Education Insights

Article

Governance Efficiency: The Underlying Logic of National Rise and Fall

Yong Zuo[1,2,*]

1 Industry-University-Research Cooperation Office, Jiangsu University, Zhenjiang, China
2 Jiangsu University Research Institute of Engineering Technology, Zhenjiang, China
* Correspondence: Yong Zuo, Industry-University-Research Cooperation Office, Jiangsu University, Zhenjiang, China; Jiangsu University Research Institute of Engineering Technology, Zhenjiang, China

Abstract: The rise and fall of nations constitutes a classic research topic shared by political science, history, and institutional economics. Reviewing the cycles of dynastic change in ancient China, some governing entities dissolved rapidly, while many others endured long-term turmoil, partisan infighting, and ineffective leadership. At the root of such divergent fates lies the disparity in state governance efficiency, which constitutes the core factor determining political continuity. Governance efficiency consists of two dimensions: decision-making efficiency and implementation efficiency. Delayed decision-making closes the window for crisis response, while failed implementation erodes central authority and emboldens local forces, ultimately shaking the foundation of state power. Taking ancient Chinese history as the primary sample, this paper compares the Tianqi and Chongzhen reigns of the Ming Dynasty to dissect the internal logic linking governance efficiency to dynastic vicissitudes. It further analyzes the governance efficiency crisis in contemporary American political ecology stemming from partisan polarization and institutional friction. The study demonstrates that a high-efficiency governance system serves as the cornerstone of national stability and development, whereas institutional rigidification, factional strife, and disjointed government decrees inevitably erode efficiency and imperil national survival. Drawing lessons from history, this paper summarizes the operational laws governing efficiency and national destiny, offering historical references and practical implications for the construction of modern national governance systems.

Keywords: governance efficiency; decision-making; implementation; national governance

Received: 21 May 2026
Revised: 08 July 2026
Accepted: 23 July 2026
Published: 27 July 2026

1. Introduction

As recorded in Zuo Zhuan: "A state may rise suddenly and perish abruptly." This line precisely captures the cyclical rise and fall of feudal dynasties in ancient China [1]. Since the unification under the Qin and Han, successive centralized imperial systems spanned over two millennia, with markedly varying durations: the Qin Dynasty lasted merely fifteen years and ended during the reign of its second sovereign; by contrast, the Western Han, Tang, Ming and Qing each endured more than two hundred years, maintaining administrative functionality despite challenges such as eunuch influence, interference by kinship groups, governance shortcomings among rulers, environmental disturbances, and frontier-related tensions.

Historical analysis has analogized centralized imperial systems to organic organisms: the central ruling group functions as the nerve center, and the bureaucratic apparatus serves as the vascular network [1]. Impeded information flow, impaired central decision-making, and weakened local implementation inevitably contribute to systemic decline. Institutional economics emphasizes that the operational effectiveness of formal structures directly influences the long-term performance of political and economic systems, offering theoretical grounding for examining historical transitions through an efficiency-oriented lens.

From a political science perspective, governing effectiveness encompasses the comprehensive operational capacity of a state's administrative system, anchored in two interdependent dimensions: decision-making effectiveness and implementation effectiveness. Decision-making effectiveness refers to the timeliness and adaptability with which leadership assesses information, formulates policy, and adjusts strategy—the core capacity for responding to emerging challenges and leveraging opportunities. Implementation effectiveness denotes the real-world outcomes of directive transmission, policy delivery, resource deployment, and local-level administration—the capacity to uphold social order and sustain centralized coordination [2]. These two dimensions are mutually reinforcing: sound decision-making provides direction for execution, while effective implementation transforms strategic choices into concrete outcomes. Conversely, delayed or misaligned decisions hinder implementation, and inconsistent or fragmented administrative action undermines even well-conceived policies.

Across historical periods, declines in governing effectiveness have consistently coincided with major institutional transitions. The recurring pattern of consolidation and fragmentation in ancient Chinese dynasties reflects corresponding fluctuations in administrative effectiveness. A notable illustration is the contrast between the Tianqi and Chongzhen periods of the Ming era. During the Tianqi period, when authority was concentrated among palace attendants, intense factional contention and widespread dissatisfaction were present at court; yet relatively high levels of decision-making coherence and administrative responsiveness contributed to institutional continuity. In the Chongzhen period, following the removal of palace attendant influence, renewed factional divisions among civil officials significantly eroded both decision-making coherence and administrative unity, ultimately resulting in the dissolution of the imperial system.

In the modern era, imperial institutions no longer exist, yet governing effectiveness remains a fundamental indicator of national capacity and institutional resilience. Certain contemporary political systems were originally structured around principles such as separation of powers, competitive party frameworks, and multi-tiered governance, intended to balance authority [3]. Over time, however, these mechanisms have increasingly manifested as sources of procedural delay, inconsistent policy direction, and fragmented coordination across governmental levels—posing substantial challenges to coherent and responsive governance.

Drawing on historical and contemporary contexts, this paper first clarifies the conceptual foundations and analytical framework of governing effectiveness [4]. It then examines the role of effectiveness in institutional endurance using records from ancient dynastic transitions, conducts an empirical case study centered on the Ming era, and finally synthesizes observed patterns to support the central proposition that governing effectiveness constitutes a foundational determinant of institutional continuity and transformation—aiming to inform ongoing efforts toward advancing national governance systems.

2. Theoretical Connotation and Analytical Framework of Ruling Efficiency

Core Connotation of Ruling Efficiency: Ruling efficiency denotes the comprehensive effectiveness with which state governance activities—including information collection, crisis assessment, policy formulation, decree implementation, resource allocation, and order maintenance—are carried out through established political institutions, bureaucratic organizations, information channels, and supervision mechanisms. It constitutes a fundamental indicator for evaluating state governance capacity [3]. Within the full governance process, ruling efficiency rests on two interdependent dimensions: decision-making efficiency and implementation efficiency.

2.1. Decision-Making Efficiency: The Core Driver of Governance Systems

Decision-making efficiency governs the front-end links of the governance chain, encompassing four stages: information acquisition, situation assessment, plan formulation, and dynamic adjustment. Its core requirements include accurate information, rapid response, and adaptive flexibility [5]. Given the underdeveloped transportation and communication technologies of ancient times, the speed of information transmission directly influenced decision quality. An administrative system's capacity to promptly obtain critical intelligence on regional emergencies, social unrest, frontier security matters, and grain reserves; formulate response plans expeditiously; and revise policies in a timely manner directly shaped its capacity to manage crises.

High-efficiency decision-making systems exhibit three distinct characteristics: first, diverse and unimpeded information channels supported by multi-tiered information networks that minimize distortion and delay; second, streamlined decision-making procedures with clearly defined authority to eliminate interdepartmental coordination bottlenecks and redundant workflows; third, adaptable strategies capable of responsive refinement to evolving conditions, avoiding inflexible or prescriptive policymaking [6]. By contrast, low-efficiency decision-making manifests as information fragmentation, delayed analysis, procedural complexity, and policy rigidity, allowing minor challenges to escalate into systemic risks.

2.2. Implementation Efficiency: The Guarantee for Governance Delivery

Implementation efficiency encompasses the final stage of the governance process, referring to the capacity of administrative bodies across all levels to effectively execute decisions and achieve policy goals. Its essential components include seamless transmission of directives, clearly defined responsibilities, and robust oversight mechanisms [2]. Policy mandates, legal provisions, and resource allocation plans can only yield measurable governance results when consistently and accurately implemented through administrative channels down to the community level. Implementation efficiency fundamentally influences the reach of state authority and the stability of social governance.

High-functioning implementation systems exhibit three key characteristics: precise delineation of duties to prevent responsibility avoidance; faithful and timely transmission of directives from higher to lower administrative levels without omission, misrepresentation, or delay; and integrated supervision and performance evaluation frameworks that promote accountability through regular inspection, objective assessment, and incentive-based management. In contrast, weak implementation leads to declining directive adherence, reduced administrative responsiveness, and the emergence of localized operational patterns, which may gradually weaken coordinated governance across administrative tiers and impair institutional coherence [7].

3. Historical Lessons: The Efficiency Logic in Ancient Dynastic Cycles

A comparison of national fortunes during the Tianqi and Chongzhen reigns demonstrates that governing efficiency, as an external administrative factor, exerts a countervailing influence on a dynasty's internal stability [1]. Even amid deteriorating court administration, a highly efficient governance structure can prolong institutional continuity; conversely, systemic administrative failure and the complete loss of functional efficiency inevitably lead to dynastic transition.

3.1. High Ruling Efficiency: The Core Driver of Dynastic Prosperity

During the Tianqi reign, Wei Zhongxian exerted substantial influence over state administration, eunuchs held prominent positions in governance, factional tensions affected court dynamics, and public dissatisfaction increased [8]. Nevertheless, the Ming Dynasty maintained institutional continuity due to sustained administrative efficiency.

At the decision-making level, Wei Zhongxian facilitated resolution of procedural bottlenecks previously associated with certain civil official groupings, thereby streamlining deliberative processes and reducing interdepartmental delays. Through institutions such as the Eastern Depot and Imperial Bodyguard, a responsive information collection and transmission system was established, enabling timely reporting on frontier military developments, regional environmental challenges, and social conditions to reach central decision-making bodies. In response to military pressures from the Later Jin in

Liaodong and recurring regional environmental challenges, coordinated troop deployments, fiscal allocations for defense, and relief coordination were carried out efficiently. Even policies requiring adjustment could be refined through personnel realignment and strategic recalibration, supporting consistent operational responsiveness.

In implementation, administrative personnel were reorganized to strengthen accountability, with measures introduced to address bureaucratic inertia, procedural delay, and inconsistent adherence to directives. Fiscal reforms—including adjustments to commercial and mining levies—helped replenish state resources, alleviating long-standing constraints on defense financing. Oversight mechanisms extended across administrative levels, reinforcing directive transmission from central authorities to local execution units and sustaining institutional coherence. Collectively, while governance during the Tianqi period exhibited notable shortcomings, its streamlined decision-making pathways and effective implementation infrastructure preserved core administrative functionality, contributing to the dynasty’s continued operation [9].

3.2. Low Ruling Efficiency: The Fundamental Trigger of Dynastic Collapse

Upon ascending the throne, the Chongzhen Emperor reorganized the imperial administration, restoring influence to certain scholarly groups. However, longstanding differences among official factions intensified, resulting in a marked decline in administrative coordination and responsiveness [3].

Decision-making became increasingly fragmented: civil officials formed distinct groupings with divergent policy preferences, leading to protracted deliberations and procedural inertia that delayed responses to pressing military and fiscal challenges. Faced with sustained external pressures and widespread social unrest, the central government frequently adjusted command appointments and strategic priorities, missing opportunities to stabilize frontier regions and restore socioeconomic order. Policy formulation increasingly reflected internal institutional dynamics rather than empirical conditions on the ground [10]. In his final recorded statement, the Chongzhen Emperor remarked: "I am a man of shallow virtue who has incurred heaven's wrath, yet all these ministers have failed me."

Administrative execution weakened significantly: following the reorganization of official appointments, certain revenue streams—including commercial and mining levies—were discontinued, contributing to persistent fiscal shortfalls. Military garrisons experienced delays in stipend disbursement, and allocations intended for regional stabilization were inconsistently delivered. Ethical standards within the bureaucracy declined, as local functionaries prioritized localized interests over centralized directives, gradually diminishing the reach of imperial governance into local jurisdictions. Oversight mechanisms were reduced in scope and capacity, undermining consistent implementation of administrative mandates. The combined erosion of decisional coherence and operational effectiveness fundamentally transformed the Ming governance structure. In 1644, forces led by Li Zicheng entered Beijing, and the Chongzhen Emperor died by suicide, concluding the Ming imperial line.

4. Core Factors Shaping Ruling Efficiency

4.1. Institutional Design: The Foundational Basis of Efficiency

Political institutions constitute the fundamental basis for effective governance. Top-level design—including power allocation, organizational structure, and procedural norms—directly determines how decisions are made and implemented. In imperial China, institutional frameworks evolved progressively: from the Three Lords and Nine Ministers system, to the Three Departments and Six Ministries system, and later to the Grand Secretariat and Grand Council during the Ming and Qing dynasties—each reflecting deliberate refinements by governing authorities to align administrative structures with evolving societal needs and enhance operational effectiveness. Well-structured institutions promote balanced authority distribution, optimize procedural efficiency, and minimize internal coordination challenges; conversely, inflexible or poorly conceived arrangements hinder coherence and diminish overall performance.

4.2. Bureaucratic System: The Operational Carrier of Efficiency

The bureaucratic cohort serves as the direct agent of decision-making and implementation. Official competence, loyalty, cohesion, and professional ethics significantly influence governance performance. Systems for official selection, assessment, and supervision jointly determine the character of bureaucratic institutions: a merit-based, accountability-driven, and integrity-focused bureaucracy supports effective governance. In contrast, a fragmented, corrupt, or underqualified cohort produces persistent internal inefficiencies and impedes policy execution.

4.3. Communication Mechanisms: The Connective Link of Efficiency

Information underpins both decision-making and implementation. Historical mechanisms—including courier stations, confidential memorial systems, circuit inspection institutions, and imperial intelligence networks—as well as contemporary government information platforms and public opinion monitoring systems, all function as channels for information transmission. Unimpeded, accurate, and timely information flow supports evidence-based decision-making and effective policy execution. When information channels become obstructed, distorted, or concentrated, central authorities risk operating without adequate situational awareness, leading to concurrent failures in decision formulation and implementation.

4.4. Power Structure: The Critical Variable of Efficiency

The distribution of authority between central and local governance bodies, among central administrative departments, and across functional domains serves as a pivotal factor influencing operational efficiency. Excessive concentration of authority limits local initiative and weakens the alignment of policy formulation with practical implementation conditions; excessive dispersion of authority may lead to coordination challenges, inconsistent enforcement, and fragmented administrative outcomes that hinder coherent policy execution. A well-calibrated allocation of responsibilities and authority enables effective integration of centralized guidance with localized adaptability, supporting sustained high-performance governance.

Four interrelated dimensions—institutional design, bureaucratic systems, information infrastructure, and authority allocation—jointly determine the effectiveness of decision-making and implementation processes. When both decision-making responsiveness and implementation fidelity remain robust, governance systems can respond promptly to emerging challenges, enhance cross-level coordination, and maintain orderly development, thereby reinforcing institutional resilience. Persistent weakening or systemic deterioration in these two dimensions may allow unresolved issues to accumulate, amplify internal inconsistencies, and diminish institutional capacity, potentially resulting in long-term governance strain. This analytical framework offers interpretive utility for historical administrative patterns in imperial China as well as contemporary governance assessments in sovereign states, demonstrating broad applicability.

5. Ruling Efficiency: The Underlying Logic of National Rise and Fall

Ruling efficiency serves as the core thread interconnecting governance system operation, political system sustainability, social order stability, and the maintenance of ruling legitimacy [11, 12]. It follows a complete causal transmission chain: shifts in governance efficiency → operational status of administrative systems → vitality of political systems → capacity to respond to social crises → fluctuations in ruling legitimacy → ultimate trajectory of national development. Far more than a single administrative operational indicator, governance efficiency constitutes the underlying dynamic determining whether political institutions can function effectively, manage internal and external challenges, and sustain foundational governance structures. Variations in its magnitude trigger cascading consequences across governance domains that ultimately shape long-term national outcomes.

5.1. Ruling Efficiency Determines the Operational State of Administrative Systems

The bureaucratic administrative system forms the core vehicle of state governance, with governance efficiency—encompassing decision-making and implementation speed and accuracy—serving as the primary driver that activates administrative functions and standardizes bureaucratic operations. These elements are intrinsically interrelated. Under high-efficiency governance models, central decision-making benefits from timely information flow and well-defined authority frameworks, enabling rapid situation assessment, adaptive policy formulation, and dynamic refinement. Supported by comprehensive supervision and performance evaluation mechanisms, officials at all levels carry out their responsibilities effectively, ensuring consistent and faithful implementation of directives. Under such conditions, administrative systems operate with streamlined workflows, clearly delineated accountability, strong execution capacity, and responsive course correction. The administrative cohort achieves coordinated governance synergy, minimizing internal friction, procedural delays, and deviations from policy intent, thereby accurately translating strategic governance objectives into resource deployment and grassroots service delivery.

By contrast, sustained deterioration in governance efficiency undermines administrative functionality [13]. Sluggish decision-making impedes access to timely and accurate information, delays risk identification, and results in inflexible policies misaligned with evolving realities. Implementation shortcomings foster fragmented responses, role ambiguity, and superficial compliance, manifesting as delayed directive transmission, diluted policy application, and weakened frontline governance presence. Concurrent challenges—including institutional rigidity, coordination gaps, and information asymmetry—shift administrative systems from instruments of effective governance toward arenas of operational strain, eroding their ability to fulfill essential public administration functions and diminishing overall governance resilience.

5.2. Administrative Operational Status Defines the Vitality of Political Systems

Administrative systems constitute the operational foundation of political structures, and their functional condition directly determines the resilience and stability of political systems. Efficient and well-coordinated administrative functioning supports the implementation of central governance, facilitates balanced coordination between central and local institutions, and ensures that high-level institutional frameworks yield practical outcomes. This strengthens the system’s capacity for adaptive adjustment and functional restoration. Even amid transient challenges—including leadership transitions, localized institutional adjustments, and minor natural events—robust administrative mechanisms mitigate disruptions and harmonize diverse interests to maintain orderly governance and long-term institutional continuity.

When administrative systems experience sustained functional decline, the overall resilience of political systems progressively weakens. First, central governance effectiveness gradually diminishes, as state authority fails to be consistently implemented at the local level, allowing regional institutions to operate with increasing autonomy and reducing coherence in national administration. Second, routine inter-agency coordination challenges supplant policy implementation as the dominant focus of institutional activity, increasing procedural friction and diminishing adherence to established norms. Mechanisms for adaptive adjustment and functional restoration become increasingly ineffective. Political systems transition from dynamic, integrated configurations toward fragmented, inflexible arrangements, losing essential capacities to absorb external pressures and sustain institutional integrity.

5.3. Political System Vitality Governs the Efficacy of Social Crisis Response

All governance systems encounter recurring societal challenges, including natural hazards, land-related disputes, widespread economic hardship, and security-related incidents, all of which assess national capacity for coordinated response—an ability fundamentally shaped by the vitality and functionality of the governing system. Dynamic, well-functioning systems employ responsive decision-making structures to identify emerging societal risks promptly, supported by effective administrative mechanisms that ensure timely deployment of resources for emergency response, social stability support, and territorial security. Such systems contain localized challenges before escalation, maintaining societal equilibrium within manageable parameters.

By contrast, weakened or inefficient governance systems exhibit markedly diminished responsiveness to societal challenges. Inflexible and slow decision-making processes miss critical opportunities for timely action, permitting initial concerns to develop into broader systemic disruptions. Administrative functions may falter in delivering emergency assistance, social support, or public services; instances of mismanagement or misuse of resources during such events undermine public trust. Isolated incidents—such as natural hazards or socioeconomic strain—may thus intensify into widespread social instability, cross-regional disruptions, or compromised external security postures, resulting in profound societal disorganization and national-level operational strain [14].

5.4. Crisis Response Outcomes Reshape Political Ruling Legitimacy

Ruling legitimacy forms the core foundation of institutional continuity, grounded in effective governance—including public welfare provision, administrative competence, and orderly societal functioning. The quality of responses to large-scale challenges serves as a principal basis for public assessment of legitimacy. Timely and effective management of such challenges, coupled with sustained improvements in living standards and institutional coherence, reinforces public confidence and broad-based support, thereby reinforcing institutional legitimacy through a reinforcing dynamic: effective governance → improved public welfare → strengthened social cohesion → enhanced institutional resilience. This accounts for the enduring stability of many historical administrative systems despite internal leadership transitions or bureaucratic complexities, sustained by consistent governance credibility.

Conversely, persistent shortcomings in addressing large-scale challenges gradually diminish institutional legitimacy. When institutions consistently fail to alleviate widespread hardship, ensure equitable service delivery, or uphold accountability mechanisms, fundamental public expectations regarding fairness and wellbeing remain unmet. Confidence in institutional capacity and commitment weakens progressively, and traditional frameworks for assessing institutional authority—rooted in historical patterns of performance-based recognition—lose resonance over time. Public alignment with institutional purposes and shared societal goals recedes, undermining the broad-based engagement essential for long-term institutional sustainability.

5.5. Fluctuations in Legitimacy Determine the Final Outcome of National Rise or Fall

Net gains or losses in governing legitimacy constitute the ultimate decisive factor for national rise and fall, with governance efficiency serving as the underlying logic permeating the entire causal chain. The trajectory of national prosperity unfolds as follows: high-efficiency governance drives healthy administrative operation, activates institutional vitality, enables precise resolution of diverse social challenges, consolidates broad public support, and reinforces governing legitimacy—ultimately contributing to long-term state stability and sustained historical continuity. The enduring strength of ancient dynasties such as the Han and Tang did not rely solely on individual leadership qualities, but rather stemmed from robust decision-making and implementation systems established during their formative and mature phases, sustaining a virtuous cycle of governance that preserved legitimacy over extended periods.

The trajectory of dynastic decline follows the reverse sequence: sustained deterioration of governance efficiency triggers cascading consequences—administrative dysfunction, institutional weakening, systemic failure in responding to crises, and progressive erosion of governing legitimacy—culminating in fundamental shifts in political order and historical transition. The Qin Dynasty's rapid dissolution resulted from institutional rigidity and breakdown in governance capacity, while the Ming Dynasty's conclusion during the Chongzhen period reflected comprehensive inefficiency and diminished societal confidence—both rooted in the collapse of functional governance, which disrupted virtuous cycles and undermined foundational conditions for continuity. In contemporary contexts, deepening institutional fragmentation and political polarization in certain countries have similarly impaired governance effectiveness, gradually weakening public trust and institutional credibility, thereby generating persistent challenges in national administration. In summary, governance efficiency ultimately shapes the trajectory of nations and institutions, representing the indispensable core determinant of historical development and institutional resilience [15].

6. Practical Implications

Governance efficiency constitutes a central factor shaping national trajectories. Across historical periods—from imperial polities to contemporary nation-states—the interplay between decision-making capacity and implementation effectiveness forms a foundational dimension of governance systems. High-efficiency governance contributes to risk mitigation, social cohesion, and institutional continuity; conversely, diminished governance performance may exacerbate societal tensions, impair institutional functionality, and undermine long-term viability.

Historical patterns indicate that governance capacity tends to follow cyclical variation over time. At institutional inception, reforms are introduced, administrative structures are refreshed, and performance peaks—often coinciding with periods of broad-based prosperity. Over successive phases, however, structural inflexibility, factional dynamics, and erosion of administrative integrity gradually reduce functional efficacy. When core governance mechanisms become significantly impaired, systemic transition becomes increasingly likely. The contrast between successive administrative periods during the Ming Dynasty illustrates this pattern. In recent decades, institutional frameworks have evolved alongside measurable improvements in governance performance.

Historical analysis of governance practices offers insight into enduring principles underlying state development. Foundational institutions serve as structural anchors for state formation, while internal systemic attributes act as primary determinants of developmental outcomes. Sustained competitiveness arises only when institutional design is matched by operational maturity and executional reliability. Institutional arrangements supporting coordinated action across administrative levels facilitate the translation of structural advantages into tangible developmental outcomes. Administrative coherence and policy coherence enable consistent implementation. Supported by enhanced governance performance, sustained progress has been achieved across multiple domains. A longitudinal perspective confirms that variations in governance efficiency correlate strongly with shifts in national developmental trajectories.

Recent institutional refinements have emphasized systematic enhancement of governance capacity and responsiveness. Collaborative governance models have been advanced, integrating diverse stakeholders in shared responsibility frameworks. Decision-making processes have been strengthened through evidence-informed approaches, implementation pathways have been optimized, and anticipatory mechanisms for systemic challenges have been expanded. Governance modernization has supported balanced economic advancement, equitable spatial development, and improved quality-of-life indicators. Economic expansion, demographic resilience, and improvements in human development metrics reflect these advances. Ongoing upgrades in governance infrastructure support continued progress along established developmental pathways.

References

1. J. W. Dardess, *Ming China, 1368–1644: A Concise History of a Resilient Empire*. London, UK: Bloomsbury Publishing PLC, 2011.

2. P. S. Ropp, *China in World History*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2010.
3. D. C. North, *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
4. W. Tang, "The Entanglements of the Empress: A Re-Examination of the Generation of the Stele of Heir Apparent's Making Transcendents and Its Political Implications," *Frontiers of History in China*, vol. 21, no. 2, p. 121, 2023.
5. J. T. Dreyer, *China's Political System: Modernization and Tradition*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2018.
6. D. N. McCloskey, *Bourgeois Equality: How Ideas, Not Capital or Institutions, Enriched the World*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2016.
7. K. C. Doğan, "Dynastic Bureaucracy in Ancient and Imperial China: A Weberian Review," 2023.
8. F. Xie, "A Theory of National Resilience Surplus: The Protocol for a Global Thought Laboratory," SSRN, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://ssrn.com/abstract=6607619.
9. J. C. Bradbury and W. M. Crain, "Bicameral legislatures and fiscal policy," *Southern Economic Journal*, vol. 68, no. 3, pp. 646–659, 2002.
10. H. Van der Wee, "The Rise of the Western World: A New Economic History," *Business History Review*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 237–239, 1975.
11. S. Weiguo, "The historical narrative of the Wanli Korean campaign in the Qing Official Ming History," *Chinese Studies in History*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 76–100, 2019.
12. K. Knight, "The Politics of Attention: How Government Prioritizes Problems," *University of Chicago Press*, 2008.
13. J. Bendor and T. M. Moe, "An adaptive model of bureaucratic politics," *American Political Science Review*, vol. 79, no. 3, pp. 755–774, 1985.
14. N. McCarty, K. T. Poole, and H. Rosenthal, *Polarized America: The Dance of Ideology and Unequal Riches*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2016.
15. P. M. Blau, *The Dynamics of Bureaucracy: A Study of Interpersonal Relations in Two Government Agencies*, rev. ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1963.