

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.63332/joph.v5i6.2453>

## Tribe and State: Paradigms of Progress and Development

Mohammed Shunnaq<sup>1</sup>, Ricardo Sanmartin Arce<sup>2</sup>, Juan Ignacio Castien Maestro<sup>3</sup>

### Abstract

*In the Middle East, the relationship between tribes and the states has been long and complex, including the tribal system in many states, Jordan included. The modernization efforts of the state had impacted tribal traditions but continued to influence and even determine political loyalties and the social identity of the citizens. Jordan's political and social framework is constituted mainly by tribes. Historically, tribal leaders were very important in Jordan's system of governance, and today, more than ever, are quite integrated into modern Jordanian politics. The study aims to examine Jordan's political evolution through the tribal heritage that exists within its constitutional monarchy and democratic system. The study uses qualitative analysis of historical and contemporary material, such as sources of information on tribal governance and political influence in Jordan. Results indicate that even with modernization, tribes have a strong influence on the political process in Jordan and are a continuing force in governance. In conclusion, the integration of tribal customs into the modern Jordanian state has occurred. However, the on-going interaction between state and tribal organizations is central to the political stability and identity of Jordan.*

**Keywords:** Tribe, State, Jordan, Sub Identity, Bedouins, and Development.

### Introduction

since the rise of the first pristine states in the Middle East around 3000 BCE, the contrast between settled, agrarian societies and nomadic, non-state communities has been the enduring, defining characteristic of human civilization. Grain production for the maintenance of military forces and administrative structures was agrarian states, whereas the communities outside the sedentary zones survived by means of nomadic pastoralism, foraging, and subsistence horticulture. As such, largely benefiting from the territory and natural resources of Indigenous peoples available to non-state groups to exploit, these non-state groups organized themselves into tribes as the fundamental unit of political and social life in order to resist the expansionist tendencies of states that sought to enslave them or seize their resources. Over time, as states grew economically (or militarily) powerful enough, these tribal systems became challenged (or eclipsed) by the growing power of centralized states.

Tribes are historically and contemporarily comprised of families related by descent or a claim of common origin and have been cohesive social units structured as such. In terms of a sheik or tribal leader, the tribes operated according to a culture of rules in an informal status, and they relied upon leadership hierarchies to coordinate defense, besides other interactions with outside groups. The solidarity and coordination enabled these structures to work well in order to survive in hostile environments in tribal groups. On the other hand, the state is a legal-rational type of

---

<sup>1</sup> Yarmouk University, Email: [mshunnaq@yu.edu.jo](mailto:mshunnaq@yu.edu.jo), (Corresponding Author)

<sup>2</sup> Royal Academy, Madrid

<sup>3</sup> Universidad Complutense de Madrid



government with bureaucracy, legal and institutional frameworks, authoritative power, and a hierarchical structure governing control over the army and police force. Over the years, the centralized state has been considered the dominant model of political organization for modern society.

Although historically, there had been issues between these two forms of organization, their relationship to each other had often been complicated and intertwined—indeed, tribes and states could even be found overlapping and coexisting. The decline of tribal autonomy with the appearance of centralized states was normally a consequence of the emerging status. However, in many societies, like North Africa and the Middle East, tribes have never ceased to be valuable. These systems of tribalism have not only survived but have been able to adapt and survive coexisting along side with these modern state structures. In some ways tribes have become integrated into state systems, including holding true to traditional roles within rural communities and influential political actors in modern governments.

This dynamic is especially relevant in Jordan, which is an especially compelling case in point. The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, inaugurated in the early 20th century, assimilated tribal traditions into its national identity and multi functionality. Unlike some other states which either marginalized or suppressed tribes, Jordan built such a model where tribal affiliations are key components for its political and social fabric . The integration of this society has kept Jordan in social stability while utilizing tribal networks to obtain political legitimacy. The Jordanian case is suggestive of a more general dialectic between tribes and states and of different ways in which traditional and modern systems can coexist and evolve.

This article discusses the history of the theory of tribe-state dynamics in the Middle Eastern context and Jordan as a case study. Through the use of the methodologies of sociology and anthropology and Ibn Khaldun's idea of 'aşabiyya—tribal solidarity—it draws attention to the enduring relevance of tribes for the founding of state structures and their governance. It further analyses the effect of urbanization, modernization, and globalization on these relationships and links between historical legacies and current realities. Therefore, the study aims to examine Jordan's political evolution through the tribal heritage that exists within its constitutional monarchy and democratic system.

## **Methodology**

This study uses a socio-anthropological analysis and a historical comparative methodology to explore the dichotomy between tribes and states in the Middle East and North Africa through a case study on Jordan. This research adopts a historical approach through the development of tribal structures and their relation to state formation from pre-modern to contemporary periods. Tribal-state dynamics are compared across societies, and how kinship-based affiliations have mutated into centralized governance is analyzed using a comparative framework. The study draws on sociological and anthropological theories, using the studies of Ibn Khaldun, Max Weber, and Ernest Gellner particularly, drawing upon such core concepts as "aşabiyya" (tribal solidarity), kinship networks, institutionalization, and national identity. Additionally, the study also brings an interdisciplinary perspective that combines political science, history, and cultural studies to offer a comprehensive account of the changing tribe-state relationship. The study is based on secondary data, such as historical records, scholarly literature, and theoretical models, and therefore, it has a firm theoretical base for understanding the complexities of tribal integration into the modern state.

## **Tribe and State in Middle Eastern and North African Societies: The Case of Jordan**

### **Tribes and States. Revisiting an old problem**

The tribe-state dichotomy has been a central theme in the history of the social sciences, tracing its roots to the European Enlightenment period. Pioneers of the Enlightenment laid the groundwork for understanding the evolution of human societies, with social evolutionist theories emerging in the 19th century to describe the transformation from "primitive" tribal systems to state-based governance. Lewis Henry Morgan (1881) introduced a temporal sequence that illustrated this transition. His ideas were later adopted and expanded upon by Engels in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*. This transformation is fundamentally marked by the replacement of kinship-based social bonds—whether real or fictive—with relationships mediated through state apparatuses. Such systems often became independent of familial or kin relationships, forming the basis of societies with greater complexity and internal integration. Nonetheless, Graebner and Wengrow (2024) in *The Dawn of Everything: A New History of Humanity*, argue against the linear evolutionist viewpoint that societies naturally evolved from tribe organization to an advanced state. They contend that the interplay between kinship systems and state structures has always been multifaceted, with kinship networks often coexisting with state institutions instead of being entirely supplanted by them. This goes against the oversimplified story that tribal systems are 'backward' and state structures are a more sophisticated form of social organization.

This theoretical framework has influenced numerous investigations into sociopolitical transitions across various societies and historical periods. For instance, British functionalist anthropologists applied this model to study traditional African political systems, while Marxist scholars analyzed the emergence of early civilizations in the Old World. The analysis of tribal kingdoms, such as those of the Germans and Huns, also demonstrated the relevance of these ideas. Wittfogel (1959) and Service (1977) emphasized the role of social classes in state-building, asserting that this transition was closely linked to the rise of centralized governance structures.

However, like all theoretical dichotomies, this model has faced criticism. Its overly generic and teleological assumptions imply that the modern state is the ultimate endpoint of societal evolution, an idea critiqued for its ethnocentrism. Despite these limitations, the classic model remains a valuable starting point for sociohistorical research. While the establishment of states appears to have occurred across diverse regions and periods, the processes are neither universal nor linear. Certain tribal societies exhibit internal tendencies toward state formation under specific conditions, challenging the assumption of a unilinear trajectory. Importantly, statehood should not be seen as inherently "superior" in terms of human values, especially considering the domination and exploitation often associated with its emergence.

The implications of this model are explored in specific societies to demonstrate the complex and evolving realities of the tribe-state relationship. For example, the coexistence between tribal systems and state structures in Muslim societies in the Middle East and North Africa is well documented. Kinship-based organizations like clans and tribes have not disappeared with the rise of powerful and centralized states in pre-modern times. However, these entities instead formed a complex coexistence. It brought about contradictions in the relations of modern states, often founded on the Western governance model. Kemalist Turkey and Pahlavi Iran viewed states that suppressed tribes by force in some contexts. In other cases, like Yemen and Afghanistan, state violence was less markedly violent. In other cases, a symbiotic relationship

was formed between tribal and state institutions, such as in Saudi Arabia.

This article seeks to study the dialectic between tribes and states in the Middle East and North Africa, chiefly in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. Jordan is severely underdeveloped and was founded slightly over a century ago, as its Bedouin tribes provided essential support during its formative years. Although these tribes have been influential in Jordanian state structures, they have been keeping traditional tribal ethos and have been contributing to the formation of social networks in a wide diversity of fields, including politics). This study offers important insights into the dynamics of the tribal relationship with states in the region, more generally, especially the role of tribal systems in political modernization and democratic development.

The article will first conceptualize terms such as 'kinship,' 'tribe,' and 'state' to fully analyze this phenomenon. It will then present a historical overview of the dialectic relationship between tribality and states in the Middle East and North Africa. The case study of Jordan will focus on this unique approach to integrating tribal systems into state governance.

### **Specifying the Nature of State-Building**

The classic evolutionist model of societal transformation is the gradual replacement of kinship-based social bonds by relationships mediated through a centralized state apparatus. But this substitution is hardly ever complete; redefined relations of kinship, with the former kinship ties surviving as it were, are usually found. Typically, these restructured bonds govern narrower social functions like marriage, inheritance, and day-to-day sociability by organizing domestic groups for biological and social reproduction. As time goes by, traditional affiliations slowly erode, and kinship groups grow larger, like clans and tribes, until the state uses up its roles and they fail away. This procedure is an inflection point between a system of governance that is according to kinship norms and another formed by codified rules and bureaucratic institutions. This is supported by ethnographic evidence in that, for instance, in the Gulf Arab states, kinship networks continue to be important in distributing power and resources and in effecting political alliances and economic opportunities. The same is true in Somali clans, where customary legal systems such as the xeer are parallel governance mechanisms alongside state structures. Indeed, the Bedouins of Jordan continue to use tribal-based dispute resolution mechanisms that operate side by side with state-founded judiciary systems to show how kinship structures remain robust despite modernization efforts. These are instances of the gradual replacement of kinship rule by state-mediated relationships, which is neither inevitable nor inevitable, but rather a historical and socio-political process of complex and dynamic character.

During the process of state formation, the state increasingly takes over life spheres that associate the large social unit with production planning, trade, military service, and law enforcement. Normally, this transition is the replacement of informal norms and customs with written laws enforced by courts, registries, prisons, and government organizations. For example, the tribal customary law (urf) in Jordan had traditionally settled, in the absence of state intervention, conflict resolutions such as land ownership and social responsibilities with tribal leaders (sheikhs), mediating the conflicts with the strategy of reconciliation and compensation instead. Before modernization, theft or homicide crimes could sometimes be resolved by the blood feuds or diya (blood money) payments, while now these cases are within the jurisdiction of state codified laws and formal judicial institutions. Kinship-based bonds differ from state-mediated relationships in nature and scope. To maintain Kinship bonds, they are direct and personal, usually mediated by ancestry or descent from common ancestors. These relationships create networks of support and reciprocal obligations from which mediated communities are sustained

locally. Instead, state-mediated relationships are much more abstract, offering the ability to interact with large communities while loosening the reliance on individual connections. This change in Jordan's governance by an increasingly reliance on social welfare programs, formal legal systems, and national policy all of which have largely replaced traditional tribal sources of support and conflict resolution, as a manifestation of an ongoing clash between customary practices and State authority . For instance, while a nomadic pastoralist tribe may rely on kin to provide care for livestock in times of need, in the case of a state-based system, people use institutions to access resources or services rather than personal relationships.

This distinction reinforces the complexity of the integration of society in the processes of state-building. State systems, by contrast, are linked to participation in broader political, economic, and social activities, while kinship bonds give immediate and localized support. Further, this dynamic is also present with regard to religious affiliations. Often, universal religions create bureaucratic structures similar to states so that people can have individuals they share in a belief without kinship ties. Yet, in order for full consolidation to be attained, a state must establish relations with its citizens directly, helping them through their needs and concerns directly, without intermediating. Thus, this history differs from the pre-modern states, which relied on intermediaries — feudal lords, guilds, or religious authorities — to govern. Accordingly, pre-modern states were less consolidated statehood with weaker institutional structures and more indirect relationships with their subjects.

The institutional sphere of modern states is highly diverse in its level of institutionalization, which guarantees the state's autonomy from the society it governs. Institutionalization refers to the separation of roles within state institutions from the people who hold them. The separation produced a barrier that serves to isolate governance processes from external personal relations, thereby empowering the state with the capacity for impartial and efficient governance. In contrast, many pre-modern states blurred the distinction between institutional and social roles and consequently adopted personalized governance models. Such systems meant access to state institutions through clientelistic or kinship affiliation, and governance relied on personal relations with a particular official or tribal leader.

Full state building requires that state institutions are dissociated from personalized relationships, which allows the state to become an autonomous entity. This process turns pre-modern states, which combine features of acephalous societies like Nuer in Southern Sudan, into more consolidated modern states. The degree to which a society has achieved modern statehood can be assessed using several criteria: considers the boundaries set by the state as to the degree to which it regulates various social activities, the measure of direct interaction between individuals and state institutions, the extent to which national identity is incorporated within statehood projects, and the degree to which institutionalization occurs within the state apparatus.

In this process, institutionalization is a crucial part of it as it makes the state capable of independent social relationships. Modern states separate institutional roles from the people who hold those roles in order to ensure that rules of governance are impartial and effective. The contemporary state innovation of separation is distinct from all other pre-modern systems that rest on personalized networks and personalized relationships to govern. Ultimately, the transition from kinship-based affiliations to state-mediated relationships reflects a complex interplay between tradition and modernization. This illustrates the diverse pathways societies take in their political and social development.

## **Tribes, Clans, and States in the Middle East and North Africa: A Complex Historical Dialectical Interplay**

The conceptual elaboration developed in the preceding sections is instrumental in analyzing the intricate interplay between states and kinship groups in the Middle East and North Africa. As outlined earlier, the history of this region reflects a limited and uneven state-building process. Ayubi (1996) characterizes many states in the area as "fierce," with their intense reliance on repression, yet "weak," due to their inability to continuously and effectively shape the societies they govern. In this context, not only kinship networks but also those based on ethnicity, regionalism, and religion persist as significant societal structures. The widespread influence of clientelism further compounds this persistence. As a result, narrowly constructed national identities often compete with or are questioned by segments of the population, leading to the prominence of sub-national identities that challenge national cohesion.

The functioning of state institutions in the region is often mediated by informal personal relationships rooted in communal and clientelistic networks. This dynamic undermines the formal laws and regulations that define modern bureaucracies, increasing the susceptibility of state institutions to non-state actors' influence. These informal norms and interactions frequently take precedence over formal legal frameworks, creating significant institutional fluidity. Against the backdrop of the criteria established to evaluate statehood, this institutional fragility significantly undermines the level of statehood in many MENA states.

### **External and Ideological Constraints on State-Building**

The relative weakness of states in the MENA region can be attributed to external and ideological factors. Externally, many states occupy a peripheral position in the global economic and political system, which disrupts the integration of their resources and agencies. Ideologically, traditional interpretations of Islam have often viewed modern nation-states as illegitimate, advocating instead for a pan-Islamic umma. However, this ideology lacks a clear blueprint for transitioning from existing nation-states to a unified Islamic political entity. Scholars such as al-Jābirī (1992), Badie (2014), Carré (1993), and Muḥammad 'Alī (2000) have highlighted the limitations of classical Islamic political thought, which has historically offered limited theoretical elaboration on this issue. Similar constraints are evident in Islamic legal theory, which Colson (2017) critiques for its inability to address the practicalities of state governance. While a deeper exploration of these ideological challenges lies beyond the scope of this article, they remain critical to understanding the region's state-building dynamics.

### **The Enduring Influence of Kinship Groups**

The strong influence of kinship groups across the region can be explained by ecological and historical factors. The arid and mountainous geography of many areas hindered the development of advanced production systems capable of supporting complex state administrations. This ecological reality facilitated the survival of tribal and clan organizations, which exhibit extraordinary flexibility and adaptability to diverse circumstances. Tribes have demonstrated their resilience through strategies such as complex matrimonial arrangements and the absorption of foreign groups and individuals. By manipulating genealogies to "discover" new ancestral links or justify the exclusion of specific lineages, tribes maintain their cohesion and adaptability.

In regions characterized by arid climates, tribes and clans often developed militaristic and agonistic lifestyles, enabling them to resist complete incorporation into state systems. Even powerful empires, such as the Ottoman and Safavid Empires, struggled to exert full control over

their territories due to limited agricultural resources and volatile income sources. These challenges fostered instability and limited the states' ability to maintain authority, allowing tribal groups to seize and control large agricultural areas for nomadic pastoralism .

### **Tribes as State-Building Agents**

The relationship between tribes and states in the MENA region is further complicated by the role of tribes as both state-building agents and impediments to state consolidation. Many states were established or captured by coalitions of nomadic tribes united by strong corporate solidarity, or 'aşabiyya, a concept famously described by Ibn Khaldun . These states are often called dynastic states whose power and cohesion were derived from their military capacity, with the clientelistic networks that fed them. 'Aşabiyya could be reinforced by da'wa, the appeal to specific Islamic ideologies, but these appeals often had ambivalent effects which reinforce unity as well as division amongst different groups. Consequently, pre-modern states often lacked a unified political community or "proto-national" identity on which to build stable governance.

The decline of dynastic 'aşabiyya and the weakening of state apparatuses often left rulers without mechanisms to maintain cohesion. Tribal populations, characterized by their egalitarian ethos and solidarity, resisted the authoritarian structures of the state. In response, many rulers resorted to recruiting slaves and foreigners for administrative and military roles, as these individuals lacked ties to local kinship networks . While this policy insulated the state from tribal influences, it also isolated state institutions from society, fostering tendencies toward despotic governance.

### **Tribal-State Interactions and Social Differentiation**

Interactions between tribes and states often led to social differentiation within the tribal world. Tribal elites, such as raid commanders and mercenaries, gained wealth and influence through their roles in state-related activities. This resulted in the emergence of tribal aristocracies, whose leaders were often invested with religious legitimacy as descendants of the Prophet (shurafā') or as figures within Sufi brotherhoods . Over time, these aristocrats formed alliances with state institutions, further blurring the lines between tribal and state structures. For example, the Sa'dūn family, which led the powerful Muntafiq tribal confederacy in southern Iraq, claimed Sharifian descent and used their religious legitimacy to consolidate power .

Even in some cases, tribes became state-like entities that developed private guards, systems of tribute collection, and formal judicial structures. Nevertheless, the proto-states were frequently unstable and collapsed under internal or external pressure. In other cases, tribal states achieved modern state consolidation partially or fully by conquering territory (as in the case of the emirate of Ibn Saud). Nevertheless, modern states manage stability via governance, economic development and social welfare rather than expansion. Whereas in the tribal systems, leadership is hereditary and kinship-based, in the modern state administration, officials are selected based on their merits, being appointed through competitive exams, bureaucratic procedures or democratic elections. Such leadership turnover and institutional renovation speeds also characterize modern states from kinship-based governance, which is more static and entrenched by generation . These developments helped to make state building; on the other hand, they have tended to reinforce tribal orders in a complex and ambivalent way.

### **Modernization, Tribes, and the Weakness of Statehood**

Modernization efforts in the MENA region for two centuries have been unbalanced, externally imposed, and often lacked Western influence. As a result, tribalism, clans, and religious

communalism, along with clientelism, are cohabiting with modern state structures. For Ayubi (1996), the weak institutionalization of the state in the region has led to the 'hypertrophy' of military and security agencies as an expression of the lack of a robust civil society that can prevent authoritarianism. In this situation, kinship networks have new functions: serving as conduits for political influence and social protection.

Tribal structures tend to persist and provide both issues and options for modernization. On the one hand, tribes prevent the emergence of nationally homogenous identities and encourage clientelism. On the other hand, they serve as channels for political participation and as counterbalancing authoritarian power. The subject of the duality of this continuity is the complex and contradictory dialectic between state and tribe, which inflects the political and social landscapes of MENA.'

### **What is the Tribe?**

The notion of 'tribe' has been explained and understood by the disciplines differently. According to classical lexicons such as *Lisan al-‘Arab* by Muḥammad ibn Manẓūr, a tribe is of several hierarchic descent categories ranging from the widest 'folk' (sha‘b) to the narrowest of 'clan' (‘imāra), 'sub-clan' (batn), 'lineage' (fakhidh), and even extended 'family' (faṣīla). While these terms also convey kinship, they also represent an organic unity, explaining tribes as parts of a body in such a way that they are each needed together for a holistic whole. Ibn Manẓūr groups tribes together as branches of a tree while emphasizing the tribe's hierarchical part within larger societal units. Ibn Manẓūr (1984) infers the dual nature of the tribe as both a concrete social group and an abstraction that can adapt.

In sociology, tribes are viewed as systems of social organization encompassing multiple local groups. These groups may be nomadic, relying on pastoralism or foraging, or sedentary, concentrated in villages and urban areas, even in cities, tribal identity persists, with extended families maintaining strong kinship ties and a collective sense of solidarity (‘aṣabiyya). Tribal affiliation serves as a source of identity, social cohesion, and political influence, particularly in regions like the Middle East and North Africa, where tribal traditions remain integral despite widespread urbanization .

### **Tribes as Social and Political Institutions**

Tribes historically served as key social and political units, especially before the emergence of modern nation-states. In tribal societies, kinship determines rights and responsibilities, such as protection, access to resources, and participation in communal activities. This system of shared ancestry forms the foundation of a tribe's internal structure, fostering a sense of mutual obligation among its members. Unlike nation-states, which grant rights based on birth or legal residence, tribal systems are deeply rooted in kinship bonds. Despite the rise of centralized governance, tribes continue to influence the social and political dynamics of the Middle East and North Africa .

### **Key Characteristics of Tribes**

Collective leadership, kinship and social cohesion are common features and tribal social arrangement is characterized by customary legal systems. The autocratic rather than democratic feature of their leadership is typically decentralized: authority is embodied by elders (shuyūkh), who mediate disputes and enforce norms. Kinship confers a common identity in the sense that it binds persons in relations of loyalty, of reciprocity binding them together. Customary laws and

conflict mechanisms also punctuate and reinforce social cohesion of tribes beyond states, since they complement or replace state systems. This makes tribes able to work at a resilient social unit that can sustain internal order and solidarity in different settings.

### **The Role of Tribes in Society**

Historically, tribes have created the political, social and legal shape of their regions. Tribal leaders are also politically intermediaries between local communities and governments, but use their influence to act as intermediaries to their people and wrestle with state institutions. Participation in formal governance structures (e.g. parliaments, advisory councils) is a part of this political role that actually often goes beyond. Tribes are organized around social cohesion and promote identity, which gives their members a feeling of belonging and strength as a collective. The traditional legal system still exists in tribes, as they settle disputes and manage resources in their own communities. These roles emphasize the on-going existence of tribes despite modernization and globalization.

### **Challenges Facing Tribes**

Modernization, urbanization, and globalization pose significant challenges to tribal systems. Traditional tribal ties are weakened in the course of urban migration and economic changes together with the fact that younger generations adopt individualistic values. In addition, tribal cohesion has been further disrupted by conflicts and political instability, dragging tribes in to regional conflicts as proxy for powers. This phenomenon is demonstrated well by the continuing tribal conflicts in Libya's civil war, as historically powerful tribes have been dragged into civil war on one side or the other due to their power. Often these state standards are in conflict with the tribal customs in terms of normative values of modern states. Nevertheless, despite these challenges tribes have shown extraordinary adaptability by integrating in to state structures and keeping their own social roles. For example, in Jordan, the tribal influence still persists in the legal and political spheres that combine tribal mediation practices with the formal state institutions.

### **Tribes in the Arabian Peninsula**

Some of most influential tribes of history such as Quraysh, Tayy and Judhām have formed in the Arabian Peninsula. Hierarchical leadership and tight kin relations characterize these tribes that have instilled a colonial, political and social mold of structures in the region. A defining feature of Arab tribes is tribal accountability: any member of his tribe will be made answerable for the actions of his kin. The accountability this system necessitates encourages solidarity, which allows tribes to rally very quickly, either in response to external or internal threats. Leadership hierarchies that are, such as the shuyūkh, are still important organizing and mediating roles in keeping tribal cohesion and settling disputes.

### **Adapting to Modern Challenges**

Tribes throughout the Middle East and North Africa have remained remarkably resilient in the face of pressures arising from modernization. They have been adapting by participating in formal governance structures, such as parliaments while continuing to play their traditional part in resolving conflict and leadership. Tribal leaders have found that in many instances they have become influential political actors, using the position to influence the modern state system in favour of their communities. This particular dual role underscores the way in which even the most traditional of tribes can remain relevant in the face of rapid socio-political change.

## **Evolution and Dynamics in the Middle East**

In pre-modern times, the concept of "state" (dawla) in Arabic lexicons had a distinct meaning compared to its Western counterpart. According to *Lisan al-‘Arab* by Muḥammad ibn Manzūr, the term dawla carried two primary definitions: the alternating turn of buyers and sellers in the circulation of funds, and the turn taken by combatants in the progression of a war. These meanings emphasized temporality and change, rather than permanence or stability. In classical Arabic thought, a dawla was perceived as an organism that emerged, flourished, and eventually declined—a concept markedly different from the Western idea of the state, which conveys connotations of high status and enduring stability.

### **Defining the State: Western Perspectives**

Max Weber provides a widely accepted framework for understanding the state as a social institution. According to Weber, the state holds the legitimate monopoly over the use of force and serves as a central organization tasked with unifying rules and drafting laws. The state plays a critical role in regulating societal relations across various domains. During the industrial era, the state's capabilities expanded to include control over a country's energy infrastructure, enabling it to penetrate society and enforce strategic policies deeply.

The modern nation-state (as defined in political science) is also much more than a legal entity. Institutions and organizational structures form a complex network of interactions between public and private social, economic, and political forces of a nation. The interaction has gone beyond domestic boundaries; it embodies an interdependency relationship where states and other actors are constantly influencing each other.

### **Historical Dynamics: Empires and Small States**

Historically, the Middle East has been characterized by two predominant political entities: great empires and small states. These great empires, the Ottoman and Safavid Empires, brought together many peoples and vast lands into a centralized imperial rule. A status of power usually seated in their major cities allowed them to recruit and mobilize resources against both internal and external tribal threats. These empires were famous for political stability, familiar enduring dynasties and permanent military forces.

Conversely, the Middle East's small states were limited by few resources that prevented growing of strong military and administrative capacities. Unlike the empires, these states were constantly unstable and collapsing and generally had difficulty exercising control on their territories. Fragmented political structures could not normally withstand internal and external pressures, and were often susceptible to resistance by tribal groups and external conquest. Lebanon is a modern example of this instability. It has collapsed because of endemic corruption, bad leadership and economic mismanagement. Before the compounded crises of the COVID-19 pandemic and the 2020 Beirut explosion, the country's financial system had already turned into a Ponzi scheme. Lacking a governing body, however, dysfunction has been thrust forward as much as international aid has been delayed.

### **Tribes and the State: Coexistence and Influence**

States and tribes in the Middle East have had a unique and enduring relationship. Unlike most other continents, in which tribes were subjugated or relegated to a marginal position, tribal

groups in the Middle East have frequently remained within the bounds of the state. They have tended, disproportionate to their numbers, to exert their influence upon the political and social dynamics of the region. The variety of strategies adopted by the states to manage the tribes were suppression and accommodation. Short-run political circumstances frequently determine such strategic engagement.

In most cases, tribal peoples made a significant contribution to state formation. Tribal leaders, however, often became the dynastic founders, exploiting their kinship networks and military powerbase to found ruling regimes. This phenomenon happened in particular in the pre-modern Middle East, where tribal fluidity and alliances greatly facilitated tribal participation in state-building processes. Yet tribes that maintained such coexistence were rarely seen in Western city-based civilizations as they became assimilated or eradicated, as happened at the end of the Germanic, Celtic, and Gothic tribes after the fall of Rome.

### **Modern Implications of Tribal-State Relations**

The presence of tribes has remained enduring in Middle Eastern states as a result of the unique socio-political fabric of the region. While in the Western nation-state, tribal identities had been subsumed into the centralized rule; the Middle East retained a complicated intermediary system of tribal and state structures. The interplay of these factors has been channeling the governance models of the region and policy choices and administrative frameworks. However, despite the development of states in the Middle East to incorporate principles of modern governance, states continue to work with tribal groups as key stakeholders within their social-political constituencies .

In conclusion, the state in the Middle East has passed through both a special historical path and through the channels of contact with tribal groups and a larger global environment. Modern nation states in the region have institutional design that reflects global trends but are significantly shaped by their roots in the historical and the influence of tribal identities. To understand the nature of Middle Eastern statehood it is necessary to comprehend the complex interplay in which it exists.

### **Sub-Identities**

#### **A Delicate Balance Between Diversity and National Unity**

Identification is a concept that is about the set of features or characteristics which define a group, society, nation, or state from others. This fosters a sense of belonging among its members and sets them to include themselves with a particular social entity, which is the ultimate source of their loyalty and solidarity in the group . Secondary affiliations referred to as sub identities, are subset of this larger identity or framework. Despite being secondary, sub identities coexist with primary identities. Each of these arises from a variety of dimensions, be they cultural, social, geographical, professional, religious, or political. The identities of individuals and groups are often bounded by subidentities that influence their behavior, choice, and orientation in life.

Examples of sub-identities are ethnic, gender, religious, political, and professional identities. Such sub-identities are largely important in forming people's perceptions of themselves and their underlying affiliations. Management of subidentities is necessary in diverse and multicultural societies where social cohesion and national unity are key to survival.

### **The Role of Inclusive National Identity**

The development of a cohesive society and a robust nation-state requires that we develop an inclusive national identity. It recognizes people as citizens of the nation irrespective of their sub-identities. National identity, in a multicultural context, provides a homogeneous picture of the diversity of present affiliations of different social groups to the collective good. The achievement of such an identity is possible only through continuous social, economic, and political efforts and an adequate, fair, and just enforcement of laws to guarantee equality and protection of basic rights for every group. The cooperation between political institutions is also necessary to maintain this balance so that no group should receive any preference over another.

In Jordan, the interaction between primary, secondary, and national identities is in the support by the government for tribes (qabā'il) and clans ('ashā'ir). Prince Al-Hussein bin Abdullah made a notable address on the key role of tribal and clan unity, which they have made in supporting the government and other civil society institutions in helping the country during crises. Prince recognizes sub-identities and terms them as a natural part of all societies while underplaying national identity. He argues that although people can be proud of their tribal roots, in the end, their loyalty lies with the nation (Al-Hussein, *On the Threshold of the Second Centennial of the State*).

### **The Dual Impact of Sub-Identities in Jordan**

Studies on sub-identities in Jordan reveal their dual impact on social cohesion and national integration. First, sub-identities bring together social cohesion by reinforcing a feeling of belonging and loyalty to the local and national community. They help to preserve national unity and enrich Jordanian society with cultural and social diversity. They also promote interaction and communication among extra social segments of society and increase mutual understanding.

Sub-identities can also have negative things when their respective identities outweigh the national identity. Social fragmentation from an excessive focus on sub-identities is the consequence of the same process that would weaken national integration and stability. Sub-identities in conflict can weaken social cohesion, dividing our nation by leaving certain sections economically, socially, and politically weaker. In particular, such divisions may inhibit opportunities for integration and cooperation among regions and groups, reducing progress.

### **Managing Sub-Identities for National Cohesion**

To achieve unity in diversity, the challenges of Jordan's sub-identities have been addressed through nuanced approaches. The 'Jordan First' campaign of 2002 is an example of such a campaign that was meant to promote a unified national identity that does not reject cultural and social diversity. A nuanced approach is required that affirms the distinctiveness of each sub-identity without reducing that to a preference towards isolation but rather to integration into the broader national system. The campaign stressed balanced government policies and collective society's efforts to ensure equilibrium, no one being favoured over the others in the process. Jordan also wanted to promote a unified national identity that would serve to weaken any possibility of sub-identities or the idea of collective sense of nationhood.

Initiatives designed by the government of Jordan to support tribal structures and strengthen a sense of national unity through balanced work actively in preserving this balance. By consolidating tribes into state institutions and opening space for them at the table of governance, Jordan shows how multiple sub-identities can go contiguous with the unified national size.

However, the state also needs to address the risk that sub-identity-based divisions can result in an inequitable distribution of resources and sub-representation in decision-making.

## **Tribe and State in Jordan**

### **The Interplay of Tradition and Modernity**

Jordan is a country that is filled with tribal values and norms; thus, descent is central to identity and heritage. Jordanian society is founded on tribal values, and the Jordanian government recognizes that the country's identity is centered on the culture and values of the tribes. Jordan is among the members of the League of Arab States for blending the identity of Bedouins of the east and south of the country with the settled populations of the Levant in the north. It is not only geographical but also cultural, a broad indication of the complicated social tissue of this nation.

Given Jordan's demographic changes, tribes (qabā'il) and clans ('ashā'ir) play a remarkable role in Jordan's social and political life. More than 70 percent of Jordan's population is under the age of 30, lives mostly in towns and cities, and is far away from traditional tribal affiliations and ties. They are the younger and more educated demographics that generally support the modern political vision to promote liberalism and civic values. Even so, tribes continue to play a significant political role in Jordan, staying at the center of the political structure.

The paradox in the creation of a modern state is expressed by the historical persistence of tribal organizations in Jordan. In Godelier's view, there are two possible scenarios when tribes interact with the state: Interprets that either tribes are the basis of state formation, or else they are marginalized and absorbed into state structures. Integration of tribes into the state's political and social system is a characteristic of Jordan's government.

### **Tribes in Jordan: A Central Social and Political Force**

Jordan is a traditional Arab country where tribes are the fundamental social, economic, and political units. Many Jordanians identify as tribal. Yet tribes still have considerable political power despite the modernization of the country. Represented in the Jordanian House of Representatives and local councils, they actively participate in Jordanian and local political decisions. Central government authority has been balanced with the influence of tribal leaders, even as the state has tried to integrate tribal power into its modern institutional framework.

Through the lens of "Jordanian patriotism," the relationship between tribes and the state in Jordan can be better understood. As a result of this relationship, there has been some confusion on the local and national levels concerning the mode of functioning of state institutions. The political structure of Jordan's polity is clan-based, stemming from the historical weight of tribes in this context, holding leadership that normally rests with male elders and sheikhs. It is though important to note, however, that this patriarchal structure has had its contradictions, particularly when looking at the modern and globalized image of the Jordanian monarchy in comparison with the deeply embedded tribalism .

The apparent contradiction between the modern international image of the monarchy and the strong local tribal influence on so much political decision-making in Jordan is one of the paradoxes of Jordan. The royal family is presented in the international media as a symbol of a modernity; however, locally, the monarchy tends to operate through clan structures that replicate more traditional values and a system of authority . Symptomatic of wider dilemmas confronting Jordan as it strives to reconcile its invaluable tribal heritage with the requirements of modern statehood, this tension between the modern monarchy and the traditional tribal system.

The modern state has brought significant transformation of Jordan’s tribal system. The state has attempted to incorporate tribes into its governance, but that has not meant the tribes lost all of their influence. The settlement of Bedouin by King Hussein in 1958 was one of the main transformations of the tribal system. Further, many of Jordan's tribes before this were still nomadic, making it hard for the state to keep them under control. The transition from nomadic herder to sedentary farmer eased the government's exercise of power over land ownership and law enforcement — but brought about the demise of the traditional Bedouin way of life.

Even though these changes have occurred, the tribal identity is still not gone. Though such changes occurred, tribal identity has not vanished. Today, the tribal system in Jordan is more fluid than in the past and still contributes most directly to the texture of daily life, mostly in rural areas. Loyalty to the tribe and loyalty to the nation still define the identity of tribes in Jordan, whereby national identity and tribal allegiance overlap. This Tribal system now acts successfully, with the tribes exercising considerable influence in political decision-making and being involved in the system of both the social and economic spheres.

**Political Influence of Tribes: Mechanisms of Power**

Various mechanisms give tribes in Jordan a strong influence on the political system. Parliamentary representation is one of the main channels of influence. Major clans in Jordan represent the House of Representatives well, and tribal leaders influence getting voters to the polls and garnering political support for their candidates. Tribes can speak directly into policy-making processes and advocate for their constituents through this representation.

Furthermore, the relationship between tribes and the monarchy is unique in Jordan. The King makes himself accessible to Clan leaders who may advise and help the King in whatever matters concerning the group. So, this interaction enables tribes to influence royal decisions but reinforces their role in the construction of the country's political landscape . The political power of tribes also results from their socio-economic impact, which, as with many tribes, are sources of economic resources that can be applied to exert pressure on decision-makers and influence public opinion.

Table 1 shows major Jordanian companies ownership structures and tribal affiliations, and shows that many main economic players in Jordan such as Shoman, Nuqul, Darwazah families, are of Palestinian origin and have no direct affiliation to Jordanian tribes. This underlines the significant contribution that non-tribal families play in Jordan’s private sector compared to their political dominance in the public sphere. Moreover, Jordan Phosphate Mines and Arab Potash are still mainly government-owned, which features a state-led resource management style and financial power.

<b>Company</b>	<b>Owner(s)</b>	<b>Tribal/Clan Affiliation</b>
<b>Jordan Phosphate Mines Company</b>	Majority-owned by the Jordanian government and foreign investors	No direct affiliation with a specific clan
<b>Arab Bank</b>	Founded by Abdul Hameed Shoman; currently owned by the Shoman family	Shoman family, of Palestinian origin; not

		affiliated with a traditional Jordanian clan
<b>Arab Potash Company</b>	Majority-owned by the Jordanian government and Arab investors	No direct affiliation with a specific clan
<b>Nuqul Group</b>	Founded and owned by the Nuqul family	Nuqul family, of Palestinian origin; not affiliated with a traditional Jordanian clan
<b>Hikma Pharmaceuticals</b>	Founded by Samih Darwazah; currently led by the Darwazah family	Darwazah family, of Palestinian origin; not affiliated with a traditional Jordanian clan

Table 1. Ownership and Tribal Affiliation of Major Jordanian Companies

However, due to the significant importance represented by tribes in the Jordanian political system, tribal interests are not well represented and integrated. An increasing Palestinian population in Jordan has reduced political representation, and there is a rising demand for a fairer share of parliamentary seats. Further, migration and urbanization have resulted in demographic changes, and some tribal areas lost political weight.

### **The On-going Role of Tribes in Jordan's Political and Social Development**

In Jordan, tribes are a powerful political force, especially in rural areas where the concentration of tribe effect is high. Despite the problems of urbanization and demographic changes, tribes mold the country's political system. The intervention has been to monitor the relationship between tribal and national identities and strive to mix tribal interests with the political structure to ensure social coherence and national stability.

In Jordan, tribes still assume a leading role in the political and social development of the country. These aren't relics of the past; these are participants in the nation-building process. One of the key factors for Jordan's political stability has been the monarchy's ability to retain the tribal band's allegiance, and the continued integration of tribal groups into the modern state system has revealed the adaptability of the formal tribal structure to changed political and social conditions.

### **Conclusion**

The relationship between tribes and the state constitutes a fundamental variable in understanding political and social evolution. The change from tribal systems to state management by way of economic, social, and political changes holds the key to the structure and authority of the state. The political character of Jordan has been stamped by enduring tribal affiliations, which have come to serve as both traditional loyalties and demands of modernization. Even as it tried to integrate tribal structures to increase its legitimacy, this interaction stabilized the political system and created problems for wider national integration. The analytical complexity of this relationship is relevant to state-building processes in that this relationship is a key element that shapes identity, governance, and societal cohesion.

### **References**

Abdullah, Thabit AJ. "The Mandaean Community and Ottoman-British Rivalry in Late 19th-Century Iraq: The Curious Case of Shaykh Şahan." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 61,

3336 *Tribe and State: Paradigms of Progress and Development*  
no. 3 (2018): 396-425.

Al-Jallad, Ahmad. "Notes on the Language of the Hismaic Inscriptions and a Re-Reading of Line 4 of the Madaba Hismaic Inscription." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 30, no. 3 (2020): 561-69.

———. *The Religion and Rituals of the Nomads of Pre-Islamic Arabia: A Reconstruction Based on the Safaitic Inscriptions*. Brill, 2022.

al-Rousan, Mohammad. *The Tale of Tribes*. . 2018.

Al-Sharah, Mohammad Kanoush. "Political Liberalisation in Jordan: A Study of the Democratisation Process; 1989-1993." Durham University, 1997.

Al Oudat, Mohammed Ali, and Ayman Alshboul. "'Jordan First': Tribalism, Nationalism and Legitimacy of Power in Jordan." *Intellectual discourse* 18, no. 1 (2010).

Alisøy, Dorthea Rennestraum. "Affiliations Carved in Stone: An Analysis of Kinship and Social Structure in the Safaitic Inscriptions." The University of Bergen, 2017.

Alon, Yoav. "Tribes and State-Formation in Mandatory Transjordan." *Civil Wars* 8, no. 1 (2006): 66-82.

Anderson, Benedict. "Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism." In *The New Social Theory Reader*, 282-88: Routledge, 2020.

Ayubi, Nazih N. *Over-Stating the Arab State: Politics and Society in the Middle East*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 1996.

Badie, Bertrand. *L'état Importé: Essai Sur L'occidentalisation De L'ordre Politique*. Fayard Paris, 1992.

———. *Les Deux États: Pouvoir Et Société En Occident Et En Terre D'islam*. Fayard, 2014.

"Abdul Hameed Shoman Foundation." 2025,

<https://www.arabbank.com/mainmenu/home/sustainability/ah-shoman>.

Bendix, Reinhard. *Nation-Building and Citizenship: Studies of Our Changing Social Order*. Routledge, 2017.

Bonte, Pierre, Édouard Conte, and Paul Dresch. *Émirs Et Présidents: Figures De La Parenté Et Du Politique Dans Le Monde Arabe*. CNRS, 2001.

Bonte, Pierre, Édouard Conte, Constant Hamès, and Abdel Wedoud Ould Cheikh. "Al-Ansâb, La Quête Des Origines: Anthropologie Historique De La Société Tribale Arabe." (No Title) (1991).

Carré, Olivier. *L'islam Laïque: Ou Le Retour À La Grande Tradition*. FeniXX, 1993.

Castien Maestro, Juan Ignacio. "Problems of Nation-Building in Afghanistan: Before and after the Last Taliban's Takeover." In *The Failure of a Pseudo-Democratic State in Afghanistan: Misunderstandings and Challenges*, 9-35: Springer, 2024.

Childe, V. Gordon. *Man Makes Himself*. London: Watts., 1951.

Choueiri, Youssef M. *A Companion to the History of the Middle East*. John Wiley & Sons, 2008.

"Arab Mining Company Projects." 2025, <https://armico.com/projects/0>.

Cordeman, Anthony H. *Greater Middle East: From the " Arab Spring" to the " Axis of Failed States"*. JSTOR, 2022.

Coulson, Noel. *A History of Islamic Law*. Routledge, 2017.

"The Man - the Story of Samih Darwazah." 2025, <https://www.samihdarwazah.com/the-man/>.

Dresch, Paul. *A History of Modern Yemen*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Dukhan, Haian. "Tribes and Tribalism in the Syrian Uprising." *Syria studies* 6, no. 2 (2014): 1-28.

Eickelman, Dale F. "The Middle East and Central Asia: An Anthropological Approach." (No Title) (1998).

Engels, Friedrich, and Ernest Untermann. "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State." In *Politics and Kinship*, 217-23: Routledge, 2021.

Evans-Pritchard, EE. "The Nuer." Oxford: Clarendon Press." (1940).

Fortes, Meyer, and Edward Evan Evans-Pritchard. *African Political Systems*. Routledge, 2015.

- Frank F Furstenberg, Lauren E Harris, Luca Maria Pesando, Megan N Reed. "Kinship Practices among Alternative Family Forms in Western Industrialized Societies. ." *Journal of marriage and the family* (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12712>.
- Fukuyama, Francis. "The Origins of Political Order: From Prehuman Times to the French Revolution." Farrar, Straus and Giroux (2011).
- Gao, Eleanor. "Tribal Mobilization, Fragmented Groups, and Public Goods Provision in Jordan." *Comparative Political Studies* 49, no. 10 (2016): 1372-403.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Muslim Society*. Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- . *Nations and Nationalism*. Cornell University Press, 2008.
- Graeber, David, and David Wengrow. *The Dawn of Everything: A New History of Humanity*. Penguin UK, 2021.
- Harris, Marvin. *The Rise of Anthropological Theory: A History of Theories of Culture*. AltaMira Press, 2001.
- Heller, Agnes. *Everyday Life*. Routledge, 2015.
- Hodgson, Marshall GS. *The Venture of Islam, Volume 1: The Classical Age of Islam*. Vol. 1: University of Chicago press, 2009.
- Jabiri, Muhammad Abid al. "Fikr Ibn Khaldun: Al-Asabiyya Wa'l-Dawla. Ma'alim Nazariyya Khalduniyya Fi Al-Tarikh Al-Islami." Beirut: Markaz Dirasat al-Wahda al-Arabiyya, 1992.
- Kenny, Patrick. "Tribal and State Justice Systems in Contemporary Jordan: Conceptual Conflicts and Their Practical Resolution." *Journal of Legal Anthropology* 8, no. 1 (2024): 77-100.
- Khan, Shahab A. "Desert Power: Exploring How Jordan Can Democratize through Tribalism." (2022).
- Khoury, Philip Shukry, and Joseph Kostiner. *Tribes and State Formation in the Middle East*. Univ of California Press, 1990.
- Lacher, Wolfram. *Libya's Fragmentation: Structure and Process in Violent Conflict*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020.
- Layne, Linda L. "' Tribalism': National Representations of Tribal Life in Jordan." *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development* (1987): 183-203.
- Maestro, Juan Ignacio Castien. "The Dificult Road to Modernisation." *La balsa de piedra: revista de teoría y geoestrategia iberoamericana y mediterránea*, no. 10 (2015): 3-23.
- Magazine, Tharawat. "Meet Jordan's Largest Family Business, the Nuqul Group." 2009. [https://www.tharawat-magazine.com/family-business-winning-strategies/family-bus-profile-nuqul-group-jordan/?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.tharawat-magazine.com/family-business-winning-strategies/family-bus-profile-nuqul-group-jordan/?utm_source=chatgpt.com).
- Manzoor, Muhammad Bin Makram Bin. *Lisan Al Arab*. Vol. 4, 2016.
- Mboh, Lovelyne. "An Investigation into the Role of Traditional Leaders in Conflict Resolution: The Case of Communities in the Mahikeng Local Municipality, North West Province, South Africa." *African Journal on Conflict Resolution* 21, no. 2 (2021): 33-57.
- Meillassoux, Claude. "Anthropologie De L'esclavage: Le Ventre De Fer Et D'argent." (No Title) (1986).
- Menaifi, Ferial. "How Can Social Cohesion Foster State-Building and Confront Tribalism? A Comparative Analysis of the Post-Arab Uprisings Period in Tunisia and Libya." *Arab Studies Quarterly* 44, no. 2 (2022): 68-83.
- Morgan, Lewis H HG. *Ancient Society*. Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Muḥammad 'Alī, Nabīl. "MafhūM Al-Dawlah Al-MithālīYah Bayna AflāṬŪN Wa-Al-QadhdhāFī: Al-JāNīb Al-SiyāSī." (2000).
- Northcutt, Taylor. "Tribal Statecraft and Freedom of Expression in Jordan." (2023).
- Peters, Emrys L. *The Bedouin of Cyrenaica: Studies in Personal and Corporate Power*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.

- Peterson, Brenton D, and Manar Zaki. "Reforming Somali Customary Justice." (2023).
- Rosen, Lawrence. *The Culture of Islam: Changing Aspects of Contemporary Muslim Life*. University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Rowland, Jennifer. "Democracy and the Tribal System in Jordan: Tribalism as a Vehicle for Social Change." (2009).
- Rubin, Barnett R. "The Fragmentation of Afghanistan." *Foreign Affairs* 68, no. 5 (1989): 150-68.
- Salzman, Philip Carl. "The Middle East's Tribal DNA." *Middle East Quarterly* (2008).
- Sangaré, Youssouf T. "Chérif Ousmane Madani Haïdara on the Obligation to Venerate the Prophet and His Family in Contemporary Mali (En Islam Contemporain Iv)." In *The Presence of the Prophet in Early Modern and Contemporary Islam*, 551-84: Brill, 2023.
- Scott, James C. *Against the Grain: A Deep History of the Earliest States*. Yale University Press, 2017.
- Service, Elman R. "Origins of the State and Civilization: The Process of Cultural Evolution." Norton New York, 1975.
- Simonen, Katariina, and Katariina Simonen. "Tribalism and Local Agreement." *Ancient Water Agreements, Tribal Law and Ibadism: Sources of Inspiration for the Middle East Desalination Research Centre—and Beyond?* (2021): 111-32.
- Suwaed, Muhammad. "Tribalism, Borders and States in the Middle East." Paper presented at the Geography Research Forum, 2022.
- Tapper, Richard. *Tribe and State in Iran and Afghanistan (Rle Iran D)*. Routledge, 2012.
- Tarawneh, Khalid. "Jordanian Phosphate Mining History." Paper presented at the Fifth International Conference of Beneficiation of Phosphates, 2008.
- Tell, Tariq. *The Social and Economic Origins of Monarchy in Jordan*. Springer, 2013.
- Thompson, EA. "The Early Germans. Oxford: Clarendon Press." (1965).
- Thompson, Edward A. "The Goths in Spain." Clarendon Press, 1969.
- Thompson, Edward Arthur. "A History of Attila and the Huns." (No Title) (1948).
- Vassiliev, Alexei. *The History of Saudi Arabia*. Saqi, 2013.
- Weber, Max. *Economy and Society: A New Translation*. Harvard University Press, 2019.
- Weiner, Scott J. *Kinship, State Formation and Governance in the Arab Gulf States*. Edinburgh University Press, 2022.
- Wittfogel, Karl August. "Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study of Total Power." *Science and Society* 23, no. 1 (1959).
- Young, William C. "The Uses of Kinship for Political Ends by Local Descent Groups in Jordan." *Kinship* 2, no. 2 (2022).
- محمود، مؤيد جبير. "الاعتدال في الخطاب السياسي وأثره في بناء الهوية الوطنية العراقية." *قضايا سياسية*, no. 67 (2022).