

CHARLES UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Institute of Political Studies

Erik Illmann

**Reasons for Relocating Capital Cities and
Their Implications**

Bachelor Thesis

Prague 2015

Author: **Erik Illmann**

Supervisor: **PhDr. Michael Romancov, Ph.D.**

Year of Defense: 2015

Bibliographic Entry

ILLMANN, Erik. *Reasons for Relocating Capital Cities and Their Implications*. Prague, 2015. 69 pages. Bachelor Thesis (Bc.) Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Institute of Political Studies. Department of Political Science. Supervisor of the Thesis PhDr. Michael Romancov, Ph.D.

Abstract

This bachelor thesis explores the process of capital city relocation. Its aim is to create a typology of reasons, why capital cities move. In the first part the thesis describes capital cities from a theoretical viewpoint and introduces theories relevant to their relocations – the growth centre (pole) theory, the theory of nation-building, and a theory determining the relationship between capital cities, distance, and conflict. In the second part it explores the cases of fifteen relocations of capital cities since the year 1900 and two currently considered relocations. Based on these case studies I arrive at the conclusion that there are five reasons why capital cities move: 1. Nation-building purposes, 2. Spread of regional development, 3. Issues of the capital city, 4. To mitigate the threat of insurrection, and 5. The decision of the leader.

Abstrakt

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá procesem přesunů hlavních měst. Jejím cílem je vytvoření typologie důvodů, proč se hlavní města přesouvají. V první části práce jsou teoreticky popsána hlavní města a představeny teorie relevantní k jejich přesunům – teorie růstového centra (growth centre theory), teorie budování národa (nation-building) a teorie zkoumající vztah mezi hlavním městem, vzdáleností a konfliktem. V druhé části je prozkoumáno patnáct přesunů hlavních měst od roku 1900 a dva v současnosti uvažované přesuny. Na základě těchto případových studií dospívám k závěru, že existuje pět důvodů, proč se hlavní města přesouvají: 1. Nation-building důvody, 2. Rozšíření regionálního rozvoje, 3. Problémy hlavního města, 4. Snížení rizika povstání a 5. Rozhodnutí lídra.

Keywords

capital city, geographical relocation, nation-building, conflict, growth centre, Ankara, Brasília, Abuja, Belmopan, Lilongwe

Klíčová slova

hlavní město, geografická relopace, nation-building, konflikt, růstové centrum, Ankara, Brasília, Abuja, Belmopan, Lilongwe

Length: 91 164 characters

Declaration

1. The author hereby declares, that he compiled this thesis independently, using only the listed resources and literature.
2. The author further declares, that the thesis has not been used for obtaining any previous university degree.
3. The author consents to the distribution of the thesis for study and research purposes.

Prague, 4 January 2015

Erik Illmann

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my supervisor, PhDr. Michael Romancov, Ph.D., for his comments and advice, especially in connection with the theoretical part of the thesis.

Institute of Political Studies

Project of the Thesis

Název / Title: *Důvody přesunů hlavních měst a jejich důsledky / Reasons for Relocating Capital Cities and Their Implications*

Akademický rok vypsání / Academic Year of Announcement: 2012/2013

Jazyk práce / Language of the Thesis: angličtina / English (původně čeština, později změněno / originally Czech, later changed to English)

Ústav / Department: Katedra politologie (23-KP) / Department of Political Science (23-KP)

Vedoucí / Supervisor: PhDr. Michael Romancov, Ph.D.

Řešitel / Author: Erik Illmann

Předběžný nástin tématu

Petr Veliký r. 1712 přesunul po staletích hlavní město Ruska z Moskvy do nově postaveného Petrohradu ze strategických důvodů (být blíže Evropě, zjednodušit námořní obchod) a současně chtěl postavit nové hlavní město jako „výkladní skříň“ nového Ruska, jakési ruské Versailles. Austrálie v 19. století vytvořila jako své hlavní město Canberru, z důvodu sporů o lokaci hlavního města mezi dvěma největšími městy, Sydney a Melbourne, nebylo vybráno ani jedno z nich a místo toho zřízena Canberra, která leží přibližně napůl cesty mezi nimi. Brazílie přesunula své hlavní město z Rio de Janeira do Brasílie r. 1960 z důvodu situace v přelidněném Riu, přílišném zatížení vlády problémy samotného Ria a nevhodného geografického umístění na pobřeží. Irán uvažuje, že přesune své hlavní město pryč z Teheránu z důvodu neklidného podloží pod hlavním městem a nebezpečí vážného poškození města silným zemětřesením.

Přesunů hlavních měst bylo v dějinách stovky a jak patrně z výše zmíněného, důvody se značně lišily. Jako hlavní cíl své práce se pokusím uceleně sepsat a popsat důvody, proč se hlavní města přesouvají. Abych tohoto dosáhl, musím nejprve charakterizovat hlavní město – jaké atributy naplňuje, co tvoří „hlavní město hlavním městem“. Do této části bych rád umístil krátkou vložku týkající se monocefalických a polycefalických států a vliv tohoto faktoru na atributy hlavního města a případného vlivu na přesun a krátkou vložku týkající se zajímavých a nezvyklých hlavních měst (USA, JAR, Nizozemsko).

Tato část práce týkající se charakteristiky hlavních měst přímo souvisí s hlavní částí mé práce, důvody přesunu hlavních měst, neboť kdybych zmapoval pouze důvody přesunů hlavních měst a ne atributy hlavních měst, tak nezjistím, jaký měl důvod přesunu vztah k atributům původního hlavního města (např. pokud by stát přesunul své hlavní město z okraje území do středu, tak tato informace nic neřekne bez zjištění, jestli je geografické umístění ve středu území jedna z charakteristik, které hlavní města běžně naplňují).

V další části své práce se chci zabývat důsledky přesunu hlavního města. Z jedné strany bych se chtěl zaměřit na to, jestli nové hlavní město splnilo účel přesunu, z druhé strany bych se chtěl podívat, jaké důsledky má přesun hlavního města obecně, zejména pro politické, ekonomické a kulturní elity země (např. jak zareagovali členové brazilského parlamentu na přesun hlavního města).

V závěrečné části bych se rád zaměřil na existující hlavní města a pokusil se předpovědět, který stát by v budoucnu mohl čelit nutnosti přesunout hlavní město. Uvědomuji si, že tento úkol se může ukázat nad mé síly.

Cíle práce

Hlavním cílem práce je tedy vytvořit ucelenou typologii přesunů hlavních měst a kromě toho potvrdit či vyvrátit následující hypotézy.

První hypotézou je, že přesun hlavního města nemá výrazný dopad na úroveň ekonomických aktivit původního hlavního města. Důkaz pro to může být případ Rio de Janeira či Istanbulu.

Druhou hypotézou je, že trvá několik desítek let, než se hlavní město stane pro obyvatelstvo atraktivním a „skutečným“ hlavním městem. Podporovat tuto hypotézu může fakt, že brazilská vláda i 20 let po přesídlení platila lidem za přestěhování do nového hlavního města.

Zdůvodnění výběru tématu

Jenom pohledem na vývoj v posledních sto letech je zřejmé, že se nejedná o okrajovou záležitost a zaslouží si pozornost – přesunuta byla hlavní města ve více než 20 zemích světa, zmínil bych zejména Brazílii (přesun z Rio de Janeira do Brasílie r. 1960), Rusko (přesun z Petrohradu do Moskvy r. 1918) a Turecko (přesun z Istanbulu do Ankary r.

1923). Pohledem ještě dále od historie zjistíme, že v lidské historii byly přesunuty stovky hlavních měst. Domnívám se, že tento proces je velice důležitý a má široké dopady především na fungování státu, jeho hospodářství a na život jeho obyvatelstva.

Přesto všechno si myslím, že tomuto procesu není věnována dostatečná pozornost, není žádná známá či široce přijímaná „teorie přesunů hlavních měst“ či typologie důvodů přesunu. Nejčastěji existují pouze případové studie, zabývající se přesunem jednoho konkrétního hlavního města (např. zmiňovaná Brasília).

Vymezením atributů hlavních měst, prozkoumáním případů z minulosti, vytvořením typologie a zmapováním důsledků bude možno předvídat, čemu budou čelit státy, které se rozhodují své hlavní město přesunout (Haiti, Irán), jaké tyto přesuny budou mít důsledky a také pokusit se předpovědět, jaké státy by v budoucnu mohly přistoupit či být nuceny přistoupit na přesun hlavního města.

Předpokládaná metoda

Jako teoretický základ pro první část mé práce, charakteristiku hlavních měst, použiji teorii centra a periferie Steinna Rokkana, práce autorů, kteří tuto teorii dále rozvíjejí (např. Vít Hloušek) a monografie autorů, kteří se specificky zabývali problematikou hlavních měst (např. John Taylor).

Hlavní část mé práce, důvody přesunů hlavních měst, chci vypracovat pomocí řady případových studií. Plánuji zmapovat všechny případy posledních 100 až 150 let a zjistit, jaké důvody byly za přesunem. Předpokládám, že budu z velké části používat prvotní zdroje (články v denním tisku, oficiální dokumenty vlády a státního aparátu). Je možné, že se jako vhodná ukáže jiná metoda, např. komparativní.

Důsledky přesunů hlavních měst plánuji zpracovat podobně jako předchozí část, tzn. pomocí řady případových studií. Podle vhodnosti by se zde mohla ukázat jako vhodná i komparativní metoda, např. srovnat důsledky přesunů hlavního města v Brazílii a Turecku. Jak řečeno, vhodnost této metody a konkrétní města, na které by šla použít, se ukáže až během vypracovávání práce.

Intended Method (English)

As a theoretical basis for the first part of my thesis, the characteristics of capital cities, I am going to use Stein Rokkan's centre-periphery theory, works of authors further

developing this theory (e.g. Vít Hloušek) and works of authors specifically concentrating on the topic of capital cities (e.g. John Taylor).

The main part of my thesis, reasons for relocating capital cities, I intend to elaborate through a series of case studies. I plan to go over all capital cities relocations in the last 100 to 150 years and find out the reasons for the moves. I assume that I will be mainly using primary sources of information (e.g. newspaper articles, official government documents). It is possible that other methods might prove useful, such as the comparative method.

I aim to elaborate the implications of capital cities relocations in a similar fashion, through a series of case studies. The comparative method might also show itself useful, for example to compare the implications of relocating the capitals of Brazil and Turkey. As stresses before, usefulness of this method and particular cities would be established in the process.

Předpokládaná osnova

1. Úvod

2. Hlavní město

- Aplikace teorie Steina Rokkana

- Atributy hlavního města

- Zajímavé případy hlavních měst

3. Důvody přesunů hlavních měst

- Případové studie přesunů hlavních měst

- Typologie přesunů hlavních měst

4. Důsledky přesunu hlavního města

- Dopady na hospodářství, politiku, obyvatelstvo, infrastrukturu atd.

- Splnil přesun svůj účel?

- Problémy přesunu hlavního města

5. Predikce do budoucna – možné přesuny hlavních měst

6. Závěr

Intended Contents (English)

1. Introduction

2. Capital City

- Application of Stein Rokkan's Theory
- Attributes of Capital Cities
- Interesting Examples of Capital Cities

3. Reasons for Relocating Capital Cities

- Case Studies of Capital Cities Relocations
- Typology of Capital Cities Relocations

4. Implications of Capital Cities Relocations

- Impacts on Economy, Politics, Inhabitants, Infrastructure etc.
- Did the Relocations fulfil its purpose?
- Problems associated with Capital Cities Relocations

5. Prediction for the Future – Possible Capital Cities Relocations

6. Conclusion

Předpokládaná literatura / *Intended Bibliography*

BEST, Alan (1970): *Gaborone: Problems and Prospects of a New Capital*. In: *The Geographical Review*. vol. 60, n. 1. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.

ELDREDGE, Wentworth (1975): *World Capitals: Toward Guided Urbanization*. New York: Anchor Press.

EPSTEIN, David G. (1973): *Brasília, Plan and Reality: A Study of Planned and Spontaneous Urban Development*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

GORDON, David (2006): *The Twentieth Century Capital Cities*. London: Routledge.

HLOUŠEK, Vít (2004): *Centra a periferie v Evropě*. In: *Středoevropské politické studie*. vol. 4, n. 1. Dostupné z WWW <http://www.cepsr.com/clanek.php?ID=189>

MOORE, Jonathan (1984): *The Political History of Nigeria's New Capital*. In: *The Journal of Modern African Studies*. vol. 22, n. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

POTTS, Deborah (1985): *Capital Relocation in Africa: The Case of Lilongwe in Malawi*. In: *The Geographical Journal*. vol. 151, n. 2. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.

PRESTON, E. James, SPERIDIAO, Faissol (1956): *The Problem of Brazil's Capital City*. In: *The Geographical Review*. vol. 46, n. 3. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.

RAWAT, Rajiv (2005): *Capital City Relocation: Global-Local Perspectives in the Search for an Alternative Modernity*. Toronto: Department of Geography, York University. Dostupné z WWW <http://prayaga.org/documents/paper-capitalcity.pdf>

ROKKAN, Stein (1987): *The Centre-Periphery Polarity*. In: Rokkan, Stein; Urwin, Derek; Aarebrot, Frank H.; Malaba, Pamela; Sande, Terje (1987): *Centre-Periphery Structures in Europe*. An ISSC Workbook in Comparative Analysis. Frankfurt - New York: Campus, s. 17-50.

ROKKAN, Stein (1975): *Dimensions of State Formation and Nation-Building: A Possible Paradigm for Research on Variations within Europe*. In: Tilly, Charles (ed.): *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, s. 562-600.

SCHATZ, Edward (2003): *When Capital Cities Move: The Political Geography of Nation and State Building*. Notre Dame: Helen Kellogg Institute for International Studies. Dostupné z WWW <http://kellogg.nd.edu/publications/workingpapers/WPS/303.pdf>

TAYLOR, John, LENGELLÉ, Jean, ANDREW, Caroline (1993): *Capital Cities: International Perspectives*. Ontario: Carleton University Press.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
1. What is a capital city?	3
1.1. Basic attributes.....	3
1.2. Physical expression.....	4
1.3. Implication for capital city relocations	5
2. Theories applying to capital city relocations	6
2.1. Capital city as a city in its own right.....	6
2.2. Nation-building and State-building.....	6
2.3. Growth Centre (Pole) Theory	8
2.4. Capital Cities, Geographical Distance, and Conflict	9
3. Case Studies I – Past Relocations	11
3.1. India	12
3.2. Russia.....	14
3.3. Turkey.....	15
3.4. Pakistan.....	16
3.5. Brazil.....	17
3.6. Belize	19
3.7. Tanzania.....	21
3.8. Malawi.....	21
3.9. Cote d’Ivoire	23
3.10. Nigeria	23
3.11. Germany	25
3.12. Kazakhstan	26
3.13. Malaysia	27
3.14. Myanmar	28
3.15. South Korea.....	31
4. Case Studies II - Considered Relocations	33
4.1. Iran	33
4.2. Indonesia.....	34
5. Typology of reasons for capital city relocations.....	36
5.1. Nation-building.....	38
5.2. Spread of regional development	38
5.3. Issues of the capital city.....	39
5.4. Threat of Insurrection	39
5.5. Decision of the leader	40
6. Implications of capital city relocations	42
Conclusion	44
Shrnutí	46
Bibliography	47
Non-periodical	47
Periodical	51
Online News	54

Introduction

Every country in the world has a capital city (in this thesis also called *a capital*), which usually is the largest city and the seat of the government. From time to time a country decides to move (relocate) its capital to another city, sometimes even planned and built especially for that purpose. To name a few: Turkey moved its capital to stand as a symbol of the new post-Ottoman country and its regime, Kazakhstan moved its capital to strengthen the Kazakh national identity, and Belize moved its capital to avoid the danger of hurricanes.

It is obvious at first sight that the reasons for moving a capital are very diverse. That lead me to the question if there is a common logic that prompts such a risky move, in other words if it is possible to find a set of reasons, why capital cities move. The literature on capital cities in general is very scarce (as opposed to literature on individual capital), the literature on individual relocations of capital cities even scarcer, and the literature on capital city relocations in general is virtually non-existent, not to speak of literature on reasons and implications of capital city relocations. In the few articles that deal with the topic I found the reasons covered in an inadequate way, usually categorized according to activity or field, i.e. political, geographical, economical reasons. In my opinion this typology is unsuitable, because it is too abstract to provide any real insight into the question at hand.

Since the year 1900, a capital city relocation has occurred on average every six years and is a tremendous undertaking for any country, but has not been subject to complex scientific inquiry, which is why I believe it deserves more attention. In this thesis I am going to find the reasons why capital cities move. The main goal is to create a typology, which would cover all (or almost all) cases of capital city relocation and which, at the same time, would be concrete enough to be helpful when looking at potential capital city relocation in the future.

To achieve this goal I am going to examine individual capital city relocations of the 20th and 21st century, i.e. use the method of multiple case studies. I do not inquire into older relocations, since I am interested in reasons for moving a capital city of a modern nation state. Capital cities evolved as well, fulfilled various functions and reasons for their relocations differed. Because I intend for my typology to be applicable to today's world I exclude these older relocations.

I examine each relocation individually and explore the reasons behind it, using mainly secondary sources – academic works written by political scientists, architects, geographers, demographers, historians, urbanists, politicians, sociologists, and others, preferably describing the individual relocation in a compact manner. With each relocation I compressively list the main reasons behind it in an order of decreasing importance. Then I attempt to create a typology of reasons for moving a capital, primarily by determining if some of the reasons were present in multiple relocations.

The thesis consists of three major parts – a theoretical part, individual case studies, and the typology of capital city relocations. In the theoretical part, firstly I describe what a capital city is, secondly I present theories relevant to capital city relocations. In the next part I examine individual capital city relocations in a chronological order, ending with the ones presently considered or planned. Finally I present my own typology of reasons for relocating a capital city.

The project of the thesis presumed an equal part dedicated to both the reasons for capital city relocations and their implications (consequences). However, the topic proved to be too extensive and the implications of the relocations too specific to each case to be summarized, so I decided to give only a general account of what follows a capital city relocation in the final part of the thesis. Also the hypothesis proved to be unfit, therefore I decided not to address them in the thesis.

1. What is a capital city?

Before looking at relocations of capital cities and their reasons, it is important to know what it is that is being relocated. In this chapter I am going to describe what makes a capital city a capital, i.e. how it is different from other cities in a given country.

First of all, it is crucial to realize that capitals are complicated and unique entities, differentiating in space and time, therefore searching for a common sign or signs is often futile. Even if a common sign is found, there are most likely going to be numerous exceptions [Rapoport, 1993: p. 31; Corey, 2004: p. 45].

Second of all, capitals have not been subject to complex scientific inquiry. There is voluminous literature on individual capitals, but very little on capitals in general [Rapoport, 1993: p. 31; Slack and Chattopadhyay, 2009: p. 5]. This is quite surprising considering how much has changed in the landscape of capitals in the last 120 years – in the year 1900 there were about forty national capitals in the world; a century later, in the year 2000, the number was around two hundred [Gordon, 2006: p. 1]. Also, 75 per cent of the 1900 capitals were not capitals a century later [Vale, 2006: p. 15]. Two major events had impact on this increase in the number of capitals – the collapse of empires and the creation of federations [Vale, 2006: p. 17].

1.1. Basic attributes

The word *capital* is derived from the Latin word *caput*, which means *head*; this leads to the important conclusion that from the very beginning the idea behind capitals was not that of *city*, but that of *headquarters* [Rapoport, 1993: p. 31].

We might easily define capital legally – many countries have their capital embedded in their constitution or another legal act (for example the Czech Republic, Germany, or the Netherlands). However in doing so, we forgo “the essence” of capitals, i.e. what makes them unique.

However great their differences, researchers seem to agree on one common sign – capital city is the seat of government [Hall, 1993: p. 69; Wusten, 2000: p. 129; Corey, 2004: p. 45; Rawat, 2005: p. 1; Slack and Chattopadhyay, 2009: p. 292]. Others add the legislature as well [e.g. Spate, 1942: p. 622]. Again, there are exceptions: iconic is the

case of the Netherlands (the capital is Amsterdam, but the government is in the Hague; it is therefore possible to say that the Hague is the *de facto* capital of the Netherlands).

Capital city is the centre of authority and control over a given territory. Gottmann and Harper define a capital as a “...*seat of power and a place of decision-making processes that affect the lives and the future of the nation ruled, and that may influence trends and events beyond its borders. Capitals differ from other cities: the capital function secures strong and lasting centrality; it calls for a special hosting environment to provide what is required for the safe and efficient performance of the functions of government and decision-making characteristics of the place*” [Gottmann and Harper, 1990: p. 63].

It is also possible to define a capital as “*an instrument for the organization of the surrounding territory*”. This definition is more abstract and avoids defining a capital by the presence of certain elements, which might be culture-specific [Rapoport, 1993: p. 32]. Central to this definition is *control*: control of the surrounding territory. There are many means of control – politics, administration, military power, culture, education, communication, transport, history, or justice and law [Rapoport, 1993: p. 34]. But considering that politics (political authority) is without doubt the most important means of control, superior to the others and influencing them in a major way, this definition is compatible with the previous one.

An attribute, which comes often to the fore when discussing capitals, is size. The capital is typically the biggest city in a given state: when looking at countries with population larger than half a million, 83 per cent of them have their biggest city as their capital city [Dascher, 2000: p. 373]. However, it is not always so – among the exceptions are the United States of America, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Switzerland, or Brazil. Since the 1800s there has been a trend towards placing the capitals in smaller cities [Rapoport, 1993: p. 33]. Some urbanists see a casual relationship between the political and administrative functions of a city and its size – the presence of these functions leads to a faster growth of that city [Turner and Turner, 2011: p. 19].

1.2. Physical expression

The presence of government and usually other institutions needs a physical expression, which gives a capital its appearance and makes the capital a powerful symbol

[Rapoport, 1993: p. 34; Corey, 2004: p. 49]. The capital symbolizes the national identity – it shows to the inhabitants as well as to the world the qualities a country wishes to portray, such as history, capitalism, revolution, religion, or pride [Dijking, 2000: p. 65; Wusten, 2000: p. 131; Corey, 2004: p. 49]. These qualities are expressed throughout the country, but achieve their highest and most developed form in the capital city – the monuments and buildings are the biggest, most decorated, most redundant; the physical appearance also demonstrates the ability of a country to construct such monuments [Rapoport, 1993: p. 36].

This symbolism is even more important in federal countries, which tend to be ethnically, linguistically, and religiously diverse, their capitals therefore need to be neutral, reflect this diversity, and unite the nation [Slack and Chattopadhyay, 2009: p. 3].

Therefore in capitals, we find imposing buildings of parliaments, museums, libraries, universities, memorials, or art galleries. A great example of this is Washington, D.C., with the buildings of the legislature (the Capitol), executive (the White House), judicature (the Supreme Court), monuments (Washington Monument, Lincoln Memorial, Jefferson Memorial), museums and art galleries (the Smithsonian's), and others all placed in an imposing plan around the National Mall, creating a powerful symbol resonating throughout the country and the world.

1.3. Implication for capital city relocations

To summarize, the basic attribute of a capital city is that it hosts the national government. Usually, the capital is also where the highest body of the legislature meets and judicature resides and usually it is also the biggest city in a country; but as said before, there are exceptions to these additional signs.

A capital city relocation is therefore the physical move of the national government from one city to another city, but usually entails the move of the entire central state apparatus [Schatz, 2004: p. 111].

2. Theories applying to capital city relocations

In this part of the thesis I provide theoretical background for capital city relocations described further. Given that the process of relocating a capital is highly country-specific, i.e. the relocations and their reasons differ greatly from each other and some are altogether unique, it is impossible to find one theory, which would explain all of them.

2.1. Capital city as a city in its own right

Linked to the previous chapter on capital cities, “...for a national capital to be successful, it must function both as a national seat of government for the country and it must function as a prosperous and liveable city in its own right” [Corey, 2004: 50].

This is a transcendent factor, strongly affecting the potential of a city as a capital. If a city is under constant threat of natural disasters (such as floods or earthquakes) or has other problems such as poor infrastructure, overpopulation, or pollution, it can threaten the entire existence of that city and of course affect the city’s ability to serve as a capital (for example the government could be preoccupied with the issues of that city alone and loose perspective of the entire country or the inadequate infrastructure could have a direct adverse effect of the functioning of the government and administration).

These issues can be dealt with in multiple ways – building dams, investing into new infrastructure and so on. However, if they are not successfully dealt with, the capital city might (or might be forced to) move to another city. This of course does not solve the problems of the previous city, but it no longer affects the functioning of the government.

2.2. Nation-building and State-building

Before looking at the processes in greater detail, let me address the issue of terminology. Nation-building and state-building have not always been distinguished – some view nation-building as specific to post colonialism, some use it to describe activities of the United States and its allies in countries like Iraq or Afghanistan only, others are of the opinion that the terms are interchangeable, but state-building is used in

politics, whereas nation-building by academics [Bogdandy et al., 2005: p. 580]. In this thesis, I will use the following definitions of state-building and nation-building:

State-building can be defined as “*the effort to undermine alternative, rival power bases and develop viable institutions*“ [Schatz, 2004: p. 119]. It includes the establishment, re-establishment and strengthening of political or other structures capable of delivering political goods, in other words the construction of a new infrastructure and a symbolic apparatus, expressing the legitimacy of the leader [Schatz, 2004: p. 120; Bogdandy et al., 2005: p. 583]. The process of state-building is the reaction to state failure: situation, where a country (i.e. its government) is incapable of delivering positive political good on such scale, that it threatens its legitimacy and existence [Bogdandy et al., 2005: p. 580].

Nation-building can be defined as “*the process of collective identity formation with a view to legitimizing public power within a given territory*” [Bogdandy et al., 2005: p. 586] or “*the effort to secure the loyalty of broad populations inhabiting the territory represented by the state*“ [Schatz, 2004: p. 120]. It is the reaction to nation failure: situation, when the differences between individual groups prevail over the national, “superior” identity and cause that it is highly unlikely or impossible that the decision of the government will be obeyed. This is typical for countries with multiple communities, identifying themselves along religious, language, class, or ethnic lines [Schatz, 2004: p. 121; Bogdandy et al., 2005: p. 585].

A country, in which the majority of the population does not view itself as a nation and the consensus about customs, rituals, and traditions is absent leads to poor functioning of the state and can result in civil war, as it did in Yugoslavia or Bosnia and Herzegovina [Bogdandy et al., 2005: p. 585].

There are several strategies to cope with these issues: foreign intervention, creation of a unifying ideology, built around language or religion, constitutional development and the constitution as a object of identification, establishment of a functioning state apparatus [Hippler, 2002; Bogdandy et al., 2005: p. 587], and also the relocation of a capital city (or building of a new one), which can provide a forum for communication and interaction between individual group and serve as a symbol of the country and the nation.

When applying this theory to capital cities, there is one significant aspect of the development of modern countries that should be kept in mind – in Europe, securing the loyalty of spatially bounded populations was central to the Westphalian system. The process of state-building and nation-building began before the modern state emerged. Outside Europe, it was often the other way around – statehood was established and then it was attempted to fill this “form” with a nation and state structures. This logically led to different functions of their respective capital cities [Schatz, 2004: p. 113-114].

In this thesis I work mainly with the concept of nation-building, but given that the processes are closely connected I sometimes mention them both.

2.3. Growth Centre (Pole) Theory

The basic idea of this theory is that development does not occur evenly throughout a territory, but rather around centres [Parr, 1999: p. 1195; Campbell, 1974: p. 43]. If there is a central industry in one place (for example a car manufacturer), its presence will cause through direct and indirect effects the emergence of other industries in that place, thus causing economical growth and development. Among the direct effects are that the central industry requires goods and services from its suppliers, whereas the indirect effect is for example that the employees of the central industry will seek accommodation, goods and services. This is described as the so-called *linkage effect* – through the direct and indirect effects the presence of a central industry will cause growth in other areas [Campbell, 1974: p. 44].

Whereas growth centres appear naturally, they can also be planned. Growth centre theory claims that instead of spreading investment evenly over a territory, a better strategy is to concentrate investment in one place, create a growth centre, which, in return, will stimulate economic activity and welfare in its region [Parr, 1999: p. 1195].

There are several strategies to spur growth, mostly depending on the background for the employment of the growth centre theory, the most relevant being what Parr describes as modifying the national urban system (mostly countries with the majority of population in one or two cities; such structure is regarded highly undesirable, since it hinders national development and the dominance of the metropolis prevents other cities from developing) and reviving a depressed area (areas with high unemployment, low per-

capita income, social deprivation, poor infrastructure etc.). These two backgrounds very often overlap (the cause of a depressed area might be the existence of a metropolis, therefore the processes of preventing its further growth and supporting development in the depressed area are interlinked [Parr, 1999: p. 1202-1203].

The answer in both cases is to create a planned growth-centre in an urban centre of a medium size, which is supposed to prevent further growth of the metropolis and spur development in the depressed area. This might be achieved by supporting interregional mobility, tax benefits, state interference, and also by relocating the capital city [Parr, 1999: p. 1204].

Unfortunately the growth centre strategy did not entirely fulfil its promises and theoretical weaknesses and empirical shortcomings were found. After being very popular in the 1960s and 1970s, it was rejected and stopped being employed by governments [Potts, 1985: p. 183; Parr, 1999: p. 1195].

2.4. Capital Cities, Geographical Distance, and Conflict

The closer insurrection emerges to the centre of political power (i.e. the capital city) the more dangerous it is for the government (or the regime). The theory is built on the principle that political influence grows with the proximity to power: therefore the dangers of insurrections decrease with growing distance to the capital city. As a result, conflict will frequently emerge and overthrow the government closer to the capital city. That is why inhabitants of the capital have more influence than inhabitants anywhere else and their support of the government is very significant [Ades and Glaeser, 1994: p. 3; Dascher, 2000: p. 375; Campante et al., 2014: p. 5].

An excellent historical example of this phenomenon is the French revolution – the 550 thousand inhabitants of Paris (only 2 per cent of the population of France) had a bigger influence on the outset, process, and result of the revolution than the remaining twenty-eight million inhabitants of France. Further examples might be Thailand or Ukraine [Campante et al., 2014: p. 5-6].

Capital cities very often play a crucial role in insurrections and revolutions. The governments are aware of that, which influences their policies – inhabitants of the

capital receive “special treatment”, such as tax benefits, in order to buy their support and loyalty [Ades and Glaeser, 1994: p. 4].

It should be noted that this theory applies only to relatively non-democratic countries and that primate cities in non-democratic countries are up to 45 per cent larger than their democratic counterparts. This is caused by the “special treatment” mentioned above: if they stayed in the periphery, the government would ignore them, as they present no or very little danger [Ades and Glaeser, 1994: p. 10-11].

As a result, the government (or the regime) might attempt to limit the number of inhabitant in their close proximity. Strategies to achieve that include motivation to relocate to other parts of the country, limits on intrastate migration, or even mass deportation [Campante et al., 2014: p. 8]. Another strategy is to relocate the capital city away from the main population centres, i.e. into isolation – by doing that, the government (or the regime) lessens the risk of being overthrown, but risks bad governance [Campante et al., 2014: p. 2].

3. Case Studies I – Past Relocations

In the next part I am going to explore the relocations of capitals in the 20th and 21st century. I present fifteen cases, covering all, which are considered to be significant [Schatz, 2003: p. 5; Corey, 2004: p. 52; Rawat, 2005: p. 4]. I intentionally leave out several relocations, either because of little relevance (for example Botswana or Mauritania¹) or because there is so little information on them that by including them I would risk basing my typology on data, which does not have the necessary standards (for example the Philippines). I am certain that their omission does not compromise the validity of my typology, because none of them seems to significantly differ from the cases presented here.

Country	Year	From	To
India	1911	Kolkata	New Delhi
Russia	1918	St. Petersburg	Moscow
Turkey	1923	Istanbul	Ankara
Pakistan	1959	Karachi	Islamabad
Brazil	1960	Rio de Janeiro	Brasília
Belize	1970	Belize City	Belmopan
Tanzania	1974	Dar es Salaam	Dodoma
Malawi	1975	Zomba	Lilongwe
Cote d'Ivoire	1983	Abidjan	Yamoussoukro
Nigeria	1991	Lagos	Abuja
Germany	1991	Bonn	Berlin
Kazakhstan	1997	Almaty	Astana
Malaysia*	1999	Kuala Lumpur	Putrajaya
Myanmar	2006	Yangon	Naypyidaw
South Korea*	2012	Seoul	Sejong City
Iran**	?	Tehran	?
Indonesia**	?	Jakarta	?

* partial relocations, ** considered relocations (*4. Case Studies II – Considered Relocations*)

¹ Neither of these countries inherited a colonial-era capital, therefore they had to establish an initial capital.

I do not strictly distinguish cases of post-colonial relocations. I am aware that their colonial past makes these relocations qualitatively different and the fact their former capital cities served the needs of the colonial power instead of controlling the territory and creating loyalty (in its modern meaning) was an important factor [Schatz, 2004: p. 115]. However I do believe that the reasons for the relocations are in fact similar and can be compared to the relocations in countries without a colonial past (or with a more distant colonial past).

It is crucial to bear in mind that relocations of capitals are extremely complex undertakings, generally with multiple reasons and factors, and it is therefore very difficult to retrospectively determine which were the decisive ones; also because the real reasons and the ones proclaimed by the government very often differ, especially in non-democratic countries.

Based on the research of mainly academic articles I shortly describe the historical background of each move and introduce the reasons for the relocation, ordered by decreasing relevance (i.e. reason 1 was the main reason, reason 2 etc. was less important in the decision to relocate the capital).

3.1.India

India² relocated its capital city from Kolkata³ to New Delhi in 1911.⁴ It was a move ordered and planned by the colonial power, which makes it unique in the landscape of the 20th century relocations. It is not without interest that India kept New Delhi as its capital when it gained independence in 1947. Kolkata, on the other side, continued its descent to its present state.⁵

In 1911 lord Hardinge, Viceroy of India (1911 - 1916) wrote a letter to London, to the Earl of Crewe, Secretary of State for India, outlining why Britain should move the

² Correctly British Raj, which lasted until 1947 and whose centrepiece was today's India; this is also important to take into account when examining the "central location" argument, since the territory ruled from Kolkata and later New Delhi was significantly larger than India today.

³ Former spelling also *Calcutta*.

⁴ The King announced the construction of New Delhi and at the same time declared it the capital, even though New Delhi was inaugurated in 1931 after 20 years of construction. This is why it is possible to find both 1911 and 1931 as dates of the relocation.

⁵ For more information about the impact the relocation had on Kolkata see: The Wall Street Journal. *Was New Delhi a Death Knell for Calcutta?* [online]. 2011. Available at: <http://blogs.wsj.com/indiarealtime/2011/11/28/was-new-delhi-a-death-knell-for-calcutta/>.

capital from Kolkata to Delhi [Wright, 2011]. Plans of the relocation were known to only a dozen people in India and a dozen people in the United Kingdom [Lahiri, 2011: p. 7]. The relocation was announced six months later, in December 1911, by King George V. himself at the royal durbar in Delhi and came as a surprise to those attending [Lahiri, 2011: p. 4].

Reason 1 – Threat of insurrection

The main reason behind the move was the fact that Kolkata was the centre of anti-British opposition, frequently carrying out bombings and political assassinations. With the capital in Delhi, lord Hardinge explained, the British would escape the pressure of having separatists and terrorists directly at their footsteps and assuage the nationalist forces [Broomfield, 1968: p. 40; Chakravarty, 1997: p. 61]. Lord Curzon, former Viceroy of India and the loudest opponent of the move, also confirmed that this was the main reason behind the relocation [Khaleej Times, 2011; Wright, 2011].

The fact that lord Hardinge moved with his viceregal court in March 1912, long before proper accommodation and other infrastructure was ready in Delhi, seems to support this view [Lahiri, 2011: p. 9].

As the capital cities and conflict theory explains (*2.4 Capital Cities, Geographical Distance, and Conflict*), by creating a distance between the centre of political power (i.e. the capital city) and the centre of the opposition the threat of a potential insurrection was reduced.

Reason 2 – Effective government, State-building

A 1909 bill, known as the Morley-Minto reforms, enabled Indians to run for legislative council positions, causing their overall influence and importance to grow. Therefore, as lord Hardinge claimed, the British could not anymore rule by fiat from Kolkata, located in the eastern part of the country, and needed a more centrally located capital, such as Delhi [Wright, 2011].

Kolkata also hosted one of the provincial governments and it was seen as undesirable to have the capital in the same city [Lahiri, 2011: p. 35].

Other reasons

It was also suggested that the British were building themselves a memorial [Chakravarty, 1997: p. 67]. The imposing architecture of New Delhi (mainly its central part: the Raj Path and its surroundings) did very little to contradict this claim.

Reasons against the move

The biggest opponent of the move at the time of its announcement was lord Curzon, who refused the “central location argument” and claimed that New Delhi was too far from major centres such as Madras (today Chennai) and Rangoon. Also, Kolkata was the business centre of British Raj and Curzon was worried about New Delhi being detached from the rest of the country [Wright, 2011].

3.2. Russia

Russia⁶ relocated its capital city from St. Petersburg to Moscow in 1918. This move is rooted in the very specific historical circumstances of the final phases of the First World War. It should be noted that Moscow was the capital city until 1712, when Peter the Great moved the capital to St. Petersburg as part of his Europeanization programme [Gritsai and Wusten, 2000: p. 35].

Reason 1 – Military Precaution

The main reason for relocating the capital back to Moscow was military precaution – after peace negotiations collapsed a German assault of the city was expected [Spate, 1942: p. 627; Gritsai and Wusten, 2000: p. 39; Hickey, 2011: p. 576]. In March 1918, in strict secrecy, the capital city was moved to Moscow, which was chosen by Lenin himself. The citizens of St. Petersburg found out about the relocation from the newspaper *Pravda* only after it was already carried out [Presidential Library, 1926].

Other reasons

Apart from security reasons the move represented a “*clean break with the tsarist regime*” and Moscow was supposed to become “*a propagandistic shop window for the whole country*” [Gritsai and Wusten, 2000: p. 39]. Another reason was that whereas St.

⁶ Correctly Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic.

Petersburg was mainly oriented externally [Gritsai and Wusten, 2000: p. 35], the new Russian state was mainly concerned with internal political problems and the control over its territory could be carried out more easily from a city with a more central location [Gritsai and Wusten, 2000: p. 39].

3.3. Turkey

Turkey relocated its capital city from Istanbul to Ankara in 1923. The move is rooted in the revolutionary changes after the First World War and the collapse of the Ottoman Empire.

The Treaty of Sévres planned the occupation of Turkey in zones; Istanbul was occupied by the United Kingdom, France, and Italy [Bilsel, 2007: p. 97]. When contemplating the centre for the resistance, Atatürk considered Ankara, Sivas, and Erzurum, but decided against the later two because they were located too far from the western front and did not have good connection with Istanbul [Gul, 2009: p. 85]. The National Assembly moved to Ankara in 1920, the resistance organized itself spontaneously around it and remained there until the end of the Turkish war for independence (1919-1922) while Istanbul was occupied [Gul, 2009: p. 85].

In October 1923 the sultanate came to an end and the republic was proclaimed. Ankara, the centre of the resistance and revolution, became the new capital city. Even though there was slight opposition – mostly from Istanbul, but also several other countries – who wished the capital back in Istanbul and saw Ankara only as temporary, Atatürk met with them and explained the advantages of having the capital in Ankara [Gul, 2009: p. 86].

Reason 1 – Historical development

Historical factors have to be taken into account when exploring any capital city relocation, but it is obvious from the description above that it played a key factor in Turkey. Declaring Ankara the capital of Turkey was a logical consequence of the wartime events [Bilsel, 2007: p. 97].

Reason 2 – Nation-building

Connected to reason 1 and similar to the case of Russia, the move had a symbolic significance – it depicted the end of the sultanate, to which Istanbul was inseparably connected, and the beginning of the republic [Zeigler, 2003: p. 265; Bilsel, 2007: p. 97; Gul, 2009: p. 85]. The new country was searching for a new national identity and Ankara as the new capital city was supposed to accelerate this process through physically expressing the new nation and its life-style. Ankara was viewed as *tabula rasa*, a place allowing for a new beginning [Kezer, 2009: p. 124].

Ankara went through a phase of major development to become a showcase of the new regime and its energy. It also displayed the secular character of the new state [Gul, 2009: p. 85].

Other reasons

A practical reason behind the relocation was also the effort to distance the new centre of power from the conservative circles loyal to the sultanate, centred in Istanbul [Kezer, 2009: p. 124]. Further, contrary to Istanbul, Ankara is located in the central part of the country, therefore fits the plan of overall development of the country – whereas Istanbul is too remote from the majority of the country, Ankara is located in the centre and should generate changes and development for the entire country [Bilsel, 2007: p. 97; Demirtaş, 2008: p. 103] – i.e. function as a growth centre.

3.4. Pakistan

Pakistan relocated its capital city from Karachi to the planned city of Islamabad in 1959. Whereas Karachi is located on the coast of the Arabian Sea in the utmost south of the country, Islamabad is located in the northern, more central part of the country. This move cannot be understood without taking into consideration the country's history.

In 1947, when the British Raj came to an end, India retained its capital in New Delhi and Pakistan⁷ was suddenly without a capital. It took the logical step of temporarily

⁷ Until 1971 Pakistan consisted of two parts divided by 1400 kilometres of Indian territory: West Pakistan (current Pakistan) and East Pakistan (current Bangladesh).

placing the capital in Karachi, the country's biggest city, economical centre, and transportation hub, despite its many shortcomings (see below) [Lovejoy, 1966: p. 923].

President Ayub Khan (president from 1958 to 1969) brought stability to the country and also plans for a new capital city, which would enable effective government and unite the nation [Lovejoy, 1966: p. 923]. The new capital was named Islamabad, meaning the *City of Islam*.

Reason 1 – Issues of Karachi

As already mentioned, Karachi was never meant to be the permanent capital of Pakistan, only a temporary one. Karachi was not fit to serve as a capital, the biggest problems being the city's poor infrastructure and overcrowding [Prentice, 1966: p. 58], climate, lack of water and the surrounding dessert preventing eventual expansion and development [Lovejoy, 1966: p. 923].

Reason 2 – Nation-building

Unclear national identity and ethnical diversity were amongst the most pressing issues of the young country [Harper, 2011: p. 64; Kalia, 2011: p. 1]. President Khan planned for the new city to reflect this diversity and stand as a symbol of a proud and united Muslim nation, distinct from India [Harper, 2011: p. 68].

Reason 3 – Decision of the leader

President Ayub played a major role in the decision-making as well as the selection of the site for the new capital. Some suggest that his intent was to consolidate his power and move away from the powerful muhajirs and businessmen centred in Karachi, but also to show his capabilities and legitimize his rule [Harper, 2011: p. 65-66].

3.5. Brazil

Brazil relocated its capital city from Rio de Janeiro to the planned city of Brasília in April 1960. This move is likely the most well known, which is also caused by the concept and modernist architecture of the city. The master plan of the city with its iconic central part in the shape of a bird was created by Lúcio Costa and the main

buildings were designed by the renowned Brazilian architect Oscar Niemeyer, who was inspired (among others) by Le Corbusier.

The idea to relocate the capital of Brazil was by no means novel – it is possible to find documents emphasizing the need to relocate the country's capital inland and away from Rio de Janeiro dating as far back as 1822 [Holford, 1962: p. 15]; the 1891 Constitution even reserved land for the federal capital [James and Faissol, 1956: p. 304] and the 1946 Constitution read that “*the capital of the Union shall be moved to the central highlands*“ [Holford, 1962: p. 16].

However the idea of a new capital city would have never become reality had it not been for president Juscelino Kubitschek de Oliveira (president from 1956 to 1961), whose support of the project was absolutely crucial and who built his entire presidency around it [Holford, 1962: p. 16; Snyder, 1964: p. 45]. Kubitschek knew that he had to make enough progress during his presidential term, otherwise the project was very likely to be abandoned by his successor – therefore the famous slogan “*Fifty Years' progress in Five*” [Frasser, 2000: p. 216]. The president himself did not escape criticism for only “*seeking a cheap way to win a place in history*” and was accused of populism [Epstein, 1973: p. 26].

The move was an enormous task, which took over the entire national budget and even endangered the country's economy [Snyder, 1964: p. 35].

Reason 1 – Spread of regional development (development of the inland)

The most cited and persuasive reason behind the relocation was to create the new capital city as a growth centre and so spur economical development in Brazil's vast interior, with its immense natural resources and possibilities for employment [James and Faissol, 1956: p. 305; Snyder, 1964: p. 35; Epstein, 1973: p. 27; Marsden, 1989: p. 782; Hardoy, 1993: p. 122; Frasser, 2000: p. 216].

Nevertheless the steps taken by the government do not correspond with these plans and very little was done to stimulate growth and develop the hinterlands [Snyder, 1964: p. 35], as is very often the case – the growth centre theory did not fulfil its promises and its appealing rhetoric was mainly used for gaining support for the project [Potts, 1985: p. 183].

Reason 2 – Nation-building

Brasília had enormous symbolical value - the proponents of the move saw the new capital as a way to Brazil's magnificent future, the construction expressed Brazilian nationalism: through this project Brazil aimed to show the world its capabilities, leave behind its semi-colonial past and attempt to establish its position as a global superpower. Because of this growing nationalism the project received wide support of the people, who wanted to symbolize their national pride [Snyder, 1964: p. 34; Epstein, 1973: p. 30].

Brasília was also supposed to become a national centre and “*focus of national unity, that element of stability in the confusion of the nation's life*” [Snyder, 1964: p. 34]. It was believed that Rio de Janeiro is too open to the world and influenced by it, therefore Brazil wanted to create a “*highly centralized, self-sufficient kind of life*“ and the capital city was the first step [James and Faissol, 1956: p. 306; Epstein, 1973: p. 28].

Reason 3 – Issues of Rio de Janeiro

Rio de Janeiro was and is a huge city with a lot of problems, mainly poor infrastructure and overpopulation – the public utilities (gas, water, electricity, telephone) and transport system are unable to keep up with the growing population [Epstein, 1973: p. 28]. The government was running the risk of losing perspective of the whole country because of the problems in its immediate proximity [James and Faissol, 1956: p. 306; Epstein, 1973: p. 29]. Another side effect was low administrative efficiency [Hardoy, 1993: p. 122]. That is also why moving the capital to Sao Paulo would not help, since the situation would be identical.

3.6. Belize

The Central American country of Belize⁸ relocated its capital city from Belize City to Belmopan in the year 1970. This capital city relocation is fairly straightforward, since the main motive for it is clear – safety. Belize City was under constant threat of hurricanes [Kearns, 1973: p. 147].

⁸ Correctly British Honduras – the country gained independence in 1981; in 1973 the country changed its name to the current *Belize*.

The former capital city of Belize, Belize City is located on the coast of the Caribbean Sea, less than 45 cm (!) above seal level. Every few years a hurricane would hit the coastline (the most disastrous in 1931 and 1955), kill thousands of people and destroy most of the city, and in doing so, severely interrupt the functioning of the government and administration during a time they were needed [Kearns, 1973: p. 148; Everitt, 1986: p. 107]. To deal with this the government resorted to slightly absurd practices – they would try “*to move all important papers inland whenever a low-pressure system developed over the western Caribbean*” [Kearns, 1973: p. 148]. The last incentive to move the capital city came in 1961, when hurricane Hattie killed 261 people and levelled 80 per cent of the capital city [Kearns, 1973: p. 148].

After this incident the decision to relocate the capital city was made and an inland, 76 m above sea level site was chosen, where the new capital called Belmopan would be constructed. Construction began in 1967 and Belmopan became the new capital city of Belize in 1970.

Reason 1 – Safety (Hurricanes)

The main reason behind the relocation was the fact that Belize City faced the permanent threat of hurricanes. As said in the theoretical part about capital cities, a capital city must be also a functioning city in its own right. It is apparent that Belize City was not and is not properly able to function as a normal city, therefore was definitely not suited to serve as a capital city, i.e. host the government and administration.

Reason 2 – Spread of regional development

The second, less cited and probably not as important reason behind the decision was the intent to spread regional development and decentralize the country – one third of the country’s inhabitants lived in Belize City. In moving the city inland the government hoped to develop the country’s interior, secure a viable economy and distribute the population more evenly [Kearns, 1973: p. 151]. It is obvious that this is only a subsidiary reason, because even if the country were not centralized, the capital city would still have to be moved inland in order to protect it from hurricanes.

3.7. Tanzania

The East African country of Tanzania relocated its capital city from the coastal Dar es Salaam to Dodoma, located in the central part of Tanzania, in 1974. To be more exact, the move was announced by president Julius K. Nyerere (president from 1964 to 1985) in 1973, Dodoma became the *de jure* capital of Tanzania in 1974, the parliament moved to Dodoma in 1996, but the government as well as foreign embassies and private corporations are still in Dar es Salaam, which continues to be the primate city of the country [Smiley, 2007: p. 60]. The relocation remains unfinished, mainly due to financial problems, and its future is unclear [Griffiths, 2005: p. 94].

Reason 1 – Spread of regional development

The move was carried out in the spirit of the socialist *ujamaa* (familyhood) movement, which aimed to “restructure Tanzanian society and produce more even growth and development” by (among others) creating a system of growth centres, mainly nine urban centres with Dodoma as its centrepiece, to which population from Dar es Salaam was supposed to shift and which were to induce economic development in their areas [Stren, 1975: p. 279; Smiley, 2007: p. 55].

Reason 2 – Nation-building

By moving the capital away from Dar es Salaam, the colonial port and capital, the country intended to distance itself from its colonial past, unite the nation, and build Dodoma as a symbol of the Tanzanian national identity [Smiley, 2007: p. 59; Green, 2011: p. 236].

3.8. Malawi

Malawi relocated its capital city from Zomba to Liliongwe in 1975. President Hasting K. Banda (president from 1961 to 1994) announced the decision in 1964 and was able to realize the project thanks to loans from South Africa, since the United Kingdom refused to fund the project [Potts, 1985: p. 188].

Reason 1 – Spread of regional development

The most declared and decisive reason behind the move was the attempt to develop the central and northern part of the country, so addressing the pressing issue of the regional imbalance in the country's development [Kalipeni, 1992: p. 23; Griffiths, 2013: p. 165], stemming from the colonial past of the country – the southern region was the main area of European settlement, with its commercial centre in Blantyre and administrative centre in Zomba [Potts, 1985: p. 183].

As the planning commission for the new capital city said: *“An important overall objective in shifting the capital from Zomba to Lilongwe is (...) that this will provide a new growth centre augmenting not only agricultural activity in the Central and Northern regions, but also industry and commerce. (...) The Northern region is expected to benefit enormously from the spread effects of the new capital city development, with major economic activity generated in the centre of the country”* [Potts, 1985: p. 186].

But as often the case, the government did very little to enable the relocation to fulfil this role [Potts, 1985: p. 187]. It is suggested that emphasising the economical aspect of the relocation was primarily to gain support for the project [Kalipeni, 1999: p. 80].

Reason 2 – Decision of the leader

President Banda's role in the relocation was crucial – the idea to move the capital came from him (he supposedly had that idea while in prison in Rhodesia). Whether he did it for personal prestige and consolidation of his power or for rational reasons, it is clear that his ratio is likely to have been different from the ratio of a democratic government [Potts, 1985: p. 188].

Other reasons

A factor also contributing to the decision was the intention to centralize political institutions, since they were divided between Zomba and Blantyre. By placing the capital into a more neutral central location, the country also hoped to prevent regional jealousies and facilitate a feeling of national unity [Kalipeni, 1999: p. 80].

3.9. Cote d'Ivoire

The West African country of Cote d'Ivoire relocated its capital city from Abidjan, located on the coast in the south of the country, to Yamoussoukro, placed in a more central part of the country, in 1983.⁹ Nevertheless, Abidjan remains the political, economical and cultural centre of the country and the host of foreign embassies [Elleh, 2002: p. 131].

Reason 1 – Decision of the leader

This move is a prime example of a relocation, which cannot be understood without considering the position of president Félix Houphouët-Boigny (president from 1960 to 1993), who relocated the capital to his birthplace and hometown Yamoussoukro, through which he also intended to consolidate his power [Schatz, 2003: p. 9; Griffiths, 2005: p. 95].

Although certain economical aspects were proposed to justify the move (mainly development of the inland), it is clear that the relocation was a tribute to the president [Elleh, 2002: p. 132].

3.10. Nigeria

Nigeria relocated its capital city from Lagos¹⁰, located on the coast in the southwest corner of the country, to inland Abuja, near the geographical centre of the country, in 1991. Lagos, which was the federal capital city and the capital city of Lagos state, suffered from many problems such as overpopulation, poor infrastructure, peripheral location, and ethnic dominance by a single tribe [Moore, 1984: p. 168]. However, the official report of the Federal Capital Development Authority¹¹ claims the reasons behind the move were mostly due to these problems and mentions nation-building purposes only as subsidiary, whereas the majority of studies attributes the move mainly to nation-building (see below).

⁹ Actually Cote d'Ivoire relocated its capital also in 1900 and 1939. In this thesis I concentrate only on the latest move.

¹⁰ For further information on how Lagos became the capital of Nigeria in 1914 see Adejuyigbe, 1970.

¹¹ Established by a governmental decree to oversee the development of Abuje; see www.fdca.gov.ng.

Reason 1 – Nation-building

The most likely motive for moving the capital city away from Lagos and to the central part of the country stemmed from the diversity of Nigeria: religious – whereas the southern part (where Lagos is located) is mostly Christian, the northern part of the country is predominantly Muslim [Schatz, 2003: p. 13; Shelley, 2013: p. 342] and ethnic – the main competing ethnic group being the Yoruba, Hausa, and Ibo [Adejuyigbe, 1970: p. 305].

The new location of the capital city addressed this diversity by placing the capital city in a place dominated by no ethnic group [Taylor, 1988: p. 6] and between the culturally, linguistically, and religiously different northern and southern part of Nigeria, so creating a bridge between them: a neutral city, the whole country could identify with [Adejuyigbe, 1970: p. 305; Moore, 1984: p. 174; Schatz, 2003: p. 13; Ikoku, 2004: p. 35]. Abuja was to become a symbol of a united nation, which is illustrated e.g. by the main cathedral and main mosque in Abuja, which are located right across the street from each other.

As a Nigerian official said: *“It is needless for us to state the obvious that we are just in the process of building a nation of the many nations which occupy the geographic area known as Nigeria. It is our belief that one way of forging the idea of unity of this nation is by building a capital city which will belong to every Nigerian, where every Nigerian will rest assured that he has opportunity to live in parity with every other Nigerian, and where no Nigerian will be regarded either in law or on the facts as a native foreigner”* [Ikoku, 2004: p. 35].

Reason 2 – Decision of the leader

A second factor, which also contributed to the relocation, was the leadership of general Murtala Mohammed [Moore, 1984: p. 171]. Some argue, that he relocated the capital city for personal prestige rather than for the need of the country [Schatz, 2003: p. 6]

Other reasons

Further factors, which may have contributed to the decision, were the poor infrastructure of Lagos, central location of the new capital, climate, the fact that the new capital could stimulate economic growth in the underdeveloped interior of the country

[Taylor, 1988: p. 6], and state-building purposes, i.e. centralize power and undermine lower tiers [Adama, 2012: p. 21].

3.11. *Germany*

In 1949, with the division of Germany, Bonn became the capital city of the Federal Republic of Germany. Berlin remained the *de jure* capital, but for obvious reasons could not fulfil the functions of a capital,¹² therefore another place had to be chosen to be the *de facto* capital. In a narrow decision Bonn was chosen over Frankfurt am Main.¹³

After the fall of the Berlin Wall the Unification Treaty was signed in October 1990, which stated, that Berlin is the capital of Germany, but that the government and parliament remains in Bonn and that the issue of the capital would be addressed after the unification [Stahl, 2014: p. 3].

In June 1991 the German Parliament (*Bundestag*) began a long and strenuous debate and with votes 338 for Berlin and 320 for Bonn surprisingly decided, that Berlin would become the capital.¹⁴ In order to reduce the cost of the relocation it was decided that the government and administration would move during the next ten to fifteen years. The parliament and the chancellor relocated in 1999, whereas a part of the administration remains in Bonn to this day [Zimmermann, 2009: p. 103].

Reason 1 – Nation-building

The main aim of the relocation was to integrate the Eastern *Länder* [Slack and Chattopadhyay, 2009: p. 3]. The five *Länder* of the former German Democratic Republic were in desperate need of a sign that they are part of the federation and

¹² Berlin was separated from the remainder of the territory and had strong military presence of the United States.

¹³ The Parliamentary Council (*Parlamentarische Rat*) voted 33:29 in favour of Bonn. Concerns were that a city the size of Frankfurt would be reluctant to give up its capital city status after reunification, since it was intended that after reunification Berlin was to become the capital of a united Germany once again. Also, the size of Bonn was supposed to emphasize the temporary character of it as the capital. This temporary character began changing in the 1970s (due to the worsening relationship with the East) and more official building were erected [Hanf, 1993: p. 300].

¹⁴ It was generally expected that the Parliament would vote for Bonn, German media predicted an outcome in favour of Bonn with votes up to 343:267 [Stahl, 2014: p. 4].

moving the capital back to Berlin was a powerful symbol [Hanf, 1993: p. 313; Zimmermann, 2009: p. 103].

As former German Interior minister and the main negotiator for the Federal Republic of Germany Wolfgang Schäuble put it: *“Today isn't a fight between two cities but a decision about the future of our society. We have to send a sign of solidarity to the people in East Germany that we are aware of their problems.”* [Johnson, 1991].

Reasons against

The supporters of Bonn saw Berlin as a symbol of the past – of Prussian militarism, Hitler – and were worried about a centralized government after decades of federalism. At the same time they viewed Bonn as an image of a humble, well-functioning democracy, free of the megalomania and emotions of Berlin [Cowell, 2011].

3.12. Kazakhstan

Kazakhstan relocated its capital city from Almaty to the planned city of Astana in 1997. What makes this move unique is the fact that the reasons behind the relocation were similar to reasons behind relocations in postcolonial Africa, but unusual for a post-Soviet country [Schatz, 2003: p. 2].

At first sight misguided and originally explained as an excessive decision of president Nursultan Nazarbayev (president since 1991), the majority of researchers today agrees that even though the role of president Nazarbayev was crucial, there were actually several reasons for the move [Schatz, 2003: p. 1].

Official reasons were mostly of geographical nature – location of Almaty in a seismically active region, surrounding mountains preventing economical growth, and proximity to China. Nevertheless even though all of these factors may have contributed to the decision and location of the future capital, they were not the decisive ones [Schatz, 2003: p. 12-13].

Reason 1 – State-building and Nation-building

Kazakhstan was not and is not an ethnically homogenous country – approximately 40 per cent of the population is Kazakh and 40 per cent Russian, inhabiting mostly the

northern part of the country. In the 1990s this diversity had a destabilizing effect and represented pressing state- and nation-building challenges: there were for example calls for the inclusion of northern Kazakhstan into Russia [Schatz, 2003: p. 17; Rawat, 2005: p.7; Whetstone, 2005: p. 14; Kopbayeva, 2013: p. 802]. By moving the capital closer to the Russian inhabited region, Nazarbayev showed he is ready to confront the ethical issue [Schatz, 2003: p. 17].

President Nazarbayev was also determined to root a Kazakh national identity, which was endangered by the Russian part of the population. Astana was created as an object of national pride and a symbol appealing to the entire country, therefore sometimes using contradictory images; the term *Eurasianism* is used in this context [Schatz, 2003: p. 18; Kopbayeva, 2013: p. 804-805].

Through the relocation, Nazarbayev also intended to transform the country's Soviet-era state apparatus and governmental structure and reduce the number of state employees [Schatz, 2003: p. 13-15; Corey, 2004: p. 91].

Reason 2 – Decision of the leader

The state-building and nation-building challenges may have been extremely pressing, the role of president Nazarbayev nevertheless cannot be omitted, as the move never would have happened without him [Schatz, 2003: p. 1; Rawat, 2005: p. 8].

3.13. Malaysia

Malaysia relocated part of its capital from Kuala Lumpur to the planned and newly constructed city of Putrajaya in 1999. Putrajaya is located 25 kilometres south of Kuala Lumpur and is the seat of the federal government. It is denoted as “administrative centre” or “federal administrative capital”. Kuala Lumpur remains the official capital city, where the economical and financial centre and the king and parliament are located.

Reason 1 – Decision of the leader

Mahathir Mohammad, prime minister of Malaysia from 1981 to 2003, and his government played a crucial role in the relocation. Mahathir was no stranger to initiating and completing giant projects, which were part of his “Vision 2020”, a plan to make Malaysia a first world nation by the year 2020. Projects like Petrona Towers

(tallest building in the world at the time), the Kuala Lumpur International Airport and the Multimedia Super Corridor had already been realized under his leadership [Corey, 2004: p. 59; Moser, 2010: p. 288; Fujita, 2010: p. 9].

As such, Putrajaya is inseparable from Mahathir, it is “*the most potent and expensive symbol of Mahathir’s pet projects*” [Moser, 2010: p. 288]. Also, contrary to for example Brasília, whose plan was chosen in a competition, the plan for Putrajaya was chosen exclusively by the government [Calvin, 2010: p. 16].

Reason 2 – Nation-building

The modern, well-planned city of Putrajaya was supposed to distance Malaysia from its colonial past and become a symbol of a diverse, yet united nation, its identity and modern future [Fujita, 2010: p. 8]. It is “*an urban showpiece for the country, intended to demonstrate both to Malaysians and the international community that Malaysia is a stable, prosperous, progressive, and technologically sophisticated Muslim country, but at the same time, showcase Malaysia’s rootedness in traditional culture and religion*” [Moser, 2010: p. 285].

Mahathir was known for changing the environment for nation-building purposes [Moser, 2010: p. 288].

3.14. Myanmar

Myanmar relocated its capital city from Yangon¹⁵ to Naypyidaw in 2006. This relocation is without doubt the most confusing, often described as “completely irrational” [McGeown, 2005] and to this day it is unclear why the military regime decided to move the capital from Yangon, the country’s metropolis, to the planned city of Naypyidaw, built in secret in the central part of the country, north of Yangon.

The decision was taken by the ruling generals and the process was very swift: the government employees found out only two days prior to the move and were not allowed to quit their jobs: they were forced to relocate [The Economist, 2005]. Representatives of foreign countries and international organizations found out actually after the move

¹⁵ In 1989, the name of the country was changed from *Burma* to *Myanmar* and the name of the capital from *Rangoon* to *Yangon*.

and when asked, how to get it touch with the government, the Burmese Ministry of Foreign Affairs issued a statement saying that should something urgent come up, they could send a letter or fax [Sipress, 2005].

The only reason the government officially gave was that the move is “*to ensure more effective administration of nation-building activities*“ [Myoe, 2006: p. 3] and the Information minister Kyaw Hsan said in an interview that Naypyidaw has a more “strategic location“ [McGeown, 2005]

Consequently media and researchers attempted to explain the move. Some of the reasons seem bizarre, but as Aung Zaw, editor of Irrawaddy, a publication run by Burmese journalists in exile said: “*I'm Burmese, and sometimes even I don't understand what the government is thinking*”[McGeown, 2005].

Whatever the reasons, the relocation of the capital brought with itself many inconveniences, as the economical, financial, and cultural centre remained in Yangon, but many documents, approvals etc. have to be obtained in Naypyidaw. The inhabitants of Yangon note that very little changed, only the electricity became even more unstable and joke about “the transfer of power” [BBC News, 2005].

Reason 1 – Threat of insurrection

However confusing, it seems that the main reason for moving the capital was a very rational one – the regime feared insurrection. By moving the capital city to Naypyidaw and distancing itself from the often-hostile inhabitants of Yangon, the regime practically eliminated the danger of a destabilizing demonstration [Myoe, 2006: p. 9; Seekins, 2007: p. 5]. The centre for demonstrations in Myanmar is Shwedagon Pagoda in Yangon, close to the centre of the regime, therefore a big threat. To start an insurrection in Naypyidaw, on the other hand, would be very difficult – apart from having almost no population, the city has no public spaces, where a large crowd could gather, and no mobile phone coverage. Even if a large-scale demonstration did occur in Yangon, which contains 10 per cent of the population, it would hardly affect the regime, hidden hundreds of kilometres away [Campante, 2014: p. 7].

A connected practical motivator was to avoid the repeating of the events of 1998, when top-army personnel stayed home at the height of anti-regime protests, because they

were surrounded by civilians and feared retribution should the regime fall [Seekins, 2007: p. 5]. In Naypyidaw there is no such danger.

It is further suggested that the regime was trying to escape not only their own people, but also “the world”, i.e. foreign embassies and international organization, all of which remained in

Reason 2 – Following advice of fortune-tellers

The Burmese are known for being superstitious and following advice of fortune-tellers; the occult plays an important role in Myanmar’s society [Myoe, 2006: p. 10]. General Than Shwe supposedly received very concrete advice, that if he does not relocate the capital city, his rule will come to an end [Paddock, 2006].

Reason 3 – Fear of foreign invasion

Another explanation is that the regime is irrationally afraid of a foreign invasion, especially of an invasion led by the United States [Myoe, 2006: p. 6] – as Shari Villarosa, a United States diplomat in Yangon said: “*They really believe, and they have believed for a long time, that we are planning an invasion, which is nuts*” [The New York Times, 2008]. The regime also expects such invasion to come from the water and as their navy is not very strong, the regime feels more comfortable fighting on land. Given that an attack would be aerial anyway, this point is moot [McGeown, 2005].

Nevertheless the location would give the regime more time for preparation. The city is supposed to have a system of tunnels, designed by the North Koreans [Charbonneau, 2009].

Other reasons

Burma has a tradition of moving its capital city and general Than Shwe might have been imitating the kings of old by building himself a capital [Myoe, 2006: p. 12]. The regime may have also intended to locate itself closer to ethnic minorities in border region and be able to control them [Myoe, 2006: p. 8]. The regime may have also been concerned about information security in Yangon and information leaks, especially to diplomatic missions [Myoe, 2006: p. 5].

3.15. South Korea

South Korea relocated part of its capital city Sejong City in 2012. However this is a simplification, since the situation in South Korea was more complex.

South Korea is an extremely monocephalic country: almost half of the population lives in the Seoul metropolitan area, which is sometimes nicknamed the *Republic of Seoul*. In 2004, 346 out of 410 public agencies were located in Seoul [Salmon, 2014]. This is a result of governmental policies, adopted to pursue compressed growth. This concentration led to a decrease in the quality of life in Seoul (congestion, pollution, high costs) [Kwon, 2014: p. 2] and prevented the development of the rest of the country - as Oh Young-jin, former aide to president Roh said: “...if everything is in Seoul, it is an inequality issue for provincial areas, which drives people from around the nation to Seoul“ [Salmon, 2014].

President Roh Moo-huyn (president from 2003 to 2009) centred his office term around “balanced national development”, part of which was the plan to relocate the capital away from Seoul [Kwon, 2014: p. 2]. However, the mayor of Seoul and future president Lee Myung-bak contested the Special Act for Balanced Nation Development in front of the Constitutional Court, which sided with him, stating, that the relocation of the capital was incompatible with the “customary constitution” [Park, 2008: p. 65].

Nevertheless president Roh did not drop the plan and decided to keep the capital in Seoul (including the office of the president, the parliament, and key ministries), but move a significant portion of the administration to other cities throughout the country – for example maritime- and fisheries-related agencies to the port city of Busan or energy- and labour-related agencies to Ulsan [Park, 2008: p. 65; Salmon, 2014].

The centrepiece of this decentralization effort was Sejong City, a planned city 120 kilometres south of Seoul, where 36 ministries and agencies were moved and which became South Korea’s *de facto* second capital city and administrative centre. The city has a futuristic design, is 52 per cent green and its centre is Sejong Government Complex, home to 18 ministries and agencies, which has an almost four kilometres long roof garden.

Even though president Lee attempted to abort the plan in 2009, it was already too late and the project had support of the parliament and his own political party [Kwon, 2014:

p. 2]. Lee claimed that the division of administration would lead to low efficiency. Sejong City was inaugurated in February 2012; president Lee did not attend [Kyu-wook, 2012].

Reason 1 – Spread of regional development

The sole purpose behind the potential move and later behind the decentralization was to achieve balanced territorial development by mitigating the excessive dominance of Seoul. Sejong City was supposed redistribute the country's wealth by creating growth centres to modify the country's urban system and stimulate economic development in other parts of the country [Kang, 2012: p. 4; Kwon, 2014: p. 1].

The prevailing opinion was that now, that South Korea is a first world country, economical growth is no longer a priority, but the country should concern itself with who benefits from the growth [Harlan, 2012], e.g. the ideal was fairness, which, as president Lee said, was a pre-requisite for becoming developed democracy [Harlan, 2011].

Other reasons

A factor, which also played a role in the debates, was that Seoul is less than 60 kilometres from the border with North Korea. However, this reason was more emphasised in the 1970s, when the idea to relocate the capital was championed by then president Jeonghui Park. With the confrontation between South Korea a North Korea far less serious today this aspect is not as relevant [Kwon, 2014: p. 1].

4. Case Studies II - Considered Relocations

To show that the relocations of capital cities are not only a phenomenon of the past I am going to describe the cases of two countries, which are currently considering moving their respective capitals. It was already noted that the process is very complicated, with many reasons and factors coming into play, therefore it is virtually impossible to predict, whether the relocation is indeed going to take place, and if so, when.

4.1. Iran

Tehran has been the capital of Iran since 1795. It is the political, economical, and cultural centre of the country. Talks of moving the capital away from Tehran became more prominent in 2011, supposedly stemming from Ayatollah Ali Khamenei himself [Borzyakov, 2013]. In December 2013 the parliament voted for considering and further investigating the plan [Karami, 2013]. The official reasons for the move differ greatly from what several academics see as motivation for the potential move.

Official reasons

The most often cited reason for the relocation is the danger of earthquakes. As some scientists have already warned the city could be hit by a severe earthquake, disrupting the functioning of the government and administration [Esfandiari, 2013].

Apart from the danger of earthquakes, Tehran is considerably overcrowded, with the population tripling in the last decade, polluted and experiences major traffic problems (World Bank estimates that Iran loses 900 million dollars due to these problems) [Al Jazeera, 2004]. Overall the city is said to be unable to host a well functioning capital city, since it is not a functioning city in its own right. If correct, the reason for relocating would be very similar to Belize.

Nation-building

Iran currently faces serious nation-building challenges from the Azerbaijani minority, the second largest ethnic group in Iran (there are between 12 and 22 million Azerbaijanis in Iran, i.e. twice as much than in Azerbaijan). Their loyalty is key to maintaining the regime and Iran's territorial integrity [Souleimanov et al., 2013: p. 71]. That is why Iran considers moving the capital city to Tabriz, the fourth largest city in

Iran and the administrative, cultural, and historical centre of the province [Borzyakov, 2013; Mammadova, 2014].

In 1828, Azerbaijan was divided by a peace treaty between Russia and Persia. North Azerbaijan gained independence in 1991, whereas the larger part, southern Azerbaijan, is still part of Iran. The Azerbaijani minority has always been subject to discrimination in Iran [Souleimanov et al., 2013: p. 73; Mammadova, 2014].

Potential Azerbaijani ambitions to gain independence and possibly reunite with Azerbaijan are a danger to the whole country; Iran therefore tries to integrate the Azerbaijani minority. By moving the capital city to Tabriz, the centre of the Azerbaijani minority, and relocating government officials, employees, security forces and their families, the ethnic composition of the region would change and the Azerbaijani dominance would be disturbed [Mammadova, 2014]. The Azerbaijani minority would be exposed to Iranian culture and customs. The relocation would also result in stronger presence of security forces in the Azerbaijani region, therefore the suppression of a potential revolution would be easier [Borzyakov, 2013] (that is precisely what Schatz calls a “stick” function of a relocation [Schatz, 2004: p. 122]).

This might seem contradictory to the capital city and conflict theory (see 2.4 *Capital Cities, Geographical Distance, and Conflict*), but I believe, that the case of Iran is different – whereas in the case of for example Myanmar, the regime feared being overthrown, therefore isolated itself, whereas in Iran the danger is separatism, by relocating the capital city Iran intends to prevent the Azerbaijani minority from gaining independence.

4.2.Indonesia

The case of the Indonesian capital Jakarta seems to be very straightforward – many people view the city as being unable to host the capital due to its physical issues.

Reason 1 – Issues of Jakarta

Jakarta suffers from major overpopulation (Jakarta is the largest city in the world without a subway), poor infrastructure and traffic (Jakarta loses up to 3 billion dollars due to slow traffic) [The Economist, 2010; Rukmana, 2014]. The transport of officials is

said to contribute to the bad traffic situation, since the entire traffic is always stopped for them to go through [The Jakarta Post, 2010].

Reason 2 – Safety (Floods)

Floods present a constant danger for Jakarta. They strike the city every year, with large floods hitting the city on average every five years. The last large flood hit the city in January 2013 and gave rise to a new round of talks about moving the capital [Rukmana, 2014].

Note

From the statements of politicians it is not entirely clear, whether the government is not able to function properly in the city, or whether the presence of the government and state administration contributes to the issues of Jakarta (therefore relocating the capital would relieve Jakarta).

Critics say that even if the capital city were moved, the issues of Jakarta would still have to be addressed. I would add that if the reasons are in fact that the government is not able to function properly in Jakarta, this point is moot, because the government has to be in a city, where it can function well.

There are currently many projects aiming at improving the situation of Jakarta (such as anti-flood barriers) [The Jakarta Post, 2014]. If they're successful, the topic of moving the capital might become irrelevant. Of importance also might be that the current president of Indonesia, Joko Widodo, is the former governor of Jakarta, therefore should be familiar with its situation.

5. Typology of reasons for capital city relocations

In this part of the thesis I am going to fulfil its objective: create a typology of reasons for capital city relocations. At first, I would like to stress again that relocations are usually the result of multiple results and factors. According to some, the cases are so diverse that even if a typology were created it would be too abstract to be meaningful [Schatz, 2003: p. 2].

Based on research of capital city relocations in the 20th and 21st century, I do believe that it indeed is possible to create a simple and practical typology, since the reasons are not as many as it may have seemed at the beginning. Reasons for capital city relocation, if at all described in general, have usually been divided according to field of activity, such as political, economical, or geographical. In my opinion such typology is unnecessarily abstract and it is in fact possible to determine four or five reasons why capital cities move.

In this table I summarize my findings of the previous part. I examined fifteen past relocations and two currently considered: seventeen relocations altogether. The table shows all relocation and the reasons behind them.

Relocation	Reason 1	Reason 2	Reason 3
India	Threat of insurrection	Effective government, State-building	
Russia	Military Precaution		
Turkey	Historical development	Nation-building	
Pakistan	Issues of Karachi	Nation-building	Decision of the leader
Brazil	Spread of regional development	Nation-building	Issues of Rio de Janeiro
Belize	Safety (Hurricanes)	Spread of regional development	

Tanzania	Spread of regional development	Nation-building	
Malawi	Spread of regional development	Decision of the leader	
Cote d'Ivoire	Decision of the leader		
Nigeria	Nation-building	Decision of the leader	
Germany	Nation-building		
Kazakhstan	State-building and Nation-building	Decision of the leader	
Malaysia	Decision of the leader	Nation-building	
Myanmar	Threat of insurrection	Following advice of fortune-tellers	Fear of foreign invasion
South Korea	Spread of regional development		
Iran	Nation-building		
Indonesia	Issues of Jakarta	Safety (Floods)	

I arrive at the conclusion that there are actually four reasons for relocating a capital city: 1. Nation-building, 2. Spread of regional development, 3. Issues of the capital city. and 4. Threat of insurrection. Further I add 5. Decision of the leader, which, as explained below, differs from reasons 1.-4., but needs to be introduced as well. This typology encompasses all but two main reasons for past relocations – the case of Russia and Turkey, both of which were deeply rooted in the specific historical circumstances of the First World War.

5.1. Nation-building

This was the main reason for moving the capital in Nigeria, Germany, Kazakhstan, and might be the main reason in Iran and the second most important reason in India, Turkey, Pakistan, Brazil, Tanzania, and Malaysia.

Nation-building is “*the process of collective identity formation with a view to legitimizing public power within a given territory*” [Bogdandy et al., 2005: p. 586] and as already suggested before, it is the main reason for moving a capital city [Schatz, 2003: p. 2]. Many countries faced and face nation-building challenges – the consensus about the national identity and customs is absent, the population does not identify with the country and the nation, which causes tensions in the country and makes the functioning of the country and its government difficult. This situation is typical for ethnically or religiously diverse countries.

Whereas these issues can be addressed in multiple ways, the relocation of the capital city is one of the more innovative ways (see also Schatz, 2003: p. 2). A capital city is a powerful symbol of the country and symbolizes the national identity (see *1.2 Physical expression*). The relocation of the capital, usually to a new city planned and constructed especially for this purpose (such as Brasília, Abuja, or Putrajaya), enables to create, adjust or strengthen the national identity, express ideas of history, religion, ideology, or ethnicity. The location and the physical expression of the capital has the potential to unite the nation, become an object the population can identify with, and be a source of national pride.

5.2. Spread of regional development

This was the main reason for moving the capital in Brazil, Tanzania, Malawi, and South Korea and the second most important reason in Belize.

All of these countries were highly unevenly developed – the majority of economic activities were concentrated in one city (e.g. Seoul) or area (e.g. southern Malawi), which hindered the development in the rest of the country. One of the ways to address this issue is to relocate the capital city to this depressed area. As growth centre (pole) theory explains, the capital city will function as a growth centre – the arrival of the central state apparatus will spur development in that region through the so-called

linkage effect (for example: the relocation will lead to construction and the presence of construction companies, which will require services and goods, as will the government employees; through a complex system of direct and indirect effects economic growth and development should be, according to this theory, secured).

Even though this theory did not entirely fulfil its promises, it prompted several relocations, one of them in the last decade, and it cannot be said with certainty that it will be irrelevant in the future.

5.3. Issues of the capital city

This was the main reason for moving the capital in Pakistan, Belize and might be in Indonesia, and an important factor in Brazil.

A capital city must also be a “*prosperous and liveable city in its own right*” [Corey, 2004: p. 50]. If it is faced with constant natural disasters, poor infrastructure, overpopulation, or pollution, it can threaten the sole existence of that city and of course affect the city’s ability to serve as a capital (for example the government could be preoccupied with the issues of that city alone and lose perspective of the entire country; alternatively, the inadequate infrastructure could have a direct adverse effect on the functioning of the government and administration).

If the issues are not successfully addressed, it can lead to the decision to relocate the capital city: this will not solve the problems of the city, but it will no longer affect the functioning of the central state apparatus. Nevertheless these two aspects are very often confused and the relocation is seen as a way to solve certain problems of the city, mainly congestion. The evidence, whether the relocation reduces or diverts congestion is inconclusive [Corey, 2004: p. 89].

5.4. Threat of Insurrection

This was the main reason for moving the capital in India and Myanmar.

The reason stems from the theory which explains that the closer insurrections or riots take place to the centre of political power (the capital city) the more dangerous they are for the government or the regime and the bigger is their potential to dislodge the

political authority. The theory is built on the principle that political influence grows with the proximity to power. As a result a small mob in the capital city is far more dangerous than a much larger mob outside the capital.

By moving the capital city away from the main population centre, the government or the regime distances itself from potential rioters, who therefore present a smaller threat. Such was the case in Myanmar – the regime felt threatened in Yangon with its five million inhabitants, therefore moved the capital city hundreds of kilometres away to an especially built city in the middle of the jungle, where the risk of a dislodging insurrection is virtually zero.

It should be noted that this theory applies only to relatively non-democratic countries. Considering there is still a number of dictatorships and authoritarian regimes I believe it is very possible a move prompted by this logic could occur in the future.

5.5. Decision of the leader

This was the main reason, or more precisely a decisive factor in Cote d'Ivoire and Malaysia and a very important factor in Malawi, Nigeria, and Kazakhstan.

Once again, this is true only for relatively non-democratic countries. The decision to relocate the capital has to be always reached and it is always an enormous undertaking, involving massive expenditure of state resources, breaking political alliances, and convincing the public, therefore is very difficult to reach in democratic countries [Rawat, 2005: p. 8]. Non-democratic countries, on the other hand, avoid these obstacles in the decision-making process – a non-democratic leadership will either communicate the decision very little or give a number of superficial reasons to hide its real motivation [Schatz, 2004: p. 118].

Either way it is obvious that in the case of several relocations the decision of the leader (whether it was a dictator, political party, or military regime) was the most important factor in the entire relocation – the idea originated from them and they carried out the move. Because of its importance I include this factor in my typology.

Based on case studies presented in this thesis it is safe to say that relatively non-democratic countries are more likely to relocate its capital than democratic countries, but this factor alone is not sufficient [Schatz, 2004: p. 118].

Final note on the typology

When examining and studying the presented typology, it is important to bear two aspects in mind. First of all, relocation of a capital city is a flexible and innovative tool, capable of addressing many issues and the ones presented in this thesis are only the ones occurring in the past. I am fairly certain that a relocation for different reasons and addressing different issues is going to occur in the future, but considering the complexity of the topic at hand, I did not dare to present further theoretical reasons for relocating capital cities. Second of all, to move the capital is just one way to solve the mentioned issues, it therefore cannot be said that a country facing for example nation-building challenges stemming from ethnic diversity will automatically relocate its capital.

6. Implications of capital city relocations

In this part of the thesis I am going to shortly describe the consequences of capital city relocations. During my research I found that the implications are highly case-specific - the decisive factor is the reason why the country decided to move its capital. The extent of the thesis does not allow me to explore the implications the same way I explored the reasons. Nevertheless the method would be the same – inquire into individual case studies and see if a set of consequences can be found. I decided to briefly introduce consequences, which generally apply to all capital city relocations, I specifically concentrate on the impacts the relocation has on the new capital city.

The decision to move the capital tends to be permanent – even if highly controversial and disputed at the time of adoption, once a capital is relocated, all arguments seem to disappear [Rawat, 2005: p. 3].

Following the relocation, the new capital experiences significant economical and population growth. The presence of the central state apparatus brings with itself investments and opportunities in the public sector, mainly employment, which leads to in-migration from the country [Dascher, 2000: p. 388; Corey, 2004: p. 90; Schatz, 2004: p. 121; Rawat, 2005: p. 3]. People shift to the new capital also because proximity to political power increases their political influence, which leads to special treatment of the capital's inhabitants (see 2.4. *Capital Cities, Geographical Distance, and Conflict*).

An adverse effect of this growth is its negative environmental impact on the surrounding area [Hardoy, 1993: p. 118].

Planned cities built exclusively to serve as capitals constitute a special case – whereas an existing city turned into a capital already has a basis of population, infrastructure, services etc., planned capitals are *tabula rasa* and it usually takes decades before they turn into attractive and liveable cities [Kearns, 1973: p. 168]. People are therefore often reluctant to relocate here – in the case of Brasília the government was twenty years after it's inauguration still paying people premiums to relocate here.¹⁶ A recent example of this is Sejong City, where people complain about lack of services and difficulties

¹⁶ BBC News. *Taking the capital out of a city* [online]. 2009 [cit. 2014-12-27]. Available at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8338092.stm>

developing relationships (to combat the later issue the city hired romance counsellor to help) [Kim, 2013].

The importance of the new capital city significantly increases – it becomes the political centre, from which the country is controlled, and a place where people exercise some of their fundamental rights [Rawat, 2005: p. 3]. The city becomes more cosmopolitan and international – the city represents the country in the world and diplomatic mission and international organizations usually move here. Also its history becomes more linked to the history of the country [Hardoy, 1993: p. 120].

The appearance of the city changes as well – capital city is a powerful symbol of the country and its national identity, important for the inhabitants of the country as well as the world (see *1.2 Physical Expression*). The new capital city will therefore be the centre of massive investment, mostly in order to become the “face of the country” [Schatz, 2004: p. 121]. For example Ankara underwent a phase of major physical development after becoming the capital of Turkey in 1923 [Gul, 2009: p. 85].

The former capital is impacted in the way that it no longer is the political centre of the country. However the relocation often does not significantly affect the economical, cultural, or financial functions of that city – an example of this might be Yangon, Rio de Janeiro, Istanbul, or Lagos.

Conclusion

The aim of the thesis was to create a typology of reasons, why capital cities move. The imagined typology was planned to encompass all (or almost all) capital city relocations and at the same time remain concrete enough to be meaningful.

I arrive at the conclusion that the reasons for relocating a capital are not as diverse as some academics believe (mainly Schatz, 2003) – based on seventeen case studies I find that there are actually only five reasons for relocating a capital city:

- a. **Nation-building purposes** – capital cities are powerful symbols and by relocating them, usually to a planned city built especially for that purpose, they can create, adjust, or strengthen the national identity of the country, settle regional jealousies, and express qualities such as religion, ethnicity, or ideology. Through that capital cities are capable of uniting a nation and becoming objects of national pride.

The main examples of such relocation are Nigeria and Germany.

- b. **Spread of regional development** – an unevenly developed country can relocate its capital city to the underdeveloped region: the presence of the capital, according to the growth centre theory, will cause economic growth in that region. It should be noted that the promises of the theory are doubtful and its rhetoric is mainly used for gaining support for the project.

The main examples of such relocation are Brazil and Malawi.

- c. **Issues of the (previous) capital city** – a capital city must be a functioning and liveable city in its own right. If a city faces problems such as floods, poor infrastructure, overpopulation, or population, and this affects the functioning of the government, the government might be forced to relocate the capital to another city.

The main examples of such relocation are Belize and Pakistan.

- d. **Mitigation of the thread of insurrection** – non-democratic countries fear being overthrown. The danger of insurrection is greater in the capital, since the closer a mob is to power, the bigger its influence. By moving the capital city away from

the main population centre and into isolation, the regime can lessen or virtually exclude the risks of insurrections.

The main examples of such relocation are India and Malawi.

- e. **Decision of the leader** – this is not a reason per se, rather a decisive factor. In several relocations, the leader played an absolutely crucial role – the relocation was his idea and he carried it out. Even if there were some actual reasons, the relocation never would have happened without him. Again, this is true for relatively non-democratic countries only.

The main examples of such relocation are Cote d’Ivoire and Malaysia.

It is important to bear in mind that the issues the relocation attempted to solve can be addressed in different ways as well, and that the topic at hand is extremely complex, therefore I do not exclude that relocation for a different reason may occur in the future.

After a city becomes a capital, it experiences significant population and economical growth, its importance increases, it becomes more cosmopolitan, and its physical appearances changes as well.

In my opinion the study of capital city relocations deserves more attention. Nearly two relocations occur every decade and many countries today face the same challenges as the countries, which relocated their capital in the past, did. The case studies can be a useful tool – for example the relocation in Germany could be helpful for Korea, should it ever reunite – I do not exclude that the capital could be placed in Pyongyang for the same reasons Berlin became the capital of a reunited Germany.

The study of the implications of capital city relocations is of even bigger importance, since the countries considering relocating their capital cities should be aware of the consequences of such decision for the old capital, the new capital, and for the country.

Shrnutí

Cílem této bakalářské práce bylo vytvořit typologii důvodů, proč dochází k přesunům hlavních měst. Na základě studia případů patnácti provedených a dvou zvažovaných přesunů hlavních měst docházím k závěru, že důvodů je ve skutečnosti pouze pět:

- a. **Budování národa (Nation-building)** – hlavní města mají neopomenutelný symbolický význam a jejich přesun může posloužit k vytvoření či posílení národní identity. Případ takového přesunu je například Nigérie či Německo.
- b. **Rozšíření regionálního rozvoje** – nerovnoměrně rozvinutá země může přesunout svoje hlavní město do nerozvinuté oblasti, kde svou přítomností povede k ekonomickému růstu. Případ takového přesunu je například Brazílie či Malawi.
- c. **Problémy hlavního města** – pokud hlavní město čelí neustálým problémům (špatná infrastruktura, povodně, přelidnění), může to narušit fungování vlády, která se může rozhodnout přesunout hlavní město jinam. Případ takového přesunu je Belize nebo Pakistán.
- d. **Zmenšení rizika povstání** – nedemokratické země můžou přesunout svoje hlavní město do izolace, dále od hlavních populačních center, a tím snížit riziko svého násilného svržení. Případ takového přesunu je například Indie nebo Myanmar.
- e. **Rozhodnutí lídra** – toto je spíše rozhodující faktor než důvod; nelze však opomenout, že v mnoha případech bylo rozhodnutí lídra naprosto zásadní a bez něj by k přesunu nikdy nedošlo.

Poté, co se město stane hlavním městem, zažívá výrazný populační a hospodářský růst, zvyšuje se jeho důležitost, stává se více kosmpolotíním a jeho fyzická podoba se mění.

Bibliography

Non-periodical

ADES, A. and GLAESER, E. (1994): *Trade and Circuses: Explaining Urban Giants*, Working Paper No. 4715, Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research.

BILSEL, C. (2007): Remodelling the Imperial Capital in the Early Republican Era: the Representation of History in Henri Prost's Planning of Istanbul, IN OSMOND, J., CIMDINA, A. (Eds.) *Power and culture: identity, ideology, representation*. Pisa: Plus-Pisa University Press.

BROOMFIELD, J. (1968): *Elite Conflict in a Plural Society: Twentieth-century Bengal*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

CALVIN, C. (2010): *Planning Citizens: Putrajaya and the 21st Century Malaysian* [online]. Chicago, Illinois [cit. 2014-12-24], available at: http://www.elliscalvin.com/projects/Calvin_BA_Final.pdf. Bachelor Thesis (BA). University of Chicago.

CAMPANTE, F. et al. (2014): *Capital Cities, Conflict, and Misgovernance: Theory and Evidence* [online], working paper [cit. 2014-12-24], available at http://www.worldbank.org/content/dam/Worldbank/Event/DEC/Urbanization-Conf-2014/CampanteDoGuimaraes_Sep14.pdf.

CHAKRAVARTY, S. (1997): Architecture and Politics in the Construction of New Delhi, IN LEE, M., WILDING, M. (Eds.): *History, Literature and Society, Essays in Honour of S. N. Mukherjee*. Sydney: Mahonar.

COREY, K. (2004): Relocation of National Capitals: Implication for Korea, IN *International Symposium on the Capital Relocation, 22 September 2004*, Seoul: Seoul Development Institute, pp. 42-107.

DEMIRTAŞ, N. (2008): *Social Spatialization in a Turkish Squatter Settlement: The Dualism of Strategy and Tactic Reconsidered*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

ELLEH, N. (2002): *Architecture and Power in Africa*. Westport: Praeger.

EPSTEIN, D. (1973): *Brasília, Plan and Reality*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

FRASER, V. (2000): *Building the New World: Studies in the Modern Architecture of Latin America, 1930-1960*. London: Verso.

GORDON, D. (2006): Capital Cities in the Twentieth Century IN GORDON, D. (Ed.): *Planning Twentieth Century Capital Cities*. London: Routledge.

GOTTMANN, J. and HARPER, R. (1990): *Since Megalopolis*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

GRIFFITHS, I. (2005): *The African Inheritance*. London: Routledge.

GRIFFITHS, I. (2013): *The Atlas of African Affairs*. London: Routledge.

GUL, M. (2009): *Emergence of Modern Istanbul: Transformation and Modernisation of a City*. London: Tauris Academic Studies.

HALL, P. (1993): The Changing Role of Capital Cities: Six Types of Capital City, IN TAYLOR, J. (Ed.): *Capital Cities : Les Capitales : International Perspectives - Perspectives Internationales*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

HANF, T. (1993): Berlin or Bonn? The Dispute over Germany's Political Center, IN TAYLOR, J. (Ed.): *Capital Cities : Les Capitales : International Perspectives - Perspectives Internationales*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

HARDOY , J. (1993): Ancient Capital Cities and New Capital Cities of Latin America, IN TAYLOR, J. (Ed.): *Capital Cities : Les Capitales : International Perspectives - Perspectives Internationales*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

HARPER, A. (2011): Islamabad and the Promise of Pakistan, IN KALIA, R. (Ed.): *Pakistan: From the Rhetoric of Democracy to the Rise of Militancy*. New Delhi: Routledge.

HICKEY, M. (2011): *Competing Voices from the Russian Revolution*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, LLC.

HIPPLER, J. (2002): Ethnicity, State, and Nation-Building-Experiences, Policies and Conceptualization, IN *SEF-Symposium 2002 (Development and Peace Foundation,*

Bonn), 11-12 December 2002 [online], Bonn: University Club, [cit. 2014-12-24], available at http://www.jochenhippler.de/html/ethnicity-_state-_and_nation-building.html.

KALIA, R. (2011): Introduction, IN KALIA, R. (Ed.): *Pakistan: From the Rhetoric of Democracy to the Rise of Militancy*. New Delhi: Routledge.

KALIPENI, E. (1999): The Spatial Context of Lilongwe's Growth and Development, IN KALIPENI, E., ZELEZA, T. (Eds.): *Sacred Spaces and Public Quarrels: African Cultural and Economic Landscapes*. Trenton: African World Press.

KANG, J. (2012): *A Study on the Future Sustainability of Sejong, South Korea's Multifunctional Administrative City, Focusing on Implementation of Transit Oriented Development* [online]. Uppsala [cit. 2014-12-25], available at: <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:571211/FULLTEXT01.pdf>. Master's Thesis. Uppsala University.

KEZER, Z. (2009): Ankara, IN MAKAS, E., CONLEY, T. (Eds.): *Capital Cities in the Aftermath of Empires: Planning in Central and Southeastern Europe*. London: Routledge.

KOPBAYEVA, D. (2013): IS ASTANA A NATIONALISTIC PROJECT? THE ROLE OF KAZAKHSTAN'S NEW CAPITAL IN DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATIONAL IDENTITY, IN *1st Annual International Interdisciplinary Conference, AIIC 2013, 24-26 April 2013, Portugal*, pp. 800-813.

LAHIRI, N. (2011): Delhi's Capital Century (1911-2011): Understanding the Transformation of the City, IN *Colloquium Program for Agrarian Studies, Yale University, 4 March 2011* [online], Yale University, [cit. 2014-12-05], available at <http://www.yale.edu/agrarianstudies/colloqpapers/20lahiri.pdf>.

MYOE, M. (2006): *The Road to Naypyitaw: Making Sense of the Myanmar Government's Decision to Move its Capital*, ARI Working Paper Series No. 79, Singapore: Asia Research Institute.

RAPOPORT, A. (1993): On the Nature of Capitals and their Physical Expression, IN TAYLOR, J. (Eds.): *Capital Cities : Les Capitales : International Perspectives - Perspectives Internationales*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

RAWAT, R. (2005): *Capital City Relocation: Global-Local Perspectives in Search for an Alternative Modernity* [online], unpublished paper [cit. 2014-11-20], available at <http://prayaga.org/documents/paper-capitalcity.pdf>.

SCHATZ, E. (2003): *When Capital Cities Move: The Political Geography of Nation and State Building*, Working Paper #303, Notre Dame: The Helen Kellogg Institute for International Studies.

SHELLEY, F. (2013): *Nation Shapes: The Story Behind The World's Borders*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, LLC.

SLACK, E. and CHATTOPADHYAY, R. (2009): Introduction, IN SLACK, E., CHATTOPADHYAY, R. (Eds.): *Finance and Governance of Capital Cities in Federal Systems*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

SMILEY, S (2007): *Patterns of Urban Life and Urban Segregation in Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania*. Ann Arbor: Proquest.

STAHL, J. (2014): Capital Gains – The firm value of locating next to the government, IN *Proceedings of IAC-EMM 2014: International Academic Conference on Economics, Management and Marketing in Prague IAC-EMM 2014, 7-8 August 2004*, Prague: MAC Prague Consulting.

TAYLOR, R. (1988): *Urban Development Policies in Nigeria: Planning, Housing, and Land Policy* [online], unpublished paper [cit. 2014-11-30], available at: <http://msuweb.montclair.edu/~lebelp/CERAFRM002Taylor1988.pdf>.

VALE, L. (2006): The Urban Design of Twentieth Century Capitals, IN GORDON, D. (Ed.): *Planning Twentieth Century Capital Cities*. London: Routledge.

WHETSTONE, D. (2005): *Nursultan Nazarbayev's Influence on the Relocation of the Kazakh Capital* [online]. Tallahassee, Florida [cit. 2014-12-23], available at: <http://diginole.lib.fsu.edu/etd/1122/>. Master Thesis (MA). Florida State University.

ZEIGLER, D. (2003): Cities of the Greater Middle East, IN BRUNN, S. et al. (Eds.): *Cities of the World: World Regional Urban Development*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

ZIMMERMANN, H. (1993): Berlin, Germany, IN TAYLOR, J. (Ed.): *Capital Cities : Les Capitales : International Perspectives - Perspectives Internationales*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

Periodical

ADAMA, O. (2012): *State, Space and Power in Postcolonial Africa: Capital Relocation as a State Building Project in Nigeria*, *Hemispheres: Studies on Cultures and Societies*, 27, pp. 21-42.

ADEJUYIGBE, O. (1970): *The Case for a New Federal Capital in Nigeria*, *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 8:2, pp. 301-306.

BOGDANDY, A. et al. (2005): *State-Building, Nation-Building, and Constitutional Politics in Post-Conflict Situations: Conceptual Clarifications and an Appraisal of Different Approaches*, *Max Planck Yearbook of United Nations Law*, 9, pp. 579-613.

BORZYAKOV, S. (2013): Азербайджану назло: Иран может перенести свою столицу из-за Израиля и азербайджанских сепаратистов [online], *Vzglyad* [cit. 2014-11-23], available at: <http://www.vz.ru/world/2013/12/24/665864.html>.

CAMPBELL, J. (1974): *A Note on Growth Poles*, *Growth and Change*, 5:2, pp. 43-45.

DASCHER, K. (2000): *Are politics and geography related? Evidence from a cross-section of capital cities*, *Public Choice*, 105:3-4, pp. 373-392.

DIJKING, G. (2000): *European capital cities as political frontiers*, *GeoJournal*, 51:1-2, pp. 65-71.

EVERITT, J. (1986): *The Growth and Development of Belize City*, *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 18:1, pp. 75-111.

FUJITA, M. (2010): *Forays into Building Identity Kampung to Kampong in the Kuala Lumpur Metropolitan Area*, *Journal of Architectural Education*, 63:2, pp. 8-24.

GREEN, E. (2011): *The Political Economy of Nation Formation in Modern Tanzania: Explaining Stability in the Face of Diversity*, *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, 49:2, pp. 223-244.

- GRITSAI, O. and WUSTEN, H. (2000): *Moscow and St. Petersburg, a sequence of capitals, a tale of two cities*, *GeoJournal*, 51:1, pp. 33-45.
- HOLFORD, W. (1962): *The Federal Capital of Brazil*, *The Geographical Journal*, 128:1, pp. 15-17.
- IKOKU, G. (2004): *The City as Public Space: Abuja - the Capital City of Nigeria*, *Forum*, 6:1, pp. 34-45.
- JAMES, P. and FAISSOL, S. (1956): *The Problem of Brazil's Capital City*, *Geographical Review*, 46:3, pp. 301-317.
- KALIPENI, E. (1992): *Population Redistribution in Malawi since 1964*, *Geographical Review*, 82:1, pp. 13-28.
- KEARNS, K. (1973): *Belmopan: Perspective on a New Capital*, *Geographical Review*, 63:2, pp. 147-169.
- KWON, Y. (2014): *Sejong Si (City): are TOD and TND models effective in planning Korea's new capital*, *Cities*, not yet published.
- LOVEJOY, D. (1966): *THE DESIGN OF ISLAMABAD—NEW CAPITAL CITY OF PAKISTAN*, *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, 114:5123, pp. 923-941.
- MAMMADOVA, S. (2014): *Iran's Capital Relocation Threatens Azerbaijani Minorities* [online], *Harvard International Review* [cit. 2014-11-23], available at: <http://hir.harvard.edu/archives/3198>.
- MARSDEN, P. (1989): *Brasília: Modern Day Stonehenge*, *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, 299:6702, pp. 781-782.
- MOORE, J. (1984): *The Political History of Nigeria's New Capital*, *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 22:1, pp. 167-175.
- MOSER, S. (2010): *Putrajaya: Malaysia's new federal administrative capital*, *Cities*, 27:4, pp. 285-297.
- PARK, J. (2008): *The Judicialization of Politics in Korea*, *Asian-Pacific Law & Policy Journal*, 10:1, pp. 62-113.

- PARR, J. (1999): *Growth-pole Strategies in Regional Economic Planning: A Retrospective View: Part I. Origins and Advocacy*, *Urban Studies*, 36:7, p. 1195-1215.
- POTTS, D. (1985): *Capital Relocation in Africa: The Case of Lilongwe in Malawi*, *The Geographical Journal*, 151:2, pp. 182-196.
- PRENTICE, A. (1966): *Islamabad: A New Capital City*, *Geography*, 51:1, pp. 58-61.
- SCHATZ, E. (2004): *What capital cities say about state and nation building*, *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 9, pp. 111-140.
- SEEKINS, D. (2007): *The Geopolitics and Economics of Burma's Military Regime. Understanding SPDC Tyranny* [online], *The Asia-Pacific Journal* [cit. 2014-11-24], available at: http://www.japanfocus.org/-Donald_M_-Seekins/2573.
- SNYDER, D. (1964): *Alternate Perspectives on Brasília*, *Economic Geography*, 40:1, pp. 34-45.
- SOULEIMANOV, E. et al. (2013): *The Rise of Nationalism Among Iranian Azerbaijanis: A Step Towards Iran's Disintegration?*, *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, 17:1, pp. 71-91.
- SPATE, O. (1942): *Factors in the Development of Capital Cities*, *Geographical Review*, 32:4, pp. 622-631.
- STREN, R. (1975): *Urban Policy and Performance in Kenya and Tanzania*, *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 13: 2, pp. 267-294.
- TURNER, S. and TURNER, R. (2011): *Capital cities: a special case in urban development*, *The Annals of Regional Science*, 46:1, pp. 19-35.
- WUSTEN, H. (2000): *The cityscapes of European capital cities*, *GeoJournal*, 51:1-2, pp. 129-133.

Online News

Al Jazeera. *Iran considers changing capital city* [online]. 2004 [cit. 2014-11-23]. Available at: <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/middleeast/2013/12/iran-considers-changing-capital-city-20131228162648464879.html>.

BBC News. *Taking the capital out of a city* [online]. 2009 [cit. 2014-12-27]. Available at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8338092.stm>.

CHARBONNEAU, L. *WITNESS: Overnight in Myanmar's ghost town capital*. Reuters [online]. 2009 [cit. 2014-11-25]. Available at: <http://www.reuters.com/article/2009/07/04/us-witness-myanmar-naypyidaw-idUSTRE56312Y20090704>.

COWELL, A. *In Germany's Capitals, Cold War Memories and Imperial Ghosts*. The New York Times [online]. 2011 [cit. 2014-11-24]. Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/24/world/europe/24berlin.html?pagewanted=all>.

ESFANDIARI, G. *Iran: A Capital Idea? Experts Disagree On Whether To Relocate Earthquake-Prone Tehran*. . Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty [online]. 2013 [cit. 2014-11-23]. Available at: <http://www.rferl.org/content/article/1051104.html>.

HARLAN, C. *In South Korea, fairness is the new ideal*. The Washington Post [online]. 2011 [cit. 2014-11-25]. Available at: http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/in-south-korea-fairness-is-the-new-ideal/2011/06/24/AGjAsooH_story.html.

HARLAN, C. *With new Sejong City, South Korean government aims to rebalance power*. The Washington Post [online]. 2012 [cit. 2014-11-25]. Available at: http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia_pacific/with-new-sejong-city-south-korean-government-aims-to-rebalance-power/2012/08/17/e8f6dc60-e2bd-11e1-a25e-15067bb31849_story.html.

JOHNSON, I. *Germans choose Berlin over Bonn for capital*. The Baltimore Sun [online]. 1991 [cit. 2014-12-06]. Available at: http://articles.baltimoresun.com/1991-06-21/news/1991172061_1_bonn-to-berlin-german-capital-united-germany.

KARAMI, A. *Iran parliament approves bill to move capital from Tehran*. Iran Pulse. [online]. 2013 [cit. 2014-11-23]. Available at: <http://iranpulse.al>

monitor.com/index.php/2013/12/3530/iran-parliament-approves-bill-to-move-capital-from-tehran/.

Khaleej Times. *Delhi 100 as the capital city* [online]. 2011 [cit. 2014-12-03]. Available at:

http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticle08.asp?xfile=data%2Finter...1%2FDecember%2Finternational_December330.xml§ion=international.

KIM, S. *South Korea Offers Romance Help for Lovelorn Officials*. Bloomberg [online]. 2013 [cit. 2014-11-30]. Available at: <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-09-11/south-korea-offers-romance-help-for-lovelorn-officials.html>.

KYU-WOOK, O. *President misses Sejong City launch*. The Korea Herald [online]. 2012 [cit. 2014-11-25]. Available at: <http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20120702001181>.

MCGEOWN, K. *Burma's confusing capital move*. BBC News [online]. 2005 [cit. 2014-11-25]. Available at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/4416960.stm>.

PADDOCK, R. *Abrupt relocation of Burma capital linked to astrology*. The Boston Globe [online]. 2006 [cit. 2014-11-25]. Available at: http://www.boston.com/news/world/articles/2006/01/01/abrupt_relocation_of_burma_capital_linked_to_astrology/?page=1.

Presidential Library. *Moscow becomes the capital of the Soviet State* [online]. 1926 [cit. 2015-1-03]. Available at: <http://www.prilib.ru/en-us/History/Pages/Item.aspx?itemid=458>.

RUKMANA, D. *The Megacity of Jakarta: Problems, Challenges and Planning Efforts*. Indonesia's Urban Studies [online]. 2014 [cit. 2014-11-23]. Available at: <http://indonesiaurbanstudies.blogspot.cz/2014/03/the-megacity-of-jakarta-problems.html>.

SALMON, A. *Goodbye Seoul, Hello Sejong City*. SMARTPLANET [online]. 2014 [cit. 2014-11-25]. Available at: <http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/global-observer/goodbye-seoul-hello-sejong-city2/>.

SIPRESS, A. *As Scrutiny Grows, Burma Moves Its Capital*. The Washington Post [online]. 2005 [cit. 2014-11-24]. Available at: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/12/27/AR2005122701248.html>.

The Economist. *Myanmar: A capital move. According to astrologers, anyway* [online]. 2005 [cit. 2014-11-24]. Available at: <http://www.economist.com/node/5139038>.

The Economist. *Metro or Bust, Should Indonesia move its capital city?* [online]. 2010 [cit. 2014-11-23]. Available at: <http://www.economist.com/node/17101162>.

The Jakarta Post. *Palangkaraya, Jonggol or Jayapura? Pick your capital* [online]. 2010 [cit. 2014-11-23]. Available at: <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2010/08/05/palangkaraya-jonggol-or-jayapura-pick-your-capital.html>.

The Jakarta Post. *Weekly 5: The capital's big controversial projects* [online]. 2014 [cit. 2014-11-23]. Available at: <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2014/10/17/weekly-5-the-capital-s-big-controversial-projects.html>.

The New York Times. *Myanmar's new capital: Remote, lavish and off limits* [online]. 2008 [cit. 2014-11-24]. Available at: http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/23/world/asia/23iht-myanmar.4.13919850.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0.

WRIGHT, T. *Why Delhi? The Move From Calcutta*. The Wall Street Journal [online]. 2011 [cit. 2014-12-03]. Available at: <http://blogs.wsj.com/indiarealtime/2011/11/11/why-delhi-the-move-from-calcutta/>.