



History 2021

The History of Succession

Introductory

Questions

(Avan)

Greetings Scholars! Of course Avan is here in his old stomping grounds of history. Have fun!

- **Have you ever succeeded someone else in a role or position? Has anyone ever succeeded you?**
 - Yes to both questions. I have succeeded many students from my school who're now in university when it came to leadership positions for after-school activities. MUN, WSC and even IHBB, there were those who came before me (who I even competed alongside and against) and there will always be those who came after me (this is somewhat the beauty of succession, by nature it never stops for one person). Those were at least official successions, in that they were announced and I took over the mantle of whatever position the previous person had.
- **What is the difference, if any, between succeeding someone and replacing them?**
 - Since the dictionary definition of “succeeding” within this context is quite literally “to follow to replace another in some rank, office or authority etc.” It’s rather hard to find the differences between these two phrases. Indeed when you succeed another it is the act of replacing them because either they are no longer worthy of the title or have decided to pass it on (or you know, they’ve just kicked the bucket and died but either way still counts). Succession is just something the upper classes tend to use a lot more to subtly cover up the fact that someone’s been replaced (how disapproving I am of that you can imagine).
- **Would you prefer to succeed a popular leader or an unpopular leader?**
 - Ah here comes a rather interesting question. In the view of my own historical-political lens, neither is preferable over the other unless you yourself are guaranteed to be a better leader. Succeeding a popular leader might seem to be the ideal option, but keep in mind that you've got to be of the same if not better quality than that leader in order to keep the public satisfied with your tenure in office. Succeeding an unpopular leader is almost the same, except now the prosperity of your nation quite literally depends on you being able to please the populace and turn around all the negative thoughts they have about the former leader (revolution status: imminent! Rise up workers and claim what is rightfully yours! *throat clearing noise* whoops guess my rants are back and here to stay). It really

depends on what you'd prefer; having to keep the public happy and risk criticism if you can't, or having to turn the public happy and risk a revolt if you don't. Both in my opinion are not exactly ideal, though admittedly the popular leader option wouldn't have as high a risk of some bloke trying to assassinate you if you turn out to be a horribly successor.

- **What is the relationship between “succession” and “success”? Should there be a different word for a succession that doesn't succeed?**

- Theoretically (and this is very theoretical and often not the case), the relationship between success and succession is much like the relationship between two scholars competing for the top spot in Globals. One is inevitably bound to succeed where the other has failed (or at least, that is the technical way in which we expect the scholar to triumph). The succession itself is when the other scholar succeeds to a greater extent than the previous reigning scholar to “dethrone” him/her if you will.

It doesn't really matter if there's a different word for succession that doesn't succeed (we just call it a “failure” then, dear god WSC staff didn't think this particularly through did they?). In modern days the “succession” is more of a formal thing that we hope (but probably don't entirely know) will bring about greater success for either the person or the people whom they serve. If you wish to see an example of a succession that didn't succeed, look no further than the President of the United States of America.

- **Is it possible for someone to succeed himself or herself—or does succession require a change?**

- Technically speaking a succession requires (as previously Googled) “The replacement of another in rank, status, office etc.”. By definition then the succession requires a change of person in order to officially be called a succession. You don't see British monarchs going “ah well, time to succeed myself with myself” anytime in history so the rule still applies to the people whom succession is actually used to refer to.

- **What are the distinctions, if any, between succession and the transfer (or taking) of power? Does the term “succession” require power to be transferred with the consent of the person surrendering it?**

- Not always. There have been plenty of times in history when leaders were succeeded against their will (I doubt Lenin would've been pleased to hear Stalin was put in charge of the USSR, given he literally wrote in his will not to let the man succeed him). The transfer (or taking, as is sometimes the case) of power is usually more distinct from succession because either the leader was forced by regulation or circumstances to step down (Nixon and Watergate anyone?). Succession is (again) a term used by the *petty* bourgeois ruling class to establish that they've consented to handing over the throne or mantle of power to (usually) their next of kin (apparently dying is a way of consenting, pretty ironic if you ask me but ah well).

- **Succession usually refers to a change of leaders. Can it also refer to a change among followers?**

- Of course it can. A followership doesn't need to stay static (neither does its leader), it can change and shift as it wishes (most usually due to changes in the leader's position or whatnot). A rather interesting example of this was Sir Winston Churchill, the British Prime Minister who led his country through World War II and amassed the unity of the British and Allied people under his direction. Yet the very moment the 1945 General Election swung around, his followers were suddenly "succeeded" by the staunch conservatives and the "radical" labour voters had allowed his rival, Clement Attlee, to succeed him in power (a rather hilarious tale, as Churchill was at a summit with Stalin and Roosevelt before being told "I'm sorry sir but as you are no longer the leader of our country you have no power here").
- **Has your head of school or principal ever changed—and, if so, who chose their successor?**
 - I have literally lost count of how many school principals and head of schools we've had at NIST since I came in Year 2 (yeah we have separate roles for head of school and principal, don't ask). In the earlier years this process was usually governed by the former head of school and a third-party recruiting organisation that worked with the parent organisation of our school to choose a candidate that would then be voted on by the larger parent body (I know, extremely democratic and bureaucratic, the entire process could take a year in itself). Most recently however, and by recent I mean literally two months ago (our new principal will be succeeding the current one in August), the recruiting organisation began reaching out to students in order to get their opinions on the candidates they'd selected (incidentally, I just so happened to be one of those lucky students to interview new candidates). I quite agree with the process (no it isn't as Communist as I'd like but hey nothing ever really is) and it is quite a nice model other schools might like to trial.
- **Should succession processes be transparent to the public, or should the public only be alerted when they are complete?**
 - Ah, now this is something that I'm sure might divide the more politically minded among us scholars (and there are quite a lot of us out there). It really depends on the nature of the succession in this day and age. The American Presidency for example, is almost entirely transparent from start to finish (except you know, when a major scandal (which is mainstay to America sometimes) happens). Others, such as the succession process of the British Monarchy or (more recently) the Japanese Emperor are often more "behind-closed-doors" for the very reason that the succession is more of a ceremonial process than an actual transferring of an office with political power.

Personally I'd much rather prefer it if the entire process were made transparent to the public (gasp Avan supporting something America practises? What has the world come to!). After all, it is the public who this person is going to represent and voice on the world stage, so why not let the public know everything about their rise to power?

- **Is it better when everyone knows who is going to take over an organization well in advance, with a schedule in place for the transition—or are successions more likely to succeed when they happen more organically?**

- This is something that obviously the WSC staff wanted you to research in far greater detail than I have (A.K.A “I haven’t bothered to research at all because it’s a bloody introductory question”). However from what I can tell you it depends once again on the situation and the position in question where the succession is occurring. If the position is for example an executive head of a company (or in our case a school!) then probably communicating it well in advance whilst providing a schedule to all who will be affected by it is probably a good idea. It’s happened with my school before that both students and parents were informed almost more than a year in advance of an executive position (i.e the principal of secondary or the head of student welfare) being replaced and the current progress on the succession.
 - It’s often rare these days that circumstances force successions to occur more organically, as in the past it wasn’t unheard of for monarchs or other leaders to be assassinated or suddenly die of sickness (I’m looking at practically every single European country here) and as such, their successors were quite literally rushed into the newly vacated position. I honestly can’t say many of these went well since the “organic” nature of the successions often led to the successor being overwhelmed by unfinished tasks (I’m talking about literal wars and economic reforms) that their predecessors unintentionally left for them to finish.

The Return of the Kings: Succession in Politics (Chi, Avan)

- **Simba can’t wait to be king; Prince Charles has waited a long time. Both cat and man seem to follow a variation of succession rules first codified by a 6th century French tribe—the Salii. Explore these related terms and how they relate to royal succession even today:**
 - **line of succession | absolute primogeniture | agnatic primogeniture**
 - **Line of succession:** An [ordered sequence](#) of named people who would [succeed](#) to a particular [office](#) upon the [death](#), [resignation](#) or [removal](#) of the current [occupant](#); constructed using the rules of an established order of succession. The most well known line of succession is likely the British monarchy.
 - **Absolute primogeniture:** A law in which the throne will be given to the eldest child of the sovereign regardless of genders. This is rather different to what occurred in the past, where generally men would be the successor. This is currently the system in many countries, including: Sweden (since 1980), the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth realms (since 2013), Norway (since 1990), Belgium (since 1991), Luxembourg (since 2011), Denmark (since 2009) and the Netherlands (since 1983).
 - **Agnatic primogeniture:** The restriction of succession to those descended or related to a past or current monarch exclusively through the male line of descent (descendants through females were ineligible to inherit the throne unless no male of the patrilineage remained alive). This was primarily practiced throughout Europe when monarchs had the most power within their nation, and most commonly men would therefore be the monarchs. However, there were exceptions to this, such as Cleopatra VII Philopator

- **illegitimate child | coronation | abdication | usurper | regency**

- **Illegitimate child:** A child who is born to parents who are not married to each other. An illegitimate child is often referred to as a “love child” or a child who is born “out of wedlock”. This term originated in Medieval Latin between 1485-1495. In the past, an illegitimate child was considered “child of no one” so he/she has no rights to inherit. Nowadays, the illegitimate child can inherit the throne, though they must show proof that he/she is the biological child of people of the current monarchs (rather easy considering the genetic technology we have these days)
- **Coronation:** A ceremony in which a person is made a king or queen. There are many rituals in the ceremony, such as taking of special vows by the monarch, the investing and celebration of regalia to the monarch. Coronations have changed over time and become much simpler. Coronation are still observed in the United Kingdom, Tonga, and several Asian countries.
- **Abdication:** An act of renouncing the throne, either due to force or of their own free will. Some cultures view this as a regular event that helps maintain stability during political succession; whereas, in other societies, this is viewed as an extreme abandonment of duty. Recently, many monarchs of Spain, Cambodia, Japan, the Netherlands, and the Papacy have abdicated due to old age.
- **Usurper:** A person who takes a position of power by force or illegally, but not always taking the throne within a monarchy. Usurpers can rise to power in a region by often unexpected physical force, political influence or deceit. In other words, an usurper is a person who takes the power of a city, country, or established region for himself.
- **Regency:** A period of time when a country is ruled by a regent (someone who isn’t the monarch but is still ruling) due to the king or queen being unable to rule. The most well known example is the period in Britain (1811-1820) during which the Prince of Wales (later George IV) acted as regent during his father’s periods of insanity. In France (1715-1723) there was a period of regency of Philip, Duke of Orleans, during the minority of Louis XV.

- **Act of Settlement | Succession to the Crown Act | Perth Agreement**

- **Act of Settlement:** An act in the UK that was passed in 1701 in order to secure Protestant succession to the throne and to strengthen the guarantees for ensuring a parliamentary system of government. The act also strengthened the Bill of Rights (1689), which had previously established the order of succession for Mary II’s heir. The next Protestant in line to the throne was the Electress [Sophia of Hanover](#), a granddaughter of James VI of Scotland, I of England and Ireland. After her the crowns would descend only to her non-Roman Catholic heirs
- **Succession to the Crown Act:** Right thanks Commissar Chi! I’ll take over from here. If you cast your mind back (or just scroll up I suppose) to the concept of male primogeniture (in which a younger male heir can displace an older female one in the line of succession), this Act by parliament in 2013 (yeah pretty recent,

the British weren't particularly rushing to get this one out. Then again they're not in that habit, just look at Brexit) basically amended the Act of Settlement mentioned above (thus bringing to an end 312 years of male preference for the crown). This basically meant that now the eldest child, regardless of sex, will always take priority over their younger siblings in the line of succession. The Act also annulled the Royal Marriages Act of 1772, ending the disqualification of a person who married Roman Catholic from succession (basically the Church of England got a big fat L there). Interestingly enough, this Act also repealed the necessity of anyone outside the first six people in line for the throne to ask the sovereign permission before marrying (yes the British Royal family has a notorious history of "long wedding" processes).

- **Perth Agreement:** Basically, the international Commonwealth version of the Succession to the Crown Act above, the Perth Agreement was the shared agreement made by 16 prime ministers of the Commonwealth who still recognised the constitutional monarchy of the Westminster system. In essence this system practically has the same ramifications as the one above, though rather interestingly a change here is the ban on non-Protestants being monarchs continues from centuries ago, and therefore the monarch must be in communion with the Church of England (god aren't the English conservative?). The countries which signed this agreement are: the United Kingdom, Jamaica, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Barbados, the Bahamas, Grenada, Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Belize, Antigua and Barbuda and Saint Kitts and Nevis (surprise, surprise, most of them are islands hardly anyone has ever heard of; all that remains of the once majestic British Empire).
- **In 2011, all 16 countries that still recognize the British monarchy agreed to end their bias in favor of male children. Lines of succession would run through all children equally, regardless of gender. Discuss with your team: would it make more sense for royal families to set aside primogeniture altogether and just have the most qualified descendant to take over? Or should all the descendants vote on which of them should lead, perhaps as part of a reality TV show?**
 - Straight away I'm gonna go ahead and dismiss the final "reality TV show" suggestion as absurdly ridiculous (though I digress it would be hilarious to watch Queen Elizabeth II nag on her children with members of the Royal Household). It honestly makes more sense in my Communist opinion to set aside primogeniture altogether and indeed pick the most qualified descendant (then again with the monarchy being reduced to all but a symbol of the country, I doubt those 'qualifications' mean much). However, considering the whole "dynasty of rulers" and "house of monarchs" concept that the old monarchist countries still cling onto, I doubt that'll happen anytime soon. By the way, I may sound like I'm thrashing the monarchist system here (fitting seeing as Marxists absolutely deplore the notion of a ruling class) but in all honesty I rather enjoy the idea of still

having a king, queen or whatever royal person on the throne (I'm a sucker for romanticist "glory of the past" notions, and this is one of them).

- **Just before it became an empire, Rome was ruled by a pair of Triumvirates—groups of three leaders sharing power. The first ended with a civil war and an assassination. The second ended with a civil war and a pair of suicides. Explore what happened in this succession process and who the major players were, then ask yourself: would co-rulers be more effective in other settings in the modern world, such as businesses or writers' rooms? What is the ideal number of co-rulers to have in office at the same time?**

- Ah right brilliant here's where we get into the actual "History" of Succession (you made me wait long enough WSC staff, time to unleash unlimited power!!). Let's begin by taking a trip back in time to the founding of the Roman Empire as many of you might remember it today.
- The first triumvirate was actually an unofficial alliance formed between three of the most powerful administrators and leaders of the Roman Republic (before it became an empire, Rome was governed by a very democratic style senatorial hall). The first three are probably the most famous members you've ever heard of in Roman history: the legendary military leader Julius Caesar, great statesman Pompey and craft politician Marcus Licinius Crassus. All three of these people agreed to come together in an alliance of sorts against the constitution of the Roman Republic, designed to prevent any one person from gaining too much power. They all agreed to use their own influence to push each other up the hierarchy. In essence once they had secured the power of the Roman government, they each would gain a certain portion of land and total rule over it. This alliance disintegrated however in 53BCE, when Crassus died on a disastrous campaign against the Parthian Empire (occupying what is now Turkey). With Caesar and Pompey at odds with each other, their alliance quickly disappeared and was replaced with a rivalry that would transform Rome unlike any before. Both sides supported different "parties" within the senate, Julius Caesar sided with the Populares (the equivalent of the British Liberal Party) whilst Pompey backed the Optimates (the equivalent of the British Conservative Tory Party). Upon his infamous crossing of the Rubicon in 49BCE, a civil war erupted across the Republic, with Caesar gaining the upper hand and defeating Pompey at the Battle of Pharsalus in 48BCE. Pompey himself fled to Ptolemaic Egypt, where he was assassinated that same year and his head infamously delivered to Caesar in a basket (brutal but that's how things were done back then). Legend has it that Caesar refused to look at the dismembered head of his former friend and ally, taking over the Roman Republic as it's leading politician. He was assassinated on the Ides of March in 44BC (an event I'm sure you're fairly aware of).

The second triumvirate of Rome quite literally rose out of the demise of the last one. It's main figure was Octavian, the adopted son of Caesar and a military man just like his recently deceased father. He joined two other Romans who had served Caesar in the Conquest of Gaul and later the civil war: Marcus Aemilius Lepidus and Marcus Antonius (better known as Mark Antony, yes English makes horrible things out of

translations). This Triumvirate differed from the first one in that it was a fully legal and recognised body; being approved by the Roman Senate in 43BC with the enactment of the Lex Titia (the law that legalised the group to exist). Because of this legal recognition, the Second triumvirate possessed immense political powers; their *imperium maius* (their authority as citizens) outranked that of the entire senate, even that of the consuls (at the time the highest possible political position). The men immediately set about avenging the death of Caesar, which they did so in the typical Roman fashion (read: brutal beheadings, dismemberments and suicides). However in 37 BCE Lepidus, who'd failed to accompany Antony or Octavian on many of their vengeance missions, was dismissed from the Triumvirate and forced into exile. With the Empire being shared between Octavian and Antony (the former in the west and the latter in the east), tensions flared again over (what do you expect?) a matter of marriage. Antony, despite having married Octavian's sister Octavia (their mother wasn't great at names I admit) was beginning to be drawn towards Cleopatra (yes that Cleopatra of Egypt). He secretly envied her resources and wished to ally with her in an effort to conquer Octavian's western possessions and unite the two halves of the Roman Republic under an Egyptian capital (then it isn't exactly a Roman republic is it?!). This plan quickly fell apart however when Octavian got the senate to declare war on Cleopatra and the subsequent naval battle at Actium in 31BCE saw both Cleopatra and Antony committed suicide. Side note: I find it somewhat amusing that I refuse to even hit a girl now (because I'd lose any fight) and back then we had men literally declaring wars on them. Octavian would march into Rome triumphant and the senate would bestow upon him a title that he would use to shape the Roman civilization into the greatest the world had ever seen: Augustus Caesar, First emperor of the Roman Empire.

- **Rome was neither the first nor the last time leaders tried to share power. As early as 2000 BC, Egyptian Pharaoh Amenemhet I [appointed his son](#) Sesostri I, as a co-regent, to help ensure a smooth transition after his death. Investigate the following examples of co-regencies and diarchic rule, evaluating why some failed and some succeeded. Then, discuss with your team: if each of today's world leaders were forced to co-rule with another leader, which new pairs of leaders would work well together? Which would not?**

- **[Hatshepsut & Tuthmosis III](#) | Catholic Monarchs of Spain**

- **Hatshepsut & Tuthmosis III:** It's not everyday (or even every century) that you see a mother and her child on the throne together (though the image of a young baby Pharaoh sitting on his regent mother's lap is rather charming). Simply put, one of the few women pharaohs of the Egyptian civilisation, Hatshepsut was actually married to her half-brother Tuthmosis II (it's a confusing family tree I suggest you read the source for more details) and bore him a girl who was named Neferure. However, upon the death of Tuthmosis II, Egypt was left in a dynastic crisis. The solution came in the form of young (literally, he was still two years old around this time in 1479BCE) Thuthmosis III. Under normal circumstances, Hatshepsut would've ruled as regent for her son until he was the proper age to ascend the throne independently. However, because Hatshepsut's background

was of low-class origins, a compromise was reached: Thutmosis III would become Pharaoh under the guidance of his stepmother (Queen Hatshepsut). However, a few years after this agreement Hatshepsut inexplicably became the “king” of Egypt and forced Thutmosis to languish in obscurity for the next 20 years. Luckily however when Hatshepsut finally did die in 1458BCE Thutmosis was well-prepared for the challenge of leading his people and brought Egypt into a golden age where it expanded greatly and saw huge leaps in architecture and cultural monuments.

- Overall a fairly successful co-regency, as Hatshepsut’s experience with Thutmosis II by his side helped her rule Egypt fairly and prepare her son to take over with even greater results.
- **Catholic Monarchs of Spain:** Now then, let’s spin the clock ahead some 2,900 years and cross the Mediterranean to Spain. In the year 1469 two monarchs of different Spanish kingdoms (yep, Spain, like many other European countries was not unified at all back then), came together in matrimony and as a result the unification of the Spanish mainland came to be. Queen Isabella I of Castille and King Ferdinand of Aragon were wed in Valladolid and as such the de facto unification of their lands came to be. Interestingly, contrary to many stereotypes about wedding ages back then, Isabella was a full year older than Ferdinand when they were married (shocking! But then again she was 18 and he 17, so meh still a young marriage). Their union marked the beginning of a new dawn for Spain, and it quickly rose in prominence under their guidance to become the dominant country of not just Europe but the world. In 1494, Pope Alexander VI bestowed upon the two the title of “Catholic Monarchs of Spain” after their efforts in expulsing the Muslim Moors from Spain and banning the practice of Judaism (in what became infamously known as the unexpected Spanish Inquisition). If you think these names are familiar to you, it’s highly likely that’s because these were the two monarchs who funded Christopher Columbus’ trip to find an Atlantic sea route to India in 1492 (and then ended up “discovering” the American continent).
- **Gonghe Regency | Co-Princes of Andorra | Alaric & Eric**
 - **Gonghe Regency:** Ah great I can use a line from one of my favourite video games here: Hearts of Iron 4 (shoutout to any fellow scholars who play it!). “China descends into a strange interregnum”. Simply put, during this period between 841 to 828 BC, the Chinese Zhou dynasty experienced a disruption in their governmental control over China when their tenth king, King Li, was exiled by nobles during the Compatriots Rebellion (frankly I love that name, sounds so communal it might as well be communist). The usual symptoms caused the rebellion, an unhappy people beset by their corrupt king (history has always repeated itself it seems). Interestingly historians are unable to accurately tell us what happened after his exile. There are two conflicting accounts: one by the Han Dynasty historian Sima Qian and another within the chronicle The Bamboo

Annals (these names are getting better and better). The first account tells that during the Gonghe (which Qian interpreted to mean “joint harmony”) period, the Zhou dynasty was led by two dukes, the Duke of Shao and Zhao ([Wikipedia](#) is pretty funny here when noting that both Dukes shouldn’t be confused for each other or their much more well-known ancestors who shared the same name). However the second account, which has almost been entirely confirmed, notes that the Regency was instead led by one person, the Count of Gong (god I’m so close to cracking up over these titles). Whoever was in power, their reign stabilized the country until Li died in exile and power was passed to his son in 828BC.

- **Co-Princes of Andorra:** Oh wow, this is both interesting and hilarious. Up until now I’ve never heard of Andorra but apparently it is a real microstate that lies between France and Spain in the Pyrenees mountain range. It came into being way back in 1278 when the Bishop of Urgell (Spain) and the Count of Foix (France) arranged for it’s diarchal (two-person) rule. What’s interesting is that it has persisted into modern times, with the current leaders being the newest Bishop of Urgell (Joan Enric Vives Sicillia) and the President of France (Emmanuel Macron). Hilariously the history of Andorra has practically been one of contests between France and Spain, with both of them having divided up the lands of the micronation between themselves or even fully conquering it before relinquishing its independence. It wasn’t until 1993 that the Andorran people voted on their first constitution (up until then, no one could actually say what either prince had been responsible for!). The full list of new “duties” and powers granted to the two rulers can be seen [here](#), whilst I will take the final sentence to note that up until then: Andorra had been paying tribute of approximately \$460 to the French ruler on odd-numbered years and on even-numbered years a tribute of \$12 along with six hams, six cheeses and six live chickens to the Spanish bishop (I can just imagine him comparing his tribute to the French ruler! What jealousy that disparity must’ve caused).
- **Alaric & Eric:** Right I’m not gonna go ahead and talk about some fairy-tale kings who may or may not have existed. Go ahead and read this [Wikipedia](#) link about these two legendary kings of Sweden.
- **ngwenyama & ndlovukati of Eswatini | medieval paréages**
 - **ngwenyama & ndlovukati of Eswatini:** Wow here’s yet another obscure country whom hardly anyone knows anything about (unless of course you’ve done research into it so go figure). Eswatini (more commonly known by its old name of Swaziland) is a landlocked country in Southern Africa and has for centuries been ruled (and continues to be ruled) by an absolute monarchy. The two words above (I’m not going to type them out every time because of how long and annoying their spelling is) basically refer to the titles bestowed upon the King and Queen Mother respectively. the ngwenyama literally translates to “Lion of Swaziland” whilst the ndlovukazi (another name for the ndlovukati) translates

to “She-Elephant” in the native Siswait language. Interestingly, ever since the inception of the state in 1745 and the monarchy, both of the persons holding those titles have ruled jointly (and in the case of no king, the ndlovukazi becomes regent by default). Whilst the King is seen as the administrative head of the country, the Queen Mother is often the spiritual and national head of state, her roles include overseeing important rituals and passing on the coronation of the ngwenyama to the next in line.

- **Medieval paréages:** You can probably guess where this term comes from (hint: their ancestors had a thing for beheadings and one in particular had a jab at invading Russia). That’s right! France. In the medieval era, paréages were feudal treaties that recognised joint sovereignty over a territory by two rulers who were on equal footing (or as it’s known over there, *pari passu*). Yet the contract could also apply to families, wherein two persons inherited equal divisions of lands and titles. As something of a link (cause we scholars love those!), the most famous example of this treaty was the Act of paréage that created the Principality of Andorra (go just a bit up now if you’ve forgotten!) between the Count of Foix and the Bishop of Urgell. These agreements were mainly used in the middle ages to help strike rapport over the “population” of France’s wooded wilderness in its southwest. The church and local king often got involved in this case, with the former granting land from nearby granges, the latter giving market privileges, and the two sharing the tax revenue from the new attractive town, known as a bastide (Capitalism, expert in stealing since the Middle Ages).
- **When Fidel Castro’s health began to decline in the mid-2000s, his brother Raul took his place as the leader of Cuba; some analysts were surprised at the stability of the regime throughout the transition. More recently, Raul [handed off the presidency](#) (though not all power) to his own vice president and chosen successor, Miguel Diaz-Canel. Discuss with your team: is Cuba a good model for other countries transitioning away from family rule? Compare it to the process of succession in North Korea—how did the current leader in Pyongyang assume power, and who might succeed him? Are there other countries where the office of vice president has led with automatic precision to the presidency?**
 - FINALLY! A model taken from a country with Marxist values. Now the imperialist United States will learn from its’ neighbours (then again, Donald Trump seems to be pretty bad at that).
 - The transition of power that took place in Cuba was indeed rather surprising to many historians, since many predicted that Raul’s handling of his rather legendary brother’s regime would collapse and give way to a full democracy within a few years. In many ways the peaceful transition of power through some consensus of both the Communist Party and the greater populace signalled a revolutionary (apologies) change in Cuba’s apparent past trajectory of maintaining the familial hold over the country.

In stark contrast, the North Korean leader whom I’m sure we all can name (either from his signature hairstyle or rather frightening nuclear policy, take your pick) came to

power in an almost completely different manner than Cuba's peaceful handover. Kim Jong-Un didn't have any problem getting into power in 2011 since his father Kim Jong-Il had literally trained him for it, but his consolidation of said power was very brutal and harsh. He immediately set about removing any possible usurpers to his "throne", including his own uncle Jang Song-thaek and possibly his own half-brother Kim Jong-Nam. As for who will succeed the "Brilliant Comrade," the most likely candidate is quite literally; nobody. The North Korean leader doesn't have a son and therefore no heir to his position should he die. It is entirely possible that some high-ranking cohort within the party might assume leadership until such an heir can be found, but the North Korean power struggle that would ensue might mirror that of post-Stalinist Russia (I highly recommend watching *The Death of Stalin* by the way, hilarious satire about that topic).

Perhaps the "elephant in the room" (or should I say "eagle in the room") when it comes to the vice presidency automatically taking over the role of the president should the latter leave a vacuum is the United States of America. If the President were to suddenly die and an election was not about to take place, the Vice President would be automatically vested with the powers of the President until such a time as a general election can be called. Interestingly (or rather, infamously), this has happened before in American history. President Richard Nixon was the first and thus far only President (unless Trump's impeachment goes poorly for him but brilliantly for the world) to have resigned while still in office. He did so after the Senate threatened to impeach him for the Watergate Scandal. Following his departure from the White House, Vice President Gerald R. Ford stepped in to fulfill his duties until the 1977 elections.

- **The United States tends to take a dim view of monarchies, perhaps because of its own revolutionary past. But in 2000 it elected the son of one former president to the White House, and the wife of another won the popular vote in 2016. There is talk of Chelsea Clinton campaigning for Congress, nearly [30% percent of Republicans](#) would choose Donald Trump Jr. to succeed Donald Trump, people keep asking [Michelle Obama](#) to run for president, and there always seems to be [a next Kennedy](#). Discuss with your team: does hereditary succession have some kind of intrinsic appeal, even to voters in a supposed democracy?**
 - Hereditary succession is quite appealing because most people think that the child of a president can have some kind of genes that can make him/her a good leaders in the future and they can receive some advice from their parents. The same with the president's wife, people tend to think that the wife of a person who won the popular vote or the wife of a president will be a perfect rulers because they can see how their husbands work and learn from that.
- **In the United States, attention is often focused on the president—but the vice president must also sometimes be replaced. Read about the [process of succession in the American government](#), then discuss with your team: should the president be able to select anyone to replace the vice president at any time? In the event of an impeachment, should the**

president be replaced by someone from the opposing party, rather than by his or her own party—or would this encourage too many attempts at impeachment?

- **Sighs** I suppose that everything must be in balance. The WSC lets me loose on one loosely-Communist related question and suddenly counters it with (in my opinion) the most boring political system in the world (sorry not-sorry American scholars or scholar politicians). Simply put if the head honcho dies, next in line is the vice-president, followed by the speaker of the house, followed by the Senate president and then failing all those three (extremely unlikely but good to be safe); the 15 executive members of the Cabinet (I can kind of imagine the panic if the 15 person on that list also can't take the mantle of power). However in a somewhat amusing twist the 25th Amendment allows the vice president to take control of presidential duties whilst the actual president is ill or otherwise temporarily unable to fulfill their duties (i.e every single day of the current presidency). George H. W. Bush was granted this amendment for all of eight hours whilst Ronald Reagan was having surgery in 1985.
 - Now section 2 of the 25th Amendment is where we get into the controversial side of things (yay we love that!). It basically stipulates that if the office of the Vice President is empty, then the President himself is allowed to choose who will become the Vice President (that choice must be confirmed by a majority vote of both houses of Congress). Gerald Ford was chosen using this rule when Vice President Spiro T. Agnew resigned in 1973. When Nixon then resigned in 1974, Ford took over the presidency and selected Nelson Rockefeller to be the Vice President. It was, rather tragically, the assassination of John F. Kennedy in 1969 that prompted the 25th Amendment, as prior to that there had been no rules in place about choosing the vice president replacement.
- **In British-inspired parliamentary systems, opposition parties frequently assemble “Shadow Cabinets”—ministers who mirror those in power. Explore this concept: how often do Shadow Cabinet members succeed those they are shadowing? Should presidential systems include a shadow president?**
 - Oh thank goodness, we've moved away from America to their cousins across the pond (yes I'm clearly a Brit at heart, and a 19th century one for that!). The concept of a “shadow cabinet” is in my opinion something that provides a rather intriguing glimpse into the exact nature of their British-style parliament. Put in layman's terms, the Shadow Cabinet is essentially the “counter-opposite” of the current government ministers who “shadow” their opponents on the other side of the “bench” (the line of chairs and speaker's podium separating the two parties in the House of Commons). They are responsible for scrutinising and criticising their opposite number, developing alternative policies and hold the Government accountable for any actions it may have controversially executed. Since May 2010, the Labour Party under Jeremy Corbyn (who may resign soon) has been a constituent party of the Shadow Cabinet (as they are “Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition”, a polite British term that basically means “We didn't win the election so now we'll nag at those who won”). As far as my historical knowledge goes (and in all honesty it isn't that far), the only known example of a Shadow Cabinet

succeeding the cabinet it criticised was during the Second World War, when the Liberal and Labour Shadow Cabinet ruled a Vote of No Confidence (again another British polite way of saying “You’re not cut out for the job mate”) against Neville Chamberlain’s poor handling of the government during World War 2. In his place, they agreed to support a coalition party under the leadership of the “British Bulldog” himself: Winston Churchill.

- **In a presidential system, when control of the government shifts from one political party to the other, power must be transferred between them. Read about this process [in the United States](#), then discuss with your team: should new leaders be required to keep some members of the previous administration around, to help ensure a smooth transition? Do you think all administrations would be equally inclined to help their successors?**

- Right now I've given up on trying to detail the unnecessarily complicated and intricate “behind-the-scenes” mechanisms of the US government (it’s like having to listen to k-pop, utter torture), I’ll let you read the article first and glean all the information you require from it but I will gladly mention my own opinion on the two subsequent questions.

I personally think that the system of keeping members of the previous administration to help ensure a smooth transition would certainly help out a lot. Historically nations that have benefited from this kind of support from their (well back then) colonial overlords once the decolonisation process went underway have seen varying degrees of success (but success nonetheless). In fact one major example where poor colonial handling of the transition of power was India, where the British quite literally disappeared from the country without setting in place the proper “remnant cabinet” if you will to help smoothly transition the British Raj from 300-year old prize colony to a fully-functioning and thriving democratic independent state (given this failure on the part of the British, India is doing rather well all things considered. Indian scholars feel free to enlighten me otherwise).

- **Governments of all kinds, from the Weimar Republic to Katolis, are vulnerable to coups, or takeovers from within, usually in the form of [secret plots with military backing](#). Consider these [examples](#) of coups in France, Spain, Libya, Uganda, and Chile, and this [failed coup](#) in the United States. Discuss with your team: what would it take to justify a coup? Can coups take place in private companies? Would you ever support a coup in your own school, if you felt teachers or other students were being mistreated?**

- Right then first let’s whiz (sure) through the coups detailed in the prompt and then we’ll get onto the discussion questions (that’s how I usually do it, you should be used to it by now scholars!).
 - **America:** The year is 1933. America’s newest president, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, has just been sworn into office. It is a dangerous time, America’s own values of freedom and democracy hang in the delicate balance. The Great Depression has ravaged the economy and the societal mood is far from happy. Roosevelt embarks upon the most ambitious and controversial presidential

initiative ever seen: The First Hundred Days, a series of radical legislative programs aimed at stimulating the economy and beginning the recovery from the recent crash. Of course, these actions were upsetting opponents at both sides of the political spectrum. Those on the far right believed Roosevelt was attempting to enforce communism upon America (god I wish that were true), whilst those on the far left claimed his reforms weren't going far enough. To that end, a group of right-wing financiers attempted to convince Roosevelt to relinquish power to a fascist-style military government (imagine that!). Luckily, their "Wall-Street Putsch" (nicknamed after the similar failure of Hitler's Munich Beer Hall Putsch) failed after the Marine general whom they attempted to ally with informed the Congress and charged the men with treason.

- **France's** coup was far more successful and you're probably familiar with the person who it propelled it to power: Napoleon Bonaparte. In 1799, France was under the leadership of a five member Directory, but their power was under threat from this up and coming general who had just finished off his immensely successful Egyptian campaign. On November 10, Napoleon arranged a special legislative session of the Directory outside Paris. With the support of many high-level co-conspirators and even 2 of the 5 members of the directory, he hoped to convince them to give him the total authority of the nation. Despite meeting some resistance from the lower house (the equivalent of the House of Representatives), Napoleon managed to get himself elected as first consul to a brand new three-member Consulate. It would be only five years later that he quite literally crowned himself Emperor of France and consolidated the coup's intention.
- **Spain:** 1936, a leftist coalition has just won the general election in the Iberian country. As a result, the conservative right-wing government is forced into "exile", among them is a prominent military veteran and hardline Catholic supporter, General Francisco Franco. Having been persuaded to join his fellow army officials in overthrowing the democratically elected leadership, he first broadcasted a call to action for the military to overthrow the government, which was heard by many garrisons throughout the mainland (he himself was in "exile" in the Canary Islands). He then flew in secret to Morocco, where his old loyal veterans were awaiting his arrival: the battle-hardened Army of Africa, whose Moroccan soldiers were among the most feared in all of Spain. With support from Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, the entire army was transferred over the Mediterranean to Spain, where the ensuing civil war ensured his rise to power as the sole leader of the country. Whilst Hitler and Mussolini perished in the decade after helping Franco, "El Caudillo" would remain ruler of Spain until his death in 1975.
- **Libya:** A country which even now is notoriously unstable, Libya's political past has been one of constant clashes with the United States and a brutal military regime of total obedience. Its leader was among one of the most dangerous men in the world: Muammar Gaddafi. Much like Franco, Gaddafi had come to loathe

the leadership of his country (at the time a monarchist government backed by Western bankers and supporters) whilst he was a junior army officer. On September 1st 1969, he and 70 other conspirators surrounded key government offices and practically immobilised the leadership; declaring a success to their almost bloodless coup over the radio a mere two hours later (King Idris had been away at a health resort in Turkey). The next 42 years would see him completely transform all way of life in the country, until he was deposed and killed in the 2011 Arab Spring uprising.

- **Idi Amin:** The self-proclaimed “King of Scotland” was actually a harsh Ugandan dictator between 1971 and 1979. Idi Amin grew up in a country that had yet to become independent from British rule, indeed he had climbed up the political ladder by benefiting from his success as a top-ranking general in the British Empire’s colonial army. It wasn’t until the colonisers left in 1962 that he proceeded to become close allies with it’s first president: Milton Obote. Yet the partnership would not last forever, and with Obote away at a conference in Singapore in 1971, Amin launched a coup and succeeded (albeit with some violence and deaths having broken out in the country). Despite having promised the “return of democracy”, Amin would go on to become portrayed as the “savage ruler” of Uganda. During his eight year rule, it’s estimated that around 300,000 perceived political opponents were killed and his abuse of human rights saw many western countries break off all relations from the country. In 1978, his attempt to annex the Kagera Region of neighbouring Tanzania ended in spectacular failure when the Tanzanian Army invaded Uganda in response (talk about an escalation!), he was subsequently ousted from power and spent the remainder of his life in exile; first in Libya and then in Saudi Arabia.
- **Chile:** The final country on this list and perhaps the one which I can complain about the most (you’ll see why soon). In the 1970s, Chile had just elected a Marxist-leaning president by the name of Salvador Allende; whose land reforms and economic stance worried one nation in particular (hint: it rhymes with Alarica). Allende’s allegiance to the Communist ideology worried many who believed he would ally with the Soviet Union and foment even more “revolutions” in South America (how great that would be!). As a result, the head of the Chilean Army (who by the way, Allende had just promoted to that position!) joined a CIA-backed coup to overthrow the government by force and impose “democracy” upon the nation. His name was Auguste Pinochet and his coup on September 11th 1973 would lead Chile into 17 years of dictatorial terror. All the while this Fascist dictator who went around purging his opponents and any who dared speak against him went unnoticed by the American government (gee America, didn’t that democracy go well?). Pinochet’s army was feared above all, but one branch in particular gained notoriety internationally: the “Caravan of Death”. This was a death squad that flew helicopters around the country, killing political prisoners without them being given a trial.

- Right whew onto the questions. Coups are (in my opinion) only justified if the current leadership of the country has undermined every single aspect of life: economy, society and politics, to the point where the popular support of a coup has reached a majority compared to the supporters of the leadership. Only then can a coup be truly justified, as a coup should serve the greater populace rather than the interests of a few. Coups can indeed happen in companies, though they're obviously less violent and more bureaucratic than coup d'états that countries can go through (just imagine the CEO of Google being overthrown by his executive board at gunpoint, that'd be something!). If there was a coup in my school (highly unlikely but alright we'll foresee it), I'd probably only support the party if their reasons were justified and they had gained the majority beforehand.

The Company You Don't Keep: Corporate Succession

- **The surge in global industrialization in the 19th and early 20th centuries led to the emergence of giant companies all over the world—and, often, tremendous family fortunes. Take a look at companies such as Standard Oil, Ford, U.S. Steel, and De Beers, and contrast them with more recent companies such as Microsoft and Intel. Who succeeded their original leaders—and how effectively did the new leaders steer these companies into the future?**
 - Firstly, let's take a look at those extraordinarily capitalist businesses from a time gone by. Standard Oil, Ford, U.S Steel and De Beers all share one major thing: they were led by the family that had founded them. Even when the offsprings of their original founders weren't on the executive board, they were still profiting massively from the revenue of the company. Standard Oil, Ford and U.S Steel are the three "giants" of the 20th century, whose founders made their fortune in the businesses of big industry. Standard Oil and U.S Steel were both founded by two of the three "titans" of 19th century America: John D. Rockefeller and J.P Morgan respectively.
 - The successor to John D. Rockefeller's "black gold" empire was his top aide at the time of his retirement in 1897: John Dustin Archbold. He would lead the company for the next 14 years until the American government declared the multinational corporation (one of the first and largest at the time) an "illegal monopoly" and broke it up into many smaller businesses which continue to operate to this day; ExxonMobil and Chevron among them.
 - Ford's automobile monopoly continues to exist to this day, with the family having occupied executive positions on the board ever since the company's inception in 1903. The current iteration of that principle is William Clay Ford Jr. the great-grandson of the legendary automobile empire creator. Ford remains one of the largest companies in the world and has now expanded its reach well beyond the American borders.
 - U.S Steel was actually a merger company (that is, it was the result of combining two previously separate corporations together). The banking mogul J.P Morgan, who often clashed with John D. Rockefeller for dominance of the American

market, formed it in 1901 by merging Carnegie Steel Company (which had been sold to him for an eye-watering equivalent of 14.8 billion dollars in modern money) and National Steel. The corporation would come to dominate the steel industry, at one point being simultaneously the largest steel producer and largest corporation in the world. Interestingly, Morgan himself selected Charles M. Schwab to become the corporation's first President (it was Charles himself who had suggested the creation of the company in the first place). It was during the tenure of its second president however, James A. Farrell, that US Steel rose to become the first American billion-dollar corporation, expanding the business by a factor of five between 1911 and 1932. His success has since been unmatched by any other US Steel President.

- **Analysts have found that different cultures treat business succession differently; for instance, a number of American researchers have [criticized East Asian business owners](#) for assuming their companies should be [passed](#) on to their children and other relatives. Discuss with your team: is there really something wrong with the default idea of “my children should take my place”?**

- I don't think there is anything wrong with that idea because it is a common thinking to keep my fortune and my company in my family. Also, people tend to want to pass their company to someone they trust, children: therefore, will be the best choice.

- **Sometimes, a company is doing badly, and its directors force the leader out of power in an effort to recover. Sometimes, the leader does something bad, and keeping them around becomes a liability even if the company is thriving. The same can be true at organizations of all kinds, from local nonprofits to national governments. Consider the following examples from the private sector. What led to the departure of each company's leader, and how was a successor selected?**

- **Boeing | Alibaba | Uber | WeWork | Instagram**

- **Boeing:** You've probably heard of Boeing in the news lately, what with all the company drama over their 737 MAX model aircraft having skipped plenty of safety regulations just to maximise profit (typical capitalist profit-seekers, always ignoring the human cost). In December of 2019 the board announced that CEO Dennis Muilenberg would be resigning as a collective result of the 737 MAX debacle and the subsequent fallout with stakeholders and investors. The then-chairman of the board David Calhoun took over as president and CEO on January 13th, following standard procedure as per company policy.
- **Alibaba:** Unlike Boeing, Alibaba (the Chinese e-commerce tech giant) didn't face quite a huge scandal over its company actions which led to the resignation of its leader. In fact the famous founder Jack Ma announced that he was retiring from active leadership of the company on his 50th birthday (September 10th, 2019, a fitting farewell to the great leader). His efforts would instead focus on philanthropic efforts, especially the funding of rural education. His hand-picked successor is Daniel Zhang, who was given the position for his incredible array of skills and service to the company ever since he joined in 2007.

- **Uber:** Now here's where we get into the slightly murky side of corporate succession. Chances are you've ridden an Uber (or at least one of your friends/parents has the app on their phone) or even a regional version (such as Grab or Go-Jek) of the transportation-network app. It's founder, Travis Kalanick, resigned in 2017 as CEO and more recently on December 31st 2019 gave up his board seat. The main reason behind his resignation as CEO is two-fold. The first is public backlash over his time serving as one of Trump's economic advisors on the Strategy and Policy Forum, the second is much more grave and concerns reports that he ignored accounts of sexual misconduct and even harassment within Uber itself. His successor, Dara khosrowshahi, became CEO after moving to the company from his previous position as the CEO of highly-successful travel technology group Expedia.
- **WeWork:** Rather interestingly, WeWorks is fairly new company on this list, having only come into existence since 2010 (beating Uber by a full year but tying with Instagram). WeWork, unlike many of the other companies, is a rather "new-model" business initiative in that what it does is quite unique. If you've ever been to one of those "shared workspaces", you've basically experienced a model of what WeWork does: they design and build those workspaces for technology startups (what a very particular group but alright). However, co-founder Adam Neumann received a fair bit of backlash in 2019 when the Wall Street Journal reported that the company was "besieged with criticism over its governance, business model, and ability to turn a profit" (that last part is especially concerning, as WeWork lost a total of \$2 billion in 2018 alone). Neumann resigned from the company in August of 2019 following this article and the ensuing pressure from investors. Ever since then the Board of Directors promoted Artie Minson and Sebastian Gunningham as co-CEOs of the company.
- **Instagram:** At long last! An app that I actually possess and use to communicate with many other scholars (@star.wars.nerd.2.2.2 in case you're interested, doubtful you would be). Instagram was co-founded in 2010 by Kevin Systrom and Mike Krieger (these things are often done in duos nowadays I've just realised). However, just two years afterwards Facebook acquired the company for a staggering \$1 billion, meaning that now Systrom and Krieger had to respond to the wishes of "robot" Zuckerberg (seriously go watch the videos of him I question his organic life form status). Interestingly Krieger and Systrom never actually justified their resignation from the CEO position of Instagram in 2018, merely stating that they would be stepping down from their titular positions. Facebook selected Adam Mosseri as the new CEO.
- **Researchers at Stanford have identified "[seven myths](#)" of corporate succession. Discuss with your team: are they really just myths, or is there some truth to them? The researchers also find that CEOs tend to behave in six different ways during moments of transition:**

- **Seven Myths:** The Seven myths of corporate succession are, for the most part, real myths within the corporate world.
 - The first myth is rather easily disproved by statistics: “Companies know who the next CEO will be.”, apparently according to a separate study only 54% of companies can claim to be actually preparing someone for the succeeding role.
 - The second myth is that there is one model of succession which triumphs over all of them, in reality there are four general approaches (CEO-in-waiting, internal development, external recruit and inside-outside approach), all of which have been used in the past and their degree of “superiority” to each other depends on the company and the practices in which the method was enacted.
 - The third myth is rather contrary to the procedure set in place by the 2nd section of the 25th Amendment (remember that? If not, scroll up!); it basically states that CEOs should choose their successors. Now this myth is often disproved because whilst the CEO is often given the choice to select the initial candidate(s), the ultimate decision rests with the board of directors (reason being is because the CEO is meant to only be vested with the current vision of the company, whilst the board represents the current and future wishes of the investors and stakeholders).
 - The fourth myth is that succession is primarily a “risk-management” issue, that is to say simply that the task of selecting a successor is meant to focus on how to avoid the risks of a vacancy in leadership. In reality however, the Stanford article discusses that succession is far more success-oriented because the selection process often aims to choose a person whose skill set and visionary thinking will improve the value of a company rather than simply preserve it.
 - The fifth myth is that boards can effectively analyse CEO talents, whilst in reality there are is a staggeringly low percentage of directors that can actually identify holistic and merit-based individuals as opposed to merely checking their financial backgrounds and previous working experience in capacities related to the CEO. Often times this is why the CEO themselves are given the role of choosing a candidate, since they’re actually capable of picking up and evaluating the skills their successors will require.
 - The sixth myth is that boards prefer internal candidates. This basically means that junior executives will have a higher chance of being selected as CEO successors compared to external candidates (those from outside the company applying for the position). In reality, despite what the numbers say, boards tend towards selecting external candidates more often due to the simple fact that they have been CEO before, junior executives are often ignored in light of people from outside the corporation who have actually been in the CEO position prior to being evaluated by the board.
 - The seventh and final myth of the CEO succession process is rather sad and certainly something we should change immediately: that boards want a female or minority CEO. In reality only 5 percent of the Fortune 500 companies (the largest

American companies by revenue) have female CEOs (so for those of us not particularly skilled at math, that's only 25 of the 500 companies. For scholars who studied last year's curriculum, you might remember from social studies the concept of "glass ceilings" and "glass cliffs" as explanations for why women are often neglected in the CEO workplace.

- **Active Advisor | Aggressor | Passive Aggressor**
 - **Active Advisor:** The first and in my opinion most ideal CEO behaviour during succession, the active advisor is kind of like the Yoda CEO (Star Wars references are back!). These CEOs during the succession process will acknowledge that it is time for them to step down, providing thoughtful insight into the selection process without overstepping their roles. This type of CEO is aware of their limits and trusts that the board will make the ultimate decision without them needing to impose their will upon the directors.
 - **Aggressor:** Rather self-explanatory, the aggressor CEO acts like the mirror opposite of the active advisor CEO during the succession process. They will attempt to influence the decision to have the board select a hand-picked candidate of theirs, undermining the chances of any other candidate getting the job.
 - **Passive Aggressor:** This CEO is kind of like the aggressor but far more "stealthy" I suppose in influencing the decision. They will attempt to covertly undermine all the other candidates except for the one they hand-picked to take the role.
- **Capitulator | Hopeful Savior | Power Blocker**
 - **Capitulator:** I'm terribly sorry (no not really, I'm a historian what can I say?) but right now the image of a French CEO waving a white flag after the board has fired them is appearing in my mind (please tell me some of you can see it as well). The capitulator is basically the reluctant CEO, they won't even (unlike the previous three) acknowledge that it's time for them to step down and when the board is very close to making a decision, they'll renounce their resignation and ask to be CEO for longer.
 - **Hopeful Saviour:** Consider this CEO the equivalent of the Cold War CIA, manipulating events elsewhere to the point where the international community requests that the US step in to "save" the situation. This CEO will either promote successors that remind themselves of them (so basically narcissistic CEOs) or they will purposefully hand-pick a poor candidate so that the board will be forced to request their return to the position to "save" the company.
 - **Power Blocker:** The final type of CEO when it comes to the succession process, the power blocker CEO is to the hopeful saviour as the aggressor is the passive aggressor. Whereas the hopeful saviour is covert and subtle with their manipulation, the power blocker is rather bold and explicit about their delaying actions. They will throw up obstacles, call in personal favours or simply demand to stay in an effort to remain CEO and derail the selection process (or at the very least slow it down and prolong their time as leader of the company).

- **Discuss with your team: which of these terms, if any, apply to other examples of succession in this outline and in your own experience? How would you handle the case of a leader who wants to hold onto power even when others believe it is time for them to go? Is it possible they are right to resist?**

- The terms above that probably relate to the experiences in my life (especially with all the leadership transitions I've either been a part of or witnessed), include active advisor and passive-aggressor. Thankfully we haven't had someone force their hand-picked candidate or even delay their succession process in my time (yet!) but it'd be interesting to see how an executive leadership board would deal with that sort of dilemma.

In terms of handling a situation where a leader wants to hold onto power, I'd probably converse with the other members of the executive board and devise a negotiation wherein the leader maintains some capacity of authority within the group, but is also relegated to a role which ensures that cannot either directly influence or even undermine the succeeding leader.

- Sometimes it can be right for a CEO to resist calls for them to step down, especially if they feel like the company is simply too unstable to afford the delays of such a process.
- **Sometimes, corporate succession descends into unexpected chaos, with more than one person claiming to be in charge—as happened just last year at [Hong Kong Airlines](#). Discuss with your team: in such situations, might the best solution be to appoint co-leaders?**
 - (Chi): In that case, co-leaders will be effective as no-one will be jealous of each other because he/she is the leaders while I am not and can continue cooperating to run the company. Also, doing this can avoid unnecessary conflicts.

The One After the Chosen One: Succession in Works of Fiction (Xavier)

- ***Spoiler Alert*** At the end of *Avengers: Endgame*, a [weary but content Captain America](#) hands his iconic shield to Sam Wilson, signaling that he has chosen Sam to [succeed him](#). **Discuss with your team: is the transfer of such a symbol enough to indicate a shift of power and title, or should the characters be taking a different, perhaps more public approach? Are there examples in real-world history where one person transferred their position to their chosen successor in this way?**
 - Firstly, YAY THE AVENGERS ARE IN THE CURRICULUM! Now that I've got that out of the way, let's talk about this form of succession. Symbols certainly hold high amounts of power within our world, whether it be a logo of a major company or a religious symbol. We can of course assume that a superhero's symbol, such as Captain America's, would also have this weight and majesty, and therefore the passing on of the shield shows that everything that Captain America stands for is being passed onto Sam Wilson. However, I think the main thing that we should look at is the importance of Captain America. When an important figure makes a decision regarding their succession,

generally people will recognise that this decision must have been made for a reason, and will therefore not react negatively towards this succession. Imagine if Elon Musk said that he was handing SpaceX off to someone else, you'd assume that he had a good reason to do so. Because of this, being public about the handing on is a very important approach, as otherwise Sam may be accused of being a "fake Captain America."

The first example I can think of in terms of objects being handed over to show succession is the crowning of a King / Queen, where objects such as the Crown and Sceptre are presented to the new leader of the country during their coronation. Generally, the passing on of a crown is a definite symbol that a succession has occurred.

- **In the universe of Buffy the Vampire Slayer, when one Slayer dies, another is called to take her place. Research how the process of slayer succession works—including the roles of "Watchers" and "Potentials"—and then discuss with your team: is it good for such an important choice to be out of human hands? Are there positions in real life for which it would make sense to have Watchers and Potentials?**

- Alright, the Slayer (within the Buffy the Vampire Slayer Universe) is a female human who gains superhuman powers that allows them to defend against supernatural threats to Earth. Originally, the first Slayer was actually created by a group within Africa known as the "Shadow Men." These individuals infused a captive girl with the soul of a demon, allowing her to then become a defender against evil. The group of shadow men went on to become the first "Watchers." Watchers are responsible for tracking and taking on Supernatural Entities, generally by locating them and then sending the current Slayer off to combat the threat, as well as locating potential. Let's explain the purpose of potentials. When the current Slayer dies, the powers of the slayer are passed down to a random potential, who may be one that the Watchers have located or one who the Watchers have not. This of course results in incredibly complicated searches for this one individual who is the Slayer (though sometimes it's two, and at one time it was 1800. I honestly have no idea either...). I think the fact that this super important choice is out of human hands makes complete sense, as imagine having to decide which individual should be the Slayer, a fate that often drastically decreases their life expectancy due to the dangers of the job. Also, within the Buffy the Vampire Slayer universe, the Watchers are known for often being rather corrupt, which also shows that it is good that the decision of the Slayer is out of human hands.

In terms of having real life positions that should have Watchers and Potentials, I would say there already are such positions! One position which immediately comes to mind is that of professional sports, such as soccer. Watchers can represent Talent Scouts, who go searching for individuals who could one day be incredibly talented soccer players, or whatever sport may be relevant, whilst potentials are obviously these individuals.

- **Working with your team, consider the following examples of succession in fiction. How often does the person doing the succeeding get to choose whether to take on their new role—and how often do they receive guidance from the person they are replacing?**

- **King Arthur | the [Choosing](#) | the Flame & Commander**

- **King Arthur:** This is a rather complicated fictional succession, for the reason that Arthurian legend has been incredibly convoluted throughout the ages, and therefore there are many different interpretations and accounts. I'll describe as many of these as possible. Firstly, let's put some ground-work in. King Arthur, also known as Arthur Pendragon, is a fictional King and Knight associated with Camelot and the Knights of the Round Table. He was married to Guinevere and never had children, resulting in his succession being slightly complicated. Of course, succession only occurred among men during the time when this legend was created, and as such a male successor would be chosen. Arthur never had kids, and therefore the succession went first to his brother-in-law, King Lot. However, Lot was killed in the Battle of Terrabil, and therefore would be unable to take the throne. The succession would then go to Mordred, who had actually been killed by Arthur and had killed Arthur himself at the Battle of Camlann. Now is where it gets complicated. In **some** Arthurian legend, Sir Gawain (one of the Knights of the Round Table) is the brother / half brother of Mordred, and would therefore be the King. Unfortunately, he had died at the hands of Lancelot, and therefore couldn't take the throne. We're now running rather low on supposed successors, and now we finally find one who is still alive. Constantine II is either the nephew, cousin, half-nephew or half-nephew once removed of King Arthur, and succeeded him as the King of Britain. However, there are also those who say that Arthur was never succeeded, as he never truly died, and he will one day return to protect Britain in its darkest hour.

We also have the fact that King Arthur was a successor, who became King after removing the Sword from the Stone, which was placed there after Uther Pendragon's death.

The amount of choice that Constantine II had in the succession is unknown, but he likely was the closest living relative of King Arthur, and therefore would be the successor. I would also assume he would likely be quite willing to be a successor, considering he would get to be King of Britain. He would have received no guidance whatsoever from King Arthur, due to the fact that Arthur was dead by this point.

- **the Choosing:** The Choosing is the process that is used to select the Lord Commander of the Night's Watch within the Game of Thrones Universe. The Night's Watch are an organisation that protect members of the Seven Kingdoms from the Threats that lie outside the Wall, primarily by guarding it and protecting it from the Wildlings and the White Walkers. After the death of a Lord Commander, there is a period where a temporary Lord Commander is reinstated, after which an election can occur. The election of a Lord Commander is the most fair of any system of bringing a leader into power within the Game of Thrones

Universe, as every single member of The Night's Watch gets a vote on who they believe should be the new Lord Commander, regardless of their position within the organisation. Because of this, a servant and the First Ranger have equal voting power. To get elected within the books, you need a 66% majority, whilst in the t.v. show, you only need 50%. The most famous Lord Commander that has been elected via the choosing is Jon Snow.

The decision to become a Lord Commander is one's own, as you have to nominate yourself to the process, though others can suggest that you do it. You also receive no advice or guidance from the previous Lord Commander, as they will have perished when a new Lord Commander is elected.

- **the Flame & Commander:** This is a form of succession within the “The 100” Universe. This was a book series that was then developed into a T.V. show, based on the idea of a post-apocalyptic world where Earth was deemed uninhabitable due to radiation, and 100 teenagers are sent down to it to determine whether it is safe for human habitation. The Commander is the leader of Coalition / Wonkru (depending on what season you're in). This is a group of United Tribes who live in the Eastern U.S. The Commander is chosen through a process known as the Conclave. Throughout the lifetime of the previous commander, those who have a genetic trait known as “Nightblood,” which renders their blood black and increases their resistance to radiation, are taken to train in Polis. Upon the death of a Commander, all Nightbloods are forced to fight to the death, with the lone survivor being declared the newest commander. They then have the Flame (also known as A.L.I.E 2.0) installed within them. This is an artificial intelligence that contains the memories / consciousnesses of the previous commanders which when implanted into the back of a Nightblood's neck will give them guidance and provide them with access to this information. If the Flame is installed within a non-nightblood, their brain will be liquified within seconds.

Any nightblood can be selected to be the Commander, and though they technically have a choice, when you are forced to either die or fight for your life there really isn't much of a choice. Those who become the Commander have the advice and guidance of every single Commander who has come before them.

- **All Might & Midoriya | Rand Al'Thor | Supreme Sorcerer**
 - **All Might & Midoriya:** Within the Universe of My Hero Academia, many individuals have what are known as “Quirks,” basically the equivalent of superpowers. All Might had the incredibly powerful “One for All” Quirk, which allowed him to stockpile a ridiculous amount of energy within his body and then release it, giving him incredible power, as well as superhuman strength, speed and stamina. Whilst every quirk that an individual have is given to them at birth, passed down through their parents, One For All is a quirk which is passed down from one individual to another, making it a transferable quirk. It is named One

For All because it is One Quirk for All People. To transfer the Quirk, the current owner must freely transfer it to another. Izuku Midoriya is the current possessor of the One For All Quirk, after it was transferred to him from All Might. Before he did so, he had to consume a strand of All Might's hair (weird, I know) to show that he had enough strength to use One For All without killing himself. The transfer then occurred, giving Izuku the One For All Quirk, and making him the ninth holder of the One For All Quirk.

Though the One for All Quirk can be forcibly transferred, generally this does not occur. Izuku was trained by All Might before the transfer of the Quirk occurred. All Might also didn't die when the quirk was transferred, resulting in Izuku being able to consult him if he feels he needs to.

- **Rand Al'Thor:** We now move to the Universe of "A Wheel of Time" to discuss Rand al'Thor. Rand al'Thor is the reincarnation of Lews Therin Telamon, the leader of the Forces of Light during the War of Power. He's one of the most powerful Channelers (basically magicians) in the world. He had no choice in his succession as the newest Dragon, as it was instead fated in a prophecy that one day Lews Therin Telamon would be reincarnated, and would be the prophesied saviour and breaker of the world. Rand has actually heard the voice of Telamon in the past, giving him advice, though he doesn't always.
- **Supreme Sorcerer:** Once again, we come back to Marvel, now going to Doctor Strange and the Mystic Arts. There is actually an incredibly specific definition of the Supreme Sorcerer (more commonly known as the Sorcerer / Sorceress Supreme, as I will be referring to it as), with the definition being the "practitioner of the mystic or magic arts who has greater skills than all others or commands a greater portion of the ambient magical energies than any other organism on a given world or dimension." Technically, there can be two Sorcerer Supremes, as one can have the greatest skills and the other can command the greatest portion of ambient magical energies, but generally, there is only one. The responsibility of the Sorcerer Supreme is to defend their universe (!) from magical threats, such as Dormamu. Those who are the Sorcerer Supreme are basically immortal, as they do not age and are vulnerable to disease. The method of succession is rather simple, with it being that as soon as someone gets more magical skill or ambient magical energy, they then become the Sorcerer Supreme. This results in the individual who has the role of Sorcerer Supreme possibly losing it at any moment. The first ever Sorcerer Supreme in the Earth-616 Dimension (the most well known Marvel Universe) was Agamotto, who had the Eye of Agamotto named after him (an object that acts as a receptacle for the Time Stone). The most well known Sorcerer Supreme, however, is Doctor Strange, who succeeded the Ancient One to become Sorcerer Supreme.

Becoming the Sorcerer Supreme technically isn't something that you choose, as

it's out of your control. However, most individuals who become the Sorcerer Supreme train to do so, and are therefore not surprised when they receive the role. They almost never receive guidance from the person they succeed, as the most common cause of a change in Sorcerer Supreme is due to the death of the previous one, though technically the previous Sorcerer Supreme can give guidance. Also, there is technically no need for the previous Sorcerer Supreme to provide guidance, as the current Sorcerer Supreme has the greatest knowledge of the mystic arts in the universe.

- **Not every fictional leader or hero has a successor. Consider Robin Hood, or Dumbledore. Discuss with your team: are there some shoes that are best left unfilled?**

- Personally I feel as though there are some shoes that are best left unfilled by a single person, but I don't think there are any cases in which a vacancy is always better than having some form of replacement leadership surpass the previous leader. The success of a party, corporation or even nation can depend upon the course that their leadership takes, so if there is no leadership there's a high chance the direction of that group will disintegrate and along with it the group itself (if any scholars here remember last year's Tuckman Model, the leader is essential even in the later stages of group management to ensure everyone can continue without them being present).
~Avan

Creative Succession

- **After Jon Stewart stepped down as host of The Daily Show on Comedy Central, the network announced his successor would be the relatively unknown South African comedian Trevor Noah. Although there was [controversy](#) around Noah's selection, he benefited from Stewart's support and from [institutional continuity](#): the show kept around many of the same writers and producers. Watch clips of Noah's [debut performance](#), then discuss with your team: are there lessons here for those choosing successors to other popular television hosts? Why do you think The Daily Show continued with a new host while its popular companion series The Colbert Report came to an end once its original host (Stephen Colbert) left?**
 - Frankly, as a former avid watcher of the Daily Show and a great fan of Trevor Noah, I may have a slight bias towards this matter (though I regardless recommend you watch several of those Daily Show videos if you've ever got the time). There are probably several lessons here for TV show hosts when it comes to succession. Firstly, the Daily Show has a certain "style" about it that other shows might not necessarily possess. The Daily Show basically has a fluid "shape" if you will around it. As long as the host can deliver the real news in an engaging yet informative (and also amusing) way, the way in which they do that is ultimately up to the host themselves. Trevor isn't like Jon in the way that he runs the show and he's made that clear several times, much to the amazement of the show's fanbase. Secondly, because the Daily Show wasn't strictly "Jon Stewart's thing", unlike the Colbert Report (it is literally named after the bloody host), Trevor Noah and many other successors can take the show in whatever direction

they please without having to worry so much about ripping off or tarnishing the legacy of the previous host.

- **Explore these other examples of host transitions—and non-transitions—over the years, then discuss with your team: what made some transitions easier or harder than others?**

- **Walter Cronkite | Jay Leno | Oprah Winfrey | Ralph Lawler | Mary Berry**

- **Walter Cronkite:** If you've ever listened to old American evening news broadcasts (an oddly specific action/hobby but hey we scholars are a varied bunch), chances are you've heard the voice of Walter Cronkite. Cronkite was an American broadcast journalist who served as an anchorman for the CBS Evening News from 1962-1981. His service to the journalism industry started much earlier, as he was a war correspondent for the American news agency during the Second World War (in many cases he was on the front lines reporting on developments while being shot at). In the 1960s and 70s, he became known for his signature departing catchphrase of "And that's the way it is" followed by the date of the broadcast. His career earned him the title of "most trusted American" by the population, millions of whom would tune into his segment every night. In keeping with the CBS policy of mandatory retirement at the age of 65, Cronkite stepped down in March of 1981, broadcasting his last ever news relay on March 6th. He was replaced by Dan Rather, whose service to CBS along with other news agencies and TV broadcasting shows ensured he got the job smoothly.
- **Jay Leno:** Before Jimmy Fallon or Conan O'Brien came to fame as the hosts of nighttime talk shows, Jay Leno was the face of night time television and was applauded by all. Serving as the host of The Tonight Show with Jay Leno from 1992 to 2009, Leno propelled the show to garner top ratings, much to the benefit of the NBC broadcasting company which owned it. Yet in 2009, Leno's contract with NBC had expired and he left the show to be replaced by Conan O'Brien. Unfortunately, that change was not desirable for NBC. After just seven months of broadcasting NBC announced that they planned to move the show to a time slot past midnight, which caused great backlash from O'Brien who demanded that NBC not modify the showtimes or he would leave as host of the show. After two weeks of negotiations, NBC bought out Conan's contract for \$45 million; ending his tenure as host and his relationship with the company. Jay Leno would return to host The Tonight Show on March 1st 2010, immediately after the Winter Olympics had ended. It was a sort of "hopeful saviour" moment for Leno, despite him not having played a part in selecting O'Brien to replace him.
- **Oprah Winfrey:** I probably don't need to introduce this woman to many of you scholars who either are well aware of her existence and have probably watched (or indeed are fans) of her old show The Oprah Winfrey Show. Broadcasting from 1986 to 2011, the show was hosted by Winfrey until it's 25th season came to an end just 9 years ago. Because the show was "unique" to the host who helped it rise to fame alongside herself, the need to choose a successor was not

present when Winfrey announced that the show, her show would be ending after the final season.

- **Ralph Lawler:** Oh here's something rather different. Ralph Lawler is set apart from the other names on this list because he didn't actually run his own show or indeed take over as host of one of them. In fact Lawler was the voice of the National Basketball Association's Los Angeles Clippers team for an amazing 41 year period between 1978 and 2019. His signature phrases such as "Bingo!" and "Oh me oh my!" were often hallmarks of the Clippers' games and fans would consider him part of the team more than an external member of it. His time came to an end in the final 2018-2019 season, in which he handed over his position to Brian Sieman. He is forever immortalised for his outstanding service in the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.
- **Mary Berry:** If you've ever watched cooking shows on channels like TLC or the Asian Food Networks, chances are you've heard of The Great British Bake Off, a long-running cooking contest where Mary Berry became the very symbol of the show's judges. Known as Mary, Queen of Cake, the culinary master of desserts and cakes (obviously) joined the show as a judge alongside Paul Hollywood in 2010, before announcing she would be leaving along with presenters Sue Perkins and Mel Giedroyc in 2016 when Love Productions announced their intention to move the show to broadcast on Channel 4 instead of the long-standing BBC One. The successor
- **Tragically, the world's most famous quiz show, Jeopardy!, will soon need a [new host](#)—as current host Alex Trebek has said that his struggle with pancreatic cancer will force him to retire. Discuss with your team: should he be involved in selecting his replacement—and should he be replaced, as many have suggested, with someone better able to embody youth and diversity?**
 - Ah Jeopardy, that American TV show which I oddly regret not ever watching beyond a single episode (and that was because my former WSC coach sent the link to me). Alex Trebek has been hosting the quiz show since it's been a syndicated run (basically meaning it's broadcasted on multiple stations) way back in 1984. I honestly think Alex should be involved in the choosing of his successor to an extent, after all the show has become synonymous with his rise to a small screen icon (apparently there's a thing about people discussing how flawlessly his tie matches his suit every week but alright there's a TV fanbase custom for you). Perhaps someone better able to embody youth and diversity would be nice for a change and to keep up with modern trends, but because the host of Jeopardy's job is very professional and allows little in the way of personal expression (at least compared to The Daily Show or Late Night Show), people probably wouldn't mind if another qualified, slightly more experienced (older) person signed on.

i successori: Succession in the Criminal Underworld

- **The leaders of criminal organizations and syndicates are often the most powerful people in their communities—and the most in danger of being usurped. Read about the [Gambino](#)**

crime family in New York, then consider: how do civil wars within such Mafia organizations and their equivalents impact the general public?

- The Gambino family of New York is quite literally the name associated with organised crime in American circles, often because it was the family business which managed to strike up such a notorious reputation for its operations throughout much of the 20th century. The family history actually dates back beyond the first Gambino member: Carlo Gambino, who became the boss of the crime organisation from 1957 to his death in 1976. The Gambino family was one of the “Five Families” who dominated the organised crime scene in America during the latter half of the 1900s, earning them the collective nickname of the American Mafia (the other names, for those curious are: Bonanno, Colombo, Genovese and Lucchese). It was after his death that the Gambino family would enter a period of civil dispute. His successor, Paul Castellano, was gunned down in front of a Manhattan Steak Club in 1985, apparently a power grab orchestrated by another member of the gang, Mr. Gotti. Ever since then the Gotti family has been running things within the original Gambino clan, despite many of their members having had legal actions pressed against them (Mr. Gotti himself went to life imprisonment in 1992 and died whilst serving his sentence in 2002).

Civil wars in such Mafia organisations can often impact the public through several ways. Firstly the war itself can also claim innocent lives who were never associated with the gang to begin with and it can also draw in other rival gangs looking to outmanoeuvre their rivals once and for all. In fact it wasn't uncommon in British townships or even larger cities to see gang members come into skirmishes with other gangs and even local law enforcement officials (Peaky Blinders anyone?).

- **Consider [this article](#), which describes a formalized succession ritual amongst the Japanese yakuza. “Without [these ceremonies],” one boss says, “We wouldn’t be yakuza.” How do such ceremonies affect the culture of a group? Discuss with your team: does your nation have similar traditions—such as inauguration in the United States—to demonstrate the transfer of power? How about your school?**
 - Wow, never realised just how intricately ceremonial some gangsters can be (now that’s what I call class). The Japanese yakuza gangs are among the most ceremonial in the world and their traditions of succession go back decades. The ceremonies of this group affect their culture in many ways, though sometimes it’s the reverse, that the culture affects the ceremonies and therefore the group. I doubt any American or even European gangs have this type of symbolic ritual (or at the very least any sort of formal event) that signifies the passing of one crime boss and the rising of another. Thailand as far I’m concerned has a tradition similar to this, it’s called the coronation (as a matter of fact the new king’s coronation was recently finished last year after a year’s mourning for his father). My school doesn’t quite have that sort of tradition in the sense that the former head will pass on something to the new head, but perhaps the closest thing we have is a “farewell speech” and “new head of school assembly” in which the official transfer of power will be made public to both students and parents.

- **In 1931, a number of leading crime families in America transitioned from a Godfather-type form of leadership in which one person was in control indefinitely to a more democratic council called “The Commission”, complete with term limits and consensus requirements. As you investigate how this [Commission formed](#), evaluate if it achieved its purpose. Should companies or other organizations adopt similar practices?**
 - American society practicing some form of communal leadership? Preposterous (then again, this part of society specialises in racketeering and extortion so oh well). In 1931 if we return to our old “friends” the Gambino family, we find them creating a Commission with the four other families that dominated organised crime in New York along with gangs in Chicago and Buffalo. This sort of “United Nations” as the article describes (more like “United Criminals” but alright) managed organised crime throughout the entire United States and as a result it prevented a scenario in which one boss came to boss around all other gangs. It achieved its purpose rather well and since then the number of deaths in gang-related violence (especially deaths of innocent bystanders) have lowered significantly compared to prior to The Commission’s creation.
 - Organisations generally tend to practice this principle with their Board of Directors (or a similarly named conglomerate of stakeholder representatives responsible for managing most of the company). The Board is directly responsible for all operations within the company and they are capable of choosing a CEO and dismissing one if it is their decision. Most nations tend to practice a similar principle with their democratic bodies (the Parliament of the UK and the Congress of America are examples of this), even in NIST (the school I attend), there is a board of executives who help manage the school together in order to avoid one person running the entire show (what a nightmare that would be for the students, though we actually don’t hear or see much about this board)

Succession and Failure

- **The Mongol Empire is often remembered as synonymous with Genghis Khan, but it outlived him—at least for a while. Before his death, Genghis designated his third son Ögedei as his heir. His plan worked: after some minor court intrigue, Ögedei took control. The next handoff was not as clean, however. When Ögedei died some years later, his sons fought to succeed him, and the Empire never recovered. Research the circumstances around the passage of power from each of these generations to the next. Who ultimately took power? Discuss with your team: is there anything Ögedei could have done differently to limit the repercussions of his passing? Is a clear line of succession easier or harder to achieve in a conquest-based society?**
 - Ah the Mongols, the only people in history to ever have successfully conquered Russia in winter. At its height, the Mongol empire was the largest empire in the world and in history it is the second largest empire ever to have covered the world. the story of the Mongol Empire is indeed largely attributed to Genghis Khan’s uniting of the splintered Mongol tribes into one efficient and militarily brilliant group. Yet when it came to who would succeed the great Khan, many within the Empire were uncertain as to how exactly

his third son Ogedei would fare. In 1227, Genghis passed away, leaving for his son an empire which stretched from the Pacific Ocean in China to the Caspian Sea of Central Asia. Ogedei himself would then embark upon the greatest expansion campaign of the Mongol Empire, hitherto unmatched in scale or speed by any other empire in recent years. Under his administration, Mongol generals sallied forth from Asia into the Kievan Rus (early Russia), conquering eastern Europe as far as Poland until the great Khan passed away in 1241. Had he lived for another year, it is likely the Mongols would've overrun the league of European powers allying to resist their vicious swathes of deadly soldiers. But in 1241, the kurultai (basically the customary gathering of princes and local administrators throughout the empire) took place to attempt to find the new leader of this ever-larger Empire. Until the kurultai could be held however (with many princes scattered thousands of kilometers away from the Mongol heartlands of China, Ogedei's own widow, Toregene, took over the regency for the time being. With her quick manipulation, it seemed likely that Ogedei's oldest son Guyuk would be poised to inherit the mighty title of Great Khan. Yet the absence of Batu Khan (a grandson of the great Genghis himself and leader of the Golden Horde Khanate), signified a stalemate for a full four years, as all leaders of the Empire were meant to be present for the kurultai to begin. When Genghis Khan's youngest brother Temuge attempted to seize the power for himself, Guyuk came to the great Mongol capital of Karakorum to attend the 1246 Kurultai where he was duly elected Great Khan. After his death in 1248 (only two years, harsh), the lack of clear succession prompted Batu to call a kurultai on his own territory, where he nominated Mongke, another grandson of Genghis from Batu's son Tolui lineage (Genghis was a literal monster when it came to children, it's believed 1 in 200 men can trace their birth back to him). Yet after Mongke's death in 1259, the kurultai was unable to elect a successor and the great princes broke off into their own khanates, disintegrating the unity of the once legendary and dominating Mongol Empire.

- **The Mongol Empire's crisis was largely internal, but unclear lines of succession can draw entire regions into conflict. When the king of Spain died in 1700 without an heir, royal families elsewhere in Europe claimed the throne—sparking a war for influence across the continent and beyond. Explore the outcome of this conflict and the other examples below, then discuss with your team: could something like them happen in today's world?**

- **War of the Spanish Succession | Wars of the Roses | The Three Kingdoms**

- **War of the Spanish Succession:** Brilliant! Now get into the actual wars over succession (this is where the *longer* sections of explanations will return). The beginnings of the War of the Spanish Succession (in case you had any doubts about which nation the succession crisis was in, the war is extraordinarily specific in the naming) can be traced back to the year 1701, when King Charles II of Spain (from the Habsburg dynasty of Austria) passed away. Charles represented an interesting crossroads between the great families and nations of Europe. On one hand he was of the Spanish Habsburg line, meaning that in theory the Germanic-Austrian Holy Roman Emperor Leopold I should inherit his vast empire (remember, this was a time when the Spanish empire stretched across

the world and was larger than many other European powers). However, because Charles had been the son-in-law of Bourbon French King Louis XIV, his father believed that the right to own his lands should go to the French dynasty. On either side of the two possible successors, a mass of supporters developed. All in Europe knew that if another nation could successfully inherit the vast riches and resources of the Spanish empire, it would upset the scales of balance in the region greatly.

- To that end, William III of England and Louis XIV, often at odds with one another, join forces in 1698 and come up with a series of partition treaties should the empire go to the new-born nephew of Leopold I, Joseph Ferdinand. Yet after the boy's death in 1699 (well that didn't last long did it?). Undeterred, the new partition treaty of that year sets aside all the possessions of the Spanish crown to Austrian archduke Charles (yes there are many similar names here, try not to get lost), whilst leaving Italian territories and Lorraine to the Bourbon dynasty. Charles II (the Spanish king now on his deathbed) changes his will in response, giving all of his territory to Louis XIV's second grandson, Prince Phillip of Anjou. Louis, ecstatic over the new favouring of the French line, renames his grandson Phillip V of Spain (a bit premature, but alright). Leopold I, enraged by the shunning of his Habsburg claim, mobilises his army for war.
- In 1702, the tension escalations between Austria and France have come to a climax. England, once an avid supporter of Louis, switches to support Austria along with the Netherlands. Leopold I can also rely upon his many German kingdoms and puppet states within the Holy Roman Empire (neither Holy, Roman or an Empire!), most reliable among them the militaristic kingdom of Prussia (the state that would later form Germany under Otto von Bismarck, remember him?). On the French side, the electorate of Bavaria proves to be a useful ally, whilst Spain, Portugal and Savoy also ally with the Bourbon house (though the latter two out of fear more than loyalty). From the onset of war in 1702, the aim is clear: each side must try to conquer as much of the late Spanish king's territory before the other beats them to it.
- The imperial side of Britain, The Netherlands and Austria are first to the prizes. The brilliant Prince Eugene of Savoy and Duke of Marlborough are the two top military commanders of the campaign, with the former targeting northern Italy and the latter wreaking havoc in the Spanish Netherlands. But in 1704, their success is turned on its head when French and Bavarian forces attempt a daring strike to the very capital of the Austrian Empire itself: Vienna. Luckily, the two imperial generals are able to link up a deal a decisive blow to this French-Bavarian expedition at the Battle of Blenheim in August of that year.

- The war at sea is also swinging in favour of the imperials. The British and Dutch navies, among the most powerful in the world, wrest Gibraltar from Spain (hence the British possession of the island until this day), whilst the Mediterranean is practically locked down from any Spanish ship or French vessels. By the end of 1706 Louis XIV is inclined to make peace talks with the enemy. Yet the outrageously unfair demands of the Austrian and British monarchs compared to Louis' generous peace terms form an impasse of talks, with hostilities resuming all the way until 1712. By then political and royal changes have threatened to upset the balance of power even further.
- By 1712, there have been several upheavals in the succession situation. Louis XIV is growing frail and Leopold I has been dead for 7 years. In both cases their successors (or to-be in the case of France) have been increasingly fragile. In the Bourbon dynasty, a two-year old Louis XV is all that stands between Phillip and the throne; whilst in Austria Charles is already emperor, his brother Joseph I having died in 1710. Now the allies have had their strategy interrupted. No longer can they place Charles on the throne of Spain, as to do so would be to grant him powers of unrivalled authority across both Europe and overseas. Subsequently, Phillip (now being the official King of Spain) cannot be allowed to simultaneously become King of France if Louis XV dies (at the moment that likelihood is high). Luckily, the allies persuade Phillip to renounce his claim to the French throne that year, paving the way for peace talks the subsequent year.
- In 1713 the French and Spanish monarchs send diplomats to Utrecht in the Netherlands to deal with the prickly issue of territorial disputes and succession laws. The house of Bourbon wins most of the prizes, as Phillip is recognised by the treaty to have possession of the Spanish crown and it's overseas territories. But Britain and France also benefit as well. The former gains Gibraltar, Minorca and several French Canadian possessions in Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and the Hudson Bay provinces.
- In 1714, Austrian Emperor Charles VI (the new title for Leopold I), is given all of Spain's Italian possessions along with the Netherlands. However, this war of succession only sets up the conditions for another one just 25 years later. Charles, alarmed at the reduction of power in the Holy Roman Empire, issues a Pragmatic Sanction to secure the family's inheritance of the remaining territories. The Sanction defines the line of succession first to his male heir, then to a female heir, before finally switching to any daughter of his deceased elder brother Joseph I. However, in 1740, Charles VI has died, with no male heir to inherit the throne. Europe marches to war again over the man (or woman!) who will

inherit his lands (it will become known as the War of the Austrian Succession).

- **Wars of the Roses:** If you thought the War of the Spanish Succession was the first “world” war, then here’s a nice pace of change. The Wars of the Roses occurred well before the Spanish matter, and it was kept isolated to the British isles. If you also thought the War of the Spanish Succession was complex, then the Wars of the Roses makes it look like a simple family line rather than sprawling, intergenerational family tree. As such, I’ve given up attempting to detail this conflict from start to finish, so I’ll go ahead and [link this article](#) explaining it in brief.
- **The Three Kingdoms:** If you’d like to make this learning more fun than it already is, [here’s](#) an Oversimplified video about the Three Kingdoms. You’ve probably heard of this from either the newest Total War video game (yes I dabble in strategy games too!) or the famous historical chronicle about the period: Romance of the Three Kingdoms (which in all honesty makes it sound like some sort of domestic love triangle feud). Though it’s often disputed by historians nowadays when exactly this period in Chinese history began, many can agree that the Three Kingdoms warring against each other began sometime around 220AD and ended around 280AD. The cause for the Three Kingdoms period wasn’t quite a matter of succession as the previous two. Please watch the video as well as the line of succession here is wider than it is long and as such is confusing even for me to comprehend (I’ll probably do a video on it later on the official website Youtube channel).
- **Just two months after taking office, American president Ronald Reagan had been shot. No one knew for sure if he would survive or what might happen next. Amid the chaos, Secretary of State Alex Haig offered reporters words of reassurance: “As of now, I’m in control here at the White House.” The statement haunted him for the rest of his career. Look into it why caused so much controversy, then discuss with your team: was it justified? Is it ever fair for an unelected official to succeed an elected one?**
 - On March 30th, 1981, American President Ronald Reagan and several other members of his entourage were shot at in Washington D.C after a speaking engagement at the Washington Hilton Hotel, a bullet fired by John Hinckley Jr. (whose main motive for the assassination was to impress a film actress he was obsessed with, of all things) ricocheted off the nearby presidential limousine and struck Reagan in the chest, puncturing a lung and breaking a rib. Rushed to the emergency room of the George Washington University Hospital, he was put into explorative surgery and would not be discharged until April 11th. Now as we’ve outlined above, as per the 25th Amendment the Vice president would normally become acting president in this case, yet the Vice president himself (George H.W Bush) was away in Fort Worth, Texas, leaving Secretary of State Alexander Haig left in a position of nearby power. Making that famously controversial statement, Haig later iterated that he meant to imply that he was functionally in control of the government. At the time people criticised him for it, as they

took it to mean that he was now acting president, despite the Presidential Succession Act of 1947 that stated that the Speaker of the House of Representatives would have been the next in line for President (not Haig, as he would've been after the Speaker).

- It probably wasn't a justified statement and was something erroneously ambiguous that Haig had made up on the spot in the middle of a time of crisis, but it certainly cost him his political reputation and may have led to his premature resignation from the cabinet in 1982.
- **The Walt Disney Company has had a history of difficult successions. Most recently, in 2016, the company announced the [abrupt departure](#) of COO Thomas Staggs, who had been set to take over as CEO in 2018. No one knows for certain why he left; one plausible theory is that the person then serving as CEO—Robert Iger—was reluctant to step aside on schedule. Research the situation, then discuss with your team: at least at first, was Disney's process a model for others to follow, or was it flawed from the start?**
 - Alright this article is honestly one of the most engaging I've ever read not just for 2020 but for the entire time I've written anything for this website. Go read it for yourself and you'll see why (high praise considering it's about an American business of all things). Simply put, the up-and-coming planned successor for Robert A. Iger as CEO of Disney had been the company's favourite and even Iger's protege Thomas O. Staggs. Yet in March of 2016 Disney dropped the ultimate succession bombshell (or as we Generation Z peeps might call it, an epic fail) by not only removing the guarantee of Staggs as successor but entirely removing him from the company as a whole. Though Disney itself and Robert Iger did not provide any details as to why the decision (which had been all but official prior to that fateful meeting in mid-March) had been made to "broaden the succession selection", many believed that Iger, who'd helped to oversee many of Disney's hey-day moments in his tenure (from Big Hero 6, Inside Out and most notably Star Wars VII: The Force Awakens), was simply not willing to let go of the company that was now thriving under his reign.

Of course the Disney model was a brilliant thing from the start. Iger personally groomed Staggs and promoted him to key positions prior to the succession selection process to ensure his skills and experience would impress the board of directors as well. It went so well that a Stanford professor by the name of David F. Larcker used it in his book: "Corporate Governance Matters". Whilst Iger was technically playing the role of a passive-aggressor in the light of the CEO models discussed above, the decision was ultimately made by the board and to the delight of company employees at all levels who knew their future was bright with Staggs at the helm.

- **Black smoke rose from the Sistine Chapel one day in early October 1978. It was a sign that a Conclave had concluded: a new pope had been elected to lead the Roman Catholic Church. This new pope, Polish clergyman Karol Józef Wojtyła, also took on a new name: John Paul II. Are there other leadership traditions in which it is common for a leader to adopt a new name? Discuss with your team: is it something more leaders should do? Be**

sure to learn more about how the conclaves function—and sometimes [malfunction](#). What was unique about the [most recent papal succession](#), in 2013?

- I am just going to go ahead and note that the second link takes you to a brilliant Netflix feature called The Two Popes which I highly recommend watching. It is often the case that leaders will not so much adopt a new name as carry on the tradition of adding something to their names in the case that they become the leaders of entire nations. British Monarchs have often added numbers to their titles upon succeeding their fathers or mothers (I'm looking at all the Georges, Johns, Henrys and other typical British male monarch names). I am also going to note now that yes; the World Scholar's Cup staff did make an error on their part for the prompt. At 6:18PM on October 16th 1978, the smoke from the iconic chimney of the Sistine Chapel was **white**, signalling that the conclave had come to a decision about their new pope (well played WSC staff, you tried). hilariously 20 years prior to that papal conclave (in 1958), the smoke had emanated white, scrambling the public into a frenzy that a new pope had already been selected. It turned out that the damp straw that the cardinals had added to their burning ballots had failed to catch on fire until minutes after the white smoke emerged, turning it back and confusing everyone. The history of the conclave failing to correctly signal it's decision has been for quite a while, as there is no other way than the chimney to signal that the pope has been selected. A various number of materials and firestarters have been used in history, ranging from smoke bombs (yep, you read that right) to Italian army flares (again, amazing and hilarious) to even chemical additives. More recently, since the 2005 election the bells of the Sistine Chapel have also rung into addition to the white smoke to make sure it's clear to all that the pope has actually been selected.

What's interesting about the more recent Papal Conclave of 2013 was that the succession took place after the former Pope, Benedict XVI, stepped down and resigned the papacy of his own accord. He'd been the first pope to resign for almost six centuries (the last one was Gregory XIII in 1415) and the first to resign of his own will for almost eight centuries (the last one was Celestine V in 1294).

Succeeding Backwards

- **Sometimes, the new guy (or non-guy) is the old guy (or non-guy). Steve Jobs, the co-founder of Apple, was pushed out in 1985, only to be brought back in 1997—whereupon he cemented his legacy by leading a struggling Apple back to the prominence it still enjoys today. Learn more about his [departure and return](#), then discuss with your team: was it a mistake to let him go in the first place?**
 - Ah Apple, that lovely little garage startup (then again, aren't all tech giants these days?) company that has come to symbolise one side of the Android-Apple race for smartphone dominance (I personally own an Android phone so I'm biased here). Yet the story of Steve Job's rise and fall is much like that of a hopeful saviour model of CEO succession, except for two key differences: Jobs was never CEO of Apple until rather recently in the

company's history, and he didn't exactly do the whole saviour thing discreetly. But let's take a quick detour and set up the scene for you lot to take in:

- It's 1976 and the Steve duo (formed of Jobs and Wozniak) have just founded Apple Inc.; their ultimately goal is to rival and replace the then tech giant IBM and the up-and-coming Microsoft. Yet Mike Markkula, one of their first employees, realised that neither of the two men possessed the skills required to effectively manage the company. Thus he brought in a friend by the name of Michael Scott to become Apple's CEO until he left in 1981 after Apple's IPO (basically when a company goes public on the stock market). Markkula then became CEO himself until Jobs decided to recruit then Pepsi CEO John Sculley (with the famous line: "Do you want to sell sugared water for the rest of your life? Or do you want to come with me and change the world?"). In reality Jobs himself had asked to become CEO, but the board and Apple employees found him both difficult to work with and extremely straining on the company's expense (his ideas were ambitious but very expensive to roll out). After the failures of the otherwise revolutionary Lisa and Macintosh projects in 1985, Sculley moved to reassign Jobs away from the Macintosh development group, attempting to reign in his power and control over the product creation side of the company. Furious, Jobs went to the board directly, which failed spectacularly when all of them sided with Sculley (well that coup didn't go too well did it?). Jobs then went on to form another tech company called NeXT, where he repeated the same innovative-product high-price failure of his Apple days.
- During this time, Apple went through a series of CEO changes, starting with Sculley's firing in 1993 due to terrible losses over poor product initiatives; followed by the three-year tenure of Michael Spindler until 1996. The third CEO (third time's the charm! Right?), Gin Amelio, planned to buy NeXT for \$429 million in 1997. This not only brought back Jobs to the fold, but it would be the undoing of Amelio as CEO (great move buddy). Then in June of that same year, an anonymous party sold 1.5 million Apple shares in a single transaction, causing them to dip to a 12-year low. On the weekend of the 4th of July (how symbolic), Jobs convinced the board to name him interim CEO and show Amelio out the door.
- Surprise surprise! Jobs revealed that he was the "anonymous party" that had sold all of the Apple shares in an effort to get the board to appeal to him and undermine Amelio. The next year, with Apple finally on the rise again, Jobs was named the full-fledged CEO of Apple and remained so until his death in 2011.
- It may have been a mistake to let Steve Jobs go in the first place, as it was Steve's radical forward-thinking vision that had allowed Apple to come to prominence in its early days. His firebrand version of company management was certainly a little risky and frustrating for his co-workers and subordinates, but the decision to fire him (or accept his resignation, there are two conflicting accounts here) in 1985 may have simply been a miscalculation of both Sculley and the board, who were faced with a variety of

problems and did not need Jobs' ambitious drive at that moment to burden them down even more.

- **Consider the following individuals who were also replaced, only to return later to their positions. Discuss with your team: are there common threads in their stories? Did they find more success the second time around?**

- **Starbucks - Howard Schultz | Hooli - Gavin Belson | Google - Larry Page | Yahoo - Jerry Yang**

- **Starbucks:** Ah Starbucks, that lovely little American coffee brand which has been known for mutilating the beloved drink that the European graciously gave to the New World (then again, the fact that most American citizens had to learn how to pronounce “latte” in the first years of it’s opening is rather hilarious). In 1982, Howard Schultz became director of marketing for the young Seattle startup, which hadn’t even considered becoming a full-fledged cafe-style chain yet. Shortly afterwards, a trip to Italy had convinced Schultz that Starbucks needed to become the American equivalent of Italian streetside coffee bars if it ever wanted to profit massively. However, upon his return to the states, the owners refused to go into this business model because they feared that becoming a restaurant would cause them to fade immediately and practically disappear. Frustrated with his lack of progress, Schultz left the company in 1985 before setting up his own cafe by the name of Il Giornale (a Milanese newspaper he’d read while in Italy) and making inroads with his “Italian-style cafe” philosophy. In 1987, the original founders of Starbucks decided to sell their retail unit to Schultz for \$3.8 million, after which the company took off in it’s growth and went public in 1992. Schultz however, left the company in 2000 citing his “exhaustion” from helping to grow Starbucks into a global company, he didn’t go very far however and simply remained as chief global strategist. In 2008, with Starbucks’ profit lagging behind competitors and it’s stocks price having not risen at all, Schultz came back as CEO and immediately set about reframing the business he’d tendered since practically it’s creation. Schultz realised that Starbucks was growing increasingly dependent on opening new stores for new revenue, whilst old store-sales were hardly generating any income at all. To counter this, he fired many executives, closed hundreds of weak stores and introduced the Starbucks Reward Card to incentivise repeated loyalty to the brand. It was with this initiative that Starbucks truly began to skyrocket towards its peak position nowadays. Schultz himself stepped down once again as CEO in 2016, satisfied with his success at the company. Interestingly, I’ll go ahead and add that he’s a major shareholder of Jamba Juice, though the WSC Staff obviously prefer the far-superior Boost Juice chain (which I’ve never tried in my life).
- **Hooli:** Oh great, a fictional character who doesn’t actually exist (does the theme construction process seriously involve the WSC staff watching these shows and go “hey, that’d be great in our new curriculum!). If you’ve ever heard or watched

the TV series Silicon Valley, chances are you've heard of Hooli and the man who made it: Gavin Belson. Basically the main antagonist of the show, Belson practically steals from many of the other companies and attempts to undermine their innovative products in order to elevate his own company's status (typical capitalist competition, always out for yourself). I'm actually not sure where the "succession" takes place here since the TV show is not something I'm willing to watch and no website has provided the information I required. Go see what you can find for yourselves scholars! Happy searching!

- **Google:** Ah here's an interesting link with the previous name, apparently Gavin Belson was made to mirror the joint characteristics of Google CEO Larry Page, Larry Ellison and Marc Benioff (all of them apparently megalomaniacs when it comes to business management). Larry Page is no doubt someone you've probably heard of before when it comes to the titan of a tech company that has come to practically dominate every aspect of our waking lives (even our sleeping life too!). Larry was the cofounder of Google alongside Sergey Brin (whom hardly anyone has ever heard of) in 1998, the two creating a search-engine algorithm which wouldn't place parties which had paid extra money towards the top. Initially called BackRub (yep, good thing that name was dropped). Page became CEO of Google but by 2001 there was something that bugged (get the pun?) him about the company. The management layer of Google was something new to the company in 1999, a concept which basically meant that now there were executives separating Larry and Sergey from their "normal" engineer subordinates. Since Google back then only hired the most talented of engineers (and why wouldn't you? Tech was hard to handle back then), Larry felt as if though this new layer wasn't required at all. His idea was simple: fire all the project managers and have all the engineers report to one person who would then report to Page. This plan, surprisingly, didn't go well (you can probably hear the sarcasm in my voice there) and Page was forced by pressure to hand over the CEO position to Eric Schmidt, a former CEO of Novell (yet another tech company that specialised in networking software). After 10 years of "parental supervision" as Larry and Sergey called it, Schmidt relinquished his CEO position back to Larry as he felt the young pioneer had matured enough to responsibly oversee the now gigantic company (in those 10 years it had snapped up Youtube and Android while also releasing its browser). Page stepped back down in 2015 after creating the parent company Alphabet (which he became CEO of by default) to help oversee Google's massive economic and employment situation.
- **Yahoo:** Please go ahead and do this on your own scholars, all the information I can provide is that Jerry Yang is very closely tied to both Yahoo! and Alibaba.
- **Bulgaria - Simeon Saxe-Coburg-Gotha | Chile - Michelle Bachelet & Sebastián Piñera**

- **Bulgaria:** FINALLY, AN ACTUAL BLASTED COUNTRY THAT I CAN TALK ABOUT. NO MORE ANNOYING READS ABOUT IPOS, EXECUTIVE RESHUFFLES AND TERRIBLE BUSINESS LINGO I WILL NEVER USE IN MY LIFE.

- *Throat clearing noises*, as you can see scholars, I'm not one for the world of economics and business (at least not one for a capitalist market view!). So let's get straight into it then. Bulgaria is an Eastern European country with a rich history of having several foreign powers rule over it (to some degree or another). It was once a province of the Ottoman Empire, later on becoming a member of the Soviet Bloc during the Cold War (even more reason for me to be excited!). So what's Simeon Saxe-Coburg Gotha got to do with all of this? For that, we need to travel back to the 1940s, with Bulgaria having just emerged from the carnage of the Second World War. Prior to 1946, Bulgaria had been ruled by a monarchy (that's right!), the people were governed by a single Tsar (yes just like the Russian word because it came from the same alphabet). Simeon Saxe-Coburg Gotha (interestingly that was the formal last name of the British House of Windsor's members until WW1, when it became Windsor after being deemed "too German"), was born into this period, having been baptised just two years before the war broke out (1937 for those non-historically invested among us). After his father's death in 1943, young Simeon ascended the throne. However because he was only six years old, a regency consisting of his uncle Prince Kyril, Prime Minister Bogdan Filov and Army Lieutenant General Nikola Mikhov ruled until he was ready. That time never came however, because after the 1946 Bulgarian Referendum, in which the people voted by a sweeping majority to become a Republic (basically to allow greater public control of the government), the monarchy was deposed (coincidentally enough the Soviet Red Army just happened to be in the area when this referendum was going on, a total coincidence with no relation at all). On September 16th, the family was exiled and Simeon (now retired to Simeon II) fled with his family to Alexandria, Egypt where he completed college (in the middle of a World War, perfect timing). It wasn't until July of 1951 that Francisco Franco's Spanish government gave asylum to the family and they moved there. Simeon would return to his country some 39 years later, after the fall of communism (a sentence I also never wish to type ever again) allowed him to re-enter the country he had fled as a young boy. Fifty years after the monarchy had been abolished (1996), Simeon returned to Bulgaria and formed his own political party 5 years later (named the "National Movement Simeon II", not exactly the most modest of names but it was later renamed the "National Movement for Stability and Progress"). With this political body now behind him, Simeon would

be granted the Prime Ministership of his beloved homelands after winning a majority in the 2001 elections. Under his leadership, long overdue in the country, Bulgaria would join NATO and begin to rise out of the recent economic crisis, with ministerial positions now being given to qualified persons rather than those with influence on the government (hey an actually decent monarch/Tsar, too bad Nicholas II wasn't like that).

- **Chile:** Ah Chile, we've actually just visited the country on these notes with the overthrow of Allende and the CIA-backed rise of Augusto Pinochet (which turned out to be a brilliant (sarcastic) move on their part). Rather amusingly, the two people that we're going to cover now actually succeeded each other and have both served (or in the case of Pinera, are serving) 2 terms as Chilean President. So let's begin on this rather amusing case:

- Michelle Bachelet and Sebastian Pinera both actually ran in the same elections ever since 2005. In that election, Bachelet represented the center-left Socialist Coalition of Parties for Democracy whilst Pinera represented the center-right National Renewal Party (guess which one I would've voted for). In the election, Bachelet edged ahead with 53.5% of the vote, becoming the first female president in Chile's history (a milestone, especially considering it was so early on in the new democratic period!). In the 2010 elections, it was Pinera who led the popularity and later election polls, winning over the populace with his center-right ideals, something the country had not experienced for almost 20 years (he was the first right-wing leader since 1958). Bachelet then won again in the 2014 elections, with Pinera once again cycling back in 2018 (he is the current President of Chile). It's rather hilarious but also rather telling to see their Wikipedia pages; especially that of Pinera, whose "succeeded by" and "preceded by" are both Bachelet.

- **"Community" - Dan Harmon | "Guardians of the Galaxy" - James Gunn**

- **"Community":** I'm not one for TV shows and I'm even less of a person for American sitcoms (with the sole exception of the amazing "The Big Bang Theory", any fellow fans out there?), so this'll be something new for both of us scholars. "Community" is a comedy television series created by Dan Harmon, it first broadcasted on NBC in 2009 and Harmon helmed the show as it's executive producer and showrunner (eyyy a 2019 curriculum flashback!) until the end of the Third season in 2012, when Harmon was fired from NBC over "creative conflicts" between him and the Sony executives (I mean the conflicts were about the creative nature of the show, not that the fights themselves were unusual or particularly artistic). After the failures of a Fourth season under the co-leadership of Moses Port and David Guarascio, Harmon was brought in to serve as showrunner next to Chris McKenna for the fifth season in 2013. After NBC cancelled the show at the end of that season the following year, Harmon announced that Yahoo! would be screening the sixth and final season in 2015. I

highly recommend reading further at [this link](#) for the specific reasons why his return was necessary and welcomed by the “Community” (hilarious aren’t I?)

- **“Guardians of the Galaxy”:** Oh finally a piece of media that I’ve actually watched before (I’m nowhere near as large a fan as Xavier is, but I do enjoy the Marvel Cinematic Universe a fair bit). Guardians of the Galaxy originally released in 2014 and its sequel, Guardians of the Galaxy 2 (how creative) released in 2017. Both were directed and produced by James Gunn and both were critically acclaimed and beloved by fans as a more light-hearted yet “rough-and-rumble” gang twist on the usual earth-bound Avengers movies. However, in July of 2018 Gunn was fired from directing the planned “Guardians of the Galaxy 3” movie after it was revealed that he had tweeted seriously offensive jokes about topics such as pedophilia, rape and child abuse prior to getting the job directing the first Guardians movie (a stark reminder that you should always beware of your online footprint, it can come back to haunt you). Gunn accepted his dismissal and both Disney along with Sony took steps to reduce their associations with him. However, very very recently (and I mean March 2019 recently), Gunn was reinstated back as the director of Guardians of the Galaxy 3 after a series of meetings with Alan Horn in which he expressed his apologies and regret for those tweets. Rumour has it Disney was also under pressure from the now-legendary “Guardians” cast themselves, most notable among them was Dave Bautista you know, the “stay-invisible-by-staying-still-for-a-really-long-time” Drax actor; who stated that he might not want to work for Disney without the creative talents of Gunn in the leadership role. So now at least Marvel fans will be greeted by his usual firebrand and unorthodox film visions when the next Guardians of the Galaxy movie rolls out.
- **Lakers – Phil Jackson | Real Madrid - Zinedine Zidane**
 - **Lakers:** Why is it always sports that I’ve got to go back to at some point or another? Ah well it’s only two players so let’s get this over with. For those of you who actually follow news about the NBA (I both applaud and respect you), Phil Jackson might be a familiar figure to you lot. Despite having begun his career as a power forward for the New York Knicks and New Jersey Knits (they sound ridiculously similar but all right), Jackson quickly rose to fame as a coach for the Chicago Bulls and later the Los Angeles Lakers (1999-2004 and again 2005-2011). After leaving the Lakers first in June 2004 due to losses in the NBA Finals and debacles with individual players (I’m not even going to try and list all of them so go research those intricacies yourself), Jackson was asked to return just a year later after his successor, Rudy Tomjavanich, resigned due to health issues after just 41 games. He would lead the team to victories and losses, culminating in his final stint during the 2010-11 season. Under his coaching, the team won 5 NBA championships, while Jackson himself continues to hold the record of most combined championships won (both as a player and a coach, 13 throughout his career).

- **Real Madrid:** I'm fairly certain I've heard this name mentioned several times amongst my more athletically-aware peers but it's still a nice rabbit hole to quickly jump into for WSC. Actually hang on I've got no idea about this guy and what on Earth he's got to do with succession. Scholars I'm sure this sport is more familiar to those among you who actually either watch it or play it, so that's a starting point for you to research on your own.
- **Entire political systems have sometimes been brought back into power—for instance, the English monarchy in 1660, the New Republic post-Endor, and the Bourbon monarchy in France. Discuss with your team: what motivates people to welcome back such institutions—is it familiarity? Do the restorations tend to succeed? Be sure to keep an eye on the headlines for similar re-successions unfolding in our world today.**
 - Often the motivation for these reintroductions of entire political systems is, as the WSC staff have suggested, familiarity. There was nothing wrong with the old system and the people were used to it, so why go through all the trouble of introducing something completely radical and new with no guarantee that it'll work at all? The restorations do often tend to succeed. The English monarchy has managed to exist alongside it's Parliament ever since Charles II returned to the British throne in 1660 from exile; the New Republic (yes a Star Wars reference!) managed to stabilise the galaxy and ease the wounds of the tyrannical Galactic Empire that came before it whilst also safeguarding it from external threats such as the Yuuzhan Vong invasion. The Bourbon Dynasty in France admittedly did not succeed to that degree at all (you had one job France, one!). Re-successions aren't as common in the world right now as most nations haven't undergone the same sort of transformation (read: outright civil war or anarchy) that existed in the past. The only major recent re-succession of sorts was the fall of the Soviet Union (I never wish to type those words again) and the rise of the Russian Federation, which reintroduced the once-attempted democratic Duma-style of government.

Concluding Questions

- **Sometimes, one country interferes with the process of succession in another. In 2016, Russia attempted to influence the results of the American presidential election; in 1953, the United States and the United Kingdom backed an effort to replace the leader of Iran; the Soviet Union installed its own preferred government in Czechoslovakia after the 1968 Prague Spring. Discuss with your team: is it ever appropriate for a country to get involved in another country's choice of leader?**
 - It's never appropriate for countries to get involved in another country's choice of leader. I will note right now that the United States has intervened in more elections and overthrowing of leaders around the world than any other country in history (yeah sure you're the guardian of freedom and democracy America). The right to choose a country's own leadership is a key cornerstone of the concept of sovereignty (the authority of a state to govern itself) and the infringement of that right by other countries, in whatever capacity, can be considered a breach of sovereignty (tantamount to an act of war in some historical cases!).

- **Who should be responsible for succession planning? Should it generally be the role of a leader to search for a future replacement—and does this answer vary across different types of organizations, from governments to sports franchises?**

- I thought we already answered the majority of these questions up above in terms of what's going on in the world right now (and I'll add it appears to be working quite well). Simply summarised, as of now succession planning first rests upon the current "sitting" leader who picks out candidates as per a combination of personal preference and guidelines put in place for such procedures. Then those successors are placed in front of a board of executives in order to assess their potential for success once the current leader is gone. Based on the leadership style employed by the current CEO and/or the criteria of the evaluating board, either a single person or two in particular will be selected for the successor position.

In governments obviously this differs wildly based on the notion that democracies are entirely within the control of the people. You don't see American presidents telling the Congress to swear in their sons and neither do you see the British or Japanese monarchs picking some qualified random person off the street to be the next ruler (though the idea of old Queen Elizabeth II going out of Buckingham Palace to interview strangers for their "Royal compatibility" is rather amusing).

- **Is it a good idea for someone to "groom" an appointed replacement? Consider the steps outlined [here](#). Discuss with your team: would you follow them, and do they apply outside the workplace? Along the same lines, Apple CEO Tim Cook has said, "I see my role as CEO to prepare as many people as I can to be CEO." Is this good advice for all leaders, or are there times when the best decision is to have fewer potential successors around?**

- Please see the article yourself (I'm writing this as its late at night and have school tomorrow, my tether is almost at its end, especially for long links).

- **In many ancient regimes, years were numbered based upon dynasties; thus, the emergence of a new dynasty would very literally mean the start of a new historical era. How much would such a succession-based calendar influence people's understanding of time and authority?**

- Ah yes this is something rather interesting. Whilst not as popular in Europe since the end of the Middle Ages, the most well-known example of this type of "era dating" occurred in England, with the Stuart, Edwardian and Victorian eras all coming to signify a "new age" for the country's leadership based on who had succeeded the previous holder of the position. In Ancient China this was much more common, as the huge amount of dynasties were often considered their own historical eras outright rather than continuations of the entire Chinese royal line. A succession-based calendar would likely influence people's understanding of time and authority by having them associate that time with the authorities (if that makes any sense). In essence then, people would come to associate the "high" and "low" years of a successive period with the current leadership rather than viewing it as a normal cycle of the entire leadership.

- **Can more abstract concepts or even products experience succession? For instance, can one city succeed another (i.e., as a hub for immigration)? How about space exploration programs (i.e., Apollo vs. Mercury), languages, World Scholar's Cup themes, or iPhone models? Discuss with your team: when is the term "succeed" more appropriate than "replace" or "follow"?**
 - It is entirely possible for abstract concepts and products to experience succession. America succeeded its former colonial master Britain as the hub of capitalism, whilst fuel-efficient twin-engine planes like the Boeing 737 or Airbus A350 have become successors to the giant workhorses of the aviation industry; the Boeing 747 and Airbus A380 (yes I'm a bit of a plane geek/nerd too). Since I don't have a team this WSC season (cries silently), the term succeed is generally (or at least as is the norm) more commonly appropriate when referring to an actual position of some sort rather than a concept or an object. Replace is often used when something is material and "follow" is rarely used nowadays except when describing who came before and who will come after.
- **The Commonwealth recently [announced](#) that Prince Charles would succeed his mother as its leader. Discuss with your team: what is the significance of this succession, and are there any problems with the process that led to his selection?**
 - Ah the Commonwealth, all that remains of an Empire which once spanned a quarter of the world's surface area and ruled over almost a fifth of all persons living at the time. Interestingly, though Prince Charles as the hereditary heir to the British Monarchy is guaranteed to succeed his mother (assuming she actually dies before he does, remember all those "dead queen" memes?) it doesn't guarantee him the position of succeeding her as Head of the Commonwealth. I certainly don't think there were any problems with the process that led to his selection, as the Commonwealth is more of a unified "ceremonial" organisation rather than an active military alliance or political conglomerate of some sort like NATO or the old Warsaw Pact. The significance of this decision obviously is that the queen is actually bypassing her own husband, Prince Phillip, in favour of maintaining the British line of succession (as Prince Phillip was an "outsider" who married into the Royal Family).
- **Has the rise of social media made it easier or harder for new leaders to assume power? How about the existence of the Internet more broadly? Discuss with your team: are your answers to these questions the same across politics, business, and other types of organizations?**
 - The rise of social media has certainly had its ups and downs for successors and their path to power. For a start, social media and the internet as a whole has made it a lot more accessible for individuals and corporations alike to start either looking for a successor or applying to become one (remember not so long ago people had to physically advertise their vacancies in newspapers of all things!). Yet often times the evaluations of these new candidates will involve scrutinising their online presence and background (information which the web has made perhaps a tad too public in some cases). Then of course once the new leader is in power the web is filled with reaction articles, all the

way from reputed business/political/organisational headlines to private discussions among company employees. In some cases it can even be the internet's reaction to a new leader's time that will decide how long they stay in power or if they are even forced to leave due to their negative profiling having an impact on the company. Now obviously those types of impacts aren't quite as common on say the national level (though mind you the public backlash against leaders like Mr. Trump and Boris Johnson have certainly played their part in influencing the national mood).

- **Consider [this advice](#) for those succeeding charismatic, popular leaders. Discuss with your team: do you find it compelling? And, is it really a bad idea for a new leader to try to emulate the old one's methods and personality—or does focusing on creating a unique new identity pose its own risks? Would any of this advice apply outside the world of business?**
 - I certainly think that the advice that the video suggests (yes I'm not going to detail them, it's literally just a two minute video scholars) is plausible and even effective for a successor succeeding a legendary or revolutionary leader before them. As for emulating the old leader's methods and personality, that depends on the situation. If perhaps your company employees are used to the old leader's usual distinct style of leadership or their methods, then perhaps trying something new right away isn't the best thing to do until after they've come to slowly transition to their new leader (remember, as a successor you're not the only one who has to adjust to the position, everyone else has to adjust to you being the one in charge now). All of this advice does apply to arenas beyond the business world as well and might even be handy in succeeding the previous WSC Club leader in your case!
- **Are there times when someone would want to keep a succession a secret?**
 - Perhaps there are times when successions should be kept a secret, especially when the thick of the circumstance (if you will, that's another made-up "Avanism") demands it. By that I generally mean situations where the loss of the leader will directly influence the outcome of an event for the worse. One common example is if a major military leader falls in the heat of battle and their death must remain masked from their troops lest the demoralisation affect the tide of battle (and possibly the war!). A famous example of this was the death of Admiral Horatio Nelson (one of my personal military heros) during the Battle of Trafalgar, when he was shot by a French musketeer and died before the battle's conclusion, his death was kept secret from the entire fleet until they had triumphed over the Spanish and French forces and had returned to British shores.
- **In the United States, whenever the entire Congress gathers for a presidential speech, one Cabinet member is always designated to remain a safe distance away, so that he or she can succeed to the presidency if everyone at the speech is killed. Discuss with your team: should the public have some input into the choice of "designated survivor"? What is the line of emergency succession in your own country? And, should the World Scholar's Cup have a designated survivor when the entire staff gathers for a Global Round?**
 - The public probably should have some degree of input into the choice of designated survivor, seeing as that person will then become the leader right away (skipping the previous 17 positions required to even be in line for presidential succession) and the

entire apparatus of governance will have been decimated. That'd be a great plot for a book by the way if an evil genius first targeted the designated survivor and then took out the entire Congress (am I a bit on the dark side? You choose scholars!). In terms of the Thai line of succession (even though I am Indonesian, I'll just mention the country I represent(ed) in the WSC), the king is given the chance to choose their heir; usually the oldest male heir available (but the rule has no mention of restrictions against a female heir). However, the king is also capable of removing their heir from that title and replacing them with another person (also once the heir has been selected no-one except the king can dispute it).

The World Scholar's Cup having a designated survivor staff member will hopefully be a consideration that never needs to be taken seriously, seeing as the likelihood of the entire staff (volunteers included!) will perish or be incapacitated at a Global Round (at regionals yes perhaps individual members, but not all of them surely!). I don't know why any human would ever dare consider the Global Rounds a "legitimate target" for some sort of strike.

- **Within hours of the death of Iranian general Qassem Soleimani, his former lieutenant Esmail Ghaani had been named his successor. Discuss with your team: how important is it that prominent lost leaders be replaced as soon as possible?**
 - It is of the utmost importance (and in the case of Donald Trump, probably of the utmost joy for me) that lost leaders be replaced as soon as possible. The vacancy of an executive position can lead to consequences that might undermine or even nullify the rest of the leadership's ability to function and manage a body properly. Hence why many nations around the world have (as we've looked into several times on this page alone) backup protocols in the case that their leader is lost.
- **Is there a teacher in charge of the World Scholar's Cup at your school? If so, imagine that he or she suddenly left. Discuss with your team: who would you want to have succeed them? Should there be a formal process for identifying this successor, and, if so, who should be involved in the decision?**
 - When I was actually a scholar at NIST (ah the good old days), Khun Mick (or as he was known to the WSC staff Mr. Mick) was the teacher in charge of the World Scholar's Cup. It should be noted that he has already been succeeded as leader of the extra-curricular activity (our version of after school clubs) and that leader is none other than the person who initially founded this website (surprise surprise). I think I'm doing a fairly good job in filling Khun Mick's role, though the process of identification was more of me volunteering to do so rather than him asking me too (though he did later reveal that I would've been his first candidate for succession, so an honour it was indeed).

Written by: Avan Fata, Xavier Dickason, Chi Thùy Hoàng

Proofread by: Avan Fata and Xavier Dickason