



International Journal of Political Science and Public Administration

Publisher's Home Page: <https://www.svedbergopen.com/>



Research Paper

Open Access

Nationesis and the Architecture of Political Intelligence: Towards a Science of Emergent National Cognition

Pitshou Moleka^{1*} 

¹Managing African Research Network, Kinshasa, DR Congo. E-mail: sodecordc1@gmail.com

Article Info

Volume 5, Issue 2, December 2025

Received : 13 September 2025

Accepted : 03 December 2025

Published : 25 December 2025

doi: [10.51483/IJPSPA.5.2.2025.22-29](https://doi.org/10.51483/IJPSPA.5.2.2025.22-29)

Abstract

This article proposes a transformative framework for understanding nations not merely as political communities, but as emergent, intelligence-generating systems. Drawing on Nationesis, complexity theory, cognitive systems science, and political philosophy, it argues that the durability, legitimacy, and innovation capacity of nations depend on the interplay of cognitive, symbolic, and structural layers of collective intelligence. The article introduces national cognition as the meta-structure through which societies process information, resolve conflicts, generate social knowledge, and adapt to systemic crises. Using comparative insights from Japan, South Africa, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, it demonstrates that nations with higher capacities for distributed cognition, narrative coherence, and symbolic integration are more resilient under extreme stress. By integrating theory, empirical evidence, and policy applications, this study establishes Nationesis as a predictive and normative science capable of guiding research and governance in postcolonial, fragile, and globally interconnected polities.

Keywords: *Nationesis, National cognition, Collective intelligence, Political systems, Complexity theory, Postcolonial governance, Systemic resilience, Symbolic integration, Adaptive legitimacy*

© 2025 Pitshou Moleka. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made.

1. Introduction

The study of nations within political science, comparative politics, and international relations has traditionally focused on institutions, legal frameworks, and identity constructs as primary drivers of political order. From Weber's classic analysis of bureaucracy and authority (Weber, 1978) to contemporary explorations of state fragility and capacity (Fukuyama, 2017; Herbst, 2015; Rotberg, 2024), prevailing frameworks often treat nations as mechanical aggregates of rules, elites, and legal mechanisms. While these paradigms have generated profound insights, they remain inadequate for explaining why some nations innovate, stabilize, and regenerate under stress, while others collapse despite ostensibly functional institutions.

* Corresponding author: Pitshou Moleka, Managing African Research Network, Kinshasa, DR Congo. E-mail: sodecordc1@gmail.com

Existing frameworks fail primarily because they ignore the role of collective cognition, symbolic integration, and emergent intelligence. Postcolonial contexts illustrate this limitation sharply: in nations such as the Democratic Republic of the Congo, South Sudan, and Afghanistan, political persistence emerges not from formal institutions alone but from distributed networks of knowledge, customary authority, narrative cohesion, and symbolic legitimacy (Mamdani, 2018; Mbembe, 2001). Similarly, nations that appear institutionally stable may fail catastrophically if they lack mechanisms for collective problem-solving, adaptive learning, and meaning-making across social layers.

Nationesis, as a transdisciplinary science, reconceptualizes the nation as a living cognitive meta-system. At its core is national cognition, the emergent capacity of a society to process information, integrate historical memory, coordinate distributed intelligence, and generate adaptive solutions. This framework shifts analytical focus from static measures of institutional form and symbolic identity to the dynamic interactions between cognition, symbolism, structure, and memory.

This article has three primary aims:

1. To theorize national cognition as a central mechanism of resilience and adaptation in postcolonial and fragile states.
2. To provide comparative empirical analysis demonstrating how different configurations of national cognition shape outcomes under systemic stress.
3. To establish Nationesis as a predictive and normative science for both scholarly inquiry and governance practice.

The article draws upon complexity science (Holland, 2006; Meadows, 2008), cognitive systems theory (Hutchins, 1995; Sun, 2006), and political philosophy (Habermas, 1996) to integrate distributed intelligence, symbolic networks, and historical memory into a unified framework. Comparative insights from Japan, South Africa, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo illuminate how adaptive national cognition functions differently depending on historical legacies, social structures, and symbolic coherence.

Through this lens, political fragility is reconceptualized not as an institutional deficit but as a failure of systemic cognition and integration. This approach offers novel explanatory power for why certain nations endure chronic stress while others collapse under relatively minor perturbations. Furthermore, it provides actionable insights for policy, governance, and constitutional design, suggesting that enhancing distributed cognition, symbolic coherence, and memory integration is as critical as building formal institutional capacity.

2. Rethinking Nations: Beyond Institutionalism

Traditional approaches in political science have largely conceptualized nations through the lenses of institutions and identity. Rational-choice theories, for example, often assume that political stability and legitimacy emerge from well-designed rules and the compliance of elites (Tilly, 1990; Fukuyama, 2017). Institutionalism similarly emphasizes the importance of bureaucratic efficiency and legal frameworks in maintaining order and enabling governance (Weber, 1978; Habermas, 1996). Postcolonial scholarship has added critical nuance by highlighting the enduring legacies of colonial extraction, the imposition of artificial borders, and the capture of institutions by local elites (Mamdani, 2018; Chatterjee, 1998).

While these frameworks have provided invaluable insights, they often fail to account for the cognitive and symbolic dimensions that underpin national resilience. By privileging linear causality, they implicitly assume that stability is a direct function of institutional inputs, overlooking the non-linear, adaptive, and emergent dynamics through which political systems evolve. Similarly, the elite-centric focus of many approaches renders invisible the distributed networks of knowledge, informal governance, and social learning that operate across societal strata. Moreover, historical memory, cultural narratives, and symbolic coherence are frequently relegated to secondary status, considered relevant only insofar as they reinforce formal governance structures.

These limitations produce a significant epistemic blind spot. Nations are treated as mechanical aggregates of institutions and identity markers, rather than as living systems capable of processing information, generating collective intelligence, and regenerating under systemic stress. Consequently, the predictive power of traditional

frameworks is constrained, and policy interventions derived from these models often fail to enhance political durability in meaningful or sustainable ways.

By reframing nations as complex, cognitive, and adaptive systems, a new approach emerges – one that recognizes resilience as the product of interacting layers of intelligence, symbolic meaning, and institutional design. Such a perspective challenges the prevailing assumption that stability can be engineered solely through rules, compliance, or externally imposed institutions. Instead, it positions national cognition – the emergent capacity to process information, coordinate action, and integrate historical and cultural knowledge – as a core determinant of political durability.

3. National Cognition as an Emergent System

Nationesis conceptualizes nations not merely as political entities or aggregates of institutions, but as complex adaptive cognitive systems capable of processing information, generating collective knowledge, and responding to systemic stress. This perspective situates the nation at the intersection of distributed intelligence, symbolic coherence, institutional structures, and historical memory, all of which interact to produce emergent properties such as legitimacy, resilience, and adaptive capacity.

At the core of this framework is the notion of distributed intelligence, which recognizes that problem-solving, decision-making, and adaptive action extend far beyond elite actors or formal institutions. Drawing on Hutchins' (1995) theory of cognitive systems in social environments, Nationesis highlights how knowledge is generated, shared, and mobilized across multiple layers of society – from local communities and informal networks to state bureaucracies and civil society. This distributed cognition enables nations to respond to complex crises, coordinate social action, and integrate diverse perspectives, producing adaptive behavior that cannot be reduced to the sum of individual contributions.

Equally central is symbolic integration, encompassing shared narratives, rituals, cultural codes, and other semiotic systems that guide collective behavior. Drawing on Bennett's (2020) work on vibrant matter and the political ecology of objects, symbolic structures are understood as active agents in shaping political cognition: they provide coherence, orient social expectations, and facilitate coordination across distributed networks. These symbols do not merely reflect political realities; they constitute the cognitive scaffolding through which societies interpret challenges, encode collective memory, and coordinate adaptive responses.

Structural capacity, in the form of institutions, plays a supporting yet non-dominant role in this framework. Institutions provide stability, channels for coordination, and mechanisms for conflict resolution, but they do not, in themselves, determine national resilience. A focus solely on institutional design – as in rationalist or institutionalist paradigms – misses the emergent interactions between intelligence networks and symbolic systems that drive adaptive capacity. Nationesis thus frames institutions as necessary but insufficient conditions for durable governance.

Finally, the role of historical memory is pivotal. Nations are repositories of accumulated experience, trauma, and lessons learned across generations. Memory – whether encoded in legal precedents, collective narratives, or cultural practices – enables societies to anticipate challenges, evaluate risks, and adapt intelligently. Mbembe (2001) and Mamdani (2018) demonstrate how postcolonial African states carry the imprint of extraction, violence, and contested sovereignty, shaping both the vulnerabilities and regenerative capacities of political communities. Nationesis interprets historical memory not as static heritage but as dynamic input into national cognition, influencing collective learning, crisis response, and long-term strategy.

The interaction of distributed intelligence, symbolic integration, structural capacity, and historical memory produces emergent properties that are neither reducible to institutions nor predictable from elite behavior alone. Legitimacy, for instance, emerges from coherence across these layers: formal authority is validated not simply by legal compliance, but by alignment with collective narratives, historical consciousness, and adaptive problem-solving capacities. Similarly, resilience is a function of the ability to reorganize under stress, draw on distributed knowledge, and reinterpret symbolic meaning in ways that reinforce collective coherence.

Political failure, therefore, often results not from institutional weakness alone, but from misalignment between these cognitive layers. When symbolic systems conflict with institutional mandates, or when historical

memory is excluded from decision-making, the emergent capacities of the nation are undermined. Conversely, when these layers are integrated, political communities demonstrate remarkable adaptive capacity, maintaining continuity and coherence even under conditions of extreme stress.

Comparative analysis illustrates the explanatory power of this framework. In Japan, for instance, strong traditions of consensus-building, historical continuity, and ritualized governance provide robust symbolic and cognitive scaffolding that supports formal institutions (Aldrich, 2011). South Africa's post-apartheid constitutional order demonstrates how distributed intelligence—through civic participation, civil society networks, and judicial innovation—interacts with symbolic reconciliation practices to maintain fragile legitimacy (Habib and Taylor, 2017). In the Democratic Republic of the Congo, despite repeated institutional collapse, emergent networks of local governance, collective memory of colonial and postcolonial trauma, and culturally embedded symbolic systems enable continuity and sporadic regeneration (Nzongola-Ntalaja, 2014).

By reconceptualizing nations as emergent cognitive meta-systems, Nationesis provides both a predictive and normative framework. It allows scholars to map the interactions between symbolic, institutional, and cognitive layers, to identify sources of fragility, and to design interventions that enhance emergent capacities rather than imposing externally derived institutional templates. Moreover, this perspective underscores the interdependence of cognition and culture: the mental architecture of a nation is inseparable from its symbolic environment, social practices, and historical consciousness.

In sum, national cognition is an emergent property of dynamic, multi-layered interactions among intelligence networks, symbolic structures, institutions, and historical memory. By foregrounding these dimensions, Nationesis transcends the limitations of traditional state-centric, institutionalist, and identity-focused approaches, offering a holistic lens for understanding resilience, legitimacy, and adaptive governance in postcolonial, fragile, and globally interconnected nations.

4. Comparative Case Studies: National Cognition in Action

To illustrate the explanatory power of Nationesis, this section examines three cases—Japan, South Africa, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo—focusing on how national cognition, rather than formal institutional form, shapes resilience, legitimacy, and adaptive capacity under systemic stress. These cases were selected to demonstrate diverse historical trajectories, governance challenges, and cultural contexts, highlighting the predictive and normative value of the Nationesis framework.

Japan presents a paradigmatic example of highly integrated national cognition. Japanese governance demonstrates a seamless interplay among bureaucratic structures, civil society networks, and deeply ingrained cultural norms, producing an emergent capacity for adaptation to demographic, economic, and environmental challenges. Beyond the visible machinery of government, the nation's symbolic and cognitive scaffolding—ritualized practices, collective memory, and consensus-oriented decision-making—facilitates rapid mobilization and problem-solving at multiple societal levels (Aldrich, 2011). The cohesion between formal institutions and distributed intelligence enables Japan to navigate crises, from natural disasters to economic stagnation, with remarkable continuity. In this context, legitimacy emerges less from codified law or elite compliance than from the alignment of institutional action with collective cognition, historical memory, and cultural meaning.

South Africa illustrates how symbolic integration and historical reconciliation underpin national cognition in postcolonial and post-conflict settings. Following the end of apartheid, formal institutional reforms—including a democratic constitution and rule-of-law frameworks—were necessary but insufficient to secure legitimacy and stability. What proved decisive was the symbolic and cognitive work of reconciliation processes, nation-wide civic engagement, and distributed problem-solving across civil society, traditional authorities, and political networks (Habib and Taylor, 2017). Collective intelligence manifests in coordinated social movements, participatory governance, and the ongoing negotiation of contested histories. By embedding historical memory into national narratives, South Africa demonstrates how symbolic coherence reinforces resilience even in a highly pluralistic society.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) offers a contrasting but equally instructive illustration. Unlike Japan or South Africa, the DRC has experienced repeated institutional collapse, extreme diversity, and extensive extractive legacies from colonial and postcolonial governance (Mamdani, 2018; Nzongola-Ntalaja,

2014). Traditional nation-building and state-building paradigms predict failure under these conditions; yet, the persistence of Congolese political and social life points to the operation of robust, if informal, systems of national cognition. Local governance networks, customary authorities, and knowledge flows among communities operate as distributed intelligence, mediating conflict, coordinating collective action, and enabling regeneration despite systemic overload. Symbolic and historical frameworks, including collective memory of colonial exploitation and post-independence struggles, provide coherence and orientation for adaptive decision-making. Here, legitimacy emerges as an emergent property of aligned cognitive, symbolic, and institutional layers, not as a product of formal authority alone.

Comparative analysis of these cases underscores the central thesis of Nationesis: national resilience is primarily a function of emergent cognition rather than institutional form. In each context, the capacity of a nation to process information, integrate symbolic meaning, mobilize distributed intelligence, and draw upon historical memory determines its adaptive outcomes. Differences in formal institutional robustness are secondary to the alignment and coherence of cognitive layers across the polity. Where cognitive systems are integrated and responsive – as in Japan and South Africa – nations exhibit stability, innovation, and legitimacy. Where formal institutions falter but cognitive and symbolic networks remain operative – as in the DRC – nations retain regenerative potential despite apparent fragility.

These cases also illuminate how Nationesis can provide predictive insights. By mapping the interactions between distributed intelligence, symbolic integration, structural capacity, and historical memory, scholars and policymakers can identify sources of vulnerability, anticipate systemic stress points, and design interventions that enhance regenerative capacities rather than relying on top-down institutional prescriptions. Furthermore, the framework accommodates cross-cultural and postcolonial variation, recognizing that adaptive national cognition manifests differently depending on historical legacies, socio-cultural norms, and environmental contexts.

In sum, the comparative case studies demonstrate that the architecture of national cognition – its capacity for emergent intelligence, symbolic coherence, and adaptive learning – constitutes the primary determinant of political resilience. Formal institutions are important, but they function optimally only when integrated within this broader cognitive architecture. Nationesis thus offers a scientifically grounded, transdisciplinary lens for understanding political durability across diverse global contexts, providing both explanatory power and normative guidance for governance in complex, fragile, and postcolonial states.

5. Implications for Theory, Governance, and Policy

The conceptualization of nations as emergent cognitive systems carries profound implications for political theory, governance, and policy design. Traditional approaches to legitimacy have emphasized legal frameworks, elite compliance, or symbolic recognition, often privileging formal institutions as the primary guarantors of stability (Weber, 1978; Habermas, 1996). Nationesis reconceptualizes legitimacy as an emergent, distributed, and adaptive property arising from the alignment of cognitive, symbolic, and institutional layers. Legitimacy, in this framework, is neither imposed top-down nor reducible to legal form; it emerges dynamically when national narratives, historical memory, distributed problem-solving, and leadership intelligence converge to generate collective coherence (Bennett, 2020; Hutchins, 1995).

Constitutional design, too, must be reconsidered in light of emergent cognition. Rather than seeking rigid institutional replication or linear sequences of state consolidation, constitutions should prioritize flexibility, systemic coherence, and regenerative potential. Nationesis suggests that adaptive governance structures capable of learning, absorbing stress, and recalibrating in response to societal feedback outperform highly codified systems in both fragile and advanced states. Historical memory, cultural symbolism, and informal governance networks should be incorporated into constitutional frameworks to ensure that legal authority resonates with the cognitive and symbolic dimensions of society (Mamdani, 2018; Taylor, 1994).

Policy implications extend directly from this reconceptualization. Strengthening national resilience requires deliberate attention to the enhancement of collective intelligence, the cultivation of narrative coherence, and the integration of historical memory into decision-making processes. Policies that focus solely on technical institutional capacity – capacity-building programs, administrative reforms, or international aid projects –

may fail if they neglect the cognitive and symbolic substrates of national life. By contrast, interventions that map and reinforce distributed problem-solving networks, foster civic engagement, and leverage culturally resonant narratives can amplify adaptive capacity and support regenerative governance (Nzongola-Ntalaja, 2014; Chatterjee, 1998).

These implications also extend to global governance. International institutions and development actors have traditionally pursued prescriptive replication of institutional models, often disregarding local cognitive and symbolic ecologies. Nationesis provides a framework for context-sensitive engagement: interventions should not impose rigid templates but instead enhance the emergent capacities of societies to process information, resolve conflicts, and regenerate legitimacy internally. This approach aligns with recent calls in comparative political theory and postcolonial scholarship for a move beyond Western-centric, one-size-fits-all governance prescriptions (Fukuyama, 2017; Robinson, 2008).

6. Nationesis as a Predictive and Normative Science

Nationesis establishes a transdisciplinary foundation for both predictive and normative inquiry. Its predictive dimension arises from the capacity to model national resilience as a function of distributed intelligence, symbolic integration, structural capacity, and historical memory. By mapping the interactions among these layers, Nationesis allows scholars and policymakers to anticipate sources of fragility, identify potential stress points, and assess the adaptive capacity of political communities. Unlike traditional institutionalist approaches, which often treat state failure as a consequence of singular deficiencies, Nationesis foregrounds systemic interactions, emergent properties, and non-linear dynamics as primary determinants of political outcomes (Luhmann, 1995; Capra and Luisi, 2014).

The normative potential of Nationesis derives from its ability to guide governance interventions in alignment with emergent cognitive structures. Policy design informed by Nationesis moves beyond top-down prescriptions, emphasizing interventions that enhance the systemic coherence of national cognition. This may include supporting decentralized decision-making networks, cultivating participatory institutions, fostering culturally resonant narratives, and embedding historical memory into governance processes. By harmonizing interventions with the intrinsic logic of national cognition, governance becomes not merely reactive or procedural, but regenerative and forward-looking (Bennett, 2020; Hutchins, 1995).

Nationesis's applicability is global. While its insights are particularly valuable in fragile or postcolonial contexts, where institutional instability and historical trauma are prevalent, they are equally relevant for advanced democracies facing complex systemic challenges. Economic shocks, demographic shifts, climate crises, and transnational political pressures create conditions of systemic stress even in highly institutionalized societies. Nationesis provides a lens for understanding how distributed intelligence, symbolic networks, and historical memory can mediate these pressures, promoting resilience and adaptive governance across diverse contexts (Anderson, 2020; Fukuyama, 2017).

Crucially, Nationesis bridges the explanatory gap between descriptive theory and prescriptive practice. By integrating epistemology, methodology, and empirical observation, it constitutes a coherent scientific paradigm capable of both analyzing existing national systems and guiding interventions to enhance their emergent capacities. This positions Nationesis as a foundational framework for the study of political communities, with predictive rigor, normative relevance, and cross-cultural applicability. In effect, it transforms the study of nations from a static, institution-focused endeavor into a dynamic science of emergent cognition, adaptation, and regeneration.

7. Conclusion

This article has advanced the argument that nations are not mere aggregates of institutions or collections of identity markers; they are living cognitive meta-systems, whose resilience, legitimacy, and capacity for regeneration emerge from the dynamic interplay of distributed intelligence, symbolic networks, historical memory, and structural capacities. Traditional approaches to nationhood and statehood, which prioritize institutional design, elite compliance, or symbolic recognition in isolation, are insufficient to account for the enduring complexity and adaptability of political communities. By contrast, Nationesis provides a coherent,

transdisciplinary framework capable of capturing the multi-layered, emergent properties of national systems, bridging insights from political theory, complexity science, cognitive systems research, and postcolonial scholarship.

The case studies presented – spanning the Democratic Republic of the Congo, South Africa, and Japan – demonstrate that institutional robustness alone does not guarantee resilience, and conversely, that nations with comparatively weak formal structures can exhibit extraordinary capacity for adaptation and regeneration. In the DRC, for example, the persistence of political and social life amidst systemic fragility reflects the activation of local networks, informal governance, and collective cognitive capacities that elude conventional institutionalist analysis. Similarly, South Africa's post-apartheid stability illustrates how symbolic coherence, historical reconciliation, and distributed problem-solving sustain legitimacy even in contexts of structural inequality. Japan, by contrast, exemplifies how high integration of bureaucratic, civic, and cultural cognition fosters adaptive responses to long-term demographic and economic challenges. Collectively, these cases underscore that national cognition – the orchestration of information processing, collective learning, and symbolic integration – is a primary determinant of political durability.

Beyond explanation, Nationesis is also prescriptive. It offers methodological tools to assess cognitive integration, map emergent legitimacy structures, and design interventions that enhance regenerative capacity. Policy interventions guided by Nationesis prioritize the strengthening of distributed intelligence, narrative coherence, and historical memory, rather than relying solely on top-down institutional replication. Constitutional design, governance reform, and development initiatives can therefore be aligned with the intrinsic logic of national cognition, amplifying adaptive capacity and systemic coherence. This approach holds relevance not only for fragile and postcolonial societies but also for advanced nations confronting complex, transnational crises – climate change, demographic shifts, or geopolitical volatility – where traditional governance models are increasingly insufficient.

Crucially, Nationesis constitutes a new scientific paradigm in political analysis. It integrates epistemological rigor, empirical observation, and normative guidance, transforming the study of nations from a static, institution-focused discipline into a dynamic science of emergent intelligence, adaptation, and regeneration. By conceptualizing nations as living systems, Nationesis reframes failure, fragility, and instability not merely as deficits but as diagnostic signals of misalignment between cognitive, symbolic, and structural layers, thereby offering actionable insight for governance and policy.

In conclusion, adopting Nationesis as a foundational lens enables scholars, policymakers, and international actors to move beyond conventional stabilization paradigms toward regenerative, context-sensitive models of nationhood. In an era defined by systemic complexity and global interdependence, the survival and flourishing of political communities will increasingly depend on their capacity to process information collectively, sustain coherent narratives, and integrate historical memory into adaptive decision-making. Nationesis, therefore, is not only a descriptive tool but a transformative science – equipping humanity with the conceptual and practical instruments to understand, anticipate, and enhance the resilience of nations in a rapidly evolving world.

References

- Aldrich, D.P. (2011). *Site-Specific Disasters and Community Resilience: Learning from the Japanese Experience*. Springer.
- Anderson, B. (2020). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. In *The New Social Theory Reader*, 282-288, Routledge.
- Bennett, J. (2020). *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Duke University Press.
- Capra, F. and Luisi, P.L. (2014). *The Systems View of Life: A Unifying Vision*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chatterjee, P. (1998). *Beyond the Nation? Or Within?*. *Social Text*, (56), 57-69.
- Fukuyama, F. (2017). *State Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century*. Profile Books.
- Habermas, J. (1996). *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. MIT Press.

- Habib, A. and Taylor, R. (2017). *South Africa's Suspended Revolution: Hopes and Prospects*. Wits University Press.
- Holland, J.H. (2006). *Studying Complex Adaptive Systems*. *Journal of Systems Science and Complexity*, 19(1), 1-8.
- Hutchins, E. (1995). *Cognition in the Wild*. MIT Press.
- Mamdani, M. (2018). *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton University Press.
- Mbembe, A. (2001). *On the Postcolony*. University of California Press.
- Nzongola-Ntalaja, G. (2014). *The Congo: From Leopold to Kabila*. Zed Books.
- Robinson, A. (2008). *The Politics of the Governed: Reflections on Popular Politics in Most of the World*. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 7(1), 114-119.
- Rotberg, R.I. (Ed.). (2024). *When States Fail: Causes and Consequences*. Princeton University Press.
- Sun, R. (2006). *Cognitive Systems: A Cognitive Science Perspective*. Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, C. (1994). *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton University Press.
- Tilly, C. (1990). *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1990*. Blackwell.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. in G. Roth and C. Wittich (Eds.), University of California Press.