

POWER POLARITY IN THE FAR EASTERN WORLD SYSTEM 1025 BC--AD 1850: NARRATIVE AND 25-YEAR INTERVAL DATA

David Wilkinson

Journal of World-Systems Research, Vol V, 3, 1999, 501-617

<http://jwsr.ucr.edu/>

ISSN 1076-156X

© 1999 David Wilkinson.

ABSTRACT

Power polarity in the Far Eastern macrosocial system is assessed at twenty-five year intervals 1050 BC--AD 1850. Consistent with analysis of Indic system data, there is no support for the theory that the normal world-system power configuration is multipolar, hegemonic, or universal-empire. Instead, several different "stability epochs" are discerned.

This study provides some of the first systematic long-term data on the evolution of the political structure of the Far Eastern world system, based on a range of valid and reliable archaeological and historical sources. It is part of an ongoing attempt to expand the space-time horizon of such disciplines as international relations and world systems research, and to heighten the attention to empirical data of the more humanistic discipline of civilizational studies.

1. Reprise: Project, Units of Analysis, Variable Values

This is one in a series of articles and papers exploring various aspects of very large scale social systems from an empirical, comparative-historical perspective. To denote its unit of analysis, it uses the terms "civilization," "world system," or "macrosocial system" more or less interchangeably. "Civilization" is historically prior; "world system" is more familiar to readers of this journal; the author has argued that these terms properly denote the same set of entities (Wilkinson, 1995a). "Macrosocial system," a more recent coinage, is the most neutral across the social sciences, but thus far commands only a small constituency. The use of all three terms is intended as a reminder that there are important literatures whose relevance should not be lost on account of terminological exclusivity.

The author is not alone in pursuing the empirical study of macrosocial systems. Toynbee (Table V, 1946) attempted to chart epochs of "Times of Troubles" and "Universal Empire" in civilizations. More recently, related contributions have been made by Algaze (1993), Blanton and Feinman (1984), Chase-Dunn and Hall (1997), Cioffi-Revilla (1996), Cioffi-Revilla and Lai (1995), Feinman and Marcus (1998), Midlarsky (1988), Modelski (1987), Peregrine (1992), Quigley (1961), Rasler and Thompson (1994), Thompson (1988, 1999), Willey (1991), and Yoffee and Cowgill (1988) among others.

This paper, like its immediate predecessors, directs itself to assessing the polarity, or systemwide power structure, of one such system, the Far Eastern (East Asian), over some three thousand years. This paper continues an attempt to increase the coding resolution, from 100 year intervals (Wilkinson, 1997) to 50-year intervals (1999a) to the current 25-year intervals.

Previous papers in this series (Wilkinson 1980-82, 1987a, 1993-1994) have addressed the question of the definition and roster of very large-scale very long-lived social systems. The criteria there proposed involve (1) a minimum settlement size-level of 10,000 in at least one city (thus Chaco Canyon in the U.S. Southwest, with a size of "perhaps 3000"--Lekson 1999: 68--falls short) and (2) an "individuating" criterion (a historically-autonomous political-military-diplomatic transactional network, not part of a larger such network).

The list of entities that certainly, very probably or probably met both the size-level and the individuating criteria is itself necessarily a work in progress, as smaller and more obscured systems slowly emerge out of the fog (whether real or in the mind of the observer). The following list is current, and adds one "probable" (Omotic civilization) to the last update (Wilkinson, 1993-1994) of a list begun much earlier (Wilkinson, 1980-1982). Macrosocial systems already generally recognized are simply named; others are briefly noticed. The order in which the systems are listed reflects the approximate order of each one's absorption into the Central world system.

1. **Egyptian or Northeast African world system/civilization.**
2. **Mesopotamian or Southwest Asian civilization/world system.**
3. **Central civilization/Central world system.** 3500 years of world system history, c. 1500 BC to the present.

Formed in the near east by the expansion, collision (in Syria and Anatolia) and fusion of Egyptian and Mesopotamian world systems. Continued to expand, and in due course engulfed, approximately in this order, all the other previously autonomous civilizations whether great or small: the Aegean, Irish, Mesoamerican, Andean, Chibchan, West

Central African, West African, East African, Indonesian, Indic, Far Eastern, Japanese, African Great Lakes, and Omotic world systems.

Central civilization probably included or includes, as regions or epochs, the whole history of the following entities often labeled "civilizations" on the taxonomically inadequate basis of their genuine cultural distinctness: Persian, Classical, Medieval, Byzantine, Russian, Western. Central civilization may reasonably be said to have had five phases: Near Eastern (c. 1500–300 BC); Greco–Roman (c. 300 BC–c. 500 AD); Medieval (a time designation, c. 500–c. 1500 AD, intended to include Catholic, Orthodox and Islamic cultures within Central civilization); Western (c. 1500–c. 1940 AD); and Global (c. 1940 AD to date). Greco–Roman and Western phases were characterized by a greater dominance of one geographic area and one cultural tradition within the Central complex than the Near Eastern, Medieval and Global phases.

4. **Aegean (Minoan-Mycenean-Hellenic).**

5. **Irish.** Its maximum area was approximately that of contemporary Ireland. Cities began after, probably well after, 5th century AD. Engulfed by Central civilization until the Norman–English invasions of the 12th century.

6. **Indonesian.** Its maximum area included contemporary western Indonesia, Malaya, and (perhaps as a shared semiperiphery with Far Eastern) some of coastal Vietnam. Engulfed by Central civilization via Portuguese, British and Dutch invasions after 1511.

7. **Mesoamerican or Mexican.**

8. **Andean or Peruvian.**

9. **Chibchan.** Highlands of Colombia. Possibly, even probably independent and very early in its evolution when engulfed by Central civilization in the person of Spanish conquistadors of the 16th century.

10. **East African (Coastal/Swahili).** Extant, 14th to 15th century AD, possibly citified since 12th century or even earlier. Engulfed by Central civilization (Portuguese, Ottomans) from the 16th century.

11. **West Central African (Kongo/Tio).** Extant, 15th century AD, possibly earlier. Engulfed by Central civilization (Portuguese) early 16th century.

12. **West African (Western Sudanic).** An autonomous civilization from at least the 8th century AD, perhaps 4th or 6th (Ghana); engulfed by Central civilization (Morocco) in the 16th century.

13. **Indic or South Asian.**

14. **Mississippian.** Centers at Cahokia (Illinois), Macon (Georgia), Moundville

(Alabama), Etowah (Georgia), Spiro Mound (Oklahoma), and Aztalan (Wisconsin). Never incorporated into the Central world system; collapsed before AD 1700, after about 1000 years as a world system, perhaps as a result of depopulating plagues, perhaps in turn forerunning European explorers.

15. Japanese world system. At its greatest extent coterminous with contemporary Japan. Budded off Far Eastern system mid 1st millennium AD; engulfed by Central civilization during the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

16. African Great Lakes world system. Probably a world system, late 17th to late 19th century, when engulfed by Central; possibly such earlier.

17. Omotoc world system. Southwestern area of current Ethiopia. Probably isolated and autonomous 18th, perhaps 15th, to 19th centuries AD; much missing data. Incorporated into the Central world system by Abyssinian conquest (Ethiopian state formation) in last decade of the 19th century.

18. Far Eastern world system. This system, the subject of the current paper, began when a polyculture in the Yellow River basin produced one and then many cities over 3000 years ago. This expanding civilization, with its polity of states, hegemonies and empires, probably soon collided and fused with another, begun in the upper Yangtze basin perhaps even earlier. Continuing to grow outward, it early began to interact regularly tradewise with other macrosocial systems (Central and Indic) to form a larger oikumene (tradenet). At its greatest extent the Far Eastern system included contemporary China, Korea, Vietnam, Tibet, Mongolia, Burma, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and also early Japan. The Far Eastern network was absorbed through war and diplomacy into Central civilization in the late 19th and/or early 20th centuries, between the First Opium War and the First World War. Before that time, it went through a long sequence of changes in macropolitical structure.

A recent paper in this sequence (1996a) attempted to extract a long-term sequence of macropolitical configurations for Indic civilization from an independent macropolitical data source, the monumental Historical Atlas of South Asia, edited by Joseph E. Schwartzberg, which provides a remarkable amount of information upon the political trajectory of Indic civilization from 560 BC.

It was possible to use Schwartzberg's atlas to produce a series of data for the power configurations of the Indic system, using the following categories:

- Universal State/Empire
- Hegemonic
- Unipolar (non-hegemonic, "unipolarity without hegemony")

Bipolar
Tripolar
Multipolar
Nonpolar

The coding concepts of, and distinction between, hegemony and (non-hegemonic) unipolarity are discussed at greater length elsewhere (Wilkinson, 1994a, 1994b, 1999b); the other codings reflect well-known systemic concepts. In brief, these categories cut the continuum of possible degrees of centralization of state power configurations in a macrosocial system, or world system, or civilization, as follows:

- at the most centralized end, where one state encompasses the whole system, is the **universal state** (Toynbee) or empire (Quigley);
- next to it is **hegemony** (or "unipolarity with hegemony"), where a single great power or superpower, with influence to match its capability, oversees a number of subject states which retain internal autonomy;
- next to that is the condition of **unipolarity** (more precisely, unipolarity without hegemony), where a single great power, lacking the influence to match its capability, rests among a collection of non-subject non-tributary states;
- nearer the decentralized end come configurations with two, three, or more great powers: **bipolarity, tripolarity, multipolarity**;
- and most decentralized, with many ministates and no great powers, is **nonpolarity**.

This coding scheme for power concentration is certainly nominal; it may also be ordinal. However, more dimensions than one may be involved, or the ordinal topology may be nonlinear: configurations herein labeled both "hegemonic" and "nonpolar" are sometimes thought by other writers to be "feudal."

2. Coding Narrative: Far Eastern System

The Far Eastern world system may have existed at the time of, and with a core state from, the semilegendary Hsia (Xia) dynasty. (The traditional Wade-Giles transliteration system is used herein, except in a few instances in which a more recent pinyin transliteration would reduce, not increase, the confusion and pronunciation errors of an ordinary reader.) A walled city a mile square near present Zhengzhou may have been the Hsia capital Yangcheng, and large walled Lungshan-culture towns may have been Hsia subcenters. But because of fundamental historical and archaeological disagreements, little can be said of configurations in the Far Eastern world system before the triad of Hsia, Shang and Chou, often treated as a succession of dynasties in a single state, but by Chang (1980:348-355) argued to be three states, respectively to the center, east and west of the Central Plain of the Yellow River, arising and succeeding one another in that order and in power primacy.

Furthermore, we omit the Hsia "era" as essentially not yet datable (Chang, 1986: 306; Murphey, 1996:33, suggests 2000-1600 BC, Chang, 1983: 512, 2200-1750 BC), nor classifiable as to polarity-configuration. The most frequent coding would likely be hegemonic, but there would have been a period of bipolarity in the transition to Shang (cf. Chang 512-513). An area of perhaps 350 X 450 miles, mainly in the middle Yellow River basin, could speculatively be assigned to the entire Far Eastern system during the alleged Hsia period. (See Herrmann 2; Wheatley's comment, xiii; Penkala 8)

The Shang era which supposedly followed Hsia is also omitted, as not yet firmly datable nor classifiable at most particular moments. (Chang, 1983:512-514, proposes 1750-1100 BC--cf. Chang, 1980:322-329--and his description, like that of Keightley, 1983, seems to leave a choice between hegemony or unipolarity without hegemony.) The system's boundaries were now more likely 500 X 500 miles, with extensions into parts of the Huai and Yangtze basins. (See Herrmann 3-4, and Wheatley's comment, xiii-xiv; Penkala 10; Blunden and Elvin 54-55)

Late Shang does seem to have been clearly hegemonic, with Shang ascendancy over a multicultural system in the lower and middle Yellow River basin which contained the Shang royal domain (the bureaucratic core empire), vassal states, friendly states, independent states, and hostile states. (Hsu and Linduff 20-25, 145; see map, Blunden and Elvin, 34-35, and Keightley, 538) Yin, the final Shang capital near Anyang, "may have covered at its peak as much as 10 square miles" (Murphey, 34), implying fairly widespread and massive extractions by the militaristic slaver aristocracy of Shang. Chao Lin notes a move in finds that late Shang was in the process of moving "from a state confederacy toward an empire" by conquering small states, establishing overlordship, and transforming vassal states into Shang administrative districts. (93-105, 129)

Toward the end of Shang's prominence, Chou (possibly proto-Tibeto-Burmans, "Ch'iang" or "Jung": Pulleyblank, 460) slowly arose out of a weak, distant and intermittent vassalhood (Keightley, 529-532) to become a strong and growing state, variously imitating, resisting, fighting, or submitting to Shang. (Hsu and Linduff 45-49) This would have entailed a bipolar transition period; this was followed by a period of Chou hegemony.

Chou chronology remains extremely unsettled before 841 BC, with problems that are numerous, complex, and highly specialized, with all dates subject to significant future alterations. The "Western Chou" era may have lasted 250 or more than 300 years: while 771 BC is the generally accepted ending date, conflicting recent chronologies begin it 1122, 1100, 1087, 1050, or 1027 or 1025 BC. (Hsu and Linduff 390; Ebrey 23, 30; Blunden and Elvin 55; Huang 15; Murphey 35; Bodde, 1986:21; Shaughnessy, xix) From 1025, however, coding becomes plausible, because Chou was by then established as a hegemony, and apparently remained hegemonic to 841. We shall use Shaughnessy's dates for the Chou reigns (which are mentioned because much Chou material is organized by reign).

In Chou's ascent to primacy it is recorded as having destroyed 99 "states" and subjugated 652; but these were probably statelets, clusters of villages. (Hsu and Linduff, 113) Chou then set up a system of governance usually styled "feudal," but effectively hegemonic, in the Yellow River basin. The early geography of the Chou-centered world-system did not much alter that of its Shang-centered predecessor: the Huai, Han and Yangtze basins remained outside the system. (Hsu and Linduff 127-128)

1025 BC. Hegemonic. Hegemon: Chou. (King Ch'eng: Shaughnessy, xix; but cf. Hsu and Linduff, 387-390)

King Ch'eng established many new "states" in the Yellow River basin. Chou, as foreign conquerors, planted many new garrison and colonial fortress-cities to control new territorial states containing both Shang remnants and the numerous non Hua-Hsia peoples Shang had conquered but not incorporated. (Eberhard, 1952, 4, 6, 66-68; Hsu and Linduff 127-128, 158-163, 187-189, 224, 269, 379)

Eberhard emphasizes the polycultural character of the Chou state and the system in which it resided: "a little area of China surrounded by large tribal areas. Large parts of what politically belonged to China as a state at that time, still belonged ethnically and culturally to the tribal areas." (1967: 22) Existing "vassal" nations and states in the world-system's polyculture area (which contained proto-Chinese "Hua-Hsia" peoples and many others) remained substantially autonomous, and underwent little internal reorganization. (Hsu and Linduff 123, 127-128, 150-152, 380)

1000 BC. Hegemonic. Hegemon: Chou (King K'ang)

King K'ang planted new military-garrison states to the south. (Hsu and Linduff, 129-133)

975 BC. Hegemonic. Hegemon: Chou (King Chao)

This appears to be the peak of Chou dynamism, with firm control of the Yellow River basin, defense against northern nomads, and notable expeditions southward to the Han and Huai valleys. (Hsu and Linduff 133-137)

950 BC. Hegemonic. Hegemon: Chou (King Mu)

925 BC. Hegemonic. Hegemon: Chou (King Mu)

The reign of King Mu may have involved hegemonic order-maintaining operations. (Hsu and Linduff 137-140)

900 BC. Hegemonic. Hegemon: Chou (King Kung)

875 BC. Hegemonic. Hegemon: Chou (King I)

The system seems to have been stable at this time, for these reigns were "uneventful." (Hsu and Linduff, 140) But there seems to have been a bureaucratization and centralization going on which eventually reached a critical point. (Hsu and Linduff 140-141, 145, 146, 280)

850 BC. Hegemonic. Hegemon: Chou (King Li).

In 841 BC an attempt by King Li to monopolize finances and repress opposition by terror, i.e. to reorganize the system as a genuine centralized bureaucratic empire, was stopped by a coup of the "feudal nobles" (i.e., leaders of subject states), who installed a more pliant Chou king after a 14-year "regency." (Hsu and Linduff, 144-146) Incidentally, it also firmed up the chronology of Chou. (Hsu and Linduff, 387-390)

825 BC. Unipolar. Polar state: Chou (King Hsüan).

Chou never recovered from the coup and the regency. Under Li's successor Hsüan, Chou had lost control of its northern frontier, was hard-pressed by mobile peoples--Jung in the north and Hsien-yun near the western capital. Chou military expeditions southward, earlier and even into the troubled late reigns, had expanded Chou's grasp, permitting substantial tribute-collection in the Han-Huai area. Now in its preoccupation with defending the northern frontier against nomads, Chou also let slip its grip on its southern vassals, whom it could no longer mobilize on its behalf. (Hsu and Linduff 258-262, 268, 279)

800 BC. Unipolar. Polar state: Chou (King Hsüan)

775 BC. Unipolar. Polar state: Chou (King Yu).

Horse-nomad Jung had been fought on the northern frontier by the Chou vassal-garrison states of Jin and Ch'in, by King Chao and King Mu. In 771, a Jung alliance captured the Chou capital and killed the king. The dynasty fled east. (Hsu and Linduff 135, 139-140, 192-194, 259, 265) The "Eastern Chou" revived a doctrine of universal empire and a rhetoric of feudalism; but behind it hid, no revived Chou hegemony, but a multistate system, more often than not multipolar (cf. Walker, 13, 20), continuing for five centuries, until the rise of Ch'in (Qin). There was first a brief period of extreme disintegration, with two rival Chou kings. (Maspero, 171)

750 BC. Nonpolar: "a world of numerous small city-states." (Blunden and Elvin, 61)

By the beginning of the annals of Lu, 722 BC, there were about 170 states in the former Chou conquest area, ten of them rather more important than others, and "of

approximately equal power": Lu, Cheng (Zheng), Wey (Old Wei), Sung (Song), Chi (Ji), Ch'en, Ts'ao, Ts'ai, Ch'i (Qi), Chou (Walker, 20-21). Most of these states were on the central plain of the Yellow River, and were of Chou derivation, e.g. Cheng was a Chou colonial state. Sung was a remnant of Shang. Ch'i lay to the east, "was the direct descendant of Hsia" (Chang, 1980:350) and/or had a Chiang nobility (Chou allies) overlying a Shang population, over subjugated "indigenous," or at least "ancient," peoples. (Hsu and Linduff 160, 186, 201-205)

725 BC. Multipolar. Great powers: Lu, Cheng, Wey, Sung, Chi, Ch'en, Ts'ao, Ch'i, Chou.

As the system reordered itself, it also expanded. There probably was a Yangtze civilization/world system simultaneous with and parallel to the Yellow River system, and only coupling to it at about this time. The Yangtze system was probably hegemonic, its hegemon being the state of Ch'u (probably Man "barbarians," Miao-Yaos, Pulleyblank 460) in the upper Yangtze basin, which had had some previous brief collisional interaction with Chou. (Hsu and Linduff 128, 133-134, 138, 221, 225-226)

Ch'u in this period reorganized itself for northward expansion, came into continued interaction with the southern Chou colonial states, and began to conquer them. Ch'u tended over time both to extend its hegemony by subjugating independent states, and to annex its subject states and turn them into internal metropolitan provinces. Consequently, the multistate system occasionally assumed a bipolar configuration in which Ch'u led a southern, Yangtze-basin empire, and was opposed by an alliance led by one or another of the northern, Yellow River states. (Maspero 178-179; Walker 38-39)

The leader of the northern alliance is often spoken of in the literature as a "hegemon," but in fact no northern leader managed to achieve systemwide hegemony. Different states led the northern alliance at different times; as time went by, direct Chou successors were displaced by larger, less "Chinese" peripheral powers in the alliance headship, with its prerogatives: to call meetings; to mediate and arbitrate disputes; to authorize or undertake intervention (Walker, 79, 87-89). The status of the "hegemons" was dependent not only upon their personal qualities, but also upon the intensity of the southern challenge. When Ch'u underwent episodes of weakness or diminished militancy, the northern alliance would weaken or dissolve and a multipolar configuration would emerge.

For the twenty-year period 720-701 BC Walker (14, 55) identifies two great powers: Ch'u and Cheng. Blunden and Elvin (63) see Cheng's leader, Duke Chuang (r.c. 742-700, reign dates after Legge Prol. 102-111; Maspero 744-701; Maspero's dates cited hereafter e.g. as 744-701M), as the first northern "hegemon." However, in this period the states of Ch'i and Sung were also highly active in fighting wars, making alliances, and leading coalition invasions. Furthermore, Cheng was in fact an aggressive expansionist; repeatedly fought one or several of the northern states, including Chou itself (720, 718-

716, 712-711, 706, 704, 701); only once helped them against the Jung (705); and never led them to resist the depredations of Ch'u (705, 703, 702). Chou, and then, after Chou suffered a great defeat (707M), Sung, led the counteralliance which provided northern resistance to Cheng. (Legge, 1-55; Maspero, 172-174) Accordingly, and matching Walker's (14, 55) ranking for 700-681:

700 BC. Multipolar. Great powers: Ch'u, Ch'i, Cheng, Sung.

The northern states continued to fight one another, allowing Ch'u to expand unhindered, until 680M, when Ch'i, which had itself been expanding successfully, presided at the first "hegemonic" northern conferences (which would involve some, but rarely all, of: Sung, Lu, Wey, Cheng, Ch'en, Ts'ai, Ts'ao) to arrange coercion of deviant northern states, Cheng first of all. (Maspero 182-183)

The statesman Kuan-tzu (Kuan Chung; Guan Zhong; Kuan I-wu; d.c. 644), in the employ of Duke Huan of Ch'i (r. c. 683-641, or 685-643M), undertook extensive centralizing, meritocratic, state-monopolistic, mercantilist, legalist, militarizing reforms, eliminating internal hegemonic or "feudal" structures. In consequence Ch'i was able to field "the largest and best organized army of its time." (Maspero, 180-181; Walker, 29-33) Meanwhile, Ch'u was stalled 676-671M by rebellion and civil war, and even became temporarily polite and entered relations with Chou. (Legge, 97-99, 105-106; Maspero 185-187)

675 BC. Bipolar. Polar states: Ch'u, Ch'i.

(This is also Walker's ranking for 680-661: 14, 55.) Ch'u began reasserting its power by invading Cheng 666M. Eventually, in 665, Ch'i and the league, which were often active against Jung, Ti and other "barbarians," came to the aid of Cheng against a Ch'u invasion. After 658, Ch'u was somewhat contained by rescues, and by counterinvasions of states which inclined its way. Ch'u still made progress, though only slowly, against small border states: eliminating Hsien 655M, subjugating Hsu 654M (Walker, 29, 31-34; Legge, 56-173; Ebrey, 39; Maspero 182-188)

During this period, the small northern state of Jin (Chin), having recovered from the paralysis of sixty years of civil war, subjugated all its 7 or 8 small neighbors, establishing itself as a local hegemon on the north side of the Yellow River in a series of campaigns 669-652M. (Romanization in this section generally follows Wade-Giles, except that, to reduce the most obvious chance of confusion, the Pinyin "Jin" is used instead of Wade-Giles' "Chin.") The small Western state of Ch'in (Qin) had unified the Wei valley in a series of local wars 713-655M, but organized its acquisitions not hegemonically but as districts in a centralized state. (Maspero 175-178) Jin was a colonial state planted by Chou on the former Hsia territory, interacting with the northern Jung (Rong) nomads; Ch'in was a far western peripheral state, "non-Chinese" (i.e. non Hua-Hsia) , whose later

conquests would by a sublime historic irony produce the "China" of which it was not really much a part. (See Hsu and Linduff, 190, 192-193)

650 BC. Bipolar. Polar states: Ch'u and Ch'i.

Walker (52), apparently to the contrary, appraises the interval 660-641 BC as multipolar, with four great powers, Ch'u, Ch'i, Ch'in and Jin; but the latter pair seem to have risen to systemwide prominence only after 643M, when, after the death of Huan, Ch'i fell into some disorder, and lost its place. Ch'u swallowed a few more small states. Sung, under Duke Hsiang, attempted to assume the northern hegemony 641-637M, but got no following, and actually provoked the league to enlist Ch'u against Sung. (Maspero 188-191; Legge 172-186)

Ch'u accordingly made major advances, forcing the subjugation of Cheng, Ch'en, Sung, Ts'ai and Lu (633M). The northern semiperipheral state of Jin, under Duke Wen, in response assumed the headship of the Yellow River alliance (Ch'i, Sung, Cheng, Wey, Lu, Ch'in) against Ch'u, militarized his country, organized a large army, attacked Ch'u vassals Ts'ao and Wey (632M), inflicted a major defeat upon Ch'u in 631 (632M), disassembled its league, and compelled Ch'u to make peace in 627 (628M). (Maspero 188-201; Legge, 207-221)

After the death of Duke Wen of Jin at the end of the war (628M), a multipolar period ensued. Ch'in took advantage of the Jin succession to begin asserting itself, and became embroiled in a stalemated war with Jin (627M); Ch'u took advantage of the Ch'in-Jin war to reopen its struggle with Jin over the intervening states of Ts'ai, Ch'en, Cheng and Wey (627M). (Maspero 198-203)

This quarter-century was accordingly unusually variable, moving from bipolarity to multipolarity (643) to unipolarity (after 636) to bipolarity (631) to multipolarity (628).

625 BC. Multipolar. Great powers: Ch'u, Jin, Ch'in, Ch'i, Cheng.

(This matches Walker's great power list for 640-621: 14, 55.) Walker argues for the inclusion of Cheng, often treated as a pawn, on the grounds of its extent, wealth, centralization, patriotism, effective statecraft, defensive resilience, and occasional successful aggression: 49-52) Jin and Ch'u recognized stalemate and stopped fighting (624M). Another succession crisis in Jin (621-614M), in which Ch'in intervened, paralyzed it and caused the league to decline. Ch'i and Ch'u took advantage. Ch'i attempted to reassert its leadership, attacking its small neighbors Lu, Chu, Chü and Ts'ao, and forcing their submission. Ch'u returned to menace, invasion and subjugation (Ts'ai, Cheng, Ch'en, Sung 618-617M) and then collapsed into its own internal succession strife (614-611M), to the profit of Jin's alliance; reasserted itself (608-607M), and collapsed

again (605M), reasserted itself and was successfully resisted by Jin (600M). (Maspero 203-206; Legge, 224-305)

600 BC. Multipolar. Great powers: Ch'u, Jin, Ch'in, Ch'i, Cheng.

(Walker lists Ch'u, Jin, Ch'in, Cheng, and Wu--but not Ch'i--for 620-601, and drops Cheng for 600-581: 14, 55. But this may be a misprint: Wu was not assertive until 583, or even, per Walker 52, 568.)

Ch'u, under King Chuang, rose suddenly to the greatest prominence, conquering Cheng and greatly defeating Jin (597M), subjugating Sung (596-594M), befriending Ch'i; the system was, briefly, unipolar (594-591M). (Legge 307-338; Maspero 206-207) The tables turned rather quickly: Ch'i tried to take advantage of Jin's weakness and a succession crisis in Ch'u to extend its influence over Lu; in 589M 587L a revived Jin defeated Ch'i and forced it to submit 588M and renewed the league; whereat Ch'u made a treaty with Jin 588M. Ch'u-Jin bipolarity ensued 587-583, with intervening states vacillating between fears and pressures. (Legge 343-363; cf. Maspero 207-208) As Maspero says (209), "The suddenness with which these hegemonies arose and collapsed shows how fragile they were."

In 583 BC (584M), the southeastern peripheral state of Wu, a Ch'u vassal in the Yangtze delta, originally a distant Chou colony planted on a distinct local culture (Hsu and Linduff, 160) which was probably "Yi" Mon-Khmer (Pulleyblank, 459), inspired or provoked by assistance from Jin, revolted from Ch'u, allied with Jin, and began to assert itself against Ch'u. (Legge 362-364; Maspero 209-211) Jin was able to seize Ts'ai and Ch'en (583M), resume the leadership of the northern states (Sung, Wey, Lu, Ch'i) plus Wu. Ch'u sued for peace (582M); Jin and the league defeated Ch'in (578M). Jin was again the most powerful state. (Legge 370-407; Maspero 210-211)

Ch'u returned to action against Cheng, Wey and Sung (576M), but was rebuffed by Jin and the league (575M), which could however achieve nothing decisive. (Maspero 211-212)

Again this quarter-century was conspicuous for quick transitions: multipolarity, unipolarity, bipolarity, unipolarity, bipolarity.

575 BC. Bipolar. Polar states: Ch'u, Jin.

This is consistent with Walker (46), though elsewhere he rates the great powers 580-561 as including Ch'u, Jin, Ch'in and Wu (14, 55).

For a moment Jin resumed unipolar status, enforcing league membership upon Cheng (571M) and Ch'en and Hsu (570M), supported by Ch'i, conciliated by Ch'u. Then Ch'u resumed its incursions (566M) and Jin, weakened by internal divisions, could do no

better than maintain bipolarity. (Maspero 211-213; Legge 385-409) The camp of Ch'u included the small states of Hsu, Ch'en, and Ts'ai, and that of Jin the small states of royal Chou, Cheng, Wey, Chi, Ts'ao, Chü, Small Chü, Lu and Hsuch. The "middle powers" Ch'in and Yen in the northeast were neutral (Hsu, xii).

Jin's league defeated Ch'in's attempt to ally with Ch'u (561-559M), and Ch'i's defection and attack on Lu (556-553; -555M). (Maspero 213-214; Legge 471-528).

This period accordingly saw rapid change in the power structure: transitions from bipolarity to unipolarity, bipolarity, tripolarity, bipolarity, tripolarity, and bipolarity again.

550 BC. Bipolar. Great powers: Ch'u, Jin.

Ch'i redefected and attacked Jin itself, but was defeated again and brought back to the league 549-547 (550-548M; Maspero 213-214, Legge 471-528).

Walker (14, 55) gives the great powers of 560-541 as Ch'u, Jin, Ch'i, Ch'in, Wu, but this better describes the situation a few years later, when Ch'u and the northern league led by Jin made peace in 546M. At this time there was an explicit acknowledgement that "Tsin, Ts'oo, Ts'e and Ts'in are equals," such that neither Ch'i nor Ch'in could be compelled to join the settlement; and Wu was also left out, or let out. (Legge 532-535; Hsu 57-58; Walker 56-58) Blunden and Elvin (64) see this settlement as Jin and Ch'u having arranged a dual hegemony; here we would instead concur with Walker's judgement.

In 538M Ch'u became active again, creating a counter-league and leading it to war against Jin's ally Wu, which got no help from Jin, having in fact embarked on a career of expansion of its own. Among those thus led was the future great state of Yüeh, which comes to notice 535 BC. Yüeh, a non-Chinese (non Hua-Hsia) state (Hsu and Linduff, 161, 190), possibly Mon-Khmer (Pulleyblank, 459) lay in the far southeast, beyond Wu, in the Yangtze delta. (Maspero 214-215)

Ch'u conquered Ch'en and Ts'ai; Jin had become internally conflicted and could not respond, but Wu resisted stubbornly. Eventually Ch'u's relentless expansionism exhausted and alienated its population. A coup threw Ch'u into sudden disorder in 528 (529M), and the victors abandoned Ch'u's recent gains in the north (528M). Jin (528) and Ch'i (525) took the occasion to expand while Ch'u recovered and resisted Wu. (Maspero 213-216). Accordingly:

525 BC. Multipolar. Great powers: Ch'u, Jin, Ch'i, Wu.

This is in accord with Walker's rating for 540-521 (14, 55). There was now a chaotic succession of assertive acts by a variety of powers, sometimes involving one state alone,

sometimes carrying along a few allies or a part of the northern league: as by Wu 518 and 511 and 505, Yüeh (or Yu-yüeh) 504, Ch'in 504, Ch'i 502 and 500. Wu for instance did great damage to Ch'u 506M, was defeated by Ch'u, Ch'in and Yüeh 505M, and defeated Ch'u again 504M. Jin occasionally called the states together (510M, 506M), and unilaterally settled disputes in royal Chou (520M, 519M). (Legge, 532-773; Maspero 216-219)

500 BC. Multipolar. Great powers: Ch'u, Jin, Ch'i, Ch'in, Wu, Yüeh.

Walker ranks only Ch'u, Jin, Ch'in and Wu as great powers 520-501, and only Ch'u, Wu and Yüeh in 500-481: 14, 55. On a criterion of unimpeded aggressiveness, all five seem about equally qualified in 500. Judging by the same criterion, all five were highly active over the next quarter-century: Ch'i was again aggressor in 497, Yüeh in 496, Ch'u in 495 and 494, Ch'i and Wu in 494, Jin in 493, Ch'i in 492 and 491, Jin and Wu in 490, Jin in 489, Wu and Ch'i in 488, Ch'u in 487, Wu, Jin and Ch'u in 486, Ch'i and Wu in 485, Yüeh, Ch'u and Jin in 483, Jin in 482 and 481, Yüeh, Jin and Ch'i in 479, Yüeh in 477 and 476. (Legge, 772-863; using the dating in the Concordance pp. v-xi, rather than that implied by Legge on p. 861)

In 497-490M, Jin fell into civil warfare among its great territorial lords, and its league began to dissolve. (Maspero 217, 227-228) Ch'i took advantage of the troubles to intervene to increase them, and to expand its local hegemony, until it too fell into succession difficulties after 489M. (Maspero 234-235) Wu had a skyrocket career: subjugating Yüeh 494M, attacking Ch'i 489-485M, usurping Jin's notional leadership of the non-functional northern league 482M, and exhausting itself in the process; in 482M it was defeated, and in 475-473M destroyed and annexed by Yüeh, which however was not strong enough to keep all its territory but shared with Ch'u. (Maspero 217-221, 242)

The larger states began extinguishing middle powers about this time. Sung absorbed Ts'ao 487 BC. (Walker, 27) Ch'u erased Ch'en 478 BC (479M). (Ssu-ma 1994, 78, 105; Maspero 242)

481 traditionally ends the "Spring and Autumn Era." Walker notes that there were then 13 important states, five of which were non-Chou (22), i.e. in some rather strong cultural sense "non-Chinese": Jin, Ch'in, Ch'u, Wu, Yüeh--in fact, almost every great power. The Far Eastern system remained polycultural: "there was a very small area in which only Chinese lived, and a large area surrounding it [but within the "Chinese' states] that was occupied by non-Chinese," Liao hunters, Yao hunters, Yüeh sailors, Tai ricegrowers, Tibetan sheep breeders, Turkish horse-breeders, Mongol cattle-breeders, Tungus pig-breeders. (Eberhard, 1967, 18-22)

475 BC. Multipolar. Great powers: Jin, Ch'i, Ch'u, Yüeh.

Yüeh was again aggressive in 474 (when it destroyed Wu), Jin in 473 (472M), Yüeh in 470, Jin in 469 and 463 (463M). Here the detailed data of the Tso Chuan ends. (Legge, 772-863) Maspero's dates are hereafter normally employed.

110 or more states having been extinguished 722-463 BC, 22 remained. (Hsu, 1, 58-59).

In 453 Jin ceased to function as a unit and began to dissolve into three component parts, Hann (Han), Chao (Zhao), and (new) Wei. (Maspero 225-228)

Though it may be an illusion caused by the end of the detailed data series, it seems that the other three major powers, Ch'u, Ch'i and Ch'in, remained mostly quiet with respect to each other, Ch'u recovering and reorganizing, Ch'i involved in internal struggle and reorganization, Ch'in slowly expanding westward against stubborn tribal resistance, for the next 100 years. (Maspero 233-242)

450 BC. Tripolar. Great powers: Ch'u, Ch'i, Ch'in.

Ch'u annexed Ts'ai in 447M (Maspero 242).

425 BC. Tripolar. Great powers: Ch'in, Ch'i, Ch'u.

Jin faded away in stages to 375 BC. About 424 BC the three new states had recognized one another's independence; by 402 (403M) they had been recognized by Chou. (Legge, Prol. 105; Maspero 228-229) They began functioning as major powers, though not quite at the level that Ch'u, Ch'i and Ch'in were later able to manage when internally stable, united and centralized. They were not so in this period, but rather preoccupied by internal power struggles and reorganizations, Ch'in being immersed in chronic civil war. Hann was able to begin the conquest of Cheng in 408M, and Wei to reduce and subjugate Wey, without interference. Yüeh occupied itself with local aggressions against its northern neighbors. (Maspero, 236, 244, 251)

400 BC. Multipolar. Great powers: Ch'in, Ch'i, Ch'u, Hann, Chao, Wei, Yüeh.

Two states of some significance were now emerging, Yen (Yan) and Ko-Choson. The northeastern peripheral state of Yen had been formed by resting a Chou elite on a Shang population. (Hsu and Linduff, 194-201) Beyond Yen there had by now formed a proto-Korean state in southern Manchuria and northwest Korea, a confederated kingdom of walled town-states, Ko-Choson ("Ancient Choson," "Old Choson"). (Lee, 13-14; Eckert et al, 11; Han 12-15; Henthorn 21))

The extent of the system in the warring states period, when its boundaries were expanded in the northeast (states of Yen and Ko-Choson), north (building of walls of Yen, Chao and Wei), and southwest (rise of Shu-Pa area of Szechwan, and its later

conquest by Ch'in), would now be about 800 X 900 miles. (See Herrmann 6; Penkala 14; Blunden and Elvin 62-63)

Internal troubles and reorganizations continued at the start of the fourth century BC. Hann erased Cheng by stages 398-375 BC. Stability was restored in Ch'in. Yüeh fell into disorder 376-357. (Maspero 237, 244, 251-252)

New combinations were spurred by the efforts of Wei after 386 to refound Jin by subduing Hann and Chao. Interference by Ch'i was soundly defeated 384-378, and Wei gained stature. (Maspero 247-248)

375 BC. Multipolar. Great powers: Ch'i, Wei, Ch'u, Ch'in.

Wei added to its stature by a victory over Ch'u 371, survived a succession civil war and a revolt by Hann and Chao 370, and brought Wey, Lu and Sung into a truncated northern league 356 BC. Ch'in, Ch'i and Ch'u all intervened, individually and then in combination 356-351, and forcibly dissolved Wei's league despite staunch resistance. Hann remained allied to Wei. (Maspero 248-249)

In this period Ch'in, advised by Lord Shang (fl. 361-338 BC, Walker, 100), began to undertake productive, totalitarian and militaristic imperial reforms, in emulation of Ch'u, and increasingly in opposition to the then pre-eminent northern leader Ch'i, aggressive and pre-eminent in the north with Wei's eclipse. (Ssu-ma 1994, 109-110; Walker, 100; Maspero, 237-242)

350 BC. Multipolar. Great powers: Ch'i, Wei, Ch'u, Ch'in.

Wei sought protection from Ch'in against Ch'i 350-349. Wei, with Hann, reasserted itself 346, defeating Ch'u, but was compelled to recognize the hegemony of Ch'in in 342. Hann thereupon broke away; Wei tried to coerce it, and was defeated by Hann, Chao, Ch'i and Ch'in, and saved only by the intervention of Ch'u. Wei never recovered; in its extremely exposed central position it now became the prime advocate of peace. Wei received peace and even support from Ch'i, but became the main target of Ch'in's relentless eastward drive. (Maspero, 249-251).

Ch'i, powerful but passive, dominated Chao and Wei. Yüeh revived, began to assault Ch'i, then turned toward Ch'u, and was unexpectedly destroyed by it 334 or 333M. Ch'u annexed the old territories of Wu and exercised suzerainty over petty states in the original Yüeh lands. (Blunden and Elvin, 71; Maspero, 251-252; but Nienhauser believes Yüeh survived to c. 230 BC, note 117 to Ssu-ma 134)

Ch'i and Ch'u then fought each other to stalemate and exhaustion c. 333-323, giving Ch'in a free hand against Wei, which it slowly dismembered, 332, 331, 329, 325. (Maspero 251-252)

325 BC. Tripolar. Great Powers: Ch'in, Ch'i, Ch'u.

Ch'in mediated peace between Ch'i and Ch'u, and took its pay by subjugating Wei 323. (Maspero 252-253) Ch'i and Ch'u combined against Ch'in about 321, and when Wei rebelled (319) they went to its aid, bringing along Chao, Hann, Yen, and even the Huns (or proto-Huns, Hsiung-nu) of Inner Mongolia. Yen and the Huns may have attended as Chao vassals. This first major countercoalition forced Ch'in to retreat (318) but could not defeat it, and broke up over a prestige rivalry between Ch'i and Ch'u. Ch'in inflicted a paralyzing defeat upon Hann (317), and then took the opportunity to destroy the isolated state of Shu (316), thereby conquering the immense and rich territory of Szechwan, a major food source. Ch'in then extended its attacks, usually taking a bit of territory on each occasion: Chao 316; Chao and Hann 315; Wei and Hann 314; Chao 313; Ch'u, Ch'i (via Hann), and Yen (via Wei) 312; Ch'u 311. Ch'in isolated, defeated and subjugated Wei and Hann, and compelled Ch'u to cede a strategic mountain barrier and Wei the right bank of the Yellow River. Ch'in had also (315) broken through Jung resistance on its west to reach an important Central Asian caravan terminus. Ch'i had compensated itself poorly enough by occupying Yen 314, but was driven out by a revolt in 312. All the major states but Yen submitted to Ch'in in 310; Yen, hostile to Ch'i after the occupation, became friendly to Ch'in. (Maspero 241, 252-255, 257-258; Ssu-ma, 1994, 110-113. See Nienhauser's note 267--Ssu-ma, 1994, 112--which suggests confusion about which members of the "coalition" of 318 or 317 were actual combatants, or even participants at all)

But Ch'in lost its hegemony in a succession crisis 307-305 BC. Wei and Hann revolted to Ch'i. Ch'in made territorial concessions to keep peace with Ch'u 304, gave lands back to Hann and Wei 302, put down a rebellion in Shu 301 and sent a hostage to Ch'i. Ch'i now dominated Lu and some smaller states, Ch'in was an ally-protector to Wei and Hann and Yen, Ch'u protected Sung and the now-divided Chou realm; only Chao was outside the three spheres of influence. In 302 war broke out between Ch'in and Ch'u. (Maspero, 257-258; Ssu-ma, 114-115)

300 BC. Tripolar. Great powers: Ch'in, Ch'i, Ch'u.

Ch'in made major gains against Ch'u in a war lasting to 292. Ch'i, Hann, Wei, Chao and Sung took advantage of this war to attack Ch'in 296--the second major countercoalition against Ch'in. They could not get past its mountain defenses, though Ch'in ceded some land to buy peace for the moment. Ch'in resumed its steady advances against Hann, Ch'u, and especially Wei 294-286. (Maspero 258-261; Ssu-ma, 115-117)

Ch'i now took the initiative, annexed Sung 286 BC, became hegemon to Lu and thirteen other small states, and proceeded to assault the "Three Chin" (Hann, Chao, Wei). The other six major powers formed an alliance which crushed Ch'i 285-284 BC. Yen actually occupied almost the whole of Ch'i 284-279 BC. When Ch'i at last drove Yen out, it returned as only a minor power, usually a passive ally of Ch'in. (Ssu-ma 117; Maspero 261-263)

The system was now bipolar. Ch'u had profited by the coalition to take over the former territory of Sung, and dominate Lu, Hann and Chou. Ch'in then turned on Ch'u in 280, and crushed it 278 BC, annexing its capital Ying and the Yangtze heart of Ch'u. (Maspero, 263-264) The system became unipolar.

275 BC. Unipolar. Polar state: Ch'in.

Ch'u was largely confined to the Huai valley by a peace of 272-263. (Maspero, 263-264; Ssu-ma, 118-119) The polar state, Ch'in, was uniquely aggressive, attacking Wei or Hann or Chao almost every year. (Ssu-ma, 119-121; Maspero 265-267) Blunden and Elvin (72) emphasize its overwhelming preponderance in resources --territory almost equal to the other states combined, population probably larger than any other. Resistance was fierce, and slowly crushed. Ch'in defeated Wei with great slaughter 273 (274M), Chao with even greater 260, but the struggle continued. (Bodde, 1967:86; Maspero 264-266)

At the northeastern edge of the system, Ko-Choson declined under Yen pressure, losing the Liaotung peninsula. (Eckert et al, 12)

250 BC. Unipolar. Polar state: Ch'in.

Ch'in, having eliminated West Chou 256-255 BC, finished off East Chou 249 BC. On both occasions the offending part of Chou, divided since 367, had tried to form a general alliance against Ch'in. (Ssu-ma, 83, 121-122; Maspero 267-268) Ch'u annexed Lu 249 (Maspero 264). A five-state countercoalition against Ch'in, led by Wei, did form, and defeated it 247 BC, but then dissolved. (Ssu-ma, 122) Ch'in resumed its attacks and piecemeal expansion. Another five-state coalition including Hann, Wei, Chao and Ch'u attacked Ch'in 241, but was driven off. (Ssu-ma, 128)

Struggles for power interrupted Ch'in's march 239-235 BC; it then resumed on a much grander scale. Ch'in's unchallenged military predominance over the other states in the system led within twenty years to the final elimination of the other states in a series of annexations. Hann was destroyed 230 BC, Chao 228 BC, Wei 225 BC, each abandoned by the remainder of the states. (Ssu-ma, 132-134; Maspero 267-268)

225 BC. Hegemonic. Hegemon: Ch'in.

Ch'in finished off Ch'u in 223, Yen in 222, and Ch'i in 221. (Maspero 28) Ch'in built a universal state (with 36 commanderies each run by a governing committee) rather than a hegemony (Ssu-ma, 137). This universal state was designed and intended to last to infinity (Ssu-ma, 136), and actually lasted 15 years, to 206 BC. In consequence it falls between our datum points and therefore fails to appear in the coding at all.

It is of interest that the First Emperor of that universal Ch'in state, Ch'in Shih Huang Ti, found it expedient to join together the frontier great walls of the extinguished northern states of Chao, Wei and Yen, to create the first Great Wall of China. (Ssu-ma 146) The implication is that the system had extended itself even further north, and that the steppe peoples, especially the "Huns," were now a part of it.

Rebellions broke out in 209 BC, the year after the death of the First Emperor. (Ssu-ma 158) From 206 to 202 BC there was anarchy through the former Ch'in empire, and then the reconstruction of an empire called Han. Walker proposes (98, 37-39) that the Han state which succeeded Ch'in as the strongest element in the Far Eastern system looked more like the Jin of the late 7th and early 6th centuries BC (a league hegemon leading many locally autonomous states) than Ch'in and Ch'u ("totalitarian" empires which erased states and made their territories into provinces). True enough, as far as the former territories of Ch'in are concerned.

However, by 200 BC, the Far Eastern world-system has grown once again. Partly because of the peripheral effects of the Ch'in empire, the field of inquiry and narrative must now expand far beyond its imperial territory, which can hereafter be treated only as the cultural-political-economic-demographic core of a system at whose semiperiphery significant polities were forming under core pressure. Roughly these may be identified as: NE, (proto-) Korean; N, Steppe (Hun/Hsiung-nu, Sienbi/Hsien-pi, Turk/T'u-chüeh, Avar/Juan-juan, Mongol, etc); NW, Kashgaria (Tarim basin); SW, mountain (Tibeto-Burman, Tai); SE, coastal (Yüeh/Viet). The system's extent is now about 1000 X 1300 miles. (See Herrmann 9; Penkala 18) Core state claims of hegemony (and universal empire) must be evaluated in some relation to these polities, at least when they are citified. At the same time, the geographic extent of semiperipheral polities often overstates their relative politico-military and economic-demographic weight in the system.

Granting that Han became hegemonic to the systemic core, what of the extended semiperiphery?

The steppe polities in general, are hard to classify. At times they seem cityless stateless tent nomads nearly irrelevant to the discussion; at times they seem to form a state, with a mobile capital, or at least a headquarters, with an empire rivaling Han (as under Mao-tun 201-178 BC, or Chih-chih 56-36 BC); at times they seem like the nub of a small abortive civilization in the Orkhon basin, isolated from the Yellow River basin by

the Gobi desert. We shall treat them according to their level of organization at any given coding year.

The first steppe polity to be a clear participant in the Far Eastern system was the proto-Hun (Hsiung-nu) tribal confederation, which had begun to contend with the proto-Alans (Yüeh-chih) to its west on the Mongolian plain. The Hun confederation (we shall use the later European label) was driven from Inner Mongolia south of the Gobi to Outer Mongolia north of the desert by a Ch'in army of 100,000 men in 214 BC, but returned to Inner Mongolia in 209 BC when Mao-tun proclaimed himself shan-yü or emperor (and "son of heaven"), ruling from the capital encampment Lung-cheng (near the future site of Karakorum: Ishjants 153-154, 158, McGovern 115-116; Ssu-ma 167). The fall of Ch'in allowed the Huns under Mao-tun to incorporate the tribes of eastern Mongolia and western Manchuria. They also made vassals of the thirty-odd walled city-states of Kashgaria--Turfan, Loulan, Karashahr, Kucha, Aksu, Kashgar, Yarkand, Khotan, Khema, and others--fighting off the Han armies in 200 BC (Ishjants 154, Ma and Sun 227-228, Barfield 33-35, McGovern 117-122, 133).

Southern Yüeh (now the Kwang provinces of S. China, plus north Vietnam), under its king-emperor Chao To (Tuo), a relic Ch'in conquistador of 218-214, declared its independence in 208, calling itself Nan-yüeh, or Nam-Viet 207. (Ssu-ma, 145-146; Ebrey, 83; Hall, SEA, 211-212)

In present Yunnan there had existed since perhaps 316 BC a independent kingdom of Dian (Tien) (Backus, 4), possibly Tai (Pulleyblank, 460).

200 BC. Bipolar. Polar states: Han, Hun. Korea: Ko-Choson weak and independent. Mongolia, Kashgaria: Hun vassals. Nan-yüeh and Dian independent.

The state of Wiman Choson (Chao Hsien), in Northwest Korea and Southeast Manchuria, was founded between 194 and 180 BC by a Chinese refugee, one Wiman, who seized the pre-existing Ko-choson state. Its capital was the city of Lelang, or Lolang, near Pyongyang. Wiman Choson expanded northward, eastward and southward. (Nelson 167-168, 203, 189; Eckert et al, 13)

Nan-yüeh accepted Han suzerainty 196, but revolted and declared itself an empire 183; a Han expedition against Nan-yüeh failed 181 BC. Han conciliated Nan-yüeh. (Majumdar, 14; Hall, SEA, 212; Ebrey 83)

Huns defeated a huge Han invasion army 200 BC. McGovern contends that thereafter, and to 140 BC, the Hun empire became "the largest and most powerful single unit in the Far East." (129) "The empire of continental Asia then belonged to the Hsiung-nu." (Grousset 34) In 198 BC Mao-tun concluded an unequal treaty with Han to delimit their imperial boundaries at the Great Wall, exacting heavy tribute in silks,

fabrics, handicrafts, rice, gold and money. In 176 BC the Huns defeated the Alans/Yüeh-chih and seized Kashgaria from them.

175 BC. Unipolar. Polar state: Hun.

In 166 BC the Huns fought Han to stalemate. A treaty of essentially equal character, despite the Han tribute contained therein, was negotiated. (Ishjamts 154; Enoki et al., 175; Barfield 35-36, 45-48, 53-54; McGovern, 121-129)

150 BC. Bipolar. Polar states: Hun, Han. Korea: Wiman Choson independent. Kashgaria: Hun vassals. Nan-yüeh: independent. Dian: independent.

Han itself remained internally as much a hegemonic as an imperial state until 140 BC. Han Wu-ti ruled 140-87 BC, and his reign saw dramatic shifts in power. He replaced vassal states with provinces within the Han domains; he expanded the Han empire in all directions.

Han food and luxury tribute to the Huns was successfully used to render the Huns economically dependent upon Han, and to produce internal tensions between an increasingly sinified elite and their conservative society. (Eberhard, 1952, 73-75; cf. Barfield 51-52) Han Wu-ti's wars with the Huns 133-123 BC drove them to move their capital north of the Gobi.

Southern Yüeh maintained its independence until Chao To's death in 137 BC, after which Han established control over its rulers. (Ebrey, 83)

125 BC. Unipolar. Polar state: Han.

Han was able to follow the Huns across the Gobi, and inflicted major defeats on the Huns in Outer Mongolia 119 BC, but at enormous expense. Though embroiled in leadership struggles, the Huns refused to accept vassal status, and Han lost the ability to defeat them across the desert. The Huns avoided invading Han armies in 111 and 110, and defeated a third in 103. (McGovern, 136-143; Grousset, 35; Barfield, 54-58; cf. Ishjamts, 155). But weakened by rapid successions and impressed by Han advances on both their flanks, the Huns were inclined to be unusually submissive in 101-100 BC, although there was a sudden breach in the latter year. (McGovern 153-154)

In Korea, Wiman Choson was conquered by Han in 109-108 BC, after an abortive attempt of 128 BC. Han set up four colonial commanderies, Lelang, Imdun, Hyondo, and Chinbon, Lelang being the longest-lived. (Nelson, 167-168; Lee, 16-19; Eckert et al, 13-14)

In Manchuria, a Han mid-Yalu commandery of Ch'anghae was established and abandoned somewhere between 128 and 115 BC, perhaps at Ye (proto-Koguryo?) request for support against Wiman Choson. (Han 26; Lee 23; Henthorn 20, 22)

Han conquered the Kansu corridor to Kashgaria from the Huns in 121 BC. In campaigns of 108, 103 and 101 BC Han may be said to have acquired hegemony in Kashgaria, which in this case meant that it received hostages, sent military colonists, and received tribute. (Ma and Sun, 227-228; McGovern 140-141, 149-152)

Southern Yüeh rebelled 112 BC, but was conquered, annexed, and further integrated into the empire 111 BC as a tributary protectorate. Thereupon Eastern Yüeh (now SE China) and Dian (the later Nanchao and Yunnan area of the southwest) volunteered to become tributary vassals 110-109 BC (Hall, SEA, 212; McGovern 144-145; Ebrey 8; Buttinger 93). What Han Wu-ti established in Yunnan was the "nominal" control or "sponsorship" whereby local rulers were acknowledged and given titles as agents for the Chinese in their own territories. (Backus, 4, 6) This is one of many possible hegemonic forms; as with others, its content or meaning is highly variable.

100 BC. Universal Empire. Metropole: Han. Korea: north incorporated (four Han colonial commanderies), south weak. Huns: weakened, remote, passive. Kansu: incorporated. Kashgaria: Han vassals. Dian: Han vassal. E. Yüeh: Han vassal. Nan-yüeh: Han tributary protectorate.

The Far Eastern system under Han was greatly extended, to perhaps 1200 X 1800 miles. (See Herrmann 10-11; Penkala 20; Blunden and Elvin 30) Note that the semiperiphery is mostly hegemonic in structure, while the core is a genuine empire. The classification of the system as a whole as Universal-Empire rather than Hegemony reflects a judgment about the relative sizes and weights of these two parts at the time.

In first century BC Korea, the Han commanderies colonized the northwest. Small Korean polities--southeastern Chihhan, southwestern Mahan, south-coast Pyonhan--grew up in the far south, Mahan at least having walled cities and Chihhan city-like stockades. These weak leagues alternately raided and formally submitted to Lelang. All the Chinese Han commanderies but Lelang had evaporated by 75 BC. (Nelson, 167-171; Lee, 19-21; Henthorn, 22-25; Han 33; Eckert et al, 14)

Han campaigns against the Huns in 99, 97 and 90 BC all failed. (McGovern 156-168; Barfield 56, 59) In the southwest, Dian rebelled unsuccessfully in 86 and 83 BC (Ebrey 83).

75 BC. Unipolar. Polar state: Han.

A Han campaign against the Huns 72-71 BC had limited success, mainly achieved by Han diplomacy, which incited the Tokhars (Wusun) of Dzungaria against their Hun

overlords. (McGovern 156-168) But the Huns suffered a major disaster in a retaliatory attack on the Tokhars in 71 BC, whereupon their other vassal peoples--Dingling in the north, Wuhuan in Manchuria--rose up and attacked them. Between 60 and 55 BC there was factional internal warfare among the Huns. In 55 BC they split into an Eastern (Inner Mongolian) branch under Huhansie and a Western (Outer Mongolian) branch under Chih-chih. The Eastern Huns requested and received Han vassal status in 51 BC. The Western Huns sent hostages and tributary presents to Han, though remaining far beyond any real Han control. (McGovern, 156-171, 187; Barfield 40-41, 59, 61-63)

Han moved slowly to increase control over Kashgaria. Having subjugated Loulan 77 BC, Han extended control over Kucha 71 BC, Yarkand 65 BC, Turfan 60 BC. A Han protector-general ruled Kashgaria after 60 BC. (McGovern, 171-181)

Around Kokonor, Chiang tribes formed a confederation. The Han broke this up, subjugated the Chiang, and colonized around Kokonor 61 BC. (McGovern, 184)

50 BC. Universal Empire. Metropole: Han. Korea: Han Lelang commandery plus small statelets in south. Huns: Eastern Huns of Inner Mongolia Han vassals. Western Huns of Outer Mongolia Han pseudo-tributaries. Kashgaria: united Han protectorate of vassal city-statelets. Dian: Han vassal. Nan-yüeh: Han tributary protectorate.

Chih-chih's Western Huns, at first placatory, moved west, abandoning Outer Mongolia, and created in and around Turkestan a widespread empire. Chih-chih built a huge walled city (perhaps at the fortress on the Talas near the Jaxartes/Syr Darya) which served as the Western Hun capital. But a Han expedition of 36 BC destroyed city, empire, and Chih-chih. (Ma and Sun 228; Zhang, 1996a, 304; McGovern 187-196; cf. Ishjamts, 155, 163)

Huhansie's Eastern Huns occupied the now-vacant Outer Mongolia, but remained, on the whole, on good terms with Han, despite some episodes in which the Tokhars (Wusun) of Dzungaria, Han vassals, and the Wuhuan of Manchuria, Hun vassals, provided some cause for dispute. (McGovern, 186-187, 196-204) The Han gave the Eastern Huns gifts in return for tributary visits, and it is possible that this relationship had turned from vassalage to extortion, somewhere in this period (Barfield, 63-66); but it seems to me more like one of very well-paid, but uniquely valuable, mercenary service.

Han retained its protectorate-general over Kashgaria, maintaining garrisons, planting colonies, undercutting vassals, dividing vassal states; the latter strategy also increased control over, and disorder within, the Tokhars of Dzungaria. It even acquired a purely nominal hegemony over the Kanggu of the Jaxartes basin. (McGovern, 204-208)

The Chiang of Kokonor rebelled 42 BC and were overwhelmed, subjugated, expelled or colonized. (McGovern 210)

25 BC. Universal Empire. Metropole: Han.

AD/BC. Universal Empire. Metropole: Han. Korea: Han Lelang commandery plus small statelets in south. Huns: Han vassal tribal confederacy. Kashgaria: Han protectorate; vassal city-statelets. Dian: Han vassal. Nan-yüeh: Han tributary protectorate.

In the Han metropole, Wang Mang set up the one-emperor Hsin dynasty (AD 9-23). Hsin attempted nationalization of land, manumission of slaves, land division, grain price stabilization, and creation of grain reserves. Hsin also degraded and abused vassals. Wang Mang's reforms ultimately provoked class uprisings which destroyed him and vassal rebellions which dissolved the Han/Hsin empire. In particular, Wang Mang attempted to turn the Huns into a fully subjugated people, which they successfully resisted; indeed, they and the Wuhuan were in rebellion by AD 9. Hun raids (sometimes conducted with Wuhuan and Sienbi cooperation) were supplemented by operations against Hsin rule in Kashgaria. After the Hsin collapse, a Later, or Eastern, Han dynasty nominally reestablished itself AD 25. (McGovern 213-228)

In southeastern Manchuria, Koguryo coalesced as a state by the 1st century AD (though its traditional founding date is 37 BC). It sent envoys AD 9 to Wang Mang, and mobilized forces to enlist against the Huns, but fought Hsin instead, AD 12. (Nelson 204, 207; Henthorn, 26-28; Lee, 23-24; Han 27)

In eastern Manchuria, the Puyo tribal confederation (Henthorn 18-19, 28; Han 22-25; Lee 21-22) had become powerful enough to be ordered to mobilize against the Huns AD 12. Puyo accepted vassal relations with Hsin, and was used to check Koguryo and the Sienbi.

Some rebels in Kashgaria fled to the Huns, who staged repeated raids on Hsin; others held Karashahr against Hsin. As Kashgaria bit by bit, except Yarkand, defected from Hsin, the bits drifted into tributary vassalage to the Huns. (Ma and Sun 229; McGovern 215-222, 226-230, 239-240, 246).

Dian rebelled unsuccessfully AD 14. (Ebrey 83) Nan-yüeh was heavily colonized by Han people AD 1-25, with attempts to organize it along more conventional bureaucratic lines. (Hall, SEA, 212-213; Buttinger 97-99; Majumdar, 69)

AD 25. Multipolar. Polar states: Hun, Han, Koguryo, Puyo.

The Huns supported a Han pretender in North China AD 30-36. The Later Han dynasty was actually secure only by about AD 40. (McGovern 215-216, 224-228)

A rebellion in Lelang was crushed by the new Han governor AD 30, but the Han direct-rule area contracted. (Lee 19; Henthorn 24)

Puyo resumed vassal service to Later Han, and began using the Chinese title wang in AD 49.

The Huns were expelled from Kashgaria AD 29 by the Han vassal state of Yarkand, which became the local hegemon. Refused office as Han Protector-General AD 41, the ruler of Yarkand then declared and enforced his independence as Kashgaria n overlord by AD 46. From that point his oppressive rule provoked a series of risings by city-states who defected to the Huns. The Tokhars (Wusun) of Dzungaria, cut off from Han, became independent. (Ma and Sun 229; McGovern 215-222, 226-230, 239-240, 246).

A fatal drought decimated the Huns. Intrigue and faction split the Huns again, AD 47 or 48, into Northern (Outer Mongolia) and Southern (Inner Mongolia) confederacies, almost constantly at war. The Southern Huns served after 48 as a Han vassal and buffer, defending and supported by the Han garrison towns, and were well rewarded by Han embassies. The Northern Huns maintained independence and sought to control Kashgaria and Dzungaria, the Wuhuan and the Sienbi. But the Han were able to entice the Wuhuan to settle down as vassals, and mobilized the Sienbi as fighting vassals by offering a bounty on Northern Hun heads. (McGovern, 231-238; Barfield, 71-77)

Dian rebelled unsuccessfully again AD 42-45. (Ebrey 83) The southern part of Nan-yüeh, the Yüeh/Viet-populated future Tonkin, rebelled against Han AD 36, achieving independence 40-42. It was reconquered and reorganized as a Han imperial province, military colony, and conversion/assimilation target. (Hall, SEA, 212-213; Buttinger 97-99; Majumdar, 69)

AD 50. Unipolar. Polar state: Han. Korea: Han Lelang commandery, reduced. Manchuria: Puyo a Han vassal; Koguryo independent and hostile. Huns: vassal tribal confederacy (S); independent tribal confederacy (N). Kashgaria: independent Yarkand hegemony. Dian: vassal. Tonkin: imperial province/colony.

Koguryo was a militant and expansionist state, aiming northwest, southwest, south and southeast, always into Han's territory or hegemonic empire. Koguryo conquered many tribal peoples southward into present Korea (e.g. Okcho), extracted tribute, and fought frequently with the Han commanderies on the Yellow Sea coast. (Eckert et al 17; Lee 24; Henthorn 28; Nelson 207)

Puyo sent regular embassies to Han. (Lee 22)

After Loulan, Turfan and Kucha had rebelled against Yarkand and accepted Northern Hun protection, Yarkand began to consolidate the rest of its Kashgarian empire by replacing subject kings with puppets, and these with appointed military governors.

Khotan rebelled against this policy AD 60, with such success that Khotan replaced Yarkand as local overlord. At this point a Northern Hun army forced Khotan into vassalship, thereby giving them control over Kashgaria from AD 61. The Tokhars (Wusun) remained independent in Dzungaria. (McGovern, 239-246, 257)

Han and the Northern Huns had thus far not clashed directly, only through intermediaries and buffers. From AD 65 the Huns began raiding Kansu directly. The Han state, by now internally secure, counterattacked successfully in 73-74, inflicting a major defeat on the Northern Huns and regaining the overlordship of Kashgaria. As of AD 75 Han had their northeast and north frontiers securely in the hands of friendly Wuhuan and Sienbi or submissive Southern Huns, and Kashgaria to the northwest well controlled. (McGovern, 255-258, 264-274, 276; Barfield 77-80)

AD 75. Unipolar. Polar state: Han.

When one Han emperor died, and the next reversed his imperialist policy, Han abandoned the attempt to control all Kashgaria AD 76. Kucha and Yarkand were lost to Northern Hun vassalship, though Khotan and Kashgar were held. (McGovern, 255-258, 264-274, 276)

Drought, famine, emigration and surrender afflicted the Northern Huns after AD 82. They made peace with Han AD 84. Han vassals, the Sienbi and Southern Huns, attacked them with great success AD 85 and 87. The Han general Pan Ch'ao reestablished control in Kashgaria AD 88-91, and became Protector General. Having directly attacked and defeated the Northern Huns in 89, Han installed a vassal over them in 91. When the successful Han general Dou Hien was for his pains executed in 92, his Hun ins tallce revolted, and was destroyed AD 93 by an alliance of Han, Southern Huns, Sienbi, and others. Some Northern Huns moved west, and were confined to Dzungaria as distant, virtually autonomous Han vassals. Some joined the Han vassal Sienbi, who took over Outer Mongolia. The vassal Southern Huns had fallen into civil warfare. Pan Ch'ao undertook demonstrations and enforcement of Han control against various Kashgarian states AD 94 and 97. (McGovern 274-289; Ishjants, 155; Barfield, 77-80)

AD 100. Universal Empire. Metropole: Han. Korea: Han Lelang commandery. Manchuria: Puyo vassal; Koguryo independent and contained. Mongolia: vassal Southern Huns (s); decentralized Sienbi (n). Kashgaria: tributary. Dzungaria: vassal Northern Huns. Dian: vassal. Tonkin: province/colony.

The Han core lost centrality and cohesion in the 2nd century AD, beginning with a succession crisis AD 105 which was followed by uprisings on the northwest frontier AD 106, in the west AD 107, and in the north and northeast AD 109. (McGovern, 291-294)

Han abandoned Kashgaria AD 107 in the face of revolts beginning 106. The Northern Huns of Dzungaria regained control there 107-119, defeated a Han counterstroke 119-120, and raided the northwest. (McGovern, 291-293)

Han's northern allies, the Southern Huns, Wuhuan and Sienbi, took advantage of floods and famine in the metropole to rebel in 109 but were defeated, the Huns and Wuhuan re-subjected, and the Sienbi driven off, in 110. (McGovern, 294-295) There were revolts among the Southern Huns AD 124, crushed by Han. (McGovern, 3020-202)

In the west, proto-Tibetan Chiang proclaimed a rival emperor and began attacking Han in 107; by 116 their empire had been liquidated through a series of assassinations. (McGovern, 293-294)

AD 125. Unipolar. Polar state: Han.

The Sienbi returned as raiders after 115. Their leader Kijgien reorganized their rival tribes (AD 121-133) into a cohesive tribal confederacy raiding Han, but resisted by Southern Huns and Wuhuan. After his death his works evaporated. (McGovern, 304; Barfield, 88)

Pan Yung reestablished Han supremacy over Kashgaria in a campaign 123 -127, and it was enforced against Khotan 133. In Dzungaria, the Tokhars (Wusun) were let alone and the Northern Huns stalemated in campaigns of 134 and 135. (McGovern, 295-301)

Revolts by Southern Huns and Wuhuan AD 140-143 were put down by Han. (McGovern, 302-303)

AD 150. Universal Empire. Metropole: Han. Korea: Han Lelang commandery. Manchuria: Puyo vassal; Koguryo independent. Southern Huns: vassals, with Wuhuan. Sienbi: weak. Kashgaria: Han vassal city-states. Northern Huns: held at a distance. Tonkin: province/colony.

The Southern Huns and Wuhuan were on the whole submissive, at least between revolts of 153 and 158. (McGovern, 303)

Shortly after 150, Tanshihuai reunited the Sienbi. He established a Sienbi state with laws, large forces, and vassals--Dingling of Siberia, Puyo (Fuyu) of Manchuria, Tokhars (Wusun) of Dzungaria. He drove the Northern Huns out of Dzungaria and broke up their state for good. Tanshihuai raided Han regularly after 156. By 166 he had established a Sienbi steppe empire of dimensions comparable to that of the Huns, though with less of a settled population. He asserted full equality with Han. (Kyzlasov 318-319, McGovern 304-308, Ishjamts 156; Grousset 53-54)

AD 175. Bipolar. Polar states: Han, Sienbi.

Han lost much cohesion and went rapidly downhill toward the century's end. After the Revolt of the Yellow Turbans of 184, Han broke into warlord statelets, though the "dynasty" nominally continued to 220.

In Korea, the Chinese commanderies fell into disorder in the 180's. (Henthorn, 28) There was strong fighting between Koguryo and the Han warlords of Liaotung; both were expansionist. (Lee 24; Henthorn 28)

Tanshihuai destroyed a Han-Southern Hun army AD 177, after which the Southern Huns slowly disintegrated. But when Tanshihuai died around 180, he left no competent successor, and his Sienbi empire decayed after 180, though it remained a power into the first decades of the next century. (Kyzlasov 318-319; McGovern 303-308, 313-314; Ishjants 156; Grousset 53-54)

Tonkin, nucleus of the current Vietnam, revolted against the Han and achieved independence AD 183. To its south, Lin-yi, proto-Champa, predecessor of South Vietnam, did the same AD 192. (Majumdar, 18, 69; Hall, SEA, 28)

AD 200. Multipolar. Core: warlords of Later Han. Manchuria: Puyo pro-Han; Koguryo independent. Korea: Han commandery at Lelang. Steppe: independent Sienbi state decaying. Kashgaria: independent city-states. Tonkin: independent. Champa: independent.

After a chaotic period of revolution and warlord secession and imperialism, the Three Kingdoms period AD 220-265 found the Far Eastern core split among Wei in the Yellow River basin (Loyang), Shu Han in the western Yangtze Szechwan basin (Chengdu), Wu in the eastern Yangtze area (Nanking). Wei was largest, most densely populated, best armed and wealthiest.

In Korea, another Chinese commandery, Taifang/Taebang, with a capital city near present Seoul, was established AD 204 by the Lelang commander, the northeast China warlord. Puyo formed ties with Lelang. Koguryo moved its capital south to the Yalu AD 209. From this point it is convenient to treat Koguryo as a Korean rather than Manchurian state, although it was both. (Nelson, 169, 189, 220-222; Henthorn, 28-30; Lee 23, 37)

The Sienbi state split, hiving off Toba, Muyung and T'u-yü-hun (or Tugon: Beckwith, 17) kin-tribe parts. (Ishjants, 156)

The Southern Huns broke up into many tribal units, some pro-Han, some independent AD 216; later they were loyal or submissive to Wei, while it lasted. (McGovern, 313-315)

Wei inherited the Han protectorate of Kashgaria. (Ma and Sun, 229-230; Grousset, 54) Shu Han inherited Han sponsorship of Dian; Chu-ko Liang led a major expedition into Yunnan, but rejected direct control in favor of patronage. (Backus, 6)

AD 225. Unipolar. Polar state: Wei.

In Korea, Lelang sought independence as "Yen" in 237, but was crushed and taken over by Wei. (Nelson, 169, 189; Henthorn, 28-29; Lee 23) The Korean state of Paekche in the southwest of the peninsula dates no later than about the middle of this century; it was hostile to Koguryo and friendly to the Chinese dynasties, though it probably defeated a Wei attempt to extend the commanderies AD 246. (Nelson, 220-222; Henthorn 29-30; Lee 37)

Wei, provisioned by Puyo, successfully attacked Koguryo AD 244, taking the capital and holding it for a year, in reprisal for a Koguryo raid of 242. (Henthorn 29; Han 23, 42; Lee 23, 45)

The independent state of Tonkin was suppressed AD 226. (Majumdar 69)

Champa (actually then called Lin-yi, after its capital) sent embassies to offer tribute to the Chinese governorate of Tonkin, and received embassies to spread "Chinese civilization" in the 220's; nevertheless Champa aggressively attacked and expanded against Tonkin in 248. (Majumdar, 22; Coedès, 42-44; Hall, SEA 29)

The Indianized state of Funan, centered on the Mekong Delta, predecessor of Chenla and Cambodia, now puts in an ambiguous appearance. Was Funan truly "the dominating power on the peninsula for five centuries" (Coedès, 36, 61)? Or was it a temporary assemblage of small chiefdoms for trade with, and requests for aid from, whichever Chinese state was handy (D. Chandler, 1996: 15)? Did Chinese envoys find there "walled cities" (Hall, SEA, 27) or "walled villages" (Coedès 42)? Whatever it was, it was polite, sending embassies offering presents to Wu in 243. (Coedès 40-41)

AD 250. Unipolar. Polar state: Wei. Yangtze basin: Shu Han and Wu independent. Korea: Koguryo and Paekche independent; Chinese commanderies at Lelang and Taebang. Manchuria: Puyo vassal to Wei. Mongolia: Southern Huns vassals; Sienbi independent, divided. Kashgaria: Wei protectorate. Dian: vassal of Shu Han. Tonkin: Chinese governorate. Funan: tributary to Wu. Champa: independent and hostile to Tonkin.

Wei annexed Shu Han AD 263. Wei was overthrown by a military coup in 265 that changed the state-name to Jin. This "Western" Jin state lasted about 265-302, sometimes as the polar state in a unipolar system, sometimes as a systemwide hegemon.

The Toba group of Sienbi achieved hegemony over 36 tribes AD 258. (Huang, 87)

A Southern Hun tribal rebellion was put down in 271. (McGovern, 316)

In Kashgaria, several states became powerful from the mid-3rd century: Kashgar, Khotan, Loulan and Shan-shan. (Zhang, 1996b, 284, 288-289; but McGovern, 174, identifies Loulan with Shan-shan)

Funan sent an embassy to Wu 268. It then may have aided Champa in the latter's northward expansionist attacks on Tonkin c. 270-280.

AD 275. Unipolar. Polar state: Western Jin.

Western Jin annexed Wu in 280. Western Jin, unlike Wei, partly decentralized itself, appointing territorial lords. (Holcombe, 35-36) From 281 to 302 there were famines, plagues, floods and banditry in north China. Northern peoples had been allowed to immigrate and settle, and ethnic conflicts grew. (Wright, 24)

In south Korea, Mahan and Chinhan opened trade relations with Western Jin. (Han 33)

The Sienbi invaded Puyo AD 285; Western Jin restored Puyo. (Lee 22; Henthorn 28)

A Southern Hun rebellion was put down in 296. (McGovern, 316)

Funan sent three embassies to Western Jin, 285-287; Champa sent one 284. (Majumdar, 23; Coedès, 42-44; Hall, SEA, 28-29).

AD 300. Unipolar. Polar state: Western Jin. Manchuria: Puyo vassal to Jin. Korea: Koguryo independent, checked by Paekche (friendly to Chin); Chinese colonies at Lelang, Taebang. Tonkin: Jin governorate. Champa: strong, independent, peaceful relations with Western Jin. Funan: at peace with Western Jin since last embassy.

A succession struggle in Western Jin from AD 300 produced civil wars and decentralization. The Sixteen Kingdoms 302-420 could be seen as a multipolar period for the system, though perhaps at times unipolar for the core. The core always included the central, Yangtze state of Eastern Jin. There was usually a far southern state (Nam Viet), a western state (Ch'eng), 3 Korean states, and several northern states, Hun, Mongol or Toba.

There were fratricidal civil wars in Western Jin 300-306. These provided the occasion for northern alien tribes to enter and conquer north China. (Holcombe, 27) The Jin empire's overlord for the Southern Huns, one Liu Yüan, revolted as Hun shan-yü AD

304; claimed the heritage of Han and created a Han Kingdom in North China; claimed the entire empire AD 308. The Hun/Han state conquered and destroyed the imperial capital Loyang AD 311; controlled most of North China by 317. The Western Jin fled and reorganized as a Yangtze basin state, the Eastern Jin at (modern) Nanking, 317. A coup overthrew the Han/Hun dynasty, 318. Two Hun-ruled states, a Western Chao at Changan and an Eastern Chao at (modern) Beijing, emerged 319. (McGovern, 316-351)

Eastern Jin continued the process of decentralization, territorialization, and feudalization of its predecessor. It suffered rebellion 322-324. (Holcombe 29-30, 38-42)

In Korea, Koguryo conquered the Jin Lelang commandery in AD 313; Paekche absorbed Taebang. Puyo was isolated from Jin when Jin lost southern Manchuria, c. 316 to the Murung Sienbi, who reorganized as the state of Former Yen AD 319. (Nelson 169, 211; Henthorn 30, 34; Lee 23, 36; Han 23, 43)

AD 325. Multipolar. Great powers: Eastern Jin, Western Chao, Eastern Chao, Liang, Nam Viet, Koguryo, Paekche, Puyo, Former Yen.

Eastern Chao conquered Western by AD 329. United Chao, with capitals at Loyang and Ye (Anyang), overawed the Yangtze state of Eastern Jin, the divided Toba Sienbi of Southern Mongolia, the Liang state of Kansu, the Former Yen state of the Murung tribe of the Sienbi in southern Manchuria, as well as the city-states of Kashgaria. Chao however then failed to complete an attack on Eastern Jin 342, failed in an attempt to further subjugate Former Yen (and lost overlordship of it), was consequently repudiated by the Tobas and Liang, and was repulsed in an attack on Liang. (McGovern, 316-351)

Though plagued by disastrous rebellion 327-328, still Eastern Jin was able to conquer Szechwan 347. (Holcombe 29-30, 38-42)

Former Yen badly defeated Koguryo in 342 and subjugated Puyo in 346. (Han 23, 43; Lee 23; Henthorn 30, 34)

Champa built itself up militarily in a peaceful period to 336. After a coup, an aggressive ruler subjugated interior tribes, and then had a falling-out with Eastern Jin. Champa requested the cession of the territory of Jih-nan 340, did not receive it, seized it anyway during troubles there 347, and defeated Jin forces 348 and 349. (Majumdar, 23, 24; Coedès, 45; Hall, SEA 29)

AD 350. Multipolar. Yangtze basin: Eastern Jin. Yellow River basin: United Chao. Japan: Wa/Yamato state. Korea: Paekche vs. Koguryo (independent). Manchuria: Former Yen (Murung Sienbi); Puyo vassal to Former Yen. Mongolia: Toba

Sienbi. Kansu: Liang. Kashgaria: city-states. Tonkin: Jin governorate. Champa: independent and aggressive.

The Chao dynasty destroyed itself as its Hans massacred and destroyed its Huns, and were overrun by Former Yen 350-351. (McGovern 350-351) Former Yen conquered Loyang 364, but ran athwart of a sinifying Tibetan state of Former Ch'in, set up in 350 at Changan, which conquered all of Former Yen by 370. (Grousset, 58-60; Holcombe, 31; Eberhard, 1952, 77-78; Huang, 88)

Around mid-century Paekche became an Eastern Jin vassal. Paekche destroyed and incorporated Mahan AD 369. Paekche and Koguryo fought for the center of the peninsula, Paekche being victorious AD 371. Koguryo accepted vassal status to Former Yen in 355 and Former Ch'in AD 372. (Fairbank et al, 282; Henthorn, 33-35, 37, 47; Lee 22, 37; Han 35, 43-44) Puyo became a Koguryo protectorate when their mutual overlord, Former Yen, was destroyed AD 370. (Henthorn, 34; Lee, 22)

About 371, a Togon state in the Kokonor area appeared; it became a vassal to Former Ch'in during the latter's brief ascent. (Molè, xiii, 77, 79)

Champa attempted unsuccessfully to expand northwards 351 and 359, lost Jih-nan instead, and sent an embassy in 372. Funan reappears for the first time since 287, sending tribute to Eastern Jin 357 and then falls silent again. (Coedès, 46-48, 56; Hall, SEA 29, 31; Majumdar 25)

AD 375. Bipolar. Polar states: Former Ch'in, Eastern Jin.

Former Ch'in annexed the Liang state in Kansu 376 and subdued Kashgaria 382 - 383. It thus reunited the north, and turned to attack Eastern Jin. But its assault on south China failed in 383 and the state split into five parts. A (Turkic/Sienbi) Toba state expanded from Tatung to Anyang (Ye) in the 390's, transporting and settling conquered Sienbi, Huns and Koreans, and taking on the dynastic label Northern Wei 398/399. (Grousset, 58-60; Holcombe, 31; Eberhard, 1952, 77-78; Huang, 88)

Eastern Jin weathered wars with the north, puppet emperors, regional and palace strongmen. A rebellion of 399 was too much for it to survive. (Holcombe, 30-33)

Koguryo remained tributary to whatever was the strongest state in north China, accepting patents of investiture, though the relation seems to have become almost nominal quite soon, since in 391 Koguryo began a vigorous expansion in all directions, which suzerains generally discouraged. Silla, in the southeast, formed as a state about this time out of the Chinhan tribe of Saro, and proceeded to seek Koguryo's suzerain protection against Paekche. In southern Japan, a strong unified state, Wa or Yamato, had

by now formed. Paekche sought Japanese protection, and became a vassal in 397. (Fairbank et al, 282; Henthorn, 33-35, 37, 47; Lee 22, 37; Han 35, 43-44)

On the south coast of Korea, Pyonhan had evolved into the Kaya League of six states, with old trade and cultural links to Yamato. Pressed by Silla and Paekche, the Kaya League probably became tributary to Yamato, and secured military aid. The Wa-Kaya alliance attacked Silla in 399. (Henthorn 35-37)

Kashgaria came under Former Ch'in for a moment, 382-383, just before that dynasty collapsed. (Grousset, 59)

About 388-390 Togon was vassal to one of the Former Ch'in successor states, Western Ch'in (Kansu). Togon revolted in the 390's, but was defeated and resubjugated. (Molè, xiii, 77, 79)

Champa sent an embassy in 377, then renewed its attack on Jih-nan 399 and was defeated. (Coedès, 46-48, 56; Hall, SEA 29, 31; Majumdar 25)

AD 400. Multipolar. Yangtze basin: Eastern Jin. Yellow River: "16 kingdoms," notably Northern or Toba Wei at Tatung; also Later Liang, Northern Liang, Hsia, Later Ch'in, Western Ch'in, Northern and Southern Yen (Ebrey 87; Grousset 59-62). Japan: Yamato/Wa. Korea: Silla vassal to Koguryo; Koguryo vassal to a N. Chinese state, Paekche vassal to E. Jin and Yamato. Manchuria: Puyo vassal to Koguryo. Kokonor: Togon vassal to Western Ch'in. Tonkin: Jin governorate. Champa: independent, aggressive against Tonkin.

The Eastern Jin at Nanking, in what should probably be called the Yangtze State (since it continued as fundamentally the same state through a series of "dynastic" coups), underwent a coup in 403 and a countercoup 404-405, fell under the control of their saviors, and were in due course replaced by the Liu Sung (Former Sung) AD 420. (Holcombe, 32-33) A separate ethnic identification, "nan-ren" (Southern people), had by now developed among the inhabitants of the Yangtze State, and northerners and southerners had developed contemptuous labels for each other. (Wright, 28-29)

Silla, backed by Koguryo, defeated the Wa-Kaya attack in 400, and made peace with Wa in 402. Wa troops installed a Paekche scion during a succession struggle there in 405. (Henthorn 37-38)

Avars (Ju-juan, Juan-juan, Hun-Mongols--Liptak, 48; Grousset, 84) established a powerful nomad empire or Kaghanate in Mongolia 402-555. In the early 5th century it contended on equal terms with Northern Wei, the Toba state of north China. Northern

Wei drove the Avars back in 402 and 424 and raided across the Gobi 425 to disrupt their hordes. (Kyzlasov 321; Grousset 60-62)

Togon raided Western Ch'in c. 401, was badly defeated, and settled down to wage a long and unsuccessful struggle to regain lost territories. Togon submitted once again 421. Taking advantage of its position on the route to Kashgaria, Togon also submitted to the Yangtze State 423. (Molè, xiii-xv, 5-10, 27, 80-86)

Champa renewed its invasions of the Chinese province of Tonkin in 405, 407, 413, at which time it was badly defeated and counterinvaded, and fell into anarchy to 420. Raids on Tonkin continued, but Champa was again badly defeated 420, and in 421 sent an embassy to the Yangtze State requesting investiture. (Coedès, 56-57; Hall, SEA, 35; Majumdar, 25-26, 28-31)

AD 425. Multipolar. Great powers: Yangtze state (Liu Sung dynasty); Northern Wei, and other Yellow River states; Avar confederacy; Koguryo; Wa; Champa.

The Northern Wei, having taken Loyang 423, proceeded to destroy and absorb the other states of north China by 439. They and the Yangtze State thereafter constituted the "Northern and Southern Dynasties." (Grousset, 61-62) The Northern-Southern period to 589 included a south China dynasty on the Yangtze, a partly sinified Yellow River Toba state (Wei/Yuan), three Korean states, Puyo, and far southern states (Champa, Funan). More shapeless were far southwestern proto-Burman formations (Pong, Talaung, Prome), and the Avar steppe tribal confederacy in the far north. At its most centralized the system was probably occasionally bipolar, more usually multipolar.

Koguryo's "Long-lived King" Changsu-wang (413-491) maintained tributary ties and accepted investitures from both northern and southern Chinese dynasties, as well as northern nomadic peoples, thereby gaining effectively total independence. (Henthorn 47; Lee 38, 46; Han 47) Changsu-wang moved the capital south again in 427, to Pyongyang, and created several new major regional capital cities. Koguryo now pressed hard on Paekche and Silla, which allied against it in 433, Silla having stopped sending tribute and hostages. (Nelson 211, 216; Lee 38-40; Henthorn 47) In Manchuria, Puyo remained dependent on Koguryo. (Han, 23)

Northern Wei raided the Avars again 429, 443, 449 to keep them off balance. (Kyzlasov 321; Grousset 60-62)

Northern Wei annexed the Shan-shan (Loulan) kingdom of Kashgaria in 445. (Zhang, 1996b, 289; Molè, 116) It extracted tribute from Karashahr and Kucha in 448. (Grousset, 62)

During the rise of Northern Wei, Togon submitted to it (431) and seized Hsia and Western Ch'in territory; unable to extract more territory, Togon then shifted its major

submission back to the Yangtze State. A pattern of good but weak relations with the Yangtze State continued. Togon alternately submitted and rebelled, raided and counterraided Northern Wei, which drove them out of their lands 444-446; they then took Khotan, and ranged through Kashgaria. (Molè, xiii-xv, 5-10, 27, 80-86)

Champa continued to pay tribute to the Yangtze State, but even so attacked Tonkin again 431, evoking an unsuccessful punitive invasion. Champa tried to ally with Funan to destroy Tonkin 431-432, requested its cession from the Yangtze State in 433, invaded again. In 446 another Chinese expedition badly defeated Champa, and took and sacked its capital. (Coedès, 56-57; Hall, SEA, 35; Majumdar, 25-26, 28-31)

Funan refused to help Champa conquer Tonkin 431-432. Funan instead sent embassies and presents to the Yangtze State 434, 435, 438. (Coedès, 56; Hall, SEA, 32)

AD 450. Multipolar. Major powers: Northern Wei (Yellow River Basin); Yangtze State (Liu Sung dynasty); Avar empire (Mongolia); Koguryo (Korea, Manchuria). Manchuria: Puyo vassal to Koguryo. Korea: Silla, Paekche independent. Kashgaria: Avar or Togon hegemony. Kokonor: Togon hostile to N. Wei. Tonkin: Yangtze State governorate. Champa: subdued, peaceful. Funan: vassal to Yangtze State.

Northern (Toba) Wei expanded at the expense of the Yangtze State AD 466-469. Northern Wei counterraided the Avars in the Gobi once more 458. (Grousset 64-65)

The Avars acquired overlordship in Turfan 460. (Grousset 64; cf. Molè, 136, who sees Turfan as independent after 460.) Loulan passed from Northern Wei to Avars 468. (Molè, 116, 135)

Togon sent tribute to Northern Wei and the Yangtze State, but was in fact quite independent of both. Wei invaded Togon in 460 and took loot; in 470, and got brief submission; in 473, and got regular tribute, after which peaceful relations were reestablished. (Molè, xv, 11-16, 27, 29)

Champa adopted a peace policy and sent rich tribute embassies to the Yangtze State in 455/456, 458, and 472. (Majumdar, 31-33; Coedès, 57-58; Hall, SEA 32)

AD 475. Multipolar. Major powers: Northern Wei; Yangtze State (Liu Sung dynasty); Avar empire; Koguryo.

The Southern Ch'i dynasty supplanted Liu Sung in the Yangtze State AD 479. Northern (Toba) Wei undertook major and controversial centralizing reforms, moved its capital to Loyang 494, and attempted sinification in language, surnaming, rites, dress, and marriage. (Wright 30; Grousset 64-65; Ebrey 92)

Koguryo seized the Han valley, and the Paekche capital, AD 474-475 despite Paekche appeals for help to Silla (which provided it) and Northern Wei (which did not). Koguryo now controlled a great empire, and was doubtless as strong as any state in the system. It finally absorbed Puyo AD 494, but thereafter stopped expanding. (Han 23, 47-48; Henthorn 38-40; Lee 40)

Loulan passed from Avars to Dingling 491-493, to Togon at the end of the century. Togon was in control of Khotan and Turfan, and generally in Kashgaria, in 485. (Molè, 116, 135)

A succession crisis after c. 480 led to a coup in Champa by an exiled Funan rebel. Funan sent presents and asked the Yangtze State for help in conquering Champa 484, but did not get it; instead the Yangtze State recognized the usurper, as it did his restorationist successor, who sent embassies 492 and 495. (Majumdar, 31-33; Coedès, 57-58; Hall, SEA 32)

AD 500. Multipolar. Great Powers: Northern Wei (Yellow River); Yangtze State (Southern Ch'i dynasty); Avar empire (Mongolia); Koguryo. Korea: Silla, Paekche, Kaya League. Kashgaria: Togon vassals? Kokonor: Togon tributary to N. Wei. Tonkin: Yangtze State governorate. Champa: tributary to Yangtze State, between embassies. Funan: Yangtze State vassal, between embassies.

Until the near-unification of the core by Sui (581) the Far Eastern system remained multipolar, with a central, Yangtze state (S. Ch'i, S. Liang, Ch'en), one and later two Yellow River states (e.g., E. and W. Wei; N. Chi and N. Chou), three Korean states, several steppe khanates, and two southern states--Champa and Funan or Chenla.

AD 502 the Yangtze State dynasty changed from Southern Ch'i to Southern Liang. Nobles, landlords, officials, became increasingly corrupt and oppressive. Liang faced popular rebellions in 504, 511, 516. (Wright, 41)

Northern Wei failed in its last major attempt to conquer the Yangtze State in 507.

The Avars built their own first town, Mumo-chen, about 511. (Kyzlasov, 322)

Togon, hegemonic in Kashgaria, continued regular tribute to Northern Wei to 524, when a series of insurrections in the latter state interrupted relations. (Molè, xv-xvi, 16-19, 32, 110, 135)

Champa sent embassies to the Yangtze State 502, 510, 512, 514. So did Funan 503, and 517-539. (Coedès, 59-60; Hall SEA 33; Majumdar, 33, 36)

AD 525. Multipolar. Great powers: Yangtze State; Northern Wei; Avar empire; Koguryo.

Rebellions against the Southern Liang dynasty of the Yangtze State broke out in 529, 530, 533, 541, 542, 544, increasing in frequency, extent and participation. (Wright, 41) Finally the disastrous revolt of the Tartar general Hou Ching 548-552 crippled Liang. (Marney 15-16, 139-162)

AD 534: the Northern Wei state, divided over sinification, split in two, a sinifying Eastern Wei at Ye/Anyang, and a Toba-revivalist Western Wei at Changan. (Grousset 65-66; Wright 31) Mutually hostile chauvinisms continued to animate northern and southern states. (Wright 31-34)

In Korea, Silla reorganized and centralized its state, and began an expansionist career by eliminating the independent Kaya city-states 532-562. (Nelson, 237; Henthorn 35, 40; Lee 41, 43) Paekche also reorganized and developed ties with the Yangtze State (Southern Liang) and with Yamato. (Han, 48)

The Avars became allies and frontier-protectors for the divided Eastern/Western Wei states of north China. (Kyzlasov, 322)

Kashgaria was under Togon overlordship during this period. (Molè, 32, 135; but cf. 34, 136)

Togon established friendly "tributary" relations with Eastern Wei after 539, but were beyond the reach or aid of that state. (Molè, xv-xvi, 16-19, 110)

A Tonkin satrap revolted against the Yangtze State 534 or 541, and became independent until 547. (Coedès, 70; Wright, 183-184; Hall, SEA, 213)

Champa embassies, lapsed after 514, were sent again to the Yangtze State 526, 527, 529/530, 534. The Funan embassies of 517-539 were its last. (Coedès, 59-60; Hall SEA 33; Majumdar, 33, 36) Champa attacked independent Tonkin 541 or 543, and was defeated. (Majumdar, 36; Coedès, 70)

AD 550. Tripolar. Great Powers: Eastern Wei/Northern Ch'i; Western Wei; Avar empire. Yangtze State (Southern Liang dynasty): paralyzed by Hou Ching rebellion. Korea: 3 Kingdoms. Mongolia: weakened Avar hegemony. Togon: independent. Tonkin: Yangtze State governorate. Champa: independent. Funan: no news since 539.

The Eastern Wei at Anyang were succeeded by their Northern Ch'i puppeteer-creators AD 550. The Western Wei at Changan took Szechwan from the Yangtze State 553 (Ebrey 93), and were replaced by their own puppeteers, Northern Chou, 556-557.

The Hou Ching rebellion and factional struggles among its Liang opponents tore the Yangtze State apart. Western Wei was called in, took the western Yangtze State territories as its reward 553-554, suppressed most factions, and installed a puppet Liang

government in the rump state 555. (Marney, 162-175) A Yangtze State general staged a coup and changed dynasties from Southern Liang to Southern Ch'en 557, but the state lost control over outlying territories to local warlords. It gained a breathing space while the two northern states struggled with each other. (Ebrey 91, 93; Wright 42-43)

With Koguryo weakened by civil war, Silla and Paekche took the center of the peninsula from it in 551; Silla then seized all its ally's gains in 553 and destroyed its avenging army in 554. Silla, which was developing a militaristic-elitist organization and cult finished conquering the Kayas in 562, and next seized the east coast from Koguryo. (Han 49-50, 76; Henthorn 43-45; Lee 43-44, 47)

Turk (T'u-chüeh) subjects of the Avars rebelled and destroyed the Avar empire 552-555; in its place there arose the First Turk Kaghanate (552-630). (Kyzlasov, 323) The Turks defeated Khitans, incorporated Kyrgyz, crushed the Hephthalite Hun Empire 557-561. The Turkish Kaghanate collected tribute from, arbitrated between, and protected the two north Chinese states, Western Wei (coup-superseded by Northern Chou 557) and Northern Ch'i (coup-successors to Eastern Wei 550). (Sinor and Klyashtorny, 332-333; Grousset 66, 81-83; Wright, 187-188)

Togon's raids and its relations with Northern Ch'i led to repeated Western Wei/Northern Chou attacks 552-576, once with Turk Kaghanate help. (Molè, xvi-xvii, 20-22, 39-44)

Champa sent embassies to the Yangtze State 568 and 572. (Majumdar, 37; Coedès, 70-71; Wright, 184)

In the second half of this century the Funanese vassal kingdom of Chenla, proto-Cambodia, rebelled and began the conquest of Funan. (Coedès, 61, 65-68.) David Chandler (1996: 26-27) doubts the might, centralization, extent and durability of Chenla, which he sees, following Claude Jacques, as a collection of small entities only sometimes led by one leader. This is in a sense old news, since evidently the same could be said of "China" at most moments after its inception, and a fortiori of the steppe kaghanates and other semi-peripheral formations. But the duration of unity is worth problematizing in principle at the "state" level, as well as at the system level, despite the practical problems that will normally preclude extensive analysis of both problematic levels simultaneously.

AD 575. Unipolar. Polar state: First Turk Kaghanate.

The core of the system was rolled up in twelve years' time. Northern Chou and Southern Ch'en combined to conquer and divide Northern Ch'i (575-577); Northern Chou robbed all the booty from Southern Ch'en (577). Sui, led by a notable military

commander, overthrew Northern Chou, which had fallen into the hands of a child emperor, by coup and civil war (580-581).

The Turk empire split into Eastern and Western states 582-584. The Eastern Turk Kaghanate was divided, partly by lineage rivalry, partly by Sui diplomacy, from the 580's onward. (Grousset 88-89)

When the Turkish Kaghanate split, Sui, having made careful logistical and strategic preparations, eliminated its intervening tributary state of Later Liang, used a conscription system inherited from Western Wei to mobilize an overwhelming force, launched a preliminary psychological-warfare campaign, conquered Southern Ch'en (588-589), and put down a southern rebellion (589-590) against Sui cultural impositions. Force and diplomacy won the submission of the southern tribal peoples. (Wright, 43, 54-61, 139-156; Holcombe, 137-138) The system was then unipolar.

Sui now undertook to recover political and military power from fragmented and overstaffed local satrapies and reconcentrate control and revenues in the capital, in the hands of a meritocratically examined bureaucracy of new men. (Wright, 95, 98-105) It undertook to formulate and impose universal moral, legal, cultural, historical, religious, and ritual norms designed to create and justify Sui "cultural hegemony," drawing on ancient and recent, northern and southern traditions: its main objective was the cultural reintegration of the south. (Wright, 108-138, 156-161)

Paekche allied with Koguryo to resist Silla imperialism; but a Koguryo expedition of the 590's to regain the Han river basin in the peninsula's waist was defeated by Silla. Silla proceeded to submit to Sui. (Han 49-50, 76; Henthorn 43-45; Lee 43-44, 47)

The Turks attacked Sui in 597, as did Koguryo in 598. A Sui retaliation against Koguryo failed. (Henthorn 46-47; Lee 47; Han 76)

After being attacked 552-576 by Northern Chou, Togon submitted and became a regular Northern Chou tributary. But Togon took advantage of the Sui coup against Northern Chou to resume raids. Sui sent punitive expeditions 581 and 583, and encouraged dissidents. Togon resumed tribute and submission after Sui's conquest of the south 589. (Molè, xvi-xvii, 20-22, 39-44)

In Yunnan, which had become quite independent by this century, a Sui mission of c. 583 produced acceptable diplomatic relations; in 589 Sui received "appropriate gifts" and conferred an "appointment" on the local ruler. He later resisted Sui, which in 597 invaded and extracted submission; but Yunnan rebelled again in 598. (Backus, 8-12)

There was another unsuccessful revolt in Tonkin, inspired by the Sui conquest of the Yangtze State, 590. Tonkin again revolted under the Ly, 600. (Hall, SEA, 213)

Toward the end of Southern Ch'en (557-589) Champa repudiated its vassal status, then resumed tribute to Sui 595. (Majumdar, 37; Coedès, 70-71; Wright, 184)

AD 600. Unipolar. Polar state: Sui. Korea: Koguryo aggressively independent; Silla Sui vassal; Paekche Koguryo vassal. Mongolia: Eastern Turk Kaghanate. Western Turk Kaghanate. Kokonor: Togon Sui vassal. Yunnan: independent. Tonkin: independent, in revolt against Sui. Champa: tributary to Sui. Funan: under conquest by Chenla.

Sui began the century with improvements in education, the building of an eastern capital at Loyang, extensive construction of canals. From about 609, Sui moved from domestic integration and improvement to foreign imperialism. Sui's agenda included subjugating the Kaghanate, Togon, Yunnan, Tonkin and Champa; but its chief obsession was Koguryo. (Wright, 172-183)

Suspecting a Turk-Koguryo alliance after 607, Sui repeatedly attacked Koguryo, 612, 613, 614, with disastrous results until the third campaign, when Koguryo offered submission. Sui found the submission inadequate and prepared another attack. But Sui's reputation and finances had been heavily damaged. Taxation, conscription, and failure produced desertion, banditry and rebellion. Revolts began at home 613, and Sui dissolved into twelve contending warlord states. After a chaotic period (618-624), the state of T'ang emerged victorious throughout the ex-Sui realm. (Henthorn 46-47; Lee 47; Han 76-77; Wright, 190-195; Fitzgerald 1933)

Sui diplomacy split the Eastern Turks into pro- and anti-Chinese factions, and then insured the success of their favorites. The Western Turk Kaghan became a threat to Sui and its Eastern puppet 601-602. Sui sponsored a Uighur (Tölös) uprising against the Western Turk Kaghan 603, then split the Western Turks and gained control over both factions by 611. Sui rebuilt and extended the Great Wall against the Eastern Turks. (Wright, 187-189) But the Eastern Turks revolted in 615, after Sui's Korean fiasco. They supported several vassal Chinese pretenders in the post-Sui chaos 617-622. They invaded in some force 622, 623, and attacked the T'ang western capital Changan in 624, but were defeated and withdrew to Mongolia. (Grousset, 89-93; Mu and Wang, 350; Fitzgerald, 1933: 24-25, 60-67, 98, 129-146, 166-167, 199)

Sui secured homage from Turfan 609, from Kucha 618. (Grousset 89) Between 618 and 630 the Western Turk Kaghanate acquired control of Turfan and part of Kashgaria. (Grousset 93)

Sui and Tölös/Uighur allies crushed the Togon state 608-609 and drove the Togon out of Kokonor, coming into touch with Tibet, a settled kingdom with towns which had recently undergone a dynastic change; it sent embassies to Sui in the same years. After

Sui fell, Togon revived and returned to Kokonor, alternating raiding with tribute; and Tibet expanded to become a major power. (Beckwith 17-24; Backus 24-25; Richardson 28-32; Mu and Wang, 360, 362; Molè, xvii-xviii, 44-57, 145-151; cf. Fitzgerald, 1933:162-164, 201)

Sui invaded Yunnan and suppressed the rebellion there in 602. There is no evidence of the imposition of Sui taxes or administration in Yunnan (Backus 12-13); presumably hegemony was restored.

Sui reconquered Tonkin 602 (Hall, SEA, 213; Wright 183-184). T'ang 622 established a protectorate general of Ngannan/Annam there (but we shall continue to call it Tonkin). T'ang dominated in a "firm and efficient" manner that produced peace, prosperity and stability. (Hall, SEA, 213)

Perhaps exasperated by Champa's history of alternating submission with attacks, or incited by reports of its fabulous wealth, Sui invaded its then tributary, defeated it, and looted its capital in 605. Champa begged pardon, then neglected tribute. With the arrival of T'ang Champa resumed its embassies: 623, 625. (Coedès, 71-72; Hall, SEA, 35-36; Majumdar, 37-39)

Funan continued sending embassies to T'ang. Cambodia (Chen-la) befriended Champa, and sent embassies to late Sui 616-617, then to early T'ang 623. (Coedès, 65, 69-70; Hall, SEA, 106-107)

Sui in 610 raided the Liu-ch'iu islands (Ryukyus or Formosa?), with no lasting gains. (Wright, 184-1860)

AD 625. Multipolar. Great powers: T'ang, Tibet, Togon, Eastern Turk kaghanate, Western Turk kaghanate.

Koguryo early accepted T'ang investiture and tributary status, and T'ang attempted to mediate among the three Korean kingdoms. But Koguryo went to war with Silla again in 631, having spent 16 years in building its own Great Wall against Sui and then T'ang. Silla meanwhile had begun a systematic imitation of and vassalage to T'ang. Under attack from Koguryo (and Paekche, 642) Silla appealed to T'ang, which ordered Koguryo to desist. The order having been rejected, T'ang attacked Koguryo in 644-645, 647 and 648, but without success. (Henthorn 47-48, 50; Lee 48, 66; Han 78; Fitzgerald 1933: 187-199)

The Eastern Turks attacked Changan again 626 during a T'ang internal crisis, demanding tribute, but were faced down. The tables then turned as T'ang consolidated. T'ang, pursuing the "half-forward" policy of hegemony, again supported a Uighur uprising 627 and a Turk civil war 628, and was able to defeat and subjugate the Turks and usurp the kaghanate 629. Sarinda Turkish invasions in 641 and 646, attempting to

exploit presumed T'ang exhaustion, were thoroughly defeated. The Uighurs rebelled against the Sarinda confederacy with T'ang aid, and achieved independence as T'ang vassals. (Grousset, 89-93; Mu and Wang, 350; Fitzgerald, 1933: 24-25, 60-67, 98, 129-146, 166-167, 199)

One of the Western Turks' subject tribes, the Karluks, rebelled 630. The Kaghanate split, the T'ang supporting one faction. Kashgaria then came under T'ang hegemony. Kashgar and Khotan paid homage 632, Yarkand 635. Kocho in Turfan offered tribute 630, stopped tribute 639, and was invaded and annexed as a province 640. Beshbalyk was taken from the Western Turks. Karashahr submitted 632, rebelled and was subdued 640, again 648. Kucha submitted 630, rebelled 644, and was taken 648. (Mu and Wang 350-351; Grousset 89, 93-101; Fitzgerald 1933: 164-166)

T'ang crushed Togon again 634-635, installing a sinified puppet, again receiving Tibetan embassies. After Tibet defeated Togon, Tanguts and T'ang 637-638, a Chinese princess was obtained as wife for the Tibetan emperor AD 641. If not tribute extracted from T'ang, this was at least a recognition of independent and significant status. (Beckwith 17-24; Backus 24-25; Richardson 28-32; Mu and Wang, 360, 362; Molè, xvii-xviii, 44-57, 145-151; cf. Fitzgerald, 1933:162-164, 201)

T'ang first established a more direct form of rule in Yunnan, reappointing a local ruler as T'ang prefect, but also sending a T'ang garrison (Backus, 14). T'ang later returned to the more usual form of "loose rein" or "indirect control," appointing a local chief as T'ang representative and satisfying themselves with submission and tribute in return for recognition. In the 640's the T'ang again sought more direct control, moving against walled cities of the Man people, hoping to control a route to India. (Backus, 16-21)

Champa sent frequent embassies to T'ang: 628; 630, 631 (with "rich presents"); 640, 642. (Coedès, 71-72; Hall, SEA, 35-36; Majumdar, 37-39) Declining Funan continued sending embassies to T'ang until extinguished by Cambodia (Chen-la) about 627/635. Cambodia sent an embassy to T'ang 628. (Coedès, 65, 69-70; Hall, SEA, 106-107)

AD 650. Unipolar. Polar state: T'ang. Korea: Koguryo independent of T'ang; Silla a T'ang vassal; Paekche vassal to Koguryo. Mongolia: T'ang kaghanate over Eastern Turks. Kashgaria: T'ang protectorates. Western Turks: independent, divided, weak. Togon: T'ang vassal. Tibet: independent. Yunnan: T'ang tributaries. Tonkin: T'ang protectorate. Champa: T'ang tributary. Cambodia (Chen-la): spottily tributary to T'ang.

The T'ang state was vigorous to 665, then weakened by internal intrigues. (Grousset, 102-103)

T'ang attacks on Koguryo in 655 and 658-659 also failed. (Henthorn 50; Han 78) T'ang now decided to cooperate with Silla in eliminating Paekche first, then attacking Koguryo from the south. T'ang and Silla attacked Paekche in 660, and destroyed it, though complete victory was delayed by a three-year guerrilla uprising. Koguryo defeated a Silla-T'ang attack in 661, but became involved in a succession struggle after 666. T'ang and Silla eliminated Koguryo 668 (bypassing the wall). T'ang attempted peaceful annexation of all Korea. Silla resisted militarily, successfully, after 671. (Lee 66-72; Han 80-86; Henthorn 52-54; Nelson 219, 247)

The Western Turk remnant of the First Kaghanate reunited 651-657 and attempted to conquer Kashgaria; instead it was defeated by T'ang and Uighur allies, divided again, and the two parts came under T'ang client khans. But when the T'ang center weakened after 665, the Western Turks revolted and became once again independent. (Mu and Wang, 351; Grousset 102-108; Sinor and Klyashtorny, 334-335)

Tibet 660-663 conquered Kokonor, destroying the Togon state, acquiring control of some Togon around Kokonor, driving others into T'ang. Western Turk remnants submitted to Tibet. (Molè, xviii-xix, 58, 177-178; Beckwith, 29-33) A T'ang expedition to reconstitute Togon was disastrously defeated 670. (Molè, 59, 180-182) Tibet had already begun to struggle with T'ang for the valuable Kansu corridor and Kashgaria. (Mu and Wang, 349) A direct conflict occurred when the Tibetans acquired hegemony over the T'ang Kashgaria protectorates (Kucha, Khotan, Kashgar and Karashahr) 665-677, and forced the T'ang to pay tribute. (Beckwith, 34-36, 40-43; Richardson, 28-32) Backus considers Tibet thereafter a dominant military power, probably stronger than T'ang. (28-29)

A Yunnanese revolt against T'ang control led to a vigorous T'ang reply and reassertion of hegemony, 651-656. Another Yunnan rebellion led to further T'ang extension in the 670's. But Tibet had by now become a major military power in this area too, and Yunnan became a contested area of Tibetan expansion and T'ang containment. (Backus, 21-23, 30-32)

Champa sent embassies to T'ang: 653, 657, 669, 670. (Coedès, 71-72; Majumdar, 39, 45, 47)

Cambodia (Chen-la) sent several more embassies to T'ang after 650. Its king Jayavarman I conquered large dominions to the north. (Coedès, 72; Hall, SEA, 108)

AD 675. Bipolar. Polar states: Tibet, T'ang.

Silla expelled the inadequate T'ang forces 671-676, and controlled the whole south and center of the Korean peninsula. T'ang set up a Koguryo scion in Liaotung, which became a "lesser Koguryo" vassal state. In 696 a former Koguryo general set up the state which became Parhae in the northern reaches of former Koguryo; he held off a T'ang attack, and in 698 T'ang made peace with him as a new vassal. (Lee 69-72; Henthorn 53-54; Han 85-86)

The Eastern Turks revolted from T'ang 679-681, withdrew, and created what became the Second Turkish Kaghanate of 682-745. Raids against T'ang began at once. By 689 the Turks had subjugated the Western Turk Turgesh. By 691 the Turks, now under their great Qapagan Kaghan, brought under the Tokuz-Oghuz and Uighurs of Mongolia. After 693 the Turks repeatedly invaded China and exacted tribute from the usurping Empress Wu (who briefly changed the dynastic name to Chou 690-704, a usage which we shall not follow here), threatening to restore T'ang. In 696-697 the Turks took payment from Empress Wu for subjugating their own rebellious allies, the Khitan Mongols, who had begun raiding northeast China on their own account. The Turks then resumed their own raids and massacres. (Sinor and Klyashtorny, 334-335; Beckwith 60; Grousset 106-108)

Tibet defeated T'ang armies in Kashgaria in 678 and 689 (Beckwith 44, 51) While the Empress Wu reordered affairs in T'ang, court intrigues weakened Tibet severely. Tibetan subjects, Tanguts and Chiang, defected to T'ang. T'ang recovered lost ground in Yunnan 688-694, and reconquered Kashgaria in 692-694 (Beckwith, 34, 52-57; Backus, 32-33; Mu and Wang, 352; Grousset, 107)

T'ang lost ground against Yunnanese rebels, perhaps Tibetan-aided, in the early 680's, but recovered well 688-694. (Backus, 21-23, 30-32) In farther Yunnan, the early Nanchao state sent missions to T'ang, receiving gifts and titles. (Backus, 57)

Champa continued to send embassies to T'ang: 686, 691, 695, 699. Cambodia (Chen-la) sent embassies to T'ang to 683. (Coedès, 71-72; Majumdar, 39, 45, 47; Hall, SEA, 108)

There was a Pyu state in upper Burma at Old Prome (Srikshetra) from at least 673, perhaps 638 (Hall, Burma, 8) or even six centuries earlier (Hall, SEA, 154); its size and external orientation are unclear.

AD 700. Tripolar. Polar states: Tibet; T'ang (Empress Wu's "Chou"); Second Turkish Khaganate. Korea: united under independent Silla state. Manchuria: T'ang vassal Parhae. Kashgaria: T'ang vassals. Yunnan: disputed between T'ang, Tibet, and locals. Tonkin: T'ang protectorate. Champa: T'ang vassal. Cambodia: T'ang vassal. Burma: Pyu state at Old Prome.

A tripolar power configuration reasserted itself in many years of the 8th century, though there was constant struggle, with frequent collapses and sudden recoveries. Different powers each assumed the first rank for a while--the Eastern Turks around 712, T'ang around 750, Tibet around 763. None could durably occupy and incorporate the core territory of another. Shifting alliances, including also Arabs and the Western-Turk

Turgesh confederacy (usually Tibetan allies) as well as smaller states and groups, were the rule. (Beckwith 6 ff.)

T'ang created numerous "legates," military officers with great autonomy, on its menaced frontiers. (Levy, 1)

T'ang invested the Parhae king 713, but subverted one of his vassals 722. (Han 86-87; Lee 72; Henthorn 54)

The second Turkish Kaghanate expanded until 711, subjugating the Kyrgyz Turks of the upper Yenisei (west of the Orkhon in Outer Mongolia) and the Bayirku Turks of the upper Kerulen (Outer Mongolia, east of the Orkhon) The Kaghanate controlled the Western Turks and the Turgesh and Karluk Turks of Dzungaria, paralyzing a T'ang-Tibetan alliance. They collected slaves and booty. But their far-ranging western expedition was defeated by Arabs near Samarkand and their siege of Beshbalyk failed 714. At this defeat many subject peoples seceded or revolted to T'ang, Qapagan Kaghan was killed by Bayirku rebels, and the empire was only reestablished by Kultegin after a weakening war 716-718, and the Western Turks were lost to it. After decisively defeating a T'ang attack 720-721, the Kaghanate sold T'ang continuing peace for a continuing price, and relations continued friendly. (Beckwith 72-77; Sinor and Klyashtorny 339-341; Litvinsky and Zhang, 24; Grousset, 108-115)

The Turgesh allied with Tibet and assaulted the T'ang protectorate in Kashgaria 717-736.

T'ang was involved in major fighting with Yunnanese 707, 710, 713, 715, with little to show for it. (Backus, 36-40)

A Vietnamese revolt against T'ang occupied the local capital but failed 722 despite aid from Champa and "Land Chenla." (Hall, SEA, 213; Majumdar, 70) After 706 Cambodia divided into "Land Chenla" and anarchic southern "Water Chenla." Land Chenla, possibly extending to Yunnan/Nanchao, was am bivalent: sent an embassy to T'ang 717, helped the Viet revolt against the T'ang governor of Tonkin 722. (Coedès 85-86, 95; Hall, SEA, 110)

Champa sent embassies to T'ang frequently: 702, 703, 706, 707, 709, 711, 712, 713, then lapsed. (Majumdar, 47; Coedès, 72, 94)

AD 725. Tripolar: Second Turkish Kaghanate, T'ang, Tibet.

Parhae sent a force oversea to attack T'ang-controlled Shantung 732; Silla, commissioned by T'ang launched a disastrous retaliatory attack against Parhae 733. (Han 86-87; Lee 72; Henthorn 54)

Succession and secession problems dissolved the second Turkish empire 741 -745. The steppe was soon reorganized by struggles among Turkic vassal peoples, Basmil, Uighur, Karluk: the Second Turkish Kaghanate was succeeded by the Uighur Kaghanate in 744. T'ang approved the Uighur accession, and the Uighurs became T'ang clients. (Beckwith 72-77; Sinor and Klyashtorny 339-341; Litvinsky and Zhang, 24; Grousset, 108-115)

T'ang was generally at war with Tibet in this half-century. Turgesh-Tibetan attacks were held off in Kashgaria to 736. The T'ang high point was reached during their western operations of 736-750, when they subdued the now disunited Turgesh and attacked the Tibetans from the west, over the Hindu Kush. At that point T'ang ruled Kashgaria and Dzungaria, and had clients on the Jaxartes, the Oxus, in the Pamirs, Kashmir and present Afghanistan. (Adshead, 43; Beckwith 114-137; Grousset 114-115, 118-119)

T'ang finally made gains in Yunnan from 729 to the 740's. (Backus, 36-40) From at least 730, Nanchao conciliated both T'ang and Tibet. Both regarded it as a subject ally; but in fact it was operating on its own account, though using T'ang help, to conquer western and then eastern Yunnan. (Backus, 41-45, 52-66)

Champa embassies to T'ang were now sporadic: 731, then 749. (Majumdar, 47; Coedès, 72, 94)

AD 750. Universal empire. Metropole: T'ang. Korea: tributary to T'ang under Silla. Parhae: independent. Uighurs: T'ang clients. Turgesh: fragmented T'ang vassals. Kashgaria: T'ang rule. Tibet: reduced and under T'ang attack. Nanchao: strong and growing T'ang-Tibet vassal. Tonkin: T'ang protectorate. Cambodia: partly independent, partly anarchic. Champa: tributary to T'ang. Burma: Pyu state at Old Prome.

The T'ang universal empire (hegemonic in the semiperiphery, weighted by the size of the imperial core) lasted only a few years. A long-distance T'ang enforcement action against Tashkent provoked a Karluk revolt. Karluks, with Arabs under Ziyad ibn Salih, defeated Kao Hsien-chieh at the Talas in 751, marking a limit to T'ang's westward expansion. The Karluks took Dzungaria. T'ang continued to press Tibet hard, to the point that the latter fell into revolt in 755. But this was of no use to T'ang, which itself now collapsed. (Grousset, 119-120; Beckwith 137-142)

Signs of strain had already shown. For whatever reason, from the early 750's T'ang began to feel threatened by Nanchao's growth. Nanchao and T'ang became enemies, and Nanchao became a vassal ally of Tibet alone. (Backus, 70-71; Beckwith, 141). T'ang expeditions of 752, 753 and 754 against Nanchao ended with a rout of T'ang forces by Nanchao and Tibet in 754. (Backus, 75-76)

Corruption had depleted and enfeebled T'ang forces, except for northern frontier troops under foreign generals. The Turco-Sogdian T'ang general An Lushan rebelled against the dynasty in 755. To defeat the rebellion, T'ang had to call in the loyal frontier troops and the Uighurs, thereby forfeiting control over the outlying regions. (Backus, 73, 77; Grousset, 120-121) T'ang was compelled to make a compromise peace in 763. Several rebel generals who had "surrendered" were accepted as governors of their own provinces. T'ang's own military governors also escaped central control. (Levy, 1; Wang, 7-8) The T'ang state broke up into "approximately 40 states ruled by military governors, many of whom were effectively independent" (Blunden and Elvin 26), paying no taxes, appointing their own subordinates, establishing hereditary succession. (Ebrey 127-128) The term "warlords" seems apt. But in time the independent ex-rebel armies institutionalized further, becoming hereditary, professional and self-governing. (Wang, 10) Nevertheless, T'ang continued to conduct the foreign relations of its now much enfeebled state.

Silla fell into intense factional struggle, with six revolts or coups 750-800, especially serious in 768-771. Parhae took advantage of the T'ang collapse to absorb the Liaotung area and the Lesser Koguryo state. About this time Parhae reached an accommodation with T'ang on the same terms as Silla, i.e. as a tributary. (Han 87, 112; Henthorn 55, 79; Lee 72, 92)

During the An Lushan rebellion, the Uighurs twice recaptured the eastern capital of Loyang from rebels (757, 762) and restored it to T'ang, on the second occasion pausing a year to plunder it. Thereafter the Uighurs dealt with T'ang as an equal ally, patronizing and protecting Manichaeans (the Uighur state church after 763) in the T'ang domains. (Grousset, 120-122)

T'ang officials provoked an escalating quarrel with Nanchao by 751. Nanchao sent tribute and submitted--to Tibet. Nanchao defeated T'ang forces in 751, 753, and, with Tibetan help, 754, 756, 757. Nanchao expanded into southwestern Yunnan and even established domination over the Pyu kingdom in upper Burma (757-763), while operating with internal autonomy and subordination to Tibet. (Backus, 69-71, 75-77, 80; Hall, Burma, 9; Coedès, 95)

Tibet recaptured all T'ang-occupied Tibetan territories 756-757, and took the war into north China. In 763 it went so far as to capture and sack the T'ang western capital of Ch'ang-an. Tibet took the Kansu corridor 758-71. (Beckwith, 144-155; Mu and Wang, 362-363; Backus, 81, 84-85)

Land Chenla sent an embassy to T'ang 753, helped it against Nanchao 754, sent another embassy 771. (Coedès, 93-94; Hall, SEA 110)

The Pyu kingdom of upper Burma was conquered by Nanchao 757-763 and placed under Nanchao hegemony. (Backus, 102; Coedès, 95; Hall, Burma, 9)

AD 775. Tripolar. Polar states: Tibet, Uighurs, T'ang.

Silla suffered another serious revolt AD 774-780.

T'ang, able to operate diplomatically but not militarily, sought widely for allies to control Tibet. Talk had been exchanged with Indian and Arab powers about joint action against Tibet. Coordination could not be arranged, but Tibet did become separately involved against the Arabs after 786. (Beckwith, 152, 157; Backus, 87-89) T'ang persuaded the Uighurs to campaign on its behalf against Tibet in the late 780's. (Backus, 87-89, 92) Tibet became entangled in a protracted war with the Uighurs in Kashgaria after 790. (Beckwith, 154-157; Ma and Wang, 365)

In 779 Tibet and Nanchao invaded Szechwan and were severely defeated. (Backus, 84-85) Tibet had begun to increase its demands for tribute, soldiers and garrisons on Nanchao, and lowered Nanchao's symbolic vassal status. T'ang began to regain ground against Tibet in Yunnan after 789. In 793, Nanchao switched suzerains, submitting to T'ang. (Backus, 85-95) Nanchao expelled Tibet from northwestern Yunnan and stabilized its state control. (Backus, 99-100)

The defeat of Tibet and Nanchao in Szechwan 779 may have motivated the T'ang - Tibet border treaty of 783. Tibet helped T'ang put down the Chu Tz'u rebellion, in return for lands T'ang failed to deliver. War resumed; Tibet took the Ordos (in the bend of the Yellow River) 786-787. Tibet made major gains in Kashgaria 789-791. (Beckwith, 144-155; Mu and Wang, 362-363; Backus, 81, 84-85) But in the 790's, with Uighur and Nanchao help, T'ang began defeating Tibet regularly, and Tibet entered upon a long decline. After 797, there was a succession crisis in Tibet. (Beckwith, 156-157; Backus, 85, 94-99)

A Vietnamese revolt in Tonkin 791 seized the capital, but was suppressed by T'ang a few years later. (Hall, SEA, 214)

Champa fell into disorder, was raided by Javanese fleets, and then restabilized between raids. With greater order after 787, Champa sent another embassy to T'ang 793. (Majumdar, 49-52)

Land Chenla sent an embassy to T'ang in 799. (Coedès, 93-94; Hall, SEA 110)

AD 800. Tripolar. Polar states: T'ang; Tibet; Uighur Kaghanate. Korea: T'ang tributary Silla. Manchuria: T'ang tributary Parhae. Nan-chao: T'ang vassal. Tonkin: T'ang protectorate. Champa reordered and tributary to T'ang. Cambodia: Land Chenla T'ang vassal, Water Chenla anarchic. Burma: Pyu vassal to Nanchao.

T'ang reasserted some control over its warlords 806-820 by reducing the size of provinces and thus the power of governors. An enlarged palace army led by eunuchs

outweighed any provincial army. But the palace, the emperors and the succession then fell under the control of the eunuchs. (Wang, 9-10; Levy, 1)

The Uighur Empire in Mongolia continued its frontier warfare with the Tibetan Empire until a general settlement in which Tibet made peace with the Uighurs, T'ang and Nanchao 821-823; the first three, at least, were behaving as equals. (Beckwith, 163-167)

Silla underwent major insurrection and short-lived secessions after 822, and fell into disorder. (Han 112-113; Lee 92-94; Henthorn 79-81)

Under King Son (813-830), Parhae reached its zenith as a large and prosperous state. (Han 87-88; Lee 72-73)

Nanchao and T'ang maintained a stable peace in the first half of the 9th century, with Nanchao submissive; with one major exception. Nanchao did invade and loot Szechwan 829-830. But further predation was discouraged and impeded by a T'ang reorganization of the province, and Nanchao-T'ang relations were restabilized. (Backus, 105-127)

Champa raided Tonkin 803 and 809, conquering two disputed provinces with the aid of the local people, but was driven out by the T'ang Protector of Tonkin 808/809. Champa raided Cambodia around the same time. It then entered a period of piety and religious foundations. (Coedès, 103; Hall, SEA, 214; Majumdar, 52-55)

Cambodia was anarchic c. 800, but made strides toward unification 802-850 via Jayavarman II's wars, city-foundings and alliances. (Coedès, 97-99, 102-103; D. Chandler, 1996: 34-36; Hall, SEA, 112-114) For D. Chandler, 802 marks the beginning of Cambodia's "period of greatness." (1996: 29)

Nanchao extended its dominance over Pyu in upper Burma. (Backus 102) Pyu vassals of Nanchao from upper Burma appeared at the T'ang court, with embassies 802 and 807 (Hall, Burma, 9; Coedès, 104), as did their "Mi-ch'en" or Mon vassals from lower Burma in 805. (Coedès, 106)

AD 825. Tripolar. Polar states: Uighur, Tibet, T'ang.

After a period of some tripolar stability, there was great disorder: two of the polar states collapsed. The Kyrgyz and Karluk Turks overthrew the Uighur Kaghanate and took its capital city Karabalgasun 840, reversing a trend toward settlement and urbanization in the Orkhon. Some Uighurs fled to T'ang, others to Tibet. The T'ang could take no better advantage of this collapse than to suppress the now-unprotected Manichaeans. (Grousset, 124-125, 196; Beckwith, 165-166, 168) Other Uighurs fled from the Orkhon to Kashgaria, settled there from 843, at Kocho/Turfan, Beshbalyk,

Karashahr and Kucha, and formed a second Uighur empire, and began the Turkization of what was to become Eastern Turkestan. (Grousset, 125-126; Zhang, 1996a, 314)

The Tibetan empire also collapsed after 842. Corruption, faction, religious strife, uprisings within and without the metropole, civil war, paralyzed and divided Tibet, which lost border areas to T'ang and withdrew into introversion. (Beckwith 168-169; Ma and Wang, 365; Richardson, 28-32).

Court intrigues, assassinations, regencies and coups further weakened T'ang after 820, rendering it unable to take full advantage of the 840's collapse of both other major powers (Ebrey 129), although after 845 there was some recovery of internal control (Wang 12).

Disorder continued in Silla. Tribute to T'ang failed after 847. (Han 112-113; Lee 92-94; Henthorn 79-81)

Nanchao and T'ang remained mostly at peace. There was however a premonitory Nanchao raid on T'ang's Tonkin protectorate 846. (Hall, SEA, 214)

Cambodia continued a period of internal development under Jayavarman II.

In 832 Nanchao depopulated Prome and destroyed its vassal Pyu kingdom; it destroyed the Mon Mi-ch'en kingdom in 835. It may have established suzerainty over Pyu vassals (18 claimed), including the Mon states. (Hall, Burma, 10-11; Backus, 129; Coedès, 105) With the Pyu removed, their Burman neighbors founded a city and state, Pagan, traditionally dated 849. Pegu, traditionally dated 825, and Dvaravati replaced Mi-ch'en as Mon centers. (Hall, Burma, 10-11, 14; Hall, SEA, 155-156; Wheatley, xx; Coedès, 105-107)

AD 850. Unipolar. Polar state: T'ang. Korea: nominally "Silla," actually chaos. Manchuria: Parhae T'ang vassal. Uighurs: chaotic. Tibet: chaotic. Nanchao: T'ang vassal. Tonkin: T'ang protectorate. Cambodia: reunifying. Burma: Pagan vs. Nanchao?

The T'ang were able to reinstate some larger imperial-bureaucratic control in the relatively peaceful period to 860. (Wang, 12) But mismanagement, corruption, flood, plague, and famine began to incite banditry/rebellion: Ch'iu Fu 859-860, P'ang Hsün 868-869, Huang Ch'ao 874-884. (Blunden and Elvin 26; Backus 144-145, 156-157; Grousset 126-127; Levy 1-6, 119, 123-124; Wang)

T'ang recaptured the Kansu corridor in 851; about this time Kashgaria must also have thrown off Tibetan rule. (Beckwith, 170-172)

In the second half of the century, Nanchao's ambitions became grander. Nanchao claimed the empire; diplomacy broke down. Nanchao invaded T'ang Tonkin 858, briefly captured it 860-861. Nanchao held Kwangsi in 861, Tonkin again 862 and then 863-866. Nanchao invaded Szechwan 866-870 and again 874. (Backus 131-158)

AD 875. Unipolar. Polar state: T'ang.

The Huang Ch'ao rebellion reached major scope, and, like An Lu-shan's, seized both imperial capitals. Central authority collapsed ("At this time, central power was at its weakest": Wang, 5). Imperial armies mutinied year after year. Some went over to the rebels and then returned to T'ang. Turkish tribes were called in to the rescue, and ex-mutineers and ex-rebels were given appointments. T'ang attempts to regain control backfired and led to further decentralization 885-893. The de facto independent states--bandit, Shato, mutineer, hereditary--began an elimination process as they fought one another for succession to the shadow empire, though T'ang was not officially terminated until 907. (Blunden and Elvin 26; Backus 144-145, 156-157; Grousset 126-127; Levy 1-6, 119, 123-124; Wang 5, 11, 16, 19-23, 31, 35-43; Eberhard, 1952 55-64)

Disorder continued in Korea, with seven major military groups moving toward proto-statehood after 890. One founded "Later Paekche" in the southwest in 892. (Henthorn 81-82; Lee 98-99)

Nanchao was driven out of Szechwan. Exhausted, Nanchao became submissive to T'ang after 875, and began to decline. T'ang was itself exhausted by its efforts, increasingly preoccupied by the Huang Ch'ao crisis, and unable to do more than stabilize its frontier with Nanchao. (Backus 131-158)

T'ang maladministration provoked revolts in Tonkin in the 850's. There was an interval of reform 858-860, then a struggle with Nanchao there 860-866. T'ang control over Tonkin thereafter stabilized. (Backus, 131-133; Hall, SEA, 214)

Champa sent an embassy to T'ang in 877; thereafter, with T'ang's renewed decline, relations were interrupted. Champa went through a peaceful, religious monument-building period. (Coedès, 123; Hall, SEA, 203; Majumdar, 60)

Cambodian kings from 877 began a long period of monumental works--reservoirs, statues, and temple-mountains. (D. Chandler, 1996: 37-39)

For Burma there are no reliable data till about 1050, though Pagan existed from 825 or 849 onward. (Hall, Burma, 11, 14)

AD 900. Nonpolar (core anarchy). Korea: Silla anarchic; Later Paekche hostile to Silla. Kashgaria: Uighurs. Tibet: withdrawn. Nanchao: decaying. Tonkin: T'ang

protectorate. Champa: peaceful, prosperous, independent. Cambodia: prosperous and independent.

The elimination process among T'ang warlords continued. One, Chu Wen, an ex-Huang-Ch'ao rebel, had emerged as clearly the best collector of provinces by 903, killed the T'ang emperor in 904, and replaced T'ang 907. (Wang, 43-46)

During the Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms period, 907-960, the core was multipolar, and the system as well (see the map c. 920, Blunden and Elvin 25). There was ordinarily one Yellow River Basin state which underwent a sequence of coups (the Five Dynasties, actually six) and a number of southern states (the Ten Kingdoms, actually no more than seven or eight at any given moment). The various states practiced mercantilism, manipulating trade so as to accumulate (copper) money (Blunden and Elvin 26).

The Yellow River State was seized by the bandit-warlord Later Liang dynasty 907-923, then by the Shato Turk Later T'ang dynasty (923-936). (Grousset, 128-130; Wang, vii et passim)

Later Paekche established ties to south China. Another new state, Later Koguryo, also hostile to Silla, was founded in central Korea 901. It was successively renamed Majin, Taebong and Koryo. Koryo established ties to the north China Yellow River State. After 918 Koryo patronized Silla. (Lee 99-103; Henthorn 82-83; Han 123-124)

Khitan Mongol nomads in the Liao basin of Manchuria proclaimed an empire in 916, later to be named Liao, which title we give it here for convenience. Liao drove the Kyrgyz Turks out of the Orkhon in 924. (Han 88-89, 126; Lee 91; Grousset 127-130)

During the multipolar period in the core, a Vietnamese state arose in Tonkin by stages. It began as an indigenous vassal of the Yellow River State 907-923. (Hall, SEA, 215)

Cambodia bordered Nanchao and Champa. (Coedès, 114) Monumental building continued there, despite a division of the country 921-928. (D. Chandler, 1996 39-41)

AD 925. Multipolar. Great powers: Yellow River State (Later T'ang); Khitan Liao empire; Koryo; Wu; S. Han. Minor powers: in South China, several other states; in Korea, Later Paekche, Silla; in Manchuria, Parhae; in northwest, Uighurs; in Yunnan, transitional regime between Nanchao and Tali; in Tonkin, Vietnamese proto-state; Champa; Cambodia (divided).

The Yellow River State passed to the Later Jin (936-946), and Later Han (947-951) dynasties, with a brief conquest by Liao 946-947. (Grousset, 128-130; Wang, vii et passim) The successive dynasties reduced the power of the governors, increased centralization of finances, reinvigorated the imperial bureaucracy, and created a new elite of palace officials to replace the eunuchs and a new Emperor's Army to overawe the provinces. (Wang, 134-143, 169-178, 194) But they also repeatedly emptied the treasury in donatives to their soldiers. (Eberhard, 1952, 96-97)

Koryo absorbed Silla in 935; in 936 Koryo destroyed Later Paekche and reunited the Korean peninsula. (Lee 99-103; Henthorn 82-83; Han 123-124)

The Khitan Mongol empire of the Liao basin conquered Parhae in 926. Parhae's ex-Koguryo elite fled to Koryo; its Tungusic Malgal population fell under Khitan rule, but would later rebel to found the Jurchen Jin state. The Khitan installed the Later Jin dynasty in the Yellow River State, acquired northeast China lands in payment, made Yen-ching (Beijing) into their southern capital, and founded the Liao state in 946. (Han 88-89, 126; Lee 91; Grousset 127-130) They accidentally conquered the Yellow River State in 946, but soon lost it to revolts and a succession crisis. (Wang, 191-194)

After a series of usurpations 902-937, a Tali kingdom emerged to replace Nanchao in Yunnan, and lasted 3 centuries. Tali confined itself to Yunnan only, was neither aggressive nor large, and was generally let alone by South China even after the Sung unification. (Backus, 160-163)

The Vietnamese state in Tonkin became involved in struggles with the Southern Han state at Canton, and its local supporters, ending in victory 939. An independent Nam Viet/Dai Viet state was proclaimed in 939. (Hall, SEA, 215)

Champa enjoyed a period of peace, piety, temple-building, scholarship and splendor until impoverished by a Cambodian invasion in the 940's. (Majumdar, 61-66)

Cambodia invaded and looted Champa 945-946, but was then defeated. (Hall, SEA, 120; Coedès, 117, 124)

AD 950. Multipolar. Yellow River State: Later Han. South China: 8 small states (Herrmann 33), notably Southern Han at Canton and Southern T'ang at Nanking. Korea: Koryo independent and expanding. Manchuria: Liao independent and expanding. Kashgaria: Karakhanid west, Uighur east. Yunnan: Tali independent. Dai Viet: independent. Champa: independent. Cambodia: independent.

The Later Han dynasty was overthrown in the Yellow River State by Later Chou 951, fled to Taiyuan, and established a Liao-protected Northern Han state there to 979. Despite its many "dynasties," the Yellow River State had now recovered from the 885

post-Huang Ch'ao nadir of disintegration and functioned as a single integrated state (Wang 195, 206-207)

Sung overthrew Later Chou 960. The (Northern) Sung deleted seven states from 963 to 979, notably Southern Han 971 and Southern T'ang 975. (Grousset 130-132)

Karakhanid Muslim Turks became established in southern and western Kashgaria (north and east remaining Uighur), with a seat in Kashgar itself around 950. (Grousset, 144-145)

Dai Viet fell into twelve warring statelets by 965; one conquered the rest by 968. Champa resumed tribute embassies (to the Yellow River State) 951, 958, 959, then with greater frequency to Sung: 960, 962, 966, 967, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974. (Coedès 124 -125; Hall, SEA, 203-204, 216; Majumdar 66-68, 72-74)

A generally prosperous century had begun in Cambodia (D. Chandler, 1996: 41).

AD 975. Bipolar. Polar states: Sung, Liao.

The Sung continued to expand, destroying Northern Han 979 in despite of its Khitan Liao protectors. Thereafter, the core was bipolar (Sung vs. the Khitan steppe empire of Liao). Two Sung attacks (979, 986) failed to conquer Liao Beijing and were disastrously defeated; but Liao counterstrokes were also defeated. (Grousset 130-132) Tanguts, a Tibetan people, founded a new state (Minyak; Western Hsia/Xia; Hsi Hsia) in the Ordos and Alashan steppes northwest of Sung China. The small but militaristic Tangut state was recognized by Liao 990 and expanded against Sung. (Grousset 132) A tripolar situation ensued.

Koryo established contact with Sung in 985. Koryo expanded northward and Liao eastward until they confronted one another at the Yalu river 989. Koryo was invaded by Liao 993, and compelled to accept tributary vassal status and sever relations with Sung in 994. (Henthorn 96-97; cf. Han 137-139, Lee 125)

Champa sent tribute embassies to Sung in 976, 977, and 979. Dai Viet and Champa began a five-century-long struggle. When the Dai Viet ruler was assassinated 979, Champa intervened on behalf of a refugee warlord claimant, but suffered disaster. Dai Viet restabilized 980, defeated a Sung invasion, and sent an embassy to Champa. Champa insulted and was invaded by Dai Viet, was badly beaten, and fell in two 982, when Dai Viet sacked the Cham capital Indrapura and annexed Champa's northern territories. Champa was refused Sung aid against Dai Viet 985, came back together 989, fought off Dai Viet 990, exchanged presents with Sung 992. At Champa's request, Sung successfully ordered Dai Viet to stop attacking Champa. Champa attacked Dai Viet again in 995, yet also paid it tribute. Champa sent an embassy to Sung 999. (Coedès 124-125; Hall, SEA, 203-204, 216; Majumdar 66-68, 72-74)

In Cambodia, the reign of Jayavarman V, 968-1001, was "an age of learning."
(Hall, SEA, 120)

AD 1000. Tripolar. Polar states: Liao, Sung, Minyak. Korea: dual vassal. Kashgaria: Karakhanids and Uighurs. Tibet: withdrawn. Yunnan: Tali independent. Dai Viet: independent Sung vassal. Champa: independent Sung vassal. Cambodia: independent.

The polar states were prominent on different power dimensions, an intriguing situation worth closer study than we can here undertake. Sung was ten or twenty times the size of Liao, yet Liao was militarily much the stronger. Sung was disastrously defeated by Liao 1004, but held its capital Kaifeng. Minyak also fought Sung 1001-1003. Sung was forced to submit to both, granting substantial annual tribute. (Ebrey 138, 157, 166-167)

"Tribute" of course has to be interpreted. Extortion, bribery, subsidy, taxes, trade, hire, and charity all involve a flow of wealth, and the flow itself has no unambiguous meaning. Sung however appears to have resisted payment, by force, and unsuccessfully, which suggests it was a subject vassal under a dual hegemony it was too weak to shake off.

Koryo, having resumed trade and tribute to Sung, and then fallen into disorder, was invaded by Liao 1010 and 1018, made peace and resumed tribute to Liao in 1022. (Henthorn 97-98; but cf. Han 139-142, Lee 126)

Liao, Minyak, Uighur, Karakhanids and Tibetans contested Kansu and Kashgaria after 1017, with greater success to Uighur and Karakhanids in Kashgaria and Minyak in Kansu. (Grousset, 133, 146)

Champa moved its capital from Indrapura to Vijaya (Binh Dinh) 1000. Champa sent embassies to Sung 1004-1005, 1007, 1010, 1011, 1015, 1018, and to Dai Viet 1011. Champa was attacked by Dai Viet 1021. (Coedès, 139-140; Hall, SEA, 204, 216; Majumdar 74-76, 80)

Cambodia underwent a chaotic succession 1001-1003, a partition, and a slow civil war of reunification to about 1010. Thereafter it expanded westward during the long reign of Suryavarman I. The Mon kingdom of Dvaravati/Lopburi/Louvo had sent an embassy to Sung 1001; attacked by Haripunjaya, it appealed to Cambodia, and was annexed. Cambodia even attacked Lower Burma, though there it was defeated by Pagan. City-formation, bureaucracy, coercion, trade, all flourished in the Cambodian empire. (Coedès, 134-137; D. Chandler, 1996: 42-44; Hall, SEA, 121-122, 155-156; Wyatt, 28)

AD 1025. Multipolar. Great powers: Liao, Minyak, Uighurs, Karakhanids, Cambodia.

Minyak fought Sung again 1039-1042. Sung tribute to Minyak and Liao was increased 1042-1044. (Ebrey 138, 157, 166-167)

Koryo, now tributary to Liao, broke off tributary relations to Sung in 1030. (Henthorn 97-98)

Champa was again attacked by Dai Viet in 1026. Champa stopped tribute to Dai Viet 1027; sent tribute to Sung 1030; underwent civil war 1038-1039; requested Sung investiture 1042. The Sung connection brought no help. Champa raided Dai Viet 1043, was counterinvaded 1044 and disastrously defeated; Dai Viet sacked the new Cham capital Vijaya. Champa sent embassies to Dai Viet 1047, 1050, and Sung 1050. (Coedès, 139-140; Hall, SEA, 204, 216; Majumdar 74-76, 80)

In Burma, Pagan emerged from mists and myths when the kingship of Anawrahta united the loose federation of immigrant Burmans from Nanchao 1044, occupying the former Pyu capital of Old Prome. Before 1050, Suryavarman I of Cambodia, pushing on from his conquest of Dvaravati, attacked the Mon states of Pegu and Thaton in Lower Burma. Anawrahta came to the aid of the Mons and drove out the Khmers. (Hall, SEA, 121-122, 156-158)

AD 1050. Multipolar. Great powers: Liao, Minyak, Uighur, Dai Viet, Cambodia, Pagan. Korea: Koryo Liao vassal. Manchuria: Liao. Sung vassal to Liao and Minyak. Kashgaria: Karakhanids and Uighurs. Tibet: withdrawn. Yunnan: Tali independent. Dai Viet: independent. Champa: tributary to Sung and Dai Viet. Cambodia: independent, expanding. Burma: Pagan, Pegu, Thaton prominent.

Wang An-shih of Sung attempted extensive centralizing reforms and innovations to fight corruption and increase revenues. The reforms led to controversy and factional struggle rather than rejuvenation. (Ebrey 139, 141)

At some time in or near this period Koryo resumed tribute to Sung as well as Liao. (v. Han 153)

Karakhanids united western Kashgaria and Dzungaria about 1055, then partitioned them again. (Grousset, 147)

Champa restored internal order after a period of chaos 1050, and entered a period of religious endowments and military preparations. Champa sent embassies to Sung 1050, 1053, 1056, 1061, 1062, and to Dai Viet 1050, 1055, 1057/1059, 1060, 1063, 1065, 1068. Champa returned to more normal relations thereafter, disastrously attacking Dai Viet 1068. Dai Viet took the Cham capital again 1069; Champa ceded three provinces

for peace 1070, and fell into civil war to 1084. Even so Champa sent tribute to Dai Viet 1071, 1072, 1074, and to Sung, which was beginning to reassert itself, in 1072. Champa defeated an attack by Dai Viet 1074/1075 and by Cambodia somewhere between 1074 and 1080. (Coedès 140, 152-155; Hall, SEA, 204-205, 216; Majumdar, 77-91)

Cambodia underwent uprisings 1051 (Champa-sponsored) and 1065, and thereafter was split in two, even three. Attacks on Champa and Dai Viet in the 1070's were unsuccessful. (Coedès, 138-139, 152-154; Hall, SEA, 122-123)

In Burma, Anawrahta of Pagan built a noticeable empire. He allied with the Mon state of Pegu in Lower Burma, and conquered the Mon state of Thaton, destroying it by deportations 1057. Thereafter Pagan expanded greatly in all directions. (Hall, Burma, 15-19; Hall, SEA, 159-160, 162-163; cf. Coedès 149-151, 155-156)

AD 1075. Multipolar. Great powers: Liao, Minyak, Sung, Dai Viet, Pagan.

Sung stirred at last and led Cambodia and Champa in an unsuccessful attack on Dai Viet 1075/1076. Champa then paid tribute to Sung and Dai Viet 1077, and yearly to Dai Viet 1081-1085; to both Sung and Dai Viet thereafter, except for a stoppage in the Dai Viet tribute in the early 1090's when Champa sought but was refused a Sung alliance against Dai Viet. (Coedès 140, 152-155; Hall, SEA, 204-205, 216; Majumdar, 77-91) From 1095 Champa was tributary both to Sung and to Dai Viet, but the latter was the more real overlord since Sung refused to help Champa against Dai Viet. (Majumdar 91)

Pagan paused its expansion to put down a Mon revolt in Pegu in the 1080's; it engaged in great temple-building and supported Buddhist religious scholarship. (Hall, Burma, 15-19; Hall, SEA, 159-160, 162-163; cf. Coedès 149-151, 155-156)

1100. Multipolar. Great powers: Liao, Minyak, Sung, Dai Viet, Pagan. Korea: Koryo Liao vassal. Sung: dual vassal to Liao and Minyak. Tibet: withdrawn. Yunnan: Tali independent. Dai Viet: independent. Champa: vassal to Dai Viet. Cambodia: weak, withdrawn, divided. Burma: united under Pagan.

Tungusic Jurchen from northeastern Korea and eastern Manchuria, settled Liao and Koryo vassals from the tenth century, steadily improved their organization, stopped tribute after 1100, defeated and made peace with Koryo, declared war on Liao 1114, and formed the state of Jin 1115. Jin allied with Sung 1118, made Minyak a vassal 1124, and destroyed Khitan Liao 1125. (Fairbank et al, 297; Lee 128; Han 153-154; Ebrey 150; Grousset 134-138; Chan, 52-59, 62)

Koryo resisted Jin 1107 but then traded land for peace, and accepted vassal status in 1116 (Henthorn 110) or 1126 (Han 155-156; Lee 128; Chan 58).

Another Karakhanid unified western Kashgaria and Dzungaria about 1100. (Grousset, 147-148, 164-166)

Cambodia was forcefully reunited about 1113 by Suryavarman II, and began a career of wide-ranging imperialism. Its vassal state Louvo managed to send an embassy to Sung 1115, possibly displaying or seeking independence, but did not do so again until the next Cambodian collapse. Cambodia itself sent embassies to Sung 1116, 1120. (Coedès 159-162; D. Chandler, 1996: 49-52; Hall, SEA, 125-126, 205)

AD 1125. Multipolar. Great powers: Jin, Sung, Dai Viet, Cambodia, Pagan.

Sung intrigued against Chin; Jin then captured the Sung capital Kaifeng 1126-1127. Jin conquered the whole Yellow River basin, forcing Sung to move its capital south to the Yangtze basin. Jin's cavalry army attacked Sung 1129-1130, but found the Yangtze rivers, canals and paddies a bad terrain, and Jin was under Mongol attack in the north. Sung made peace with Jin 1138/1141, and from 1142 made annual payments, resuming the vassal status originally imposed by Liao. (Fairbank et al, 297; Lee 128; Han 153-154; Ebrey 150; Grousset 134-138; Chan, 52-59, 62)

Koryo's submission to Jin led to a suspension of cooperation with Southern Sung; but later Koryo sent tribute to both Sung and Jin, though its genuine overlord seems to have been Jin alone. (Fairbank et al, 297; Lee 128; Han 155-156; Henthorn 110; Chan 58)

A Mongol federation under Qabul Khan, at first a Jin vassal, had begun to raid Jin in the eastern Gobi (1135-1139), and defeated a Jin army. Jin bought peace with lands, cattle and grain in 1147. (Grousset 138, 197)

The Khitans of Liao fled westward after being defeated by the Jurchen, and established the state of Western Liao, or Karakhitai, ruling Uighurs and Karakhanids in Kashgaria (1130), Karluks in Dzungaria and Ferghana, and Muslim Turks on the Oxus. (Herrmann 38-39; Grousset, 147-148, 164-166)

Sung at last reopened trade with Tali, which remained independent. Neither state was aggressive along their common border. (Backus, 163-164)

Champa sent tribute to Dai Viet 1102; made an abortive attack on Dai Viet 1103 to recover its lost provinces, and again sent tribute; then sent numerous embassies to Sung and Dai Viet 1116-1126. (Coedès, 160, 164-165; Hall, SEA, 205; Majumdar, 91-92, 94-98)

Champa joined Cambodia's unsuccessful attack on Dai Viet 1128, paid tribute to Dai Viet 1131, repeated the fiasco 1132 and the reparation 1136, and broke with Cambodia. Cambodia thereupon invaded, occupied and subjugated northern Champa 1145; but a

national resistance arose in the south and defeated Cambodia, its Champa vassals, and a Dai Viet intervention 1147-1150. (Coedès, 160, 164-165; Hall, SEA, 205; Majumdar, 91-92, 94-98)

Cambodia sent an embassy to Sung 1128. It was "recognized as a great vassal of the [Sung] empire" in 1128. It then began a long quarrel with Dai Viet, attacking it 1128, 1129, 1131 (with Champa), 1138 (without Champa), generally without much success. Cambodia negotiated commercial matters with Sung 1136-1147. After conquering and being driven out of ex-ally Champa 1145-1149 Cambodia resumed attacks on Dai Viet 1150, with disastrous result. During this period the great temple project of Angkor Wat was built. (Coedès 159-162; D. Chandler, 1996: 49-52; Hall, SEA, 125-126, 205)

Burma (Pagan) paid tribute to Sung, with missions starting in 1103 and 1106, and was treated as an equal to Dai Viet. Possibly the contact was an attempt to countervail Tali raids from Yunnan, but Sung was too preoccupied and weak to help; Pagan had to rebuff Tali itself 1111. The long, somewhat disorderly reign of Alaungsithu (1113-1165) was notable mainly for its public works and monuments. (Hall, Burma, 18-22, 25; Hall, SEA, 163-165; Coedès, 157, 166-167)

AD 1150. Multipolar. Great powers: Chin; Mongols; Karakhitai; Sung; Dai Viet; Cambodia; Pagan. Koryo vassal to Jin. Sung: vassal to Jin. Minyak: vassal to Jin. Kashgaria: Karakhitai. Tibet withdrawn. Yunnan: Tali independent. Dai Viet: independent. Champa: independent. Cambodia: aggressively, unsuccessfully expansionist, independent Sung "vassal." Pagan: independent Sung "vassal."

Despite dissenter resistance, the Jurchen of Jin sinified rapidly after moving their capital to Yen-ching (Beijing) 1153. Another massive and costly Jin attack on Sung failed 1161, and peace was restored on the basis of the status quo ante (Sung tribute unchanged) 1163-1165. Jin then went through a period of placid prosperity. (Ebrey 168-169; Grousset 138-139; Chan 67-75)

Koryo continued as a Jin vassal, during years of intrigues and revolts. (Henthorn 114; Lee 140-144; Han 158-163)

Jin combined with Tatars of eastern Outer Mongolia to destroy the Mongol khanate 1161. The Tatars proceeded to raid the Jin frontiers. The Jin changed allies, supporting Mongols against Tatars. (Grousset 192, 198, 200, 202-204)

Kara-Khitai was drawn into struggles among its Muslim Turkic vassals of Khwarizm (Khiva). (Grousset, 166-167)

Champa defeated a Dai Viet-sponsored rebellion 1150-1151, sent tribute to pacify Dai Viet 1152, 1154, 1155, 1160, sent tributary embassies to Sung and received recognition 1155, put down another rebellion 1155-1160. Temples were restored and re-

endowed. Tribute was sent to Dai Viet 1164 and 1165; a border war with Dai Viet 1166 was followed by conciliatory tribute 1167. Champa looted Arab merchants to send tribute to Sung and request a Sung investiture 1167, but received a scolding instead. Champa conciliated Dai Viet with tribute 1170 and went to war with Cambodia. (Coedès 163-166, 170-171; Hall, SEA, 207; Majumdar 98-109)

Cambodia suffered a temporary decline after its rout by Dai Viet. Its vassal Lopburi/Louvo sent an independent embassy to Sung 1155, the first since 1115. Weakened by internal rebellion, Cambodia was invaded by Champa 1167. (Coedès 161-164; D. Chandler, 1996: 53, 58-59; Hall, SEA, 127)

AD 1175. Multipolar. Great powers: Chin; Sung; Tatars; Dai Viet; Champa.

Jin faced floods, overspending, and sinification problems from the 1180's. Sung and Minyak began harassing attacks from the 1180's, with Sung preparing for a major confrontation. (Ebrey 168-169; Grousset 138-139; Chan 67-75)

Koryo continued Jin vassalhood, palace intrigues and internal revolts. (Henthorn 114; Lee 140-144; Han 158-163)

The Kerayit Mongol Khan Togrul, a Jin client and vassal, defeated the Tatars with Jin help, and became the chief power in Mongolia 1199. About 1175 Togrul had acquired a vassal Temujin, who had become Khan of the Mongols proper 1196. (Grousset 192, 198, 200, 202-204)

Champa's attack on Cambodia was hampered by a Sung embargo on horses 1175. Champa plundered the Cambodian capital 1177, and was expelled 1178-1181. Trying again, Champa was itself subjected and divided by Cambodia 1190. Champa freed itself by 1192, held off Cambodian attacks 1193-1194, sent an embassy to Dai Viet 1194, secured Sung investiture 1199. (Coedès 163-166, 170-171; Hall, SEA, 207; Majumdar 98-109)

Cambodia, still weak and a target, was again invaded by Champa 1177 and 1178, and Angkor pillaged. Under Jayavarman VII, a devout Mahayana Buddhist, Cambodia made a quick recovery, resubjugating Lopburi by 1180, expelling the invaders by 1181, putting down revolts, neutralizing Dai Viet 1190, and turning a Champa attack of the same year into a brief conquest and subjugation of Champa. (Coedès, 161-164, 169-171; D. Chandler, 1996: 53, 55, 58-59; Hall, SEA, 127-128; Wyatt, 28) A hasty and widespread public works program was undertaken : roads, temples, rest-houses, reservoirs, and hospitals." (Chandler, 1996: 60-68)

Pagan embroiled itself in somewhat obscure struggles 1165-1174, and then enjoyed peace, prosperity, orderly development, public works, monumental building, and religious schisms. (Coedès, 166-167, 177-178; Hall, Burma, 22-23; Hall, SEA, 165-168)

AD 1200. Multipolar. Great powers: Chin; Minyak; Sung; Champa; Cambodia. Korea: Koryo vassal to Jin. Mongolia: Mongol tribal confederation vassal to Jin. Kashgaria: Karakhitai. Tibet: withdrawn. Yunnan: Tali independent. Dai Viet: independent. Champa: independent Sung vassal. Cambodia: strong, aggressive and independent. Burma: peaceful and independent.

Sung raided Jin 1204, heavily attacked Jin 1206 and was defeated; Sung and Jin made peace 1208 based on an indemnity and an increase in the tribute from Sung to Jin. Sung stopped tribute 1211. (Grousset 139-140; Chan 94-95, 115)

Cooling of the steppe produced a subsistence crisis for its pastoral nomads, who responded by uniting and moving south. (Ebrey 169) Intense warfare was waged among the steppe peoples 1200-1207. An independent Mongol-Turkic steppe empire emerged under Temujin, now proclaimed Kaghan as Genghis Khan. (Grousset 205-216)

The Mongols began their conquest by attacking Minyak. After a devastation 1205-1207 Minyak became a vassal, but was attacked again 1209, and resubjugated itself. The Mongols rebelled against their overlord Jin on the occasion of the succession of an incompetent 1209. Minyak and Sung also attacked Jin. Jin was driven out of Peking in intense warfare 1211-1215. A long slow struggle for north China followed, while the Mongols turned their main attention westward. Minyak refused to supply troops for the Mongol western campaign. Meanwhile Jin tried to resubjugate Sung 1217-1224 in an unsuccessful campaign costly for both. (Grousset, 227-233; Chan 98-100, 115-116)

Koryo began this period as a Jin vassal plagued by internal rebellion. (Han 163-164; Henthorn 116) When the Mongol empire attacked Jin, Khitan declared independence and tried to refound Liao in southern Manchuria; when Mongols captured the Jin capital Yen-ching in 1215, they drove the Khitans into Koryo 1217, where Koryo combined with the Mongols to conquer them 1219. The Mongols then enforced tribute on Koryo. (Han 147-149; Henthorn 116-119; Lee 165-167; Grousset 259; but cf. Grousset 228 on the Later Liao)

Kara-Khitai was suzerain to Uighurs and Karakhanids of Kashgaria, Karluks of Dzungaria, and Muslim Turks of Khwarizm. The Uighurs changed suzerains to Genghis Khan's Mongols in 1209, the Karluks in 1211. Khwarizm threw off the overlordship of Kara-Khitai 1207-1210. A coup in Kara-Khitai 1211 allowed a temporary reassertion of

its lordship in Kashgaria and Dzungaria, until the Mongols overran the state in 1218. (Grousset 168-170, 233-236, 330)

Tibet sent submission to Genghis in 1207. (Richardson, 33-34)

Champa was subjugated by Cambodia 1203. The Cambodian-installed vassal ruler put down revolts and assisted Cambodia in wars with Dai Viet. Cambodia withdrew from Champa in 1220 and made peace with a local ruler 1222. Champa underwent reconstruction. (Majumdar, 109-113)

With Burmese and Thai help Cambodia attacked Dai Viet 1207. Cambodia and its Champa allies jointly attacked Dai Viet 1216, 1218. By 1218 the Khmer empire was at its largest, bordering Nanchao (i.e. Tali), controlling Dvaravati/Lopburi/Louvo but not the Mon state of Haripunjaya, fighting Dai Viet, in control of Champa. Great expenditures were made on monuments and hospitals. But the attacks on Dai Viet were defeated. In a succession crisis, Cambodia lost control of Champa 1220, and of its Thai vassal state Louvo (about the same time). (Coedès, 171-177, 180-182, 195-196; Briggs, 235, 216, 237; Hall, SEA, 186, 207; Wyatt, 52-53)

AD 1225. Multipolar. Great powers: Mongols; Jin; Sung; Minyak; Dai Viet.

The Mongols destroyed and massacred Minyak 1226-1227; during this campaign Genghis Khan died, after having decided to establish a tributary system rather than exterminate the sedentary population. Jin, which had regained some lost ground, was destroyed 1232-1234. Sung unwisely helped the Mongols finish off Jin, and more unwisely attacked them in 1234, whereupon the Mongols began the conquest of Sung, which resisted with remarkable vitality. Sung was defeated 1236-1238 and driven out of Szechwan after a long struggle. (Grousset 247-248, 251, 257-259, 282)

Koryo resistance to the Mongol tribute 1225 led to a Mongol attack 1231. Koryo submitted, then revolted 1232; was invaded 1232 and 1235, and submitted again; revolted 1247. (Han 147-149; Henthorn 116-119; Lee 165-167; Grousset 259)

Some Jurchens of Jin resettled in their old tribal homeland of Southern Manchuria, where they paid taxes and tribute to the Mongols. (Rossabi, 3-7)

Uighur Kashgaria remained subject to Genghis and his successors. (Grousset) Tibet was invaded and subjugated by the Mongols in 1239. (Richardson, 33-34)

Cambodia lost control of its other Thai vassal state Sukhothai (1238). (Coedès; Briggs; Hall; Wyatt)

Pagan experienced a peaceful, pious, monument-building, literary era. (Hall, Burma, 23-24; Coedès, 183; Hall, SEA, 168)

AD 1250. Bipolar. Polar states: Mongol empire; Sung. Koryo: independent, resisting Mongols. Manchuria: Jurchens Mongol vassals. Kashgaria: Mongol vassals. Tibet: Mongol vassal. Yunnan: Tali independent. Dai Viet: independent. Champa: independent. Cambodia: independent. Thailand: Louvo and Sukhothai independent. Burma: Pagan independent, peaceful.

The Mongol Kaghan Mongka resumed the conquest of Sung from 1253, deputing it to his brother Kublai. Mongka's death and succession problems provided Sung a respite 1259. Kublai became Kaghan 1260-1264 via a civil war, and resumed the attack on Sung. Kublai moved the capital from Mongolia (Karakorum) to Beijing ("Dadu," Khanbalik) 1260-1267. A long siege of Siangyang and Fancheng 1268-1273 allowed a speedy conquest of most of Sung 1273-1276. Kublai had assumed the Chinese dynastic label Yuan 1271. (Grousset, 258, 284-288; Ebrey 173; Penkala 47)

The Mongolian homeland was the imperial metropole until Kublai moved the capital. Immediate Mongol resistance from 1260 transformed Mongolia into "an unstable and anarchic frontier zone." (Dardess, 21, 31) The Mongol civil wars pitted sinifying Mongols--Kublai and his Yuan state--against other Mongols, steppe-loving defenders of the yasa laws: Arigh Böke 1260-1264, Qaidu 1269-1301. Yuan was repeatedly victorious, but could never manage to stamp out the opposition entirely. (Grousset, 285-286, 291)

Yuan attacked Koryo four times 1253-1257. A coup in Koryo overthrew the recalcitrants. Koryo surrendered, and called in Mongol troops to put down resistance, which was suppressed by 1273. Korea was used as the base and supply source for the disastrous Mongol invasions of Japan 1274. (Han 167-173; Lee 149-151; Henthorn 119-122; Grousset 289)

Both Mongol civil wars afflicted Dzungaria and Kashgaria, which came under control of the rebel Ögödei and Jagatai khanates or served as battlefields. (Grousset 331-336) Yuan lost the ability to administer this area, or to manipulate the succession there, after 1260, when Kublai transferred the kaghanate capital away from Karakorum. (Dardess, 21, 27)

Yuan invaded Tali 1252, abolished the Tali state and ruled Yunnan as an imperial province, though the old ruler was retained as a puppet. (Grousset, 283-284; Backus, 164) They colonized it heavily. (Ebrey 195)

Mongols seized Hanoi in 1257, but met resistance and retired, though receiving submission from the Tran king 1258. A Dai Viet complaint to Kublai against Cambodian and Champa attacks got no help 1268. (Grousset, 284, 290; Fairbank et al, 266; Coedès, 192; Hall, SEA, 216-217)

Independent Champa raided Dai Viet, stopped tribute, and demanded return of the provinces lost in 1070. Dai Viet sent a moderately successful punitive expedition 1252. (Coedès 182, 192-193; Hall, SEA 207-208; Majumdar 113-122) Thereafter Champa underwent a coup 1257 and adopted a placatory policy. Champa tribute embassies went to Dai Viet 1266, 1267, 1269, 1270. Temples were endowed.

Narathihapate's megalomania culminated Pagan's monumentalist era, which Yuan rudely interrupted by demanding submission from the ancient tributaries of its predecessor dynasties. Burma refused tribute in 1271 and 1273. (Grousset, 290-291; Hall, Burma, 24-27, 34; Coedès 183, 190, 193-194, 209-210; Hall, SEA, 169-172)

AD 1275. Unipolar. Polar state: Yuan. Sung reduced. Koryo submissive; Jurchen Manchuria tributary. Kashgaria and Dzungaria independent. Dai Viet nominal vassal to Yuan; Champa vassal to Dai viet. Cambodia weak and quiet. Pagan quiet.

After another distraction caused by the second (Qaidu) civil war in Mongolia, Yuan conquered the remnant of Sung 1277-1279.

Yuan again attacked Japan from Koryo, again disastrously, 1281.

Yuan attempted to impose a centralized provincial administration in Manchuria. Jurchens of Manchuria, exasperated by Yuan demands for supplies and men for the Japan invasions, joined the second Mongol revolt; their section of it was put down in 1287. The Yuan provincial administration was reestablished. (Rossabi, 7-8; Dardess, 23-24)

A Yuan expedition against Champa 1282-83 was refused passage or assistance by Dai Viet, which considered Champa its own subject. Dai Viet being otherwise insufficiently submissive, Yuan invaded Dai Viet 1285, seized the capital, but was resisted and its armies defeated or forced out. Yuan again occupied Hanoi 1287, but withdrew and accepted an offer of vassalage and tribute from Dai Viet 1288. (Grousset, 284, 290; Fairbank et al, 266; Coedès, 192; Hall, SEA, 216-217)

Champa offered submission to Yuan 1278, exchanged embassies 1279-1280, accepted Yuan vassalage 1280 but expelled Yuan viceroys and thus refused annexation 1281. Yuan invaded 1282-1284, could not overcome national guerrilla resistance, refused to withdraw and receive tribute. The Mongol invasion of Dai Viet 1285 was meant to get through to Champa, but Yuan was defeated by Dai Viet and Champa. Champa instead sent a tribute embassy 1285, which was accepted. After a succession in Champa, tribute to Dai Viet was stopped; presents went to Yuan 1292, but Champa refused to allow a passing Yuan fleet to land that same year; and Yuan accepted this rather limited degree of vassalage. (Grousset 290; Coedès 192-193, 217; Hall, SEA, 208; Majumdar, 113-122. Majumdar, 122, denies any tribute to Yuan in the 1290's)

Cambodia defeated the Mongols in 1283 and paid tribute nonetheless in 1285. (Coedès 192) Yuan representations to the Khmer empire 1296-1297 apparently failed to extract homage. (Briggs, 244; Coedès, 213; Hall, SEA, 136)

Yuan favored a new Thai immigrant population, which seized power from old rulers and was submissive to Yuan, in much of southeast Asia. (Hall, SEA, 187) At the end of the century, Cambodia was under attack by its former Thai vassal Sukhothai, which had taken over much other vassal territory of the former Khmer empire from 1270. (Briggs, 240-241, 250, 253; Hall, SEA, 187; Wyatt, 54-56) From 1282 Sukhothai sent embassies to Yuan, 1292, 1294, 1295, 1297, 1299, even while it expanded locally at Cambodia's expense; its King may have obeyed an order to visit the Yuan court, and was encouraged by Yuan in his expansion. (Briggs, 240, 242; Coedès 206; Hall, SEA, 134, 190) While Sukhothai acquired a wide hegemony over Thai tribes in the south, Chiengmai/Lan-na was its ally from 1287, and Lopburi/Louvo was its independent equal and sent its own embassies to Yuan from c. 1280 to 1299. (Wyatt, 56-58, 63; Coedès, 196, 204-205, 208; Hall, SEA, 134)

The Thai Lao prince Mangrai of Chiengsaen and Chiengrai conquered the Mon kingdom of Haripunjaya c. 1281, founding the city of Chiengmai and the state of Lan-na (usually also called Chiengmai) 1296, apparently with Yuan concurrence. (Wyatt, 44-49; Briggs, 241; Coedès, 195, 208-209; Hall, SEA, 187) Chiengmai's relations with Yuan at this time are however not clear: perhaps Chiengmai was a Yuan vassal from 1294 (Grousset 291); perhaps it was an object of an unsuccessful Yuan punitive expedition, ordered 1292, repulsed 1296. (Wyatt, 48-49)

Burma (Pagan) attacked a Yuan tributary in 1277. Yuan struck back in 1277-1278; Pagan continued its raids. Yuan invaded 1283-1284, conquering much of the country, provoking Mon rebellion, and carrying Shan (Thai) tribal invaders in their wake. By 1287, the Pagan state was destroyed, and the city burnt 1299. A Yuan province was established in the north 1285-1303; the rest of Burma broke up into statelets like the new Burman refugee state of Toungoo in the southeast, the independent Mon state Pegu in the delta (which obtained Yuan recognition after 1287), and various Shan chiefdoms which dismembered a second Yuan province that had been set up around Pagan. (Grousset, 290 - 291; Hall, Burma, 24-27, 34; Coedès 183, 190, 193-194, 209-210; Hall, SEA, 169-172)

Yuan from 1280 was probably sufficiently comprehensive, cohesive at the core and powerful in the semiperiphery, to be called a universal empire, despite local revolts.

AD 1300. Universal empire. Metropole: Yuan. "It was under the Mongols that the first true provinces...appeared, in the sense of scaled-down replicas of the central administration." Blunden and Elvin 27. Korea: vassal. Manchuria: Jurchen tributary vassals. Mongolia: rebel or contested. Kashgaria: rebel or contested. Tibet: subjugated. Dai Viet: independent Yuan vassal. Champa: independent Yuan vassal. Cambodia:

independent of Yuan. Thailand: Sukhothai and Lopburi Yuan vassals; Chiengmai rebelling against Yuan. Burma: divided, Yuan province/various rebels.

After the death of Kublai's successor Temur Oljaitu in 1307, the dynasty declined rapidly. A major cultural-factional controversy pitted steppe Mongols against court-bureaucrat Mongols. In 1307 this struggle manifested itself in conflicting imperial candidacies (Qaishan vs. Ayurbarwada). On this occasion the steppe candidate was successful. (Dardess, 9, 12-21, 38-42) Despite weakness at the top, the bureaucracy continued to function.

The victory of the steppe candidate brought no power back to the steppe. Instead Mongolia was reduced to Yuan provincial status 1307, with bureaucrats and garrisons and colonists, relief grants and subsidies. The northern steppe homeland was fully absorbed, administratively assimilated into dependency. (Dardess 8, 24-25)

Koryo and Manchuria remained subject to Yuan in this period. (Han 155-159; Rossabi, 9)

After the Jagatai-Ögödei Mongol rebellions against Yuan petered out in 1303, the two rebel lineages fought. Kashgaria and Dzungaria fell to the Jagatai branch 1306, with Yuan help. There were raids and counterraids between Jagatai and Yuan thereafter until a peaceful, loose tributary relation was established 1323. (Grousset 336-338; Dardess 12, 25-26)

Exasperated by rebellions and incursions in provinces surrendered by Champa for a marital alliance of 1306, Dai Viet attacked and subjugated Champa 1312, then defended its vassal against a Sukhothai raid 1313. Champa revolted 1314-1318 without success. Yuan objected to Dai Viet's acquisition of a Yuan vassal, and the next Champa revolt got Yuan diplomatic support 1324, though it had to defeat Dai Viet on its own 1326. (Coedès 229, 230; Hall, SEA, 209, 217; Majumdar, 122-128)

Cambodia entered an obscure period. (Coedès, 228-229)

A Yuan punitive expedition of 1301 against Chiengmai was a disaster; but Chiengmai, raiding to 1311, sent tribute missions to Yuan 1315, then fell into succession struggles from 1317 onward. (Wyatt, 49-50, 75; Coedès, 226-227)

Sukhothai sent embassies to Yuan to 1323. It was able to raid Champa over Cambodian territory 1313. After its founder's death (1298? 1317?), its power and thrust declined, its vassals rebelled, and it adopted a more status quo policy, and involved itself in piety, monuments and scholarship. Lopburi/Louvo then displaced Sukhothai as the local power. (Coedès 206, 219-222; Hall, SEA, 191-192; Wyatt, 59-60)

Burma remained divided. A Yuan invasion 1301 was defeated by Burman and Shan (Thai) resistance; the Shan chiefs then sent repeated submission and tribute to Yuan, which accepted it, and even abolished its other Burma province in their favor 1303. The Shan chiefs then divided and ruled the Burman area of Upper Burma from Pinya 1312 and Sagaing 1315. A Thai dynasty ruled the Mon state of Pegu in the south. (Hall, Burma, 27-31; Briggs, 241; Coedès, 190, 209, 227-228; Hall, SEA, 172-173)

AD 1325. Universal empire. Metropole: Yuan.

After a series of abbreviated monarchs (nine successions 1307-1333, often by coup), the long feeble final Yuan reign (to 1370) was disturbed by factional-ideological struggles among the Mongol elite over Confucianism and racism. Signs of loss of control appeared in the 1340's: floods, banditry, piracy, famine. One pirate gained dominion over maritime grain shipments. (Grousset, 320-325; Dardess, 53-102)

Koryo continued a Yuan vassal (Han 155-159), as did Jurchen Manchuria until Yuan repeatedly raised its gerfalcon tribute. The Jurchen revolted 1343, 1346-1347, 1348-1355, by which time Yuan had worse revolts to preoccupy them. (Rossabi, 9)

Another Yuan succession struggle between a steppe and a court-bureaucrat candidate (1328-1329, Qoshila and Tugh Temür) went badly for the now-subjugated steppe, whose candidate was defeated. (Dardess, 9, 12-21, 38-42)

The Jagatai candidate for the Yuan throne was defeated in 1329; thereafter, the Jagatai khanate isolated itself from Yuan. (Dardess, 8, 27-30) In 1347 the local Dughlat Mongol clan called in one Tughlugh Timur as Jagatai kaghan; he converted to Islam. (Grousset 344)

Champa, having thrown off Dai Viet lordship in 1326, sent embassies to Yuan 1327, 1328, 1330, then ceased and became fully independent during a period of state weakness in both Dai Viet and Yuan. Champa remained independent, at peace and prosperous to its next succession crisis 1342; thereafter it underwent civil war. (Coedès 229, 230; Hall, SEA, 209, 217; Majumdar, 122-128)

Cambodia seems from what little evidence exists to have been post-imperial, weak, peaceful, friendly to Yuan (sending an embassy in 1330) and Dai Viet (sending a greeting delegation 1335), and rich. (Coedès, 228-229)

Chiengmai reestablished order 1328, sent tribute to Yuan in 1326, 1327, 1328, 1329, 1347, and spent most of this period in city-building and temple-building. (Wyatt, 49-50, 75; Coedès, 226-227)

The Burman refugee city of Toungoo became a kingdom in 1347.

AD 1350. Universal empire. Metropole: Yuan. Korea: Koryo vassal to Yuan. Manchuria; Jurchen in revolt. Mongolia: part of Yuan metropole. Kashgaria: independent, isolated. Tibet: independent. Dai Viet: independent. Cambodia: independent. Champa: civil war. Thailand: Lopburi independent. Burma: Yuan vassals/independent statelets.

Many Chinese popular rebellions broke out from 1351. Yuan was able to put down all but two by 1354 using mixed Chinese, Miao, Mongol and Central Asian armies. (Dardess, 104-116) Intrigue and power struggles within Yuan then paralyzed its forces. From 1355 Yuan fell apart into regional warlordism. Semi-independent loyalist strong men took over North China; the two major rebels received appointments as nominal loyalists on the coast; suppressed rebellions sprang up again to form three major de facto independent rebel-revival states. A Mongol warlord destroyed one; a second, which became the Ming state, captured Nanking 1356, disposed of the other three groups one by one, seizing all south China. Civil warfare among its warlords paralyzed the Mongol north after 1360. Ming swept the Mongols out of north China 1368-1369. (Grousset 323-325; Dardess 104-156)

The Mongol empire pulled back into Mongolia; the Ming pursued. Ming expeditions of 1369, 1372, 1374, all failed to end Mongol raiding and bring submission. (Rossabi 12; Grousset 502-503)

Koryo rebelled successfully against Yuan 1356, defended themselves against the neo-Sung Red Banner Chinese rebel army 1359-1362, suppressed a Yuan counterattack 1368, and accepted Ming that same year. (Henthorn 128-135, 152; Han 180-181, 185-191, 220-222; Lee 161-165)

Mongol-Jurchen forces in Manchuria rejected Ming minatory embassies of 1370 and 1371. (Rossabi, 13-19)

One Qamar ad-Din usurped the khanate of Moghollistan (Dzungaria, Kashgaria, and the vicinity) from the Jagatai dynasty 1363. Tamerlane of Samarkand sent or made eight expeditions 1366-1390 to subdue this Qamar ad-Din. (Grousset 422-426)

Tibet reestablished its autonomy of Yuan by 1350, and remained independent and introverted to the 18th century (Richardson, 35, 49).

Champa ended its civil war 1352, fought off a Dai Viet intervention 1353, and attacked Dai Viet 1353 in another unsuccessful attempt to reconquer lost territory. Champa launched successful raids on Dai Viet 1361, 1362, 1365, and defeated a Dai Viet punitive expedition 1368. Champa established early and annual tributary ties to Ming from 1368. Ignoring Ming commands to be at peace with Dai Viet, Champa intervened in Dai Viet civil strife and sacked Hanoi 1371, and neutralized Ming with lies 1372 and tribute 1373. (Coedès 230, 237-238; Hall, SEA, 209-210, 217-218; Majumdar, 128-134)

Cambodian chronology becomes problematic. Hall suggests there was an Ayuthia conquest of Angkor 1369-1375 and again 1389, while the rulers of Cambodia, sometimes in revolt against Ayuthia occupation, were exchanging missions with Ming 1371, 1373, 1378-1383, 1386-1390. (Hall, SEA, 139-141) Coedès dates the Ayuthia conquests of Cambodia 1352-1353 and 1393-1394 (236-237); Briggs doubts their existence (254-255).

A former piece of the Cambodian empire, and then of Sukhothai's, became independent, with Cambodian aid, as the Thai state Laos (Lan Chang, Luang Prabang) 1353. To its east Laos bordered Dai Viet and Champa, to its south Cambodia, to its west Chiengmai, Sukhothai and Ayuthia. Laos expanded in all directions, then exhausted itself attacking both Dai Viet and Ayuthia until a coup of 1373, after which it turned toward peace, trade and prosperity. (Coedès, 223-225; Hall, SEA, 137, 192, 284-284; Wyatt, 82-83)

Lopburi founded the new city and state Ayuthia 1350/1351. Sukhothai was at first perhaps a vassal, perhaps a weak ally. Ayuthia became strong as Yuan overlordship weakened, but cultivated Ming when that became established. A first Ayuthia assault on Cambodia was successful 1369-1375, then expelled. Sukhothai had recovered its independent strength; Ayuthia attacked Sukhothai from 1371. (Hall, SEA, 191-194; Wyatt, 66-69)

AD 1375. Unipolar. Polar state: Ming.

After a breach and a flirtation with Northern Yuan remnant, Koryo became a Ming tributary in 1384. In the process, a pro-Ming faction abolished Koryo and created the Yi dynasty in what the Ming designated as the state of Choson. (Henthorn 128-135, 152; Han 180-181, 185-191, 220-222; Lee 161-165)

Mongol-Jurchen holdouts in Manchuria, having rebuffed another Ming demand for submission in 1378, raided the Ming holdings, were overawed by a Ming army, and accepted vassal status. (Rossabi, 13-19, argues that there was no Ming "hegemony" because Ming did not collect the taxes, raise the armies, and govern the area, but also shows that the Jurchens offered submission, paid tribute, tolerated an inferior position, and provided auxiliaries, i.e. that there was Ming hegemony but no imperial province.)

Ming inflicted a great defeat on the shrunken Mongol empire 1388. The steppe empire dissolved: Kyrgyz, Alans (Asod) and western Oirat Mongols (Kalmyks, Jungars) went their own way, and all paid homage to Ming. (Rossabi 12; Grousset 502-503)

Having survived Tamerlane's expeditions to 1390, Qamar ad-Din vanished 1392, a Jagataite was restored, and Tamerlane sent another expedition 1399-1400 to plunder Kashgaria. (Grousset 422-426) In 1385 Ming ambassadors nonetheless obtained Jagataite or Dughlat homage, whatever its worth. (Grousset 485)

Ming conquered Yunnan 1381 against last-ditch Mongol resistance and resumed the Yuan policy of massive colonization. (Ebrey 195)

Dai Viet next ignored Ming peacemaking advice, attacked Champa 1377, and was badly defeated. Champa pillaged Hanoi again 1377 and 1378, annexing several provinces and sending booty to Ming. Champa attacks of 1380 and 1382 failed, succeeded 1383-1384, but suffered defeat 1390 and re-lost all the reconquered territories. Tribute sent Ming by a new coup government in Champa was rejected 1391 but accepted 1397 and 1399. (Coedès 230, 237-238; Hall, SEA, 209-210, 217-218; Majumdar, 128-134)

Ayuthia completed its subjugation of Sukhothai by 1378. It then intervened in Chiengmai in the late 1380's, while Chiengmai attacked Sukhothai in the same period. (Hall, SEA, 191-194; Wyatt, 66-69)

Thais of Chiengmai and Ayuthia claimed several provinces of the Mon state, whose capital was Martaban. Chiengmai attacks of 1356 were driven off. Ayuthia seized Martaban 1363, forcing the Mon state to move its capital to Pegu 1369. After this setback, the Mons held their own, because Ayuthia was more concerned to subdue Cambodia, Sukhothai and Chiengmai. (Hall, Burma, 34; Hall, SEA, 179-180)

Burma became more clearly quadripartitioned: many Shan statelets established themselves in the north; a Shan dynasty extinguished local competitors, ruled, and assimilated to, the Burmans of Upper Burma from Ava; a Thai dynasty ruled, and assimilated to, the Mons of Lower Burma from Pegu; a Burman dynasty ruled Burman refugees at Toungoo. Ava fixed a border with Pegu 1371, and received Ming recognition and support against northern Shans 1383. Ava took advantage of a succession struggle to attack Pegu 1385, took Prome, but could not complete the conquest. The main axis of conflict in Burma became Ava vs. Pegu, Burmans vs. Mons. (Coedès, 227-228; Hall, Burma, 30-31; Hall, SEA, 174-175)

AD 1400. Unipolar. Polar state: Ming. Korea: Choson vassal to Ming. Manchuria: settled Jurchen Ming vassals. Mongolia: divided; Ming vassals. Kashgaria: being looted by Tamerlane's forces. Tibet: independent, introverted, religious, no military or political salience. Dai Viet: independent. Champa: independent of and at war with Dai Viet; tributary to Ming. Cambodia: independent. Ayuthia: strong, aggressive, polite to Ming. Chiengmai: independent, strong. Laos: at peace with its neighbors. Burma: divided and at war, Ava/Pegu/Toungoo.

There were Ming naval expeditions to Sumatra, Ceylon, Persia and Arabia 1403-1433, which brought back prisoners and prestige.

Korea provided steady tribute-trade of horses and oxen to Ming. (Henthorn 154-155)

Ming embassies succeeded in securing peace and economically beneficial tribute of horses, furs, camels and luxury goods from the Jurchens of Manchuria. (Rossabi, 19-36)

The Oirat Mongols expanded their control through western Mongolia. In the east a Kublaid arose again, rallied the Alans, and refused vassalage to Ming. Ming campaigned into Outer Mongolia 1410-1411 and routed the Kublaid. The Oirats finished them off, claimed Mongol hegemony, and threw off the Ming yoke. Ming attacks across the Gobi drove the Oirat off at heavy cost 1414-1415. The eastern Mongol Khorchins then rose up again, first for a Kublaid, then on their own. Ming, now with Oirat help, attacked them in Mongolia 1422-1425, without decisive result. (Grousset 504-507)

The Oirat Mongols became hegemonic in Dzungaria and eastern Kashgaria about the 1420's. Tamerlane's son and successor Shah Rukh (r. 1407-1447) ruled at Herat and Samarkand. He allied with the Dughlats of Kashgaria and defeated the Jagataite Khan of Moghollistan (Dzungaria) 1425. (Grousset 506, 457-460, 492)

Dai Viet underwent a coup 1400; the losers called in Ming, which conquered Dai Viet 1407 with the help of Champa. Ming reorganized it as "Annan," and tried to sinify it. Rebellion began 1418. (Hall, SEA, 218)

Champa defeated a Dai Viet invasion 1401, but was badly defeated by the next 1402 and had to cede its historic and fertile northern half and accept vassalage. Champa appealed to Ming 1403 which called on Dai Viet to leave Champa in peace. Dai Viet seized Champa's tribute to Ming and invaded Champa in great force. Champa again appealed to Ming 1404, which sent ships and an ultimatum. Dai Viet desisted, but was anyway invaded, conquered and annexed by Ming 1407, while Champa regained its just-ceded territories and reaffirmed tribute to Ming. Champa invaded Cambodia after 1407, was asked to withdraw by Ming, and commemorated victories against Cambodia 1421. (Coedès, 238-239; Hall, SEA, 141, 210, 218; Majumdar, 134-141)

Cambodia continued tributary missions to Ming until 1419, complaining of Champa invasions to Ming 1408 and 1414, and receiving diplomatic support. (Hall, SEA, 139; Majumdar, 138) It then underwent major change which for Chandler ended its "period of greatness" (1996: 29), although he is unable to accept the label "decline" (78).

Laos suffered internal struggles and many successions after 1416. Laos embroiled itself in the Ming-Dai Viet war 1421; its force sent to aid Dai Viet changed sides and was expelled by Dai Viet. (Hall, SEA, 285)

Chiengmai underwent a succession war 1401, and repelled Ming invasions from Yunnan 1404 and 1405, then was at peace. (Wyatt, 76-77)

Ayuthia intervened and imposed a candidate on rebellious vassal Sukhothai 1410. An attack on Chiengmai 1411 captured Chiengrai. Ayuthia controlled the Sukhothai succession 1419. (Hall, SEA, 194-195; Wyatt, 69-71, 77)

Ava and Pegu fought constantly 1401-1417; Ava also fought Arakan 1404-1430. Ming did not take administrative control of Burma, but obstructed the growth of any powerful state, e.g. Ming reprimands saved a Shan state from Ava 1406. Upper Burma fell into anarchy 1426-1440. (Hall, SEA 175-177, 180; Hall, Burma, 31, 35)

AD 1425. Hegemonic. Hegemon: Ming. Korea: tributary. Manchuria: Jurchens tributary to Ming. Mongolia: Oirats assisting Ming, Khorchins resisting. Kashgaria: outside the Far Eastern system. Dai Viet: conquered, rebellious. Champa: vassal to Ming. Cambodia: in crisis. Laos: independent. Chiengmai: independent. Ayuthia: independent. Burma: kept divided by Ming

Korea extended itself northward against the Jurchen, essentially reaching the present Tumen-Yalu river boundary 1431-1447. (Henthorn 154-155)

After 1426, Ming began to retrench on empire, becoming isolationist and xenophobic, while the Jurchen demanded more reciprocal gifts for more, increasingly unwelcome, "Jurchen embassies" to Ming, whose rejection provoked armed raids. Jurchens cooperated with the Oirat Mongol attack of 1449. (Rossabi, 36-44)

With Ming help, the Oirats took the Kaghanate 1434-1439. They then attempted the further reconstruction of the steppe empire, attacking Ming all along its northern frontier. Oirat inflicted a great defeat on Ming 1449, capturing the Ming emperor Ying-tsung, but could not capture fortified cities. (Grousset 504-507)

The Timurid Shah Rukh of Samarkand seized Kashgar, which the Dughlat Mongols of Kashgaria took back about 1433-1434. (Grousset 506, 457-460, 492)

The Vietnamese country regained its independence in (and may be called Vietnam after) 1428--whereupon it sent submission to Ming. (Hall, SEA, 218) Its "Later Le" dynasty received Ming recognition and the royal title.

Champa made peace with independent Vietnam 1428, but attacked it during a succession crisis 1434, was defeated and made peace. There was a succession in 1441 and a Ming investiture, and renewed attacks on Vietnam 1444 and 1445. Ming requested armistice of both, but Vietnam took its capital and king 1446, ignoring a Ming order to release him. A successor requested and received Ming and Dai Viet investiture 1447, but was overthrown 1449. (Coedès, 238-239; Hall, SEA, 141, 210, 218; Majumdar, 134-141)

In Cambodia, a succession crisis, partition, civil war and Ayuthia intervention led to Angkor being abandoned in the 1440's in favor of Phnom Penh. (Hall, SEA, 142-143; D. Chandler, 1996: 77-80; cf. Coedès, 237-238)

At peace to 1441, Chiengmai fell into a succession war to 1450. (Wyatt, 76-77)

An Ayuthia attack on Cambodia 1431-1432 succeeded as a raid, but failed as an attempt to establish a vassal state. In 1438 Sukhothai was abolished, annexed and provincialized by Ayuthia; the resulting state may now be called Siam, with Ayuthia its capital city. Siamese campaigns against divided Chiengmai 1442 and 1448 failed. (Hall, SEA, 194-195; Wyatt, 69-71, 77)

Ming suppressed a Shan attempt to revive Nanchao 1438-1465, becoming embroiled with Ava in the process 1441-1446, producing a formal act of submission by Ava 1445. Once the Burman attacks ceased, Pegu entered a long period of peace and prosperity. (Hall, SEA 175-177, 180; Hall, Burma, 31, 35)

AD 1450. Bipolar. Polar states: Ming; Oirat. Korea: Ming vassal. Manchuria: Jurchen independent, cooperating with Oirat. Mongolia: Oirat confederacy strong and independent. Tibet: independent. Vietnam: independent Ming vassal. Champa: independent. Cambodia: in retreat. Siam: aggressive, unsuccessful. Chiengmai: independent. Burma: divided, north anarchic.

Unable to conquer Ming, and threatened by factionalism, the Oirat Khan Esen made peace with Ming, became its vassal, claimed the Kaghanate (1453), and was assassinated (1455). Oirat was able to invade Moghollistan, but eastern Mongolia fell to the Kublaids, who fought one another and the Oirats. Dayan was proclaimed khan 1470; his people defeated the Oirats and restored Kublaid primacy among the Mongols. (Grousset 507-510)

Korea continued regular tributary-vassal embassies to Ming, whose effect was to provide the Korean ruler with a trade monopoly in return for his submission. (Han 219, 223, 227; Lee 189. As to the degree of Korean vassalhood, cf. Fairbank et al. 300--"unswervingly loyal" with Han 222--"only nominal.")

There was sporadic warfare between Ming and the Jurchens of Manchuria. (Rossabi 47-48)

The Jagataite Khan of Moghollistan raided the Timurid Abu Sa'id of Samarkand after 1451, who then supported a Jagataite claimant so as to divide the Kashgaria-Dzungaria region, which however was reunited under the Jagataite Yunus 1472. (Grousset 460-461, 493-495)

There were major Miao and Yao risings in south and southwest China against Ming control and colonization 1464-1466. (Ebrey 197)

Champa was at odds with Vietnam, but received Ming investiture 1453 and 1457. Champa refused homage to Vietnam; war began, and Champa complained to Ming, which declined to help. Champa sent tribute to Vietnam 1467, but Ming-level tribute was demanded, and refused 1469. Champa attacked Vietnam 1469; Vietnam complained to Ming, invaded, and took Champa's capital again, this time permanently, 1471, along with 4/5 of the country. Ming, anxious for good relations with Vietnam, offered no assistance. A rump of Champa continued a reduced existence until the 19th century, slowly retreating before Vietnamese annexations, maintaining Ming investitures and embassies to 1543. (Coedès, 238-239; Hall, SEA, 210; Majumdar, 141-146)

Cambodia was well into five hundred years of alternating wars with, and submission to, Siam. The Ming seem not to have intervened nor been invited, perhaps because this was regarded as an internal affair. An overthrow of Thai-oriented vassals around Angkor c. 1450 was followed by civil strife. (Hall, SEA, 146-147; D. Chandler, 1996: 80-81)

Chiengmai attempted to acquire rebellious Sukhothai from Siam 1451, but was distracted by an attack from Laos. Chiengmai fought Siam off and on from 1456 to 1464. Siam apparently failed to capture Malacca 1455 and was discouraged from further attacks by Ming, held off Chiengmai with some loss of land 1460-1462, suppressed another rebellion in Sukhothai 1462. (Hall, SEA, 196-199; Wyatt, 77-81, 86-88)

There was a period of calm among the Shan states after the Ming punitive expedition, maintained by occasional Ming warnings.

AD 1475. Unipolar. Polar state: Ming. Korea: tributary. Manchuria: Jurchen independent and hostile to Ming. Mongolia: independent Kublaid khanate. Kashgaria-Dzungaria: independent Jagataite khanate. Vietnam: independent; expanded by conquest. Champa: mostly annexed by Vietnam. Chiengmai and Siam: independent, mutually hostile. Burma: quiet under Ming supervision.

Ming adopted a more pacific policy toward the Jurchens of Manchuria around 1478, allowing numerous tribute missions and tolerating substantial smuggling. (Rossabi 47-48)

The Kublaid khan Dayan's Mongols resumed raids on the northern Ming frontiers in 1497. (Grousset 507-510)

Kashgaria revolted from the Jagataite Khanate of Mogholistan, split under competing Dughlat emirs about 1479, and was largely resubjugated by the Jagataite Ahmed 1499. (Grousset 460-461, 493-495)

Vietnam invaded Laos 1478, took its capital Lan Chang, but was driven out again. Laos now sought and achieved prosperity through peace and trade with Vietnam and the Thai states. (Hall, SEA, 285; Wyatt, 84)

Chiengmai complained to Ming of Vietnamese incursions stemming from Vietnam's attack on Laos 1478-1479, was urged to become a Ming tributary, and apparently agreed. Siam fought Chiengmai again without decisive result 1486 and 1494. Siam prospered through trade, and engaged in notable public and religious works. (Hall, SEA, 196-199; Wyatt, 77-81, 86-88)

Ming control in Burma weakened after 1481, and the Shan state of Mohnyin began to raid Ava, which could not curb it. Pegu meanwhile enjoyed peace, stability, prosperity, and trade, and devoted its energies to religion. (Hall, Burma, 32, 35-37; Hall, SEA, 177-178, 180-181)

AD 1500. Unipolar. Polar state: Ming. Korea: Ming vassal. Manchuria: Jurchens independent vassals of Ming. Mongolia: Kublaid khanate raiding Ming. Kashgaria: Jagataite khanate. Vietnam: independent vassal of Ming. A much reduced Champa still receives investiture from Ming, and is perhaps protected from extinction by Ming pressure on Vietnam. (Majumdar 145-146) Cambodia: vassal to Siam. Siam (Ayuthia) is in conflict with Lan-na (Chiengmai) over the remains of Sukhothai. Laos: at peace with Siam and Vietnam. Burma: divided among Ava (anarchic), Mohnyin, Pegu, Toungoo.

Korea continued a Ming vassal during a period on internal factional struggles and elite purges. (Han 264-267; Henthorn 177; Lee 205-206)

Manchurian Jurchens continued peaceful tribute-trade relations with Ming. (Rossabi 49-50)

The Kublaid khan Dayan's Mongols raided Ming to 1505. (Grousset 510-511; Ebrey 210)

The Jagataite Khan of Mogholistan was attacked by, but expelled, the Dughlat Emir of Kashgar 1514, reunited the Dzungaria-Kashgaria districts within the Jagatai dynasty, and began raiding northwest China 1517. Later Dzungaria was lost to the Kyrgyz-Kazakhs of the Great Horde. (Grousset 497-500)

Vietnam underwent rapid turnover at the top and feudal decentralization below 1497-1527. (Hall, SEA, 218-219)

Cambodia is spoken of as warlike and independent in a European source of c. 1512-1515. There was some alternation between raiding and Siamese hegemony which is hard to sort out in this period. (Cf. Hall, SEA, 146-147, and D. Chandler, 1996: 81-82)

Siam fought Chiengmai over Sukhothai 1507-1508, 1510, 1513, 1515, and kept it. Peace followed. Chiengmai invested in religious foundations, Siam in public works. (Hall, SEA, 199, 286-287; Wyatt, 80-82, 89-92)

Shan Mohnyin continued to attack Ava, which ceded territory 1507. A Ming intervention 1520 was without effect. Mohnyin captured Ava, pillaged it, and set up a Shan state there. Meanwhile Toungoo expanded greatly at the expense of Ava, receiving many Burman chiefs when Ava fell to Mohnyin. (Hall, Burma, 38-41; Hall, SEA, 178, 181, 287-289)

AD 1525. Unipolar. Polar state: Ming. Korea, Manchuria tributary. Mongolia independent Kublaid khanate, quiet. Kashgaria-Dzungaria: Jagataite, hostile. Vietnam: disintegrating. Siam, Chiengmai: independent, peaceful. Burma: Mohnyin and Toungoo dividing Ava.

The Jurchens of Manchuria continued a placid tributary trade with Ming, even though Ming once again limited, controlled and monopolized their traffic after 1536. (Rossabi 49-50) Their largely passive acceptance of Ming exploitative behavior suggests that the previously irrepressible Jurchens had reverted to subordinate, genuinely tributary status.

The Kublaid Mongol khan Dayan ruled the Mongols until his death 1543. His grandson and successor Altan Khan had resumed raids on Ming almost every year from 1529. In 1542 he defeated a Ming army, capturing or killing 200,000 Ming people in a single month. In 1550 he raided to Peking. (Grousset 510-511; Ebrey 210)

The Le dynasty of Vietnam was overthrown by the Mac 1527, but nominally restored in southern Annam by the Nguyen and Trinh. The Mac held Tonkin, and Ming ordered both sides to remain in place as Ming vassals. (Hall, SEA, 218-219)

Laos continued to seek peace, and to prosper by trade with Thailand and Vietnam. Public works and religious foundations increased. The capital was moved from Lan Chang (Luang Prabang) to the better-placed trade site of Vien Chang (Vientiane). Laos intervened in a Chiengmai succession struggle 1545-1547. (Hall, SEA, 285-286; Wyatt, 84-86)

A succession dispute in Chiengmai invited Siamese, Shan and Lao intervention from 1545, which left Siam defeated and Chiengmai independent but chaotic. A succession struggle in Siam invited Burmese and Cambodian intervention 1548-1549, which was repelled. (Hall, SEA, 199, 286-287; Wyatt, 80-82, 89-92)

Toungoo conquered Pegu 1535-1542, repulsed an attack by Shan-ruled Ava and six other Shan states 1544, and created a Mon-Burman Burmese state 1546. Proposing to conquer the world, Burma thereupon attempted, unsuccessfully, to subjugate Arakan and

Siam 1547-1548, and fell back into disorder and secession. (Hall, Burma, 38-41; Hall, SEA, 178, 181, 287-289)

AD 1550. Unipolar. Polar state: Ming. Korea: Ming vassal. Manchuria: Jurchens reduced to tributary status. Mongolia: Altan Khan independent and hostile to Ming. Kashgaria: Jagataite Khanate hostile to Ming. Tonkin: Mac vassal to Ming. Annam: Le/Trinh vassal to Ming. Cambodia: vassal to Siam? in revolt? Siam: independent. Chiengmai: chaotic. Burma: anarchy.

Korea remained a Ming vassal, subject to intense elite factional strife.

In Manchuria, Jurchen had begun to protest Ming trade controls by predatory raiding, which led to successful Ming repression 1574, (Rossabi 51-53).

Altan Khan ruled to 1583, raiding Ming, but also demanding the opening of frontier markets. (Grousset 510-511)

Jagataite Kashgaria brought in devout Muslim khojas, and religious factionalism arose, dividing the Aqtaghlik of Kashgar from the Qarataghlik of Yarkand. (Grousset 500-501)

Bayinnaung united Burma by blitzkrieg: Toungoo, Prome, Pegu, 1550-1551, Ava 1555, Shan states to 1562. Burma subjugated Chiengmai 1556, and again 1558-1559 and 1564-1565 after defeating Laotian and resistance forces. Burma repressed a Mon rebellion in Lower Burma 1564. Burma attacked Siam from 1563, twice conquering Ayuthia (1564, 1568-1569), placing a vassal on the Siamese throne 1569. In 1569 a Venetian traveler estimated Burma's wealth and strength as higher than that of the Ottoman Empire. But Burma bogged down in expeditions to Laos 1569-1570, 1571, 1574-1575. (Hall, Burma, 41-48; Hall, SEA, 289-300, 380, 398-399; Wyatt, 92-104, 118)

Cambodia attacked Burma-occupied Siam in 1570 and 1575. (D. Chandler, 1996: 84-85; Hall, SEA, 147-149, 295, 297, 299; Wyatt, 100)

Laos defended Chiengmai against Burma in the 1550's and 1560's with more determination than success, and resisted repeated Burmese invasions in the 1570's. (Hall, SEA, 294-295, 467; Wyatt, 120)

Chiengmai remained chaotic until subjugated by Burma against resistance in the 1550's and 1560's. (Wyatt, 92-93, 118)

AD 1575. Bipolar. Polar states: Ming, Burma. Korea: Ming vassal. Manchuria: Jurchens raiding Ming. Mongolia: independent Kublaid khanate. Kashgaria:

independent Jagataite khanate. Vietnam: two states. Burma: aggressive and expansionist.

Japan invaded Korea 1592-1593 and 1597-1598, was resisted by Korean and Ming armies and Korean guerrillas, but was most stymied by the ironclad cannonships of the Korean navy. (Lee 208-2; Han 267-273; Henthorn 177-185.)

Ming punitive expeditions against Jurchen raids continued 1579-1580, 1582, 1584, and 1588. But north of northeastern Korea, Jurchen vassals of Ming under Nurhachi had formed an expansionist state by 1583, and began assailing Korea. Nurhachi attacked Ming in Manchuria 1593, but otherwise performed as a loyal Ming vassal and tributary. (Rossabi, 51-53; Henthorn, 186)

Tibetan lamas of the Yellow Hat sect undertook missions to the Mongols, with great success, converting Altan Khan 1576. Tibet and Mongolia were united, the Tibetan Dalai Lama as spiritual leader, the Mongol Altan Khan as temporal leader, by an assembly at Kokonor 1577. The eastern Mongols, ruled by Altan Khan to 1583, became by degrees less aggressive and centralized. (Grousset 513-515)

Vietnam was partitioned further by a split between Le/Trinh in the center and Nguyen in the south. The Trinh captured Hanoi and drove the Mac to Caobang on the border 1592, where they held out with Ming support. (Hall, SEA, 219)

Cambodian incursions into Siam continued: 1578, 1582 twice, 1587. But Siam, having at last recovered, drove a Cambodian attack force all the way back to the capital Lovek 1587, taking Lovek and devastating the country 1593-1594. (D. Chandler, 1996: 84-85; Hall, SEA, 147-149, 295, 297, 299; Wyatt, 100)

Having held back the Burmese, Laos fell into anarchy in the 1580's, achieved renewed unity and independence, but not stability, 1591-1592. (Hall, SEA, 294-295, 467; Wyatt, 120)

Chiangmai rebelled unsuccessfully against Burma 1595, then fell under Siamese suzerainty 1599 when Burma collapsed. (Wyatt, 92-93, 118)

Siam prepared for war with Burma from 1550. Siam invaded Cambodia to force submission 1555-1556. Siam was conquered and subjugated by Burma in the 1560's, invaded five times by Cambodia 1570-1582, but recovered, rebelled 1583, defeated repeated Burmese invasions to 1593, offered Ming the Siamese navy against Japan 1592, turned the tables and invaded Burma from 1593. (Wyatt, 92-104)

Another Burmese expedition to Laos bogged down 1579. Burma's people were impoverished by the state's constant conscriptions. Burma fell into annual rebellion from 1581. Siam rebelled, defeated five Burmese invasions 1584-1593, invaded Burma 1593, took the suzerainty of Chiengmai 1599. Burma broke apart into warring states--Toungoo, Ava, Prome, the Shan states--with pieces to Siam and Arakan, by 1599. (Hall, Burma, 41-48; Hall, SEA, 289-300, 380, 398-399; Wyatt, 92-104, 118)

AD 1600. Unipolar. Polar state: Ming (Wan Li reign). Korea: vassal. Manchuria: Jurchen Ming vassals under Nurhachi. Mongolia: independent, divided. Tibet: independent and spiritual authority for independent Mongolia. Vietnam: three de facto states, Mac, Trinh and Nguyen. Cambodia: under strong Thai pressure. Laos: independent. Siam: strong, united, vassal to Ming, suzerain to Chiengmai. Burma: divided among Arakan, Toungoo, Siam, Ava, and various warring chiefs.

The Manchurian Jurchen chief Nurhachi named himself emperor and his state "Later Chin" in 1616. The state-name was changed to Ch'ing 1636, but we shall style it Manchu, after the national name chosen 1652. Manchu defeated Korean-Ming armies in Manchuria 1619, and began extending its influence over Mongol tribes from 1624. (Henthorn, 186; Han 275)

Korea vacillated between Ming and neutrality 1619-1623, then rejoined Ming and resisted Nurhachi 1623-1627. (Henthorn 186-189; Han 276-278; Lee 215-217)

The Nguyen overlords of southern Vietnam ceased to visit the Le court in the north in 1600. War broke out between North (Le/Trinh) and South (Nguyen) Vietnam 1620. It proved a durable near-stalemate despite seesawing victories and defeats. (Hall, SEA, 219-220) South Vietnam began to colonize the Khmer-populated but unadministered region of the Mekong Delta by the 1620's. (D. Chandler, 1996: 82, 94-95)

Cambodia became a vassal of Siam 1603. During Siam's struggle with Burma over Chiengmai 1615-1618 Cambodia declared independence 1618 and drove out the Siamese garrison in Lovek; Cambodia maintained itself against Siamese attack 1622-1624. Cambodia sought South Vietnamese protection against Thailand, and got it at the price of allowing Nguyen colonization of the Mekong Delta. (D. Chandler, 1983: 84; Hall, SEA, 283, 382, 459-460)

Laos underwent a rebellion and coup 1622, then fast turnover of monarchs. (Hall, SEA 467-468; Wyatt 121-122)

Chiengmai returned from Siamese to Burmese control 1614-1615. (Wyatt, 119)

Siam fought Burma for the independent Shan states to 1605; then a succession turned it toward peace, foreign trade, centralization, revenue-building. A revolt of Japanese exile-traders and an invasion by Laos were defeated 1610-1612. Reunited

Burma recaptured some of its territories 1614 and Chiengmai 1615, with a truce in 1618. Siam lost control of Cambodia by 1622. It then occupied itself with trade, assassination, revolt, and again trade. (Hall, SEA, 380-384; Wyatt, 105-111)

Another reunification of Burma occurred, starting from Ava: Shan states, Prome 1608, Toungoo 1610, the chief port Syriam (headquarters of a Mon state with a Portuguese adventurer-king) 1613. Burma then resumed war with Siam 1614, making some territorial gains, and took Chiengmai 1615. After a truce with Siam 1618, Burmese policy shifted toward peace with war-preparation. (Hall, Burma, 63-68; Hall, SEA, 398-403)

AD 1625. Bipolar. Polar states: Ming; Manchu. Korea: Ming vassals. Mongolia: divided. Vietnam: two states. Cambodia independent. Laos unstable. Chiengmai controlled by Burma. Siam independent, trading. Burma independent, peaceful.

Famine in 1627-1628 produced uncontrollable banditry in Ming. Two main large rebel groups coalesced by 1636. Floods, epidemics, and bankruptcy undercut Ming; the two rebels established new "dynasties." (Ebrey 214-215)

The Manchu state, at Shenyang/Mukden after 1625, subdued eastern Mongolia in the 1630's. Manchu expanded to the Great Wall by 1644, recruiting Mongols and defecting Ming armies. Manchu replaced the Ming at Peking in 1644, and defeated the bandit "dynasties." Manchu still had to fight four Ming princes in the south and southwest, defeating one in 1645 and another in 1646. (Grousset 516-518; Ebrey 227)

Korean rebels joined Nurhachi, and Korea, invaded, was forced to switch suzerains and promise tribute to Manchu from 1627. A decade of resistance culminated in a major Manchu invasion, and genuine subjection after 1637. (Henthorn 186-189; Han 276-278; Lee 215-217)

The disintegrated and quarrelling eastern Mongols went over to Manchu tribe by tribe--Khorchin, Chahar, Ordos, Tümed--from 1624 to 1635. Khalkha Mongols of central Mongolia drove the Oirat westward. (Grousset 516-517, 525)

Kashgaria, nominally the Jagataite khanate of Moghulistan, remained controlled and divided by its Muslim clergy or khojas. Oirat Mongols settled in Dzungaria. (Grousset, 501, 525).

An Oirat tribe, the Khoshot Mongols, took Kokonor and intervened in a Tibetan quarrel on behalf of the Dalai Lama and the Yellow Hat sect, establishing the Dalai Lama as his vassal ruler of central Tibet. (Grousset 523-524)

Cambodia suffered coups in 1630 and 1642. (D. Chandler, 1983: 84; Hall, SEA, 283, 382, 459-460)

Unstable to 1637, Laos then enjoyed a long reign that restored internal peace and military strength, and created good relations and border treaties with all neighbors. (Hall, SEA 467-468; Wyatt 121-122)

Chiengmai revolted unsuccessfully against Burma 1631. (Wyatt, 119)

Burma pursued peace but prepared war to 1628. After a succession and the suppression of a Mon revolt, Burma turned to peaceable conservative isolation and xenophobia. The last Ming emperor arrived in Yunnan in 1644 and began conscripting Burmese men and goods, but was defeated by Burma by 1650. (Hall, Burma, 63-68; Hall, SEA, 398-403)

AD 1650. Unipolar. Polar state: Manchu. Ming resistance in southeast and southwest China. Korea: Manchu vassal. Mongolia: Manchu vassals. Dzungaria: Oirat Mongols. Kashgaria: fragmented. Kokonor: Khoshot Mongols. Tibet: Kokonor protectorate. Vietnam: three states, two long at war. Cambodia: independent. Laos: peaceful and stable. Siam: independent. Burma: withdrawn.

Manchu overcame Ming resistance in the south by 1659, only to face a rebellion by three Chinese viceroys, again in the south and southwest in 1674. Manchu enjoyed a period of unusual leadership stability: three emperors ruled 1669-1799. (Ebrey 224)

The Koxinga dynasty of Ming rebels seized Formosa from the Dutch 1661.

The North-South Vietnam war continued sporadically, with triumphs and routs, until a peace of exhaustion set in 1672.

A South Vietnamese intervention force carried out a Cambodian coup 1658. As a price Cambodia became a tributary. Cambodia's sea trade was taken away by Vietnamese and overseas Ming-refugee Chinese in Saigon. In 1673 South Vietnam took advantage of a succession crisis to install another vassal, but was driven out. (D. Chandler, 1996: 88-89; Hall, SEA, 460-463)

Chiengmai vacillated between Burma and Siam after 1658, but returned to Burmese control 1664. (Hall, SEA, 385; Wyatt, 119-120)

Siam fought Burma 1661-1662 to no great net effect. Siam captured Chiengmai 1662, using Manchu backing to keep Burma quiet; but a local revolt restored Burmese lordship 1664. European power politics now began to

enter Siamese history. Dutch demands for trade monopolies were enforced by a blockade 1664. (Hall, SEA 385-397, 477; Wyatt, 111-118, 125)

Manchu mopped up Yunnan 1658, driving Ming remnants to Burma where they fought Burmese to 1662. Weakened Burma had further trouble with a Mon revolt 1661, an associated war with Siam 1661-1662, a Manchu invasion that mopped up Ming and forced obedient surrender by Burma of a Ming prince 1662, and a struggle with Siam over Chiangmai 1662-1664. Stagnation, peace, isolation, and feudal fragmentation then set in. (Hall, Burma, 68-69, 73; Hall, SEA, 403-404, 407)

AD 1675. Unipolar. Polar state: Manchu.

Manchu put down the Three Viceroys Rebellion in 1681.

Chahar and Tümed eastern Mongols of Inner Mongolia rose against Manchu and were put down 1675. Galdan became Oirat Khan in Dzungaria c. 1676. He attempted to acquire control over the four Khalka khanates of central Mongolia, succeeding 1688-1690. Manchu artillery drove Galdan out 1690, and the Khalka khans became Manchu tributary vassals 1691. Galdan's Oirats tried again to conquer the Khalkas, and even the eastern Khorchins, but were thoroughly defeated by Manchu artillery and muskets and driven westward 1696. (Grousset 528-531)

C. 1677-1678 the last Jagataite Khan of Kashgaria drove out the Aqtaghlik faction of khojas, who appealed to the Dalai Lama, who referred then to the Oirats of Dzungaria. The Oirats drove out the Jagataites and the Qarataghlik faction. Kashgaria, reunited under a Muslim Aqtaghlik theocracy, became a protectorate of the Oirat Mongol empire. (Grousset 501, 527-528)

Kokonor continued in control of Tibet. (Grousset 524)

Manchu naval expeditions conquered independent Formosa 1683. (Ebrey 227)

The Nguyen of South Vietnam turned to expand against the Chams, annexing, subjugating, and working to assimilate their few remaining independent districts. They sought, but were refused, Chinese recognition and direct vassal status. The Le/Trinh of the north eliminated the Mac, who had lost their Ming patrons, in 1677, and engaged in peaceful, stable development. (Hall, SEA, 219, 438-439, 442-444)

Another Cambodian civil war in the 1680's was settled when Cambodia accepted South Vietnamese suzerainty, and allowed some separated territories to come first under Nguyen patronage, then suzerainty, then administration and colonization. Another Cambodian separatist with Vietnamese forces was stopped 1699. (D. Chandler, 1996: 88-89; Hall, SEA, 460-463; but cf. 444-445, with a different story)

Laos remained stable to 1694, except for a predatory war with the small tributary state of Tran Ninh (capital Xieng Khouang), which produced a long feud. Otherwise culture, arts and crafts flourished. Succession coups however disturbed the country 1694 and 1700, and a Vietnamese-Tran Ninh force, perhaps with Siamese help, installed a candidate vassal 1700. (Hall, SEA, 469, 478; Wyatt, 122)

An English blockade of Siam in reprisal for piracy was destroyed 1687; a French plan to take control of the country 1688 was squashed. An anti-European reaction restricted further trader presence thereafter. There were insurrections 1690, 1691, 1692 and 1698-1700. (Hall, SEA 385-397, 477; Wyatt, 111-118, 125)

Manchu was let in by Ming warlords; though it acquired the rest of "China proper" by 1659, it was only a core hegemon until the warlords ("viceroys") were suppressed in 1681. Manchu may be considered a (briefly) universal state after the acquisition of Formosa 1683 and the crushing of the Oirat Jungars 1696, with Eastern Mongolia thereby acquired, and the Khalkha states hegemonically reorganized, Kokonor and the two Vietnams submissive, and the rest of Southeast Asia variously enfeebled.

AD 1700. Universal Empire. Metropole: Manchu (K'ang Hsi reign). The core is centralized, the semiperiphery tributary, divided or weak. Formosa: under imperial administration. Korea: Manchu vassal. Mongolia: Manchu administration or hegemony. Kokonor: Khoshot Mongols. Dzungaria: Oirats independent, weak. Kashgaria: Oirat vassals. Tibet: Kokonor protectorate. Vietnam: North Vietnam peaceful and developmentalist; South Vietnam expansionist vs. Cambodia. Cambodia: under Vietnamese pressure. Laos: two coups this year. Siam: insurrection. Burma: peaceful, weak, stagnant, and feudalized.

Manchu and Oirat fought each other back and forth to stalemate on the Kashgaria frontier 1715-1731. (Grousset 536-537)

Tibet fell under the control of a leader who favored the Oirats as against Manchu. Manchu incited Kokonor to intervene in Tibet and forcibly enthrone a chosen substitute Dalai Lama with Manchu official sanction 1705-1710. Tibetans appealed to the Oirat Mongols, now of Kashgaria. The Oirat seized Tibet 1717, ending the Kokonor protectorate. Oirat defeated a Manchu intervention 1718, but were driven off by Manchu forces in 1720. (Grousset, 524, 532-536; Richardson, 49, 51, 99; Ebrey 227)

Cambodia entered two centuries of chronic civil warfare, disintegration, factional vassalhood to and invasion by Vietnam and Siam. (D. Chandler, 1996: 95) Six successive independent regimes were replaced by a Vietnamese -installed one 1710, which held off Siamese-candidate attacks 1710, 1714, 1722, the last however only by tribute to Siam. More Cambodian territory was lost to South Vietnamese colonization in 1714. (Hall, SEA, 445, 463-465)

A Formosan revolt was suppressed 1721.

The continued succession struggle split Laos 1707 into two states, North Laos (Luang Prabang) and South Laos (Vientiane), hostile and aggressive toward each other and in search of foreign patrons. (Hall, SEA, 470-471, 474-475)

After the insurrection of 1698-1700, Siam was generally peaceful and stable except for succession struggles. In the 1710's Siam became involved in a proxy war with Vietnam over the domination of Cambodia, sometimes winning, sometimes losing, but never preventing Vietnamese direct colonization and annexations. Trade increased noticeably in the 1720's. (Hall, SEA, 478-479; Wyatt, 126-129)

AD 1725. Unipolar. Polar state: Manchu.

The Manchu-Oirat war for Kashgaria continued stalemated to 1731; a similar war was fought on the Khalkha Mongol front 1731-1735, after which a truce was made on the basis of the status quo ante, and held 1735-1745. Dzungaria fell into disarray. (Grousset 536-537)

Another Manchu expedition drove the Oirats out of Tibet again 1728-1729. (Grousset, 524, 532-536; Richardson, 49, 51, 99; Ebrey 227) Violent campaigns were waged on the Tibetan border 1747-1749.

Le/Trinh North Vietnam was peaceful, stable, reforming administration and the economy, and engaged in ethnocentric policies to reduce Chinese influence. Nguyen South Vietnam was preoccupied with expanding against Cambodia. (Hall, SEA, 442-445)

Another Cambodian succession dispute led to another Siamese installation 1738, then a South Vietnamese installation and annexation 1747, then a Cambodian national rising and Siamese intervention that expelled the South Vietnamese. Cambodian attacks on South Vietnamese settlers in former Cambodian territories led only to further territorial losses 1731, 1739-1749. (Hall, SEA, 445, 463-465; but cf. 478; Wyatt, 130)

After dynastic troubles to 1727, North Laos established internal peace, sent two embassies to Manchu 1729 and 1734, and drove off North Vietnamese demanding tribute 1750. South Laos established suzerainty over Tran Ninh. (Hall, SEA, 470-471, 474-475)

Chiengmai, much reduced by detachment of former provinces, successfully revolted against Burma 1727. (Wyatt, 123-124)

In Siam, a peaceable period ensued upon a succession struggle of 1733, and friendly relations were even established with Burma after 1740. (Hall, SEA, 478-479; Wyatt, 126-129)

Burma continued to decay peacefully. Burma failed to control deep plundering raids by its ex-tributary Manipur. The Mons seceded, massacred Burmans, set up a state at Pegu 1740, captured Prome and attempted to conquer Upper Burma. (Hall, Burma, 73-74; Hall, SEA, 407-410, 475)

AD 1750. Unipolar. Polar state: Manchu (Ch'ien Lung reign). Korea: vassal. Mongolia: Manchu vassals. Dzungaria: Oirat succession crisis. Kashgaria: Oirat vassals. Tibet: Manchu hegemonic expedition. North Vietnam: peaceful developmentalist. South Vietnam: expanding against Cambodia. Cambodia: independent. North Laos: tributary to Manchu. South Laos: independent. Siam: peaceful. Burma: civil war Ava-Pegu.

Civil war and revolt among Oirats in Dzungaria 1750-1753 led the defeated prince Amursana to invite Manchu intervention 1754. Easy Manchu victory was followed by an attempt to impose Manchu administration (1755). The Oirats rebelled; Manchu reconquered and annexed Dzungaria (1757), killed off most Oirats, and recolonized the territory. (Grousset 537-539) The Kashgarian Qarataghliks rebelled against the divided and weakened Oirats 1753. Amursana and Manchu installed two Aqtaghlik khojas in their place 1755. The two khojas rebelled against both Oirats and Manchu 1757; Manchu conquered Kashgaria 1758-1760, and annexed it as Sinkiang. (Grousset 541-542)

Manchu oppression and Tibetan rebellion in Lhasa 1750 led to a Manchu invasion 1751 which gained control over the Dalai Lama's succession and policies in 1751. (Richardson 99)

South Vietnam seized both the opportunity offered by Siam's preoccupation by Burmese invasions to 1767, and more Cambodian territory. Wars between Siam and South Vietnam followed 1769-1773. South Vietnam then had to face a three-way war with the Tayson rebels and North Vietnamese invasion from 1773. (Hall, SEA, 445-446, 450-454)

Cambodia underwent a series of internal coups and countercoups in the 1750's and 1760's, losing more and more provinces to South Vietnam. Cochin Chinese drove out a king (Ang Non) and installed a candidate (Ang Tong) against Siamese resistance 1769. Siam reinstated Ang Non. South Vietnam reinstated Ang Tong 1772, but Ang Non overcame him 1773. (D. Chandler, 1996: 96-97, 118; Hall, SEA, 445, 450, 456, 465, 483, 488)

North Laos (Luang Prabang) submitted to Burma 1753, but rebelled after 1760. South Laos (Vientiane) allied with Burma and helped it conquer North Laos 1764-1765.

When Siam defeated Burma from 1767, North Laos rebelled again, attacked South Laos 1771, but was defeated by Burma. North Laos allied with Siam 1774. (Hall, SEA, 470-472, 475-476; cf, Wyatt, 134, 157)

Chiengmai underwent a succession struggle 1759-1761, conquest by Burma 1763, revolt and reconquest, and another revolt to Siamese rule 1774-1776. (Wyatt, 133-134, 142)

Siam's peaceful episode was interrupted by a succession struggle 1758, and a Burmese invasion and siege of Ayuthia 1759-1760, and by its invasion, siege, conquest and destruction 1765-1767. Siam fell apart into five warlord states plus a Burmese-occupied area. A Manchu invasion of Burma took the pressure off, and rescued, Siam, allowing a Siamese national insurrection and forcible reunification 1767-1769, and an intervention in Cambodia 1769. Burma attacked again without success 1772-1773. (Hall, SEA, 479-488; Wyatt, 132-158)

In Burma, the Mon state conquered Ava 1752. A Burman, Alaungpaya, turned the tables with great suddenness, recaptured Ava 1754, Prome 1755, Syriam 1756, Pegu 1757, Manipur 1759. Manchu recognition was given him. Burma invaded Siam 1759-1760. Four rebellions were put down by Alaungpaya's successor 1760-1763. Hsinbyushin of Burma conquered Chiengmai and North Laos 1764, and destroyed Ayuthia 1767. Irritated by Shan border disturbances and tributary complaints caused by the Burmese invasions, Manchu invaded 1766 and was defeated by Burma, which invaded the Manchu empire. Manchu counter-invaded and was disastrously defeated 1768 and 1769, and sued for and got peace and greatly improved trade and political relations. Meanwhile a Siamese national rising had expelled the Burmese 1767-1768. Burma returned to the war with Siam in 1770, but only managed to lose North Laos and Chiengmai, and provoked another Mon revolt 1773. (Hall, Burma, 74-79, 83-86, 89-96; Hall, SEA 410, 426-437, 476, 488, 625-627)

There was a long and difficult campaign on the Tibetan border 1755-1779. The growth of the Manchu empire within the Far Eastern system paused about 1774, here and in Burma, when corruption and weakening of the Manchu center provoked internal revolts that turned the dynasty's policy toward the status quo.

AD 1775. Unipolar. Polar state: Manchu.

Manchu had to deal with Muslim revolts in Kansu 1781 and 1784; a revolt in Formosa 1786-1787; Miao revolts in the south and southwest 1795-1797; and the more dangerous White Lotus Society rebellion in three provinces 1796-1804.

Another Manchu expedition restored "order" or at least hegemony in Tibet 1792, and imposed it in Nepal as well. (Richardson 99)

The Tayson state peaked in 1788, destroying the Trinh, conquering North Vietnam, and securing Manchu recognition. The Nguyen then slowly ground up the Tayson with French aid, holding half the country by 1800. (Hall, SEA, 445-446, 450-454)

South Vietnam installed another Cambodian favorite (Ang Eng) 1779. Tayson Vietnamese revolutionaries invaded Cambodia. Thereafter Siam took over and reinstalled Ang Eng, while detaching several Cambodian districts 1795. (D. Chandler, 1996: 96-97, 118; Hall, SEA, 445, 450, 456, 465, 483, 488)

Siam conquered and occupied South Laos 1778, making North Laos a vassal. Siam allowed South Laos vassal status 1782. South Laos took advantage of a North Laos succession struggle after 1787 to invade, massacring and deporting many 1791/1792. Siam replaced its South Laos vassal 1792/1794 and at China's behest restored North Laos. (Hall, SEA, 470-472, 475-476; cf, Wyatt, 134, 157)

Devastated by war, Chiengmai began to make a good recovery in the 1790's. (Wyatt, 133-134, 142)

Siam took Chiengmai 1775. Burmese attacks on Siam 1775 and 1776 failed. Siam conquered South Laos and subjugated North Laos 1778. Siam underwent rebellion and coup 1781-1782, and was effectively reorganized. Burmese attacks 1785-1787, and Siamese invasion of Burma 1791-1793, achieved nothing much, and fighting died down to raiding. Siam became suzerain to Cambodia after 1795. Trade and learning flourished. (Hall, SEA, 479-488; Wyatt, 132-158)

A passive and pious ruler of Burma achieved peace 1776-1782. His successor Bodawpaya put down another Mon revolt 1783, conquered Arakan 1784 provoking endless revolt, disastrously attacked Siam 1785-1786, failed to conquer Chiengmai 1787 and 1797, indulged religious megalomania, but sought and secured friendly relations with Manchu toward the end of the century. (Hall, Burma, 74-79, 83-86, 89-96; Hall, SEA 410, 426-437, 476, 488, 625-627)

A Manchu invasion of Nepal 1792 established suzerainty over the Gurkha dynasty.

The deferential behavior of Burma, Siam and North Vietnam toward Manchu, and its direct control elsewhere, suggest--

AD 1800. Universal empire. Metropole: Manchu China (Chia Ch'ing reign). Korea: Manchu vassal. Vietnam: civil war; Tayson in north, Nguyen in south. Cambodia: vassal to Siam. Laos: North and South vassals to Siam. Chiengmai: vassal to Siam. Siam: stable, strong. Burma: independent, friendly to China.

Manchu put down the White Lotus Society rebellion in 1804. A revolt of the Heavenly Reason Society failed to seize Peking 1813. Manchu thereafter became inwardly focused, and the system went its own way by default.

Manchu recognition of the Tayson did not abate the Vietnamese civil war. Yet in 1802 Nguyen Anh became Emperor as Gia Long, sought Manchu investiture, agreed to pay tribute, and did so. (Hall, SEA, 453-454)

Siam appointed a king of Cambodia 1802. Cambodia entered a tributary relationship to Siam and Vietnam both. Cambodia sought to survive and preserve independence, but drifted from Thai control to Vietnamese instead. Siam attempted to divide Cambodia and install a second vassal 1812; Vietnam drove him out and garrisoned Phnom Penh 1813. An unsuccessful attack on Siam 1816 was followed by an unsuccessful anti-Vietnamese millenarian rebellion 1820-1821. (D. Chandler, 1996: 106, 114-135; Hall, SEA, 456-457, 491-492)

Siam had a minor war with Burma 1810, split authority over Cambodia with Vietnam to 1812, lost it but took Cambodian territory thereafter. (Hall, SEA, 488-493; Wyatt, 160-180)

Arakanese rebels against Burma repeatedly escaped to British India; Burma pursued them. Burma began quarrelling with Britain from 1811 and fighting it from 1824. (Hall, Burma, 101-105; Hall, SEA, 635-641) Burma thereby was taken out of the Far Eastern world system and brought into the Central system.

AD 1825. Unipolar. Polar state: Manchu.

Khoja attempts to regain Kashgaria from Kokand failed 1825-1831.

From 1841 interaction between France and Vietnam grew apace. Vietnamese persecution of French Catholic missionaries and converts, and French warship diplomacy (Hall, SEA, 686-688), were rapidly detaching Vietnam from the Far Eastern system and attaching it to the Central system.

Siam tried to establish a vassal regime in Cambodia 1831-1834, but was driven out by insurgents and Vietnam. Vietnam attempted a peaceful annexation after 1834, suppressing annual rebellions from 1836, fighting against a major Thai-assisted insurrection 1840-1847 which produced a dual-vassal but basically Thai-sponsored regime. (D. Chandler, 1996: 106, 114-135; Hall, SEA, 456-457, 491-492)

South Laos sought to escape Siamese suzerainty by tribute to Vietnam and a direct attack on Siam 1826. The revolt received no help and was disastrously defeated 1827, and the country depopulated. North Laos remained firmly under Siamese overlordship despite tribute missions to Vietnam 1831 and 1833. Xieng Khouang, which helped Siam

put down a Vietnamese-sponsored South Laos recovery expedition, was conquered and annexed by Vietnam. (Hall, SEA, 472-476)

Siam absorbed South Laos 1828. Siam failed to subjugate Cambodia 1831-1834, but achieved a superior position there 1845. (Hall, SEA, 488-493; Wyatt, 160-180)

Somewhere between the First Opium War (1841-1842) and the First World War (1914-1918) the Far Eastern world system was absorbed by the Central system, and this sequence must end. Probably 1858-1860, from the Treaties of Tientsin to the Peking Conventions (foreign diplomats in Peking), is critical. This allows one more coding. Important segments of Southeast Asia having been detached from the Far Eastern system, and despite Manchu control having been weakened in the Far Eastern core by the Taiping Rebellion begun 1850, the reduced world system appears hegemonic.

AD 1850. Hegemonic. Hegemon: Manchu (Tao Kuang reign). Korea: Manchu vassal. Mongolia: Manchu hegemony. Kashgaria: Manchu hegemony. Tibet: Manchu hegemony. Siam: independent. Cambodia: protectorate of Siam.

3. Summary. The Far Eastern world system was coded on the power configuration variable at 25-year intervals from 1025 BC to AD 1850, its approximate date of engulfment by the Central system (Wilkinson, 1987) Earlier, problems of chronology and data availability become substantial.

The following sequence (time series) was obtained:

-1025	Hegemonic
-1000	Hegemonic
-975	Hegemonic
-950	Hegemonic
-925	Hegemonic
-900	Hegemonic
-875	Hegemonic
-850	Hegemonic
-825	Unipolar
-800	Unipolar
-775	Unipolar
-750	Nonpolar
-725	Multipolar
-700	Multipolar
-675	Bipolar
-650	Bipolar

-625	Multipolar
-600	Multipolar
-575	Bipolar
-550	Bipolar
-525	Multipolar
-500	Multipolar
-475	Multipolar
-450	Tripolar
-425	Tripolar
-400	Multipolar
-375	Multipolar
-350	Multipolar
-325	Tripolar
-300	Tripolar

-275	Unipolar
-250	Unipolar
-225	Hegemonic
-200	Bipolar
-175	Unipolar
-150	Bipolar
-125	Unipolar
-100	Empire
-75	Unipolar
-50	Empire
-25	Empire
AD/BC	Empire
25	Multipolar
50	Unipolar
75	Unipolar
100	Empire
125	Unipolar
150	Empire
175	Bipolar
200	Multipolar
225	Unipolar

250	Unipolar
275	Unipolar
300	Unipolar
325	Multipolar
350	Multipolar
375	Bipolar
400	Multipolar
425	Multipolar
450	Multipolar
475	Multipolar
500	Multipolar
525	Multipolar
550	Tripolar
575	Unipolar

600	Unipolar
625	Multipolar
650	Unipolar
675	Bipolar
700	Tripolar
725	Tripolar
750	Empire
775	Tripolar
800	Tripolar
825	Tripolar
850	Unipolar
875	Unipolar
900	Nonpolar
925	Multipolar
950	Multipolar
975	Bipolar
1000	Tripolar
1025	Multipolar
1050	Multipolar
1075	Multipolar

1100	Multipolar
1125	Multipolar
1150	Multipolar
1175	Multipolar
1200	Multipolar
1225	Multipolar
1250	Bipolar
1275	Unipolar
1300	Empire
1325	Empire
1350	Empire
1375	Unipolar
1400	Unipolar
1425	Hegemonic
1450	Bipolar
1475	Unipolar
1500	Unipolar
1525	Unipolar
1550	Unipolar
1575	Bipolar
1600	Unipolar
1625	Bipolar
1650	Unipolar
1675	Unipolar
1700	Empire
1725	Unipolar
1750	Unipolar
1775	Unipolar
1800	Empire
1825	Unipolar
1850	Hegemonic

This sequence of polarity data points toward the need to make comparisons between systems (e.g. the Indic system--Wilkinson, 1996a), as well as to test our theories about systems in general. The idea that multipolarity is the normal structure, for instance, is evidently challenged by this data set; but a more complex appreciation of the role of multipolarity (or hegemony, or universal empire) may also be indicated. Theories of world systems have been better developed in their theoretical parts than in their empirical

sections; this paper deliberately leans in the other direction, with hope for more productive interaction between data and theory in future.

Bibliography

- Adshead, S.A.M. 1993. *Central Asia in World History*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.
- Algaze, Guillermo. 1993. *The Uruk World System: The Dynamics of Expansion of Early Mesopotamian Civilization*. University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Backus, Charles. 1981. *The Nan-chao Kingdom and T'ang China's Southwestern Frontier*. Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Barfield, Thomas J. 1989. *The Perilous Frontier: Nomadic Empires and China*. New York: Basil Blackwell, 1989.
- Beckwith, Christopher I. 1987. *The Tibetan Empire in Central Asia*. Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Blanton, Richard, and Gary Feinman. 1984. "Mesoamerican World System." 86 *American Anthropologist* no. 3 (1984), 673-682.
- Blunden, Caroline, and Mark Elvin. 1983. *Cultural Atlas of China*. New York: Facts on File, 1983.
- Bodde, Derk. 1967. *China's First Unifier*. Hong Kong University Press, 1967.
- Bodde, Derk. 1986. "The state and empire of Ch'in." Pp. 20-102 in Twitchett and Loewe, eds., 1986, *infra*.
- Briggs, Lawrence Palmer. 1951. "The Ancient Khmer Empire." 41 *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, N.s., Pt. 1 (1951).
- Buttinger, Joseph. 1958. *The Smaller Dragon*. New York; Praeger, 1958.
- Chan, Hok-lam. 1984. *Legitimation in Imperial China*. University of Washington Press, 1984.
- Chandler, David P. 1983. *A History of Cambodia*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1983.
- Chandler, David P. 1996. *A History of Cambodia*. 2nd ed.: Boulder, CO: Westview, 1996.

- Chang, Kwang-chih. 1986. *The Archaeology of Ancient China*. 4th ed. Yale, 1986.
- Chang, K.C. 1983. "Sandai Archaeology and the Formation of States in Ancient China: Processual Aspects of the Origins of Chinese Civilization." PP. 495-521 in Keightley, ed., 1983, *infra*.
- Chang, Kwang-chih. 1980. *Shang Civilization*. 4th ed. Yale, 1980.
- Chao Lin. 1982. *The Socio-Political Systems of the Shang Dynasty*. Taipei: Academia Sinica, 1982.
- Chase-Dunn, Christopher, and Thomas D. Hall. 1997. *Rise and Demise: Comparing World-Systems*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1997.
- Cioffi-Revilla, Claudio. 1996. "Origins and Evolution of War and Politics." 40 *International Studies Quarterly* (1996), 1-22.
- Cioffi-Revilla, Claudio, and David Lai. 1995. "War and Politics in Ancient China, 2700 B.C. to 722 B.C." 39 *Journal of Conflict Resolution* no. 3 (September 1995), 467-494.
- Coedès, G. 1968. *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*. Trans. Susan Brown Cowing. Ed. Walter F. Vella. Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1968.
- Dardess, John W. 1973. *Conquerors and Confucians: Aspects of Political Change in Late Yüan China*. Columbia University Press, 1973.
- Eberhard, Wolfram. 1952. *Conquerors and Rulers: Social Forces in Medieval China*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1952.
- Eberhard, Wolfram. 1967. "The Growth of Chinese Civilization." Pp. 9-27 in Wolfram Eberhard, *Settlement and Social Change in Asia*. Hong Kong University Press, 1967.
- Ebrey, Patricia Buckley. 1996. *The Cambridge Illustrated History of China*. NY: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Eckert, Carter J., et al. 1990. *Korea Old and New: A History*. Seoul: Ilchokak, 1990.
- Enoki, K., G.A. Koshelenko, and Z. Haidary. 1994. "The Yüeh-chih and their migrations," pp. 171-189 in Harmatta et al., eds. 1994, *infra*.
- Fairbank, John K., Edwin O. Reischauer, and Albert M. Craig. 1978. *East Asia: Tradition and Transformation*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978.
- Feinman, Gary M., and Joyce Marcus. 1998. *Archaic States*. Santa Fe, NM: School of Americas Research Press, 1998.

- Fitzgerald, C.P. 1933. *Son of Heaven: A Biography of Li Shih-Min, founder of the T'ang Dynasty*. Cambridge University Press, 1933.
- Frank, Andre Gunder. 1994. "Hegemony and Social Change." Pp. 371-372 of the forum "Hegemony and Social Change," 1994, *infra*.
- Grousset, René. 1970. *The Empire of the Steppes*. Rutgers University Press, 1970.
- Hall, D.G.E. 1960. *Burma*. 3rd ed., London: Hutchinson, 1960.
- Hall, D.G.E. 1981. *A History of South-East Asia*. 4th ed., NY: St. Martin's, 1981.
- Han Woo-keun. *The History of Korea*. Trans. Lee Kyung-shik; ed. Grafton K. Mintz. Seoul: Eul-Yoo, 1970.
- Harmatta, János, B.N. Puri and G.F. Etemadi, eds. 1994. *History of Civilizations in Central Asia. Volume II: The development of sedentary and nomadic civilizations: 700 B.C. to A.D. 250*. Paris: UNESCO, 1994.
- "Hegemony and Social Change," a forum. 38 *Mershon International Studies Review* (1994), 361-376.
- Henthorn, William E. *A History of Korea*. New York: Free Press, 1971.
- Herrmann, Albert. 1966. *An Historical Atlas of China*. New ed. Chicago: Aldine, 1966.
- Holcombe, Charles. 1994. *In the Shadow of the Han*. University of Hawaii Press, 1994.
- Hsu, Cho-yun. 1965. *Ancient China in Transition*. Stanford University Press, 1965.
- Hsu, Cho-yun, and Katheryn M. Linduff. 1988. *Western Chou Civilization*. Yale University Press, 1988.
- Huang, Ray. 1997. *China: A Macro History*. Rev. ed. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 1997.
- Ishjants, N. 1994. "Nomads in Eastern Central Asia." Pp. 151-169 in Harmatta et al, eds., 1994, *infra*.
- Keightley, David N. "The Late Shang State: When, Where, and What?" Pp. 523-564 in Keightley, ed. 1983, *infra*.
- Keightley, David N., ed. 1983. *The Origins of Chinese Civilization*. University of California Press, 1983.

- Kyzlasov, L.R. 1996. "Northern nomads." Pp. 315-325 in Litvinsky et al., eds., 1996, *infra*.
- Langer, William L. *An Encyclopedia of World History*. 4th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.
- Lee, Ki-baik (Yi, Ki-baek). 1984. *A New History of Korea*. Trans. Edward W. Wagner, with Edward J. Shultz. Seoul: Ilchokak, 1984.
- Legge, James. 1972. *The Chinese Classics*. 5v in 4. Volume V: *The Ch'un Ts'ew with the Tso Chuen*. 2nd ed. rev. [Taipei: Wen shih che ch'u pan she, 1972.]
- Lekson, Stephen H. "Chaco Death Squads." 52 *Archaeology* no. 3 (May-June 1999), 67-73.
- Levy, Howard S. 1955. *Biography of Huang Ch'ao*. Trans. and annotated by Howard S. Levy. University of California Press, 1955.
- Liptak, Pal. 1983. *Avars and Ancient Hungarians*. Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, 1983.
- Litvinsky, B.A., and Zhang Guang-da. 1996. "Historical Introduction." Pp. 19-33 in Litvinsky et al., eds., 1996, *infra*.
- Litvinsky, B.A., Zhang Guang-da, and R. Shabani Samghabadi, eds. 1996. *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*. Volume III: *The crossroads of civilizations: A.D. 250 to 750*. Paris: UNESCO, 1996.
- Ma Yong and Sun Yutang. 1994. "The Western Regions under the Hsiung-nu and the Han." Pp. 227-246 in Harmatta et al., eds., 1994, *supra*.
- Majumdar, R.C. 1985. *Champa*. Delhi: Gian, 1985 (c1927).
- Marney, John. 1976. *Liang Chien-wen Ti*. Boston: Twayne, 1976.
- Maspero, Henri. 1978. *China in Antiquity*. Trans. Frank A. Kierman Jr. University of Massachusetts Press, 1978.
- McGovern, William Montgomery. 1939. *The Early Empires of Central Asia*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939.
- Midlarsky, Manus I. 1988. *The Onset of World War*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1988.
- Modelski, George. 1987. *Long Cycles in World Politics*. University of Washington Press, 1987.

- Molè, Gabriella. 1970. *The T'u-yü-hun from the Northern Wei to the Time of the Five Dynasties*. Rome: Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1970.
- Mu Shun-ying and Wang Yao. 1996. "The western Regions (Hsi-yü) under the T'ang Empire and the Kingdom of Tibet." Pp. 349-365 in Litvinsky et al., 1996, *supra*.
- Murphey, Rhoads. 1997. *East Asia: A New History*. New York: Longman, 1997.
- Nelson, Sarah Milledge. 1993. *The Archaeology of Korea*. Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Penkala, Maria. 1966. *A Correlated History of the Far East*. The Hague: Mouton, 1966.
- Peregrine, Peter. 1992. *Mississippian Evolution: A World-System Perspective*. Madison, Wis.: Prehistory Press, 1992.
- Pulleyblank, E.G. 1983. "The Chinese and Their Neighbors in Prehistoric and Early Historic Times." Pp. 411-466 in Keightley, ed., 1983, *supra*.
- Quigley, Carroll. *The Evolution of Civilizations*. New York: Macmillan, 1961.
- Rasler, Karen A., and William R. Thompson. 1994. *The Great Powers and Global Struggle 1490-1990*. University Press of Kentucky, 1994.
- Richardson, Hugh Edward. 1962. *Tibet and its History*. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Rossabi, Morris. 1982. *The Jurchens in the Yüan and Ming*. Cornell University China-Japan Program, 1982.
- Schwartzberg, Joseph E., ed. 1992. *A Historical Atlas of South Asia*. 2nd impression, with additional material. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Shaughnessy, Edward L. 1991. *Sources of Western Zhou History*. University of California Press, 1991.
- Sinor, D., and S.G. Klyashtorny. 1996. "The Türk Empire." Pp. 327-347 in Litvinsky et al., eds., 1996, *supra*.
- Ssu-ma Ch'ien. *The Grand Scribe's Records*. Volume I: *The Basic Annals of Pre-Han China*. 1994. Ed. William F. Nienhauser, Jr. Indiana University Press, 1994.
- Thompson, William R. 1988. *On Global War: Historical-Structural Approaches to World Politics*. University of South Carolina Press, 1988.

Thompson, William R., ed. 1999. *Great Power Rivalries*. University of South Carolina Press, 1999.

Toynbee, Arnold J. *A Study of History*. 1946. Abridgement of Volumes I-VI by D.C. Somervell. Oxford University Press, 1946.

Twitchett, Denis, and Michael Loewe, eds. 1986. *The Ch'in and Han Empires, 221 B.C.-A.D. 220*. Vol. 1 of *The Cambridge History of China*. Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Walker, Richard Louis. 1953. *The Multi-State System in Ancient China*. Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String, 1953.

Wang Gungwu. 1963. *The Structure of Power in North China During the Five Dynasties*. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1963.

Wheatley, Paul. 1966. "Refurbishing the nine cauldrons." Prefatory essay, pp. vi-xxix, in Herrmann, 1966, *supra*.

Wilkinson, David. 1980-1982. "A Definition, Roster and Classification of Civilizations." Paper presented to the International Society for the Comparative Study of Civilizations, Pittsburgh, 1982.

Wilkinson, David. 1987. "Central Civilization." *Comparative Civilizations Review*, Fall 1987, 31-59.

Wilkinson, David. 1993-1994. "Spatio-Temporal Boundaries of African Civilizations Reconsidered." Part I, *Comparative Civilizations Review*, Fall 1993, 52-90. Part II, *Comparative Civilizations Review*, Fall 1994, 46-105.

Wilkinson, David. 1994a. "Classical Hegemony." Paper presented to the International Studies Association, Washington DC, 1994.

Wilkinson, David. 1994b. "Hegemony and Social Change," pp. 374-376 of the forum "Hegemony and Social Change," 1994, *supra*.

Wilkinson, David. 1995a. "Civilizations Are World Systems!" pp. 248-260 in Stephen K. Sanderson, ed. *Civilizations and World Systems: Studying World-Historical Change*, Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira, 1995.

Wilkinson, David. 1995b. "Civilizations, World Systems and Hegemonies." Paper presented to the Conference on World System History, Lund, Sweden, March 25-28, 1995.

Wilkinson, David. 1996a. "Configurations of the Indic States System." *Comparative Civilizations Review*, Spring 1996, 63-119.

Wilkinson, David. 1996b ["World-Economic Theories and Problems: Quigley vs. Wallerstein vs. Central Civilization."](#) *Journal of World-Systems Research* 2:17.

Wilkinson, David. 1997. "Hegemony in Two World-Systems/Civilizations." Paper presented to the International Studies Association, Toronto, 1997.

Wilkinson, David. 1999a. "Structural Sequences in the Far Eastern World System/Civilization." *Journal of the Comparative Study of Civilizations* no. 4 (1999), 21-62.

Wilkinson, David. 1999b. "Unipolarity without Hegemony." *International Studies Review*, vol. 1 no. 2, Summer 1999, pp. 141-172.

Wiley, Gordon R. "Horizontal Integration and Regional Diversity: An Alternating process in the Rise of Civilizations." *American Antiquity* no. 2 (1991), 197-215.

Wright, Arthur F. 1978. *The Sui Dynasty*. New York: Knopf, 1978.

Wyatt, David K. 1984. *Thailand: A Short History*. Yale University Press, 1984.

Yoffee, Norman, and George L. Cowgill, eds. 1988. *The Collapse of Ancient States and Civilizations*. University of Arizona Press, 1988.

Zhang Guang-da. 1996a. "Kocho (Kao-ch'ang)." Pp. 303-314 in Litvinsky et al., eds., 1996.

Zhang Guang-da. 1996b. "The city-states of the Tarim basin." Pp. 281-301 in Litvinsky et al., eds., 1996.