

INTRODUCTION TO COMPARATIVE POLITICS



Introduction to Comparative Politics

This text is disseminated via the Open Education Resource (OER) LibreTexts Project (<https://LibreTexts.org>) and like the hundreds of other texts available within this powerful platform, it is freely available for reading, printing and "consuming." Most, but not all, pages in the library have licenses that may allow individuals to make changes, save, and print this book. Carefully consult the applicable license(s) before pursuing such effects.

Instructors can adopt existing LibreTexts texts or Remix them to quickly build course-specific resources to meet the needs of their students. Unlike traditional textbooks, LibreTexts' web based origins allow powerful integration of advanced features and new technologies to support learning.



The LibreTexts mission is to unite students, faculty and scholars in a cooperative effort to develop an easy-to-use online platform for the construction, customization, and dissemination of OER content to reduce the burdens of unreasonable textbook costs to our students and society. The LibreTexts project is a multi-institutional collaborative venture to develop the next generation of open-access texts to improve postsecondary education at all levels of higher learning by developing an Open Access Resource environment. The project currently consists of 14 independently operating and interconnected libraries that are constantly being optimized by students, faculty, and outside experts to supplant conventional paper-based books. These free textbook alternatives are organized within a central environment that is both vertically (from advance to basic level) and horizontally (across different fields) integrated.

The LibreTexts libraries are Powered by [NICE CXOne](#) and are supported by the Department of Education Open Textbook Pilot Project, the UC Davis Office of the Provost, the UC Davis Library, the California State University Affordable Learning Solutions Program, and Merlot. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 1246120, 1525057, and 1413739.

Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation nor the US Department of Education.

Have questions or comments? For information about adoptions or adaptations contact info@LibreTexts.org. More information on our activities can be found via Facebook (<https://facebook.com/Libretexts>), Twitter (<https://twitter.com/libretexts>), or our blog (<http://Blog.Libretexts.org>).

This text was compiled on 12/16/2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Licensing

1: States, Nations, and Political Development

2: The Political Development of the British State

- 2.1: Section 1-
- 2.2: Section 2-
- 2.3: Section 3-
- 2.4: Section 4-
- 2.5: Section 5-
- 2.6: Section 6-

3: The Political Development of the Modern German State

- 3.1: Section 1-
- 3.2: Section 2-
- 3.3: Section 3-
- 3.4: Section 4-
- 3.5: Section 5-
- 3.6: Section 6-

4: The Political Development of the Russian State

- 4.1: Section 1-
- 4.2: Section 2-
- 4.3: Section 3-
- 4.4: Section 4-
- 4.5: Section 5-
- 4.6: Section 6-

5: The Political Development of Modern China

- 5.1: Section 3-
- 5.2: Section 4-
- 5.3: Section 5-
- 5.4: Section 6-

6: The Political Development of the Modern Indian State

- 6.1: Section 2-
- 6.2: Section 3-
- 6.3: Section 4-
- 6.4: Section 5-
- 6.5: Section 6-

7: The Political Development of the Islamic Republic of Iran

- 7.1: Section 1-
- 7.2: Section 2-
- 7.3: Section 3-

- [7.4: Section 4-](#)
- [7.5: Section 5-](#)
- [7.6: Section 6-](#)

[8: The Political Development of the Modern Brazilian State](#)

[Index](#)

[Glossary](#)

[Detailed Licensing](#)

Licensing

A detailed breakdown of this resource's licensing can be found in [Back Matter/Detailed Licensing](#).

1: States, Nations, and Political Development

Facts, Theories and Case Studies

In the study of Comparative Politics, we use evidence and theory to explain diverse political behaviors and outcomes. The social sciences try to identify patterns and develop generalizations for human processes which are in themselves always unique. In that way, these theories help us better understand what is similar in these processes even as we recognized that no new political processes are exactly the same. The challenges in political science are shared by all the social sciences. No two individuals are exactly the same and yet that does not render psychological theories of human development meaningless. More specific forms of theorizing—related to gender or racial identity—also seek to identify patterns and generate understandings about what is common in a particular experience of identity even though each person's genes, perspective, and experience are distinct.

So, in political science, we look to develop theories about the impact of particular kinds of electoral systems, or why policies to promote economic development work more or less successfully, or why democratic institutions succeed or fail, or when and how new rights claims get recognized and addressed or not. We will examine questions such as these by looking at some of the theoretical concepts political scientists use to analyze them and then applying those theories and concepts to a series of case studies. The particular case studies will vary with the topics we study, but 9 countries will receive more sustained attention: United Kingdom, Germany, Russia, China, India, Nigeria, Brazil, Iran and the United States. We will begin by analyzing their histories and learning how each nation took its modern form. In the process, we will see that while each state has a unique history, the challenges they have faced are similar and their outcomes can be compared to better understand politics as a realm of human experience that we all encounter one way or another. The Russian Revolutionary Leon Trotsky said “you may not be interested in war, but war is interested in you.” A famous Prussian diplomat, Carl Von Clausewitz called war “the continuation of politics by other means”. And indeed, political systems—states—are interested in you, whatever your own personal views might be.

What are Nation-States?

In this way, our *unit of analysis* is something that has come to be called the *modern nation-state*. To approach our topic, we must first ask, what is a nation-state? And, what makes it modern? While these seem like simple questions, they raise deep and complex historical issues and if we are to answer them well, we must grasp some of that complexity. We will speak of each country as a single unit, but each has a long and complex history. Some cases are really multiple cases because the state in those places has undergone radical changes. China has been an imperial dynasty, a one-party capitalist state, and a one-party communist state. Germany has been a strong democracy, a weak democracy, a constitutional monarchy, and, of course, the fascist state created by the Nazis. We cannot understand the present political system in each country without understanding how the political systems of the past rose and fell. In this way, we will be studying processes rather than simply analyzing a photograph of the present. The goal is to understand how the present state in each place took the form it has, what were the political conflicts and processes that generated that form, and how, based on our understanding, might it change in the future? With each system we will ask: What was the problem for which a particular system seemed the solution? Then, we can analyze how particular political systems were able to either maintain power or were transformed and replaced with a new system.

We have to begin by taking apart the term “nation-state” and analyze its components conceptually and historically. This is a form of political organization that is just over 200 hundred years old. The terms nation and state are much older; how did they get fused in this particular manner? Humans have developed and evolved in social groups. But the form these groups and communities have taken have varied widely across space and time. While we may be wired for group attachment and identity, no particular form is inscribed in our genes.

So, how did membership in a nation-state come to seem so fundamental to a modern sense of political identity? What made it a force that political leaders could use to generate a sense of nationalism and shared identity that made its members willing to

sacrifice their lives and in the process produce some of the bloodiest conflicts in human history?

The Emergence of the Modern State in Europe

What we call the Modern State is a new form of a very old kind of political structure which began to emerge more than 5000 years ago among human communities. The principal features of what social scientists call a state is the capacity to administer and create structures of governance for a particular territory and its inhabitants. States have varied in their size and the mechanisms of rule. They have also differed in the extent of actual control they exercised over the people they claimed to govern. Prior to the 19th century, larger and more powerful states were universally hierarchical and authoritarian in their political structure. Even when conceptions of citizenship existed, such as in ancient Greece and Rome, those rights were limited and coexisted with various forms of slavery.

The form of state which emerged in Europe in the 17th and 18th century built upon the legacy of previous states but gradually developed a far greater level of centralization and administrative reach. Why did it emerge in Europe and how did a few of these states become global powers which have shaped the structure of the modern world so powerfully? Europe in the middle ages was a collection of largely decentralized states whose leaders' power over their "realm" or "subjects" often diminished quickly the further one lived from the seat of royal power. During the so-called "dark ages" of European history, far more centralized and powerful states emerged in China, India and the Middle East. From 1000-1800 AD, China and India accounted for roughly two-thirds of global GNP. Some medieval cities in Europe and elsewhere developed conceptions of civic virtue and citizenship, but operated within geographically limited areas.

What happened? One version of western history celebrates the rise of the enlightenment, capitalism, and the technological progress each made possible. But, other regions were not lacking in the conditions, practices, and technologies which we associate with modern developing nations. They had extensive trade relations with other regions of the globe and had long had their own centers of science, knowledge, and commerce that surpassed Europe for most of the past thousand years. To understand why Europe became the center of political and economic processes which transformed the world and made it, along with its former colonies in the United States, the dominant global powers, we need to understand what happened in Europe, how other regions responded, and what the consequences of those interactions were for political development in all these regions

Historian Paul Kennedy, in *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*, argues that the conditions that kept Europe a region in which no one state could conquer and govern as wide a territory as rulers in India, China, or the Middle East (under the Ottoman Empire) also contributed to its rise to global power and dominance. Kennedy argues that European geography made conquest of the entire continent difficult. Europe's climate made it possible for a wide range of products to be produced while sea and river travel facilitated the expansion of trade. This, in turn, propelled the development of shipbuilding that eventually enabled Europeans to explore, conquer, and exert control over markets and labor from Southeast Asia to the Americas.

War, Wealth, and the European State System

This process generated new wealth as well as new competition for control that in turn generated almost constant military conflict. From the beginning of the 16th to the beginning of the 19th century, European states were constantly at war. This generated enormous new fiscal pressures on states as European politics became very much a "pay to play" system. Rulers who could maintain the wealth necessary to keep their armies of mercenaries supplied with weapons and food gained in power. Those who could not saw their power diminish and were often dependent on alliance with a more powerful state.

In this very competitive environment, control of territory, through military victory and administrative development, became a central priority. One could no longer claim control over a realm or kingdom unless he or she could actually control that territory from the capital to the border. To do so, required the capacity to tax the population while able to maintain and upgrade military capacity. This, in turn, required a more developed bureaucracy to carry out the policies of the state—particularly taxation and military conscription—in an effective and consistent manner.

The most successful European states such as the United Kingdom and the Netherlands also provided greater opportunities for the emergence of more commercial and fully capitalist economies. Simply put, a state could gather more taxes from a wealthier

population and its economic base was more stable the more diverse its commerce. While the Catholic Church had long taken a negative view of commerce and finance, the Reformation generated what German sociologist Max Weber termed the Protestant Ethic—a set of spiritual values which viewed wealth and prosperity, and the financial discipline and skill to acquire them, as a sign of God’s favor.

At the same time, the rulers of other more centralized regions felt less pressure to innovate and were more able to place limits on commercial expansion. This had particularly important consequences in China when the Ming rulers very deliberately turned inward and sought to limit internal commerce and keep western commercial expansion away from their shore. As we will see, by the 19th century, China fell behind the West in its economic and military stature and was forced to open its economy on very unequal terms, leading to what the Chinese refer to as the “century of humiliation.”

Thus, at the eve of American and French Revolutions, a collection of more centralized and powerful states emerged in western Europe. Its central features were territorial control and a priority placed on maintaining its sovereignty over that territory. But while these are the first “modern states” there are still some important points to keep in mind. None of these states are democratic or based on a notion of popular sovereignty in the modern sense. The people these rulers’ control were subjects, not citizens. Also, the competition that gave rise to these more powerful centralized states was by no means over. The borders of these countries would continue to shift well into the 20th century and it was war that determined where those borders were.

This last point is worth further reflection before we move to discussion of the emergence of nationalism and popular sovereignty. The map of Europe in 1945 was the product of two terrible world wars but also the culmination of centuries of conflict. In other words, it was a map built, to put it bluntly but accurately, by Europeans killing other Europeans. Wars were won and lost and borders were set by the terms of peace treaties negotiated between the warring leaders. The maps of other regions, and particularly Africa and the much of Asia were not made in the same way. Colonial powers defeated local rulers and established borders that served their interests but did not correspond to the boundaries of previous kingdoms and states. When colonial powers left these regions, the leaders of the newly independent countries were often given sovereign control over countries which were culturally and politically diverse and not based on pre-colonial borders or identities. Put another way, without Western colonialism, the maps and political boundaries of all of these regions would look quite different.

From Empires and Kingdoms to Nations

So, how did the modern state become the modern nation-state? To answer that question, we must start with one of the most important concepts in political science: *legitimacy*. Simply defined, this is the idea that a given set of rulers in a particular state are viewed as having a right to rule by most of its residents. This does not mean they agree with all the state’s decision. A classic illustration of the concept is the result of the 2000 presidential election in the United States. After lengthy discussion, the Supreme Court ruled that a recount of the ballots in Florida would end and George W. Bush became the President-Elect. His opponent, current Vice President Al Gore accepted this ruling saying that while he fundamentally disagreed with the decision, he recognized the authority of the Court as the final arbiter of the matter. In other words, he accepted the legitimacy of the system and thus accepted this outcome.

While every state uses some coercion, even the most repressive authoritarian ruler has sought to establish the idea that their rule is based on more than might alone. Over the past two centuries, the claim that a given government represents “the people” has been the dominant way that states have legitimated their authority, but this is a quite recent development. Prior to the late 18th centuries, most forms of legitimacy were rooted in other claims—tradition, religion, reputation of the leader, legal traditions, historically rooted practices, etc. What all of these shared in common was a hierarchical conception of authority.

These conceptions of authority came under increasing challenge in the 17th and 18th century by political philosophers who argued that legitimate authority came from the consent of those being governed by that authority. The most famous articulation of this view came from John Locke in his Second Treatise on Government. Locke argued that all humans had a natural right to life, liberty and property. Legitimate authority grew from a social contract among the members of a given community to establish a government to project those rights. The notion that legitimate authority was grounded in a contract among equal members of a community challenged the previous basis for a ruler to claim sovereignty over a territory. It was not enough that other rulers recognized your authority, yours own subject had to as well.

Once the idea of popular sovereignty took hold, the basis for legitimate authority was transformed. The French and American Revolutions challenged a continent of monarchies and empires by making subjects into citizens. We will see, however, that this by no means resolved the question of precisely who could be a citizen, and what rights he or she possessed. Those questions defined much of political conflict in the 19th and 20th centuries, and the 21st century will be no different.

Nationalism and the Age of Popular Sovereignty

Of all the “isms” that have dominated global politics for the past two centuries, nationalism is by far the most powerful and yet the most difficult to define precisely. Unlike liberalism, Marxism, fascism, or theocracy, there is no deeply developed philosophical foundation to nationalism. There are no theorists akin to Karl Marx, John Locke, or John Stewart Mill who have articulated sophisticated defenses of communism or liberal democracy. At the same time, virtually every modern government, regardless of its views on rights, levels of representation, or the relationship between states and markets, seeks to legitimate its authority by claiming to protect and defend a distinct nation’s right to exist.

The first important example of nationalism in action is France under Napoleon. The French Revolution destroyed the old order and sought to create a new one based on the principles in the Declaration of the Rights of Men: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. This required changing the way in which people thought about their political identity. What did it mean to be a “citizen”? For most people in most places including France, this was a radical new idea. What did it mean to be “French”? If you had asked a person living under the reign of Louis XIV in the middle of the 17th century—who are you?—they might have referred to their family, parish, region, the monarchy, or their professional status. Few would have said they were “French” in the modern sense of the term. The idea of membership in a “nation” as political simply did not exist beyond a tiny elite.

So, how were people to come to see themselves this way? After the modern nation of Italy was unified in 1861, one of the leaders of that movement, Massimo D’aseglio asserted that “we have made Italy, now we must make Italians.” His statement clearly illuminates the difference between state and nation. Italy was now an internationally recognized state; but internally it was a collection of regional identities, and after the revolution the same was true in France, especially outside Paris.

One of the most famous and influential definitions of nationalism was provided by Benedict Anderson. Nations, he argued, were “imagined communities” in which millions of people felt themselves connected to fellow citizens most of whom they would never meet but for whom they would be willing to make sacrifices. Anderson argued that while these nations were modern political constructions shaped by state policy, their political power derived from their ability to marshal loyalty and sacrifice. “If nation-states are widely conceded to be “new” and “historical,” the nations to which they give political expression always loom out of an immemorial past, and still more important, glide into a limitless future” (1983: 19). Political leaders quickly realized that the sense of belonging to a larger community, regardless of the political ideology, provided a powerful basis for political mobilization.

Napoleon was the first to realize the power that war could have to create this sense of national identity. In sending peasants off to fight and quite possibly die for “France”, the state was imprinting that identity more fully into the mind and heart of each soldier. By creating a state which gradually was able to enforce the same laws, teach in the same version of French across the whole of the nation, and educate its young in the laws, history, and common culture of that nation, the state was constructing a modern French identity but rooting it in symbols and narratives that made it seem much older. Charlemagne, Joan of Arc, Louis XIV, Moliere—all were folded into the story of France as something that was both new and very old. It was a story, a political construction; but it was very powerful. This process became one of the fundamental templates used by political leaders across the globe over the next two centuries. In fact, everywhere European nations sought to build their national power by extending their colonial influence, the result was usually to inspire nationalist movements in response, from Mexico to China and everywhere in between.

What kind of nation? Civic and Ethnic Nationalism

It was previously noted that nationalism has not had a Karl Marx or John Locke to articulate a distinct ideological or philosophical rationale. All of the states we will study this semester have sought, regardless of the political ideology of the state, to foster a strong sense of nationalism. While Marx, Lenin, and other communist theorists were hostile to nationalism and considered themselves “internationalist,” communist parties survive in power today in places where they have fused communism and nationalism. In the modern world, legitimacy has been most powerfully grounded in the claim to represent a nation.

Popular sovereignty and nationalism emphasize membership in a particular community. What is the basis of that national identity? Some states have articulated a vision of “civic” nationalism in which membership in the community, at least in principle, is based on adherence to a particular set of political values embodied in the laws of the country. Alternatively, “ethnic” nationalism grounds membership and belonging in ancestry, descent, and blood. As we shall see, when we discuss race and ethnicity, these definitions seem clear cut in theory, but political reality can be much more blurred. Recall that modern states were built from diverse political kingdoms and realms. In this way, virtually every modern state contained people with distinct regional and cultural identities. They were, to use a modern term, multicultural. The rulers usually represented particular groups but then sought to foster a more unified national identity.

Consider the United Kingdom: it built a civic nationalism around membership in a state that combined English, Scot, Welsh, and Irish under the rule of the a single state nby early in the 18th century. Yet, all the non-English regions have sought autonomy and independence from the UK. The civic identity of Britain has been further strained by immigrants from former British colonies such as Jamaica, Nigeria, and Pakistan. For some modern nationalists, this is too much cultural diversity. Clearly for some citizens of the UK, being British means being Protestant and White. Similar views have become political potent in France and other European countries in response to immigration from Africa and Asia. The political rise of Donald Trump has been interpreted to reflect similar tensions between civic and ethnic nationalism in the United States.

As noted, we will look at these issues in more depth later, but for now can note that they demonstrate one of the fundamental lessons of comparative politics: the legitimacy and stability of any political system, however old, is never fixed, never “once and for all.” If the conflict over Brexit teaches anything, it is that no system is immune to the political pressures caused by change. As the conditions which allowed one system to flourished are transformed, new political responses emerge to challenge old ones. This process is never ending.

1: [States, Nations, and Political Development](#) is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

2: The Political Development of the British State

The First Modern State

In most comparative politics textbooks, the United Kingdom, the official name for the country often referred to simply as Great Britain or Britain, is the first case study. We might ask, Why is this? Britain's global presence is now very far from what was in the early 20th century when it possessed a vast global colonial empire. While it is still one of the largest economies in the world and an important diplomatic player in many regions, its role in global affairs is likely to continue to decrease in the years ahead and it is safe to assume that it will never again play the kind of dominant role it did in the past. In the global politics of the 21st century, Britain is probably the least important country we will study this semester.

Still there are several important reasons why we start with Britain. While it is less visible today, we are in many ways living in a world that the United Kingdom played a huge role in creating. The making of the British state and empire affected every region of the world, a point that will be clear in the other cases we will examine. The impact on Germany and Russia is unquestionable and profound. India and Nigeria are former British colonies that would not, for better or worse, exist in their present form without British colonialism. Britain did not formally colonize China and Iran, but the actions of British commercial interests and military forces profoundly shaped the path of their political and economic development in the 19th and the first half of the 20th centuries. The impact of Britain in Brazil is lesser but important nonetheless. One way or another, Britain is going to be present in our examination of political development. Therefore, we must understand the role its colonial and commercial empire played in the development of the British state and how that process shaped events in places elsewhere.

We also start with Britain because it was the first country to go through processes of modern political development that all states after have been forced to confront one way or another. By the beginning of the 18th century, the country had developed the foundations for what became the first modern nation-state. This did not happen quickly, and its implications were by no means evident to the country's leaders, but the structures that emerged reflected their response to four fundamental challenges that have faced the leaders of subsequent states.

Since Britain was the first to develop a modern capitalist economy and representative institutions, political scientists and policy makers have sometimes looked to it as a model for countries attempting these processes later. The modern field of comparative politics emerged after World War II with scholarship and policy frameworks heavily influenced by assumptions about what had made Britain successful. Its success in addressing the challenges of modern state building suggested that other countries, and especially newly independent "developing countries" could look to Britain to provide a path to a similar future. We will see however that many of those policy frameworks did not translate well in other political settings. For that reason, a closer look at the experience of Britain can help identify what is unique to its historical development and what lessons we might derive and apply to other settings.

Finally, the history of political development of the United Kingdom is important also because of the decline of British power. Powerful empires of the past rose, fell, and then often were conquered and disappeared. Britain is still with us and understanding how Britain has dealt with the process of decline and evolved from a major power to a "regular" country provides important comparative lessons. The current debates about Brexit and Britain's relationship to Europe is not new and illustrates that no political settlement, however stable it may appear, is ever fixed and permanent. Fate reshuffles the deck and political leaders, with mixed results, respond. Britain provides important and revealing opportunities to examine that process

The Long Struggle for Democratic Representation

As the first country to go through the industrial revolution, Britain generated an unprecedented level of wealth and reset the goal posts for economic wealth for every country thereafter. It was also the first country to develop a modern parliamentary system in which a representative body, based on a principle of consent of the governed, was the preeminent ruling body. While representative institutions had existed in smaller scale settings in some European cities, the consolidation of power by the British Parliament vis-à-vis the monarchy across the whole territory of the United Kingdom also created a new framework and political standard for establishing political legitimacy. It is the framework which continues to govern, not without significant challenges, the United Kingdom today.

One of the truly unique features of the British political system is the absence of a constitution in the usual sense of the term. Nearly every other nation in the world, with the exception of Israel, New Zealand, Saudi Arabia, and a couple much smaller states, has a written constitution that lays out the structure of the government, mechanisms for establishing leadership, the definition of citizenship and the rights that pertain to it, etc. The British Constitution is not a single document but a thousand years of political processes and practices. This includes acts of parliament including the passage of a Bill of Rights in 1689, as well as the Magna Carta by which the responsibility of the King to consult with wealthy barons was initially established. The constitution also includes conventions, practices that are not codified in a specific document but have emerged over time as relatively inviolable precedents. Before 2011 and the passage of the Fixed-Term Parliaments Act, there was no specific constitutional provision that required an election at least every five years, but no prime minister would violate this convention. Periodically, there is discussion of the need for a written constitution but the strong majority view has been that this constitution has proven flexible and effective in ruling Britain over a very long period during which many countries have seen multiple constitutions but not experienced the relative stability and continuity of Britain.

The Magna Carta is often seen as the originating point for liberal democracy in Britain and this is true but only in a very limited way. The agreement between the barons and King John established a parliament but it took a few more centuries for the body to have the right to review laws. Initially the powers of the feudal barons only consisted of the right to consent or not consent to the king establishing special taxes, however by the fifteenth century Parliament had the right to make laws. Nonetheless, representation in this body was limited to a very narrow group of wealthy landowners.

The Protestant Reformation generated conflicts throughout Europe and Britain was no exception. Henry VIII broke with the Catholic Church when it would not annul his marriage and permit him to remarry, and established the Church of England. After the reign of his daughter, Elizabeth I ended, James I and Charles I sought to strengthen royal authority and began to use the concept of divine right to legitimate their authority even though it had not been a part of the constitutional tradition in England. They also moved the Church of England towards what seemed a more Catholic form of liturgy and structure. Growing conflict between Charles and parliament led to the English Civil War in 1642 when Charles battled armies of the English and Scottish parliaments. In 1647, Charles was captured, put on trial, and executed in January 1649. After 10 years of conflicts and authoritarian rule, Charles II became king in 1660, and was followed by his brother James II. Parliamentary opponents forced the king to abdicate and his daughter Mary and her husband William took the throne in 1688. Known as the Glorious Revolution, this was a crucial turning point in British politics. The new monarchs accepted limits on the power of the monarchy which strengthened the hand of parliament especially regarding the power to tax. Over the next century, kings sought to restore their power in a few instances, but by the beginning of the 19th century, a clear division between the Prime Minister, elected by the majority in Parliament, as the Head of Government and the Monarchy as the largely symbolic Head of State. British statesman and scholar Walter Bagehot wrote the most famous work on the British Constitution in which he differentiated between the “dignified” (monarchy) and “efficient” (Parliament) branches of government. In effect, the monarchy provided a symbol of tradition and continuity as well a focus of citizen loyalty, while Parliament, led by the Prime Minister and Cabinet, carried out public policy and global diplomacy. After the Glorious Revolution, religion also ceased to be an important issue in British politics. This was not to be the case in most other European countries, including Germany, for another couple of centuries.

These events occurred while the British state was achieving a far greater level of territorial unity. England and Wales unified with the Acts of Union of 1536 and 1542. It was not until 1603 that Scotland and England unified when James VI of Scotland took the English throne. While England, Scotland, and Wales were thereafter known as ‘Great Britain,’ they remained politically divided for another hundred years, when they came together with the Act of Union of 1707. While Britain was often involved in wars in Europe and in the Americas (and occasionally in Asia), its territorial control was not at issue. As an island apart from the rest of Europe, Britain did not face the same kinds of security issues, and the need for as large a standing army, as other countries on the continent. Its leaders placed particular emphasis on developing the country’s naval power both for the protection of the country and in support of expanding British commercial power in other regions of the world. While Britain was involved in European wars, they usually took place on the continent and Britain was able to keep its involvement limited. For example, Britain fought the Battle of Trafalgar, its last major battle during the Napoleonic Wars, in Spanish waters and the British fleet of 27 went almost unharmed against the French and Spanish fleet of 33 ships.

The factors we have just analyzed—unification, resolution of religious conflicts, and the establishment of a stable parliamentary system—gave Britain some important advantages in developing a modern state. It enabled an emerging commercial class to become politically dominant and shape policies that led to the industrial revolution occurring in Britain first. While other European leaders dealt with territorial battles and internal conflicts over religion and authority, Britain’s industrialization occurred in a

relatively stable domestic political environment. While it was losing its colonies in what became the United States, Britain was developing a much wider colonial empire through the combination of its expanding naval and commercial power.

Colonialism and a Global Commercial Empire

The industrial revolution began in Britain when growing commercial wealth and new technologies enabled Britain to develop a global economic network. As a relatively small country, it sought markets and raw materials elsewhere. Powerful British trading companies, most famously the British East India Company, had been extending their reach into the Americas and Asia throughout the 17th and 18th centuries. Inventions such as the cotton gin provided immense new opportunities in textiles and other new manufacturing industries, and generated a push for new markets for British goods and new sources of the raw materials needed to make them. Cotton provides the clearest example of this dynamic. Britain relied on foreign markets to supply the materials, and to buy the products made with them. British interests provided capital for the expansion of cotton production in the United States, a process which also deepened the importance of slavery in the economy of the new country. A combination of private British companies and the powerful British Navy forced open markets in China and India, undermining local manufacturers in the process. Some regions, like China and parts of the Middle East became subject to British economic power while others, like India, eventually became colonial subjects of the British Crown. While it did not develop new colonies in the Americas in the 19th century, Britain became the major source of investment capital for the development of new mineral and agricultural exports from Latin America. During the reign of Queen Victoria from 1837-1901, the British empire encompassed more than 25 per cent of the world's population and had direct colonial rule of over four dozen countries, along with indirect rule over other independent states such as China. Britain did all this while facing virtually no competition from Europe. By the time the United States and Germany got interested in Asia, Britain was in a position of dominance that was very hard to challenge.

The expansion of British economic and military power had immense consequences in the places that fell under their domination. Britain's promotion of free trade policies, and the use of British military power to force open markets on other regions, created the foundations of an international economic order which remains the basis for inequalities between the nations of the Global North and South to this day. The British saw themselves as a force of progress, and a national identity developed around the idea of carrying the "white man's burden" to less "civilized" places in the name of what they viewed as universal and God-given principles of open markets and free trade.

The Social and Political Impact of Industrialization in Britain

The process of industrialization and the new social processes and relationships it created also drove the expansion of voting rights and full political citizenship in Britain. The Glorious Revolution of 1689 reflected the idea that legitimate authority of a state should derive from the consent of the governed. Initially, those who were entitled to give their consent was limited to a small elite but as the idea of popular sovereignty became more powerful in the wake of the American and French Revolutions, the notion of citizenship as the principle basis for membership in a political community became stronger. At the same time those entitled to be recognized as citizens were relatively few and political power in Parliament lay mostly in the hands of rural landowning elites.

The basis for that power was gradually being transformed by industrialization and economic development, however. Between 1750 and 1850, a rural society based on clear hierarchies and a complex network of kinship, professional, religious, and class relationships transformed into an urban commercial society in which many of the connections that created identity and a sense of belonging gave way to far larger and more impersonal cities and workplaces. This rapid urbanization caused the emergence of features such as inequality, exploitation, and a larger working class. Labor conditions in these new industrial settings were harsh and workers had few rights. The growth of commerce also created a new middle class of accountants, lawyers, social workers, teachers, and other professionals who formed the leadership of new political parties and movements demanding the expansion of political representation.

Conflicts developed between the interests of rural and urban economic interests emerged, as reflected in battles over the Corn Laws in the 1830s and 1840s. These tariffs protected agricultural producers from foreign competition but caused higher food prices in the cities. Sustained protests against the tariffs, which led to their repeal in 1846, was one reflection of the emerging political power of the urban working class and middle class population. Yet, Britain was still far from meeting the contemporary definition of a democracy. Voting rights were limited to less than 5 per cent with rural areas still dominant. With increased pressure, a small section of the male middle class achieved the right to vote from the Reform Act of 1832. The act only extended the right to vote to 7 per cent of the population, however, and continued to include property requirements. In response, the Chartist movement emerged in the 1830s to call for universal male suffrage and the end of property requirements, but it took almost another century for their demands to be fully enacted. The Representation of the People Act of 1867 expanded the right to vote to 16 per cent of the population. The Franchise Act of 1884 doubled that percentage but it was not until the Representation of the People Act of 1918

that a majority of men and women over the age of thirty had the right to vote. Finally, by 1928, all men and women ages 21 and up gained voting rights. The voting age was lowered to 18 in 1969, the same year as it was in the United States.

Thus, while the Glorious Revolution established the dominance of Parliament and a representative system of government, it took 240 years for the achievement of universal adult voting rights. Britain was not a democracy in the contemporary sense of the term until the beginning of the 20th century. The length of this process is important to highlight because it reflects an important difference between Britain and the other cases we will examine. The pressures for the expansion of political rights came after Britain had established effective territorial control and industrialized. Countries facing these challenges after would not have the luxury of 240 years in which to democratize. The demand for political rights would occur more quickly and in a far more globally competitive context in a setting in which Britain had already established a global economic order that well served its interests. Countries coming to these processes later would have to play "catch up" and encountered challenges that Britain was largely spared.

British Political Development in Comparative Perspective

By nature of being first, the United Kingdom enjoyed the privilege of more time to develop a modern state and economy in a more organic and gradual way. In the initial period of industrialization, Britain faced no global competitors with the same range and power. The United States would eventually catch up and surpass its former colonial power that would take most of another century. China was still an important power in the East but as our case study of that country will show, when the crunch came, Imperial China could not match the military power of Britain. Britain fought wars with France quite often, but they had ceased to be an important rival in the Americas by the late 18th century and spent a lot of the 19th century in the aftermath of the French Revolution. Tsarist Russia was a massive empire but remained economically and culturally feudal until late in the 19th century. Britain's most important rival in Europe in the early 20th century was Germany, but it was not to unify until 1870. It developed rapidly afterwards but in the shadow of and living in a global economic order shaped very much by Britain. Germany was forced to face the four challenges of state building at the same time in a very competitive global environment which seemed, especially to German nationalists, to place real limits on their ability to develop.

In these ways, British political development benefited from several luxuries not available to those who came after. Still, these advantages had an expiration date. By the beginning of the 20th century, Britain's declining power was starting to show. Allied with France, they could not have defeated Germany without the United States. A long running Irish independence movement led to the establishment of the Republic of Ireland in 1922, covering all but a small area in the north of Ireland that had a Protestant majority. By the end of World War II, it was apparent that Britain no longer had the economic resources or political ambition to maintain a colonial empire. Moreover, the battle against Hitler's effort to establish a regime based on racial and ethnic purity forced many in the West to reexamine the assumptions of cultural superiority which had made colonialism seem not only necessary but proper to the advancement of progress. To many in Britain, taking up the "White Man's burden" no longer seemed justifiable. This did not end racist attitudes that had been propagated over centuries, but it did lead Britain to, more quickly than some of its European neighbors, end colonial rule by the mid 1960s.

Free Markets and Democracy

The impact of universal suffrage also pushed the British political system in new directions which had an impact on its global role. The Labor Party formed in 1906 to represent the political interests of the British working class, and became a political voice in opposition colonialism and empire on both financial and moral grounds. They also pushed for the development of new social programs similar to those emerging in other European countries, most notably Germany, and challenged the long time dominance of economic policies based on laissez-faire principles of limited state intervention. The years between the two World Wars was a time of continual conflict between powerful new unions representing importing economic sectors such as mining and transport on the one hand, and a state dominated by commercial interests. These conflicts reflect the tensions between free market policies, which generate growth but also tend to foster inequality, and the demands of democratic citizens for policies that both foster growth and address those inequalities at the same time. In countries where politicians have to be responsive to these demands, the result has been variations on a set of social programs known generally as the Welfare State. In the United States, this term often connotes programs focused on the poor, but elsewhere it refers to universally available benefits. Examples include health insurance, social security, free public education, and unemployment insurance.

Post World War Policy: From the Collectivist Consensus to Thatcherism

It was not until after World War II, however that “welfare state” programs were fully developed. The most prominent example was the National Health Service, which guaranteed access to health care to all British citizens. The British state became much more actively involved in the management of the economy and nationalized several important sectors including steel and coal. The two dominant parties, Labor and Conservative, generally agreed with the terms of a “collectivist consensus” that the state should play a larger role in regulating the economy.

These policies helped Britain recover from the Depression and WW II but by the 1970s, the British economy was facing serious problems. State policies had not helped Britain keep up with other European countries and many of its industries were less competitive globally than they had once been. Labor relations also grew more conflictive and costly strikes and work stoppages led to Britain being tabled the “sick man of Europe” by critics. New voices within the Conservative Party questioned the Party’s embrace of higher levels of state intervention. When Margaret Thatcher became the leader of the Party in 1975, she pushed for a rejection of the collectivist consensus and a return to more free market policies. She argued that state intervention had undermined the country’s economic dynamism and fostered a culture of dependency on the state which had undermined competition and made the population flabby. It was time, she argued, to scale back the welfare state and “life on the dole” in favor of a return to a culture of competition and entrepreneurship. She questioned the premise of the collectivist consensus in very fundamental terms:

We have gone through a period when too many children and people have been given to understand ‘I have a problem, it is the Government’s job to cope with it!’ or ‘I have a problem, I will go and get a grant to cope with it!’ ‘I am homeless, the Government must house me!’ and so they are casting their problems on society and who is society? There is no such thing! There are individual men and women and there are families and no government can do anything except through people and people look to themselves first. (Interview, Women’s Own Magazine, September 23, 1987)

The economic challenges of the 1970s produced divisions within the Labor Party as militant trade unionists protested Labor government policies which had limited the growth of wages and led to increased unemployment. A series of crippling strikes during the “winter of discontent” in 1978-79 brought down Labor Prime Minister James Callaghan and led to new elections which brought Thatcher and the Conservatives back to power in May 1979. Prime Minister Thatcher pursued policies designed to dismantle statist policies, scale back the welfare state and restore Britain’s global competitiveness. Over the next several years, her government privatized virtually all state run companies, selling them to private investors. Her programs had harsh effects initially, producing higher employment, and they provoked strong protests. Growth rates did improve over the course of the 1980s, but so did inequality. Thatcher was not successful in her efforts to scale back the welfare state or privatize the National Health Service but her policies returned Britain to much more free market economic policies and became the opening wave of neo-liberalism as a global economic policy framework with immense consequences.

Margaret Thatcher remained Prime Minister until 1991 when she resigned over disagreements with her party on Britain’s relationship to the European Union. Memories of labor conflict in the 1970s and bitter divisions with the Labor Party in the 1980s helped keep the Conservatives in place until 1997 when Tony Blair moved party economic policy closer to the center. His “third way” between Thatcherism and socialism echoed the Democratic Party under Bill Clinton in maintaining the general economic policy of his predecessor but trying to strengthen the social safety net and liberalize social policy in areas like LGBT rights. Blair also oversaw the “devolution” of more power to the parliaments of Wales and Scotland and continued to make progress on the implementation of the Good Friday Accords that ended conflict in Northern Ireland.

Britain’s relationship to Europe and the EU remained an ongoing issue, especially within the Conservative Party. The party returned to power under David Cameron in 2010 and in 2016, under pressure from “Euro-skeptics” in his party, Cameron presented a referendum on Britain’s participation. In July 2016, a small majority voted for “Brexit” though efforts by Cameron’s successor, Theresa May, to negotiate that exit with the EU led to her resignation and the issue remains unresolved. Unable to resolve the issue, May resigned and new elections brought Boris Johnson, a leader to the “leave” movement, to power in December 2019. He promised the quick negotiation of a new trade deal with Europe and economic policies that would make Britain “Singapore on the Thames.” As in so many other places, Covid-19 threw a monkey wrench in these plans and put Johnson in the ICU. Since his recovery, Johnson has focused on containing what was the most lethal outbreak in the world in terms of the percentage of those who died from the virus.

The Luxury of Time

Political development in Britain has been a millennium in the making. Other systems we will study have even deeper roots in their country’s history, most notably China and Iran. However, no other country has experienced the degree of gradual, evolutionary

change that Britain has experienced. If an English nobleman of the late 17th century were to wake up in modern Britain, he would experience astonishing levels of economic and technological development. Yet, the contours of the political system would be recognizable, even if the levels of popular participation by what he would consider commoners were not.

How do we account for this gradualism and for the fact that while Britain's political development has not been bloodless by any means, it has been characterized by far less upheaval and conflict? England's separation from Europe clearly afforded important advantages throughout its history and the establishment of territorial unity by the beginning of the 18th century was also not contested by its neighbors in the ways that borders throughout the rest of Europe were until 1945. Spared the need for the kind of land-based army that Germany and France required, it could focus on developing its navy and using it to open up new commercial opportunities around the globe at a time when European powers were battling for territorial control on the European continent.

The consolidation of parliamentary control and territorial unity were not simply good policy choices, they were gifts of fate and geography that enabled Britain to begin the process of industrialization and global expansion before the age of popular sovereignty. When demands for political and social rights increased, the British state had developed the economic and institutional capacity to address them once they felt the political pressure to do so. The countries who went through these processes later often had to address all four challenges at the same time in periods when universal suffrage was the norm and patterns of inequality were already entrenched in the international economic structures. We will see that political leaders have responded to those challenges in a wide variety of forms, but the common feature will be upheaval on a scale that Britain has not endured, outside of the World Wars, since the late 17th century. In this way, Shakespeare expressed the value of British isolation, as well as how it shapes how the country sees itself in this passage from *Richard II* which describes England as:

...this royal throne of kings, this scepter'd isle, This earth of majesty, this seat of Mars, This other Eden, demi-paradise, This fortress built by Nature for herself Against infection and the hand of war, This happy breed of men, this little world, This precious stone set in the silver sea, Which serves it in the office of a wall Or as a moat defensive to a house, Against the envy of less happier lands,--This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England."

Clearly, Britain's divisions over the European Union have deep cultural and historic roots. Of course, Britain has been far from isolated from the rest of the world. Its economic development reshaped economic and political relations in every place where its merchants and its military set foot. Nonetheless, the desire of many in Britain to take back the sovereignty and control they believe they have lost to the EU demonstrates that our current age of globalization has not weakened national identities but strengthened them in some ways. The crisis over Brexit has raised questions about a larger constitutional crisis. Britain's millennium long process of political development, and its largely gradual nature, has been a source of continuity and strength but Brexit has clearly revealed potential weaknesses. The system depends on a stable two party system producing strong governing majorities, but the evidence suggests British politics is becoming more fragmented. The battle over Brexit, coupled with increased Scottish nationalism and opposition to immigration also indicates that the issue of national identity in Britain has been challenged by the processes of globalization. Whether the United Kingdom will still exist by the middle of the 21st century is open to question. In this way, the British experience shows us that in politics no political system or political identity lasts forever. The forces of changes pose new questions and new challenges.

Authors: Marc Belanger and Emily Speybroeck

[2.1: Section 1-](#)

[2.2: Section 2-](#)

[2.3: Section 3-](#)

[2.4: Section 4-](#)

[2.5: Section 5-](#)

[2.6: Section 6-](#)

2: [The Political Development of the British State](#) is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

2.1: Section 1-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

2.1: Section 1- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

2.2: Section 2-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

2.2: Section 2- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

2.3: Section 3-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

2.3: Section 3- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

2.4: Section 4-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

2.4: Section 4- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

2.5: Section 5-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

2.5: Section 5- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

2.6: Section 6-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

2.6: Section 6- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

3: The Political Development of the Modern German State

The Challenges of "Late Development"

Since World War II, the Federal Republic of Germany has been one of the world's most stable democracies and strongest economies. Yet, clearly, the path to democracy in Germany was not a gradual process as it was in Britain. By the beginning of the 20th century, Germany was the most powerful nation, economically and militarily in Europe, and in every way a serious rival to Britain and France. The path to this point was, however, very different. While its experience and level of success are unique in many ways, it also reflects Germany's response to a problem that faced every other country we will study, the problem which Alexander Gerschenkron called "late development". Once the United Kingdom set the standard for economic and political development in the wake of the Industrial Revolution, every country attempting to do so after would be forced to play "catch-up." Since Germany began this process in the mid-19th century, they had many advantages that other countries would not have. But the tumultuous events that befell German in the first half of the 20th century, the rise of the Third Reich, and the unparalleled destruction wrought by World War II, cannot be understood without full consideration of the challenges that "late development" posed for Germany after it became a unified nation in 1870. Trying to do in 30 years what Britain did over 200, caused strains within Germany and within Europe that provide a preview of conflict and upheaval in our other case studies. In that way, while Germany's outcomes are perhaps more extreme, their situation, and the choices facing their leaders in many ways provide a better vantage point than the case of the United Kingdom does to understand the challenges of modern political development.

Unification: From the Holy Roman Empire to the German Empire

The modern nation-state of Germany did not emerge in its modern form until 1870 after the completion of a series of wars of German unification. The territory that became Germany was at the heart, geographically and politically, of the religious and political conflicts that created constant war in Europe from the 16th to the early 19th century. The efforts of the Hapsburg dynasty to reunite Christendom in the wake of the Reformation made it a continual zone of contention in Europe. As a result, the region was a collection of German-speaking principalities with political systems that varied between representative and absolutist. While these countries shared a Germanic language (though with many distinct regional dialects), geographic and religious factors hindered the unification process until the emergence of Prussia in the 18th century as a powerful rival to Britain and France. At the same time, Germany's cultural traditions—as reflected in philosophy, literature, and music—provided a stronger basis for national identity than in many other nation-states that emerged in the 19th century. Nonetheless, defeat by the armies of Napoleon demonstrated that despite its growing strength, German states were not the equal of France or Britain in terms of the institutional capacity of the state or the economic power it could place in the service of national power. Napoleon attempted to integrate German states within the French Empire through the establishment of the Confederation of the Rhine which comprised 39 German principalities, though not Prussia. Yet, as in many other places, the effort to impose national power and control led to stronger nationalist forces of resistance, building bonds that would aid initially in the battle against Napoleon but then contribute to the unification process in the later part of the nineteenth century.

After the defeat of Napoleon, the Congress of Vienna created the German Confederation under the control of Austria Empire. Austria's foreign minister, Klemens Von Metternich sought to limit the growing power of Prussian as well as nationalist forces in Europe more generally. In many ways, however, nationalism was a genie unleashed by Napoleon which could not be put back in the bottle, especially in a region in which German culture and identity had deep roots. With the new, stronger ties between Germanic states, a trade union called the *zollverein* was established that allowed for freer and easier trade. The various states had previously had different currencies and practices that had hindered the development of commerce and trade. Prussia remained by far the strongest political and economic force. Within Prussia, the dominant power were the Junkers, a landed elite with very authoritarian conceptions of the role of the state in managing the economy and social order.

At the same time, the influence of the French and American revolutions, and the conceptions of popular sovereignty and political equality they embodied, inspired liberal and democratic movements as well; these conflicts came to a head during the uprisings of 1848 that emerged across Europe. Middle and working class reformers met in Frankfurt to establish a constitution that would guarantee the “basic rights of German citizens.” These efforts were quickly defeated by an alliance of German states led by Prussia. Over the next two decades, Prussian nationalists, led by Otto Von Bismarck, carried out a series of wars against Denmark, Austria and finally, in 1870, France which led to the establishment of the German Empire in a territory that closely matches Germany today.

Under the terms of a constitution adopted in 1871, which lasted until the end of World War I, Germany was officially a Constitutional Monarchy, with the Kaiser as the Head of State and the Chancellor as Head of Government. A parliamentary body, the Reichstag was elected by universal adult male suffrage. It was also a federal system in structure, but Prussia was, as usual dominant. The legislative districts were set up in a manner that gave more weight to conservative rural areas and the central authorities—the Chancellor and Kaiser were the dominant political actors. With clear territorial borders unifying most of the German speaking peoples outside Austria, Germany was now in a position to establish itself as a major world power.

The German Empire: Doing in 30 years what Britain did in 150 years

Bismarck had a vision for the new, unified Germany: a powerful, industrialized modern state that would be able to compete with other European powers like Great Britain and France as well as the other emergent power across the Atlantic, the United States. He did not believe Britain’s experience provided much guidance moving forward. The process of industrialization in Britain had occurred over the past century as the result of an alliance between a rising commercial class that consolidated its political control over the state by the beginning of the 18th century and used that control, and the military power of the state to expand its economic influence across the globe. The dynamic economic forces were largely private, but the British state combined a powerful navy with a legal structure which enabled the full unleashing of British commerce and enterprise around the world. Britain and France had already had two centuries of colonial control in the Americas and while these regions were largely independent by the mid-19th century, their role in the growth of the economic and political power of the two countries was immense.

With the help of its military power, Britain had also opened up markets throughout Asia for its products and taken direct colonial control of a good part of a South Asian colony that included the modern nations of India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Burma. France had also acquired colonies in North Africa and South East Asia. These factors point to important differences in the position of Germany, especially in comparison to Britain. With the establishment of political stability after 1688 and territorial unity by 1750, Britain has been able to develop its internal economic growth and colonial empire in an environment of more limited global competition. As the first country to industrialize, Britain had both more time, and was able to set parameters to what Germany could do.

Bismarck and the German leadership concluded that if Germany wanted to catch up and compete as a modern state, rapid industrialization was essential. Germany did not have the luxury of waiting for a rising commercial class to accumulate the capital and investment necessary to make Germany a global economic power. Germany did not have a large middle class to spur economic development in the form of small, privately run independent businesses. As a historically agrarian peasantry based population, Germany also did not have a cache of merchants waiting to expand Germany’s economy through capitalist development. Germany did not have the levels of small business ownership that Britain did, so large banks and organizations dominated the economy. The German economy focused on heavy industries like mining for coal and ores, and producing heavy machinery, chemicals and steel rather than consumer products. In prioritizing rapid industrialization, Bismarck fused political and economic development. The newly unified state would need to oversee and coordinate the development of new German industrial power. Germany needed to use the power of the state to facilitate the rise of powerful commercial enterprises and ensure they had the necessary labor force, infrastructure and access to capital necessary. The necessities of economic and political development were completely entwined.

Bismarck's response to these challenges established a pattern for the relationship between the economy and political system that has continued to characterize Germany's approach to a market economy into the 21st century. The German state played a key role in coordinating the development of powerful German industries in cutting-edge areas like petrochemical, pharmaceutical, and industrial machinery as global exports. Powerful banks and industrial associations operated with a degree of coordination that would have violated antitrust laws in the United States. In Germany, however, Bismarck saw them as necessary to establish its German economic power. This reflected what Bismarck termed "organized capitalism". The state was not directly involved in controlling the means of production in the manner of socialism or communism, but instead played a powerful role in coordinating the activities of banks and the private companies in ways which would make Germany a powerful international economic force. These policies placed particular emphasis on developing German exports, and Germany remains one of the leading export nations in the world, its products synonymous with quality.

The Political Challenges of Rapid Development

These efforts were fabulously successful in terms of industrial growth and economic power. By 1900, Germany was the largest economy in Europe and producing more steel than Britain, France and Russia combined. This growth occurred with a dizzying speed and generated significant political challenges. As the revolutions of 1848 demonstrated, Germany was a politically diverse and conflictive region in which liberal democrats, militarists, socialists, and other political forces competed. The Socialist Worker Party, later to become the Social Democratic Party, was founded in 1875, but its ability to organize was limited by laws banning participation by "socialist" movements. While political participation was restricted, Bismarck understood that the state needed to respond to the social and political challenges generated by rapid economic growth. The formerly agrarian working class that now provided the workforce for the factories and heavy industry lacked formal political representation. People uprooted by industrialization, who had lost their mooring in rural communities and been thrown into larger cities and huge industrial labor forces, needed the state to foster bonds of solidarity and community. It was the responsibility of the state, Bismarck believed, to use nationalism and social welfare programs to counter the messages of more radical socialist and communist political forces.

This led to the creation of what became the first modern *welfare state*. In the United States, this term is often associated with programs that target poorer members of society, but in most contexts, it applies to programs that are universally available. Rather than expanding political rights, Bismarck sought to appease the working classes with social programs that would directly benefit them and foster loyalty toward the state. Still focused on economic growth above all, Bismarck recognized how politically destabilizing such a process could be. This "revolution from above" weakened or destroyed the old ties of rural kinship and parish communities. Thrown into rapidly expanding cities and huge new industrial enterprises, urban dwellers experienced all the dislocation and alienation which Marx and other contemporary radicals associated with capitalism. Bismarck believed that a more democratic system would create intensive political mobilization that would undermine the goal of rapid economic growth. Yet, repression alone would not solve the problem. The state had to establish a modern conception of citizenship in which each member felt they had a place and would be taken care of. Economic progress depended on the creation of a state which could foster new forms of community and solidarity to replace older forms which were weakened by rapid urbanization. Social security and health insurance programs would tell citizens the state was looking after them and protecting their interests.

The creation of the first welfare state demonstrates how the economic and political problems of building a modern state in Germany, or anywhere else, were tightly linked. Economic change created immense new political challenges. Rapid industrialization produced unparalleled wealth but also unprecedented levels of inequality in highly visible ways. Social programs were designed to address those challenges but they did not halt efforts at political mobilization among both middle class and working class political parties. As in Britain, but in far more rapid and conflictive ways, new political parties emerged especially on the political left. Workers' councils were formed to challenge corporate power and expand workers' political rights. The space for these movements expanded somewhat in the years before World War I but the fundamental character of the regime remained authoritarian.

The policy of combining limits on political participation with welfare state programs was tied to the underlying logic of industrialization—to foster a state and society which could compete fully and equally with the other emergent powers. Modern states require the ability to coordinate economic policies on a broad scale in ways which generate economic growth and mobilize the population as workers and citizens. These processes are by their nature somewhat at odds with the logic of democracy and, as

we saw in the United Kingdom, the state only expanded individual rights when strong social movements demanded them, usually over a long period of time during which the state sought to resist reform for as long as possible.

Nationalism, Popular Sovereignty and Political Legitimacy in the German Empire

The political challenges of rapid modernization in Germany demonstrate how in the age of popular sovereignty one of the central challenges for modern states is to foster a sense of legitimacy among the population. While repression played a role in maintaining power, these states also sought to establish the rightness, what political scientists refer to as the *legitimacy* of their power. The claim of nationalists, then and now, is that a given people possess a very particular kind of shared bond with the members of the nation. Benedict Anderson described modern nation states as “imagined communities,” gatherings of individuals who feel themselves bound by language, history and expectations of loyalty and sacrifice on behalf of a community, most of whose members will never meet or come near each other. What makes it possible for people to feel that bond, to see and think of themselves as members of a nation? In the case of Germany, language and shared culture provided some glue, but it also clearly took wars of unification. Then it required a powerful state in order that Germany establish its place in the international hierarchy. While nationalists often present these bonds as products of a long shared history, what the German state was creating was something quite modern---a German identity that would weaken and transcend all the religious, political and regional ties which had kept Germany from uniting in the past. Those bonds of national identity could not be simply assumed to be present; they had to be actively created and reinforced by the actions of the state as the institutional embodiment of the nation.

The policies of Bismarck and other German leaders enabled the country to quickly catch up with the other great powers. In the process, these leaders confronted the same challenges as the United Kingdom but on a much more accelerated time scale. Britain was politically unified before the industrial revolution and before the rise of modern ideologies of popular sovereignty. It was able to industrialize in a far less demanding domestic political environment. Movements for expansion of the suffrage emerged gradually and could be responded to in a similar manner. Imperial Germany faced the challenges of economic and political development---industrialization and the development of mass suffrage based systems of representation---at the same time.

Considering the enormity of the task: the level of success of the German empire in fostering rapid political and economic development is among the most impressive political achievements in the modern world. Still, significant political tension and conflict persisted. While rapid economic growth, social programs, and military power provided some basis for a strengthened sense of nationalism, German nationalists remained frustrated by Germany's global status and power. While the nation emerged from the “scramble for Africa” with colonies in East and South Western Africa, they were less richly endowed regions and there was still a strong resentment of Britain and France's larger global empires. The “Social Darwinist” ideas of the late 19th century framed international relations as a zone which operated according to the “survival of the fittest.” More immediately, as an exporting nation, German nationalists felt stymied in their pursuit of resources and markets. Feeling cramped with Central Europe, they sought *lebensraum* or “living space” in which Germany could more fully be Germany. While understandable within the terms of global competition, Germany's efforts to address these frustrations through development of its military power clearly made their neighbors wary. Eventually the consequences of Germany's growing pains and nationalistic mindset would come to fruition after the assassination of the Austrian Archduke, and heir to the throne of the Austria-Hungary, in Sarajevo, Bosnia by a Serbian nationalist. Europe would erupt into a continental war that pitted the Axis powers, led by Germany, against the Allied powers comprised of Great Britain, France and Russia.

Nonetheless, without the terrible consequences of World War I, it is quite possible that Germany's leadership would have been able to manage these challenges in as relatively smooth a manner as did Britain. Political participation may have continued to expand and accommodation with more radical political forces might have been possible. But the growth of German power, and the spread of nationalism across Europe, eventually generated conflicts which diplomacy and limited war could not contain. The consequences of unprecedented technological development combined with the political power of nationalism produced what political scientists term “total war”. No longer was war simply a battle between rulers and their armies; it involved nations against nations, and the nationalistic fervor this generated led to a war of unimaginable brutality. It is a mark of the achievement of

Imperial Germany that it fought three other countries alongside a relatively weak ally for over 4 years. On the eastern front, battling the far superior German forces led to the collapse of the Russian monarchy and the abdication of the Tsar, setting in motion the processes that led to the Bolshevik take over and the Russian Revolution. On the Western Front, Germany fought Britain and France to a standstill that was only resolved when the United States at last entered the war in spring 1917.

The Weimar Republic: Democracy without Democrats

The loss of WWI had immediate and very harsh consequences for Germany. When the Kaiser abdicated the German throne near the end of the war, the challenge of negotiating the Versailles treaty fell to the leaders of the Social Democratic Party (SDP). A new constitution was drafted in the city of Weimar that became the basis for what became known as the Weimar Republic. This constitutional monarchy of the German Empire became a parliamentary democracy overnight. When Germany signed the Treaty of Versailles, the European Allies forced Germany to pay reparations, or monetary war damages, and placed severe limitations on the country's military capacity, including the creation of a demilitarized area in the Rhineland region near the border with France and Belgium. These politics devastated the German economy, with inflation rates rising rapidly. They were also viewed by German nationalist as a humiliating betrayal.

Commentators have sometimes described the Weimar period as “democracy with democrats.” While overstated, it does express well the dilemma that German democracy continually faced. Parties such as the SPD and other smaller parties of the center-right and center-left were committed to the goal of moving away from the militarism and authoritarian nationalism of the German Empire. But alongside moderate parties were radical parties of the right and left which saw liberal democracy as merely a path to power which could enabled them to impose quite different political systems. Parties which were openly hostile to the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, including the fledgling National Socialist (popularly known as Nazis) party, condemned the Weimar Republic and its proponents a traitors who had sold out Germany with territorial concessions and limits on Germany's military power. On the other side of the political spectrum was the power German Communist party and other left movement committed to socialist revolution.

As noted, the Weimar Republic was a parliamentary system in which the head of state, the Chancellor, emerged from the leadership of the majority party or parties that were able to form a ruling coalition. The system used voting method called proportional representation in which voters selected a party and seats in the Reichstag were distributed on the basis of the proportion of the vote each party received. This kind of system gives room for small parties but can also produce unstable ruling coalitions because there is seldom one party that receives a majority of the vote. Politics was very factionalized and coalitions of 3 or 4 parties were common. 13 Chancellors served between 1919 and 1933; only two last more than two years, several were in power for a few months a party coalitions gave way to internal conflicts and rivalries. The Social Democratic Party (SDP) was the most powerful, and held power from 1919-1920 and 1928-1930. However, factions broke off from the SPD and formed new parties. Inspired by the events of the Russian revolution, a Communist party formed which accounted for a not insignificant 15% of the voting base. An Independent Social Democratic Party (USPD) also formed out of the SPD. The once prominent Catholic Center Party, which had 25% of the voting base before WWI, but quickly began to lose support after 1918. This system and political environment also made it possible for parties that were not committed to the maintenance of liberal democracy, including the Nazis and Communists to get a foothold. As a result, Chancellors seldom were in office for more than a couple years and policy agreement was hard to reach. Street conflicts between right and left wing forces, against each other and against the forces of the Republic, were common. Two of the most bitter foes were the Communist Party and National Socialist German Workers Party, the Nazis. The SPD and other mainstream parties relied on the military to maintain stability but nationalists who were not in favor of a democratic system of government and were bitter about the constraints on Germany's military dominated it. Hence, the stability of democracy was in the hands of an institution which viewed it a reflection of the humiliation inflicted on Germany after WW I, while some of the leading parties viewed electoral democracy as simply a road to power.

The Rise of Hitler and Nazism

As the economy improved throughout the 1920s, so did the stability of the Weimar Republic. However, with the onset of the depression in 1929, the power of radical forces grew making stable ruling coalitions even harder to maintain. The share of the vote that went to radical parties increased; the Nazis came in second behind the SPD, and in the parliamentary elections in November 1932, they received the highest total—33%. The SPD received 20% and the Communist party received 15%. After negotiation between conservative parties, President Paul von Hindenburg appointed Nazi leader Adolf Hitler as Chancellor. A fire in the Reichstag set by the Nazis was blamed on the Communists and became the pretext for President Von Hindenburg to issue emergency decrees curtaining civil liberties. The Nazi dominated Reichstag passed the Enabling Act that empowered the state to make laws without the approval of the Reichstag. This became the basis for a complete curtailment of free speech, press, assembly and political association. The Communist Party and other left parties including the SPD were banned. In 1934 the Nuremberg laws stripped German Jews of their citizenship. In keeping with the goals of a fascist political philosophy, the state sought to control every aspect of political life. It defined who was a citizen and who was an enemy. The latter category included Jews most notably, but also people of “deviant” sexuality, religious dissidents, Gypsies and other ethnic minorities as well as artists associated with the “decadent” and “degenerate” forms of modern art which had been prominent in Germany, and especially in Berlin, during the Weimar period. Sexual and artistic freedom was associated with liberal democracy and became part of the long list of scapegoats that the Nazis sought to target as enemies of Germany.

The Nazis justified the dismantling of liberal democratic institutions and centralization of political power as the necessary means to rebuild the economy and restore Germany’s military power. In doing so, Hitler offered another version of “organized capitalism;” the economy remained principally in the hands of German private businesses but the Nazis placed party officials within companies to ensure they were operating in a way which served the interests of the state and the nation. Germany’s industrialists were generally happy with this arrangement; it brought firm control over labor unions and made the state an important consumer of many of their products as it sought to rebuild Germany’s infrastructure and war machine.

At the heart of Hitler’s vision for Germany was the expansion of its *lebensraum*. This first required him to break with the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and begin the process of remilitarization. German annexed Austria in 1935 and remilitarized the Rhineland in 1936. In 1938, he claimed the right to annex a region of Czechoslovakia called the Sudetenland, which he deemed German. European powers initially opposed this but at the infamous Munich Conference in September, Britain and France pressured Czech leaders to accept the Accord. Hitler promised, “It is the final territorial demand which I shall make of Europe.” British Prime Minister told his citizens, “I believe it is peace for our time.” A year later, German invaded Poland and World War II began. Germany was able to defeat and occupy France by mid-1940 and bombarded British cities from the air. President Roosevelt tried to offer aid to the British but resistance in Congress and the US public to joining the war was strong, led by major public figures including aviator Charles Lindbergh.

It was at this point that Hitler made a disastrous choice; though Germany had signed a non-aggression pact with Soviet leader Joseph Stalin in 1939 when the two powers had carved up Poland, he declared war on the USSR on June 22, 1941. After some initial military successes against the technologically less advanced Soviet army, the German effort to take control of Moscow failed that winter and a nearly 3-year siege of Leningrad (now Saint Petersburg) bogged down into a brutal war of attrition that the Soviets eventually won. By the time the US took on Germany directly with the D-Day invasion of June 6, 1944, the writing was on the wall for the Third Reich, but it would still take another year to induce Germany to surrender on May 8, 1945. In the wake of the occupation of Germany by allied forces, the degree to which Hitler had sought to rid his empire of Jews, which was known by Allied intelligence services, became fully visible to the world. Shocking evidence of the systematic effort to murder millions of European Jews, more than 80% of which were living outside of Germany, generated a new term, “genocide” and an international effort to hold the surviving leaders of the Third Reich responsible for “crimes against humanity,” another new concept in international law.

The Federal Republic of Germany: From Division to Reunification and Beyond

Since the Third Reich was defeated by allied powers operating on different fronts, the occupation of Germany was by necessity divided among the Allied powers. The US, UK and France maintained zones of occupation in the western regions and the USSR in the east. As the wartime alliance gave way to the Cold War, however, the former allies could not agree on a basis for unification of the regions. Gradually, these occupations hardened into two German nations: The German Democratic Republic in the east and the Federal Republic of Germany in the west. (During the Cold War they were widely referred to as East Germany and West Germany). The political and economic systems in each country reflected those of their occupying powers and each remained closely within the emerging superpowers spheres of influence throughout the Cold War. The FRG occasionally showed independence in its foreign policy, but leaders of the GDR remained tightly aligned with the USSR.

In writing a new constitution, the drafters looked back to the previous effort at democratization in Germany—the Weimar Republic—and sought to understand what went wrong and how the flaws with that system could be avoided. A parliamentary system with a Chancellor or as head of government and President as head of state was reestablished but the latter position was made more ceremonial and did not possess the emergency powers that had proven so important to the rise of Hitler and the Nazis after the 1932 elections. The legislative body was renamed the Bundestag and its membership was determined by a creative blend of proportional representation and single-member district election. The constitution writers wanted to support both strong political parties and a stronger sense of individual responsibility among legislators to their local constituency. The constitution established a 5% threshold rule for parties to be granted seats in the Bundestag. A powerful upper house, the Bundesrat, represented the interest of German states and had to approve all legislation as well as oversee their implementation. The overriding goal was to foster cooperation and consensus through a state that would be strong and effective while fostering commitment to democratic values.

The dominant German figure in this process was Konrad Adenauer of the Christian Democratic Union. The CDU sought to overcome traditional religious divides in Germany while articulating a “communitarian” philosophy that was both hostile to communism but committed to a concept of capitalism called the “Social Market.” in which market forces served the whole community, not just the individual. The CDU was the ruling party until 1966. Its principle opposition was the old Social Democratic Party (SDP), one of the few parties not tainted by participation with the Nazis, but still seen by many Germans as too radical until its leadership was able to moderate its image by the mid-1960s. The SPD was the ruling party from 1969-1982. Under the rule of this constitution, and as a member of NATO, the Federal Republic became a stable democracy and the strongest economy in Europe. The Social Market philosophy characterized public policy under both the CDU and SPD and represented continuity in many ways, under a democratic political system, with Bismarck’s “organized capitalism”. German industries and state agencies worked together in ways that would be unthinkable in the United States and violate anti-trust laws, but in Germany, this model produced high wages, strong systems of social benefits, and the continuation of the nation as major exporting power.

The emergence of reforms in the Soviet Union under Mikhail Gorbachev after 1985 fundamentally changed the relationship between the superpowers and the impact was quickly felt in Eastern Europe. Once it became apparent that Soviet tanks would not be coming to the rescue of Communist leaders in the Soviet bloc, it did not take long for citizen action. Election of non-communist leaders in Poland in early 1989 quickly set off a chain reaction that included the fall of the Berlin Wall, the most powerful physical and symbolic icon of the Cold War, on November 9, 1989, and end of rule by the Communist Party in East Germany. While the leadership of the protest movements in the east had not initially pushed for unification, West German chancellor Helmut Kohl quickly took it up, and in 1991 eastern Germany became a part of the Federal Republic.

Unification proved more difficult than expected. Economic conditions in the east were worse than expected. The East German economy had been considered strong by Soviet standards, but weak by all other accounts. The West German economy was doing well, but the unification took a toll on the overall economy of the FRG, which suddenly had to bear the burden of the GDR’s slower economy. The east had damaged or inferior infrastructure which would need rebuilding. Unemployment levels were high, putting pressure on the social welfare institutions in the FRG. There was also resentment in the east at the paternalism and condescension

of the west. One western business person observed that “Communism turned Germans into Russians,” expressing disdain for the loss of what was seen as a strong German work ethic.

In these ways, unification was an expensive process. West Germans had to pay a unification tax to help cover some of these costs, which was not popular with all Germans. Unification was also expensive politically. Helmut Kohl had to stretch himself politically thin in order to appeal to both East and West Germans. Kohl had to convince both sides that unification was a good idea. He also had to get the West Germans to pay the unification tax without serious upset bubbling to the surface that could threaten the unification process as well. In 1998, 14 years of CDU rule were ended by the election of the SPD under its new leader Gerhard Schroeder. The CDU returned to power in 2006 with Angela Merkel as Germany’s first female Chancellor. Since then the country has remained the most powerful economy in Europe and a dominant player in the European Union. Chancellor Merkel’s government has faced challenges in dealing with the economic problems of other EU countries, most notably Greece, as well as opposition to her initially generous policy toward Syrian refugees. The most explicitly nationalist party to emerge in Germany since World War II—the Alternative for Germany (AfD)—has drawn some support and generated concern because of the xenophobic and anti-Semitic views of some of its members. Parties such as the AfD have appeared in virtually every European nation in recent years and its showing in 2017 (11% in elections in the Bundestag) is less impressive than some parties elsewhere. The legacy of Nazism make these issues especially sensitive for German citizens, but events in the rest of the continent show that the kinds of racist nationalism mobilized by the Nazis is by no means unique to Germany; Germany’s past may still provide lessons that make most Germans less likely to go down that path than some of their neighbors.

[The Long and Winding Road to Liberal Democracy in Germany](#)

Germany today is the most powerful and stable nation in Europe and its democratic institutions remain as strong as any. How it got there offers important lessons in the complexities of political development. Late unification and the challenges of playing catch up produced early unparalleled economic success. Only the rise of China over the past 40 years provides a comparable example of such rapid industrialization. Nonetheless, the need to pursue state building, economic development, the construction of a national identity, and foster a sense of modern German citizenship challenged German leaders and rattled its neighbors. The horror produced by the Third Reich left such an indelible imprint on the 20th century that we might ask, would it have been better for German leaders to take a more gradual approach. Might the country and the world have been spared some of the nightmare the two world wars produced immediately and in their aftermath? We will never know the answer, of course, but we can remember that once Britain and France established the models for a modern, centralized nation-state, its power and possibilities were quickly recognized and imitated. Britain did not choose to do things more gradually, geography and history gave it opportunities that countries industrializing later would not have. Germany’s history provides a powerful lesson in both the best and the worst that can come from that challenge of late development and remind us that in politics there are not magic wands or perfect solutions.

Authors: Marc Belanger and Mary Coleman

- [3.1: Section 1-](#)
- [3.2: Section 2-](#)
- [3.3: Section 3-](#)
- [3.4: Section 4-](#)
- [3.5: Section 5-](#)
- [3.6: Section 6-](#)

3: [The Political Development of the Modern German State](#) is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

3.1: Section 1-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

3.1: Section 1- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

3.2: Section 2-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

3.2: Section 2- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

3.3: Section 3-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

3.3: Section 3- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

3.4: Section 4-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

3.4: Section 4- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

3.5: Section 5-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

3.5: Section 5- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

3.6: Section 6-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

3.6: Section 6- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

4: The Political Development of the Russian State

The Origins of the Modern Russian State

While the modern nation of Germany did not emerge as a unified territorial state until 1870, a territory comparable to modern Russia existed by the middle of the 17th century. It was under the rule of Ivan III (The Great) and Ivan IV (The Terrible) that Russia expanded to include parts of modern Poland and Ukraine, as well as much of its post-Soviet territory. Ivan IV declared himself Tsar in 1547 and consolidated control over Russia's feudal noble class with brutal repression. Peter the Great ruled from 1689-1725; he modernized the state and military and Russia became a powerful nation within the emerging system of states in Europe.

During these periods of consolidation and wider territorial control, Russia developed several characteristics as a great power that had important consequences for the development of its state over the next several centuries and into the 21st century as well. While Peter the Great modernized the state through the establishment of a stronger bureaucracy, the civil service positions were concentrated in the nation's small noble elite. Unlike in Britain and Germany, Russia's landed elites were not wealthy. Individual holdings tended to be small and remained under conditions of feudalism until the emancipation of the Russian serfs in 1861. Peter and subsequent Tsars sought to keep the nobles dependent on the modest wages of their civil service positions. Whereas landed elites in Germany and Britain became important sources of wealth and investment capital that fueled industrialization, Tsarist rule constrained similar development. Thus, the commercial powers and forces that were transforming Western and Central Europe were largely absent in Russia. Among the great powers of Europe in the 18th and 19th century, Russia was militarily powerful, because of its size and population, but economically weak; it has remained so in many ways up to the present. While Europe was urbanizing, Russia remained an overwhelmingly feudal society. Small elites in Moscow and St. Petersburg interacted with the networks and processes of the larger European culture, but the vast majority of the population were illiterate peasants locked into serfdom. While it retained its great power status, it fell further behind the rest of Europe over time.

Another significant source of cultural and state unity was the Russian Orthodox Church. Russia believed that it was the 'third Rome,' or the true center of Christianity after the fall of Rome, and the Byzantine Empire. Orthodox Christian doctrine was the official religion of the Russian state and a central way in which Tsars legitimized their power. It became the central unifying force by which some Russians leaders and intellectuals drew a strong distinction between "western" civilization, and a unique and separate Russian identity. A Westernized urban elite pushed back against these conservation forces, generating tensions between "Westernizers" and "Slavophiles." Most movements for reform, including the Decembrists of the 1830s, and more radical socialist and communist movements later in the 19th century, came from the small urban population. The tsar had his own secret police force to root out these liberal and radical reform movements. The vast cultural divide between these elites and the mass of illiterate serfs made building support among the masses for such movements very difficult. Even after Tsar Alexander (1855-1881) emancipated the serfs in 1861, peasants were tied to the land. Despite legal freedom from their landlords, the serfs were legally required to pay a land tax to the lords' overtime that would eventually lead to land ownership. However, the serfs made little money and still had to work the land to survive. These so-called redemption payments were not abolished until 1907. Peasants continued to live in small village level cooperatives providing little basis for the expansion of production and commerce in agriculture.

Playing Catch up: Modernization/Industrialization

Prior to the middle of the 19th century, most modernization efforts undertaken by Tsars focused on military and administrative reforms but left Russia's feudal socio-economic structure firmly in place among the country's vast rural population. A major catalyst for Russian industrialization and economic development was the loss of the Crimean War to the British in 1854-1856. The war clearly underlined serious economic weakness in the Russian state which undermined its military preparedness. As it had in the Opium Wars against China, the British displayed a technological superiority that reflected the impact of industrialization.

In response, Tsar Alexander II sought a path of rapid industrialization. He began by the emancipation of serfs on privately held lands in 1861 and state held lands in 1866, in hopes of freeing them for commercial agriculture or industrial employment. As with Germany, the country was trying to play "catch-up" with Britain. Unlike Germany, however, Russia did not have an equivalent of

the Junkers, the Prussian landed elite whose wealth helped fuel Germany's rapid and successful industrialization. Tsars had kept their own landed elite dependent on state employment in the bureaucracy. Russia was thus required, as were many other nations who sought to industrialize in the 20th century, to seek foreign investment, which came largely from Britain and France. Russia was also hampered by its class structure; it had a very small middle class and conditions in the countryside still tied many peasants to their villages. Where rapid development of commercial agriculture in Britain and Germany had forced peasants into cities and factory work, Russia's feudal structures continued to constrain the process. The communal land holding institution known as the *mir* remained a large part of the societal make-up of Russia and deeply ingrained in their daily life even after the formal end of feudalism.

Industrialization policies focused on large scale production of items such as coal, textiles, oil, and iron. The construction of the Trans-Siberian railway opened up the possibilities of internal trade. While these policies generated significant economic growth, Russia's internal social and political weaknesses limited their impact. The cultural and economic divide between the urban and rural areas widened. Many peasants were unwilling or unable to leave for opportunities in the cities. An industrial working class did develop but the workers quickly became discontented with oppressive working conditions and limited rights, resulting in frequent strikes. The Tsars forces severely repressed these efforts, imprisoning or exiling the leaders, some of whom would later lead the Russian Revolution. The limits of these efforts, and the distance Russia still had to travel to catch up with its competition became clear in humiliating fashion in the wake of the Russo-Japanese war. The East Asian nation, pursuing policies modeled on Britain and Germany, also carried a process of rapid economic modernization after 1868. The war displayed the fruit of that process when Russia had to surrender and accept expanded Japanese influence in Northeast Asia.

In response to this shocking military defeat, disgruntled workers and military personnel, spurred on by radical movements, led a failed revolution in 1905. Wide spread strikes during this time slowed industrialization even more. In response to this, the Tsar Nicholas II created a constitutional monarchy and, almost 700 years after the Magna Carta led to the creation of the English Parliament, established the Duma as a parliamentary body. Election rules gave the vote to all men over 25 and a wide range of political parties emerged, though most of the more radical parties including the Communist Bolsheviks boycotted the elections. However, Nicholas II and his Prime Minister dissolved the Duma after 73 days. The tsar permitted elections to a second Duma in 1907 and the radical party participated this time and won seats; it managed to last 103 days until the Tsar ran out of patience with the efforts of legislators to wrest real power from the Russian monarch. This cycle of election followed by dissolution of the Duma occurred twice more before the onset of World War I in 1914.

If war had not come, it is possible that Nicholas II would have gradually developed more tolerance for parliamentary power. It is important to note that the Duma was established in an age when universal mass suffrage was the expectation. While participation of the full peasantry remained limited, elections to the Duma were generally comparable in their level of participation to those elsewhere in Europe including Britain. (That was not the case in 1215 in England). Prime Minister Peter Stolypin did carry out reforms that freed serfs from some of the remaining vestiges of feudalism. He hoped thereby to stimulate the development of a class of small farmers and stronger commercial agricultural markets. Russia might have remained a weaker but growing economy, illiterate peasants might eventually have started to make some real progress, and a more liberal political system might have slowly taken hold. It is also possible another revolutionary movement would have emerged like in 1905, but until this point repressing radicalism had been the one thing Tsarist regimes had been consistently good at. Radicals might have chosen to try to get a foothold in the political system through increased participation in the Duma. Revolutions always seem inevitable in retrospect and the victors shape the narrative to strengthen that. However, revolutions are complex processes that no movement ever fully controls, which is why they are relatively rare.

However, war did come, and with it the destruction of the Russian monarchy and the political and economic order it had created. The challenge of trying to fight the technologically and militarily far superior German army simply proved too great. By the beginning of 1917, the Tsarist state collapsed. Soldiers without food or ammunition deserted *en masse*. After refusing to recognize the reality and negotiate a ceasefire with the Kaiser's forces, Nicholas II abdicated his throne in February 1917. A "Provisional Government" made up of moderate parties and monarchists tried to hold the country together while continuing to fight the war against Germany. Had the leaders of that government sought peace and focused on stabilizing the country, it is quite possible the Russian Revolution would never have occurred. The forces that the revolution brought to power were initially weak and had a limited political base. But that slowly changed as the collapse of the state continued and a political vacuum emerged. That vacuum made the revolution possible.

Revolution in Russia

Revolutionary movements had been part of Russian society for most of the 19th century. The first revolutionary movements began developing as young elites were becoming more and more educated. These individuals generally went outside of Russia to receive their educations and returned with a broader perspective on the need for political and economic reform. These elites became the basis of a small intelligentsia fully aware of the political ideologies emerging in the rest of Europe. The first call for revolution came from the Decembrists in 1825 when they unsuccessfully demanded a constitutional monarchy.

Later revolutionaries drew on the ideas of a broad array of socialist and anarchist thinkers in Europe, including Karl Marx and Frederic Engels. Marx and Engels advocated for collective ownership of the means of production via socialist and communist revolutions. They theorized that a capitalist economy would be overthrown by a socialist revolution and then communism would emerge from the socialist society. The first Marxist group formed in 1883 and called themselves the *Emancipation Labor Group*. They believed that the western styles of industrialization produced disillusionment within working classes, and that the western factories were inherently unjust. In 1903, the Russian Social democratic Labor Party, or the RSDLP splintered into two factions. These two factions were the Bolsheviks, or the majority; and the Mensheviks, or the minority. Vladimir Illich Lenin emerged as the leader of the Bolshevik Party. The Bolsheviks, and particularly Lenin sought to adapt Marx's ideas, developed with reference to events in Britain and Germany, to the far less economically developed context of Russia.

This goal presented some immediate theoretical and practical challenges. Marx viewed capitalism as historically necessary. First, the establishment of capitalism would generate unparalleled production capacity and wealth. It would do so by concentration of ownership and intense exploitation of the industrial working class, or proletariat. Concentrated in huge industrial centers these workers would realize they were the real producers of this wealth. As a result, they would overthrow their masters through a revolution that established communism. This did not happen in 19th century Britain or Germany, but Lenin saw another possibility: because foreign imperialists dominated Russia's capitalism sector, it was especially repressive and not subject to some of the welfare state style reforms carried out in Britain and Germany. This made Russia vulnerable to overthrow. Once a revolution occurred in Russia, Lenin argued, it would spur a revolutionary wave that would sweep across Europe and liberate the working classes. The weakest link in the chain would begin the process of breaking it.

However, the Russian secret police were effective at keeping these groups under control and exiled Lenin to Siberia from 1895-1897. He lived in Europe prior to the uprising of 1905, and was forced into exile again in 1907. After the Tsar abdicated and the Provisional Government formed, Germany sought to force Russia out of the war by helping Lenin and other Bolshevik leaders return in 1917. In an atmosphere of growing chaos, worker councils, or Soviets, began taking control of industrial enterprises. Peasants began to seize estates. A master political organizer, Lenin seized on two slogans: "All power to the Soviets" and "Land, Peace, Bread." To a war weary population, these slogans resonated powerfully and the Bolsheviks took power in November 1917. Almost immediately, the Bolsheviks negotiated the Brest-Litovsk peace accord with Germany, ending Russia's participation in World War I. A civil war ensued between the Red Army of the Bolsheviks and other revolutionary forces, and the White Army of the Provisional Government authorities and reformers and monarchists. The White Army forces received support from outside powers but the Bolsheviks still prevailed by 1921 and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was established on December 28, 1922.

What is to be done? Rebuilding the State

Having vanquished its foreign and internal enemies, the new government now had the challenge of establishing a communist state in a war ravaged, semi feudal country. The challenge is stated well in the title of Lenin's 1902 pamphlet: *What is to be Done?* In it, Lenin explained his view of the role of the Communist Party as a *vanguard* party. Lenin rejected liberal democracy as a form of government and representation because capitalist-oriented parties would inevitably use cooptation and control to maintain their power. The working class needed representation that could discern what was best for them, and act as a protector. Lenin called his solution "democratic centralism" and asserted that it represented the true interests of the masses. This is the essence of what is known as *Marxism-Leninism*: the marriage of Marx's vision of a classless society free of private property and Lenin's vision of the one-party state necessary to realize that vision. Other communist revolutions, in China, Vietnam, Cuba, and elsewhere would build on Lenin's approach. Indeed, in many ways Lenin has had a far greater influence on the practices of Communist leaders than Marx.

Once in power, however, the Bolsheviks faced an array of problems. The Communists were not well established among the population at the time of the civil war and struggled to maintain power. Many of their most loyal worker cadres perished during the civil war and the leaders of the Soviet Union faced the challenge of consolidating political control and fostering industrialization among a population that knew little about them. The Party leaders confronted these challenges by institutionalizing Lenin's

conception of democratic centralism with the Communist Party in the role of vanguard. The structures of the Communist party and the state merged in increasingly tight ways. The party dissolved the constituent assembly and banned political parties in an attempt to centralize power. They restricted the role of trade unions to educate about the role of the party and passed rules that prevented party members from meeting in groups ahead of meetings. Gradually but firmly, the Party eliminated spaces for dissent and the growth of opposition with the party. In 1919, the Party Central Committee established the Secretariat and the Politburo as the dominant decision making bodies. When Lenin died in 1924, these processes deepened under the leadership of Josef Stalin; by 1929, voices of dissent or opposition to Stalin had been virtually eliminated. The secret police force, the GPU, played an increased role in monitoring and punishing any opposition.

What is to be done? Industrialization and the peasantry

The new government also faced immense economic challenges. As was previously indicated, the writings of Marx were not especially helpful. He had envisioned communism occurring after capitalism. Communist revolutions, according to Marx, started with capitalism in an urban society, not a rural one like Russia. Capitalism would produce wealth and communism would see that everyone benefited from it equally and without exploitation. So, how do revolutionaries establish communism in a society that had not really experienced capitalism in a sustained way? The many volumes of Marx's writing contain no theory about how industrialization would occur under a communist political system. Capitalism, Marx assumed, had already done that. Lenin had hoped that a revolution in Russia would spark other socialist revolutions across Europe, but a worker uprising in Germany failed in 1918 and went no further. Crackdowns on leftist parties convinced Lenin that the Soviet Union was on its own. During the war, a very strict program of "war communism," under the leadership of Leon Trotsky, gave the party complete control over the productive forces. The state forcibly requisitioned grain and other agricultural commodities. This served the purposes of war but left resentments in the countryside.

In an effort to address that problem, the Party opted for a moderation of communist economic structures in 1921. The New Economic Policy (NEP) required peasants to meet a production quota that went to the state; they could then do what they wished with the surplus. While this seemed to compromise communist principles by permitting a free market in agriculture and the accumulation of small levels of private wealth, party leaders viewed it as a way to build trust among the peasants in the party and its goals. The NEP did limit the ability of the state to use agriculture as a source of capital for industrialization. Critics of the policy, most notably Leon Trotsky, argued that the state should procure more of the production and sell it in international markets to finance industrialization. Peasants should be encouraged to join cooperatives and moved more quickly towards a fully communist economy. Prosperous producers should be taxed more heavily.

Throughout these debates, Stalin supported the NEP and criticized those who challenged it. He focused his efforts on consolidating personal control of the party, and thus the state itself, and used the opposition of Trotsky, his most significant political rival, and other party members, to the NEP as evidence of their disloyalty to the party. The party expelled Trotsky in 1927 and forced him into exile in 1928. Soviet agents murdered Trotsky in Mexico in 1940. Once Stalin had eliminated Trotsky and consolidated his complete control over the party and the Soviet state, he reversed his position and abruptly ended the NEP in 1929.

Collectivization and Terror

With the end of the NEP in 1929, economic pragmatism gave way to the pursuit of complete control of the economy through a process of *collectivization*. The economic structures that emerged after 1929 were to remain in place until the late 1980s. These policies created a *command economy* in which the state makes all decisions about what will be produced, in what quantities, and at what price. Private property and free markets are not present. One of the official justifications for collectivization was to eliminate rural inequality and free the peasantry from the exploitation of better off peasants known as Kulaks. However, these policies confronted significant resistance from the peasants they were supposed to benefit. Fields and livestock were burned and slaughtered rather than be handed over to the state. Some regions of the Soviet Union experienced famine on a massive scale: between 3-4 million perished in Ukraine alone. Some scholars have estimated the overall deaths to exceed 10 million. Overall production levels declined, but what mattered to Stalin was that the state controlled virtually all of it. The country's productive resources and its citizens were now under the complete control of the Soviet state and could be used to feed workers in the cities or purchase the components of industrialization through trade.

Stalin's system is perhaps the most thorough example of a *totalitarian* regime. Every aspect of social, economic and political life was completely controlled. The state eliminated any space for independent thought or organization. Political participation was only possible through state and party established organizations. Failure to participate in at least some of these organizations became evidence of disloyalty. Secret police monitored every organization, work place, and family, even children were encouraged to

report “anti-Soviet” or “anti-social” (it was the same thing) or behavior. Once Stalin had established control over the economy, he set out to eliminate any remaining vestiges of opposition or even the mildest questioning of orthodoxy. A series of “show trials” between 1936 and 1938 forced party members, including some of the original Bolsheviks, to confess to political sins they did not commit before they were executed. Leading central committee members and military officers that Stalin suspected of the slightest bit of disloyalty were detained, accused, and killed; tens of thousands of party members perished in these purges.

The Great Patriotic War

As the rise of the Third Reich created tensions throughout Europe, Stalin hoped to keep the USSR out of a European war. He signed a non-aggression pact with Germany in 1939. The Molotov-Ribbentrop treaty effectively carved up Poland into zones of German and Soviet control. Whether the old joke that “the only person Stalin ever trusted was Hitler” is true or not, this agreement did not work as Stalin hoped; Germany invaded the Soviet Union in June 1941. Their initial *blitzkrieg* brought German forces close to victory in Moscow but then bogged down into long and bloody sieges that eventually brought retreat and defeat. However, even though Stalin’s Five Year Plans were wasteful and inefficient, industrialization had enabled the country to hold back the Nazis, though at a staggering human cost. While his purges were damaging to the quality of his officer corps, his call to the people to defend the homeland helped spur what Russians still call the Great Patriotic War. The entry of the United States into the war and the D-Day invasion at Normandy in June 1944 helped conclude this terrible war, the war on the Eastern Front was the most decisive turning point. German casualties exceeded 4 million; nearly 4 times the total on the Western front. The German army killed nearly 7 million Soviets while more than a million more died as prisoners of war. 3-4 million Soviet citizens died of starvation and other war related causes.

The memory of the war and the immense loss and suffering it caused has remained an indelible part of the political culture of the Soviet Union and Russia after 1991. It provided a stronger basis for the legitimacy of the Soviet state than any other accomplishment during its 70 years of existence. The ideology of Marxism and the Soviet versions of it that emerged under the leadership of the USSR presented communism as a force that transcended nationalism and other more limited forms of community. The nationalism of World War I was denounced as an ideological smoke screen, like religion in earlier ages, to prevent workers from realizing their true brotherhood. Yet, against the genocidal nationalism of the Nazis, it was the will to defend “Mother Russia” that provided the fundamental motivation that led to victory. The Soviet state found many ways to remind people of that over the next several decades.

The Cold War

As devastating as the war was for the Soviet Union, the country emerged from the war far more powerful globally. Europe was in ruin and the Soviet army occupied the eastern portion of Germany. It quickly became apparent that the wartime alliance had been a marriage of convenience as the two emergent superpowers disagreed on a wide range of issues from Central Europe to the Korean peninsula. Stalin quickly moved to challenge independent non-communist governments in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the rest of Eastern Europe. A bipolar world order emerged in which two ideologically opposed foes fought for dominance. They avoided direct war, but battled each other on a variety of fronts and levels: the pursuit of nuclear weapons, espionage, and proxy wars from Vietnam to El Salvador.

In the years immediately after World War II, the Soviet state remained dominated by Stalin. His death in 1953 led to a leadership battle from which Nikita Khrushchev emerged as the most powerful. Khrushchev and other party leaders began a process of *de-Stalinization*. In a speech to the Party Congress in 1956, Khrushchev criticized the “cult of personality” around Stalin and sought to reestablish control by the Communist Party by moving to revive The Central Committee and Politburo as decision-making bodies. The system did not become more democratic in terms of citizen participation but it became more stable and predictable. Collective decision making by the party leadership, rather than the whims of one individual, became the principal force shaping policy. This focus on organization, process, stability, and predictability characterized policy making in the Soviet Union until the 1980s. In doing so, the party reaffirmed the Leninist idea of the vanguard party. The secret police were brought back under state control as well and the use of wide spread terror and murder of dissidents ended. For a time in the late 1950s, Khrushchev permitted a bit wider range of cultural freedom.

The economic structures put in place by Stalin in the 1930s remain entrenched but Khrushchev put more emphasis on improving agricultural productivity. The production of consumer items also improved. By the early 1960s, Soviet life settled into a kind of new normal in which a gradually improving standard of living coexisted with strict controls on political activity as well as information. For many Soviet citizens, life was far easier than any other period in the 20th century. The basics—food, healthcare, education, housing—were available to most. The position of worker in this “workers’ state” remained tightly under the control of

the party. Absenteeism, drunkenness, pilferage, and black markets for valued products were rampant. A famous joke went, “you pretend to pay us, we pretend to work.”

In the wake of the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962, the Central Committee removed Khrushchev from his position in 1964. This ended most of the small political and cultural openings of the past decade. Under the leadership of Leonid Brezhnev, the party leadership focused further stability. Modest efforts to improve productivity never got far as the economic structures and remained under the control of a bureaucracy of party officials who used their positions to maintain their power. Political dissidents were no longer summarily executed, but placed under house arrest, subject to psychiatric detention, or incarcerated in a labor camp.

Throughout these years, the Soviet formula for legitimating its authority remained consistent. The defeat of Nazism in the Great Patriotic War remained a central theme and improved access to education and consumer goods and limited access to information about the outside world led many to see their conditions as an improvement. The Cold War ticked down a notch in the early 1970s as Soviet leaders negotiated arms control agreements with U.S. president Richard Nixon and Jimmy Carter. By the end of the 1970s, these thaws in the Cold War gave way to new conflicts. Revolutions in Iran and Nicaragua overthrew US-backed leaders and led to charges that President Carter had “lost” the two countries to Soviet influence which helped elect Ronald Reagan in 1980. An uprising against a Soviet ally in Afghanistan in turn led to Soviet military intervention in December 1979. In Poland, workers organized an independent trade union, called Solidarity, which challenged the Soviet-backed leadership of the country, which was a member of the Warsaw Pact. The country’s aging leadership struggled to deal with these issues and the stress they put on the country’s struggling economy. Then, Soviet leader Brezhnev died in November 1982. His successor, Yuri Andropov re-introduced modest programs to increase worker productivity but he died after a year in office. His successor died after less than a year in office. In the leadership struggle that ensued, Mikhail Gorbachev emerged as the new leader of the country.

Glasnost, Perestroika and the End of the Soviet Union

Gorbachev represented a new generation of party leaders in the USSR. He was born in 1931, and joined the party in 1952. His predecessors had been survivors of the Stalin era and, like most of that generation, were conservative and risk-averse. Gorbachev had a better education and had the opportunity to travel outside the country. While official state television told its citizens they lived better than West Germans, Gorbachev knew that was not true. He also realized that the US had indeed succeeded in turning the war in Afghanistan into the Soviet’s “Vietnam,” a bloody quagmire that was draining resources and losing support at home. He believed that improving the economy would require deeper levels of reform and would only be possible by relieving the pressures of the Cold War in ways that would enable him to cut back on military spending.

He introduced two policy initiatives toward these ends. *Perestroika* aimed to structure the economy in more productive directions while *glasnost* sought to open up the political system to critique and reform. While the economic reforms were not successful, the political reforms transformed the Soviet Union, providing an unprecedented level of freedom of speech. Gorbachev hoped this would generate constructive political movements that would strengthen the legitimacy of the system. *Glasnost* unleashed a torrent of public debate and in 1989, elections were held for the governors of the Soviet republics. Legislation introduced by Gorbachev ended the Party’s monopoly on political power, which had been a fundamental tenet of Leninism. These reforms made Gorbachev enormously popular in Europe and the United States as he negotiated arms control agreements with President Reagan and permitted non-communist governments to come to power in Poland and other Eastern European countries that had been Soviet allies. On November 9, 1989 the Berlin Wall came down and in 1991, East and West Germany reunited. Gorbachev received the Nobel Peace Prize and became one of the most admired men in the United States and Europe.

In his home country, however, Gorbachev faced growing problems. Economic reforms mainly provided opportunities for party elites to take control of state companies that were privatized and deepened the control of black market mafias. The Soviet leader found himself between a rock and hard place. On one side, nationalist forces in the republics sought greater autonomy. In the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, annexed by Stalin during World War II, protest movements demanded independence. At the same time, party officials, long wary of his reform, concluded the process has gotten out of hand. On August 16, 1991, they placed Gorbachev under house arrest. Over the next four days, their efforts to regain control and end reform faced popular opposition and key members of the military were unwilling to use repression. The leaders were arrested and Gorbachev came back to Moscow on August 19.

Gorbachev’s position had been critically weakened, however. Russian President Boris Yeltsin, directly elected in 1990, met with the leader of the other republics. Over the next months, they negotiated a peaceful break-up of the USSR and on December 26, 1991 the Soviet Union ended after 70 years in existence. The Russian Republic emerged as one of 16 newly independent nations-

states with Yeltsin as the President. Gorbachev was now president of a country that no longer existed. His policies transformed international relations but at home he was deeply unpopular and his political career was over.

How to explain the remarkable turn of events? Historians will debate this question for a long time, but we can start by remembering how the USSR came to be. A state in collapse after two and a half years fighting a far superior foe left an institutional and political vacuum. A party with limited popular base but clear ideas about what it wanted to do with political power took control. It imposed its power in very brutal fashion on a wary population. Other revolutions—in China, Iran, and Cuba, for example—came to power in part as mass movements. This provided leaders in those countries with a valuable reservoir of legitimacy. Machiavelli famously noted that a leader needed to be feared but it was also good to be loved. The leaders of the Soviet Union always had to rely far more on fear. When Gorbachev asked his fellow citizens to work with him to make the country better, the limited reservoir of legitimacy became visible. Many of his fellow citizens did not want to make communism better; they wanted something different.

Moreover, Gorbachev’s economic reforms did more harm than good for many Russians. Some commentators have criticized Gorbachev for trying to carry out economic and political reform at the same time. It would have been better, they argue, to do what Chinese Communist reformers did: focus on economic reform first. Yet, Chinese leaders were not facing the hostility of the United States as an impetus to maintain high levels of military spending. In order to pursue economic reform, Gorbachev needed to improve relations with the west and its human rights record became an important test of his sincerity. Chinese leaders faced no such pressure. Gorbachev also faced a much more massive challenge on the economic front. China’s command economy system was far less developed than in the USSR. Reforms in agriculture and state-owned enterprises could be carried out relatively easily and produced positive results quickly. In the Soviet Union, a deeply entrenched economic bureaucracy either sabotaged or coopted *perestroika*. This is another point at which the lack of underlying political legitimacy of the party undermined reform efforts.

The Russia Republic: Failed Democratization and Return to Authoritarian Rule

In the 1990s, a new Russian constitution created the elements of a democratic political system and competitive elections in 1996 led to the reelection of Boris Yeltsin. Almost immediately after the end of the USSR, Yeltsin’s economic advisors convinced him to carry out a rapid transition from a command to a market economy through a process that came to be called “shock therapy.” State policies privatized state-run businesses, devalued the Russian currency, and ended subsidies of many food staples and public services. Many workers were laid off. The standard of living for many declined and inequality grew between the winners and losers in this new market economy. A new class of economic “oligarchs” emerged and the capacity of the state declined, especially in areas such as public health, security, and fiscal administration. By the end of the decade, the Russian government underwent the humiliation of asking the IMF for assistance in dealing with its debt crisis. One of the two great superpowers of the Cold War era found itself seemingly reduced to the status of a “Third World” country.

President Yeltsin resigned in 1999 and appointed a little known former KGB officer, Vladimir Putin, as his successor. Putin set out to reassert the power of the central government over regional authorities and the oligarchs. Putin believed that Russia’s democratization process in the 1990s weakened the state and sought to re-centralize power. Putin has reestablished the dominance of the central government in Moscow through constitutional changes that strengthen executive authority and limited the space for political opposition. Putin has repackaged an old formula: a unique Russian identity framed in opposition to the west and the liberal ideologies it represents, with nationalism replacing monarchy or communism. His foreign policy—including annexation of the Crimea from Ukraine, intervention in the civil war in Syria, and interference in foreign elections—have restored some of Russia’s global prominence. Nonetheless, its stature remains, as it was under the Tsars and the Communist party, rooted in military power that covers economic weakness.

Authors: Marc Belanger and Mary Coleman

[4.1: Section 1-](#)

[4.2: Section 2-](#)

[4.3: Section 3-](#)

[4.4: Section 4-](#)

[4.5: Section 5-](#)

[4.6: Section 6-](#)

4.1: Section 1-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

4.1: Section 1- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

4.2: Section 2-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

4.2: Section 2- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

4.3: Section 3-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

4.3: Section 3- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

4.4: Section 4-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

4.4: Section 4- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

4.5: Section 5-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

4.5: Section 5- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

4.6: Section 6-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

4.6: Section 6- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

5: The Political Development of Modern China

Introduction: Ancient State, Modern Global Superpower

China's history, reaching back more than 4,000 years, begins long before most modern nations and states had even an outline of their existence. Despite civil unrest and recurring external invasion, China took the shape of a unified power defined by its ancient traditions, as well as structures of bureaucratic rule which continue to influence modern day China's society and politics. Indeed, for most of the past two thousand years, China's state was by far the most centralized and continuous in its patterns of rule. While empires in other regions rose and fell, a succession of imperial dynasties ruled China. A state bureaucracy run by a partly merit based civil service carried out the policies of rulers. Confucian principles of order, harmony, and the interests of the community over the individual provided cultural continuity across dynasties. A principle of legitimacy—the *mandate of heaven*—both promoted obedience to authority but could also become the basis for challenging the legitimacy of corrupt or inept rulers who lost the “mandate.”

The rise of European colonialism in the 18th and 19th century provided the challenges that finally ended imperial rule in 1911. Several decades of internal conflicts culminated in the Chinese Revolution, which led to the establishment of the People's Republic of China in 1949. Long regarded as a “sleeping giant” by Westerners, the emergence of China as a global superpower since the 1980s has been the most important development since the end of the Cold War. In moving the country forward, the Chinese Communist Party has continually reminded its people of the “century of humiliation” when China fell under the dominance of imperial powers. As recently as 1980, China was often classified as “developing” or “third world” – insulting labels for a country that was far more advanced in political, economic and technological terms than other regions, including Europe, for most of the past two millennia. The Chinese leadership justifies its policies as necessary to ensure China never again suffer the same fate. In this chapter, we will examine that history—dynastic rule, imperialism, revolution, and the reestablishment of global prominence, more closely.

Foundations of Imperial Rule

China's cultural history spans back more than 4,000 years. During the Qin dynasty (221-206 BCE), China experienced political centralization by establishing sovereignty, the appointment of nonhereditary officials to government provinces, the minting of currency, development of standard weights and measures, and the creation of public works including roads, canals, and even the production of portions of the Great Wall. These were all enormous advances in comparison to the rest of the world at this time. Sovereign power was further expanded by the Han dynasty (206 BCE - 220 CE). These dynasties laid the foundation for an imperial system, which lasted until its overthrow in 1911. While dynasties of Chinese rulers rose and fell, patterns of institutional rule and the foundations of legitimate authority provided a strong degree of political and cultural continuity.

Confucian principles: harmony and community

While sometimes described as a religion, Confucianism is more accurately thought of as a social and civic philosophy oriented toward promoting the most healthy, harmonic social order. Confucian ideals of community and harmony have provided the ethical foundation and underlying motivation for many socio-political consolidation efforts throughout Chinese history. Established in the 6th-5th century BCE, Confucianism has also fostered a base for the development of Chinese civil service. Confucian thought was emphasized in schools and was a main testing point for educational entry exams. Confucianism's ethical values not only influenced the country's many imperial leaders, they also remain at the core of Chinese tradition, values, and social codes today. The Confucian emphasis on harmony and community are still evident, for example, in the Chinese Communist Party's rejection of liberal democracy because of what it views as an overemphasis on the rights of the individual. While the Party is officially atheistic and represses all forms of religious expression, the strongly secular orientation of Confucianism towards order and harmony in earthly relations has reinforced its own political values.

The Bureaucracy of Mandarins

The development of Chinese civil service resulted in a class of educated men chosen on the basis of a rigorous series of competitive exams that tested their familiarity with Confucian thought. These exams lasted several days, were taken in isolation, and the test

results would determine a man's status. This system provided a small degree of upward mobility for exceptional young people from lower classes. The establishment of a meritocratic, professional bureaucracy emerged centuries before anywhere else in the world. This notion came hand-in-hand with the country's advanced understanding of citizenship that was promoted by the institutionalization of its bureaucracy. The successful candidates shared a common language and culture. The mandarins formed a scholar-bureaucrat society that endured throughout each Chinese dynasty, despite any rule-related differences. Despite frequent transitions from ruler to ruler, China's political system remained intact due to each dynasty's reliance on the cultural, political, and institutional continuity which the Mandarins provided.

Mandate of Heaven: Legitimacy and Revolution

The Mandate of Heaven, a teaching of Confucianism, served as the divine source of authority and justification for the right to rule China. This divine right to rule brought with it the responsibility to be a 'just ruler' with a moral obligation to use this bestowed power for the good of the Chinese people. A ruler who was corrupt, inept, or too authoritarian could lose this mandate, giving the people a right to overthrow an unjust ruler. It was this principle which provided the moral and political basis for the overthrow of dynasties and their replacement with a new one over the two thousand years of imperial rule.

The Rise of Western Colonialism and the Chinese Response.

During the Ming Dynasty (1368-1644), China was the most advanced region of the world in science, economics, communication, technology and public works. It also had the largest economy in the world. How, then, did the oldest political system and largest economy fall into what became known as the "century of humiliation" during the 19th century? Towards the end of the Ming Dynasty, European merchants and missionaries came to China seeking markets and converts. The response of the Qing dynasty, which began in 1644, was to move strongly to limit the access of foreigners to China. While China was enduring internal unrest and uprisings, as well as a population explosion that its productive forces could not keep up with, Western Europe was in the early stages of what became the Industrial Revolution. In search of new markets and sources of raw materials, Western states and merchants aggressively demanded that China open its markets and accept the emerging principle of free trade. As foreign enclaves emerged in India and in ports along the South China sea, the trade in opium became increasingly lucrative. European merchants, and particularly British merchants, used the military power of the British Navy to open regions of Eastern India to the cultivation of the crop. China, with a population of over 200 million by 1800 provided a huge market for European merchants. When China attempted to ban the import of opium, European merchants used the banner of "free trade" to demand that China let them operate freely. These clashes led to the Opium Wars, a series of conflicts in which Britain and France used their superior military technology to impose a humiliating peace on the Qing rulers. Under the terms of the 1842 Treaty of Nanking, the British took control of Hong Kong, which they maintained until 1997, and Britain received concessions that lowered the level of export taxes they had to pay and effectively exempted the country from the Chinese legal system. Other European powers later obtained similar concessions; the effect was to carve up China into zones of foreign economic influence.

Internal Conflict and the End of Imperial Rule

These foreign encroachments occurred alongside internal conflicts rooted in China's growing economic weakness. The legitimacy of the Qing dynasty was shaken by a series of internal conflicts and revolts. The Taiping Rebellion (1850-1864) resulted in the deaths of over 30 million people, making it one of the most violent conflicts in human history. Hong Xiuquan, a young man who failed his imperial examinations for the third time in 1847, initiated it. He developed an ideology that mixed Christianity and elements of Chinese religious traditions with opposition to the corruption and weakness of the Qing dynasty. Hong's followers consisted of China's poorest and outcast residents who were looking for a way to end their socio-economic suffering. This group, historically overlooked, formed a large army/political organization that swept across all of China. This movement was strong and popular enough that it cost 15 years and more than 20 million lives to defeat Hong and his followers. While the rebellion failed, some of its principles shaped the ideas of later Chinese revolutionaries, including land reform, gender equality and the beginning of a modern notion of nationalism.

Anger about the impact of foreign influence from merchants and missionaries also fueled the Boxer Rebellion in 1900. After 1860, the treaty settlement of the second Opium War had granted Western missionaries and other foreigners the right to travel and proselytize within China. Christianity began to permeate Chinese villages and attract peasants. Under declining economic conditions, made worse by drought, Chinese peasants began attacking Christian missionaries as well as Chinese converts. The movement that emerged called themselves Yihequan (Righteous and Harmonious Fists), Westerners referred to the groups as

Boxers because of their use of martial arts techniques. Boxer attacks against foreigners began to spread across rural China and eventually to Beijing. While eventually put down by troops drawn from eight foreign armies, the rebellion further weakened the legitimacy of imperial rule and strengthened the view of a growing movement of nationalists that fundamental political change was necessary.

Revolution and Civil War

The Opium Wars, foreign economic domination, and internal rebellions of the 19th century gradually destroyed the authority of the Chinese state. Defeating the Taiping Rebellion had required allowing the creation of local military forces, a tacit admission that the central government had lost authority. The Boxer Rebellion defeat by foreign armies provided the final nail in the coffin of imperial rule. In 1911, military uprisings swept away imperial rule after 2000 years and on January 1, 1912, the Republic of China was established. One of the leaders of the nationalist movement, a US educated doctor named Sun Yat-Sen, became the President. However, in the process of negotiating the abdication of the child emperor Pu Yi, Sun agreed for Yuan Shikai, a military officer who had sought to promote modernization of the Qing Dynasty, to become president. Opposed to democratic reforms, Yuan tried to establish himself as emperor and repressed the KMT and other forces seeking political modernization. Yet, effective power remained in the hands of the military forces that had ultimately brought down the Qing Dynasty and had significant regional bases. Yuan was forced out by early 1916 and rivalries among military leaders caused China to fall into more than a decade of violent internal conflict. The fall of a system long in power always produces a version of the problem that faced Humpty Dumpty: how to put things back together after they have fallen apart. While China was never directly ruled by colonial powers in the way that India was, the impact of foreign influence was far more destabilizing, destroying a 2000 year old political order and leaving a political vacuum in its wake.

With the central government in Beijing unable to restore unity, Sun Yat-Sen established an alternative government in Guangzhou in 1921 and sought support from the newly established Soviet Union after other countries had rejected his requests for aid. The Soviet leaders encouraged Sun to work with the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) which was founded in 1921 by a group of intellectuals who had been inspired by the Russian revolution in 1917 and by the anti-imperialism of the Soviet Union. The party grew out of the May 4th movement of 1919 which emerged in response to Chinese anger at the actions of Western nations during the negotiation of the Versailles Treaty that ended World War I. Chinese representatives had asked for the end of nearly a century of special privileges and concessions that had been granted to western powers and that areas previously under German control that were given to Japan be returned to Chinese control but these requests fell on deaf ears.

While embracing Marxism, the party was strongly nationalistic in its orientation as well, a characteristic it retains into the present day. While some Marxists reject nationalism as way to divide workers, the CCP sought to restore Chinese unity and recover the international power that Western colonialism had taken away. The CCP joined with Sun Yat-sen's Nationalist party in 1924, acting on advice from the Soviets, with the shared goal of fighting the warlords holding power throughout China. By 1925 they had defeated the warlords and reestablished central control. Following Sun Yat-sen's death in 1925, a KMT general, Chiang Kaishek took over leadership of the party and became head of state. Relations between the KMT and CCP became tense and eventually unraveled. Chiang violently suppressed the CCP, killing tens of thousands of Communist members, including 5,000 in the Shanghai Massacre in April 1927. All communist were expelled from the Party that summer; in response to the "Red Army," led by Mao Zedong and China was again engulfed in war.

Maoism: Reinventing Marxism/Leninism in a rural country

Nationalist repression had devastated the ranks of the CCP. It also forced the party to rethink its approach and the most important intellectual force behind that was Mao Zedong. Mao had been one of the founders of the CCP and, as one of the few leaders from a peasant background, had strongly challenged the traditional Marxist skepticism about the peasantry, whereas Marx had written about the "idiocy of rural life" and seen the urban proletariat as the revolutionary force within capitalist society. However, Mao was facing a different challenge than the one envisioned by Marx. He was not making revolution in a highly industrialized nation like Germany or Britain or even a semi-industrialized one like Russia. China was a country whose long-standing state structures had been weakened and its economy made subordinate to foreign economic powers. The CCP's working class base in the cities, among a relatively small and foreign controlled industrial base, was devastated by KMT repression. In many ways, if a communist

revolution were going to come to China, it would have to come about by winning the support and building an army of the more populous peasant class. This theory provided the basis for what later became known among Latin American revolutionaries like Fidel Castro as *foquismo*, a strategy based on building a movement in the countryside, surrounding the cities, and eventually toppling the center from the periphery. Like Lenin, Mao has had far more practical significance than Marx in adopting theory to the demands of specific political contexts.

However, in 1934, this seemed far-fetched to all but Mao and his fellow party leaders. KMT attacks continued to force the CCP to flee westward into the hinterland. Seemingly weakened beyond the point of recovery, the party began what became one of the legendary and mythologized events in Chinese political history: the Long March. After being encircled and in a position to nearly be eliminated, Mao's forces had been able to retreat from KMT forces and live to fight another day. The Long March was a nearly 4,000 miles journey through some of China's most unforgiving geography. At the end of this march, the CCP established a base in Yanan, a remote and impoverished area of northwestern China. The human cost of the march was enormous, reducing CCP forces by as much as 90% by some estimates, and the interactions with the peasants were far more brutal than in the official version presented by the CCP. It did two important things, however: it enabled the CCP to survive, and Mao emerged as the dominant political and ideological force within the party.

Foreign Invasion and Revolution

The Japanese invasion of China in 1937 began World War II in Asia, pushing the Nationalist government to the far southwestern section of the country. This essentially eliminated the party as a combatant against Japanese aggression. In contrast, the CCP base in Yanan was on the front line up against Japan's troops in northern China. Mao and the CCP successfully mobilize their peasant base utilizing guerilla warfare to fight off the Japanese and increase their popular support. As important for the long run success of the revolutionary movement and the stability of the post-revolutionary state, the war effort led to the creation of the People's Liberation Army as a strong effective military force. In the wake of the KMT's retreat, the CCP was seen as more committed to defeating Japan and fighting for China's sovereignty and interests. While some historians have challenged this version of events, there is no question that the war against Japan greatly strengthened the CCP and weakened the KMT in both military and political terms. After the defeat of Japan by US forces, the civil war continued with the Communist forces in a much stronger position. Despite United States support for the KMT, the majority of Chinese viewed Chiang Kai-shek as a corrupt and repressive leader of a regime beholden to foreign powers, while the CCP was stronger and more popular than ever.

After the Truman Administration concluded it was a lost cause and declined to offer direct military support to the Nationalist, the CCP took power on October 1, 1949. Mao Zedong, standing on a podium in Tiananmen Square, where the May 4th Movement had protested 30 years before, Mao officially declared the founding of the People's Republic of China (PRC). The KMT had to retreat once again, this time to the island of Taiwan. In spite of their military loss, the KMT continued to hold China's seat in the UN until 1971, following the normalization of relations between the PRC and the United States. The PRC has never officially recognized Taiwan's sovereignty and maintains that the island will return to the mainland PRC's control at some point in the future, an idea completely rejected by Taiwan and not accepted by most other national governments.

Comparing Communist Revolutions

Before looking more closely at how the CCP transformed China after 1949, a comparison of the Chinese and Russian Revolutions can bring to light important differences between the two processes, differences that in turn help explain why the CCP is still in power in the PRC today and the Soviet Union ended in 1991. Both revolutions were made possible by destructive wars that weakened the pre-revolutionary state and created openings for the revolutionary movement to take power. Without the Japanese invasion of China, it is quite possible that Chiang Kaishek's forces would have been able to consolidate their power while the CCP remained a marginal force. However, the Communists did have a base among the peasantry and if the character of the KMT regime had not changed in ways which more effectively addressed the needs of the population, Mao's combination of nationalism and the revolutionary potential of the peasantry could have made for revolution without the war with Japan.

Thus, as a mass movement, the CCP came to power with the support of the majority of the population and this provided a degree of political legitimacy that the Communist Party in Russia never possessed. The CCP certainly used vicious repression against those identified as political enemies. Yet, they also possessed the political support to carry out successful mass campaigns against a range of social ills. In Russia, on the other hand, without World War I and the collapse of the Tsarist state, it is very difficult to imagine credible scenarios by which the Bolsheviks take power. Lenin and many other leaders were in exile or in prison. With the collapse of the Russian state, the abdication of the Tsar and the effort of the Provisional Government leaders to continue the war, a political

vacuum was created that Lenin and the Bolsheviks effectively took advantage of. Under the policy of War Communism, they effectively seized the state and built the military means to defeat their enemies and consolidate control.

Unlike in China, however, the Bolsheviks had not built a mass movement. Lenin recognized this in the establishment of the New Economic Policy, which was designed to bring the peasants along with the goals of the revolution. Stalin ended the NEP and replaced it with perhaps the most ruthless state policies ever imposed on a society, but they were not all that less repressive than what would be done by Mao. However, without the legitimacy that a mass movement built for the Chinese revolution, the Soviet leaders had to rely more exclusively on repression. When Gorbachev liberalized the USSR in the 1980s, the long-term consequences of that lack of legitimacy became apparent. The Chinese revolutionaries presented communism as the means to restore China's loss of national power; its policies fused nationalism and communism. Even in the wake of some disastrous policies Mao promoted which we will explore below, the legitimacy of the Party remained strong with the majority of the population because of the ways their lives improved materially after the revolution. The Soviets repressed nationalist movements in the name of a "union of socialist republics" a fiction that never gained in legitimacy or traction with the public.

Transforming China: Policies and Conflict in the 1950s and 1960s

After defeating the nationalists, Mao and the Chinese Communist Party quickly turned their attention to some of China's most pressing issues. Among these issues was a massive land reform campaign that redistributed property from the rich to the poor, increasing productivity in the countryside. Another successful campaign strove to eliminate opium addiction and prostitution from the cities. A national law enhanced the legal status of women in the family and allowed many Chinese women to liberate themselves from arranged marriages and other traditional practices. While the party did gain considerable additional legitimacy with the Chinese masses from its successful social policies, it did not hesitate to use violence against "class enemies"; during the campaign of land reform in which the Party made good on its promise to free peasants from oppressive landlords, well over a million and perhaps as many as 5 million were killed. Unlike in the Soviet Union, these killings were often not carried by state security agents but by the peasants themselves.

In economic policy, the Party initially adopted Soviet style Five Year Plans with the goal of boosting agricultural and industrial production. By the mid-1950s, China had become a Command Economy in which state planners took the place of private owners and market forces. While these policies produced significant economic growth and industrial development, they conflicted with Mao's vision of a nation driven by the revolutionary power of peasants and gave too much power, in his view, to bureaucracies and party elites. In 1956, Mao called on the Chinese people to "let a hundred flowers bloom, let a hundred schools of thought contend." He called for the public to offer their opinions and criticisms of CCP, believing it would strengthen his hand against party officials who sought a more conventional path to industrialization. When the results of this campaign demonstrated significant public discontent, Mao led an "Anti-Rightist" campaign designed to identify "class enemies" and "capitalist roaders" within the ranks of the party which Mao charged had sought to undermine the revolution.

In 1958, Mao pushed his conception of permanent revolution and opposition to bureaucracy further when he proposed the Great Leap Forward, a policy of radical decentralization in which local communes and village committees would replace economic managers and experts as the principal economic decision makers. Villages were encouraged to develop their own industrial products and processes. Mao presented this as a path toward rapid industrialization that would conclusively demonstrate that mobilization of the revolutionary will and fervor of the masses could accomplish far more than experts. The results, however, were disastrous, producing upheaval in the countryside that caused one of the worst famines of the 20th century and the death of at least 30 million people.

Mao's policies were discredited and the economic policy went back to the more conventional and pragmatic policies that had preceded Mao's experiments. One of Mao's policy rivals Deng Xiaoping, famously noted "Whether a cat is black or white makes no difference. As long as it catches mice, it is a good cat." Translated into the Chinese context this meant that if the application of technical expertise and limited market incentives could stimulate more wealth, it was a good thing even if it seemed to conflict with conventional Communist ideas. These debates reflected the dilemma that countries who sought to establish communism faced in societies that had not fully industrialized. Marx's writings did not provide much guidance because he had assumed that communism would be established after capitalism had already reached an advanced stage. Deng's policies acknowledged the fact that capitalism had demonstrated unparalleled capacity for generating wealth and that some of the mechanisms of that system could be used, under the careful leadership of the CCP, to do the same. In this way, it was a policy more consistent with the logic of Marx's theory. The full potential of this idea was not realized until after Mao's death, when Deng oversaw the establishment of economic reforms that transformed China.

Mao fights back: The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution

While the massive failure of the Great Leap Forward discredited Mao's policies for a few years, he still has enormous influence within the party. The publication of *Quotations from Chairman Mao Zedong*, or "The Little Red Book" encouraged the spread of "Mao Zedong Thought". In response to the failures of his policies, Mao asserted that they had not gone far enough. Soviet style bureaucracy and hierarchy, he argued, had hindered the progress of revolution and previous failures only indicated how far the counterrevolutionary process had been allowed to go. His supporters accused the CCP of following a capitalist path and encouraged the public to challenge the bureaucracy at all levels. Student radicals, known as the Red Guards, violently attacked and imprisoned any they considered enemies of the revolution through what became the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. The Red Guards targeted intellectuals of any kind, including teachers and other public officials, attacking, imprisoning and exiling any authority figure viewed as the enemy. Mao pushed students to report "revisionist" ideas expressed by their teachers, and children were even encouraged to report enemies within their families. At the height of the Cultural Revolution in 1966 and 1967, when party officials were identified as enemies of the revolution they were sent to the countryside to learn to be true revolutionaries by working alongside peasants in communes feeding pigs and planting crops. Experts' estimates of total deaths during this campaign range from 500,000 to 3 million, though an final figure will likely never be known. The Red Guards destroyed libraries and burned books including invaluable historical works.

By 1968, even Mao realized things had gotten out of hand. The pursuit of political purity had left the economy once again in shambles. The Army reasserted control over the Red Guards and the worst atrocities ceased. Mao never again attempted another version of the Great Leap Forward or Cultural Revolution. Until his death, party policy remained stuck between the poles of Maoism and pragmatists like Deng Xiaoping. While economic growth remained stagnant, the early 1970s brought important changes in the international status of the PRC. Relations with the Soviet Union deteriorated throughout the 1960s as the two communist countries fought for leadership among the communist movement globally. A brief war flared up in 1969. Observing these divisions, United States President Richard Nixon and his National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger saw an opportunity to isolate the USSR globally by improving US relations with the People's Republic. After secret negotiations, President Nixon announced the normalization of relations between the United States and China and made a historic visit to the country in 1972. This initiative began a period of improved relations between the two countries that continued over the next several decades

After Mao: Economic Reforms and the Reemergence of China as a Global Power

After Mao's death in 1976, some of his allies, led by Mao's wife Jiang Qing, attempted to assert authority. This power struggle ended quickly with the arrest of the "Gang of Four." With the memory of the Cultural Revolution still present, there was no appetite for a return to Maoism. By 1978, Mao's old rival, Deng Xiaoping, had emerged as the most influential leader within the party, though he never took the position of Party Chairman. Under his leadership, a series of economic reforms introduced market incentives that have transformed China into an economic powerhouse over the past three decades. Deng also carried out political reforms designed to prevent the kind of outsized leadership by one person that Mao had been able to exercise. A new constitution established clear lines of authority between state and party institutions. While the CCP retained complete political dominance, mechanisms for political transitions among the leadership and the establishment of a President with fixed terms of office were designed to prevent the unpredictability and volatility of the Mao era. While western governments have continued to criticize human rights violations in China, China was granted membership in the World Trade Organization in 2001 and its economy has become a principal driver of global economic growth over the last two decades and especially since the global recession of 2008-9. As a relatively resource poor nation, China has become a major purchaser of global commodities and thus, a major economic player globally, and especially in Latin America and Africa were it now rivals global lenders like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund as a source of development capital.

In 1979 Deng also became the first leader of the PRC to visit the United States as relations between the two countries continued to improve until recent years. Observers in the US often compared Chinese economic reforms favorably to those undertaken in the Soviet Union by Mikhail Gorbachev. Deng's policies went much further in creating a market economy and offered more economic opportunities to Chinese citizens than Gorbachev's very limited reforms. Observers also often assumed that China would initiate political liberalization in the manner of Gorbachev's glasnost policy. The Chinese leadership did introduce some quite limited opportunities for Chinese citizens to register grievances and problems, but Deng and other Chinese officials consistently stated that they would not relinquish the Communist Party's monopoly on political power in the way that Gorbachev permitted in the last years of the Soviet Union. That Deng was serious became clear after the Party's violent crackdown on student protest in Tiananmen Square in June 1979, just as Soviet backed regimes in Eastern Europe were beginning to crumble. The pursuit of market oriented economic growth by a one party state led observers to coin the term "Market-Leninism" to describe the Chinese hybrid of capitalist

economics policy under a classically Leninist vanguard state. Under the leadership of current President Xi Jinping, central control has grown stronger and the space for dissent has tightened, processes we will look at more closely in later readings.

Authors: Marc Belanger and Cameron Moore

5.1: Section 3-

5.2: Section 4-

5.3: Section 5-

5.4: Section 6-

5: [The Political Development of Modern China](#) is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

5.1: Section 3-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

5.1: Section 3- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

5.2: Section 4-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

5.2: Section 4- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

5.3: Section 5-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

5.3: Section 5- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

5.4: Section 6-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

5.4: Section 6- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

6: The Political Development of the Modern Indian State

Old Civilization, Post-Colonial State: The Complex History of Modern India

India has been a place of great cultural, linguistic, and religious diversity for all of its history, which scholars date back to the third millennium B.C. India has two official languages, English and Hindi, but only a minority of Indian citizens speak each. There are 16 languages spoken by more than 10 million Indians and another 27 languages and dialects spoken by more than one million people. By 2025, India will replace China as the world's most populous nation. In recent years, it has been one of the world's fastest growing economies. It has a booming IT sector and possesses nuclear weapons. At the same time, a half billion Indians live in poverty comparable to much poorer countries. It is the world's largest democratic state, but in recent years, a growing Hindu nationalist movement has challenged and even rewritten some of the secular political principles established in the country's constitution.

The subcontinent has experienced the rise and fall of many empires, some of which include most of the current territory of the state of India. However, while India is the product of long and deep civilizational influences, its current borders are the products of colonialism and the challenges of independence from the British Empire. The most recent large empire to rule in the Indian subcontinent was the Mughal Dynasty, founded in 1526 by Muslim conquerors from what is contemporary Uzbekistan. Ruling an empire that stretched from portions of Afghanistan and Pakistan and almost all of modern India except a small region in the south, the Muslim rulers demanded tribute from local rulers but did not try to convert the population and left much of local Hindu cultures alone.

By the 18th century, the power of the Mughal rulers weakened and became fragmented among local rulers. In the absence of British colonialism, these conflicts would have perhaps led, as they did in Europe, to the emergence of larger and smaller states with varying degrees of power across the subcontinent. It is impossible to know exactly what the map of the region would look like, but it is doubtful the borders would be the same as the current ones. British colonialism left many negative legacies for modern India, but it did establish a much larger state than any local rulers would have been able to build on its own. The territory of modern India was never ruled in as unified a manner as occurred under the Imperial dynasties in China. Rather, it was comprised of small kingdoms divided by ethnic, linguistic, and religious identities. What's more, a number of people practiced Hinduism, a very diverse religion with many local variants in how the caste system operated and governed local social hierarchies. Hinduism did not provide the kind of unifying cultural influence that Confucian principles did in China. It is only under the influence of nationalism that a broader and more unified conception of Hindu identity emerged, an issue we will return to later in this chapter. In these ways, European colonialism left a deep impact on modern Indian state's borders and its political institutions.

The British East India Company and Reverse Development in India.

Trade between Europe and the Indian subcontinent had a long history but with the European exploration and conquest of the Americas, new sources of wealth led to further efforts by Europeans to expand their commercial interests in South and East Asia as well. India was of interest because of their large market, relatively developed port facilities, and internal trade routes. The British successfully entered into this market via the creation of the British East India Company, which was granted by royal charter from Queen Elizabeth I. Initially, the charter granted a monopoly to the British over exports from India to England, however, as time passed, the East India Company transformed from just a trade organization to an informal and eventually the formal governing power. The British were interested in the new markets, as well as the opportunity to control commodities such as tea, cotton, silk, and with extensive British capital, opium.

As British merchants expanded their operations in India, they also effectively exploited some of the weaknesses of Mughal rule. As noted, the Mughals left much of the local cultural and political systems in place. The British East India Company capitalized on this by strategically working with rival kingdoms, looking to grab hold of the power the Mughals were losing. They were able to establish control of a series of ports along the Indian ocean, establishing a foothold in India. After a series of military victories starting with the Battle of Plassy in 1757, the Company expanded its control in inland areas. It built an army of mostly paid Indian soldiers, a practice that had begun with the French East India Company, and was another benefit of the fragmented cultural and social context. These soldiers were known as Sepoys and by the early 19th century British commercial interests controlled most of

the trade and commerce in India. Where they encountered resistance to its policy of using taxation and trade monopolies to expand its power, the Company applied military force directly through a private army that by 1778 was 67,000 strong. The BEIC built this army using mostly paid Indian soldiers. They were known as Sepoys, a term applied to professional soldiers of the Mughal Empire, but they became the largest armed force used by the British as it expanded control. By the middle of the 19th century, Indian soldiers outnumbered British almost 5-1.

This process had the result of undermining local enterprise and commerce, a process that MIT economists Daren Acemoglu and James Robinson referred to as “reversing development” in their book *Why Nations Fail* (Crown 2012). Prior to its transformation at the hands of the British East India Company, India had the largest textile industry in the world and its cotton cloth had long been a valued luxury item in Europe. The development of the cotton industry in the Americas, powered by slavery and the cotton gin, provided British producers with a chance to develop their own textile industry. Parliament restricted imports of Indian cloth and British commercial enterprises used their economic and political power to undermine and ultimately destroy the Indian textile industry in global trade.

In areas that fell under British control, the British used taxation and crown-granted monopolies to ensure that, unlike in their colonies in North America, local economic enterprises could not develop, expand, or compete with British interests. When paying local rulers off against each other did not work, military force was used to consolidate British power. Finally, the level of British commercial and political dominance led to the Sepoy Rebellion in 1857. A coalition of Sepoys and local princes revolted, motivated by increasingly aggressive British efforts to establish direct political control as well as the expanded efforts of missionaries to challenge Hindu practices and Christianize Indian. As in other regions, the British used the banner of modernization and expanded rights, including for women (while rejecting their expansion back in Britain), to justify these efforts. British forces won after a relatively short but very bloody conflict that led to the death of an estimated 800,000 Indians, most of them civilians killed by famine or British retribution for the killing of British settlers. Afterwards, the British East India Company was disbanded and the British government took over direct political control of the whole subcontinent, ruling a colony that included the modern nations of India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh. This outcome partly reflected the cultural and regional diversity of India and the lack of unifying conception of Indian identity. The Indian soldiers in the rebellion were mostly higher caste Hindus from the Bengal region in eastern India. Sepoys in many western and southern regions, including Muslims and Sikhs, did not join the fight and in its aftermath the colonial army was dominated by soldiers from Punjab in western India.

The British Raj

From the beginning, Britain viewed India as a colony to exploit for its economic value, not a place to settle in the manner of what became Canada, Australia, or the United States. In ruling over a vast continent, the British government resembled its Mughal predecessors in making little effort to change the culture or institutions of most of rural India. In order to consolidate its new formal power, the British implemented three levels of rule over India. Most directly, in areas such as Bombay and Madras, the British established direct colonial rule, where British civil servants held legal power, maintained law and order, and collected land taxes. In the rural areas, the British left authority in the hands of traditional Indian Maharaja princes and other local elites who essentially became tax collectors for the colonial empires and kept the peace locally. Local leaders retained relative freedom to rule as they wished once they accepted British rule. As a result, British rule had little consequences for many Indians who continued to be shaped by the dynamics of local caste and cultural systems. In fact, the structure of village life and the caste systems that ruled them served the British goals in India well by providing a foundation of stability and a conservative social order. It also made large scale rebellions less likely.

At the same time, how the British ruled India did have a powerful influence on the independence movement that gradually emerged to challenge British rule as well as the political institutions that India’s leaders established after independence. In contrast to its practice in Africa, Britain established a more centralized and effective colonial bureaucracy. The deep roots of its economic interests in India made effective rule more of a priority, as did the development of internal infrastructure. The establishment of a civil service system provided opportunities for upper caste Indians, called Brahmins, to participate in the administration of India. In the process of working alongside their British colonial counterparts, this group began to push for greater rights and power. In 1885, a retired British civil service official, Allan Hume, founded the Indian National Congress (INC). Though he was a British citizen, Hume was sympathetic to Indians’ resentment about their lack of a voice in colonial rule. The initial demands of the INC were quite moderate and reflected the respect many educated Indians had for the British political system. The right to vote was still limited to upper and middle class males in Britain, and the upper class males of colonial India were asking for the same level of representation and citizenship within the Empire.

While Hume and a few other British officials viewed their colonial counterpart's complaints with sympathy, the official response of the British government was consistently negative. By the early part of the 20th century, more militant INC members rejected the goal of greater autonomy within the empire, or "dominion" status comparable to Canada and pushed for independence. These sentiments deepened significantly in the wake of World War I. In spite of the fact that over a million Indians served in the British Army during the war, and Indian casualties totaled nearly 75,000, the British government continued to reject calls for expanded civil and political rights for Indians. While many INC leaders continued to admire British political institutions, it was clear that their colonial rulers refused to see them as political equals.

Gandhi and the Non-Violent Struggle for Independence.

World War I led to the end of three long running empires: the Austro-Hungarian, Russian, and Ottoman. In their place, new countries emerged and the principle of "self determination of peoples" became an oft-repeated principle. It quickly became apparent however, that this principle would not be applied beyond Europe and especially not to the colonial empires of the victorious nations. Britain and France stripped Germany of its colonies in Africa and its spheres of influence in Asia but ignored calls for independence in their own colonies. In India, protests against colonial rule began almost immediately at the end of the war and a far broader and more organized movement emerged under the leadership of Mohandas Gandhi. The massacre of over 400 Indians, including 40 children, by the British India Army at the town of Amritsar on April 13, 1919, was an especially galvanizing event. This show of force, while condemned by some within Britain, seemed to demonstrate Britain's willingness to use its monopoly of military force to maintain colonial rule. It reinforced the fact that white rulers in Britain were generally not willing to see people of color in other regions as their equal. Racial hierarchies and notions of "the White Man's Burden" were simply too pervasive an influence on how European rulers viewed their colonial subjects.

In response, Gandhi called for a campaign of non-violent resistance to colonial rule. He believed this would generate sympathy within Britain and beyond for the independence cause. Gandhi rejected the idea that this kind of movement was passive. By actively encouraging peaceful acts of civil disobedience and non-compliance with the expectations of their colonial rulers, Gandhi and the INC forged a movement whose membership extended to lower caste and even non-caste or "untouchables." They boycotted British legal and educational institutions and merchandise, instead promoting indigenous products and services.

In successfully mobilizing the masses from the diverse groups in society, the INC also laid the foundation to become a political party within a democratic India after Independence. One of the most important characteristics of the INC in this regard was its secular political philosophy. The INC worked with the other major anti-colonial movement, the Muslim League, and consciously sought to create a movement that transcended India's deep divides of religion, culture, caste, and class. While some in the movement sought to build it around specifically Hindu identity, Gandhi, and most of the INC leadership, viewed that as a prescription for endless conflict in a land as diverse as India. The INC also operated in part as a democratic institution internally, with elections to determine leadership. In these ways, the INC laid many of the foundations for democracy in India. A famous though unconfirmed story recounts Gandhi being asked what he thought of western civilization. He is said to have replied "I think it would be a good idea." Whether he actually said this, the story rings true as it highlights the ways the Indian independence movement succeeded in part by mobilizing the ideals of the opponent against itself in much the same way that one of Gandhi's greatest admirers, Martin Luther King, Jr, later did when he invoked the Declaration of Independence as part of the Civil Rights Movement in the United States.

War, Conflict and Partition

Unfortunately, these hopes for a secular India were not fully realized. While Britain had been on the winning side of World War II, its economy was devastated and its citizens were ready for political leaders to focus on the home front. As serious independence negotiations moved forward, the divisions within the movement came quickly to the table. While the leadership of the Muslim League respected Gandhi and other INC leaders, they did not believe the INC could guarantee the security and full representation of India's Muslims in a country in which they comprise only 25 percent of the population and in which some called for the establishment of India as a Hindu state and nation. The League, led by Ali Jinnah, called for an independent Muslim state. When INC rejected these demands, violence broke out. Unable to contain the growing violence, and facing political divisions at home, the British decided to grant the request of the Muslims, and hurriedly partitioned the subcontinent in 1947 by drawing arbitrary borderlines between a secular Indian state and the Muslim state of Pakistan, comprised of two regions, West Pakistan and East

Pakistan, that were a thousand miles apart. The Muslim state was unstable from the start and East Pakistan would become the nation of Bangladesh in 1971, after a brutal campaign of repression by the East was ended by Indian intervention.

While the British government hoped the declaration would resolve the conflict, it caused the subcontinent to erupt in horrific violence and mass migrations in both directions. The areas of East and West Pakistan were majority Muslim, however, there were still millions of Hindus and Muslims on the "wrong" side of the new borders in the eyes of nationalists on each side. After the declaration, 10 to 12 million religious migrants crossed paths in migration, seeking refuge in their new designated states. In the end, over 1 million people died in the communal violence. For Gandhi, this violence was a crushing disappointment to his hopes for a secular India. He carried out several hunger fasts during the independence movement and tried one last time to end the violence. A Hindu nationalist, believing that Gandhi had betrayed Hindus, assassinated him in January 1948. While the communal violence was gradually brought under control, it established hostile relations between the two countries which have continued through four wars and seven decades.

Even had Gandhi lived, the uncontested leader of the INC as it prepared to become the Congress Party and rule India was Jawaharlal Nehru. Nehru had worked with and was favored by Gandhi when he was still alive. As the only national political party, the Congress won a majority of the seats in the Lok Sabha, the new parliamentary body established by the Indian constitution. Nehru became the country's first prime minister. In keeping with the principles of the INC, the Indian Constitutions, ratified by a Constituent Assembly in 1949, established the new country as a sovereign and secular democracy with a federal structure. Growing from 7 states when the country was founded to 29 today, India's state structure was built around its cultural and linguistic diversity.

As a new democracy, India has some advantages over other post-colonial political systems that emerged in the decades after World War II. Its lengthy independence movement enabled the INC to build a national reputation and constituency across caste, religion, and region that bolstered its legitimacy as a ruling party. Nehru's long participation in the independence movement gave him political connections across the country that helped resolve conflicts that emerged within some of India's states. The movement also went a good ways towards fostering a sense of national identity while its inclusiveness and its roots in both urban and rural areas provided a foundation for participation in democratic elections. Moreover, the British established a bureaucratic structure that the new government could build upon.

While the nature of the independence movement and the limited forms of participation permitted by the British provided some political advantages, colonialism's economic legacy was far more negative. Thus, while India's political system was heavily influenced by Britain, its economic policies looked more to socialist and communist systems for guidance. Believing that colonialism had made India dependent on Britain and deepened the poverty and illiteracy of hundreds of millions, Nehru pursued the kinds of economic nationalist policies that many other post-colonial and developing countries did in the 1950s. "Import substitution" policies were designed to promote the development of domestic manufacturing. Import tariffs and various forms of government subsidy created a protected market in which Indian manufacturers could emerge as the principle producers of a wide array of consumer goods from trucks to everyday household items. An elaborate system of rules governed the granting of licenses for the creation of private enterprises. While these policies led to significant industrialization, it was mostly in the form of highly protected domestic industries with little incentive to become globally competitive. The "license raj" as this came to be known provided nearly endless opportunities for pervasive bureaucratic corruption.

Nehru also sought to make India self-sufficient in food production through the cultivation of new "green revolution" high yield seed varieties of rice and other basic grains. These policies helped India become more self-sufficient, but did not do as much to overcome India's poverty. The advantages of new seed varieties went largely to landowning elites that were an important constituency within the Congress Party. Anti-poverty programs became tools for politicians to build patronage networks for mobilizing voters, but had little impact on overall levels of poverty and illiteracy. Land reform programs that gave peasants access to land did not challenge the market power of larger scale producers. Programs designed to help small farmers by providing credit often ended up simply creating high levels of debt. Huge gender inequities remained largely untouched by government policies.

After Nehru: Indira Gandhi and the Congress Party.

Nehru served as the prime minister until his death in 1964. His successor was a man named Lal Bahadur Shastri, however, he died from a heart attack in 1966. The INC then chose Jawaharla Nehru's daughter, Indira Gandhi, to be their candidate, in hopes that her relation to Nehru would win the party support, and her being a woman would make her easily manipulated. This assumption proved quite incorrect. Indira Gandhi's era changed Indian politics and left legacies that are present today. As noted, the economic system that Nehru established encouraged corruption and patronage, but was also successful at generating industrialization. At the same time, Nehru's long involvement with the independence movement and his personal reputation enabled him to resolve internal party

conflicts. Indira Gandhi took a much more heavy-handed approach which quickly antagonized her rivals in the Congress Party. Gandhi's approach to her critics in the party was to force them out. In the process, she remade the Party more narrowly into a political machine for her own advancement. She accused her opponents of being conservatives and enemies of India while positioning herself as an advocate for India's poor, though her policies in practice put very little dent into the poverty of nearly one half billion Indians.

In 1975, in the face of a serious challenge to her authority, Gandhi declared a state of emergency, suspending the constitution and declaring martial law. The move provoked massive resistance until it was lifted in 1977. In elections that year, the Congress Party lost its ruling party status for the first time since independence. The new Janata Party was a loose coalition of opposition parties and former Congress members. They shared a hatred for Indira Gandhi, but once in power were not able to agree on much nor govern effectively. As a result, Gandhi and Congress returned to power in 1980 and continued to centralize power around her with populist appeals to the poor as a strong part of her rhetoric. In practice that pro-poor discourse was undermined by an emphasis on promoting more foreign investment and economic liberalization. Even more significantly, Gandhi tried to use religious conflict to her advantage. Presenting herself as a leader who could resolve conflicts between Sikhs and Hindus in the state of Punjab, her policies cynically played off fears on each side. In the end, this all blew up in her face all too literally when she was assassinated by her Sikh bodyguard after she ordered the Indian army to attack the holiest Sikh temple and kill over 1000.

Her son Rajiv became Prime Minister after her death and deepened the liberalization policies that sought to open the Indian economy to foreign investment and global trade. He also sought to play down some of the ethnic and religious tensions his mother had inflamed. He had more success on the economic front, as India's economy reached much higher levels of economic growth, but on the religious front, the genie was hard to put back in the bottle. Hindu nationalist forces, always present but politically marginal until the 1980s, became more prominent as the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), a party seeking to rebrand India as a Hindu nation, gained power first at the state level, and then for a short time in 1997 at the national level. While the BJP's first time in power lasted mere weeks, the inability of the Congress Party to provide effective policies gave them another opportunity from 1998-2004 and then again in 2014, when Narendra Modi became Prime Minister. While his promises to re-ignite economic growth to pre-2008 levels achieved only modest results, his efforts to promote Hindu nationalism have pushed India away from its secular roots.

In the 2000s, rapid economic growth led many to compare India and China and speculate on whether the dragon or the tiger would be the dominant global force in the 21st century. Over the past decade, however, India has not been able to maintain the pace set by China and its crushing levels of poverty and pervasive corruption seem as entrenched as ever. The BJP has sought to replace the secular national identity with a Hindu nationalist identity. If it is successful, the terms of democratic citizenship in India will have been fundamentally altered, with uncertain but potentially troubling consequences for the "world's largest democracy."

India and China: The Differing Responses to Foreign Intervention

Since India became independent two years before the establishment of the People's Republic of China, the two countries present a fascinating comparative contrast. Both fell under foreign domination in the 19th century and yet they pursued quite different political paths in the middle of the 20th century. India embraced the parliamentary democracy model of its colonial masters while China is ruled by the Communist Party in a textbook version of Lenin's conception of the vanguard party. How to explain such different responses to foreign intervention and domination?

Part of the explanation can be found by looking more closely at the impact of foreign control in each society. In India, British colonialism led to de-industrialization and economic weakness, but it also unified a politically and culturally diverse region in a way it never had been before. Colonialism established borders that would likely have looked different if they had been determined, as they were in Europe, by local wars of competition and conquest. India's borders and the identity forged by the independence movement through non-violent civil disobedience were, in this way, products of colonialism, and from the standpoint of its post independence leaders, this proved quite productive. India leaders did not have to conquer or subdue its internal population in the way that European states did, or for that matter the Chinese Communist Party did. External sovereignty within the borders established by colonialism was granted to the new government. Having been built in this way, it would have been very difficult to impose one-party rule on such a diverse country without great violence. The violence of the partition provided a glimpse of what kind of carnage might have followed from any effort to impose a dominant ethnic, cultural or political identity. While the partition addressed fears across religious lines, there were many other fault lines and sources of identity, and they have occasionally flared up since 1949. India's border with Pakistan has been contested, especially in Kashmir.

While the country was never formally colonized, the consequences of foreign domination in China were far more devastating. Decades of bloody internal conflict before the end of dynastic rule was followed by almost four decades of warlord conflicts, civil

war, and foreign invasion. The CCP had to battle for control of China on the ground. The bitterness of its attitude toward the west for the "century of humiliation" made liberal democracy and capitalism part of the problem that China had to overcome. China's long history of centralized rule and the desire to reject all forms of western control made communist ideology with a powerful nationalist component. That's not to say that communist rule in China was inevitable. Without the Japanese invasion, the nationalist forces might have gradually destroyed their communist enemies. But given their corruption, continued ties to foreign powers, and inability to effectively rule the country, a more centralized political project that could restore the country's unity and power was far less likely to take democratic form. Some form of modernizing authoritarian government was the more likely outcome.

Authors: Marc Belanger and Emily Speybroeck

[6.1: Section 2-](#)

[6.2: Section 3-](#)

[6.3: Section 4-](#)

[6.4: Section 5-](#)

[6.5: Section 6-](#)

6: [The Political Development of the Modern Indian State](#) is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

6.1: Section 2-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

6.1: Section 2- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

6.2: Section 3-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

6.2: Section 3- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

6.3: Section 4-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

6.3: Section 4- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

6.4: Section 5-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

6.4: Section 5- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

6.5: Section 6-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

6.5: Section 6- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

7: The Political Development of the Islamic Republic of Iran

Modern State, Ancient Identity

Like China and India, Iran is a modern nation-state with deep roots in the past. While a revolution in 1979 established the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iranians look back with pride on cultural and political traditions that go back to the rule of Cyrus the Great in the Sixth Century BC. While Iran is in the Middle East and its population is almost entirely Muslim, it differs from its neighbors in the region in two important ways. While 90% of Muslims around the world are Sunni, Iran is one of two countries with a Shi'a majority (Iraq is the other). A second important distinction is that Iran is not an Arab state; the majority of its inhabitants are of Persian descent, though there are significant Kurdish and Azeri minorities. Many of the conflicts Iran has encountered with Arab neighbors in recent years are rooted in these differences. More often than not, religion has not been the actual source of conflict. The real battles have been over power and influence in the region. As we shall see, Iranian identity has also been shaped and reshaped by foreign invasion and intervention, from Alexander the Great in the 4th century BCE to Britain, Russia, and the United States in the 20th century. One of the lasting consequences of this history is a strong sense of nationalism and defense of the country's sovereignty which most Iranians share regardless of political differences. We cannot understand the current tensions between Iran, its neighbors in the Middle East, and the United States, without taking that history into account. We will look more closely at the contemporary manifestations of these attitudes in later readings. This chapter will trace the historical events and processes that have shaped modern Iranian politics and culminated in the Iranian Revolution and the establishment of the Islamic Republic.

Foreign invasions: Change and Continuity

As just noted, a series of foreign invaders, starting with Alexander the Great, have left lasting influences on modern Iran even as a sense of Persian cultural identity has endured. The most important of these invaders were the Arabs who brought Islam to Iran in the 7th and 8th century. While a distinct sense of Persian culture persisted in language, literature, and other cultural forms, the religion became dominant over much of the region quickly. As the reach of Arab empires receded, other invaders—Turk, Mongol, and Afghan ruled over Iran but the invaders that would leave a lasting influence were the Safavids, which ruled over Iran from 1501 to 1736. The rulers of this dynasty were ethnic Turks who migrated into the northern region of what is modern Iran during Mongol rule in the 13th century.

After consolidating control, they sought to establish a more administratively centralized state than had existed previously, though not on the scale of a modern nation-state. In order to create a stronger sense of unity among ethnic Persians, Turks, Azeris, Tajiks, and other ethnic groups, the population was forced to convert to Shi'a Islam. It was a brutal process; the Safavid monarch, or Shah, Ismail I killed and imprisoned Sunnis who resisted and destroyed Sunni Mosques. The Safavids, like most Muslim rulers throughout the Middle East and Europe at this time, tolerated other small religious communities, including Jews and Christians, as long as they paid their taxes and supported the kings. Despite becoming a Shi'a based empire, the Safavids also made little effort to change the cultural traditions of the population; the capital Isfahan, remained a Persian city and Persian cultural traditions and values remained strong.

The Qajar Dynasty: External Control and Internal Reform Movements

The Safavid Dynasty collapsed in 1722 when Afghan Tribesmen invaded. Another group of ethnic Turks rose to power after a fifty-year civil war. The Qajar rulers were descendants of a Turkish tribe that had lived in the northern region of the Safavid dynasty and served in important positions in the administration of that dynasty. Once they established effective control, the Qajars moved the capital to Tehran, where it remains today. The Qajars saw no need to reinvent the proverbial wheel and kept many of the governmental structures that the Safavids had in place. Shi'ism became the official religion of Iran, even though it was already practiced by the majority of the population.

In the 19th century, the expansion of European trade and commerce caused by the industrial revolution and imperialism presented significant challenges for the Qajar dynasty. While the consequences of outside influence were not on the same scale as in India and China, they were nonetheless pervasive and lasting. Russia expanded the territorial control of the Russian empire into the Caucasus mountains region to the northwest of Iran. The Russians also demanded to be able to claim the fishing rights in the

Caspian Sea. Oil rights were sold, under intense diplomatic and military pressure to various British companies, giving them considerable influence in the area and other resource rights were sold bit by bit to European investors in the region. The Qajars also borrowed vast sums of money from European lenders which increased the amount of power and influence Europeans had in Iran. At several points, the British military took direct control of Iranian customs operations to be sure taxes were paid on British goods.

As in India and China, growing foreign influence in Iran and the inability of the Qajars to maintain the empire's sovereignty and independence provoked internal opposition. As in every other place where European nations took control in the pursuit of national power, nationalist sentiments grew in response. The Qajar concessions to British and Russian economic demands were condemned as "capitulations." Most of these opponents were well-educated elites who saw much to admire in modern western political and economic reforms and institutions, but did not wish to live under foreign domination and strove to see Iran establish its rightful place as a sovereign, modern nation. Anger about Iran's economic and political weakness came to a head in 1905 when the Qajar ruler, Shah Muzaffar ad Din took loans from Russia to finance a trip to Europe. After he went back on promises to establish a legislative assembly group, over 10,000 Iranians camped out inside the grounds of the British Embassy and drafted a constitution which the Shah signed, under pressure from Britain, on December 30, 1906.

Thus, the Constitutional Revolution of 1905 established a constitutional monarchy that lasted, in various forms and guises, until the Iranian Revolution in 1979 and continues to influence the constitution of the Islamic Republic. The new constitution codified the establishment of a parliamentary body, the *Majlis*, which was to represent all people, including religious minorities who were assigned seats. Christians, Jews, and Zoroastrians all had seats in the *Majlis*, though Bahais were denied representation. The *Majlis* controlled many aspects of the state including laws, budgets, loans, and treaties. A bill of rights was drafted which included standard civic freedoms and rights and limits were placed on the power of the monarchy. Alongside with demands for the establishment of parliamentary democracy, reforms also demanded that foreign "capitulations" be renegotiated, and Iran reassert sovereignty over its territory and resources, but the constitution did not alter the terms of foreign economic control. In fact part of the agreement that led to the approval of the constitution granted Russia control over the army.

One of the key points of debate and contention throughout the establishment of the constitution was the relationship between Islam and democracy. Some reformers argued they were inherently incompatible with each other, while others argued that democracy was the only form of government that could successfully incorporate Islam. Some reformers argued for the establishment of a more secular government and the weakening of Islamic influence over law and education. This was to be a debate with no easy resolution, and the new government clearly reflected these tensions. The new system was modeled after secular European systems, but also infused with Islam. Shiism was declared the official state religion. To accommodate the religious authority in the government, the Guardian Council was created. These members were senior clerics elected by the *Majlis*; they had veto power over bills that they deemed to conflict with Islam.

The Continuing Pressure of Outside Forces

While the new constitution appeased reformers for a time, it was far from the efficient and modern state that Iran required to alter the balance of power with European powers. The state bureaucracy remained weak administratively, with little capacity to collect taxes. In 1907, the Russian and British governments signed the Anglo-Russian Agreement which effectively carved the country into two spheres of influence and limited Iranian sovereignty to a small neutral area in the center of the country. A dispute with Russia over taxes led to Russian military forces invading and occupying the capital and suspending the taking control of the capital in 1911. The *Majlis* was shut down and the constitution suspended.

From this state of weakness, the onset of WWI launched Iran into further chaos. While not directly affected by the fighting that was going on in Europe, Iran was under pressure from Europe to pick a side since all actors coveted its oil and other resources. Alongside the pressure from Europe, famine hit, and one million people, 10% of the total population, died. Internal conflict also intensified as liberal and conservative members of the *Majlis* clashed over legislation. An urban middle class movement called for social reforms that would replace Sharia law, generating intense opposition from conservatives. While the conflict roiled Tehran and other major cities, there was also conflict in the countryside. The provinces that were ruled by local tribes were becoming increasingly chaotic. German forces encouraged southern tribal groups to rise up against British control and in response Britain organized its own paramilitary force of rural peoples. Russian influence dropped off with the abdication of the Tsar and the Russian Revolution, leaving Britain as the dominant international force after the war ended.

The Rise of the Pahlavi Dynasty

In response to the growing anarchy and national dissolution, Iranian military officers seized power in 1921. Colonel Reza Khan, who was the commander of the Cossack Brigade, took control, and after becoming Prime Minister in 1923, declared himself Shah

Reza Pahlavi in 1925. Taking his name from an ancient Persian monarch, the new Shah set out to build a more effective central state that could reassert physical control over the country. The political model he sought to emulate was that enacted in nearby Turkey by another ambitious military officer, Kemal Ataturk. Ataturk sought to build a modern, secular state in which a powerful military would reinforce an administratively more powerful and effective modern bureaucracy while fostering a European style national identity. Ataturk systematically weakened Islamic forces and banned wearing of the veil and other Islamic forms of dress and display in public places such as government offices and schools.

Reza Khan pursued the same path in Iran. He shared Ataturk's disdain for representative democracy, pursuing a form of "modernizing authoritarian" rule designed, like Bismarck's policies in Imperial Germany, to make Iran a modern state, with secular nationalism as the anchoring ideology. As a result, the size of the state bureaucracy grew while the power of the Majlis, already weakened by political divisions, was further diminished by executive power. A system of universal conscription was established and the army grew from a fragmented collection of local forces to a strong, unified force. National development programs fostered new industries and greater production of consumer goods. A trans-Iranian railroad was constructed along with a more extensive system of roads. Increased employment in state agencies, including an expanding school system led to the growth of a middle class.

Reza Pahlavi's policies established greater territorial control and brought more internal order to Iran, though at the price of political rights and the aspirations of constitutional reformers. At the same time, Great Britain and the Soviet Union remained interested in the region and in order to keep both sides happy, Khan had to maintain a delicate balance act. But World War II raised the stakes for outside powers and in 1941, the Shah abdicated his throne as Britain and the Soviet Union, who feared it falling under German control, took effective control of Iran.

Nationalism, the Cold War, and More Foreign Intervention

After World War II, the United States joined Britain as a major-power influence on Iran. When abdicating in 1941, Reza Pahlavi left his son Muhammad Reza Shah on the throne. In the initial context of the Cold War, the Shah was pressured to move Iran towards a parliamentary democracy in which the Shah's role would be more symbolic and ritual; he would be head of state but subordinate to the rule of the Prime Minister and the Majlis in the construction of domestic and foreign policy. Press freedoms expanded, along with a stronger judiciary and competitive elections. Dr. Muhammed Mossadegh led the National Front, a middle class nationalist party whose most important policy goal was to take control of Iran's oil resources from the British owned Anglo-Persian Oil Company. The Front also sought to accelerate the process of making the Shah more of a figurehead and symbolic representation of the Iranian past, with parliament and prime minister in control of the state and the military.

The most powerful rival political movement was the communist *Tudeh* party, whose membership came heavily from working-class trade unions. The United States initially saw Mossadegh and the National Front as a group it could work with to marginalize the communists. But things turned quite sour when, after becoming Prime Minister, Mosaddeq carried through with the plan to nationalize Iran's oil by creating the National Iran Oil company in 1951. The move received unanimous support in the Majlis, reflecting widespread popular support. The United States initially sought to work with Mossadegh to create a compromise by which the AIOC would get some compensation as well as continued access to Iranian oil. Such a deal was not acceptable to Britain, however. After the International Court of Justice sided with Iran, Britain worked with forces close to the Shah to overthrow Mossadegh, but this was initially unsuccessful and strengthened the Prime Minister as a defender of Iranian sovereignty.

After the failed effort to oust Mossadegh, the British continued to enforce an embargo on the export of Iranian oil, greatly weakening the economy. They also sought the support of the Eisenhower Administration in a joint effort to remove Mossadegh and restore the full powers of the Shah. They convinced Secretary of State John Foster Dulles that Mossadegh was pushing Iran towards communism, citing the Prime Minister's collaboration with the Tudeh Party. The CIA, the British MI-5, and Iranian military officers loyal to the Shah began a program of destabilization, Operation Ajax. CIA-paid protesters, posing as members of the Tudeh Party staged increasingly violent demonstrations. This in turn generated a wave of strikes and demonstrations that led Mossadegh to strengthen his power. Between August 15 and 19, 1953, a group of military officers, supported by the CIA, removed Mossadegh from power and banned the Tudeh Party, arresting many of its members. The coup was seen in Washington as a stunning success and its methods were applied the next year in Guatemala in Central America. In the context of the Cold War, the Eisenhower Administration believed it had scored an important victory in containing the spread of communism in an area of vital interest to the United States. As we will see, however, the 1953 coup eventually produced significant "blowback," a term used in the intelligence community for the long term unintended negative consequences of intelligence operations.

The White Revolution

From the beginning, Iranians were divided about the coup. While the economy had weakened because of the oil embargo, and Mossadegh had become increasingly authoritarian, the long history of foreign intervention in Iran colored how many viewed events. The Shah himself had opposed the coup thinking it was unlikely to work and having himself been a supporter of nationalization. But once in power, he quickly moved to continue the policies of his father, seeking to strengthen the Iranian state, build up the economy, and weaken Islamic authorities and institutions. This became known as the White Revolution.

The Shah's modernization policies were most visible in the area of defense and security. The military grew to be the 5th largest in the world by 1979 and was fortified by the purchase of over \$12 billion in military hardware from the United States. They also had the largest Navy in the Persian Gulf and the largest air force in Western Asia. Iran also developed an impressive tank brigade. A secret police force was created, SAVAK, or the Organization to Protect and Collect Info for State. This secret police force's main objective was to obtain information about possible sources of dissent or track down "enemies of the state," which included almost all of the Shah's political opposition. It was ruthlessly effective; thousands were jailed and torture was widespread.

The principle development goal of the White Revolution was to make Iran a modern industrial economy. The Shah's father, Reza Pahlavi, had begun a significant effort to develop modern industries, largely focused on developing local consumer goods industries. Using the resources from rising oil prices, Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi greatly expanded the role of the state in continuing this process. A land reform program made sharecroppers owners in an effort to modernize agriculture. The Shah's pursuit of secularization also led to a narrowing of the reach of Sharia law in family law, which increased legal rights for women in relation to divorce and employment. They also gained equality in political rights, but the significance of this was diminished by the curtailment of those rights for all Iranians.

Foreign investment was encouraged, and Tehran quickly became home to the local offices of hundreds of foreign banks and companies attracted by the apparent stability of the Shah's government. Economic growth rates reached some of the highest levels of any developing state in the post-World War II era. By 1979, 21 government ministries employed over 300,000 civil servants. Bridges, roads, ports, and highways were all built in Iran, expanding the infrastructure and making more internally connected. One of the biggest accomplishments of the Transport ministry was the expanded construction of the Trans-Iranian railways which connected Iran regionally in a way that it had not been before. The efforts of the transportation ministry coincided with efforts of the Ministry of Industries to expand the number of factories in Iran. These factories began manufacturing consumer goods.

The Agricultural Ministry carried out one of the signature elements of the White Revolution: a program of land reform. Promoting small scale farm industry by the agricultural ministry was viewed as an effective way for the Iranian state to prevent a communist revolution and promote a class of prosperous farmers. While the program weakened landed elites, the follow up did not support farmers adequately. As a result, agricultural production stagnated and the country grew even more dependent on oil production. The land reform program was also undermined by corruption as a system of royal patronage system enabled the Shah and his allies to acquire property and accumulate huge tracts of land on which to develop their own companies.

While carrying out these modernization efforts, the Shah's regime kept a tight rein on political activity. He believed a strong and authoritarian state was necessary to maintain control over the modernization process and ensure that the country moved forward. While there were two main parties, Iranians sarcastically referred to them as the party of "yes" and the party of "yes, sir!" The Shah believed, as had his father, that democracy would produce instability and that the tight control of dissent and opposition was necessary. By 1975, Iran was effectively a one-party state and dissent was not tolerated. The ambitious goals of modernization and industrialization, like many other states before, had an adverse effect on democracy. From the perspective of the Shah, the reduction of political rights within Iran was, for the time being, the price of progress.

The Islamic Revolution 1979

While the human rights abuses of the Pahlavi Dynasty were the target of international criticism from human rights organizations, most western governments valued the continued supply of oil as well as the stability that the Shah seemed to provide in a volatile region. For many westerners, impressed by the shiny veneer of modern Tehran, the Shah was seen as a perhaps tough but necessary form of rule for a modernizing country. He continued to sell oil to Israel when the Arabs would not, and he was a central player in the Nixon Administration's post-Vietnam "doctrine" of supporting local strongmen in place of direct intervention. By 1975, the regime seemed firmly entrenched and the notion that within 4 years it would be swept away by a revolution that would establish an Islamic Republic was beyond inconceivable to any observer of the region.

Revolutions always seem unlikely in advance and inevitable after the fact and this is especially true with the Iranian Revolution. At the time, the Shah's regime seemed to reign supreme, supported by strong global allies, a large military, effective security apparatus and a growing modern economy. What made the revolution possible? The Shah's policies were successful in statistical terms, but those numbers masked some significant problems. Rapid industrialization made Iran become a far more urban society very quickly. Land reform had given sharecroppers land but not the tools to become prosperous and many migrated to cities in which wealth and poverty were quite visibly contrasted. While the middle class benefited from some of the economic growth, and while some may have supported the removal of Mosaddeq initially, the role of foreign powers in the *coup* left a humiliating stain for many Iranians, which the lack of democracy in the new regime only deepened. A well-educated and more prosperous middle class expected, as middle classes have everywhere, more political rights.

However, the most pointed criticisms of the Shah and his reforms came from religious voices, most notably the Grand Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini. Ayatollahs are the highest level authority figures within Shia Islam. (There are no Sunni ayatollahs). There is no doctrinal equivalent of the Pope above them and they have diverse views on the relationship between religion and politics. Some focus on scholarship and do not get involved in politics, but Khomeini was not like that. While he was a highly respected jurist and scholar, he was also a long-time critic of the Shah's secularization policies; he had been exiled first to Iraq and then France. But his ideas were disseminated through cassettes of his sermons which were smuggled into Iran. A listener, selling his wares in the streets of Tehran could hear a blistering attack on the Shah for turning away from Iran's cultural and religious roots and selling out the country to foreign interests. This critique fused Islam and nationalism in a way that could mean many things to many people and became one of the most important intellectual foundations for a movement which emerged and grew stronger in the mid 1970s. It was a socially and intellectually diverse movement—students, workers, women, secular and religious reformers, liberals and communists. Anger over the role of Western powers, especially the United States, Britain and France, and a desire to retain control of the country's sovereignty united these disparate groups. Corruption by the Shah and his cronies, the abuses of the SAVAK, and the lack of democracy were other common themes.

As the domestic protests against the Shah grew into a mass movement, previously bedrock international support in the United States and Europe gave way to very mild calls for the Shah to pursue political liberalization. The Shah reacted indecisively; statements of conciliation combined with repression indicated that the Iranian leader was not prepared for the depth of opposition, and even hatred, being expressed by so many million of the citizens he thought he had been serving so well. In November 1978, he rejected a SAVAK plan to arrest more than a thousand of the movement's leaders, and he ordered the release of all political prisoners. But these concessions seem to have only weakened his hold on power. Members of the military began to see the writing on the walls and negotiated with the opposition. Finally, on January 16, 1979, he left the country, piloting his own Boeing 707 to Egypt, the first of several stops on what was to be a most humiliating exile.

As in other countries in which a revolution brought down one regime, the Iranian revolutionaries also confronted the “Humpty-Dumpty” problem: what new system will replace the old? In Iran, the overthrow of the Shah turned out to be the easy part in many ways. Once he was gone, a power struggle ensued between the secular and religious forces within the revolution. Everyone agreed that the Shah had gone too far in marginalizing Islam, but how far should it be brought back? Ayatollah Khomeini's speeches before the Shah fell from power had talked about the compatibility of democracy, human rights, and Islam, but revolutionaries less driven by the later had assumed the Ayatollah would go back to his scholarship and serve a more symbolic role.

However, it quickly became apparent that Khomeini had quite different intentions. The leader for the Provisional Government that initially emerged was Mehdi Bazargan, a secular nationalist politician. In the initial chaos of these early days, it was Khomeini's supporters who were able to mobilize more effectively. They put together a referendum calling, in undefined terms, for the establishment of an Islamic Republic; it received 96% of the vote. Khomeini skillfully targeted his opponents with anti-US rhetoric suggesting secular forces would be the continuation of rule by the Shah. Events in the US ratcheted up this conflict when President Jimmy Carter, pressed by members of the Republican Party whose support he needed to pass an arms control agreement before the Senate, reluctantly agreed to let the Shah enter the United States for medical treatment. The move provoked outrage in Iran and led students loyal to Khomeini to take over the United States Embassy on November 4, 1979 and hold on to it for 444 days. In this tense and angry context, a referendum on Khomeini's constitution, which combined elements of democracy and theocracy but gave him the strongest position, was passed overwhelmingly.

Khomeini constructed the position of Supreme Jurist (what became widely identified as the Supreme Leader) on a Islamic principle called *velayate-e-faqih*, which asserted that God's sovereignty was the most important thing, not human sovereignty, and it could only come about through clerical guidance by a revered clerical authority. His view of this concept and the power it gave to the Supreme Jurist was not shared by most other Islamic authorities. But Khomeini asserted that all laws, civic rights, financial

regulations, economics, and military actions must be based on and in agreement with Islam and the Koran. The constitution would be formed with this as a guiding belief. Nonetheless, it did include the direct election of a President who would be the official head of state, and the Majlis remained the legislative body for passing all laws. The new constitution also re-established the Guardian Council, which had been made irrelevant by the Pahlavis. The Council was empowered to review all candidates for office and legislation to ensure that it was properly Islamic. In these ways, the constitution of the Islamic Republic is a hybrid of two seemingly contradictory ideas--theocracy and democracy. In other readings, we will examine that tension in practice as it has played in the four decades since the establishment of the Islamic Republic.

Once firmly in power, Khomeini and his allies deployed a combination of religion and nationalism to maintain their legitimacy and authority with the majority of Iranians. The Iraqi invasion of Iran by Saddam Hussein in 1980 provided once such opportunity, though not one Khomeini would have chosen because of the terrible price the country would pay over the next decade. The conflict was not about religion; it was a battle between two regional powers. Hussein believed that instability in Iraq could enable his army to quickly capture some strategic border areas while demonstrating Iraq's leadership among Arab nations. It quickly settled into a bloody stalemate that lasted 8 years and killed more than one million Iranians and a half million Iraqis. Most horrifically, the Iraqis used chemical weapons against Kurd and Iranian communities in both countries.

The Continuing Debate over the Meaning of Islamic Republic

The war with Iraq ended in 1988 and Ayatollah Khomeini died in 1989. His successor, Ali Khamenei was not a cleric with the same degree of religious authority as a scholar or Islamic thinker. Most of the senior Iranian Shi'a clerics did not support Khomeini's conception of the role of the Supreme Leader, but Khamenei was a strong and loyal ally. He has served in this position to the present.

Iran in the 1990s faced many challenges. The economy was devastated by war and economic policies carried out under the regime of President Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani that were not able to keep up with the challenges of a young, well educated, and growing population. During the campaign for President in 1997, a reform candidate emerged, Mohammed Khatami. Educated in the west and a student of western political philosophy, Khatami's call for a less fundamentalist form of Islam appealed to women, students, and young professionals tired of being hounded by morality police and more interested in better job opportunities than Islamic purity. Khatami was not the preferred candidate of Supreme Leader Khamenei, but he won the election with nearly 70% of the vote, a clear indication of public desire for softening the role of Islam in politics and daily life.

When Khatami was allowed to take office, many hoped that he would enact significant reforms and seemed to indicate that the democratic elements of the Islamic Republic's constitution had real substance and power. The election emboldened a student movement that sought to liberalize educational institutions by carrying out a series of strikes and protests. The limits of reform became evident, however, when these protests were forcibly repressed by the military and police units loyal to Khamenei. While Khatami was reelected in 2001, his calls for reform became much more muted. The public, it seemed, could vote for reform, but the official who took office would continue to be limited in their ability to bring it about.

Disillusionment among reformers led to reduced participation in the Presidential elections of 2005, and an Islamic hard-liner allied with Khamenei, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, was elected. Riding the wave of high oil prices in the first three years of his term, Ahmadinejad fused fundamentalism and populism to generate a brief boom. But economic good times ended with the financial crisis of 2008, and the opposition in 2009 unified strongly behind Mir-Hossein Mousavi, who had been Prime Minister of Iran during the 1980s while Khamenei had served as President. (The position of Prime Minister was abolished through a constitutional amendment put forward by Khamenei and his political allies after the death of Khomeini).

While his re-election had initially appeared likely, Ahmadinejad started to lose ground in the polls, as support for his opponent grew. The morning after the election on June 12, 2009, the government announced that Ahmadinejad had won with a 62% of the votes, but this figure was widely viewed as fraudulent. After the results were announced, Mousavi called on his supporters to protest. Over one million people protested the election result, the largest public demonstrations since 1979. The government quickly began to crack down on the protests and arrested 5,000 people. The government televised the trials and levied false charges against those who were arrested. Allegations of rape and torture of those who were arrested surfaced after the trials. Mousavi remains under house arrest in 2020. The election of 2009 demonstrated that the Iranian state was still keen on keeping a firm handle on Iranian citizens.

The next election in 2013 also featured a reform candidate, though more moderate than Mousavi. Hassan Rouhani campaigned on improving relations with the US and liberalizing the economy. As in 1997 when Khatami was elected, the election of Rouhani demonstrated that the democratic institutions of the Islamic Republic could be used by voters to express a desire for change.

However, the concrete accomplishments of the Rouhani regime have been far more modest. He negotiated an agreement with the United States and 5 other countries that limited Iran's nuclear capability and provided for extensive international monitoring in exchange for the elimination of some of the international sanctions that had been placed on Iran. The economic consequences of the treaty were not as broad and positive as Iranians had hoped, however, and the election of Donald Trump in the United States led to the US pulling out of the agreement in 2018. Falling oil prices, Iran's involvement in proxy wars in Syria and Yemen, and high rates of COVID-19 have further weakened Iran's economy and marginalized it internationally.

The Tug of War between Theocracy and Democracy

The challenges facing the Rouhani regime reflect the tensions within Iran's political system. Most of the public has clearly demonstrated a desire for political and cultural change that would reduce the power of Islamic hard-liners, open the educational system, increase freedoms for women, and improve relations with the outside world. The Trump Administration, and Congressional Republicans during the Obama Administration, as well other powers in the Middle East including Israel and Saudi Arabia, have consistently portrayed Iran as an aggressive force in the region that must be contained, and perhaps even transformed through "regime change." This in turn strengthens the hands of Iranian hard-liners who stand to lose greatly in both political and economic terms, by any process of genuine reform. They portray Iran as once again, as so often through its history, under attack by foreign powers. So while hard-liners battle their foreign foes, the Iranian people often seem caught in the middle, observers of a situation they long to change but so far, have not been able to.

Authors: Marc Belanger and Mary Coleman

[7.1: Section 1-](#)

[7.2: Section 2-](#)

[7.3: Section 3-](#)

[7.4: Section 4-](#)

[7.5: Section 5-](#)

[7.6: Section 6-](#)

7: [The Political Development of the Islamic Republic of Iran](#) is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

7.1: Section 1-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

7.1: Section 1- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

7.2: Section 2-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

7.2: Section 2- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

7.3: Section 3-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

7.3: Section 3- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

7.4: Section 4-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

7.4: Section 4- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

7.5: Section 5-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

7.5: Section 5- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

7.6: Section 6-

Your page has been created!

Remove this content and add your own.

□ Edit page

Click the Edit page button in your user bar. You will see a suggested structure for your content. Add your content and hit Save.

Tips:

□ Drag and drop

Drag one or more image files from your computer and drop them onto your browser window to add them to your page.

□ Classifications

Tags are used to link pages to one another along common themes. Tags are also used as markers for the dynamic organization of content in the CXone Expert framework.

□ Working with templates

CXone Expert [templates](#) help guide and organize your documentation, making it flow easier and more uniformly. Edit existing templates or create your own.

□ [Visit for all help topics.](#)

7.6: Section 6- is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

8: The Political Development of the Modern Brazilian State

The Political Development of the Modern Brazilian State

The Country of the Future?

Brazil is by far the largest country in South America in size and population, bordering all other South American countries except Ecuador and Chile. Its geography is as diverse as its population. Brazil's borders contain the Amazon rainforest, a huge ecological resource. Like India and Nigeria, its borders are the product of colonialism but, as in the United States, independence created a nation ruled by the descendants of the colonial power rather than the original inhabitants. Yet, while Brazil became independent earlier and under different circumstances, its political and economic development share much in common with other “developing” nations including the rest of Latin America. Among the world's nations Brazil has long been viewed as a “sleeping giant”. It is the world's 5th largest country and has the 6th largest population. (211 million in 2019). At several points in the 20th century, as well as the past decade, it has appeared that Brazil was primed to finally realize its potential. At each point, however, economic and political crises have led to reversals of fortune. A popular joke in Brazil used to say that “Brazil was the country of the future, and always will be.” This expressed the sense that the country is like that star athlete with all the skills and natural ability who never quite reached his or her potential but still hopes to. In order to understand why that has been the case and what possibilities the future may offer, we need to examine the roots of the Brazilian state in its history as a Portuguese colony and the evolution of its political institutions since it became independent in 1823.

Legacies of Colonialism

Prior to conquest by Portuguese explorers, the region that became Brazil was home to a wide array of indigenous communities. The Americas was the last continent to be inhabited by humans when migrants from Asia crossed into the hemisphere during the last ice age. Evidence of human inhabitants in modern day Brazil has been traced back to 9000 BCE. Unlike the larger states that Spanish conquerors confronted in the Andes region and Mexico, these communities were much less centralized with between 2 and 6 million people living in the region when the Portuguese arrived.

The first Portuguese colonizers arrived on the Northeast coast near the present-day state of Bahia in 1500 and the first permanent settlement was established near present day Sao Paulo in 1532. The absence of metals, especially gold, led to little organized effort to establish control for the first few decades though the trade in a reddish wood that came to be called Brazil wood (from a Latin word) gave the colony its name. In 1533, a system of internal colonies called *capitanias* granted control to Portuguese nobleman. The system did not work well and the Portuguese monarch John III established stronger administrative control over the region, including a colonial capital of Salvador in Bahia. He also promoted the arrival of Jesuit missionaries.

By far the most important development during this first century was the emergence of sugar as the dominant export from the colony. The relatively small and fragmented indigenous population was decimated by exposure to European diseases like smallpox for which they had no immunity. An estimated 80-90 % of the pre-colonial indigenous population died in this manner. Sugar is a very labor-intensive crop and its cultivation and harvest is a grueling task. Brazil turned to the Atlantic trade in African slaves for the bulk of its labor. Until sugar cultivation diminished and slavery was abolished in Brazil in 1889, an estimated 4-5 million African slaves (roughly half the total number overall) were brought to Brazil, leaving a permanent mark on the country's culture, demography, and socio-economic conditions.

While some historians have argued that slavery in Brazil was more humane than in the US, it is more accurate to say that it operated differently and left different legacies for each society. Sugar cane cultivation was, as noted, brutal work and from early on slave owners did not emphasize maintaining slaves and their descendants as a self-reproducing work force. Many slaves were simply worked to death; until the abolition of the slave trade in the early 19th century, it was easier to import more slaves. Unlike in the United States, slavery was not a condition for life; slaves who survived the brutal labor conditions could purchase their freedom and by the time slavery was abolished there were three times as many freed Blacks as slaves. Since Brazil was colonized largely

by men, relationships with African and indigenous women were common and led to a complex caste system based on ancestry and skin color. While this meant a less rigid color line than that which emerged in the United States, it was a more stratified and hierarchical society as well. The modern-day impact of these characteristics of Brazilian slavery will be examined more fully in future readings.

While sugar was dominant, the pursuit of other sources of wealth gradually led to settlement in more interior regions in the south and west of the colony. Gold was discovered in 1695 while cotton and coffee production emerged in the 18th century. At the same time, the colony experienced little internal trade and a tradition of effective rule being in the hands of local elites developed and would continue after independence. In the context of 17th and 18th century Europe Portugal was, like Spain, a diminishing power that was falling behind other nations in its economic and military power. Nonetheless, it was able to maintain a monopoly over trade and commerce in Brazil and the colony was an essential source of wealth. An important long-term result of this was that while British policies in its American colonies enabled the emergence of a merchant class which eventually provided part of the foundation for the independence movement, Brazil's economy remained firmly under the control of the Portuguese crown. This inhibited the internal development of Brazil's economy and established a pattern of dependence on the export of agricultural and mineral commodities which continues to the present and has often been a source of economic and political instability.

Independence, Constitutional Monarchy and Economic Change

The American and French Revolutions had a huge impact on the rest of the Americas. Efforts by both the Spanish and Portuguese monarchs to assert more control over their colonies generated resentments among regional elites. The vastness of their colonial possessions made the relative unity which emerged among the British colonies that became the United States much more difficult and colonial rule did not foster a strong sense of shared identity. Most residents of the colonies identified with their local region and its social and political hierarchies. Ideas related to representation, popular sovereignty, and republicanism (as opposed to monarchical) were popular among some of the region's elites though colonial rule had given them little direct experience of them.

It was the Napoleonic Wars which proved decisive in the independence of Brazil and the rest of Latin America. In 1808, Napoleon invaded Portugal and Spain, forcing King Dom João VI to flee to Brazil with his son, Dom Pedro. After Napoleon was defeated, Dom João returned to Portugal in 1821 and left his son to rule over Brazil. Dom Pedro saw this as his opportunity to become a ruler in his own right, and declared Brazil independent from the Portuguese crown in 1823, making himself emperor of a constitutional monarchy. While the nations of Spanish Latin America fought bloody battles first against Spanish control and then among regional elites, Brazil's independence came about peacefully. While the emperor remained the dominant power, the rudiments of representation and popular sovereignty were planted as well. A constituent assembly was established but when Dom Pedro did not like the result he imposed his own constitution. It established a two-house legislative branch and limited property-based voting rights but enabled the monarch to remain the *poder moderador* or "moderating power" through the right to disband the legislatures.

An important behind the scenes actor in this process, not surprisingly, was Britain. It was British military assistance that enabled the monarchy to move to Brazil and that process began a series of economic concessions that gradually made Britain the dominant source of imports as well as the leading source of investment capital in the 19th century. The Brazilian economy became more integrated into an expanding global economy in which Britain was the dominant power. Like the rest of Latin America, the legacy of colonization by a declining power meant Brazil became independent in a condition of economic weakness and dependence. While Dom Pedro made some efforts to establish more central control, regional elites continued to be important powers on the ground. In 1832, Pedro left the throne to his 5-year-old son who took full power in 1840 and remained Emperor until 1889. He retained the powers of his father; Liberal and Conservative political parties emerged though legislative bodies remained subordinate to the emperor. Brazil also became embroiled in regional conflicts with Argentina and Uruguay which had the important long-term consequence of strengthening the power of the military as a political force.

While the political system fostered stability and continuity, economic change gradually generated new elites and new challenges. Coffee and rubber gradually replaced sugar as the dominant exports. Britain, as elsewhere, became the dominant international economic force providing the bulk of Brazil's imported goods while buying most of its exports. The British supported local elites who pushed for the end of slavery. In 1871, the Law of the Free Womb freed children born of slaves. Several states within Brazil banned slavery in the early 1880s and in 1885 the daughter of Pedro II, in authority while her father was in Europe, banned slavery. The next year, the Brazilian military overthrew the monarchy and a new constitution, influenced by the US, established a

republican system with a president and congress with the right to vote extended to franchise all literate males. After slavery ended, Brazil did not develop a system of legal segregation like that which emerged in the United States. Nonetheless, black Brazilians still faced significant every day forms of de facto discrimination. Brazil's leaders pursued a policy of *enblancamiento* through encouragement of European immigration that, it was hoped, would improve the overall genetic stock of the county. No effort was made to address the systematic economic inequalities that four centuries of slavery produced.

The First Republic (1890-1930)

This period is sometimes known as the Old Republic. It is also described as “rule by the governors” because state level elites remained dominant and a system that political scientists refer to as *clientelism* and *patrimonialism* emerged. The latter designation referred to the role of local leaders whose power was built around personal loyalty and personal and public interest often blurred. Using the power of the state in ways that directly benefited leaders and their supporters became the norm. This in turn fostered political parties that were electoral machines through which votes were exchanged for services and favors, often in quite obvious and explicit ways. These could include jobs, educational opportunities, new infrastructure and service in neighborhood, etc. These practices resemble the “political machines” that long operated in many US cities.

One particular version of this which emerged in Brazil was called *Coronelismo* by which rural populations were induced to support landed elites for fear of violent retribution. In Brazil, it led to the growth of new political parties to integrate rural peasant and urban working-class populations as the right to vote gradually expanded. This tradition of clientelism has remained an important characteristic of Brazilian politics. It is also described sometimes as “patronage” politics.

At the national level, clientelism and patronage politics produced a system which Brazilians called *Café com leite*, or coffee with milk. The office of President was effectively alternated between Brazil's two most important states, Sao Paulo (where coffee was the dominant product), and Minas Gerais, (cattle and dairy). During this time Brazil's economy boomed along with the global demand for its exports. Urbanization, the mass migration of peasants from the impoverished northeast to the big cities in the south, and the emergence of a growing middle class generated demands for political reform that challenged the clientelism and elitism of the political system. New political parties, including a communist party emerged. The Brazilian military was also growing in its power and political ambition and some of its young and especially ambitious officers were drawn to the fascist ideology of Mussolini in Italy, with its emphasis on order and nationalism and hostility to liberal democracy.

The challenges facing Brazil in these years mirror those we have examined elsewhere. Brazil's growing integration in the global economy through its exports industries generated internal economic growth and some industrialization. While this did not occur on the scale of Britain or Germany or bring the instability that befell China or Iran, Brazil experienced all the same challenges. With the development of the electoral system, new social groups sought their own mechanisms of representation to challenge political elites. The peaceful political inclusion of these groups into the electoral system became the principal institutional challenge. While the economy was strong the system of *Café com Leite* could generally manage this process, but Brazil's deep economic and social divides led some to conclude that fascism or communism provided better paths forward for Brazil.

The *Estado Novo*: Fascism with a Samba Beat

The Great Depression took an enormous toll on the Brazilian economy. As the entire world plunged into an economic depression, the demand for coffee and cattle dried up. Economic unrest caused social and political unrest. In 1930, a defeated presidential candidate, Getulio Vargas, collaborated with military officers to overthrow the government in power. Vargas became the dominant force in Brazilian politics until his death in 1954. Working in an environment in which fascist and communist ideas were in conflict, Vargas was ideologically flexible. His priority was the establishment of a stronger central state. He replaced the governors of the states with his own appointments, and sought to build a base of support among the country's growing urban working class. He was elected President under a constitution written in 1934 that only permitted one term; in 1937 he declared himself the leader of the *Estado Novo*, a semi fascist state in which he abolished political parties and sought to foster a stronger state and more unified sense of nationalism among Brazilians.

The system that Vargas established is one that political scientists refer to as *corporatism*. As the Latin roots of the term (*corpus*) suggest, this is a conception of the state as needing to serve as the equivalent of the brain in human bodies. Whereas liberal

democracy is based on the idea of a state that is an umpire limited to protecting individual rights, a corporatist state plays a far more active role in trying to foster a harmonious social order. Liberal democracy is viewed as fostering conflict and competing interest groups while a corporatist state seeks to promote unity. Rather than wait for interest groups to organize, the corporatist state organizes society and tries to manage competition and conflict from the top down.

One clear example of corporatism in action is a series of labor laws Vargas instituted that were designed to increase worker rights but also prevent the establishment of independent labor unions. Strikes were prevented and the state became the mediator of labor disputes. The goal here was similar to what Bismarck sought when establishing welfare state programs in Germany: to present the state as the protector of the people and thus prevent the emergence of more radical political demands and movements. Vargas also established a minimum wage and rudimentary health and social security systems as well as a pension system for public employees. Vargas also sought to diversify the Brazilian economy and expand its industrial base through the promotion of import substitution policies similar to those carried out in India after independence. Economic and political goals were directly interrelated: building national industries would provide more employment and foster greater loyalty to the state. While providing protection to private domestic producers, these policies also created new-owned enterprises including steel and oil.

Vargas promoted cultural policies to foster a stronger sense of national identity as well. In contrast to earlier efforts to promote *embranqueamento* or “whitening” by encouraging European immigrants and interracial marriage that would “dilute” the effect of African genes, Vargas promoted the idea of Brazil as a “racial democracy.” Samba schools and clubs received state support in these efforts and Brazil’s music and dance were promoted as global tourist attractions. An “Afro-Brazilian” identity was embraced, though racism continued to exist.

Vargas’ *Estado Novo* was also an example of a form of political leadership which political scientists have identified as *populist* or *populism*. There is not a consistent political ideology and populist politicians can run across the political spectrum. Populist politicians generally express a strong, charismatic personality who is able to articulate and mobilize a sense of himself--populists are almost always men--as especially in touch with the feelings, aspirations, and experiences of the masses. The populist presents himself as the person who can save the nation from the corruption of self interested elites and professional politicians. Many populists adopt an authoritarian approach and are not particularly tolerant of dissent. They can be quick to label critics as “enemies of the people.”

Democratic Populism and the Limits of Clientelism

Vargas is a particularly interesting example of populist leadership because most evolve in a more authoritarian direction, whereas the Brazilian president moved in the other direction towards democratic populism. During World War II, some Latin American leaders openly admired Hitler and Mussolini and remained neutral, but Vargas allied with the United States. This position encouraged many Brazilians to push Vargas for a return to democracy. In response he developed two political parties: the Social Democratic Party (PSD) and the Brazilian labor party (PTB). While officially separate parties, the two parties were both pro-Vargas and a coalition candidate, Eurico Dutra, was elected in 1945. Vargas ran and was elected as the candidate of the PSD-PTB in 1950. Their opposition third party was the National Democratic Union (UDN). Vargas deepened his earlier promotion of economic nationalism but downturns in the global economy and corruption scandals led to pressure from the military for Vargas to resign. Instead, Vargas committed suicide on August 24, 1954, leaving behind a suicide note claiming that a wide array of enemies had attacked him to weaken Brazil.

In the wake of Vargas’ death, another PSD-PTD candidate, Juscelino Kubitschek, was elected in 1955, promising “50 years progress in 5”. Import substitution was deepened as new industries were developed including automobiles. Kubitschek also promoted the development of a new capital away from Rio de Janeiro to a new planned city called Brasilia. During his term, employment increased but so did inflation and budget deficits and corruption. By the end of his term, many Brazilians were tired of the PSD-PTD and in 1961, the opposition UDC candidate Jânio Quadro was elected. After 7 months, he resigned and Vice President João Goulart became president.

During Goulart’s term, democratic populism in Brazil faced growing challenges. Throughout this time, the patterns of clientelism and patronage politics that developed during the years of *Café con Leite* continued. This kind of system is dependent on the capacity of the state to provide benefits to the population that keep it content. That capacity requires the state to have consistent levels of financial resources. But in the years after World War II Brazil’s economy encountered boom and bust cycles. While the economy had been diversified by import substitution policies, it was still dependent on the global market for its exports. When

prices were high, the state was flush and could provide the services it promised to voters. However, prices for Brazil's exports tended to fluctuate, generating periodic trade imbalances and debt.

Brazil's political challenges were also affected by regional and global developments. The Cold War led the United States to fear the spread of communism and the Cuban Revolution in 1959, which brought Fidel Castro to power, sent shock waves through the entire continent. When President Goulart pursued land reform policies to address rural poverty, fear of "another Cuba" in Brazil grew among Brazil's elite as well as the Johnson Administration. With the support of the US Ambassador to Brazil and conservatives in the Brazilian senate and courts, the military forced Goulart from power on April 1, 1964.

The Military in Power: Bureaucratic Authoritarian Rule and the Brazilian "Miracle"

While there were significant voices calling on the military to act, the Brazilian military was by no means acting simply on behalf of others. It had a sense of its own centrality in protecting the sovereignty of Brazil that dated back to the days of the monarchy. The training officers received in the Superior War College of Brazil went beyond courses on military issues. Classes in economics, organizational theory, social science, and public policy gave officers a strong sense of their own capacity to govern more effectively than politicians they viewed as self-interested. When the military took power in 1964, it had the support of conservative political elites, but it had very much its own agenda. After the overthrow of Goulart Army Chief of Staff General Humberto Castelo Branco became president. The military sought to maintain a veneer of democratic legitimacy by abolishing the preexisting parties and establishing its own party, the National Renovating Alliance, and an official opposition party, the Brazilian Democratic movement. The executive was strengthened and Congress greatly weakened. Direct election of the president was replaced by an electoral college.

The government which emerged from military rule was described by Argentine political scientist Guillermo O'Donnell as "bureaucratic-authoritarian" and the term captured the goals of the military well. The problem facing Brazil, in this view, was politics. There had been too much of it. Politicians used clientelist policies to mobilize voters, promising them more and more and moving Brazil's politics more and more to the left. The result was economic and political instability. The solution was to limit the impact of popular political pressures on state officials so they could carry out the policies necessary for Brazil to deepen its industrial base and strengthen the economic capacity of the state. The "bureaucratic" aspect involved a still stronger role for the state in promoting Brazilian industries and attracting foreign investment. In order to accomplish this, the state would have to become more "authoritarian" in its capacity to silence protest and limit citizens' demands on the state.

In practice this meant promotion of state-owned companies in areas such as computers, aircraft, as well as mining and agriculture. The economic results were impressive statistically, with growth rates over 10% per year from 1968-1974. At the same time, repression against political dissent as well as a small Cuban style guerrilla movement reached levels never seen before in Brazil. Imprisonment or the outright disappearance of those labeled "radical" for the participation in left-wing political activities was widespread and torture of prisoners was common, as documented in a report issued in 1985 called *Nunca Mais* (Never Again).

Abertura and the Transition to Democracy

As the economy improved and the threat of radicalism diminished, the military faced growing pressure to return to democratic rule. While they hoped to maintain dominance with a system of limited democracy, such a system had limited appeal or legitimacy even among Brazilian elites. By 1974, the Catholic Church and many civilian political leaders were calling for opening the system back up. Equally important was the rise of Brazilian social movements including labor, student, indigenous, and Afro-Brazilian organizations. In its effort to end the clientelist patterns of state-citizen relations, the military inadvertently created the conditions for the emergence of the most independent social movements in Brazil's history. Military leaders responded with a program of *abertura* or opening, which they hoped would satisfy popular pressures while keeping them, or their close allies in power. The military intended that the system provide its party, ARENA, with significant advantages, but by playing by the rules of what was supposed to be a somewhat rigged game, opposition parties made continued advances in elections to national and state legislatures. Popular pressure demanded and won the reestablishment of direct elections for state governors in 1982 and opposition candidates won several of those elections.

The final showdown in the battle between military and civilian control came in response to the military effort to use the electoral college to maintain control of the next presidential election in 1985. This sparked a movement called “*directas Ja*” or “direct elections now.” All the forces of the newly emergent Brazilian civil society came together—social movements, opposition parties, and new labor unions. This movement held huge rallies which increased pressure on the military government. While the military did not bend on this issue, the electoral college plan backfired as the military candidate was defeated by an opposition coalition called the Democratic Alliance. Tancredo Neves of the PMDB was elected president but died just before taking office; Vice President Jose Sarney became the first civilian president since 1964.

The Consolidation of Brazilian Democracy: Still the Country of the Future?

However, the legacy of the authoritarian military regime and party hung heavy over the political system. A constituent assembly met to draft a new constitution which took effect in 1988. There was much debate about the relative merits of a parliamentary versus a presidential system. Initially, a presidential system was adopted but with the promise that the question would be put to a vote within 5 years. In 1993, that system was approved. The constitution also restored power to state governments and gave the newly independent labor movement more rights.

The issue that challenged the new democratic system the most was the economy. Military governments had financed state development by taking on huge loans from private banks. In the 1970s, these banks were awash in “petrodollars” deposited by oil producing countries after price hikes in the mid-1970s. In the wake of the Brazilian “miracle,” these seemed like good bets for borrower and lender, but further price hikes at the end of the decade, global recession, and inflation left Brazil, and other Latin American countries, facing a massive debt crisis in 1982. At this point, with the markets for its exports depressed, Brazil could barely pay the interest on its debt. They were then required to seek the help of the International Monetary Fund. To avoid defaulting on its debts, Brazil signed Structural Adjustment Agreements with the IMF which forced it to liberalize its economy and cut back its huge state sector, devalue its currency, and end state subsidies. The results were positive for the banks and Brazil was able to continue to pay the interest on its debt. But at the macroeconomic level, the result was “the lost decade”: a period of negative economic growth and a steep decline in the standard of living. We will explore the economic policy responses to these conditions further in later readings. They placed clear limits on the capacity of the state to address the poverty, inequality, and lack of opportunity which the majority of Brazilians faced. At the same time, the fact that the roots of these conditions were in military rule gave President Sarney and his successors a bit more room to develop policies without fear of a return to military rule.

In 1989, Brazil held its first presidential election since 1960. A little known former governor from the small, poor state of Alagoas in Northwest Brazil, Fernando Collor de Mello, was elected president. He defeated Luis Inacio da Silva of the left-wing Workers Party (PT) by making bold promises to fix inflation and corruption and challenge the IMF. In power, he reversed his campaign promises by further opening up the economy. In 1992, Collor was caught in a bribery scandal that led to demands for his impeachment. This was an important test of the strength of democracy in Brazil. In the past, this level of protest would have generated calls for the military to intervene and it may well have chosen to do so. But in 1992, with the Soviet Union disbanded, Cuba facing economic crisis, the US no longer concerned about the spread of communism, and the military still smarting from its own failures in power, the situation was resolved peacefully when Collor resigned and his Vice President, Itamar Franco became president. Minister of Finance Fernando Henrique Cardoso established the “*Real Plan*” which created a new currency, the *real*. Cardoso’s plan helped bring inflation down to its lowest levels in decades and as a result he was the president of Brazil in 1994 and reelected in 1998.

Another important marker of the consolidation of democracy in Brazil was the election of Lula da Silva in 2002. The leader of the PT, Lula had been a perennial front runner in early election polls in the previous election. However, fear of the party’s left-wing ideology and platform had kept Lula from gaining enough support to win the election in Brazil’s two tier election system in which the two top candidates in the first round face off in a second round and one must get more than 50%. Lula made a concerted effort to calm the fear of the global economic community and was elected in 2002 and reelected in 2006. His protegee, Dilma Rousseff won the election in 2010 and again in 2014. The success of the PT was made possible in part by robust economic growth that was fueled by demand for Brazilian exports. Even after economic crisis of 2008 and 2009, Chinese growth kept Brazil’s economy growing. For the first time, Brazil recovered more quickly from a global recession than the US.

But this condition did not hold and with slowed growth in China and India, Brazil’s growth came to an abrupt halt in 2014. Brazil’s new middle class was especially hard hit and this quickly brought attention anew to the old Brazilian problem of corruption.

President Rousseff was impeached in 2017 and in 2018, a new, largely unknown populist, Jair Bolsonaro, emerged. Speaking crudely about women, LGBT peoples, and racial minorities, he promised to deal forcefully with crime, expand gun rights, and end corruption. In power, however, he was quickly accused of corruption within his family and his mishandling of the coronavirus pandemic has led Brazil to have the second highest number of cases in the world.

Thus, Brazil's quest to make good on its extraordinary potential continues. Amidst the economic decline, pervasive corruption, high levels of crime and police violence, Brazilian democratic institutions have managed to survive challenges that might have undone it in the past. We will look at these issues more closely in future readings, but for now most Brazilians appear to believe that the solution for the problems of democracy is more rather than less democracy.

Authors: [Mary Coleman](#) and [Marc Belanger](#)

8: [The Political Development of the Modern Brazilian State](#) is shared under a [not declared](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by LibreTexts.

Index

D

dire

Glossary

Sample Word 1 | Sample Definition 1

Detailed Licensing

Overview

Title: Introduction to Comparative Politics

Webpages: 51

All licenses found:

- **Undeclared:** 100% (51 pages)

By Page

- Introduction to Comparative Politics - *Undeclared*
 - Front Matter - *Undeclared*
 - TitlePage - *Undeclared*
 - InfoPage - *Undeclared*
 - Table of Contents - *Undeclared*
 - Licensing - *Undeclared*
 - 1: States, Nations, and Political Development - *Undeclared*
 - 2: The Political Development of the British State - *Undeclared*
 - 2.1: Section 1- - *Undeclared*
 - 2.2: Section 2- - *Undeclared*
 - 2.3: Section 3- - *Undeclared*
 - 2.4: Section 4- - *Undeclared*
 - 2.5: Section 5- - *Undeclared*
 - 2.6: Section 6- - *Undeclared*
 - 3: The Political Development of the Modern German State - *Undeclared*
 - 3.1: Section 1- - *Undeclared*
 - 3.2: Section 2- - *Undeclared*
 - 3.3: Section 3- - *Undeclared*
 - 3.4: Section 4- - *Undeclared*
 - 3.5: Section 5- - *Undeclared*
 - 3.6: Section 6- - *Undeclared*
 - 4: The Political Development of the Russian State - *Undeclared*
 - 4.1: Section 1- - *Undeclared*
 - 4.2: Section 2- - *Undeclared*
 - 4.3: Section 3- - *Undeclared*
 - 4.4: Section 4- - *Undeclared*
 - 4.5: Section 5- - *Undeclared*
 - 4.6: Section 6- - *Undeclared*
 - 5: The Political Development of Modern China - *Undeclared*
 - 5.1: Section 3- - *Undeclared*
 - 5.2: Section 4- - *Undeclared*
 - 5.3: Section 5- - *Undeclared*
 - 5.4: Section 6- - *Undeclared*
 - 6: The Political Development of the Modern Indian State - *Undeclared*
 - 6.1: Section 2- - *Undeclared*
 - 6.2: Section 3- - *Undeclared*
 - 6.3: Section 4- - *Undeclared*
 - 6.4: Section 5- - *Undeclared*
 - 6.5: Section 6- - *Undeclared*
 - 7: The Political Development of the Islamic Republic of Iran - *Undeclared*
 - 7.1: Section 1- - *Undeclared*
 - 7.2: Section 2- - *Undeclared*
 - 7.3: Section 3- - *Undeclared*
 - 7.4: Section 4- - *Undeclared*
 - 7.5: Section 5- - *Undeclared*
 - 7.6: Section 6- - *Undeclared*
 - 8: The Political Development of the Modern Brazilian State - *Undeclared*
 - Back Matter - *Undeclared*
 - Index - *Undeclared*
 - Glossary - *Undeclared*
 - Detailed Licensing - *Undeclared*