Comparative Politics

Section 1: Introduction

1.1 Introducing Comparative Politics

What is Comparative Politics?

What is Politics?
- Politics is the human activity of making public and authoritative decisions, 2
- Public refers to the fact that these decisions affect the whole of society, not specific groups, 2
- Authoritative refers to the fact that the government has the power to enforce them, 2
- Politics is thus the competition of acquiring, maintaining, and exercising this power, 2

The Nature of Political Science
- In other languages, like German, there is no distinction between knowledge and science
- Of course there are differences between natural and social sciences, in particular because humans (the objects of Social Science) can answer back and change their behaviour in response to such studies

What is Comparative Politics?
- Comparative politics is one of the three main subdisciplines of political science, the others being political theory and international relations, 3
- Political theory deals with normative and theoretical questions, while comparative politics deals with empirical questions, 3
- While international relations deals with interactions between political systems, comparative politics deals with interactions within political systems, 3
- It seeks to understand power relations between individuals, groups, organizations, classes, and other institutions within a political system, 3
- Of course, the distinction is not always so neat as this, and globalisation has led to increasing overlap between internal and external affairs, 3
- Comparative politics seeks to get to the heart of the nature of politics and sovereignty, and has been tackled by such great thinkers as Aristotle, Machiavelli, and Montesquieu, 3

The History of Comparative Political Study
- Comparative political studies dates to the time of Aristotle, who identified several different types of political systems
- The modern discipline of comparative politics is a relatively recent development, dating only from the 1950s
- Partly this is explained by the post-war end of the isolationist policies of the USA
- The increasing use of quantification and statistical analysis during this period also promoted the development of comparative politics, as it was only in the 1950s that many nations brought out the statistics needed to do this
- The end of empires in the 1950s also led to an explosion of new states to be studied
- In the Cold War, the West was also competing with Communism (esp. USSR, later also China) for influence in developing world; needed knowledge of nations to do this effectively
**Why Study Comparative Politics?**

- Examination of other countries informs us about problems and processes in our own country.
- Allows us to avoid ‘reinventing the wheel’ – learn from the experiences and mistakes of other countries so as to ensure you can adopt the best version of everything.
- Allows us to have greater tolerance of cultural and political difference.
- For example, after world war two many new democracies looked at the experience of the Weimar Republic to see what doesn’t work, what is needed for a stable constitution.
- One lesson for example was that the Weimar republic had too many tiny parties in parliament, which squabbled with each other.
- As such, many ex-communist east European states adopted lower limits on the size of parties that could have parliamentary representation.

**The Substance of Comparative Politics**

**What Does Comparative Politics Compare?**

- Traditionally and predominantly, comparative politics compares political systems at a national level.
- Other units that can also be compared are sub-national political units, supra-national units, empires, geographic regions, international organisations, or types of political systems.
- Comparative politics also compares components of different political systems with each other, for example different parliaments, welfare policies, regional governments, etc.
- Because the coverage of comparative politics is so broad, at different times in history it has tended to focus on different things.

**Traditional Comparative Politics**

- Before the second world war, comparative politics was mainly concerned with the analysis of the state and its institutions.
- Mostly these institutions were state powers, administration and military bureaucracy.
- Analysis focused on comparison of constitutional texts, legal documents and jurisprudence.

**The Behavioural Revolution**

- The 1930s to 1960s saw the introduction of behavioural ideas from sociology and biology, which shifted the focus of comparative away from institutions.
- This was also accompanied by increased attention towards the study of non-European nations, as opposed to the previous exclusive emphasis on major western European models.
- This revolution was partly motivated by the rise of fascism, communism, and then decolonisation in the third world, all of which seemed to confirm that the world was not converging on western parliamentary government systems, as had been supposed.
- In particular, there was more emphasis placed on the study of ideologies and mass communication, which seemed to be important to the success of fascism and communism.
- Comparative political studies of smaller European states (in particular Scandinavia), and also India, South Africa and other states, also showed that, contrary to previous ideas, there were many different models of parliamentary government which were effective, not just the Westminster system of Great Britain.
- These changes led to a change in methodology, which now emphasised the analysis of real behaviour rather than theoretical laws, large case studies of many nations, and the construction of the first large databases for use with statistical techniques.
In addition, labels and categories had to be changed and redefined so they were more appropriate for use in analysing non-western systems, 8

**Back to Institutions**

- The trouble with this new approach, however, was that the only way to compare such a broad range of cultures and societies was to engage in an excessive amount of abstraction, which reduced the usefulness of the results obtained from these models, 9-10
- This counter-reaction to systemic functionalism began around 1967, and involved four key tenants, 10
  - The first was a return to the pre-eminent role of institutions, especially the state, but also more general sets of rules or social norms, 10
  - Second was a move away from excessive abstractionism by reincorporating varying historical, cultural, socio-economic and geographical circumstances, 10
  - This was possible because of a return to more narrow geographic analyses, and more modest attempts to derive partial rather than absolute global laws, 10
  - Third was a return to detailed case-study analysis, which was deemed crucial to the study of important but rare events, which cannot be studied statistically (e.g. revolutions), 10
  - Lastly was the increasing adoption in the late 1980s of rational choice models from economics, which seeks to study human institutions using the tools of economics by assuming that decisions are made by rational and self-interested individuals, 11

**Schools of Comparative Politics**

- The discipline of comparative politics contains three separate traditions, 4
  - The first tradition is oriented towards the study of individual countries; this harkens back to the traditional approach of comparative politics as referring to the study of foreign governments in isolation, 4
  - The second tradition is methodological, and is mostly concerned with establishing rules and standards by which different countries can be understood using rigorous logical, conceptual and statistical models, 4
  - The analytical approach is primarily concerned with the identification and explanation of differences and similarities between countries and their institutions, 4
  - It aims to provide explanations through careful analysis of data and case studies to test the validity of various explanatory models, 4

**Methods of Comparative Politics**

**Types of Research Methods**

- The methods used in comparative politics depend on the type of analysis being conducted, 13
  - Analysis can be extensive (dealing with a large sample size but usually fewer variables or details), or intensive (the reverse, like case studies), 13
  - Research can also be cross-sectional (comparing regions and countries), cross-organizational (comparing ideologies or policies), or cross-temporal (comparing things across time), 14
  - Comparative research can focus on identifying and explaining similarities or weaknesses, 14

**Hypothesis Testing**

- Comparative begins by observing and describing similarities and differences that exist in the real world, especially by establishing classifications and typologies, 4
It then seeks to explain these similarities and differences. For example, why did social revolutions occur in France and Russia but not in Germany or Japan?, 4

To do this, comparative political scientists formulate hypotheses and use empirical data to test them, 5

Finally, comparative politics attempts to use this knowledge to make predictions, 5

Obviously, comparative politics is not an experimental science, 5

Instead, all that can be done is to look at different regions with different characteristics to try to infer correlation and hence causation between different variables, 5

**Case Study Analysis**

- The case study approach: study one example in depth to investigate the worth of a theory
- Specific or focused comparison between specific groups of countries
- Representative: pick an example that is typical of the category (e.g. Poland representative of ex-communist states), and generalise from it
- Prototypical: a state that forges ahead of most others into a new direction, and is expected to become a model for other countries (e.g. US, Soviet Union)
- Deviant: an exception to the norm, for example India (many political scientists think that democracies cannot be successfully consolidated without significant economic development; India seems to be a deviant case to this)
- Crucial: pick a country that is least likely to display certain characteristics, and extrapolate to show that if those characteristics are even apparent there, then they should be apparent everywhere (e.g. democratisation in Saudi Arabia)
- Archetypal: study a country that creates a totally new category (French Revolution)

**Case Studies or Aggregate Data?**

- The behavioural revolution brought with it an increasing emphasis on ‘large N’ studies, with many data points and application of statistical techniques, 14
- In the past, scholars had tended to focus on the US, Britain, France, models that all other nations were expected to eventually evolve towards, as well as the ‘failed’ cases of Germany and Italy, 14
- With such a small sample size, use of statistical techniques was difficult, 14
- With the rise of ‘large N’ research, emphasis came to be placed on measurable quantities, and focusing on variables and their relationship, rather than case studies, 14-15
- The price of this was a loss of specific cultural and historical detail about particular countries, 15
- More recently there has been a return to ‘small N’, case-study based research, 15
- The goal is to try and understand complex phenomena holistically, rather than splitting it up into examining one variable at a time, 15

**The Rise of Aggregate Data**

- For a long time, the only statistics available for use in comparative political analyses were official ones, 16
- These had their origins during the age of Mercantilism in the 17th century, and became particularly important in the 19th century, as urbanisation and industrialisation strengthened the perceived need and ability for the state to monitor and intervene in national affairs, 16
- These interventions and growing welfare policies obviously needed statistical information in order to be implemented, 16
With the behavioural revolution, however, researches became much more suspicious of state statistics that could be subject to manipulation (especially in developing nations), and so went to greater efforts to construct their own datasets, 17

The process of computerization beginning in the 1950s also made the analysis of large datasets much more practical for many researchers, 17

**The Rise and Fall of Survey Data**
- Also, official datasets did not contain all the variables that were of interest to researches, especially those concerning religious, political and social values, 17
- Hence the rise of surveys as a means of generating such data, 17
- Use of individual survey-based data has also waned somewhat, as it has proved to be hard to conduct without falling prey to cultural bias (e.g. pride, honour, patriotism, etc, have different meanings in different countries), 18-19
- Also, this type of survey data is simply not available for the long stretches of time needed to analyse many important historical questions, like democratization or state formation, 18-19

**The Ecological Fallacy**
- The use of aggregate data in comparative politics studies took a severe hit in 1950, when William S. Robinson published his famous article about the ‘ecological fallacy’, where he showed that correlations observed at the level of aggregate data cannot be used to infer correlations on the individual level, 17-18
- This led to many important conferences of social scientists to discuss this matter, 18

**Problems in Making Comparisons**
- Appropriate selection of cases
- Cultural bias of the researcher
- Overall subjectivity
- Causality inference: Galton’s problem, how do we know that two countries with a similar characteristic really have a similar underlying process that caused it, or if it was just coincidence

**Convergence and Globalisation**
- Up until the 1950s, comparative politics literature assumed there would be convergence of political systems towards the model of the major western liberal democracies, 20
- This trend towards convergence seems to have been renewed since the collapse of Communism, and rise of capitalism and democracy throughout much of Africa and Asia, 20
- This actually makes the task of comparative politics more difficult, as it is much easier to analyse many separate isolated systems (as nations were traditionally modelled), then many heavy inter-connected and interdependent ones, where processes and changes in one nation are copied and spill-over into others, 21
- Indeed, the increasing influence of globalisation and international developments in state affairs has led to a greater intermingling of the disciplines of comparative politics and international relations, 21
1.2 Comparative Politics and Ethics

Introduction to Political Culture

What is Political Culture?
- Political culture is the sum of the fundamental values, sentiments and knowledge that drive political processes, 89
- Political culture is best studied comparatively, and can shed light on many important phenomena, such as the motivations of the September 11 terrorists, 89

Types of Beliefs and Values
- Values are more deep seated things that you hold dear, generally in the abstract on focusing on basic ideas, while attitudes are more specific toward specific policies
- Beliefs are often related to religious beliefs
- Other aspects are related to emotional, evaluative and cognitive orientations
- Emotional orientations because we often rely on our emotions to shape our political actions: for example feeling angry or sympathy towards others
- Evaluative orientations relate more to intellectual analysis of policies or issues

Why Study Political Culture?
- In order to better understand other societies
- Analysing the legitimacy of a political system
- Better understand conflict (e.g. ethnic) and stability – how are these groups really different, and are there areas where compromise could be made
- Better understand institutions and structures (e.g. why does America have a presidential rather than a parliamentary system?, why does Australia have compulsory voting?)
- Explaining differences between societies that are at similar levels of economic development and appear to have rather similar structures and institutions
- Better understand prospects for change, and direction of such change

How Do We Study Political Culture?
- Sample surveys – these can only be conducted in countries where this is legal (cannot conduct social science surveys in China)
- Electoral results – not very useful in single party states
- Archie Brown’s method of analysing communist systems (also applies also to authoritarian systems)
- Survey data collected within communist states
- Systematic interviewing of émigrés – but must consider that émigrés are more likely to be hostile to the regime
- Creative literature – but must consider censorship, and the fact that authors may not be representative of the population
- Memoirs, such as accounts by long-term foreign residents

Categorising Political Culture

Parochial Cultures
- Almond and Verba identified four ideal types of political culture: parochial, subject, participant and civic cultures
Citizens of parochial cultures are not even really aware of the existence or importance of the state. They have very little knowledge of the state and political system, and identify much more closely with their tribe, village, etc.

**Subject Cultures**
- In a subject culture, people do know about the state, and may well be bombarded by state propaganda.
- Despite this high level of knowledge, the system does not encourage citizens to participate in politics in a self-motivated way.
- This latter caveat is important, because in the USSR for example, people were encouraged to participate in politics, but only in exactly the way the state wanted. They were not encouraged to participate in their own way.

**Participant Cultures**
- In a participant culture, citizens are encouraged to engage in self-motivated political participation: e.g. join political parties, join trade unions, vote, canvass, etc.
- The problem with a true, pure participant culture is that if everyone is participating in politics all the time, nothing will ever get done or decided.
- In practise, the more practical version is a civic culture, where people are encouraged to participate, but often do not feel the need to.

**Almond and Verba’s ‘Civic Culture’**
- Almond and Verba conducted an important study into political culture in various countries in 1959-1960.
- Almond and Verba proposed that the most stable democracies arose when nations had a majority of participant-attitude citizens, but with a sizeable stabilising minority of the other two categories.
- This allows the nation to have the right balance between democratic control and elite flexibility of action.
- After empirically testing their model, they concluded that the UK and the US came closest to their ideal model of civil culture, hence apparently confirming their hypothesis.
- Critics, however, have argued that the idea of ‘political culture’ as they measured it was very vague, and that their analysis could be confounded by the fact that people may believe they can influence government because they know from experience that they can, thereby reversing the direction of causality.

**Salient Aspects of Political Cultures**
- Orientations towards problem-solving (pragmatic vs. rationalistic): for example, British precedent-based legal system compared to Roman-based law.
- Orientations towards collective action (cooperative vs. individualistic): for example, increased emphasis on collective in Asian cultures than in Anglophone cultures.
- Orientations towards the political system (allegiant vs. alienated): are people loyal to the state or hostile to it?
- Orientations towards other people (trusting vs. suspicious): related to levels of corruption.
- According to Kavanagh (1972) ‘The political culture may be seen as the overall distribution of citizens’ orientations to political objects’.
Political Socialization

- Political socialisation is the process of transmitting political culture to a new generation, 100
- This happens mostly through uncontrolled processes, as children observe behaviours and attitudes of those around them, and slowly incorporate them into their own world view as they grow, 100-101
- Because it is so hard to control and is largely based on the family and other traditional authority figures, political socialization tend to replicate the status quo, 100
- That said, rare traumatic events, like the Vietnam War or September 11, can have a powerful affect on changing political culture, 101-102

Trust and Postmaterialism

Factors Affecting Political Culture

- Religious traditions (e.g. empirically, Catholic countries are much more corrupt than Protestant countries)
- For those who argue that this is caused by the religious differences, they argue that in catholic countries put people before the state, whereas Protestant countries are more individualistic, and so tend to be more loyal to the state
- Life-changing experiences (e.g. war, major economic crisis) can change people’s fundamental values, not merely the attitudes
- Institutional arrangements (e.g. compulsory voting in Australia seems to have generated widespread support amongst Australian citizens for compulsory voting)
- Socialisation refers to the process of acquiring political culture
- Much of this occurs on a subconscious level, for example by observing the political views and practices of others, especially parents
- Formal means of socialisation occur through schooling, the media, and in extreme cases by brainwashing

Political Trust and Social Capital

- Between 1981 and 1991, there has been a decline in the level of trust in public institutions such as the parliament and the civil service in virtually all countries examined, 90
- This is most visibly illustrated in the United States, where the proportion of Americans who said that they trusted the Federal government to do the right thing declined from 75% in 1964 to 25% in 1994, 91
- Interestingly, much of this decline is attributable to specific events, such as the Vietnam War and Watergate, and levels of trust show improvements during periods of peace and prosperity like the 1980s and late 1990s, 91
- Surveys in various European countries consistently show that people are more likely to trust institutions of law and order like the police, courts and military, and less likely to trust instruments of democratic control over them, like media, parties and parliament, 91
- It seems, however, that there is no significant correlation between levels of political trust in the government, and levels of social trust in other people, 93
- Indeed, while virtually all nations saw a decline in the former over the past few decades, only the UK and the US saw a decline in the latter (interestingly they are both heavy TV-watching states), 93

Putman’s Study of Trust in Italy

- Putman has argued based on his case study of regional governments in Italy that low levels of political trust lead to less effective governments that are unable to introduce significant or effective policies, 92
• In the case of Italy, Putman explained these differences in political trust and social capital based on the different historical experiences of north and south Italy, 92
• Specifically, northern Italy has a long history of communal self-government, while southern Italy has a long history of feudalism and foreign rule, 92

**The Rise of Postmaterialism**
• One development which may explain these changes in political trust and social capital is the rise of the ideology of postmaterialism, beginning around the 1960s, 93
• During this period, the first of the post-war generation of the west began to reach adulthood, 93
• Unlike previous generations, they had never known large-scale war, but had grown up during a time of peace and prosperity, 93
• Studies have indicated that the wealthier a democracy becomes, the higher the proportion of post materialists it tends to have, 93-95
• This trend is very visible in Europe, where postmaterialism is much higher in Scandinavia and West Germany than Greece or Italy, 95
• Perhaps even more important than peace and prosperity in the development of postmaterialism has been the rise of university education, particularly in Arts-type courses, 95

**The Importance of Postmaterialism**
• It has been suggested that this gave rise to a change in values from emphasising order, discipline, and economic achievement, to self-expression, flexible rules, and social activism, 93
• Post-materialists tend to challenge elites, and to be more attracted towards single-issue groups rather than the all encompassing political platforms of the old political parties, 93
• The number of postmaterialists in western countries was only about one quarter of the number of materialists in 1970, but as generational change continued, by 2000 the groups were roughly equal in size, 95

**Political Culture in Authoritarian States**

**Ignoring Political Culture**
• Lacking the legitimacy that comes from free elections, authoritarian rulers must resort to other means of securing their power, 96-97
• One common means is simply to ignore the political culture of the population, and simply rule through naked force, 97
• This strategy, however, seldom works for very long unless accompanied by other methods, 97

**Manipulating Political Culture**
• A second approach is to manipulate the political culture by drawing upon pre-existing trends and beliefs that would support their authoritarian rule, 97
• In autocratic Asian and Latin American nations, for example, many dictators have attempted to take traditional deference of fathers to sons and peasants to lords and transfer them to the national leader, 97

**Changing Political Culture**
• The final approach is to seek to change the country’s political values, 97
• This occurred in Nazi Germany and communist nations, who took control of the educational systems and attempted to remake society in their own mould, 97
• The communists went furthest in this, however, in their attempts to increase mass participation in politics, and thus generate the cultural change to a classless communist society, 97
• In the event, the forced mass participation they encouraged became very artificial and ritualistic, and actually served to deplete social capital by increasing cynicism towards politics and reducing levels of social trust, problems that plague these nations to this day, 97-98

**Political Culture in New Democracies**
• New democracies tend to struggle with lack of support for the government and political system, much more so than established democracies, 95
• One reason is simply that they lack the authority that naturally accrues as a result of a long record of success, 95
• These governments also struggle with excessive public expectations following the overthrow of the old regime, 95
• At the same time, they inherit the general political mistrust and parochial attitudes that usually existed under the old regime, 95
• Lacking the ‘reservoir of goodwill’ build up after generations of success, attitudes towards new democracies tend to be mostly based on current performance, 96
• The consequence of this is that economic progress tends to go hand in hand with successful democratisation, as the cases of West Germany and Spain illustrate, 96
• In the case of eastern Europe after the collapse of Communism, we can see that the initial reserve of goodwill for the new government evaporated quickly as people’s unrealistic expectations about the rate of economic recovery were not met, 96

**Elite Political Culture**

**What is Elite Political Culture?**
• The elite political culture are the beliefs, attitudes and ideas about politics help by those who are closest to the centres of power, 98
• Elite political culture is by definition much more influential than mass political culture; in democracies it also tends to be more liberal, as studies on attitudes toward free speech in America during the McCarthy era have shown, 98
• One of the important reasons for this trend towards liberalism is the university education of virtually all of the elites, which fosters humanistic, humanitarian values and a belief in the ability of politicians to solve social problems, 98

**Belief in Right to Rule**
• One vital component of the elite’s political culture is their own belief in their right to rule, 98
• If this is lost, then the regime is unlikely to be able to survive any significant challenges, 98-99
• One prime example of this is Eastern Europe during the fall of communism. After years of economic stagnation, the communist leaders no longer truly believed in their own legitimacy to rule, 99
• This also explains why Communism remained in China, as the leaders saw rapid economic development, and so continued to believe in their legitimacy, 99

**Attitude Towards Public Interest**
• A second crucial aspect of the elite political culture is whether the rulers see the posts they hold as a means of serving the interest of the nation, or a way of enriching themselves and their families or tribes, 99
The latter attitude is common where resources are scarce and government institutions weak, which is the case in many ex-colonial nations, 99

Of course, no official is guided solely by the national interest, but the point is really the degree to which corruption and destructive self-serving behaviour is frowned upon or simply accepted as normal, 99

**Attitudes Towards Political Rules**

- The third aspect of political culture of elites concerns their attitudes towards the rules of the political game, 100
- This mostly concerns the degree to which politicians and leaders are willing to confine their competition to within established rules of conduct, 100
- When political competition is seen as absolute and without boundaries, for example in Northern Ireland during the times of the IRA, the polity will not be very stable, 100
- Conversely, stability is achieved when both sides fight stoutly within the sphere of the political game, back make no effort at all to move outside these rules once defeated, as for example is the case in Great Britain, 100
- Watergate is an example of a politician moving somewhat outside the rules of the game to promote his victory; if most American elites had this attitude, then American democracy would be far less stable, 100
- Attitudes like this can also lead to elites of opposing cultural or religious groups within the same polity coming to compromises or agreements with one another; hence this attitude is important for the maintenance of peace between rival groups, 100

## Section 2: Non-Democratic Regimes

### 2.1 Authoritarianism

**Examining Authoritarianism**

**Categorisations of Governments**

- Aristotle identified six different types of governments, many of them with names that we would find strange today
- Monarchy, tyranny, aristocracy (rule by the virtuous), oligarchy (rule by the rich), polity (rule by the propertied) and democracy (rule by the poor)
- A modern scholar called Samuel Finer identified another six: military rule, dynastic, façade democracies, quasi-democracies, and liberal democracy
- Today, the most basic division is between democracy and dictatorship

**The Three Worlds: Western and Chinese**

- Another way of dividing the world that was popular in the 1950s to the 1980s was the three world system
- Interestingly, the Chinese had a different interpretation of this than the west
- For them, the first world were the superpowers (USA and USSR), the second world were industrialised nations (regardless of capitalist or communist), and then the third world was everyone else

**What is Authoritarianism?**

- The trouble with trying to come up with definitions of political forms like democracy and authoritarianism is that it is very difficult to separate positive from normative analysis, 229
• Linz (1970) put forth a new definition of authoritarianism, 235
• ‘Authoritarian regimes are political systems with limited, not responsible political pluralism, without elaborate guiding ideology, without intensive political mobilization, in which a leader (or small group) exercises power in formally ill-defined by in practise quite predictable limits’

**Totalitarianism versus Authoritarianism**

• Jeanne Kirkpatrick built upon this idea, relegating totalitarian regimes to Marxist nations, and arguing that authoritarian states were comparatively less repressive and capable of reform into capitalist democracy, 235
• In much contemporary analysis, the categories of totalitarianism and authoritarianism have largely been collapsed into each other, as many argued that the only real difference between them is the fact that totalitarian regimes generally have a planned economy, which is not really a fundamental political difference, 236

**The Importance of Regime Legitimacy**

• Max Weber argued that legitimacy, or the degree to which a government was able to convince the population of the legitimacy of its fundamental principles of organisation, is critical to the long-term stability of any regime, 229
• Belief in the legitimacy of a regime conveys authority upon the specific rulers of that regime, thereby increasing their ability to maintain law and order, 229
• The question of regime type is very closely related to that of regime legitimacy, 230
• The overarching question is, how are specific governments able to channel the power capacities of the state in a form of governance that is able to sustain law and order over time, survive changes in governments, while also solving the problems that the society faces, 230

**Authoritarian Regimes and Legitimacy**

• Many analysts explain the rise of autocratic regimes as caused by the loss of legitimacy of democratic regimes, owing to their inability to solve the most pressing social and economic problems, 230
• The new government often takes authoritarian form in that it seeks to concentrate power in a strong executive, which will have the power to impose drastic solutions with force and coercion if necessary, 230
• The trouble with modern authoritarian regimes is that they are only able to gain legitimacy on the basis of a particular immediate crisis situation, 230
• Once this crisis is over or they fail to solve it, they are perceived as illegitimate, as democracy has essentially achieved monopoly over legitimacy in the modern world, 230

**Types of Authoritarianism**

**Sub-Types of Autocracies**

• Given the enormous breadth of the authoritarian category, recent efforts have been made to identify sub-types, 236
• In general, however, all that can be agreed upon in this regard is that the major commonality of authoritarian states is that they are mostly defined in opposition to the values of democracy, 236

**What is Co-option?**

• Most authoritarian regimes maintain their power by a mixture of coercion and co-option, 240
Co-option often takes the form of an implicit exchange of privileges (for example state contracts, welfare benefits, higher wages, etc) for the giving up of political rights, 240

**Patrimonial Regimes**
- Patrimonial regimes tend to be highly personalised, with the formation of elaborate networks of patron-client relations forming around the ruler, who is the central figure from which the privileges flow, 240-241
- In such regimes, rulers spend a great deal of time attempting to consolidate or hold on to their power by manipulating this network of client relations and factions, 241

**Corporatist Regimes**
- In more organised, corporatist-type authoritarian states, the co-option and factional alliances often occur more between groups than individuals (such as the military, corporations, trade unions, etc), 241
- In practise, many authoritarian states practise a mixture of clientalism and corporatism, 241
- This style of maintaining power has the benefit of giving the government unrestricted ability to implement the kind of policies needed to solve national problems and crises, 242
- The downside, however, is that often over time, or once the crisis has passed, the individuals or groups who previously gave up their political power to the state become increasingly less willing to make this trade-off, often realising that state policy is not always made in accordance with their interests, 242
- This trend is often identified as being responsible for the decline of South American authoritarian regimes in the 1970s and 1980s, 242

**Authoritarianism and Modernity**

**Divinity-based Authoritarianism**
- Historically, authoritarian rule has been the norm throughout the world, though it was usually linked with various religions or philosophies which conveyed legitimacy on the rulers, 230
- The most common form of this was the belief that the ruler possessed some kind of unique ability to communicate or intercede with divine or transcendental powers on behalf of the ordinary people, 231
- This idea can be found in the Catholic Church, the Chinese Mandate of Heaven, and the western Divine Right of Kings, 231

**Clientalism**
- In these early authoritarian systems, often a small group of elites competed amongst themselves for favour and offices, which were in turn selectively granted by the sovereign as a means of retaining control over the elites, 231
- This form of clientelism is still found in a number of less-developed authoritarian states today, 231

**Modern Technocracies**
- The concept of a central elite authority needed for their specialist knowledge or ability to interpret something has survived into the modern world, 231-232
- Examples include the US Supreme Court interpreting the Constitution, Communist party leaders interpreting and applying communist theory, and the need for highly trained technocrats to use their specialised knowledge (e.g. of engineering or economics) to guide a country to modernisation, 232
This is related to the widespread perception that associates the executive with some kind of ‘collective good’, while legislative and representative bodies are often more associated with narrow factional or regional interests, 232

**Universitas Versus Societas**
- The result is a kind of on-going tension between the universitas and the societas conceptions of state and government, 232
- The former sees state and society as a single entity administered by a board of ‘trustees’ on behalf of the ‘greater good’, while the latter sees society as an aggregation of many diverse interests and groups, all held together by a set of rules and procedures that allow them to pursue their multiple interests in concert, 232
- Authoritarian regimes virtually always adopt a universitas conception of society in order to justify their regimes, 232

**Authoritarianism as Pre-Modern**
- According to the modernisation theory developed in the 1950s and 1960s, countries almost always began as autocracies, and then as they developed or modernised moved towards either the positive end (democracy), or the negative (totalitarianism), 233
- As such, both democracy and totalitarianism were seen as products of modernity, while authoritarianism was seen as a kind of pre-modern remnant, 233
- Societies that tried to democratise too early in the development process could often lapse back into this authoritarian phase, 233

**Modernisation Causes Authoritarianism**
- Samuel Huntington developed an important argument in this vein, to the effect that rather than producing a stable base for democracy, modernisation actually led to political and social turmoil, which if not properly handled by the existing government could lead to political decay and a collapse of public order, 234
- Huntington further argued that in many underdeveloped societies, the military was the only modern, professional, organised institution that was capable of restoring order to the state in this time of turmoil, 234
- In this view, a military dictatorship could actually act as the means to create a stable political order and institutional structure that would eventually be capable of supporting democracy, 234

**Examples of Modernising Autocracies**
- Examination of such ‘modernising’ authoritarian regimes in Greece, Spain, Portugal and Latin America during the 1960s and 1970s increasingly cast doubt on the earlier view that Authoritarian states were mere holdovers of backward government systems, 234-235
- This argument was lent further credence by the rise of the East Asian Tigers; states led by strong authoritarian governments with an openly modernising agenda, 235

**The Origins of Authoritarianism**
- There are three broad classes of explanations for the origins of authoritarianism: cultural, economic and political structural, 237

**Cultural Explanations**
- Cultural explanations focus on the underlying patterns of institutions and values that may predispose a society to authoritarianism, mostly by making it easier to gain legitimacy, 237
- Though the weaker form of this argument has merit, stronger forms have serious problems
Most significant is the fact that all societies at one time or other were authoritarian, and yet some have developed into democracy, some into modern forms of authoritarianism, while others still maintain traditional authoritarian forms. The theory does not explain this, 237-238

**Economic Explanations**

- Economic explanations often emphasise the conflict generated by the modernisation process
- In particular, states must balance the needs of providing goods to placate the population with the need to accumulate surplus capital for investment and development, 238-239
- Groups forced to bear the brunt of this, perhaps workers, farmers or merchants, may mobilise in political opposition to the state, 239
- In more fragile democracies, this can often lead to government crackdown and the rise of authoritarianism, 239

**Political Explanations**

- Political explanations emphasise ‘crises of transition’, perhaps economic reforms or decolonisation, lead to the collapse of traditional intuitions and sources of authority, and their tendency to be replaced by newer authoritarian forms, which can restore order by force, 239
- There is no simple relationship between capitalism and democracy in the developing world, as different states at different levels of development tend to develop into different types of authoritarian states (some traditional parochial type, others become technocratic-modernising type), 240
- One argument that has been made concerning the origin of authoritarian regimes is that they often stem from actions of the executive in attempting to circumvent apparently recalcitrant legislatures, 240

2.2 Authoritarian Myanmar

The Burmese Road to Socialism

**The Colonial Legacy**

- Burma is a Theravada Buddhist state
- Was a British colony from the mid 19th century until 1948
- Burma was originally administered as part of India, right up until 1937
- The Burmese were quite hostile to British rule, with many demonstrations in the 1930s; they did not join the commonwealth after gaining independence
- One reason for this was a system of mini-apartheid established by the British (for example segregated train carriages)
- The British also ignored an ancient Buddhist custom of requiring people to remove their shoes in religious buildings; this was very unpopular with Buddhists

**Early Independence**

- From 1948 until 1962, Burma was a fairly effective parliamentary democracy
- Burmese democracy, however, was never very well established, in part because of its low levels of economic development
- In 1962, there was a military coup, and Burma was remained a military dictatorship ever since
- The coup group called themselves the Revolutionary Council, and set about dissolving the legislature, removing power from state governments, and centralising the courts under their own control, 497
The Burma Socialist Program Party

- In 1974, the country was renamed the Socialist Republic of Burma
- The name socialist indicated that the state wanted to maintain a large role in managing the economy, though it was not socialist in the Russian or Chinese sense
- After failing to successfully coopt the former political elites into a national unity government, the Revolutionary Council instead established its own political party, the Burma Socialist Program Party, 498
- The BSPP was originally comprised exclusively of elite members of the Revolutionary Council, but over the course of their 1970s membership was increasingly opened to the masses, and political and career advancement came increasingly to be linked to party membership, 498

Economic Policies

- The new government nationalised all foreign and many larger domestic businesses, and declared a state monopoly over the trade of several essential commodities, notably rice, 498
- Though unpopular with the urban middle classes, the government’s economic programs were initially appealing to peasants, who had their debts forgiven and land rents abolished, 498
- Over time, however, the country’s rice production and economic growth languished, corruption spread, and people became more disillusioned with the government, 498

The Regime’s Ideology

- The regime’s political and economic policies were justified by an ideological document released in 1964 called the Correlation of Man and His Environment, 498
- This document draw upon Therevadran Buddhist believes concerning the corrupt nature of man, and combined them with Marxist arguments regarding the necessity of socialism, 498-499
- Despite the government’s socialist policies, farms remained in private hands, and the country remained neutral in the cold war, 499

Opposition to the BSPP

- The BSPP was opposed on several occasions by student groups, who organised protests and rallies that were violently suppressed by the state, 499
- They mainly protested against the anti-democratic policies of the regime, and also the regime’s neglect of higher education, and consequent reduction in its quality and career prospects, 499

Civil War, and Economic Collapse

Insurgency Groups

- From the 1960s through to the 1980s, the Burmese government was consistently faced with the problem of rural insurgency groups, especially the communists and the Karen separatists, 500
- During the Cultural revolution in China, these groups received Chinese support, but as relations between Burma and China improved in the late 1970s, this support dried up, and the insurgent groups lost a great deal of strength, 501

Non-Alignment

- From the beginning, the BSPP pursued a policy of strict non-alignment, refusing to enter into military alliances or accept any aid that came with political obligations, 501
- This policy was widely supported by most political factions, 501
- The policy was also one of geostrategic necessity: allying with either superpower would have antagonised China, while allying with China or the US would have antagonised India, which was close to the USSR, 501
So sincere was Burma’s commitment to non-alignment that it refused to join ASEAN until 1997, by which time it was clear that membership did not constitute preference for any particular nation or ideology, 502

**Economic Reform**
- The Burmese economy experienced some growth during the 1970s, mostly thanks to foreign loans, but other than that little was achieved, 502
- In 1987, Ne Win made a surprise announcement at a secret party meeting that the socialist experiment had been a failure, and the party would be examining economic reform, 502-503

**The Struggle for Democracy**

**The 8888 Uprisings**
- This economic turnaround and the following disruptions caused by their various economic experiments sapped the government of its remaining respect and legitimacy, 503
- In March 1988, a brawl started in a Rangoon teashop, which soon escalated into nationwide anti-government protests, 503
- As the authorities began to lose control Ne Win announced his resignation and called for a referendum on the organisation of multiparty elections, 503
- The party, however, rejected this call, and chose a former general as Win’s successor, 503

**Restoring Order**
- However, the demonstrations continued, and this new leader was in turn forced to resign
- He was then replaced by a civilian leader called Maung Maung, who promised to hold multiparty elections, 503
- Even this did not halt the demonstrations, and so one month later a new military government called the State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC) came to power and imposed martial law, 503
- SLORC was determined to restore order, and finally managed to put down the demonstrations after a great deal of violence (several hundred were killed), 503

**The 1990 Elections**
- The new government retained the promise to hold multiparty elections, which finally took place in May 1990, 503-504
- The National League for Democracy, led by Aung San Suu Kyi, daughter of the highly popular independence movement figure General Aung San, received 60% of the vote, 504
- The military, however, effectively ignored the results of these elections, and set about reforming the political and economic institutions to their liking, 504

**Economic Growth and New Problems**
- The military were greatly aided in this by the surrender of the communist party rebels in early 1989, which led to an agreement by which they would promote economic development in these rural regions and grant the former insurgents local autonomy, 504
- Over the course of the 1990s, the Burmese government made ceasefire agreements with most of the remaining ethnic rebel groups, promoted economic development and trade liberalization, and for the first time allowed NGOs to enter and promote rural health and education, 505
- Economic liberalisation, however, led to a growth in the drug and sex trades, which in turn saw a rapid rise in the rate of HIV infection, 505
Political Stalemate
- As of the 2000s, the issues that led to the 1988 uprising still remain unresolved.
- The political situation is still in a state of stalemate, with San Suu Kyi remaining under house arrest, and no success in further efforts at implementing a democratic constitution.

The Current Political Situation

The Name Myanmar
- The name Myanmar was introduced by the current regime in order to break the link with the past; most countries do not recognise the new name.

Political Rulers
- The Burmese rulers have tended to be relatively withdrawn and reclusive; no personality cults.
- Most Burmese have never even heard the voice of their leader, Than Shwe.
- The current regime justifies its hardline policies on the basis of avoiding ethnic conflict.
- However, they have persistently refused all requests for federalism or parliamentary representation as a means of dealing with ethnic problems.

Human and Civil Rights
- The Freedom House ranking of Burma was ranked seven in both categories (political and civil rights), the lowest possible score.
- In 2006, the ILO announced its intention to seek prosecution of members of the military junta for ‘crimes against humanity’ (but Burma does not recognise ICJ anyway).
- Regime limits access to internet.

Civil Society
- Burma has little in the way of a civil society.
- There is an identifiable opposition; the NLD (National League for Democracy), headed by the most famous Burmese, Aung San Suu Kyi.
- History of protest politics, e.g. July 1962 at Rangoon/Yangon University; 1974 (at funeral of U Thant); ‘8888 Uprising’ (8 Aug 1988 – re. political oppression and state of economy); Aug-Sep 2007 (initially re. fuel price hikes).
- Interestingly, Buddhist monks often play a leading role in such demonstrations.
- There is also a ‘civil society’ in exile – government, political parties, trade unions, etc.

Political Freedoms
- Burma does have an opposition party, but its leader has been under house arrest for decades.
- There have been many protests in Burmese history, but these are not recognised by the state, and are always put down with violence.
- The judiciary is totally under the control of the military.
- Elections are only held periodically, and when they are held they are only symbolic.

Ideology and Dynamism
- There is no real role of ideology in the current Burmese system; it is ruled mostly by force.
- Removed reference to ‘Socialist Republic’ in 1988, after new military regime assumed power.
- The regime also lacks any real dynamism or progression.
The Role of Propaganda
- Burmese propaganda is very nationalistic, and plays on the fears of internal and external enemies – this is typical of authoritarian states
- However, propaganda is nowhere near as pervasive as in totalitarian states, and not as comprehensive as Ne Win’s concept of ‘The Burmese Way to Socialism’.

Ongoing Problems

Constitutional Reform?
- The last parliamentary elections in Burma were held in 1990, though the military refused to recognise the results
- There have been a number of mass demonstrations against the regime, the last major one in 2007, though these were violently repressed
- In 2008, a new constitution was introduced stating that Burma was on the road to democracy and promised elections, though no date was given
- According to the new constitution introduced in 2008, the military would retain one quarter of the seats in parliament

International Isolation
- Burma does not really have any allies or friends; its only relationships with other countries take the form of economic business relationships
- Western democracies have obviously criticised Burmese political practises, as has ASEAN (though using very careful language)
- The United Nations has described the initial reaction of the Burmese authorities to offers of aid following the 2008 cyclone as ‘unprecedented’
- The authorities initially maintained that they did not need any help, and even after they did accept help, they maintained tight control and disrupted the process

Legitimacy
- It is hard to judge legitimacy in Burma, owing to the tight government controls
- The periodic public uprisings seem to indicate that the government legitimacy is low
- This is backed up by the fact that in the 1990 elections, the government only received 2% of the vote, but kept ruling anyway

Corruption Levels
- In 2003, they ranked 129 out of 133 – just above Haiti, Nigeria and Bangladesh
- In 2009, they ranked 178 out of 180 (score 1.4) – just above Somalia and Afghanistan
- Burma has also been ranked as one of the most corrupt states in the world

2.3 Totalitarianism

Defining Totalitarianism

What is Totalitarianism?
- There are many different types of dictatorship: monarchical, communist, fascist, theocratic, plutocratic and military
- Of these, some are described as totalitarian, and some as authoritarian
- Some see totalitarianism as a subset, extreme form of authoritarianism, while others see authoritarianism as a midpoint between totalitarianism and democracy
• The key idea of totalitarianism is that the state has total (or relatively totalistic) control over all citizens
• As such, there were no totalitarian states before the 20th century, as it is only modern technology that permits this degree of control
• The number of authoritarian regimes has not been declining over the past twenty years, though the number of totalitarian regimes has fallen dramatically since the 1980s
• Some modern examples of totalitarian states include Cuba, Libya, North Korea, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Turkmenistan, maybe also the Taliban

Characteristics of Totalitarianism
• A single chiliastic ideology
• A single mass party
• State terror
• A near monopoly of mass communication
• A centrally directed economy
• These traits are all interconnected and related one another (part of a broad syndrome), and therefore should not be examined in isolation, 21
• That is, just because a regime has one or even several of these characteristics does not make it totalitarian, 21

An Elaborate Ideology
• This usually consists of an official body of doctrine covering all vital aspects of man’s existence
• Everyone in the society is supposed to adhere to this doctrine, 22
• The ideology generally makes a chiliastic claim concerning the rejection of society as it currently exists, and a focus on achieving a final perfected state of mankind, 22

Single Party
• There is a single mass party, usually led by one man, consisting of a small dedicated minority of the population (usually up to 10%), 22
• The party is organised hierarchically, and generally is intertwined with the state bureaucracy, 22

System of Terror
• The state operates a system of widespread terror, either through the party or secret police, 22
• The terror is directed not only against the enemies of the state, but essentially against the whole population, in order to keep them in line with the state’s ideology, 22

Comparing Authoritarianism and Totalitarianism

Common Features
• Centralised rule by a powerful leader or small group (e.g. a military or exclusive party), usually subject to few constraints
• Few human or civil rights
• The rule of law is not respected
• Civil society is weak or non-existent. Civil society refers to social structures that exist above the level of the family and below the level of the state
• These could be sporting groups, religious groups, political groups, etc
• The right of citizens to organise themselves in some kind of civil society is generally held as being crucial for full democracy
• Fear of the system among the populace is common
• Elections, if held at all, are largely symbolic, not competitive

**Important Differences: Ideology**
• Ideology is a set of ideas designed to defend and promote the interests of a particular political group
• Ideology is very important in totalitarian systems, while it usually does not play much of a role in authoritarian systems
• Authoritarian systems may emphasise a degree of nationalism, but this itself is not an ideology, as it does not specify much about how the state should be organised or run

**Important Differences: Dynamism**
• Totalitarian systems are generally dynamic, in that the leaders have an end goal to which they attempt to push society
• In contrast, authoritarian systems generally seek to maintain the status quo, and are really only interested in maintaining power
• In concert with this, totalitarian systems tend to make a very heavy use of propaganda

**Atomisation of Society**
• Another important characteristic of totalitarian states is the atomisation of society, the breakup of all social units of society (e.g. family and religion), leaving only the individual and the state
• This is most famously seen in Stalinist Russia, where children were encouraged to tell on their parents to the authorities

**Other Possible Differences**
• Some more controversial differences is isolationism, charismatic leaders, the level of legitimacy of the state, and levels of corruption
• Many autocratic countries begin with charismatic leaders, but later on they are replaced by less charismatic ones (look at the communist world)
• The trouble with the legitimacy argument is that legitimacy is also very hard to determine, even in democracies
• Higher levels of corruption are correlated with authoritarian states, but this might simply be because most authoritarian states tend to be underdeveloped

**Analysing Totalitarianism**

**Variations to Note**
• The party plays a much greater role after Stalin that it did during his reign, 23
• Communist ideology is always more grounded in specific ideals and theoretical principles than fascism or other totalitarian ideologies, owing to the legacy of Marx, 23
• State control over the economy took very different forms in Nazi Germany than it did in Communist states, 23

**The Origins of Totalitarian Regimes**
• There is a tendency here to blame specific philosophers like Marx, Engels, Hegel and even Luther, 18
• None of these thinkers, however, was totalitarian at all, and so ideological explanations are not really satisfactory in explaining the rise of these regimes, 18-19
Many different explanations have been put forward to explain the rise of Nazism, and in practise probably all of them played a role; no historical process like this as a single simple cause, 18-19

**Why didn’t the USA Become Fascist?**
- It did not feel threatened by foreign powers like Germany did
- The Americans did not feel the need for a nationalistic policy to compensate for the First World War
- That said, the rise of the welfare state during the New Deal in America did represent significant change; it was just in a different direction, consistent with different circumstances

**Communism versus Fascism**
- Fascist and communist totalitarian dictatorships are basically, but not wholly, alike, 15
- Having rejected ideology as a major explanatory factor, we are able to see the many essential similarities between fascist and communist states, 19
- This is in spite of the extremist trends of different times: to portray them as totally different during WWII, and totally the same during the Cold War, 19
- In reality there are clear differences between them: for example, the avowed purpose of communist states is to promote the global revolution of the Proletariat, while the purpose of fascist states is to promote the grandeur and imperial dominance of a particular nation or race
- Communist and fascist states also have different historical antecedents, 19
- Fascism arose as a reaction to communism directed to the middle classes, whereas communism arose as a reaction to the many problems of industrialisation directed at the working classes, 20

**Totalitarianism Versus Totalism**
- One popular metric for measuring ‘totalitarianess’ is the degree to which a government seeks to achieve total control over the lives of its citizens, controlling their thoughts and attitudes as well as their actions, and reshaping all people in accordance with their ideology, 16
- According to this view, it is this goal of total control that is the defining characteristic, while the specific means they use are secondary in importance, and largely incidental, 16
- One problem with this definition is that although states may try to obtain total control, they can never truly succeed, 16
- Further, it is the specific procedures and institutions generated in the attempt to achieve this control that are actually some of the most important aspects of a totalitarian system, 16
- Another problem with this definition is that it would also apply to many historical movements and philosophers, such as Plato (who wanted total control to make virtuous citizens for the good of the community), Puritans, the Caliphate, Sparta, and even medieval monasteries, as totalitarian, even though they are nothing like Hitler’s Germany or Stalin’s Russia, 16-17
- The specific difference between all of these ‘primitive’ regimes and modern totalitarian states is, of course, the specific organisational methods and modern technologies available to them to help them achieve their objectives, 17
- We can thus distinguish totalitarianism from the more general phenomenon of totalism on this basis of means of implementation, 17

**Survival of Civil Organisations**
- It is sometimes argued that fascist regimes are fundamentally different from communist ones, on the basis that most fascist states, especially Italy, retained a significant number of constitutional, civil and political aspects of the proceeding liberal democratic society, 20
• Largely, however, this apparent discrepancy is explained by the fact that most of the states that became communist, especially Russia and China, never had any liberal or constitutional heritage in the first place, 20
• These sorts of things, especially universities and churches, did survive in communist states that did have some degree of liberal heritage, like Hungary and Poland, 20
• The general principle we see here is that some isolated remnants of the preceding society and government always survive even after a radical change, 21

Totalitarianism and History

An Emergent Innovation
• Totalitarianism resembles earlier forms of autocracy, especially in the lack of accountability of the rulers to anyone but themselves, 15
• Totalitarian dictatorship is a historical innovation, unique to modern times, 15
• Totalitarianism is an emergent rather than a planned phenomenon, the outgrowth of political expediency in various crises, 16

Historical Novelty of Totalitarianism
• Many of the six characteristics identified above were lacking in historical autocratic regimes, thereby ruling them out as true totalitarian systems, 23
• For example, efforts were made in the past to organise various forms of secret police, but non achieved anything close to the level of terror or efficiency of the Gestapo or KGB, 23
• Equally, Roman dictators and absolute monarchs alike all neither had nor needed a party to support them, or even much of an ideology, 24
• Even when some form of party was present, like the Medici in Florence, they had no coherent ideology to speak of, 24

The Need for Modern Technology
• Needless to say, having a monopoly over communications, exercising effective and widespread secret police terror, and managing a centrally directed economy all require levels of technological advancement not achieved until the 20th century, 24
• Technology is also very important for the state monopoly over weapons, as while it is not hard for an individual to own a sword or a rifle, it is impossible for such an individual to own a tank or a bomber, let alone an atomic bomb, 24
• Overall, the trend towards more advanced technology also usually represents a trend toward greater scales of organisation, and hence a greater advantage to the state, 24

The Democratic Genesis
• Ideology and party organisation are a concept unique to modern democracies, 25
• Hence, their application in totalitarian systems betrays the fact that these systems have their origins in democratic societies, 25
• This is consistent with the rhetoric of leaders like Lenin and Mussolini, who described their government as more ‘ prefect’ versions of democracy, that transcended the old class conflicts and boundaries of traditional bourgeois democracy, 25
• It is also the case that most communist and fascist parties (at least original founding ones) were established within an original democratic context, and only later took on the trappings of authoritarianism as they took over the state, 25
• Indeed, the totalistic nature of the ideologies of most authoritarian parties, and the fanaticism with which their most devoted members pursue their policies, mark authoritarian parties as a kind of extreme version of democratic parties, which have strayed in to the realm of religion

2.4 Nazi Germany

The Rise of the Nazis

History of the Second Reich
• Germany was united in 1871 by Bismarck, and became a monarchy under the Hohenzollerns
• Interestingly, the process of unification of Germany began with a customs union and then went further, similar to the process of unification for the European Union
• The new Germany was dominated by Prussia, in particular the Prussian military culture and bureaucratic traditions
• Prussian bureaucracy and culture in general had a culture of diligence, obedience and efficiency – also a strong Lutheran influence
• When Germany lost the first world war, it also lost its monarchy and government, which was replaced by the Weimar Republic

The Early Nazi Movement
• Hitler joined a radical right-wing party in Munich after the war, and soon rose to become its leader owing to his extraordinary leadership and public speaking abilities, 26
• The only real common beliefs in this movement were hatred of liberalism, communism, and Judaism, and a general dissatisfaction with the existing order, 26
• This dissatisfaction was what distinguished the movement from the older, more respectable (and conservative) right-wing groups in Germany, 26

Nazi Ideology
• The Nazis saw history as an unending struggle for survival between races, 25
• The superior Aryan race could only avoid extinction by fostering racial purity at home, and becoming a world power so that it could acquire ‘living space’ by wars of conquest in the east
• This would also stabilize Germany’s economic and political problems, 25
• Although implicit in Nazi ideology, these extremist notions of racial persecution and war were not advertised too openly, so as to appeal to a more moderate audience, 25

What the Nazis Stood For
• Aggressive nationalism
• The Master Race – the Aryans
• Lebensraum – living space for the master race
• Racism, particularly anti-Semitism and anti-Slav
• Homophobia
• Anti-communism
• Prussian efficiency, obedience and military tradition
• Diligence and obedience to the Fatherland

Support from Elites
• Nonetheless, Hitler soon gained many allies in the military and big business, who saw him as another ally against the left, 26
Hitler’s party was particularly useful, as it was a Worker’s Party that directed the energies of its members to combating socialists, rather than the authorities and business leaders, 26

**Munich Putsch and Afterwards**
- Despite this sympathy, the conservative elites were not yet prepared to support Hitler in his 1923 attempt to take over the Bavarian government, 26
- However, Hitler’s friends in high places, including the Bavarian justice minister, were able to secure him a very light jail sentence, 26
- During the mid 1920s, the Nazis gradually built up their movement across Germany, and began serious attempts to win allies in high places and gain parliamentary representation, 26
- This was all part of a grand plan to use legal means to attain power, 26-27

**Factors in the Rise to Power**
- October 1929 Wall Street Crash led to significant unemployment and economic hardship in Germany
- Germans also felt humiliated by the loss of the First World War and blame for the war by the other allies
- Another factor contributing to the Nazi success was the failure of the Weimar Republic
- There were too many small parties who squabbled with each other, and were not able to achieve anything
- Hitler was an extremely skilled orator, and was able to encapsulate popular sentiment in short simple slogans
- The Nazis also promised to end unemployment through government projects, and succeeded in doing so

**Consolidating Power**

**Hitler as Chancellor**
- Many conservative leaders in Germany felt that once Hitler became Chancellor, he would, under the pressure of Hindenburg and the other parties, put aside his radicalist agenda and settle down to rule normally in coalition with the other conservative members of his cabinet, 27
- Hitler, however, had no such intentions. He used his control over communications and the media to great advantage, 27

**The Reichstag Fire**
- In February 1933, he blamed a fire in the Reichstag upon the communists, and used it as an excuse to get Hindenburg to pass an emergency decree suspending civil liberties and allowing the Nazis to take over the state police forces, 27
- This allowed the Nazis to imprison political opponents under the guise of legality, 27
- Using these twin tools of propaganda and intimidation, the Nazis were able to gain 44% of the vote in the elections of March 1933, which together with his German National allies gave him a majority in Parliament, 27

**The Enabling Act**
- The Reichstag Fire decree had also allowed the Nazis to place many of the communist party delegates under house arrest, 28
By means of threats and promises, Hitler was able to pursue the Catholic Centre party to vote with him. Without the Communist party deputies being able to cast their votes, this gave Hitler the two-thirds majority that he needed to pass the Enabling act, 28

This act effectively gave Hitler power to pass laws without parliament’s approval. Within a few months all other political parties had been outlawed, 28

**Nazification of Media and Trade Unions**
- In the following year, large numbers of socialists, intellectuals and other political opponents were arrested 28
- Nazi-friendly editors were placed in the prominent newspapers, similarly with Nazi-friendly clergy in Protestant churches, 28
- Free trade unions were taken over and incorporated into the state-controlled labour front
- Indeed, leaders of virtually all mass organisations were pressured to give evidence of their loyalty to the regime, 28
- Few people put up any active resistance against this process, most importantly most of the moderate officials, army officers, and professors, 28

**Control of Civil Society**
- Like all totalitarian leaders, Hitler was not content with merely controlling the state – he also sought to bring all aspects of organised society under his control. 29
- To this end, the Nazi party worked out a series of formal and informal agreements with such bodies as the Catholic church, the army, businesses, and the civil service, 29
- Basically, these special groups were allowed to remain in position and retain a degree of influence, as well as avoid open Nazification, in exchange for tacit support of the regime
- Virtually all other, less powerful economic, labour and social organisations were taken over by the party, 29

**Winning the Hearts of the People**
- Ordinary citizens were got on side by expanding welfare benefits, eliminating unemployment, establishing state-run recreation and vacation programs, and playing open nationalist, anti-socialist and anti-Semitic sentiment, 29-30

**The Civil Service and Military**
- As war approached, it became necessary for Hitler to bring the civil service and the military even more tightly under his control, 30
- Civil servants were expected to join the Nazi party, while many senior military leaders were sacked and replaced with pro-Nazi appointees, 30

**The Nazis in Power**

**Key Features of Nazi Germany**
- Hitler revived the German economy through a program of massive rearmament and public works, designed not to improve living standards but to prepare the nation for war, 24
- The German people were pacified by a series of welfare programs, elaborate propaganda, and symbolic displays of nationalism and grandeur that gave them a sense of status and belonging, 25
- Low unemployment
- Concentration camps and police state
- Rejection of the rule of law – this is a bourgeois concept that disrupted the rule of the state
• A particular style of art and architecture; very large, square, simple but imposing

Running the Nazi State
• The nazi state was based on the cult of a single charismatic leader, 30
• It was only his demagogic talent and ability to inspire personal loyalty that kept the party together, and prevented the bureaucracy, military, and other interest groups from regaining the primary loyalties of their members, 31
• The Nazis were both unable and unwilling to provide the state with a coherent, organised system of government, 31
• Instead, the Nazi state was comprised of a system of competing, partly overlapping individual ‘empires’, each overseen by a different nazi big-wig, in an atmosphere of mutual distrust, 31
• Only the efficiency of average German officials and the overall oversight of the Fuhrer kept the system from disintegrating, 31

Nazi Economics and Ideology
• Hitler was contemptuous of the idea of a coherent ideology, so it falls somewhat short of the Chiliastic ideology that usually characterises totalitarian states
• The socialist part of the party referred to an opposition to unearned income, but this was very much linked with anti-Semitism
• At the same time, Hitler supported cooperation with private businesses
• Did have a lot of central economic planning and control, but not always formally government ownership, or along the Soviet model
• Basically Hitler just wanted big economic units that he could control; he wasn't too concerned if they were private or publically owned

Other Totalitarian Properties
• Was a police state using organised state terror (Gestapo)
• However, the state terror in Nazi Germany was not random like in the USSR, but directed against specific groups, including Jews and Homosexuals
• Single party state led by a dictator
• Near monopoly of mass communications; propaganda by Goebbels
• Had political control of the judiciary
• Were highly expansionionist

The Power of the SS
• Gradually, Heinrich Himmler gained predominance in this battle for power within the Nazi state
• Himmler began as head of the SS, and subsequently consolidated his position by taking over control of the entire German police force, 31
• Eventually the SS even established its own army and its own bureaucracy, and there were even plans for a separate SS state to be established after the war, 32

The Attitude of the Bureaucracy and Military
• Crucial to the continued functioning of Nazi Germany was the high discipline and loyalty of most of the members of the military and state bureaucracy, 32
• They followed the dictates of Hitler obediently in German tradition which did not include comparing ones orders to one’s personal moral compass, 32
Many of them may have secretly opposed Nazi ideology, but it took years of soul searching before even some of them made an effort to get rid of Hitler in the July 1944 assassination attempt, 32

**Attitudes of the Public**

- This general acceptance of Nazi orders applied to most of the population as well, who were drawn into passive acceptance of Nazi horrors by herd instinct, years of nationalist propaganda, and telling themselves that the Nazis more questionable actions were inevitable, or more than balanced by the regime’s good qualities, 35

### 2.5 The Soviet Union

**Historical Background**

**Russian Culture and History**

- Russia has a long history of autocratic rule, under the Tsars, communists and now Putin
- Russia has also been strongly influenced by the Orthodox church; it has been said that this may partly explain the tendency of the Russian people to put up with more than most
- Russia also has a ‘large country mentality’, which is often used to explain the fact of the continued autocratic rule
- The idea is that people thought that they needed a strong central ruler in order to keep the country together
- Another fact is that Russia has enormous land borders that Russia has, which had made it feel much more vulnerable to invasion than other states like Italy, France or the UK

**The Origins of the USSR**

- The meaning of the word ‘soviet’ in Russian is council, thereby connotating a system of democracy
- The name USSR itself dates from 1922

**Lenin an Autocrat?**

- In the early 20th century, Lenin wrote a pamphlet called ‘What is to be done?’
- In this pamphlet, he advocated an elitist, hierarchical and secretive party structure
- Some argue that he only stated this because at the time he wrote the government was still controlled by the Tsars, who would have persecuted any mass or open socialist party
- Even if this is the case, Lenin still shows later on his ‘true colours’

**The 1921 Rebellion**

- In 1921, there was a rebellion by workers and sailors, who wanted increased worker involvement in the government
- The rebels were repressed by Lenin and Trotsky
- The Communist Party did realise, however, that they were losing the support of those who were supposed to be their main supporters, namely the workers
- In order to combat this, they adopted two separate policies

**The Beginning of Repression**

- In the economic sphere, they loosened up, introducing the New Economic Policy
- In the political sphere, however, they went the other way, clamping down on other political parties and factionalism within the communist party
Up until 1921, other political parties were legal, and the communists were even in coalition with another party.

In 1921, however, other parties were outlawed, and the USSR became a single-party state.

It was at this time that Lenin began to show his ‘true-colours’, and act rather authoritarian.

**Socialism in One Country**

- Lenin was internationalist in his outlook, believing that it could never succeed unless a majority of advanced industrialised states were communist.
- Once the world revolution failed to occur, Stalin adopted the new policy of Socialism in One Country; another justification for this was the concern about renewed western invasion.

**The Soviet Government**

**Key Features**

- Terror, especially under Stalin
- No structural unemployment
- Planned and centralised economy
- No rule of law
- Centralised one-party system
- Architecture and literature focused on gigantiture, and ‘socialist realism’

**The Nomenclature System**

- The nomenclature system involved a list of all the important positions and occupations in society.
- Any appointments or removals of people on this list had to be approved by the party.
- This system, for example, allowed the Communists to control the media, as the editors were on this nomenclature list.
- Another factor that aided the rise of the communists was Lenin’s exemplary public speaking ability, and his ability to encapsulate popular sentiment in simple phrases (for example, ‘peace, land and bread’).

**The USSR as a Totalitarian System**

- Had chiliastic ideology; communism and Marxism-Leninism
- Single-mass party led by a dictator
- State terror, particularly during the Stalin error (KGB)
- A near monopoly of communications (Pravda, artistic censorship)
- A very highly centrally planned economy
- Expansionism
- Political control of the judiciary

**Reasons for Collapse**

- Imperial overstretch
- Economic problems
- Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin – refolution, the idea that a leader begins are reform process, and then loses control
- Loss of legitimacy
Early Theories of the USSR

Origins of Totalitarian Theory of the USSR

- The discipline of Soviet Studies originated in the USA around the late 1940s, just as the Cold War was beginning, 121
- Many of these early studies were conducted in whole or in part by defence or intelligence agencies, and tended to draw in academics who generally agreed with Washington’s perspective of the world, and generally big supporters of containment, 121-122
- In this environment, it is not surprising that the dominant model that emerged of the Soviet Union was that of a centrally controlled totalitarian state, comparable to Nazi Germany, 132
- Emphasis was placed on methods of rule and indoctrination like the education system, military, the party, dictatorship, and administrative controls, 122

Factors Causing Totalitarianism

- The following factors were identified by George Kennan as contributing to the rise of totalitarianism in Germany and Russia, 124
- The large size of the two nations, 124
- The impact of WWI, which strained the systems of both nations, 124
- The late survival of feudal institutions, and corresponding late and imperfect development of bourgeois-democratic institutions, 124
- The strong development of romantic nationalism in the nineteenth century, 124
- The fact that both Russia and Germany were great military powers that were characterised by high levels of centralisation and bureaucratization, 124

Authoritarian and Totalitarian

- Carl Friedrich has argued that authoritarian and totalitarian are, in some sense at least, opposites, rather than close points on a continuum, 125
- This is because totalitarianism involves the elimination of all traditional sources of authority, and their replacement by the state, 125
- All societies have some degree of authoritarianism, but totalitarian states seek to destroy this and replace it with a new kind of complete social control, 125

Totalitarian Art

- Italy, Germany and Russia all utilised similar forms of ‘totalitarian art’ in order to promote their state agenda, 126-127
- Art in these states had to take sides, glorify the leader, serve the state, and dramatize its ideology, 127
- As such, the main point of totalitarian art was the content, with the form only serving to help bring this content to as wide an audience as possible, 27
- The result of all this political pressure is that this ‘totalitarian art’ has been described as ‘glib, mendacious, stereotype realism’, 127

Reactionary Theories

Move Away From Totalitarian Models

- Around the beginning of the 1960s, there was a move away from the use of the simple ‘totalitarianism’ model to describe the soviet union, 128
It was argued that this model did not have room to see the changes that took place in the Soviet Union over time, especially before, during and after Stalin, 128.

It was also argued that the USSR should not be studied in isolation, but needed to be considered alongside other authoritarian states like China, Turkey, and Egypt, in a broader comparative approach, 128.

**The New Left and Totalitarian Models**

- The 1960s saw the rise of a new generation, among them historians and political scientists, who were much more sceptical than their forebears had been of the moral superiority of the US, 129.
- Third World leftist revolutionaries like Fidel Castro and Che Guevara were romanticised, 129.
- At the same time, American ‘imperialism’ was denounced, and they were given a larger share of the blame for the instigation of the Cold War, 129-131.
- In this environment, many such leftists began to argue that the USSR was not really totalitarian, and especially that it should not be compared to fascism (a comparison that was very embarrassing to their neo-Marxism movement), 130-131.
- The influence of these ideas on Soviet studies usually was not deliberate or conscious, as many people in this field were not leftists, but broad social and ideological movements such as this cannot but help to have an effect, 132.

**Changes in the Soviet Union**

- Developments within the USSR also played an important role in changing the western perceptions of the Soviet regime, 131-132.
- Firstly, there was a clear reduction in the intensity, or at very least the obviousness and openness, of Soviet terror after the death of Stalin, 131.
- Secondly, the instigation in the 1960s of academic exchange programs allowed western scholars to spend some lengths of time in the USSR, which had not been possible before, 131-132.
- They increasingly saw that, while the state was intrusive, it was not the totalitarian monster depicted in nineteen eighty-four, 132.
- They also saw that Soviet citizens had not all been totally atomised, but retained some degree of civil society, not being merely passive receptors of the party’s orders, 132.

**Comparative Communism**

- The rise of social science approaches to political science in the 1960s also contributed to a growing feeling about the oversimplicity and inaccuracy of the totalitarian, totally top-down, terror-based, dictator-controlled model of the Soviet Union, 132-135.
- It was felt that what was necessary was to treat the Soviet Union much more like an ordinary western nation, and analyse the social networks, political relationships, patronage, and other such issues in a more systematic way, rather than just ignoring them, 133.
- Robert Tucker argued that the totalitarian model encouraged people to focus more on the structural, outward uniformities between totalitarian states, while ignoring their diverse cultural, economic and social systems and heritages, 133.
- This would be like characterising the US, India, the UK and Venezuela as all being basically alike because they share such intuitions as freedom of the press, elected parliaments, government controls, multiple political parties, managed free markets and independent judiciary, 133.

**Pluralist Totalitarianism**

- Scholars contested the notion that the party totally dominated all social and political life in the USSR, arguing that intellectuals, jurists, managers, representatives of the nationalities, scientists,
the military, and factions within the party itself all acted to shape state policy at different times and in different ways, 134

- It was observed that the Soviet bureaucracy was perhaps best conceived of not as a ruling class, but as an educated middle class with a variety of interests and internal conflicts, 134
- Overall, it was clear that there were many different ‘factions’ in soviet politics, and so models that incorporated only dictatorship and mass terror were clearly outdated, 134

**Changes in Communist Nations**

- Another criticism was that the totalitarian model was totally incapable of explaining the changes that occurred within the USSR and other communist states over time, 135
- It was agreed that totalitarianism aptly described the early phases of these regimes, but that this was mostly tied up in the need to mobilize the population for rapid industrialisation, 135
- Once this had been achieved, the revolutionary elite became bureaucratised, and society became more diverse and complex, 135
- Communist states in particular faced the unique problem of conflict between those who wanted to continue to push the radical revolution, and those more conservative individuals who preferred to use less coercion and more material incentives and generally settle down to govern what they had established, 136
- Thus, once the communist party realises that it has reached the end of its revolutionary potential, it becomes extinct as a conservative bureaucracy, 136
- An extension of this idea that repression was diminishing and pluralism increasing was that the USSR was gradually converging towards western states, and that really the two were just different types of modern society, fundamentally not totally different, 136-137
- It has even been argued that even under stalin, there were those who benefitted from his policies and those who did not, thereby instigating various kinds and degrees of support or opposition to the regime that could be characterised as a type of civil society, 141

**Section 3: Mixed Regimes**

**3.1 Transitional States**

**Introduction to Transitional States**

**What is a Transitional State?**

- A transitional state is one in rapid transition between one political system and another
- In transitional states, there is generally a sudden and distinct break; it is not merely a slow change over time
- Most analysts are only concerned with the transition to democracy

**Examples of Transitions**

- Latin America: (Argentina – military junta 1976-83; Brazil – populist and military junta 1930-85; Chile – military dictatorship 1973-90; Uruguay – military dictatorship 1973-85)
- Southern Europe: (Spain – Franco dictatorship late-1930s-1975; Portugal – Salazar-Caetano dictatorship 1932-74; Greece – Colonels’ regime 1967-74)
- Post-Communism: (former Eastern Europe – Communist since 1940s; former USSR – most of it Communist since 1917; Afghanistan – Communist since 1978; Mongolia – Communist since 1924; Cambodia – communist since 1975; plus lots of disputed cases in Africa)
Post-Communist Transitions
- Claus Offe argued that post-communist transitions are different from other revolutions in that they tend to be non-violent and non-military
- Another anomaly is the absence of revolutionary counter-elites, and also the absence of ‘big theory’ ideologies (like communism or fascism)
- Though the revolutionary leaders certainly had ideologies and goals (e.g. democracy), often these ideas were not very well defined, thought out, or agreed upon
- Claus also developed the idea of ‘triple transition’: simultaneous economic, political and identity changes
- An example of the latter case is the fact that Russians had to get used to the idea that they were no longer part of a bigger entity, the Soviet Union

Features of a Transitional State
- Generally neither very affluence nor very poor (e.g. communist nations, Latin America, Southern Europe)
- Can come from left wing or light wing political background
- Culturally very diverse – could be catholic, muslim, orthodox, protestant
- Politically there is disagreement. The majority view is that they are democratising; but analysts such as Jacques Rupnik and Thomas Carothers argue that they move in different directions (e.g. Belarus; Turkmenistan)

Hybrid Versus Transitional States
- A transitional state has made a (reasonably) clean, explicit and rapid break from the past and is attempting overtly to establish and consolidate a new type of political system (most frequently democracy)
- A hybrid system is a mixed system, combining elements of the system it already has with elements of a very different system
- The hybridisation may occur following a clear-cut break, or it may happen gradually
- Both types of system are inherently unstable, but may survive for some time if the economy is performing well and/or if the state exercises high levels of coercion
- A hybrid system may over time transit fully from the original type of system to the new one

Democratic Transition
What is a Democratic Transition?
- A democratic transition is complete when sufficient agreement has been reached about political procedures to produce a freely and popularly elected government that has the defacto power to generate new policies that does not have to be shared with other bodies, 77
- This definition highlights the importance of distinguishing between liberalisation and democratisation, 77

Democratisation versus Liberalisation
- Liberalisation can refer to a wide variety of policies designed to reduce social or political control, such as reduced censorship, greater freedom for trade unions or religions, the introduction of some legal safeguards, release of political prisoners, toleration of an opposition, etc, 77
- Democratisation requires liberalisation, but is broader in scope, and more specifically political
- Democratisation requires open contestation of the right to govern via free, competitive elections, 77
Hence, it is clear that there can be liberalisation without democratisation, 77

**Non-Completed Democratisation**
- It is also quite possible for democratisation to begin but never be completed, 78
- One of the most common examples of this is when a ruling party or military junta introduces free elections, but retains such significant political and constitutional prerogatives that they are still the true sovereigns, 78
- The need to reach agreement about a particular constitutional arrangement is also important because if the political elites and population as a whole cannot give support and legitimacy to at least the basic architecture of the new regime, then it is unlikely to succeed for long, 78
- Having this clear definition is also useful as a ‘fixed goal post’ for what must be done before a democratic transition can be said to be complete, and reforms said to be enough, 78
- Even once a democratic transition is complete, additional requirements must be met before we can say that the democracy has been consolidated, 78

**Three Requirements for a Consolidated Democracy**
- Behaviourally, there must be so significant national, social, economic, political or institutional actors that spend significant resources attempting to achieve their objectives by creating a nondemocratic regime or tuning to violence or foreign interventions to secede from the state, 79
- Attitudinally, a democratic regime is consolidated when a strong majority of public opinion holds the belief that democratic procedures and institutions are the most appropriate way to govern society, and that any support for system alternatives is small and marginalised, 79
- Constitutionally, a democratic regime is consolidated when government and nongovernment institutions became habituated, internalized and subjected to conflict resolution within the realm of specific laws and procedures sanctioned by the democratic process, 79
- It is possible for a consolidated democracy to later break down, but this would not be the result of some weakness or specific problem related to the transition process, but to some new development or problems that the democratic regime fails to solve, leading to the rise in support for nondemocratic alternatives, 79

**Democracy as a System**
- All five of these arenas must be properly operational for a successful democracy to function, 82
- As such, it is more appropriate to view democracy as an interacting system, rather than a simple regime, 82
- No single arena can function fully or properly without some support from all the other arenas, 82

**Democratic Consolidation**

**What is Consolidation?**
- Holmes defines transition as a two phase process, consisting of transformation followed by consolidation
- In simple terms, transformation involves the establishment of the rules, deciding what kind of economy, government, and institutional arrangements are to be adopted, with the influence of the old regime still being very important
- During the consolidation phase, the rules have been established, and the government begins to introduce actual reforms in the political and economic system
- The general idea is that transitional states are moving towards democracy, though there is some
dispute about this (for example, a number of the post-communist states are still authoritarian)

**Factors Aiding Consolidation**
- Strong economic performance
- Elite commitment – the elites must believe what they are doing
- A conducive global economic climate, to help with investment and trade
- Involvement in international organisations, such as the necessity of democratising before Spain
  and Portugal could join the EU

**Requirements for Consolidation**
- Przeworski argued that consolidation is complete when democracy is the ‘the only game in town’
- State: without the existence of the state, or if large parts of society do not identity with the
  state or want to join another state, then there cannot be a properly consolidated democracy
- Free and lively civil society
- Autonomous and valued political activity
- Rule of law that guarantees rights
- State bureaucracy that is usable by the elected government
- Institutionalised economic society
- Offe argued that a mark of consolidation is that major political debates are no longer about the
  basic rules, but are under them
- Some argue that regular competitive elections are the only necessary condition for democracy,
  whereas other argue that many other criteria are also necessary, such as free media, civil society,
  etc

**Civil Society**
- Civil society refers to all the social groups and movements that operate independently from the
  state, 79
- These groups can include women’s groups, churches, intellectual organisations, trade unions,
  entrepreneurial groups, etc, 79
- Civil society can also refer to ordinary citizens, insomuch as they become involved in rallies or
  protests that may assist in regime change, as for instance occurred in Latin America and Eastern
  Europe, 80

**Political Society**
- Political society is distinct from civil society in that it refers specifically to the arena in which
  actors contest to gain control of the government, 80
- Civil society may be able to disrupt or even destroy governments, but they cannot replace them
  with any new government without entering the realm of political society, 80

**Civil Versus Political Society**
- Some theorists establish a false conflict between civil and political society, perhaps arguing that
  after the democratic transition has been completed, then civil society has done its work, and
  can now demobilise, 80
- This falsely assumes that civil society must always be in fundamental opposition to the state,
  working towards its demise, rather than as a force which helps to shape the government,
  keeping it within bounds and in line with public wishes, 80
• On the other hand, some leaders of civil society view the process of compromise and disagreement that characterises politics with distaste, 81
• What they fail to see is that the mediation between and arrival at a compromise among different groups is the very purpose of a democratic regime; it is not a sign of weakness, 81

Respect for Rule of Law
• These two requirements for civil and political society must also be accompanied by a widespread respect and support for the basic institutional structure and rule of law, so that all significant actors agree to bind themselves within the restrictions of the laws and constitution, 81

Functioning Bureaucracy
• Modern democracy also requires the effective capacity to maintain its monopoly of the legitimate use of force and the safeguard of the rules of law and basic rights, 81
• In order to do this, it requires judges, police, a military, and other administrators, 81
• Hence, it must have a functioning bureaucracy that is controllable by the democratic government, 81
• This last condition is very important, because it is not always met in cases where the former ruling party had effectively become merged with the state bureaucracy, for example in the former communist world, 81

Economic Society
• By economic society, we mean a set of generally accepted socio-political institutions, norms and regulations that mediate between the state and the market, 81
• This is an important criteria because of the empirical fact that there has never been a consolidated democracy that is either a command economy (except in wartime) or a pure market economy, 81
• There is also a strong theoretical basis for thinking that a nontrivial degree of market autonomy, ownership and diversity is necessary for the existence of a lively and independent civil society that is necessary for a democracy, 81
• Also, if all property and production decisions is in the hands of the state, there is little or no possibility for any type of independent civil society to exist or do anything, 81-82
• On the other hand, the very fact the democracy involves free and open contestation and compromise between different groups means that it is virtually certain that sooner or later policies will be adopted to provide public goods, redistribute income, ban certain controversial activities, etc, 82

The Process of Democratization
• The process of democratisation is highly uncertain – really it is better described as a process of ‘inconclusive struggles’ that may, if all goes well, lead to democracy, 32
• An important factor that determines if democratisation is successful or not is the nature of the elites who come to power after the old regime is overthrown, 32
• The international situation and context can also play an important role, 32
Democratization in Southern Europe

Italy: From Consensus to Conflict, 1945-48
- The very first post-war government in Italy was a national unity government that was in power from June 1945 to June 1946, and whose main task was the purge of fascist and Nazi activists and collaborators, 32-33
- Elections were first held in June 1946, which gave the Christian Democratic Party a majority over the socialists, 33
- A referendum was also held concerning the nature of the new government: 54% voted for a Republic, and 46% for a monarchy, 33
- This was very much split on geographic lines, with support for the monarchy strong in the south, and support for the republic strong in the north, 34
- There was some tension immediately after the result, with concerns of an imminent military coup, but in the end the results were accepted, and the new constitution came into force in 1948, 34
- The democratic transition in this case was greatly aided by the leader of the communist party, who urged his party to remain moderate and accept the election results, 34
- Very evident in this transition are the common themes of nature and temperament of the political elites, international political situation, and chance all playing a big role, 34

Democratic Consolidation in Italy
- Much of the Italian political elite was forced to resign in 1992, following widespread revelations of corruption, clientelism, and Mafia connections within the political parties and the government, 41
- The political system before this time had been based on a few key pillars, including the domination of the DC in coalition with various other parties, the exclusion of the communists from any governmental positions, and the centrality of parliament over the fragmented and ineffectual party structures, 41-42
- This inability to form a stable party structure was responsible for the series of fifty governments that Italy had between 1948-1992, none of them lasting very long, 42
- However, this rapid political change was not overly disruptive because it was generally the same people in power, just moved around between cabinet positions, etc, 42
- This also applied on a party basis: it was generally the same few parties that made up the government each time, it is just that no particular combination was particularly stable, 42

Portugal: The Revolutionary Transition, 1974-6
- A series of military and political advances by African liberation movements threatened Portugal’s economic stability and led to the overthrow of the Caetano government by a group of Portuguese army officers in 1974, Encarta
- A seven-man junta, under General António de Spinola, was installed and promised democracy at home and peace for the African territories, Encarta
- Thence followed a complicated struggle involving the military, the political parties, and various social movements, 35
- Eventually an agreement was signed whereby the parties agreed to participate in free elections under the supervision of the military, 35
- The socialists won a plurality of the vote, and were able to stabilise the system by charting a middle course between the communists on the one side and the military on the other, 35-36
Democratic Consolidation in Portugal

- The early Portuguese post-revolution coalition governments were too weak, fragmented and inexperienced to push through any significant reforms or accomplishments, 43
- Political stability was also diminished by the interference of the president in parliamentary and political affairs, 43
- This problem was finally solved when in 1982 a coalition government adopted a new constitution that removed many of the powers of the president, making him into an essentially ceremonial figure, 43-44
- This change, coupled with the beginning of the move towards European integration and the rise to power of a competent and popular leader helped to consolidate Democracy in Portugal, 44

Spain: The Consensual Transition

- The democratic transition in Spain was heavily influenced by the recent events in Portugal, 37
- At the same time, it proceeded differently from events in Portugal, in that the transition was affected largely by a consensual ‘transition through transaction’, or mutual agreement between the old and new elites, 37
- Franco’s death and the succession of King Juan Carlos I were followed by several months of political ambiguity. The new king favoured full democratization, but many powerful interests were against change, Encarta
- The deadlock was broken in July 1976 when Prime Minister Navarro resigned at the request of Juan Carlos, who then appointed Adolfo Suárez González in his stead, 37
- Adolfo Suárez was chiefly responsible for the transition to democracy, managing to deliver compromises acceptable to all political parties, and the general public, 37
- In 1977 he was able to convince the very reluctant military to allow him to legalise the communist party, and was aided by the moderate, pro-monarchy stand of the communists, 38
- He was finally able to get a new constitution passed in 1978, 38

Democratic Consolidation in Spain

- The early years of Spanish democracy saw many threats, including Basque terrorism, left-wing insurrection, and the danger of a military coup, 44-45
- This latter event almost occurred in 1981, but was resisted by the king and failed, 45
- Eventually the situation stabilised when in 1982 the socialist party won an absolute majority in both houses of parliament, and so was able to establish a stable government, 44-45

Greece: A Hegemonic Transition, 1974-5

- Constantine Karamanlis, former Prime Minister of Greece from 1955-1963, was recalled from exile following the resignation of the military government to lead the nation back to democracy, 39
- A managed to win a majority for his party in parliament, put through a new constitution, make compromises with the other parties, and avoid another military coup, 39-40

Transition in Post-Communism Poland

Why Poland Succeeded

- Democratic consolidations is more likely to occur when the citizens regard the emerging democratic regime as historically legitimate, continuing on an earlier democratic and/or liberal legacy, 68
This was the case in post-communist Poland, where democracy was viewed as a continuation of practices of the Poland-Lithuania Commonwealth, and especially the interwar democracy.

Another factor aiding the transition to democracy was the fact that a majority of Poles believed that democratisation was a corequisite for economic reform, which was self-evidently necessary as by the late 1980s the Polish economy was in shambles, with massive rates of inflation, food shortages and a crushing foreign debt.

Poles also see becoming a democracy as a necessary prerequisite of becoming a ‘normal state’, and joining the western political, economic and military institutions.

Historically, Poles have seen themselves as a unique and distinct people, recalcitrant of central authority (especially foreigners), and a bastion of Catholic Latin Civilization on the doorsteps of Russia.

For example, during the period of Russian rule in the 19th century, Polish aristocrats and intellectuals developed an insurrectionary tradition, manifested in the uprisings of 1794, 1830, 1863 and 1918.

The First Polish Republic

The period of Polish independence between the wars gave the country experience with such things as party politics, elections, independent foreign policy, and a market economy.

At the time, the state faced too many challenges to remain stable: it had to integrate territories formally ruled by three different states, each with unique administrative and economic infrastructures, defend itself from irredentist claims from said states, combat economic underdevelopment and low literacy, and deal with ethnic minorities.

The memory of this time, however, helped Poland in its second attempt at democracy.

Wartime and Soviet Poland

Despite its enormous losses, the war actually had a number of beneficial effects for Poland.

Firstly, the Holocaust, expulsion of Germans from the west, and loss of territories to the east combined to make the new Poland and ethnically homogenous state, thereby eliminating a large source of instability and conflict.

Secondly, persecution by first the Nazis and then the Soviets decimated the ranks of the nobility and intellectuals, thereby effectively wiping out the Polish class system.

Finally, the loss of territory in the east helped Poland to see itself more as a central European state, with the potential to look more to the west than the east in future.

During the Soviet era, dissident Polish intellectuals equated Communism with Russian domination, and saw true Polish identity as being west-European, Catholic and democratic.

Another important consequence of the Soviet era was rapid urbanisation and a rise in education levels.

The Rise of Solidarity

Solidarity split up in 1990 as Wałęsa competed in the presidential election against former Solidarity allies.

Wałęsa won by a large majority, but was unclear about what he wanted to make of his office; this led to an ambiguous definition of presidential, prime ministerial, and parliamentary powers in the 1992 “Little Constitution”.

Post-Communist Poland thus suffered from a confused, unstable, and conflict-ridden political process.
Parliamentary Elections

- Proportional representation adopted for the 1991 election produced a Sejm composed of 29 political parties, none with a clear majority, and nine of whom only won a single seat, 78-79
- This fragmentation made it impossible to form a strong government, and the two years after the elections were marked by a series of weak and ineffectual coalition governments, 80
- Finally, a parliamentary vote of no confidence in the government forced the calling of another election in 1993, 80
- This election adopted a much stricter voting requirement for parliamentary representation, and had a special provision granting extra seats to the largest parties, 80-81
- This had the desired effect of drastically reducing the number of parties in parliament (down to seven), and concentrating the holding of seats much more, 81
- The DLA and the PPP (made up of ex-communists) polled one third of the vote, but thanks to these new provisions they actually won two-thirds of the seats in the lower-house, and three quarters of the seats in the senate, 81-82
- Because the tight election rules had prevented any of the right wing or catholic parties from gaining representation, there was widespread opposition to the perceived bias in favour of the ‘reds’, and statements to the effect that the existing parliament was not representative enough to adopt a new constitution, 82

The Constitution and Powers of the Presidency

- During Lech Walesa’s presidency, the provisional nature of existing constitutional law, as well as its deliberate vagueness regarding the division of power between president and parliament, led to a ferocious and prolonged struggle for power, 82-83
- In late 1992, Walesa managed to get passed a somewhat more permanent ‘Little Constitution’, which adopted a hybrid split of power between the parliament and the president, 83
- Lech Walesa’s goal had been to establish a system with a strong presidency, on the French model, and he did succeed in gaining significant powers, including the ability to initiate legislation, refuse to sign bills passed by parliament into law, and control over the defence, internal affairs, and foreign affairs ministries, 83
- The president was also granted the power to declare martial law for three months, dissolve parliament if no government can be formed, take an active role in forming the government if parliament experiences difficulties, and to take the ‘leading role’ in matters of security and foreign affairs, 84
- At the same time, the Little Constitution granted additional powers to the government, including the power to pass decrees on a number of matters, to make various appointments without presidential approval, the requirement for PM countersignature on most presidential decrees, and the ability for the parliament to impeach the president, 85
- Various factions have been pushing for the adoption of a more permanent ‘Big Constitution’, but continual power struggles between parliament and president, as well as various divisions over social policy, have stalled the implementation of this, 86

Civil Society and the Media

- Civil society has expanded rapidly in Poland since 1989, as evidenced by the proliferation of political, cultural, professional, student and other organisations, 99
- There were also independent churches and charity groups, labour unions and farm cooperatives, 99
Another important area of progress toward democratic consolidation has been the explosion of free media, following the abolition of censorship in 1990, 99
Private newspapers and radio stations have multiplied, many of them with significant amounts of foreign ownership, 99-100

**Democratic Consolidation in Progress**
- Successful democratisation requires the accountability and responsibility of those in power, and the political participation of the people, 102
- In order for this to be obtained, necessary prerequisites include competitive elections, a stable constitutional framework, and functioning political parties, 102
- The emergence of a politically active civil society is also important, and this was certainly aided by the trade-union based struggle against communism throughout the 1980s, 103
- Overall democratisation in Poland has been a success, in particular the fact that they have been able to pursue economic reforms in spite of frequent political uncertainties and upheavals, 103
- The process has also been assisted by the west, and the overall goal of integration with western political, economic and military structures, 104

**Current Problems**
- Leaders still squabble with each other frequently
- There is still no properly consolidated party system, with many small parties complicating the system
- Poland has also become caught up on the issue of lustration, or prevention of old communist party leaders from entering government or civil service
- This distracted attention from more important matters, and eliminated a good deal of political and administrative experience from use
- Many analysts argue that Poland has focused too much on the past, not looking forward enough to the future

3.2 Politics in China

The Revolution and Civil War

**Qing Reaction to Western Influence**
- Premodern China reacted to western imperialism and encroachment in basically the same way as all other societies; it gave up its traditional institutions grudgingly, realising that they were no longer suited to global competition with the west, 271
- As is typical with other societies (compare UK to France to Germany to Russia), the highly underdeveloped and backward Chinese placed a great deal of emphasis and reliance on the role of the state in promoting development, 272

**Weakness of Chinese Emperors**
- Unfortunately for China, it began to come under significant western pressure at the exact wrong time in its dynastic cycle; the middle region where emperors were not great but not totally incompetent, 273-274
- If ambitious and powerful emperors like Qianlong had been in power, china would have been much more likely to react well and rejuvenated itself in response to western encroachment, 274
- On the other hand, if the dynasty had been about to collapse, it is likely a stronger, more effective dynasty would soon have come to power in its stead, 273-274
As it was, Chinese leadership was too weak to come up with an effective response to the west, but still strong enough to struggle along for some decades, 274

**The Overthrow of the Qing**
- The Qing dynasty was eventually overthrown by a revolutionary movement led by Sun Yat-sen, an American trained doctor who believed that Chinese need to be transformed into a modern democratic country that could protect itself from the west, 274
- However, political turmoil prevented Sun from enacting his dream, and the country was for a time ruled by the general Yuan Shikai, who attempted to re-establish the old order with himself as emperor, 274
- After Yuan died in 1916, China was split into territories controlled by competing warlords

**Founding and Ideology of the KMT**
- Sun Yat-sen established the KMT from his base in southern China, and even sought Soviet support for the training of his officers, 274
- A military academy for the movement was established, which then came under the command of the general Chian Kai-shek
- Sun was torn between his liberal ideal and his growing belief that a strong state would be necessary to achieve his objectives, 274
- This indecision was mirrored in the party itself by a disagreement over whether the party would adopt a Soviet model or German-statist approach to development, 275

**The Rise of the KMT**
- During the early 1920s the KMT movement gradually grew in strength, though it was also heavily infiltrated by communists on orders from the Soviet government, 275
- Following Sun’s death in 1925, the Kuomintang, now under the leadership of the young general Chiang Kai-shek, launched a military expedition from its base in Guangzhou in 1926, 275
- They succeeded in capturing the lands south of the Yangzi river, 275
- Relations between the left and right factions of the KMT soon became strained, and in just the Kuomintang completed the reunification of China early in 1928, Chiang conducted a bloody purge of the party’s Communist membership, 275
- Thenceforth he relied upon support from the propertied classes and foreign powers, 275
- The period 1928 to 1936 is considered to be the ‘golden age’ of KMT rule, a time of industrial and commercial expansion and relative stability, 275

**Communists and the Long March**
- The communists then became rebels in the country’s mountainous regions, where they tried to gain the support of peasants by appealing to their desire for land redistribution, 275
- In 1934 the communists were forced to abandon their southern base in Jiangxi and commence the ‘Long March’ to establish a new northern base at Yanan, 275
- It was during this march that Mao was able to obtain leadership over the CCP, 275

**Japanese Invasion and KMT-CCP Relations**
- Things might have developed very differently had it not been for the all-out Japanese invasion of the country in 1937, 275
- Mao proved to be more capable of appealing to nationalism and generating support from amongst Chinese intellectuals, who thus became increasingly fed up with Chiang’s campaign to wipe out the communists, 276
Following Chiang’s kidnapping in 1936, we were last convinced to arrange a ceasefire with the communists and instead focus on the threat of Japan, 276

The Defeat of the KMT

- The fragmented and outdated Chinese forces proved unable to put up much resistance against the Japanese, and thus the KMT was forced into adopting a policy of ‘trading space for time’, 276
- As the KMT retreated from the countryside and the Japanese proved unable to penetrate it, there was a power vacuum that was successfully exploited by the communists, 276
- By the end of the war, the KMT forces were exhausted and in no shape to conduct a civil war
- At the same time, inflation and corruption had undermined the legitimacy of the KMT, while the communists gained substantial peasant support on the basis of their land-reform policy, 276
- In the end, the KMT was defeated in a number of decisive campaigns, and they were forced to retreat to Taiwan, 276

Political Trends in Communist States

The KMT in Taiwan

- The KMT adopted a model of state rule very similar to that used in Japan and Germany, emphasising nationalism, authoritarianism and technocratic capitalism, 276
- In large part this was because they believed that large-scale state involvement would be necessary for modernisation, but relied too heavily on the support and cooperation of the gentry, intellectuals and international investors to try anything truly revolutionary, 276-77
- Unlike the communists, the nationalists came mostly from upper and middle class backgrounds, and had deep respect for the cultural history of China and Chinese values, 277
- Thus, they criticised the communist focus on ‘class struggle’, and appealed instead to nationalism for legitimacy, 277

Authoritarian vs Totalitarian State Policy

- Ironically, although the KMT and the CCP adopted very different approaches to the government and development of China, increasingly the pressures of the global political and economic environment have led to the convergence of their two systems to a significant degree, 272
- Taiwan’s greater exposure to the west and its heavy reliance on the United States however have ensured that its transition to free market democracy has occurred more rapidly, 272-273
- Interestingly, the communists themselves did not have much success until during the war with Japan they combined their idea of class struggle with peasant-based nationalism, 277
- The statist authoritarian state model was pursued quite successfully by the KMT in Taiwan until the pressures of modernisation and the US led them to turn to a democratic liberal model, 277-278
- At around the same time, the disaster of the cultural revolution convinced the PRC leadership to switch from a communist authoritarian model to a nationalistic authoritarian technocratic model similar to that being abandoned by Taiwan, 277-278

Developmental Stages of the Communist Regime

- The USSR and Communist China both went through similar stages of political and social development, 279-280
First came the initial period of radical transformation, when the revolutionary elites set about remaking society according to their desires, nationalising industry and establishing a single party state, 279-280. This initial period was inevitably led by a single powerful dictator, who used elaborate spy networks, secret police, purges and other terror tactics to maintain their power, 280. Over time, however, the nation as a whole and also the party leadership become weary with this intense system, and once this dictator dies a reform is initiated, 280. The reform period usually involves a reduction in the use of terror and role of the secret police, a diminution of the party’s total control over all aspects of society, and some loosening of the central planning apparatus, 280. This reform, however, breeds liberal ideas and leads to calls for even further liberalisations. In response, the state enters the consolidation phase, where a conservative technocratic regime takes power whose aim is to preserve the essential structures and institutions of the regime with minimal change, 280. Reforms are halted, and maybe even reversed in some areas, but there is no attempt to return to widespread terror or major reform, 280. The USSR entered this phase with Brezhnev, while China entered it following the death of Deng, 280.

Difference between China and USSR

- One key difference between the reform processes in China and the USSR has been that the planning model was much more strongly discredited in China than in the USSR, and so economic reforms in China were much more radical (they were also influenced by the Asian Tigers), 297.
- The model of authoritarian developmental capitalism that has been adopted now in China, with strategic state manipulation of the private corporate sector, is very similar to that adopted by NICs in East Asia like South Korea, Singapore and Taiwan, 297-298.
- In order to maintain the dynamism and effectiveness of their communist political hierarchy, the Chinese have adopted a system of mandatory retirement ages for various levels of the bureaucracy and party hierarchy – this has been effective at preventing the petrifaction that occurred in the Soviet leadership, 298.

Will China Become Democratic?

- One encouraging sign that they may be heading in this direction is the recent introduction of competitive (though not multiparty) elections at the village level, 299.
- There is potential for the continuing development of existing trends whereby day-to-day affairs at a village or even township level are managed by a committee of elected officials, who in turn are watched over and guided by communist party officials, 299.
- In the short run, however, the legitimacy of the existing authoritarian regime will be buttressed by the continued strong economic performance, 300.
- When or if China reaches a stage when economic growth stagnates or the structural changes go deep enough into society such that strong political participation for liberalization arises, then the pressure for democracy will greatly increase, 300.

Maoist China

The Rise of Mao

- Mao realised that there was no hope for them to establish much of a power base in China’s cities, as the working class was too small and too disinterested to be of much help, 281.
• Instead, he realised that they would have to cater to the peasants, primarily by the promise of land redistribution (as opposed to the creation of communes), 281
• When in 1935 the KMT finally unseated the communists from their Jiangxi base, Mao was able to seize the opportunity to unseat his Moscow-trained rivals (who favoured the traditional urban-based approach), and take control of the party leadership himself, 281
• Upon defeating the Nationalists, Mao embarked upon a massive campaign of social reform, freeing women from their traditional subjugation to men, establishing a command economy, and completely reforming the social hierarchy, 282
• They were able to go much further in their social reforms than had ever been possible under the KMT owing to the fact that they penetrated much deeper into the Chinese rural heartland, 282

Relationship with the Military
• Upon seizing power, the communist party had made sure to consolidate its control over both the government and the military, 283-284
• Although the division of labour was never properly defined, basically the party formulated and approved policy and directed the state, while the government carried out its orders, 283
• The military was packed at all middle and senior levels by party members, and it was controlled at the top by the party’s Central Military Commission, which was virtually always chaired by the country’s paramount ruler, 284-285

Who Rules China
• Identifying the paramount ruler in China has proven to be rather difficult, especially after Mao, as there is not a particular office that he holds all the time, 284-285
• The nominal head of government is the Prime Minister, but he has virtually always been a different figure to the true state leader (even under Mao), 284-285
• The title of president is largely symbolic and during the days of Mao and Deng was held by various individuals, but since the time of Jiang Zemin it seems to have been usually occupied by the paramount leader, 285-284
• The paramount leader is usually the communist party leader and chairman of the party military committee, but even here there is some flexibility, as Deng was never party leader, 284-285

Technocrats vs Party Todies
• Under Mao, there was somewhat of a periodic vacillation between more centralised control of the economy by technocratic officials, and more decentralised control by party cadres, 285-286
• The former prevailed during the early-mid 1950s when they were following the Soviet model, and also during the interval between the Great Leap and the Cultural Revolution, 286

The Great Leap Forward
• Mao launched the Great Leap Forward following his displeasure at what he felt was the revisionism of Khrushchev, and his belief that China could be modernised without foreign help by utilising the spirit and energy of its many people, 282

The Cultural Revolution
• The Cultural Revolution was a struggle between two very different approaches
• The first approach was very egalitarian, pushed by Mao
• The opposing view held that some degree of order and hierarchy was needed in order to modernise the nation
- During the Cultural Revolution, Mao oversaw the arrest and imprisonment of many government officials judged not to be revolutionary enough – in essence, he worked hard to destroy the very institutions he had built up throughout the 1950s, 286
- Mao’s economic priorities were on heavy industry, which were given about one half of all investment over the course of the late 1950s to late 1970s, in spite of the fact that they accounted for only a small portion of national output; agriculture and light industry was neglected, 286-287
- The most extreme phase of the revolution was 1966-1969, but a more moderate version continued until 1976

**Mao’s Incompetent Policies**

- The conflict between Mao and his political enemies was in essence a conflict between cadres and technocrats, party versus state and revolutionaries versus conservatives, 287
- Mao’s policies, however, were not really popular with anyone; they kept the masses poor and terrified, while the party elite were also constantly worried about some new purge or political campaign and were prevented from enjoying material comforts, 288
- Mao’s foreign policies had also set up China as antagonistic to both superpowers, while poverty and an emphasis on revolutionary fervour meant that their military was out of date, 288
- The discrimination against the wealthy and intellectuals had also undermined China’s education system and hence developments in science and technology, 288
- Overall, it was clear to the post-Mao Chinese leadership that significant reforms were needed in order to protect China’s position in the world and their position within China, 288-289

**China After Mao**

**Deng Unleashes Reform**

- Reform began only a month after Mao’s death, with the arrest of the Gang of Four, which was comprised of Mao’s wife and three other ultraleftist politicians, 289
- At the communist party meeting in December 1978, Hua Guofeng was voted out in favour of the radical reformist Deng, 289
- At first there was some conflict between the radical market-oriented reformists led by Deng, and the technocrats led by Chen Yun, who favoured more measured changes designed to maintain stability, 289-290
- The technocrats line was followed only until around 1983, when Deng’s marketisation drive began to be implemented by the new PM Zhao Ziyang, 290

**Tiananmen Square Protests**

- Reforms were slowed somewhat by the Tiananmen Square protests of 1989, which in large part occurred because an impatient student body was beating against the as yet ill-defined boundaries of Deng’s liberalising reforms, 290-291
- The economic upheavals (including inflation and business cycles) that coincided with reform also contributed to the unrest, 290-291
- Ultimately, the heavy-handed government crackdown against the protestors showed clearly the limits of reform, 291
- After this, the technocrats regained power for a time until Deng was able to restart his reforms, 291-292
Although China’s period of intense reform was artificially prolonged by the influence and dynamism of Deng, it did finally come to an end in 1997 with the death of Deng, and the rise of a new generation of more conservative technocratic leadership, 292-293

**Jiang Zemin, Hu Jintao and Neoconservatism**

- This shift toward great stability under Jiang is demonstrated by his efforts to bring inflation and other macroeconomic instabilities under control in the early-mid 1990s, 293
- Jiang’s other policy of firm suppression of all potential political opposition is manifested by his suppression of the Falungong religious movement, whose ability to draw recruits from members of the party, government and military and even stage protests against the government proved very threatening to him, 294
- The transfer of power from Jiang to Hu Jintao between 2002-2004 did not mark any significant changes in economic or political policies, 294
- In general, the newer generations of Chinese leaders are just younger, less experienced and more highly educated, 294
- Indeed, the rise of the first top Chinese leaders to hold PhDs in the early 2000s is representative of this trend towards technocratism, 294

**The Uniformity of Technocratic Leadership**

- Both Jiang and Hu were much less powerful and charismatic and had much less of a personal impact upon Chinese politics than either Mao or Deng; they are more representative of the technocrats than anything else, 295
- All communist technocrats tend to behave more-or-less alike anyway, favouring political stability over growth and material prosperity over ideology; security of power and job tenure is the most important consideration, 296
- Hence, it does not matter so much that Jiang or Hu came to power as opposed to someone else, as they are much more ‘first among equals’ rather than strongmen, 296-297
- Indeed, the focus on stability and slowing of the pace of reform is not only the result of the ideology of the rulers, but also the simple fact that they lack the power to introduce radical reforms that Deng and Mao possessed, 296
- Like the USSR, there is no established means of succession of leadership, and like many communist leaders Mao died in office

**China as Totalitarian?**

- Some liberalisation since Mao, but still relatively high levels of coercion
- As in the Soviet Union, the Chinese operate a nomenclature system to maintain control over all the important posts in society
- Has a single chiliastic (i.e. geared towards long term peace and happiness) ideology, though this has been very much on the backburner since the 1980s
- Has a single mass party, typically led by a dictator (who is the Chinese leader – Hu has been head of the Party since 2002 and Head of State since 2003)
- There are other parties in china, but they are very small and controlled by the government
- State terror: not so much since the 1980s, but still suppression of political opponents and censorship of the internet
- A near monopoly of mass communications – FH Press Freedom score 2009; 85 – Not Free
- Has a centrally directed economy, though more scope for private ownership since 1999
• Expansionism: to some extent (e.g. Tibet and engagement in Africa), but not to the extent of Germany or the USSR
• Total political control of the judicial system (Rio Tinto case 2010?)

**China as a Hybrid System**
• Politically communist, and many call it totalitarian (e.g. Tiananmen 1989; treatment of ethnic minorities), though this is debatable
• Economically: increasingly marketised and privatised (i.e. capitalist); but are still state economic plans, if less detailed and directive than before
• Socially: increasingly like a capitalist or bourgeois system, except that the majority of the population is still rural

### 3.3 Politics in Iran

**Historical Background**

**Introduction**
• Iran is the world’s only theocracy, the only other one of recent times being the Taliban in Afghanistan, 563
• Religious scholars in the Muslim world have always been critical of rulers who strayed too far from Islam, they have very rarely called for outright political control by clerics, 563
• The current Iranian government was established in 1979 following a revolution led by cleric Ruhollah Khomeini, 563
• He argued that sovereignty belongs only to god, and that the shariah takes precedence over human laws, 563

**Twelver Shiism**
• Shiites believe that the legitimate successors to Muhammad were his descendents, known as Imams, 565
• Although some Shiites believe in an unbroken line of imams to the present day, most believe that the twelfth was the last, hence the name Twelver Shiite, 566
• They believe that the last Imam disappeared as a child in 874 AD, and did not die, but rather will return to establish a just world at the end of history, 566
• The disappearance of the last Imam produced a dilemma for the Shiites, as he was the only one to hold legitimate political authority, 566

**Shiites in Power**
• As Shiites were almost always a minority without political power, thus was generally not a significant issue, 566
• This all changed with the rise of the Shiite Safavid dynasty in the 17th century, 566
• At first, the Shiite Ulema were willing to allow the secular Safavid rulers to govern, so long as they did so in accordance with Islamic beliefs, 566
• However, during the chaotic period of the 18th century, when many short-lived dynasties rose and fell indifferent parts of the country, the ulema became increasingly independent and powerful, for instance taking tithing money directly instead of via the state, 566
• The role and function of the ulema somewhat resembles that of the Catholic clergy, except that they are not arranged in a clear, formal hierarchy (though there are less formal rankings), and
there is no clear chain of command, so ulema frequently disagreed with each other about various issues, 566

**The Qajar Dynasty**
- The Qajar dynasty finally emerged victorious from the civil wars in 1798, ruling an area very similar to the modern boundaries of Iran, 566
- For the first century or so of Qajar rule, the shah upheld the official Shiite state religion in return for support from the clergy, 566
- As the 19th century progressed, however, many Iranian intellectuals (i.e. ulemas) began to bemoan the backwardness of their state in comparison with Europe, arguing that this was a cause of their weakness and a threat to their independence, 566-567
- Indeed, it is probably true that the only reason Iran was not colonised is because Britain and Russia were content to leave it as a neutral buffer state between their respective empires, 566
- These reformists argued that the reason for Iran’s backwardness was its authoritarian political system, and that the best way to modernise would be to adopt a rule of law and democratic parliament like the European states, 566-567
- This belief was apparently confirmed by the defeat of authoritarian Russia by Japan, an Asian country but one with a rule of law, 566-567
- Some ulema argued against such notions of foreign imports, but supporters managed to frame them in Islamic terms, 566-567
- The widespread democratic movement eventually forced the Shah to enact a constitution in 1906, 566

**The Pahlavi Monarchy**
- The constitution of 1906 did not bring the progress that was desired, and Iran’s sovereignty was repeatedly violated throughout WWI, 567
- The led in 1921 to the overthrow of the government by Reza Khan, who in 1926 declared himself to be the first Shah of the Pahlavi monarchy, 567
- He initiated an ambitious modernisation program, outlawing veiling and reducing the social and political influence of the ulema, 567
- He was ousted in 1941 by the British owing to his pro-Axis sympathies, and was replaced by his son Mohammad-Reza Shah Pahlavi, 567
- This young Shah, however, at first lacked the authority to truly govern the country, which task instead was carried out over the course of the 1940s and 1950s by varies prime ministers and cabinets, 567-568

**CIA Coup and After**
- In 1951, the Iranian government nationalised the oil industry, which until then had been controlled by a British-owned company that operated almost totally outside the supervision of the state, with very low royalties paid, 568
- Subsequent negotiations with the British government failed to arrive at a satisfactory compromise, and so in 1953 the British, with the help of the CIA, sponsored a coup overthrowing the government, 568
- The Shah then took an increasingly active role in the government, pursuing modernisation and westernisation policies in concern with a generally authoritarian approach, 568
- Both of these policies, however, aggravated the more traditional religious clergy, leading to the outbreak of riots in 1963, 568
These riots were suppressed, and their leader, Ruhollah Khomeini, was exiled, 568
This defeat caused the reformist movement to become radicalised, as they increasingly felt that reform could not be achieved by constitutional means, 568
As the Shah suppressed civil society and other forms of political opposition, the only place where such ideas could freely be debated was in the mosques and other religious circles, this increasing the prominence of religion in the political reform movement, 568

The Islamic Revolution

Small-scale liberalisation reforms begun by the Shah in 1977 in response to the election of US president Jimmy Carter only elicited calls for even more radical reforms, 568-569
By 1979, a coalition of intellectuals, university students and teachers, politically active clerics, and various other merchants and industrial workers was actively calling for the abolition of the monarchy, staging rallies, strikes and leaflet campaigns, 569
At first the Shah vacillated, and eventually was forced to flee the country, 569
Khomeini’s followers were the best organised and most united force, and so they were able to take control over the government and implement a new constitution, 569
Nevertheless, in order to placate the non-religious elements of the revolution, Khomeini retained the parliament elected by universal suffrage, 569
Khomeini’s hold on power was greatly strengthened by the Iran-Iraq war, which enabled him to consolidate his power by calling for national unity against a common enemy, 570

Khomeini’s Political Ideology

In accordance with Khomeini’s ideology, this system gave a critical role for clerical oversight, so that it could be ensured that the country was run in accordance with Islamic law, 569
This was based on Khomeini’s principle of guardianship of the jurisprudent, which held that a cleric specialising in jurisprudence should be president, as they knew Islamic law best, and therefore would be in the best position to enforce it, 569
Such a doctrine is not very well founded in scripture, however, and most Shiite clerics disagree with it, seeing their role as being purely advisory, 569

Institutions of the Islamic Republic

Basic Outline
The Iranian political system is characterised by the coexistence of both elected and appointed officials, reflecting the attempted synthesis of divine and popular sovereignty, 570
Another important factor to consider in relation to the Iranian government is its existence as a rentier state, namely a government that can raise enough revenue from sale of oil (or other natural products), and thus is much less responsive to the demands of society, on whom it is not dependent for taxation revenues, 570
The Leader (religious), chosen by the Assembly of Experts and with an unspecified term of office (generally understood to be until death)
There is also a democratically-elected President (must be male), elected every four years and limited to two terms (last election held June 2009)
The Leader has considerable control over the Council of Guardians, though there is also a unicameral legislature (parliament), the Majlis, elected every four years
However, ‘when push comes to shove’, Iran has a unique doctrine, velayet el-faqih (transl. ‘guardianship of the jurisprudent’ – i.e. by the ulema or clergy), that ranks the power of the Leader over the people’s elected representatives (cf. Plato’s ‘philosopher kings’)
The system can work if Leader and President are basically of similar opinions; if not, there is a real tension (at the moment this condition is met)

**The Leader**
- The leader is the highest authority in Iran, responsible for setting overall national policy, appointing many of the key administrative officials of the state, appointing the head of the judiciary, the director of state controlled media service, and heads of the military, 571
- The leader also controls a number of economic organisations the control significant state resources and subsidies, and so give the ruler great financial freedom, 571
- The leader is appointed for life by the Assembly of Experts, which in turn is elected by popular vote, although always under the oversight and candidate vetting of the Council of Guardians, which in turn is appointed by the leader, 571

**The President**
- The president, who must be a male Twelver Shiite, is elected by popular vote every four years, 571
- The president was mostly ceremonial until the death of Khomeini in 1989, after which time he gained significant executive powers, although remaining subordinate to the leader, 572

**Parliament**
- The Iranian parliament has nearly 300 members elected by popular vote for four-year terms, 572
- Apart from a few special members to represent religious minorities, all MPs must be muslim
- Women are allowed in parliament, and constitute a small but vocal minority of MPs, who have been known to raise and debate women’s issues, 572
- Originally about half of the parliament was composed of clerics, but over time as civil and political society has developed, this proportion has been steadily decreasing, 572
- Although the parliament serves as a forum for open debate and policy proposal, real power is exercised by the Council of Guardians, 573

**Council of Guardians**
- The Council of Guardians consists of six ulema and six lay Muslim layers, 573
- The Council has the right to veto all pieces of parliament legislation if it judges it to contradict either the constitution or Islamic law, with the lay lawyers only allowed to contribute to analysis of constitutional consistency, 573
- All members of the council of guardians are appointed directly or indirectly by the leader, though the lay lawyers are subject to parliamentary approval, 573
- The Council of Guardians also supervises elections for parliament, the presidency, and the Assembly of Experts, 573
- In this way, it is able to remove candidates that it does not consider to be suitable, 573

**Expediency Council**
- The Expediency Council was created by Khomeini in 1988 in order to arbitrate the frequent disputes between Parliament and the Council of Guardians, 573
- Its members are appointed directly by the leader, and are generally chosen from amongst top government officials, 573
- The Expediency Council also has the role of advising the Leader in formulating overall state policy, 573
Iran as a Hybrid System

- Politically: an increasingly fragile mixture of theocracy (unique in the world, though Taliban in Afghanistan was another) and democracy
- Elements of a police state (e.g. against ‘immodestly dressed’ women)
- Have been several purges of liberals, and many political prisoners
- Economically: authorities basically oppose large-scale capitalism (being seen as a western product), and discourages investment by foreigners
- The post-revolution leaders and governments have been volatile (not very consistent) on this, thereby encouraging investment
- The state subsidises many prices, ostensibly in order to maintain social order
- Socially: there was reduction of inequality under Khomeini, but inequality has increased again in recent years (despite strong support for poor from Ahmadinejad)
- Attitudes towards large-scale capitalism has negative effects on the development of a bourgeoisie, hence tending to retard the growth of democracy
- Iran is a very divided society in terms of attitudes towards theocracy and democracy
- The cities are full of many sophisticated, somewhat westernised, educated intellectuals, though in the countryside there is widespread support of the president

Society and Political Culture

Attitudes to Foreigners

- Frequent foreign meddling in Iranian affairs, especially by the Russians, British and Americans (notably the 1953 coup) has made many Iranians susceptible to conspiracy-theory understandings of the international system, 580
- This is why the 1979 taking of hostages at the American embassy was so popular, as it was seen to be fighting back against the conspirators, 580

State Legitimacy

- The two biggest drivers of political socialization in Iran are the family and social group, and government-controlled institutions like the educational system and the military, 583
- As with many such states, state-sanctioned political socialization in Iran focuses on generating national unity while downplaying and hiding political and ethnic differences, 583
- Under the Islamic regime, the school curriculum was Islamized, with mandatory Arabic, religious and revolutionary history courses, and a heavily pro-clerical presentation of the revolution and anti-monarchy outlook, 583
- Textbooks also present the state’s ideal for the family, with women shown veiled, children with Islamic names and families eating by sitting on the floor, 584
- The fact that Iran’s borders were not arbitrarily dictated by colonial powers helps to explain why the state is more legitimate than it is in many African states, although in recent years there has been a rise in ethnic nationalism amongst non-Persian minorities, 581
- There are many Iranians who do not support the theocratic regime, and in large measure they have abstained from much active participation in politics, believing it to be a futile farce, 581

Distrust and Suspicion

- Another important characteristic of Iranian political culture is the high levels of distrust of the government and political opponents, 581
- For example, political opponents will commonly accuse each other of being traitors in league with foreign powers, an attitude that makes compromise difficult, 581
This low level of trust may be related to Iran’s tradition of absolutism and consequent lack of concept of the rule of law, 582

It is this distrust that contributes to the Iranian tendency towards factionalism and consequent lack of formation of political parties, 582

There is also a generally high level of suspicion of large scale private enterprise, in part because all foreign businessmen are viewed with suspicion, in part because many of the wealthiest businessmen of the past were closely connected to the Shah, and in part because the state, owing to its oil revenues, is seen to be in a position to undertake economic development and poverty reduction, 582-583

Islamization of Society

- Efforts to Islamise society have been front and centre of the state’s policies, involving such activities as enforced public veiling of women, banning of alcohol consumption, and severe penalties for adulterers and homosexuals, 598
- On the surface such policies have been effective at generating public compliance, 598
- However, under the surface, drug addiction, prostitution, bootlegging and corruption are commonplace, 598
- Surveys have shown that private religious belief and observance are about the same as they were in the mid 1970s, but public religiosity, such as attendance of Friday prayers, has diminished, thereby demonstrated public resistance to the government’s state-sponsored religious practices, 599
- This is related to a strain of anticlericism that has long existed in Iranian Islam, largely a result of the perception that many clerics are corrupt and hypocritical, 599

Higher Education

- As the universities were seen to be the haven of counter-revolutionary activism, the state closed all universities between 1980 and 1983, 584
- After this time the universities were reopened with strict entrance and religious requirements, and preferential treatment for revolution and war veterans, 584
- The state even tried to alter the university curriculum by promoting concepts such as ‘Islamic Economics’ and ‘Islamic Sciences’, in an effort to combat the perceived anti-Islamic, Eurocentric nature of the mainstream disciplines, 584
- Despite all these efforts, it seems that the state has largely failed to produce a reliable class of staunch supporters, as many of the regime’s opponents are graduates of the state schools and universities, 584
- This fact is also supported by the large student demonstrations of 1999 and 2003, 584

The Role of Religion

- Interestingly, the World Values Survey indicates that Iranians express religiosity to about the same degree as Americans, at notably lower rates than other Muslim states like Egypt, 585
- Religion certainly plays a very prominent role in Iranian political life, with official speeches and announcements filled with religious expressions, and religious observance made public and conspicuous, 585
- State radio and television are also saturated by symbolic Shiite language and references to Shiite and revolutionary history and ideals, 585
- At the same time, religious issues like the role of Islam in public life are still widely contested amongst leading ulema, there being no true leader of the religion as the Catholics have a Pope
• These debates circulate not only amongst the religious scholars and political leaders, but also resonate with ordinary Iranians, 585-586
• Interestingly, most clerics (both historical and modern), have not been interested in involvement in politics, and prefer to remain in their seminaries to teach and study, 586
• Thus, the new regime has actually been intrusive and annoying for many such clerics, as it has tried to monitor the teachings in the seminaries to ensure that they are sufficiently militant and consistent with the regime’s interpretation of Islam, 586

The Mass Media
• The television and radio in Iran are controlled by state officials appointed directly by the leader, and so are very important mechanisms for reflecting the ideology of the regime, 587
• However, in recent years the rise of satellite television has increased the number of Iranian household with access to anti-regime Persian language programming from overseas, such as CNN and BBC, 587
• The state has tried to outlaw satellite dishes, but the law has not been successfully enforced, 587
• For the first decade after the revolution, newspapers were tightly controlled by the regime, but since the death of Khomeini the regime has begun to feel more secure, and hence allowed the proliferation of independent newspapers, 587
• This led to the rise of critical and investigative journalism by many educated persons who criticize the regime and call for more accountability and participation of civil society, 587
• Recently the regime has cracked down on the more radical of these journalists (some have been imprisoned), but many other have turned instead to the internet, 587

Political Actors

Rulers under the Shah
• Under the Shah, the political elite was mostly recruited from the small class of wealthy landowners who could afford to send their children to western universities, and who also demonstrated their loyalty to the regime, 588
• However, the Shah was also careful to quickly remove anyone whom he viewed as a potential threat, 588

Current Leadership
• The post-revolutionary regime mostly relied upon those with strong revolutionary credentials, especially students of Khomeini, 588
• Many of these people were from lower or middle class backgrounds, were younger then the former leaders, and hailed from the provinces, 588
• Increasingly, as the revolutionary generation ages, many of the new recruits into the ruling classes are those who have risen through the ranks of either the military or academia, 589

Islamic Republican Party
• In 1979 followers of Khomeini founded the Islamic Republican Party, whose purpose was to work towards the creation of an Islamic state, 576
• However, factionalism over various economic and social issues grew within the party over the course of the 1980s until it reached the point that the party ceased to function, and so it was dissolved in 1987, 576
One of the core disputes was that of the extent to which the government should intervene in the economy: both leftists and rightists (in the western sense) based their positions on Islamic principles. These two wings of the party constantly clashed with one another, but were kept in basic order by Khomeini, to whom both sides deferred, and hence he was able to orchestrate a compromise. After his death in 1989, however, a number of political parties sprang up espousing different ideologies (e.g. more or less socially conservative and more or less free market). It was competition between these ideologies upon which the outcome of elections was based.

**Contemporary Elections**

- This pattern was also played out in the presidential elections that took place from 1997 onwards, where candidates would compete on the basis of competing ideologies and by appealing to different social groups who felt disgruntled, for example women and students who disliked increases social restrictions.
- Presidential elections before 1997 had been dominated by the nominees of Khomeini, who always won easily.
- Parliamentary elections have traditionally been based around individual candidates who are supported or promoted by various more prominent individuals, as there is no disciplined or developed party structure.
- Candidates are vetted by the Council of Guardians, which makes it difficult for radicals or reformists to get into office, but the degree to which this vetting power is used differs from one election to the next.
- In rural areas, voters are generally more focused on the concrete achievements of candidates in resolving local problems, as opposed to ideological concerns.
- Because of the limited power of representative institutions and vetting of candidates, elections in Iran act more as a barometer of regime legitimacy than as a means to change policy, which more emphasis on turnout than the result.
- That said, the presidential elections of 1997 and 2005 both saw the defeat of the regime’s preferred candidate by an outsider, thereby demonstrating that the elections can have some effect.
- Iran lacks an organised or coherent party structure, which such parties as do exist being little more than loose alliances of individuals.

**The Role of the Military**

- Interestingly though, most of the military figures are attached to the quasi-military groups controlled directly by the leader, and not the regular army, navy or air force.
- As such, unlike neighbouring Iraq, Turkey and Pakistan, the military has not played a particularly influential role in Iranian politics.

**The Importance of Clientalism**

- Clientalism, or the forging of patron-client relationships with those in positions of power (working in the office of the leader, state banks, economic foundations, etc), is very common in Iran.
- Family and marriage ties are also a common way of obtaining political office, which in turn can become a mechanism for obtaining such benefits as subsidized foreign currency, subsidised loans or import licences, 589
- Patrons use their positions to hand out various benefits to their clients, family, friends and schoolmates, 589

**Civil Society**
- Labour, business and professional organisations do exist, but are heavily (if not totally) influenced by the state, and generally do not play much of a role in politics, 590
- Other more local interest groups have tended to become merged either with state-supported Islamic organisations or simply merged with the patron-client system, 591
- However, recently there has been a rise in the prominence and influence of interest groups representing those who have been marginalised by the state, such as women’s rights, 591
- Other important semi-organised socio-political groups include the Bazaari merchants, and war and revolutionary veterans, 591
- Some of the latter have accused the state of not doing enough to support veterans, organising war films and political movement to promote their view, 591

**Rallies and Protests**
- Because of the lack of institutionalised interest group representation and the resounding success of such tactics in the 1978-9 revolution, rallies and protests are a popular means of political activism and expression of grievance in Iran, 592
- Industrial workers have used protests to prevent the privatisation of state firms that they feared would lead to job losses, while women and ethnic minorities have protested against the perceived discrimination against them, 592
- Students have in recent years organised the most virulent protests, often against such actions as the closure of a liberal newspaper or jailing of an outspoken regime critic, 592
- These movements, however, have received little or no support from any external groups, and so have always been quickly suppressed by the regime, 592

**Policy Formulation**

**The Role of the Leader**
- Because there are so many policy-making bodies in Iran, duplication and contradictions are common, 592
- As the whole basis of Iranian theocracy is rule according to Islamic beliefs, the predominant power naturally goes to those tasked with interpreting what are Islamic beliefs, which in the constitution is specified to be the leader, 592
- Khomeini issued numerous edicts to this affect, often because he needed to break some deadlock between Parliament and the Council of guardians, 593
- Some of his edicts actually contradicted previously established practise, for example when he repealed previous bans on the eating of caviar and the playing of chess, 592-593

**The Expediency Council**
- After Khomeini, the Expediency Council (which he created) became the predominant body for the formation of national policy, 593
Ironically, although the Expediency Council has traditionally been conservative and protective of the regime’s power and the status quo, it has become increasingly concerned about his ultraconservative and populist policies, which they felt threaten Iran’s security, 593

**Parliament**

- Legislative proposals are mostly brought before parliament by the cabinet (chosen by the president), although the actual effect they have on policy making is severely limited by the Council of Guardians, which can invalidate parliamentary legislation on the grounds that it contradicts Islam, or even the policies of one of the many non-elected specialised agencies established by the leader (e.g. Council for Cultural Revolution), 593-594
- Areas where the parliament does have some influence include setting the budget and managing and providing state welfare, 593-594

**Coordination Difficulties**

- The existence of so many independent power centres means that policies are often uncoordinated and contradictory, 594
- This includes not only the bodies mentioned above but also the judiciary, which often takes an activist approach to implanting the law, 594
- This led to a conflict in the 1980s and 90s between the media liberalising policies of the president and the conservative media crackdown of the judiciary, 594
- The independent power of the many state and quasi-state security and military organisations in Iran has also significantly hampered the government’s ability to deliver credible foreign policy commitments, 595
- For example, while the government was promising not to interfere in the Israeli-Palestinian peace process, various organisations were still channelling military aid to the Palestinian Jihad groups, 595

**Economic Policymaking**

- The correct method of fostering economic development has been a topic of hot debate since the revolution, 595
- State-based initiatives dominated during the 1980s, in part owing to the demands of war and the cessation of international investment, 595
- The conclusion of the war and rise of liberalism following the fall of the Soviet Union by the late 1980s began a trend in Iran towards more market-oriented initiatives, 595
- Deregulation and sale of state assets was also hoped to improve upon the generally poor economic performance of the 1980s, though it has also produced significant opposition owing to layoffs and insecurity of those who rely on state subsidies, 595
- The economic reforms have also been unpopular with a number of the large economic foundations that control large portions of Iran’s economy with little oversight by parliament, 595

**Policy Outcomes**

**Anti-Women Laws**

- The legal status of women had improved under the Shah monarchy, but this was radically and quickly reversed after the revolution, 599
- Women are not allowed to testify in adultery and murder cases, and in other trials her testimony counts only half that of a man’s, 599
• Divorce for women is exceptionally difficult, and women need their husband’s permission in order to travel abroad, 599
• There are also many restrictions on women’s sports, owing to the nature of sporting attire, and restrictions in their entry to certain occupations and fields of study, 599

**Spreading Progress and Prosperity**
• The post-revolutionary government has tried to address one of the chief complaints of revolutionaries by making substantial efforts to improve the welfare of ordinary people, 597
• The education system is remarkably effective, with high literacy rates, 597
• The health system is also quite universal, even if the quality of care is not always very high, 597
• Efforts have also been made to reduce the birth rate, although population growth is still fairly rapid, 597
• Despite these improvements, warfare and poor economic policies have stunted economic growth, and many Iranians credit the improvements solely to oil revenues, not any virtues of the government, 597

**Incoherent Policies**
• The incoherence and contradictory nature of Iran’s overlapping political bodies does have the advantage that it inhibits the rise of Totalitarianism, as any pervasive control of society as simply impossible, 596
• For example, although music is heavily controlled in Iran (ulemas frown upon it because of its association with other pleasures like wine and women), with permits being required for the production or distribution of music, there are three independent agencies that are responsible for different aspects of this, thereby providing a means for individuals to play one bureaucracy off against another, 596-7

**Foreign Policy**
• The Iranian constitution includes a clause calling upon Iran to ‘struggle to spread the rule of divine law in the world’, in typical revolutionary language, 601
• This made it very difficult to actually deal with other countries in practical matters, and since the 1990s Iran has emphasised to a much greater extent ‘national interest’ in its foreign policy, 601
• Iran’s foreign policy has also been dominated by a struggle against what its leaders have termed ‘world arrogance’, or western hegemony, 601
• However, the overtly Shiite nature of the Iranian regime and especially their ongoing war with Iraq has isolated them from most of the rest of the Arab world, 601
• This is further encouraged by Saudi Arabia (with US support), as its Wahhabist Islamic doctrine is hostile to Shiism, 601
• However, Iran does fund a number of Shiite groups in other Arab states, including Hizballah and a Shiite party in Iraq, 601-602
• America has also not had diplomatic relations with Iran since 1979, and still maintains a trade embargo against the country, 302

**Policies of Ahmadinejad**
• Ahmadinejad is a radically conservative populist, anti-Zionist, and wants a ‘revolution within a revolution’, re-elected in a highly questionable election June 2009 which led to riots
• Powerful anti-Western, and now also anti-Zionist, messages – plays on national identity
• That said, many Iranians take a more sophisticated view of the world, and are not very fond of the government anti-Western policy
3.4 Managed Democracy in Russia

Historical Background

Gorbachev's Reforms

- Russia has had a long history of despotic leaders, both under the Tsars and the communists
- In 1985, Gorbachev came to power, and introduced perestroika, or economic re-structuring
- He realised, however, that economic reforms now and in the past were blocked by the bureaucracy, and so to circumvent this he introduced glasnost (openness)
- The idea was that the bureaucrats would be unable to resist the combined pressure of leaders from above and the public from below

The Collapse of the USSR

- As soon as freer speech was permitted, however, people began criticising all aspects of the system, not just the things Gorbachev wanted them to criticise
- In particular, many of the minority peoples began criticising Russian domination, thereby instigating the rise nationalism – not something Gorbachev had intended
- This has been described as a refolution, a reform that got out of hand and became a revolution
- The end of the USSR was greatly hastened by the bungled coup of August 1991, which led to the calls of many of the other republics calling for independence

Yeltsin vs Parliament

- In the beginning, Yeltsin, a key figure in the 1991 coup, was very popular
- However, in Sep-Oct 1993, there was a major clash between Yeltsin and the parliament, owing to Yeltsin’s appointment of a PM supporting radical economic reforms, which vested interests in the parliament opposed
- There was also a clash over the new constitution and relative levels of power between the Parliament and President
- This became very problematic; there was an attack on White House, and Yeltsin shut down parliament and the constitutional court
- Although these were reopened relatively soon, both the court and the parliament realised that if they overstepped the mark again, they would be liable to being shutdown again
- In 1993 Yeltsin succeeded in establishing a constitution that gave him significant powers
- However, Yeltsin became an increasing embarrassment to Russia over the succeeding years, owing to his declining health, corruption charges and alcoholism

How Putin Came to Power

- At the end of 1999 Yeltsin apparently did a deal with his successor Putin, whereby Yeltsin gave over power to Putin in exchange for immunity from prosecution
- He was elected in March 2000 and then again in 2004

Why Putin was Popular

- Putin’s main emphasis was on making Russia great again, as many Russians had to significantly readjust to the loss of their status as a superpower, their empire, and the home of socialism – indeed, never before had a country lost so much in peacetime
- Putin was popular because of his symbolism of strength
- Ironically, Putin also benefitted from the September 11 attacks, owing to the increased western sympathy for Muslim terrorist attacks in Chechnya
Another source of increased popularity was that the Russian economy began to recover under Putin, in part as a result rising oil revenues as a result of rising oil prices.

The Bicephalous System
- Despite his popularity, Putin was forced by the constitution to give up the presidency after two consecutive terms.
- However, because both Putin and the Russian people seemed to want Putin to remain in power, he placed one of his own supported in power as president and became PM.
- This has led to the existence of a bicephalous or dual executive system comparable to France.

Putin in Power

Putin Consolidates Power
- Putin began his time by putting together a cabinet full of officials bent on furthering the pro-market economic reforms that had languished as a result of disorganisation and resistance during Yeltsin’s second term, 248-249.
- This problem was able to be overcome under Putin, both because he was willing to reorganise the government structure, and also because the 1999 elections produced a president and parliament who were in agreement concerning the need for these policies, 249.
- Now that parliament was freed from constant disputes with the president and debates about impeaching him, they finally were pressed by Putin to pass a number of bills that had been languishing for years, including a flat income tax and lower company taxes, 249.
- This alliance and cooperation between president and parliament is not in itself antidemocratic, as all presidents want a compliant parliament, 249.
- What was antidemocratic was the fact that the 1999 elections that produced this compliant parliament were not totally fair, as the government went to significant efforts (especially putting pressure on the major media outlets) to promote pro-Kremlin candidates, 249.

Weakening the Federation Council
- Under the Russian constitution, each region of the federation was to send two deputies to the Federation Council, the upper house of parliament, 249.
- However, the constitution did not say how these representatives were to be selected, and so for the first few years Yeltsin appointed many of them directly, 249-250.
- Before long, however, the provinces had won the right to directly elect these representatives, thereby placing a check on the power of the president even if he had a majority in the lower house, 249-250.
- The Federation Council had the power to veto house legislation, but this could be overwritten by a house supermajority, something that Putin attained after the 1999 election, 250.
- Using this power, Putin was able to do away with the Federation council, replacing it with an unelected body that could be manipulated by him and his connections, 250.

Moscow Versus the Regions
- In May 2000, Putin established seven ‘super-regions’, accountable directly to Moscow, and with the authority to directly oversee many of the most important and sensitive areas of state operations, including finance, the tax agencies, and the police, 250.
- Their purpose is to oversee the bureaucracy and ensure that all federal laws are being followed, 250.
• Around the same, a law was passed giving the president the right to ‘suspend’ (in practise fire) governors accused of wrong-doing, 250
• Putin has also stopped Yeltin’s practise of making bilaterate agreements with particular states, preferring whenever possible to deal with them collectively, 250
• Finally, Putin also pushed through a law that increased the amount of taxes that had to be passed on to the federal government to 55%, and introduced regular reviews to ensure this was actually occurring, 250-251

**Party Fractures and Election Machinations**

• Russia’s political parties are very weak and amorphous entities, playing little real role in the selection of presidents or regional administrative heads, 251
• Unified Russia, a merger of Fatherland-All Russia and Unity, is the major party that backs Putin, 251
• Most of the other parties (with the exception of the communist party), are fairly weak, non-unified and ephemeral, 251-252
• Putin has actually called for a more mature, consolidated party structure, potentially by ending proportional representation, 252
• Another trend under Putin has been increasing central government interference in provincial elections, 252
• Both the lack of an organised, effective opposition and the ability to interfere in local elections all belie a lack of checks and balances on the president’s power, 252

**Politics and Administration**

**Elections in Russia**

• Elections have been held regularly since independence when they should have been
• Though some have accused them of being tampered with, this is by no means unique to Russia

**Political Parties**

• There is a semi-consolidated system of political parties; two parties regularly do well (CPRF; LDPR), and the winning party is usually pro-President (currently United Russia)
• While the winning party in each election has often been relatively new, its composition (membership) is actually rather similar from election to election
• Parliament has recently passed law to make it easier for political parties to register for elections and to enhance their role at local level
• Political parties have also been guaranteed equal media coverage, and minor parties’ leaders can now be in parliament, even if their party does not cross the 5% threshold

**Medvedev’s Reforms**

• ‘Practically every idea President Dmitry Medvedev had suggested in the message to the Federal Assembly became a law over the last six months’
• This included amending constitution, anti-corruption laws (e.g. requiring politicians to openly declare their wealth), and ‘making life easier’ for political parties as described above
• In signing the constitutional amendment into law in December 2008, several commentators claimed he was acting unconstitutionally, as amendments are supposed to be ratified by Parliament in no less than 12 months, and this amendment was pushed through quickly
Medvedev and Putin agree on most things, but not on everything, and so Medvedev cannot really be said to be Putin’s man.

The Media and Oligarchs
- There has been some crackdown on free media under Putin (particularly television), although newspapers still regularly very critical of Medvedev and Putin.
- Putin also tried to clamp down on the oligarchs, but only if they were threatening the political system (e.g. Khodorkovsky case).

Civil Liberties

The War in Chechnya
- Putin has responded to the second Chechnya war, which broke out in 1999, which extensive violence, heavy weaponry bombardment, military occupation, and oppressive patrols, 252.
- Atrocities have been committed by both sides, including raping, mistreatment of prisoners, torching of villages and summary executions, 253.
- Moscow has no real strategy of how to win or pull out of the war, which has now displaced about 400,000 refugees, 253.

Civil Liberties and Intellectuals
- Under Putin, the powers and influence of the FSB have been increased, with more emphasis on harassing human rights activists, environmentalists, religious groups, and western NGOs, 253.
- This is achieved by such means as restriction of visas, limiting contact with Russian citizens, and even prosecuting them for espionage, 253.

Muzzling the Independent Media
- Putin has made significant moved to undermine the freedom of the media, especially in television, 253.
- The commercial network NTV was in 2000 taken over by a company with strong ties to the Kremlin, with its former manager forced to flee abroad under threats of prosecution for alleged past misdeeds, 253.
- NTV has since then been repeatedly purged of those journalists unwilling to present a pro-Putin line, 253.
- Other distasteful media outlets have been closed, and foreign journalists who printed inconvenient stories about the war in Chechnya have been arrested and intimidated, 253–254.
- Of course, there are still media outlets not under government control, but they are marginalised and do not command the largest audiences, 253.
- This control of the media is making it increasingly difficult for opponents of Putin to air their grievances, especially during election time, 254.

The State of Russian Democracy

Describing the Russian Democracy
- Russia is often described as a ‘managed democracy’, as it has some elements of democracy but is still fairly centralised and controlled.
- It has also been described as a ‘super-presidential system’, owing to the ‘hegemonic’ role of the president (at least until 2008).
- The power of the presidency has declined somewhat since Putin has left office and become the prime minister.
Putin’s Agenda and Reforms

- Many of Putin’s actions are fairly pragmatic responses to the messy state of affairs that he inherited from Yeltsin, 254
- Yeltsin was disinterested in the day-to-day business of government, and to buy support and stability in trying times he made many concessions to provincial governors and business groups, that undermined the functionality of the government system in the long run, 254
- Putin this was forced to take measures to reverse these arrangements, including increasing tax revenues taken from provinces, reducing provincial governor autonomy, going after the worst of the oligarchs, and ending the polarization of the executive and legislature, 254
- In the long run these administrative reforms may actually be very important for the development of a stable democracy, 254

Putin’s Attitude to Democracy

- Putin’s economic liberalisations will help the rise of a middle class often considered so essential for the effective operation of a democracy, 254
- Overall, however, it seems that despite Putin’s frequent democratic rhetoric and occasional actions (e.g. support for jury trials), he is much more interested in strengthening the power of the state than in promoting democratic values, 254-255
- Russian democracy is not and never has been consolidated, and under Putin it has generally been moving in the wrong direction, 255

Some Overall Assessments

- Colton and McFaul 2003: their overall assessment is ‘mixed and contradictory’ and note that ‘Some say autocracies are being replaced, as often as not, by hybrid regimes entwining democratic with authoritarian principles’
- Is Russia becoming a hybrid system, a mixed (semi-presidential) system, or an electoral (a minimalist) democracy?
- Does it matter if Russia is a managed democracy or even a quasi-dictatorship? What do the people want?
- Some initial thoughts on democracy and legitimacy. Sil and Cheng Chen (2004) argue that there is probably a weak correlation between legitimacy and democracy in Russia

The Future of Russian Democracy

- That said, democratic norms and rules still govern and permeate society to some degree, and there is no way that, for example, Putin could just do away with the elections, 255
- For the foreseeable future, it seems that Russia will remain in a fairly stable state of managed, quasi-democracy, and indeed it seems that this stability is what most contemporary Russians seem to want after decades of upheaval, 255

3.5 Developing and Failed States

Introduction and Definitions

The Problem of Failed States

- Failed states were explicitly identified as a threat to global security in the US national security strategy report of 2002
- They were said to be the breeding ground for all sorts of problems, including terrorism
Failed States in the Post-War Order
- There is an argument that failed states emerged as a result of the rise of the liberal order after World War Two
- Before the war, there was very little order or organisation in the international system, and states that were unstable generally either collapsed and reconstituted themselves or were taken over by someone else
- In the post-war order, the legitimacy delivered by the deeply embedded in the UN charter and other such institutions means that states are able to remain in existence even after it has lost effective control of the country
- This had led to the rise of many failed states that in previous eras would probably have totally collapsed or been taken over by others

The Rise of Failed States
- Decolonisation led to the profusion of a large number of states that lacked the infrastructure and governmental experience needed for state stability and proper governance
- The idea of ‘failed states’ emerged in the aftermath of the Cold War
- Basically, a large number of weak states that had been held together by Cold War sponsorship began to unravel
- Over the course of the 1990s there was a series of international crises that were caused by the collapse and reconstitution of various of these failed states
- Examples include Cambodia, East Timor, Sierra Leone, the Balkans, Rwanda, Somalia
- It became increasingly obvious that these states simply lacked the ability to run themselves and provide for the demands of their citizens

Three Definitions of the State
- Social contract model: citizens give up a certain amount of autonomy for the government in response to a certain amount of social order
- The Corporatist Model: the state is the body that has a monopoly over the legitimate use of force. Society is governed by impersonal laws designed to restrain political power
- The Legal Model: must possess a government, permanent population, and the capacity to enter into arrangements with other states
- A constitutive state is one that is recognised by other states, whereas a declarative state is one that claims existence on its own, without international recognition

Analysing State Failure

Characteristics of Failed States
- Failed states are those that do not maintain an effective level of security and public goods
- Army is often used as a political tool rather than as national defence
- Policy force is not able to effectively maintain order or help the population
- Poor or no social welfare, like health and education
- High levels of corruption
- Low levels of state and regime legitimacy
- Very high inequalities of power between citizens and rulers
- Low levels of investment caused by corruption and poor security
- Low levels of education and high unemployment
- High levels of external indebtedness
• Little or no evidence of civil society
• High degrees of lawlessness, and protection is not delivered by the government, but by organised crime or local warlords – neomedievalism
• Tribe, family group or other local networks are the major source of identity, socialisation and security

Causes of State Failure
• Wars, both internal and external
• Severe environmental problems, including draughts
• Economic problems
• Corruption and criminal behaviour by political elites (Mobutu)
• Bad management (Solomon islands)
• Failed states represent a significant source of instability, as they are incapable of creating or maintaining stable and effective governance
• Theripple effect – one failed state in a region disrupts its neighbours
• For example, the wars in Afghanistan have destabilised bordering regions of Pakistan and Iran, owing to refugee flows and overflow of conflict across borders
• Other examples include West Africa in the 1990s and the civil war in Rwanda

The Case of Somalia
• The paradigm example of the failed state is Somalia, which is a totally dysfunctional state with no central government and roughly equally-matched factional powers
• The people of Somalia are divided between six clans, which have now became the basis for Somalian government
• The main function of centralised government in Somali when it did exist was to keep the clans divided so that the central government to stay in power
• The most interesting thing about Somalia is that part of the country, known as Somaliland, is relatively well developed and stable

The Failed States Indices
• The Fund for Peace Failed States Index
• The World Bank Governance Indicators
• Freedom House’s Freedom in the World report
• They all use a relatively uniform set of criteria. The Failed States Index uses 12:
• Demographic pressures
• Refugees and displaced persons
• Group grievance
• Human flight
• Uneven development
• Economy
• Delegitimisation of the state
• Public services
• Human rights
• Security apparatus
• Factionalised elites
• External intervention
Failed States as a Contested Idea

- Who defines what failed means? – inevitably the failed states and the international institutions that they sponsor
- Some thinkers in the developing world argue that many third-world governments and elites have a very different conception of what constitutes good or effective governance

Theories of Development

Introduction

- Argument that there is no such thing as a ‘failed state’ in the context of a developing state
- Instead, there are simply some states that have failed to consolidate the process of political development
- Development theory is basically a discussion about the best way to achieve desirable changes in a given society

Modernisation Theory

- It is possible for developing states to develop based on the models and institutions already used in the developed world
- Argument that the key to a prosperous nations was the key to a strong developed state
- This is related to the argument that the emergence of a middle class in the process of economic development is crucial for the emergence of democracy
- Samuel dissented from this view, arguing that the emergence of a modern state was predicated upon order, and as such democracy was not necessarily favourable for development, as it promotes competition that could spill over into violence
- It is also recognised that the process of modernisation causes significant social disruption, but the argument is that this is world it for the benefits of modernity

Dependence theory

- The capitalist system has developed such that the developed world extracts wealth from the undeveloped world
- They argue that developing states are inherently disadvantaged by internal characteristics and their relationship with the developed world
- For example, states the rely on commodity exports are unable to properly develop the industries needed to develop
- The argument was that the economy had to be removed from the world capitalist system by means of tariffs and other government controls
- A subset of this is Latin American Structuralism

World Systems Theory

- Emerged from dependency theory in the mid-20th century, expounded by Immanuel Wallerstein
- He argued that there are actually three tiers to the world economic-political system: the core (rich and powerful), the periphery (economically weak, influenced by and dependent on the core), and the semi-periphery (somewhere in between the two)
- The core of the argument is that these tiers represent fundamental functional elements of the world economy, which were imbedded by the original rise of globalisation in the late 19th century
- This in turn leads to the conclusion that poor nations are locked into their position by the fact that core states need them there
Section 4: Democratic Regimes

What is democracy?

- Schumpeter is often seen as a ‘minimalist’ proponent of applying democracy
- Samuel Huntington (1991) has argued that “a twentieth-century political system is democratic to the extent that its most powerful decision makers are selected through fair, honest, and periodic elections in which candidates freely compete for votes and in which virtually all the adult population is eligible to vote . . . It also implies the existence of those civil and political freedoms to speak, publish, assemble, and organize that are necessary to political debate and the conduct of electoral campaigns”
- This minimalist definition of democracy is now in the minority among political scientists
- The more popular approach is the substantive approach, which holds that elections are only a starting point; a necessary but not sufficient condition for democracy
- Democracies must also have extensive civil liberties (inc. freedom of speech and assembly, and not only relating to elections, freedom from excessive interference by the state), protection of human rights, concept of the rule of law (no retrospective legislation, innocent until proven guilty), and a well developed civil society that is recognised by the state (including an active and independent mass media)

4.1 Presidentialist Democracy in America

Historical Background

Early European Settlement

- The history of the modern United States begins with the establishment of the first thirteen colonies by European (mostly British) migrants in the seventeenth century, 78
- Most of these settlers came in search of land and also religious freedom, especially the protestant radicals known as the Puritans, 78
- By the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, the political system of the colonies had been established as a mixture of local elected assemblies presided over by British governors, 79
- Fuelled by a high birth rate, importation of African slaves and continued European immigration, the colonies grew rapidly, 79

Growing Strife

- Eventually, the local colonialists became numerous and powerful enough that around the mid 18th century (especially after the end of the Seven Year’s War in 1763), there began to be increasingly severe power struggles between the British government and the colonial legislatures, 80
- As each believed that it had the exclusive right to levy taxation over the American colonies, the British government’s attempts to introduce new taxes in the 1760s sparked a spiral of petitions, protests, boycotts, and acts of civil disobedience, 80
- The British responded by disbanding the colonial legislatures and cracking down with military force, 80
- This eventually led to the 1770 Boston Massacre, where British soldiers attacked a mob of colonists, thereby further fuelling colonial opposition to British rule, 80
The War of Independence
- In response, in 1774 anti-British forces organised the first Continental Congress in Philadelphia, which asserted the exclusive right of colonial legislatures to levy taxes, 80
- Two years later, the Congress (with representatives from all the states) appointed a committee to draft a constitution, and approved the Declaration of Independence, 80
- This evoked the War of Independence, in which the outnumbered colonialists were able to defeat the British in part because of their superior knowledge of the terrain and also their alliance with the French, 80
- Britain finally granted independence to the colonies in 1783, 80

Articles of Federation and Constitution
- Distrust of a strong central state had been an important theme in the independence movement, but proved to be an impediment to the establishment of a stable post-revolution polity, 80-81
- Initially, the states had organised themselves into the very loose Articles of Federation, which had a unicameral parliament with one representative from each state that required a unanimous vote for the passage of all legislation, and had only very limited powers (mostly sorting out disputes between the states), 81
- Realising that this model was inadequate to deal with problems of defence, foreign relations, and economic management, in 1787 the constitutional convention of state delegates was held to consider the implementation of a stronger federal government, 81
- The new constitution, reflecting a compromise between the federalists and the anti-federalists, was finally adopted in 1788, 81
- The first US congress met in 1789, and quickly passed legislation introducing the Bill of Rights, an effort to stem the fears of those who opposed a strong central state as threatening to civil liberties, 81

Western Expansion and Slavery
- Over the succeeding decades, America continued to expand westward with the Louisainia purchase, the acquisition of Florida from Spain, the war of 1812, and the Mexican-American War, 81-82
- This expansion introduced new problems of its own, most importantly the issue of slavery, 82
- Slavery had mostly been ignored by the original drafters of the constitution in order to ensure agreement between north and southern states, 82
- Slavery was abolished in the north after the Revolution, but continued to flourish in the south, 82
- This led to the important question of whether the new western states being admitted into the Union would be slave or free states, 82
- This issue was also brought to increase prominence because of the rising abolitionist movement, the outlawing of slavery in Britain, and the increasing view of northerners that the slavery of the south was an anachronistic institution that conflicted with the ideals of capitalism and individual liberty, 82

The Civil War
- The election of Abraham Lincoln in 1860 and concomitant rise of the new anti-slavery republican party provoked the secession of the eleven southern states from the Union, and the commencement of the Civil War, 82
- What followed was a devastating five-year long civil war, which the north ultimately won owing to its superiority in population and industrial power, 83
- In 1865 with the end of the war, the Thirteenth amendment to the Constitution was passed, banning slavery, 83

*The Rise of the Federal Government*
- Aside from this, the war greatly expanded the power and influence of the federal government, in addition to setting the strong precedent for its leading role in reintegrating the southern states into the Union during the Reconstruction era, 83
- The federal government began to exercise these powers more fully during the Progressive era (c. 1900-20), when presidents Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson introduced anti-monopolistic legislation, established the first national parks, established the Federal Reserve to regulate banking, and pushed through the Sixteenth Amendment, which gave the federal government the power to implement an income tax, 83
- The Great Depression further expanded the state’s role, particularly in the area of industrial relations and welfare benefits, 83
- Such measures were pushed forward by Roosevelt and his majority in both houses of Congress in spite of the opposition of the Conservatives and the Supreme Court, 83-84

*The Post-War Era*
- This trend towards increasing federal power was further emphasised during WWII, when the state directly intervened in the economy in order to manage the war effort, not to mention the use of propaganda and internment of the Japanese, 84
- Popular pressure to take action against such longstanding problems as racism, poverty, sexism and environmental degradation welled up and overflowed in the 1960s, thereby leading to a series of socially and economically activist administrations and interventions under Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon, 84-85
- They pushed through civil rights laws, began the War on Poverty, and imposed wage and price controls during the oil crisis, 84-85
- This trend toward statism was finally reversed somewhat during the rise of privatisation and neo-liberalism that began during the presidency of Ronald Reagan, and continued to a somewhat lesser degree under Clinton and Bush, 85

**Presidential System Basics**

**Definition**
- Only one in the West (USA), but many in Latin America, Africa, Asia
- In these systems the executive is very separate from legislature, and largely unanswerable to it (separation of powers)
- The head of state and head of government are usually the same person: no PM

**Advantages**
- Some consider a president to be more legitimate than a Prime Minister, as they are directly popularly electorate
- The existence of a single powerful politician allows for fast and effective decision making
- Fixed number of political offices and fixed terms provide some predictability to the system
- The direct election of the president increases the legitimacy of the ruler in new democracies that have often experienced nondemocratic practices in presidential elections, 154
• The presidential system also has two separately elected and therefore independently legitimate branches of government to act as checks upon the other, 154

Disadvantages
• Presidents who believe they have popular legitimacy may be able to more easily become a dictator or authoritarian – not enough control over the executive
• The concentration of power reduces the amount of popular input into policy
• Legislation can actually take longer to pass, as you need cooperation of both legislative and executive arms must cooperate
• Presidents become ‘lame duck’ presidents near the end of their term
• On the other hand, the dual democratic legitimacy of presidential system can easily lead to cause deadlock between the president and parliament, 155
• Secondly, the fixed terms of the presidents cause rigidity in the political process, 155
• Thirdly, the excess concentration of powers of the president might cause authoritarian behavior of the president, and hinder democratic relations with other institutions, 155

The US as a Presidentialist Democracy
• The US is the only truly established democracy with a presidential system, though there are some other quasi-developed ones, such as Brazil in South Korea
• The executive is very separate from the legislature, and largely unanswerable to it
• About the only direct contact the president has with Congress is his annual ‘State of the Union’ address to congress
• This is a deliberate choice of the US system, which has a very distinct separation of powers
• The president is technically not directly elected, but appointed by the Electoral College
• Unlike most countries, the US has very precisely fixed terms of office, and limits on number of consecutive terms (latter only since the 22nd Amendment was ratified in 1951)

Types of Democracy
• Direct vs. indirect (mainly representative) democracy
• We actually have the technology today to introduce direct democracy, though there is no agreement as to whether this would be a good thing
• Liberal (sometimes libertarian) Democracy: emphasis is on individual rights, and on keeping government small and focusing on individual decision making and problem solving rather than ‘society’ solving problems
• There is also less of an emphasis on participation by individuals, which is seen as optional
• Republicanism: arose as a reaction to monarchies, and focuses more on public issues; expects citizen participation
• Social Democracy: once again there is less emphasis on the individual and more on society; use of a mixed economy
• Socialist democracy: even more emphasis on the state than in a social democracy, and much less emphasis on the individual
• The socialist countries argued that democracy was about outputs (the social benefits that the government gave to people), more-so than actual public input into the political system
The American Government

Introduction

- In order to protect against authoritarianism, the founding fathers established a state governed by the rule of law, 85
- This is the principle that people are only punished as authorized by existing statutes, that all citizens are equal before the law, and no one is above the law, including political leaders, 85
- The founding fathers also introduced further protections to limit the power of the state, including federalism, separation of powers and the Bill of Rights, 85
- These actions, however, meant that the end product state was far too weak to carry out the many tasks required of it, 85-86
- This is what led to the civil war and the massive expansion in government powers since then, 86

The Constitution

- The US constitution is the oldest written constitution still in use in the world, and has provided a model for the constitutions of many other states, 86-87
- The constitution has thus served to shape the actions and responses to multitudinous problems and crises that could never have even been imagined by its original framers, 86-87

Checks and Balances in Government

- The powers of government were divided amongst the three branches so that each could serve as a check on the powers of the other, 87
- For example, the president can veto legislation passed by Congress and appoint justices to the Supreme court, 87
- The senate can disprove of executive appointment and refuse to ratify treaties, 87
- The lower house can pass legislation and impeach the president or federal judges for serious offences, 87
- Judges are appointed for life with little political oversight, and have the power to interpret the constitution and strike down any legislation they believe conflicts with it, 87

The Executive

- The US president is both head of state and head of government, and as such is invested with substantial formal authority, 89
- He generally takes the lead on determining foreign policy, although treaties are subject to approval by the senate, 89
- As head of government, he is responsible for managing the day-to-day affairs of administration, and makes appointments to senior positions in the executive and judicial branches (again with senate approval), 89
- The president can also initiate proposals for congress to consider and veto legislation that they pass, 89
- Before the twentieth century, most US presidents (with obvious exceptions like Lincoln and Andrew Jackson), were relatively weak figures who had little real political influence, 89-90

The Legislature

- The legislature is the dominant branch of the US government, with exclusive right to appropriate funds and approve the president’s annual budget, 90-91
- The lower house is comprised of 435 members distributed according to population, while the senate has two members from every state, 91
Senators serve a six year term, and tend to be less partisan than members of the house, more likely to cross the floor to vote for a policy they believe is in the interests of their constituency, 90

Members of the house are elected every two years, and tend to be more partisan and more specialised, 90

The House in general also spends less time debating and deliberating than the senate, 90

The Judicial System

The judicial branch of government was initially quiet weak, but in the landmark Marbury v Madison case of 1803, the Supreme Court established its right of judicial review over the consistency of proposed legislation with the constitution, 91

The Supreme Court justices are appointed for life, but in the past few decades they have become so powerful that their appointment (which must be approved by the senate) has become a matter of intense political struggle, 92

Analysing the US System

Powers of the President

Details of presidential power are scant in the Constitution, and in practise largely depend upon the personality and political position of the incumbent

Some see this as being a strength as permitting flexibility, while others see it as a weakness and confusing

The President has his own Executive Office of the President, which has grown dramatically in recent decades (since it was established in 1939), and is answerable only to the president

The president can hire and fire cabinet ministers and even create new offices on demand

The Congress has power over taxes and declarations of war, though in practise presidents have been able to conduct wars without the direct approval of Congress (e.g. Vietnam)

The president has the power to veto Congress legislation, and although this can be overruled by a two-thirds majority of both houses of Parliament, this is very difficult to obtain

Limitations of the President’s Powers

The President has to control a huge federal bureaucracy, which can sometimes be quite unruly and recalcitrant

Some even go so far as to say that he has more responsibilities than powers

Some argue that there is insufficient discussion in the US system, as there are no formal mechanisms of debate or communication between president and Congress

Problems of lame ducks towards the end of presidential tenure, for example George W. Bush presidency as GFC and then GEC unfold

Voter Fatigue and Suffrage

Federalism and separation of powers mean that US voters are called to the ballots far more often than in virtually any other country, 95

When presidential elections, senate and house elections, state, local elections and primaries are all included, US voters are likely to have the opportunity to vote several times per year, 96

This ‘voter fatigue’ is one of the biggest reasons for low turnout in US elections, 96

Suffrage in the United States has gradually been extended over the course of its history, with the gradual removal of property requirements over the first half of the nineteenth century, the granting of votes to blacks after the civil war, and to women in 1920, 96
**Legislative Deadlock**

- As both legislative and executive offices are elected, there has been a tendency in the US government for ‘legislative deadlock’, when these two divisions of government are controlled by different parties, 87-88
- Although the US is often criticised for this, the system was deliberately designed this way by the founding fathers, 88
- The counterargument is that what the US government loses in governmental efficiency it gains in the fact that these institutions limit government power, 88

**The Party System**

- The US party system is far weaker and less disciplined than that in most other countries, 96
- At the same time, the FPTP single-member elections districts have consolidated a system dominated by two major parties, 96
- About one third of US adults identify with each of the two major parties, with the remainder describing themselves as independent, 97
- This large class of independents has occasionally provided ground for the rise of third parties or independent presidential candidates, such as the Progressives, Ross Perot and Ralph Nader, 97-98
- These third parties mostly serve as ‘protest groups’ to highlight a certain issue, which is then usually fairly quickly taken up and addressed by one or both of the major parties, thus leading to the decline of the third party, 98

**The Electoral System**

- Primaries (nominating elections) are a very unusual form of election that is found in the US
- Also many offices are elected that would not be in other systems, for example some judges
- The Electoral College is also somewhat unusual, and can sometimes distort the popular vote
- Turnouts are typically low by international standards, but in the November 2008 presidential election they reached 61%, the highest in more than four decades
- Choice of political parties: Democrats were founded by Thomas Jefferson in 1792, the Republicans in 1854 on an anti-slavery ticket (Lincoln was the first Republican president)
- Role of money: very important in the US system, though also very open and transparent

**Political Culture**

**American Ideology and Values**

- Individual freedom based on a conception of protection from state power, rather than the provision of state services, 101
- Favour for individual over collective goals and responsibilities, 101
- Strong sense of the importance of private participatory civil society, and desire to become involved in such things, 101
- Populism, or domination over the elite and the technocrats by the masses, exemplified by direct election of many officials, 101
- Strong belief in the ability to succeed through hard work, and consequent dislike of large scale government redistribution, 102-103
- Widespread scepticism of attempts by the state to promote social welfare, exemplified by many checks and balances in the constitution, 103
- High level of religious observance compared to other advanced countries, possibly related to the early separation of church and state, 103-104
Immigration and Racism
- In response to large-scale migration from southern and eastern Europe beginning in the 1880s, in the 1920s the US congress introduced restrictive immigration quotas that favoured immigration from northern Europe, 100
- These quotas were abandoned in 1965, leading to an influx of immigrants from Asia and Latin America, 100
- Contrary to the popular perception of the US as a peaceful mixing pot of cultures, immigrants to the US have always experienced resentment and discrimination, 100

Race, Gender and Voting
- Race and right to vote: the vote was theoretically granted to all people regardless of colour or race since 1850
- However, blacks were for a long time prevented from voting because they often had unpaid taxes, and therefore were denied the vote
- This was only overturned with the twenty-fourth amendment in 1964
- Gender and right to vote: women got the vote in 1920

Attitudes to Government
- Big focus Democracy and civil rights
- US has a somewhat ambiguous attitude regarding sovereignty, for example Cold War interventions and the War in Iraq
- They are not very supportive of international organisations like the World Court or the UN
- The rule of law is also not always fully respected, for example Guantanamo Bay

Political Economy
- Although direct state involvement in the US economy is more limited than in other wealthy states, many benefits are provided in the form of tax exemptions, such as tax breaks for home ownership and student loans, 105
- The trouble with these is that they are much less transparent, and benefit the middle-classes more than the poor, 105

Political and Cultural Trends
- Freedom from religious persecution (e.g. Pilgrims, Puritans)
- Frontier mentality, first with the ‘wild west’ and later with outer space
- Strong appreciation and respect for risk-taking
- Individualism and entrepreneurship (liberal democracy, focusing on individual rather than collective rights)
- Small government, at least compared to European states
- Amendment Two – ‘the right of the people to keep and bear Arms’
- Role of religion more important than in many western nations (Protestant 52%, Catholic 24%, Jewish 2%, Moslem <1%)
- Role of race/ethnicity also very important (White 80%, Black 13%, Asian 4.5%, Native American <1%, and although not always treated as an ethnic group, Hispanics account for 15% of the population)
- Fascinating mixture of conservatism and dynamism in the US political system
- Conservative elements: death penalty, imperial system of measurement, old constitution
- Dynamic aspects: technological and scientific leadership, space program, military
4.2 Semi-Presidentialism in France

General Background

Introduction

- Vincent Wright has said of the French system: “The central question of any constitution – who rules? – is fudged. Certain articles clearly suggest that the Prime Minister governs, whilst successive Prime Ministers and Presidents of the Republic have so far claimed that the President rules”
- With the French Constitution of 1958 we enter the world not of Descartes but of Lewis Carroll (the author of Alice in Wonderland, where nothing is as it appears)
- This well characterises the French system, where it is really unclear whether the president, parliament or a mixture of both is the true ruler
- France has the oldest presidency in Europe, though its nature and powers have changed considerably over the years

Historical Background

- 1789 – 1st French Revolution (overthrows Bourbon Monarchy and introduces constitutional monarchy)
- 1792 – monarchy collapses, leading to the establishment of the 1st Republic
- 1799 – Coup d’état by Napoleon, who becomes Consul
- 1804 – 1st Empire under Napoleon
- 1814 – Napoleon abdicates, leading to return of the Bourbon Monarchy
- 1830 – 2nd French Revolution and establishment of July Monarchy
- 1848 – 3rd French Revolution, leading to establishment of the 2nd Republic
- 1852 – Coup d’état brings Napoleon III to power in the 2nd Empire
- 1870 – War loss against the Germans led to the establishment of the 3rd Republic
- 1871 – Paris Commune established (impressed Marx!)
- 1940 – German invasion and collapse of the 3rd Republic, the Vichy state in the southern part of France (not German-occupied until 1942)
- 1944 – Allied invasion and establishment of the Provisional Government under de Gaulle
- 1946 – 4th Republic established with de Gaulle as president
- 1951 – France agrees to form European Coal and Steel Community (forerunner of the EU) with Germany and Benelux countries
- 1954 – France loses Vietnam as colony; war breaks out in Algeria
- 1956 – France loses Morocco and Tunisia as colonies
- 1958 – Unrest among French settlers in Algeria led to a Coup d’état and the establishment of the 5th Republic. A new Constitution was adopted following a referendum which strengthened the position of president relative to parliament.
- 1962 – Algerian war ends; constitutional reform further increases power of president
- 1968 – The May ‘Events’, massive strikes and protests of workers and students, which led to the fall of de Gaulle’s government
- 2008 – Joint session of Parliament opts by a margin of one vote to limit the tenure of the president to two terms, and marginally increase the powers of parliament
**Political Culture**

- France has a strong Revolutionary tradition, but also strong conservative streak (only one left-wing president in the 5th Republic)
- This is in contrast to the US, which had a single revolution and since then has been much more stable
- Tradition of centralism and statism, traditionally sceptical of too much freedom for the market, more centrally planned economy
- Strong national pride, yet citizenship based on *jus solis* (one’s place of birth), not *jus sanguinis* (parent’s place of birth), and enthusiastic members of the EU – adopted the Euro
- In some ways, more participatory than the USA, for instance having much higher turnouts in elections (84% in the 2007 presidential first and second rounds); frequent referenda
- In theory, France is ‘an indivisible, secular, democratic, and social Republic’
- However, the indivisible refers to the unitary nature of the state, not the political attitudes
- In fact there are much deeper divisions than in the USA, as demonstrated by the dual popularity and influence of the French Communist Party and the extreme right National Front (Jean-Marie Le Pen)
- This is also exemplified by the continual move backwards and forwards between Republic and Monarchy in the 19th century

**History of French Presidents**

- Charles de Gaulle (1958-69): right of centre and former PM
- He did not like political parties, thinking they were divisive, comparing the case of the French Fourth Republic with that of Weimar Germany, when lots of small parties made the system unstable and ineffective
- He certainly had a point: the 4th Republic had 25 governments and 15 PMs
- Nevertheless, he accepted the fact that a president needs party support, both to get elected and once in office
- Georges Pompidou (1969–74): right of centre and a former PM. He died in office
- François Mitterrand (1981–95): left of centre (socialist)
- Jacques Chirac (1995–2007): right of centre (though communist as young man); a former PM and Mayor of Paris (was accused of corruption in association with this)
- Nicolas Sarkozy (2007–present): right of centre

**A Semi-presidential System**

**Problems with the Fourth Republic**

- The French have had fifteen constitutions since the revolution, and like many European states are not averse to re-writing theirs every few years, 113
- The failure to resolve the war in Algeria by the late 1950s led many French to the view that their current constitution was flawed, 113
- The essential reason was that the executive, the president, had too little power, being merely a figurehead, 113
- Real power lay with the premier, who had to rely upon highly unstable parliamentary coalitions in order to stay in power, 113
In only twelve years, there had been over twenty French cabinets, with governments frequently losing the support of one or more minor parties in a vote of no confidence, often for the very fact of their own effectiveness of personal dislike, 113

**Introducing Semipresidentialism**

- De Gaulle devised the semipresidential system because he disliked the weakness of the current French president, but also disliked the American presidential system, owing to all its checks and balances, 114
- Thus, the system he devised basically allowed him to dominate the running of the government, as the president continued to do until 1986, when the premier and president were elected from different parties, 114
- Originally the French president was elected for seven year terms (lowered to five years in 2000), with no limit as to the number of terms he could serve, 114

**Models of Semi-Presidentialism**

- Examples include France, Weimar Germany, and Portugal
- Maurice Duverger’s (1970) definition identifies 3 key components:
  - President is popularly elected
  - President has considerable powers
  - Prime Minister and cabinet also possess some executive powers, but are answerable to parliament, which can remove them
- Robert Elgie’s (1999) definition also identifies 3 key components:
  - President is popularly elected
  - President is subject to fixed terms of office
  - Prime Minister and cabinet are answerable to parliament

**Advantages and Disadvantages**

- Advantage: can encourage a simpler party structure in a highly pluralistic environment
- It is argued that the simultaneous and politically coordinated election of the premier and the parliament would serve to distinguish between parliamentary and prime-ministerial prerogatives while creating favorable conditions for executive-legislative cooperation, 156
- Also, presidential parliamentarism combines individual accountability of presidential regimes with collective responsibility of parliamentary regimes, 156
- On the other hand, there is a lack of clear authority and decision making hierarchy

**Analysing the French System**

- The French Presidency has been criticised as having a tendency to authoritarianism; certainly de Gaulle was accused of this
- Although this may be true of the president personally, this is greatly restrained by the active civil society, unions, free media, etc
- Some also argue that there is insufficient discussion of major decisions, although once again civil society and other structures of the system counteract this
- Slow adoption of legislation is not really an issue, as the President can only delay Acts by 15 days once adopted by parliament
- Problems of lame ducks towards end of tenure?
- Note that half of the 5th Republic’s presidents had also been Prime Ministers
The problem of co-habitation of politically opposed PMs and Presidents is real, but occurs in other systems even when politicians are of the same party, for example conflict between state and federal labour governments in the US.

Institutional Details

**The French President**

- The president is the head of state and head of government
- According to Vincent Wright, the French president has five main functions:
  - Typical Head of State roles, including receiving foreign heads of state; accreditation of ambassadors, etc
  - Guardian of the national interest, and can, after consulting with the PM, dissolve the National Assembly
  - Make senior appointments, including the PM, though this right is in practice restricted by fact that only parliament can dismiss the PM’s government
  - The president also appoints members of PM’s government (cabinet ministers), but only upon the recommendation of the PM
  - In theory, the president is supposed to rise above partisan politics; indeed he was not even allowed to enter the National Assembly until the constitutional reform of 2008
  - The President is a key figure in policy-making, as the chief executive presiding over the Council of Ministers; however, the president cannot ultimately veto legislation
  - In theory, the president can rule by decree, but only for a limited time and only in exceptional circumstances; this power has only been used once in 5th Republic by de Gaulle in 1961, concerning the war in Algeria

**President Election and Term Limits**

- The French President is directly elected, and must achieve an absolute majority, operating on a two-round run-off system
- This method has been widely copied by many other nations, including many ex-communist states in eastern Europe
- The idea was that by having such a direct election, the President would have greater public legitimacy
- In the 3rd and 4th Republics, the president was much less powerful, and was only indirectly elected by Parliament
- The President has fixed terms of office of five years (was previously 7 years, but changed to 5 years following a referendum in 2000)
- There are also limits on no more than two consecutive terms

**Powers of the President**

- Under the constitution, the president selects the premier, who then selects his cabinet, with no parliamentary approval required, 114
- The president also chairs cabinet meeting, and initiates most legislation on the advice of cabinet ministers, 114
- However, although the president has the power to force parliament to skip debate and simply vote yes or no on an issue, he does not have the power to veto parliament’s decisions, 114
- There is also a tradition in the French Fifth Republic for the president to bypass the parliament and call direct referendums about important issues, 114
The president also has the power to call a state of emergency (basically according to his own criteria), during which time the parliament still meets but has no power to block his decisions, 115

Cohabitation
- In 1986, a conservative parliament was elected while the socialist president still had two years left in his term, thereby producing for the first time a situation where the president did not control a parliamentary majority, 115
- This led to a practice, continued to the present day, called cohabitation, where the president has basically led the premier have predominant say over domestic affairs and policies, while he has concentrated on foreign affairs, 115
- Thus in the end the president has proven to be much less powerful than de Gaulle intended, 115

Premier and Cabinet
- Until cohabitation, French ministers and the premier acted mostly as servants to carry out the president’s legislative agenda in parliament, 118
- The president cannot directly fire the premier, but if they are of the same party he can (as has been done a number of times) ‘persuade’ them to resign, 118
- In addition, if the parliament does not approve of the cabinet, they can censure and fire them, thereby forcing the president to call new elections, 116-118
- Another interesting feature of the French system is that French ministers do not have to have been members of parliament, and indeed if they were MPs they must resign their seat in order to take up the ministerial post, 118
- Unlike in the US, where departments are fixed by statutes and are changed only after much deliberation, French (like most European) ministries are little more than ad hoc combinations of existing departments and government bureaus, and are frequently changed in line with the government’s policy agenda, 120

The National Assembly
- The national assembly was dominant throughout the third and fourth French Republics, 121
- However, the lack of a stable party system meant that cabinets and coalitions were constantly being formed and broken, 121
- Paradoxically, this constant political reshuffling actually stifled real policy change, as most governments were focused on maintaining their coalition, and were too concerned about losing support to do anything too controversial, 121
- Under the Fifth republic, there is a much looser connection between parliament and cabinet, with the former only having the power to censure the latter, 121
- Aside from the fact that the cabinet (appointed by the president) initiates most legislation in parliament and can force it to be voted on quickly with no debate or amendments, the government can also rule by decree if the premier and president both agree, 123
- Although a few laws must be passed by parliament, many do not, including power over the budget, 123

The French Senate
- The French upper house has relatively little power, and can be overridden by the lower house by a simple majority vote, 124
- However, the system for electing senators (who serve nine year terms) was designed by de Gaulle such that it gave disproportionate representation to rural and small town France, 124
• De Gaulle hoped that this would give him conservative support, but in practise it has mostly serve to greatly increase the political influence of french farmers, who because of their senate control can cause a lot of problems if they are dissatisfied, 124

4.3 Parliamentary Democracy in Britain

Historical Background

Early Political History

• 1215 – Magna Carta signed by King John, granting various liberties, including no arbitrary imprisonment or dispossession of property
• Some see this as the start of the rule of law, and hence the state of modern political systems. There are even elements of the Magna Carta in the US Constitution (even same wording)
• 1265 – Simon de Montford convenes 1st parliament, challenging the king
• 1295 – Development of parliament, this time authorised by king, called the Model Parliament (though very restricted membership and powers, still had legitimacy)
• 1536 – Union of England and Wales
• 1605 – Gunpowder plot, an attempt by Catholic anti-monarchists to blow up parliament and the king
• 1628 – Petition of Right, strengthening notion of rule of law

The Path to Democracy

• 1642 – Start of English Civil War (Parliamentarians vs. supporters of the king)
• 1649 – Execution of Charles I; Britain becomes a Republic
• 1658 – Death of Cromwell, with return of the monarchy coming two years later
• 1688 – ‘Glorious Revolution’, where William III (invading from Netherlands) replaces James II with the support of many parliamentarians, but on understanding that he does not try to reassert power of the monarchy, as James II had done
• 1707 – England, Wales and Scotland form Great Britain
• 1801 – Union of Great Britain and Ireland
• 1832 – Great Reform Act to make representation fairer more for the large industrial cities and less power for the small ‘rotten boroughs’. Also increased the size of the electorate, which now comprised about 20% of adult males.

The Twentieth Century

• 1911 – Parliament Act which stripped the House of Lords of the power to amend or delay finance bills
• 1918 – Universal male suffrage
• 1921 – Ireland partitioned; Irish Republic withdraws from UK
• 1928 – Universal female suffrage (partial since 1918)
• 1949 – Parliament Act; House of Lords can now only delay non-finance bills for up to one session (previously two)
• 1958 – Life Peerages Act; before this time all Peerages were hereditary
• 1963 – Peerages Act, enabling peers to renounce peerage, allowing certain individuals to stand for the lower house; peeresses can now enter the House of Lords
• 1973 – UK Joins the EEC, though not very enthusiastic Europeans; island mentality?
Recent Developments

- 1999 – Establishment of Scottish parliament, National Assembly for Wales, and Northern Ireland Assembly, though the latter was suspended until 2007 because of profound disagreements between various parties
- 1999 – House of Lords Act further reduces its power
- 2003 – House of Lords vote in both houses of parliament, with very unclear results (except that most Lords wanted appointments, not elections, to the Upper House)
- 2007 – Commons votes for elected upper house, Lords votes for appointed (as a reward and as separate from the common people)
- 2010 – Parliamentary election in May – will it be the end of the de facto 2-party system?

Analysis of British Prime Ministers

- Peter Hennessy (in The Prime Ministers, 2000) has classified British post-war PMs as follows
  - Weather maker: someone who introduces fundamental reform or change
  - System-shifter: not quiet so important but still influential
  - Promise unfulfilled: didn't really achieve what they set out to
  - Seasoned coper: competent but not especially influential
  - Clement Attlee (1945-51, L) – ‘weather maker’, essentially introduced the welfare state
  - Winston Churchill (1940-45; 1951-55, C) – ‘seasoned coper’
  - Anthony Eden (1955-57, C) – ‘catastrophe’, owing to the Suez Canal crisis
  - Harold Macmillan (1957-63, C) – ‘promise unfulfilled’
  - Alec Douglas-Home (1963-64, C) – ‘punctuation mark’
  - Harold Wilson (1964-70, L) – ‘promise unfulfilled’
  - Edward Heath (1970-74, C) – ‘system-shifter’, got UK into the EU
  - James Callaghan (1976-79, L) – ‘seasoned coper’
  - Margaret Thatcher (1979-90, C) – ‘weather maker’, fundamentally changed the nature of conservative party and politics in general
  - John Major (1990-97, C) – ‘overwhelmed’
  - Tony Blair (1997-07, L) – ‘system-shifter’
- Of these PMs, there have been described as ‘presidential’: Wilson (his Foreign Minister George Brown resigned in 1968 because of Wilson’s alleged presidential tendencies), Thatcher, and Blair (said to have told people to shut up in cabinet and rule very strongly)

Parliamentary System Basics

Introduction

- This is the dominant system used in the West
- Executive and legislature are not separated, as the chief executive (e.g. Prime Minister or Chancellor) is part of the legislature and is answerable to it
- Head of state and head of government are not usually the same person; many parliamentary democracies still have monarchs as heads of state, including UK, Sweden, Spain, Australia

Advantages

- It doesn’t matter that the head of state is not popularly elected, as they have little power
- Provides for more considered decision making owing to debates on floor of parliament
• Limited but not fixed terms of office allow government to continue as long as wanted, and return to the electorate to regain an electoral mandate in a time of crisis
• Parliamentary government can make directly policy response to external changes in circumstances because of unified power between the cabinet and the parliament, 153
• Secondly, in a parliamentary system the lines of responsibility for policy making are clear, because voters easily know that the failure of government policies are caused by the majority in parliament, the government's accountability is high, 153

**Disadvantages**

• Head of government is not directly elected by the people, so may have less legitimacy
• Division between parties in parliament may also slow decision making
• The lack of separation of powers can also lead to the bullying of the legislature by the executive
• On the other hand, parliamentary systems can be less stable than presidential systems because of the frequent changes of the cabinet and legislature, 153
• Moreover, in a parliament composed of a coalition among two or more parties, disagreements on policies or issues among them often delay policy-making and its implementation, 153
• Secondly, because the position and power of the prime minister is unstable and relatively weak under parliamentary system, it is difficult to have powerful leadership to resolve the problems such as transitions, which new democracies usually face, 153
• Thirdly, parliamentary systems have developed in the countries in which political party systems are well developed, and generally do not function so well if this strong party system is absent, 153

**British Parliamentary Government**

**What is a Parliamentary Democracy?**

• Parliamentary democracy is the most popular system among Western states
• Definition of parliamentary democracy: ‘a political system in which the supreme power lies in a body of citizens who can elect people to represent them’

**The British Constitution**

• Britain is very unusual in having no written constitution, though it most certainly has an unwritten constitution
• A great explanation of this was produced in a book published in 1867 by Walter Bagehot called ‘The English Constitution’
• He distinguishes between the dignified and efficient elements of the constitutional
• The former are more traditional and ceremonial, such as the monarchy, while the latter refer to the active and practical elements of the system, such as parliament and cabinet

**Political Culture**

• Still has a Commonwealth and some remnant of imperial mentality (e.g. reticence to give up sovereignty to EU)
• Still a class-based society (see books by Nancy Mitford and Jilly Cooper)
• The importance of old public school ties that ‘open doors’ for later advancement
• *Sang froid* and stiff upper lip?
The UK as a Parliamentary Democracy

- Voting system: simple Majoritarian in that the candidate with the most votes wins, with single candidate constituencies
- Has maximum but not minimum terms of office (maximum of five years)
- Chief executive (Prime Minister) is part of the legislature and is answerable to it (no clear separation of powers); PM appoints Cabinet
- No need for co-habitation (compare with France and USA), although the House of Lords sometimes can create some problems
- Judicial and constitutional review: until 2009 the ultimate appeal of the legal system was the 12 Law Lords, professional judges in Upper House, existing since the 19th century
- However, the Constitutional Reform Act of 2005 established the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom, operative from October 2009
- Mainly the ultimate court of appeal in the UK, not nearly as constitutionally-oriented as the Supreme Court in the USA or the German Federal Constitutional Court
- Weak head of state, not popularly elected, not same person as head of government – Queen Elizabeth II since 1952; are still many monarchies in Western Europe

Future Trends

- Monarchy: it seems that most Britons still want it, viewing it as a source of stability
- Upper House: almost certainly will continue to be reformed
- Increased moves to Federalism?
- Leave EU or further integrate into it? Likely to remain reluctant Europeans, though Liberal Democrats are in favour of this
- Move to PR electoral system: once again, Liberal Democrats will strongly push for this
- If the British Prime Ministership is becoming more presidential, is there really much difference between the three democratic systems we have studied?
- It seems that power is becoming ever more concentrated and centralised in most major democracies. If so, is that bad for democracy?

Analysing the Prime Minister

Introduction

- There has been a long-standing debate in British politics concerning the nature and extent of the powers of the Prime Minister, 13
- Some have argued that the PM is so dominant that the UK virtually has a presidential system, while others have argued that the PM is placed under significant restraints by the Cabinet, 13
- Both of these models, however, are too simplistic, and ignore the fact that the powers of the PM are and have always been largely dependent on the personality and preferences of the one who holds the office, 13

The Prime Ministerial or Presidential Model

- The argument for the PM domination of government in the post war era is based on the fact that the PM has power to appoint his cabinet and dismiss members at will, 14
- He also controlled cabinet agenda and business, could announce decisions without taking a vote, could select, reshuffle and dismiss ministers at will, and had the advantage of media concentration upon his personality and policies, 14
The idea is that, though cabinet ministers are responsible for their departments, overall there is no collective cabinet responsibility; rather, just as in the US system, each minister is directly responsible to the PM, 14

This explanation has been criticised as oversimplistic, 14

**The Chairmanship Model**

- In fact, the PM faces significant constraints from their party and the cabinet, and always faces the ultimate threat of a leadership challenge, 14
- Thus, while they may be able to keep issues off the agenda for a while, they will not be able to do so indefinitely in the face of significant cabinet agitation to discuss them, 14-15
- The fact that ministers seldom publically disagree with the PM does not mean that their final decisions are not reached after substantial amounts of compromise and negotiation, 15
- In choosing the cabinet the PM is often compelled to select those most popular and powerful within the party, in part so as to prevent them stirring up trouble and leadership challenges in the backbenches, 15
- Also, the fact that the PM lacks a department of their own actually puts them at a disadvantage relative to their ministers, especially as civil servants are primarily loyal to their departments rather than the PM, 15

**The Personality and Circumstances View**

- This perspective considers the other two views to ignore the important factors of external circumstances and the personality of the particular PM, 15
- Some PMs, like Churchill and Thatcher, tended to dominate their cabinet, while other less so, 15-16
- Indeed, many PM’s ability to dominate their cabinet vacillates over the course of their term, 16

**Three PM Case Studies**

**The Major Premiership Assessed**

- Margaret Thatcher was a very forceful PM, often announcing her views at the beginning of cabinet sessions and almost daring people to challenge her, rather than promote discussion as many past PMs had done, 16-17
- She also showed a fondness for more informal discussions with ministers in order to bypass the full cabinet, 16-17
- Further, those who became critical of her style or policies were often ‘softened up’ for dismissal for a campaign of leaks and innuendoes, 17
- Nevertheless, the ease with which she was eventually ousted from party leadership shows that she was clearly not a dictatorial figure, 17
- Major was a very different PM to Thatcher, preferring to foster consensus and encouraging debate during cabinet meetings rather than actively pushing his own agenda, 17
- Indeed, he was accused of being indecisive, lacking vision and allowing circumstances rather than his own objectives to dictate outcomes, 18-19
- Over time the public, the conservative press and even the party turned against Major, and following their catastrophic loss at the 1997 elections he resigned as leader, 19-20

**Tony Blair as Prime Minister**

- Tony Blair was the youngest PM since 1812, and also presided over the transition from old to new labour, 20
He also seemed determined to appear more organised and purposeful than the apparently aimlessly meandering governance of Major, 20

In order to improve the efficiency of government and the relationship between politicians and the civil service, Blair introduced a number of important administrative reforms, 21

These various reforms, along with Blair’s cabinet reshuffles and apparent reform of some of its procedures, has seemingly increased his power at the expense of cabinet, 22

Apparently, Blair took many more executive decisions, held fewer real debates or consultations with cabinet members, and reduced the length of time for which cabinet met, 22-23

Nonetheless, none of these developments seem to be anything fundamentally different from what occurred under Thatcher, and thus both occurrences seem mostly to be the result of personality and leadership style rather than any fundamental political changes, 22-23

The Party System

The three largest French parties are the centre-left Socialist Party (PS), the centre-right Union for French Democracy (UDF), and the right-wing neo-Gaullists (UMP), 124-125

The three smaller parties are the Communists, the Greens, and the far-right National Front, 125

Like Britain and the US, France uses single-member districts, but instead of a simple plurality requires an absolute majority in order to be elected, 125

If, as is usually the case, the candidate does not get a majority on the first round, a second round is held with the top two or few candidates, 125

Presidential elections are run in basically the same way, 125

Although there are still more French parties than in the UK or US, over the decades the number of relevant French political parties has been diminishing, 125

Section 5: Challenges to the State

5.1 The Challenge of Nationalism

Defining Nationalism

The Classic Definition

Joseph Stalin (1913): ‘A nation is a historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture’

Historically constituted: this could be a recent or ancient historical roots

Common language: not sufficient for a single nation, for example, different dialects of German

Territory: a rather amorphous concept, as contiguous territories do not always form a single nation (e.g. Germany), and some nations didn’t or don’t have a territory (Jews)

Common culture: most cultures have a variety of subcultures, not just one

Five Key Doctrines of Nationalism

The world is divided into nations, each with its own character, history and destiny, 74

The nation is the sole source of political power

Loyalty to the nation overrides all other loyalties

To be truly free, every individual must belong to a nation

Every nation requires full self-expression and autonomy
Six Aspects of Nationalism

- As an ideology, Anthony Smith (2004) argues it can be summarised as six propositions:
  a. The world is divided into nations, each with its own character, history and destiny
  b. The nation is the sole source of political power
  c. Loyalty to the nation overrides all other loyalties
  d. To be truly free, every individual must belong to a nation
  e. Every nation requires full self-expression and autonomy
  f. Global peace and justice require a world of autonomous nations

Ideology, Sentiment or Symbol?

- Nationalism can be defined in three basic ways: as an ideology, a sentiment, or as symbolism, 73
- Nationalism as sentiment refers to the feeling of national consciousness and identity amongst citizens, even in the absence of any strong ideology of nationalism, 72
- Conversely, there can be nationalist movements and ideologies in countries with little or no feeling of national consciousness, such as occurred in many ex-colonial nations, 72-73
- Nationalist language and symbolism often goes along with one or both of the other two types, and is generally manifested in such things as slogans, symbols, and ceremonies, 73
- Nationalism as a movement can be defined as a political movement for attaining the autonomy, unity and identity of some unit believes by the members of the unit to constitute a nation, 73

What is National Identity?

- National identity can have a number of different meanings and bases of reference, 74-75
- First is the simple idea of identity as sameness – whatever is different between us and them is what defines ‘us’ as a nation, 75
- More sophisticated is a philosophical idea that developed in the 18th century, according to which each nation has its own unique and distinctive national character or (as it was called at the time) ‘national genius’, 75
- The idea was that each nation had its own particular ways of thinking, acting and communicating, and indeed should work to discover and maintain these distinctive traits, 75
- There was a conception that some kind of ‘pristine’ or ‘ancient’ identity lay waiting to be recovered, but hidden amongst centuries of cultural and social accretions that did not genuinely belong to the nation, 75

What is National Unity?

- There are also several different ways of understanding nationalist unity, 75
- On the one hand, it simply refers to the desire to unify the national territory and gather together all people of the nation back to their homeland, 75
- More philosophically, national unity refers to the feeling of familial brotherhood and fraternity that is supposed to be felt between members of the nation, even to such an intensity that it overcomes other loyalties, 76-77
- It is such ideas that are used to justify state actions to remove supposed ‘barriers’ to unity, such as sub-national political units, languages or ethnic groups, 76

What is National Autonomy?

- The goal of autonomy is pursued because it is believed to be an essential pre-requisite for full realisation of national unity and identity, 76-77
- Once again, this developed alongside enlightenment ideas concerning the importance of individual freedom as a prerequisite for personal advancement, 76-77
• Note that there is no explicit mention of state sovereignty, as many historical nationalist thinkers and contemporary nationalist movements insist only on autonomy, and not necessarily on possessing a fully sovereign state, 74

Imagined Communities

What is a Nation?
• Anderson’s definition of a nation: ‘an imagined political community, imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign’, 6
• Nations are imagined because the members of all nations will never meet or even know of most of their fellow members, and yet in their minds they still live in their communion in some way, 6
• This does not mean that the nation is somehow false or fabricated, as virtually every community or cultural group is imagined in this sense, it is just that they are imagined in different ways and to have different properties, 6-7

The Nation as an Imagined Concept
• Hugh Seton-Watson (1965): ‘A nation exists when an active and fairly numerous section of its members are convinced that it exists. Not external objective characteristics, but subjective conviction is the decisive factor’
• Benedict Anderson (1983): ‘The nation is an imagined political community’
• This key insight is basically that a nation is a socialised, imagined concept, and thus is something that can be changed

Nations as Inherently Limited
• The nation is limited because every nation is defined to exist over a limited area and population, beyond which lie other nations, 7
• Also, nationalists do not expect or hope that most all or even much of the rest of mankind will one day join their nation, as for example Christians or Muslims may wish the world to be converted to their religion, 7
• Nations are imagined as communities because regardless of the actual levels of inequality, the nation is always conceived as being a ‘deep, horizontal comradeship’, 7

Why Nations Still Matter
• All the major successful revolutions since WWII, including in China, Vietnam and Iran, have been conducted within nations and using nationalist language to some degree, 1
• Communist movements and states also became increasingly nationalistic over time, as demonstrated by interventions in Eastern Europe, the Sino-Soviet split, and the Chinese war with Vietnam, 2
• The United Nations is still solidly based around the nation-state, 3
• All of this points to the fact that the ‘end of nationalism’ has certainly not yet come, 3
• At the same time, the nation has long been a concept that has escaped any satisfactory definition, 3

The Three Paradoxes of the Nation
• Their objective modernity (dating to the late 18th century) to the historians eye versus their subjective antiquity in the eyes of nationalists, 4-5
• The formal universality of nationality as a socio-legal concept versus the uniqueness and non-overlapping nature of each particular nation, 5
The political power of nationalists versus their philosophical incoherence, in that unlike liberalism, socialism or any other ideology, nationalism has no great thinkers or doctrines attached to it, 5

It really belongs more with kinship and religion than fascism or liberalism, 5

The Origins of Nationalism

How did Nationalism Arise?

- Gellner has said that ‘nationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness, but the invention of nations where they do not exist’, 71
- The question we must ask, then, is how did such a concept come to be invented?, 71
- Clearly, they originated from pre-existing ethnic identities, and the stronger and more persistent the pre-existing identity, the more likely it was that a nationality would form to be based on that identity, 71

Types of Nationalism

- Nationalism is such an amorphous concept that really the differences between nationalist movements separated by space and time (in terms of ideology, aims, etc) are arguably more important than their differences, 79
- Nonetheless, we can differentiate between two very broad types of nationalism, 80-81
- First is the ‘rationalist’ nationalism, where the nation is viewed as an association of human beings living in a common territory under the same government and laws, 80
- Second is the mystical, genealogical nationalism, where the nation is seen as a seamless organic entity, with a mystical soul and mission that generally can only be discerned and understood by elite intellectuals, 80-81
- These different conceptions of nationalism tend to produce different kinds of nationalist movements, 82

Nationalism as a Meta-Theory

- One of the most important reasons for the popularity of nationalism was that it tied into and drew upon powerful existing loyalties and identities, especially those of ancestors and family heritage, community and history, 78
- Nationalism provided a kind of meta-theory or framework for understanding and bringing order to the universe that simultaneously related to all the core aspects of the common people’s lives and beliefs and sentiments, 78

Political and Intellectual Causes of Nationalism

- Both the civic and the ethic conceptions of nationalism developed during the 18th and 19th centuries as a result of increasing concern of intellectuals with the idea of national character, 85-88
- This tied in nicely with the rise of centralised autocratic states, which naturally benefitted from identifying ‘their’ state with ‘their’ nation and population, 86
- Renewal of scholarship and humanist philosophy also led to increasing interest in historical comparisons between states and peoples, with some idea of ranking their relative worth based on their effectiveness at improving the human condition (a new enlightenment concept), 86-87

Origin of the Civic/Ethnic Dichotomy

- The civil/rational conception of nationalism has its basis in comparison and identification with classical Greek city-states, 87-88
• In contrast, the mystical/ethnic conception can be traced to a revival of interest in rural and medieval cultural literature and heritage, which was thought to embody some kind of primal identity of the nation, 88-89
• Of course, such literary and philosophical trends were not the primary causes of the rise of nationalism, which had more to do with the centralisation of power in state governments and the increasing economic integration of rural areas, 90
• These things did, however, provide the concepts, symbols and language necessary in order to explain and justify these developments, 90
• After these ideals developed in Europe, they soon spread to Eastern Europe, the Middle East, Asia and eventually Africa, 90-91

Intellectuals and Nationalist Culture
• Nationalism should rightly be seen as a form of culture, incorporating ideology, mythology and symbolism, that to some degree overlays or replaces older forms of culture like religion and familial bonds, 91
• This cultural aspect of nationalism is in large part why intellectuals, especially artists, poets and historians, where so critical in the development and spread of early nationalism, 92-94
• It may be that this ideology was highly popular to intellectuals and the broader public because it provided a ‘new mythology and symbolism’ with which to legitimate and ground human thought and action, something that many felt the need for with the retreat of religion and traditional regional or community ties, 96-97

Types of Nationalism

Different Types of Nationalism
• Anthony Smith (2004) claims five common ways in which the term Nationalism is used
• As a general process of formation of nations, sometimes called ‘nation-building’ (though that term is often conflated with state-making)
• As ‘national sentiment’, or sentiments, attitudes and consciousness of belonging to a nation, and aspirations for its well-being, strength and security
• As a symbolic language, or more recently, a ‘discursive formation’ of meanings attached to the concept of the nation
• As a movement with political goals for the attainment or maintenance of the status of a nation, entailing one or more activities and organizations designed to achieve those goals
• As a doctrine, or more loosely, and ideology of ‘the nation’, seeking its autonomy, unity and identity

Ethnic Politics
• Ethnic politics are different to nationalism, as they involve the call of some cultural group for greater rights and fairer treatment within the existing state, rather than establishment of a new state of its own

Civic vs Ethnic Nationalism
• These are two different conceptions of citizenship and national identity
• The ethnic conception is based on racial or heredity
• For example, if you have German ancestry (‘German blood’) you can automatically become a German citizen
• The civic notion is rather based on location of birth and ideology
• The civic conception thus is based more on a primordial definition of nationalism, while civic notion is much more along the lines of the ‘imagined community’

**Official vs Unofficial Nationalism**

• Official nationalism refers to the nationalism promoted by the government, to develop a sense of national identity
• It is often very common when states are first being constructed out of several existing units (e.g. unification of France and Italy)
• Unofficial nationalism comes not from the government but from the people, and is generally disintegrative rather than integrative (e.g. in USSR, Yugoslavia)
• This is not always the case, however, as sometimes the majority group will sometimes try to get minorities to assimilate and adopt their own views
• Irredentist nationalism seeks to unify peoples of the same nation but in different states

**Analysing Nationalism**

**The Nation as Unique and Chosen**

• All variants of nationalism are basically extensions of the ancient idea that each ethnic community was the basis of all civilisation and centre of the universe, and was thus ‘chosen’, 84
• This has now morphed into the idea that each nation is somehow uniquely special and chosen (even though there are many of them), and that their culture, history and identity must be carefully preserved, 84

**Symbols and Nationalism**

• These core ideals are all embodied and brought to remembrance in the symbols and tokens of nationalism, including such things as flags, anthems, statues, war memorials, national holidays, historical re-enactments, coinage, parades, capital cities, museums, passports, frontiers, etc, 77
• In a way, these all form rites and ceremonies that are part of the ‘religion’ of nationalism, which is the worship of the nation by itself, 78
• Just like in any religion, the ceremonies and symbolism are necessary in order to articulate and ensure the continuity of abstract concepts like national identity and destiny, 78

**Nationalism as an Ideology**

• Nationalism is not the same as patriotism, which is simply love of one’s country, as nationalism is much more political and ideological
• National identity is also not the same thing, and focuses mainly on external symbolism like flags, anthems, national holidays, own currency and stamps, etc
• Nationalism is a partial or quasi-ideology, in that it does not offer a full political or economic program for society as liberalism or socialism does
• However, insomuch as it is a set of ideas designed to promote the interests of a group, it counts as an ideology
• Nationalism only really dates to the 18th century, particularly the French Revolution

**Political, Economic and Social Calls of Nationalism**

• On the political level, nationalism calls for autonomy and global relations conducted between nations, 91
• On the economic level, nationalism calls for a high degree of control and self-sufficiency, 91
At a social level, nationalism calls for the legal equality of citizens and their participation in public life for the national good, in a feeling of brotherhood and social unity.

**Factors Contributing to Nationalism**

- Historical traditions: historical memories of atrocities and disagreements between nations can extend back for hundreds of years (e.g. Jews, Shiites)
- Effects of official and unitarist nationalism: if it goes too far, it can cause resistance and hence the rise of disintegrative nationalism amongst minority groups
- Rapid modernisation and/or revolutionary change: these cause significant disruption to traditional values and lifestyles, and so might lead to the rise of nationalism
- Political structures: often a federal system can serve as a means to placate or encourage nationalism, depending on the circumstances
- Political climate: often a strong dictator or authoritarian regime can keep nationalism under control for a time
- Poor regime performance: economic or other political problems can incite and enhanced nationalist feelings, as one group blames the other
- Perceptions of unequal or unjust (inequitable) treatment
- Regime sycophancy towards a foreign power: this can annoy people and lead to calls for a new state based on nationalist ideals
- Direct and indirect external stimulation: sometimes nationalism can be encouraged by external groups, or at least inspired by the actions of such groups (e.g. East European revolutions)
- Alternative organisations and leaderships: the nationalist ideal must have strong leaders to promote and pursue the movement

5.2 The Challenge of Globalisation

**Aspects of Globalisation**

**Economic Aspects**

- Arguments about international division of labour are somewhat exaggerated, as companies often go where they are the cheapest to produce
- Also, movement of finance (especially investment funds) are much freer to move about than workers and migrants
- A post-industrial society is one where the majority of the workforce is employed in service industries, such as hospitality, banking, etc
- This has important implications for social structure, as for example the workforce becomes more complicated and segmented, class identity weakens

**Communications**

- The internet is probably the biggest and most important example of this
- Language potentially becoming more unified

**Social Impacts**

- Rapid economic development can have many destabilising social effects
- For example, disruption of traditional family structures by urbanisation
- Effects on families, such as increasing workloads, internet addiction
Political Impacts

- Some claim that globalisation reduces sovereignty, and hence undermines the power of the state
- Others argue that this effect as exaggerated, as for example IOs are still dependent upon states for their power and revenues
- That said, it is clear that the power of IOs, NGOs, TNCs and so on has increased
- Some argue that this has increased the problem of democratic deficit
- Marcroregionalisation is also another consequence and manifestation of globalisation

Cultural Phenomenon

- The standardisation and homogenisation of many products and services has eroded cultural differences; ‘McDonalisation’
- Much greater prospect for travel and tourism
- Environmental issues that cannot be solved by any single state

Analysing Globalisation

The Meaning of the Term

- One important aspect of this term is the ‘isation’, indicating that this is a process, not an event
- The concept also incorporates important elements of compression of time and space
- For example, emails allow communication at any time and between any place
- These communication aspects are arguably more important than the economic aspects
- Marxists see globalisation as just the most recent iteration of imperialism, where imperialism is seen as the highest form of capitalism

The Development of the Concept

- Globalisation is actually a fairly new term, only about twenty years old
- Usually dated to around 1989, as this is when people really stated talking about it
- Others claim that even though the term was not used before the late 1980s, the process dates to the 1940s and 50s with the end of formal colonialism
- The idea was that the informal colonialism of globalisation replaced the formal colonialism of the European powers
- This is related to the increasing importance of corporations exerting influence rather than governments

Advantages of Globalisation

- Modernisation of states and economies
- Equalisation of development and income levels between states (though not within states)
- Reduction of poverty
- Homogenisation of cultures and languages promotes understanding and peace
- Improving governance, according to the theory that modernisation brings democratisation
- Better capacity for addressing transnational and global issues, especially as solutions can be shared over all nations
- Enhanced global awareness of common problems (e.g. diseases)
- Creation of global culture
- Greater freedom in time and space (e.g. emails)

Disadvantages of Globalisation

- The notion that democratisation and modernisation go together is not necessarily so clear
• The argument that the very poorest in the world are getting poorer, not better off
• The homogenisation of global culture makes things boring
• More power to relatively unanswerable agencies
• Threatens state sovereignty
• Threatens jobs in wealthy countries
• Economic development adds to environmental problems, and it is still up to states to solve these problems
• Threatens local languages and cultures, which can actually increase racism, right-wing extremism and aggressive identity politics
• Facilitates internationalism of organised crime

5.3 The Challenge of Terrorism
• Terrorism gets more attention than Nationalism or globalisation, but in terms of the number of people impacted it is probably for less significant

Concepts of Terror and Terrorism

What is Terrorism?
• The word terrorism is derived from the Latin terrere, meaning to tremble or cause to tremble, or to frighten
• Thus, the essential point of terrorism is to frighten people
• Key elements include apparently arbitrary (indiscriminate) and essentially unpredictable violence (actual or threatened) directed against non-combatants (and hence not obeying warfare conventions) for political ends
• Political terrorism is the use of violence and coercive intimidation by revolutionary movements, regimes or individuals for political motives, 11
• Political terrorists are distinguished from organised crime groups in that their motives are political rather than acquisitive, and also that they always use actual violence, rather than the mere threat of violence, 12

Terrorism and State Terror
• When making this distinction, terrorism refers to action by non-state actors against mostly non-state actors
• State terror involves state use of terror against particular groups of people, although this was often directed against some kind of particular sub-group
• Examples include Mao in China, Pol Pot in Cambodia, Nazi Germany and Stalin in Russia

Characteristics of Terrorism
• Terrorism must always be defined by means rather than ends, as the ends of terrorist groups are often ambiguous (e.g. Al Qaeda)
• Terrorism is not specific to any particular religion or end of the political spectrum, although it is always extremist
• Labelling theory (from criminology): use of the word terrorists versus freedom fighters; terrorism as a pejorative term
• Terrorism has a strong hero/martyr tradition

Indiscriminate Attacks
• Political terrorism is indiscriminate in nature, in that it has no particular targets, 13
For these types of attacks, the psychological terror and harm is always far out of proportion to the actual physical harm, largely because of this fact that anyone can be a target, 13

In this sense terrorism is quiet similar to state terror, which also lacks a particular target, and does not punish for any particular purpose (i.e. there is generally nothing the victim can do to avoid their fate), only to terrorise, 14-15

Amorality

Terrorism is also amoral in nature, in that the existing ethical codes of society are always either attacked directly, declared to be subordinate to the terrorists aims, or simply ignored, 16-17

This is also related to the fact that terrorism differs from intimidation in that terrorists generally do not give specific warnings about their actions, nor do they attempt to change policy by threats alone – they always use physical violence directly, 18-19

Terrorism and Values

Terrorism is a strongly value-laden term, in that when one declares a group to be terrorist, one is making a statement concerning their methods, ideals and justification, 20-21

Common justifications of terrorism include just vengeance, the idea that a lesser evil must be committed to bring down or end a greater evil, the argument that the group had no other political or social avenue through which to pursue their grievance, and the argument that terrorism has been effective in similar situations elsewhere, 23-25

Another interesting and related question is whether acts committed by terrorists should be considered as equally, more, or less heinous than comparable non-terrorist crimes, 25-26

These moral issues become even more pronounced when the terrorist activities are being conducted by states, or members of state governments, militaries, etc, 27-28

History of Terrorism

Early Developments

Most analysts will identify the beginning of modern terrorism with the Reign of Terror in France (1793-4)

There have been many examples of such state terrorism since, mostly by extreme right-wing or extreme left-wing governments

In 1879, there was the first example of non-state actors calling themselves terrorists – Narodnaya Volya (People’s Will) in Russia, who assassinated the Tsar

By 1890s, terrorist groups had appeared in Europe and Asia

The Twentieth Century

The start of WWI was directly linked to a terrorist act, the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo

The last group to call itself terrorist was Lehi (fighting for Israeli state) in the 1940s

The 1960s and 1970s was somewhat of a heyday for terrorism, especially communist groups such as the Red Army Faction in Germany, Red Brigades in Italy, Directe Action in France, Weathermen (Weather Underground) in USA, Tupamaros in Uruguay and the PLO

This was all part of the general rise of the counter culture and anti-authoritarianism of the time, which was linked to the sexual revolution and the anti-Vietnam movement

In 1993 was the first Al Qaeda attack on US territory (on the World Trade Center)

By the 2000s we see the rise of global terrorism, making it more difficult to target
**David Rapaport’s ‘Wave’ Approach**

- 1. Anarchist wave (1880s – 1914): originated in Russia in the late-19th century, with the 1890s sometimes called the ‘Golden Age of Assassination’; incorporated same nationalism and some transnational cooperation
- 2. Anti-colonial wave (1919 – 1960s): many groups in the third world focused on fighting the colonial powers. Assassination not popular, and groups do not cooperate. Became redundant following decolonisation
- 3. ‘New Left’ wave (1960s – 1970s): response to Vietnam War, focused on disliked politicians and judges rather than the general public
- 4. Religious wave (1979 – present): marked by the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and Iranian Revolution. Al Qaeda (literally ‘the base’, originally named after anti-Soviet training camp) was founded in the late 1980s

**The Nationalist and Secessionist Wave**

- Prime examples include EOKA in Cyprus, advocating the end of British rule in Cyprus and union with Greece; active 1955-59
- ETA as a Basque country secessionist organisation based in Northern Spain and Southern France since 1959
- PLO active in the middle east since 1964
- IRA reactivated terrorism campaign in 1969, which essentially ended 1997, though splinter group ‘Real IRA’ continues to engage in terrorism
- Tamil Tigers active in Sri Lanka since 1976, though almost destroyed by May 2009

**Analysing Terrorism**

**Common Targets**

- Random attacks on populace, mostly in the Middle East
- Attacks on agents of the state (politicians, military, police)
- Attacks on symbols (especially embassies or famous buildings)

**Common Methods**

- Assassinations
- Kidnapping (hostages) and ransom demands
- Hijacking
- Suicide attacks

**Terrorist Mutation**

- There is a tendency in some cases for terrorists to become statesmen, e.g. Michael Collins (Ireland, 1916-1922), Israel’s Menachem Begin, Egypt’s Anwar Sadat, South Africa’s Nelson Mandela, and Palestine’s Yasser Arafat
- Terrorists can also mutate into organised crime gangs, for example the triads in china, often as a result to the need to fund their activities

**Some Causes of Terrorism**

- Sense of injustice – though it is argued that this is often overplayed, and many terrorists are actually just antisocial with particularly different personalities
- For example, Bin Laden and the Ayatollah are both from wealthy families
- Sense of threatened identities – in particular in reaction to globalisation
Desire for political change – could be restoration or reformation

Technological opportunities (e.g. internet and mobile phones)

Psychology of terrorists – including revenge and belief in better after-life (particularly relevant for the ordinary grunts)

**Facilitators of Terrorism**

- Globalisation: better communications and easier transmission of people and funds
- Diasporas: more migration across the world permits easier communication across ethnic groups in other countries for support and funding
- For example, the IRA long sourced much of its funding from the Irish diaspora in the US
- Excessive state responses: if states become extremely violent in their response to terrorism, this can encourage further terrorism
- Familism and loyalty

**Combating Terrorism**

- The first international effort to combat terrorism occurred under President Theodore Roosevelt, in the early 20th century (he succeeded President McKinley, who was assassinated in 1901)
- Repressive measures and counter-measures, including military, police, and intelligence
- If repressive means are excessive, it can be counter-productive in terms of ‘othering’ terrorists
- Propaganda, including emphasising the immorality, illegitimacy and ineffectiveness of terrorism, such as emphasising the fact that Muslim terrorists kill more Muslims than anyone else
- Overall terrorism does not seem very successful, but there are some exceptions, such as Hezbollah in Lebanon in 1983 and Spain’s withdrawal from Afghanistan after 2004
- Sanctions against states seen to support or promote terrorism
- Responsive measures, such as engaging with the concerns of terrorists, and possibly with terrorists themselves
- Book terrorism, organised crime and corruption

**5.4 The Challenge of Corruption**

**Defining Corruption**

**What is Corruption?**

- Corruption is usually defined as the ‘private abuse of public office’, but this definition is not as straightforward as might be imagined
- For instance, if prison management has been contracted out to a private company, is the prison warden corruptible?
- Generally it is agreed that some public employee or agent must be involved for something to be considered corruption; price fixing between private companies is therefore not corruption
- Private abuse can involve both individuals and private organisations, such as political parties

**Core and Penumbra Corruption**

- Core forms of corruption are those that are undoubtedly criticised in most if not all societies
- Penumbra forms of corruption are ones that are not always unacceptable, depending on the culture (nepotism and cronyism are prime examples)

**Types of Corruption**

- Black corruption is where both elites and the public broadly agree that it is bad for society
- White corruption occurs where elites and citizens think there are some benefits to the particular forms of corruption
- Grey corruption is where there is disagreement over the rectitude of the corruption
- Grass-eating and meat-eating: grass eaters are those who will accept bribes when offered, while meat eaters are those who overtly or covertly ask for a bribe
- Administrative or petty corruption vs. political or high-level corruption

**Analysing Corruption**

**Measuring Corruption**

- Official crime statistics: reports, investigations, prosecutions, investigations and sentences
- The trouble with relying on these is that many states do not generate these data
- Also, by the very nature of corruption it tends to remain unreported, and the statistics could be biased by corrupt officials
- Perception surveys: ask people how prevalent they think corruption is
- It is argued that perceptions may not correspond to reality, although it could be argued that perceptions create reality, so if people think corruption is a problem then by definition it is a problem
- Experiential surveys: ask people how many bribes they have paid or accepted in the past twelve months, or some other time frame
- For example: International Crime Victim Survey, the 2009 TI CPI
- Tracking surveys (e.g. PETS) – track expenditure at every level of administration to make sure it gets to where it is supposed to; has been shown to be fairly effective
- Multi-angulation involves using a combination of these techniques to come up with the best result possible

**Causes of Apparent Rise in Corruption**

- Impact of neo-liberalism and globalisation, in that officials feel less secure in their employment, and perhaps weaken the feeling of professional integrity
- Decline of moral standards, going along with the decline in religion (though this does not apply to all societies, particularly poor countries where corruption is the biggest problem)
- Effects of end of Cold War: during the Cold War there was an incentive to turn a blind eye to corrupt third war allies
- Regulation against corruption has become more stringent since the 1990s, for example the FCPA 1977 and OECD Anti-Bribery Convention 1997

**How Corruption Effects the State**

- Taxation revenues to the state are diminished
- Reduces investment by foreign corporations owing to additional costs of business
- Social stratification, owing to the divisions between those who can afford to pay bribes and those who receive bribes, and those who do not
- State capture, whereby wealthy or influential individuals are able to bribe or capture politicians such that they pass laws beneficial to the bribers
- Corruption undermines the legitimacy of the state, potentially leading to revolution or state collapse
- Security problems such as weapons smuggling, people smuggling and human trafficking are worsened by the involvement of corrupt officials
Culture and Perceptions of Corruption

- While this is true for certain gray areas like nepotism and cronyism, surveys show that certain core forms of corruption, such as officials taking bribes, are almost universally considered wrong in all cultures, 9
- Also, just because citizens regard corruption as normal does not mean that they regard it as acceptable, just that they feel powerless to do anything about it, 9
- Too often these culturalist arguments are simply used by the elites as a means of avoiding more intense investigation into their own practices, 10

Measures Against Corruption

- Legal and punitive measures, such as legal proceedings, legislation, special bodies, campaigns, and naming and shaming
- Incentives like salaries and rewards and whistleblower protection schemes
- Administrative and technical measures for improvement of collecting fines, rotation of offices, CCTV and data-banks
- Other measures including links with foreign control agencies, signing up to international treaties and conventions, education, and political will

Corruption, Organised Crime, and Terrorism

The Importance of Conceptual Distinctions

- It is important to clearly distinguish between the conceptually different phenomenon of organised crime, corporate crime, terrorism and corruption, as otherwise our efforts to combat these phenomenon will be hampered, 8

Table of Soft Threats to the State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-oriented Corruption</th>
<th>Group-oriented Corruption</th>
<th>Organised Crime</th>
<th>Terrorism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessarily collective</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrators’ position enjoys high social status</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Not usually</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group has exclusive membership</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Yes (state office)</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group is organised hierarchically</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Not necessarily</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group is durable</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Not necessarily</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary objective is materialistic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary objective is political or ideological</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions are typically coordinated</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions are typically targeted</td>
<td>Not necessarily</td>
<td>Not necessarily</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions are at least in part consciously illegal</td>
<td>Not necessarily</td>
<td>Not necessarily</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually involves violence, threatened or actual</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate clandestinely</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally seek publicity</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widely perceived as improper and/or illegal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Linkages between Crime, Corruption and Terrorism**

- There has recently been increased recognition of the important linkages between organised crime and official corruption, 2
- For example, smuggling and trafficking of weapons, drugs and people would be much more difficult were it not for the presence of corrupt police, border officials, customs officials, etc.
- A similar linkage has been observed between terrorism and organised crime, where the former often uses the latter as a means of funding, 3
- There is also a well-known phenomenon whereby former members of both official and unofficial military organisations tend to drift into organised crime once their military position lapses, 3
- Examples of this linkage include the admission that the Belsan school hostage terrorists had been aided by corrupt Russian officials, the links between Chechen rebels and Afghan drug smugglers, and connections between Ecuadorian drug smugglers and Hezbollah, 4

**Corporate Crime and Corruption**

- Corporate crime is also receiving more attention of late, though unfortunately it is often combined in the same category as corruption, 5
- It is important to keep these two phenomena distinct, largely because the perceived and actual function of the state is very different to that of corporations – people expect the state to set an example, while corporations are not held to this same standard, 5
- The recent trend towards merging of the state and the market in the form of private-public partnerships and contracting out has the potential to increase corporate crime and corruption by reducing the transparency of these processes, 5-6

**Unintended Consequences of State Policy**

- Yet another interesting problem (which also highlights the need to have clear conceptual distinctions between these phenomena) is that efforts by states to combat one can have flow-on effects, even negative unintended consequences, for other areas, 16
- For example, post 9/11 attempts by many states to crack down on terrorism has made border security much more stringent, thus increasing the market of and hence scope for people smuggling, 16