, Indian textiles, and Chinese porcelain and silk, and from Africa ivory, gold, and, until the trade was stopped, slaves. Later many other commodities, such as tea, coffee, diamonds, copper and other metals, were added. This trade proved to be very profitable, and was considered to benefit particularly the European state whose subjects engaged in it. Each European state therefore sought to exclude rival European states from it, by tariffs and also by military force. The military force took the form of naval battles with rival European states, naval piracy under the euphemism "privateering", and land armies in the trading territories themselves, principally in Asia. The trading territories were also occupied by European armies in order to protect their trading stations from local attacks. Later, European colonists settled in the Asian and African territories in order to cultivate highly profitable crops such as tea, coffee, rubber, and tobacco. Some of this trade and cultivation was on terms which we would now consider unjust, but without the colonial involvement it would not have occurred or have occurred on a much smaller scale.

The first European state to engage in Asian trade on a large scale was Portugal in the 15th and 16th centuries. Portugal established trading ports but failed to support them by conquering the hinterland territories. It was displaced by the Netherlands in the 17th century, which was in turn largely displaced by Britain in the 18th century and France in the 19th century. Britain became the dominant colonial power in Asia, in consequence of winning the Seven Years' War (1756-63) and the war against Napoleon (1803-15). These countries found that a combination of superior weaponry, finance, and organisation enabled them easily to overturn local personal states which were often weak, divided, or oppressive, and to set up formal colonial regimes run by European officials. The few exceptions, notably Iran, Afghanistan, Thailand, China, Japan, and Korea⁵⁰, were sufficiently strong and united to resist European colonisation but not the temporary imposition of onerous trading terms with Europe ("unequal treaties"). Once local wars had been won by the colonial states, local populations sometimes (but not always) found that colonial government was better than or as good as that which it replaced, more secure from local wars and disputes, and founded on a more reliable legal system, and it was usually accepted until the national independence movements of the 20th century⁵¹. Indigenous peoples readily served in colonial armies, and the colonial governments installed modern communication systems and railways. Acquisition of European languages enabled the colonial populations to acquire an understanding of European civilisation in addition to their own. The consequence was European

colonial rule of huge areas in Asia: Britain in India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Burma, Malaysia, and Singapore; French rule in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, Dutch rule in Indonesia, and Spanish (later United States) rule in the Philippines. The prestige of European colonial regimes was adversely affected by their defeat by Japan in the Second World War. All these colonised countries became independent states in the period 1946 to 1965, each one on the basis of an indigenous nationality. However, the European names for Indonesia and the Philippines indicate their original colonial framework.

The third objective of European colonisation was settlement of surplus populations in areas which could be made available for that purpose, in North America, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. In those territories there was no state structure, and indigenous tribal peoples who had occupied the land, usually for centuries, were displaced in a series of wars. Settlement was originally by people of British origin except in South Africa (Dutch) and Quebec (French), which were both conquered by Britain. Nation states on the British model were rapidly set up in these territories, so successfully in North America that the United States declared independence in 1776. The war of 1812 between the United States and the British Empire settled the eastern boundary between them. Self-government was achieved by Canada (1867), Australia (1901), New Zealand (1907), and South Africa (1910), and legal sovereignty by these states in 1931; their nationality was reinforced by participation on behalf of Britain in the First and Second World Wars. After self-government, the countries were settled by emigrants from many other European and later non-European states. In 1994, South Africa was re-founded after the ending of racial discrimination there.

By the last third of the 19th century almost the whole of Asia had been colonised. Although the colonies were often a financial liability to the “home” country, they were seen by the colonising states as providing a strategic advantage in access to land, raw materials, trade routes, and potential military bases, and a source of employment for their elites. European exploration of Africa and advances in medicine made it seem possible to colonise that continent also. Britain already had long-established trading posts on the coasts of what are now Ghana, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, and Gambia. Portugal had similar trading posts on the coasts of what are now Mozambique and Angola, and France had a trading post in Senegal and from 1830 a settlement colony in Algeria. In a series of treaties, Britain, France, Italy, Belgium, and Germany divided the whole of the African continent, except for Ethiopia and Liberia, into territorial units, each governed as a colony. The historic Ethiopian state had been strong enough to resist colonisation⁵², and Liberia was founded for the resettlement of African Americans. The colonising states wanted to avoid the wars which had characterised the earlier stages of colonialism, and were also anxious not to leave any area uncolonised. The division was therefore carried out largely by agreement, the process ending by 1912. Each colonising state attempted to develop its colonies and exploit the local resources in its own fashion. German colonies were transferred to Britain and France after the First World War.

Egypt, which Britain had seized from nominal Ottoman control in 1882, became officially independent in 1922, although British influence was to continue until 1956. Under pressure from national independence movements and the increasing cost of maintaining control, Britain, France, Belgium, and Italy had all relinquished by 1964 government of their African colonies, which achieved independence as states within the borders of the colonial territories. The same had occurred for the Spanish and Portuguese colonies in Africa by 1975. Algeria, occupied in 1830, was regarded as an integral part of France from 1848 but gained independence as an Arab state in 1962. Zimbabwe had been self-governing under European settler control from 1923, and was re-founded under local African control in 1980.

The United States was not one of the original colonial powers, but it acquired the Spanish colony of the Philippines in consequence of its 1898 war with Spain. The Philippines became an independent state in 1946. Although the U.S. did not acquire any other overseas colonies⁵³, its commercial interests dominated the formerly Spanish Central American states from Guatemala to Panama, including Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and (French) Haiti, from the late 19th century until the 1960's. These countries had been neglected and misgoverned during the Spanish colonial period. When after the 1820's they become sovereign states (Cuba remained under Spanish control until 1898), they were too small, poor, undeveloped, and isolated to possess a strong national sense or effective independence. The Caribbean states also suffered from the social legacy of slavery. An alliance with U.S. agricultural producers gave the countries a source of income and infrastructure investment in return for concessions of land, labour, and political support. The need to protect its economic interests led the U.S. to

intervene militarily and politically in Nicaragua, Honduras, the Dominican Republic, Cuba, and Haiti in the early 20th century, and to control the Panama Canal Zone from 1904 to 1999. The various countries have now gone their different ways, becoming (with the possible exception of Haiti) viable nation states. Cuba reacted so strongly against U.S. influence that it adopted a Soviet model, whose final outcome is yet to be seen.

In the same period that colonial control was extended to Africa, it was spread to the populated islands of the Pacific. These colonies also became independent states by 1978, except for Réunion which remains voluntarily under French sovereignty. There are no trading or overseas colonies left.

Precursors of the Nation State: The Military State

We have noted that for several centuries Roman Emperors were nominated by the Roman army or a particular legion of it. From the foundation of the Roman Empire by Augustus in 27 BCE until the murder of Commodus in 192 CE, the majority of emperors belonged to one of three successive dynasties, gained power by inheritance or (more often) by adoption, and died peacefully. However, from 192 to 284, 31 emperors were acclaimed by the army, gained power after defeating their rivals in battle, reigned for an average of 3 years and were then usually murdered. Many of these emperors were of humble origin and had worked their way up through the ranks. Each was considered legitimate and endorsed by the Roman Senate. In 284 Diocletian (284-305) managed to stabilise the system, and he and his successors mostly succeeded by consent⁵⁴ and died naturally, until from 395 the Western Empire came under the control of barbarian generals. The Eastern (Byzantine) Empire from 395, as we have noted, functioned more like a personal state of the usual type.

During the third century CE, therefore, the rulers of the Roman Empire were nominated by the army, which controlled its own recruitment and promotion. Because the army was not under the control of a personal ruler, such a state does not come within our definition of personal state, and we suggest for it the new category of military state, in which legitimate rule lay with the army. Such a state was historically comparatively rare.⁵⁵ One example was the Mamluks, a military elite which ruled Egypt 1250-1517 and administered Egypt under the Ottoman sultans 1517-1811. The term meant “owned”, and individual soldiers were purchased as slaves from Turkish tribes, not recruited in Egypt. The sons of Mamluks were not Mamluks. Before 1517 they exercised rule in Egypt through a Sultan, who was in general not hereditary but was the strongest Mamluk general at that time, and who sought the nominal endorsement of the puppet Caliph.

A further example was the Janissaries (“Yeniçeri”, “new soldier”), an elite standing army founded by the Ottoman Sultans in about 1365, and recruited not from Turkey but from a levy of Christian children. From about 1622 the Janissaries became largely independent of political control, nominating or deposing and murdering many of the Ottoman Sultans, until they were suppressed by Mahmud II in 1826. In addition, the Janissaries were introduced by the Ottomans to support their rule in Algeria and Tunisia, and in both those provinces escaped from political control to set up a military government under an officer called a dey, effectively independent but subject to Ottoman suzerainty. The deys of Algeria governed from 1671 to 1830, and in a similar manner to third-century Roman emperors about one-half of deys were assassinated. They were followed by French rule. The deys of Tunis ruled from 1591 to 1640, when a non-military ruler called a bey gained control⁵⁶.

A military state should be distinguished from other types of state in which the army had a role in nominating or sustaining the ruler. In pre-national states, the founders of the great majority of personal or theocratic states established their dynasties by military action with a specifically recruited army. Once installed and recognised as legitimate, the dynastic ruler might retain the army for defence or police work, and would hand on the inheritance to his dynastic successor. Only when the dynasty was seen to be failing might a further army be recruited by a contender aiming to seize power. This pattern occurred with the dynasties ruling in China, Iran, and many other countries. In all of these, the ruler was in charge of the army, not the reverse, and the state was personal or theocratic, not military.

More recently, the military have become involved in government in states where national identity and civil society were not strong enough to be represented by constitutional government, but where the personal rule of a dynasty was not available or capable. Such states were generally troubled by divisions, whether social, tribal, aristocratic, or religious, which the existing constitutional structure could not reconcile. In such cases, the army would supplant or supervise the Constitution and set up a

military ruler who functioned as a personal ruler had previously done. Army involvement of this type first arose in Spain and its former Latin American colonies in the 19th century. In Peru 1824-72 and Bolivia 1825-80, no effective government existed except for army generals, who ruled until a commercial oligarchy was strong enough to nominate the president, who might be civilian or military. In Venezuela 1899-1958, military rule occurred until there was sufficient support for democracy to take over. In the 20th century, military rule has occurred as part of the constitutional development of (for example) Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Greece, Turkey, Indonesia, Thailand, Pakistan, Egypt, the Philippines, Brazil, Nigeria, Uganda, Ghana, Ecuador, and the Sudan. The African states were former colonies within whose arbitrarily determined borders no strong national identity had arisen before decolonisation. Army rule (with its attendant disadvantages) was accepted as legitimate so long as it was fulfilling the function that other forms of government had failed to do. In many of these countries, stronger constitutional bodies have subsequently made further military involvement unnecessary. The military regime has itself often facilitated this transfer, to the point of setting up political parties to represent civil society.

Military rule as we have defined it best describes the government systems in the later stages of the German and Japanese Empires. On the 1914 outbreak of the First World War, strategic control passed to the German General Staff, who in 1917 dismissed the civilian Chancellor and replaced him a nonentity. Ludendorff, the Quartermaster General, became effective dictator of Germany until 1918. The fall of the monarchy in 1918 did not destroy the German military caste, which was instrumental in bringing Hitler (1933-45) to power and launching the Second World War. The Japanese military secured effective control of the Japanese government in 1937 after a long period of increasing influence, and took Japan into the Second World War until its defeat and de-militarisation in 1945. Both of these military regimes aimed at gaining a large local empire and were supported by much of public opinion. As with other imperial military regimes, they continued until they were destroyed in war.

A more recent example is the Iraqi regime overthrown in 2003. The Iraqi monarchy established by the British in 1921 was destroyed in a violent coup in 1958, followed by five successive military regimes. In 1979 a sixth military government was set up by Saddam Hussein. These governments developed the Iraqi economy and education, but controlled the country through the army, based on only one of the communities into which the country was divided, the Sunnis, not the majority Shi'a, the Kurds, or the Assyrian Christians. These other communities were not represented, and Saddam cannot be said to have created an Iraqi nation. In line with the military character of his regime, Saddam fought a war with Iran 1980-88 and invaded Kuwait in 1991.

With the exceptions of those instances where a military regime had imperial ambitions, military government has been generally an unavoidable stage in the development of many nation states, when their national identity was insufficiently strong or coherent to support a stable constitutional system. For that reason, it continues in Burma to the present.

Precursors of the Nation State: The Tribal State

The tribal peoples who founded or took over historic personal states employed two different economies, depending on their environments: agriculture (or fishing) and pastorage. Agricultural tribes, once they became sufficiently strong and numerous, tended to settle in one place to improve the yield of their lands. As they became stable political communities they developed rules of ownership based on land, and to defend their property from domestic or foreign attacks set up systems of law and government, originally of a personal form supported by a religious sanction⁵⁷. Writing and numeracy were welcomed as making such personal rule more effective. Such emerging agricultural communities were the basis of all the original personal states of Europe and Asia. In this context, we cannot speak of a tribal state distinct from the personal state to which it gave rise.

Pastoral tribes did not have the same clear transition to statehood as agricultural ones. By nature they were mobile, seeking the best pasture for their flocks. Being mobile, they were generally not literate. Tribal identity generally took the form of descent from a common ancestor, real or supposed. Ownership was based not on land but on the number of sheep, cattle or other livestock owned, either by an individual chieftain or communally by the tribe. To defend their property, pastoral tribes formed alliances with neighbouring tribes, but to reinforce that they developed a warrior tradition, to enable

them to defend themselves or to seize the livestock of other tribes. In addition, pastoral tribes in a position to trade did so, by barter or by using the coinage of settled communities.

Three groups of pastoral tribes are of significance in state development: Arabian Bedouin, North African Berbers, and the tribes of central Asia, originally Iranian but later Turkish or Mongol. Their way of life enabled them to develop their population and warrior skills to the point at which they became a threat to the neighbouring agricultural communities. One pastoral tribe would come to dominate its neighbours militarily, and forged a tribal army for the purpose of attacking the neighbouring settled communities. If an agricultural state was not sufficiently strong and well-organised, the pastoral tribes would defeat it. The first outcome of the defeat was generally pillage of the agricultural state, but this phase (which unfortunately occurred repeatedly) generally did not last for long. The pastoral tribe adopted the religion of the agricultural state (Islam or Confucianism in the historic contexts we are referring to) and consequently some of its ethical values, and soon began to appreciate the merits of the agriculture-based civilisation. Sometimes, the tribal chieftain was converted into a personal ruler of the agricultural state and the pastoral tribe became his army. This happened when the Turkish Seljuq tribe conquered Iran and Anatolia and adopted Iranian culture 1064-1157, and the Manchu tribe conquered China in 1644 and established the Chinese Qing dynasty 1644-1912. In other cases, which occurred only in some Moslem states, the pastoral tribes established a tribal government of the agricultural state, maintaining the alliances which brought them to rule and their pastoral way of life. Pillage was replaced by taxation and rule was carried out under a mixture of the Shari'a system of Moslem law and tribal custom.

This system of government can be called a tribal state, meaning a state ruled by a pastoral tribe or tribal federation. Among the Berber tribal states, there was often a strong religious motivation, the dominant tribe identifying itself with an Islamic movement or sect. The head of the dominant tribe generally took the title Sultan. The stability of the system depended on personal relations between the dominant tribe and other members of the federation and within the tribe, which in turn depended on distribution of the fruits of government, and on the support of religious authorities, the ulema (Islamic scholars) or shaikhs (Sufi teachers). In addition, a successful tribal ruler might keep a private army of non-tribal peoples to enforce his rule. Dissident tribes were always liable to rebel, and lack of agreed rules of succession meant that accession of a new sultan was often preceded by conflict. Unsuccessful candidates for power were, as with military states, frequently murdered. Administration was limited to the sultan's entourage, and other representative institutions were generally lacking. The result was that tribal dynasties did not achieve the longevity which often characterised personal dynasties administering an agricultural state with an established bureaucracy. Despite these drawbacks, civilised life continued to be possible. In those countries affected by tribal states, a stable urban society eventually grew strong enough to resist them⁵⁸.

Arabian Bedouin tribes were part of the Arab armies which established the first Islamic empire in the 7th century, but the empire itself was a personal theocratic state with an agricultural basis. Bedouin tribes continued with their pastoral life, and invaded North Africa in the 11th century, causing widespread devastation and destruction of settled communities. Their influence eventually resulted in the arabisation of the Maghreb.

The tribal states of North Africa were of Berber origin and arose by conquest of the coastal communities established by the Carthaginians, Romans, Vandals, and Byzantines. Having been converted to Islam 703-11, Berbers had rejected the political authority of the Caliphate by 788. The first substantial states established by Berber tribes were the Almoravid (1073-1147) and Almohad (1130-1269) empires, founded in Morocco. They were succeeded by further tribal states in Morocco and in what are now Algeria and Tunisia. In Morocco, the tribal nature of government continued until the Sa'dian dynasty established a personal government in 1510, succeeded by the present Alawi dynasty in 1668. Morocco remained outside the influence of the Ottomans, from 1517 the principal Islamic power. In Algeria (1525), Tunisia (1574), and Libya (1551) tribal rule was replaced by governors installed by the Ottomans, but in each country effective Ottoman rule was soon lost to local military or personal regimes under nominal Ottoman suzerainty.

Tribal states had a major influence on the Iranian Empire, which usually included modern Iraq, Afghanistan, and adjoining areas of the Caucasus, Central Asia, and Pakistan. After the conversion to Islam, the Abbasid Caliphate gradually broke up into provinces ruled by military dynasties, of which the most successful were the Buwayhids (950-1062). These military states were conquered by a

Turkish pastoral tribe, the Seljuqs (1064-1157), and then by the Mongols (1256-1353). The Seljuq dynasty rapidly adopted Iranian civilisation and also conquered Turkey. On its break-up, one Turkish tribe founded the Ottoman Empire. However, the Mongols remained pastoralists and caused massive devastation. Devastation was continued by the successor Mongol-Turkish Timurid dynasty (1370-1506), which later adopted Iranian urban culture. Their rule in Iran was replaced by the White Sheep Turks (1378-1508). Finally, a non-tribal dynasty, the Safavids (1502-1736) re-established the Iranian state. This rapid sequence of military and tribal regimes held back Iranian political development for about 500 years, while the role of leading Middle Eastern power was adopted by the Ottomans.

Tribalism also occurred in those post-colonial African states whose boundaries had been set by 19th century treaties between European colonising powers. Although the newly independent country had the trappings of a nation state and spoke the language of the former coloniser, it comprised in reality a number of tribes (often many) which had been resident before colonisation. The struggle against colonial rule had not been long or fierce enough to create a single national identity, so that the principal loyalty was still to the tribe, not the country. A further incentive was the lack of relation between colonial borders and tribal boundaries, so that tribes were often divided between states. In such circumstances, political parties usually had a tribal basis. In order to rule, therefore, the early governments of the former colony had to rely on the only people whom it knew well enough to trust, namely members of its own tribe or tribes. The consequent temptation to favour those tribespeople over other tribes in the distribution of assets and offices was therefore strong, and sometimes not resisted, so that the government lost legitimacy among the excluded tribes. These problems and conflicts can be overcome when national loyalties prove stronger than tribal ones, and national political leaders emerge who represent a national policy rather than a tribal identity.

The concept of a tribal society is sometimes applied to states divided communally, for example between Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland or between Kurds and Arabs, or Islamic or Christian sects in Syria, Iraq, and Yemen. The term is not used in that sense here. Communal divisions are of relevance to our analysis when they provide a competing loyalty to the nation state, but not when the primary loyalty remains to the nation within which the communities occur. In a tribal state, the primary loyalty is to the tribe. It may be argued that this remains the case in Afghanistan, where the Pashtun tribe has been dominant since the foundation of the state by the Durrani dynasty in 1747.

Development of the Nation State

The central concept for understanding all state organisations is that of legitimacy. Legitimacy means that the instructions of the ruler will be accepted. The first requirement of any society is peace and order, and the only way to bring that about is to possess a ruler who is generally accepted as legitimate. A legitimate ruler can both resolve disputes by judging them and enact laws by which disputes can be avoided or resolved without the need for judgement. So great is this need that states will hang on to an existing source of legitimate government for as long as possible, until it is evident that he or she can no longer fulfil his or her functions. Where the source of legitimate government fails and in consequence competing sources of legitimacy arise, the result is a civil war, the bitterest form of conflict. All civil wars – the Roman civil war (44-30 BCE), the English Wars of the Roses (1455-71), the English civil war (1642-48), the American civil war (1861-65), the Mexican civil wars (1857-61, 1910-20, and 1926-29), the Spanish civil war (1936-39), the Irish Troubles (1922-3 and 1966-98), the Sudanese civil wars (1955-72 and 1983-2006), the Colombian civil wars (1899-1902 and 1948-58), the El Salvador civil war (1979-91), now the Afghan civil war (2003 on), and many others – have their origin in disputes on competing legitimacies. These civil wars eventually result, by one means or another, in the establishment of a new legitimate authority in the state.

In our review of different forms of state, we have identified five – personal states, empires, military states, tribal states, and theocracies – whose governments depended on the fact that they were not accountable to the people they ruled. If they were accountable to the people, they could not function. In a sixth, the city state, government was in theory accountable to the city, but in practice was carried on by an oligarchy of wealthy traders or their descendents. This was because the rationale of a city state was the accumulation of wealth by trade, so that those who were most successful at it expected to govern. City states arose when the surrounding personal states or empires generated comparatively little wealth from an agricultural economy, or were too badly governed to allow wealth to be created. When territorial states began to provide the opportunity for significant wealth creation by their population, the rationale for city states and their ability to defend their autonomy ceased.

The significance of the nation state is that the source of legitimacy was reversed. As the population became aware of its nationality, the ruler was held accountable not to himself or to some religious authority but to the nation. This process of accountability generally proceeded in stages. The ruler was at first held accountable to those persons in the state who generated the most added value – the principal landowners, merchants, and financiers. If this accountability was effective and the national wealth continued to increase, accountability was extended to a broader section of the population, until full democracy was achieved.

In practice, this series of transitions has proved difficult in many states. Where the state broadly coincided with a nationality, and the ruler was a competent ruler whose objectives coincided with those of the nation, the advent of nationality might temporarily strengthen dynastic rule rather than weaken it. In that case, the principal political tensions arose from the growth of political parties representing different ideas and programmes. However, in many cases the state did not coincide with nationality, or the ruler was not competent or had objectives different from his or her influential subjects. Theocracies regarded any threat to their authority as immoral. Military states sought escape from national pressures by attacking their neighbours. In these cases, the process of conversion to nation states could be painful and violent. For many personal states, the decay of the dynasty resulted in a crisis of legitimacy while a new source of government emerged. There was often a phase in which a non-dynastic ruler fulfilled the function which a competent dynastic ruler would have performed. For many non-dynastic states, government was carried on by a narrow elite which failed to produce a ruler who could manage the tensions arising from the extension of nationality and industrialisation to the whole population. In those cases, there was an unstable sequence of authoritarian regimes and social revolts, until eventually a stable constitutional system emerged.

Nation states first emerged in the countries on the western edge of Europe, which had generally stable and long-lived dynasties providing a framework legitimate rule. There appear to have been two reasons for this: (i) The Holy Roman Empire, which failed as an imperial state, was too weak to interfere with the development of the states to the west of it, while acting to protect them from states to the east of it. (ii) The city states that we have described in Renaissance Italy and Northern Europe, also profiting from the failure of the Holy Roman Empire, became rich through long-distance trade. The

states of Western Europe were able to exploit this wealth to increase the added value of their own economies, which were otherwise dependent on low-productivity agriculture, so acquiring the resources to develop their nationality. They then themselves aspired to long-distance colonial endeavours, which also increased their wealth and resources. These two factors seem to differentiate the emerging nation states from other parts of world where nation states did not appear until later.

In some countries such as France, previous political institutions were held to be incapable of achieving these outcomes, and entirely new institutions were devised, often with difficulty and after much experimentation. In other countries such as England, existing institutions were adapted for the new purposes. England and Scotland had the advantage of existing strong Parliaments, and England had an independent legal system established during the time of personal rule. The majority of countries did not follow the French example, but sought to adapt their existing institutions, whose deficiencies might take considerable time to resolve. Rulers who were aware that that their country had developed a strong national identity thought that this would strengthen their authority, not realising that their legitimacy now depended on national support, not the reverse.

Once the concept of nation state had been established in Western Europe and the Americas, its spread across the world has been effected by the decay of the eight or so territorial and trading empires which existed in 1900 and their replacement by the present 193 United Nations member states. Each such formerly subject state has necessarily rejected the authority of the imperial power. Initially, as in Ireland or Italy, this transition was resisted. However, in most cases the new state was established when the imperial power lost either the means to control its dependent territory or the will to do so under pressure from the state's inhabitants. In a few cases, the rebellion against the imperial power was conducted by a theocratic or tribal element, not a national one, and no nation state resulted.

Phase I: Consolidation of the Personal or Imperial State

It follows from our definition of a nation state that its emergence was marked by three phases, the first two of which prepared the way for the succeeding one. Phase I, before the nation state, was the formation of a personal or imperial state with clear boundaries under the secure government of a legitimate ruler. Within such clear borders, the state could develop a single language, or at least a single language for government use. Supported by his (or, rarely, her) legitimacy, the ruler could develop and consolidate a single administration for currency, taxation, justice, and military conscription, to the extent that his resources permitted it. The desirable outcome was peace and security over a large part of the ruler's domain, so that a literature, culture, historical memory, and commercial infrastructure could develop which were specific to the country and so create or reinforce a national sense. The profound difference between the mentality of a pre-national personal state and a modern nation state is exhibited unconsciously by a perceptive historian of East Asia, C.P FitzGerald:

“This is one of the most interesting aspects of both Japanese and Chinese [pre-modern] society. Liberty, or lack of an authoritarian government, has always resulted in military anarchy, and has rarely produced creative art or literature. Firm, not to say oppressive and harsh, rule has produced peace and apparent content, and also a great flowering of the arts and literature. It is disturbing to observe this from the western point of view...”⁵⁹

So used have we become to the idea that progress is identified with national liberty that we have forgotten how formerly in a pre-national state progress was seen to derive from a ruler whose primary function was to suppress anarchy and consolidate government power.

We consider first the historic personal states of Western Europe, where the national concept first appeared. Administrative consolidation of those states had to overcome deep-rooted historical obstacles. The most significant was the personal nature of the rule, which meant that the relationship between the ruler and each of his principal subjects (landowners, cities, or the church) might be different. Such differences were known historically as “privileges” or “liberties”, meaning that they demarcated the boundary of authority between the ruler and the subject. Their differences might delay the formation of single principles of administration, justice, and taxation for the whole country. Wealthy subjects who felt that their privileges had been infringed might rebel, and systems of law were based on tradition and so might vary across the kingdom. Church hierarchies had powers which varied between states, but might include direct rule of ecclesiastical states, the right to sit in legislatures, immunity from taxation of income or property, or exclusive control of education, health, marriage,

probate, or social services. A second constraint might be incapacity of the ruler, which often meant waiting for the next generation of dynast, but in case of extreme incapacity might entail deposing the legitimate ruler (in fact or in name), an action which raised a major problem of legitimacy for his successor. A third delaying factor might be the invasion of the state by a neighbouring personal ruler seeking to extend his territory, as occurred continually throughout the period of personal states, since such an invasion diverted the resources of the ruler from state formation to defence. Alternatively, the ruler might be a person of ability and ambition, who desired to extend his territory and even dreamed of founding a territorial empire. The attention, efforts, and resources of his subjects were then diverted to gaining, ruling, or retaining this intended empire. A fourth delaying factor might be incapacity of the ruler's administrators, who were frequently inadequately remunerated and accordingly open to corruption.

In the West European states, these problems were in due course overcome or became manageable by the rough standards of the time. They failed to be overcome in the North Italian and German territories subject to the Holy Roman Empire (963-1806)⁶⁰, so that these failed to consolidate into national states, principally because of the theocratic pretensions of the Medieval Papacy. By contrast, in the states to the west of the Holy Roman Empire control by the ruler of the state's religion became a consolidating factor, since it was in theory from religion that he derived his authority. After the high point of the Papacy's theocratic claims, which peaked with Boniface VIII in 1302 and ended with Pius V in 1570, European kings gradually gained control over the appointment of bishops and communications with the Papacy. The Lutheran reformation (1517)⁶¹ and Anglican reformation (1534), by breaking with the Papacy, formalised these controls within individual states. Calvinism (1536) gave control of the Church to a synod of the "elect", in principle not amenable to political control, but in practice nationally based. Nationalisation of the religion in this way encouraged each nation to believe that it had a unique identity, and in order to reinforce that, members of religions other than the national one might be persecuted. However, in those countries which remained Catholic both the dynasty's sense of legitimacy and the people's sense of identity were so connected with membership of a supranational Church, despite local control of its administration, that development of a national identity was affected.

As personal rulers became sufficiently strong and wealthy, they began to question why particular aristocrats, cities, or religious bodies had privileges or exemptions which limited the tax that they paid, the authority of their administrators, the scope of the law, or their contribution to conscription. Personal rulers who succeeded in reducing these immunities on their own authority are termed by historians "enlightened despots", and operated mainly in Eastern Europe in the 18th century. Nevertheless, the idea of administrative uniformity took a strong hold in Western Europe also. The ultimate effect of administrative standardisation was to undermine the idea of personal rule, under which each subject had his or her own relation with the ruler, and to prepare the way for rule accountable to the nation. Both Frederick II of Prussia and Joseph II of Austria understood this idea, to the extent of calling themselves "first citizen", without realising its eventual effects. Modern exponents of the idea have been President Atatürk of Turkey (1923-38) and Shah Mohammed Reza of Iran (1941-79), the former with success and the latter with failure.

Administrative standardisation and the prestige of the ruler in personal states was supported also by the calling of assemblies of leading subjects. This occurred in most West European states, primarily to obtain consent for taxation, and initially included only leading aristocrats and clerics. As trade gave cities some economic independence, their leading merchants were invited to the same assemblies to agree to the taxation. This arrangement continued as long as the ruler was in need of money from the leading aristocrats, clerics, and cities. In return for agreeing the taxation, aristocrats, clerics, and cities negotiated with the ruler resolution of their grievances. However, in most states the economic assets of the ruler eventually became so substantial and his central administration so powerful that the calling of assemblies became less necessary. The assemblies themselves failed to assert themselves as a corporate body, and were more disposed to dispute within themselves the respective immunities and privileges of their members, disputes which emphasised rather than reduced the justification for personal rule. The most damaging example of such parochialism was the Polish Parliament or Sejm (1573-1795), which prevented the consolidation of a strong Polish monarchy.

In two states, however, England and Scotland, assemblies did not atrophy but grew in function and self-confidence, and are known by their present name of Parliaments. Strong kings found Parliament useful in enacting legislation, for example the English statutes of *Quo Warranto* (1290)⁶² and *Praemunire* (1353)⁶³. When the monarchy failed, Parliament was the forum where a change in

monarch was legitimised, for example the depositions of Edward II in 1327, Richard II in 1399, and Henry VI in 1461. Under strong Tudor monarchs, Parliament was the body which legitimised the break with the Catholic Church in 1534 and 1559. Parliament's early development of a sense of its own identity and authority, unlike assemblies in other countries, was aided by the existence since the time of Henry II (1166 onwards)⁶⁴ of a national system of law and royal law courts – the Common Law – and by the relative geographical compactness of England.

After this survey of national consolidation in West European States, we turn to the parallel process in other parts of the world, which were generally subject to a territorial or colonial empire, and where the same events occurred though often more recently and on a shorter timescale. The imperial power defined the borders of each dependent territory (province or colony) and established control over it by defeating or replacing local rulers, who fulfilled the same function as aristocrats in European states. The aristocrats were retained, and once imperial rule was established, the colonial or imperial governor established working relations with them. Alternatively, where there was no local aristocracy, the imperial governor appointed an administrator. The imperial power consolidated its authority within the dependent territory, establishing a single system of order, justice, taxation, and currency, and in the modern era also physical infrastructure and education. These positive measures generally resulted in acceptance of imperial rule for a period, often enabling the imperial power to recruit a local army to support its system of government⁶⁵. The imperial power generally did not attempt to replace the subject state's religion, and where the attempt was made it was usually disastrous and soon abandoned⁶⁶. These measures enabled a cultural self-awareness and hence a nationality to develop among the subject people, of which their language, culture, historical memory, or religion might be a component.

Imperial territories can be thus described as in Phase I as defined for West European states, but we now observe a significant difference. Whereas in Western Europe the nationality created by consolidation of the state was in the first instance identified with the ruling dynasty, in the imperial territories nation states arose only when the imperial power collapsed, withdrew, or was overthrown, with seven possible outcomes:

- (i) A nationality had arisen within the imperial territory and had the same boundaries. It replaced the imperial power as the source of authority, as generally in Italy, North Africa, South-East Asia, Ethiopia, and the states settled by British emigrants.
- (ii) The former imperial territory contained two nationalities, one dominant and the other subordinate. The subordinate nationality asserted itself, establishing its own state, as Bangladesh and the Equatorial Provinces of Sudan⁶⁷, freeing the identity of the dominant state.
- (iii) Nationalities had arisen which crossed imperial provinces and had generally unclear boundaries, as in much of Eastern Europe. Nation states were formed within new boundaries by a process of national consolidation, often after much violence and hardship.
- (iv) The empire coincided with the nation state, as the United States and China.
- (v) The remnant of the imperial power was left to form a nation state and possessed the necessary national identity to do so, as Germany, Hungary, Turkey, Iran, and Russia. In the case of Austria, a national identity had to be created.
- (vi) The boundaries created by the imperial power were respected, but the national identity and institutions were initially imperfect and had to be created, as in much of Latin America, Sub-Saharan Africa, and Pakistan. These instances are discussed further below.
- (vii) No nation state was formed, as Afghanistan, Somalia, Bosnia, and Burma.

Sometimes, as in Morocco, Jordan, or Tonga, a local monarchy succeeded in identifying itself with the national sentiment. More often, local dynasties were seen as an obstacle to national development and were deposed as soon as the colony achieved independence⁶⁸.

In those former imperial countries which withdrawal of the imperial power left with firm borders but an insufficient national identity or institutions to express it, national identity was challenged by competing sources of legitimacy whether aristocratic, tribal, or religious, often with deep historical roots. Any constitutional settlement left by the imperial power broke down almost immediately. Since the principle of the nation state had generally been accepted, the task of nation building was entrusted to an authoritarian ruler, usually the army. The army nominated a military ruler who was head of state and carried out the functions formerly performed by the dynastic or imperial power, so that we may say that the country remained in Phase I. Army rule was accepted because it had a clear command

structure and the means of enforcing order, and was capable (whether efficiently or not) of the tasks of national consolidation which we have noted for personal and imperial rule. It continued until the problems of national identity and legitimacy had been resolved, often after defeat of one or more aristocratic, tribal, or religious rebellions. At that point, military government could cease and be replaced with a Constitutional system.

Military rule has the evident disadvantages that it permits no checks on maladministration and no simple process for replacing an unsatisfactory ruler. A coup d'état is usually employed both to establish a military ruler and to replace one, except when Constitutional government ensues. Since military government fulfils the functions of personal rule in dynastic states, it may even become hereditary, as occurred for example Syria in 2000, where the son of the military ruler succeeded him.

In a few instances a military regime which originally came to power to achieve national consolidation in fact adopted imperial ambitions instead. Such instances are fortunately rare, and are mainly confined to Hohenzollern and Nazi Germany (1871-1918; 1933-45), Japan (1937-45), and Saddam Hussein's Iraq (1979-2003). In Somalia, a military regime 1969-91 failed to achieve national consolidation, despite a common religion and language, and the country is now divided among tribal areas. In Burma, a military regime commenced in 1962 has failed to overcome the tribal divisions which survive from colonial times. The personal rule of Colonel Gaddafi in Libya from 1969 to 2011 has been directed to create a nation state from the two different provinces of Tripolitania and Cyrenaica.

However, except in those instances where military rule obstructs the development of the nation state, it can be regarded as a form of government which is adopted when other systems fail, usually because the national identity and civil society are insufficiently developed to provide a popular basis for rule. It only ceases to be accepted when civil society begins to assert itself, as in Nigeria from about 1993. A successful military regime may even prepare a civil society to succeed it. Military government may therefore be seen as stage through which nation states with an insufficient civil society may have to pass.

Phase II: Transfer of Legitimacy to the Nation

We have defined the nation state as one in which the primary loyalty is to the nation. To achieve this, there has to be a nationality, that is a sense of unique national self-awareness, and that nationality has to be asserted. Assertion of the nationality involves the transfer of legitimacy from the former ruler to the nation by means of a successful rebellion or assertion of national sovereignty. This is Phase II. The former ruler can be a personal, imperial, military, tribal, or theocratic ruler. Alternatively, the former ruler can be another nation state with which the rebelling nation state no longer identifies itself. The successful assertion of national sovereignty can usually be identified to a particular historic event, often the culmination of a long period of dissatisfaction with the previous form of rule. When that act is taken, the body intended to express the new national legitimacy is rarely clearly defined, so that renunciation of the previous ruler can be a leap in the dark. It is therefore only made when the previous form of rule has become quite unacceptable, by which time the nationality can have been developing for quite a long period.

There also has to be a single defined nationality for legitimacy to be transferred to. The reason why the event took place first in Western Europe was in that in those countries – Netherlands, England, Scotland, France, Spain, Portugal, Switzerland, Sweden, and Denmark – the state coincided, more or less, with the nationality. During the period of personal rule in those states, a cultural, legal, and historical identity had developed and, as importantly, the country had become sufficiently wealthy to afford it. In contrast, the countries of Eastern Europe and the Middle East were largely ruled by empires comprising many peoples, who could not readily develop or express their nationality until the empires collapsed. Government in Islamic states often had a theocratic element, which delayed the growth of a national sense there. Other parts of the world did not have a state structure, or their government was not stable for a sufficiently long period, or a civil society had not developed to the necessary extent. Later, many of these peoples and states were incorporated into European colonial empires, whose internal borders provided sufficient stability for the present nations of the world to emerge. In China or Iran, dissatisfaction with a ruler might be expressed by a change of dynasty.

As we itemise later, the first national rebellions against imperial or personal rulers, such as those of Switzerland, the Netherlands, Scotland, England, the United States, France, and the former Spanish

colonies in the Americas, were strongly opposed by the ruler as a form of treason against his rule and often against his religion. Later national rebellions against other nation states, such as those of Italy, the Irish Free State (now the Irish Republic) and Belgium, were strongly opposed as the ruling nation state did not realise or accept that an independent nationality had developed. Wars and civil wars ensued before the rebellions finally succeeded. Outside Western Europe, the empires which controlled most of the rest of the world in 1900 collapsed in wars against each other. The colonial empires failed as their component parts acquired a national identity, and then sufficient self-confidence to demand independence. At first, those demands were resisted, and then the cost of resisting them across the whole colonial empire became too great for the colonial powers to afford and the will to do so disappeared. The Soviet empire collapsed as its ideology and economic system were shown to have failed. The Persian Empire was reduced by successive wars with its neighbours to the present Persian-speaking heartland. Later assertions of national sovereignty against other nation states, such as those of Norway or Slovakia, generally took place peacefully⁶⁹ as the concept of an independent nation state became generally accepted.

Historically, there have been many more peoples than there are now nation states. The consolidation of nation states has therefore involved the subordination of other identities, whether linguistic or religious, either by agreement or violently. In each case, a single legitimacy is recognised which lies with the nation, to which the other identities are subject. We have already remarked that China has 56 recognised minorities, as has Vietnam. The Spanish nationality includes the Catalan and Basque identities. India is a federation of 28 states and 7 territories, each with its own language; in practice, the official languages are Hindi and English. The 83 provinces (called subjects) of the Russian Federation include 21 ethnic republics. Great Britain comprises England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland, of which Scotland at least regards itself as having its own nationality. The Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka have only recently been defeated in a long civil war (1983-2009) against the Sri Lankan nation state. Karen and Shan minorities in Burma are currently in rebellion against the Government. Nearly all the African states include many tribes and languages, and employ the former colonial language for official purposes and education.

In most countries, the move to national self-assertion occurred once and was completed. In a minority, it was thwarted or reversed. In all the countries in which that happened, nationality was expressed though a Parliament set up on a European model, but that Parliament was elected by a narrow elite and was subsequently overthrown or ignored. In Turkey (1876), Iran (1907), and Egypt (1923)⁷⁰, the weakness of civil society enabled traditional institutions to disregard Parliament and thereby renounce accountability. Subsequently, a genuinely national revolt occurred, but only in Turkey (at least until 2011) has parliamentary government been established. In Germany, Russia, Japan, Iran, and Ethiopia, a determined minority seized power in the name of an imperial or theocratic ideology and imposed it on the nation by ruthlessly taking over all social, cultural, military, and political bodies. In Japan, the 1889 Constitution was subverted in 1937-8 by the military in the name of the imperial cult. In other countries, the minority took advantage of the disorder and confusion of a national revolt. In Russia, the attempted constitutional rule in 1917 was destroyed by the Communist seizure of power, which lasted until 1991. In Germany, the Weimer Constitution of 1919 never established legitimacy and was overthrown by the Nazis in 1933. In Iran, the 1979 national revolt which overthrew the shah transferred power to Ayatollah Khomeini, whose followers imposed a theocratic regime in the framework of a nominally constitutional system; Iran has therefore twice failed to achieve a nationally legitimate government. In Ethiopia, a Marxist military regime established in 1974-5 was overthrown by a national revolt in 1991.

National development in Arab-speaking states was complicated by the parallel growth from about 1911 of a pan-Arab national movement, whose goal was one Arab state based on the concept of a single Arab cultural and historical identity. This movement placed its hopes in the kingdom of Greater Syria which was set up in Damascus in 1920 under King Faisal ibn Hussein after the defeat of the Ottoman Empire. The almost immediate division of Lebanon, Syria and Iraq between France and Britain under the 1916 Sykes-Picot agreement, Faisal becoming king only of Iraq, associated Western colonial rule in Arab minds with suppression of Arab nationality. Individual Arab states subsequently became independent under local rulers or oligarchies ([Saudi] Arabia 1917, North Yemen 1918, Iraq 1921, Egypt 1922, Syria and Lebanon 1944, Jordan 1946, Libya 1951, Oman 1951, Morocco and Tunisia 1956, Sudan 1956, Kuwait 1961, Algeria 1962, South Yemen 1967, Bahrain, Qatar, and UAE 1971). However, the continued influence and occasional military interference of Britain and France in Arab states up to 1956, Jewish settlement in Palestine leading to the establishment and consolidation of

Israel (1948-67), and President Nasser of Egypt (1953-70)'s successful 1956 nationalisation of the Suez Canal boosted a sense that all Arabs were subject to colonial interference and should respond by pursuing Arab unity. Nasser identified himself with this sentiment and sought to become the pre-eminent Arab nationalist leader. Supposedly reactionary or pro-Western monarchies in Iraq (1958), North Yemen (1962), and Libya (1969) were deposed⁷¹, and unions were attempted between Egypt, Syria, and North Yemen 1958-61, and Libya, Egypt, and Syria 1972-77. The failure of these projects showed that the primary allegiance of Arab populations is to their states, not to a hypothetical Arab union, and each country has developed its own national identity and institutions, a conclusion confirmed by the events of 2011. An unfortunate consequence of the anti-Western attitude was the adoption of "socialism" as an economic ideology, which meant in reality protectionism, in those countries under Nasser's influence. Countries not directly influenced by his ideas, such as Morocco and the Gulf states from Kuwait to Oman, have adopted an open economy and capitalism and have benefited accordingly.

The political development of Latin American states arose from their origin in the rapid and unexpected decolonisation in the 1820's, leaving them in the hands of a small social class of European origin with little sense of nationality or identification with indigenous traditions. The only available tradition was the theocratic one on which the Spanish monarchy was founded, but this was opposed within the elite by a secular attitude also derived from Europe, often resulting in conflict while the privileges of the Catholic Church were reduced. The usual first form of Government was rule by a series of generals, or in the case of Brazil by an emperor inherited from the Portuguese monarchy. As a small wealthy elite developed, it formed an oligarchy which constituted the next stage of rule, often in alliance with the military which came from the same social background. Subsequently, the need for a strong government to develop the country usually gave rise to a presidential dictatorship. In all these stages, there invariably existed a Constitution which stated how presidents were elected but failed to control his powers and activities. Changes of government were more frequently executed by a military coup. Pressure for a better standard of life from ordinary people often produced charismatic presidents ("caudillos") who promised social reform, beyond their power to deliver, and resulted in political parties of a more popular basis which paid greater regard to indigenous cultural traditions. Eventually, all these factors coalesced to form a national identity and functioning constitutional system in each country, and the military dropped out of the process as their role was no longer needed.

In China and Vietnam, a national revolt occurred in the mid-to late 20th century but did not take a Parliamentary form, instead becoming identified with a Communist party. These countries are still nominally Marxist-Leninist, but have adopted capitalist economics without becoming Parliamentary states.

A small number of countries have not yet achieved a sufficiently strong national self-identity to legitimise a stable political authority. Examples are Afghanistan and the former colonial states of Burma and Somalia, in which authority lies with tribal groupings in potential or actual conflict with each other. In Afghanistan, failure of the dynasty and colonial rule by the Soviet Union destroyed the legitimacy of the government, which was taken over in a civil war by the theocratic Taliban. The Taliban then allowed itself to be the vehicle for the imperial theocratic ambitions of Al-Qa'ida and was accordingly overthrown by the United States allied with non-Taliban tribes. Because of the weakness of Afghan nationality, the post-Taliban government has uncertain legitimacy and is subject to a Taliban insurrection.

Phase III: Establishment of Constitutional Legitimacy

Once the transfer has occurred, any ruler not accepted by the nation is seen as illegitimate. Phase III is therefore the process whereby a legitimate national government is established. Since the government is accountable to the nation, the nation generally considers that it should have the right to confirm or withdraw its approval of it from time to time. For the same reason, the nation generally considers that the powers that the government possesses should be debated and approved, and the manner in which it exercises those powers, including powers to levy and spend taxes, should be debated, approved, and scrutinised by a body independent of the government. The process of conferring powers is termed legislation, and the independent legislating body is an elected Parliament. Legislation also defines the mutual rights and obligation of national citizens against each other. The powers of the government and the rights and obligations of citizens are defined in a system of law, and the legitimacy of the elected government and Parliament validates the system of law. The subjection of the government to law is

called the Rule of Law. Since the government is subject to law, application of the law to individuals, formerly a function of the ruler, is required to be performed by judges independent of the government.⁷²

The processes whereby these various bodies are elected or appointed, and their mutual relationships, are held to constitute the nation state and are therefore termed its Constitution. A state in which a Constitution is recognised and functions is termed constitutional. Governments come to office and Parliaments are elected with a view to carrying out a political programme, and there are invariably differences within the nation on what that programme should be. There are therefore several political programmes, each of which is devised and promoted by a different political party. At elections, political parties campaign for their separate candidates for Parliament and for the government if it is elected independently. In order that the electorate should be free to choose between political programmes, it is considered that there should be no legal or other constraint on who can stand for public office, on what programme they should do so, on public debate on the programmes, or on the campaigning of political parties. The process of election should also be independent and fair. This entire system is generally understood as democracy.

In practice, political parties are generally divided between idealistic parties which promote a programme of more radical reform and pragmatic parties which are more concerned with adjusting their programme to a conservative understanding of the nation's problems. These are respectively termed left-wing and right-wing, a chance terminology arising from the French revolution. In most countries, there is a tension and balance between left-wing and right-wing programmes. A radical programme which is not mitigated by practical considerations may be unrealisable or even harmful. A conservative programme which has no idealistic element can be complacent or even inert. It is not the purpose of this essay to examine these distinctions further, except to remark that the nature of radical programmes has changed with time. Particular idealistic programmes have become fashionable and then, when seen to run their course, lost popular appeal. The nature and even the identity of left-wing parties have therefore changed, while right-wing parties have generally been more stable. A particular radical programme which is not adopted by a left-wing party may be promoted by a right-wing party as part of this on-going dialogue.

The principle of constitutional government had of course been invented much earlier, and was practiced in the ancient city states of Greece and Rome. However, we are here concerned with Parliamentary constitutional government for a territorial state, in the sense described above. It could not occur until the legitimacy of government was held to lie within the nation rather than outside it. Once that transition had occurred, each country had to decide where within the nation legitimate authority resided, and by what process political programmes were to be promoted and the persons charged with implementing them approved. That involved a huge change from the system it replaced, in which government, legislation, and adjudication were all imposed by an external authority. In the case of each nation state, it is possible to identify a particular historic event by which constitutional government was established, that is, the point at which there was a legitimate government subject to law and a legitimate independent Parliament had the monopoly of primary legislation and taxation. The first countries in which this occurred were those of Western Europe, since they were the first in which legitimacy was transferred to the nation. Such a transition depended also on two practical factors:

- (i) A ruling dynasty of sufficient calibre, capable of guiding the country within the framework of existing institutions while it developed economically and constitutionally. So long as competent or at least adequate government continued, the dynasty (or its substitute) would retain the legitimacy to rule while constitutional government developed.
- (ii) Elements in society sufficiently wealthy and well-organised to afford participation in Parliament and to campaign for political programmes for the government and Parliament to carry out. These wealthy social elements are what we generally term civil society.

The initial obstacle to constitutional rule in West European states lay with dynastic rulers who regarded opposition from a Parliament, or from those calling for a Parliament, as rebellion. They resented being constrained in their choice of ministers and programmes, or in the appointment of judges. They objected also to the formation of political parties, as they considered that they alone had the right to initiate policy. This occurred in late 17th century England and Scotland, and in 19th century

Netherlands, Belgium, and Scandinavia. Eventually, the separate legitimacy of Parliament and its control of taxation brought the dynasty, Parliament, and civil society into a constitutional arrangement. Even when that had occurred, civil society was usually limited to the wealthier classes of society, who alone had the right to vote at elections. As the prosperity of the nation state increased, further social elements considered themselves part of civil society and demanded the vote, until finally it was extended to all men and then to all adults.

England had the good fortune of the strong Tudor dynasty which fulfilled this function in the 16th century. The ruling Alawi dynasty in Morocco performed a similar role from the 1930's onward. Unfortunately it sometimes happened that the dynasty was weak or non-existent, with the result that the entire political process could fail, as the dynasty no longer possessed the historic legitimacy to maintain its authority, and different minority political factions struggled for supremacy. The outcome in early 20th century Germany, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Greece, Poland, and the Baltic States was political instability, followed by rule by a substitute dynasty in the form of an authoritarian dictator. In an extreme case, failure of both the ruling dynasty and of civil society meant that it was not clear where legitimate authority lay within the nation. This occurred in Spain in the later 19th and early 20th century, and culminated in the bitter civil war of 1936-9. The resultant Franco dictatorship (1939-75) was accepted as the source of authority until democratic institutions and civil society were ready to take over.

An analogous problem occurred in former colonies of European states, with the exception of countries such as India and Sri Lanka where nationality and civil society were sufficiently strong to take over. In East Asian and North African states, the nationality was usually well-defined but colonial rule had undermined the authority of the traditional rulers while not creating a civil society strong enough to assume leadership. Some Islamic or partly Islamic states (Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, and Pakistan) had a historic state tradition, but government was in the hands of well-established oligarchies of families or confessional groups. In sub-Saharan Africa, states of sufficient size and clear boundaries had not existed before European colonial rule, in part because of lack of a widely-used written language, and boundaries were set arbitrarily by the colonial rulers. While a national movement of some sort had existed before independence, the authority of sectional or tribal groups was often much stronger. In almost every instance, the boundaries determined by the former colonial power were respected. The solution adopted was generally authoritarian rule, which continued the government function of the former colonial power while the country slowly developed a civil society. This authoritarian rule retained legitimacy so long as no alternative appeared available. If the competency of one dictatorship failed, it might be replaced by another. When civil society had developed to the point that a national sense could over-ride sectional divisions, the authoritarian system could be replaced by constitutional government. This sequence of events has occurred in many former colonial countries, and is resulting in the gradual spread of constitutional government across the world.

In a few cases, independence of a former colony revealed that it included more than one nationality, as in Pakistan, Sudan, and Sri Lanka. Unless as in Sri Lanka the minority nationality could be defeated, division into two countries might occur. The United States adopted constitutional government in 1787-91, almost from its inception. However, this Constitution remained under threat so long as minority of Southern (actually, South-Eastern) States refused to accept that it could prohibit slavery. Only after the South had been defeated in the civil war of 1865-8 could the US Constitution be said to be established.

It sometimes happened that civil society participating in politics was wealthy or had increasing wealth, while the dynasty was weak or failed, and this again held up the development of constitutional institutions. The Netherlands suffered a long period of economic and political stagnation until a dynasty was imposed on the country externally (1815). In France there occurred a failure both of the dynasty and of the political system, since there was no functioning Parliament until 1789. They were replaced firstly by an authoritarian dictator in the form of Napoleon (1799-1815) and then by entirely new constitutional institutions which proved impermanent and were revised many times before they became stable in 1958.

Finally, constitutionalism can be obstructed in states which have adopted a stable national government, but are at risk from a minority theocratic faction with some historical legitimacy, as at present in Iran, or an imperialist faction as in Germany 1918-45 and Japan 1937-45. After 1917, many West European countries were disturbed by an attempt by local Communist parties to take over power without an electoral mandate. Fear of this takeover was the trigger which brought dictators to power in Italy,

Germany, Spain, and Greece, and also contributed to political instability in France up to 1939. With the fall of the Soviet Union, this risk of a Communist revolt has vanished. Now, many Islamic countries are under threat from a theocratic faction, mostly co-ordinated by Al-Qa'ida, which seeks to impose a clerical dictatorship by means of extreme violence.

As with the transition to national legitimacy, it is only possible to be sure in retrospect that the transition to constitution government will not be reversed. The dates of transition which we identify are therefore the ones that are apparent at this point in time.

The Development of Individual Nation States

We now review the development of individual nation states and suggest dates in each case when national legitimacy and constitutional legitimacy were established. Phases I, II, and III as defined above are so marked. Countries are listed in order of Phase II.⁷³

The Development of Individual Nation States: 15th to 18th Centuries:

Switzerland, Netherlands, Scotland, England, United States, France

The earliest state to achieve a successful national revolt is believed to have been the eleven founding Swiss cantons, which gained effective independence from the Holy Roman Empire^I in 1499^{II} with the Peace of Basel with the Emperor Maximilian I. Independence was formally confirmed by the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia. Although represented in a loose confederation, the cantons had no central government and each one, governed by a self-perpetuating oligarchy, was independent. Some cantons had become Protestant while others remained Roman Catholic, and there were occasional wars over religion and between the oligarchies and peasants. From 1798 to 1815, when Switzerland covered its present territory of 26 cantons, the country was under French occupation. In 1848^{III} after a brief civil war, the Swiss Federal Constitution was adopted, providing for a Swiss government and Parliament, and subject to modifications remains in force.

The second state to achieve a successful national revolt was the Netherlands, which had originally been formed by the Duke of Burgundy in 1363^I as a personal state of 17 provinces including the present Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg. The seven provinces (or States) comprising the Netherlands acquired their own identity through the adoption of Calvinism and renounced the sovereignty of the Philip II of Spain in 1581^{II}. War with Spain ensued, ending in the formal recognition of Dutch independence in 1648. The seven provinces became very prosperous through trade and industry, but remained legally independent, meeting in a States-General to agree only on foreign and defence policy. The provinces were governed by self-perpetuating oligarchs. The House of Orange, descended from Prince William of Orange (1579-84), commanded the Dutch armies with the title “Stadtholder” (“deputy”), but only when so requested. The absence of a single Netherlands monarchy prevented a strategic view being taken of Dutch interests. Awareness of this need resulted in conflict within the country from 1781 onwards between supporters and opponents of the House of Orange. In 1796, under French occupation, the provinces renounced their independence in favour of a single state. A Netherlands monarchy under the House of Orange was established in 1815 (King William I, 1815-40). A Parliamentary Constitution was granted in 1848^{III} by his son King William II (1840-9), and this remains in force.

A Scottish Gaelic monarchy was founded by Kenneth Mac Alpin (843-58) and was extended to the modern area of Scotland by Malcolm II (1005-34). David I (1124-53) established a feudal landowning system, coinage, towns (burghs), monasteries, and episcopal sees^I. An attempt by kings of England to conquer Scotland in 1296 was defeated at Bannockburn in 1314 by King Robert I (1306-29). The first Parliament to include burghs is dated 1326. The Scottish dialect of English was adopted by the burghs and became general in Southern Scotland by 1400. Scotland was converted to Calvinist Protestantism in 1560. In 1603, the Scottish king became King James I of England (1603-25) by hereditary succession. The attempts of his son Charles I to impose Anglican church organisation and liturgy and to rule Scotland through bishops provoked a Church General Assembly and Parliament to renounce his authority in religious matters in 1638-9^{II} and to establish Presbyterianism. Royal authority in general was not renounced, and Charles II was accepted as king in 1651. The theocratic element in Presbyterianism (called Covenanters) was defeated in 1666. In 1689, William III was accepted as king by Parliament under a settlement called the Claim of Right^{III} which confirmed the Presbyterian Church and the Scottish legal system. In 1707 Parliament agreed to union with the English Parliament in a single state. A rising in 1745 by highland clans in favour of the Catholic grandson of James II was defeated. The use of standard English became general in the 18th century. In 1999, a Scottish Parliament and local self-government were re-established within the British state.

England was first state whose Parliament successfully revolted against its legitimate monarch, and was the first state to establish Parliamentary constitutional government. Its unity was established in 927 by the Anglo-Saxon king Athelstan (925-37) and confirmed by conquest in 1066^I by the first Norman king William I (1066-87). Efforts by the English kings to build an empire in France were defeated

when the Norman kings' lands there were seized by the French king Philip II in 1202-4 and England was defeated in the Hundred Years' War in 1450-53. The first Parliament to include knights of the shire and burgesses⁷⁴ as well as leading aristocrats and clerics was called in 1265. Wales was conquered 1282-1301. The break with the Roman Catholic Church and the establishment of the Protestant Anglican Church occurred under the competent rule of the Tudor monarchs Henry VIII (1509-47) and Elizabeth I (1558-1603). The writings and judgements of Sir Edward Coke (1606-34)⁷⁵ reinforced the English Common Law as an independent system. These events, and the civil society which developed to support Parliamentary representation, developed a sense of English national identity and a sense by Parliament of its own legitimacy independent of the Crown, expressed in Parliament's Petition of Right (1628). King Charles I (1625-49) did not accept this, and in consequence a civil war broke out between the king and Parliament, ending with the king's defeat and execution in 1649ⁱⁱ.

The military regime which followed 1649 did not establish a legitimate government in Britain, and Charles I's son Charles II (1660-85) was therefore recalled as king. However, Charles II and his brother James II (1685-88) attempted to control Parliament by manipulating the city franchises which elected MP's and by dismissing judges. In addition, James II sought to restore Roman Catholicism. Accordingly, his nephew William III (1689-1702) was invited from the Netherlands to replace him and James II was expelled. The Bill of Rights (1689) and Act of Settlement (1701)ⁱⁱⁱ confirmed the independence of Parliament and of senior judges. England became part of Great Britain in 1707. As political parties developed strong roots in civil society, kings had to appoint Prime Ministers acceptable to Parliament. In 1832, the first Reform Act started the process of replacement of the privileged franchises under which MP's had been elected, with voting by all qualified citizens. Voting was extended to all adult citizens by 1928.

The 13 British coloniesⁱ which were the foundation of the United States declared independence from the British Crown in 1776ⁱⁱ, accepted by Britain in 1783. The 13 states drafted and ratified the United States constitution, establishing the office of President, Congress, the Supreme Court, and a Bill of Rights 1787-91. The supremacy of the Constitution was legally established in 1803. African slaves were imported until 1808 for work on plantations. The mid-western territories were acquired by purchase from France in 1803 and the western and south-western territories were conquered from Mexico in 1848. The 11 Southern States did not accept the supremacy of the US Constitution with regard to slavery, and were defeated in the Civil War of 1861-65ⁱⁱⁱ, and it can be argued that the supremacy of the Constitution was not finally established until that date. Immigration from Europe to the U.S. was unrestricted until a law limiting it was passed in 1921. Rapid westward expansion was completed with admission of the 48 continental states in 1912, Hawaii and Alaska being admitted in 1959. Property-based franchises were removed by 1850 and women were entitled to vote in 1920. Discrimination on grounds of race was outlawed in the Civil Rights Act 1964 and enfranchisement of African Americans and Native Americans was achieved by the Voting Rights Act 1965.

On the failure of the Carolingian dynasty in France, the Capetian dynasty was elected in 987. By that time what is now France had become divided between a large number of personal states or fiefdoms, acknowledging only nominal allegiance to the French king. In addition, many provinces to the east were nominally subject to the Holy Roman Empire, and other provinces were ruled by the king of England. By taking advantage of their prestige as anointed kings and protectors of the Roman Catholic Church in France, military conquest, marriage, purchase, failures of feudal heirs, alleged breaches of feudal law, and punishment of rebellions, successive French kings were able gradually to accumulate the various provinces into a single kingdom owing direct allegiance to them. This process commenced principally with king Philip II Augustus (1180-1223) and was largely completed under Louis XIV (1643-1715)ⁱ. French was made the official language in 1539. However, since every province became subject to the French Crown in different circumstances, each one had a different personal relationship with it, with different privileges or immunities, resulting in inconsistent and overlapping legal, administrative, and fiscal jurisdictions. The French Nobility and Clergy also had their own privileges. To collect the taxes required by incessant wars against the Hapsburgs and later colonial wars with England, the kings created a strong centralised bureaucracy and a theory of uncontrolled ("absolute") personal rule, which the elements of French society were too divided to successfully oppose⁷⁶.

During the 18th century, a French civil society appeared which created a new ideal of administrative harmonisation and political and religious liberty, under the influence of writers and campaigners such as Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, and Montesquieu. In 1789 the monarchy went bankrupt and called a

Parliament (or États-Généraux), which rapidly converted itself into a National Assembly and assumed political controlⁱⁱ. Within a few years, this and succeeding French Parliaments had abolished all privileges and immunities, removed internal customs barriers, disbanded the traditional courts, restructured the French provinces, standardised administration and tax collection, and executed the king. Napoleon (First Consul 1799-1804; Emperor 1804-15) set up an autocracy which completed these reforms and rewrote the French legal system (Code Napoléon). The Roman Catholic Church was subject to a Concordat with the Pope in 1801 and all involvement of the French state in religious matters ended in 1905. Unfortunately these rapid changes and the further changes which followed 1815 did not define a stable relationship between the electorate, government and Parliament. There have been 13 written French Constitutions. The Second Empire 1852-70 established an effective executive, but failed on its defeat in the Franco-Prussian war 1870-71. Under the Third Republic 1875-1939, the government lacked independent authority, being at the mercy of ever-changing Parliamentary majorities⁷⁷. Universal male suffrage was enacted in 1848 and female suffrage in 1946. It can be argued that not until the Fifth Republic in 1958, initiated by President de Gaulle (1959-69) with an independently elected president, was a stable Constitution establishedⁱⁱⁱ.

The Development of Individual Nation States: 19th Century:

Sweden, Spain, Norway, Portugal, Greece, Belgium, Hungary, Denmark, Romania, Italy, Canada, Japan, Germany, Iceland, Bulgaria

In the early middle ages Sweden was divided among separate rulers, under one of whom, King Eric IX (1150-60)⁷⁸, Christianity became established. The country was united under the Regent Birger Jarl (1248-66) and his son King Magnus Ladulås (1275-90). In 1397, Queen Margaret I of Denmark was invited to become ruler of Sweden. The period of rule by Danish kings was ended with a successful revolt by King Gustav I (1523-60), who started the new dynasty of Vasa and was the effective founder of the Swedish stateⁱ. He formalised the Parliament (Riksdag) in 1527 to comprise four estates of nobles, clergy, burghers, and peasants (smallholders). He broke with the Church of Rome in 1531; Lutheranism was then gradually accepted and became the official religion in 1593. The monarchy was declared hereditary in his family in 1544. His grandson Gustav II Adolf (1611-32) established an empire over the Baltic States and in North Germany which continued until 1721⁷⁹, and ensured that Protestantism would survive in North Germany. Charles XI (1660-97) promoted the use of the Swedish language. The kings of Sweden were personal rulers, working with the Riksdag as necessary, except for the period 1720-72 when they were subject to an aristocratic Council of State (Riksrådet). In 1809 the Riksdag adopted a new Parliamentary Constitution, and in 1810 Marshal Bernadotte was invited to rule as King Charles XIV John (1818-44), replacing the Vasa dynastyⁱⁱ. In 1866 the four estates of the Riksdag were replaced by two directly elected chambersⁱⁱⁱ, reduced to one chamber in 1970. The principle that the Government is accountable to Parliament was accepted in 1917⁸⁰.

The Spanish state was formed by the marriage in 1469 of Queen Isabella of Castile and King Ferdinand of Aragon, although Aragon remained autonomous until 1716ⁱ. The Spanish language came into general use in the 13th century, but Catalan, Galician, and Basque continue in the northern provinces. Through inheritance, the Spanish Crown acquired in 1521 large territories in Europe, and through conquest 1519-32 gained all of South and Central America except for Brazil. The Spanish Crown saw the conquest of Spain from the Moslems as a crusade, and its rule had a strong theocratic element. Moslems, Jews, and other non-Catholics were persecuted or expelled, undermining the development of a civil society. The huge resources in bullion which it drew from the American colonies were used to sustain its European empire, not invested to generate wealth, and in consequence the Spanish economy became so weak that the European empire was largely lost by 1713. King Charles III (1759-88) made some improvements in finance, infrastructure, education, and commerce, and in reducing theocratic control, but apart from Alfonso XII (1874-86) his successors were not competent rulers. The American colonies achieved independence in 1825.

Following Napoleon's invasion of Spain 1808-14, a Parliament (Cortes Generales) in 1812 convened and drafted a Constitutionⁱⁱ. The subsequent development of a constitutional nation state was hampered by the incapacity of the Spanish monarchs, civil war with a rival dynasty (the Carlists), and claims for autonomy by Catalonia and the Basques. In consequence, effective control fell into the hands of successive generals. There have been 11 written Spanish constitutions. Although a Parliamentary constitutional system was established in 1874, lack of a civil society prevented the system taking root, political control remaining in the hands of local party bosses (caciques). After

King Alfonso XIII (1886-1931) was obliged to abdicate, the subsequent Republic was undermined by attacks by anarchists, regional separatists, Communists, and Catholic elements, culminating in the civil war of 1936-9 and the dictatorship of Franco 1936-75. On Franco's death, a stable Parliamentary constitutional monarchy was established in 1978^{III}.

Norway was united and converted to Christianity by King Olav II (1016-28). Haakon IV (1217-63) stabilised the law of succession and established a central administration^I. Magnus VI (1263-80) issued a single code of law. In 1388, the Norwegian Crown was inherited by Margaret I, Queen of Denmark, and her successors remained Kings of Norway until 1814. Norway retained its own laws, coinage, and army. It also retained its own administration until 1665, when the government was centralised in Denmark. Norway adopted Lutheranism in 1537 at the same time as Denmark. When in 1814 it appeared that Norway would be transferred from Denmark to Sweden as a punishment for Denmark's alliance with Napoleon, a self-appointed assembly adopted a Parliamentary Constitution^{II}. Norway was obliged to accept the king of Sweden but retained its constitutional rights. In 1905, the Norwegian Parliament peacefully renounced the Swedish connection and elected a Danish prince as King Haakon VII (1905-57). These actions were confirmed by referenda^{III}.

Afonso I (1139-85) proclaimed himself king of Portugal in 1139 and the boundaries of the kingdom were settled in 1250^I. Portugal pioneered European overseas exploration in the 15th and early 16th centuries and acquired an overseas empire, mainly in Africa and in Brazil. The economy became very dependent on gold discovered in Brazil in 1697 and an agreement in 1703 to export wine to Britain. Following a French invasion in 1807 the king of Portugal fled to Brazil, but returned in 1821 when a revolt established a Parliamentary monarchy^{II}, which was confirmed after a civil war 1832-4. However, the system remained dependent on royal initiative, supported by a narrow political elite. Lack of economic development and continued clerical influence caused dissatisfaction with the monarchy, which was overthrown in 1910. The new Republic failed to establish public order, financial discipline, or political stability, and was overthrown by the dictatorship of Salazar 1926-68. Salazar retained political control with army, clerical, and monarchist support, and allowed the economy to develop. His system was overthrown in 1974 by army officers with anti-capitalist opinions.⁸¹ The new 1976 Constitution reintroduced Parliamentary democracy, and changes in 1982 and 1989 removed military influence and restrictions on capitalist enterprise^{III}.

The Ottoman Turks conquered Greece from Crusader states in 1458-60 and governed the Christian population through the Greek Orthodox Church^I. In 1821 a successful revolt broke out, and with assistance from Britain, France, and Russia independence for the southern part of the country was achieved by 1829^{II}. Further wars against the Ottomans extended the country to its present borders by 1923, to comprise largely Greek-speaking people of Orthodox religion⁸². In 1923, an exchange of populations occurred with the new Turkish Republic. Legitimacy was achieved through the adoption of a monarchy, at first with a Bavarian king and from 1863 with a Danish dynasty. Although the king worked with an elected Parliament, civil society and political parties remained weak and successive kings interfered in politics. A disastrous quarrel arose between King Constantine I (1913-7; 1920-2) and Prime Minister Venizelos (1910-20; 1928-32) over policy towards the First World War. In consequence, political parties became based not on different policy programmes but on different views of legitimacy: monarchists, Venizelists (constitutional monarchists)⁸³, Republicans, and in the 1940's Communists. Between 1832 and 1975 there were seven functioning Constitutions, three Dictatorships, and two Republics. A Communist insurgency was defeated 1946-9. After the third dictatorship 1967-74, a constitutional settlement was agreed in 1975 in the form of a Parliamentary Republic^{III} and political parties started to promote political programmes of the usual type. However, despite a period of strong economic growth it has become clear that the political system remained oligarchic in structure and until 2011 failed to provide the leadership that the country needs.

The Duke of Burgundy formed a personal state in the Low Countries 1363-1477 by uniting a number of different lordships which had nominally been part of the Holy Roman Empire. This state comprised 17 provinces and included some of most prosperous trading cities in Europe, inherited by the king of Spain in 1521. In particular, Antwerp became the principal commercial and financial centre of Northern Europe from 1482 until the revolt of the Netherlands against Spain, when the conquest by Spanish forces in 1585 resulted in the departure of its leading merchants and financiers, mainly to Amsterdam. The Netherlands independence in 1581 left 10 provinces which remained Roman Catholic and were ruled by the king of Spain through viceroys. One province (Artois) became French in 1659 and the remaining nine provinces were transferred to Austrian rule in 1713, of which one is now the

independent state of Luxembourg. Belgium was formed from the remaining eight provinces, plus the Prince-Bishopric of Liège which had been outside the Burgundian state^{84,1}.

In 1790-1 there was an unsuccessful attempt to establish an independent Belgian state, in rebellion against the Austrian (Holy Roman) Emperor. In 1795 Belgium was incorporated into France and the bishopric of Liège was abolished. On the defeat of Napoleon in 1815, it was made part of the newly created kingdom of the Netherlands. Although the union brought economic advantages, Belgium had by now developed its own nationality and found rule by the king of the Netherlands oppressive. In 1830 a successful revolt against Dutch rule created an independent Belgian state¹¹. A Parliamentary Constitution was adopted in 1831¹¹¹ and Leopold I (1831-65) of Saxe-Coburg was invited to be king⁸⁵. Large iron deposits enabled Belgium to be one of the earliest continental European countries to industrialise. At first the official language was French, but in 1898 Flemish was accepted on an equal basis. Under a new constitutional settlement in 1993, the country was restructured as a federal state, with separate Parliaments and administration for the Flemish and French-speaking areas and Brussels⁸⁶.

The Magyar people settled in Hungary in 896 CE. In 1000, their ruler Stephen I (997-1038) accepted Catholic Christianity and was nominated King by the Pope. By 1091, the kingdom had extended to include what are now Slovakia, most of Croatia, Vojvodina (now in Serbia), and Transylvania (now in Romania), which remained its boundaries until 1918. The politically active elements of the kingdom were a Hungarian-speaking class of landed gentry and magnates, represented in the Diet (Parliament). The peasants spoke the various languages of their regions and the official language remained Latin until 1844. The towns were settled mainly by Germans and Jews. After 1222, the Diet gained the right to approve legislation, but given the wide scope available to an active king his rule could not be called constitutional. After extinction of the original Árpád dynasty (972-1301) kings were elected by the Diet, and although several capable kings reigned, the lack of strategic direction resulted in a catastrophic defeat in 1526 by the Ottomans, who occupied almost all of Hungary. The western provinces became subject to the Hapsburg rulers of Austria (1526-1918), who reconquered Hungary in 1687¹ and restored the previous Hungarian-speaking landowners. After 1517, the Reformation divided the country between Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists.

The Hungarian agricultural economy started to develop in the late 18th century. In the early 19th century, an awareness of the Hungarian nationality and language developed, culminating in the adoption of Magyar as the official language in 1843 and its increasingly widespread use. In 1848, under the leadership of Kossuth (in power 1849), the Diet declared independence, broadened the franchise, and abolished serfdom¹¹. The revolt failed, but in 1867 the Hapsburg Emperor was forced to accept most of the rebels' terms and establish the Austro-Hungarian dual monarchy. The Hungarian kingdom then comprised all its historic territories, including speakers of Slovak, Croatian, Serb, and Romanian. In the late 19th century these peoples began to resent Magyar dominance and became nationally conscious, and on the collapse of the Hapsburg monarchy in 1918 their provinces seceded to join their respective national states. Hungary was left as a core Hungarian-speaking state, and became a Parliamentary monarchy (with some imperfections), under Admiral Horthy (1920-44) as Regent for the non-existent king¹¹¹. A Republic was declared in 1946. Some political liberalisation took place during the later phase of Communist rule (1949-89). In 1989, democracy was re-established on the basis of a reformed version of the 1949 Constitution.

Denmark converted to Christianity in the 10th century. After a number of attempts to unify the kingdom, King Valdemar I (1157-82) established a secure monarchy¹. Valdemar II (1202-41) codified the local laws, which were standardised as a single system in 1683. In 1388 under Queen Margaret I (1375-1412), the Crowns of Denmark and Norway were united, an arrangement which lasted until 1814 and brought wealth from dues on Baltic trade. Lutheranism came to Denmark in 1525 and became the official religion in 1536. After many wars with Sweden, the boundaries between Denmark, Norway, and Sweden were fixed in 1660. In the early 19th century a civil society developed which demanded a share in government, so that in 1849 the Danish Parliament was restored after two centuries and an independent judiciary established¹¹. The German-speaking provinces of Schleswig-Holstein were lost in 1864, but Danish-speaking North Schleswig was restored in 1918. The king accepted in 1901 that the Government was accountable to Parliament¹¹¹. Greenland, settled by Denmark from 1721, remains subject to the Danish Crown but has been self-governing since 1979.

In the Middle Ages the state of Romania did not exist, but consisted of three separate principalities which had adopted Orthodox Christianity: Wallachia, Moldavia, and Transylvania. Each principality

had a predominantly Romanian-speaking population subject to a landowning class (“boyars”), which held political power and elected a ruling prince (“voivode” or “hospodar”) for life. Although Wallachia and Moldavia became tributary states of the Ottoman Sultan in the 15th century, their princes continued to be elected by the boyars until 1711-15, when the Ottomans started to impose rulers in the form of Greek courtiers (“Phanariots”)⁸⁷. Unlike Wallachia and Moldavia, the boyars of Transylvania were Hungarian or German (“Saxons”), and its prince was subject to the king of Hungary. When Hungary was occupied by the Ottomans 1526-1687, Transylvania became a tributary of the Sultan in the same way as Wallachia and Moldavia. After 1711, Transylvania was ruled by a governor appointed by the Hapsburg king of Hungary. An attempt was made by Mihai Viteazul (1599-1601) to unify the three principalities, but unsuccessfully. During this period, the Romanian population (called “Vlachs”) had no political rights.

Romanian identity and the common use of the name “Romanian” commenced in Transylvania in the late 18th century. The Latin alphabet was adapted to write Romanian and gradually replaced the previous Cyrillic alphabet⁸⁸, becoming official in 1860. From 1834 to 1854 Russia imposed a protectorate on Moldavia and Wallachia, a civil society developed and Western influence increased^{89, 90}. Following Russia’s defeat in the Crimean War, both principalities became self-governing and in 1859 chose the same government under the name Romania^{i, ii}. In 1866 a prince was elected from the House of Hohenzollern (Carol I, 1866-1914). Following successful participation in a Russian war against the Ottomans, Romania became in 1878 an independent kingdom and gained the Dobruja territory which gave it access to the Black Sea. Meanwhile, the Hungarian rulers of Transylvania had been attempting unsuccessfully to impose the Hungarian language there. Following the collapse of the Hapsburg monarchy in 1918, Transylvania rejected Hungarian rule and was united with Romania. 7% of Romanians still speak Hungarian. Substantial measures of land reform were enacted in 1921 and 1945. A Republic was declared in 1947 and a Communist regime was imposed 1946-89. A new democratic Constitution was adopted in 1991^{iii, 91}.

Italy had not been a single state since shortly after the end of the Western Roman Empire in 476. In 1796 it consisted of the Papal State, three republics, two kingdoms, and four duchies. The French invasions of Italy in 1796 and 1800 encouraged a sense of Italian nationality, which was nurtured by Mazzini’s propaganda and the work of political societies. The existing petty rulers became discredited and there were several attempted uprisings in the early 19th century against them and against Austrian rule in Lombardy-Venetia. Piedmont-Sardinia, the strongest Italian state, adopted a Parliamentary Constitution in 1848. In 1859, its Prime Minister Cavour persuaded the French Emperor Napoleon III to attack Austria, an action which stimulated the overthrow of all the petty rulers in North Italy and their annexation by Piedmont. In 1860 Garibaldi overthrew the ruler of South Italy and Sicily. The Kingdom of Italy was proclaimed in 1861 and completed by acquiring Venetia in 1866 and Rome in 1870. These acquisitions were confirmed in each annexed state by a plebiscite, fraudulent in the case of Southern Italyⁱ.

The new Italian state started with a sense of national and political identity limited to a small oligarchic eliteⁱⁱ, a backward economy, and opposition from the Roman Catholic Church. Centuries of separate rule in the various provinces had left differences of administration, law, taxation, politics, and land ownership. The South did not receive the improvement in governance that it was expecting, and was controlled by military occupation. The population spoke around 20 different dialects, often not mutually comprehensible. After the death of Cavour in 1861, governments were weak and unstable⁹² and not supported by an adequate civil society. The oligarchy was broadened by an extension of the franchise in 1882 and nearly universal male suffrage in 1912, but Catholic political participation was prohibited by the Church until the Concordat of 1929 and social opposition was intermittently suppressed. Discredited by its performance in the First World War (1915-18) and unable to manage the social tensions caused by early industrialisation, the state allowed itself in 1922 to be taken over by a “fascist” dictatorship under Mussolini which survived until defeated in the Second World War in 1943. In 1946, a Parliamentary Republic was set up and female suffrage was introducedⁱⁱⁱ. Governments continued to be weak and unstable, but an effective independent judiciary emerged and Italy finally became an industrial state. In 1992, a political corruption scandal resulted in the disbandment of the existing political parties. With new political parties, more stable government has resulted. The Italian language is now spoken by about 90% of the population, often in addition to a regional dialect.

The Canadian provinces other than Quebec were settled by British people from the 17th century. Quebec was settled by French people, but captured by British troops in 1759-60 during the Seven Years' War, confirmed by the Treaty of Paris in 1763, the Quebecois being permitted to retain French law and the Catholic religionⁱ. The eastern border with the US was confirmed by the US-British War of 1812 and the western boundary by a treaty in 1849. Ottawa became the capital in 1857. Following pressure for self-government, the federal Dominion of Canada was created in 1867, comprising Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotiaⁱⁱ. This concept gave self-government to Canada under the British Crown, but retained control by Britain of foreign relations and defence. The remaining provinces (other than Newfoundland) joined the Dominion by 1905ⁱⁱⁱ. Participation by Canada in the First World War in Europe increased Canada's national sense and raised pressure for full independence, which occurred in practice in 1919 when Canada signed the Treaty of Versailles and joined the League of Nations in 1920, and in law in 1931 by the UK Statute of Westminster. The term "Dominion" is no longer used. Newfoundland became a separate Dominion in 1907, reverted to a British colony in 1934, and joined Canada as a province in 1948. A new flag was adopted in 1965 and in 1982 the legal device of a UK Act of Parliament was used to adopt a new Constitution.

The pre-eminence of the imperial dynasty⁹³ of Japan over the landed aristocracy was established in 593-622 CE by Regent Shōtoku, codified in 646 as the Taika reforms by Regent Fujiwara (645-69). At about the same time Buddhism became a popular religion, merging with the native Shintoism. A centralised administration was set up at Nara in 710 and moved to Kyoto in 793 in order to escape the influence of the Buddhist priesthood. Increase in wealth of landed estates gave rise to a warrior class (samurai), serving feudal landowners (daimyo). Head of the feudal warrior class was the Commander-in-Chief (Shogun), a hereditary position which from 1185⁹⁴ controlled the government in the name of the emperor and for the first time ruled all of Japan. A civil war between daimyo factions which started in 1467 was won in 1603 by the first Tokugawa Shogun, Ieyasu (1603-16)⁹⁵¹, who founded a shogunal dynasty and administration based in Edo which lasted until 1868, while the imperial capital remained at Kyoto. The Tokugawas effectively controlled the daimyo aristocrats and samurai, resulting in political and social stability at the cost of immobility, although a merchant class developed which supported the "Ukiyo-e" culture⁹⁶. Confucianism was supported, in contrast to Shintoism which was the religion of the imperial house⁹⁷. Christianity was proscribed and almost all entries and exits from the country were forbidden. Information on the outside world was obtained from the Dutch, through whom foreign trade with Europe was conducted. In 1854, the Americans forced Japan to accept Western access and trade. By 1868, sections of the daimyo and samurai class (especially the Choshu and Satsuma houses from west Japan) realised that their society and economy needed to be updated. A small oligarchy seized power in the name and with the support of the Emperor Meiji (1867-1912), abolished the shogunate, and carried out a political, social, and economic revolution. The imperial Shinto cult was re-emphasised. Feudalism were abolished, all persons were declared of equal status, the capital was moved from Kyoto to Edo (renamed Tokyo), and Western technology, education, armed forces, and institutions were adoptedⁱⁱ.

The motivation of the 1868 reformers was to establish Japan's status in the world. Unfortunately, they concluded that Japan was at risk from predatory Western empires, and that to be fully independent Japan should build its own empire. The Meiji Constitution (1889), although it included an elected Parliament, combined imperial absolutism with an oligarchic bureaucracy vested with undefined responsibility⁹⁸. In 1937-38 it was interpreted to give power to the Japanese military without political control. In a series of wars, Japan acquired Taiwan, Korea, the Marianas, Manchuria, the eastern coast of China, South-East Asia, and Indonesia. This empire was destroyed by the US and its allies in the Second World War 1941-5. Under US occupation 1945-52, Japan became in 1946 a Parliamentary constitutional monarchyⁱⁱⁱ, and is now much more prosperous than when it was an imperial power.

We have already summarised how the attempt to form a single German state in the Middle Ages failed with the end of the Hohenstaufen dynasty in 1250. Two German rulers, the Hapsburg Archduke of Austria and the Hohenzollern Margrave of Prussia, formed large personal states in territories east of the Holy Roman Empire, which was divided into many small personal states. In 1803, the Holy Roman Empire was reorganised and in 1806 the last emperor abdicated. In 1815, Prussia gained the Rhineland territories. The 39 personal states which were set up in 1815 on the defeat of Napoleon's attempt to conquer Germany were not compatible with a developing German nationality, stimulated by the use of the German language⁹⁹, the example of French nationality, the German customs union formed by Prussia, and writers such as Goethe and Schiller. The 39 states also failed in matters such as a single currency, legal system, and weights and measures. German nationalists therefore decided that

Germany should be unified by the Kingdom of Prussia, which was primarily but not wholly German, rather than Austria, which was not. An attempt in 1848-9 to form a single German federation under a German Parliament and the Prussian king as Emperor failed. In a series of wars 1864-6, Prussia under Chancellor Bismarck (1862-90) excluded Austria from Germany, deposed some German rulers and dominated the remainderⁱ, while allowing no effective power to the German Parliament. The Hohenzollern German Empire was declared in 1871ⁱⁱ. Because it was based not on a clear transfer of legitimacy to the German nation but on a series of successful wars, it was fatally unclear on whether this was a personal state under the Hohenzollern Emperor, a German nation state, a military state, or a European Empire seeking world power status¹⁰⁰. Germany's very rapid industrialisation led her rulers to believe that the last might be possible, and the Republic which was set up in 1918 did not acquire the legitimacy to limit Germany's ambition. The Nazi dictatorship set up in 1933 pursued the imperial idea with even greater violence which it sought to justify by a racist ideology, until its defeat and occupation of 1945. A Parliamentary Federal Republic founded on a German nation state was finally established in 1949ⁱⁱⁱ.

Iceland was settled from Norway from 874 and adopted Christianity in 1000. The absence of a government allowed blood-feuds between landowners. In 1262-4, Iceland submitted to the rule by the king of Norwayⁱ, subsequently the king of Denmark. Lutheranism was imposed by the king in 1550 and government was centralised in Denmark in 1660. In 1843 the Icelandic Parliament was re-established. It achieved a degree of home rule in 1874ⁱⁱ, responsible government in 1904, and in 1918 an independent stateⁱⁱⁱ. A Republic was declared in 1944 while Denmark was under German occupation.

A state was established in the Southern Balkans in 681 CE by the Turkish-speaking Bulgarian tribe, which adopted the language of the Slav-speaking inhabitants. Orthodox Christianity was accepted in 865, and in 870 the Bulgarian Church was recognised as autonomous. In 893 Old Church Slavonic was adopted as the language of Orthodox liturgy and spread from Bulgaria to the other Slav Orthodox states. The Cyrillic alphabet for Slavonic languages was devised in Bulgaria in the early 10th century. Simeon I (893-927) obtained recognition as "Tsar" in 925ⁱ and extended the Bulgarian state to include modern Macedonia, Albania, and Thrace. After a period of Byzantine rule 1041-1186, the state was re-established within similar borders by Tsar Ivan Asen II (1218-41), but did not recover from a devastating Mongol raid in 1242 and was conquered by the Ottomans in 1393.

Because of its central position in the Balkans, the Ottomans exercised direct rule in their Bulgarian province ("Rumeli"), which included Macedonia and Thrace. The native aristocracy was displaced and the Bulgarian Church was made subject to the Orthodox Church in Constantinople. The first movement for Bulgarian independence came from the Bulgarian Church, which resented being governed by Greek bishops¹⁰¹. Under pressure from Russia, the independence of the Bulgarian Church was restored in 1870 and was recognised in Macedonia and Thrace by 1874, but unfortunately not by the Greek Orthodox Church until 1945. In 1876 a badly-organised political revolt was cruelly repressed, leading to a successful Russian war against the Ottomans¹⁰². Russia then proposed a self-governing Bulgarian state to include Macedonia and Thrace, but this was not accepted by the European powers, which at the 1878 Congress of Berlin limited Bulgaria to its present borders^{ii, 103}. A prince of the House of Saxe-Coburg was elected in 1887 (Ferdinand, 1887-1918) and an independent kingdom was declared in 1908. Bulgaria's attempts to extend its territory to Macedonia and Thrace in a war in 1913 and in the First World War were unsuccessful¹⁰⁴. Social conflicts between peasants and landowners prevented the formation of a stable political system until after Communist rule 1944-89 and declaration of a Republic in 1946. A Parliamentary Constitution was adopted in 1991ⁱⁱⁱ.

The Development of Individual Nation States: 1900-1933:

Australia, Finland, Iran, Argentina, Russia, Uruguay, Czech Republic, Poland, the Baltic States, Mongolia, Ireland, Turkey, Thailand, Mexico, Colombia

The colony of New South Wales in what is now Australia was founded by British settlement in 1788 and gained responsible government in 1855. The remaining Australian colonies were founded by 1859 and became self-governing by 1890ⁱ. The colonies became States of the Commonwealth of Australia when a federal Constitution was enacted in 1901 after a referendum in each state^{ii, iii, 105}. Australia's national sense was enhanced by its participation in the First World War in Europe. Initially a self-governing Dominion, it developed to full international independence by 1919 de facto and de jure by

1931 in the same way as described above for Canada, except that a British Act of Parliament was needed in 1986 to remove remaining constitutional links between the UK and Australian States. Canberra became the capital in 1927.

Finland was conquered by Sweden and converted to Christianity 1249-93. It was settled by Swedes, and the official and literary language was Swedish even though the bulk of the population spoke Finnish. It was treated as part of Sweden under the name Österland (later, Finland) and from 1362 sent representatives to the Swedish Parliament. Lutheranism was adopted at the same time as Sweden. In the late 18th century a separate sense of Finnish identity developed. When in the course of the Napoleonic wars Russia annexed Finland in 1809, the change was accepted on the assumption that Finnish autonomy would be respected. The country was run as Grand Duchy under a Russian Governor-General but with Swedish laws¹. From the 1835 publication of the Finnish national epic the *Kalevala*, the use of Finnish was encouraged by both the Swedish upper classes and Russian officials, so that in 1892 it became an official language alongside Swedish. The Finnish Parliament (Diet) met from 1863 on the old Swedish model. In 1899-1900 Emperor Nicolas II attempted unsuccessfully to reverse these measures and integrate Finland into Russia. Following the 1905 revolution in Russia, the Finnish Diet converted itself in 1906 into a single-chamber Parliament elected by all adults, male as well as female¹¹. In 1917 it declared itself an independent Republic¹⁰⁶, and in 1919 adopted a Parliamentary Constitution¹¹¹.

For most of its history, the state of Iran (Persia up to 1935) included both the present Persian-speaking state and most or all of the neighbouring countries of Iraq, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Afghanistan, and Baluchistan (in Pakistan), some of whose languages are related to Persian and some not. In 637-51 CE the Sassanid empire (224-651 CE)¹⁰⁷, which had exhausted itself in wars with Byzantium, was conquered by the Arab Caliphate based in Damascus. Iran became Muslim during the next three centuries¹⁰⁸. In addition to agriculture, the principal source of revenue for Iran was cross-Asian trade, and traders found the Islamic legal and social environment more congenial than the previous Zoroastrianism. The existing Persian language, civilisation, administration, art, and culture continued and developed in an Islamic setting through successive regimes¹⁰⁹. Unrest at discriminatory treatment from Damascus resulted in a move of the Caliphate to Baghdad in 821. Successive Persian and then Turkish and Mongol military and tribal dynasties replaced Arab rule and adopted the title "sultan" (king), while respecting the Caliph's religious and juridical functions until the destruction of the caliphate by the Mongols in 1258. None of these dynasties lasted for more than a century or contributed much to the development of the country, and some contributed only destruction.

The first Iranian dynasty since 1062, the Safavids (1502-1736), converted the people to Shi'a, a version of Islam which appealed to the oppressed population, and adopted the title Shahanshah (emperor)¹. Under them and the Qajars (1779-1925) the present territorial boundaries of Iran were set, in wars with the Ottomans (1638), the British (1857), and Russia in the 19th century. Tehran became the capital in 1795. The Qajar dynasty were weak rulers who failed to adapt Iran in response to encroachments by Britain and Russia. In response, protests in 1906 by clerics and the merchant class led to enactment of a Parliamentary Constitution in 1907¹¹. However, the Pahlavi shahs (1925-79), also of military origin, largely ignored the Majlis (Parliament) in attempts to modernise the country by decree. In consequence, Iranian nationality became identified with the Shi'a clergy rather than with the dynasty, which was overthrown and replaced by Ayatollah Khomeini (1979-89). Khomeini used the resultant chaos to take over all social, cultural, media, police, judicial and political bodies with his Shi'a followers. The 1979 Constitution of the present Islamic Republic established a theocracy ("velayat-e faqih")¹¹⁰ within the centralised structure of a modern Parliamentary state¹¹¹, an arrangement increasingly under dispute from the civil society created by modern economic and educational development.

Argentina was originally defined as 13 (now 23) provinces and the city of Buenos Aires, the port and financial centre. Independence was secured from Spain 1816-18 after a war led by General San Martín, and the borders with neighbouring Paraguay, Bolivia, and Uruguay were settled in a series of wars 1814-24. Disagreements concerning the relations between the provinces and Buenos Aires resulted in an intermittent civil war which continued until 1879. In 1853 a Constitution was agreed which established the Argentine state with Buenos Aires as the capital¹. A further series of wars in the 1870's against the indigenous peoples of the interior resulted in a population of largely European descent. From 1853 to 1916 the President, while formally elected, was in fact nominated by a small ruling

oligarchy of merchants and landowners. From about 1880 exports of beef and grain increased rapidly, as did overseas financial investment and immigration, resulting in rapid growth of the Argentine population and economy. In 1916 the first popular elections took placeⁱⁱ, bringing to power President Yrigoyen (1916-22; 1928-30)¹¹² who sought to advance industrialisation and social policies. Unfortunately whereas the 1853 Constitution (which with amendments is still in force) settled relations between the capital and provinces, it failed to establish institutions capable of reconciling and resolving political differences among the public. The consequence has been military overthrow of the Government whenever a President or his/her policies were seen to have failed, starting in 1930. Military and military-sponsored Presidents held power for 37 of the 53 years 1930-83. Each military presidency was called “de facto”, and because of internal differences was usually of short duration.

The modern economic development of Argentina unfortunately followed a pattern set by President Perón (elected 1946-55; 1973-74¹¹³) of industrial protection, nationalisation, and state intervention. This policy did not produce the expected growth, but large public and overseas debts and currency inflation. It was combined with rapid development of social services and trade union power which were very popular and established a Peronist political movement¹¹⁴. In consequence, the military Governments which replaced both Perón presidencies lacked legitimacy and were faced with popular uprisings which were harshly suppressed. Military rule was discredited by the 1982 failed occupation of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), and subsequent presidential vacancies have been dealt with constitutionallyⁱⁱⁱ. President Menem (1989-99) introduced trade liberalisation, privatisation, and deregulation, but Perón’s political legacy was so unmanageable that there were three currency collapses 1975-91 and a debt default in 2002.¹¹⁵ Economic stability has yet to return.

The first Russian state was the principality of Kiev, which converted to Christianity in 988 and was destroyed in a Mongol invasion in 1240. The Grand Principality of Moscow was founded in 1303. Grand Prince Ivan III (1462-1505) conquered the other Russian principalities and renounced Tatar suzerainty. Ivan IV (1533-84) assumed the title “Tsar” and extended Russian control over Tatar-occupied territories. The Patriarchate of Moscow was founded in 1589. A centralised bureaucracy was established and a legal code was issued in 1649. After the failure of the previous dynasty, an assembly (Zemsky Sabor) elected the Romanov dynasty to power. Russian settlers explored Siberia, which together with the Ukraine were acquired by 1689. Peter I (1682-1721) assumed the title “Emperor”, gained access to the Baltic, built St Petersburg, introduced Western technology and education, and started the Russian Navy. Catherine II (1762-96) acquired a port on the Black Sea, Lithuania, and the eastern part of what was then Poland. In the 19th century, Russian control was extended to Finland, central Poland, Central Asia, and the Caucasus. In this way, a huge Russian empire developed. The Russian language was standardised under the influence of the writer Pushkin (1799-1837).

Experiences of rebellion, invasion, and disorder during periods of weak or disputed tsars led Russians to accept a system of uncontrolled personal rule called autocracy, supported by a religious sanctionⁱ. The Zemsky Sabor was no longer summoned. Serfdom, meaning compulsory labour service by peasants tied to the land, commenced in the 16th century because of the absence of a money economy in agriculture, and grew harsher by the 18th century. Tsar Alexander II (1855-81) realised that change was necessary. He abolished serfdom in 1861, instituted elected local government and trial by jury in 1864, set up a state bank, relaxed censorship, and encouraged railways. These reforms facilitated a civil society and industrialisation. Alexander II was considering a State Duma (Parliament) when he was assassinated. His successors Alexander III (1881-94) and Nicholas II (1894-1917) were not equal to the task and reversed many of the reforms. A revolt in 1905 resulted in the establishment of a State Duma, but without significant control over the autocracy. A further revolt in 1917ⁱⁱ ended the monarchy and gave power to the State Duma, but it was soon overthrown by the Russian Communist Party. The Communists abolished all political rights and retained power until 1991, continuing the Russian empire under the name “Soviet Union” under four bogus Constitutions. The rule of Stalin (1922-53) was one of the most violent and oppressive in recent world history. Attempts by President Gorbachov (1985-91) to liberalise the Soviet system resulted in its collapse and the break-up of the empire. Russia asserted itself as a separate sovereign state, as did the subject states in the Baltic, Central Asia, the Caucasus, and the Ukraine. The State Duma was re-established, and President Yelstin (1991-99) became Russia’s first directly elected head of government. A power struggle in 1993 between the President and State Duma established the presidency as the source of executive power and the Parliament (the State Duma and Federal Council) of legislative authority, under a Constitution adopted by referendum in 1993ⁱⁱⁱ.

Uruguay originated as Banda Oriental del Uruguay (“East Bank of the [River] Uruguay”), ruled from Buenos Aires¹¹⁶. The capital Montevideo was founded in 1726. The independent state was established in 1828 following an inconclusive battle for control between Argentina and Brazil. Power was initially divided between two factions, the Blancos (conservative, later the National Party) supporting the livestock farming interest and Colorados (liberal) supporting the urban interest. A civil war between them 1838-52 was won by the Colorados. Slavery was abolished in 1852. In 1875-90 the military intervened and the Blanco rebellion were finally defeated in 1904¹. The originally tiny population (75,000) was swelled by mass European immigration, so that the present population is 88% European descent, 8% mestizo, and 4% African descent. The principal industries were meat and wool, Montevideo being the commercial and financial hub. A modern state system was established by President Batlle (1903-07; 1911-15)¹¹⁷, providing advanced utilities, local government, justice, education, and social services¹¹⁸. In 1917, under Batlle’s influence, a new Constitution enacted direct elections of President and Congress and separation of Church and State¹¹⁹. However, the same constitution transferred social services, education, and the economy to an elected National Council (“Colegiado”) independent of the President¹¹⁹. Batlle also established a protectionist and state-controlled economy. This oligarchic system worked so long as world conditions favoured the country’s narrowly-based industries, but when these conditions ceased the Colegiado became ineffective and the absence of capitalism led to unemployment. Female suffrage was enacted in 1934. In 1933 the Colegiado was abolished and its powers transferred to the President, but in 1952 it was re-established, this time completely replacing the presidency. Unemployment and severe inflation led in 1958 to the return of the National Party to power, for the first time since 1870. Free market policies were adopted but did not correct the decline. Trade union unrest and an urban terrorist movement (the Tupamaros) resulted, reflecting the absence until then of a mass working-class political movement. Although the presidency was re-established in 1967, in 1973 the military seized power and defeated the Tupamaros in a violent campaign¹²⁰. Democracy was restored in 1984¹²¹, and President Sanguinetti (1985-90; 1995-2000) continued economic reforms within the Latin American Mercosur free trade area. In 2004 the Frente Amplio (“Broad Front”), a new left-wing party, was elected to the presidency and Congress.

The Czech state (called until 1918 Bohemia¹²¹) was created in Czech-speaking lands by the dynasties of Přemysl (874-1306) and Luxembourg (1310-1437). Catholic Christianity was adopted in 874. Přemysl Otakar I (1198-1230)¹ became the first independent King of Bohemia. Germans settled in order to work the mines and populate the towns, and because of its mines and industry the country became and remained relatively prosperous. King Charles (1346-78) became Holy Roman Emperor, established the Archbishopric and University of Prague and embellished the city. An early form of Protestantism was preached by the University Rector, Jan Hus (1402-15), who was betrayed and executed. Jan Hus also reformed the Czech alphabet. The consequent divisions in Bohemian society between different religious concessions were not reconciled, and the Hussites were defeated by the newly elected Hapsburg king Frederick II (1617-37) in the Battle of the White Mountain 1620. The Austrian Hapsburg dynasty (1526-1918) made the Crown hereditary and imposed Catholicism by force, expelling the Protestant landowners and replacing them with German-speaking Catholic ones. However, two-thirds of the population remained Czech-speaking peasants. Hapsburg rulers after 1740 removed obstacles to Czech self-advancement, and after 1815 Czech national identity gradually reasserted itself by standardising of the Czech language, Czech education, Czech universities and cultural institutions, and Czech works of literature and history. At the collapse of the Hapsburg Empire in 1918 a Czech nation was ready to assert itself¹²², in a federation with Slovakia which spoke a virtually identical language but had been a province of Hungary since 1091 CE. The resultant state (Czechoslovakia) had about 75% of the industry of the former Hapsburg Empire and a democratic Constitution¹²². The one-third German minority remained disaffected and were used by Hitler as an excuse for annexation 1938-9. They were expelled in 1946. The Czech and Slovak nationalities remained distinct, and the two Czech and Slovak states therefore separated amicably in 1992¹²³.

The core of the kingdom of Poland was the areas around the cities of Poznań, Kraków, and Warsaw, established as a Catholic state by the Piast dynasty (966-1370). Under the successor Jagiello dynasty (1386-1572), the loss to Prussian settlers and Bohemian (later Austrian) rulers of territories to the West was compensated for to the East by a personal and later a political union with the Grand Dukedom of Lithuania, a huge territory which included the modern states of Lithuania, Belarus, and most of the Ukraine. The port of Gdańsk was acquired, but other parts of the Baltic coast were occupied by Prussian settlers. This state was probably at its height in 1569 and enjoyed a cultural flowering known as the Polish renaissance, but it lacked internal cohesion, as it contained speakers of Polish, German,

Lithuanian, Latvian, White Russian, Ukrainian, and Yiddish, and after the Reformation was divided religiously between Catholics, Lutherans, Calvinists, Orthodox, and Jews. Cohesion was gradually appearing through the wider use of Polish, a reversion to Catholicism under the Counter-Reformation, and use of the Baroque style. Unfortunately, after 1573 the kingship was elective, and although a number of able kings were elected they did not have the advantage of loyalty to a hereditary dynasty. The Parliament (Seym) represented only the interests of groups of landowners.¹²³ In consequence Poland became much weaker than the neighbouring states Prussia, Russia, and Austria, which progressively partitioned the country in 1772-95. In 1773, the Polish king started some educational and military reforms, and in 1791, a new Parliamentary Constitution with a hereditary monarchy was adopted, but all too late. After 1815, a strong Polish nationality developed in the occupied territories. In 1918, a Polish Republic was proclaimed by President Piłsudsky (1918-22; 1926-35) in the areas formerly subject to Russia and Austria, and in part of those formerly subject to Germany^{I, II}. In addition to Polish-speaking areas, it included regions speaking White Russian and Ukrainian which were annexed by the Soviet Union in 1940. A Parliamentary Constitution was adopted, which failed to stabilise and was overthrown in 1926. In 1945, the remaining parts of Poland subject to Germany were annexed to Poland and their German inhabitants expelled, creating a uniformly Polish-speaking state. After the fall of Communism in 1989, a new democratic Constitution was adopted in 1997^{III}.

The state of Lithuania was established by Grand Duke Mindaugas (1236-63)¹²⁴ in the territory where Lithuanian is now spoken. Taking advantage of the Mongol invasion of Russia, Grand Duke Gediminas (1316-41) and his sons extended control to what is now Belarus and most of the present Ukraine, establishing the capital at Vilnius. Lithuania being still pagan, Grand Duke Jogaila (1377-1434) married the heiress to the Polish monarchy, Queen Jadwiga (1384-99), accepted Catholicism and became King of Poland¹²⁵ in 1386. Jogaila's cousin Grand Duke Vytautas ruled Lithuania as his deputy 1392-1430, consolidating its extensive territories as a fief of the Polish Crown^I. The Teutonic Knights were defeated in the battle of Grünwald in 1410. The eastward expansion of Lithuania was checked by the growing power of Russia (battle of Vedrosha, 1500) and in 1569 the two states were combined into a single kingdom called the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, with one Parliament (Seym/Seimas). Lithuanian landlords became Polish in language and culture, ruling over peasants who spoke Lithuanian, Belarusian, or Ruthenian (Ukrainian). The Lithuanian language was written in the Latin alphabet from the 16th century. Lithuania shared the fate of Poland, and was absorbed by Russia in the three partitions, 1772-95.

The states of Latvia and Estonia were first established within their present borders in 1918. Before then, they consisted of three duchies: Estonia (northern Estonia), Livonia (southern Estonia and northern Latvia), and Courland (southern Latvia). Livonia and Courland were created in 1237 by the Teutonic Knights, an order of militant German crusaders, with their capital at Riga. Estonia was established by Denmark in 1227 with its capital at Reval (now Tallinn), was sold to the Teutonic Knights in 1346, and voluntarily accepted Swedish sovereignty in 1561. In all three duchies, a German landowning class governed a Latvian or Estonian-speaking peasantry. In 1522-24 they became Lutheran, and church services started to be held in the vernacular languages. Livonia and Courland were conquered by Lithuania/Poland in 1562 and became fiefs of the Polish Crown. Livonia was taken over by Sweden in 1629, and in 1721 both Estonia and Livonia were annexed by Russia under Tsar Peter I (1682-1725). As already noted, in 1795 Lithuania lost its non-Lithuanian territories and (with Courland) fell under Russian control, completing subjection of all the Baltic territories to the Russian Empire^I.

In Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, a national movement in favour of the indigenous language arose in the 19th century, gradually superseding German, Polish, and Swedish influences and defeating attempts at russification in the later part of the century. Following the 1917 revolution in Russia the three countries declared independence within their present national borders, confirmed by 1920^{II, 126}. Land reform took place. Parliamentary constitutions were adopted, but with insufficient provisions for a stable executive, with the result that all three countries had become dictatorships within a few years. Forcible incorporation within the Soviet Union in 1940 and again in 1944 was carried out with extraordinary violence, mass killings and deportations. On the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the three countries again became independent and adopted Parliamentary democracy^{III, 127}.

The Mongol people first appear in history with the conquest by Genghis Khan (1206-27) of the whole of Northern Eurasia and by Khubilai Khan (1260-94) of China¹²⁸. The Ming dynasty (1368-1644) took China from the Mongols, and after 1388 what is now Mongolia was divided between a number of

tribes, in particular the Oirat to the West, the Khalkha to the East, and the Tümed to the South. The ruler of the Tümed, Altan Khan (1542-82) was converted to Tibetan Buddhism in 1578 and conferred on the head of the sect the title “Dalai Lama”, used by his successors ever since¹²⁹. Within 50 years all Mongols had adopted Tibetan Buddhism and the principal Buddhist scriptures had been translated into Mongolian. The reason for this action was partly the superiority of Buddhism to the previous Mongol religion and partly the availability of literate Tibetan administrators who were not Chinese¹³⁰. The Mongol rulers had noticed that the Mongol followers of Khubilai Khan had been quickly absorbed by Chinese culture. In 1636 the ruler of the (non-Mongol) Manchu people east of Mongolia, Hong Taiji (1626-43), conquered southern Mongolia in the course of founding the Qing dynasty of China (1644-1911). The Manchu became Chinese in culture, so that southern Mongolia became the Chinese-populated province of Inner Mongolia. In 1691 the Mongol Khalkha nobles, under threat from the Zunghars (an Oirat tribe), pledged allegiance to the Qing emperor Kangxi (1661-1722). The Zunghars were defeated and destroyed 1755-59 by the Chinese with Khalkha help, leaving the Khalkha dominant in what is now Mongolia, then called “Outer Mongolia”¹. The Qing did not convert Outer Mongolia to Chinese culture but ruled it through a Buddhist theocracy, which came to dominate society, landed property, and culture¹³¹. The capital Ulan Bator was founded in 1778. When the Qing Empire collapsed in 1911, independence was declared under the rule of the head of the Buddhist Church in Mongolia (Bogd Khan), but was overturned by a Chinese invasion in 1919. A 1921 uprising led by Sükhbaatar¹³² supported by Soviet troops expelled foreign forces^{133, II} and established an independent Mongolian republic in 1924. The subsequent Soviet-backed regime dismantled the theocracy and the 583 Buddhist monasteries but also imposed a Soviet-type economic and political dictatorship. A Japanese invasion in 1939 was successfully repulsed. The Cyrillic alphabet was adapted for Mongolian in 1946, replacing the traditional alphabet devised in about 1204 from the Uyghur script. The fall of the Soviet Union led to the collapse of Communism in Mongolia, multi-party elections in 1990, and a new Constitution in 1992^{III}. The Mongolians remain 90% Buddhist.

Kings of England claimed to be Lords of Ireland from 1155. In 1494, an Act of the Irish Parliament (Poyning’s Law) made itself subject to the English Parliament. Henry VIII declared himself King of Ireland in 1541 and in the period 1536-1604 Ireland was unified by English conquest^I. Because the native Irish population refused to convert to Protestantism, the native landowners were displaced by English and Scots and laws discriminating against Roman Catholics were introduced. These laws were largely rescinded over the period 1771-1801¹³⁴ and Poyning’s Law was repealed in 1782. However, a rebellion against English rule took place in 1798, and in consequence in 1800 the Irish Parliament voted for union with Britain in a single state. A famine in 1845-9 resulted in mass emigration and a sharp decline in the population. Use of the Irish language declined rapidly in the 19th and 20th centuries, being now limited to the western seaboard. Following continual agitation on land ownership, laws over the period 1870-1903 restored ownership to Irish landowners. A political party advocating home rule (later, full independence) was founded in 1870, and by 1886 had gained 86 of the 100 Irish seats in the UK Parliament. However, this nationalism was limited to 26 of the 32 historic Irish counties, and was not shared by the majority population of the 6 counties which were to become Northern Ireland. A rising took place in Dublin in 1916. In 1922 the 26 counties achieved self-government as the Irish Free State^{II}, under a Constitution determined by treaty with Britain. Following full sovereignty in 1931¹³⁵, a new Constitution was adopted in 1937^{III} and a Republic was declared in 1949. Northern Ireland remains within the United Kingdom but was subject to a civil war 1966-98, concluded by the 1998 Good Friday agreement which set up a devolved Northern Irish government and assembly.

The Ottoman dynasty was founded in 1302 CE and by 1453 had conquered all the former Byzantine empire in what is now Turkey, Greece, and the Balkans. By 1535 the Empire had extended to most of the present Arab countries, Hungary (lost in 1687), and the Crimea (lost in 1783). While officially Islamic, its system of government was based on devolution to confessional groups called *millet*, which included the Greeks, Armenians, other Christian groups, Albanians, and Jews, retaining their own languages, religion, and laws. The official language was Ottoman Turkish, based on the Turkish of the earlier Seljuqs, but so influenced by Persian and Arabic that it was not comprehensible to the ordinary Turkish speaker. In 1517 the Ottoman Sultan assumed the additional title of Caliph.

Reform of the Ottoman army, administration, education, law, industry, and infrastructure was commenced by Sultan Mahmud II (1808-39) and continued by his successors under the general name Tanzimat^I. The resultant centralisation resulted in pressure for a Parliament, which was introduced in 1876. It had little effect, and in 1908 the army installed a military regime (the “Young Turks”). In the 19th century and early 20th centuries, the Ottoman territories in Europe all became independent states

and the North African territories became European colonies. Muslim populations in these European countries left in large numbers for Turkey. After defeat and loss of the Arab provinces in 1918, a National Assembly was called by the successful general Mustafa Kemal (later Atatürk) in 1920, who deposed the Ottoman Sultan, defeated attempts by Western armies at occupation, and founded the Republic of Turkey in 1923ⁱⁱ. Atatürk (1923-38) became the first President. The population was forced to choose between the new Turkish nationality or expulsion. The Turkish language was reformed in 1932 and religious influences have been removed from political life. Turkey remained a dictatorship until 1946, after which party activity was allowed. The legitimacy of constitutional institutions remained in doubt, with repeated intervention of the military in politics, until the democratic 1983 Constitutionⁱⁱⁱ. Constitutional stability has been aided by greater prosperity and growth of civil society since the 1980's.

King Ramathibodi I (1341-69) founded a kingdom called Ayutthaya, named after its capital city, in what is now Thailand. Its economy was based on highly productive rice cultivation. The king adopted Theravada Buddhism and issued a code of law called the Dharmaśāstra. Ayutthaya lasted until 1767 when it was destroyed in a Burmese invasion. The kingdom of Siam was subsequently established by King Rama I (1782-1809), founder of the present Chakri dynastyⁱ. Rama I moved the capital to Bangkok, defeated the Burmese in 1785, and conquered Cambodia and Laos. King Mongkut (1851-68) established stable treaty relations with the British and introduced Western education. King Chulalongkorn (1868-1910) introduced modern methods of government and taxation, railways, and communications, and revised the legal system. The loss to the French of Cambodia (1867/1907) and Laos (1893/1904), and to the British of the four northern Malay states (1909)¹³⁶, restricted the country to largely Thai-speaking peoples. A sense of Thai nationality was stimulated, expressed by adoption of the name Thailand in 1939. The relative incapacity of King Prajadhipok (1925-35) caused a military coup in 1932 which abolished the absolute power of the kingⁱⁱ, replacing it with a military-bureaucratic oligarchy ruling under nominal royal suzerainty. Power was exercised through a series of military dictators: Pibul Songgram (1938-44; 1948-57), Sarit Thanarat (1963-73), and Thanom Kittikachorn (1963-73)¹³⁷. By the 1960's a civil society developed which demanded improved government and democracy. In 1973 the military were overthrown by public demonstrations and Prime Minister Prem Tinnasulanon (1980-88) sought to introduce Parliamentary government. However, frequent failures of the political process have resulted in further periods of military rule 1978-80, 1991-92, and 2006-7. Elections took place in 2011 under the present Constitution adopted in 2007ⁱⁱⁱ.

After Spain conquered the Aztec Empire in 1521, it extended its political control to what is now Mexico, the states of Central America, and the present U.S. states of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, Nevada, and Utah. However, its control of these northern territories was weak. The whole colony was termed "New Spain" and was ruled by Spain through expatriates. The majority of the population is now of mixed race (mestizos), the remainder being of European or indigenous descent. The country was converted to Roman Catholicism but religious practices are influenced by local cultural traditions. Spanish is the predominant language but at least five indigenous languages are recognised¹³⁸. Independence was declared and was confirmed in 1821 after a war. The country then adopted its name from the capital, Mexico City, and the Central American territories were allowed to secede. At independence, Mexican society comprised at least three elements with different ideas on the country's identity: the Roman Catholic Church and its supporters ("Conservatives"), the educated Liberal elite, and the bulk of the population who were mainly employed as labourers on large estates. These three identities were not fully reconciled until 1929, after three civil wars. Because there had been no cultural break with Spain, the Church had inherited an independent juridical status, educational and religious monopoly, and large estates, all of which the Liberals considered obstacles to Mexican national identity and progress. After a brief monarchy, a republic was declared in 1823ⁱ. Although nominally a Constitution existed and elections took place, in fact Presidents were placed in or ejected from power by one or another faction, initially under the influence of General Santa Anna (1828-55). Texas declared independence in 1836 and the remaining northern territories were lost in a war with the U.S. 1846-48.

In 1855 the Mexican Liberals overthrew Santa Anna and commenced a programme to remove the juridical privileges and monopolies of the Church and limit its estates. In 1857 a Constitution was enacted to realise this programme, leading to a destructive civil war with the Conservatives, 1857-61. The Liberal victor in this war was President Benito Juárez (1859-64; 1867-72)¹³⁹. After Juárez' death, the country accepted a dictatorship by President Porfirio Díaz (1877-80; 1884-1911), who concentrated on railways, electricity, ports, and other essential infrastructure, financed by foreign capital. Díaz was

eventually overthrown by a movement called the Mexican Revolution of 1910, whose programme was land reform, a fully secular state, social legislation, expansion of education, and nationalisation of foreign-owned assets. In 1917 this programme was incorporated into a new Constitution, but it gave rise to a military revolt 1913-14 and two destructive peasant uprisings (Emiliano Zapata 1910-19 and Pancho Villa 1910-23), and then to an equally destructive civil war with the Catholics (“Cristeros”) 1926-29. Only with the defeat of these rebellions was a single Mexican identity created^{II}. The reform agenda was implemented by stages, and the 1917 Constitution is still in force. A cultural programme¹⁴⁰ reconnected with Mexico’s pre-Spanish past. Stability was achieved from 1929 by rule by a single political party, the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI), which nominated successive presidents, notably Cárdenas (1934-40) and Camacho (1940-46). From 1930 the economy started to expand, but protectionist policies caused a collapse of the currency and debt default in 1982. From 1986, free trade and privatisation were instituted and economic growth recommenced, so that Mexico is now one of the World’s leading economies. In 2000 multi-party elections at last took place^{III}.

The area now covered by Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador, and Panamá was conquered by the Spanish in 1536 from the Chibcha tribe. The majority of the population are now of mixed race (mestizo), and the Spanish language is predominant. Originally governed from Lima (Peru), a separate “Viceroyalty of New Granada” was set up in 1739 with its capital at Bogotá, the present Colombian capital. Independence was declared in 1810 on the collapse of the Spanish monarchy, and in 1819 the Spanish army was defeated by General Simón Bolívar, who attempted to set up a Republic covering the whole of the Viceroyalty with himself as President¹⁴¹. In 1830 Venezuela and Ecuador seceded, leaving a country with approximately the present borders. From the beginning of the new state, two different concepts of state organisation were promoted, one a loose federation of autonomous provinces, with an indirectly elected president and removal of Roman Catholic Church influence (“Liberal”); the other a strong presidency supported by an influential Catholic Church, able to appoint provincial governors (“Conservative”). These two ideas were never reconciled and each side did not accept the state organisation enacted by the other, resulting in civil wars 1839-41, 1860-62, 1876-7, and 1899-1902. New Constitutions favouring one concept or the other were adopted in 1832 (“Republic of New Granada”), 1858 (“Grenadine Federation”), 1863 (“United States of Colombia”), and 1886 (“Republic of Colombia”)^I. Under the 1886 Constitution presidents and Congresses were elected, from 1910 directly, but one party or another would frequently boycott elections. The army rarely intervened and then only for a short period, and the usual Latin American solution, an extra-Constitutional dictator, did not occur¹⁴². An attempt to rule through a third party was made by President Restrepo (1910-14), but his system did not survive his term in office. Panamá was lost in a 1903 war with the U.S. From 1930 sufficient stability had arisen for rapid industrialisation and the movement of population to the towns to begin^{143, II}, but by 1948 a further Liberal-Catholic civil war had broken out which lasted until 1958. In consequence, the necessary reforms to develop the state occurred more slowly than in other countries. Direct elections by all adult males were implemented in 1936 and by women in 1954, and social legislation was similarly delayed. This neglect of the interests of the general population gave rise from about 1958 to several popular guerrilla movements, financed from the narcotics trade, which are still in operation. In 1958-90 the solution of Conservative-Liberal power-sharing was employed. In 1991 a new Constitution was adopted^{III} and in 2002 the first recent president from outside the Liberal or Conservative Parties (President Uribe, 2002-10) was elected. Economic growth has resumed.

The Development of Individual Nation States: 1934-1966:

Philippines, Chile, Ecuador, Jamaica, Austria, Brazil, Jordan, Malaysia, New Zealand, India, Sri Lanka, Korea, Indonesia, China, Bolivia, Egypt, Morocco, Vietnam, Peru, Tunisia, Venezuela, Ghana, Algeria, Kenya, Singapore

Before 1565 CE, the islands of the Philippines comprised small tribal states with traditional religions; in addition, Islamic sultanates had been established in Mindanao and Sulu in the South. The Spanish conquered most of the islands 1565-71, established Manila as the capital, and converted most of the population to Catholic Christianity^I. The country was named the Philippines after King Philip II of Spain. Resistance remained only in Muslim Mindanao and the mountain regions of Luzon Island, both eventually given autonomy in 1987. Under Spanish rule the only high-value economic activity was monopoly trade between China and Spanish Latin America. The remainder of the economy was feudal, with taxes being paid in goods and labour services. Traders and artisans of Chinese origin were persecuted by the Spanish and eventually absorbed. Trade was liberated from 1811 with the development of exports of sugar and hemp. Public education commenced in 1863. Travel by students

abroad produced a class of Philippines nationalists, who mounted a rebellion and declared independence in 1896. However, the Philippines were ceded by Spain to the United States after the Spanish-American War of 1898, and the US defeated the insurrection in a war in 1899-1902 and assumed colonial control. The US introduced mass public education which converted the national language to English, in addition to Tagalog (Pilipino), the most widespread of the indigenous languages. The US also introduced modern administration, local government, and judicial system. Self-government was granted in 1935ⁱⁱ and independence in 1946. While the Philippines has had strong Presidents, its constitutional development has been hampered by weakness in Parliament and in the civil society which supports Parliament. The second fully legitimate Constitution, enacted in 1987, may provide stabilityⁱⁱⁱ.

Chile was occupied by Spanish people from 1541, when the capital Santiago was founded. Comparatively limited numbers settled there and mixed with the indigenous peoples, with the result that the population is relatively homogeneous. The Mapuche people of Araucania were not subdued until 1883. Independence from Spain was declared in 1810 and secured by Generals San Martín and O'Higgins in 1817. After a period of constitutional experiments, Chile came by 1833ⁱ to be ruled by an oligarchy of landowners, later joined by nitrate and copper miners and financiers, who elected the President and Congress under a restricted franchise. The powers of the Roman Catholic Church were not reduced until 1872. This oligarchic structure invested in infrastructure and in education for its own class, but did not prepare the country for industrialisation, and in consequence the economy was at the mercy of fluctuations in commodity markets. A war 1879-84 with Peru and Bolivia secured substantial new nitrate-producing territories to the north, and the present border with Argentina was established by an 1881 treaty and 1902 arbitration ruling. A revolution in 1925, associated with President Alessandri (1920-24; 1925; 1932-38), extended the powers of the President and the suffrage to all adult males¹⁴⁴ and by 1938 the political monopoly of the oligarchy had been brokenⁱⁱ. However, the oligarchy's economic dominance remained, and middle-class parties grew up committed to breaking this economic power by land reform and nationalisation measures, policies which were adopted by successive Presidents 1938-70 without evident success. Meanwhile, the interests of the working class had also been neglected, resulting in parties promoting socialist solutions¹⁴⁵. These tendencies culminated in the more extreme policies of the Marxist President Allende (1970-73), which led to severe inflation, economic collapse, and social disorder. Allende was overthrown¹⁴⁶ by General Pinochet (President 1974-90), who secured political control by severe repression. Pinochet introduced a system of market-based capitalism which has established Chilean prosperity, and handed over to democratically elected successors under a Constitution first enacted in 1981, but much amended sinceⁱⁱⁱ.

Ecuador originated as the Spanish Audiencia of Quito, which was transferred to the Viceroyalty of New Grenada in 1720. It comprises four territories: the coast (centred round the port of Guayaquil), the agricultural Sierra highlands (centred round the capital, Quito), Oriente (underpopulated Amazonian forest), and the Galapagos Islands. The population is 70% mestizo, 12% indigenous (mostly Quechua), 10% European descent, 8% others. The country became independent from Spain in 1822 and from Bolívar's Republic of Gran Colombia in 1830, when it took the name "Ecuador". Weak and insecure rulers were replaced by the first effective national Government, the Conservative and Catholic President García (1859-65ⁱ; 1869-75), who ruled with the support of the feudal landowners of the Sierra. His religiously based policy was replaced by the anticlerical Liberal President Alfaro (1895-1901; 1905-11), whose support from the Guayaquil commercial classes remained dominant until 1925. A central bank was set up in 1925. Although direct elections were enacted in 1861 (extended to women in 1929), Ecuador was ruled by oligarchic factions, based either on the coastal or the Sierra interest, which formed transient alliances under one or another party label. These factions failed to agree policies to address urgent national issues, or on a president to carry them out. The respective powers of Congress and the Presidency were also undefined, many Presidents assuming or attempting to assume dictatorial powers. The only constitutional rule which was regularly applied was that no president could succeed himself. In the absence of any other authority the factions were mediated by the military, which intervened regularly to depose presidents they considered to have failed or to appoint their own nominees in his stead. Although eventually the charismatic President Velasco was elected on promises of radical social change (1934-35; 1944-47), his policies were unpredictable and inconsistent and had little effect¹⁴⁷.

In 1941 a war was fought with Peru in which Ecuador lost a large part of its Oriente province. This outcome generated an outburst of national feelingⁱⁱ which supported more stable and effective governments 1948-52 and 1956-60¹⁴⁸. However, President Velasco continued to be elected and to be

erratic and ineffective (1952-56; 1960-61; 1968-72), giving rise to longer periods of military rule in an attempt to carry out reforms (1963-67; 1972-79). In 1967 oil deposits were found, economically exploited from 1972, and in 1970 natural gas was also discovered. These exports transformed the Ecuadorian economy, which hitherto had depended primarily on cocoa beans and bananas. In 1979 removal of the literacy test gave the vote to many indigenous people. From that date most elections have been democratic and completed their term, although the last coups took place in 2000 and 2005 under popular pressure, and the last attempted coup was in 2010. Continued inability to control government finances caused adoption of the dollar in 2000. The country's 20th Constitution, enacted in 2008, may show whether constitutional rule has finally replaced oligarchic instabilityⁱⁱⁱ.

Jamaica¹⁴⁹ was seized from Spanish control by a British raid in 1655, confirmed by a 1670 treaty with Spainⁱ. It became the location of a successful sugar plantation economy worked by African slaves, many of Akan and Igbo origin. There were major slave revolts in 1760 and 1831. The British Parliament abolished the slave trade with Africa in 1807 and slavery altogether (with compensation to the slave-owners) in 1834, although the slaves remained in a servile state until 1838. About 90% of the present Jamaican population is of African or mixed African-European descent, the remainder being of Indian, Chinese, or European origin. After 1838 the economy diversified into bananas, coffee, and other products, but the plantation system remained, giving rise to a major rebellion in 1865. In 1866 the planter-dominated Assembly which had controlled the island since 1662 was abolished and it became a British colony¹⁵⁰. Kingston, founded in 1692, became the capital in 1872. A partly elected consultative assembly was set up in 1884, based on a property franchise equal to 7% of adults¹⁵¹. Major labour unrest in the primary Jamaican industries 1934-38, caused by inequalities of wealth and opportunity, led to the formation of political parties and trade unions. Inadequate attention and investment by Britain in previous decades began to be rectified in 1940, and state-sponsored primary and secondary education, which previously had depended on spasmodic charitable and religious donations (often by planters), spread rapidly. In 1944 a general election for a Parliament was held under universal suffrageⁱⁱ. In 1948 the University of the West Indies was founded in Kingston. After an abortive attempt at a federation of British West Indian territories, Jamaica became independent in 1962ⁱⁱⁱ, under a Constitution which is a development of that enacted in 1944.

Austria was the home state of the central European empire created by the Hapsburg dynasty (1276-1918), who from 1438-1806 were also Holy Roman Emperorsⁱ. From 1526-1918, the Empire included Austria and what are now the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Croatia, and Slovenia. At various times, it also included what are now Belgium, the Netherlands, the Franche-Comté, Bosnia, and territories in Italy, Romania, Poland, and the Ukraine. The Hapsburg Emperor was also King of Bohemia and King of Hungary. Emperor Ferdinand II (1619-37) imposed Catholicism on his territories, with the partial exception of Hungary. In 1529 and 1683 Ottoman sieges of Vienna were defeated, and Vienna became a brilliant architectural, artistic and intellectual centre. Serfdom was abolished in 1848. A directly elected Parliament (Reichsrat) was introduced in 1861 for the non-Hungarian parts of the Empire, but differences between the various nationalities (German, Czech, Slovenian, Italian, Polish, and Ruthenian) rendered it ineffective. At the end of the First World War in 1918, the Hapsburg dynasty fell and the non-German-speaking peoples seceded to join their respective national states, leaving a German-speaking core under the name "Austria". Unfortunately, no Austrian nationality had developed, and its desire to join the German Republic was thwarted. The resultant Austrian Republic (1920) lacked legitimacy and was divided on ideological lines between Catholics and Socialists. A dictatorship was introduced in 1934 and the country was annexed by Germany in 1938. An Austrian nation state emerged on liberation from the Nazis in 1945ⁱⁱ, and a constitutional state was re-established at the end of occupation in 1955ⁱⁱⁱ.

Brazil comprises 26 states (earlier 18) and the federal capital. It originated as a single colony of Portugal whose boundaries with Spanish South America were delimited by the Treaty of Tordesillas (1494). The national language is Portuguese. 92% of the population is either of European origin or of mixed race with Native Americans or Africans originally imported as slaves. Independence was declared in 1822 under a monarchy descended from the Portuguese royal family. Political stability was secured under the second and last Emperor Pedro II (1831-89), who ruled through an indirectly elected Congressⁱ. The slave trade was abolished in 1850 and slavery in 1888. The republican regime 1889-1930, while nominally democratic, was in fact an oligarchy of rich planters of coffee, sugar, rubber, etc whose activities then comprised the national economy. It was succeeded by the dictatorship of President Vargas (1930-45), who encouraged industrial development and the middle class but held back the economy through strong protectionist measures¹⁵². The democratic republic which succeeded

(1946-64) was the first one in which the Brazilian public participated fully in free elections^{II}. The present capital Brasilia was founded in 1960, moving from Rio de Janeiro. However, the republic was unable to manage the change from a protected economy and the expectations of the new working class, allowing the public debt and currency inflation to get out of control. The Government was overthrown by a military regime (1964-85), which restored social stability and started to open up the economy to foreign investment and free trade. In 1988 the present Constitution, Brazil's seventh, was adopted, bringing in a stable democratic system^{III}. The economic reforms, including privatisation of state-owned industries, were continued by the post-1985 Governments, especially that of Presidents Cardoso (1995-2003) and Lula da Silva (2003-11). Brazil now has one of the World's fastest growing economies.

The boundaries of the Kingdom of Jordan were established as a British protectorate in 1920 on the defeat of the Ottoman Empire¹⁵³. With agreement of the British, Abdullah bin al-Hussein, son of the Sharif of Mecca, obtained acceptance as ruler under the title Emir (1921-51)^I. In 1946, independence was declared and the Emir became King Abdullah I^{II}. In 1949, Jordan claimed suzerainty over the Palestinian territories, which was lost in practice in 1967 and finally renounced in 1988. In 1971, a rebellion by Palestinian armed militants was suppressed. Jordan has benefited from the relative homogeneity of its Muslim Arab population and from the concentration of successive rulers on the development of the country. The present Parliamentary Constitution was adopted in 1952^{III}. While the king retains a dominant influence, constitutional government has continued to develop, and under stable and legitimate government the economy, infrastructure, and society have continued to grow. The country absorbed many hundreds of thousands of Palestinian refugees after the 1967 war with Israel and Iraqi refugees after the 2003 Iraq war.

The first states in what is now Malaysia, similar to those of Indonesia (below), were small Malayan states under Hindu-Buddhist influence within the Sumatran-based Srivijaya Empire (683-1193 CE). Subsequently the Sultanate of Maleka (Malacca) (1403-1511) became wealthy from trade passing through the Straits of Malacca and conquered the whole of Malaya, becoming the conduit through which Malaya was converted to Islam¹⁵⁴. In 1511 Maleka was captured by the Portuguese, then in 1641 by the Dutch and in 1795 by the British. During these centuries the nine Sultanates, originally sovereign, which make up Malaya were established. Since Britain required trading ports in the region, Maleka was combined in 1826 with Penang and Singapore to form a colony called the Straits Settlements. In the 19th century a huge growth in demand for Malayan tin attracted large numbers of Chinese immigrants to mine and process it, whose descendants now comprise 23% of the population. The rubber industry was also established in the 1870's. Disputes between the Sultans and between Chinese and Malays, and indifferent governance by the Sultans, led the British to establish 1874-1914 suzerainty over the whole of Malaya, largely by consent^I. Government by Resident Advisers to the Sultans introduced modern infrastructure, administration, law, public health, and education. A proposal by Britain in 1946 to form a unified Malayan state provoked a strong adverse national reaction by Malays^{II}, and instead a federal structure of 11 states was set up, namely the nine sultanates, Maleka and Penang. A Communist insurgency was defeated 1947-53 with Malay nationalist support. Malaya became independent in 1957 as a constitutional Federal Parliamentary kingdom^{155, III}. In 1963 the Federation was expanded to include Singapore and the former British colonies of Sarawak and Sabah, forming the present Malaysia. Ethnic tensions between Malays and Chinese led to the expulsion of Singapore from Malaysia in 1965 as a separate Republic (discussed below). A policy of advancing the economic prospects of Malay speakers, called Bumiputra, has been followed since the 1970's as a means of consolidating national identity. The official language is Malay, with English as the second language used in business and education. Rapid economic expansion began in the 1980's.

The foundation of New Zealand was the treaty of Waitangi, signed in 1840 between a representative of the British Crown and Maori tribes. This acknowledged the sovereignty of Britain and guaranteed Maori property rights and Maori rights as British subjects. In consequence, New Zealand was declared a colony and in 1841 and became self-governing in 1853^I. Continued European immigration caused land disputes with the Maoris in North Island, which resulted in Maori wars in the 1860's and 1870's. A Maori Land Court was established in 1865 and a Waitangi Tribunal in 1975. New Zealand became a Dominion under the Crown in 1907 and supported Britain in both the First and Second World Wars. Limitations on foreign policy and defence arising from Dominion status were removed by signature of the Treaty of Versailles in 1919, membership of the League of Nations in 1920, and the 1931 Statute of Westminster^{III}, in parallel with the same developments for other Dominions. However, a sense of independent New Zealand nationality probably did not arise until 1947, when all residual limitations on

New Zealand sovereignty were removedⁱⁱ. An independent New Zealand nationality was created in 1948. New Zealand is therefore a rare example of a state whose constitutional development preceded the sense of separate nationhood which it expresses. Maori became an official language in addition to English in 1987.

With the final defeat of the Maratha confederacy in 1818, the rule of the British East India Company in India was definitely establishedⁱ, and was exercised by two means: directly ruled provinces, and native states which accepted British suzerainty. The Company's trade monopoly was abolished in 1813. Infrastructure improvements included a network of courts from 1773, irrigation and canals from 1835¹⁵⁶, postal service from 1837, railways from 1853, telegraph from 1855, secondary schools from 1855, and universities from 1857. Persian¹⁵⁷ was replaced by English as the official language in 1837. However, the Company's policy of dispossessing local rulers in cases of disputed succession, the activities of evangelical missionaries, and fears by Indian soldiers of ritual pollution triggered a revolt in 1857-8, mainly in Hindi-speaking areas. On suppression of this revolt, Company rule was replaced in 1858 by direct rule by Britain and the immediate causes of complaint were discontinued. Gradual economic growth and development of the professions during the late 19th century resulted in a civil society. The Indian National Congress was founded in 1885 and began campaigning for some measure of home rule (Swaraj) from about 1907. Delhi became the capital city in 1911. Participation of Indian soldiers overseas during the First World War made the British aware that home rule was inevitable, and Indians were admitted as full Indian Army officers from 1917¹⁵⁸. Acts in 1909, 1919, and 1935 increased the participation of Indians in Central Government, Provincial Government, and the senior civil service. Gandhi's campaigns for self-rule created an Indian national awareness among the mass of the population. However, the areas which were to become Pakistan and later Bangladesh did not identify with Indian nationalism and the country was accordingly partitioned. India and Pakistan became independent states in 1947ⁱⁱ. Between 1947 and 1950, the princely states and directly ruled provinces were rearranged into a Union of what are now 28 linguistically-based States and seven directly ruled Union Territories. The official languages of the Union are Hindi and English, and 21 other languages are recognised. In 1950, a new Federal Republican Parliamentary Constitution was adoptedⁱⁱⁱ.

Sri Lanka was populated in the fifth century BCE by people from India who now speak Sinhalese, and who were converted to Buddhism in about 247 BCE. The northern part of the island was settled by Hindu Tamils from South India from about 1000 CE. Because of its resources and location, it has always been of interest to traders, and in the centuries after 1000 CE Arab traders (called Moors) arrived and intermarried. In the 16th century CE, Sri Lanka comprised seven native kingdoms. Kandy was the largest of these, occupying the central highlands and east coast. All the kingdoms except Kandy were conquered first by Portugal 1505-1619 and then by the Dutch 1638-58, leaving behind a mixed population called Burghers. Britain seized the Dutch territories in 1796, conquered Kandy in 1815-8, and set up a centralised administration for the islandⁱ. The British adopted a plantation economy, growing coffee, tea, and rubber in addition to the traditional cinnamon. Tamil labourers were imported from India to work on these plantations. In 1919 the Ceylon National Congress was formed to campaign for greater autonomy, but split between Sinhalese members (74% of the population), and Tamil members (18% of the population). In 1931, a State Council was elected by universal suffrage, which shared Government functions between British officials and Sri Lankan ministers¹⁵⁹. In 1948 Sri Lanka became an independent stateⁱⁱ with a Government coalition of Sinhalese and Tamils under Prime Minister Senanayake (1948-52). Sinhalese was declared the sole official language in 1956, a situation reversed in 1978 when both languages received equal status. In 1978 Sri Lanka became a Presidential Parliamentary Republicⁱⁱⁱ. The secessionist Tamil Tigers were founded in 1976 and in 1983 commenced a violent civil war, which was finally defeated in 2009.

Statehood in Korea was established under strong cultural influence from China, with the adoption of Confucianism as a philosophy of government and Buddhism as a religion from 372 CE. The country was unified by the Silla dynasty 676-935, the Goryeo dynasty 936-1392, and the Joseon dynasty 1392-1910^{160, i}. Movable metal type was invented in Korea in 1234. The Joseon founder King Taejo (1392-98) moved the capital to Seoul and adopted Neo-Confucianism. King Sejong (1418-50) promulgated the locally designed Korean alphabet Hangeul. During a destructive Japanese invasion 1592-8, the Japanese navy was defeated by Korean-devised ironclad ships. In the 17th and 18th centuries, advances took place in coinage, irrigation, commerce, and applied arts. However, the Joseon adopted a policy of no contact with outside countries for trade or any other purpose, which resulted in gradual social, technological, and economic stagnation, only broken in 1876. The Chinese Qing

dynasty exercised a nominal suzerainty but no effective control, until displaced by Japan in a war 1894-95. Japan established a protectorate in 1905 and annexed the country in 1910, deporting the royal family to Japan. Under Japanese colonial rule there was considerable investment in infrastructure and primary and secondary education, but economic exploitation and cultural and political repression. The defeat of Japan in 1945 should have resulted in national liberation, but North Korea was occupied by Russia, which set up a Communist regime which is still in place. In South Korea, a National Assembly established in 1948 a republican constitutionⁱⁱ and elected as President Syngman Rhee (1948-60), who ruled autocratically. Rhee's rule was followed by several military regimes. With the present South Korean Constitution, the sixth (1987), stable and democratic Presidential government has been establishedⁱⁱⁱ.

The first Indonesian states were small tribal states formed in Sumatra and Java under Indian cultural influence. They merged Hinduism and Buddhism with local animistic religions and were ruled by priest-kings. The states were for periods united into larger kingdoms, of which the most notable were the empires of Srivijaya (683-1193), which included Malaya, and Majapahit (1293-1498). The economy of these states was based on rice cultivation and on trade in spices from the Moluccas, especially pepper, cloves, nutmeg, and mace, and also gold and sandalwood. Control of the straits of Malacca (Maleka, in Malaya) was the main source of profit from trade, which gave rulers enough added value to support a feudal system of government¹⁶¹. Islam gradually took over as the predominant religion 1400-1600, except in Bali, and coexisted with earlier religious practices. Colonial rule began when the Portuguese captured Maleka in 1511, losing it in 1641 to the Dutch. The Dutch sought to establish a trade monopoly. They seized the Moluccas in 1605, founded a capital at Jakarta in 1619, and achieved control of Java by stages up to 1830. From 1830 to 1870, they changed their economic system to forced cultivation of export crops such as tea, coffee, sugar, palm oil, tobacco, and rubber (the "Culture System"). In 1870 they finally opened the country up to commercial plantations, started to improve its infrastructure and public health, and began research into tropical agriculture. They did not achieve control of the whole archipelago until 1908¹, but continued to run the country without any native involvement.

Education of native Indonesians from about 1901 rapidly produced a class of nationalists who sought independence from the Netherlands, and who adopted the name "Indonesia" which had been invented in 1850. Indonesian, a dialect of Malay, was adopted as the national language in 1926. At the end of the Japanese occupation in 1945, President Sukarno (1945-67) proclaimed independence, which was recognised in 1949 after a guerrilla war with the Dutchⁱⁱ. The lack of preparation for independent government resulted in an unstable constitutional system, with weak Parliamentary rule until 1957, then dictatorship by Sukarno, an attempted Communist coup in 1965 defeated with much bloodshed, and dictatorship by President Suharto 1968-98. West Irian was acquired in 1969. Democracy has been gradually introduced, and the first direct presidential elections took place in 2004ⁱⁱⁱ.

Chinese civilisation was founded in North China before 1000 BCE. The first Qin emperor established the first unified state in 221 BCE and extended it to South China. Until about 1700 CE China was the world's most advanced state, and until about 1800 CE it was the world's largest economy. Chinese civilisation is also the world's oldest continuous state civilisation. Until 1912 CE, it was ruled by a succession of dynasties under the authority of the Mandate of Heaven, a concept which allowed the replacement of a failing dynasty. However, there was usually an interval between dynasties when there was civil war or competing states, and most dynasties suffered rebellions from time to time. In addition, there was a continual threat from Northern barbarian (Turkish, Mongol, or Tungus) invaders; these and the rebellions and civil wars caused periodic devastation. The religious framework of Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism was established at an early date. Confucianism provided a religious sanction to the Empire by the concept of political harmony which paralleled the harmony to be found in Nature and Heaven, subject to the principles of benevolence, moral example, and filial piety. In normal circumstances when times were peaceful, a bureaucracy recruited by competitive examination governed the huge state in a systematic fashion, controlling land ownership, markets, mining, and the postal service, collecting taxes, and holding censuses. The law was generally subordinate to the dictates of custom and ethics, and did not develop an independent existence¹⁶².

Under this system, the Chinese population rose from 53 million in 1 CE to 435 million in 1850 CE¹⁶³. Chinese culture was technologically innovative, inventing among others paper, gunpowder, the compass, printing, paper money, the wheelbarrow, the collar harness, the iron plough, the stirrup, white porcelain, lacquer, silk weaving, the paddle wheel, and the stern-post rudder, and supported industry

and internal and foreign trade. Canals were built. The territory was extended to the whole of China by 100 BCE¹, to the silk route in 639 CE, and to Tibet and Xinjiang by 1892 CE. Beijing became the capital in 1403 CE.

The decline of the Chinese imperial system started in about 1800 CE, when emperors and their governments failed to appreciate that Western civilisations had developed more advanced industrial, financial, educational, military, and political systems. Western countries wished to correct their trade imbalance with China, which exported large amounts of tea, porcelain, and silk, by supplying Western industrialised goods which the emperors initially refused to accept. In consequence, China came under increasing diplomatic, commercial, and military pressure¹⁶⁴, while suffering several devastating internal rebellions 1850-77 and 1898-1901. A last-minute reform programme was thwarted in 1898 by the Dowager Empress Cixi (1861-1908), although the traditional civil service examinations were abolished in 1905. After a military rebellion caused the last emperor to abdicate in 1912, no stable government emerged until the effective establishment of the Republic of China in 1928. Although the Republican government (Presidents Sun Yat-Sen 1917-25; Chiang Kai-Shek 1926-49) implemented reforms, it never had full popular support and was never legitimated by a Constitution. The previous Confucian system and the new Republican system having lost credibility, the idea of a complete revolution in society and politics which was provided by the Russian revolution 1917-20 became attractive, and gave birth to the Chinese Communist Party in 1921¹⁶⁵. The Japanese invasion 1937-45 stimulated a strong national Chinese reaction with which the Communists identified themselves. On the surrender of Japan the Republican government lost power to the Chinese Communists in a civil war 1945-49. It can be argued that the Chinese Communists (People's Republic of China) in 1949 were the first legitimate government in China since 1912¹¹.

The People's Republic of China is now subject to its fourth Constitution since assuming power, although all give a monopoly of power to the Communist party. The most recent amendments in 2004 guarantee human and property rights, but without an independent method for enforcement. It contains a limitation of two five-year terms for the offices of President and Prime Minister. During the first period Mao Zedong (1949-76) implemented extreme socialist policies which were violent and highly destructive. Thereafter, Deng Xiaoping (1981-9) and his successors have implemented capitalist market-oriented policies which are raising the Chinese economy to a world level comparable to that before 1800. This is creating a civil society which will inevitably influence future Chinese politics.

Bolivia started as the Spanish colony of Upper Peru. It achieved independence in 1825 after the Spanish army in Peru had been defeated, taking its name from the Liberator General Simón Bolívar. The population is approximately 15% of Spanish origin, 30% mestizo (mixed race), 30% Quechua and 25% Aymara¹⁶⁶. The country initially lacked a civil society and, although possessing a formal Constitution, was governed by ineffective military rulers from 1839 to 1880¹. The military were discredited in a war 1879-94 with Chile, in which Bolivia lost its Pacific territories and became landlocked¹⁶⁷. 1880-1936 government was taken over by an oligarchic elite of mine-owners and land-owners, founded on Bolivia's principal industries of silver mining, tin mining, and agriculture. The workers in these industries were the majority indigenous population, who were oppressed economically, denied political rights, and were the principal source of taxation. Within this oligarchic system, which from 1936 included also the military and lasted intermittently until 1982, the president had almost unlimited powers for a four-year term of office. The sole effective constitutional principle¹⁶⁸ was that a president could not succeed himself, although he could hold the position again later.

In 1898 the effective (but not formal) capital of Bolivia was moved from Sucre to La Paz, closer to the tin-mining areas, as the tin industry expanded with development of the railway and silver mining declined. Although the country remains Roman Catholic, the privileges of the Catholic Church were removed 1905-11. The desert Chaco territory, wrongly believed to contain oil, was lost to Paraguay in a war 1932-35. During the period 1936-52 the interests of the indigenous majority began to be expressed by socialist political parties, which adopted a programme of nationalisation, land reform, and trade union power. In 1952 the most successful of these parties, the Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario (MNR), was elected to the presidency by the non-indigenous franchise¹¹. The MNR extended the vote to the indigenous population, nationalised the three largest tin mining companies, redistributed large landed estates, abolished compulsory agricultural labour, and increased social expenditure (President Paz Estenssoro, 1952-56; 1960-64; 1985-89). The vulnerability of the single-commodity Bolivian economy to international markets and a currency hyperinflation prevented the social benefits expected from these measures, and the need to reintroduce market disciplines to the

economy gave rise to an ideological split within the ruling party, the military, and Bolivian society, between theoretical Marxists supported by the trade unions and pragmatic economic centrists. Weak military governments oscillating between these programmes ruled from 1969 to 1982, when finally democratic multi-party elections were established. Presidents are now elected by popular vote, confirmed by Congress if no one candidate has an absolute majority, and the first peaceful transfer of power took place in 1985. A consistent economic liberalisation programme has been implemented from 1985, largely under the guidance of President Sánchez (1993-97; 2000-3). Local government was extended to the nine departments and the cities 1994-95. Trade Union power was defeated in 1995. However, the reversal of attempts to privatise the water industry (2000) and the newly developed natural gas industry (2005) shows that ideological divisions remain, complicated by disputes over the coca trade¹⁶⁹. In 2009 a new Constitution (Bolivia's 17th) incorporates the rights of indigenous peoples and allows a five-year presidential term, renewable once¹⁷⁰. The country is now called "The Plurinational State of Bolivia".

Egypt was conquered by the Muslim Arabs 639-42 and remained a province of the Caliphate until 868. The official language became Arabic in 705 and the population became largely Arabic-speaking and Moslem by 1250, although 10% are still Coptic Christians. From 868 to 1250 the country was ruled by four successive locally-based dynasties (generally reliant on mercenary soldiers), which provided sufficient stability for agriculture and trade to flourish. Cairo was founded as the capital in 969. 1250-1517 it was governed by the Mamluks, a military elite which renewed itself by slave capture. Each successive Mamluk Sultan seized power in a coup, with an average reign of 6 years, legitimacy being supplied by nomination by a puppet caliph. In 1260 the Mamluks defeated the Mongol armies, saving Egypt and the Levant from devastation, and in 1291 completed expulsion of the Crusaders. However, the quality of government gradually declined, and became worse under Ottoman rule 1517-1805, when the country was treated as a vassal state under Mamluk administration.

In 1805¹ Muhammad Ali (1805-48), an Albanian commander, seized power in Egypt and founded a dynasty under nominal Ottoman suzerainty which lasted until 1952. He destroyed the Mamluks and reformed the system of agriculture, taxation, trade, education, medicine, administration, and the army. He introduced cotton, now Egypt's staple crop. These reforms were continued by his successors, who introduced modern infrastructure, so that the population rose from 4 million (where it had stayed for centuries) to 10 million by 1900. From 1860, Egyptian writers increased national awareness of the country's history and culture¹⁷⁰. However, the quality of government declined, and in 1882 Britain imposed a disguised protectorate, made official in 1914, to protect its Suez Canal and financial interests. In 1919 a national revolt against the British and the founding of a popular nationalist party (Wafd) resulted in independence in 1922-3 as a Parliamentary monarchy. However, in practice the king remained autocratic, the Wafd failed to address Egypt's social problems, and British troops stayed. In 1952-3 a further national revolt led by the army abolished the monarchy and the 1923 Constitution¹⁷¹, and in 1955 British troops left. President Nasser (1953-70) and his successors have provided stable but autocratic government until the constitutional revolution of 2011, and the Egyptian economy has continued to develop. The population is now 77 million.

Morocco was originally populated by Berber tribes. In 703-11 it was conquered from the Byzantine Empire by Arab Muslims, and was part of the Caliphate until 788 when an independent Berber Muslim state was set up. Orthodox Sunni Islam was established by two successive Berber dynasties, the Almoravids (1073-1147) and Almohads (1130-1269), which ruled also in central Maghreb and Muslim Spain, and established their capital at Marrakesh¹⁷¹. The country became culturally and linguistically Arab following a Bedouin invasion from Egypt, although Berber languages are still spoken. The Sa'dian Sultan al-Mansur (1578-1603) defeated an attempted penetration by the Portuguese in 1578 and also by the Ottomans. The present ruling dynasty, the Alawi, adopted the title Sultan in 1666 and under Mohammed III (1757-90) established a central state¹⁷². Following international agreement the French imposed a protectorate in 1912, creating the cities of Rabat (now the capital) and Casablanca and introducing modern infrastructure. National feeling commenced in about 1930 and took the form of the Istiqlal (Independence) Party. Sultan Mohammed V (1927-1961) succeeded in identifying himself with this national movement while retaining working relations with the French. He supported the French army in 1939 but in 1944 endorsed a call for independence. A French attempt to depose him in 1953 failed¹⁷³, and in 1956 Morocco became independent, the Sultan assuming the title King in 1957. Those parts of northern Morocco occupied by Spain joined the new kingdom, apart from the Spanish enclaves of Ceuta and Mellilla. In 1996 Morocco became a Parliamentary monarchy¹⁷⁴, and after the 2002 election political power changed hands peacefully.

The origins of the Vietnamese people lie around the Red River in what is now North Vietnam. From 111 BCE to 938 CE they were subject to the Han and Tang dynasties of China. They adopted the Confucian political system and Buddhist religion, but did not become Chinese or cease to speak Vietnamese. On achieving independence, the rulers of the country (then called *Đai Việt*) assumed the title “Emperor” to indicate equality with the Chinese ruler. Successive dynasties from 1009 to 1528 undertook the organisation of the state, with dike building, education and examinations for officials, reform of taxation, law, justice, land, and currency, mapping, and writing of a national history. Chinese and Mongol invaders were defeated. A system of writing based on Chinese characters (*Chữ Nôm*) developed. In 1471 the defeat and absorption of the Malay kingdom, Champa, extended the country into what is now South Vietnam, and further advances by 1757 reached almost to the present boundaries. This southern extension proved beyond the capacity of rulers to control, and from 1528 to 1802 the country was divided into two or three warring parts. In 1802 it was reunited by Emperor Gia Long (1802-20) with French military help¹. Gia Long renamed the country *Việt Nam* and his Nguyễn dynasty lasted until 1945. He and his successors revitalised the traditional administration and infrastructure, but persecuted Catholic missionaries and resisted trade with European states. The French invaded and conquered the country 1858-83. Although the French invested in transport infrastructure and irrigation, their administration failed to respect Vietnam’s territorial integrity or to create a commercial or administrative class. The Latin alphabet (*Quốc Ngữ*), invented in 1651 and based on Portuguese, was adopted by the French, and also by Vietnamese nationalists in the interests of mass literacy. Vietnamese nationalism became identified with the Vietnamese Communist Party (*Việt Minh*), led by Hồ Chí Minh (1945-69), who proclaimed Vietnamese independence on the defeat of Japan in 1945. The French were defeated 1945-54 and the Americans in a further war 1954-75¹⁷², to establish the Vietnamese Communist state¹¹. A degree of capitalism was introduced in 1986.

The Inca Empire was founded in 1438 with its capital at Cuzco, and grew to include most of modern Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia, and Chile. It was conquered in 1532 by Spain, which set up a Viceroyalty of Peru with its capital at the newly founded city of Lima. Ecuador was removed from the Viceroyalty in 1739, and Bolivia and Chile in 1776. 45% of the present population of Peru are indigenous, 15% of European origin, and 37% mestizo (mixed race). 80% speak Spanish, 16% Quechua, and 3% Aymara. The independence of Peru was declared by General San Martín in 1821 and confirmed by General de Sucre in 1824, but it started with little sense of identity other than as a Spanish colony. Until 1872, despite a formal Constitution the presidency was held by a succession of military leaders¹. By 1872 development of the economy had produced a commercial oligarchy of Spanish origin which took over the government, sometimes in alliance with the military which then shared its social background. A disastrous war with Chile 1879-84 lost to Peru valuable nitrate-producing territories. The presidency was strengthened by President Leguía (1908-12; dictator 1919-30)¹⁷³ and President Benavides (1933-39), who promoted infrastructure development. Political movements arose to express the interests of working people (mainly indigenous) who had moved from the farms to the cities as the economy developed, after 1931 in particular the *Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana* (APRA) led by Haya de la Torre. An interest in indigenous culture also developed. At first there was a civil war between the oligarchy and APRA, but from 1956 the two sides became gradually reconciled, as the social profile of the armed forces became broader and APRA became more adapted to capitalism¹¹. The military President Velasco (1968-75) implemented a radical programme of land reform, but after 1980 all presidents have been civilian and completed their legal term¹⁷⁴. Women were allowed the vote in 1955, and the 1979 Constitution¹¹¹ removed the literacy test which had prevented many indigenous Peruvians from voting¹⁷⁵. A new Constitution was enacted in 1993 during the presidency of Alberto Fujimori (1990-2000). Historically, the presidency has had a wide degree of latitude in determining policy, and attempts are now being made to make it more accountable to Congress.

The origins of Tunisia lie in a personal Islamic monarchy established by the Hafsids dynasty (1230-1574)¹, in succession to the Morocco-based Almohad Empire which had ruled the Maghrib 1130-1269. Under the Hafsids, the Arabic language was generally adopted, Tunis became the capital, and the location of the country provided trade revenues. In 1584 the country was occupied by the Ottomans, but by 1591 the local Ottoman Janissary troops had rebelled and established autonomy under their officer the dey. The governor appointed by the Ottomans, called the bey, managed in 1640 to secure the support of the religious and civilian authorities in Tunis to depose the dey and set up a dynasty of beys under nominal Ottoman suzerainty. The second dynasty of beys, the Husainids (1705-1957), established an effective central administration. They ruled until France imposed a protectorate in 1881, then reigned nominally under French control. Reforms in administration and education were

commenced under the beys by their minister Khair-ad-Din (1873-77), and the French introduced modern administration and infrastructure. An anti-colonial movement was established as the Destour Party in 1920. However, this was eclipsed by the mass-membership Neo-Destour Party, founded in 1934 by Habib Bourguiba with a strong nationalist agenda. Bey al-Munsif (1942-3) attempted to identify himself with this nationalist trend, but was deposed by the French. Under pressure from the Neo-Destour, independence was secured in 1956ⁱⁱ. The office of bey was abolished in 1957 and Tunisia was declared a republic with Bourguiba as President (1957-84). Although presidential and parliamentary elections occurred, the country was in practice subject to the autocratic control of the Neo-Destour leadership until the constitutional revolution of 2011.

What is now Venezuela was originally not one colony but five separate provinces, whose administration was largely neglected by the colonial administrators. Caracas was founded in 1567. Only in 1777 were the provinces merged into a single Spanish colony. After three wars of independence which killed about half of the European population and destroyed much of its agriculture, Venezuela was liberated by General Simón Bolívar in 1821 as part of his republic of Gran Colombia, but seceded and became independent in 1830 under President Páez (1830-35; 1839-43; 1861-63)ⁱ. Until 1899 the country was an oligarchy of leading landowners and merchants of Spanish origin, the landowners having private armies (“caudillos”) and liable to revolt. Each president was elected with virtually unlimited powers but was always at risk of being overthrown. In 1899 the boundary with Guyana was determined by U.S. mediation¹⁷⁶. From 1899 to 1958 (with a partially democratic interlude 1945-48), Venezuela was governed by a sequence of five military dictators, whose rule was unchecked and who rewrote and re-wrote fictitious constitutions. The country’s large oil reserves began to be exploited from 1918 and were used to invest in infrastructure. However, power remained in the hands of the 21% Spanish-origin elite (“criollos”), with the 68% mixed-race population (“pardos”) and others hardly benefiting. In 1947 universal male and female suffrage was enacted. In 1958 democracy was finally introduced with the election of President Betancourt (1945-48; 1959-64), and all subsequent elections have resulted in a peaceful transfer of powerⁱⁱ. Large landed estates were broken up but large-scale social investments did not then occur. A partly protectionist and state-controlled industrial policy resulted in the nationalisation of the oil and iron ore industries in 1975. President Chávez (1999 to present) came to power blaming the previous governments as oligarchic and promoting a programme to invest heavily in education and health care, which he has implemented. He has also improved the education of judges and protected indigenous peoples’ land rights. However, he has continued with protectionist industrial policies. His government style has become increasingly interventionist, and it cannot be said that Venezuela is fully democratic. A new Constitution (Venezuela’s 26th) was adopted in 2009 to express Chávez’ ideas.

British colonial activity on the coast of what is now Ghana¹⁷⁷ started in 1821 and a colony was proclaimed in 1874. By 1899, it had been extended inland to the former kingdom of Ashanti (1701-1896) and to the territories to the north of itⁱ. The western part of Togo was added in 1956. The core of the Ashanti and neighbouring economies had been trade in gold, slaves (stopped in 1807), timber, and agricultural products. Cocoa became the staple cash crop in the 1920’s. The colonial government ruled through tribal chiefs and from the 1920’s invested in education, healthcare, transport, and other infrastructure. National sentiment commenced in the 1930’s and was reinforced among war veterans who returned in 1945. Ghana was the first British African colony (other than South Africa) to achieve independence in 1957 and became a Republic in 1960ⁱⁱ. However, the independence leader President Nkrumah (1952-66) distorted the 1957 Constitution to establish a centralised one-party state controlled by his nominees, and built up a huge public debt through government development projects and a pan-Africanist foreign policy. His overthrow in a coup was followed by political and economic instability until 1992, during which there were three periods of military rules and two civilian Constitutions. In 1981 leadership was assumed by Jerry Rawlings (elected President 1993-2001). A stable presidential Constitution was adopted in 1992ⁱⁱⁱ and economic growth has been re-established. Local government through 110 district assemblies has been instituted.

The first state to be based in what is now Algeria was the Zayyanid dynasty of tribal rulers (1235–1556), who replaced the Morocco-based Almohad Empire (1130-1269). Around 1500 CE privateering, or the capture of ships and their crews for sale or ransom, became a major source of income for the Maghrib states. In 1525 the leader of these corsairs, Khair al-Din Barbarossa, became the agent for establishment of Ottoman power in Algiers by means of a corps of Janissaries called “Ujaq”, and was awarded the title beylerbey. In 1659 the Ottomans recognised a local ruler called the dey, hereditary from 1710, who ran a military oligarchic government¹⁷⁸ and continued to practice piracy until 1815-16,

when a war first with the United States and then with Britain forced the piracy to cease. In 1830 the French invaded Algeria on a flimsy pretext, deposed the dey, and in 1834 declared it to be a colony. The name "Algeria", from the capital Algiers, was first used by the French in 1839. A major rebellion 1839-42 by a Sufi shaiikh, Amir 'Abdul-Qadir who had been recognised as tribal leader, was defeatedⁱ. A policy was then adopted of expropriating land for European colonists (from France, Italy, Spain, and Malta), who migrated to Algeria in large numbers, eventually reaching at least 10% of the population. A unsuccessful Arab rebellion in 1870 resulted in further expropriations, so that by 1900 the colonists owned 63% of the country's wealth. In 1848 Algeria was declared part of France, the colonists (but not the Arabs) obtained representation in the French Parliament, and French law, administration, and education were imposed. In this way, a colonists' constituency was established which resisted all concessions and which weak French governments could not oppose¹⁷⁹.

Leadership of the Algerian nationalist movement came in the 1930's from a small group of évolués, or Arabs assimilated to French culture. Popular support came from the large number of originally tribal people who had migrated to towns. After repeated political rebuffs, an armed Arab uprising in 1954 began a brutal war of independence. The French President de Gaulle (1958-69) overcame two revolts by the colonists and negotiated Algerian independence in 1962ⁱⁱ. The colonists, who had largely monopolised professional, industrial, and managerial positions, returned to France. The war of independence left political authority in the hands of the Algerian army. When multi-party parliamentary elections eventually took place in 1991 they were unexpectedly won by Islamist Fundamentalists and were annulled, resulting in a civil war which lasted until 2002. Elections since then have been managed to ensure that the governing party wins.

The boundaries of Kenya¹⁸⁰ were set by agreement between Britain, the colonial power, and the colonial powers of neighbouring territories. Britain declared Kenya a protectorate in 1893ⁱ and a colony in 1920, fixing the boundary with Uganda in 1902¹⁸¹. Economic development started with a railway constructed inland from Mombasa (an ancient port) from 1895 and the founding of Nairobi in 1905, but from 1902 took the form of British-owned settler farms in the temperate highland areas, which continued until independence. The largest tribes in Kenya are the Kikuyu, Luhya, Luo, Kalenjin, and Kamba. The Kikuyu, as the tribe most affected by the settler policy and whose leaders had acquired University education overseas¹⁸², initiated the pressure against colonial rule and were responsible for the Mau Mau rebellion 1952-56. In 1963, independence was achieved by agreement between the tribal leadersⁱⁱ. However, Presidents Kenyatta (1963-78) and arap Moi (1978-2002) ruled autocratically through their respective tribes (Kikuyu and Kalenjin), leading to government centralisation, corruption, land disputes, and tribal animosities. Fortunately, Kenyatta pursued an open economic policy, so that the country is now the most industrially developed country in East Africa and the regional hub for finance, telecommunication and transport services. Autocracy was gradually relaxed, so that the 2002 election led to a peaceful change of Government but did not prevent serious intertribal violence in 2007. A new Constitution was approved by referendum in 2010 with widespread support, with the intention to re-establish checks and balances on the presidency, the rule of law, and effective local governmentⁱⁱⁱ.

The island city of Singapore¹⁸³ was founded in 1819 as a free port by Sir Stamford Raffles, an official of the British East India Company, who was seeking a deepwater harbour superior to Melaka (Malacca) and Penang. Raffles was also motivated to increase British colonial influence in the area vis-à-vis the Dutch. In 1824 the island was ceded to the East India Company by the Sultan of Johor and a treaty was concluded with the Dutch demarcating the straits of Malacca as the border between British Malaya and the Dutch East Indies (now Indonesia). The port was an immediate success, attracting Chinese, Indian, Malay, and other traders and immigrants from South China. The present population mix is 74% Chinese, 13% Malay, 9% Indian. After a period of unsatisfactory rule by the East Indian Company, the British colony of the Straits Settlements was created in 1867ⁱ, comprising Singapore, Melaka, and Penang, with Singapore as the predominant partner. Despite heavy British investment in a naval base, the island was conquered and occupied by the Japanese 1942-45. In 1946 the Straits Settlements were dissolved and Singapore became a separate Crown Colony. In 1959 internal self-government was granted under free Parliamentary elections which brought to power Lee Kuan Yew (Prime Minister 1959-90). The present Constitution, with amendments, is that enacted in 1959ⁱⁱⁱ. English was adopted as the principal official language in support of Singapore's role as an international business centre. The other official languages are Mandarin Chinese, Malay, and Tamil, and the spoken home languages are Mandarin 35%, English 32%, Chinese dialects (especially Hokkien) 15%, Malay 12%, Tamil 3%. Lee at first considered that Singapore could not survive as an independent state and sought inclusion in the

new Federation of Malaysia in 1963, when formal British sovereignty ended. However, the Federation was Malay-dominated, and the rapid appearance of ethnic Malay-Chinese tensions resulted in Singapore having to leave Malaysia in 1965 and become an independent Parliamentary republic¹¹. Singapore was therefore faced for the first time with the need to establish a distinct national identity, which it has sought to achieve through education, symbols, and ceremonies. Since 1959, measures to attract foreign investment in finance and industry, the absence of corruption, a reliable legal system, and sustained expenditure on housing, education, transport, communications, and other public services have raised Singapore to an advanced modern economy¹⁸⁴.

The Development of Individual Nation States: 1967-1999

Nigeria, Honduras, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Guatemala, Uganda, Paraguay, Nicaragua, South Africa, Yemen, Slovenia, Croatia, Ethiopia, Ukraine, Cambodia, Eritrea, Tanzania, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Haiti

The present state of Nigeria comprises speakers of about 500 languages, of whom three (Hausa/Fulani, Yoruba, and Igbo) comprise 68% of the population and six (Edo, Ijaw, Kanuri, Ibibio, Nupe, and Tiv) a further 27%. At the time of colonisation, the northern part of the country was the Sultanate of Sokoto, an Islamic Hausa/Fulani feudal state founded in 1809¹⁸⁵, and the southern part comprised a large number of tribal states which traded with European merchants. In the South-West, the Yoruba Oyo Empire (founded about 1400) had collapsed by 1836; to its east was the Edo Kingdom of Benin. The South-East included the Igbo-dominated Aro Confederacy, founded in 1690¹⁸⁶. Trade was in slaves until the British abolition of the slave trade in 1807¹⁸⁷, and in palm oil and palm kernels. The original capital of Nigeria, Lagos, was founded by the Portuguese in 1472 and annexed by Britain in 1861. The Royal Niger Company, founded in 1879 by George Goldie, established Britain as the principal trading power. British political control was gradually extended in order to secure trade routes, counter French and German influence, and abolish the slave trade: the Oil Rivers Protectorate in 1891, conquest of the Yoruba Kingdom of Ijebu in 1892 and of Benin in 1897, establishment of the Colony of Southern Nigeria (replacing the Royal Niger Company) in 1900, conquest of Aro in 1901, conquest of the Sultanate of Sokoto in 1903, and unification of Nigeria into one colony in 1914¹⁸⁸.

The British sought to rule Nigeria from 1914 through existing tribal authorities. In the North, this meant the previous Islamic hierarchy, where Christian missionaries were forbidden to operate. The South soon adopted Christianity, in combination with native religions, and acquired a small Western-educated elite who started to agitate for greater self-government. No action was taken to advance self-government until 1945, leaving only 15 years to prepare for independence in 1960¹⁸⁹. To conciliate the three leading tribal groups (Hausa/Fulani, Yoruba, and Igbo), a federation of three Regions was set up (Northern, containing half the population¹⁹⁰, Western, and Eastern), each with its own Government, Assembly, and dominant political party, together with a federal Government and Parliament with limited functions. The rights of the many minority groups were neglected. This system was not capable of expressing Nigerian national identity, mediating between competing interests, or controlling misgovernment, and was overthrown by two military coups¹ in 1966 which murdered the leading Northern politicians and 30,000 Igbo living in the North. The task of creating a Nigerian political identity was then left to the Nigerian army, which governed through military rulers, of whom the most notable were Generals Gowon (1966-75) and Obasanjo (1976-79; elected President 1999-2007). The country was reorganised as 12 states, now increased to 36 states plus the Federal Capital. An attempt by the Igbo-dominated territories to secede was defeated in a civil war 1967-70¹¹. The capital was moved in 1991 from Lagos to Abuja, in a neutral central location. After a failed attempt at democracy 1979-83, a second period of military rule 1983-99 received far less public acceptance than the first. The present democratic Presidential Constitution was adopted in 1999¹¹¹, although instances of corruption and communal violence still occur. Political parties, founded in 1998, are now national. The earlier tribal rulers, 83 in number, still have ceremonial and cultural functions, and may provide translation services from English, the country's official language.

Honduras existed as an independent state from 1838, when the Federal Republic of Central America which had been formed in 1821 on the end of Spanish colonial rule broke up. The population is 85% mestizo. The capital moved from Comayagua to Tegucigalpa in 1880. Until 1933 its political system was an unstable oligarchy, with many presidents achieving little and failing to complete their three-year terms. The reasons for this were unresolved conflicts between the "Liberal" (secular) and "Conservative" (clericalist) parties, interference from the more securely based governments of

neighbouring Guatemala and Nicaragua, usually in either the Liberal or Conservative interest, and intervention by factions of the army. Until 1899 most foreign exchange had been obtained from silver mining, but from then on, Honduras like Guatemala reached agreements with three U.S. fruit companies for the mass cultivation of bananas, becoming the world's leading supplier¹⁹¹. The country became an economic colony of these companies, which sought land and political influence in return for providing employment and investments in railways, ports, housing, and other infrastructure¹⁹². This led the U.S. government to involve itself to protect its economic interests, intervening seven times during 1903-25 in order to conserve Honduras' political stability. Finally President Carias (1933-49)¹ remained in power long enough to begin the formation of an effective state. Succeeding governments began a gradual programme of educational, social, industrial, and agrarian legislation under the influence of junior army officers, but still usually did not complete their four-year terms. A 1969 war with El Salvador over immigration problems discredited the army but evinced widespread popular support, consolidating the national identity^{192, ii}. From 1975 rapid economic growth financed substantial infrastructure and telecommunications investment. In 1982 a new Constitution (nominally the country's 12th) ended military government and secured stable civilian administrations, the head of the army being dismissed in 1984ⁱⁱⁱ. It is probable that this Constitution is secure, despite a further military intervention in 2009.

Bangladesh originated as that part of the British Indian province of Bengal which is primarily Muslim by religion and Bengali by language. It shared in the desire not to be part of an independent Indian state, and accordingly in 1947 became the eastern part of Pakistanⁱ. Despite the fact that the eastern part had the larger population, independent Pakistan was dominated politically and economically by the western part, whose leading language is Urdu. An attempt to impose Urdu on the whole country stimulated a movement for a separate Bengali nationality, led by Mujibur Rahman (Prime Minister and President 1972-75). Following elections in 1970, independence from Pakistan was achieved with Indian support after a war in 1971ⁱⁱ. A Parliamentary Constitution was adopted in 1972ⁱⁱⁱ which is still in force, despite two periods of military rule. The Parliamentary basis of Government authority was confirmed by referendum in 1991. Attempts to enhance Islamic influence on the state have been unsuccessful, and religious or customary law is limited to marriages and inheritance. There is a distinct Bengali cultural tradition, due especially to the Bengali writers Ram Mohan Roy (1774-1833) and Rabindranath Tagore (1861-1941), who were both Hindu.

The Moslem League was founded in 1906 to represent the interests of Moslems in British-ruled India. During the following decades, unsuccessful negotiations took place between the Indian Congress Party and Moslem League with a view to defining the participation of Moslems in an independent India. The name Pakistan was devised in about 1932 to describe this Moslem self-identity. In 1940 the Moslem League, led by Jinnah (1947-48) issued a manifesto for a separately demarcated Moslem entity, which formed the state of Pakistan after partition and independence in 1947. Independence relied on the concept that Pakistan did not want to be part of the new Indian state, but left unresolved the principles of its own national identity. The first step in this identity was the development of a separate Bengali nationality in the eastern part of the country, which after a war of independence became independent in 1971, leaving Pakistan as the western part of the countryⁱ. In consequence, the first direct national elections took place in 1970 and the outline of the present state was adopted in 1973 through the present Constitutionⁱⁱ. The second step was the incorporation of Islam into Pakistan's legal system through the introduction in 1978 of Shari'a Law. A Federal Shariat Court exists which can declare any law to be repugnant to Islam. The third step was the introduction in 2001 of an effective system of elected local government, of which the most important are four provinces (plus the capital territory and tribal areas) and about 100 districts. The fourth step was the 2010 decision to establish a Parliamentary rather than a Presidential form of government, with a Prime Minister accountable to Parliament, of which the lower house is directly elected and the upper house represents the provincesⁱⁱⁱ. While these decisions were being taken, the country has been subject to military rule for long periods (1958-71, 1977-88 and 1999-2008), while politics was in the hands of an oligarchy of about 28 political families¹⁹³. It is hoped that this state-forming process is now complete.

From 1609 Guatemala, together with Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica, constituted a Captaincy-General within the Viceroyalty of New Spain, based on Mexico. Unlike its neighbours, 65% of the Guatemala population are native American. When Mexico became independent in 1821, a Federal Republic of Central America was established by the five states, excluding the province of Chiapas which remained in Mexico. However, the Federation did not have popular legitimacy, and dissolved in 1838 into independent republics under pressure from the Guatemalan President Carrera

(1844-48; 1850-65)^I. The military became the sole source of political authority in Guatemala, ruling until 1944 as a series of dictatorships. The governments were clerically oriented until 1871, when secular ("liberal") leadership came to power (Presidents Barrios 1873-85; Cabrera 1898-1920; Ubico 1931-44), and a start was made on education and state formation. Like the other Central American states, Guatemala was too poor, isolated¹⁹⁴, and underdeveloped for economic independence, and it became the economic colony of the U.S. United Fruit Company for the mass cultivation of bananas. In return for access to land, labour, and political support, the Company provided employment and invested in railways, ports, electricity, and telecommunications. However, the bulk of the rural population remained illiterate and held in subjection. In 1944 and 1951 the first genuine elections took place, of presidents with a programme of political freedom, education, and land redistribution (Presidents Arévalo 1944-51; Arbenz 1951-4). Unfortunately, having raised expectations among the population, negotiations over land redistribution broke down, and in 1960 a violent civil war broke out between insurgents fighting for wholesale distribution of property and a further series of military governments defending property rights. The civil war continued until 1986^{II}, when at last a genuine Constitution was enacted, free elections were held, and civilian governments came to power with a programme of the rule of law and an end to political violence. In 1996 peace was finally concluded, including terms on indigenous rights and agrarian reform^{III}.

When Britain proclaimed a Protectorate over Uganda in 1894, about half the country comprised three historic Bantu-speaking kingdoms, founded on the following dates: Buganda (1374), Bunyoro (1520), and Toro (1830)¹⁹⁵. A fourth, Ankole, was added in 1901. Buganda was the largest and most powerful of these. The name "Uganda" is its Swahili version, and the Bugandan capital Kampala became the capital of Uganda. After signing treaties with these kingdoms, Britain ruled them indirectly through their existing administrations. The remainder of the country, populated by Nilotic and Sudanic-speaking tribes, did not have kings and was ruled by the colonial governor. British government was largely established by 1901^I. The railway constructed from Mombasa in Kenya reached Lake Victoria by 1901 and Kampala by 1931, stimulating the profitable cultivation of cotton and later of coffee, especially in Buganda. Indian traders immigrated and started to cultivate sugar. Education was developed, and Makerere became a University Collage in 1949. At independence in 1962, no strong anti-colonial movement had arisen and the principal controversy concerned the relative autonomy of Buganda. The post-independence governments accordingly lacked national legitimacy, and the gap left by the colonial power was filled by dictators (Obote 1966-71 and 1981-85; Idi Amin 1971-79), who ruled by violence, terror, and the exploitation of tribal enmities. The historic kingdoms (the principal remaining source of legitimate rule) were abolished in 1966 and Indian Ugandans were expelled in 1972, devastating the economy. A Ugandan popular rebellion (the National Resistance Army) was founded in 1981 and overthrew the dictatorship in 1986, establishing the present President Museveni in power^{II}. The historic kingdoms (now six) were restored as cultural entities in 1993. A Constitution was adopted in 1995 and elections were held in 1996^{III}. In 2005, multi-party politics was resumed.

The capital of Paraguay, Asunción, was founded in 1537 and became the base from which Spanish colonists settled what is now Argentina, Buenos Aires being founded in 1580. In 1776 Buenos Aires became the capital of the Viceroyalty of Río de la Plata, which included Paraguay. With the failure of the Spanish monarchy, Paraguay successfully asserted its independence from Argentina 1811-12^I. The new country was very poor, with a low-value agricultural economy¹⁹⁶ and the river connection with Buenos Aires as its sole outlet. The low level of European immigration and 50% population loss after a disastrous war 1864-70 with Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay has resulted in a largely mestizo population which is 90% bilingual in Spanish and Guaraní. Disputes about secularisation, which affected many Latin American countries, were dealt with early and were not significant. Paraguay's poverty and isolation inhibited its social, educational, and economic development compared with neighbouring states, and in consequence the landowning and military class accepted a long series of personal rulers with little or no constitutional limitation, 1814-70, 1881-1904, 1939-1948, and 1954-89¹⁹⁷, although there was a nominal Constitution from 1870. During other periods government was an unstable and often violent oligarchy of political factions, the average length of a presidency being 22 months, and rule by a dictator seemed more secure. Paraguay only survived as a buffer state between Argentina and Brazil. A successful war with Bolivia 1932-35 expanded the borders in the Chaco region and reawakened Paraguayan nationalism¹⁹⁸. Eventually, under President Stroessner (1954-89) the Itaipú hydroelectric dam (jointly with Brazil) produced a large economic surplus, and the road network was extended and connected to a port in Brazil. After the overthrow of Stroessner^{II}, a democratic Constitution was adopted in 1992. The first peaceful transfer of presidential authority took place in 2008^{III}.

Nicaragua, like other Central American countries, existed as an independent state from 1838, when the Federal Republic of Central America, formed in 1821 on the end of Spanish colonial rule, broke up. The population is 69% mestizo and 17% of European origin. The economy is primarily agricultural, but unlike its neighbours has never been dominated by a single crop. Managua became the capital in 1852. Until 1893 the country was governed by a landowning oligarchy divided between “Conservatives” (clerical) and “Liberals” (secular). The first president to achieve a prolonged period in office and to commence development of the state was the Liberal President Zelaya (1893-1909)ⁱ. In 1894 Zelaya incorporated into the country the Miskito Coast, the Atlantic coastal territory which had been under British protection until 1860. At that time the United States government had ambitions to build a trans-Isthmian canal across Nicaragua, which continued after the Panama Canal was opened in 1914. Zelaya’s failure to co-operate over this, and his interference in Honduras and El Salvador, led to his overthrow in 1909 and a U.S. protectorate which lasted until 1933. On their departure in 1933 the U.S. left a trained army (the “National Guard”), whose commander sized power as President Somoza (1937-56). Somoza ruled through his control of large elements of the economy, which he used to enrich himself, while the stability of his rule enabled economic and infrastructure development to take place. On his death his regime was continued by his two sons (Presidents 1956-63; 1967-79¹⁹⁹), who lost credibility because of their rampant corruption. In 1972 a civil war began, and in 1979 the last Somoza was overthrown by the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional (FSLN), named after Sandino, a rebel leader murdered in 1934. The FSLN implemented a programme of social legislation, and in 1984 a multi-party election was won by their leader President Ortega (1985-90; 2007 to present). Unfortunately the U.S. Government misinterpreted Marxist influences in the FSLN so as to categorise it as a Communist movement, and sponsored a renewed civil war 1981-90 (the “Contras”) which was eventually defeated after the U.S. Congress withdrew supportⁱⁱ. This outcome has consolidated national identity, but the successive civil wars have been highly destructive to the Nicaraguan economy and to U.S. influence. A democratic Constitution was adopted in 1987ⁱⁱⁱ. The FSLN lost the 1990 election but regained power in the election held in 2006. Their previous Marxist-oriented policy has moved towards a mixed economy.

The population of South Africa was formed from communities with seven different origins: the original Khoisan people, Bantu peoples who arrived in tribal groups from about 500 CE, Afrikaner farmers (Dutch, German, Huguenot and others) and their descendants who arrived from late 17th century, people of mixed race (called Coloureds), British people (mainly in finance, industry, and the professions) who came after British colonial control was established in the Cape in 1815, Indian plantation workers brought in from 1860 and their descendants, and Chinese workers brought in from about 1900 and their descendants. The formation of a single nation state from these various communities has proved particularly difficult. A militant Zulu state was established from 1816 and Afrikaner farmers (Boers) trekked north from about 1835 to found two republics. The first stage was the extension of British colonial control over the whole countryⁱ. The Zulu state was defeated in 1879 and the Boer republics were defeated in two wars ending in 1902. The second stage was an agreement between the British and Afrikaners to form a united self-governing state speaking English and Afrikaans, realised through establishment in 1910 of the Union of South Africa²⁰⁰. However, the Union was based on exclusion of non-Europeans, who formed about 75% of the population, from political, economic, residence, and property rights²⁰¹. The third stage, called Apartheid (“separateness”) started in 1948 and followed a more extreme Afrikaner agenda. It excluded non-Europeans from all citizenship rights and instituted racial discrimination in most areas of life, culminating in the establishment of a Republic in 1961. The fourth stage arose when it became apparent that Apartheid could not be sustained against internal and almost universal external opposition. It was dismantled from 1990^{ii, 202}, a Parliament was elected on universal suffrage in 1994, and a new Presidential and Parliamentary Constitution was adopted in 1996ⁱⁱⁱ. Nelson Mandela (1994-9) was elected President by the 1994 Parliament. Nine provinces are represented in the Upper House. There are eleven official languages: Afrikaans, English, Ndebele, Northern Sotho, Southern Sotho, Swazi, Tswana, Tsonga, Venda, Xhosa and Zulu.

Yemen was converted to Islam in about 630 CE and became part of the Islamic Caliphate. 1229-1454 the country was ruled by the Rasulid dynasty and 1454-1516 by the Tahirid dynasty. In 1516 it was conquered by the Ottomans, but a revolt by the Qasimid dynasty of Shi‘ite Imams had largely expelled them by 1635. The Ottomans returned in the 1830’s and captured the Yemeni capital Sana‘a in 1872. The South and East of the country became independent and was divided between 21 autonomous Sunni Arab tribes. Britain established a trading and refuelling port at Aden in 1839 and reached Protectorate

agreements with the 21 tribes. A border between the Protectorate and the Ottoman province was agreed in 1904, dividing the country between North Yemen (Ottoman) and South Yemen (British). On collapse of the Ottoman Empire in 1918, the Qasimid dynasty reasserted itself in North Yemen, establishing an independent kingdom²⁰³. The border with Saudi Arabia was agreed in 1934. The port of Aden was declared a British Colony in 1937. The North Yemeni monarchy became oppressive, and under the influence of Arab national sentiment a republic was proclaimed in North Yemen in 1962 and confirmed in 1967 after a civil war. In South Yemen, revolts 1963-67 forced the British to withdraw and a nationalist movement deposed all the tribal leaders and set up a Marxist republic. The two republics were aware of their common Yemeni identity and discussions started on reunification, which eventually took place in 1990^{i,ii}. The capital was located at Sana'a, the historic capital. A democratic Constitution was approved in 1991ⁱⁱⁱ. After failure of a 1994 Marxist revolt in the South and the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Marxist ideology was abandoned. Multi-party parliamentary elections took place from 1993 and presidential elections from 1999, confirming in power President Saleh (1990 to present).

The greater part of Slovenia was from 1355 ruled by the Hapsburg dynasty, which developed Trieste as their port on the Adriatic. It consisted of the Duchy of Carniola and the southern part of the duchy of Styria, areas where the peasantry spoke Slovenian dialects while the governing class spoke German. Ljubljana, the present Slovenian capital, was the capital of Carniola. To the east of Styria a small district of Hungary, now called Prekmurje, also spoke Slovenian. To the west of Carniola was a district called Küstenland (now Primorje), including Trieste, which had belonged to Venice until 1797 and been transferred to Hapsburg Austria in 1814. The eastern part of Primorje spoke Slovenian and the western part Italian. The Slovenian language was boosted and partly standardised by translation of the Bible in 1584 and the printing of other Protestant literature, although Catholicism was reimposed by Emperor Ferdinand II (1590-1637). Interest in Slovenian language and culture was reawakened in the late 18th and 19th centuries, when the modern form of the language was standardised. On the break-up of the Hapsburg Empire in 1918, its largely Slovenian-speaking areas were constituted as the province of Slovenia within the new state of Yugoslaviaⁱ, formed by the Serbs and Croats, except that the Primorje district was seized by Italy. Slovenia was invaded in 1941 by Germany and liberated 1941-45 by the partisans of President Tito (1945-80), who set up the Communist-controlled Federal Republic of Yugoslavia of which Slovenia was a constituent Republic. In 1947 Primorje (other than Trieste) was transferred from Italy to Slovenia. Efforts by Slovenia to assert its identity increased national awareness. On the collapse of Communism the Yugoslav state disintegrated, and Slovenia adopted a Constitution and declared independence in 1991^{ii,iii}. A brief attempt by Serbian troops to reconquer the country was defeated.

Croatia was formed from four territories, all of which are predominantly Croat speaking²⁰⁴ and Roman Catholic: Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, and Ragusa. Croatia and Slavonia were settled by Slavs in the seventh century CE and converted to Catholic Christianity by the ninth century. Dalmatia originally spoke a Romance language but adopted Croatian in early modern times. Croatia became a kingdom in 925. In 1102 Croatia and Slavonia became subject to the Hungarian Crown (Hapsburg from 1526) but were ruled autonomously by a royal Governor ("Ban") and Assembly ("Sabor"). Most of their territory was occupied by the Ottomans in 1526 and freed when the Ottomans were defeated by the Hapsburgs in 1687²⁰⁵. Dalmatia became subject to the Republic of Venice in 1420 and to the Austrian Empire in 1814. Ragusa (now Dubrovnik) was an autonomous city state 1358-1808, when it became part of Dalmatia. In the 19th century, increasing cultural and linguistic awareness led to a Croat sense of identity within Croatia, Slavonia, and Dalmatia but not to increased autonomy within the Hapsburg Empire. Croatia and Slavonia were unified in 1868. With collapse of the Empire in 1918, Croatia decided to join with Slovenia, Bosnia, Serbia, and Montenegro in the new kingdom of Yugoslavia²⁰⁶ under the Serbian monarch. This decision was disputed within Croatia, but at that time it was not in a position to assert an independent statehood against aggressive Italian, Hungarian, and Serbian claims²⁰⁷. Yugoslavia failed to become a nation and became paralysed by division, Croats desiring autonomy within a federal state whilst Serbia enforced a centralised administration largely manned by Serbs. Croatia and Dalmatia were unified in 1939^{1,208}. Yugoslavia was occupied by the Germans and Italians in 1941 and was liberated 1941-45 by Communist partisans, who set up a Federal Republic of Yugoslavia under President Tito (1945-80), including Croatia as a state under firm Communist control. The Istrian peninsula was transferred to Croatia from Italy in 1947. After Tito's death and the collapse of Communism, Croatia felt free to assert its national identity. A Constitution was adopted in 1990 and independence was declared in 1991 by President Tuđman (1990-99)ⁱⁱ. The 12% Serbian minority²⁰⁹

did not accept the new state and rebelled, resulting in a civil war won by the Croat government 1991-95. The Serb population has since reduced to 5%. From 2000, democratic elections have been heldⁱⁱⁱ.

The Ethiopian monarchy is first attested in the first century CE, and was converted to Orthodox Christianity in about 340 CE. The liturgical language adopted was Ge'ez, from a dialect of which descends Amharic, the country's present official language. Islam subsequently made an entrance, and the religious divide is now 63% Christian, 34% Moslem. The three Ethiopian dynasties – Axum (4th to 10th century CE), Zagwe (10th century-1270), and Solomonid (1270-1974) – were Orthodox and Amhara. The Solomonid dynasty adopted the title "Emperor". An Oromo incursion in the 16th century altered the tribal balance, making Oromo the country's second language. Other leading languages are Tigrinya and Somali, and in total 80 languages are spoken. Portugal established contact in 1508, and in 1543 Portuguese forces helped the Ethiopians repel a Muslim invasion. An attempt by Jesuit missionaries to convert Ethiopia to Catholicism led to their being expelled in 1633 and to the effective closure of the country to foreigners until the 19th century.

1769-1855 ("Time of the Princes") the Emperors of Ethiopia were puppets under the control of feudal aristocrats. In 1855 a member of the Solomonid dynasty, Theodore II (1855-1868), re-established imperial governmentⁱ. Emperor Menelik II (1889-1913) reasserted the present borders of the country, founded Addis Ababa as the capital in 1887, and in 1896 defeated an Italian invasion. Haile Selassie (1930-36; 1941-74)²¹⁰ implemented extensive reforms in communications, transport, education, and infrastructure²¹¹. Dissatisfaction with the weakening pace of development led to the Emperor's deposition in 1974 and a republic in 1975. The army then seized power and installed a Marxist regime which governed through mass executions and terror. It was overthrown in 1991 by a coalition of four regional armies (Amharan, Tigrayan, Oromo, and Southern) in the name of the Ethiopian nationⁱⁱ. A Parliamentary Constitution was adopted in 1994 and elections were held in 1995ⁱⁱⁱ. In 1996, 13 linguistically-based regions were established.

Ukraine comprises four principal historic regions: Central Ukraine, Western Ukraine (Galicia), Eastern Ukraine (the former Cossack territories), and the Crimea. In all of these, the predominant language is Ukrainian, except for the Crimea where it is Russian. The name "Ukraine" was first used in a serious cultural sense in the 1880's and in a political sense in 1897; until then, the usual term for the Ukrainian identity was "Ruthenian". The first Ukrainian state was founded in 882 by the Varangians with its capital at Kiev, and was called Rus. It converted to Orthodox Christianity in 988 and adopted a separate cultural identity by translating the Christian scriptures from Greek²¹². By 1054 Rus included most of present Ukraine, Belarus, and Western Russia, but lost control of this territory and in 1240 was destroyed by the Mongols. Central and Western Ukraine formed a state called Galicia-Volhynia 1199-1349. In 1344-1430 Central and Eastern Ukraine were conquered by Lithuania and in 1569 (with Western Ukraine) became part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The Ukrainian nobility became Polish in identity and attempted to convert the country to Catholicism. However, Eastern Ukraine was populated by the militant and fiercely Orthodox Cossacks (the Zaporozhian Host), who asked for and were refused religious and political representation by the Poles. In 1648 the Cossacks rebelled under their Hetman (ruler) Khmelnytsky (1648-57), and in 1654 transferred the allegiance of East Ukraine to Russia. The consequent wars, ending in 1667, gravely weakened the Polish-Lithuanian state. In 1772 Western Ukraine was annexed by Austria and in 1793-5 Central Ukraine was conquered by Russia. Meanwhile the Crimea was populated by Tatars who had owed allegiance to the Ottoman Sultan since 1475, but was acquired by Russia in 1783, initiating Russian settlement there. In this way, all parts of Ukraine apart from Galicia (Western Ukraine) came under Russian ruleⁱ.

In the 19th century, Russia treated Ukraine as part of Russia, ignored or discouraged the Ukrainian language, and encouraged the restoration of the Orthodox Church²¹³. Galicia was treated by Austria as a separate kingdom²¹⁴ and Ukrainian cultural activity was tolerated there. Towards the end of the 19th century, the term "Ukrainian" started to come into general use in both Galicia and Russian Ukraine by those interested in Ukrainian language, literature, culture, and history. After the Russian revolution in 1917, nationalist movements sprang up in both Western and Central Ukraine and in 1919 these sought to establish a single Ukrainian state. However, they were defeated in the subsequent wars and by 1921 Galicia had been incorporated into Poland and the rest of the Ukraine, together with Crimea, into the Soviet Union. The Soviets set up a Ukrainian Republic and encouraged use of the Ukrainian language, but caused the deaths of millions of Ukrainians by mass famine and oppression. At the start of the Second World War in 1939 Galicia was annexed by Soviet Ukraine, bringing all Ukrainian speakers into one political unit for the first time²¹⁵. In 1954 the Soviet Union also transferred the

Crimea, previously part of Russia, into the Ukraine. It was this state which successfully declared itself independent in 1991ⁱⁱ, in the name of the attempted independence of 1919. A democratic Constitution was adopted in 1996ⁱⁱⁱ, but there remain problems of identity in those districts including Crimea where Russian is primarily spoken.

The name Cambodia (of Indian origin) was first used by the Khmer Empire (802-1431 CE), which was of Hindu-Buddhist culture and at its greatest extent ruled what is now Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and South-East Burma. Its language, Khmer, language is indigenous to the area. The Empire built Angkor Wat 1113-50 and adopted Theravada Buddhism as the sole religion in 1295, but declined and was conquered by the Thai kingdom in 1431²¹⁶. A Cambodian monarchy re-established itself in 1516-94 but was again conquered by the Thais. Thereafter the country was controlled by either the Thais or the Vietnamese and was in danger of being absorbed by those countries, until King Ang Duong (1846-60) sought French support, which resulted in a French protectorate in 1863¹. The French stabilised the boundaries with Thailand and Vietnam, but invested little in infrastructure or administration. Khmer nationality was stimulated by Japanese occupation 1941-5, and King Norodom Sihanouk (1941-70, 1993-2004) secured independence in 1953. However, the Cambodian state was very weak, and was faced with incompatible pressures from Khmer nationalism and the Vietnamese Communist army, complicated by Chinese Communist ideology, American intervention, and peasant pressure for better conditions. Norodom Sihanouk (who throughout was the sole legitimate ruler) sought to accommodate with the Vietnamese and was deposed in 1970 by Khmer nationalists, provoking Vietnamese and US invasions. In the confusion a fanatical anti-Vietnamese Communist group (Khmer Rouge) seized power in 1975 in the name of peasant rights, destroying the Cambodian state and society and instituting a reign of terror. The Khmer Rouge were overthrown by a further Vietnamese invasion in 1979, establishing a protectorate over Cambodia and a return to normal life. The protectorate was terminated by agreement in 1991ⁱⁱ. The monarchy was restored and a constitutional and non-Communist state was established in 1993ⁱⁱⁱ.

The origins of the present states of both Ethiopia and Eritrea lie in the kingdom of Axum²¹⁷, located in north Ethiopia close to the present Eritrean border. Its ruler was converted to (Coptic) Orthodox Christianity in about 340 CE, and at the height of its power it also ruled much of South-West Arabia. The language of the kingdom, Ge'ez, became the liturgical language of the church, and from it descends Amharic (the official language of Ethiopia) and Tigrinya (the principal language of Eritrea), both written in the Ge'ez alphabet. The rise of Islam from 622 CE caused the kingdom to relocate towards the highlands, becoming the kingdom of Ethiopia, while losing control of the coastal region to Muslims. The coastal hinterland remained peopled by an independent Christian peasantry, who were subject to only nominal Ethiopian overlordship. In 1557 the coastal region was seized by the Ottoman Empire²¹⁸, transferred to Egyptian rule in 1865. From 1885 Italy started to occupy the coastal cities and in 1890 by agreement with Britain and France established a colony in the coast and hinterland, which it called Eritrea after "Erythraia", the Greek name for the Red Sea¹. Italian colonial rule created a state administration, with public services, a railway, and local industries, and recruited Eritrean soldiers ("askaris") into the local army. Asmara was selected as the colonial capital and became a largely Italian city. In 1941 Italian rule in East Africa was ended by British conquest. In 1952 Eritrea was transferred to Ethiopia as an autonomous province. In 1962 this autonomy was ended by the Ethiopian government, which sought to impose direct rule and the Amharic language. Rule as a separate colony with its own army had created an Eritrean national identity, and a revolt broke out which was eventually successful when Eritrea became an independent state in 1993ⁱⁱ. The religious balance is 50% Orthodox, 36% Sunni Muslim, 12% Catholic, and 2% other. 80% speak Tigrinya or the related Tigre as their first language²¹⁹. A border dispute with Ethiopia continues. The country is not yet constitutional, as no Constitution has been ratified nor elections held under President Afewerki (1991 to present), who rules a one-party state.

Tanzania was formed in 1964 by the merger of the separate states of Tanganyika and Zanzibar. Zanzibar (including the island of Pemba) was conquered in 1698 from the Portuguese²²⁰ by the Sultan of Oman, whose successor moved there in 1840, and in 1861 it became a separate sultanate in a branch of the same dynasty. The island was a flourishing trading centre, mainly for locally-produced cloves and coconuts and for ivory and slaves traded from the mainland. The sultan also controlled the local trading ports on what is now the Kenyan and Tanzanian coast and founded Dar es Salaam in 1866. The Zanzibari population comprised a minority of Arabs and Indians and a majority of mixed descent, called Shirazis. Under British pressure, the slave trade was abolished in 1876 and slavery itself in 1897. Tanganyika originated as a German colony called German East Africa, which was founded under a

1890 treaty between Germany and Britain, whereby Zanzibar became a British protectorate and the sultan's possessions on the coast were annexed. The borders with the neighbouring British, Belgian, and Portuguese colonies were also agreed. Whilst defeating two fierce rebellions²²¹ the Germans developed the colony, experimented with new cash crops (sisal, coffee, and cotton), built a railway, founded an advanced education system, and recruited an army of native soldiers ("askaris"). In the First World War (1914-18) German East Africa was conquered by the British and became a British mandated territory, renamed Tanganyika from the lake on its western border. Rwanda and Burundi, which had been part of the German colony, were transferred to Belgian control. Tanganyika is populated by about 120 tribes, which with one exception (Bukoba) do not have prominent chiefs and live mainly by subsistence farming. Experience showed that only about 4% of the land is suited for commercial agriculture, and in this respect Tanganyika differs from Kenya and Uganda where the more fertile land supports powerful kingdoms and tribes. The 120 tribes mostly have their own languages but are able to communicate in Swahili, the common language of Zanzibar and the coastal cities²²². Meanwhile, the British continued to rule Zanzibar through its sultan, an arrangement which favoured the Arab elite.²²³

In 1954 a Tanganyikan political party²²⁴ was founded and started to press for independence, which was achieved in 1961, its leader becoming President Nyerere (1962-85). In 1963 independence was also awarded to Zanzibar, and almost immediately in 1964 the sultan was overthrown in a violent coup which murdered a large proportion of the Arab population and seized their land. Tanganyika and Zanzibar were then merged as Tanzania¹, the ruling political parties also merging in 1977. Taking advantage of the relative social harmony and lack of competing sources of authority, Nyerere established a one-party state in which all central and local Government positions were nominated by the party, and used this position to impose a policy based on socialist dogma²²⁵. All leading commercial firms were nationalised and peasants were corralled into collective farms. The effect on both commerce and agriculture were disastrous, the currency collapsed, and the centralised bureaucracy became very corrupt. On Nyerere's retirement free enterprise and privatisation were cautiously introduced and the economy started to recover. The first multi-party elections took place in 1995¹¹. The capital was moved from Dar es Salaam to Dodoma in 1996, but Dar remains the largest city. The official language is Swahili apart from in higher education and the courts. Zanzibar, while following the same political direction as Tanganyika, is autonomous in most domestic matters.

The islands of Cuba and Española (now Haiti and the Dominican Republic) were the first substantial territories explored by Christopher Columbus in the 1492. They were inhabited by the Taíno people and became the centre for further Spanish exploration, the name Cuba being of Taíno origin. However, when after about 1540 the land and mineral resources of the American mainland were discovered, the Spanish colonists lost interest in both islands and neglected them. The islands were found to be ideal for the cultivation of sugar, the growth product of that period, later supplemented by coffee, tobacco, sisal, and other agricultural products, and large sugar-growing estates were formed. The Taíno population rapidly collapsed under pressure from enslavement and disease, and large numbers of slaves were therefore imported from Africa to work the plantations. Neglect of the western part of Española enabled the French to obtain a foothold, and in 1697 French ownership of what was called Saint-Domingue was recognised by treaty, the eastern part remaining Spanish as Santo Domingo, named after its capital city. Growth of the Spanish territories was held back by commercial restrictions, but these were removed by the new Bourbon dynasty after 1700, after which the economies of Cuba and (French) Saint-Domingue flourished as slave societies, while Santo Domingo remained neglected and undeveloped. The populations of all three territories had a similar structure: a European landowning elite supported by the Roman Catholic Church, a mixed race (mulatto) population, and a majority of slaves of African origin with some Taíno admixture. The common language in Cuba and Santo Domingo (now the Dominican Republic) is Spanish and in Saint-Domingue (now Haiti) is Kreyòl (Haitian Creole)²²⁶.

In 1791, under the influence of the French revolution, Saint-Domingue rebelled and after a destructive war with France²²⁷ became independent in 1804 with the Taíno name Haiti. Slavery was abolished, Church property was seized, and the European elite was expelled. The Haitian President Boyer (1818-43) occupied Santo Domingo in 1821, abolished slavery there, and sought to create a single state on the island. The principal plantation-owners migrated to Cuba, where the successful colonial slave-based sugar economy attracted many European immigrants, so that the African and mulatto population in Cuba is about 35% (of which 25% is mulatto) while that of Santo Domingo (now the Dominican Republic) is 84% (73% mulatto), and of Haiti is almost 100% (5% mulatto). Cuba did not become

independent at the same time as the rest of Latin America because of the slave-owners' need for Spanish protection. In Santo Domingo, the remaining elite resented the domination of Haitian French-speaking anticlericals and in 1844 rebelled²²⁸, expelling the Haitians and setting up the Dominican Republic²²⁹. This new republic had no sense of national identity and unsuccessfully sought protection from the European colonial powers and the United States, even returning briefly to be a Spanish colony 1861-65. A major rebellion in Cuba 1868-78, caused by Spanish misrule and the continuance of slavery, resulted in the remigration of sugar planters and other Europeans to the Dominican Republic, which finally became established as a sugar-producing economy and society. Under the Dominican President Heureux (1882-84; 1887-99) a start was made on road and other infrastructure. In Cuba, slavery was abolished in 1886, but nevertheless a further rebellion supported by the United States in 1898 (the Spanish-American War) ended Spanish rule, leaving Cuba an independent republic in 1902.

By the 1890's, United States commercial investments in the sugar, tobacco, coffee and other plantations of Cuba²³⁰, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic, and in their public infrastructure, had increased substantially, while the three countries still lacked a sufficient sense of national coherence to support stable and honest government. They were also held back by the social divisions which were the legacy of slavery. The United States was anxious to develop and preserve its overseas interests in Latin America, with the same imperial result as the major European trading powers with regard to their interests in Asia and Africa²³¹. Disturbed by political chaos, disorder, and inefficient government, the U.S. invaded and imposed protectorates¹ in Cuba (1899-1902; 1906-09), the Dominican Republic (1916-24), and Haiti (1915-34)²³². The protectorate administrations made considerable investments in public health, technical education, transport and other infrastructure, the army and public administration, while the investing U.S. companies made substantial profits. U.S. troops were eventually withdrawn because of the cost and public pressure. After an interval, the colonial function in each country was replicated by a dictator, who ruled by means of the army and police and by domination of the economy and society: Presidents Trujillo of the Dominican Republic (1930-61); Batista of Cuba (1940-44; 1952-59); and Duvalier of Haiti (1957-71)²³³. Duvalier was succeeded by his son (1971-86). Although Trujillo was the most megalomaniac of the dictators (he renamed Santo Domingo Ciudad Trujillo), his rule was the most effective. The Dominican economy continued to grow, and multi-party elections have taken place since 1996ⁱⁱ under a Constitution last enacted in 2010ⁱⁱⁱ. Cuba became economically and culturally dependent on the U.S., which Batista failed to correct, and in reaction President Castro (1959-2008) established a Communist dictatorship, destroying the private economic sector and causing much of civil society to leave for the U.S. A Cuban national identity has emerged during his rule which may later prove difficult to reconcile with the anti-Castro dissidentsⁱⁱ. In Haiti, the Duvalier dictatorship expelled much of civil society on racial grounds (it was largely mulatto), and the country remains the poorest and worst governed in the Americas.

The Development of Individual Nation States: 2000 Onwards

Senegal, Iraq, Lebanon, Serbia, Sudan, Côte d'Ivoire

The principal peoples of Senegal²³⁴ are the Wolof (41%) in the centre, Fula (Pulaar) (26%) in the north-east, Serer (15%) in the south-west, and Jola (Djola) (5%) in the south. 90% of the population are Muslims. The French established a coastal trading post at Saint-Louis in 1659, followed by Goree (1677)²³⁵ and Rufisque (1840). After French abolition of the slave trade in 1818, the principal trade was in peanuts, peanut oil, acacia gum, millet, and cotton. The only powerful state was the Islamic Tukolor Empire of the Fula people, founded by al-Hajj Umar (1848-64), which extended beyond Senegal to the Niger River. The colony of Senegal was created by the French Governor Faidherbe (1854-61; 1863-65), who conquered the native states, defeated the Tukolor Empire (1857), founded the port of Dakar (1857), and set up a colonial administration¹. His objective was to establish Senegal as the entry point for the French trading empire in West Africa, which he achieved by building railways within Senegal and to the French conquered territories to the east. Dakar became the capital of French West Africa in 1902 and of Senegal in 1960. Senegal surrounds the state of Gambia on the Gambia River, which became a British colony in 1889 and an independent state in 1965. In 1872 the towns of Saint-Louis, Goree, Rufisque, and Dakar were declared French communes and their African residents became French citizens, but these rights were not extended to other French subjects in Senegal or West Africa²³⁶. Pressure for greater autonomy from France started in 1946, but no progress occurred until the advent of the Fifth French Republic in 1958. Senegal became an independent state in 1960, under a French intellectual, President Senghor (1960-80) who ruled through the previous French-speaking elite.

Political stability has been aided by two peaceful transfers of power, in 1981 and 2000ⁱⁱ, and by the relative homogeneity of the country, although there is an unresolved Jola rebellion in the South. Whilst only 10% are full users of the official language French, most citizens are conversant with Wolof. From being a one-party state, multiple parties are now permitted, but all effective power remains with the president. Development was delayed by Senghor's policy of socialism, but from 1993 has been replaced by privatisation and free trade, resulting in steady economic growth. The present Constitution is dated 2001ⁱⁱⁱ.

Until 1918, what is now the state of Iraq was part of the Ottoman Empire, divided into three vilayets or provinces of Mosul, Baghdad, and Basra. With the defeat of the Ottomans, Britain set up a mandated administration²³⁷ within the present Iraqi borders, and after a tribal uprising had occurred installed a monarchy of the Hashemite dynasty in 1921 (King Faisal I, 1921-33). Under a nominal Constitution enacted in 1925, government was based on an oligarchy of tribal sheikhs, wealthy merchants, bureaucrats, and army officers. The country's sectarian divisions (approximately 62% Shi'a; 20% Sunni Arab; 15% Sunni Kurd, and 3% minorities - Christian, Yazidi, Mandaean, Shabak, etc) denied to this oligarchy the necessary cultural homogeneity for stable government, so that during the monarchy the average lifetime of administrations was about eight months²³⁸. The oligarchy also showed a Sunni bias inherited from the Ottomans. After nationalist pressure, Iraq became independent in 1932ⁱ, but a defence agreement with Britain and British control of the Iraq Petroleum Company ensured that country's continued influence. In 1941, Britain intervened militarily to depose a pro-Axis²³⁹ government and in 1948 the defence agreement ended. The army became the vehicle for dissatisfaction with the oligarchy, lack of social and economic progress, and continued British presence, and in 1958 it violently overthrew the monarchy and established a dictatorship. The violence of this and succeeding regimes up 2003 may have reflected its narrow sectarian base.

After four further coups, the Iraqi dictatorship was assumed by Saddam Hussain (President 1979-2003) in the name of the Ba'ath party, whose ideology was secular, Arab nationalist, and socialist. Saddam continued the army's previous programme of land reform, secularisation, nationalisation of banks, the oil industry, and leading companies, and development of infrastructure, education, and health services. He ruled through a pervasive Ba'ath party structure and a private security apparatus, based on the 20% Sunni Arab minority, and followed a policy of murdering and violently oppressing political opponents in the army, the ruling elite, and the Kurdish and Shi'a communities²⁴⁰. Wars that Saddam initiated against Iran 1980-88 and Kuwait 1990-91 undid his economic and social gains, and the consequent view by the U.S. and Britain that he was an aggressive tyrant led in 1990-91 to severe economic and military sanctions and in 2003 to their invasion and Saddam's deposition. Iraqi infrastructure was also gravely damaged. Resentment by the Sunni Arabs at their deposition from a leading role, exacerbated by interference by al-Qa'ida, has resulted in inter-sectarian violence. In 2005 a Parliamentary Constitution was adopted by referendum, leading to elections and multi-community coalition governments dominated by Shi'a politicians. Kurdistan has become a peaceful autonomous region. The commitment of all the Iraq communities to the Iraqi state seems not in doubt, but the country is now making its third and tentative attempt to form a nation state after two previous failuresⁱⁱ.

The core of the present state of Lebanon comprised the communities of Maronite Christians (in communion with the Roman catholic Church)²⁴¹, Greek Orthodox Christians, and Druze (a Shi'a sect) located with the port city of Beirut within the Ottoman Empire. Cultural and religious links were established between the Maronites and France from the 1860's. On the collapse of the Ottoman Empire in 1918 France was awarded control of Lebanon and Syria²⁴², and extended Lebanon with Sunni and Shi'a territories in order to create a viable state. In 1926 a Constitution was adopted, together with a non-codified agreement that the President should be a Maronite Christian, the Prime Minister a Sunni, and the Speaker of Parliament a Shi'a. These Constitution and agreement are still in force. The French intention had been to create a French-oriented client state, but in practice a Lebanese identity emerged and the country insisted on achieving independence in 1944ⁱ.²⁴³ The state was economically successful in trade and finance, but the sects continued to be socially separated and government was in practice an oligarchy of Christian, Sunni, Shi'a, and Druze community leaders, the Maronites being politically and economically dominant²⁴⁴ and many Shi'a being economically disadvantaged. This arrangement was disrupted by a shift in population towards Muslims, the present balance being about 60% Muslim and 40% Christian, and by the arrival from 1970 of about 400,000 Palestinian refugees who refused to accept the political or military authority of the Lebanese Government. A multi-sided civil war between Palestinian, Maronite, Muslim, and Druze militias which commenced in 1975 was enormously destructive²⁴⁵, and led to Syrian involvement as peace-

keepers in 1976. The war was resolved in 1990 by an agreement which adjusted the previous settlement, making the Prime Minister responsible to Parliament (rather than the President) and reducing the Christian participation in Parliament (previously 55%) to 50%. Militias were disbanded except for the Shi'ite Hezbollah, located on the borders with Israel. Syrian troops were withdrawn in 2005 after widespread demonstrations following the assassination of a popular former Prime Minister^{ll},²⁴⁶. Although economic growth has resumed, the restored oligarchy of religious groups remains at risk from Hezbollah or Palestinian disruption.

Serbia was settled in the seventh century by Slavs who were converted to Orthodox Christianity by 873. A feudal state was established whose ruler was recognised as king in 1217. This state conquered much of the western Balkans under Stephen Dušan (1331-55), but was overcome by the Ottomans at the battle of Kosovo in 1389 and finally conquered in 1459. The Serbian landowners were displaced by Turkish ones, although the peasantry remained Orthodox under the patriarchate of Peć 1346-1766. Decay of the Ottoman administration in the 17th and 18th centuries exposed the Serbs to oppressive misgovernment, so that many migrated to Vojvodina²⁴⁷, a Hungarian territory north of the Danube which became about one-third Serb in population and culture²⁴⁸. The modern Serb state was born in two rebellions around Belgrade, in 1804 and 1815. Serbian autonomy was recognised in 1817 and its territory was extended in 1833 and 1878, when the country became independent^l. Government was exercised by a hereditary prince²⁴⁹ and Skupština (Parliament) until 1882, when a kingdom was declared. In 1912 a successful war against the Ottomans and in 1913 a further successful war against Bulgaria extended the country's borders south to include Kosovo and Macedonia. The Macedonian language is significantly different from Serbian²⁵⁰ and the majority of Kosovars are Moslem and speak Albanian, although both have historic connections with medieval Serbia.

Serbia suffered the loss of about half its male population in the First World War. On the break-up of the Hapsburg Empire in 1918 it acquired Vojvodina from Hungary. The Serbian Patriarchate was re-established in 1920. In 1918 Slovenia, Croatia, Dalmatia, Bosnia, and Montenegro agreed to join Serbia in a new kingdom under the Serbian monarchy, which came to be called Yugoslavia. Of these, only the language of Slovenia is significantly different from Serbian. The supposed basis of the new state was a common Serbo-Croat heritage, but this proved insufficient, as each province had a different cultural history and experience of Ottoman rule. In practice, Serbia thought of Yugoslavia as an extension of the old Serbian state, a policy which was not accepted by the other peoples and resulted in political paralysis and a dictatorship. After German occupation 1941-45 and liberation by the partisans of Tito (President 1945-80), Yugoslavia became a tightly controlled Communist federation of separate Republics. Vojvodina and Kosovo were autonomous Provinces of the Serbian Republic, and Macedonia another Republic. On the collapse of Communism in 1990, each Republic or Province sought expression for its distinct nationality in autonomy or independence. Serbian nationality became fatally confused as to whether it represented a Serb nation state, or a union of all territories (whether Serb-speaking or not) with which it had a historic connection, or a union of all peoples speaking the Serb language. President Milošević of Serbia (1989-2000) sought to establish by force a Serb state of maximum possible extent, resulting in violent civil wars in Slovenia, Croatia/Dalmatia, Bosnia, and Kosovo, all of which were lost to Serbia by 1999²⁵¹. The independence of Macedonia (1991) and Montenegro (2006)^{ll} left Serbia in little more than its 1878 territory plus an autonomous Vojvodina. A new Constitution was adopted in 2006^{lll}.

Sudan was established as a political entity from 1820, when it was invaded by Muhammad Ali, Khedive of Egypt (1805-48), destroying the Sultanate of Sennar (1503-1821) and setting up a state in North Sudan with its capital at Khartoum. North Sudan refers to the northern two-thirds of the country, which had been Arabised and Islamised in the preceding centuries through immigration of Arabs who mixed with the indigenous Nilotic peoples. South Sudan refers to the south-east third of the country²⁵², which had been protected from Arabisation by the Sudd marshes. Egyptian control was extended to South Sudan by Khedive Ismail (1863-79). Slave trading was suppressed. After defeat of the Mahdist revolt (1883-98), formal British control over all Sudan was established in the guise of an Anglo-Egyptian condominium^l, and the borders with neighbouring states were defined. From 1924 the British administered the South separately from the North, discouraging North Sudanese influence there. Three separate identities arose. North Sudan speaks Arabic²⁵³ and considers itself of Arabic culture, while South Sudan speaks about 130 languages²⁵⁴, does not consider itself Arab, uses English for intercommunication and is increasingly Christian in religion. Dafur, in the west of North Sudan, is Muslim but contains many non-Arab speakers of the Fur language. There was an autonomous Dafur Sultanate, 1603-1875 and 1899-1916.

In 1946, the British reversed their previous policy and unified the administration of North and South Sudan. On independence in 1956, the desire of North Sudan politicians to promote the Arabic language and Islamic legal code was rejected by the South, which rebelled in two destructive civil wars 1955-72 and 1983-2005. Under the 2005 peace agreement, South Sudan has an autonomous Government with its capital at Juba, oil revenues are to be shared equally, and the South will have a referendum on independence in 2011. In addition, Dafur claimed economic discrimination and rebelled against Northern political control, 2003-6. Under a Constitution drawn up in 2005, a presidential election took place in 2010, but effective power remains with President al-Bashir (1989 to present). Under economic liberalisation the economy is expanding rapidly, and it is hoped that the problems of national identity are on the way to solution¹¹.

The first French trading settlement on that part of the West African coast which became the Côte d'Ivoire occurred in the 1840's. It had not been settled earlier by Europeans because of lack of a good natural harbour. At first, French colonial policy in West Africa concentrated on their base in Senegal. However, by 1886 the French had appreciated the potential of the Côte d'Ivoire for agriculture, agreed its borders with the British-controlled Gold Coast (now Ghana), and pushed inland. The country has about 60 ethnic groups. The principal resistance to French colonisation was shown by the Wassulu Empire, a Dyula-speaking Islamic confederacy which had conquered the North in 1878 but was defeated in 1898, and by the Akan peoples (Baoulé and Agni) in the East. The Dyula language remains in common use in the North. The Akan peoples had migrated from Ghana in the mid 17th century to escape rule by the Ashanti, and resisted French rule until 1915. The Southern forest area is occupied by another group of peoples, the Kru. The French declared a colony in 1893¹ and established significant production of cocoa, coffee, bananas, palm oil, and timber. It attracted many French settlers and the French population is still about 50,000.

French administration in Côte d'Ivoire was centralised in Paris through a Governor-General in Dakar (Senegal) and built up a small French-educated African elite, one of whom, President Houphouët-Boigny (1960-93), became ruler on independence in 1960. Houphouët-Boigny encouraged economic and administrative integration with France which greatly stimulated the economy, but his one-party autocracy failed to develop Ivoirian national identity or a functioning political system. Originally an ethnic Baoulé, he nominated another Baoulé as his successor. In 1983 he transferred the capital from Abidjan (founded in 1933 and still the administrative centre) to Yamoussoukro, his home village. In the 2000 presidential election, the candidate of the North and East (Dyula and Baoulé), Alassane Ouattara, was declared ineligible by a legal technicality and the presidency was assumed by Laurent Gbagbo (2000-2010), from the southern Bété people. Further elections were deferred from 2005 to 2010. The 2010 presidential elections were again won by Ouattara, but a civil war was necessary before he was able to assume office in 2011¹¹.

Non-Nation States

Some states are nations, but are ruled by a pre-national form of government. Certain other states do not yet have a sufficiently strong sense of national identity encompassing the whole country to be described as nation states. These are listed alphabetically.

Afghanistan, Bosnia Herzegovina, Burma, Kazakhstan, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Syria

Afghanistan did not exist as a state until 1709, being divided previously between the Persian Empire, Indian states and Bukhara. It was founded through the work of three dynasties: Hotaki (1709-29), Durrani (1747-1809 and 1839-42), and Barakzai (1818-39 and 1843-1973)¹. All these dynasties were Pashtuns, who are the largest tribe in the country in the South and East, with about 40% of the total population, and speak the Pashtun language. The remainder of the population speak Persian (50%) or other languages and belong to a variety of tribes²⁵⁵. Kabul became the capital in 1776. Afghan rulers were obliged to accept British control of their foreign policy 1880-1919. Afghanistan became a Republic in 1973, a Communist Republic in 1978, was under Soviet occupation 1979-89, and was ruled by the Taliban 1996-2001. Under the present Constitution of the Islamic Republic, adopted in 2004, presidential elections took place in 2004 and 2009 and parliamentary elections in 2005.

The Pashtuns have been described as "the world's largest (patriarchal) segmentary lineage ethnic group"²⁵⁶. With one exception, all Afghan heads of state (other than transitory) have been Pashtuns.

Government was historically by the strongest and most determined individual, who maintained his rule by deals reached within the Pashtun community and with other tribes. In this way, Afghanistan was and perhaps remains a tribal state as described earlier in this essay²⁵⁷. Recent Afghan history has included many successful national uprisings: against a British invading force in 1842 and 1919, against Soviet invading forces ending in 1989, and against the Taliban government in 2001. However, none of these has resulted in consolidation of an Afghan national identity transcending tribal loyalties. Without such national support, the various programmes to modernise the country, which are recognised as essential, have encountered determined resistance. These include the attempted reforms of King Amanullah (1919-29), President Daoud (1973-8), and the Communist Government (1978-9). The extreme and violent theocratic version of Islam imposed by the Taliban Government until 2001, and from 2003 by the Taliban insurgents, can be seen in part as a reaction against these modernising movements, in part against the Soviet occupation, and in part as a reassertion of Pashtun rule, although the present elected Government is led by and includes Pashtuns.

The territory of Bosnia originated as a boundary zone between Catholic Croatia to the north (subject to the king of Hungary), Catholic Dalmatia to the west (subject eventually to Venice), the Orthodox Serbian kingdom to the east, and the mountainous state of Montenegro to the south. The mountainous and wooded land of Bosnia did not encourage state formation²⁵⁸, and was populated by a largely Orthodox peasantry and a Catholic aristocracy which only periodically was under a single ruler, most notably King Stephen Tvrtko (1353-91). The south-west part was subject to various dukes and accordingly became known as Herzegovina²⁵⁹, although there is no real distinction between the two lands. Early in the Middle Ages, the aristocratic Bosnian Church became schismatic and independent of the Pope. It was accordingly persecuted and accused of the heresy of Bogomilism, but recent research has suggested that this was a calumny²⁶⁰. In 1463 Bosnia was conquered by the Ottomans, as was Herzegovina in 1478. Sarajevo became the Ottoman capital. Alienated by religious persecution, the Bosnian Church disappeared and the aristocracy converted to Islam, while most of the peasantry remained Orthodox Christians. In the subsequent wars, many of the Catholics migrated to Croatia, leaving a Bosnian population which became predominantly Orthodox (Serb) and Moslem (Bosniak), with a Catholic (Croat) minority. An 1875 rebellion against Ottoman misgovernment resulted in Austro-Hungarian administration in 1878 and annexation in 1908. Following the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918, Bosnia-Herzegovina became part of the new state of Yugoslavia. Unfortunately the quarrels within Yugoslavia between the centralising Serbs and federalist Croats inhibited any form of national cohesion in Bosnia, unlike in the other Yugoslav states, although all three peoples speak essentially the same language. When Yugoslavia disintegrated, the Bosnian Croats and Bosniaks declared in 1992 an independent republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina, but the Bosnian Serbs rebelled, wishing to incorporate it into the new Serbian state. In the vicious tripartite civil war which broke out, the Bosnian Croats and Bosniaks also fought each other, but reached a ceasefire in 1994 and formed a political entity in the south and west of the country called the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina²⁶¹, divided into 10 cantons to resolve communal differences. The Bosnian Serbs were finally defeated in 1995 and formed a separate political entity called Republika Srpska²⁶² in the north and east. These two entities have separate identities and autonomy but together constitute the state of Bosnia and Herzegovina, for which there is a three-person presidency and national Parliament²⁶³. The state is not fully sovereign, as a UN-appointed High Representative is empowered to impose decisions and dismiss officials. The population balance in the whole country according to the 1991 census is Bosniak 44%, Serb 31%, and Croat 17%, but population movements during the civil war mean that each entity is dominated by its respective people, and the boundary between the two entities is that existing at the ceasefire.

Burma has eight principle peoples, each with their own language: Burmese (Bamar), Karen, Kayah (Red Karen), Kachin, Rakhine (Arakan), Mon, Shan, and Chin. The Karen, Kachin, and Chin include a high proportion of Christians, while the remainder are Theravada Buddhists. According to official statistics, the Bamar are 68% of the population and Buddhists are 89%. In addition there are tribal peoples and some minorities of British, Indian, and Chinese descent. The Bamar established their dominance through three military dynasties: Bagan (1044-1287), Taungoo (1531-1752), and Konbaung (1752-1885), who conquered the Mon in 1757 and Arakan in 1784 but not (except transitorily) the other minorities. Following friction with British-ruled India, Burma was colonised by Britain in two stages, 1852 and 1885-6, and the monarchy was deposed. The country was treated as part of British India 1886-1935 and governed by administrators who often did not speak Burmese or address its problems²⁶⁴. Buddhism was disestablished. British rule extended only to the former Kingdom of Burma, not to the Karen, Red Karen, Kachin, Shan, and Chin, who only accepted British

suzerainty. Karens, Chins, and Kachins joined the British army in Burma and fought against the Japanese occupation 1942-5.

When in 1947 it became apparent that Burma would become independent, a conference was held at Panglong between Burmese nationalist leaders and the representatives of the minority peoples, at which it was agreed that Burma would be a single state but that the minorities would have special representation and autonomy¹. The minority peoples did not consider that this agreement had been honoured under the terms of Burma's independence and Constitution in 1948, and broke out in revolts which have continued intermittently to the present. These revolts, and other revolts by Communist groups, enabled the Military to seize power in 1962 and remain in power ever since. The Military pursued a strongly Bamar nationalist policy, and while formally recognising the minorities' cultural autonomy, have oppressed them politically. Buddhism was adopted as the official religion in 1962. In this way, neither events leading up to independence nor those since have established a cohesive national identity or evidently legitimate government. In addition, the Military's highly protectionist economic policy has held back national prosperity. A new capital, Naypyitaw, was established in 2005, replacing Yangon (Rangoon), which had been established by the British in 1852. The country was renamed Myanmar in 1989.

The Kazakh²⁶⁵ state was founded in 1456 CE, by two Uzbek tribal leaders, Kerei (1456-73) and Janybek (1473-80), who established a khanate which lasted until 1718 and which covered the approximate territory of the present Kazakhstan. The population of the khanate comprised pastoral tribes speaking the Kazakh language, which differs in detail from Uzbek, and who had adopted Islam in the tenth century. Borders were established in wars with tribal states to the north, west, and south. To the east, khans had to contend with the Mongol Dzungar Empire (1678-1757), the last steppe nomadic empire in Central Asia. In 1718 the khanate split into three clans ("jüz"), but was united temporarily by Ablai Khan (1771-81). After destruction of the Dzungars by the Chinese Qing dynasty in 1757, a stable border with China was maintained. Under pressure from Russian settlers, the western or "Junior Jüz" accepted Russian hegemony in 1731, the central or "Middle Jüz" did so in 1798, and the eastern or "Senior Jüz" do so in 1822, when the khanate was abolished. Russia set up a colonial administration for its central Asian provinces. Its military forts disrupted the nomadic pastoral lifestyle of the Kazakhs, who began to adopt agriculture, and from the 1890's large numbers of Russians settled in agriculturally productive districts. Following unsuccessful revolts in 1916 and 1917-20, the Soviet Union set up the Kazakh autonomous region in 1920 and the Kazakh Soviet Republic in 1936¹ under strict Communist control. Failed agricultural projects, forced population movements, and Russian immigration into North Kazakhstan meant that on the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989 the population was 40% Kazakh, 38% Russian, and 22% other nationalities including German, Ukrainian, and Tatar. In 1991 the Communist party leader President Nazarbayev (1991 to present) declared independence and was elected president, confirmed under a Constitution adopted in 1995. Departure of some non-Kazakh peoples and immigration of Kazakhs from elsewhere has altered the balance to 63% Kazakh, 24% Russian, other nationalities 23%. The risk of Russian-dominated provinces wishing to secede to Russia is therefore diminished, but Russian is understood by the whole population while only 40% are fluent in Kazakh. Nazarbayev, ruling through the Russian-speaking elite, has established a stable developing market economy which is now dominated by oil and gas, metal extraction, and wheat. The capital was moved in 1997 from Almaty²⁶⁶ in the South-East to Astana in the North Centre.

In Roman times what is now Libya comprised two provinces, each centred on a natural harbour: Tripolitania (Tripoli)²⁶⁷ and Cyrenaica (Benghazi). The provinces are now mainly desert and scrub apart from the coastal areas. After conquest by the Muslims in the seventh century and occupation by the Arabs in the eleventh century they became depopulated, being largely occupied by Berber and Arab tribes²⁶⁸. The harbour and city of Tripoli continued but Benghazi silted up and became a village. In 1517 the Ottomans assumed control of Cyrenaica and in 1551 captured Tripoli. The sovereignty of the Ottomans was ineffective or nominal until 1835, when they took direct power in order to counteract French influence from Tunis. The Sufi Senussi order arose in 1843 and established itself in southern Cyrenaica in coexistence with Ottoman rule. In 1911-15 Tripolitania and Cyrenaica were seized by Italy, but full Italian control was only achieved after a major Senussi revolt 1928-34 had been defeated. In 1934 Italy declared the two provinces, hitherto separate, to be a single colony and gave it the name "Libya", a Latin name of Greek origin. The Italians invested heavily in the coastal region, developed Tripoli and Benghazi, reopened Benghazi harbour and built a coastal road. Following Italy's defeat in the Second World War, Libya was ruled temporarily by the British and then became independent in 1951 under the rule of Sayyid Idris (Amir 1920, King 1951-69), head of the Senussi order¹. However,

at independence there was not yet a single Libyan nation and Idris was not considered capable of creating it. In 1969 he was deposed by Mu‘ammar al-Gaddafi²⁶⁹, an army colonel who proclaimed a republic. Gaddafi has governed Libya in a personal manner ever since, when necessary restructuring the governmental system in order to preserve his rule²⁷⁰. Political parties have been banned since 1972 and there is no formal Constitution. The principal source of income is oil, which has been used to fund substantial investment in housing and education, and the former tribal Libyan society has now largely become urban. However, until about 2003 Gaddafi followed a policy of nationalisation, and the isolation which resulted was enhanced by his eccentric and sometimes violent foreign policy. Since then privatisation and foreign investment have started and the foreign policy has become more stable. Until Libyan society becomes more open or Gaddafi leaves office, it will not be clear to what extent he has created a Libyan nation state from its two original components.

What is now Saudi Arabia comprises the Hejaz (the west coast, including the holy cities of Mecca and Medina), al Has (the east coast, including the oil-bearing areas), Nejd (the central area), and ‘Asir (south-west). From 967 CE the holy cities and sometimes the rest of the Hejaz were under the guardianship of a family whose head had the title Sharif, under the suzerainty of successive dynasties: Fatimid (967-1101); Ayyubid (1201–1254); Mamluk (1254–1517); and Ottoman (1517–1916). In 1550 the Ottomans also acquired al Has and nominal suzerainty over Nejd. In 1744-1818 and 1824-91 the Nejd family of al Saud, in alliance with the founder of the Muslim Wahhabi sect, rebelled against the Ottomans and conquered Nejd and al Has²⁷¹. These rebellions were eventually defeated, but the Saudi leader Ibn Saud was successful at the third attempt, conquering Nejd in 1906 and al Hasa in 1913. In 1917 the Sharif declared himself king of the Hejaz, after his army with British support had driven the Ottomans from Arabia 1916-19. However, Ibn Saud conquered ‘Asir in 1920 and the Hejaz in 1925, displaced the Sharif²⁷², and in 1926 declared himself king of the Hejaz. In 1932 the unified kingdom of Saudi Arabia was formed¹. The capital, Riyadh, is Ibn Saud’s home city.

King Ibn Saud (1926-53) ruled Saudi Arabia as a personal dynastic monarchy with the support of the Wahhabi sect, which promotes a strict monotheism against the allegedly idolatrous worship of Sufi and other shrines²⁷³. He concentrated on the development of the Saudi state rather than the extension of Wahhabism, so that he suppressed an attempt in 1930 by his militia (the Ikhwan) to invade other Arab countries and he reached boundary agreements with all the neighbouring states. Oil was discovered in 1938 and exploited from 1941, and the country still has the world’s largest oil reserves. Ibn Saud’s successors as king have all been his sons. The first university was founded in 1957. Slavery was abolished in 1962. Television was introduced in 1965 against clerical opposition. Women’s education has developed to the point that each educational stage is attended by about as many females as males. Although there are about 100 tribes²⁷⁴, the population is now 95% urban and political initiative comes from the extended al Saud family. The principal source of opposition to Saudi rule has been Islamic fundamentalists who claim that Islam is insufficiently enforced, perpetrating serious terrorist incidents in 1979 and 2003. 97% of the population are Muslim, of which at least 85% are Sunni.

The country of Somalia is defined by speakers of the predominant language, Somali²⁷⁵. However, historically it was never governed by a single ruler. At the time of European colonisation in 1888, there were four independent Sultanates²⁷⁶, corresponding approximately with the six clans or tribes which make up the Somali people²⁷⁷. Each clan can trace its lineage back to a single ancestor. Somalis have been Muslim from the early days of Islam. The capital Mogadishu is an ancient trading port. The British occupied North Somalia, but experienced from 1899 a fierce revolt²⁷⁸ which was not finally suppressed until 1920. The Italians occupied the remainder of the country, and after defeating revolts by the Sultans 1923-7 established an effective colonial administration. Both colonial territories were combined in an independent Somalia in 1960. Unfortunately, neither colonial rule up to 1960, nor independence, nor a military regime 1969-91 provided the country with a single political identity, other than devising in 1973 a standard Latin alphabet for the Somali language which has made possible a large increase in literacy. There was no Government 1991-2006. The country is now divided between three autonomous territories (Somaliland, Puntland²⁷⁹, and Galmudug), the Transitional Federal Government (TFG), and the theocratic Islamic Courts Union (ICU). The ICU has split, the more moderate Islamists joining the TFG and the more extreme (al-Shabaab) continuing to fight. Despite the anarchy, private enterprise and initiative has continued to develop the Somali economy and to invest in infrastructure and education. In 2009, Shari‘a was declared the official system of law, but a customary law called Xeer is also prevalent.

The state of Syria was established as a French mandate in 1920 on the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. The mandate determined its boundaries with Jordan and Iraq. The French ruled the country directly, putting down a fierce Druze revolt 1925-27. A separate state in Lebanon was set up in 1920, but other French attempts to split up the Syrian mandate were unsuccessful²⁸⁰. Independence was achieved in 1944, but the landowners who took power failed to address the problems of land reform or relations between the Sunni majority (74%) and the various religious minorities (Shi'a, Alawi, Ismaili, Druze, and Christian). The Ba'ath Party, which had more secular middle-class membership, arose to address these issues, but also adopted a policy of pan-Arab nationalism and state domination of the economy. After a series of seven military coups, the Ba'ath became dominant in the military and seized power in 1964. In 1966, an internal coup within Ba'ath gave power to supporters of a Syrian national policy, displacing those who sought a pan-Arab identity¹. Stable Ba'ath government was at last achieved when authority was assumed by President Hafez al-Assad (1970-2000), who was succeeded by his son Bashar. Syria remains a personal state in the hands of the al-Assad family²⁸¹, and has provided stability, economic growth, and a fair distribution of appointments for all confessional groups, but still with state domination of the economy. 80% of the population are Arab (Islamic or Christian) and manifestations of Kurdish or Armenian national identity are not permitted. Islamic law is applied, but a fundamentalist Muslim revolt was put down 1976-82. Parliament has no power and is populated by government nominees. Dissent is suppressed by the security apparatus, so that a functioning political system has not developed.

¹ Described below under "Territorial Empire".

² The question of subordinate nationalities, such the Catalan or Scottish, is discussed under "Transfer of Legitimacy to the Nation".

³ Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, though fully self-governing in 1919, were subject to United Kingdom foreign and defence policy, a constraint removed formally in 1931 but in practice much earlier.

⁴ These appear to include the last two shahs of Iran.

⁵ R. Dawson, *Imperial China* (Penguin, 1976), pp. 159-61.

⁶ A.G.R. Smith, *The Government of Elizabethan England* (Arnold, 1967), pp 42, 53.

⁷ R. Dawson, *Imperial China* (Penguin, 1976), pp. 176-7.

⁸ Wikipedia, quoting A. Maddison, *Contours of the World Economy, 1-2030 AD. Essays in Macro-Economic History* (OUP 2007). Calculations are at purchasing power parity.

⁹ See "The City State", below.

¹⁰ Part of a triangular trade in slaves from West Africa. Trade with Central and South America was largely a Spanish and Portuguese monopoly until the 1820's.

¹¹ An edict in 1598 establishing a degree of toleration for Protestants. R. Briggs, *Early Modern France 1560-1715* (Oxford 1977), p. 153.

¹² C.P. FitzGerald, *A Concise History of East Asia* (Penguin, 1978), p. 122.

¹³ Canton.

¹⁴ "The Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere".

¹⁵ This concept was elaborated into a philosophical system by T. Hobbes, *Leviathan, or the Matter, Form, and Power of a Commonwealth, Ecclesiastical and Civil* (1651).

¹⁶ Dates of monarchs are regnal years and of rulers are years of office.

¹⁷ G.R. Garthwaite, *The Persians* (Blackwell 2007), pp. 29, 32.

¹⁸ C.P. FitzGerald, *A Concise History of East Asia* (Penguin, 1978), pp. 38-40.

¹⁹ J.W. Hall, *Japan: From Prehistory to Modern Times* (Tuttle, 1971), pp. 169, 178.

²⁰ Neglecting the transient Ottoman Constitution of 1876.

²¹ J.D. Fage, *West Africa, History of* (Encyclopaedia Britannica 15th Edition, 1981), pp. 769-72.

²² And in India members of the Nehru family, subject to the Constitution, until 1989.

²³ L. Kochan, *The Making of Modern Russia* (Penguin, 1962) p. 255.

²⁴ D. Mack Smith, *Italy and its Monarchy* (Yale, 1989), p. 151.

²⁵ A. Cobban, *A History of Modern France*, Vol 2 (Penguin, 1965), p. 134.

²⁶ R. Dawson, *Imperial China* (Penguin, 1976) p. 196-7.

²⁷ Majumdar et al., *An Advanced History of India* (Macmillan, 1963), pp. 374, 397.

²⁸ R. Ghirshman, *Iran* (Penguin, 1954), p. 237-8.

²⁹ "The Development of the Nation State", below.

³⁰ C.P. Fitzgerald, *A Concise History of East Asia* (Penguin, 1978), p. 251.

³¹ Oligarchy as form of government is discussed below.

³² Dates of city states are those of their prosperity and independence.

- ³³ S. Moscati, *The World of the Phoenicians* (Cardinal, 1973), p. 49-51.
- ³⁴ A. Andrews, *Greek Society* (Penguin, 1977).
- ³⁵ Wikipedia entry.
- ³⁶ The dates are of their principal reforming actions.
- ³⁷ Author's estimate.
- ³⁸ Hansa means "guild".
- ³⁹ Wikipedia, *Hanseatic League* (July 2010).
- ⁴⁰ C.R. Boxer, *The Dutch Seaborne Empire 1600-1800* (Penguin, 1973), p. 11-15.
- ⁴¹ Dates of empires are those of their imperial status.
- ⁴² The principal other exception was the Mongol invasions which destroyed the infrastructure of Mesopotamia and Iran in 1219-58.
- ⁴³ W. Ensslin, in *Byzantium*, ed. Baynes & Moss (Oxford, 1948), p. 269-70.
- ⁴⁴ The process of reorganisation had commenced in 1803.
- ⁴⁵ Silesia was lost to Prussia in 1648. Belgium was ruled by the Austrian monarchy 1713-94.
- ⁴⁶ The Baltic States were independent 1918-40.
- ⁴⁷ Mongolia was a Soviet Protectorate 1924-90.
- ⁴⁸ A.J.P. Taylor, *The Course of German History* (Methuen, 1964), pp. 200-4.
- ⁴⁹ The dates are those of colonisation.
- ⁵⁰ Korea was a Japanese colony 1905-45.
- ⁵¹ The Indian Mutiny or Revolt 1857-9 is an obvious exception.
- ⁵² Ethiopia was occupied by Italy 1936-41.
- ⁵³ Puerto Rico and Guam, also acquired in 1898, remain voluntarily U.S. overseas territories.
- ⁵⁴ Constantine (312-37 CE), who adopted Christianity as the state religion, succeeded after a civil war.
- ⁵⁵ The earlier Seleucid dynasty in Persia (312-129 BCE) has been described as essentially military in nature. Almost all its rulers were assassinated. G.R. Garthwaite, op. cit., p. 73.
- ⁵⁶ J.M. Abun-Nasr, *A History of the Maghrib* (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 175-9.
- ⁵⁷ Occasionally, rule was by a federation of chieftains, such as Iceland before 1262, but such systems were never stable.
- ⁵⁸ J.M. Abun-Nasr, op. cit., pp. 11-2, 101, 135, 202.
- J.A. Williams, *Islam, History of* (Encyclopaedia Britannica 15th Edition, 1981).
- ⁵⁹ C.P. FitzGerald, *A Concise History of East Asia* (Penguin, 1978), p. 195. He was referring to Ming/early Qing China and early Tokugawa Japan.
- ⁶⁰ North Italy ceased to be part of the Holy Roman Empire in 1648.
- ⁶¹ Dates of foundation. The influence of each denomination spread over the following decades.
- ⁶² An Act of Edward I authorising enquiry into titles to land.
- ⁶³ An Act of Edward III prohibiting legal appeals to the Papacy.
- ⁶⁴ The Assize of Clarendon of 1166.
- ⁶⁵ The Soviet-dominated Communist states of Eastern Europe (1945-89) never possessed legitimacy, but nevertheless manage to hire local police and security forces.
- ⁶⁶ Obvious exceptions are the imposition of Roman Catholicism in the Latin American states by Spain and Portugal and in the Czech Republic (Bohemia) by the Hapsburgs. We do not refer here to the voluntary acceptance of a religion as a result of missionary work.
- ⁶⁷ In an agreement to be implemented in 2011.
- ⁶⁸ In many African countries, local aristocracies have been retained with cultural and ceremonial but no political functions.
- ⁶⁹ The recent break-up of the former Yugoslavia is an anachronistic exception.
- ⁷⁰ The dates are of enactment of a Constitution.
- ⁷¹ Subsequent events have shown that the replacement regimes in Iraq and Libya were not an improvement on their predecessors, and were arguably worse.
- ⁷² The first theoretical description of this was given in J. Locke, *An Essay Concerning the True Original, Extent, and End of Civil Government (The Second Treatise of Civil Government)* (1689).
- ⁷³ The author is indebted to Wikipedia and the 15th edition of Encyclopaedia Britannica (1981) for much of this information.
- ⁷⁴ Knights of the shire were country gentry. Burgesses were electors in towns and cities.
- ⁷⁵ Period of his greatest activity and influence.
- ⁷⁶ R. Briggs, *Early Modern France 1560-1715* (Oxford, 1977), Chapter 3.
- ⁷⁷ W.L. Shirer, *The Collapse of the Third Republic* (Pan, 1972), p. 92. The average length of Government in both the Third and Fourth Republics was six months.
- ⁷⁸ Regnal number of Swedish kings called Eric and Charles, though traditional, are fictitious.

- ⁷⁹ Western Pomerania remained Swedish until 1815, when it was acquired by Prussia.
- ⁸⁰ *The Constitution of Sweden 1989* (The Swedish Riksdag, 1990).
- ⁸¹ D. Birmingham, *A Concise History of Portugal* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 178 ff.
- ⁸² A dispute over the use of two forms of Greek, literary and popular, continued until 1976 when the popular dialect was officially adopted.
- ⁸³ C.M. Woodhouse, *Modern Greece: A Short History* (Faber, 1984), p. 212.
- ⁸⁴ Limbourg was partitioned between Belgium and the Netherlands.
- ⁸⁵ H. Vanderlinden, *Belgium: The Making of a Nation* (Oxford, 1920), p. 235 ff.
- ⁸⁶ There is also a small German-speaking area.
- ⁸⁷ Until 1821.
- ⁸⁸ The first known written document in Romanian is dated 1512. The Bible was first translated into Romanian in 1688.
- ⁸⁹ In 1821, Russia secured that part of Moldavia east of the River Prut (“Bessarabia”) and retained it until 1989, except for the period 1918-40 and 1941-44. It is now the Moldovan Republic.
- ⁹⁰ The treaty was called “Reglamental Organic” and retained formal Ottoman suzerainty.
- ⁹¹ Previous Constitutions had been adopted in 1866 and 1923.
- ⁹² The average length of Governments 1860-1922 and 1946-92 was 20 months.
- ⁹³ The title Emperor may have been adopted to show equality with the ruler of China.
- ⁹⁴ The Minomoto Shogun, followed by other families. 1185-1333 the shogunal capital was at Kamakura.
- ⁹⁵ The way had been laid for his achievements by Nobunaga Oda (1568-82) and Hideyoshi Toyotomi (1585-98).
- ⁹⁶ “Pictures of the floating world”.
- ⁹⁷ C.P. FitzGerald, *A Concise History of East Asia* (Penguin, 1978), p. 200.
- ⁹⁸ J.W. Hall, *Japan: From Prehistory to Modern Times* (Tuttle, 1971), p. 299.
- ⁹⁹ Standard German was based on the language used by Luther to translate the Bible (1522-34), which was also adopted by German Catholics.
- ¹⁰⁰ Germany was run by Army High Command as a military state, 1916-18.
- ¹⁰¹ The trigger was the publication in 1762 of *History of the Slav-Bulgarians* by Paisius, a Bulgarian monk, calling for autonomy from Greek rule.
- ¹⁰² The same war from which Romania achieved independence.
- ¹⁰³ The 1878 arrangements were for two Bulgarian states, but these were united in 1885.
- ¹⁰⁴ Macedonia was annexed to Serbia in 1912 and is now an independent republic. The Macedonian language is a dialect of Bulgarian. The Bulgarian population of Thrace was exchanged with Greeks living in Bulgaria in 1927.
- ¹⁰⁵ G. Sawyer, *The Australian Constitution* (Australian Information Service, 1975), p. 23.
- ¹⁰⁶ The founder of modern Finland was Marshall Mannerheim (1918-9; 1944-6).
- ¹⁰⁷ Iranian eras all relate to dynasties.
- ¹⁰⁸ Apart from Armenia and Georgia, which remained Christian.
- ¹⁰⁹ Modern Persian evolved in the 10th century CE. The Arabic alphabet was adopted.
- ¹¹⁰ “Guardianship of jurists”.
- ¹¹¹ Garthwaite, op. cit, p. 275.
- ¹¹² The President was confined to one 6-year term (except for 1949-55) until 1994, after which he/she is permitted up to two four-year terms.
- ¹¹³ Continued until 1975 by his widow.
- ¹¹⁴ In his first presidency Perón also employed censorship and violence against opponents.
- ¹¹⁵ The author is grateful for advice from Anthony Johnson on this and other Latin American countries.
- ¹¹⁶ The official name is still “República Oriental del Uruguay”.
- ¹¹⁷ As with other Latin American states, Presidents could not succeed themselves in office.
- ¹¹⁸ G. Pendle, *A History of Latin America* (Penguin, 1987), pp. 187-192.
- ¹¹⁹ J.A. Oddone, *Uruguay, History of* (Encyclopaedia Britannica 15th Edition, 1981).
- ¹²⁰ Uruguay had more political prisoners per capita than other Latin American countries which had counter-insurgency military governments during the same period for largely similar reasons.
- ¹²¹ Or Bohemia and Moravia.
- ¹²² 1919-38 Czechoslovakia included also Carpathian Ruthenia, a Ukrainian-speaking area now in the Ukraine.
- ¹²³ Although notoriously there was a law *nihil novi* which allowed a Sejm to thwart royal initiative, in fact this was often overcome, and the elected Polish kings were able to wage successful wars and promote legislative reforms.

- ¹²⁴ Mindaugas was crowned king and converted to Christianity, but the title and conversion lapsed.
- ¹²⁵ As Władysław II, founder of the Jagiello dynasty which lasted until 1572.
- ¹²⁶ Vilnius, whose population was then largely Polish, was annexed to Poland 1920-39.
- ¹²⁷ Lithuania and Estonia adopted new Constitutions. Latvia readopted its 1922 Constitution with amendments.
- ¹²⁸ Establishing the Yuan Dynasty.
- ¹²⁹ “Dalai” is a Mongol, not a Tibetan, word.
- ¹³⁰ O. Lattimore, *Mongols* (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 15th Edition, 1981).
- ¹³¹ Senior lamas are not hereditary, but are “found” and declared to be a reincarnation of their predecessor.
- ¹³² The Mongolian national hero, after whom Ulan Bator is named. 1921 is also considered the year of liberation.
- ¹³³ Primarily the army of Ungern-Sternberg, an anti-Communist warlord who had expelled the Chinese earlier in 1921.
- ¹³⁴ A law permitting Roman Catholics to sit in Parliament and accept Government office in the whole of the United Kingdom was passed in 1829.
- ¹³⁵ The Statute of Westminster.
- ¹³⁶ Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis and Terengganu.
- ¹³⁷ These are the years when they were officially Prime Minister.
- ¹³⁸ Nahuatl, Maya, Mixtecan, Zapotec, Tzeltal, and Otomi.
- ¹³⁹ The monarchy established by French troops 1864-67 is part of this struggle, but left no mark on Mexican constitutional history.
- ¹⁴⁰ Originated by José Vasconcelos (1920-24).
- ¹⁴¹ The Republic adopted the name “Colombia”, but is called by historians “Gran Colombia” to distinguish it from the present state.
- ¹⁴² President Reyes (1904-09) attempted to set up a 10-year presidency, but without success.
- ¹⁴³ W.P. McGreevey, *Columbia, History of* (Encyclopaedia Britannica 15th Edition, 1981).
- ¹⁴⁴ Adult females secured the vote in 1952.
- ¹⁴⁵ M.A. Carmagn, *Chile, History of* (Encyclopaedia Britannica 15th Edition, 1981).
- ¹⁴⁶ Allende died in the coup, which had strong U.S. support. The Chilean Congress had passed a motion of no confidence in him.
- ¹⁴⁷ M.J. MacLeod, *Ecuador, History of* (Encyclopaedia Britannica 15th Edition, 1981).
- ¹⁴⁸ Respectively Presidents Plaza and Ponce, the only presidents of that period (with Velasco 1952-56) to complete their terms.
- ¹⁴⁹ The name is of Awarak (Carib) origin.
- ¹⁵⁰ The official language is English, but the majority speech is an English patois with West African elements.
- ¹⁵¹ J.A. Williamson, *A Short History of British Expansion* (Macmillan, 1947), Vol 1, p. 290; Vol 2, pp. 335-6.
- ¹⁵² Unfortunately fashionable in Europe at the time.
- ¹⁵³ The name was changed from Transjordan in 1950. There was an exchange of territory with Saudi Arabia in 1965 which extended Jordan’s facilities at the port of Aqaba.
- ¹⁵⁴ R. Winstedt, *Malaya and its History* (Hutchinson, 1966), p. 34.
- ¹⁵⁵ The king is elected by the sultans from among themselves for a fixed term.
- ¹⁵⁶ Often based on previous Mughal irrigation works.
- ¹⁵⁷ Persian was the official language of the Mughal Empire, originally a Persian dynasty.
- ¹⁵⁸ Majumdar et al., *An Advanced History of India* (Macmillan, 1963), p. 930-3.
- ¹⁵⁹ J.A. Williamson, *A Short History of British Expansion* (Macmillan, 1947), Vol 2, pp. 330-1.
- ¹⁶⁰ Also called the Yi dynasty from their surname. Transliterations are from Wikipedia.
- ¹⁶¹ M. Lubis, *Indonesia: Land under the Rainbow* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 78-9.
- ¹⁶² R. Dawson, *The Chinese Experience* (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1978), Ch. 1., 3., & 7.
- ¹⁶³ C. McEvedy & R. Jones, *Atlas of World Population History* (Penguin, 1985), p. 171.
- ¹⁶⁴ The Opium War with the East Indian Company was a particularly discreditable event.
- ¹⁶⁵ C.P. Fitzgerald, *A Concise History of East Asia* (Penguin, 1949), p. 136-7.
- ¹⁶⁶ 30% still speak an indigenous language rather than Spanish as their first language. 25% speak Spanish and either Quechua and Aymara.
- ¹⁶⁷ Bolivia was allowed to retain use of a railroad to the Pacific. The loss has never been accepted by Bolivian opinion.
- ¹⁶⁸ Called “prorroguismo”.

¹⁶⁹ Coca is a traditional narcotic used by the indigenous peoples.

¹⁷⁰ Notably the scholar Muhammad ‘Abduh (1849-1905).

¹⁷¹ A Berber name, from which the country name is derived.

¹⁷² At the height of the Cold War, the US Government mistakenly supposed that the Việt Minh would spearhead a Communist insurgency across Asia, instead of being an essentially Vietnamese nationalist movement.

¹⁷³ The common practice among Latin American presidents was to forbid immediate re-election but to permit re-election later. A president who broke this rule, as Leguía did in his second term, was generally considered a dictator. Re-election is now legal under the 1993 Constitution.

¹⁷⁴ Haya de la Torre was twice denied re-election by the military, but the present President García represents APRA.

¹⁷⁵ Congress of the Republic of Peru (www.congreso.gob.pe).

¹⁷⁶ The claim was renewed by Venezuela in 1962.

¹⁷⁷ The name was taken on independence, from that of an 11th-century West African kingdom. It was previously called the Gold Coast.

¹⁷⁸ J.M. Abun-Nasr, *A History of the Maghrib* (Cambridge 1971), pp. 175, 258.

¹⁷⁹ The only French Government strong enough to attempt a more balanced Algerian policy before the Fifth Republic in 1958 was that of Napoleon III, 1852-70.

¹⁸⁰ The country is named after Mount Kenya.

¹⁸¹ In order to retain the railway from Mombasa under British colonial administration.

¹⁸² Nairobi University was established in 1964. From 1956, it had offered courses leading to degrees at the University of London.

¹⁸³ The name Singapore dates from about 1400.

¹⁸⁴ The economic success is a sign of the success of the national identity. Along with New Zealand, Singapore is a rare example of a state whose Constitution was established (by the colonial power) before the nationality.

¹⁸⁵ By Usman dan Fodio (1809-15).

¹⁸⁶ The cultural origins of the Igbo are traced back to the Kingdom of Nri (1043-1911), which ruled through religious ritual.

¹⁸⁷ The slave trade was gradually suppressed by the British navy, a process completed by the 1860’s. Legal ownership of slaves continued in Northern Nigeria until 1936.

¹⁸⁸ The name Nigeria was coined in 1897 by Flora Shaw, a writer on Africa who married Frederick Lugard, Governor of Nigeria 1899-1906 and 1912-19.

¹⁸⁹ M. Crowder, *The Story of Nigeria* (Faber, 1973), Ch. 15-17.

¹⁹⁰ Part of British-administered Cameroon was added to the North in 1961.

¹⁹¹ Hence the expression “banana republic”. The three companies also involved themselves with political factions.

¹⁹² W.M. Clegern, *Honduras*, in *Central American States, History of* (Encyclopaedia Britannica 15th Edition, 1981).

¹⁹³ Wikipedia entry: *Political Families of Pakistan* (2011).

¹⁹⁴ The Pan-American Highway was built in the 1940’s by the U.S. Government for military reasons. No Pan-American Railway was ever built.

¹⁹⁵ Two more were recognised subsequently: Busoga (1906) and Rwenzururu (2008).

¹⁹⁶ The principal export crops was yerba mate, a herbal tea, cotton, and tobacco.

¹⁹⁷ Consul Francia (1814-40); Consul/President Lopéz (1844-62); Presidents Lopéz (1862-70), Caballero (1881-1904), Estigarriba (1939-40), Moríñigo (1940-48), and Stroessner (1954-89).

¹⁹⁸ The ashes of President Lopez (1862-70), who fought unsuccessfully against Argentina and Brazil, were brought to the National Pantheon of Heroes, Asunción, in 1936.

¹⁹⁹ These dates includes periods when the president was a Somoza nominee, while the current Somoza remained effective ruler as commander of the National Guard.

²⁰⁰ Full sovereignty was obtained under the Statute of Westminster, 1931.

²⁰¹ In the Cape, Coloureds had some voting rights until 1959.

²⁰² Approved by a referendum of White voters in 1992.

²⁰³ In 1918, the dynasty called itself the Mutawakkilite kingdom of Yemen. Before then, it had accepted Ottoman suzerainty.

²⁰⁴ Croat, Serbian, and Bosnian are essentially the same language. Serbian (also spoken in Montenegro) is written in the Cyrillic alphabet, Croatian and Bosnian in the Latin one.

²⁰⁵ Zagreb became the capital in 1621 as it was outside the then Ottoman-controlled zone.

²⁰⁶ Officially named the “Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes” until 1929.

- ²⁰⁷ R.W. Seton-Watson and R.G.D. Laffan, in *A Short History of Yugoslavia* (Cambridge 1966, ed. S. Clissold), pp. 175-6. W.H. McNeill, *Balkans, History of the* (Encyclopaedia Britannica 15th Edition, 1981), p. 632.
- ²⁰⁸ At the same time, a district of Slavonia called Sylvania (Srem), largely populated by Serbs, was transferred to Serbia.
- ²⁰⁹ Many Serbs had fled to Croatia from Ottoman oppression of Serbia in the 16th and 17th centuries.
- ²¹⁰ The interval was the Italian conquest and occupation.
- ²¹¹ See below for the parallel history of Eritrea.
- ²¹² Provinces of Rus became the Principalities of Novgorod and Moscow, leading eventually to the Russian Empire.
- ²¹³ Because of various disputes, there are at present three Ukrainian Orthodox Churches. In addition, a branch of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (the Greek Catholics) accepted the authority of the Pope in 1595 and survives in the former Galicia.
- ²¹⁴ With the Hapsburg Emperor as king, under the name “Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria”, in memory of the former kingdom of Galicia-Volhynia 1199-1349. “Lodomeria” is a Latinised rendering of Volhynia.
- ²¹⁵ This summary ignores Carpathian Ruthenia (Zakarpattia), a small Ukrainian-speaking province of Hungary which was transferred to Czechoslovakia in 1919, to Hungary in 1938, and to Soviet Ukraine in 1944.
- ²¹⁶ Founded at Ayutthaya in 1341, as described above.
- ²¹⁷ Axum derived its wealth from trade in African commodities with Europe and Asia.
- ²¹⁸ Under the name the Province of Habes. The Ethiopian name was Bahr Negash.
- ²¹⁹ Eritrea has nine languages: Afar, Bilen, Hedareb (Beja), Kunama, Nara, Rashaida, Saho, Tigre and Tigrinya. Tigrinya and Tigre are mutually intelligible.
- ²²⁰ The Portuguese had seized Zanzibar in 1505, but regarded it mainly as a staging post for journeys further east.
- ²²¹ The Hehe tribe (Chief Mkwawa) 1891-94 and the Maji-Maji rebellion 1905-07.
- ²²² “Swahili” is a Bantu language whose name is derived from the Arabic for “coast”.
- ²²³ Z. Marsh & G.W. Kingsnorth, *A History of East Africa: An Introductory Survey* (Cambridge, 1972).
- ²²⁴ The Tanganyika African National Union, later renamed Chama cha Mapinduzi.
- ²²⁵ Nyerere picked up his ideas partly from the Fabian Society in Edinburgh and partly from his own reflections. His policy contrasted with that of President Kenyatta of Kenya (1963-78), who followed an open economic policy with successful results.
- ²²⁶ A quite different language from French, with Fon (West African) and other elements. It is an official language in Haiti along with standard French.
- ²²⁷ Led by the Haitian generals Toussaint-l’Ouverture (1801-2) and Dessalines (1803-6), both former slaves.
- ²²⁸ One of the leaders of the revolt, Juan Pablo Duarte, is regarded as father of the Republic although he never held public office.
- ²²⁹ Repeated attempts by Haiti to restore its rule in Santo Domingo were finally defeated in 1856. The Haitian-Dominican border remained undefined for many years.
- ²³⁰ Nickel and other metals are mined in Cuba.
- ²³¹ C.P. Hill, *A History of the United States* (Edward Arnold, 1966), pp. 150-58.
- ²³² Fiscal control of Haiti by U.S. administrators continued until 1947. M.J. MacLeod, *Haiti, History of* (Encyclopaedia Britannica 15th Edition, 1981).
- ²³³ These are the periods of effective power. Trujillo ruled sometimes directly and sometimes through nominee presidents.
- ²³⁴ The country is named after the Senegal River to the north.
- ²³⁵ Founded by the Dutch in 1588.
- ²³⁶ J.D. Fage, *West Africa, History of* (Encyclopaedia Britannica 15th Edition, 1981), p. 779.
- ²³⁷ A form of colonial rule mandated by the League of Nations, forerunner of the United Nations.
- ²³⁸ M. Khadduri, *Mesopotamia and Iraq, History of* (Encyclopaedia Britannica 15th Edition, 1981).
- ²³⁹ The alliance between Hitler and Mussolini.
- ²⁴⁰ Kurds were massacred with poison gas. The marshes in the South occupied by the Shi’a Marsh Arabs were deliberately drained.
- ²⁴¹ The Maronite liturgical language in Aramaic. There are also Catholic Christians whose liturgical language is Greek.
- ²⁴² By the Sykes-Picot agreement, 1916.
- ²⁴³ W.L. Ochsenswald, *Syria and Palestine, History of* (Encyclopaedia Britannica 15th Edition, 1981).

- ²⁴⁴ Men from the same families were appointed Prime Minister by rotation.
- ²⁴⁵ Complicated by an Israeli invasion in 1982. The Israelis did not finally leave until 2000.
- ²⁴⁶ Rafic Hariri.
- ²⁴⁷ Otherwise the districts of Banat, Bačka and Baranja.
- ²⁴⁸ Now about two-thirds, the next largest population being Hungarian.
- ²⁴⁹ From two alternating dynasties, Karađorđević and Obrenović. The Karađorđević dynasty ruled from 1903 until the fall of the monarchy in 1945.
- ²⁵⁰ Macedonian is close to Bulgarian though not identical to it.
- ²⁵¹ Serbia does not yet recognise the independence of Kosovo.
- ²⁵² The traditional provinces of Bahr el Ghazal, Equatoria, and Upper Nile.
- ²⁵³ Sometimes in addition to indigenous languages such as Beja and Fur.
- ²⁵⁴ Those with the largest number of speakers are believed to be Dinka, Bari, Nuer, Latuko, Shilluk, Zande, and Pari.
- ²⁵⁵ Bilingualism is widespread.
- ²⁵⁶ Wikipedia, *Pashtun People* (July 2010).
- ²⁵⁷ Above, “The Tribal State”. President Karzai’s first proposed list of Ministers after the 2009 election was largely rejected by Parliament as ineffective or corrupt.
- ²⁵⁸ The two towns where Tito was able to arrange political assemblies during his insurrection against the German occupation, Bihać (1942) and Jajce (1943), are in Bosnia.
- ²⁵⁹ From the German for “duke” (“Herzog”).
- ²⁶⁰ J. Fine, *The Bosnian Church: Its Place in State and Society from the Thirteenth to the Fifteenth Century: A New Interpretation*. (SAQI London, The Bosnian Institute 2007). Quoted in Wikipedia. Bogomilism was allegedly a Gnostic heresy.
- ²⁶¹ Washington Accord, 1994.
- ²⁶² Dayton Accord, 1995.
- ²⁶³ A single district, Brčko, is outside these two entities.
- ²⁶⁴ C. P. FitzGerald, *A Concise History of East Asia* (Penguin, 1978).
- ²⁶⁵ This is the conventional or Russian spelling. A more accurate indigenous spelling would be Qazaq. It has the same etymology as “Cossack”.
- ²⁶⁶ Formerly Vernyi, then Alma-Ata, a name of Russian construction. It is still the commercial centre.
- ²⁶⁷ The southern part of Tripolitani is called Fezzan.
- ²⁶⁸ J.M. Abun-Nasr, *A History of the Maghrib* (Cambridge 1971), pp 189-90, 377-8.
- ²⁶⁹ This is the spelling under local Libyan pronunciation. The written Arabic spelling is al-Qadhafī.
- ²⁷⁰ It is now divided into 32 districts or Shabiyat.
- ²⁷¹ And also Hejaz and ‘Asir in 1808.
- ²⁷² The Sharif’s sons became kings of Iraq (Faisal, 1921) and Jordan (Abdullah, emir 1921, king 1946).
- ²⁷³ A large number of historic Islamic sites have been destroyed on the grounds that they inspired idolatry.
- ²⁷⁴ Wikipedia entry: *Tribes of Saudi Arabia* (2011).
- ²⁷⁵ It is also spoken in North-East Kenya and the Ogaden region of Ethiopia.
- ²⁷⁶ Warsangali, Geledi, Majeerteen, and Hobyo.
- ²⁷⁷ Hawiye, Darod, Ishaak, Rahanwein, Dir, and Digil.
- ²⁷⁸ By the “Dervish State”, led by Mohammed Abdullah Hassan.
- ²⁷⁹ The source of recent Somali piracy.
- ²⁸⁰ The area around Iskenderun, which has a Turkish majority, was transferred to Turkey in 1938.
- ²⁸¹ They belong to the Alawi, a minority Shi’a sect.