

historical events and deeprooted social forces. It is impossible to stage-manage. You can't 'do' 1688–89 anywhere except in Britain in 1688–89, and even then the leading actors were hardly in control of what they were doing. It was a complex, haphazard, fractious process. Stable political outcomes are too dependent on conditional political choices to be readily translatable from one setting to another. Context trumps everything. The crucial feature of inclusivity is that it is *internal* to the state in question: the various actors come to see their choices as framed by the choices of other members of the state.

Attempting to impose inclusivity on states from the outside won't work. It would mean treating inclusive politics as though it were extractive: i.e., as an outcome you can force on people. Extractive politics, by contrast, can be imposed from the outside, because it is by definition a kind of imposition. Bad politics translates from one place to another much more readily than good politics. It only requires ruthlessness. Tolstoy says at the beginning of *Anna Karenina* that all happy families are alike, whereas every unhappy family is unhappy in its own particular way. In politics it's the other way round. Unhappy states are relatively alike: they are all places where the same sorts of exploitative behaviour recur. Happy states have to learn how to be happy in their own particular way.

There is another big difficulty with thinking that inclusivity is the solution to the problem of political failure. Inclusive states are also extractive. They take advantage of their relative stability and prosperity to exploit nations less fortunate than themselves. States

exist in competition with other states and often ensnare them in lasting relations of exploitation and domination. Parsimonious theories of politics tend to ignore this. (It is one of the gaps in Hobbes's account that he neglects the role of economic competition between states, preferring to think of stable states as economically self-sufficient.) The 1688 revolution in Britain set this country on the path to democracy, but it also set many other countries around the world on the path to domination by Britain. The move by Britain towards stable parliamentary government before anyone else produced, among other things, the British Empire, which was a highly extractive regime, whatever its current defenders may say. The British did not take turns with their colonies.



The hideous treatment of the Congo in the late nineteenth century – one of the worst examples of extractive politics in all history – was also undertaken by an inclusive state. Late nineteenth-century