Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - *E*- ISSN: 3156-5492 | *P*- ISSN: 3156-5514

Stability Without Stagnation: Comparative Reflections on Governance Reforms under Tokugawa Ieyasu of Japan and *Alaafin* Abiodun of Ọyọ Empire

Oluwaseun Igbagboyemi SOILE, PhD
https://www.orcid.org/0000-0002-0047-1684

&

Olawale Bakare SALAMI, PhD
https://www.orcid.org/0000-0002-6737-2808

[1,2]Department of History and Diplomatic Studies,
Olabisi Onabanjo University, Nigeria

Correspondence: *oluwaseun.soile@oouagoiwoye.edu.ng*

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23267137

Abstract

This paper interrogates governance, stability, and social change under Tokugawa Ieyasu of Japan and *Alaafin* Abiodun of the Ọyọ Empire to assess the ability of pre-modern states to maintain order without stagnation. The study, based on historical and comparative analysis, examines the institutional, economic, cultural and intellectual reforms undertaken by both leaders and their strategies for consolidating power and maintaining societal cohesion. Tokugawa Ieyasu's centralisation, codification of laws and promotion of Neo-Confucian ethics resulted in a long period of peace and cultural efflorescence, while *Alaafin* Abiodun's governing of the *Ọyọmesi*, vassal towns and ritualised governance ensured political stability and the transmission of oral knowledge. Nevertheless, for all these successes, each polity had to grapple with inherent contradictions and structural constraints: rigid hierarchies, economic pressures, succession disputes and constraints on innovation demonstrated the difficulties of long-term stability. The comparative analysis shows that effective governance required dealing with authority, economic matters, and cultural guardianship, but depended on the context, norms of society, and individual leader. A comparative analysis of these cases shows the intricate relationship between stability, institutional reform and societal development, providing insights into how pre-modern states maintained continuity, change and modernisation in complex socio-political environments. The findings point to the possibility that stability and intellectual, cultural and economic progress could go hand in hand, but within limits set by historical and structural conditions. The study uses the comparative-historical institutional approach. It uses a controlled comparison of two pre-modern polities, which are politically and culturally different, in an effort to evaluate the impact of institutional arrangements on changing political stability into economic, social and cultural dynamism.

Keywords: Tokugawa Japan, Ọyọ Empire, governance reforms, institutional consolidation, cultural development, comparative history

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

Introduction

The challenge of building political stability without constraining the dynamism of society is a recurring subject in world history. States that emerged from prolonged internal conflict usually face the uphill task in balancing coercion with institutional coherence and authority with social or economic flexibility. Tokugawa Ieyasu in seventeenth century Japan and *Alaafin* Abiodun in eighteenth century Ọyọ both faced this dilemma. Each of both rulers inherited a political landscape characterised by incessant elite struggle within the precipitating internal disorder, and waning central authority. Yet both succeeded in creating relatively durable political systems that not only restored order but also created conditions for economic expansion, intellectual and cultural vibrancy, and administrative continuity. Their experiences provide an instructive vantage for understanding how stability can offer a context for stimulating constructive change in pre-modern polities.

Tokugawa Ieyasu's ascension to power followed more than a century of civil war in Japan, a period known as the *Sengoku* era. Through strategic alliances, administrative reforms, and the establishment of the Tokugawa *bakufu* (military government) in 1603, Ieyasu constructed a durable political order that mollified the *daimyō*, reorganised domains, and helped produce one of the most stable political systems in early modern Japan (Totman, 1995). While the Tokugawa system emphasised hierarchy and control, it paradoxically created fertile ground for commercial prosperity, urban growth, greater literacy, and a vibrant cultural advancement (Hall, 1968; Gordon, 2020). Hence, economic and social dynamism thus unfolded within, not in spite of, the shogunate's strict political order.

In the same instance, *Alaafin* Abiodun's reign in Ọyọ coincided with a moment of recovery from a repressive internal situation that was dramatically characterised by the extortion and despotism exacted by *Bashọrun* Gaha. The ascension of Abiodun restored balance to a polity susceptible to elite overreach and political violence. Scholars like Law (1977) and Smith (1988) argue that Abiodun brought a subtle change from a belligerent expansion model towards one which was commercially minded and diplomatically flexible. Under his leadership, Ọyọ experienced renewed stability, the consolidation of long distance trade networks, and the reassertion of royal moral authority. Although the empire would later face pressures that exposed its structural weaknesses, Abiodun's reign stands out as a period in which peace and political forbearance engendered economic and cultural renewal.

The comparison of Tokugawa Ieyasu and *Alaafin* Abiodun offers an opportunity to explore how two rulers in different geographical and cultural milieus pursued governance reforms that achieved stability without stagnation. It also informs discussions in comparative political history about the processes of state consolidation, elite management, and institutional resilience in early modern societies (Fukuyama, 2011; Herbst, 2000). By juxtaposing Japan with Old Ọyọ Empire, this paper attempts to show that the capacity for order and change is not a uniquely European or modern phenomenon but a pattern observable in diverse precolonial state systems.

The study has three related objectives. First, it examines the governance and institutional reforms through which Ieyasu and Abiodun sought to consolidate political order and manage competing elites. Second, it compares the economic, social, cultural, and intellectual consequences of those strategies in order to explain how political stability could coexist with forms of societal

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

dynamism. Third, it identifies the contradictions and limits of the two governance arrangements and draws historically grounded lessons about institutional durability, adaptability, and contemporary governance. The paper therefore asks: what were the governance reforms that allowed Ieyasu and Abiodun to stabilise their polities, and why did these reforms generate socio-economic dynamism rather than stasis? How did their political philosophies characterise institutional design, and what explains the long term courses of their states after their deaths? Through a structured comparative approach, the study interrogates the interplay between authority, reform, and societal transformation in two influential non-Western polities.

Literature Review

Scholarship on Tokugawa Japan has paid considerable attention to the political institutions, social hierarchy, economic transformation, and intellectual life that developed after the establishment of the Tokugawa *bakufu*. Hall (1968), Jansen (2000), Totman (1995, 2014), and Ooms (1985), among others, demonstrate that Tokugawa stability rested on more than military victory: it involved the regulation of the *daimyō*, the organisation of domains, ideological legitimation, and the management of social obligations. Studies of education and culture similarly show that political order coexisted with expanding literacy, urbanisation, commercial activity, and cultural production (Dore, 1965; Gordon, 2020). The implication of this literature is important for the present study because it complicates any simple opposition between political control and social dynamism. Yet much of the scholarship examines Tokugawa institutions within the Japanese historical trajectory rather than placing them in sustained comparison with a non-Asian precolonial polity.

The historiography of Old Ọyọ likewise provides substantial accounts of its political organisation, imperial expansion, commercial networks, and internal tensions. Atanda (1980), Law (1977), Lloyd (1971), Smith (1988), and related scholarship show that the Ọyọ political system combined sacred kingship with institutional checks involving the *Ọyọmesi*, the *Bashọrun*, and other political authorities. Law's study is particularly important for understanding the relationship between Ọyọ imperial power, warfare, tribute, and Atlantic commerce, while later interpretations have continued to examine the tensions between military and commercial orientations during the eighteenth century. The literature therefore provides a basis for understanding Abiodun's reign as a period of political recalibration rather than simply a personal episode of royal rule.

The comparative-historical literature provides the conceptual bridge between these two bodies of scholarship. Comparative historical analysis is concerned with historically grounded explanation, systematic comparison, attention to context, and the temporal processes through which institutions and political outcomes develop (Mahoney & Rueschemeyer, 2003). Historical institutionalist scholarship likewise stresses that institutions are neither static arrangements nor merely formal rules; they develop through political struggles and may be reproduced, adapted, or constrained over time (Thelen, 2003). What remains relatively underexplored in the literature used in this study is an explicit comparison of Tokugawa Ieyasu and *Alaafin* Abiodun around the common analytical problem of achieving durable political stability while permitting economic, social, and cultural adaptation. This study addresses that gap through a focused comparison rather than by claiming that the two polities were institutionally equivalent.

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

Theoretical Framework: Comparative-Historical Institutionalism

This study is situated within the comparative-historical tradition of institutional analysis, which treats institutions not simply as formal administrative structures but as historically developed arrangements through which political actors organise authority, regulate competition, allocate resources, and reproduce political order (Mahoney & Rueschemeyer, 2003). Comparative historical analysis is particularly useful where cases are separated by geography, culture, and chronology but confront a comparable analytical problem. The purpose is not to suggest that Tokugawa Japan and Old Ọyọ were equivalent political systems, but to use a controlled comparison to identify convergences and divergences in the ways political order was constructed and sustained. The comparison therefore focuses on institutional responses to instability rather than on superficial similarities between the two rulers.

The analytical concept guiding the comparison is stability without stagnation. Here, stability refers to the capacity of a political order to contain destructive conflict, regulate elite competition, and preserve institutional continuity, while stagnation refers to a condition in which mechanisms of political control become so rigid that they restrict economic, social, or intellectual adaptation. The study consequently asks whether, and under what conditions, institutional control can coexist with productive change. This framework allows the two cases to be compared across four dimensions already central to the paper: political and institutional reform, economic governance and social transformation, cultural and intellectual life, and the contradictions that affected the durability of reform.

Methodology and Comparative Approach

The paper adopts a qualitative historical-comparative methodology based primarily on secondary historical scholarship on Tokugawa Japan and the Ọyọ Empire. The two cases were selected because both emerged from periods of political conflict and elite competition in which rulers sought to reconstruct political order, yet they differed substantially in institutional structure, political culture, economic orientation, and mechanisms of knowledge transmission. This difference makes a controlled comparison useful for identifying both common mechanisms and context-specific outcomes. The analysis proceeds thematically rather than chronologically, comparing the cases under the four dimensions established in the theoretical framework: governance and institutional reform; economic stability and social transformation; cultural and intellectual life; and contradictions and long-term sustainability. Historical interpretation is used to distinguish the policies directly associated with Ieyasu and Abiodun from institutions that were subsequently formalised or developed under their successors. The method therefore combines contextual reconstruction with cross-case comparison and avoids treating either polity as a simple model of modern governance.

Historical Background of Japan and Old Ọyọ

To get a more complete picture of the Tokugawa shogunate that was established in 1603, it is necessary to refer to the background of one of the most chaotic periods in Japanese history. The decline of the Ashikaga shogunate in the mid-fifteenth century created a power vacuum that plunged the country into the *Sengoku*, or Warring States, period (c.1457-1600). During this time, powerful local warlords known as *daimyō* ruled their domains independently, built strongholds, maintained private armies, and regularly fought wars to expand their territory or defend their

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

autonomy. Political authority was so fragmented that even the emperor and the royal court in Kyoto lost much of their traditional influence (Hall, 1968; Totman, 2014).

This prolonged warfare gave rise to new military tactics, building of castles, shaky alliances, and a politics of opportunism. The ensuing period of instability witnessed the rise of a new faction of warlords, who had to fight for their right to rule. They were not so much dependent on heredity as on military capability and strategic acumen (Berry, 1982). It was within this volatile political landscape that three unifiers, Oda Nobunaga (1534-1582), Toyọtomi Hideyoshi (1537-1598), and Tokugawa Ieyasu (1543-1616), began the process of rebuilding centralised authority. Nobunaga initially dismantled the military orders of rival *daimyō*, brought militant religious institutions under control, and restructured domains under central oversight. After his death, Hideyoshi completed much of the unification efforts through reforms such as the sword hunt, segregation of class, nationwide land surveys, and a freeze on social mobility (Totman, 2014). However, Hideyoshi's death in 1598 reopened old rivalries, especially over succession and governance, drawing Ieyasu and other leading *daimyō* into the dispute.

The Battle of Sekigahara in 1600 was decisive in settling the question of who the rightful owner of the realm was. The victory of Ieyasu at Sekigahara enabled him to eliminate major rivals and make himself the dominant political force. He was officially appointed *Seii Taishōgun* (Barbarian-Subduing Generalissimo**)** by Emperor Go-Yōzei in 1603. This signalled the official establishment of the Tokugawa *bakufu* – the third military government in Japanese history after the Kamakura (1185-1333) and the Ashikaga (1336-1573) shogunates. The seat of the new regime was established at Edo, a small fishing village that Ieyasu had transformed into a political and military capital. Scholars such as Totman (1995) point out that Ieyasu's brilliance was not only in military success, but in creating a political system that controlled *daimyō* autonomy, safeguarded succession stability, and entrenched peace across the realm. The Tokugawa settlement created a centralised but carefully balanced regime that steadily put an end to the instability after more than a hundred years. Thus, the early Tokugawa era was a direct response to the crises of the *Sengoku* period. Ieyasu took over the administrative legacies of Nobunaga and Hideyoshi, but he transformed them into a lasting political structure. The historical context explains why the new regime set itself the task of consolidating institutions, managing elites and restoring the power of the centre.

The Ọyọ Empire, one of the most influential political states in precolonial West Africa, also emerged from a background of fluctuating power, territorial ambitions, and internal constitutional challenges. Located in the savannah north of the forest belt, Ọyọ developed a military system that was heavily dependent on cavalry. On the strength of its military power, Ọyọ was able to extend its influence over a wide area. By the close of the 17th century and early 18th century, Ọyọ had a huge tributary networks of control extending to the Niger River, the Egbado corridor, and parts of the Dahomey region (Smith, 1988; Law, 1977). The political structure of the Empire was peculiar. Power was divided between the *Alaafin*, the sovereign king; the *Ọyọmesi*, a council of kingmaker chiefs; and the *Ogboni*, the ancestral cult group, each playing a role in balancing power. This prevented the Ọyọ from becoming an absolute monarchy, but also meant the Ọyọ were subject to periods of aristocratic dominance. One of the most disruptive was the rise of *Bashọrun* Gaha in the eighteenth century. As the head of the *Ọyọmesi*, Gaha used his position to challenge the royal authority, to orchestrate the death or deposition of a number of *Alaafin* and to run the state through

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

a form of oligarchic manipulation (Lloyd, 1971; Balogun, 1985). His authority destabilised the empire and weakened the legitimacy of the monarchy.

This period of political instability is somewhat similar to the political disunity of Japan preceding the Tokugawa settlement. For years, the unity of Old Ọyọ was strained by constant internal strife and the disintegration of central authority. As the centre could no longer hold, things began to fall apart: tributary regions grew restless, aristocratic factions became more assertive, and the distribution of power shifted in a manner that could not be sustained. As Balogun (1985) opines, Gaha's era exposed the structural tensions within Ọyọ's political system by demonstrating how its checks and balances could be exploited rather than used to maintain equilibrium. The turning point came with the coalition that opposed and eventually annihilated Gaha. The coming of Abiodun to power was a moment of political recalibration. His rise restored the prestige of the *Alaafin's* office and re-established constitutional balance. Unlike his predecessors, Abiodun pursued a governance model grounded more in diplomacy, commercial expansion, and stabilisation than in constant militarism. According to Law (1977), this transition was not merely personal style but a strategic response to the empire's exhaustion after decades of turmoil.

Under *Alaafin* Abiodun, Ọyọ benefited from the expansion of long distance trade networks. The empire became an important economic hub linking the Niger basin, the northern markets, and the Atlantic coast. Peace and political restraint within the polity facilitated economic growth, urban expansion, and cultural consolidation. Although the empire would later confront pressures that exposed its long term weaknesses, Abiodun's reign stands out and is remembered as a period when political recovery created the conditions for social and economic rejuvenation.

Governance and Political Philosophy of Tokugawa Ieyasu and *Alaafin* Abiodun

The political visions of Tokugawa Ieyasu and *Alaafin* Abiodun were shaped by different historical experiences which converged around a fundamental commitment to order, stability and the careful management of power. Their governance principles emerged from periods of turbulence, and both leaders sought to build systems that would moderate conflict, curb elite competition and secure long term political cohesion. Although they operated in completely different cultural contexts, their concepts of power, legitimacy, and public order revealed striking parallels that make a comparative study analytically rewarding.

Tokugawa Ieyasu's political reflection was grounded in Neo-Confucian rationalism which had gained increasing acceptance in Japan from the fourteenth century onward. Confucian political philosophy emphasised hierarchy, moral governance and the importance of social harmony, principles that Ieyasu drew upon in constructing the Tokugawa state. According to Herman Ooms (1985), Ieyasu and his successors employed the Confucian ideology as the basic principle for legitimising the *bakufu* order, presenting the picture of the society as a moral community whose stability depended on strict order and disciplined conduct. Hence, the Tokugawa class system that separated *samurai*, peasants, artisans and merchants (*shi-nō-kō-shō*) was not only a political realisation but also an ethical project, which was aimed at promoting stability by making it clear who would play which role in society.

Ieyasu also believed in restrained but firm central authority. Rather than an absolutist governance system, his philosophy sought a pragmatic balance between central authority and the

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

daimyō autonomy. Hall (1970) and Jansen (2000) demonstrated clearly that the Tokugawa system did not eliminate the *daimyō* but incorporated them through a regulated set of institutional constraints such as the *sankin kotai* (alternate attendance) system, marriage regulations and limits on castle construction. These controls mirrored Ieyasu's persuasion that stability required a regulated political pluralism in which many centres of power existed but were systematically subordinated to the shogunate. Ieyasu's government therefore established a model, the *baku-han* system, which ensured a stable coexistence, permitting the economic development of the independent domains while at the same time preventing the emergence of opponents strong enough to disrupt national order.

Alaafin Abiodun's political ideas, although based on Yoruba concepts of sacred kingship, was similarly a pragmatic approach to finding a balance between different internal forces. The Ọyọ imperial system had combined divine kingship with strong institutional checks, especially those exercised by the *Ọyọmesi* and the *Ogboni*, for a long time. Historians like Akinjogbin (1967) and Law (1977) have observed that Ọyọ political thought was heavily influenced by the ideals of consultation, moral conduct, and the ruler's obligations to the people. The *Alaafin's* power was a measure of his ability to rule with mildness, promote the welfare of the people, and preserve the peace among competing military, priestly and aristocratic groups. Abiodun, who ruled Ọyọ in the mid to late 18th century, inherited a polity that had undergone decades of imperial expansion, military assertiveness and internal tensions. His political philosophy thus highlighted moderation, accommodation and the recalibration of civil military relations. As Lloyd (1971) and Smith (1988) argue, Abiodun sought to reduce the supremacy of the *Ẹṣọ* (the military aristocracy) that had gained power during previous campaigns. He repositioned civil institutions, brokered alliances with merchant elites and stimulated a more consultative style of rulership. These decisions demonstrated his commitment to a governance style that prioritised internal stability and economic prosperity over aggressive expansion of territories.

Both Ieyasu and Abiodun viewed governance not simply as the exercise of coercive power but as an ethical project that is based on moral leadership, predictable institutions and managed elite competition. While Ieyasu adopted the Confucian principle of order and benevolence almost exclusively, Abiodun operated within Yoruba cosmological framework whereby political authority was tied to checks and balance and the collective will of the kingmaker chiefs. Hence, both contexts required self-discipline, patience and foresight on the part of the rulers as the price of good governance. Ieyasu's famous words in the Tokugawa Testament urging princes to master frugality, avoid rashness in decision making and put the preservation of long-term stability above short-term desires is a reflection of Abiodun's reputation as a calm and temperate ruler who steered Ọyọ through a difficult period of political transition.

Equally important is the fact that both leader equated stability with rigidity although their political orientation accommodated adaptation when necessary. Ieyasu encouraged agricultural expansion, domain reforms and innovations in resource management, while Abiodun supported commercial growth, diplomatic accommodation and more predictable taxation. These political choices show a shared belief that stability must be dynamic, maintained through flexible but principled governance rather than through stasis. To summarise, the governance ideologies of Tokugawa Ieyasu and *Alaafin* Abiodun is an illustration of how ideas, institutions and leadership values can align to produce enduring political order. Although their societies differed distinctly in

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

culture and structure, both rulers articulated a vision of statecraft that cherished balance, moral authority and the long term cultivation of stability without disregarding the potential for change.

Institutional Reforms and Consolidation of Power

The central mechanism by which Tokugawa Ieyasu and *Alaafin* Abiodun acquired authority, stabilised their polities and ensured continuity in governance was institutional reform. Although their approaches differed, reflecting the social structures and political cultures of early modern Japan and eighteenth-century Ọyọ, both leaders displayed a clear awareness that stability required institutional engineering, not merely personal charisma or military strength. Hence, the reforms pursued by Ieyasu and *Alaafin* Abiodun reorganised the mechanisms of governance, managed elite factions and reshaped political practices to entrench durable authority.

In Japan, Tokugawa Ieyasu's reforms were comprehensive and system wide. Emerging from more than a century of civil conflict, he recognised that peace could be sustained only if the sources of *daimyō* rivalry were structurally constrained. His first major reform was the reorganisation of land distribution which redefined the relationship between the shogunate and the domains (*han*). According to Hall (1970) and Totman (1995), Ieyasu redistributed vast territories, rewarding loyal allies with productive lands while weakening defeated rivals by assigning them fragmented or less fertile domains. This redistribution served a double purpose, to consolidate his base of support and to limit the capacity of hostile families to renew challenges. In addition to this, the creation of *bakufu* administrative organs was another important reform. Ieyasu set up a central bureaucracy that was largely composed of *fudai daimyō*, hereditary vassals who were considered politically reliable. This bureaucracy included the *roju* (senior councillors), the *wakadoshiyori* (junior councilors) and various commissioners. This bureaucracy allowed the shogunate to co-ordinate national policy while running a relatively lean but functional administration (Jansen, 2000). Trusted retainers in key offices provided policy coherence and insulation from competing *daimyō* interests for the shogunate.

Institutionally, Ieyasu's most significant innovation was the *sankin kota*i system, formalised by his successors but rooted in his consolidation strategy. *Sankin kotai* required *daimyō* to alternate residence between their domains and Edo while maintaining their families in the capital as political hostages. The system was not just coercive, it produced predictable rhythms of political interaction, encouraged economic integration through travel and expenditure requirements, and created a busy administrative and cultural centre in Edo (Totman, 1995). It also drained the resources of the *daimyō*, reducing their ability to make war and encouraging investment in local economic development. In addition, Ieyasu's legal reforms further enhanced central authority. The *Buke Shohatto* of 1615 laid down behavioural regulations for the daimyō, mandating modest castle construction, prohibiting military alliances without shogunal approval, and dictating moral conduct based on Neo-Confucian ethics. As Ooms (1985) argues, these legal codes established a normative order that tied political obedience to moral propriety, ensuring that governance was based not only on armed force, but also ideological discipline.

But *Alaafin* Abiodun, ruling in a rather different political environment, introduced reforms that were less bureaucratic but no less important in reshaping the balance of power in Ọyọ. Whereas Ieyasu sought to control a militarised aristocracy weakened by civil strife, Abiodun faced a polity dominated by military elites whose powers had grown over decades of imperial expansion.

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

His reforms aimed at reducing reliance on military force and strengthening civil institutions, and reorienting Ọyọ toward commercial and diplomatic engagement. One of Abiodun's most notable reforms was the recalibration of civil-military relations. He curtailed the influence of the *Ẹṣọ* (the metropolitan military corps) whose commanders had become increasingly assertive under his predecessor, *Alaafin* Ojigi. According to Smith (1988) and Law (1977), Abiodun reduced the frequency of expansionist campaigns, redirected resources toward internal consolidation and strengthened the roles of non-military institutions such as the *Ọyọmesi* and the *Ogboni*. While he did not abolish the *Ẹṣọ* or undermine Ọyọ's military capacity, he succeeded in subordinating military elites to a greater, more balanced political structure.

Abiodun also pursued reforms in taxation and economic governance. With the growth of Atlantic commerce and the rising importance of coastal trading networks, he sought to stabilise revenue systems and create predictable commercial conditions. Scholars such as Atanda (1980) note that Abiodun promoted trade with European merchants at the coast, encouraged the circulation of goods such as kola, salt and cloth and worked to secure trade routes, especially those linking Ọyọ to Dahomey and the Niger basin. By shifting focus from aggressive raiding to controlled commercial diplomacy, he increased state revenue while reducing costly military campaigns. His diplomatic reforms were equally important. Abiodun's reign is associated with the consolidation of tributary relationships that had grown unstable after decades of warfare. Rather than relying solely on force, he embraced a more conciliatory diplomatic posture. Lloyd (1971) argues that Abiodun redefined Ọyọ's imperial authority by emphasising negotiated settlements, arbitration and trade guarantees. His alliance building with merchant networks, especially the Hausa and Nupe traders, also secured Ọyọ's regional influence through economic, as well as purely military, means.

Institutionally, Abiodun reinforced existing political checks on the *Alaafin*, rather than dismantling them. The *Ọyọmesi*, led by the *Bashọrun*, retained its authority to consult, advise and if necessary compel a ruler to commit ritual suicide, an extreme but constitutionally recognised safeguard. Instead of resisting these mechanisms, Abiodun worked within them, using consultation to build consensus and legitimacy. Akinjogbin (1967) notes that his inclusive political style helped stabilise a system prone to factional conflicts, making his reign one of the most peaceful in the history of imperial Ọyọ. Abiodun's reforms also extended into social governance. He urged the *Ogboni* society, which performs earth rituals and moral adjudication, to take a more aggressive role in mediating disputes, especially in the provinces. This relieved the central government of some of its burden and produced a local type of judicial order. These reforms showed that stability in a geographically dispersed empire depended upon strong intermediary institutions that could reinforce central directives at the grassroots.

While culturally different, the reforms of Ieyasu and Abiodun display common reasoning when compared to each other. Both rulers were working within a fragmented political context defined by powerful elites and long-standing traditions of warfare. Both understood that stability was not just about personal power, but institutional patterns that could help moderate elite competition and reduce the incentives for rebellion. Ieyasu did this by establishing a centralised bureaucratic order and a codified hierarchy, whereas Abiodun used a decentralised authority that balanced kingmakers, priests, merchants and military leaders. Both rulers also implemented reforms that integrated their polities economically. For Ieyasu this was in the form of domain

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

reforms, commercial expansion and infrastructural expansion caused by *sankin kotai*. For Abiodun this meant setting up trade networks, stabilising taxation and repositioning Ọyọ as a regional commercial power. Their economic policies were not divorced from political consolidation, but were a part of it, generating prosperity that buttressed legitimacy and reduced internal conflict.

At the end of the day, both rulers displayed a sophisticated understanding of the connection between institutional design and political stability. They did not act as absolute monarchs, but as strategic managers of complex societies. Their reforms helped create systems and institutions that outlived their personal reigns. This illustrates that lasting stability emerges when political power is embedded in resilient institutions, not merely in the strength of individual rulers.

Economic Stability and Social Transformation of Tokugawa Japan and Old Ọyọ

The economic landscapes of Tokugawa Japan and Ọyọ of the 18th century were characterised by policies that sought to stabilise production, regulate commerce and reorganise social relations in ways that supported long term political authority. Although the two societies were located in different ecological zones and had different cultural traditions, Tokugawa Ieyasu and *Alaafin* Abiodun both implemented reforms that linked economic resilience to larger projects of political consolidation. Their approaches reveal corresponding logics of state building, especially in the ways they curbed aristocratic predation, enhanced agricultural productivity and encouraged regulated commercial activities that strengthened socio-political stability.

The first two decades of the 17th century were a period when Tokugawa Japan struggled with problems that emerged as a result of the preceding hundred years of internal warfare. The consequence was a fragmented agrarian economy marked by interrupted production, fluctuating tax revenues and unstable transport networks. Ieyasu realised that the restoration of agricultural prosperity, the stabilisation of land rights, and the uninterrupted flow of revenue to the shogunate and its vassals was the only way in which he could establish an enduring authority. One of his most important reforms was codification of land surveys (*kenchi*), which detailed assessments of cultivated land, estimated harvests, and the tax-paying potential of each domain (Totman, 2014). These surveys reduced indiscriminate levies, checked excesses of the *daimyō* and furnished fiscal clarity necessary for long term governance. By the 1630s, the Tokugawa administration had successfully restored a system of rice-based village productivity, linking it to the stipends of *samurai* retainers and to the fiscal stability of the *bakufu* (Hall, 1968; Totman, 1995).

Another significant reform was the development of internal commerce. Although Ieyasu and his successors maintained strict control on foreign trade, especially after the *sakoku* edicts of the 1630s, they established extensive domestic commercial networks. Castle towns expanded rapidly both as administrative centres and centres of artisan production, while important urban centres such as Edo, Osaka and Kyoto became hubs of a monetised economy established around rice exchanges, merchant guilds and transport guilds (Sheldon, 1958). The growth of a wealthy merchant class, though socially inferior in the official hierarchy, contributed to a vibrant commercial economy that supported population growth, urban development and cultural production. Tokugawa economic reforms therefore produced stability, while encouraging considerable social dynamism as new occupational groups emerged and consumption patterns changed.

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

The reign of *Alaafin* Abiodun witnessed the transformation Ọyọ into a major economic hegemon, driven largely by its prolonged capacity for long distance trade. Unlike Tokugawa Japan's isolationist trajectory, Ọyọ developed and became prosperous under a web of commercial networks that stretched from the savannah to the forest belt and Atlantic coast. Before Abiodun, Ọyọ was enmeshed in political instabilities sparked by internal wars, the weighty influence of the *Ọyọmesi* and the militarisation associated with the expansionist policies of *Alaafin* Ojigi and *Alaafin* Onisile. Abiodun sought to divert the energy of the state away from ceaseless military campaigns toward commercial expansion, agricultural abundance and diplomatic management of tributary provinces for better and effective control (Akinjogbin, 1967).

One of his major economic measures was the restoration of security along the trade routes that connected Ọyọ to the Hausa city-states, Borgu territories, Dahomey and the coastal markets at Allada and Porto-Novo. This was because Abiodun fostered alliances with provincial chiefs, reduced capricious raids that endangered caravans and promoted conditions that made it possible for traders to convey commodities such as kola nuts, cloth, leather, horses, salt, slaves, and manufactured goods with minimal disturbance (Falola & Akintoye, 1980). This change from militarism to commerce transformed the social landscape of Ọyọ and allowed a predictable flow of tribute and market-based wealth that stabilised Ọyọ's political system and enriched its aristocracy.

Abiodun also gave special consideration to agriculture. Although the *Alaafin* did not introduce any formal land survey comparable to Tokugawa Japan, he supported the expansion of farming villages, encouraged the clearing of new lands in frontier areas for agricultural production, and reduced excessive levies that had previously discouraged production. These measures, combined with the growth of rural markets, enabled Ọyọ farmers to supply the expanding urban centres of Ọyọ-Ile, Igbeti and other provincial towns. The increased flow of goods strengthened the kingdom's financial base and reduced the risk of food crisis that had previously destabilised earlier regimes (Smith, 1988).

Both Ieyasu and Abiodun influenced social structures through their economic reforms. In Japan, the Tokugawa regime institutionalised a rigid class hierarchies into the well-known four-tier class system of samurai-peasant-artisan-merchant. Yet these classes were far more dynamic in practice. The growth of wealth gained from commerce empowered town-dwelling merchants, encouraged new forms of cultural expression such as *kabuki* theatre and woodblock printmaking, and engendered an increase in literacy and many new skills among urban dwellers. Rural communities also experienced transformation as growing population and improved agricultural practices encouraged some form of self-governance through village councils and communal labour arrangements (Befu, 1968). While the shogunate intended to preserve social order, the economic dynamism of the period produced significant changes in identity, occupational mobility and consumption.

Similarly, economic transformation of Ọyọ during the reign of Abiodun altered the balance of power among elites. With the relegation of militarism, the political influence of the *Ẹṣọ* warriors was reduced in favour of that of market-oriented chiefs and merchant groups, many of whom were involved in or had connections with the trans-Saharan and Atlantic commercial worlds. This created secondary (satellite) markets around the provincial centres and led to the emergence of

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

powerful trading families whose wealth rivalled those of some aristocratic lineages. Likewise, the intensification of long-distance trade created greater cultural interaction and, by extension, the diffusion of material goods and the circulation of new ideas, including Islamic scholarship from the North. These developments restructured social identities in Ọyọ, increasing the possibilities for non-aristocratic groups to accumulate wealth and prestige (Ojo, 1999).

In both societies, economic stability were crucial to larger social transformation. Ieyasu's reforms reduced the possibility of reversion to civil warfare while enabling tremendous urban and cultural development. Abiodun's policies stabilised Ọyọ after decades of internal strife, promoted commercialisation and fostered new forms of social mobility. Although the two leaders operated under different constraints and worldviews, their economic policies complied with a common logic that postulated that a stable and predictable economy was indispensable for political consolidation and long term social vitality. The legacies of the two leaders are good proof that sustained governance depends not only on military authority or ritual legitimacy, but also on deliberate and proactive shaping of economic forces and structures towards broader objectives of the state.

Stability, Culture, and Intellectual Life of Tokugawa Japan and Old Ọyọ

The Tokugawa shogunate and the Ọyọ Empire under *Alaafin* Abiodun illustrate that political stability is not in any way incompatible with cultural vibrancy and intellectual progress. In their respective realms, the consolidation of power and social order could coexist with, and even foster, cultural and intellectual development, albeit under the shadows of their respective political ideologies and social structures. Tokugawa Ieyasu, having emerged from the anarchy of the *Sengoku* period, eventually institutionalised peace through mechanisms that were intent not only ensured societal control but also encourage cultural growth. Likewise, the reign of *Alaafin* Abiodun, which historians characteristically viewed through the prism of internal political and economic reforms, was marked by the maintenance of cultural fabric of Ọyọ, the patronage of local arts and craft, and the sustenance of traditional intellectual practices.

The prolonged period of peace in Tokugawa Japan, known as the *Pax Tokugawa* created conditions for the growth of education, literature, and the arts. The shogunate adopted Neo-Confucian thought, which provided a philosophical validation for the hierarchical social order and moral governance of the Tokugawa period (Jansen, 2000). Neo-Confucianism emphasised loyalty, filial piety, and social harmony, the very ideals propagated in the education of the *samurai* class and later at *terakoya* schools that educated commoners (Totman, 1995). This structured and formal system of knowledge created an educated populace, who were aware and enthusiastic about civil affairs, establishing that stability could be used to produce intellectual dynamism. Often condemned for its rigid structure of social hierarchy, Tokugawa Japan also promoted regularised patterns of social relationships that aided the organised patronage of culture. The watchful eye of the shogunate did not deter a cultured engagement with aesthetic and literary norms, in which k*abuki* theatre, wood-block printing (*ukiyo-e*), and *haiku* poetry thrived (Varley, 2000).

In the same way, *Alaafin* Abiodun presided over a period in Ọyọ where political centralisation and institutional reforms deepened social cohesion, which in turn enabled cultural and intellectual expressions. Abiodun ensured that the *Ọyọmesi*, the council of state, and subordinate chiefs operated within clearly defined roles, curtailing the incidence of internal factionalism, while resources were wisely appropriated to cultural practices (Law, 1977). Yoruba

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

intellectual life was profoundly entrenched in oral traditions, encompassing history, philosophy, and moral instruction. The stability provided by Abiodun's leadership enabled the formalisation, standardisation, and preservation of these oral forms through poets (such as the *arokin*) and griot-like figures, who served as custodians of communal memory (Peel, 2003). Festivals, religious observances, and court-sanctioned rituals, apart from being the kernel of social homogeneity, equally served as vehicles for the transference of knowledge, ethics and collective identity.

Another important parallel between Tokugawa Japan and Ọyọ Empire under *Alaafin* Abiodun is the manner with which governance and culture intersect in both polities. In Japan, Ieyasu and his descendants used the promotion of Confucian morality and cultural pursuits to legitimise their rule and strengthen social order (Totman, 1995). The arts served a purpose beyond mere aesthetic presentation and were intimately connected to state ideology, demonstrating a sophisticated understanding that culture could strengthen political stability. Similarly, The Ọyọ Empire of *Alaafin* Abiodun offers another instance of how institutional authority can create a context for the growth and expression of culture and intellectual endeavour. The spectacle of the ritual and ceremonial obligations of the court, including the annual festivals and periodic judicial proceedings, were laced with ethical and philosophical maxims serving as instruments of social instruction and entertainment (Law, 1977).

Another dimension of intellectual life in both polities was the role of literacy and scholarly pursuits in consolidating authority. While Tokugawa Japan experienced an intellectual life embedded in the codification of laws, written records, and the proliferation of printed texts, the Ọyọ Empire, in contrast, designed literacy and learning around systematised cults and archiving of memory in order to preserve the knowledge orally and through discourses, demonstrating that intellectual sophistication need not rely exclusively on written culture (Peel, 2003). Stability in both cases facilitated the accumulation and transmission of knowledge, though through different machineries: formal education and print in Japan, oral pedagogy and ritualised knowledge in Old Ọyọ. This demonstrates the flexibility of human societies to embed intellectual life within different political and technological contexts.

One profound example of the complexity of stability is the role of culture, religion and governance. In Tokugawa Japan, Shinto and Buddhism were approved for the purpose of ideological conformity, while Confucian ethics guided bureaucratic practice, creating a triad of spiritual, cultural, and political stability (Jansen, 2000). In Ọyọ, traditional Yoruba religion, with its pantheon of deities and ritual practices, strengthened communal norms, mediated conflicts, and legitimised the authority of the *Alaafin* (Peel, 2003). Both contexts suggest that culture and intellectual life were not peripheral to governance but were central to the maintenance of social order.

Finally, these illustrations demonstrate that stability under both Ieyasu and Abiodun was not tantamount to intellectual stagnation. The flowering of culture, the persistence of philosophical inquiry, and the consolidation of knowledge systems imply that effective governance can create conditions for societal creativity and reflection. The Tokugawa shogunate's meticulous regulation of the social classes and deliberate support of the arts and cultural works allowed for the emergence of a sophisticated literary and urban culture in Japan. In Ọyọ, the machinery of courtly ceremonies

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

and rituals preserved a sense of historical consciousness, religious observances, and moral values during the time of Abiodun.

Contradictions and Constraints of Reforms in Tokugawa Japan and Old Ọyọ

Tokugawa Ieyasu and Alaafin Abiodun both introduced reforms in governance and institutions intended for stability and modernisation, but these reforms had their own contradictions and limitations. Both leaders sought to centralise and control society in a manner that ensured order but also created tensions and structural constraints. This therefore shows the difficulties inherent in attempts at consolidation of power in pre-modern states. These contradictions demonstrate the limitations of reform and show that political stability often coexisted with underlying social, economic and political pressures that could not be solved by administrative measures alone.

The Tokugawa shogunate's policies in Japan strengthened social hierarchies and restricted mobility in ways that both enhanced stability and constrained innovation. There was a rigid social hierarchy of *samurai*, farmers, artisans and merchants which constrained social mobility and reinforced social status (Totman, 2014). Such divisions guaranteed a predictable governance and social order but also stifled certain types of social and economic dynamism. For example, merchant classes became wealthy and powerful despite being nominally at the bottom of the social ladder, creating tensions between economic power and social status. This contradiction exposed the limits of the Tokugawa shogunate's reforms, as regulations could not completely bridge the gap between legal status and economic capacity. Likewise, the practice of *sakoku* or national isolation was aimed at preventing foreign intervention and maintaining social cohesion, but limited Japan's access to external ideas and technologies that would have sped rapid modernisation (Jansen, 2000). Insularity also stifled innovation and international exchange, sapping the cultural dynamism of the period and exposing the inherent tension between stability and adaptive progress.

Similarly, Alaafin Abiodun's reforms in the Ọyọ Empire maintained a delicate balance between centralisation and internal elite competition. The consolidation of power by Abiodun, including the management of the *Ọyọmesi* and subordinate chiefs, enhanced political cohesion, but was not able to remove the underlying currents of contestations within the aristocracy (Law, 1977). The authority of the *Alaafin* relied on a balance of ritual legitimacy and institutional control, but disputes over succession and rivalries between the chiefs sometimes undermined governance. These reforms, although consolidating the office of the *Alaafin*, also revealed the limitations of hierarchical governance in the effective repression of elite struggles and political competition. In addition, the use of oral traditions and ritualised authority, although effective in fostering cohesion in cultural and ethical terms, rendered *Alaafin* and the Empire susceptible to historical amnesia and selective memory, thereby eroding the ability to effect systematic transfer of knowledge and administrative continuity across generations (Peel, 2003).

Another notable contradiction in Tokugawa Japan and Ọyọ Empire under *Alaafin* Abiodun was the tension between economic policies and social stability. In Tokugawa Japan, the emphasis on agricultural productivity and tax collection provided a stable revenue sources for the shogunate, but it imposed much sufferings on peasant populations, causing periodic uprisings and local unrest (White, 1988). On the other hand, Abiodun's Ọyọ Empire, while benefiting from trade in kola, ivory, and agricultural produce, was confronted by internal tensions over resource allocation and tribute obligations from vassal towns. The concentration of economic power reinforced political

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

authority but also created pockets of dissatisfaction and raised questions of the success of reforms. The examples illustrate the way the search for stability had unintended social and economic consequences.

Both reform movements have contradictory cultural and intellectual components. Japan's emphasis on Neo-Confucian ethics and formal learning helped preserve social order but suppressed alternative intellectual trends and worldviews (Totman, 2014). The adoption of codified knowledge system served state purposes but limited the capacity for critical or subversive scholarship, reflecting a tension between cultural blossom and intellectual conformity. Ọyọ, on the other hand, inculcated these knowledge practices within the perpetuated moral and social frameworks accompanying rituals and courtly education. In Ọyọ, oral transmission of knowledge bound intellect to the retention of institutional memory, thereby impeding any chance for more formal sharing of knowledge that could have spurred broader administrative growth.

Another limitation common to both leaders was the sustainability of their reforms in the long term. Although the Tokugawa shogunate's policies successfully maintained political order for over two and a half centuries, the very mechanisms that preserved stability, such as rigid hierarchy, isolationism, and control over the *samurai* class, eventually contributed to systemic stagnation and susceptibility to external pressures in the mid-19th century (Jansen, 2000). Similarly, the Ọyọ Empire's centralised structures under Abiodun could not prevent eventual political fragmentation and decline in the 19th century, as pressures from internal rivals and changes in external trade challenged the cohesion of the state (Law, 1977). In both cases, the limits of reform highlight a fundamental tension between short-term stability and long-term adaptability.

In addition, the personalised nature of authority in both polities underscores another constraint. Ieyasu created a strong, centralised shogunate that implemented his vision and much of the system's effectiveness relied on the loyalty and competence of successors. In Ọyọ, the *Alaafin's* authority was similarly mediated by ritual, moral, and personal legitimacy, attributing governance to the business of individual leadership. While such concentration of power meant an easily implementable and coherent reform system; it would leave both polities open to leadership crises or successional disputes, which, in turn, would exemplify the structural constraints on reform dependent on individual agency.

Finally, the governance reforms of Tokugawa Ieyasu and *Alaafin* Abiodun, while fostering stability and societal consolidation, were characterised by notable contradictions and limitations. In both contexts, the interplay between hierarchy and mobility, centralisation and factionalism, economic regulation and social welfare, as well as cultural codification and intellectual freedom, revealed the inherent tensions of state-building in pre-modern societies. These cases suggest the partial and bounded nature of stability and modernisation as much a function of constraints on human and institutional capacity as of conscious policy. Understanding these contradictions provides a more complete view of pre-modern government. It illustrates how reforms, however effective in maintaining order, were always subject to the influence of a complex web of social, political and economic forces which constrained their absolute effectiveness.

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

Comparative Analysis and Lessons

A comparative study of Japan under Tokugawa Ieyasu and Ọyọ Empire under Alaafin Abiodun can provide useful insights on how political leadership can promote stability and manage societal transformation at the same time. Despite vast differences in their geographical contexts, political cultures and historical circumstances, the leaders showed that good governance requires a delicate balance of central authority, institutional innovation and cultural stewardship. A number of similarities and differences emerge from their respective approaches which shed light on broader lessons for understanding pre-modern governance and the dynamics of social coherence.

One of the major similarities arises from their reliance in reforming institutions for the purpose of consolidating power. Both Ieyasu and Abiodun set up hierarchical system to concentrate power in order to minimise internal dissension. In Japan, the Tokugawa shogunate created a rigid system of social relations and responsibilities for the people, by means of the *bakuhan* system, which balanced centralised authority with local domain independence (Totman, 2014). Likewise, Abiodun's Ọyọ deployed the *Ọyọmesi* and other political councils to regulate the power of local chiefs, to create a clear command structure and to maintain cohesion across vassal territories (Law, 1977). These structures, although culturally and operationally different, show the strategic deployment of institutional configurations to ensure stability and facilitate reformist governance.

Yet there are important differences in the modes of cultural and intellectual expression. Through formal education, literacy, and printed media, Tokugawa Japan encouraged the growth of the arts and literature, civic discipline, and the spread of Neo-Confucian values (Dore, 1965; Jansen, 2000). On the contrary, the intellectual and cultural life of Ọyọ under Abiodun was dominated largely by oral traditions, ritual practices and performance arts, with emphasis on communal memory and ethical instruction rather than codified scholarship (Peel, 2003). This divergence is indicative of how different modalities of intellectual expression could be conceived in the governance-societal development nexus. The adaptability of leadership strategies to the local context and resources is clear.

Another dimension for comparative analysis concerns the management of economic and social stability. For both polities, reforms were introduced in ways that enhanced the collection of revenue and regulation of social obligations while minimising conflict. Through the focus on agricultural productivity and taxation, Japan reinforced the economic base of the shogunate, but also imposed social restrictions, while Ọyọ's regulation of tribute and trade under Abiodun provided the court with resources and the vassal towns with coherence (Law, 1977; Totman, 2014). In both cases economic management was linked with political authority. Thus, stability was guaranteed by a mixture of coercive mechanisms and the judicious alignment of economic, social and administrative policies.

The limits of reform in each case also contribute to the comparative analysis. Both leaders' approaches, whether through social rigidity, centralised control, or dependence on personal authority, showed weaknesses that would become evident in later times. The isolationism and social stratification of Tokugawa Japan stifled innovation and led to systemic stagnation, whereas Ọyọ's reliance on oral and ritual authority opened the polity to internal disintegration and succession struggles (Law, 1977; Jansen, 2000). These examples demonstrate that governance

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

reforms, however successful in the short run, are dependent on wider structural, social and temporal factors, indicating the inherent tension between stability and adaptability.

From these comparisons, a number of lessons emerge for governance and societal transformation research. First, political stability is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for modernisation. The cases of Ieyasu and Abiodun show that prudence in institution-building, cultural engineering and economic regulation can secure order, but they do not eliminate underlying social or economic pressures altogether. Secondly, the mode of transmission of knowledge, literacy versus oral tradition, formal versus ritualised instruction, determines the range and permanence of intellectual and cultural achievements. Lastly, the personal agency of leadership is crucial: both polities relied on the vision, legitimacy and skill of a central figure to deliver reforms, highlighting that good governance is often a blend of institutional capacity and personal commitment.

To summarise, this comparative study of Tokugawa Japan and Abiodun's Ọyọ Empire demonstrates that pre-modern societies could achieve considerable stability without being static. They were both masters of institutional innovation, cultural stewardship, and strategic economic management in consolidating authority, maintaining social cohesion and fostering the flowering of intellectual and artistic life. But the contradictions and limitations of their reforms remind us that governance is always conditional, context-dependent and subject to both internal and external pressures. Through a comparative study of both cases, historians and political theorists gain a greater understanding of the complex interactions of stability, reform and social change, providing insights that transcend the geographical and political specifics of time and place.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis of Tokugawa Ieyasu's Japan and Alaafin Abiodun's Ọyọ Empire establishes that political stability and social change can coexist. Both leaders sustained elaborate governance reforms that essentially consolidated power, maintained social unity, and created circumstances for cultural and intellectual development. Both provide a useful reference point to illustrate that stability in pre-modern polities can provide the structural and ideological foundation necessary for societal progress, enabling the flourishing of arts, ritual practices, and knowledge systems even within hierarchical structures. The study, therefore, acknowledges the determining importance of institutional innovation and strategic leadership in creating an enduring legacy of governance, culture, and intellectual life.

Although their reforms were successful, they were also fraught with deep contradictions and structural constraints that Ieyasu and Abiodun could not overcome. Japan's rigid social order and restrictive external-relations regime constrained mobility and some forms of innovation, while Ọyọ's dependence on negotiated political authority, ritual institutions, and succession conventions did not eliminate the possibility of elite conflict and internal division. Both episodes demonstrate the tension between the need for stability and the need for flexibility. The intersection of order and constraint points to the implications of utilising reforms in the consolidation of power, but also to the fact that they are never absolute in their ability to manage social dynamics or forestall future challenges.

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

The comparative study of Tokugawa Ieyasu and Alaafin Abiodun provides significant lessons in understanding governance, culture, and societal development. Both polities illustrate that effective leadership is forged from the fusion of institutional reform, economic management and cultural stewardship in the pursuit of sustainable stability. But the constraints and contradictions of their styles also remind us at the same time that governance is inherently context-dependent, mediated through social structures, cultural norms and individual agency. Grasping these dynamics deepens our understanding of pre-modern statecraft, while also offering enduring perspectives on the connections between stability, reform, and social progress.

The comparison undertaken in this study has implications for contemporary governance. First, leaders should emphasise institutions and rules that will survive individual office holders, for the longevity of reform depends on institutionalisation, not personal authority alone. Second, mechanisms for managing elite competition should combine authority with consultation and predictable procedures, thereby reducing the likelihood that political rivalry becomes destabilising. Third, political stability should be linked to productive economic governance through predictable taxation, secure commercial environments, infrastructure, and policies that widen rather than narrow opportunities for legitimate economic participation. Fourth, the protection of cultural and knowledge institutions should be maintained, but with a willingness to adapt, as systems that impose order by reducing intellectual and institutional flexibility may eventually impose their own capacity to respond to changing circumstances. Finally, stability needs to be understood as a political achievement that requires adaptation rather than a permanent condition. Institutions need to be continuously adapted to changing economic, social and political pressures to be able to be effective in governance. In that sense, Tokugawa Japan and Ọyọ do not offer ready-made models for contemporary states, but they do offer historically grounded lessons about the need to combine institutional continuity with the capacity for adaptation.

References

1. Akinjogbin, I. A. (1967). *Dahomey and its neighbours, 1708–1818*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Atanda, J. A. (1980). *An introduction to Yoruba history*. University of Ibadan Press.
3. Balogun, K. (1985). *Government in Old Ọyọ Empire*. Lagos: African Publishers and Co.
4. Befu, H. (1968). Village autonomy and articulation with the State. In Hall, J. W. and Jansen, M. B. (eds.), *Studies in the institutional history of early modern Japan*, 301-314, Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400868957-017
5. Berry, M. E. (1982). *Hideyoshi*. Harvard University Press.
6. Dore, R. P. (1965). *Education in Tokugawa Japan*. University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.7968110
7. Falola, T., & Akintoye, S. A. (1980). *History of the Yoruba People*. Longman.

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

8. Fukuyama, F. (2011). *The origins of political order: From prehuman times to the French Revolution*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

9. Gordon, A. (2020). *A modern history of Japan: From Tokugawa times to the present*. Oxford University Press. PDF available online for download at http://ngc.digitallibrary.co.in/bitstream/123456789/235/1/A%20Modern%20History%20of%20Japan%20From%20Tokugawa%20Times%20to%20the%20Present.pdf

10. Hall, J. W. (1968). From Tokugawa to Meiji in Japan local administration. In Hall, J. W. and Jansen, M. B. (eds.), *Studies in the institutional history of early modern Japan*, 375-386, Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400868957-022

11. Hall, J. W. (1970). *Japan: from prehistory to modern times*. University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.18741

12. Herbst, J. (2000). *States and power in Africa: Comparative lessons in authority and control*. Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.23943/princeton/9780691164137.003.0010

13. Jansen, M. B. (2000). *The making of modern Japan*. Harvard University Press.

14. Law, R. (1977). *The Ọyọ Empire c.1600–1836: A West African Imperialism in the Era of the Atlantic Slave Trade*. Clarendon Press.

15. Lloyd, P. C. (1971). *The political development of Yoruba kingdoms in the 18th and 19th centuries*. Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, London.

16. Mahoney, J. & Rueschemeyer, D. (Eds.). (2003). *Comparative historical analysis in the social sciences*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803963.007

17. McClain, J. (2001). *Japan: A modern history*. W.W. Norton and Co Inc.

18. Ojo, G. J. A. (1966). *Yoruba culture: A geographical analysis*. University of Ife Press.

19. Ooms, H. (1985). *Tokugawa Ideology: Early Constructs, 1570–1680*. Princeton University Press.

20. Peel, J. D. Y. (2003). *Religious encounter and the making of the Yoruba*. Indiana University Press. https://doi.org/10.2979/3465.0

21. Sheldon, C. D. (1958). *The rise of the merchant class in Tokugawa Japan, 1600-1686*. Augustin.

22. Smith, R. S. (1988). *Kingdoms of the Yoruba*. University of Wisconsin Press.

23. Thelen, K. (2003). How institutions evolve: Insights from comparative historical analysis. In J. Mahoney & D. Rueschemeyer (Eds.), *Comparative historical analysis in the social sciences* (pp. 208–240). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803963.007

24. Totman, C. (1995). *Early modern Japan*. University of California Press.

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - *E*- ISSN: 3156-5492 | *P*- ISSN: 3156-5514

25. Totman, C. (2014). *A history of Japan* (Second Edition). Wiley.

26. Varley, P. (2000). *Japanese culture*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.