ORIGINS OF DEMOCRACY AND DICTATORSHIP

Dr. Madhavi. R
Dr. Shavya Singh

ORIGINS OF DEMOCRACY AND DICTATORSHIP

ORIGINS OF DEMOCRACY
AND DICTATORSHIP

Dr. Madhavi. R

Dr. Shavya Singh

ALEXIS PRESS

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

PATHS OF POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Madhavi. R, Professor, Department of Finance,
CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id-r.madhavi@jainuniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Paths of Political Development refers to the different routes that countries take in their political development, which may be influenced by various factors such as history, culture, geography, and external influences. The study of political development has become increasingly important in understanding how countries evolve and the challenges they face in achieving political stability, democracy, and economic growth. The concept of political development has evolved over time, with early theories focusing on modernization and the spread of Western democracy. However, more recent approaches emphasize the importance of context-specific factors in shaping political outcomes, such as the role of elites, civil society, and institutional design.

KEYWORDS:

Authoritarianism, Capitalism, Communism, Democracy, Dictatorship, Fascism.

INTRODUCTION

Different typical pathways that political institutions follow throughout time may help us understand why some nations have democracies while others do not. At least for the time being, only some of these path's lead to democracy. These stylized lines both demonstrate the key processes that we think connect a society's economic and political structure to its political institutions and aid us in finding our bearings among the complexity of real-world comparisons.The four basic avenues for political growth are as follows. First, there is a route that moves from nondemocracy to democracy gradually but inescapably. Democracy is never endangered once it has been established, and it persists and grows. The finest illustration of such a political growth route is seen in Britain. Second, there is a road to democracy that, once it is established, soon disintegrates. The forces that first pushed for democracy then make a comeback, but democracy then falls once again, and the cycle continues. The Argentinian experience throughout the twentieth century serves as the finest illustration of this road, where democracy is built but then fails to solidify.

A third option is logically one in which democracy is significantly delayed or a nation chooses to remain non- democratic. It is helpful to divide nondemocratic pathways into two since there are significant differences in the beginnings of such a road. Due to society's relative egalitarianism and prosperity under the first route, which maintains the nondemocratic political status quo, democracy never develops. People are content enough with the current political institutions; thus, the system is not under threat. The society whose political dynamics we describe in this manner is Singapore. The opposite scenario develops along the second of these anti-democratic courses. Political elites fear the idea of democracy so much that they would use any and all methods,

including violence and repression, to prevent it since society is so unequal and exploitative. Our model for such a course is South Africa, prior to the end of the apartheid government [1].

By analyzing the political histories of the four nations, we highlight these four routes and the factors that cause a society to follow one or the other. We talk about the mechanics of political growth in each example, looking at why they led to consolidated democracy in Britain, unconsolidated democracy in Argentina, and ongoing nondemocracy in Singapore and South Africa, although in different ways. Many of the elements that will emerge from further examination as being essential in understanding why a society chooses one course over another are highlighted in this discussion.

Britain

The establishment of regular Parliaments, which provided the aristocracy with a platform for tax negotiations and policy discussions with the monarch, is credited with establishing democracy in Britain. Parliaments didn't start meeting regularly until after the Glorious Revolution in 1688, and even then they had extremely limited powers. At this time, ideas from medieval eras regarding the existence of several social "estates" informed the composition of Parliament. These classes included the ordinary people, who were seated in the House of Commons, as well as the clergy and aristocracy, who had legal seats in the House of Lords. Elections for Commons members were, in theory, allowed, yet from the eighteenth through the middle of the nineteenth centuries, the majority of elections saw no opposition and no votes were cast. Most people did not dare vote against the candidates that the powerful landowners or aristocrats preferred since there was no secret ballot and voting was public and easily witnessed.

The Glorious Revolution of 1688 and the Civil War of 1642–51, however, both resulted in constitutional reforms that drastically altered political and economic institutions and had a significant impact on the development of democracy. These reforms resulted from a struggle between the Stuart monarch's desire to uphold and enhance their absolutist powers and the desire of the Parliament to restrain them. The government won. The end result was a reorganization of political institutions that significantly reduced the monarchy's authority and proportionately strengthened Parliament's. Because citizens no longer worried being preyed upon by the state as a result of the shift in political institutions, property rights are now much more securely protected. In particular, it gave authority to a Parliament that included businesspeople and landowners who were interested in selling to the market. Britain had started to see consistent economic development by the late eighteenth century.The First Reform Act of 1832 was the country's first significant step toward democracy. The "rotten boroughs," where multiple members of Parliament were chosen by a small number of voters, were among the biggest electoral injustices under the previous election system, and many of them were eliminated by this legislation. The right to vote was also created by the 1832 reform, and it was based universally on wealth and property.

In the years after Waterloo, the fear of revolution, which was considered as a special peril given the expansion of the new industrial sectors, increased rather than decreased, and Lord Liverpool's administration adopted a severe repressive strategy.The Industrial Revolution was well under way by the beginning of the nineteenth century, and the years leading up to 1832 were marked by persistent rioting and civil upheaval. The Peterloo Massacre in 1819, the Luddite Riots from 1811 to 1816, the Spa Fields Riots from 1816, and the Swing Riots from 1830 were not. The July Revolution of 1830 in Paris served as further impetus for the changes. The goal of the 1832

reform, according to historians, was to prevent societal unrest. According to Lang, the amount of dissatisfaction strengthened the argument for quick change now rather than later since doing nothing was just too risky. The Whigs should support reform as the lesser of two evils, just as Wellington and Peel had approved emancipation to prevent an uprising in Ireland.

The overall electorate rose from 492,700 to 806,000 as a result of the 1832 Reform Act, or 14.5 percent of adult male population. Despite this, since there were 123 seats with less than a thousand voters, the majority of British citizens were unable to cast ballots, giving the aristocracy and wealthy landowners significant room for patronage. Additionally, there is evidence that voter intimidation and corruption persisted after the Ballot Act of 1872 and the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Act of 1883. Therefore, the Reform Act was intended as a tactical compromise rather than the creation of broad democracy. Unsurprisingly, the need for legislative reform persisted long after 1832, and the Chartist movement played a vital role in addressing it.

Reform momentum finally peaked in 1867, primarily as a result of a confluence of causes. One of them was a sudden downturn in the business cycle that led to severe economic hardship and a rise in the danger of violence. The National Reform Union and Reform League were established in 1864 and 1865, respectively. The Hyde Park Riots of July 1866 served as the most direct cause. According to Searle, the Reform movement in the nation had a significant impact on the Derby ministry's decision to push for the swift passage of any Reform Bill [2]–[4].

DISCUSSION

This interpretation is supported by many other Historians

After the passage of the Second Reform Act in 1867, the number of voters increased from 1.36 million to 2.48 million, and working class people dominated all metropolitan seats. The Third Reform Act of 1884 quadrupled the electorate once again by extending to the counties the same voting laws that previously applied to the boroughs. Britain only had single-member electoral districts until the Redistribution Act of 1885 eliminated the residual disparities in the distribution of seats. After 1884, around 60% of adult men gained the right to vote. Once again, societal unrest seems to have been a major driving force behind the 1884 statute.

The Representation of the People Act of 1918, passed in the wake of the First World War, granted the right to vote to all adult males over the age of twenty-one and adult females over the age of thirty who were ratepayers or married to ratepayers. In 1928, all women were granted the right to vote under the same conditions as males. The 1918 laws were negotiated during the war and may, in part, be seen as a trade-off between the government and the working classes, who were required to fight and manufacture armaments. However, Garrard points out that most people believed that if the system was to endure and "contentment and stability prevail," men who were seen to have suffered much and been aware of the Russian Revolution had to be granted universal citizenship.

Overall, a coherent picture of British political history is presented. During the eighty-six-year era beginning in 1832, when Britain was ruled by the comparatively wealthy, mostly rural aristocracy, strategic concessions were given to adult males. In order to avoid social upheaval, instability, and maybe even revolution, these concessions were made in order to include the once disenfranchised in politics. Because social peace in 1832 could be bought by paying off the middle classes, concessions were made gradually. The specifics of political institutions, particularly the House of Lords' continued unrepresentativeness, further lessened the impact of

the compromises. The House of Lords served as a crucial safeguard for the affluent against the possibility of drastic changes coming from a democratized House of Commons, although being tested during the 1832 reforms. This was the case, at least, up to the eve of the First World War, when the battle with Herbert Asquith's Liberal administration over the adoption of welfare state components resulted in significant restrictions on the Lords' authority.

Further accommodations had to be made after 1832, when the working classes redevolved via the Chartist movement and then the trade unions. The last promise of genuine democracy was sealed by the Great War and its aftermath. Although other reasons, including pressure from the disenfranchised, surely played a part and some changes were more influenced by it than others, the prospect of social chaos served as the impetus for the development of democracy in Britain. A society that had long since lost almost all traces of medieval organization and had successfully fended off the menace of absolutism was the setting for the establishment of democracy in Britain and its subsequent consolidation. They also occurred against a backdrop of accelerated urbanization, industrialization, the growth of the factory system, growing inequality, and - in the years after the repeal of the Corn Laws - accelerated economic globalization [5]–[7].

Argentina

The contemporary Argentine Republic had its start when it proclaimed its independence in 1810. Following this time, the nation was engulfed in a chaotic succession of civil wars and internal disputes about the make-up of governmental institutions and the balance of power. In the 1860s, the anarchy finally subsided. A new constitution was drafted in 1853, and Bartolome' Mitre was chosen to serve as the united republic's first president in 1862. In order to facilitate the first of many agricultural export booms that would support the Argentine economy until 1930, Mitre set out to establish a state. The cornerstone of electoral politics was laid during this time when he established a national bureaucracy, taxation system, and judicial system. However,The 1853 election statute, which ostensibly allowed for people involvement in politics, quickly revealed itself to be a fraud. Elections were almost always ceremonial farces, orchestrated and overseen by lackeys of the elite, with a tiny minority of the public taking part.

Following Mitre, Domingo Sarmiento was elected president, and the Partido Autonomista Nacional was created around him. By rigging elections, successive PAN presidents kept their positions of power until 1916. However, they did so in light of the escalating societal unrest. The Unio'n C'vica, which began an uprising against the government in July 1890, served as an effective opposition after 1889. Following 1891, the Unio'n C'vica Radical, led by Hipo'lito Yrigoyen, staged uprisings in 1893 and 1905. However, despite the persistence of governments founded on the command and control of the populace,with expanding cities and the creation of new social strata, Argentine elites were becoming aware of the emerging parallels between Western European cultures and their own. For as long as political exclusion persisted, democracy would not be able to safeguard political stability. The early 1890s upheavals of the country were in danger of being repeated. One of the foremost proponents of political reform, Roque Sa'enz Pena, was elected president in 1910. As Rock stated:During the first decade of the century, radicals, socialists, and even anarchists contributed to the reform movement. Elite progressives worried about the Radicals' rising popularity and wondered where their next uprising might originate.

The so-called Sa'enz Pen a Law, which forbade fraudulent election tactics and instituted the secret vote, was approved in 1912. The 1853 Constitution's initial proposal for universal male

suffrage finally came to pass. According to Smith, reform "was a deliberate move to save the pre-vailing system. worried about the rumored potential of violence and labor strife.In 1916, Yrigoyen was elected president as a result of these measures.Surprises were also delivered by the changes. In the hope that the old oligarchic groups would adjust to the new circumstances and coalesce into a powerful conservative party that would have significant public support, Sa'enz Pena and his followers advocated for electoral reform. Instead, the conservatives' attempts to unite the party were constantly unsuccessful.

As a result, the Radical party gained political power in Argentina, seriously endangering established interests. Conservatives received 42% of the vote in 1916, but by 1928, that number had dropped to 25%. According to Smith, "this position contrasts dramatically with that in Britain and Sweden... Consequently, "by 1930 Yrigoyenists had a substantial delegation in the upper chamber and they threatened to gain a full majority in the upcoming elections," where traditional elites "continued to dominate systems after the extension of suffrage." The political system therefore "came to constitute an independent challenge to the socioeconomic system... It seems sense that Conservatives grew to consider democracy as dysfunctional given their early expectations.Yrigoyen was overthrown by a military coup in September 1930, and a rigged election was held the following year in 1931. "The election of 1931 restored power to the same broad complexion of groups that had controlled it before 1916 the pampas' exporting interests and the lesser landowners of the provinces" The Conservatives continued to commit electoral fraud throughout the rest of the 1930s, but by 1940 they were making some attempts to reintegrate the Radicals. A military coup put an end to this run of Conservative governments in 1943.

A number of military leaders held the presidency following the coup in 1943, but Juan Domingo Peron's ascension to power first as a member of the military junta, then as the elected president after 1946 was the key event of this time. Pero'n established a political apparatus centered on the state's control of the labor movement and led the military administration toward a more radical and pro-labor course. Pero'n oversaw a significant rise in the salaries and social benefits for the working classes during his first term as president. His programs sought to redistribute resources from the rural to the urban areas. An robust pro-industrial strategy of protection and import substitution was one of these measures. Pero'n was reelected in 1951 despite the fact that the election was marred by fraud and the suppression of the opposition. He was then overthrown by a coup in 1955. Between 1958 until 1966, military-restricted civilian administrations made a comeback, only to be overthrown by another coup in 1966. General Juan Carlos Ongan'a took office as president in 1966, but strong popular mobilization soon brought an end to his administration. Cavarozzi highlights "the popular insurrection of 1969's" significance. this uprising against the dictatorship was followed by more, especially in 1971, and corresponded with the development of many armed organizations and guerillas committed to overthrowing the state. it united blue and white collar workers, students, and the urban poor.

When Pero'n returned from exile and won the first really democratic election since his first election in 1946, democracy was once again established in 1973. The same distributional conflicts that existed previously returned after democracy, however, and "As in 1946, the kernels of his program were income redistribution in favor of labor, the expansion of employment, and renewed social reform" Following Pero'n's death in 1974, his third wife Isabel took over as head of the Pero'nist administration until it was overthrown by a coup led by General Jorge Videla in 1976. Once in charge, the Army set out to crush any remaining opposition to a political

revolution that aimed to completely demolish the Pero'nist state. The most oppressive government in Argentine history ruled until the Falklands War of 1982–1983 (or until then). Tens of thousands of individuals were "disappeared," while many more were tortured, imprisoned, and sent into exile. General Roberto Viola replaced Videla in 1981, but General Leopoldo Galtieri removed him from office the following year.

They started the disastrous invasion of the Falkland Islands as the military got more and more under attack and public demonstrations against them increased. When the Argentine army capitulated in June 1982, Galtieri resigned, and Rau'l Alfonsin, a radical, was elected president the following year as a result of democratic elections. Alfonsin was succeeded by Carlos Menem in 1990, Fernando de la Rua in 2000, and Ne'stor Kirchner in 2003, following a confusing series of interim presidents during the economic crisis of 2001–2002, when Argentina was once again a democracy.

Argentina's political history therefore exhibits a remarkable pattern in which democracy was formed in 1912, weakened in 1930, re-created in 1946, undermined again in 1955, completely re-created in 1973, undermined again in 1976, and finally restored in 1983. There were also different types of nondemocratic governments in between, from limited democracies to wholly military regimes. Argentina's political history has been marked by constant instability and conflict. As a consequence of the 1880s export boom, there was pressure on the established political elite to open the system, which corresponded with economic development, changes in class structure, and fast growing inequality. However, due to the structure of Argentine society, democracy was not possible. The ascension of the Radicals to power put traditional interests in too much danger, and they continued to struggle against democracy. This conflict was further made worse by the 1930s economic upheavals. With Pero'n as their leader, the workers became more powerful and militant, and the distributional disputes later merged with the pro- and anti-Pero'n conflict. Social demonstrations brought down dictatorial systems, while military coups caused by the radical, populist, and sometimes unworkable policies that democracies embraced brought down dictatorial systems.

Singapore

In 1819, Sir Stamford Raffles purchased Singapore from its native Malay king on behalf of the British East India Company. The island, which is 622 square miles in size and is just 176 kilometers north of the equator, had only a few hundred people living on it at the time. It quickly established itself as a key trade port for the East India Company and grew quickly as a business hub. With the British colonization of the Malayan peninsular in the 1870s and the growth of an export economy in Malaya centered on goods like tin and rubber, this function extended even after the East India Company's demise.

As in many other British colonies, Singapore had a political awakening during the Second World War and the horrific Japanese occupation as they started to prepare for independence. The first legislative council elections were conducted in 1948 with a relatively limited ballot, and the British Governor continued to select the bulk of the council members. Strikes, protests, and labor unrest were common in the late 1940s and early 1950s. They compelled the British to adopt the Rendel Commission's new constitution in 1955, which called for the election of the majority of legislative council members and the appointment of the chief minister by the leader of the majority party. However, after the elections in 1955 there were additional riots and social instability. As a result, constitutional talks were resumed, and fresh elections were scheduled for

1959, with Singapore receiving practically total internal autonomy. The People's Action Party, led by Lee Kuan Yew, won forty-three of the fifty-one seats up for election in 1959 thanks to universal suffrage.

The PAP actively pushed industrialisation from the start. In order to draw in global corporations, one of its initiatives was controlling the trade union movement. It started to weaken unions' influence in 1959, and in 1967 and 1968, when all unions were placed under government control, it finally succeeded. The National Trade Union Congress was established as a government organization to do this, and strikes were outlawed. Lee Kuan Yew and the PAP's top officials distanced themselves from the party's more radical factions at the same time. As a consequence, the party split in 1961, with thirteen legislative representatives quitting to create the Barisan Sosialis. Despite this setback, the PAP recovered and started to demonstrate its aptitude for political scheming even before independence:

The PAP then tightened its hold on authority by intimidating the BS and the unions. Most dramatically, the PAP deployed the police special branch to conduct Operation Cold Store, a sweep that eliminated the BS's high level leadership, ahead to the 1963 elections. As a consequence, the PAP won thirty-seven of the fifty-one seats in the 1963 elections, while the BS took home thirteen. The PAP first saw unification with Malaya as a component of its economic growth plan since it would provide a sizable market for Singaporean businesses. In order to create the Federation of Malaysia, Malaya, Singapore, Sabah, and Sarawak joined in 1963. However, because to animosity between Malay and Chinese officials, Singapore was evicted in 1965.

In 1965, when the republic was established, the PAP started to intimidate its rivals. As a result, all BS members resigned from their positions in parliament and abstained from the 1968 elections. Even though 51 seats were uncontested, the PAP won all of them under these circumstances. In addition, the PAP defeated a number of opposition parties to win every seat in 1972, 1976, and 1980, even though the BS ran again after 1972. Last but not least, a 1981 by-election produced the first opposition representative since 1968. In 1984, a second opposition representative was chosen, and by 1991, there were four. But since the opposition only fielded candidates for a small number of seats, the PAP was always certain of holding a majority in the Parliament. Eighty-two of the eighty-three seats were won by the PAP in 1997. The PAP won 81 seats in the 2001 elections. The PAP created nonconstituency Members of Parliament who were assigned to those opposition losers who earned the most votes in order to prevent a serious opposition from emerging during this era and to assuage concerns for some type of alternative representation. There were nine of these lawmakers in the legislature in 2001. Lee Kuan Yew withdrew from his position as prime minister in 1990, and Goh Chok Tong took him. Lee Hsien Loong, the son of Goh Chok Tong, then succeeded him in 2004.

The PAP expanded its social control at this time, especially via its control of the media. The PAP also engages in significant gerrymandering to keep its control in order to prevent losing any seats. Case indicates that "political activism in Singapore risks blacklisting, shunning, lawsuits, tax investigations, lost business opportunities, and detention without trial." Despite the fact that the founding election system was based on single-member districts in the British model, there are currently a combination of these and multimember districts. According to Rodan, "single constituencies in which opposition parties narrowly missed defeating PAP candidates in the last election have vanished, typically absorbed under group representation constituencies consisting of sitting PAP candidates."

The PAP also engages in obvious threats against the people during election season in an effort to sway their votes. According to Rodan, the electorate's home renovation program raised particular issues in 1997. Since 86% of Singaporeans reside in apartments constructed by the government, the electorate is very susceptible to such intimidation. The danger was strengthened by the introduction of a new method of vote counting that would allow the government to determine voting preferences down to the level of 5,000 people in a precinct.

Singapore lacks a landed or other nobility, which has been significant for Singaporean politics given its size and colonial past. Its population is mostly urbanized, with a population ethnically composed of around 75% Chinese, 15% Malay, and 8% people from the Indian subcontinent. The main capitalists in Singapore now are foreigners, who the PAP seems to be promoting at the cost of local economic interests. Prior to independence, Singapore similarly lacked significant capitalists or commercial interests. The PAP does not choose its MPs from among party members, but rather from the professions and the civil service since it was founded by professionals with English-language educations and members of the middle class. The party does primarily exist to serve as an electoral machine; otherwise, it would operate via the government as opposed to a separate grassroots group. I make no apologies that the PAP is the Government and the Government is the PAP, Lee Kuan Yew declared in 1984.

Overall, it is clear that when Singaporeans fought against British colonial control, the country advanced toward democracy and independence. However, after 1963, the PAP quickly imposed one-party dominance. Since then, the economy has prospered, inequality has decreased, and the PAP has retained power by mostly legal methods, including by intimidating the public and using coercive tactics. No "disappearances" have occurred despite harassment and detention, and there seems to be little pushback against PAP authority and political reform.

South Africa

The Dutch East India Company established a colony in Bay in 1652, marking the beginning of European settlement in South Africa. Its purpose was to raise food and supplies for its ships traveling from Europe to Asia around the Cape of Good Hope. By the end of the eighteenth century, the Dutch colonies had only reached approximately 100 miles inland and had progressively displaced the native Khoikhoi. Due to its advantageous location, the Cape Colony rose to prominence in geopolitical rivalry. It was taken by the British twice during the Napoleonic Wars in 1795 and again, finally, in 1806, after which the colony was incorporated into the British Empire.

Similar to the Dutch East India Company, the British had no early plans for the interior and were more focused on ensuring the security of the maritime lanes to Asia and India. However, many of the Dutch settlers who later became known as Boers or Afrikaners were alienated by the British because of their colonial tactics. In response, the Boers made a huge interior migration, forming the Transvaal in 1860 and the Orange Free State in 1854.In 1853, the British administration established a bicameral parliament that had domestic legislative authority but was subject to veto from London. This institutionalized the political structures of the Cape Colony. Government officials chosen by the colonial office made up the executive branch. The voting mechanism for the legislature used the British system of property and income limits rather than specifically disenfranchising persons based on their race.

The discovery of gold on the Witwatersrand and diamonds in Kimberley in the 1870s changed the political balance between the British Empire and the Boer Republics. The labor relations in

these regions quickly took on a pattern that would later be referred to as "apartheid," with blacks being prevented from digging for diamonds, made to carry passes to restrict labor mobility, barred from desirable professions that were made exclusively available to whites, and forced to live in segregated communities and camps. The British conquered the formidable Zulu Kingdom in 1879 after annexing the Transvaal in 1877 and the diamond fields in 1871. But following the Transvaal's successful uprising in 1881 and the South African War of 1899–1902, the British government only managed to subjugate all of the Boer Republics. The Cape Colony, Natal, Orange Free State, and Transvaal were merged to establish the Union of South Africa in 1910 after the British encouraged the provinces to unite.

Many of the massive inequities in South African society were steadily reinforced by that country's first administration, led by Louis Botha and Jan Smuts. This process culminated in the establishment of full-fledged apartheid with the election of the National Party under D. F. Malan in 1948. For instance, the Natives Land Act of 1913 prohibited Africans from owning property outside of "native areas," which were reserves set aside for Africans and made up around 12% of the total land area in 1939.

The African National Congress was established in 1912, marking the beginning of the first organized black political awareness. Initially a minor movement led by Africans from the middle class, the ANC radicalized itself after the Second World War as a result of the inability to liberalize the system. Africans' Claims in South Africa, a declaration issued by the ANC in 1943, demanded adult suffrage for everyone for the first time.Hendrik Verwoerd served as prime minister from 1958 to 1966, which is when apartheid's use after 1948 peaked. All Africans were allegedly forced into eight homelands by the government, and only those Africans whose labor was required by the white economy were allowed to live in "European areas." They needed "passes," which served as documentation that they were legitimately outside the tribal territories.

Massive violations of political and civil rights were used to maintain the apartheid government. The media was subject to strict government regulation, and radio and television were under its exclusive control. People may be detained indefinitely in solitary confinement and arrested without a hearing because to the police's extensive powers. The Public Safety Act of 1953 gave the government the authority to issue a proclamation and proclaim a state of emergency.The ANC consistently opposed the NP's policies throughout the 1950s, both in the streets and in the courts. A riot broke out at one of these protests in Sharpeville in 1960, and police opened fire, killing 83 people. Following this episode, the government took steps to finally disband the ANC, and Nelson Mandela and other prominent figures were imprisoned on Robben Island in 1964. The ANC persisted in being the center of resistance to the dictatorship despite losing a large portion of its leadership to South African jails or exile. The NP persisted in its mission to establish sovereign homelands in which all Africans would have the right to citizenship. The Transkei and Botswana were designated as independent countries by the government in 1976.

A turning point was reached in 1976 when a riot in Soweto, a sizable African township outside of Johannesburg, resulted in 575 fatalities. The ANC leadership had been destroyed by the apartheid regime in the 1960s, but following the Soweto revolt, South Africa's black people developed a protest culture. The fight to end apartheid in the nation drew together workers, children, adults, men, and women as well as the educated and the ignorant. The apartheid regime was forced to compromise in several ways. It halted the formation of homelands right once, but as soon as the unrest calmed, the government went back on its word, and two additional homelands were established in the early 1980s. A new constitution was enacted in 1984 that gave Indians and

Coloreds separate legislatures, which was more significant than the government's efforts to recognize African trade unions. In the legislature, there was still a sizable majority of white people. Only one Indian and one Colored person made up P. W. Botha's cabinet when he was elected president, and neither had a specific ministry. After 1984, the government also eliminated occupational restrictions that prevented Africans from working in a certain profession.

However, apartheid's core principles or organizational structure remained untouched. Therefore, these accommodations were insufficient to stop the strikes, riots, and social instability that spread more widely. For instance, there were 390 strikes involving 240,000 employees in 1985, and political violence claimed the lives of 879 persons. The vanguard of antistate activity was the African trade unions, whose legitimization had been a compromise after Soweto. The Botha administration reacted to these occurrences in June 1986 by proclamating a state of emergency and deploying the army into the townships to reestablish order.

When the United States imposed sanctions in October 1986, things grew worse for the apartheid government. Many members of the white elite in South Africa began to approach the ANC and black leaders starting in the mid-1980s as they realized it was impossible to maintain the same set of institutions. Profits were badly harmed by the strikes' industrial turmoil, and from the late 1970s forward, there was a consistent outflow of capital from South Africa. Famous white businesspeople met with the ANC in London and other cities, while Mandela himself was transferred from Robben Island and engaged in several conversations with various Botha government officials.

In order for there to be a peaceful transition, as acknowledged by Mandela, a solution had to be found to balance the ANC's desire for majority rule with "the insistence of whites on structural guarantees that majority rule will not mean domination of the white minority by the blacks." He abolished the ANC's prohibition at the start of 1990 and freed Mandela from jail. The nature of the end of the apartheid period and the kind of society that would come after it were the subject of intense talks. In order to lessen the possibility of black majority rule, the NP proposed a number of reforms when constitutional talks first started in December 1991.South Africa was to unite into a large, unstoppable federation of nations. The chairmanship was to alternate among party leaders, and all decisions were to be made by consensus or special majorities. Its central executive was to be a coalition of every party that garnered a significant number of seats in an election. These demands were rejected by the ANC, and negotiations ended in June 1992. They were begun in September, and by February 1993, a date had been set for the transition to the April 1994 election.

With the first new Parliament elected in 1994 and given the task of creating a permanent constitution, an interim constitution was adopted. The interim constitution had thirty-four fundamental principles and stipulated that no later change would be legal if it conflicted with them. A constitutional court created by President Mandela was to decide whether it did. A two-thirds majority of both Houses of Parliament was necessary for further revisions. The primary concession made to the NP was the need of mandatory power sharing in the cabinet, with participation in the cabinet granted to any party that gained at least twenty seats in the national legislature in proportion to those seats. In the 1994 election, the ANC gained 62.7 percent of the vote.

Like many other colonial civilizations, South Africa was built on a foundation of extreme economic and political inequality. This heritage resulted in a very undemocratic political system

that only granted voting rights to white people in the 20th century. Africans were able to exert growing pressure against this political status quo after the Second World War, making the current apartheid state unworkable and raising the possibility of a widespread uprising. Despite keeping the system largely unchanged, the state's attempts to make compromises failed to accomplish this goal, and the apartheid regime instead maintained its grip on power by using severe repression and brutality. The government in 1994 was compelled to democratize rather than take a chance on possibly far worse options.

The Schedule

In these accounts, we see four radically diverse political growth routes. Britain serves as an example of how to achieve consolidated democracy without experiencing any major setbacks. Argentina serves as an example of how a country may go from a nondemocratic system to an unconsolidated democracy and back again, with the cycle perhaps repeating itself many times. Singapore is a prime example of a nation where a non-democratic rule may endure for a very long period with only modest concessions and no severe repression. Before apartheid ended, South Africa is a prime example of a non-democratic government that relies on repression to stay in power. We now put up a framework for comprehending these diverse approaches and creating forecasts for when we anticipate one path to emerge over another [8].

CONCLUSION

Overall, the investigation of political options is a difficult and continuing process that calls for careful analysis of institutional, historical, cultural, and other institutional aspects, as well as the function of foreign players and global trends. Different political development pathways may lead to various results, with some nations establishing stability and democratic rule while others battle autocracy, corruption, and social unrest. Policymakers and academics wishing to advance constructive political change may find helpful insights from an understanding of the elements that define these routes.

REFERENCES

[1]   G. Leon, "Feudalism, Collaboration and Path Dependence in England's Political Development," *Br. J. Polit. Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.1017/S0007123417000825.

[2]   D. Acemoglu and J. A. Robinson, "Paths of Political Development," in *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, 2010. doi: 10.1017/cbo9780511510809.002.

[3]   A. R. Poteete, "Is development path dependent or political? A reinterpretation of mineral-dependent development in botswana," *J. Dev. Stud.*, 2009, doi: 10.1080/00220380802265488.

[4]   T. N. Grigoriadis and W. Kassem, "The Regional Origins of the Libyan Conflict," *Middle East Policy*, 2021, doi: 10.1111/mepo.12560.

[5]   D. Acemoglu and J. Robinson, "Non-Modernization: Power-Culture Trajectories and the Dynamics of Political Institutions," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2021, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3885881.

[6]   D. Acemoglu and J. A. Robinson, "Paths of Economic and Political Development," in *The Oxford Handbook of Political Economy*, 2008. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199548477.003.0037.

[7]   M. Koyama, C. Moriguchi, and T. H. Sng, "Geopolitics and Asia's little divergence: State building in China and Japan after 1850," *J. Econ. Behav. Organ.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.jebo.2018.08.021.

[8]   P. C. Schmitter, "Paths to Political Development in Latin America," *Proc. Acad. Polit. Sci.*, 1972, doi: 10.2307/1173175.

CHAPTER 2

DEMOCRACY VERSUS NON-DEMOCRACY

Dr. V Y John, Assistant Professor, Department of Finance,
CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email id-dr.vy_john@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Democracy and nondemocracy are two distinct forms of governance that have significant implications for political, social, and economic development. While democracy is characterized by the principles of popular sovereignty, political equality, and civil liberties, nondemocracy typically involves centralized power, limited political freedoms, and restricted access to decision-making. The debate between democracy and nondemocracy is not new, with advocates on both sides arguing for the benefits of their respective systems. Supporters of democracy highlight its ability to foster accountability, transparency, and participation, which can lead to better governance, economic growth, and social progress. Nondemocratic regimes, on the other hand, often emphasize stability, efficiency, and national security, arguing that these values are necessary for development and prosperity.

KEYWORDS:

Accountability, Authoritarianism, Civil liberties, Constitution, Corruption, Democracy, Economic development.

INTRODUCTION

There are no universally agreed-upon solutions to these fundamental concerns, nor is there a generally acknowledged framework for addressing them in political science, political economics, or social science more broadly. This book's objectives are to provide a framework for examining these queries, to offer some speculative responses, and to suggest potential directions for further investigation. In the course of our inquiry, we first provide an examination of the influence that diverse political institutions have on societal decisions and policies, with special emphasis on the distinctions between democratic and nondemocratic political systems. In order to do this, we simulate how various people and groups feel about certain policies and, therefore, about the political institutions that support these policies [1]–[3].

It is helpful to think of society as consisting of two groups, the elites and the people, with the latter being more numerous, to make the first presentation of our views easier. Our theory places emphasis on the fact that social decisions are fundamentally divisive. For instance, if the elites are relatively wealthy people, or just the affluent, they would be against redistributive taxes, in contrast to the comparatively poor citizens, or simply the poor, who will support taxation that would transfer resources to them. In general, decisions or policies that benefit the elites will vary from those that benefit the broader public. A key component of our strategy is the conflict over societal decisions and policies.

Who makes up the elite and the majority? Context and the nuanced processes by which political identities develop in various countries have a role in this to some degree. As was the case in Argentina and Britain in the late nineteenth century, it is often helpful to conceive of the elite as the relatively wealthy members of society. This isn't always the case, however; in South Africa, for example, the elites were white people, and in many African nations, the elites are linked to a specific ethnic group. The military is the elite in various civilizations, including Argentina for a time. The fact that the elite and the wealthy coexist often may not be a coincidence. In certain circumstances, people who start off wealthy might use their wealth to gain influence, notably by buying off politicians or members of the armed forces. In other situations, those who are not wealthy at first may rise to positions of authority. However, once obtained, political influence may be leveraged to generate revenue and riches, leading to a natural tendency for individuals in positions of authority to become wealthy. There is a strong correlation in both situations.

Between the Privileged and Wealthy

Our thesis relates the political conflict between the elite and the populace to which countries will transition from dictatorship to democracy and under what conditions democracy will be consolidated. These groups have competing preferences for democracy and tyranny, which they acknowledge affect societal decisions in distinct ways. We also stress that political institutions have a role in controlling how political power will be distributed in the future, in addition to determining how much redistribution occurs and who benefits from policies now. Because they take actively in the political process in democracies, people have greater influence now and, in the future, than they would in non-democracies. Our explanation stresses both the ideas that, in our opinion, are fundamental to thinking about democracy as well as how those ideas and problems may be formally described using game theory since the framework, we propose is formal [4].

DISCUSSION

We must be upfront and explicit about the specific topics we address and the fundamental tenets of our methodology. The so-called Occam's razor is an often helpful idea for creating models of social phenomena. The idea that one shouldn't provide more explanations for a phenomena than is necessary was made famous by the English philosopher William of Occam in the fourteenth century. In order to formulate responses to complicated issues, one should aim for a high level of parsimony. We regularly apply this idea in this book in order to both simplify the questions themselves and, perhaps even more audaciously, to simplify the solutions to complicated questions given the complexity of the situations we are dealing with. In truth, we use Occam's razor in a ruthless and valiant effort to narrow the scope of our fundamental questions. We exclude a lot of fascinating information from our inquiry, as well as some other crucial issues. We're hoping that this bet pays off by giving us some reasonably insightful responses to some intriguing topics. Of course, the reader will decide if our plan is successful in the end [5]–[7].

The classification of various regimes is the topic of our initial option. Today, democratic regimes rule over a large number of nations, but no two democracies are similar, and the majority show a number of distinct structural characteristics. Consider the differences between the presidential system in France and the parliamentary system in Britain, or between the majoritarian election systems utilized in the United States and the proportional representation system prevalent across most of continental Europe. Despite these variations, there are some significant similarities. Democracy is the government "by the people for the people," or, to use a common description,

"democracy is the government by the people for the people." In contrast, many other countries are still ruled by dictators and nondemocratic regimes.1 There are even more stark differences between some of these nondemocratic regimes than the dissenting voices within the democratic regime. Consider, for instance, how General Pinochet's leadership in Chile from 1973 to 1989 contrasts with the Communist Party of China's reign since 1948. The discrepancies become even more obvious when we compare them to other nondemocratic systems, such as the restricted constitutional systems that existed in nineteenth-century Europe.But these authoritarian governments all have one thing in common: they reflect the choices of a small segment of the people, the "elite." In China, the Communist Party's demands are the ones that are most important. In Chile, a military junta made most of the decisions; their tastes, as well as maybe those of some affluent social groups who supported the dictatorship, were what mattered. Less than 10% of the adult population in Britain prior to the First Reform Act of 1832, or the highly wealthy and aristocratic portions, were able to vote, and as a result, policies automatically catered to their needs.

It follows that democracies typically come closer to a state of political equality than nondemocracies, which reflect the desires of a much smaller segment of society and hence more closely resemble a state of political inequality. Understanding the social and economic factors that are fostering the emergence of more nondemocratic systems against those that are moving certain nations toward political regimes with more political equality is the main goal of this study. A dichotomous division between democracy and nondemocracy is used in our models, however. However, considering different shades of democracy is more helpful for determining how democratic real governments are and when doing empirical research. For instance, although none of the reform laws passed in Britain throughout the eighteenth century brought universal adult suffrage, they were all steps toward greater democracy. To begin understanding these movements, we simply assume a transition from nondemocracy to full democracy. Our definition is "Schumpetarian" in that we emphasize that a nation is democratic if a specific political process occurs - if certain key institutions, like free and fair elections and free entry into 1 In the text, despite the title of our book, we prefer to use the term nondemocracy to alternatives, such as dictatorship or authoritarian regime, because it has fewer specific connotations than any of the other terms. Politics are set in motion. If democracy is linked to certain results, it will be because such outcomes are a result of democratic institutions.

Due to our methodology, we are interested in understanding all processes that lead to greater democracy rather than just when universal adult suffrage was instituted. For instance, Argentina's constitution of 1853 established unlimited male suffrage, but due to widespread electoral corruption, democracy did not materialize there until President Sa'enz Pena's political reforms in 1912. In this instance, we see 1912 as a crucial step toward democracy. The reforms of 1867 significantly increased voting rights in Britain, but it wasn't until 1919 that all men were granted the right to vote. But in 1872, election fraud was outlawed and secret ballots were adopted. In this situation, we consider 1867 to be a significant development in the British political equality movement.Regarding the expansion of women's voting rights, we have little to say. Voting rights were first granted to adult males in virtually all European nations before being extended to women. This was a reflection of the gender roles that were prevalent at the time; when the roles started to alter as women joined the employment, they also gained the ability to vote. Therefore, it is probable that the processes we provide better characterize the development of male suffrage than the expansion of women's voting rights.

Only to the degree that there are certain crucial components that are key to our theory and shared by all democracies but often absent from nondemocracies, does our dichotomous difference between democracy and nondemocracy make sense and serve any meaningful purpose. Yes, this is the case. We contend that compared to nondemocracies, which are often ruled by an elite and are more inclined to protect its interests, democracy, which is typically a state of political equality, looks out for the interests of the majority more. Simply put, nondemocracy is often a system for the elite and the privileged; in contrast, democracy is a system that benefits the bulk of the population and produces policies that are usually more favorable to the majority.

In contrast to democracy, we contend that nondemocracy reflects political inequality. In a democracy, everyone has the right to cast a ballot and, theoretically, to engage in politics in some capacity. In a non-democratic system, the government is controlled by an elite, a junta, an oligarchy, or in the worst case scenario by just one person, the dictator. Therefore, it seems logical to compare the two in terms of political equality. Naturally, this does not imply that democracy is an ideal of political equality. One person, one vote is a common feature of prosperous democracies, but it is by no means a flawless system of political equality. Some people have larger voices than others, and those with financial means may be able to sway policy by non-voting means like lobbying, bribery, or other forms of influence. When we talk about political equality in a democracy throughout the book, we always talk about it in a relative sense [8]–[10].Overall, our fundamental strategy is beginning to take form. When we think of regimes, we often conceive of them as either democratic or not.Political equality is considered to exist in democracies, which are also known for their disproportionately more pro-majority policies. Pro-majority policies often coincide with pro-poor ones, particularly when there is a larger desire to shift money from the affluent to the poor. In contrast, nondemocracies tend to favor less majority-driven policies than do democracies and offer a bigger voice to the ruling class.

Components of Our Strategy

Now that the primary goal of our research has been established, we can better comprehend why some societies are democratic, why other societies transition from nondemocracy to democracy, and why some democracies return to being dictatorships. The foundational elements of our strategy have already been discussed; it is now time to carefully develop them.The first fundamental tenet of our strategy is that it is economic. By this, we do not mean that people always behave logically in accordance with some basic postulates. We don't want to imply that society consists entirely of people or social groupings. Instead, we imply that people have clearly defined preferences about the results of their acts or the effects of those actions; for instance, people may prefer more money over less, as well as peace, security, justice, and a variety of other things. There are occasions when large groups of people share interests or even take action together. What counts, however, is that people do have clear preferences that they are aware of.

Based on their evaluations of the outcomes, they compare alternative possibilities, such as democracy and nondemocracy. The economic approach contends that under such circumstances, individuals often act strategically and that this behavior need to be simulated like a game. Game theory is the study of situations where several decision-makers are strategically interacting. The fundamental assumption of game theory is that people choose different tactics based on the results. We, therefore, make substantial use of game theory in modeling preferences across different regimes and transitions between these regimes since our economic emphasis plus the existence of significant interactions between diverse political players makes all the circumstances discussed herein basically "game theoretic."

Consider a set of people for whom democracy and nondemocracy have the identical effects in all areas, with the exception that democracy produces more money for them; they naturally prefer more income to less income to illustrate the ramifications of these assumptions. As a result, we anticipate that these people will choose democracy over authoritarianism. This assumption is really tenuous on one level, but on a deeper one, our economic emphasis is getting us a lot. The most significant benefit is that we are given permission to concentrate on the effects of the regimes, and preferences for regimes are derived from their effects. Such a strategy is in line with many others. Democracy only genuinely flourishes when people start to appreciate it highly for its political qualities as opposed to just its economic and social achievements.While we do not dispute the existence of such ideological preferences, we think that what matters more is how people and groups feel about certain regimes in light of their effects on the economy and society. In a later section of the book, we analyze how adding ideological preferences impacts our findings. The takeaway is that, as long as they do not become dominant considerations, they have little effect on our conclusions.

The fact that politics is inevitably contentious is our second tenet. The majority of policy decisions lead to distributional conflict; one policy favors one group while another favors different people. Politics are at stake in this circumstance, namely the policies that society ought to enact. These groups, such as the wealthy and the impoverished, have opposing policy preferences, and each choice of policy results in winners and losers. For instance, when taxes are high, the wealthy lose out and the poor gain out, but when taxes are low, the roles are reversed. In the absence of such conflict, combining individual preferences to get societal preferences would be simple; we would just need to choose the course of action that benefits everyone. We don't live in a world that is as straightforward as that, and conflict situations are commonplace. Every time society makes a choice or enacts a law, it is implicitly supporting one side of the political conflict, indirectly settling it in one way or another, and implicitly or overtly picking winners and losers.

Although the economic method places a strong emphasis on personal choices and motivations, many people have the same interests and sometimes reach the same conclusions. Furthermore, if there are no issues with collective action or if they can resolve those that do, groups of people could be able to act in concert. If so, it will be helpful to talk about conflict and who is at odds with whom in terms of groupings of people. These groupings might be socioeconomic classes, which would be somewhat in line with Marxist histories and political theories, or they could be urban actors, ethnic or religious organizations, or the military. Our conviction that social groupings play a crucial role in political conflict and transformation is what drives our attention on social groups as significant political actors.

How does society settle political conflict in reality, leaving aside questions of political philosophy on how a just or fair society should balance these conflicting preferences? Make this issue a little more specific by imagining that there are two policies, one of which benefits the populace and the other which benefits the elites. Which option will society choose? The policy must favor one group over the other since it is impossible to satisfy both groups at once. We can assume that the political clout of a group determines which one is preferred. In other words, political power is a group's ability to impose its preferred policies in the face of opposition from other organizations. We are constantly in a political conflict environment because there are competing interests. Additionally, we are always impacted by political power because we live in

a constant state of political conflict. A group will profit more from government policies and actions the more political clout it has.

Political power: What is it? What source does it have? It is helpful to make the distinction between de jure political power and de facto political power when formulating responses to these concerns. Imagine the state of nature described by Thomas Hobbes, where there is no rule and man and beast are interchangeable. Hobbes used this scenario to support his claim that this kind of anarchy was very undesirable and that the state, as a leviathan, was required to monopolize force and impose laws on people. But under Hobbes' state of nature, how are allocations decided? Who will get to eat the fruit if there is only enough for one of the two people to eat it? The solution is obvious: because there is no rule, whomever is stronger or more forceful will be allowed to consume the fruit. In politics, raw force of the same kind is important. When a certain group possesses armies and weaponry to murder other groups when policies don't go their way, it will have a lot of political clout. Therefore, a group's ability to use force against other organizations and the general public is its primary source of political power. This is what we mean by de facto political power. However, this is not the main source of political power, which is a blessing. The Labour Party now controls major decisions in the United Kingdom, not because it can use force or because it has obtained de facto authority via other methods, but rather because the democratic system has granted it political power. As a result, the Labour Party is able to choose the policies that will benefit its supporters or its leaders the most out of those having competing effects. De jure political power is what we refer to as political power that is granted by political institutions. De jure and de facto political power combine to form actual political power; which one is more important depends on a number of circumstances, a subject we will cover later.

Finally, we refer to political institutions as the social and political frameworks that distribute de jure political authority. An election rule that grants control of fiscal policy to the party that receives 51% of the vote, for instance, is an example of a specific political institution. For our purposes, the most important political institutions are those that choose who gets to participate in political deliberation. As a result, democracy's capacity to distribute de jure political authority plays a significant role in society. The majority has relative greater de jure political authority in democracies than in nondemocracies. Therefore, the fact that democracies prioritize protecting the interests of the majority of people more than nondemocracies is merely a result of the majority's stronger de jure political authority in democracies.

To Our Fundamental Story

Now that we have the first two fundamental components of our strategy, we can begin talking about preferences among other regimes. Elites and public often engage in political conflict, and democracies tend to prioritize protecting the interests of their populace above nondemocracies. Therefore, it seems sense to believe that the general populace favors democracy more than the ruling class. Therefore, if there is a disagreement about the kind of political institutions that should exist in a society, the vast majority of people will support democracy, while the ruling class would support nondemocracy. This is a fantastic place to start.

By presuming that the elites were the comparatively wealthy and the rest the relatively poor, we might give this structure more factual substance. In fact, the shift from nondemocracy to democracy was often accompanied by intense conflict between the wealthy elite, who wished to exclude the poorer members of society, and those who had previously been excluded from

political decision-making. As we saw in 1, this was particularly evident in nineteenth-century Europe, especially in Britain, where the working class eventually claimed the right to vote. The wealthy elite first rejected their demands, but eventually had to give in and accept their inclusion in the political system.

Aminzade characterizes the introduction of universal male suffrage to French politics in the following manner, in keeping with this narrative of political changes in nineteenth-century Europe:The revolutionary movement that put the Republican party in power in February 1848 was composed mostly of French workers, particularly craftsmen. When the Parisian working class pressure led liberal Republican leaders to... to hesitantly accept the right of all men to vote.

Perhaps more tellingly, the main actors in the democratization process saw it as a conflict between the wealthy and the poor. Viscount Cranborne, a prominent British Conservative of the nineteenth century, saw the fight for reform as a war between classes rather than parties and as a component of the larger political conflict of our time, the conflict for property rights. and just figures.

Most of the instances of the introduction of universal suffrage in Latin America in the first half of the 20th century - including the experiences in Argentina in 1912, as we saw in 1, but also in Uruguay in 1919, in Colombia in 1936, and in Venezuela in 1945 - were also characterized by conflict between the poorer and wealthier factions of society. Similar to South Africa, Zimbabwe too had a conflict between affluent whites and impoverished blacks before establishing democracy. This explanation so emphasizes how most people want democratic institutions since they benefit from them and will work to get them. Given our definition of political power, we may state that when people have greater de facto political power, they are more likely to achieve a transition to democracy. The balance of political power between the elites and the general populace determines whether a society transitions from nondemocracy to democracy, according to our previously established basic theory of democra- tization.

This may be thought of as a condensed form of our idea of democratization. But in reality, it is so oversimplified that several of our theory's key components are missing. Most significantly, the importance of democracy and, more broadly, political institutions is minimized.According to the notion, democracy develops when the people have enough political clout to make social decisions that the majority of people find more agreeable. As a consequence, people prefer democracy over nondemocracy. However, if the people have enough political clout, why don't they utilize it to swiftly enact the social decisions and policies they want rather than first fighting for democracy and then waiting for it to do so? Is democracy only an unnecessary intermediary step in this situation? One may argue that.

This is merely a characteristic of the little narrative we have shown so far; neither it nor our theory exhibits this trait. In reality, political institutions manage the distribution of political power between different social groupings, which is a far more basic function of them than just acting as an intermediating variable.

They play this function because we don't live in a static society like the one in the preceding story; rather, we live in a dynamic world where people care about policy both now and in the future. By include these dynamic strategic components, which is what our theory of democratization aims to accomplish, we may better explain democracy and democratization and capture the significance of political institutions [11]–[14].

CONCLUSION

Overall, the conflict between democracy and nondemocracy continues to be a major topic in political theory and practice, with significant repercussions for international development and governance. The data shows that democracy provides the greatest route towards fair and sustainable development, despite the fact that both systems have their advantages and disadvantages. In spite of these opposing assertions, empirical data points to the fact that democracies often outperform nondemocracies in a variety of domains, such as economic growth, social welfare, and human development. The likelihood of violent conflict, corruption, and violations of human rights is also lower in democracies. However, the transition to democracy may be difficult and may call for considerable changes to the legal system, civil society, and political institutions. Such modifications may also be resisted by autocratic governments, which would obstruct democratic advancement.

REFERENCES

[1]   J. D. Fearon, "Domestic Political Audiences And The Escalation Of International Disputes," in *Theories of International Relations*, 2017. doi: 10.4324/9781315236339-18.

[2]   J. D. Fearon, "Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes," *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 1994, doi: 10.2307/2944796.

[3]   D. Acemoglu and J. A. Robinson, "Persistence of Power, Elites, and Institutions," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2011, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.888187.

[4]   E. G. Carayannis and D. F. J. Campbell, "Quadruple and quintuple helix innovation systems and mode 3 knowledge production," in *Handbook of Cyber-Development, Cyber-Democracy, and Cyber-Defense*, 2018. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-09069-6_56.

[5]   D. Collier and R. Adcock, "Democracy and dichotomies: A pragmatic approach to choices about concepts," *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.*, 1999, doi: 10.1146/annurev.polisci.2.1.537.

[6]   C. Staerklé, J. M. Falomir-Pichastor, A. Pereira, J. Berent, and F. Butera, "Global value perceptions: The legitimising functions of western representations of democracy," *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.*, 2015, doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2159.

[7]   M. Baliamoune-Lutz, "Political Elites, Democracy, and Education," *Rev. Black Polit. Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/0034644619865543.

[8]   T. Persson, "Forms of democracy, policy and economic development," *Natl. Bur. Econ. Res. Work. Pap. Ser.*, 2005.

[9]   D. Brinks and M. Coppedge, "Diffusion is no illusion: Neighbor emulation in the third wave of democracy," *Comp. Polit. Stud.*, 2006, doi: 10.1177/0010414005276666.

[10]   D. Brinks and M. Coppedge, "Diffusion Is No Illusion," *Comp. Polit. Stud.*, 2006, doi: 10.1177/0010414005276666.

[11]   K. T. Gaubatz, "Election Cycles and War," *J. Conflict Resolut.*, 1991, doi: 10.1177/0022002791035002004.

[12]   R. W. Carney, "Corporate governance and political impediments to regional harmonization: cases from East Asia," *Pacific Rev.*, 2014, doi: 10.1080/09512748.2014.948570.

[13]   D. Law, "Alternatives to Liberal Constitutional Democracy," *Maryl. Law Rev. (Baltimore, Md.)*, 2017.

[14]   S. Naidu, J. A. Robinson, and L. E. Young, "Social Origins of Dictatorships: Elite Networks and Political Transitions in Haiti," *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2021, doi: 10.1017/S0003055421000289.

CHAPTER 3

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON THEORY OF DEMOCRATIZATION

Dr. Gopalakrishnan Chinnasamy, Associate Professor,
Department of Finance, CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email id- dr.gopalakrishnan_c@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The theory of democratization seeks to explain the process by which countries transition from authoritarian regimes to democratic governance. Democratization is a complex and multifaceted process that involves political, social, economic, and cultural factors. Scholars have developed various theories to explain the causes and consequences of democratization, including modernization theory, elite theory, and institutional theory. Modernization theory suggests that economic development, urbanization, and education are key factors in promoting democracy, while elite theory emphasizes the role of political elites in driving democratic change. Institutional theory focuses on the role of formal institutions, such as constitutions and political parties, in facilitating democratic transitions.

KEYWORDS:

Accountability, Civil Society, Democratization, Elite Competition, Foreign Influence, Human Rights, Institutional Design.

INTRODUCTION

Think of the most basic dynamic society we can create, where there is a "today" and a "tomorrow," and where both elites and commoners are concerned about policies for the present and the future. Nothing prohibits society from changing its policy from the one it selected today tomorrow. Therefore, it is not enough for the public to guarantee that the policies they want now are implemented; they also want policies like these to be adopted tomorrow. Imagine if we live in a non-democratic society where the elites' interests are primarily served. Citizens can get the policies they want now because they have de facto political power, but they are unclear about their future political power. Given that we live in a non-democratic society, it's possible that the elites may become stronger and more forceful tomorrow while the general populace loses its political influence. Can they guarantee that the policies they want are carried out now and tomorrow?

Political institutions here might be significant compared to the previously mentioned static universe. By their very nature, institutions are resilient, which means that the ones that exist now are probably going to be there tomorrow as well. A democratic society is one that not only now upholds the principle of "one person, one vote," but also one that is anticipated to do so into the foreseeable future. Our definition of political institutions as a way to distribute political power previously made this durability clear: they control how political power will be distributed in the future. For instance, democracy entails that everyone will vote in tomorrow's election to choose the party that will control the country and define its policies. A large portion of the populace will be disenfranchised from group decision-making processes if there is no democracy [1]–[3].

Imagine if the people don't only utilize their current de facto political influence to get the laws they want, but that they also use it to convert the political system from a nondemocratic one to a democratic one. They will have effectively enhanced their de jure political influence in the future if they achieve this. We are now living in a democratic system where everyone will be able to vote instead of a nondemocratic one. The public are consequently more likely to obtain the policies they want in the future thanks to their enhanced political influence.

We have now advanced to a more complex conception of democratization, where the establishment of democracy, or, more broadly, a change in political institutions, appears as a means of governing the distribution of political power in the future. For the purpose of gaining greater political influence and power in the future, the populace demands and may succeed in obtaining democracy. When we go back to the beliefs of the Chartist J. R. Stephens, we can now see that he was right to call for universal suffrage as a means of securing the "right to a good coat... a good hat... a good roof a good dinner" for working men rather than directly calling for the coat, the roof, and the dinner. They would only have applied to the present, but universal suffrage might guarantee them for the long term.

Take note of the story's main latent theme, which is the fleeting nature of de facto political authority. Although it is assumed that the populace has political power now, it is unclear whether they will continue to do so in the future. The balance between the wealthy and commoners, or more broadly, between different social groupings, is ephemeral, not fixed, and not the same today as it will be tomorrow. In the dynamic and unpredictably changing environment we live in, this is understandable. When we consider the sources of political power for the disenfranchised population in non-democracies, it will become much more convincing. Let's start by attempting to comprehend why the fleeting nature of political power matters. Assume that people will continue to have the same level of political influence in the future. Why should they need assistance from political institutions? If their political influence is sufficient to enact the policies they want now, it will continue to do so in the future as well, negating the need to alter the fundamental political structures. A need for reform in political institutions arises precisely because political power is ephemeral; people may possess it now but not tomorrow. Because their current political power is unlikely to last without institutional reforms, the people want to secure it by altering political institutions, namely by establishing democracy and more self-representation.

So why do people in non-democracies have political power? They have de facto rather than de jure political authority, is the explanation. Elites dominate de facto but not necessarily de jure political power in nondemocracies. In nondemocracies, the people are not allowed to participate in the political process, despite the fact that they make up the majority and sometimes question the system, cause significant social discontent and turbulence, or even constitute a genuine danger of revolution. Even if the elites have access to superior weapons and paid warriors, what is to prevent the bulk of the people from overcoming the elite, which is a minority, and seizing control of society and its wealth? After all, people successfully captured Paris during the Paris Commune, overturned the ruling class in the Russian Revolution of 1917, toppled the Somoza dictatorship in Nicaragua in 1979, and engaged in several other successful revolution efforts. However, for the citizens to truly pose a threat, a number of unlikely circumstances must coincide: first, the masses must overcome the obstacle of collective action that prevents them from organizing; second, they must gather enough momentum to transform their organization into a powerful force against the regime; and third, the elites, who control the state apparatus,

must be unable to use the military to successfully put down the uprising. Therefore, it seems sense that such a challenge to the system would only be momentary: under nondemocracies, it is very unlikely that people would still have political power tomorrow.

Imagine that folks are now posing a serious danger of revolution to non-democracy. Currently, they have the political clout to achieve their goals and possibly overturn the current order. They may use their political clout to secure "the coat, the roof, and the dinner," but why not use it to secure more, identical goods for both the present and the future? If they can force a change in political institutions, they will get this. From that point on, policies will be decided by the principle of "one person, one vote," and residents will have greater political clout, allowing them to get the policies they want and the resultant coat, roof, and supper.

However, in reality, political institutions do not just alter because the public demands them. Typically, transitions to democracy occur when the ruling class of the current system expands voting rights. What made them do that? After all, the elite often opposes social decisions that result from the transfer of political power to the majority, such as higher taxes and further redistribution in the future exactly the results it seeks to avoid. Wouldn't the elite prefer to attempt other forms of compromises, such as offering the populace the policies they desire, rather than cede its power in the face of the prospect of a revolution? Let's revisit the era of real revolutionary peril to find the solution to this. Consider a scenario in which the populace has the power to overthrow the government and is prepared to do so if they do not get certain concessions or favorable policies that will raise their standard of living [4]–[6].

The elite's first choice is to give them what they now desire: economic redistribution and the adoption of policies that are more broadly supportive of the majority. But assume that the current concessions are insufficient to stop the populace from going on a revolution. What can the ruling class do to avert a coming, very expensive revolution for itself? It can guarantee the same policies for tomorrow, I suppose. not just today's food, today's roof, and tomorrow's coat. However, these claims could not be true. The elite's immediate interests are not served by changing policy in the direction that the public prefers. It is doing so right now to avert a revolution. Why should it happen again when the danger of revolution could be gone tomorrow? Why ought it to keep its word? There is no cause, and it is even improbable to happen. As a result, its claims may not be as good as claimed. Unconvinced by these assurances, the populace would carry out a revolution since untrustworthy promises are worth nothing.

The elite must make a genuine commitment to future pro-majority measures if it hopes to save face by promising to implement the policies that the majority prefers. A credible promise indicates that the choice on what policies to implement should not be made by the elite, but rather by the groups who genuinely support them. Or, to put it another way, it must provide the people political power. Therefore, a credible promise must alter the distribution of political power in the future. This is exactly what a democratic transition does: it transfers future political power from the elite to the populace, resulting in a credible commitment to future pro-majority policies. The third essential component of our strategy is the role political institutions play in distributing power and producing reasonably credible pledges.

Why does the establishment of democracy prevent revolutions if they are appealing to the populace? This is plausible given how expensive revolution is. A large portion of a society's wealth may be lost during revolutions, which is expensive for both the common people and the ruling class. These expenses enable the elite to make compromises or democratize in order to

prevent upheaval. In truth, democracies won't always be so pro-majority that they can stave off revolution. The elite may be able to influence or corrupt political parties even with universal suffrage, or it may be able to utilize its control of the economy to restrict the kinds of policies that democracy is able to enact. These are only two examples of how voters may see the elite. The people may rise up under such situations, believing that democracy would provide little real benefits. To narrow the scope of our research, we often confine our focus to circumstances in which the establishment of democracy prevents revolution. This implies that we do not go thoroughly into theories of revolution or the modeling of post-revolutionary societies since historically speaking, this appears to have been the norm.

We now have a solid foundation for our democratic idea. The elites have de jure political power in non-democracies, and if they are unrestricted, they would typically choose for the policies that they find most appealing. For instance, they could pick minimal taxes and no transfer of wealth to the poor. However, when people momentarily have de facto political power, they may challenge nondemocracy by posing a revolutionary danger. Importantly, such political power is transitory; they now possess it and are unlikely to do so in the future. They have the ability to utilize this power to start a revolution and alter the system in their favor, which would result in enormous costs for the elites as well as significant collateral damage and societal losses. The elites want to avoid this situation, and they may do so by pledging to implement future policies that support majorities. However, under the current political system, such pledges are often untrue. They need to give the majority formal political authority, which democracy does, in order to be respectable.

This narrative of democratization as an elite commitment to future pro-majority policies in the face of a revolutionary danger and, perhaps more significantly, as a promise made credible by altering the distribution of political power in the future, is compatible with a great deal of historical data. The political histories of Britain, Argentina, and South Africa, as well as those of twentieth-century Latin America, provide as examples of how most democratic transitions occurred in the midst of significant popular unrest and revolutionary threats. Furthermore, it was the disenfranchised and mostly impoverished colonials that exerted pressure on the colonizing authority in the 1950s and 1960s, which led to the establishment of democratic societies in the majority of former European colonies. Similar warnings of unrest and social unrest came along with the current wave of democratic transitions in Africa and Eastern Europe. To use a traditional European example, Prime Minister Earl Grey was fully aware that his proposed election reform was a necessary precaution to avert a potential revolution when he presented it to the British Parliament in 1831. No one is more adamantly opposed to yearly legislatures, universal suffrage, and elections than I am, he said. My goal is to put a stop to such dreams and initiatives, not to support them. The goal of my reform is to avoid the need for revolution by reforming to maintain rather than to topple.

DISCUSSION

The Whigs were aware that the measure had support from the working class. They were, however, equally adamant about preventing any form of prominent role for the working classes in the new election system. Thus, passing the measure prevented uprisings and rebellions, and its provisions protected the nation from the "evils" of democracy. The working classes were obviously going to be quite disappointed when they discovered how little they had really benefited from the law, but by that time they would have lost their middle class supporters, been won over to the system, and would be unable to do anything about it [7]–[9].

The same causes also had a role in shaping the following changes. For instance, similar to the First Reform Act, it has been believed that the prospect of violence had a substantial role in accelerating the pace; history was repeating itself. Similar to the French, German, and Swedish situations, the prospect of revolution served as the impetus for democracy. For instance, Tilton explains the process that resulted in the introduction of universal male suffrage in Sweden as follows: neither passed without significant public pressure; in 1866, crowds gathered around the chamber as the final vote was taken, and the 1909 reform was sparked by a large suffrage movement and a demonstration strike Swedish democracy had triumphed without a revolution - but not without the threat of a revolution.

The creation of voting rights for the public in Latin America was influenced equally by the fear of revolution and social discontent. As we saw in Chapter 1, President Roque Sa'enz Pena successfully institutionalized universal male suffrage in Argentina in 1912 by introducing the secret ballot and outlawing election fraud. The radicalization of urban workers and the social turmoil the Radical Party caused served as the driving forces for the transition to real democracy. Similar inspiration led to the establishment of universal suffrage in Colombia during the liberal president Alfonso Lo'pez Pumarejo's administration in 1936, according to renowned Colombianist historian David Bushnell. Although Lo'pez was wealthy, he was aware that Colombia could not continue ignoring the needs and problems of what he once referred to as "that vast and miserable class that does not read, that does not write, that does not dress, that does not have access to education, and that does

Similar to Venezuela, where democracy was restored in 1958 as a result of protracted upheavals and turbulence. Kolb described the scenario as a "true popular revolution of Venezuelan citizens" on January 21 and 22, with "dramatic intensity and popular violence" equipped with Molotov Cocktails, clubs, homemade grenades, and rocks, they were battling a fierce and skilled police force. The data supports the idea that most attempts to establish democracy take place in the context of serious societal unrest and the potential for revolution. Since its ideals have altered, the elite often does not provide democracy. The disenfranchised want it in order to gain political power and so increase their access to the system's economic advantages.

given democracy is developed, why does it serve as a commitment given we know that democracy often fails after it is established? This is so that institutions, once established, have a propensity to remain. Although coups do sometimes occur, overthrowing democracy is expensive. The main reason for this is because individuals invest specifically in them. For instance, when democracy is established, political parties emerge and a wide range of organizations, such as unions, emerge to benefit from the new political environment. If democracy is abolished, all of these groups' investments would be lost, which will motivate people to fight to keep democracy in place. The majority may also have more authority over the military after democracy has been established than they had under a nondemocratic system, which alters the de facto power equation.

Finally, the elite must choose between more democratic policies and policy compromises while confronting the possibility of a popular uprising. The use of force and repression is another option. The white South African administration, for instance, suppressed cries for democracy and maintained its hold on power for decades by employing the military to put down protests and the opposition. Similar to the Argentine military administrations of the 1960s and 1970s, several other Latin American nations like Guatemala and El Salvador have followed similar pattern and slaughtered thousands of people to prevent the return of democracy. like Asia, authoritarian

governments like China and Burma have resisted calls for democracy with force. This was also true in Eastern European nations under Soviet rule, as in Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968, for instance. It is obvious why elites find repression appealing since it enables them to hold onto power without having to give anything back to the disadvantaged. Repression is nonetheless expensive and dangerous for elites. Depending on the worldwide climate of opinion, it may also result in sanctions and international isolation, as occurred in South Africa in the 1980s. It causes loss of life and destruction of goods and money. The worst event for the elites would be a revolution if repression failed, which is another possibility. These arguments suggest that repression will only be appealing under certain conditions. When we take this into account for the study, we can observe that democracy develops when concessions are not believable and when repression is not appealing due to its high cost.

Republican Unification

Understanding why some nations have democratic governments while others have dictatorships requires more than just a theory of democracy. Many nations have democratic transitions but ultimately return to authoritarian rule as a consequence of military coups. In Latin America, this tendency has been particularly prevalent. An impressive illustration of the potential of Latin American democracy is Argentina. In a similar vein, the transition to democracy has been hampered in Brazil, Chile, Guatemala, Peru, Venezuela, and Uruguay. Why has democracy struggled to take root over so much of Latin America?

We must create a theory of coups or, alternatively, a theory of democratic consolidation in order to respond to this question. A solidified democracy: what is it? If the collection of institutions that define a democracy remain in place throughout time, it has become more stable. Our theory of democratic consolidation and coups is based on how elites and common people see democracy differently. Once again, the general populace supports democracy more than the ruling class. Therefore, the elites may assist or promote a coup to alter the balance of power in society when the military is on the side of the elite and there is enough instability to enable a military takeover. The same motivations driving individuals' desire for de-mocratization also drive the elites' desire to transform political institutions from democracies to nondemocracies. The interests of the elites are aligned with those of the military, and political unrest and these alignments may provide a chance for the elites to change policy in their favor.

De facto political power's ephemeral nature is a problem, however. They will have this chance today, but maybe not tomorrow. Any pledge by the populace to reduce the degree to which future policy favors the majority is untrustworthy in the context of democratic politics. When the fear of a coup is no longer present, democratic politics may once again serve the interests of the majority, allowing it to choose the policies it likes without being concerned about the elite usurping its authority via a coup. However, exactly this is what first made democracy so expensive for the privileged. The elites need political clout in order to effectively alter future policy. They use a coup to gain more de jure political sway so they can enact the things they want. In other words, a coup gives the elites the opportunity to transform their ephemeral de facto political authority into more durable de jure political power.

In the midst of political and social unrest, the military and elite social groups may be, perhaps legitimately, concerned about the sustainability of democracy and even the capitalist system. As a result, they may want to prevent a possible shift further to the left or even a revolution. This is a related reason why a coup may occur.

Factors Affecting Democracy

Now that we have a theory of democratization, we may inquire as to what elements increase the likelihood of democracy's inception and consolidation. As of now, we have discussed how our theory might explain changes from nondemocracy to democracy and potentially back again. The comparative statics of the equilibrium, or how it changes as certain underlying elements change, are equally significant. With the use of these comparative statistics, we can explain why some nations choose democracy while others do not, and why some nations maintain their democratic systems while others see them crumble. The empirical and historical work that is done to understand the incidence of democracy may then be guided by these comparative stats.

Public Sector

Democratization

According to our concept, democracy requires a reasonably potent threat of revolution from the populace. When the populace is poorly organized, the system will not be overthrown and the transition to democracy will be indefinitely postponed. Repression may also be more challenging when civil society is somewhat established and the majority is organized. Therefore, democracy also requires some kind of civil society growth. Such development is taken as provided in this text and logically illustrates the results of lengthy historical processes.

Consolidation

The health and makeup of civil society are just as crucial to the maintenance of democracy as they were to its inception. A well-functioning civil society is required both to advance democracy and to defend it. Coups are more difficult to carry out, more expensive to carry out, and less likely to succeed when civil society is more organized. As a result, democracy is more likely to be strengthened.

Crises and Shocks

Democratization

According to our idea, democratizations take place as a result of the ephemeral character of de facto political authority. In certain circumstances, it is simpler to organize opposition groups, overcome the collective action issue, and carry out revolutions at a lower cost. These are generally periods of crises, such as crop failures, economic downturns, problems relating to the global economy or debt, and even wars. These crises and macroeconomic shocks are cyclical by nature, causing sporadic shifts in de facto political control. Therefore, according to our argument, democratizations are more likely to occur when there is an economic or political crisis. The liberalization of Argentina after the Falklands War in 1983 serves as a prime illustration.

Consolidation

In times of political or economic crisis, democrats' adversaries have the same opportunity to temporarily seize de facto power as opponents of dictature. According to our study, coups are more likely to occur in times of crisis than democratizations were. The coup against Allende in Chile in 1973, which took place amid the first significant increase in oil prices and a severe economic downturn, serves as an illustration.

Sources of Income and Wealth Composition

Democratization

The elites' source of money is a key factor in determining the trade-off between democracy and repression. In certain civilizations, the elites have significant interests in land, but in others, the elites have assets in both human and physical capital. The views of landowners and capital owners toward democracy and nondemocracy are likely to vary in three key ways. First, compared to human and physical capital, land is simpler to tax. Landowners are more opposed to democracy because they fear democracy more than non-democracy because of this. Second, social and political unrest may be more harmful to owners of physical and human capital who depend on collaboration in the workplace and in trade, making landowners more ready to resort to force to maintain the system they favor. Third, numerous sets of economic institutions are possible in an agrarian-based economy, which affects how strongly elites and people favor various regimes. Slavery is one example of a labor-repressive institution that benefits more from agricultural technology than from that used in industry.

This implies that democracy is harmful for elites because it undermines their preferred set of economic institutions via changes in collective decisions. According to these three factors, democratization is more probable in a society that is more industrialized, where the elite control a significant amount of physical and human capital, than in a culture that is more agrarian, where the elites are mostly invested in land. Differently said, democracy is more probable when manufacturers rather than landowners make up the elite. Although the book doesn't specifically address the nature of revolutions, these concepts also have intriguing implications for the frequency of revolutions.

They may explain, for instance, why most revolutions occur in societies that are largely agricultural, such as those in Russia, Mexico, China, Vietnam, Bolivia, and Nicaragua. We propose that the reason for this is that landed elites choose repression over compromises, and that when repression fails, revolutions occur. Concessions are encouraged and revolutions are less common in countries that are increasingly urbanized and industrialized and where the elites have spent large sums of money.

Consolidation

The choice to stage a coup is influenced by the elites' sources of money. Coups could have a tendency to be less expensive if the elites have significant land investments. More importantly, democracy is generally worse for these people because capital may be taxed at greater rates than land and because democratic economic structures are less similar to those that the elites favor. Contrarily, coups are more costly for the elites and democracy is less of a danger when their wealth is mostly in the form of physical and human resources. As a consequence, when the elites are landowners rather than capitalists, democracy has a lower likelihood of consolidating [10], [11].

CONCLUSION

Under general, the theory of democratization offers an insightful framework for comprehending the processes of political change and the circumstances under which democracy might flourish. The theory may influence practice and policy aimed at advancing democratic governance and human rights all over the globe by recognizing the elements that contribute to democratic advancement. Despite these many strategies, the majority of democratization theories stress the significance of fundamental elements like civil society, the rule of law, and the presence of outside elements like international organizations and democratic nations. The idea of democracy also emphasizes the difficulties and complexity of the process, such as the possibility of

authoritarian reaction, the significance of violence and conflict, and the need for inclusive and participatory institutions.

REFERENCES

[1]   C. Zürcher, "A theory of democratisation through peace-building," *Conflict, Secur. Dev.*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/14678802.2018.1483559.

[2]   F. Schimmelfennig, "The normative origins of democracy in the European Union: Toward a transformationalist theory of democratization," *Eur. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2010, doi: 10.1017/S1755773910000068.

[3]   R. Doorenspleet and C. Mudde, "Upping the odds: Deviant democracies and theories of democratization," *Democratization*, 2008, doi: 10.1080/13510340802191102.

[4]   A. Stepan and J. J. Linz, "Democratization theory and the 'Arab Spring,'" *J. Democr.*, 2013, doi: 10.1353/jod.2013.0032.

[5]   M. W. Svolik, "Democracy as an equilibrium: rational choice and formal political theory in democratization research," *Democratization*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/13510347.2018.1506768.

[6]   T. V. Lankina and L. Getachew, "A Geographic Incremental Theory of Democratization: Territory, Aid, and Democracy in Postcommunist Regions," *World Polit.*, 2006, doi: 10.1353/wp.2007.0011.

[7]   M. Berg and R. Lidskog, "Deliberative democracy meets democratised science: a deliberative systems approach to global environmental governance," *Env. Polit.*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/09644016.2017.1371919.

[8]   C. Welzel, "2. Theories of Democratization," in *Democratization*, 2018. doi: 10.1093/hepl/9780198732280.003.0002.

[9]   A. S. Paglayan, "The Non-Democratic Roots of Mass Education: Evidence from 200 Years," *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2021, doi: 10.1017/S0003055420000647.

[10]   Y. H. Cho and I. Hwang, "Who defends democracy and why? Explaining the participation in the 2016–2017 candlelight protest in South Korea," *Democratization*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/13510347.2020.1845149.

[11]   L. Morgenbesser and T. B. Pepinsky, "Elections as Causes of Democratization: Southeast Asia in Comparative Perspective," *Comp. Polit. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0010414018758763.

CHAPTER 4

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

Dr. Madhavi. R, Professor, Department of Finance,
CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id-r.madhavi@jainuniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Political institutions refer to the formal and informal structures, rules, and processes that shape political behavior and decision-making. These institutions are crucial for the functioning of democratic governance and can include everything from constitutions, legislatures, and courts to political parties, interest groups, and the media. Political institutions are designed to provide stability, legitimacy, and accountability in the political system. They can also serve as mechanisms for conflict resolution, compromise, and representation. Well-designed political institutions can facilitate effective governance, promote economic growth and development, and protect human rights and civil liberties.

KEYWORDS:

Accountability, Bureaucracy, Civil service, Constitution, Decentralization, Electoral systems.

INTRODUCTION

Our approach also argues that a key factor in determining why some nations democratize while others do not may be the makeup of democratic political institutions. In particular, the elites utilize repression to prevent democratization when they can because they believe it would hurt their interests. To now, in order to convey the key ideas of our research, we have unnecessarily stylized our description of democracy as the rule of the majority. Even if their power is comparatively smaller than it is under a dictatorship, elites may be able to exert more or less control over what occurs in a democracy. under actuality, one person's vote may be worth more than another's. They may do this, for example, by planning democratic institutions. Beard contended that the constitution was drafted by wealthy property owners with the goal of preserving the value of their properties in the face of expected radical democratic forces in his 1913 book, An Economic Interpretation of the U.S. Constitution.4 The dominant classes, whose rights are thus to be determined, must perforce obtain from the government such rules that are consonant with the larger interests necessary to the continuation of their economic processes, or they must themselves control the organs of government, according to Beard.

This is because the primary objective of a government, beyond the simple repression of physical violence, is the making of the rules that determine the property relations of society. The former occurs under a despotic regime; under Although many of Beard's ideas' specifics are now under debate, many academics agree with his main points. In his landmark work, Wood, for instance, writes that the constitution "was intrinsically an aristocratic document designed to check the democratic tendencies of the period." For statistical evidence that is only partly supportive, see McGuire. The means and nature of this control become the issue of utmost significance indeed,

the basic issue in constitutional law under every other form of government where political power is shared by any section of the community. A subsidiary or downstream aspect resulting from the nature of the economic groupings demanding positive action and negative restriction is the social framework by which one form of legislation is achieved and another is prohibited. Even the idea of representative democracy as opposed to participatory or direct democracy can be seen as an effort to temper populist tendencies and weaken the influence of the majority [1], [2]. That being the case, it is obvious that democratic political institutions may be set up to restrict the power of the majority. A more recent example is the Chilean constitution drafted under General Pinochet's dictatorship, which sought to strengthen the military's veto over democratic decision-making while also systematically gerrymandering electoral districts and underrepresenting urban areas in order to lessen the threat of socialism in Chile. Another example is the way the South African constitution was drafted in an effort to safeguard the interests of white people in a democratic society.

Democracies pose less of a danger to the interests of the elites if a nondemocratic government or elite can shape or use democratic institutions to ensure that extreme majoritarian policies won't be accepted. Elites are more inclined to establish democracy because they feel less endangered. For instance, using repression to prevent democracy will be less appealing when it poses less of a danger. According to our paradigm, Pinochet's constitution therefore made Chilean democracy easier. It could even be the case, as in South Africa, that the majority of people are ready to limit their own policy choices in order to speed up the transition to democracy. The ANC understood that it had to give the whites concessions regarding the design of democratic institutions. This was preferable for the ANC than continuing the struggle against the apartheid system. A democratic process that may not otherwise occur is helped by providing the elite with credible promises.

Consolidation

As democratic institutions' form affects democratization in the first place, so does it affect whether democracy consolidates. Institutions that restrict the use of pro-majoritarian measures in democracies, in particular, are likely to aid in consolidation. Because they have influence over a powerful upper house, such as the Prussian Junkers in nineteenth-century Germany or the British aristocracy in the House of Lords, or because they are in charge of the party system, elites may really have a significant impact on democracy. Elites will be less inclined to take action against democracy knowing that they can protect themselves from the most overly majoritarian measures under a democracy. The connections between Colombia's aristocracy and both of the main governing parties are an intriguing illustration in this setting. The Liberal and Conservative Parties effectively avoided the introduction of left-wing parties during the 20th century by manipulating election systems, notably the kind of pro-portional representation. High-redistributive political agendas did not develop in Colombia in the absence of a left-wing party. Although there are frequent accusations that the system does not reflect the interests of the people, Colombia boasts one of the most established democracies in Latin America.

The argument that presidential democracies may be more unstable and prone to coups than parliamentary democracies is another illustration of the relationship between political institutions and democratic consolidation. This argument makes sense in our paradigm because a directly elected president is more likely to reflect the desires of the majority of society and, therefore, to be more populist, while under a legislative checks and balances and lobbying may enable the

elites to oppose radical policy ideas. Therefore, presidential systems may pose a greater danger to the elites' interests and lead to more coups.

Contrarily, though, this viewpoint could also contribute to the explanation of why the process of democratization in Chile may have proceeded without incident notwithstanding the systematic gerrymandering that General Pinochet established in the election laws. By underrepresenting urban regions and overrepresenting more conservative rural areas, the left's political influence was diminished. The result was a more representative democracy with fewer redistributive elements. Other countries where constitutions drafted or ordered by the military may have aided in the development of democracy include Turkey and Thailand. Ironically, Haggard and Kaufman write, the danger to civilian power in Chile, Turkey, and Korea was probably lessened during the early years of the transition due to the increased protection for the military forces.

A democracy may be strengthened by giving the elites more authority, but democracy will be weakened if the elites are given excessive power. According to our theory, conflicts between elites and disenfranchised majority that are willing to prefer democracy over something more radical because it provides them more political power than nondemocracy lead to the emergence of democracy. Democracy won't accomplish much to raise the wellbeing of the people if the elites have too much power. In this situation, democracy will not be able to resolve societal unrest; instead, a revolution or an elite that maintains its power via repression would occur [3]–[5].

DISCUSSION

The Role of Inter-Group Inequality

Democratization

Inequality between groups, as predicted by our paradigm, has an impact on the development and stabilization of democracy. We describe them using the term inequality to describe intergroup inequality for the sake of convenience. These inter-group projections may not, however, translate into claims regarding common metrics of inequality and income distribution. This is especially true when political strife is not between wealthy and poor, but rather along other lines, such as between different ethnic or religious groups. Greater intergroup inequality, all else being equal, makes revolution more appealing to the populace since it gives them the possibility to partake in the whole economy's revenue, but under nondemocracies they only receive a tiny portion of these resources. Greater intergroup disparity should be correlated with a higher chance of democratization since an effective threat of revolution is the spark that starts the democratization process.

There is still another explanation for why intergroup disparity may support democracy. Remember that when the promise of redistribution is insufficient to stave off the prospect of revolution, democracy arises as a genuine commitment to future redistribution. The likelihood that this promise will prove to be insufficient and that the elite will be compelled to establish democracy increases as the danger of revolution grows. Greater intergroup disparity increases the likelihood of democratization via this route as well since it strengthens the danger of revolution.

However, this examination of the impact of intergroup inequality is biased. It emphasizes how rising inequality raises the risk of revolution and, therefore, the public's need for democracy. Inter-group inequality, however, could also have an impact on the elites' hostility toward democracy. Consider a common redistributive taxation model like that proposed by Meltzer and

Richard to see why. Be aware that even with a steady tax rate, the burden put on the elites increases as the gap between them and the rest of society widens. This is so that the elites, who now control a bigger portion of the economy's resources, may raise a larger portion of the overall tax revenues as inequality increases. Therefore, even if the tax rate stays the same or hardly changes, rising inter-group inequality often raises the cost of democracy on the elites. Furthermore, a number of theories contend that increased intergroup inequality ought to raise the tax rate, which would exacerbate the problem. If so, there would be another justification for increased inequality, which would raise the elites' burden of carrying out democracy. Overall, it seems compelling that the costs of redistributive taxation and democratic politics to the elites in a society where the income gap between the elites and the citizens is greater should be generally higher for the elites. This is because as inequality increases, the benefits from redistribution increase, leading the citizens to prefer higher levels of taxation [6]–[8]. The most significant consequence is that repression becomes more alluring as inequality rises and democracy becomes more expensive for the elites. Therefore, increased intergroup disparity may therefore be a deterrent to democracy.

Combining these two elements of the narrative, we discover a nonmonotonic link between intergroup inequality and the probability of a democratic transition. The residents of the most equal societies do not find revolution and social unrest to be alluring enough to take part in them; either there are no obstacles to non-democratic regimes, or any difficulties can be addressed temporarily by minimal redistribution. In other words, people do not make additional significant demands in these relatively equal societies since they already benefit from the productive resources of the economy or maybe even from the growing process. This might be the reason why Singapore hasn't completely embraced democracy like South Korea and Taiwan, despite having equal and fast-growing economies. In sharp contrast, inhabitants of the most unequal nations have many reasons to be dissatisfied and often attempt to overthrow the rule of nondemocracy.

The elites, however, stand to lose a lot if they leave the system that serves their own interests and switch to one that would put more of the responsibility of redistribution on them. Therefore, a very unequal society is more likely to encounter a repressive nondemocracy instead of democracy or, occasionally, when repression is insufficient, maybe even a revolution. This process may also explain why nondemocratic governments continue to rule in Latin American nations with extreme inequality, such El Salvador and Paraguay. Therefore, this explanation implies that cultures with moderate levels of inequality have the highest chance of developing democracy. In this case, neither the elites nor the populace are wholly opposed to democracy and neither group is completely satisfied with the current system. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, we see situations like these in Argentina and Britain.

Consolidation

Additionally, inequality has a significant impact on how likely a democracy is to consolidate. The more the redistribution away from the elites, the more probable it is that they would see it as being in their interest to stage a coup against it since the greatest danger to democracy derives from its redistributive character. As a result, increased inequality is likely to undermine democracy since, as was previously noted, the elites are increasingly bearing the brunt of democracy as the economic disparity between them and the general populace widens.

This comparative static conclusion with regard to inequality provides a possible explanation as to why it may have been more challenging to establish democracy in Latin America than in Western Europe. Latin American countries suffer more from distributional conflict between the elites and the populace because they are far more inequitably distributed. According to our concept, democratic policies in extremely unequal nations should be quite redistributive at first, but then suddenly stop with a coup that returns to considerably less redistributive policies. This trend is reminiscent of how many Latin American nations alternated between the fiscally more conservative policies of succeeding nondemocratic regimes and the highly redistributive but unsustainable populist policies of short-lived democracies. It's noteworthy that Kaufman and Stallings also stress the strong relationship between populist redistribution and unconsolidated democracy:

We can show that equal societies never become democratic in the first place by combining the impacts of inequality on democracy and coups. This contributes to explaining Singapore's political growth. Societies that experience higher levels of intergroup inequality but which are still relatively modest strengthen democracy since it is not so expensive for the elites that a coup is desired. This may accurately depict Britain's political evolution. Even greater levels of inequality still result in democratization, but democracy doesn't last because coups are alluring. Unconsolidated democracy is the consequence, which is the course that Argentina took in the 20th century. The elites utilize repression to prevent democracy at the greatest levels of inequality since it poses such a danger to them, as was the case in South Africa up until 1994.

Democratization of the Middle Class

Moore's Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy is perhaps the most well-known book on the history of democracy. Our work naturally owes Moore an intellectual obligation, particularly considering that we paraphrased his title. According to our thesis, the main difference between democracies and nondemocracies is the higher political equality of democracies; up to this point, we have only made a distinction between the elites and the people. Mostly the sake of simplification, this. However, a third group that exists between the elite and the vast majority of residents may be important in many situations. Although this group might be categorised in a variety of ways, it is helpful to conceive of it as the middle class acting as a separate political actor, as has been emphasized by numerous researchers. When the middle class is included in our paradigm, we find a variety of intriguing findings, some of which support the focus on the middle class that Moore and other researchers have made.

The middle class's primary contribution to the development of democracy is as the process's engine. Remember that in our perspective, democracy arises in reaction to a significant social disturbance or revolutionary danger. By taking a significant part in the revolutionary movement or by supporting and sustaining it, the middle class may act as the engine for this process. More importantly, many of the major challenges to the ruling class were led by members of the middle class. For instance, the uprisings that contributed to the First Reform Act in Britain, the Paris Commune in France, or the Radical Party revolts in Argentina were largely middle-class movements. Due to its members' higher levels of education and more comfortable economic circumstances, the middle class may thus play a crucial role in advancing democracy. This may also help to explain why many early attempts at democratization in Europe were only partially successful. If the middle class is the main player, it could be enough for the elites to co-opt the middle class rather than provide a full democracy to everyone who is shut out of the political system. The final image is reminiscent of the slow transition to democracy that much of Western

Europe underwent: first, the middle classes are given access to the political system, and subsequently the whole public is given the right to vote.

The middle class's function as a peacemaker in the conflict between the elites and the populace may be its most significant function. Recall that elites support repression over democratization when they anticipate that democracy would embrace policies that are notably adverse to them. Because they are more rich than the general population, the middle class plays a significant role in democratic politics and usually supports policies that are much more in line with the preferences of the elites. Therefore, a sizable and wealthy middle class may serve as a barrier between the ruling class and the general populace in democracies by restricting the amount of policy change that democracy can bring about. It does this by simultaneously altering policies to the point where the populace is happy to refrain from revolting and making democracy more appealing to the elites than repression. We may be able to better grasp the differences between the political histories of Guatemala, El Salvador, and Nicaragua and Costa Rica, Colombia, and the middle class' involvement in the transition to democracy. These five nations have seen quite divergent political trajectories while sharing many commonalities in their colonial histories and economic systems.

Since the middle of the nineteenth century, Colombia and Costa Rica have developed into democracies, although with certain restrictions, and they successfully transitioned to effective universal suffrage in 1948 and 1936, respectively. Contrarily, first steps toward democracy were put down by coups and persecution in Guatemala, El Salvador, and Nicaragua in the nineteenth century, for example, in El Salvador in the late 1920s and in Guatemala between 1945 and 1954. These three civilizations very slowly transitioned to democracy. One significant distinction between these nations is that only Colombia and Costa Rica have a sizable, wealthy middle class, particularly smallholder coffee farmers. Perhaps as a result, democratic politics have been far more rife with conflict in Guatemala, El Salvador, and Nicaragua than in Costa Rica and Colombia after they were put in place.

By restricting redistribution, the middle class may be able to play a significant role in the consolidation of democracy. A big and wealthy middle class will only sometimes redistribute wealth away from the elites and toward the general populace, posing a considerably lower danger to their interests. This may help to explain why many Western European and some Latin American societies, such as Costa Rica and Colombia, with relatively sizable middle classes, have also had relatively stable democracies, as opposed to El Salvador and Guatemala, which lack such a middle-class buffer and have struggled to stabilize democracy.

Globalization

Without a doubt, international economic ties are greater now than they were forty years ago. With economic organizations like the European Union, NAFTA, Mercosur, and Asean, nations are now increasingly interconnected worldwide. Trade in commodities and services as well as cross-border financial activities have increased significantly. Do these significant political and economic developments have an impact on the conditions that will lead to the emergence and consolidation of democracy?

Democratization

In a variety of unique ways, globalization may support democracy. First, because of global financial integration, elites who hold wealth may withdraw their funds from a specific nation

with more ease. This makes taxing the elites more difficult and limits how far democracy can advance populist, extremely majoritarian policies. Because of this, elites are less likely to use repression to stop a country from moving from a non-democratic system to a democratic one as a result of international financial integration.

Second, global trade influences factor pricing, which in turn alters redistributive politics. The endowments of production factors vary among nations, and patterns of specialization and the effects of trade on relative pricing are influenced by the relative abundance of these components. An rise in incentives for the more plentiful element in each country is one effect of growing international commerce. This entails a rise in the incentives for work in less developed countries, which are often those that are still without democracy today and are thus the leading contenders for democratization. It makes intuitive sense that before there were significant trade flows, less developed nations had a surplus of labor and a dearth of capital, which reduced labor's rewards and increased capital's. Trade liberalization will push these benefits closer to those that are common in the rest of the globe, raising the benefits to labor and perhaps lowering the return on investment. Therefore, trade liberalization will lessen the disparity between labor and capital earnings, altering the degree of inequality between capital owners and labor owners.

The structure of relative factor abundance, the character of political identities, and the location of a nation on the inverted U-shaped link between inter-group inequality and democracy all affect the specific implications of our paradigm. Consider a scenario in which there is a wealth of labor in non-democratic nations, political conflict arises between wealthy capitalist elites and low-income people, and inequality is so extreme that the elites must resort to repression to maintain their position of power. In this situation, further trade integration will lessen the degree of disparity between elites and commoners and lessen the redistributive nature of democracy. Elites will be less likely to employ repression to prevent democracy since it will then pose less of a danger to them. In these situations, globalization supports democracy.

Our paradigm does not, however, imply that the effect of globalization on factor prices automatically fosters democracy. Let's assume that the wealthy and the poor are at odds, and that we are on the rich side of the inverted U-shaped relationship, where the affluent utilize repression to maintain their position of power. Now think of late nineteenth-century Latin American nations like Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. The aristocracy in these nations were land abundant and owned substantial amounts of land. The idea of international commerce projected that pre-First World War globalization would result in significant increases in returns to land. According to our concept, this makes the elites less inclined to promote democracy and raises intergroup inequality. Another aspect that, in our opinion, makes democracy more dangerous to the elites is that it raises the percentage of elite wealth invested in land. According to the opposite of these claims, in this situation, globalization would obstruct democracy.

Third, as a result of greater global commerce, many less developed countries that are now a part of the global economy may find it more expensive to disrupt economic activity. As a result, repression may suddenly be much more expensive for the elites, supporting democracy once again. And last, with the end of the Cold War and more political unity, nations that oppress their populations may now anticipate harsher penalties and responses from the democratic world. As a result, repression effectively costs more, encouraging democracy. This may be particularly crucial considering that the international community either openly or covertly supported a number of authoritarian governments throughout the Cold War, including Mobutu's catastrophic tyranny in Zaire. Globalization may promote democracy just as it can also support its

consolidation. In fact, every mechanism cited that connects democracy to growing globalization suggests that coups will be less frequent. Either because a more linked globe makes coups more expensive or because globalization suggests that democracy poses less of a danger to the elites.

Conflict nature and political identities

The majority of the comparative static conclusions that have been described so far are not elite-specific; they hold true even in countries where political conflict is not primarily based on class. Despite the fact that race and socioeconomic class often overlap, race may be more prominent in South Africa. It could be more logical to see ethnic groupings arising in Rwanda, such as Hutu or Tutsi. People of East Indian heritage and a diverse coalition of others, some of whom are wealthy and others of whom are extremely poor, have been engaged in political conflict in Mauritius. In the latter situation, ethnicity or race and class do not simply overlap. Our core analysis holds true as long as one accepts the notion that people's interests are somewhat based on economic results. Think about how we see political institutions. Here, we demonstrated that political institutions had a tendency to promote consolidated democracy by restricting the types of policies that might be implemented in a democracy. This outcome holds true even in Mauritius. Institutions constrain democracies, therefore they limit what the majority of East Indians can do to the minority of Creoles. As a result, they lessen the motivation for a Creole dictatorship to suppress democracy, and they lessen the allure of coups after democracy has been established, just as in our earlier study.

Next, think about the theories we created about the relationship between democracy or coups and the com- position of the riches of the elite. In this situation, these concepts instantly apply. Even though there is an East Indian vs. Creole political divide, as the economy grows and wealth replaces land as a valuable resource, repression and coups become more expensive and democracy becomes less redistributive. This tends to reinforce democracy, even in Mauritius, as in our first research. It's interesting to note that since gaining independence, Mauritius has seen a phase of democratic consolidation during which the value of land has drastically decreased, industry has developed quickly, and the value of human capital has increased.

Our argument is connected to numerous significant political science traditions in that it acknowledges that the character of political identities may surely affect the format of collective decision-making under democracy. Compare, for instance, a society with numerous cross-cutting cleavages based on race, ethnicity, religion, or geography with one whose political identities and cleavages are based on class. In the pluralist conception of democracy, there are many diverse groups within society. A common argument against pluralist societies is that they produce smaller welfare states and less income redistribution because the diversity of groups prevents a strong coalition in favor of redistribution from forming. As a result, pluralistic societies, for example, lack powerful socialist parties. If so, then according to our hypothesis, such countries would be more likely to have consolidated democracy as elites would have less to fear from majority rule. This explains why democracy has endured and thrived for so long in the United States, which is sometimes seen as the model of a diverse society [9], [10].

CONCLUSION

In general, political institutions have a major influence on how politics and democratic government are conducted. Poor institutions may result in corruption, inequality, and political instability whereas ineffective institutions can provide stability, accountability, and legitimacy. As a result, encouraging good governance and democratic principles depends on knowing the

structure and operation of political institutions. Political scientists have invested significant time and effort into the study of political institutions, and they have created a number of theoretical frameworks and empirical techniques to examine the function and effects of institutions in political systems. Comparative studies of political institutions in various nations and circumstances have shed light on the advantages and disadvantages of different institutional structures.

REFERENCES

[1] Y. Mao, "Political institutions, state capacity, and crisis management: A comparison of China and South Korea," *Int. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/0192512121994026.

[2] C. Y. Ho, S. Huang, H. Shi, and J. Wu, "Financial deepening and innovation: The role of political institutions," *World Dev.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.02.022.

[3] K. M. Y. Lai, W. Saffar, X. (Kevin) Zhu, and Y. Liu, "Political institutions, stock market liquidity and firm dividend policy: Some international evidence," *J. Contemp. Account. Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jcae.2019.100180.

[4] B. N. Ashraf, "Political institutions and bank risk-taking behavior," *J. Financ. Stab.*, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.jfs.2017.01.004.

[5] N. Boubakri, S. A. Mansi, and W. Saffar, "Political institutions, connectedness, and corporate risk-taking," *J. Int. Bus. Stud.*, 2013, doi: 10.1057/jibs.2013.2.

[6] K. Baldwin and K. Holzinger, "Traditional Political Institutions and Democracy: Reassessing Their Compatibility and Accountability," *Comp. Polit. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0010414019852686.

[7] E. Autio and K. Fu, "Economic and political institutions and entry into formal and informal entrepreneurship," *Asia Pacific J. Manag.*, 2015, doi: 10.1007/s10490-014-9381-0.

[8] N. T. Kuo and C. F. Lee, "Political Institutions and Cost Stickiness: International Evidence," *Eur. Account. Rev.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/09638180.2021.2000459.

[9] J. J. Patterson, "Remaking political institutions in sustainability transitions," *Environ. Innov. Soc. Transitions*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.eist.2021.10.011.

[10] S. Lissitsa, "Effects of digital use on trust in political institutions among ethnic minority and hegemonic group – A case study," *Technol. Soc.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.101633.

CHAPTER 5

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON MEASURING OF DEMOCRACY

Dr. Chaya Bagrecha, Professor, Department of Finance,
CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id-dr.chayabagrecha@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Measuring democracy is a complex and multifaceted process that involves assessing a range of political, social, and economic factors. Democracy is generally defined as a political system that upholds the principles of political equality, civil liberties, and popular sovereignty. However, measuring the extent to which these principles are being realized in practice can be challenging. Scholars have developed various indices and metrics to measure democracy, including the Freedom House Index, the Economist Intelligence Unit Democracy Index, and the Varieties of Democracy Project. These measures typically assess a range of factors such as the rule of law, electoral processes, civil liberties, and government accountability.

KEYWORDS:

Constitution, Corruption, Democracy, Elections, Freedom, Human rights, Independent Media.

INTRODUCTION

The foregoing discussion serves as an example of the different empirical consequences of our theory for the conditions that lead to and maintain democracy in a society. It is helpful to utilize simple images to show the conditions under which various regimes emerge in order to fix concepts. We use the framework in which the elites are the affluent and the public are the impoverished to translate our comparative statics on inter-group inequality into the data. Recall the four "paths" that we drew for political growth. First up was the completely con-solidated democracy of the British way. The second was the unconsolidated democratic route taken by Argentina. The third option, adopted by Singapore, was persistent nondemocracy, which allows for the maintenance of the status quo without resorting to severe repression. The fourth approach, taken by South Africa, combined repression with chronic nondemocracy. We are able to visualize these various possibilities using the comparative statics of our theory [1]–[3].

The title of our book is inspired by the fact that these nations' fundamentally varied underlying economic structures are the primary source of the various political results. We also underline the variations in political institutions, some of which are historically dictated and others of which are purposefully created with the characteristics of the regime in mind. For the sake of simplicity, we abstract away the use of concessions and assume that no revolution ever happens in equilibrium. As a result, if a revolution is a danger, a non-democratic state must decide between repression and granting democracy.

The Price of Repression

Because inequality is sufficiently low and the poor are comfortable with the current state of affairs politically, there is no need to suppress or stage coups. This relates to Region A, where

nondemocracy continues unabated, and it is here that Singapore is located. Inequality is worse and the possibility of revolution is present in Region B. But the price of repression is so great that democracy is established. Argentina and Great Britain are both located in this area. The cost of repression is sufficiently cheap that democracy can be avoided in Region C, where inequality is so extreme that revolution is a danger to nondemocracy. Up until 1994, South Africa experienced this. Because the excluded populations in South Africa were Black Africans and Coloreds, and because exclusion and repression were supported by an openly racial worldview, the cost of repression may have been reduced.

These straightforward images also enable us to map out the political development of various nations. We consider the past and present of democracy in South Africa, for instance. Why did South Africa finally transition to a democratic system so slowly? a portion of the narrative. As inequality decreased in South Africa starting in the middle of the 1970s, the white elite felt less threatened by democracy. At the same time, the industrial sector expanded at the cost of agriculture, and both physical and human capital gained significance. According to the overall picture, this indicates that the elites are less inclined to suppress at a certain degree of inequality. The line between Region C and Region B is lowered as a result. The same threshold is also moved below by changes in the global environment, particularly globalization, suggesting that given constant levels of inequality, the cost of repression has to be lower to justify the continuation of dictatorship. As a result, democracy was established in South Africa, which transitioned from Region C to Region B sometime between 1970 and 1994. What does South Africa's future hold? For evidence of this which poses the question of whether democracy would survive apartheid. One may speculate that South Africa would be in Region B and, as a result, an unconsolidated democracy since inequality is still quite high. However, the impact of South Africa's economic growth, the rising significance of human and physical capital, and more globalization has the effect of bringing the borders of Regions A and B closer together. Now, inequality must be greater for a given cost of a coup to justify waging a coup against democracy. Furthermore, as previously mentioned, the architecture of political institutions after apartheid was created specifically to further the interests of whites, which again lowers this barrier. Thus, one would wish that South Africa had moved into Region A rather than Region B, despite the fact that one cannot predict the future [4]–[6].

DISCUSSION

Democracy

Here, we provide a summary of earlier studies on democracy. We provide some of the key "stylized facts" about democracy that have received the greatest attention and have generated the most discussion in the literature. We discuss these trends informally without utilizing formal econometric methods as a reevaluation of the current empirical data is not our major objective. Even while these patterns may not be indicative of causal connections, they nonetheless provide information about the correlates of democracy in the data, which may provide guidance for the kinds of models we might create. In the next two sections, we go through several theories of democracy and describe how our method is unique and adds to the body of knowledge.

Evaluation of Democracy

The first difficulty in doing a quantitative examination of democratic tendencies is coming up with accurate and useful metrics. Political scientists have debated this topic extensively, mostly because they differ on what really defines a democracy. However, a lot of academics agree with

Schumpeter's definition, which holds that democracy depends on democracy. The range of this index is 1 to 7, with 1 being the highest level of freedom and 7 the lowest. A nation receives a score of 1 if political rights are the closest to the ideals suggested by a checklist of questions, starting with whether or not there are free and fair elections, whether or not those who are elected rule, whether or not there are competitive parties or other political groupings, whether or not the opposition plays a significant role and actually has power, and whether or not minority groups have reasonable self-government or can participate in the government through informal consensus. The primary questionnaire asks three questions on the electoral process, four about the level of political engagement and pluralism, and three about how the government runs. Depending on how many rights and freedoms are really existent, 0 to 4 points may be added for answering each item on the checklist. Following Barro, we supplement this index with the relevant variable from Bollen for 1960 and 1965, and we transform both indexes so that they lie between 0 and 1, with 1 corresponding to the most democratic set of institutions. These scores are totaled and used to determine where a country resides on the 1 to 7 scale [7]–[9].

Even with Bollen's data included in, the Freedom House index allows us to only consider the postwar period. On the other hand, the Polity IV dataset provides statistics for all nations since their independence in 1800. The Polity democracy index ranges from 0 to 10 and is derived from coding the competitiveness of political participation, the openness and competitiveness of executive recruitment, and the constraints on the chief executive. In order to examine pre-1960 events and to evaluate our primary measure, we also look at the other widely used measure of democracy: the composite Polity index. For instance, constraints on the executive is coded on a 7-point scale running from "unlimited authority" where "there are no regular limitations on the executive's actions," to "executive parity or subordination" where "accountability groups have effective authority equal to or greater than the executive in most areas of activity."

A coun- try would receive the lowest score for constraint on the executive if "constitutional restrictions on executive action are ignored" or "there is no legislative assembly or there is one but it is called or dismissed at the executive's pleasure." A country would receive the highest score, on the other hand, if "a legislature, ruling party or council of nobles initiates much or most important legislation" or "the executive is chosen by the accountability group and is dependent on its continued support to remain in office." The Polity autocracy index also ranges from 0 to 10 and is constructed in a similar way to the democracy score based on scoring countries according to the competitiveness of political participation, the regulation of par- ticipation, the openness and competitiveness of executive recruitment, and the constraints on the chief executive. We additionally adjust the aggregate Polity index such that it falls between 0 and 1 to make comparisons with the Freedom House score easier. We are able to discern between various democratic hues thanks to both of these metrics.

Przeworski and his coauthors have advocated and used an alternative empirical methodology, contending that the most helpful empirical definition is a straightforward distinction between democracy and non-democracy. These writers add additional conditions to the definition of a democracy in addition to the dichotomous classification, the most significant of which is that a nation cannot be considered democratic until a political party has been shown to relinquish power. Therefore, according to Przeworski et al., Botswana has never been a democracy because the Botswana Democratic Party has won every election since the country's independence in 1966, despite the fact that everyone agrees that elections are free and fair, that anyone can run for office, and that the government is accountable to the people. For the majority of the post-Second

World War era, Japan was not a democracy until the Liberal Democratic Party lost power, and South Africa is not now regarded as a democracy since the ANC has been in power since the end of apartheid.

None of the patterns discussed here rely on the choice between continuous and dichotomous measurements, despite the fact that this topic is the subject of a heated controversy among political science researchers. We prefer more precise measurements, although dichotomous measurements might still be useful. For instance, they make it possible to describe transitions to and from democracy more clearly. In the following, we employ the dichotomous measures created by Przeworski et al. and enhanced by Boix and Rosato to do so.

Democracy's Patterns

Plot the values of the normalized Freedom House, Polity, and enhanced Przeworski et al. indices for our fundamental 1960–2000 sample, respectively. According to these data, nations in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development started the period with almost complete democratic representation and maintained it. In contrast, democracy collapsed in other regions of the globe, notably in Latin America and Africa, but we can now clearly see the "third wave" of democratization that Huntington refers to. For all the nations that gained independence during this time span, 3.4 utilizes Polity data going back to 1840. This image clearly shows the advancement of democracy in the OECD in the years before World War I as well as evidence of the "first and second waves of democracy," the first occurring before and the second occurring after World War II. Both of these trends have influenced the way that researchers studying democracy think.

The renowned modernization hypothesis promoted by Lipset and many others subsequently has its roots in the special positive correlation between wealth and democracy. Many academics currently hold the view that democracy can only exist in nations that are wealthy and well educated, building on the discoveries of the modernization theory. Additionally, it is a widely held belief in literature and the news media that democracy will naturally occur as economic prosperity and educational attainment rise. Despite their popularity, these viewpoints suffer from the absence of a well-developed theory that explains when and how democracies arise and solidify. This book's goal is to construct such a theory and use it to comprehend, among other things, the possible connections between democratic government and economic growth.

Przeworski et al. underline another trend in the data. These authors contend and provide evidence that the tendency of wealthy nations to maintain their democracies, as opposed to poorer nations, is a major factor in the positive association between income and democracy. They score this tendency using the Przeworski et al. data. is a histogram showing the percentage of nations starting off as non-democratic and moving toward democracy. The sample comprises non-democratic nations in the years 1965, 1970, 1975, 1980, 1985, and 1990; it assesses how democratic those nations become during the next five years. Using the average global income distribution between 1965 and 1990, countries are grouped into income quintiles. However, there is no monotonic link between wealth and the percentage of nondemocracies that transition to democracy. This figure indicates that nations in the top two quintiles have a larger propensity to shift to democracy. Similar to 3.10, except for changes from democracy to nondemocracy rather than the other way around. Transitions and income quintiles have a more pronounced correlation. The risk that a country in the lowest two quintiles will become nondemocratic in any five-year period is considerable, but it is nil for those in the top two quintiles and significantly lower for

those in the third quintile. These histograms demonstrate that although there is a minimal correlation between the chance of switching to democracy and wealth, there is a significant difference between the proportion of relatively prosperous and poor democracies that return to nondemocracy.

We stress that the patterns do not correlate to causal impacts of money and education on democracy and democratic transitions, notwithstanding the fact that this is not the appropriate arena for reevaluating the current empirical data. More specifically, these relationships do not prove that a nation's tendency to become more democratic will increase as it grows affluent. A causal explanation of these trends has significant difficulties since countries with different income levels also have diverse histories and other institutional features. Our most recent research thoroughly examines this problem and establishes that affluence has little to no causal influence on democracy or democratic transitions. The economic and political trajectories of different civilizations seem to be determined instead by other historical events, which produces the sorts of relationships.

Legality, Democracy, and Redistribution

Our approach to democracy places a strong emphasis on the importance of social conflict, particularly between various groups. This approach's consequence is that inter-group inequality ought to have an impact on the stability of political institutions and, therefore, on the chance that a society would eventually become democratic. The related concept of inter-group inequality, however, is problematic since it is sometimes hard to quantify. The percentage of labor income in GDP, however, is a statistic that represents inter-group inequality when the main conflict is between the affluent and the poor. The justification for this is that, although a smaller, richer elite receives the majority of capital revenue, the poorest sectors of society get most of their income through work. Therefore, when there is conflict between the affluent and the poor, a high labor share corresponds to a low degree of intergroup inequality.

The United Nations provided the labor share statistics, which is also utilized by Rodrik. Since it only includes manufacturing, it may not be entirely indicative of the total economy. Both graphs demonstrate a favorable correlation between democracy and labor share. the correlation between democracy and another indicator of inequality, the Gini coefficient, which is more widely used in academic literature and covers more economic sectors than the labor share from the manufacturing sector. The Gini coefficient's value reflects the degree of inequality. With the Polity statistics, the link is similar to the one with the labor share but less pronounced: nations that are less democratic tend to be those that are more unequal and, as a result, have higher Gini coefficients.

These correlations do not correlate to the causal influence of labor share or intergroup inequality on democracy, as was underlined in the context of the link between income and democracy. Furthermore, despite a large body of research, there is still disagreement on the link between inequality and democracy. These correlations are not necessarily resistant to the inclusion of other factors in a regression model. While the nonquantitative literature often asserts that democracy cannot exist in nations with extreme inequality, the actual data is more conflicting. Bollen and Jackman discovered no correlation between indicators of inequality and democracy using cross-al econometrics. Muller provided empirical data that suggested more inequality increased the likelihood of dictatorships and decreased a society's willingness to democratize, while Bollen and Jackman challenged his findings as being unreliable. Przeworski et al. more

recently used probit analysis to examine the effects of three metrics of inequality on the transitions to and from democracy. They calculated the Gini coefficient, the difference between the percentage of total income that went to the wealthiest and poorest 10% of the population, and the proportion of manufacturing revenue that went to employees. The first two measures of inequality were unrelated to democracy, and they noted that "the duration of dictatorships is unaffected by wealth distribution," while the third measure revealed that "dictatorships... They also found that "democracies are less s in societies that are more unequal to begin with, in societies in which household income inequality increases, and in societies in which labor receives a lower share of value added in manufacturing" Boix reports results in which higher inequality reduces the propensity of a society to democratize.It is also pertinent to our strategy because other academics have looked at the connection between political instability, inequality, and revolution. Again, the results are conflicting, however Muller, Seligson, Alesina, and Perotti discovered that more political instability is correlated with increased inequality.

As a result, it is crucial to note that the emphasis of the extant scientific research is on correlations rather than causal relationships, which makes it rather paradoxical. Nevertheless, the relationships shown in are informative. For instance, they propose that models with democracies that are more redistributive and, therefore, have a greater labor share, as well as models with democracies that can thrive better in societies with less inequality, may reasonably replicate this trend in the data. The stronger propensity for redistributive measures in democracies may account for at least some of the positive association between democracy and labor income and the Gini coefficient. These data demonstrate a favorable correlation between democracy ratings throughout the 1990s and the percentage of tax receipts in GDP. Once again, this is just a correlation and not evidence of a connection between the two. The idea that redistribution patterns shift after democracy is also supported by historical data. The reader is recommended to Lindert for a more in-depth and satisfying assessment of the European experience; here, we just briefly touch upon some of the facts. In practice, many other tools, like as labor-market rules and educational policies, seem to be significant in governments' efforts to influence the distribution of wealth in society. Despite the relationship between democracy and fiscal redistribution.

The Reform Acts of 1867–1884 marked a turning point in British state history. Gladstone overhauled the civil service in 1871, making it meritocratic by exposing it to public inspection. A significant quantity of labor-market legislation was passed by the Liberal and Conservative administrations, fundamentally altering the structure of industrial relations in favor of employees. According to Mulligan, Sala-i-Martin, and Gil, democracies do not disperse wealth more than other types of governments. For the original examination of the relationship between democracy and labor share, see Rodrik. See Li, Squire, and Zou for further information on the connection between democracy and inequality. For further information on the many policies that democracies pursue and the various types of democracies, see Persson, Tabellini, and Persson. Under the direction of Asquith and Lloyd George, the Liberal Party brought the modern redistributive state to Britain from 1906 to 1914. This state included minimum wages, health and unemployment insurance, government-funded pensions, and a dedication to redistributive taxes. Taxes as a percentage of GNP more than doubled in the 30 years that followed 1870 as a consequence of the fiscal adjustments, and then doubled again in the 30 years that followed. The tax system's progressivity also rose throughout this period.

The Education Act of 1870 committed the government to the systematic provision of universal education for the first time, which was made free in 1891. Prior to this, the educational system

was either primarily for the elite or controlled by religious denominations for the majority of the nineteenth century. The school-leaving age was established at eleven in 1893 and raised to twelve in 1899; special arrangements were introduced for students from low-income households. Due to these modifications, the percentage of ten-year-olds enrolled in school, which was a depressing 40% in 1870, soared to 100% in 1900. Finally, a reform act passed in 1902 brought about a significant increase in educational resources and established the grammar schools that would later serve as the cornerstone of secondary education in Britain.

The scenario was similar in France. Government funding for education significantly rose under the Second Empire, which resulted in a decline in adult illiteracy from 39 to 29 percent and a rise in primary school attendance from 51 to 68 percent. The government ended tuition in public elementary schools in 1881, and in 1882 it instituted a seven-year mandatory education for kids. In 1886, 82 percent of children were enrolled in elementary schools, up from 66 percent in 1863. Significant labor-market legislation was enacted during the Second Empire's "liberal" period, with strikes being lawful in 1863 and unions receiving official approval in 1868. Additionally, central government spending as a proportion of GDP rose from 9.4 percent in 1872 to 12.4 percent in 1880, a one-third increase.

The Weimar state started a significant surge in redistribution in Germany in the 1920s. Additionally, it seems that significant redistribution in Sweden did not begin until after democracy. According to Lindert's research, there was no redistribution in Sweden before to 1920; nonetheless, it significantly grew after this time. Lindert asserts that democracy and educational advancement in Western Europe have always had a close connection. We might sum up our debate by paraphrasing Easterlin, who focused on the connection between democracy and educational reforms:

Politics and Crises

Our theory of democratization, which is covered in detail in Chapter 2, holds that political power shifts and economic and political crises are conducive to the democratic process. The explanation is fundamental to our framework: political institutions develop in order to transform ephemeral de facto political power into more enduring de jure political power. According to this logic, we may anticipate a connection between major crises and movements toward or away from democracy.

Particularly Haggard and Kaufman stressed how economic and political crises may cause both democratic and nondemocratic governments to become unstable. For instance, they claim that "democratic transitions occurred in the context of severe economic difficulties that contributed to opposition movements" in Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Peru, Uruguay, and the Philippines. On the other hand, Przeworski et al. note that "the fragility of democracy... Przeworski et al. find that "most deaths of democracy are ac- companied by some economic crisis; in twenty- eight out of thirty-nine instances, deaths of democracies were accompanied by a fall in income during at least one of the two preceding years" Our historical discussion and the following also demonstrate that many of the key transitions to democracy during both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were accompanied by a fall in income during at least one of the two preceding years.

Here, we provide some more data supporting this tendency. Both the probability of a democracy to nondemocracy transition and the probability of a nondemocracy to democracy transition are built similarly. The first graph includes the non-democratic nations in 1970, 1975, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995 and divides them into groups based on whether they had an economic crisis in

the five years before. A GDP per capita growth rate of less than 5% in any of the five years before is considered to be an economic crisis. The percentage of non-democratic countries that have become democracies is shown next, both with and without an economic crisis. The identical procedure is carried out in 3.20 for changes from democracies to nondemocracies. Both charts demonstrate how economic crises increase the likelihood of transitions. Overall, this trend supports the idea that regime changes are more likely to occur during times of crisis or instability, according on how we define it.

Democratization and Social Unrest

In reality, our strategy for democratization emphasizes not only the necessity of crises but also the significance of social discontent, the danger of revolution, and generally the de facto power of people without de jure political authority in bringing about a transition to democracy. In order to address this, we will revisit the historical topic of how democracy first emerged in nineteenth-century Europe and twentieth-century America [10]–[12].

CONCLUSION

Overall, assessing democracy requires a complicated and multifaceted approach that considers the intricate and ever-evolving character of political institutions. Even though no measure is perfect, continual attempts to hone and enhance these indicators may provide insightful data about the condition of democracy in various parts of the globe. Despite these difficulties, political science and international relations researchers continue to prioritize the study of gauging democracy. Accurate and trustworthy indicators of democracy may guide practice and policy aimed at advancing human rights and democratic government globally. These measurements may provide important insights into the elements that facilitate or obstruct democratic development by emphasizing regions of success and exposing areas of weakness.

REFERENCES

[1] D. Fuchs and E. Roller, "Conceptualizing and measuring the quality of democracy: The citizens' perspective," *Polit. Gov.*, 2018, doi: 10.17645/pag.v6i1.1188.

[2] N. Osterberg-Kaufmann, T. Stark, and C. Mohamad-Klotzbach, "Challenges in conceptualizing and measuring meanings and understandings of democracy," *Zeitschrift fur Vergleichende Polit.*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s12286-020-00470-5.

[3] R. Sigman and S. I. Lindberg, "Democracy for All: Conceptualizing and Measuring Egalitarian Democracy," *Political Science Research and Methods*. 2019. doi: 10.1017/psrm.2018.6.

[4] M. Bühlmann, W. Merkel, L. Müller, and B. Weßels, "The democracy barometer: A new instrument to measure the quality of democracy and its potential for comparative research," 2012. doi: 10.1057/eps.2011.46.

[5] I. Harbers, J. Bartman, and E. van Wingerden, "Conceptualizing and measuring subnational democracy across Indian states," *Democratization*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/13510347.2019.1606797.

[6] M. Kneuer, "E-democracy: A new challenge for measuring democracy," *Int. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2016, doi: 10.1177/0192512116657677.

[7]   D. A. Armstrong, "Conceptualizing and measuring democracy," in *What Is Democracy and How Do We Study It?*, 2021. doi: 10.1177/001041400203500101.

[8]   C. H. Knutsen, "Measuring effective democracy," *Int. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2010, doi: 10.1177/0192512110364736.

[9]   D. Giannone, "Political and ideological aspects in the measurement of democracy: The Freedom House case," *Democratization*, 2010, doi: 10.1080/13510340903453716.

[10] A. C. Alexander, R. Inglehart, and C. Welzel, "Measuring effective democracy: A defense," *Int. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2012, doi: 10.1177/0192512111414682.

[11] M. Coppedge *et al.*, "Conceptualizing and measuring democracy: A new approach," *Perspectives on Politics*. 2011. doi: 10.1017/S1537592711000880.

[12] J. Møller and S. E. Skaaning, "Beyond the radial delusion: Conceptualizing and measuring democracy and non-democracy," *Int. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2010, doi: 10.1177/0192512110369522.

CHAPTER 6

DEMOCRATIZATIONS IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY EUROPE

Dr. Batani Raghavendra Rao, Professor, Department of Finance,
CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id-br.rao@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Democratization refers to the process by which a country transitions from an authoritarian or non-democratic system of governance to a democratic one. This process can involve a range of political, social, economic, and cultural factors, and can occur gradually or rapidly depending on the specific context. The study of democratization has been a critical area of research in political science and comparative politics, and scholars have developed various theories and frameworks to explain the causes and consequences of democratization. These theories include modernization theory, elite theory, and institutional theory, among others.

KEYWORDS:

Capitalism, Citizenship, Civil Society, Constitution, Democratization, Elections.

INTRODUCTION

While democracy had briefly flourished in France during the revolution, it was shortly put an end to by the emergence of the Jacobins and subsequently Napoleon. Napoleon's downfall led to the restoration of the absolutist monarchy. After the 1830 revolt, absolute rule started to wane. This resulted in a very constrained democracy with property limitations that only allowed 0.75 percent of the people to vote. With the adoption of universal male suffrage in 1849, the Second Republic followed the fall of the Orleanist monarchy in the 1848 revolution. However, the impact of this was short-lived, first by voting rights limits established in 1850 that disenfranchised 2.8 million males, and then by Louis Napoleon's coup in 1851. This ensuing time was divided into two periods by historians: the "authoritarian" phase, which lasted from 1852 to 1860, and the "liberal" phase, which lasted from 1860 until the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, in which the French soldiers were defeated. The Third Republic was established when the government collapsed as a result of the war's loss and subsequent turmoil. Democracy was finally established with full male suffrage in 1877, however further changes like the secret ballot weren't implemented until later, in 1912.

The 1848 revolution marked the beginning of modern democracy in Germany, when, once again in response to revolutionary forces, practically all German states significantly extended public involvement in governance. However, institutional restraints significantly reduced the consequences of this democratization. Initially ruled by Junker landowners, the alliance of "iron and rye" took over control of this three-class form of government in the 1870s. The Parliament was unable to choose ministers or debate foreign affairs, and voting was oral. Although all adult men over the age of twenty-five had the right to vote after 1870, landowners in rural regions still regulated who may vote. During this time, the German Empire was ruled by a Prussian oligarchy,

despite the fact that it was a constitutional monarchy in principle, according to Abrams. The fall of the German army on the Western Front in August 1918 led to a serious danger of civil unrest and revolution, which was addressed by the establishment of the Weimar Republic in 1919.

With the establishment of a bicameral parliament with First and Second Chambers in 1866, democracy gradually spread across Sweden. Universal male suffrage was implemented in the First Chamber in 1909, but true parliamentary government didn't start until 1918, when the Conservative Party's and the monarchy's political influence was restrained. This was the result of unusual turbulence brought on by the end of the First World War and the severe economic crisis. Tilton contends that although though Sweden did not take part in the First World War, the revolution in Russia and the circumstances in Germany necessitated the surrender of democratic rights prior to the reform in 1909, which had been preceded by strikes and protests. Full male suffrage was a policy that the Liberal and Social Democratic coalition government of 1917 advocated but the Second Chamber, which was governed by the Conservatives, rejected. According to Collier, the Reform Act wasn't really approved until after the 1918 financial crisis and the subsequent Social Democratic-led worker rallies for democracy. Indeed, in November 1918, Sweden's Conservative party and upper classes began to see worker demonstrations as posing a revolutionary danger. The fear of popular unrest and, eventually, revolution is what propels political liberalization and the introduction of democratic policies in each of these situations. Wars and other shocks to the social order increased disorder [1]–[3].

DISCUSSION

In the context of Europe, our theory so far explains the birth of democracy but does not provide an explanation for why the wave of democratizations began in the nineteenth century. Ancient Greece and Rome first proposed the idea of democracy as a workable system of government, and by the seventeenth century in England, especially during the Civil War, there were persistent calls for universal suffrage. The book's conclusion offers a potential explanation for this, but even at this point, it is important to check if the evidence is in line with the comparative statics we have previously determined. Since the disenfranchised groups of society were dispersed over rural regions prior to the nineteenth century, the prospect of revolution may have seemed less dire since it was exceedingly hard for them to mobilize. Therefore, a major role in starting the wave of democracy in nineteenth-century Europe may have been the combination of rising urbanization and industrial work. Early nineteenth-century changes in society's and the economy's structure affected the balance of political power, particularly by making it considerably simpler for the politically excluded to exert de facto authority [4]–[6].

Unquestionably true, too, are the ideological shifts brought forth by the Enlightenment, the French Revolution, and the U.S. People's perceptions about the right form of government and the legitimacy of the previous political system changed as a result of the American War of Independence.Another possible response in the framework of our approach up to this point is that there was less in-equality before the nineteenth century. Remember that while inequity is low, revolution is not a danger, and even if it is, the elite may quell revolt by making redistribution pledges. Democratization is only necessary when inequality is extreme enough to make it necessary. The little information we do have on inequality in the nineteenth century is consistent with the idea that inequality was increasing up to democracy. Following Kuznets' hypothesis that inequality first increases and then lowers with economic development, a large portion of this research focuses on attempting to determine if there was ever a "Kuznets curve" historically.

The evidence for income disparity in the eighteenth century is not very solid. Three estimates of the historical development of the Gini coefficient in Britain are shown in figure 3.21. Economic historians generally agree that from the 1870s, income inequality in Britain dramatically decreased. Additionally, there is general agreement that inequality increased in the century before to this, albeit various researchers and datasets found varying timeframes for this growth. Williamson discovered that this rise occured between 1800 and 1870, but Lindert and Williamson discovered that it happened before 1800. The rest of the evidence supports Williamson. Whatever the case, the inequality statistics are unmistakably in favor of the hypothesis that inequality had increased in the century before to 1867 and the Second Reform Act, and it may have even increased prior to the First Reform Act. The research also indicates that inequality significantly decreased after political change.

Even fewer statistics are available for other nations. Morrisson examined the evidence and asserted that Sweden, Germany, and France all underwent Kuznets curves. Inequality increased in Germany over the nineteenth century, with the majority of experts putting the pinnacle around 1900. For instance, Kuznets discovered that the income share of the top 5% increased from 28% in 1873–80 to 32% in 1891–1900, remained at 32% in 1901–10, then decreased to 31% in 1911–13. According to Dumke, the same income share was 28.4% in 1880, 32.6 percent in 1900, and 30.6 percent in 1913. Unemployment decreased dramatically under the Weimar Republic. According to Kraus, the income share of the top 5 percent had decreased by 6.2 percent by 1926. In general, Morrisson contends that the Kuznets curve in Germany reached its apex around 1900, then flattened out and began to decline in the 1920s. This time period roughly coincides to the significant democracy of 1918–19. The statistics from Bourguignon and Morrisson clearly demonstrate this tendency.

According to Morrisson, Morrisson, and Snyder, inequality in France increased until 1870, reaching a high of almost 50% for the top 10% of earners. However, inequality began to decline in the 1870s; by 1890, it had dropped to 45 percent, and by 1929, it had reached 36 percent. Therefore, the key political changes in France between 1860 and 1977 roughly coincide with the Kuznets curve's top. In recent studies by Piketty on the twentieth century and by Piketty, Postal-Vinay, and Rosenthal on the nineteenth century, the common understanding about France has been, to some degree, questioned. These authors discovered that inequality increased monotonically in the nineteenth century and only decreased during the First and Second World Wars in the twentieth century using data on tax returns.

Last but not least, Soderberg noted that Sweden's income disparity increased, reached a high shortly before the First World War, leveled out or declined somewhat through the 1920s, and then began to decline quickly following. Once again, a strong correlation has been shown between the reduction in inequality and the expansion of the franchise. Overall, the Kuznets curve peak seems to have coincided with democracy in Britain, France, Germany, and Sweden, which is consistent with the process outlined in this book.

The Experience of Latin America

The data from the democratization of Latin America lends credence to the idea that the danger of revolution and social unrest was significant, and it is generally compatible with the comparative stats about inequality. We spoke about the Argentine situation, where social conflict had a significant role in the Sa'enz Pen a Law's passage, and we took notice of Bushnell's opinions on

Colombia's democracy in the 1930s. We now take a quick, more thorough look at a few additional examples.

Social conflict is seen to have had a significant impact in the historical development of the democratic movement. The Juan Vicente Gomez dictatorship, which ruled Venezuela from 1908 until 1935, put an end to a protracted era of caudillismo and political instability. Up until 1945, when the first modern democracy was established, his military heirs held power. According to Levine, the following things happened before democratization: Democracy was overthrown by a coup in 1948, but it was restored in 1958 when the General Perez Jimenez dictatorship fell after a large-scale rebellion. According to Levine, the turmoil that followed the economic slump is what sparked the redemocratization. He claims that "underground political forces, now united in a Junta Patrio'tica, mounted a wave of demonstrations and street fighting."

Threats of popular unrest and outright revolution have played a significant role in pressuring political leaders in Central America to embrace democracy. For instance, General Jorge Ubico's thirteen-year dictatorship in Guatemala came to an end in 1944 with the installation of a junta under the command of General Federico Ponce. A student uprising and a pro-democracy upsurge led to his removal the following year, which resulted in the election of Juan Are'valo as president in 1945. Following him in 1950 came Jacobo Arbenz, who was overthrown in 1954 by a coup. The similar trend was followed by Guatemala's redemocratization, which came about as a result of the conflict. The military agreed to a gradual redemocratization that began in 1982; Marco Cerezo was elected in 1985, and Jorge Serrano in 1990. After Serrano's attempted coup was thwarted in 1993, this process went on. Despite the military's strict control over these governments, there was significant civil dissatisfaction that led to political reform. The situation is similar in El Salvador, with the exception of the short early democratic phase. After the 1932 Matanza uprising, the coffee oligarchs handed over power to the military. After 1962, democratic elections were held, although they were heavily manipulated and vulnerable to significant fraud. Redemocratization took place in 1982, but during a protracted civil conflict that didn't conclude until 1992. The largest left-wing party, the Frente Farabundo Mart' por la Liberacio'n Nacional, first challenged the government in 1994.

Perhaps it is now more obvious that social conflict, often class and distributive conflict, has been at the root of the majority of democratic breakdowns and military coups in Latin America. This was a major issue of O'Donnell's groundbreaking work, and Stepan reached a similar conclusion in his examination of military coups in Chile, Uruguay, Argentina, and Brazil. He claims:In all four nations, there is a new authoritarianism. was put in place amid escalating class tension. The bourgeoisie served as the socioeconomic foundation in each nation for the new authoritarian dictatorship, whose first political actions included using the state's coercive machinery to remove... organizations for working people.

The majority of dictatorships, according to Drake's examination of the role of labor in the dictatories of Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, Spain, and Portugal, emerged out of the distributive conflict between capital and wages. Prior to the rise of the dictatorships, the militancy of the working class had already started to terrify landowners, who abandoned liberal democracy. The military saved the economic elites when they lost prestige, authority, and power. By repressing demands from the lower classes, these right-wing, militarily based administrations protected capitalism against populism, socialism, and communist. They prioritized hierarchy over equity, the private over the public, the affluent above labor, and capital accumulation over redistribution.

A alternative approach to the same problem is to examine how coups affect the value of various assets. For instance, we may anticipate an increase in the price of these assets following a coup if democracy results in the transfer and taxation of the wealthy's holdings. Information from Couyoumdjian, Millar, and Tocornal, which represents the actual value of the Chilean stock market index from 1928 to 1978. The actual value of equities steadily decreased from the 1930s through the 1973 coup, peaking with Salvador Allende's victory in 1970. The authors note that this clear pattern of degradation had to do with the growing state interference in the economy, which, directly or indirectly, hindered free business. They link this secular decline to the rising government intervention in the economy. Price restrictions, tax rises, excessive inflation, and other measures of mistrust hindered its expansion. Stock market activity was only a reflection of the decline in private sector involvement.

The value of the assets owned by the wealthy then dramatically increased, making up for thirty years' worth of losses in only five. These findings are in line with a theory of coup motives that stresses distributional conflict.Collier has made the case that the majority's social pressure was a major factor in the current wave of redemocratizations. She also suggested that labor agitation had a significant role in triggering democratic change in Bolivia, Uruguay, and Brazil. Many academics emphasize the resurgence of civil society throughout the 1980s, even in Chile, which seems to be a situation where the military retreated without being pushed too hard. According to Drake, Pinochet accepted the results of the referendum that put an end to the military rule because... The consequences of continuing the dictatorship may have been predicted to include severe social and political unrest, class conflict, economic setbacks, radicalization of the left, harsh repression, and rising violence. The assumption that political elites in Latin America were compelled to embrace democracy via the fear of revolution and the concerted efforts of the dispossessed is consequently supported by a large body of data. Furthermore, after democracy was established, elites often desired and succeeded in mounting coups to regain control.

It is interesting to evaluate what is known about long-term changes in income distribution in Latin America after the discussion of Europe. Unfortunately, Latin America is significantly less well-known than is Europe. Using information from Calvo, Torre, and Szwarcberg, we illustrate the Gini coefficient for Argentina since the Sa'enz Pen a Law's passage. Inequality in Argentina hasn't altered much during the last 100 years. Despite the fact that the overall trend has remained flat, the fluctuations have been fascinating. From the time of democracy in 1916 until the coup in 1930, inequality started to steadily decline. once then, it was flat, but once Pero'n's first administration was elected, it sank sharply. The somewhat democratic administrations that came to power after 1958 reversed the fast rise in inequality that followed the coup of 1955. By enacting pro-union policies, for instance, Fron- dizi attempted to win the Pero'nist support. However, actual democracy during Pero'n's second administration after 1973 caused inequality to further decline, and the coup of 1976 caused it to sharply rise. This broad trend is supported by other data. For instance, during the first 10 years of democratic politics in Argentina, the percentage of salaries in national revenue, which was believed to be approximately 28 percent at the time of the introduction of universal male suffrage, climbed to 42 percent.

As soon as democracy was replaced by a dictatorship, the wage share began to decline. Similar to this, under Pero'n's first administration, the percentage of salaries in the national income rose by more than 10% over a short period of time, but this growth and more were lost during the military regimes of the 1970s. These actions fit inside the parameters of our system. Because poorer groups were integrated into the political system as a consequence of democratization,

policies favoring these groups were created. Clearly, the desire to change such policies was the driving force for several coups in Argentina. The facts on income distribution reflect these intentions and political influences. In contrast to nondemocracies, democracies tended to foster equality. The Menem presidencies, which abandoned the conventional labor-friendly Peronismist policies, are the exception to this rule, as seen by the sharp increase in inequality that has occurred during the 1990s.According to research by Berry, Urrutia, and London, inequality in Colombia rose from 1938 through the middle of the 1960s before falling steadily after that until 1990. It's interesting to note that democracy did not exist from 1948 and 1958. First, under the military until redemocratization in 1958, then during the authoritarian semi-conservative Conservative administrations of Mariano Ospina Pe'rez and Laureano Go'mez from 1948 to 1953, when opposition politicians were persecuted and congress was shut down.

Research on the correlation between real wages and real rental rates of land has led to the deduction of further facts about long-term income distribution. According to these statistics, inequality increased in the majority of Latin American nations between the 1880s and the Great Depression. These writers contend that this resulted from the inclusion of these mostly land-rich nations in the international economy as exporters of agricultural products. It is interesting to note that the nations that saw this growth in inequality the fastest were those who were the most heavily engaged in international commerce, such as Argentina and Uruguay.

There are also other instances in the framework of Latin American history when democracies have launched significant redistributive initiatives. Chalker said that even in Costa Rica, a nation with a generally egalitarian background, "the most remarkable egalitarian measure in Costa Rica oc- curred in the 1960s and 1970s when the concentration in income distribution was reduced." Engerman, Mariscal, and Sokoloff demonstrate more broadly for Latin America that, as for Europe, there is a significant historical association between democracy and educational growth. It is interesting that this was a byproduct rather than a cause of democratic politics.

Our study of the origin, consolidation, and demise of democracy is based on a wide and fairly diverse body of work in political science and sociology, as well as a smaller, more recent body of work by economists employing formal mathematical models. Any assertion you make in economics is already included in Marshall's Principles of Economics, according to a running joke. Similar to the previous point, it is difficult to think of a claim on either democratization or consolidation that has not already been made elsewhere in the literature. For instance, Huntington outlines 27 key elements that he says have been linked to the promotion of democracy. However, the reasons behind people's beliefs in certain causal claims are often ambiguous, much as the causal processes that connect certain putative causes to specific outcomes. The fact that these difficulties are so clearly defined is a major advantage of the analytical strategy we use [7].

Theorizing about the topics we discuss in this book has been a major focus of academic endeavor since the studies of Lipset and Moore, at least as far back as Aristotle and Plato. Here, we detail what we believe to be our significant contributions and discuss how our study fits into the current body of knowledge. Throughout the book, we go into great detail on how our findings relate to previous research as well as specific theoretical and empirical statements that have been made in the academic literature.Lipset's study, which was influenced by "modernization" theory, was built on the solid empirical link between democracy and per capita income. He argued that as society modernized—a process correlated with expanding urbanization, a rise in the significance of industry, greater educational aspirations, and a rise in the "complexity" of society democracy

evolved. In some ways, Moore's work countered this emphasis on the clear consequences of modernization by highlighting three "paths to the modern world," of which democracy was just one and fascism and communist revolution the other two. Both academics focused on how underlying socioeconomic conditions influenced the emergence of democracy. Moore's research and the more recent addition of Luebbert connected ensuing political regimes to underlying socioeconomic conditions, such the class system and agricultural organization, as well as to the bourgeoisie's power. For instance, in Moore's argument, democracy evolved after agriculture was commercialized, was devoid of feudal or semifeudal labor relations, and the bourgeoisie was powerful.

Many political scientists, including Rustow, Linz and Stepan, and Linz, criticized these "structural" theories in the 1970s for being too deterministic and politicized. The emphasis of this critique shifted from democratization to the demise of democracy. The literature was reoriented in particular by the comparative effort on the demise of democracy directed by Linz and Stepan. They argued in favor of paying "systematic attention to the dynamics of the political process of breakdown." They held that unique decisions made by the key players, both pro- and anti-democratic, and not socioeconomic systems or circumstances, decided whether democracy would collapse. More specifically, Linz claimed that when a democracy loses its "legitimacy," it is because democratic officials have failed to resolve social and political issues. Although Lipset's theory of modernisation does not center on individual or even group decisions, Moore's analysis does include individual and group choices, such as whether the bourgeoisie forms a coalition with the aristocracy. However, his explanation does not make it apparent what decides if such a decision is taken. O'Donnell also criticized modernization theory, claiming that the demise of democracy in Latin America in the 1960s and 1970s cast doubt on the link between affluence and democracy as well as the notion that modernization supported democracy. He emphasized that the wealthiest nations in Latin America, such as Argentina, Uruguay, and Brazil, have experienced military coups.

Following recent developments, studies once again shifted emphasis in the 1980s, this time back on democratizations. The "transitions" project, which O'Donnell, Schmitter, and Whitehead oversaw, was the most significant piece of work; O'Donnell and Schmitter's book, which had a significant impact, reported their findings. They adhered to many of Linz and Stepan's analytical tenets, contending that structural explanations of democratizations were insufficient. With their influential distinction between "hardliners" and "softliners" under an authoritarian system, O'Donnell and Schmitter's book offers a framework for understanding the pertinent processes that can result in democracy and the many sorts of people involved. After that, the book explores numerous interactions between the relevant groups as well as the kinds of circumstances and conundrums that may arise between the fall of a totalitarian system and the inauguration of democracy. Every study in this lineage has a tendency to stress how people' actions and wills, which are seldom restrained by external conditions, establish democracy. As a result, although offering a few generalizations—the most well-known of which is as follows the book does not truly give an explanation of how and when democratization happens.

We contend that no transition can begin without being the direct or indirect result of significant splits existing inside the authoritarian government itself, most notably along the shifting line between hard-liners and soft-liners. The majority of political science study in the 1990s was centered on democratic consolidation, which is also the subject of the most current iteration of this transitions literature. The most crucial work is that of Linz and Stepan. This body of work

focuses on variations in democratic character and the availability of several routes from authoritarian to democratic regimes. Stepan suggested 10 different routes to democracy from nondemocratic countries in an early study. The fundamental tenet is that the character of the previous government determines the shape that democracy will take after it has been established. Linz and Stepan, for instance, make a distinction between four categories of nondemocratic governments: authoritarian, totalitarian, post-totalitarian, and sultanistic. According to them, the sort of nondemocratic government that is originally in existence determines the form of democracy that eventually develops. The difficulties experienced by people trying to establish a stable democracy in North Korea, for instance, are considerably different from those encountered in the Congo. Ideas regarding political culture and how it might play a significant role in deciding consolidation have recently become more prevalent in the literature on democratic consolidation.

Other publications have made an effort to combine actor-based and structural approaches to democracy and its consolidation. Depending on whether "wave" of democracy was being studied, Huntington hypothesized a complicated network of variables that affect democratization. For instance, he highlighted modernization, urbanization, the rise of the middle class, and a reduction in inequality with regard to the First Wave prior to the First World War. His focus switched to the effects of the Second World War and the fall of empires in the second wave. Huntington identifies five elements as crucial to the third wave: the economic recession brought on by the oil shocks of the 1970s and the inter-national debt crisis of the 1980s; the rise in income and increase in education that occurred in the 1960s; the change in the Catholic church's attitude; the shift in the attitudes of international organizations, the United States, and the Soviet Union; and the "snake oil" crisis. Little distinguishes Huntington's analysis of the impact of income level on democracy from Lipset's. According to him, the third wave of democracy was made possible by "higher levels of economic well-being, which led to more widespread literacy, education, and urbanization, a larger middle class, and the development of values and atti- tudes supportive of democracy." To achieve democracy, however, "the creation of social, economic, and external circumstances conducive to democracy is never enough. There must be some political leaders who want it to happen, regardless of their motivations.

Therefore, democ- ratization cannot happen without the structural prerequisites, even if they are required. In many ways, Huntington and O'Donnell and Schmitter's analyses of the democracy process are similar. He describes a number of stylized players in the government and the opposition and makes the case that democracy only arises when certain groups are powerful or when certain interactions take place. Huntington utilizes this discussion to create a taxonomy of many circumstances rather than offering a theory, and he concentrates on three pathways to democracy. Dahl offered a straightforward and attractive framework for comprehending democratization, which is more comparable to our approach. He argued that the fundamental problem with democratization is that, from the perspective of the incumbents who currently govern, such a transformation comes with new conflict-related possibilities, which could lead to the displacement of their objectives by spokespeople for the newly incorporated individuals, groups, or interests. The issue facing their rivals is an exact replica of the one facing the current administration. Therefore, the more at odds the government and opposition are, the more probable it is that each would want to prevent the other from having a meaningful say in how policies are made. In other words, the more at odds the government and its opponents are, the more expensive it is for one to put up with the other.

According to Dahl's theory of democracy, incumbents will democratize when either the cost of tolerating the opposition decreases, making them willing to grant them the right to vote, or the costs of repression increase. He follows up with a number of empirical assertions concerning variables that may potentially affect these costs and, in turn, the probability of democracy. Regarding the mechanics, Dahl highlighted that democracy emerged in societies where authority was broadly dispersed, or in what he termed a "pluralistic" order. The costs of repression rose while the costs of toleration fell as society got more pluralistic, which was prompted by factors like wealth development and industrialization. Therborn and Rueschemeyer, Stephens and Stephens, in particular, noted the significant role that the poor and working class had in the democratic process in contrast to Moore's focus on the bourgeoisie and middle classes. According to their ideology, the working classes support democracy and may compel it if they have sufficient power. Three groups of factors work together to shape power relations. The first is how the various classes and class coalitions balance their influence, as Rueschemeyer, Stephens, and Stephens pointed out. The structure, authority, and interactions between the state apparatus and civil society, as well as the effects of transnational power relations on the balance of class power and state-society relations, round out the three power configurations.

According to their thesis, capitalist growth, which enhances the power of the working classes, is the primary driver promoting democracy. Haggard and Kaufman's study, which focuses on showing the significance of economic crises in triggering democratizations and then on the interactions between democratization, economic policy change, and democratic consolidation, is another significant work. According to their research, societal unrest against nondemocratic regimes is the main means by which crises spread to democratic transitions. For instance, "direct action campaigns" like as anti-regime marches, general strikes, and demonstrations also played a significant role in the authoritarian retreats in their case studies.

The sociological literature on the history of state institutions provides an alternate theoretical framework for understanding democracy. This viewpoint, most often associated with Tilly, has lately been extended to Africa by Herbst. It holds that the process of state building is where democracy first emerged. To wage war, kings need resources, primarily taxes. King had to make concessions, one of which was the establishment of representative institutions, to persuade elites to pay taxes. According to this theory, democracy develops as a result of a trade-off between elites and monarchs, wherein elites get representation in return for paying taxes. The absence of democracy in Africa is a result of the unique pre- and post-colonial state creation process, which spared political elites from having to make concessions to the general populace in return for taxes to fund wars. Bates and Lien, Bates, Rogowski, and Tilly's assessments of democratization were influenced by this state formation study. These academics believed that democracy is a concession from authoritarian rulers required to increase revenue, much as the beginnings of representative institutions more broadly. The more flexible the tax base, the more difficult it is for authoritarian authorities to increase taxes unilaterally and the more likely it is that concessions in this case, democracy will be made. Therefore, Bates argues that a society based mostly on physical or human capital is more likely to be democratic than an agricultural one since land is simpler to tax. Furthermore, he argues the case that authoritarian leaders will be more inclined to uphold democracy if they have less fear of it. He ties this to their economic power in relation to democracy, arguing that democrats cannot harm prior elites if they have a strong enough economy, maybe because taxing the elite causes the economy to crash. In a circumstance when voice precludes escape, Rogowski similarly underlines the importance of people' right to leave as a factor in democracy. Last but not least, our research expands on the

literature that highlights the ability of political institutions to resolve commitment issues. The foundational study is written by North and Weingast, and Weingast has written a number of significant studies on this subject [8]–[10].

CONCLUSION

Overall, the process of democracy is intricate and dynamic, requiring a thorough comprehension of the underlying social, economic, and political elements. While there is no one-size-fits-all method for democratization, continual study and analysis may provide insightful information about the factors that help or impede democratic transitions and can guide the development of legislation and other practices that support democratic governance and human rights. But the process of democracy may also be difficult and complicated. Violence, conflict, and instability may accompany the shift from autocracy to democracy. Additionally, opposition from those who benefitted from the former regime may exist, and institutional flaws, corruption, or a lack of political will may make it more difficult to implement democracy. Democratization is still a vital objective for advancing economic growth, political freedom, and human rights. higher public engagement, enhanced accountability, and higher respect for the rule of law have all resulted from successful democratization initiatives.

REFERENCES

[1]   "Democratizations in Central Europe," in *Democratizations*, 2018. doi: 10.7551/mitpress/8013.003.0008.

[2]   P. G. Lewis, "The 'third wave' of democracy in eastern Europe: Comparative perspectives on party roles and political development," *Party Politics*. 2001. doi: 10.1177/1354068801007005002.

[3]   P. G. Lewis, "The `Third Wave' of Democracy in Eastern Europe," *Party Polit.*, 2001, doi: 10.1177/1354068801007005002.

[4]   V. Emanuele, "Dataset of electoral volatility and its internal components in Western Europe (1945-2015)," *Rome Ital. Cent. Elect. Stud.*, 2015.

[5]   S. P. Huntington, "The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late 20th Century," *J. Democr.*, 1991, doi: 10.1353/jod.1991.0016.

[6]   G. Pridham, "Uneasy democratizations - Pariah regimes, political conditionality and reborn transitions in Central and Eastern Europe," *Democratization*, 2001, doi: 10.1080/714000224.

[7]   A. Assiotis and K. Sylwester, "Does democratization spur growth?," *Econ. Transit.*, 2014, doi: 10.1111/ecot.12036.

[8]   A. C. Pinto, "The Corporatist Wave Corporatism and the Diffusion of 'Organic Representation' in European Dictatorships," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2016, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2823539.

[9]   "The third wave: democratization in the late twentieth century," *Choice Rev. Online*, 1992, doi: 10.5860/choice.29-4135.

[10]   L. Balcerowicz, "Understanding Postcommunist Transitions," *J. Democr.*, 1994, doi: 10.1353/jod.1994.0053.

CHAPTER 7

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INEQUALITY AND DEMOCRATIZATION

Dr. Rajiv Umeshchandra Kalaber, Assistant Professor, Department of Finance,
CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email id-prof.rajiv@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The relationship between inequality and democratization is a complex and multifaceted one. On the one hand, democracy is often seen as a means of promoting greater equality by providing political representation, protecting civil liberties, and promoting social welfare policies. On the other hand, high levels of inequality can threaten the stability and legitimacy of democratic systems by creating a sense of social and economic exclusion and by fueling political polarization and conflict. Empirical research has shown that there is a strong correlation between levels of inequality and the quality and stability of democratic systems. Countries with higher levels of inequality tend to have weaker democratic institutions, lower levels of political participation, and greater social unrest. In contrast, more equal societies tend to have more stable and robust democratic systems.

KEYWORDS:

Authoritarianism, Capitalism, Civil Society, Democracy, Human Rights.

INTRODUCTION

The concepts in this book expand upon the framework that Acemoglu and Robinson proposed. There, we developed the fundamental notion of democracy as a credible commitment by the elites to avoid revolution and placed the issue of regime transitions within a framework of redistributive conflict. We also derived some of the key comparative static results, such as the inverted U-shaped relationship between inequality and democratization. Our study offers the first formal, scientific examination of how democracy was established and strengthened [1]–[3]. Due to the formal political economics framework in which we analyze these problems, we seek straightforward, comprehensive answers for complex social occurrences. The above debate should have made it abundantly obvious that this is slightly outside the mainstream of political science literature on regime transitions. Instead, since the 1970s, this literature has adhered to the principle put forward by Linz and Stepan, who claimed that "the historicity of macro-political processes precludes the highly abstract generalizing of ahistorical social scientific models applicable to all past times and any future cases."

According to O'Donnell and Schmitter, "We did not have at the beginning, nor do we have at the end of this lengthy collective endeavor, a 'theory' to test or to apply to the case studies and thematic essays in these volumes." Some scholars even celebrate the lack of a theoretical framework with which to analyze regime transitions. They go on to say that if we ever had the audacity to develop a theory of these processes, it would have to be as part of a much more comprehensive investigation into the issue of "undetermined" social change, or the kind of

significant changes that take place when there aren't enough structural or behavioral parameters to direct and predict the outcome. Such a theory would have to take into account aspects of accident and unpredictability, of important choices being made quickly with little knowledge, of players having to deal with unresolvable ethical conflicts and ideological ambiguities. The third wave literature presents a number of broad statements concerning variables enabling and impeding democracy, according to a recent review of the literature on democratizations in the most esteemed journal in comparative politics, World Politics. Most of the following are no:

1. The birth of democracy has few prerequisites.
2. The formation of democracy cannot be explained by any one element alone, nor is it required.
3. A number of factors contribute to the formation of democracy in a nation.
4. The factors influencing democracy's consolidation are distinct from those responsible for its development.
5. Different countries have different combinations of factors that support democratic transition and consolidation.
6. Compared to past waves of democratization, the mix of variables that often lead to one wave is different.

DISCUSSION

The "general propositions" seem to be the assertion that there are none. We both agree that democratizations are very intricate social events when examined in depth. The same, however, may not be able to be stated of every topic that social scientists want to comprehend. One must start by oversimplifying and abstracting from many of the nuances in order to create any systematized grasp of the social environment. The choices we make in this book about which aspects to stress and which to disregard may be incorrect, but whether we do so can only be determined by how helpful the theory is from a scientific and empirical perspective, not by assumptions about how complex the phenomenon of democracy is.

According to our definition, a general claim about democracy would be an empirical assertion that was generated from a model with microfoundations and would describe the dynamics that often promote democratization. According to our hypothesis, there are several elements that affect this, including intergroup inequality, political institutions, economic structure, and the kind and degree of globalization. With respect to other factors remaining constant, our theory enables us to make comparative static predictions along the lines of: a highly unequal country is more likely to become democratic as inequality declines. In a specific and extremely unequal nation, as South Africa in the 1980s, declining inequality may be the driving force for democracy. However, this does not imply that decreasing inequality is essential or sufficient to bring about democracy. In another extremely unequal non-democratic nation, inequality may decline, but democracy is prevented because other developments lessen the allure of democratization [4], [5].

Although a close reading of the literature reveals that the distributional conflicts on which we focus are thought to be at the core of understanding democratization and coups, our approach does not easily mesh with much mainstream research on regime transitions in political science. For instance, O'Donnell and Schmitter acknowledged that authoritarian governments only liberalize when they are compelled to do so, even if they underlined that transitions correspond with breaks in the authoritarian system. O'Donnell and Schmitter stated that certain generalizations are conceivable in their findings. First of all, the property rights of the

bourgeoisie are inviolable, a basic constraint that has been seen in all prior known transitions to political democracy.

This finding is not unexpected given that the majority of the authoritarian governments in our sample of nations have purposefully promoted bourgeois interests. They also made additional claims in their study that are quite supportive of our methodology. For instance, they said that one of the pillars of our strategy is that throughout democracy, "the threat of violence and even frequent protests, strikes, and demonstrations are virtually always present." It's interesting to note that Linz's theory of democratic collapse agrees with this fundamental notion.

However, our framework does draw upon a number of literary topics. We bring the trade-off between repression and democracy into a deeper context where political institutions play a genuine role because of how they affect individuals' propensity to commit crimes. These trade-offs are similar to those explored by Dahl and are at the core of our theory. The title of our book and our taxonomy of "paths of democratization" described in 1 are both clearly inspired by Moore's work, which is also an obvious source of inspiration for our study. However, since we do not thoroughly research revolutions and because we entirely disregard the subject of how fascism arises, we only concentrate on a portion of the concerns that he did. Our emphasis on methodological individualism and our economic focus, which differs from his sociological perspective, allow us to present far more clear micro-foundations than he did. The relationship between democracy's health and the middle class is one clear example. We construct a number of explicit ways via which this power might affect the costs and advantages of democracy for particular actors and, therefore, the chance that it will be established.

Additionally, there are similarities between our work and that of academics like Therborn and Rueschemeyer, Stephens, and Stephens. Although there are many topics that are shared, our study is significantly distinct since we clearly define the processes that connect diverse aspects to the emergence and consolidation of democracy. According to Therborn and Rueschemeyer, Stephens and Stephens, democracy is a byproduct of capitalism. They place greater emphasis than Lipset did on the repercussions of such a development on the balance of class power, but their analysis is grounded in the same factual reality. They also fail to explain the process through which democratic progress results from capitalism. According to our theory, economic growth does not always result in democracy even if it may provide the poor more capacity to oppose a non-democratic system. The elite could avoid democratizing by credibly redistributing, for instance, if such development enabled citizens to pose a permanent threat to the ruling class; or, if such development sufficiently increased inequality without increasing the cost of repression, the elite would be encouraged to use repression rather than concede democratization.

According to our theory, the destiny of democracy is determined by the impact of capitalist growth on both the power of the populace and the elite's choice between repression and concession. Furthermore, our data reveals that the emergence of democracy may not be brought about only by capital accumulation. Instead, modifications to the way society is structured may be essential to altering the costs and advantages of democracy for the ruling class. These concepts highlight a unique and crucial element of our work that we feel is worth mentioning. No other writers have examined the trade-offs between democracy, other sorts of concessions, and repression in such a scenario. We consider a paradigm that simply states that the poor desire democracy and that if they have greater power, they would get it to be too simplistic. Furthermore, such a theory does not really explain the function of political institutions, which is unquestionably a crucial step in determining how and why democracy develops.

The contrast between liberalization and democratization originally articulated by O'Donnell and Schmitter comes the closest to capturing this. According to their model, liberalization always takes place before democracy. They define liberalization as "the process of making certain rights that safeguard both individuals and social groups against arbitrary or unlawful acts by the state or third parties effective." The classical liberal principles of habeas corpus, the sanctity of the private home and correspondence, the right to be defended in a fair trial in accordance with existing laws, freedom of expression, and freedom of movement are all included in this list of individual rights guarantees. Such liberalization initiatives represent a concession of the kind we have discussed here to the degree that people appreciate them. Though their historical connection has been tight, O'Donnell and Schmitter point out that liberalization and democracy are not the same thing. Liberalization may prove to be readily controlled and withdrawn at the convenience of individuals in administration without the responsibility to mass publics and constituent majorities entrenched under the latter.

It is also problematic since Moore, Therborn, Rueschemeyer, Stephens, and Stephens' study makes the assumption that political conflict is always based on class. However, there is strong evidence that a more comprehensive conceptual framework is required to provide an acceptable overall approach to democracy. The paradigm we provide is applicable to a much broader range of situations. It has been emphasized for a long time, starting with Moore and Dahl, that democracies cannot exist in agricultural civilizations. The explanation for this is given in the following fashion by Rueschemeyer, Stephens, and Stephens: "The landed upper-class, which was reliant on a vast supply of cheap labor, was the most persistently anti-democratic force. Although this process is possible, the data from Latin America is also consistent with landed interests opposing democracy because they expected losing their land. For them, democratization presented the possibility of losing their labor supply. We focus further on this issue as well as other concepts of how the asset structure affects the cost of coups. We place emphasis on the fact that democracy is accepted in the face of a society's internal conflict. Our interpretation of the historical literature leads us to believe that the kind of democratization Collier refers to as a "elite project," in which political leaders establish democracy for other reasons without outside pressure, is so uncommon that it cannot serve as the foundation for any valid generalizations. Additionally, we do not think the data supports the idea that democracy develops as a byproduct of state creation and the growth of the fiscal base, presumably brought on by external threats.

The elite project approach, which is often linked to O'Donnell and Schmitter, on the other hand, downplays the importance of external societal pressure leading to democratization and instead places an emphasis on conflict inside authoritarian governments that are in power. The elite divides between O'Donnell and Schmitter are a part of this and unquestionably occurred throughout numerous democratizations. The word "democratization" is used more broadly by Collier because she wishes to include certain nineteenth-century democratizations that are said to have occurred when emerging political parties expanded voting rights to win more supporters. Our fundamental stance is that elite splits are an expression of elite heterogeneity, but they are first brought on by the disenfranchised people' challenges to the established system. Different perspectives on democracy are influenced by this difficulty and the variety among the elite. This opinion, in our opinion, is supported by a detailed reading of O'Donnell and Schmitter as well as the case-study data that forms the basis of their research. Haggard and Kaufman assert that while divides among authoritarian elites may be significant, they may also be the result of crises. Considering Disraeli and Gladstone, as 8 makes apparent, we think this is an unsatisfactory account of what happened.

Our study focuses on a more limited range of issues in comparison to prior research on democratic consolidation. It's interesting to note that Linz and Stepan's argument that every democratization exhibits path dependence really depends on how the nondemocratic legacy affects the difficulty of establishing various consolidation factors, such as the rule of law or a non-patrimonial bureaucracy, which are outside the scope of our study given our emphasis on a Schumpeterian definition of democracy. These inquiries, albeit intriguing, are beyond the purview of those made in this book. The notion that the allocation of power in a democracy relies on a variety of circumstances, including the design of political institutions, is at the heart of our strategy. These differ, and thus, so do the results of democracy.

We clearly draw on the literature that has tried to employ such an approach since our approach is game theoretic. This project was inspired by Przeworski's basic democratization games, which he used to illustrate some of the findings of O'Donnell and Schmitter. Many academics, including Gates and Humes, Crescenzi, and Sutter, have contributed to the development of his methodology. Other academics have used simple games, notably the prisoner's dilemma, to illustrate the effects of coups and democratizations. Several of the recent significant publications, such as those by Przeworski, Haggard, and Kaufman, reflect our focus on the economic motivations of players engaged in fostering and weakening democracy. According to Haggard and Kaufman's methodology, political elites will have varied possibilities to organize support or opposition depending on how economic performance and policies influence the income of various social groups. Politics everywhere depends on both the distributional effects of policy and the overall economic performance, which affects the prospects of both incumbents and opponents.

However, most of the game-theoretic models created to date by political scientists are in reduced form, producing few to no test predictions and failing to provide light on the underlying causal processes. The payout to several participants is expressed as integers or maybe variables like x or y when we talk about reduced form. If I obtain a reward of 2 from democracy and a payout of 3 from dictatorship, I will choose dictatorship; otherwise, if I receive a payoff of x from democracy and y from dictatorship, and if x is greater than y, I will choose democracy. Such models do not explain why a certain person or group favors a particular regime, nor do they enable one to make predictions about the conditions under which various outcomes occur. More problematically, they define people's preferences in terms of the behaviors they value, following O'Donnell and Schmitter. As a result, a hardliner is someone who favours tyranny, such as an agent. When similar concepts are used in Huntington, the same issue occurs. He fails to explain why certain exchanges had place in some countries but not others, much like O'Donnell and Schmitter, and why pro-democratic forces were powerful in some nations but not in others. Furthermore, once again, the basic reasons why somebody is in favor of or opposed to a specific political system are not truly stated. An individual's preferences for regime outcomes should ideally be drawn from more fundamental desires for things like money or other things, as well as how certain regimes would affect these choices [6], [7].

This game-theoretical literature has accepted the same division between structural and political explanations of regime changes as Linz and Stepan did in the 1970s, perhaps as a result of the emphasis on reduced-form models. Colomer, for instance, argues in "Structural versus Strategic Approaches to Political Change," The research on regime change and democratic transitions may be divided into two major categories. One viewpoint stresses the structural, social, or cultural

requirements of democracy, whereas the other views political regimes as the results of deliberate reform processes. Here, the players' decisions and interactions play a major importance.

Political scientists seem to be in general agreement that such a dichotomy exists.

Shin contends that affluence, bourgeois class structure, tolerant cultural norms, and economic independence from outside actors all indicators of greater degrees of modernization are no longer necessary for the formation of a functioning democracy in a country. It is seen more as a result of the deliberate selection of certain democratic constitutions, strategic contacts and agreements among political elites, and electoral and party systems. The framework we provide is game theoretic, and people and organizations make strategic decisions based on their incentives and motives. Individuals still operate under social and economic structures that limit their choices and affect their motivations. In actuality, there is no distinction at all to be made between structural and strategic approaches they are one and the same.Therefore, our strategy is to create considerably more detailed political-economic models from which we may extrapolate predictions regarding the prevalence of democracy. We accept people's choices as given but recognize that different people may have different income levels, wealth, ways of holding money, and other possibilities. We derive individual preferences across different regime types from these basics. Consequently, we can demonstrate that "hardline" conduct is ideal for a member of the elite given his preferences, endowments, and opportunities. People are not defined by their actions. Although we are unaware of any study with a similar breadth to ours, a number of other recent formal models of democratization have been used to supplement our findings. The study of Rosendorff, who created a model to argue that declining inequality made democracy less of a danger to whites, is the most relevant. This is because it clearly relates to one of the pillars of our strategy. In his most recent work, Boix creates a simple static version of a democracy model that was inspired by our studies and is similar to the one Dahl outlined. He then applies it to historical examples of democratization, notably those in Switzerland and the US. His book indicates a few of the comparative statics we investigate in this book since it makes use of the framework we created in our previous works.

For instance, Boix talks on how trade, departure, and the economic structure affect redistributive politics and, therefore, democracy. Our understanding of coups is also influenced by Ellman and Wantchekon's research, which demonstrates how the possibility of a coup may affect the platforms put out by political parties during an election. One component of our study in 7. is this. Different formal models of democracy are presented in other articles by Feng and Zak, Justman and Gradstein, and Conley and Temimi. Another school of thought in political economy builds on the notion that democracy is voluntarily granted by political elites because it addresses some sort of market failure or contractual incompleteness. This school of thought includes nonformal work by Kiser and Barzel and Barzel as well as theoretical models by Green, Weingast, Gradstein, Bueno de Mesquita, Morrow, Siverson, and Smith and Lizzeri and Persico. For instance, Green contends that the development of parliamentary institutions provided a legitimate channel for monarchs to convey information.

The other study is based on the premise that rulers have a serious commitment issue since they are unable to employ third parties to enforce their commitments, while varying in the specifics. Therefore, establishing democracy may be Pareto-improving as a monarch may earn legitimacy by ceding some control. Ades, Ades and Verdier, and Bourguignon and Verdier all suggested a different formal strategy towards democracy. These studies examine how changes in income distribution and economic growth affect the scope of the franchise and, therefore, the equilibrium

policy for a fixed wealth threshold under the assumption that only affluent persons have the right to vote. Ticchi and Vindigni, who studied a scenario in which nations participated in interstate combat and political elites democratized to increase the incentives for their population to fight, came up with another strategy [8]–[10].

CONCLUSION

Overall, there is a complicated and dynamic link between inequality and democracy that calls for a careful analysis of the underlying social, economic, and political elements. Although this problem cannot be solved easily, continual study and analysis may provide important insights into the factors that support or undermine socioeconomic equality and democratic government. Numerous elements, such as economic growth, social programs, and political institutions, have an impact on the link between inequality and democracy. Stronger democratic regimes and lower levels of inequality are more common in nations with robust welfare programs. Similar to this, democratic systems tend to be more active and participatory in nations with robust civil society groups and independent media. However, it is not always clear how inequality and democracy are related. The formation of populist groups that question the validity of democratic institutions and norms may often be attributed to high levels of inequality. In other instances, economic elites that want to retain their privileged position may co-opt democratic institutions.

REFERENCES

[1]   J. R. Freeman and D. P. Quinn, "The economic origins of democracy reconsidered," *American Political Science Review*. 2012. doi: 10.1017/S0003055411000505.

[2]   R. Boucekkine, P. G. Piacquadio, and F. Prieur, "A Lipsetian theory of voluntary power handover," *J. Econ. Behav. Organ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jebo.2019.10.010.

[3]   B. Ansell and D. Samuels, "Inequality and democratization: A contractarian approach," *Comp. Polit. Stud.*, 2010, doi: 10.1177/0010414010376915.

[4]   B. W. Ansell and D. J. Samuels, "Assessing the Relationship between Inequality and Democratization," in *Inequality and Democratization*, 2015. doi: 10.1017/cbo9780511843686.006.

[5]   C. H. Knutsen and S. Wegmann, "Is democracy about redistribution?," *Democratization*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/13510347.2015.1094460.

[6]   C. Houle, "Why Inequality Harms Consolidation but," *October*, 2009.

[7]   P. Heller and P. Evans, "Taking Tilly south: Durable inequalities, democratic contestation, and citizenship in the Southern Metropolis," *Theory Soc.*, 2010, doi: 10.1007/s11186-010-9115-3.

[8]   A. Savoia, J. Easaw, and A. McKay, "Inequality, Democracy, and Institutions: A Critical Review of Recent Research," *World Dev.*, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2009.10.009.

[9]   Z. Kadirbeyoglu, "The Impact of Power and Civic Engagement in the Decentralized Management of Natural Resources: The Case of Turkey," *Public Adm. Dev.*, 2017, doi: 10.1002/pad.1809.

[10]   F. Amodio and G. Chiovelli, "Ethnicity and violence during democratic transitions: Evidence From South Africa," *J. Eur. Econ. Assoc.*, 2018, doi: 10.1093/JEEA/JVX034.

CHAPTER 8

AN EMPIRICAL STUDY ON MODELING POLITICS

Dr. Sireesha Nanduri, Assistant Professor, Department of Finance,
CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email id-sireesh_n@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Modeling politics involves the use of theoretical and empirical approaches to understand political phenomena, including the behavior of voters, politicians, and political institutions. Political models can range from simple mathematical equations to complex computer simulations, and they can be used to explore a variety of questions related to political decision-making, policy formation, and electoral outcomes. One of the key advantages of political modeling is that it allows researchers to test different theoretical assumptions and hypotheses in a controlled environment. By simplifying complex social phenomena into mathematical or computational models, researchers can identify key variables and test the effects of different interventions or policy changes.

KEYWORDS:

Spatial Models, Statistical Models, Stochastic Models, Theory Models, Time Series, Voting Models.

INTRODUCTION

Here, we start to examine the elements that contributed to the development of democracy. Our strategy is built on conflict over political institutions, namely democracy against nondemocracy, as was outlined. The many repercussions of these regimes are what lead to this conflict. In other words, various political institutions produce various results, resulting in various winners and losers. As a result of these effects, different groups favor other political structures. Building models of communal decision-making in democracies and nondemocracies is therefore the first stage in our explanation of how and when democracy originates. There is a ton of literature on democratic group decision-making. Instead of reviewing this literature, our goal is to highlight the key ideas about how different distributional conflicts and individual preferences are incorporated into economic and social policy. Before going to nondemocratic politics, we must analyze how people make decisions in democracies.

A democracy's most fundamental feature is that every person has the right to vote, which has an impact on the social decisions and policies that are made. In a direct democracy, the people would elect the policies themselves. The government in a representative democracy is chosen by the people, who then select which policies to put into effect. In the simplest type of democracy, candidates for office from political parties present a policy platform to voters in an effort to win their support. Besides being a tax policy, it might also be an economic or social policy of any other kind. Then, after electing political parties, voters choose policies indirectly. In a democracy, policy is determined by the interplay between voter preferences and party programs.

Election results reveal that one party will carry out its campaign promises. This strategy, which we use for the most of the book, is based on a corpus of significant economics and political science research, including that of Hotelling, Black, and Downs [1], [2].

Undoubtedly, our model does not include several key institutional aspects of democracies that exist in fact, and because of this, our method can only be considered a rough approximation of reality. Parties seldom commit themselves in a credible way to a particular course of action and instead run on a variety of issues. Parties may also be driven by partisan preferences in addition to a simple desire for office. Along with their preferences for party programs, voters may also have ideological inclinations. Different nations have different election laws; some utilize majoritarian electoral systems with single-member districts while others use proportional representation with multi-member districts. These electoral institutions control how votes convert into seats and, ultimately, governments in various ways. While some democracies are parliamentary, others have presidents. It is common for governments to be split, with policies determined through legislative negotiations between parties or by some kind of agreement between presidents and parliaments rather than by the specifics of the platforms put out by individual parties during elections. Last but not least, non-voting avenues such as lobbying and, in the worst cases, corruption are used by interest groups to influence policy.

Our models may include several of these properties, and these improved models each provide a distinct forecast on a variety of problems. However, understanding the key distinctions between democracies and nondemocracies is our first and primary goal, not comparing different forms of democracies. Nobody disputes that the United States and Britain are more or less democratically inclined than one another despite the fact that the United States has a president and Britain does not. Democracy is compatible with substantial institutional diversity. Therefore, we emphasize the commonalities of simpler forms of democratic group decision making. For this reason, we highlight that democracies are settings with comparatively equal political power. Every individual gets one vote in a perfect democracy. More broadly, in a democracy, political decisions are determined by the preferences of the majority of the populace. This is not true in nondemocracies since only a small portion of the population has political rights. Generally speaking, we see nondemocracy as the polar opposite of democracy: although democracy strives for political equality, nondemocracy is often characterized by political inequality, with greater power concentrated in the hands of a small elite.

In light of this discrepancy, our discussion in this article aims to draw attention to several recurring themes in democratic politics. We will come back to the issue of institutional diversity within democracies later. Although this does not change the fundamental tenor of our argument, it is significant because it may affect the kinds of policies that develop in democracies and, therefore, the benefits for both the ruling class and the general populace. For instance, empirical evidence suggests that majoritarian institutions did not lead to as much wealth redistribution as electoral systems with proportional representation [3], [4].

DISCUSSION

Aggregating Individual Preferences

The theory of social or collective choice, which addresses the challenge of how to combine individual preferences into "society's preferences" when all people's preferences matter, begins this subsection with some of the notions and issues it faces. These topics are crucial because we wish to comprehend how democracies operate. Which policies are determined when everyone is

allowed to vote? It is helpful to conceive of government policy as a proportionate income tax rate and a method of transferring tax revenue in order to fix ideas. Individuals often have varying preferences for policies, such as the amount of taxes, redistribution, and provision of public goods, depending on their tastes and income levels. However, there is still disagreement about government policy even when everyone have the same tastes and incomes. Everyone would clearly want to levy a relatively high tax rate on all earnings other than their own and then transfer all the revenues to themselves in a world where people desire to maximize their income. Then, how can we combine these very diverse preferences? Do we designate a single person to receive all the funds? Or will this form not be distributed at all? Or a completely different result?

Indirectly, these issues are addressed in Arrow's landmark investigation of group decision making. The startling but ultimately logical conclusion that Arrow came to is that, under weak assumptions, the only way a society might be able to make rational decisions in these circumstances is to make one member the dictator, meaning that only this person's preferences will be taken into account when determining the collective choice. More specifically, Arrow proved a possibility theorem, demonstrating that, even if people had rational, well-behaved preferences, it is often impossible to combine those desires to predict what would happen in a democracy. This is due to the fact that aggregating rational individual choices does not always result in a relation of social preferences that is rational in the sense that it enables "society" to decide what to do.

A key and in-depth conclusion in political science is called Arrow's theorem. It expands upon a crucial and basic aspect of politics: conflict of interest. Winners and losers are produced by varied societal choices, resource allocations, and policies. The challenge in developing social preferences is how to combine the interests of many groups, some of whom favor one policy or allocation while others favor others. For instance, how can we combine the desires of the affluent and impoverished portions of society, who detest high taxes that redistribute money away from themselves and toward themselves, respectively? All of the findings and discussions in this book are motivated by conflicts of interest among different socioeconomic groupings, often between the affluent and the poor. In actuality, the distinction we make between democracies and nondemocracies specifically relates to how they tip the scales of power in favor of elites, citizens, or the affluent or the poor.

Even nevertheless, Arrow's theorem does not prove that it is always impossible to combine desires that are in conflict. We must be clearer about the characteristics of people's preferences and how society resolves conflicts of interest. We must be clearer about what power is, how it is expressed, and how it is used. When we do this, we see that, even if people have diverse social preferences, there is a predetermined distribution of power among them. As a result, we may end up with predetermined social options. The most well-known instance of these power dynamics occurring is in the setting of the Median Voter Theorem, which we discuss in the next section [5].

It is helpful to be more specific about the structures that govern collective decision-making in order to go forward. We specifically want to model the collective-choice issue as a game, which may take many different forms. For instance, the game is played between two political parties in the fundamental Downsian model that we will discuss momentarily. The game is played between a tyrant and the disenfranchised populace in the dictatorship model that we examine in Chapter 5. Once we've reached this stage, searching for definite social decisions is akin to searching for the relevant games' Nash equilibrium.

The median voter theorem and single-peak preferences

Individual Peak Preferences

First, let's be more specific about how individuals see societal decisions and regulations. In economic analysis, we use a utility function that enables individuals to rate different options to indicate their preferences. We impose realistic constraints on these utility functions, such as the assumption that they are typically growing and concave, which encapsulates the idea of declining marginal utility. We are often interested in the utility function's form because we want to understand the decisions people will make while trying to maximize their utility. Being "single-peaked" is a crucial quality that a utility function may possess.

The range of acceptable preferences is constrained if persons are assumed to have single-peaked preferences. The shape or character of people's fundamental likes or utility function in relation to products or money, however, are not actually at issue with this constraint. To derive people's induced preferences, we need to take into account not only their innate preferences but also the structure of the environment and institutions in which they form their induced preferences. Hence, our reference to the "indirect utility function." The characteristics of this environment end up being quite important in deciding whether people's induced preferences are single-peaked.

In this work, we often assume that individual preferences are single-peaked. Is the limitation logical? In order to ensure that induced preferences for policies are single-peaked, voters' choice of alternatives must be subject to stringent limitations. These limitations often need to take the form of limiting the kinds of policies the government may implement, namely by banning policies that tax everyone in order to redistribute money to one person or banning person-specific transfers. Occam's razor is once again used when assuming preferences are single-peaked. By concentrating on circumstances where the MVT or analogs hold, we are assuming that democratic decision-making procedures really do result in coherent majorities in favor of or against certain policies or choices. We want to develop sparse models of complex social phenomena. This concept appears to be mostly plausible.

Such single-peaked preferences are the subject of a substantial body of political science and political economics literature. This is so that equilibrium policies may be easily determined from the collection of individual preferences by using the well-known and potent MVT, which is generated by single-peaked preferences. In this book, we either stick to the standard assumption of single-peaked preferences using the MVT or we just concentrate on a polity with a small number of distinct groups where it is simple to ascertain the social choice. This is due to the fact that our emphasis is on the general implications of democratic politics rather than on particular democratic institutions that may aggregate preferences in the absence of nonsingle-peaked preferences.

Voter Median Theorem

Let's now analyze the MVT, which was created by Black. We can demonstrate how individual preferences may be combined into a social decision by using the limits on preferences. There are several methods to express the MVT, but all of them tell us that such a choice exists and that the result of majority voting in a case with single-peaked preferences will be the ideal point of the "median voter." First, we do this using a straightforward direct democracy paradigm with an open agenda. In a direct democracy, voters directly choose between two choices; the one with the

most votes wins. When the agenda is open, anybody may suggest a new pairwise vote that would put any option against the winner of the prior vote.

Despite the fact that people's preferences vary, a definite collective choice results when citizens have single-peaked preferences and the collective choice is one-dimensional. This makes intuitive sense since the median voter simply balances the two sets of people those who want more q and those who want less. Because those who prefer levels of q less than q M do not share any preferences with those who prefer levels of q larger than q M, preferences may be combined to form a decision. As a result, no subgroup of supporters of low q can ever join forces with supporters of high q to form a different majority. These "peripheral" majorities, which cannot form with single-peaked preferences, are what generally preclude determinate social decisions. As a result, the MVT provides precise forecasts about the winning policies in direct democracy settings with single-peaked preferences.

Consider the model underpinning Proposition at this stage as an enormous form game. The set of players in this case, the n individuals the description of the game tree, which determines which players play when and what actions are available to them at each node of the tree when they have to make a choice, and the preferences of individuals, here recorded by Vi, are the three components of such a game. In order to maximize this function, a player selects a strategy, where a strategy is a function that defines which action to do at each node when a player must make a choice. In this case, a strategy is just how to vote in various pairwise comparisons. The fundamental idea behind such a game's solution is a Nash equilibrium, which is a collection of n strategies, one for each player, such that no person can unilaterally change their approach to maximize their payout. The best mutual replies must be the players' strategy, to put it another way. We also make substantial use of a refined version of Nash equilibrium called subgame perfect Nash equilibrium, where players' tactics must be mutually advantageous on each individual appropriate subgame rather than merely the overall game. However, in contrast to the models we currently explore, the premise of an open agenda makes it difficult to more precisely describe the game. We would need to be more specific about who may suggest which possibilities, as well as when and how they make those selections, in order to do this.

Downsian Party Convergence and Competition

The above illustration was based on a direct democracy, an institutional framework in which people directly elect policymakers. Representative democracy, in which people cast their votes for parties in elections and the victor subsequently implements policies, is more closely analogous to the majority of democratic countries in reality. What do the MVT results mean for political platforms?

Consider a society where two parties are vying for power by promoting rigid policies in order to get the solution to this question. Parties are chosen by voters, and the victorious party then implements the promises made in its platform. Only winning elections is important to the two parties. This is basically the model that Downs took into account in his key work, even though Hotelling far preceded his thesis. Compared to the direct-democracy model from before, the model we built may be formally examined as a game. The three following stages make up this game:

1. The platforms of the two major parties are chosen in an uncooperative manner.
2. People cast their votes for the party they like.

3. Whichever party wins the election becomes office and enacts the program it had first pledged.

The two political parties with payoff functions described in and the n people with payoff functions Vi are the participants in this game. At the start of the game, parties are the only ones that concurrently present policy programs, not individual voters. Parties must decide on a course of action q j Q for j A, B, and voters must once again cast their ballots. A set of n 2 strategies, one for each of the political parties and one for each of the n voters, would therefore represent a subgame perfect Nash equilibrium in this scenario, determining the policies the parties provided and how voters would cast their ballots. It would have the feature that neither party or voter could increase their payout by altering their approach if such a collection of tactics made up an equilibrium.

Given a policy vector Q Q, voters in the current model simply choose the party whose policy is closest to their ideal point, and since preferences are single-peaked, the MVT implies that the winner of such an election is determined by. This simplifies the description of a subgame perfect Nash equilibrium. Therefore, the parties' interactions are the only interesting strategic ones. Formally, backward induction may be used to get the answer to the game. We start at the conclusion of the game and move backward to accomplish this. Due to party commitment to platforms, the winning party will carry out the platform's stated policy. then decides which party wins, and taking this into account at the beginning of the game, parties choose policies to maximize.

Workhorse Models from Us

We present several fundamental models in this chapter that are utilized throughout the book. As previously stated, our theory of democracy and democratization is founded on political and distributive conflict. To try to isolate the key interactions, we utilize pure redistribution models in which the revenues of proportionate taxation are given to the people in a lump amount. The main conflict also arises between those who lose out on redistribution and those who gain out on it, two groups we sometimes define as the affluent and the poor. Consequently, a two-class model that just includes the wealthy and the poor is a logical place to start. The following three subtitles talk about this model.

The MVT's analogy will apply even if the policy space is multidimensional, which is another benefit of a two-class model. This is because the majority of people are poor, and we have limited the scope of our policies to prevent any intra-poor conflict from ever arising. As a result, no segment of the impoverished ever sees it as beneficial to join forces with the wealthy in a "peripheral" alliance. In this instance, the poor's favored policies triumph over the rich's. We expand this model by adding a new group, the middle class, and demonstrate how this alters a number of the model's predictions, including how inequality and redistribution are related. We wish to investigate what transpires when conflict is based on different political identities in addition to a paradigm in which political conflict is between the affluent and the poor. We present one of these models.

Assuming that tax increases are expensive, we also include a general deadweight cost of taxation that is proportional to the tax rate. The expenses rise in direct proportion to the level of taxes. Redistributing income or assets is like a leaky bucket in that when something is taken from someone, as it is transferred to someone else, some of what was taken dissipates, like water falling through the leaks in a bucket. This is how economist Arthur Okun described these

situations. Leaks are caused by the expenses associated with handling taxes and building a bureaucracy, as well as sometimes by corruption and plain ineptitude. The inefficiencies in the production process caused by higher taxes are more significant than the distortions in the investment and labor supply incentives of asset holders. Due to these factors, voters, who constitute the majority in democracies, decide on the appropriate degree of taxes and redistribution by weighing the advantages of redistribution against the drawbacks of distortions.

The "Laffer Curve," which describes the connection between the tax rate and the volume of tax collections, is a common metaphor used by economists when talking about these distortions. The Laffer Curve has an inverted U-shape. If tax rates are low, raising them will result in more tax receipts. Nevertheless, as tax rates rise, distortions worsen and finally tax revenues peak. After this point, due of the substantial distortions caused by taxes, tax rate hikes actually result in lower tax receipts.

Political equality and democracy

There are, of course, many more theoretical methods to modeling democratic politics, even if the MVT is at the core of this book and much of the positive political economy. The fact that these theories suggest various power distributions in society is a helpful approach to think about them. The most basic and maybe most simplistic system in which each individual gets one vote is the median-voter model. The two-group approach gives the people what they want since the numbers prevail.

However, as was already established, some people's tastes are really "worth" more than others. This may happen in a variety of ways. First, preferences could not merely be determined by money; they might also depend on the ideologies held by various political parties. Less ideological voters are more likely to cast their ballots in accordance with the platforms put forward by various political parties. Because these voters often referred to as swing voters tend to be more receptive to policies, the parties shape their positions accordingly. Imagine, for the sake of argument, that impoverished people are fervent socialists who choose to support socialist parties regardless of the party's platform. The reason why policy in this scenario does not reflect the preferences of the poor is because right-wing parties can never convince the poor to vote for them, but socialist parties already have their support and can thus tailor their programs to earn the support of other groups, perhaps the affluent. These concepts are based on the work of Lindbeck and Weibull, Coughlin, and Dixit and Londregan on the probabilistic voting model.

The equilibrium policy in democracy is influenced by all agents' preferences in this model; the more swing voters a group likely to include, the more their choices will matter. Thus, even if they are a numerical minority, the affluent have significant influence in democracies, for example, if they are less ideological than the poor. Second, in addition to voting, campaign donations, and the actions of lobbying and special interests may all have an impact on equilibrium policy. In such a context, those having greater resources to channel via special interests or those represented by organized special interests tend to have more influence over policy than groups with less organization and resources. If the wealthy have an edge in one or both of these areas, democratic policy may be influenced by their preferences. Initially, Becker created a model along similar lines, which Grossman and Helpman considerably improved and expanded.

Third, political parties have so far essentially served as flawless agents of the electorate. However, in practice, political parties have goals that are in part independent of those of the

general public, and as a result, their policies do not only reflect the preferences of the average voter. This is especially true when election results are unpredictable, as Wittman first suggested, or when political parties are unable to commit to arbitrary policy programs, as shown by Alesina. When any of these is true, political results are affected by the goals of political parties rather than just voter preferences. In this instance, organizations that are able to control the political parties' agendas have a bigger impact on democratic policy than their numbers would suggest.

The Downsian model and many of its expansions, such as models of probabilistic voting, also provide a sketchy description of political institutions, which is perhaps what is most intriguing. The Downsian model that is outlined here resembles a presidential election in many ways. We did not differentiate between election districts, for instance. We would need to include such districts and simulate how the disaggregated vote share projected into seat shares in Parliament if we were to use the model to reflect the results of elections for the British Parliament. Small parties tend to be underrepresented in such majoritarian structures, as Edgeworth noted in the nineteenth century and Kendall and Stuart formalized. This may be significant. As a result, there is no direct correlation between total vote share and seat share in parliament. Other characteristics of institutions may be important. For instance, institutions affect voter participation and minority groups' ability to achieve their goals in legislatures.

This is intriguing since in a democracy, institutions affect who has power. Because of the attention it has gotten in the political science literature, let's focus on one particular instance: the distinction between parliamentary and presidential democracies. Przeworski et al. provide econometric evidence in support of Linz's argument that presidential regimes are more likely to experience coups than other types of regimes. This assertion was made before as well. It seems sense that presidents would reflect the views of the average voter in society as they are chosen by a majority of the population. However, Parliament could need to compromise more disparate interests. In this instance, if we examined the same nation under these two distinct sets of institutions, we may anticipate that the result under a president would be more in line with what the people wanted.

These factors serve as our inspiration for using a simple reduced-form model to parameterize the political power of various groups in democracies. We explicitly define the first three of these theories about simulating the distribution of political power in democracies in the appendix to this and demonstrate how they transfer into the simple reduced-form model used here. Different specific models provide alternate microfoundations for our condensed form, whether they highlight different institutional elements, lobbying, relatively independent political parties, or the existence of swing votes. Naturally, these particulars are also intriguing and could be important in particular circumstances; we explore this as we go.

Let's go back to our basic two-class model and introduce a new tool for implementing policy: the tax rate on income. The indirect utility of the people, V_p, was simply maximized via Downsian political competition since they make up the majority. According to this hypothesis, the tax rate is not affected by the elite's choices. However, the equilibrium policy will more generally reflect the fact that the elite will have some influence. The easiest approach to understand this concept is to visualize the equilibrium policy as maximising a weighted sum of the indirect utilities of the elites and the general public, where the weights determine how much the equilibrium policy reflects the preferences of the various groups. We refer to a group's weight as its political power [6], [7].

CONCLUSION

Political modeling may also be used to spot patterns and trends in political behavior and decision-making, such as how political polarization affects voter behavior, how campaign money affects election results, or how institutional structure affects policy outcomes. Political modeling does, however, have its limits. Since political systems are complex and dynamic in nature, it may be difficult to effectively represent them in models, which are only as good as the assumptions and facts that support them. In addition, the data utilized to create the models may have biases and limits. Political modeling is nevertheless a vital tool for understanding and forecasting political behavior and results, despite these drawbacks. Political models may provide useful insights into the elements that influence political systems and assist guide practice and policy aimed at enhancing democratic governance and social welfare by fusing theoretical ideas with empirical data and statistical approaches.

REFERENCES

[1]   U. Khuwaja, K. Ahmed, G. Abid, and A. Adeel, "Leadership and employee attitudes: The mediating role of perception of organizational politics," *Cogent Bus. Manag.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/23311975.2020.1720066.

[2]   A. Aggarwal, J. Goyal, and K. Nobi, "Examining the Impact of Leader-Member Exchange on Perceptions of Organizational Justice: The Mediating Role of Perceptions of Organizational Politics," *Theor. Econ. Lett.*, 2018, doi: 10.4236/tel.2018.811150.

[3]   E. P. Murashova, "The role of the cognitive metaphor in the hybridisation of marketing and political discourses: An analysis of english-language political advertising," *Training, Lang. Cult.*, 2021, doi: 10.22363/2521-442X-2021-5-2-22-36.

[4]   G. Thesen, P. B. Mortensen, and C. Green-Pedersen, "Cost of ruling as a game of tones: The accumulation of bad news and incumbents' vote loss," *Eur. J. Polit. Res.*, 2020, doi: 10.1111/1475-6765.12367.

[5]   T. Kimura, "Transformational leadership and job satisfaction: The mediating effects of perceptions of politics and market orientation in the Japanese context," *Int. J. Bus. Sci. Appl. Manag.*, 2012.

[6]   O. M. Karatepe, "Perceptions of organizational politics and hotel employee outcomes: The mediating role of work engagement," *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag.*, 2013, doi: 10.1108/09596111311290237.

[7]   S. Mössner, "Sustainable Urban Development as Consensual Practice: Post-Politics in Freiburg, Germany," *Reg. Stud.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/00343404.2015.1102875.

CHAPTER 9

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON NONDEMOCRATIC POLITICS

Pujari Sudharsana Reddy, Assistant Professor, Department of Finance,
CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email id-pujarisudharsana_reddy@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Nondemocratic politics refers to systems of governance that do not adhere to democratic principles such as free and fair elections, respect for civil liberties, and the rule of law. This can include a range of political systems, including authoritarian regimes, military juntas, and one-party states. Nondemocratic politics can have significant consequences for political stability, human rights, and economic development. These systems of governance are often associated with high levels of corruption, repression, and inequality, and can result in the marginalization of minority groups and the suppression of political opposition.

KEYWORDS:

Authoritarianism, Autocracy, Bureaucracy, Censorship, Centralization, Civil-Military.

INTRODUCTION

under this article, we go through a number of concerns that come up when considering how policies are made under non-democratic systems. For our purposes, the fundamental difference between a democracy and a nondemocracy is that the former is an environment in which there is political equality: each person gets one vote. As a consequence, in a democracy, all people' choices have an impact on how politics turn out. This is not the case in nondemocracies since only a select group of people an elite has political rights. This may theoretically be any subset. The ideology of Soviet socialism asserted that it was the proletariat's dictatorship and did not even see the term "dictatorship" as having negative overtones. Similar to this, one may argue that Juvenal Habyarimana's rule over Rwanda from 1973 to 1994 was a dictatorship of a certain ethnicity, the Hutu. A military dictatorship with bureaucratic authoritarian and corporatist tendencies ruled Brazil from 1964 and 1985; this administration prioritized industrialisation while also defending the financial interests of the comparatively wealthy and resisting any drastic changes, notably agricultural ones. In contrast, Mobutu Sese Seko's kleptocratic dictatorship in the Congo from 1965 and 1997 was a highly individualistic system in which the primary goal of the state's use of power was to enrich Mobutu and those close to him. Despite these variations across nondemocracies, our goal is to highlight what we believe to be the primary distinction between democracies and nondemocracies: the degree of political equality [1], [2].

Economic policies in non-democracies are often shaped by two factors: first, the interests of the group in power, and second, the limitations that group faces. Considering all other factors to be equal, the elite pick policies that will maximize their own benefits. But elites often worry that other members of the same social group or other social groupings may replace them. Therefore, it is crucial to make sure that no faction is dissatisfied enough to try to topple the government or

engage in other political or economic activities that would be damaging to the utility of the group in power under non-democratic systems.Our study here expands on the democratic model mentioned in 4. We see a society made up of diverse people as a result. Some segments of this society are nondemocratic. In chapter four, we demonstrated that democracy is the rule of the larger group, whether it be the poor or group X if political identities are divergent. Nondemocracy is defined here as the rule of the smaller group.

We first concentrate on scenarios in which nondemocracy is only the reign of the wealthy. This is a hypothesis that makes perfect sense in many situations. For instance, formal suffrage limits have traditionally been placed on the low-income, uneducated, or assetless poor. There have also been racial voting limitations, such as in the United States before to the Civil War and in South Africa prior to the fall of the apartheid regime, but once again, the racial groups who were barred from voting were invariably impoverished. Even militaries that seem to be autonomous can serve the interests of the wealthy; the Pinochet dictatorship in Chile from 1973 to 1990 is a prime example. The danger of extreme redistributive and social programs was the catalyst for many additional dictatorships in Latin America throughout the 20th century, including those in Argentina after 1930, after 1955, and once again from 1976 to 1983. Other instances of anti-democracy coups intended to prevent radical programs include those in Brazil in 1964, Guatemala in 1954, and Venezuela in 1948. Although these coups resulted in military administrations, they were really sparked by the prospect of extreme redistributive measures. Drake contends that these despotisms' anti-labor stance served as the foundation for their model of economic growth, served as the basis for their social policies, served as the driving force behind their political practices, and served as a justification for their assassination. Their employment and terminations were significantly impacted by the conflict with the employees [3]–[5].

These instances indicate to us that there is often a direct connection between what non-democratic governments do and what the wealthy want. However, as explained in section 2, our fundamental theory and many empirical findings apply to circumstances in which nondemocracy is not only the preserve of the wealthy.The models we create here stress the interaction between the interests of the elites and the limitations imposed on them by the choices of other groups in society, particularly the disenfranchised populace. Once again, our goal is to look for broad trends that apply to various nondemocratic regime types and compare them to trends in a normal democracy. It may come out as harsh or even simple to make the dichotomous difference between democracy and nondemocracy, to look for similarities between each system, and to consistently apply Occam's razor. However, we are certain that this is the best course of action and that this dichotomy is helpful for forming intuitive notions about the factors that cause civilizations to have various political structures.

DISCUSSION

Power and Constraints in Nondemocratic Politics

The Elites in Democratic Politics

We have spoke about how the elites may have greater influence in a democracy than their sheer numbers would indicate. We showed that a broad model that permits elites to have some influence in democracy indicates that the equilibrium tax rate is, where may be viewed of as a measure of the influence of elites in democratic politics. Consider the limit of 1 in in particular; in this instance, the elites' favored policy, r, will always be the equilibrium policy.

Non-democratic politics are compared to this limit in our minds. The bulk of the population's views are disregarded and policies are decided to promote the prosperity of the elites since the society does not operate as a democracy. This debate also demonstrates that a more continuous contrast between democracy and nondemocracy is possible despite our binary classification of the two. When significant policy decisions heavily reflect the preferences of the majority, a society is more democratic. This relates to a scenario where in this model is very near to 0. On the other hand, nondemocracy is a state in which the elites' preferences prevail over those of the majority of people. This relates to the equilibrium in this case when 1.

The Revolutionary Restriction

We might conceive of nondemocracy as a situation that optimizes the value of the elites, as was highlighted in the preceding debate. However, nondemocracy is neither equal nor fair, particularly when contrasted to the ideal of democracy. As a result, the populace would always want to alter the result, the laws, and the government. They are prevented by the elites' control of the military and political institutions in non-democratic states. They have this power, which allows them to maximize their utility, but since they are the minority and desire to pursue policies that are not in the interests of the majority, there may be restrictions on the policies they may adopt [6], [7]. In nondemocracies, the main obstacle for individuals in positions of authority is the possibility that those who are out of power may try to take it from them or topple the current regime.In the debate, keep in mind that we differentiate between de facto and de jure political authority. Political institutions are the source of de jure political authority. De facto political power, on the other hand, derives from a group's capacity to outnumber another by combat or other methods. De jure, the people have all political power in a democracy.

Citizens in nondemocracies are not included in the political process and lack de facto political authority. Nevertheless, since they are the majority, they may have de facto political power and be able to work together to overturn the current government. In the most extreme case, people may decide to stage a revolution against a non-democracy in order to replace it with one that is more favorable to their interests. We provide a summary of the limits imposed on the elites by this kind of de facto political authority of the people brought about by a revolution. In this section, we go through the history of the revolution constraint and the limitations it sets on the power elites in nondemocratic political systems. As a starting point, we talk about how to formalize revolutions and present ideas about collective-action issues that could emerge when people are organized to exercise de facto authority. To keep the debate grounded, we keep returning to the two-class model that was first discussed in the previous section. According to this idea, society is split between wealthy elites and poorer, more numerous individuals. Consider what transpires after a revolution first. By definition, a revolution in this setting entails the populace employing sheer numbers to overthrow the ruling class and seize power over the society's wealth and revenue-generating assets. Therefore, in a sense, we are envisioning a revolution that results in a post-revolutionary society in which power is transferred from the elites to the populace.

Therefore, the easiest way to envision a post-revolutionary society is one in which the populace shares the economic resources. However, it is conceivable that a violent event like a revolution causes a great deal of instability and devastation and, as a result, lowers the economy's productivity. Therefore, let's imagine that after a revolution, some of the society's resources are destroyed and the remaining resources may be distributed among the population. This is obviously being simplified. Most revolutions do not operate in such an equal manner by

allocating the post-revolutionary society's resources exclusively to its members. There will always be those who gain more than others. However, our goal is to utilize the fear of revolution to restrain undemocratic politics rather than to formulate a true theory of revolutions. In order to represent payoffs in the post-revolutionary society as simply as feasible, we once again use Occam's razor. A straightforward and tempting solution for this is to assume that some economic resources are lost in the upheaval of the revolution and the remaining ones are dispersed among the populace.

The Collective-Action Problem: Evidence

How the collective-action dilemma is resolved in reality has been studied in depth by a vast empirical literature. Although there are other classification schemes for potential remedies to the collective action issue, most academics stress the significance of ideology, as we have done. However, the majority of empirical research focuses more on how people attempting to organize collective action exploit private benefits and exclusion. Popkin offers a groundbreaking analysis of how the Vietnamese revolution overcame the issue of communal action. According to him, "The issue of garnering support and defeating free riders was vital to the Viet Minh's plan. Their key strategy was to divide complex issues like starting a revolution into smaller ones so that everyone could understand how their contributions mattered and how they directly benefited one another. According to Popkin, "one factor in particular may have been vital for successful peasant mobilization... This is comparable to our model in which people gain a private benefit of by, regardless of the result of the activity. The earliest organization of peasants concentrated on local objectives and products with immediate payoffs. Communists sought to selectively give peasants what they desired, such as land, in return for their cooperation, when they seized control of communities.

There are parts of the organization that create communal goods even when the products are divided up for individual use. Popkin provides an example of how this functioned: "After land was redistributed and rents were reduced in Cochinchina, peasants frequently went out of their way to warn Viet Minh cadres that French soldiers or agents were in the area; they did not risk free riding on warnings based on the assumption that the French would not act on them. Therefore, once the Communist Party employed the proper framing of the problems and targeted incentives, people believed it was sensible to take collective action. For instance, Popkin points out that although though the Communists preferred community ownership and collective farms, granting land to peasants as private property went against their philosophies. Nonetheless, they provided land to peasants who supported the revolution. He cites a senior Communist official who claims that since the right to private property underlies every aspect of our political work among the peasants, we are obligated to adhere to it. If we had ceased dividing up landholdings, we may have run the danger of losing their support.

The Viet Minh were able to adopt the policy of exclusion to persuade people to participate in collective action since one objective of the revolution was radical land reform and because land could be provided to those who participated while being withheld from those who did not.

The Viet Minh used existing social networks and local institutions as part of their approach for addressing the issue of collective action: "The Communists were organizing tiny self-help fraternal groups, one-fourth of whose members had been political prisoners. These organizations were based on friendship clubs, straw house construction teams, celebrations of the worship of the genii, and insurance plans.Other instructive case studies demonstrate the effectiveness of

targeted incentives in maintaining group activity. Kriger demonstrated how the hope of personal benefit motivated involvement in Zimbabwe's revolutionary struggle. She conducted interviews with former members of the Zimbabwean African National Union guerillas and discovered that many joined because they anticipated personal benefit, particularly an improvement in their social standing. High-status individuals needed to be forced to join ZANU.

Evidence from the Rwandan genocide graphically demonstrates the efficacy of private benefits in promoting collective action. There are several instances of how the Hutu political elite overcame the issue of collective action that arose when they organized the Hutu people to commit atrocities against Tutsis in the extensive investigation of Human Rights Watch, which was led by historian Alison Des Forges. For instance, they ordered or allowed local law enforcement, militia, or even ordinary residents to set fire to homes and threaten the lives of individuals who refrained from taking part in the violence. Additionally, they provided compelling incentives to persuade the reluctant to murder. They gave attackers monetary payments, food, alcohol, and, in some instances, marijuana, either directly or via individuals they recruited. They even went as far as to have the community police monitor the theft of Tutsi property, which they encouraged.

Police warned those who simply intended to plunder and not murder in a number of locations. The burgomaster's ability to exercise control over the allocation of land a highly sought-after and limited source of income for the predominantly agrarian population was one of his most valuable tools for recruiting participation. The field of the Tutsi victims had been taken over by Hutu who had assaulted them in the 1960s. A subsequent generation once again aspired to acquire additional territory by eliminating or expelling the Tutsi. Undoubtedly, ideology had a significant part in the conflict in Rwanda, as did the long-standing hostility between the Hutu and Tutsi ethnic groupings. This data also implies that a different kind of selective incentives, such as harsh penalties for those who refrained from taking part in the genocide, was effective.

The fundamental transitoriness of collective activity is a major component of our theoretical paradigm. The collective action issue is challenging to begin with and very difficult to continue, even with the application of ideology or incentives. The empirical literature also highlights that collaborative action is often ephemeral since it is difficult to solve the problem. According to Lichbach, "collaborative activity that takes short periods of time may occur; collective action that requires lengthy periods of time does not. the fact that most

People's commitments to particular causes are on the decline, most dissident groups are transient, and most dissident campaigns are brief, according to Hardin. Tarrow also mentions "the exhaustion of mass political involvement," Ross and Gurr talk about political "burnout," and Hardin contends that civil society's extensive political involvement only receives enthusiastic support during times of state collapse or major crisis. It cannot be kept at a high level indefinitely.

Modeling Preferences and Restrictions in Nondemocratic Systems

Now that the collective action issue has been addressed, let's look at the effects of revolution constraint binding on non-democratic politics. To illustrate this, have a look at the game below. When discussing it and other games throughout the book, we treat the rich and the poor as if they were separate players. In general, we would have to characterize the reward functions and tactics for all the elites and all the people in order to define what an equilibrium is in such a game. The specification of strategies, one for each person, in a Nash equilibrium would prevent any member

of the elite or citizen from increasing their payout by altering their approach. However, this degree of generality is unnecessary. All elite individuals have common characteristics with all citizens. Additionally, as was previously said, we suppose that both parties have found solutions to their difficulties by collective action. This justifies our treatment of both groups as a whole, our use of the terms "the elite" and "the citizens," and our examination of an equilibrium resulting from these two groups' interactions.

However, even once the collective-action issue has been resolved, conduct still has to be individually reasonable, therefore we provide payoffs at the individual level.

How are we supposed to win at this game? "Backward induction," beginning at the bottom of the game tree, is the solution. This method, to which we made an appeal, is valuable since it describes the game's subgame perfect Nash equilibria. A modification of the original Nash equilibrium theory known as subgame perfection is helpful in dynamic games as well as games with sequential movements. The key characteristic of such an equilibrium is that it excludes Nash equilibria supported by noncredible threats that are "off the equilibrium path," which is to say that the equilibrium strategies are such that the threat will not be carried out and instead remains just a threat. A noncredible threat is one that the player making it would not consider it best to carry out if had to.

Compatibility Issues

Basic Concerns

The incapacity of persons in positions of political authority to swear off using it is a significant topic that runs through the whole novel. In other words, the issue is that promises made by persons in positions of political authority to others outside of them may sometimes be untrue. This is significant because people in authority would have less alternatives without such believable pledges, and they could occasionally find it difficult to address situations like the imminent danger of revolution outlined earlier.

Political power and the commitment problem are inextricably intertwined. Consider a non-democracy where the elites have political power in order to understand this. The elites would want to promise that they would choose policies in the future that are more to the liking of the public for a variety of reasons, but as we shall see, most likely to prevent revolution. For instance, they could wish to claim that they will transfer money to the population. The elites do, however, possess political sway in non-democracies and hence have the authority to choose the future amount of transfers and taxes. They can pledge to make transfers later on, but such assurances may not be reliable. They will determine whether to make these transactions tomorrow, and if doing so is not in their best interests, they won't. Because they have political sway, they can determine whether to make the transfers tomorrow.

It is crucial to stress that the possible decoupling between the identities of people in positions of political power and the beneficiaries of choices is what gives birth to the commitment dilemma. The transfers are made by the elites, who are not the recipients, yet they benefit the people. Instead, they are the ones who must deal with any moves. As a result, often it is not in their best interests to make similar transfers in the future, and their claims of doing so are unreliable. Compare this to a scenario where the people themselves have the political power. The identities of individuals in positions of political authority and those who profit from the transfers are consistent. The transfers from the elites to themselves would undoubtedly be implemented by the

populace. This emphasizes the fact that commitment issues emerge when the recipients of the promised reforms do not have political power. In essence, persons in positions of political influence cannot undertake not to backtrack on their previous commitments.

Numerous academics have noted that a crucial aspect of political economics is the absence of a third party that can enforce the state's commitments, which causes commitment issues and pervasive inefficiencies. This concept is covered by North and Olson, is essential to North and Weingast and Weingast's research, and is implied in several other works. For discussions of how a lack of commitment leads to inefficient political results, see also Grossman and Noh, Dixit, Dixit and Londregan, and Besley and Coate.

Politics is hardly the only aspect of social life where commitment issues are prevalent. A time component is included in almost all economic interactions. Normally, traders provide their items today but are paid tomorrow. When consumers pledge to make a payment tomorrow but find that it is not in their best interest to do so, a commitment problem occurs. In this instance, they go back on their word and refuse to pay. As a result, commitment issues in social and economic relationships are quite common. However, society often has very inexpensive solutions for handling the most significant potential commitment issues. We need to take away the flexibility of consumers to choose whether to make a payment tomorrow without having to worry about consequences if they break their word in order to eliminate possible issues. As we've seen, the issue is that anytime consumers are given the freedom to choose such a course of action, they opt not to make a payment.

If they choose not to make the payment, there must be some "constraints" on their behavior or possible consequences. Contracts, repeated transactions, and altering who gets to make the choice are three possible solutions to these commitment issues. The most typical solution for possible commitment issues is to create legally binding contracts. For instance, the trader could have the client sign a contract at the time of delivery that states the client will pay the dealer within a certain period of time. What happens if the client doesn't pay the bill? If the contract is really enforceable, the trader files a complaint alleging that the customer violated the contract's terms with an external body, usually a court of law. After confirming the validity of the claim, this agency punishes the client and, if necessary, compels him to make the payment. In a perfect world, contracts resolve the majority of possible commitment issues.

We are far from this perfect world, even in the context of strictly commercial transactions, and there are several issues with these kinds of contracts in economic transactions, including those caused by knowledge asymmetries. They also include issues such as the possibility that some crucial qualities, like as the quality of the item a trader provides to a client, may not be "contractible" since a third party is unable to verify the genuine quality. When it comes to the political sphere, prospective contract issues are significantly more severe if not impossible to overcome. This scenario must have the outside agency intervene and "enforce the contract" when consumers choose to break their pledge; otherwise, the contract would be of little value. Customers would back out with no consequences.

In commercial transactions, such enforcement is sometimes challenging but basically achievable due to the existence of "the state," with its exclusive right to employ coercive force, and the fact that it grants this right to other institutions, like the judiciary, so that they may carry out the contract. Herein lays the issue: in the political sphere, however, the entities in charge of political power are fundamentally "the state." Contracts that the state or social organizations that

dominate the state would want to make with other parties are, by definition, unenforceable since such groups cannot agree not to use their influence to break their commitments and alter the terms of the agreement. This suggests that contractual remedies are seldom effective in political commitment issues since, most often, the agent breaking the contract is the one that is intended to enforce it.

Repeated game encounters are the second option. If clients anticipate doing business with the same merchants in the future, they may be discouraged from breaking their commitments since it is understood that if they do, they would be unable to do business with them in the future. Contracts cannot perfectly replace such recurring game interactions. They are flawed because they only function when people behave in a way that is sufficiently pro-active and when the rents produced by an ongoing relationship are high enough for customers to justify incurring the costs of making payments today – so that they can either trade for those rents in the future or risk being punished by being excluded from a potentially advantageous relationship. Later, we'll talk about how this kind of repetitive gaming engagement might be beneficial but often isn't.

The third option, which is to remove the consumers' ability to make decisions, is now our only choice. The issue will be resolved if the trader, not the consumer, decides if the payment will be paid. In the preceding economic example, one method to do this was for the consumer to provide a postdated check to the trader, who would then cash it on the designated day. Because the expenses are incurred by the client and she is the actual beneficiary, it is in the trader's best advantage to cash the check. In other words, the decoupling between the identities of the person conducting the action, the client, and the person who would benefit from it, the trader, has been removed, which solves the commitment issue. The trader is now acting, and she will act in a way that serves her interests and resolves the commitment issue. Change the identity of those in positions of political power so that there is no longer a decoupling between the beneficiary of the policy and the identity of the group holding political power, even though such straightforward solutions are not available in the political sphere.

Understanding the commitment dilemma and how political institutions address it is crucial to comprehending the next sections of the book. In reality, as stated in the Introduction, the primary function of political institutions in our model is to control how political power will be distributed in the future.

Democrasization, a fundamental alteration of political institutions, occurs as a means of shifting political power from the elites to the general populace. The inherent commitment issue in politics creates the necessity for such a transfer of power. The elites in nondemocracies who control politics will resist offering the populace any concessions, such as income transfers, much as the consumer who refuses to pay. Therefore, promises of future redistribution and transfers made by the elites are untrue since the citizens are not included in the democratic system. Democratization is a technique to give such promises credibility by giving the people political authority. It is suggested that democracy as a whole has difficulties with commitment. In a democracy, the vast majority of people may pass laws that are very detrimental to the ruling class. Elites may threaten to stage a coup in retaliation, which democratic parties will want to avert by making concessions. However, leaders in democracies may not be able to prevent coups by making pledges because they lack credibility, just as they may not be able to prevent revolution in nondemocracies [8]–[10].

CONCLUSION

Overall, the study of nondemocratic politics emphasizes how crucial it is to comprehend how complex and dynamic political systems are, as well as the need of continual research and analysis to guide the policies and practices aimed at advancing democratic governance and human rights. Understanding the elements that contribute to the longevity and stability of nondemocratic political systems has been the main goal of research in this field. Examining the function of organizations like the military, judiciary, and security services as well as the impact of extraneous elements like other countries and international organizations are all part of this. Researchers have also looked at the tactics used by nondemocratic governments to hold onto power, such as censorship, pressure, and propaganda. Researchers have also looked at the possibilities for democratic transformation brought about by public upheavals, the mobilization of civil society, and outside pressure from democratic nations and international institutions.

REFERENCES

[1]   S. Gehlbach, K. Sonin, and M. W. Svolik, "Formal Models of Nondemocratic Politics," *Annual Review of Political Science*. 2016. doi: 10.1146/annurev-polisci-042114-014927.

[2]   D. Dagaev, N. Lamberova, and A. Sobolev, "Stability of revolutionary governments in the face of mass protest," *Eur. J. Polit. Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2019.08.003.

[3]   R. Enikolopov, V. Korovkin, M. Petrova, K. Sonin, and A. Zakharov, "Field experiment estimate of electoral fraud in Russian parliamentary elections," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2013, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1206770110.

[4]   A. Baturo, "Cursus Honorum: Personal background, careers and experience of political leaders in democracy and dictatorship—New data and analyses," *Polit. Gov.*, 2016, doi: 10.17645/pag.v4i2.602.

[5]   P. F. Landry, X. Lü, and H. Duan, "Does Performance Matter? Evaluating Political Selection Along the Chinese Administrative Ladder," *Comp. Polit. Stud.*, 2018, doi: 10.1177/0010414017730078.

[6]   D. Acemoglu and J. A. Robinson, "Nondemocratic Politics," in *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, 2010. doi: 10.1017/cbo9780511510809.006.

[7]   A. Rehfeld, "Representation rethought: On trustees, delegates, and gyroscopes in the study of political representation and democracy," *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2009, doi: 10.1017/S0003055409090261.

[8]   K. Koehler and H. Albrecht, "Revolutions and the Military: Endgame Coups, Instability, and Prospects for Democracy," *Armed Forces Soc.*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/0095327X19881747.

[9]   A. Debs and H. E. Goemans, "Regime type, the fate of leaders, and war," *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2010, doi: 10.1017/S0003055410000195.

[10]   M. Hoffman, "Winning hearts and votes: Social services and the Islamist political advantage," *Mediterr. Polit.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/13629395.2020.1731116.

CHAPTER 10

DIFfiCULTY OF COMMITTING NOT TO USE POLITICAL POWER

Vaibhav Goutham Suresh, Assistant Professor, Department of General Management,
CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id- vaibhavsuresh@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The commitment not to use political power is a fundamental principle of democratic governance, as it ensures that those in positions of authority do not abuse their power or violate the rights of citizens. However, the reality of political power dynamics often makes it difficult for leaders and institutions to fully commit to this principle. One of the main challenges to committing not to use political power is the temptation to use it for personal or political gain. This can include the desire to secure re-election or maintain political control, as well as the desire to advance personal or family interests. The use of political power for personal gain can erode public trust in political institutions and lead to a loss of legitimacy.

KEYWORDS:

Accountability, Authoritarianism, Corruption, Democracy, Dictatorship.

INTRODUCTION

We explore three lengthy historical instances of how it is difficult for individuals who have political power to pledge not to use it before moving on to the formal examination of commitment in political circumstances. In South Africa, we have seen some remarkable instances as well as some of the effects. addressed how the white administration made a number of concessions in the wake of the 1976 Soweto Uprising, one of which was to prohibit the formation of black homelands. The white administration broke its promises when Soweto was subdued and the danger subsided, however. The 1994 election in South Africa provides yet another intriguing example. As the size of the ANC's majority became clear, its leaders started to worry that it could be too big. For instance, the ANC would be authorized to make unilateral amendments to the constitution if it received more than 66 percent of the vote.

The ANC desired a smaller majority in the Parliament, perhaps due to its goal of establishing a consolidated democracy that would stop the white minority from engaging in subversive activity and maybe fleeing the country with their money. As a result, the ANC made an effort to not win a majority of votes in the 1994 elections, which would have given it the power to amend the constitution. The ANC realized that if it were given the power to change the constitution, they would not be able to stop itself from doing so, which might have terrible effects. The constitution was crucial to safeguarding democracy in South Africa [1], [2]. We concentrate on three more instances when a state has to make concessions because of the prospect of revolution. All of these promises of concessions came true in the sense that the revolution was put an end to before the revolutionaries were able to seize governmental power. This, together with the transient character of de facto authority, led to the state breaking its promises in all three instances, which begs the obvious question: Why would such pledges put an end to a revolution? The obvious explanation is that actual credibility levels are often unpredictable in reality, as our models

demonstrate. Even if revolutionaries are aware that there would be instances in which pledges are broken, it could be preferable to take a chance that such promises will be kept than to fully dismiss them.

The 1381 Peasants' Revolt

In British history, one of the most significant public uprisings was the Peasants' Revolt in 1381. We follow Hilton, Dobson, and Dyer in our narrative. Local unrest started in Essex, where it swiftly expanded to most of south-east England. Ultimately, a peasant army invaded London, seized control of the Tower of London, assassinated the Archbishop of Canterbury and the King's Treasurer, and then met with the then-14-year-old King Richard II in a historic conference at Mile End to air their concerns. Fallout from the Black Death served as the revolt's primary historical backdrop. The 1340s plague significantly raised wages and brought about several reforms in feudal structures that benefited farmers. However, lords consistently sought to restore their authority throughout this time, which resulted in several conflicts. Farmers want to be free from the burdens of feudal labor laws, rules, and taxes. In order to assist finance the ongoing and costly conflicts that the English kingdom was engaged in, Richard II instituted a poll tax in 1380. Everyone included on the tax register was obligated to pay fivepence. It had been used three times in the previous four years. Peasants were required to make a kind payment if they were unable to pay the levy in cash [3], [4].

A tax collector visited the Essex town of Fobbing in May 1381 to find out why the residents had not paid their poll tax; the inhabitants threw him out. Soldiers came in June to impose law and order. They were expelled as well because the residents of Fobbing had united and several other nearby villages in Essex had joined them. The counties of Kent, Suffolk, Hertfordshire, and Norfolk were rapidly affected by the uprising. Wat Tyler, a Kent native, had become the peasants' leader. The government buildings and tax records were burned by the peasants from Kent and Essex as they marched to London. On June 12, the Essex men had set up camp at Mile End, just outside of Aldgate. The Kentish guys landed in Blackheath the next day. Because the authorities were unprepared, several rebel bands from Essex and Kent joined by some of London's destitute throughout the course of the next few days. They started attacking local political targets. They destroyed the Savoy Palace, which was owned by Richard II's uncle and perhaps the most influential magnate in the kingdom, John of Gaunt. They unlocked jails, burned down legal documents, and set fire to the Treasurer's Highbury Manor.

At Mile End on June 14, King Richard and a small group of lords and knights met with the inhabitants of Essex. The peasants swore allegiance to Richard and presented him with a petition calling for the elimination of villeinage, the right to rent land for fourpence per acre, and labor services based on free contracts. The monarch agreed to meet these requirements. Surprisingly, later that day, several peasants broke into the Tower itself and took over the royal bedrooms and the bathroom closet. The Chancellor, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and John of Gaunt's physician were captured in the Tower by the rebels, who then dragged them to Tower Hill and put them to death. Many of the rebels from Essex started to scatter after these things happened.

The Kentish peasants and King Richard met the next day in Smithfield. They decreed the end of all lordships other than the king's, the confiscation and distribution of the Church's properties among the general public, and the imposition of only bishops over the whole realm. The monarch once again acceded to every request made of him. However, it is said that when rebel leader Wat Tyler insulted the king, the mayor of London dismounted Tyler and a squire shot and killed him.

Richard stood up to the mob as they were about to charge the monarch and his guards. They were sent home as a result of Tyler's death and King Richard's subsequent commitment to grant their requests.

From June 16, 1381, London was rendered secure, and over time, the government took control of all the areas that had suffered rebellion. King Richard denied accusations that he had supported the rebels' actions in a proclamation, and shortly after, he rescinded the pardons he had given them. After a court investigation, the monarch traveled to the regions where the uprising had occurred. The rebels faced harsh treatment in the counties of Essex and Hertfordshire; many of the revolt's key figures had already passed away; those who had lived were put to death. The King then sent his messengers into various regions in order to apprehend and execute the male-factors, according to an ancient historian. numerous were carried to London where they were executed by hanging, and numerous gallows were erected there as well as in other southern towns and boroughs. Eventually, as it pleased God, the King took pity on his liege subjects and granted them all pardon on the condition that they never rise again, under pain of losing life or members, that each of them receive their charter of pardon, and that they each pay the King as fee for his seal, twenty shillings, to make him wealthy. And with that, this evil battle was over. King Richard broke all of his pledges, arguing that they were made under duress and were thus not legally binding. The peasants' rebellion is a perfect illustration of how promises of concessions may be broken after the danger has passed since the de jure political power structure remained unchanged [4]–[6].

DISCUSSION

The Comunero Rebellion in New Grenada

The Late Colonial Spanish Empire in Latin America provides another illustrative example of breaking commitments. Early in the eighteenth century, when the Bourbon dynasty came to power in Spain, it made several attempts to reform colonial institutions, largely in an effort to earn more money via taxes. Two significant uprisings followed, including the infamous Tupac Amaru Rebellion in Peru and the Comunero Rebellion in Colombia in 1781.

We adhere to the most current and authoritative description by Safford and Palacios; important books on the subject are also available from Arcinegas, Cardenas Acosta, Phelan, and Aguilera Pena. Safford and Palacios point out that the Spanish Bourbons' innovations sowed the seeds of colonial uprising. In the colonies, administrative reform meant... a deliberate preference for Spaniards over Creoles when filling prominent posts, a strategy that heightened colonials' discontent with the system. Increased tax collecting efforts led to popular uprising and weakened the power of Spanish officials. War's financial requirements led to significant tax riots in New Grenada in the 1760s and a full-scale uprising in 1781.

Protests against the tobacco monopoly in Bogota in 1778 served as the impetus for the Comunero Rebellion. In order to control the supply and increase revenue for the royal government, the monopoly progressively limited the regions in which tobacco could be produced. Tobacco was commonly farmed by small farmers in New Grenada. Northeastern New Grenada's Guanenta' area was especially heavily impacted. Riots erupted in Charala', Mogotes, and Simacota in 1780. The government made no compromises in response to these acts, and the royal regent Gutierrez de Pineres raised the sales tax in addition to tightening the monopolies on tobacco and cane liquor. Because the Guanenta' was the viceroyalty's primary center for cotton weaving and because raw cotton and cotton yarn were among the impacted goods, these tax

hikes were especially painful for the locals there. These policies threatened cotton weaving and removed tobacco, two of the impoverished people in the Guanenta's main sources of sustenance.

In addition, there was a significant smallpox epidemic and poor weather contributed to food shortages in the area. Beginning in March 1781, the area was plagued by rioting. Although the insurrection was started by the underprivileged, "men of middling fortune - butchers, weavers, cattle traders, and small farmers" quickly organized it, and "men of substance came to accept formal positions of leadership." Royal supplies of tobacco and alcohol were also destroyed. When Gutierrez de Pineres deployed a small force against the rebels in May, the rebels routed them, and support grew strongly throughout northern and northeastern New Grenada. Following this first triumph, the rebels—who were now going by the name Comuneros—marched south toward Bogota, and by the end of May, when they numbered between 15,000 and 20,000, they were within striking distance of the city.

At this point, Gutierrez de Pineres had left the city and Archbishop Caballero y Go'ngora had the real authority. A list of 35 requests from the Comuneros, including the repeal of the new sales tax, were instantly accepted by him. There would be an end to the tobacco monopoly. The Comuneros also demanded Gutierrez de Pineres' expulsion and the advancement of Creoles in the government, according to Safford and Palacios, "the implementation of all of these provisions would have meant the abandonment of virtually all of the new Bourbon revenue measures of the previous two decades."

The archbishop was able to convince the rebels to return home after giving in to all of their requests. However, once the Guanenta's rebellious zeal subsided a little and reinforcements of royal forces descended from Cartagena... Exemplary penalties were administered by the royal administration. Jose Antonio Galan, who had persevered in resistance after the June 1781 surrender, and three other Comuneros were hung in January 1782; their heads, hands, and feet were displayed on poles in public spaces throughout the capital and cities that had played a significant role in the uprising. Other people... were given a 200-lash penalty, public humiliation, and incarceration in Africa. Guanenta's landless peasants were sent as colonists to the Panamanian Isthmus. The agreement with the Comuneros was terminated by royal officials after the harshest penalties had been applied.In June 1781, the Comuneros were pacified by the royal government's promise of concessions, but as soon as the danger lessened, the government broke its word.

The Russian Revolution of 1905

The Russian Revolution of 1905 serves as our last illustration. The terrible military loss of Russia at the hands of the Japanese, notably the battle of Tsushima in May 1905, was the catalyst for the revolution, but it also reflected the many socioeconomic tensions present in Russian society. Despite the fact that the serfs had been emancipated in 1865, there were still several limitations on their ability to purchase property or relocate, and working conditions in the factories of the rapidly industrializing towns were very severe. The proprietors of the factories fought attempts by the employees to organize unions. Father Georgi Gapon, a priest, was successful in founding the Assembly of Russian Workers in 1903. It had more than 9,000 members within a year.

Gapon's campaign gained traction in 1904 when the war against Japan created rapid inflation, which resulted in a 20 percent decrease in real earnings. When four Russian Workers' Assembly members. Gapon demanded industrial action after workers at the Putilov Iron Works were fired.

More than 110,000 employees in St. Petersburg went on strike during the next several days.Gapon personally appealed to Nicholas II in an effort to resolve the conflict, and in January 1905, he created a petition expressing the requests and sufferings of the employees. In addition to an eight-hour workday, improved working conditions, free medical care, higher wages for female workers, elections for a constituent assembly to be held using universal, equal, and secret suffrage, freedom of the press, speech, association, and religion, and an end to the war with Japan were all demanded in this petition.

Gapon organized a protest to deliver the petition to the tsar at the Winter Palace in St. Petersburg on January 22. The police and the Cossacks assaulted the worker procession as it approached the palace. Three hundred workers were injured, and over a hundred workers were murdered. A sequence of events that came to be known as the 1905 Revolution were sparked by the occurrence, also known as Bloody Sunday. When the whole student body staged a walkout to protest the absence of civil freedoms, strikes broke out all throughout the nation and the colleges shuttered. The Union of Unions was founded by lawyers, doctors, engineers, and other middle-class employees, who also desired a constituent assembly [7]–[9].

Sailors aboard the warship Potemkin protested the feeding of rotting meat in June 1905. In response, the captain gave the order to shoot the ringleaders. The firing squad concurred in sending the officers overboard with the rest of the crew after refusing to carry out the command. Other army and navy troops joined the Potemkin revolt.In October 1905, the railwaymen went on strike, which shut down the entire Russian rail system. Industrial workers throughout Russia went on strike at the same time. Later that month, the St. Petersburg Soviet was founded by Mensheviks including Leon Trotsky. In the next weeks, more than fifty soviets were established around Russia.

The new Chief Minister, Sergei Witte, encouraged Nicholas II to give up. In the end, he consented and released the October Manifesto, which guaranteed freedom of speech, assembly, and association. He said that there will be no more detention without charge in the future. Finally, he declared that no legislation would take effect without the consent of the Duma, a newly created body. Many Russians believed the change did not go far enough since this was merely a consultation body. The idea was opposed by Trotsky and other revolutionaries. Trotsky and the St. Petersburg Soviet's executive committee were detained in December 1905. However, the declaration of the October Manifesto's concessions had the effect of calming the nation and lessening the revolutionary danger.

On the basis of indirect universal male suffrage, the First Duma was chosen. Peasants, town residents, and members of the nobility all chose their own delegates. Members of the Duma were chosen in a provincial town meeting attended by delegates from every province. Nicholas II had established a state council, an upper chamber, of which he would appoint half the members, but since the publishing of the October Manifesto, he had already made a number of modifications to the Duma's makeup. Additionally, he still has the authority to dissolve the Duma, declare war, and rule the Orthodox Church. Ministers might be appointed and removed by the tsar. Nicholas II was breaking his October commitments before the First Duma had convened.

However, the Socialist Revolutionaries, Mensheviks, Bolsheviks, Octobrists, and members of the Constitutional Democrat Party comprised the majority of the left in the First Duma. Members of the Duma put up a number of requests during their first meeting in May 1906, including the release of political prisoners, rights for labor unions, and land reform. All of these ideas were

rejected by Nicholas II, who also disbanded the Duma in July 1906. Witte was compelled to retire in April 1906 by Nicholas II, who then appointed the more traditional Peter Stolypin in his stead. Stolypin made an effort to strike a balance between the imposition of radicals and the denial of much-needed social reforms like land reform.

The Second Duma was chosen in 1907 elections. Stolypin utilized his authority to modify the election legislation and bar a huge number of people from casting ballots. To the disadvantage of the peasants, the new election legislation also improved representation for the aristocracy and increased the influence of rich landowners. Additionally, voting procedures were altered in municipalities, where more than half of the urban deputies were chosen by homeowners. Despite the left's diminished influence, several reformers were present when the Second Duma met in February 1907 despite this. On June 16, 1907, Nicholas II dissolved the Duma after three months of contentious discussion. On November 14, 1907, the Third Duma convened. The reactionaries and nationalists now outnumbered the earlier alliance of Social-ist Revolutionaries, Mensheviks, Bolsheviks, Octobrists, and the Constitutional Democratic Party. This Dumas, in contrast to the previous one, served the whole five-year term.

Our last example of how promises may be broken without significant modifications to the basis of de jure political authority is the Russian Revolution of 1905. Nicholas II made concessions in reaction to the upheavals and instability of 1905, including, to some degree, the establishment of a democratic institution the Duma. When the revolutionary moment had gone, Nicholas II dutifully reneged on his concessions since the Duma lacked the authority to ensure that he would carry them out.

Commitment issues in Nondemocratic Models

We now begin setting the stage by offering straightforward methods for simulating prospective commitment issues in politics. Let's first go back to the game, whose main characteristic is that the elites set the tax rate before the populace decided whether to start a revolution. Now consider a different scenario in which the elites establish the tax rate regardless of whether a revolution occurs or not. In this scenario, the public would first decide whether to make the revolution decision. There was no commitment issue, despite the fact that the gap between the two games would seem little. Before the populace decided to revolt, the elites fixed the tax rate and could utilize it to avert the danger of revolution. Elites no longer have that choice since the tax rate was decided upon after the revolution.

A Straightforward Promises Game

Since the elites hold onto political power and can renege on their promises as a result of their political power, we have discussed the revolution constraint and how the elites can attempt to prevent revolution by making promises of redistribution. We have so far studied games in which either the elites move before the revolution decision and there is no commitment problem, or they move after the revolution decision and there is no possibility of promises. These two crucial components are missing from this picture: an effective threat of revolution is a rare event and occurs only when the citizens manage to solve the collective-action problem inherent in revolution. Instead, we would prefer a system where elites may make certain promises, but these promises are only marginally believable. the most basic game to include these elements. Nature chooses between two danger states—low and high—when moving first: S L or H. The purpose of establishing these two stages is to underline that only in certain circumstances can a revolution pose a real danger. In general, this may be the case because some conditions, such as a failed

crop, a business cycle slump, the conclusion of a war, or another economic, social, or political disaster, are more favorable for resolving the collective action dilemma. We presume that these two regimes' responses to the revolution danger are not the same.

Unstable Model

Whether nondemocracy can overcome the constraints imposed on it by revolutions, particularly by the threat of a revolution during unusual periods in which the citizens solve the collective-action problem, is examined in the previous analysis of how the degree of credibility of the promises made by the elite affects this. However, the introduction of the continuation game, which allowed the elites to potentially reset the tax away from what they pledged, allowed for a reduced-form model of the elites' reluctance to commit to future redistribution. We now examine a dynamic game that perfectly corresponds to the prior game's simpler version. This game's benefit is that it depicts the same problems in a more believable and engaging manner. Furthermore, as indicated and thoroughly described, the underlying intertemporal nature of institutions in our theory dictates how power will be distributed in the future. So, in order to simulate this, we need an intertemporal arrangement, which we are currently creating.

The elites may continue with the taxes they set now for a limited time, but they cannot commit to future redistribution unless there is also a real danger of revolution. Because individuals with political power cannot tie their hands in the future until they give up their political authority, the commitment dilemma assumes a more natural shape. This game serves as both a prototype and the first illustration of a dynamic model for the dynamic games examined in the rest of the book. Similar to earlier games, this one has a very straightforward recursive structure, and by concentrating on Markov perfect equilibria, we further simplify it. Subset of subgame perfect equilibria that are reasonably simple to describe are Markov perfect equilibria. The primary distinction is that, generally speaking, in a repeated game, a player's actions at any given date may depend on the whole of the game's prior history. This aspect of history reliance is constrained in a Markov equilibrium; in fact, actions at a given time can only be influenced by the "state" of the game at that moment. However, the limitation to Markovian equilibria is essentially only a model simplification. To persuade the reader, we compare non-Markovian subgame perfect equilibria to the Markov equilibria we examine in this and look at non-Markovian tactics in the following.

Promises Compatible with Incentive

The preceding study concentrated on Markov perfect equilibria and demonstrated how a revolution may develop as an equilibrium result. Any promise made by the elites when they maintain political power in their own hands is only partially believable since the political power of the population in the future was constrained. As a result, the citizens may opt to overthrow the government today via a revolution. The commitment issue, which makes it ideal for the elites to return to their most desired tax rate as soon as the fear of a revolution dissipates, was a key component of this scenario. The elites always chose the strategy that was in their immediate interests after the fear of revolution subsided, which was a result of our restriction of attention to Markovian options.

However, it is conceivable for the elites to make further commitments. For instance, they can vow to redistribute in the future even if it goes against their current interests. They can abide by this commitment because it is implicitly understood that if they don't, the people would revolt when the danger of revolution reappears, offering the elites a very little reward. To put it another

way, these pledges could be backed up by the prospect of more penalties or by "repeated-game" tactics. Once the elites depart from their prescribed conduct, punishments correlate to future behaviors that the populace will do that will harm the elites. When we give players the option to choose non-Markovian methods, nondemocracy persists over a wider range of parameter values. The key distinction between Markovian and non-Markovian tactics is that the latter enable players to condition their actions on both the current state and the game's prior history up to date (date t), in addition to only the state at date [10]–[12].

CONCLUSION

Despite these difficulties, the pledge to abstain from using political influence continues to be a key component of democratic administration. The exercise of political power must be open and responsible, with a careful balance struck between the necessity for quick action and the need to uphold democratic norms and civil freedoms. In order to advance democratic governance and human rights, policies and practices should be based on ongoing research and analysis, which may provide insightful information on the elements that support or undermine this commitment. The need to react to crises or emergencies, such as natural catastrophes or terrorist attacks, is another obstacle to refraining from using political power. Political leaders may feel pressured to respond forcefully under certain circumstances, even if it means suspending civil freedoms or flouting democratic principles. Political leaders may also find it challenging to completely commit to abstaining from utilizing their positions of power due to the complexity and interconnectedness of contemporary society. Political choices often have broad economic and societal repercussions that might put pressure on prioritizing certain interests over others.

REFERENCES

[1]   E. Segal, "Back to Egypt," in *In Those Days, At This Time*, 2018. doi: 10.2307/j.ctv6cfpn0.28.

[2]   P. Sampson, "Monastic Practices Countering a Culture of Consumption," *M/C J.*, 2014, doi: 10.5204/mcj.881.

[3]   D. J. Benjamin *et al.*, "The genetic architecture of economic and political preferences," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2012, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1120666109.

[4]   C. Becquey, "Artes gráficas mayas precolombinas: consideraciones semióticas sobre el continuo escritura-imagen," *Estud. Cult. Maya*, 2021, doi: 10.19130/iifl.ecm.57.2021.18656.

[5]   A. Bolton and S. Thrower, "The constraining power of the purse: Executive discretion and legislative appropriations," *J. Polit.*, 2019, doi: 10.1086/704330.

[6]   A. E. Yashlavskii, "'ISLAMIST SEPARATISM' IN FRANCE AS A FACTOR OF EXTREMISM," *World Econ. Int. Relations*, 2021, doi: 10.20542/0131-2227-2021-65-10-73-80.

[7]   P. Biglino Campos, "Principles governing economic and social policy, legislative power and constitutional court," *Rev. Esp. Derecho Const.*, 2020, doi: 10.18042/cepc/redc.119.02.

[8]   I. Pollard, "Bioscience-bioethics and life factors affecting reproduction with special reference to the Indigenous Australian population," *Reproduction*. 2005. doi: 10.1530/rep.1.00268.

[9]   A. Neac□u, "John locke—theorist of limiting and supervising political power by citizens," *Dialogue and Universalism*, 2021, doi: 10.5840/du202131220.

[10]   R. V. V. Boas and I. M. Motta, "The basic right to access and sustainable consumption of drinking water, a natural resource that sustains the life of everyone, in all environments, drawing attention to the vulnerable," *Rev. Juridica*, 2020, doi: 10.21902/revistajur.2316-753X.v2i59.4085.

[11]   Z. Rutovic, "The Financial-Economic Aspect of the Media and the Public Service in the Globalization Era (Budget and Ownership Framework)," *J. Cent. Bank. Theory Pract.*, 2017, doi: 10.1515/jcbtp-2017-0007.

[12]   A. A. Doolittle, "The politics of indigeneity: Indigenous strategies for inclusion in climate change negotiations," *Conserv. Soc.*, 2010, doi: 10.4103/0972-4923.78142.

CHAPTER 11

TRADE-OFF BETWEEN CONCESSIONS
AND DEMOCRATIZATION

Dr. Jaykumar Padmanabhan, Associate Professor, Department of Decision Sciences,
CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id-p.jaykumar@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The trade-off between concessions and democratization is a key challenge faced by many countries seeking to transition from nondemocratic to democratic forms of governance. Concessions can include political and economic reforms, such as the granting of civil liberties, the legalization of political parties, and the opening of markets to foreign investment. While such concessions can help build momentum for democratization, they can also create challenges and trade-offs for political leaders and institutions. One of the main challenges is that concessions may empower opposition groups that are hostile to democracy or have competing interests. For example, granting greater political freedom may lead to the emergence of extremist or populist movements that seek to undermine democratic institutions or create divisions within society. Similarly, economic concessions may benefit certain groups at the expense of others, creating tensions and potential conflicts.

KEYWORDS:

Authoritarianism, Compromise, Concessions, Democratization, Institutional Change, Interest Groups, Liberalization.

INTRODUCTION

The trade-off between concessions and democratization when the populace may question the authority of a nondemocratic ruler has been the subject of our previous research. However, as indicated in 2, nondemocracies often use force to obstruct political reform rather than making any kind of compromise. There are several instances of this. The Ceausescu dictatorship in Romania tried to thwart de-mocratization in December 1989 by mobilizing the military. This strategy failed when the army chose to support the protesters, leaving only the secret police who were devoted to the dictatorship. Similar to how the Communist Party of China chose to employ tanks to destroy the pro-democracy protest in Tiananmen Square in June 1989 rather than making any kind of compromise. Another pertinent example is the Burmese military junta's use of force to suppress any dissent in order to keep its hold on power. Now that repression has been added to the prior model, we will examine the conditions under which democracy may develop while repression is a possibility. The research first makes the assumption that repression of the populace by the elites will always be successful. O'Donnell and Schmitter emphasized that no transition can ever be imposed only by opponents against a system that retains the coherence, capability, and inclination to deploy repression in accordance with this assumption. However, in a later section of article, we discuss scenarios in which repression may fail and revolution might occur under a stable state [1]–[3].

Consolidations and Coups

We have so far considered scenarios where democracy that has already been established endures forever; the march toward democracy never stops. However, the truth is quite different. It often happens that nations lose their democratic ideals and that military coups topple democratic governments, ushering in a return to authoritarianism.

Transitions in and out of democracy have notably tarnished the recent histories of several Latin American nations. For instance, universal male suffrage came into force in Argentina in 1912 but was quickly abolished by a coup in 1930. Democracy was restored in 1946 but was overthrown by a coup in 1955. It was then restored once more in 1973, overthrown once more in 1976, and finally restored in 1983. Several semi-democratic governments in between were overthrown by coups in 1943, 1962, and 1966. Why do coups against democracy occur? Why has broad democracy endured in many Northern European nations, while its consolidation in less developed nations like those in Latin America has proven to be so challenging?

This offers a framework for examining democratic coups and then integrates those concepts with the models created in 6 to provide a framework for examining the establishment and consolidation of democracy as well as possible switches between democracy and nondemocracy.

The same economic and political motivations that played a significant role in understanding the emergence of democracy are emphasized in the development of our theory of coups. So far, we've stressed how democratic cultures allow the majority of citizens to change laws to their advantage and against the will of the ruling class. This encourages elites to resist democracy while also making people more pro-democracy. When and how democracy arises are determined by these conflicting interests. The incentives for coups are determined by the same fundamental dynamics. Because the elites prefer nondemocracy to democracy, they may, in certain cases, support a coup against democracy that would result in future policies that would be more advantageous to them.

Why launch a coup as opposed to calling for more pro-elite policies? The response is the same as in the topic of democratic transitions: elites are concerned with both current and future policies, and in democracies, future policies are selected by the median voter, who is not an elite. Therefore, democracy may offer elite-friendly policies now but cannot commit to them in the future, particularly if the elites' political influence is ephemeral. Therefore, altering political institutions once again becomes a means of influencing future policies through altering the distribution of political power.

Our data shows, among other things, that cultures with higher levels of inequality between the elite and the general populace are more prone to have coups. The degree of inequality is rising along with the amount of redistribution away from the elites. The elites thus stand to benefit more by altering the rule in an unequal society than they would in one with more equality. As always, it depends on who the elites and the public are that determines whether this assertion translates into a statement about inequality as it is often assessed.

We provide a dynamic framework that permits equilibrium democratizations and coups by fusing our theory of coups with our model of democratization. This concept allows for the possibility of frequent transitions between dictatorship and democracy in extremely unequal nations. In non-democracies, the public have a lot to gain from overthrowing the system, which often results in democratizations; in democracies, however, the elites are dissatisfied with the high degree of

redistribution and may thus attempt coups against the democratic rule. This realization sheds light on why democracy has struggled to take root in many Latin American cultures, where there is a great deal of economic disparity.

Additionally, the contrast between completely consolidated and semi consolidated democracies is made clear by our study. When there is never an actual coup danger, we argue that a democracy is completely cemented. Examples of completely consolidated democracies include OECD nations. Unconsolidated democracies are more susceptible to coups. A semi-consolidated democracy has the ability to thwart coups, but only by altering the equilibrium policies from those that would have been in place had the coup danger not existed. As a result, in contrast to fully consolidated democracies, where voters and parties may essentially disregard the prospect of a coup in making their policy decisions, semi consolidated democracies have to contend with the possibility of a coup.

A nonmonotonic link between income redistribution and inequality is another intriguing finding. Redistribution often occurs more when inequality is higher. In contrast, extremely unequal countries bounce between democracy and dictatorship in a model where there might be coups and do not redistribute as much as fewer unequal civilizations. The fact that there is little to no variation in the amount of redistribution in consolidated democracies is also interesting since it shows that the fear of coups is not a significant factor. High inequality societies, on the other hand, are either semi consolidated or unconsolidated. Because the level of fiscal redistribution varies when a society shifts between political regimes, fiscal policy is more unstable under unconsolidated regimes. Semi consolidated democracies do not see equilibrium coups, but coups are avoided by the fluctuating level of redistribution. This tendency is in line with the data offered by Gavin and Perotti, which shows that Latin American fiscal policy is more erratic than that of Europe. The question of whether the Schumpeterian definition of democracy is accurate is at the center of a significant scholarly dispute on how to define democratic consolidation. According to Linz and Stepan, it is now "the only game in town." When no significant political parties really seek to topple the democratic state, democracy has effectively become the only game in town [4]–[6].

DISCUSSION

Nevertheless, Linz and Stepan went on to add a number of other requirements that must be met for a democracy to be consolidated while offering this basic description, which is in accord with the majority of current political science research. If a functional state already exists, five other interrelated and mutually reinforcing requirements must also exist or be created for a nation to be considered a consolidated democracy. First, the environment must be favorable for the growth of a free and active civil society. Second, there has to be a politically respected and somewhat independent society. Fourth, there must be a functional state bureaucracy. Third, there must be the rule of law.   The organized economic society is the fifth requirement.

What should be added to or removed from lists like these is at the center of the consolidation discussion. On the basis of this, it is evident that many of the governments that we would consider democratic are not stable. Although Linz and Stepan's first definition agrees with our method, their latter criteria do not.Instead, we employ the term consolidation to expand on the Schumpeterian definition of democracy. As we have stated previously, this seems like a good place to start when developing a theory of democracy. This viewpoint is similar to Schedler's, who believed that the phrase "democratic consolidation" should only be used to describe

expectations of regime continuity. Therefore, the term "consolidated democracy" should only be used to refer to a democratic system that relevant observers anticipate to survive for a very long time.

Rewards for Coups

We now analyze a society where democracy has been established and the tax rate is determined by the preferences of the median voter. We still adopt the two-group concept, associating the elites with the wealthy and the general populace with the less fortunate. Therefore, in a democracy, the average voter is a bad actor. Contrary to our earlier theory, we now take into account the potential that democracy may not last indefinitely and, in fact, that a coup against democracy may occur. In democracies, people often do better than elites due to pro-citizen measures, such as income redistribution that is implicit in democratic politics. According to this logic, the elites pose the biggest danger to democracy. As a result, we simulate coups by concentrating on the elites' motivations to decrease redistribution by switching from democracy to non-democracy [7]–[9].

Reducing redistribution was a primary goal of many coups, particularly those in Latin America, and in most instances, they succeeded in doing so while also significantly altering the wealth distribution. Given that the military often leads coups, our strategy assumes that the military favors the elites' interests above those of the general populace for a variety of reasons. Although we think this is a sensible starting point, in reality, military goals are not always entirely congruent with those of a single group and might have a significant effect on the future of democracy. Future study should focus heavily on include the military's contribution to the consolidation of democracy in formal models of politics; in the book's conclusion, we briefly touch upon this subject once again.

In this, we only assume that the elites may, at some expense, command the military and stage a coup against democracy, and we investigate the conditions in which they may choose to do so. The connection between the elites' motivations for favoring nondemocracy and the reasons for people to seek democracy is an intriguing finding from the perspective of modeling. Because people care about policies and social decisions for the future as well as the present, and because they only have transitory de facto political power, they expect a genuine commitment to future pro-majority policies and, as a result, a transition to democracy. The same logic holds true for changes from democracies to nondemocracies. Elites seek less pro-citizen policies, and they can temporarily get them thanks to their political clout.

Though they also worry about future policies, they are aware that if their de facto status ends, democracy will reinstall its preferred measures, such greater taxes and income redistribution. Therefore, shifting political institutions in a direction that gives them greater de jure power that is, moving from democracy toward non-democracy is the only option for the elites to ensure the policies they like in the present and the future. Democracts have shown a strong desire to compromise with the ruling class and the military in order to prevent coups, but their lack of credibility makes it difficult for them to do so. According to Nordlinger, military interventions have occurred despite funding increases intended to prevent them, such as in the 1973 Chilean coup against President Allende. Despite military pay increases that were higher than those for comparable civilian ranks, better fringe benefits, and the acquisition of extra equipment, Allende was ousted.

The method we are modeling the transition from nondemocracy to democracy and the transition to nondemocracy differs in one important respect: in the former, the public had the choice to stage a revolution, and the elites established a democracy to stop them. Here, the elites really conduct a coup and alter the system using their political influence. Although it may seem asymmetrical, our findings are unaffected by this. In most cases, democracy arose through elite democratization, but the shift from democracy to dictatorship is nearly never consensual. For this reason, we use this specific method of simulating transitions to and from democracy.

Economic Integration

Increasing financial integration is another aspect of globalization. We now examine the effects of greater financial integration on the consolidation of democracy and the risk that repression will be used to thwart democratic transition. The "capital-in" and "capital-out" scenarios are the two situations we differentiate between. Increased financial integration often results in capital flows toward a nation with a lack of capital, which is known as capital-in. Contrarily, capital-out refers to the situation in which capital may leave a less developed nation even when it has a greater need for it due to high local taxes. These two situations are examined individually since they highlight different processes.

Democracy and Capitalism

Take into account the same model as before, but supposing there is no trading in intermediate items. Rather, we look at the effects of factor mobility—more specifically, capital mobility. We believe that the nation in issue is less K L intensive than the rest of the globe, for which the ratio of capital and land to labor is once again signified by W.

Assume for the time being that there is no chance of capital outflows and that there is financial integration, which exposes this nation up to foreign capital flows. The only thing that makes this economic model different from others is that domestic manufacture of intermediate commodities is now provided by:

$YK = K + K \nabla$

$YL = L$

$YN = 1 - \delta$

where K is the amount of foreign capital invested in this nation's production of capital-intensive commodities. We presume that investing foreign money in our nation is free of charge.

Capital-out

The previous section demonstrated how financial integration can aid in the consolidation of democracy and the transition to democracy through a mechanism akin to that of increased global trade: by affecting the disparity in income between the elites and the general populace and by influencing the price of using force to subvert democracy. The possibility that capital may flee the nation if taxes are too high, however, may play a more crucial role in financial integration. Imagine a Latin American nation before financial integration to put this in perspective. If capital is subjected to high taxes, it may elect to move into the unregulated industry or the elites may decide to spend more and conserve less.

This is what our taxes cost, C, measures. But there is still another choice after financial integration. If investors are subjected to high taxes, they may move their money to countries with

lower taxes, such as Panama or the Cayman Islands. This impacts the degree to which democracy would prefer to tax the elites and raises the flexibility of capital with regard to taxes. In this section, we examine how this possible capital-out route may affect the development of democracy. We now abstract from capital inflows in order to streamline the study and emphasize the ramifications of the capital-out mechanism; as a result, factor prices do not change after financial integration.

We provided a framework in this book for considering why certain cultures are democratic while others are not. We focused on two connected parts of this issue: the reasons why some societies decide to become democratic in the first place and the reasons why some democracies endure and grow while others disintegrate. Here, we review what we have learnt, talk about some of the areas where we think our framework might be expanded in meaningful ways, and talk about the implications of our model for the future of democracy.

A Review of Political Development Paths

We now go through the four political development narratives that we first identified in 1. How does our framework contribute to taking these many pathways into account?

Britain

What explains why Britain chose a slow-democratization route and why it was so simple to establish democracy there? The parameters in particular, the nature of political and economic institutions, the structure of the economy, the problem of collective action, and the costs and benefits of revolution - were such that there was a sufficient threat of a revolution in pre-democratic Britain and the elites could not relieve those pressures without democratization, is the answer from our analysis that is at least in part clear. Additionally, they did not think it was wise to employ repression to stop democracy. This response, however, is not full. The parameters that Britain had in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries must also be understood. We now go through which of these factors was more crucial for comprehending the British case and how it developed.

Those who wanted to establish political institutions that constrained the de jure authority of the monarchy prevailed in a number of political battles in the seventeenth century. Economic institutions were significantly enhanced by this transformation in political institutions. Property rights grew more secure as the possibility of governmental predation decreased. People with commercial and capitalistic interests had de jure political power under the new system, which resulted in significant induced changes, such as in the capital and financial markets, that were crucial for economic growth.

These institutional changes in Britain seem to be the result of two different factors. First off, Britain had political institutions that constrained the kings' authority more than other nations at the beginning of the early modern era. Why this happened seems to be the result of a difficult historical process including dynasty construction and invasions. Second, the economic structure underwent significant transformation, which significantly increased the involvement of diverse groups, especially capitalistic farmers and merchants, in various economic organizations. The early demise of feudal structures in Britain was also significant. The result of the Civil War and the Glorious Revolution were significantly influenced by these reforms, which reinforced the de facto dominance of these same interests. For instance, merchants who prospered through commerce with the colonies were able to play pivotal roles on Parliament's side in both conflicts.

A system of economic institutions that granted property rights to a wide range of individuals were the result of the conflicts that took place in Britain in the seventeenth century. The Malthusian cycle was broken as a consequence, and modern economic prosperity was launched. However, the structural changes that followed had further effects on how de facto political power was distributed. Particularly, they started to make it more simpler for the impoverished and politically marginalized to exert de facto authority. The present system could no longer be supported by the poor's growing de facto political power, necessitating a shift in political institutions to their advantage in order to avert the possibility of revolution. This was done in order to skew the distribution of de jure political power in the future and, as a result, guarantee that economic institutions and policies would be aligned with the interests of the poor. This is precisely what the democratization process accomplished. The growth in inequality, which most experts think occurred in the first part of the nineteenth century, contributed to political conflicts as well.

The British political elites started making deliberate decisions in 1832 to include the previously disenfranchised in politics because they believed that the alternative would result in social upheaval, anarchy, and perhaps revolt. The concessions were made gradually because, in 1832, the middle class could be bought off to achieve social harmony. The specifics of political institutions, notably the House of Lords' continued unrepresentativeness, further lessened the impact of the compromises. The House of Lords served as a crucial safeguard for the affluent against the possibility of drastic changes coming from a democratized House of Commons, although being tested during the 1832 reforms. Further accommodations had to be made when the working classes later regrouped via the Chartist movement and subsequently through trade unions. The last promise of complete democracy was sealed by the Great War and its aftermath.

Why did the British aristocracy establish a democracy? Political elites in several other nations made the decision to suppress the disenfranchised rather than provide them concessions as a result of similar pressures. Repression is problematic since it is expensive and runs the danger of damaging wealth and assets. The disenfranchised masses in urbanized nineteenth-century Europe were quite well organized and consequently difficult to suppress. Additionally, an economy built on physical and, increasingly, human capital had been created as a result of industrialization and the free trade policy that Britain pursued after the 1840s based on comparative advantages. Repression becomes an increasingly expensive alternative for the elites since such assets are quickly destroyed by conflict and repression. The elites in Britain found the idea of democracy less frightening and were easier to persuade to adopt it since capital is more difficult to transfer. Repression is appealing when there is a lot at risk as well as when it is reasonably inexpensive. Our analysis reveals that the improvements in economic and political institutions that allowed for sustained economic development also significantly reduced the elites' concern for democracy in Britain.

Democracies did, however, bring about shifts in economic institutions away from those favored by the elites. The impoverished were disadvantageous throughout the nineteenth century due to economic structures, notably in the job market. For instance, trade unions were prohibited, and British employees who attempted to form one may be sent to Tasmania, Australia's prison colony, as late as 1850. This practice, as well as many others, changed, as was mentioned in 3, especially after 1867, when economic institutions were modified to meet the needs of the newly franchised. The effects of these developments, although significant for the operation of the British economy in the nineteenth century, were considerably less harmful to the elites than the

possibility of opening up rural labor markets or the prospect of land reform in an economy controlled by landed elites. In truth, the reforms in Britain were comparatively simple for the elites to accept compared to the changes in economic institutions encountered by the elites in Russia, Austria-Hungary, or Guatemala and El Salvador in the twentieth century.

What about the claim that redistribution would stop democracy? Although they undoubtedly predicted that democracy may lead to it, the political elites in Britain do not seem to have given the idea of mass wealth re-distribution any thought. Perhaps pledges to redistribute could not be trusted, as Stephens recognized. For instance, it is significant that the Chartists' petition that attracted the greatest attention from Parliament was delivered in 1848, just when the continent of Europe was undergoing upheaval. The political elites had to seem to be paying attention in the face of such a revolutionary threat, but as long as they remained in power, they would only do so while the threat was still alive the Chartist movement only generated temporary dangers. Therefore, it may not come as a surprise that redistribution pledges were not the first priority in Britain while trying to quell social discontent.

Finally, why did British democracy solidify so quickly? According to our perspective, many of the same elements that were mentioned in relation to democracy may have had an impact on this. It became more stable because coups were too costly and democracy wasn't radical enough to really threaten the established elites. British society saw significant changes as a result of democracy, but it took 50 years and additional time for the full impact of educational reforms to become apparent. The elites were never threatened by the kinds of drastic wealth redistribution that are typical of democratizations elsewhere in the globe. Our method shows that the elites should have been less hostile to democracy given these conditions [10]–[12].

CONCLUSION

The complexity and difficulties of political transition are highlighted by the trade-off between concessions and democracy. The need for democratic changes must be carefully balanced with the need for stability and continuity, and political leaders and institutions must be aware of the rewards and dangers of making compromises. The results of ongoing research and analysis may be used to influence practices and policies targeted at advancing democratic governance and human rights, as well as providing insightful information about the elements that support or obstruct democratic transition. Despite these difficulties, compromises may aid in the advancement of democracy. Concessions may aid in the development of democratic institutions and foster political involvement by providing space for opposition organizations and civil society. Additionally, they may contribute to the development of political players' mutual trust and collaboration as well as a framework for discussion and negotiation.

REFERENCES

[1]   J. Bertrand, A. Pelletier, and A. M. Thawnghmung, "First Movers, Democratization and Unilateral Concessions: Overcoming Commitment Problems and Negotiating a 'Nationwide Cease-Fire' in Myanmar," *Asian Secur.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/14799855.2018.1471466.

[2]   M. Zhou, "Signaling commitments, making concessions: Democratization and state ratification of international human rights treaties, 1966–2006," *Ration. Soc.*, 2014, doi: 10.1177/1043463114546313.

[3]   A. Emery and D. Will, "Liberation movements, universal citizenship and the resolution of ethno-national conflict: Anc non-racialism and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict," *Third World Q.*, 2014, doi: 10.1080/01436597.2014.893487.

[4]   D. Ziblatt, "How Did Europe Democratize?," *World Polit.*, 2006, doi: 10.1353/wp.2006.0028.

[5]   D. H. Bearce and J. A. Laks Hutnick, "Toward an alternative explanation for the resource curse: Natural resources, immigration, and democratization," *Comp. Polit. Stud.*, 2011, doi: 10.1177/0010414011401211.

[6]   F. Schimmelfennig, "The normative origins of democracy in the European Union: Toward a transformationalist theory of democratization," *Eur. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2010, doi: 10.1017/S1755773910000068.

[7]   W. Salim, K. Bettinger, and M. Fisher, "Maladaptation on the Waterfront: Jakarta's Growth Coalition and the Great Garuda," *Environ. Urban. ASIA*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0975425318821809.

[8]   M. de la Luz Inclán, "Repressive threats, procedural concessions, and the Zapatista cycle of protests, 1994-2003," *J. Conflict Resolut.*, 2009, doi: 10.1177/0022002709341173.

[9]   G. Facal, "Islamic Defenders Front Militia (Front Pembela Islam) and its Impact on Growing Religious Intolerance in Indonesia," *TRaNS Trans-Regional -National Stud. Southeast Asia*, 2020, doi: 10.1017/trn.2018.15.

[10]   B. Martin, "The sakharov-medvedev debate on détente and human rights from the jackson-vanik amendment to the helsinki accords," *J. Cold War Stud.*, 2021, doi: 10.1162/jcws_a_01009.

[11]   L. Ntsebeza, "Democratic decentralisation and traditional authority: Dilemmas of land administration in Rural South Africa," *Eur. J. Dev. Res.*, 2004, doi: 10.1080/09578810410001688743.

[12]   M. K. Miller, "Electoral authoritarianism and democracy: A formal model of regime transitions," *J. Theor. Polit.*, 2013, doi: 10.1177/0951629812460122.

CHAPTER 12

ANALYZE DEMOCRATIC AND NONDEMOCRATIC POLITICS

Dr. Navaneetha Kumar, Professor, Department of Decision Sciences,
CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id- dr.navaneethakumar@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Democratic and nondemocratic politics are two distinct forms of governance that differ in their principles, institutions, and outcomes. Democratic politics are characterized by the principles of popular sovereignty, representation, and equality, and rely on institutions such as free and fair elections, independent judiciaries, and civil liberties. Nondemocratic politics, on the other hand, are characterized by the concentration of power in the hands of a small elite or ruling party, and may rely on coercion, propaganda, and censorship to maintain control. One of the key differences between democratic and nondemocratic politics is the degree of political participation and accountability. In democratic systems, citizens have the right to vote and participate in the political process, and elected officials are held accountable to the public through regular elections and other forms of oversight. In nondemocratic systems, by contrast, citizens may have limited or no political rights or freedoms, and the ruling elite may be unaccountable to the public or subject to arbitrary or repressive measures.

KEYWORDS:

Accountability, Civil Liberties, Corruption, Democracy, Elections, Human Rights.

INTRODUCTION

Similar factors that helped bring about democracy in Britain seem to have also been at work in Argentina. Similar to Britain, a succession of uprisings sparked by financial and economic crises helped bring about democracy in Argentina. Similar to what happened in Britain, the democratization process occurred while economic development and inequality were both quickly increasing. However, Argentina's democratic transition had distinct foundational political and economic structures than Britain's. Exports of agricultural goods were the mainstay of the economy, and the expansion of global commerce boosted rather than decreased the value of the land that belonged to the wealthy elite. Additionally, since the economy was less diversified, it was more unstable and susceptible to volatility, opening openings for political upheaval. Even though they were compelled to accept democracy, the landed elites disliked it and were able to destroy it during the crises that preceded the start of the Great Depression [1]–[3].

Institutions in the political and economic spheres did not help democracy either. Political institutions in Spain, unlike those that developed in Britain after 1688, imposed less restrictions on the exercise of political authority, especially that of the president, as seen by the deeds of Yrigoyen in the 1920s and Pero'n in the 1940s. Argentina's economic systems in some ways resembled those of other former Spanish colonies that relied on the exploitation of native peoples. Even while this legacy was little in comparison to nations like Bolivia or Guatemala, the

underlying system of economic institutions, especially in terms of access to land, raised the stakes in political conflict. A highly divided scenario developed throughout the 1930s and 1940s in which urban working classes, who controlled democratic politics, sought to shift income toward themselves. The rural aristocracy found this position unacceptable, and the military began to take a vehemently anti-Pero'nist posture. Given the economic structure, the potential benefits of the nondemocratic system much outweighed the costs of coups against democracy, particularly in light of the danger posed by extreme redistributive and populist policies in democra- cies. The military sponsored the introduction of proportional representation in the late 1950s in the hopes that it would cause the Peronist party to split up, but despite all sides' efforts to structure institutions in their favor, none of these initiatives were successful in making democracy more accommodating to the elites.

Is Argentina's democracy now firmly established? Our study offers some cause for optimism. The significant rise in globalization, especially the capital mobility brought on by financial integration since the mid-1970s, suggests that democracy may provide a considerably lower danger to the interests of the elite than in the past. The fact that Argentina has a reasonably high level of education and a substantial middle class that may serve as a significant buffer between the affluent and the poor may be even more significant. As a result, democracy remained strong throughout the 1990s even while inequality significantly increased, indicating that the fundamental political balance has shifted. Additionally, one of the long-term effects of the military's economic policies after 1976 is that organized labor and the left in Argentina now have a much weaker economic base than they did in the past, which explains the Peronist party's radical shift in economic and social policies in the 1990s. Contrarily, this change may be advantageous for the less fortunate sections of society since Argentina's democracy may finally be solidified as a result of the change in policy [4], [5].

DISCUSSION

Singapore

Why hasn't Singapore undergone democracy? Our research points to a rather straightforward solution. Singapore has a relatively egalitarian culture. The economy is dependent on outside industries and money since there are no traditional affluent landed aristocrats. The majority of people consequently seem to be content with the current situation, or at least not dissatisfied enough to take substantial and perhaps expensive collective action to bring about a significant change in political institutions. With respect to what they currently have, there is not much to gain.

The PAP's existing ruling class, on the other hand, has nothing to lose outside their position of power. The PAP, which mostly comprises of prosperous middle-class individuals, has maintained a fair amount of openness by attempting to coax talented individuals and prospective rivals into the fold. Although it is clearly connected to Singapore's wealthy elite, none are likely to have their assets or riches taken from them. Even while the political elites would probably lose their sizable rents from holding office, this is probably not enough to warrant a protracted period of repression in order to maintain their privileged positions. As a result of our study, it is also recommended that Singapore finally achieve consolidated democracy. The elites and the PAP will eventually feel that it is not professional to employ repression to thwart democracy if there is demand from a section of the populace for more representative political structures [6]–[8].

S. Africa

What caused South Africa's eventual emergence of democracy, and why was it delayed for such a long time? The historical context here is quite unlike to Singapore's. The South African white elites stood to lose a lot from democracy, which historically would have sparked widespread calls for wealth redistribution, land reform, and a significant reorganization of economic institutions away from those that favored the wealthy white elites.

In many respects, settler colonies in North America or Australia were analogous to how the state of South Africa was established. However, unlike in the United States, indigenous populations did not disappear due to imported illnesses, which created a scenario in which native Africans were used as a cheap labor force that the wealthy white elites could hire and subjugate via coercion. In this setting, white people did not only not make any accommodations for the Africans but also developed a theory to support the uneven distribution of resources in society. Because of the apartheid ideology and the fact that it was directed at a single readily recognized racial group, repression was very easy and affordable in South Africa.

However, the apartheid government could not last forever. The importance of the African majority to the survival of the white economy increased as the economy deteriorated. They got more and more resentful of their situation and politically active. In reaction, the white authority repressed fiercely, ready to forbid, arrest, torture, and even kill in order to preserve its dominion. Even yet, this was not a permanent solution. The apartheid economy's profitability rapidly decreased as a result of outside sanctions and the disruptions brought on by repression. Additionally, as the globe evolved, apartheid not only lost some of its international support during the Cold War, but a globalized economy also meant that the wealthy, white elites had less to fear from democracy. Threat of a radical African majority vanished as importance of land decreased and importance of mobile capital increased.

In addition, many of the economic rents that apartheid had produced for the whites were diminished by the concessions that the white authority made throughout the 1970s, including the legalization of African labor unions. Due to this reduction, the white population stood to lose less from the loss of political power. Indeed, from the mid-1970s forward, inequality decreased, as Rosendorff found in precisely this context. Finally, the whites and the ANC were able to work out a set of political institutions that gave the whites enough faith in the future of democracy that they were ready to put an end to their fighting and permit democratization. But there's never a guarantee as to what the future will bring. For instance, Zimbabwe's effort to build a constitution to encourage democratic consolidation has not been very successful. In his analysis of the prospects for democracy in South Africa, Thompson makes the noteworthy observation that there is "one great structural threat to democracy in South Africa: The lack of a well-educated skilled labor force - the consequence of the appalling state of education in South Africa."

Extensions and Potential Research Areas

Our idea is very oversimplified, like any social science theory. We abstracted away numerous details and other potentially significant processes in order to concentrate on the mechanisms that we believe to be crucial. This indicates that there are other perspectives on some of the fundamental topics we covered, as well as the fact that we left out additional elements that may be crucial to include for a comprehensive theory of the emergence and consolidation of democracy.

First, social conflict served as the primary impetus for the development of various political institutions in our framework. Political institution changes don't happen because both sides

agree; instead, the change-supporting side gains power and is able to enforce its views, at least temporarily. The ideas of Bates, Rogowski, Herbst, and Tilly that democracy emerges from the process of state formation, or the ideas of Bueno de Mesquita et al. and Lizzeri and Persico that democracy is voluntarily created by political elites because it leads to different equilibrium public policies that make everyone better off, were just a few of the alternative approaches to democratization that were briefly discussed in Chapter 3. Even while we think that these alternative interpretations cannot fully account for the key patterns of democratization and democratic consolidation, empirical research is still necessary to ascertain the relative weights of various factors. The identification of causal links or the isolation of really exogenous sources of variation have received little attention in empirical research on the factors influencing the development and maintenance of democracy, remaining mostly at the correlational level. No significant effort has been made to yet to differentiate between various democratization techniques.

There are a number of significant areas in which greater theoretical study seems to be of utmost importance, in addition to analyzing and testing alternative theories. To make the book's length reasonable, we chose not to explore five significant topics that we had originally intended to.The first is the military's function. Different groups make up the sole actors in our basic model, and we thought that these groups would engage in direct conflict. In actuality, the military, another institution, is a key player in uprisings, repression, and coups. Implicitly, we thought that the military did not act alone but rather joined forces with either the elites or maybe the general populace.

However, it is a widely held belief in political science that the military often intervenes for its own interests rather than that of a social group. It is also obvious that the military is very strong in comparison to other social and economic groupings in emerging economies. Therefore, developing a theory of military politics is a top research objective in order to understand when the military supports a certain group and when it may deviate significantly from social groupings. Only Ticchi and Vindigni have attempted to apply the analytical approach we take in this book and the tools of game theory to explore the military, despite the fact that there is a wealth of case-study literature on the military. Few generalizations about the aims and conduct of the military exist at this time.

The study of the military is connected to another important subject of comparative politics research. The "bare-bones" model of nondemocratic politics that we proposed in Chapter 5 abstracted away the variations across nondemocratic regimes. However, a large portion of political science literature focuses on offering various taxonomies of nondemocratic regimes. Furthermore, a lot of studies contends that the sort of nondemocratic system influences whether or not democracy can be established and strengthened. Whether this is true or not is ultimately a matter of empirical inquiry, but it is unquestionably a real possibility. We focused on the degree of political equality since we think it is the most important difference between democratic and nondemocratic regimes in this book. But adding more detailed models of nondemocratic institutions will definitely lead to many fresh discoveries.

The differences in democratic institutions are the second significant topic that was left out of our investigation while being crucial to comprehending the dynamics of democracy. The distinctions between various forms of democracy such as presidential vs parliamentarian democracies and those that employ proportional representation as opposed to majoritarian election institutions— are highlighted in a broad theoretical and empirical literature. The most intriguing method is to

tie it to the more intricate structure of political institutions, even if we present many micro foundations for the parameter in the appendix to 4. We provided instances of how democratic institutions' details are critical to the viability and longevity of democracy throughout the book. The development of models to explain how different election systems or whether a democracy is parliamentary or presidential depends on the incentives of politicians or people is still in its infancy, according to the formal literature. An intriguing subject for the next years will be the selection of the equilibrium form of democratic institutions and how this influences the viability of democracy.

According to our argument, the precise institutional structure will play a significant role in deciding how political conflicts are resolved and, therefore, whether or not democracy is established because of the way it affects how preferences are aggregated.

More theoretical work is required in the third domain, which we referred to as alternative political identities. Despite the fact that a significant chunk of political economy conceptualizes conflict as occurring along class or socioeconomic lines, it is also widely acknowledged that this is not always the case. Even though we made an effort to demonstrate that our key findings on the conditions under which democracy emerges and consolidates are independent of the form of political identities, a more detailed model should lead to a large number of novel empirical predictions. Not just the effects of political identities, but also how they are formed and how that relies on institutional structure, is a crucial field for study. For instance, historians of Africa have shown how several significant ethnic identities on the continent today that are prominent in political conflicts are essentially a result of incentives put in place during the colonial era.

Collective action and revolution are a crucial fourth topic that will need more study. We reviewed the collective-action dilemma and claimed that it is overcome by revolutionaries giving private benefits to people who participate in revolution, according to the existing empirical data. This served as the basis for the model that we created and used in the text. However, expanding our comprehension of collective behavior is an exciting field for future theoretical and empirical investigation. Additionally, we modeled "post revolution societies" in the most simplistic manner possible. Our defense is that revolutions diverge from the equilibrium course. However, improving our knowledge of what transpires during revolutions and how institutions afterwards change is a crucial issue that might lead to new hypotheses about the establishment and consolidation of democracy. Similar to military politics, there is a thriving body of case-study research on revolutions that may serve as a springboard for creating models and more concrete theories.

Finally, and probably most importantly, future literature has to provide more detailed representations of how economies function and the structure of economic institutions than those found in this book. The study of the linkages between endogenous political and economic institutions is a particularly fascinating subject for future research. Although we highlighted the significance of economic institutions and endogenized the distribution of income in Chapter 9, we did not create explicit models that included how institutions developed or changed over time. Furthermore, we only looked at scenarios in which steady asset stocks dictated income. In reality, technology advances and money build up over time. It is crucial to include these processes of development and accumulation into our paradigm. Such expansions will also assist in elucidating the possibility of route dependency in political institutions, which many academics think exists.

The Prospects for Democracy

This book's goal is to create and convey a condensed framework for analyzing democratic and nondemocratic politics as well as the changes that occur between those regimes. Our approach primarily aims to comprehend an abstract representation of intricate social occurrences. Given the framework we created here, it is important to consider the future of democracy, even as any straightforward framework that makes predictions about the future does so at its own risk.

Thinking about whether democracies throughout the globe will be solidified and how they will change from what they are now involves a number of critical concerns. First, the importance of human capital in the global economy is rising relative to that of land and physical capital for two reasons: first, the average citizen in both developed and developing countries today is better educated than they were fifty years ago, and second, it appears that technology throughout the twentieth century relied more on the skills and human capital of the workforce. A significant middle class is produced in many less developed countries that are nondemocratic or have unconsolidated democracies, despite the fact that higher returns to human capital may sometimes result in an increase in inequality. We anticipate less distributional conflict and more democracies as this gap shrinks and a middle class develops, not just in nations where political conflict has traditionally been between the affluent and the poor but also in civilizations where political conflict has traditionally been along other lines. There have been several reports of the "end of class warfare" in recent years. While we do not foresee the end of political conflict anytime soon, we do believe that it will become less heated and severe as a result of the increased importance of human capital.

Second, the economy of the globe is today heavily globalized. We think that deeper international economic and financial ties may strengthen and advance democracy for the reasons previously mentioned. Again, there will continue to be conflict between the elites and the bulk of people in the global economy, but globalization may remove some of the most destructive weapons from each side's armory. The most populist and redistributive policies are not what the people wish to follow, which gives the elites in a democracy greater security. Coups and other disturbances are far less appealing to the elites. Third, the end of the Cold War suggests that many nondemocratic governments no longer get the implicit economic and political backing they had in the past, which facilitates the transition to democracy and makes coups against it more difficult.

These three elements suggest that democracy has a promising future. Today, both in locations where it has not yet arrived and where it has not yet been cemented, democracy has a considerably higher chance of winning over nondemocracy than it had in the past.Do we anticipate democracy changing in this new period, given these developments? We have argued that democracy is in the interests of the majority and, potentially, the poor. This comparison of democracy to a typical nondemocratic system is mostly relative. We also pointed out that, despite democracy usually being more pro-majority than nondemocracy, there are still certain factors that may contribute to the dominance of the elites under democracy. There are two reasons to believe that the elites in a democracy may eventually gain greater clout.

The capacity of the elites to effectively advocate against certain programs and their control of the party system, which affects the political agenda, are the two main sources of additional power for them in democracies. Do we anticipate elites will be able to do this task more successfully in the future? There are two grounds for thinking the response may be "yes." The elites, particularly in the present unconsolidated democracies, must accept living in a democratic society given the

growing promise of democracy. They may as well try to sway democratic politics in this situation. Because of this, the elites' gains from gaining more power in a democracy could now be higher.

More importantly, as democracy develops, organized groups which may include the elites or certain subsets of them—may have more opportunities to gain power. Mancur Olson first advanced the claim that interest groups become more powerful over time in democracies in his influential 1982 political economics thesis, The Riseand Decline of Nations. Olson noted that powerful lobbies become more cohesive and trustworthy over time, and perhaps more importantly, these lobbies are able to more successfully control the main political and governmental institutions. The elite is one of the interest groups that might get stronger and take over most of politics in a democratic setting. If true, we could anticipate that democracies will eventually become less pro-majority. This idea is supported by the observation that during the 20th century, emerging democracies seemed to have been more redistributive than established democracies, as well as the finding that over the last 40 years, conservative parties have become more powerful in a number of well-established democracies.

This pertains to Robert Michels's famous 1911 book Political Parties, which contains the Iron Law of Oligarchy. According to Michels, all organizations, especially political parties, including socialist ones, have a tendency to be taken over by whomever controls them; as a result, these individuals end up being a member of the elites. This, he said, meant that democracy had little prospect of really altering society since, at worst, it just substituted one elite for another. This would never result in fundamentally majoritarian societal transformation. According to this rule, the extreme danger to democracy is diminished by a natural process of elite capture.

Second, the growing value of human capital and increased globalization have another side. These economic trends are hurting many of the organizations that have been crucial in promoting the majority and policies that promote the majority by reducing distributional conflict. Traditional social democratic parties and labor unions are among the groups losing ground. The majority of the Anglo-Saxon world, particularly the United States and the United Kingdom, where labor unions are now considerably weaker and the traditional left parties have largely turned against wealth redistribution, is where this is most obvious.

We may anticipate that as these changes spread across the globe, democracy will become less redistributive and the elites and conservative parties will gain power. This is especially true if new models of majority representation in politics and the workplace do not materialize. As a result, democracy will strengthen; yet, for those who anticipate it to change society in the same manner that British democracy did in the first half of the 20th century, it may come as a disappointment [9]–[11].

CONCLUSION

Politics that are democratic and those that are not democratic are not always incompatible. While some nations may see a shift from nondemocratic to democratic systems of administration, others may experience a hybrid of democratic and nondemocratic features. Analysis of democratic and nondemocratic politics may provide insightful information about the elements that support or obstruct political stability, economic growth, and human rights, and it can guide the creation of policies and procedures that are intended to advance democratic government and improve civil society. The level of social and economic development is another important distinction between democratic and nondemocratic politics. Since democratic systems provide

more chances for public engagement and investment, they are often linked to better levels of economic development, education, and social welfare. Contrarily, nondemocratic institutions may be characterized by social inequality, economic stagnation, and corruption when authority and resources are concentrated in the hands of a tiny elite.

REFERENCES

[1]	G. J. Ikenberry and K. A. Schultz, "Democracy and Coercive Diplomacy," *Foreign Aff.*, 2002, doi: 10.2307/20033179.

[2]	D. Ma and S. C. Hsu, "The political consequences of deliberative democracy and electoral democracy in China: An empirical comparative analysis from four counties," *China Rev.*, 2018.

[3]	A. Baturo, "Cursus Honorum: Personal background, careers and experience of political leaders in democracy and dictatorship—New data and analyses," *Polit. Gov.*, 2016, doi: 10.17645/pag.v4i2.602.

[4]	M. S. Erie, "The New Legal Hubs: The Emergent Landscape of International Commercial Dispute Resolution," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3333765.

[5]	A. I. Abushouk, "The Arab spring: A fourth wave of democratization?," *Dig. Middle East Stud.*, 2016, doi: 10.1111/dome.12080.

[6]	W. Hwang, "A Systemic Approach To Democratic Peace: Multilevel Analysis of International Politics.," *Conf. Pap. -- Midwest. Polit. Sci. Assoc.*, 2004.

[7]	"El Niño/Southern Oscillation and the Seasonal Predictability of Tropical Cyclones," in *El Nino and the Southern Oscillation*, 2010. doi: 10.1017/cbo9780511573125.006.

[8]	V. Stojarová, "Introduction," *Party Politics in the Western Balkans*. 2013. doi: 10.4324/9780203866221-7.

[9]	E. J. Scourfield, "Smooth divisors of polynomials," in *Number Theory and Polynomials*, 2010. doi: 10.1017/cbo9780511721274.019.

[10]	A. Mughan and R. Gunther, "The Media in Democratic and Nondemocratic Regimes: A Multilevel Perspective," in *Democracy and the Media*, 2012. doi: 10.1017/cbo9781139175289.001.

[11]	D. Matić, "Is nationalism really that bad?: The case of Croatia," in *Democratic Transition in Croatia: Value Transformation, Education, and Media*, 2007.

CHAPTER 13

DISTRIBUTION OF POWER IN DEMOCRACY

Dr. Navaneetha Kumar, Professor, Department of Decision Sciences,
CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id- dr.navaneethakumar@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The distribution of power is a central feature of democratic governance, and is a key factor in promoting political stability, social justice, and economic prosperity. In a democratic system, power is distributed among various institutions and actors, and is subject to checks and balances to ensure that no one group or individual can monopolize political control. One of the key institutions in democratic governance is the legislature, which is responsible for enacting laws and overseeing government actions. In a democratic system, the legislature is typically composed of representatives who are elected by the people, and who are accountable to their constituents. The judiciary is another important institution in democratic governance, and is responsible for interpreting laws and resolving disputes. In a democratic system, the judiciary is typically independent of the executive branch, and is subject to constitutional and other legal constraints.

KEYWORDS:

Human Rights, Interest Groups, Judicial Independence, Majority Rule, Media Independence, Pluralism, Political Equality.

INTRODUCTION

In this appendix, we go through the models that serve as the foundation for our examination of how political power is distributed in democracies. There, we made the case that, in some situations, the equilibrium policy in a democracy may be conceptualized as maximizing a weighted total of the indirect utilities of the wealthy and the poor. We now create a number of models that can support those assertions on a micro level and define what those "circumstances" are.

Voting with probability and the presence of equilibrium

It is helpful to review the nonex- istence of voting equilibria in models without single-peaked preferences before we explore the probabilistic voting model. Remember that the MVT only works when preferences are single-peaked and the policy space is one dimension. Although the models that we used in this book to test our hypotheses gave us a lot of useful data, many real-world scenarios involving cross-cutting coalitions and multidimensional disparities do not. The party competition game often does not have an equilibrium in terms of pure strategies in these circumstances when the MVT is not applicable. Although mixed-strategy equilibria occur in these situations, it is often undesirable to consider parties combining across their platforms. The probabilistic voting model that Lindeck and Weibull first proposed is helpful not just as a different method of deciding on policy, but also because it could provide a solution to the nonexistence issues that the traditional model raises [1]–[3].

Political capture and partisan politics

The concept that political parties have goals beyond just obtaining power is another crucial component of democratic politics. First, political parties could also have ideologies, which might influence policies in an equilibrium. Second, whether some groups may control the political agenda and how this could have an impact on democratic politics are crucial questions. The Downsian political competition model is used to analyze concerns of political capture, and we add ideological parties and demonstrate how they impact its consequences. The predictions of the model of Downsian political rivalry hold true as long as there are no problems with probabilistic voting, and there are strong pressures pushing policies closer to those of the median voter. However, the ideological preferences of parties will also influence equilibrium policy if there are either ideological concerns on the side of voters or problems with commitment on the side of parties. This opens up yet another avenue for the reduced-form model of political power in a democracy to develop, as well as another justification for why certain groups could have a greater impact on equilibrium policy than their voting percentages would imply.

Origins of Capitalist Democracy in Revolution

Aristocratic Motives for the Countryside's Transition to Capitalism

One question very immediately arises when one begins to tell the tale of the change from the preindustrial to the modern world by looking at the history of the first nation to accomplish the change. Why did England's industrialization process end with the creation of a society that was mostly free? It appears obvious that modern England has long been such, maybe even much more liberal than the United States in the critical areas of freedom of expression and the acceptance of organized political opposition. This toleration by the ruling classes has an equally obvious aristocratic component. Even if it is crucial to keep in mind potential causes other than those investigated here in order to retain a healthy perspective, suggesting all the significant reasons why this circumstance arose is a more difficult effort than it needs to be for us. The emphasis in this article will be on the unique and crucial role that the rural classes played in the transition to industrialism.

If the focus on the destiny of nobles and peasants—and the myriad gradations in between that were a particular aspect of English society—comes from the overall structure of this book and the issues it began with, then evidence analysis reveals a different axis of investigation. It doesn't take a lot of time reading English history or skepticism beyond what is recommended in standard texts on scientific method to realize that popular beliefs about the unique British ability to settle their political and economic differences through peaceful, fair, and democratic processes contain elements of myth. Such ideas are not myths, but rather a partial reality. Simple refuting won't solve the problem. The conventions of historical writing, which start the story of English industrialization sometime after 1750, contribute to the perpetuation of this partial truth by emphasizing peaceful domestic history during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries—very peaceful in contrast to France—and by eluding the period of the Puritan Revolution or Civil War.l Simply recognizing this fact forces us to consider the relationship between violence and nonviolent change, specifically in modern democracies and more broadly in the transition from societies based on agriculture to those based on modern industrial technologies.

The complex process of transformation that started many centuries before is what gave rise to the societal conflicts that erupted in the English Civil War of the seventeenth century. It is hard to pinpoint exactly when it started, just as it is impossible to demonstrate that a civil war was the

only probable outcome. However, the nature of the process itself is rather obvious. A strong and highly convoluted overgrowth of the feudal and clerical order was slowly being overgrown by a contemporary, secular society.2 More specifically, beginning in the fourteenth century, there are several indications of the growing significance of trade in both rural and urban areas, the demise of feudalism, and the rise of democracy in Great Britain. Schweinitz, Industrialization, 6, notes that these developments occurred in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, beginning with the Reform Bill of 1832. However, the gradual development of constitutional and parliamentary institutions in the centuries before 18p was a major factor in the effectiveness of these policies. I agree with the author's cautious assertion in another place that it is difficult to replicate the capitalist and democratic answers to the issues of modernisation. For social, economic, legal, and constitutional historians, feudalism meant many things, and the various facets evolved at various speeds [4], [5]. The relatively weak form of royal absolutism that existed in England coexisted with an increasingly bitter religious conflict that was both a reflection of and a contributing factor in the anxieties and resentment that inevitably accompany the demise of one type of civilization and the emergence of a new one.

Even though England had a long history with the wool trade, by the late Middle Ages, it had overtaken other nations as the biggest and most significant producer of fine wool. The effects of the wool trade were felt in the countryside as well as the cities, maybe even more so there, and most definitely in politics. The emergence of trade cities in those regions is where one would have to go to locate the origins of the strong commercial impetus that would later control English society since English markets for wool were on the continent, mainly in Italy and the Low Countries. We wouldn't be able to fully understand them by analyzing them; instead, we must accept their decisive effect as a raw fact for our objectives. There were also other significant considerations at play. The population of England was drastically reduced by the Black Death in 1348–1349, which therefore decreased the labor pool. Soon after, in Lollardy, the first unsettling signs of a religious uprising emerged, which were swiftly followed in IJ8I by a severe peasant uprising. There will be an opportunity to examine these upheavals among the lower classes and their significance later.

We'll focus on the top classes mostly for the time being. Their standing underwent significant alterations in the later half of the fourteenth and much of the fifteenth centuries. The cement that held lord and man together had largely been replaced by the land and the tenurial relationships based on it. The monarch had been trying for a long time, with varying degrees of success, to use these arrangements for his own ends, working inside them to increase his own authority, even as other features of feudalism still held sway. Feudalism had become parasitic after being severed from its soil-based underpinnings, drawing vigor from the schemes of strongmen and the monarch's retorts. A social upheaval rather than a natural disaster, the Wars of the Roses were a bloodbath for the landed aristocracy.

It greatly diminished them and enabled the Tudor dynasty, which emerged from the conflict, to pick up the process of cementing royal power with greater effectiveness. Political and theological reasons during the reign of Henry VIII may have resulted in another push in favor of commercial agriculture. The seizure of the monasteries by Henry VIII in 1536 and 1539, according to a Marxist historian, may have aided in the promotion of new, economically oriented landowners at the cost of the more established nobility and its centrifugal traditions.5 However, it is more probable that Henry VIII's tenure was most notable for undermining one of the cornerstones of the old order, the church, and for providing a precedent that his successors would later regret.

Deeper stirrings were already in motion, unprompted by the crown, which increasingly turned its back on them as a threat to peace.

DISCUSSION

The Tudor peace produced a strong impetus for the emergence of a commercial and even capitalist attitude in the countryside when combined with the ongoing stimulation of the wool trade. R.H. Tawney's unrivaled study of economic life in England before to the Civil conflict and how these factors tore down the feudal system before the conflict, among other works: A large tenantry was more important than a high financial return from the soil during the turbulent times of the fifteenth century, when land still had military and social significance in addition to its economic value. Lords had even rode out at the head of their retainers to persuade a bad neighbor. With its strict prohibition of livery and maintenance, administrative jurisdictions, and tireless bureaucracy, Tudor discipline put an end to private warfare with a heavy hand and, by sharpening the teeth of feudalism, increased the importance of the command of money to the amazement of the command of men. A man with poor moral senses can never realize that the irresistible tides of history are moral forces. Not history, but commencement oratory. To successfully navigate competing moral influences, political leaders must be ethically ambiguous. Later historians elevate the victorious politicians to the status of moral role models. Nevins typically refuses to give in to such foolishness [6], [7].

Lastly, while attempting to understand American civilization as a whole III Plans were underway in the South to found a new party in the winter of 1858–1859 that Nevins describes as "a conservative, nationalist, Union-exalting party which should thrust aside the slavery issue, denounce all secessionists, push a broad program of internal improvements, and on constitutional grounds overthrow the Democrats." It attempted to pit little farmers against powerful slaveholders by enlisting the support of influential individuals, political figures, and journalists, but it hardly made a mark. The major opponents during the last stage, when secessionists were in command of the situation, seem to have been merchants and professionals in various southern ports as well as smaller farmers who had direct trading connections with the North. Please refer to Nevins, The Emergence of Lincoln, II, pz, P3, P4, and p6. Business circles in New York blew hot and cold.

After being ardent supporters of the Compromise of 1850, they almost became abolitionists in response to Douglas's Kansas-Nebraska decision before quickly turning around. The vast majority of New York merchants, according to Foner, "had operated under the illusion that the sectional struggle would right itself in time if 'politicians and fanatics' would only leave the controversial incidents alone" since 1850. The one consistency in their worldview appears to be this desire to avoid the problems. Business suffered from excitement. "The nigger question must give way to the superior issues of a safe currency, sound credits, and solid and permanent basis of security upon which all the various commercial and business interests of the country may repose," the Herald prophesied on October 10, 1857. North and South moderates might at least agree on this platform. It eventually evolved into the platform on which the Civil War and its aftermath were resolved.

Trade is a clear-cut aspect that may create connections between various regions of a nation. It's probably likely crucial that we acknowledge the fact that Southern cotton was mostly sent to England. It indicated that the connection to the North was much weaker. English bias in favor of the South during the actual conflict is widely recognized. However, emphasizing the direction of

trade as a sign of discord will not do. As was already said, Northern mills started using cotton more often. Following the crisis of 1857, the Western market shrank dramatically, and New York merchants temporarily depended more heavily on their contacts in the South.53 In other words, trading conditions were shifting; had the war not occurred, historians who prioritize economic factors would have had no trouble explaining the situation.

Two other parts of the situation may have been more crucial, even if cotton still connected the South to England more than it did to the North. One of these has already been brought up: in the North, there is no significant radical working-class challenge to industrial capitalist property. Second, the United States lacked any significant adversaries abroad. Germany and Japan, which both went through their own versions of political modernization crises a little later 187 I in Germany and 1 868 in Japan—were in a very different condition in this regard. The typical conservative compromise of the agricultural and industrial elites did not have much support for the reasons listed above. There wasn't much to unite Southern slave owners and Northern mill owners under the sanctity of property.

The development of various economic systems that led to several civilizations with incompatible views on slavery, to put it succinctly, is what ultimately caused the conflict. The relationship between Northern capitalism and Western agriculture contributed to the temporary absence of the typical reactionary alliance of urban and landed elites and, as a result, of the one peace agreement that may have prevented the war. Compromise was particularly difficult due to two additional issues. The allocation of power at the center looked to be unclear due to the uncertain future of the West, which intensified and accentuated all sources of mistrust and conflict. Second, as was previously said, the major elements of cohesiveness in American society were still quite weak while becoming stronger.

Failure of the Revolutionary Impulse

It is needless to speak more than a few words on the Civil War itself, particularly because the most significant political development, the Emancipation Proclamation, has already been brought up. Unlike the governing classes in England at the time of the Puritan Revolution or those in France at the time of the French Revolution, the dominating classes in American society had divided neatly in two, as shown by the conflict. Divisions among the ruling classes during those two major upheavals allowed radical impulses to emerge from the lower classes, more so during the French Revolution than during the English Civil War. There wasn't a particularly analogous radical outburst during the American Civil War.

The following are some causes, at least in the main outline: There weren't a lot of despondent craftsmen and prospective sans-culottes in American cities. The Western regions' presence, even if only indirectly, lessened the potential for explosion. Second, there weren't enough supplies to start a peasant conflagration. The South had mostly black slaves at the bottom of the heap rather than peasants. They would either not rebel or they could not. Whichever is fine for our purposes. There were intermittent breakouts of slavery, but they had no political repercussions. There was no revolutionary inclination there.

Northern capitalism gave rise to what little there was in the way of a revolutionary impulse—that is, an effort to forcibly transform the existing social order. Abolitionist principles and business interests came together in the organization known as the Radical Republicans to spark a fleeting revolution that fizzled and died in a swamp of corruption. Despite the fact that the Radicals caused Lincoln some trouble throughout the war, he was able to fight it to a military victory by

focusing on maintaining the Union, that is, without mounting a substantial attack on Southern property rights. The Radical Republicans briefly controlled power in the victorious North from 1865 to 1868, around three years after the conclusion of the fighting, and launched an onslaught against the plantation system and the last elements of slavery.

Leading members of this group saw the conflict as a revolutionary conflict between a progressive capitalist system and a retrograde, slavery-based agricultural civilization. The Radical Republicans were responsible for the North and South's battle having such a character, with some of the most significant conflicts occurring after the actual combat had ended. They look as the last totally bourgeois and strictly capitalist revolutionary flicker, the last heirs of the medieval townsmen who started the uprising against their feudal superiors, from the viewpoint of a century later. Since the American Civil War, revolutionary groups have either been anticapitalist or fascist and counterrevolutionary if they were in favor of capitalism.

From Free Soil revolutionaries and abolitionist ideologues, a tiny 54 The renowned Marxist researcher Aptheker compiles these incidents in his book American Negro Slave Revolts, chap XV. A group of Republican leaders adopted the idea of slavery as an antiquated "remnant of a dying world of 'baron and serf - noble and slave.'" They saw the Civil War itself as an opportunity to eradicate this repressive anachronism and reconstruct the South in the likeness of the democratic and progressive North, based on "free speech, free toil, schoolhouses, and ballot boxes." Thaddeus Stevens, the head of the Radical Republicans in the House of Representatives, wrote privately to his law partner during the year that someone in power "with sufficient grasp of mind, and sufficient moral courage, to treat this as a radical revolution, and remodel our institutions... It would involve the desolation of the South as well as emancipation, and a repeopling of half the country."

The fact that it aligned with the interests of significant sectors of Northern society gave this movement momentum and helped it go beyond the realm of boisterous discourse.55 One was Pennsylvania's young iron and steel industry. A group of railroad interests was another. Stevens served as a Congressional go-between for both of these interests, and in accordance with accepted political ethics, he got monetary favors from both of them.G6 Northern labor contributed significantly to the support given to the Radical Republicans. Workers in the North were generally hostile to abolitionist propaganda because they feared black competition and saw New England abolitionists as hypocritical mill owners' agents, but they were enthusiastic about radical ideas for tariff protection and for delaying the devaluation of the inflated North's currency.

On the other side, business and financial interests were unenthusiastic about the Radicals. Principled Radicals turned against the "plutocracy of the North" after the war. As a result, the radical offensive was not an organized capitalist assault against the plantation system. When it was at its most powerful, it was a coalition of laborers, industrialists, and certain railroad interests. However, it wouldn't be incorrect to describe it as entrepreneurial and even "progressive capitalism"; it drew the key creative elements in American society that Veblen would later find appealing and drove away others he found objectionable, such as arrogant financiers who got their money by selling rather than "doing." Thaddeus Stevens and his colleagues possessed the necessary modest intellectual brilliance and adept political leadership to provide a broad approach. Radi-cals had a theory about where society was going and how they might profit from it. To them, the Civil War represented the possibility of a revolution. They had

a fleeting chance to attempt to make it a reality after the military triumph and Lincoln's assassination, which they embraced with little concealed glee.

Once again, Thaddeus Stevens handled both the daily political leadership and the analysis. His approach essentially consisted of seizing control of the federal government's apparatus for the advantage of the organizations he represented. To achieve this, Southern culture had to transform, else the old plantation elite would retake Congress and thwart the effort. What little revolutionary fervor there was in the whole conflict sprang from this need. Stevens had the social acumen to identify the issue, search for a potential solution, and have the courage to attempt.

Stevens provided a remarkably cogent analysis and action plan in his statements to Congress and the broader public in 1865. Instead of being seen as a collection of states that had managed to leave the Union and were now to be welcomed back, the South needed to be handled as a conquered people. "Our blood and money have been wasted if the basis of their political, municipal, and social institutions isn't torn up and rebuilt. Only by treating and controlling them like my conquered subjects would this be possible.59 They should not be permitted to go back, he argued, "until the Constitution shall have been so amended as to make it what its framers intended ining euphemism for revolution from above has passed from conventional usage into all succeeding histories - they might easily overwhelm the North, Stevens calculated carefully and openly, and t4us enable the South to win the peace after losing the war.

The concept to completely restructure Southern civilization was born out of these reasons. Stevens wanted to end the dominance of the plantation owners by seizing estates larger than 200 acres, "even though it would drive nobility into exile." He contended that doing this would allow the federal government to acquire enough property to provide each black family around forty acres. He supported his claim with facts.62 The catchphrase "Forty Acres and a Mule" eventually got used to mock the purportedly utopian expectations of the newly emancipated Black people. However, neither Stevens nor the Radical Republicans were utopians. Widespread land reform was demanded since it was understood realistically that nothing else would undermine the planters' dominance. These were able to accomplish this because the Negroes were economically impotent.

They had already started to reclaim the essence of their former authority via other ways. At least a few Radicals were able to see all of this plainly. Additionally, there are hints that it was possible to divide up the former plantations and give the Black people tiny land. The Northern military authorities conducted two trials along similar lines in 1864 and 1865 to address the problematic issue of thousands of indigent Black people. More than 40,000 Black people were given access to seized and abandoned properties, and it is reported that they successfully farmed there until President Johnson gave the estates back to their original white owners.63 However, the history of slavery hardly prepared Black people to run modest rural businesses on their own. Stevens was aware of this and believed that the Negroes would need his allies in Congress to watch after them for a very long time. At the same time, he realized that they had little power to advance themselves or the interests of the North without a minimum level of economic stability and political rights, including the right to vote.64

In a word, the radical plan for reconstruction included leveraging the military might of the North to topple the plantation aris- tocracy and establishing equal property and voting rights for Black people in order to feign a capitalist democracy. It was groundbreaking given the Southern circumstances at the time. Since the economic focus is still subdued a century later, the struggle

for civil rights for African Americans wants little more than this and really not nearly all that. Stevens was a revolutionary in the sense that he was ahead of his time. Even tolerant Northerners expressed their disbelief. In response to Stevens' speech on September 6, 1865, Horace Greeley, editor of the New York Tribune and a longtime supporter of abolition, wrote, "... we protest against any warfare on Southern property... because the wealthier class of Southerners, being more enlightened and humane than the ignorant and vulgar, are less inimicable to the blacks."65 Greeley's reservations provide a foreshadowing of what would happen when men of substance from the North and South would put aside their differences and, via yet another legendary compromise, allow the Negroes to make the most of their freedom.

Therefore, it is not surprise that the radicals quickly suffered defeat, or more specifically, that what was radical in their agenda was abandoned as it ran into opposition from Northern property interests. Contrary to the aspirations of more moderate Republicans, the Radicals were unsuccessful in getting confiscation included in the 1867 rebuilding laws. Only 37 people voted in favor of Stevens' "40 acres" bill in the House.66 He made a strong case for suffrage in this speech, much as he did in the one that followed, ostensibly in response to Massachusetts Senator Charles Sumner's demand. Instead of attempting to highlight disagreements among Radicals, I have focused on Stevens as the movement's most revolutionary leader and its most significant day-to-day strategist during its heyday.

Nclrthern opinion was not in the mood to put up with a direct assault on private property, not even on property belonging to rebels, and not even in the name of capitalist democracy. "A division of rich men's lands among the landless would give our entire social and political system a shock from which it would hardly recover without the loss of liberty," The Nation cautioned. The radical program's core was destroyed with the failure of land reform, which was a resounding disaster. Depending on your point of view, the other components of the program might only serve as palliatives or annoyances without land reform. It may be overstated to claim that this failure paved the way for Southern white landowners and other privileged groups to eventually rule the region.G7 The Radicals had never even really been successful in blocking the path. Their defeat at this particular juncture exposed the restrictions American society placed on the revolutionary urge.

The plantation economy rebounded with a new labor structure in the absence of land seizure and redistribution. There were first experiments using paid labor. These failed, at least in part because Black people tended to draw their earnings during lean times and flee when it came time to harvest cotton. As a result, sharecropping became widely despised, giving landowners more influence over their work force. The modification was substantial. Sharecropping has served as one manner of obtaining a surplus from the peasant by economic rather than political means in many regions of Asia, as we will see in due order, though the latter are often required to support the former. Therefore, it is instructive to witness basically identical patterns develop independently in America without the pre-existing presence of a peasantry.

Although comparable gadgets already existed in China and other places, the country merchant gave the American situation a uniquely local touch. Large planters were often the local merchant. He maintained control over the workforce by selling food to tenant farmers and sharecroppers at substantially higher prices than normal retail rates. Since they had credit at just one place and were often short on cash, tenants and sharecroppers were unable to do business there.68 For many Black people, economic ties have taken the role of slavery in this way. It is exceedingly impossible to determine how much true progress, if any, the shift signified. However, it would be

incorrect to claim that plantation owners benefited considerably from the new framework. As bankers pressured planters and planters pressured croppers to cultivate crops that could be rapidly converted into cash, the major result seems to have been to make the South's one-crop economy even more of a one-crop economy than it already was.

Economic and political recovery both continued, reinforcing one another rather than following a straightforward cause-and-effect chain. There is no need to go into detail about the political maneuvers that the successors to the antebellum ruling classes in the South engaged in to gain political clout, but it is important to note that many planters, merchants, and even industrial tycoons were among the "scalawags" as modern-day white collaborationists might refer to them.70 The Negroes were put "in their place" by a fair bit of violence, which may have been encouraged by the better parts, but skepticism is in order here. This helped to restore general white dominance.71 In the meanwhile, railroad executives and businessmen from the industrial sector gained power in Southern affairs. In other words, as they were in the North as well, reasonable, substantial individuals were regaining their positions of importance.

The groundwork was being done for an alliance of these along the previous front lines of conflict. When the contentious Hayes-Tilden election was resolved by enabling the Republican Hayes to gain office in exchange for overthrowing the last of the Northern occupying rule, it was officially completed in 1876. The party of wealth, property, and privilege in the North was prepared to give up the last pretense of defending the rights of the propertyless and oppressed as a result of attacks from radical agrarians in the West and radical labor in the East, even though it is on this point that the federal government became an agency of the biblical statement just quoted. vast concessions were given to railroads, and vast riches in mining and wood were also built on the sale of public lands. Finally, the federal government continues as compensation to industry that would lose workers in this manner.

In the words of Beard, "all that two generations of Federalists and Whigs had tried to get was won within four short years, and more besides."The phrase "foj.lr short years" is a rhetorical flourish; some of these measures were also a part of Reconstruction, and the resumed payment of specie did not occur until 1879. However, it is a minor issue given that Reconstruction was unquestionably a component of the overall conflict. The case for the triumph of industrial capitalism over the constraints of the plantation economy, a victory that required blood and iron to occur at all, becomes very compelling indeed if one looks back and compares what happened with the planter program of 1860: federal enforcement of slavery, no high protective tariffs, no subsidies nor expensive tax-creating internal improvements, no national banking and currency system [8]–[10].

CONCLUSION

By enabling public involvement and representation and guaranteeing that no one group or person can monopolize political influence, the distribution of power in a democratic system aid in the promotion of political stability. By providing a framework for the defense of individual rights, the rule of law, and free markets, it also aids in advancing social fairness and economic success. Ongoing investigation and analysis may provide insightful information about the elements that help or impede the distribution of power in democratic government and can guide the development of practices and policies that will improve democratic institutions and advance human rights. Along with these formal institutions, civil society and the media are also crucial to democratic administration because they disseminate information, stoke popular dissent, and hold

elected officials responsible. The term "civil society" refers to a broad spectrum of groups and organizations that function outside of the official political system, including labor unions, religious organizations, and human rights activists. The media, which includes publications, television, and social media, offers a forum for the discussion of ideas and information and shapes public opinion.

REFERENCES

[1] L. J. Modise, "The notion of participatory democracy in relation to local ward committees: The distribution of power," *die Skriflig/In Luce Verbi*, 2017, doi: 10.4102/ids.v51i1.2248.

[2] R. T. Deacon, "Public good provision under dictatorship and democracy," *Public Choice*, 2009, doi: 10.1007/s11127-008-9391-x.

[3] A. Lever and C. Chin, "Democratic epistemology and democratic morality: the appeal and challenges of Peircean pragmatism," *Crit. Rev. Int. Soc. Polit. Philos.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/13698230.2017.1357411.

[4] J. Wright and A. Escribà-Folch, "Authoritarian institutions and regime survival: Transitions to democracy and subsequent autocracy," *British Journal of Political Science*. 2012. doi: 10.1017/S0007123411000317.

[5] P. Pansardi, "Democracy, domination and the distribution of power: Substantive political equality as a procedural requirement," *Rev. Int. Philos.*, 2016, doi: 10.3917/rip.275.0091.

[6] Sumardi and E. P. Purnomo, "Relasi Perwakilan, Pemilihan dan Voting dalam Penyelenggaraan Demokrasi di Indonesia," *J. Gov. Insight*, 2021, doi: 10.47030/jgi.v1i1.250.

[7] D. S. Brown and A. M. Mobarak, "The transforming power of democracy: Regime type and the distribution of electricity," *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2009, doi: 10.1017/S0003055409090200.

[8] M. McFaul, " The Fourth Wave of Democracy and Dictatorship: Noncooperative Transitions in the Postcommunist World ," *World Polit.*, 2002, doi: 10.1353/wp.2002.0004.

[9] B. H. Bradlow, "Weapons of the Strong: Elite Resistance and the Neo-Apartheid City," *City Community*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/1535684121994522.

[10] C. Welzel, "Democratic Horizons: what value change reveals about the future of democracy," *Democratization*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/13510347.2021.1883001.

CHAPTER 14

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON ASIAN POLITICAL PROCESSES

Vaibhav Goutham Suresh, Assistant Professor, Department of General Management,
CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id- vaibhavsuresh@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The study of Asian political processes is a broad and complex field that encompasses a wide range of political systems, ideologies, and cultures across the continent of Asia. Asia is home to diverse political processes and structures, ranging from authoritarian regimes to democratic systems, from communist states to capitalist economies, and from traditional societies to modern, industrialized nations. One of the key factors that has shaped Asian political processes is the legacy of colonialism and imperialism. Many Asian countries have experienced colonization or domination by foreign powers, and have struggled to assert their own national identities and political systems in the aftermath. This has led to a range of political ideologies and movements, including nationalism, socialism, and liberalism, that have sought to address the challenges of post-colonial governance and development.

KEYWORDS:

Authoritarianism, Bureaucracy, Civil Society, Confucianism, Corruption, Democratization, Economic Growth.

INTRODUCTION

This belief could lose a lot of its strength after reflection. It's important to note how vague Beard's own perspective is. He says, "The main economic results of the Second American Revolution thus far noted would have been attained had there been no armed conflict," after summarizing the successes of Northern capitalism above.70 But until the challenging works of a distinguished historian illuminate the concerns, Beard's opinions are not in dispute. The claim that the Turkish War was a pivotal triumph for industrial capitalist democracy and essential to this victory may be contested by three related arguments. First, it is possible to argue that there is no true relationship between the Civil War and the success of industrial capitalism that followed; any argument to the contrary would be based on the fallacy of post hoc, ergo propter hoc.

Second, it is possible to argue that without a Civil War, these changes would have occurred on their own via normal economic development processes.80 Finally, one may argue that the economies of the North and the South were not actually in a severe state of competition based on the facts addressed at length previously in this "Did the Civil War Retard Industrialization?" by Cochran. I think this and the argument before it are related in the sentence 148 - 1 60. The argument that the Civil War briefly halted industrial expansion is not one that I find convincing since it is just supported by numbers. It barely mentions the issue of institutional changes, which I believe to be its core. At best, these changes were complementary to one another; at worst, they failed to connect with one another because of unlucky circumstances, like the South's large cotton exports to England [1]–[3].

Only if it were feasible to show that Southern society, which was dominated by the plantation, posed a significant barrier to the establishment of industrial capitalist democracy would all such arguments get a convincing response. The evidence strongly suggests that plantation slavery was a barrier to democracy, at least any definition of democracy that upholds the ideals of human equality, even in the most constrained sense, and human freedom. That plantation slavery was a barrier to industrial capitalism as a whole is not at all obvious from this. And comparative perspectives make it abundantly evident that industrial capitalism may establish itself in countries where these democratic aims are either marginally present or, to be more careful, where they do not even exist. The key examples for this argument are Germany and Japan before 1945.

The investigation keeps returning to political issues and conflicts between two separate civilizations—those in the South and those in the North and West. For lack of a better name, we must refer to this kind of capitalism as competitive democratic capitalism, which is in opposition to labor-repressive agricultural systems in general and plantation slavery in particular. A society that was in fact the offspring of the Puritan, American, and French Revolutions saw slavery as a menace and an impediment. Hereditary position served as the cornerstone of human value in southern civilization. Even if it was changing, the North was still devoted to the idea of equal opportunity as compared to the West. Both had ideas that were reflections of the economic structures that gave them a lot of their power and popularity. I believe it was intrinsically difficult to create political and social institutions inside the same political entity.

The issue would most likely have been resolved at the time very easily at the cost of the Negro - if the geographic isolation had been considerably larger, for instance if the South had been a colony. Even with all of its unclear ramifications, the Northern triumph was still a political success for freedom as compared to what a Southern victory would have meant, which seems plain enough to not need more explanation. One just has to speculate on what would have occurred if the Southern plantation system had managed to colonize the West by the middle of the nineteenth century and encircle the Northeast. Then, like several modernizing nations today, the United States would have had a latifundia economy, a powerful antidemocratic aristocracy, and a helpless, reliant commercial and industrial class that was unable and unwilling to advance toward political democracy. Similar circumstances existed in Russia, but with less of a commercial emphasis on the country's agriculture in the second half of the nineteenth century. It would have been far more likely to see a radical explosion of some type or a protracted semi-reactionary tyranny than a solidly established democratic democracy with all of its flaws and weaknesses.

A crucial first step toward greater progress, abolishing slavery was a momentous move at least as significant as the overthrow of absolute monarchy in the English Civil War and the French Revolution. The principal accomplishments of our Civil War were political in the broadest sense of the word, much like these violent upheavals. Later generations in America would make an effort to include economic considerations into the political framework in an effort to elevate the level of the populace toward some sense of human dignity by giving them the resources necessary to control their own destiny. Despite the fact that the methods have, for the most part, so far sucked up and twisted the objectives, subsequent revolutions in Russia and China nonetheless served the same aim. I think that in order to properly analyze the American Civil War, it must be situated in this framework. It was a significant issue that the federal government was no longer in the business of enforcing slavery.

If this obstacle hadn't been removed, it is simple to envisage the challenges organized labor would have had to overcome in its subsequent efforts to win legal and political legitimacy. The incomplete nature of the victory gained in 1865 and subsequent tendencies toward a conservative coalition between vested interests in the North and the South have played major roles in the challenges that subsequent movements toward extending the bounds and meanings of freedom have faced since the end of the Civil War. The industrial capitalist system was designed with this gap. As industrial capitalism expanded and thrived, much of the old repression made a comeback in the South under new, purely economic guises, while new forms also emerged elsewhere in the country. If the federal government stopped caring about upholding the rules against runaway slaves, it either consented or became a tool for new types of tyranny [4], [5].

Only recently has the federal government started to go in the other direction with regard to the Negro. The United States is now engaged in a protracted civil rights battle involving African Americans that will undoubtedly ebb and flow for years to come. It includes a lot more people than just black people. People with dark complexion make up the majority of America's lowest class due to the quirks of American history. The Negroes are now nearly the only feasible recruiting ground for attempts to alter the nature of the world's most powerful capitalist democracy because they represent the only significant component of American society with active discontents. What will happen to this potential, whether it splinters and vanishes or coalesces with other discontents to produce meaningful outcomes, is another matter entirely.

The main issue in the conflict between black people and their white friends is whether or not modern capitalist democracy can live up to its lofty ideals, something that no society has ever done. Here, we get to the point when the judgment and interpretation of the Civil War are most ambiguous. It has happened before in history. The fact that two well-known political figures from free societies opted to communicate their principles in speeches for their lost loved ones delivered more than 2,000 years apart is more than a coincidence. As he contrasts what they said, what occurred, and what they did with what they claimed and, most likely, wished for, the critical historian sees both Pericles and Lincoln as equivocal people. The struggle for what they said is still going on and may not be resolved until after humans are no longer here on earth. As one probes farther and deeper into historical uncertainties, they are finally discovered in both the seeker and his fellow humans as well as in the ostensibly irrevocable truths of history. No matter how minor and inconsequential our role as people may be, we are unavoidably caught up in the ebb and flow of these events and contribute to what the past will ultimately mean for the future.

DISCUSSION

Problems in Comparing European and Asian Political Processes

A time not so long ago, many intelligent thinks believed there was just one main highway to the world of modern industrial society, a highway leading to capitalism and po- litical democracy. The previous fifty years of experience have expanded this idea, but there are still clear remnants of a unilinear model in Marxist theory and certain Western writings on economic growth. One result that emerged from unique historical conditions is Western democracy. The three prior revolutions and civil wars were significant contributors to the development of liberal democracy. As we've just seen, the same broad path of development that gave rise to capitalist democracy in England, France, and the United States had some notable divergences. But there are distinctions that go well beyond those found within the democratic family. One sort of growth that culminated in fascism may be seen in German history, another in Russian history. There are

definitely certain similarities and differences between all industrial civilizations and agricultural societies, suggesting that there may eventually be a convergence of all three kinds. The partial reality, however, is that nondemocratic and even antidemocratic modernisation work if we use the seventh decade of the twentieth century as our point of view while continuing to recognize that, like other historical vantage points, it was arbitrarily imposed. For reasons that will be more evident in the sentences that follow,

This assertion could hold less water for fascism-related modernisation than for communism. That is not at issue here and remains to be seen. There is no question that both Germany and Russia succeeded to become major industrial powers, although via quite different ways. Germany was able to implement an industrial revolution from above in the nineteenth century under Prussian rule. In 1848, the last glimmer of hope for a bourgeois revolution and what was revolutionary was not bourgeois—was extinguished. Even the 1918 setback did not destroy the preindustrial social system's fundamental components. The inevitable outcome emerged in the backdrop of European history. Can they be used on Asian political institutions without changing them drastically? Currently, it is not necessary to take a position on the general question of whether or not historical terms can be transferred from one context and country to another beyond noting that, without some degree of transferability, historical discussion devolves into a meaningless description of unrelated episodes. On a purely philosophical level, these inquiries are meaningless and unanswerable, and the only thing they produce are tedious word games in place of an attempt to determine what really happened. It appears to me that there are objective standards for differentiating between superficial and significant historical parallels, and it could be good to briefly discuss these standards [6].

A superficial and unintentional similarity is one that is unrelated to other important facts or that causes one to misinterpret the actual circumstance. For instance, if a writer were to emphasize the parallels between Louis XIV and General de Gaulle's political approaches—let's say their strict adherence to the respect etiquette—he would be presenting false trivialities. In contrast, if we find that, prior to 1945, there existed in both Germany and Japan a whole series of canonically related institutional practices whose structure and origins are similar, we are justified in calling this complex unit fascism in both cases. The differences between seventeenth- and twentieth-century French society are far more significant than these superficial similarities. The same may be said for communism and democracy. Empirical research is required to determine the kind of connections. It is quite probable that the fundamental components of communism, fascism, or parliamentary democracy alone will not be sufficient to explain the key political characteristics of China, Japan, and India. One or more specific historical causal chains that do not fall into an identifiable family of sequences may have to shoulder a substantial portion of the explanation. This has always been the case when studying Western countries, and there is no reason to believe that will change when we shift our attention to Asia. The similarities between Charles de Gaulle and Louis XIV would stop being superficial if it were possible to show that they were, in fact, signs and results of a deeper and more substantial link. Such findings are not always ruled out in advance. Up until Freud discovered their relation to serious human difficulties, verbal slipups looked unimportant. It must be emphasized once again that the only way to answer such queries is by carefully reviewing the available evidence.

Imperial China's Fall and the Sources of the Communist Substrate

A LONG, LONG TIME AGO, IN CHINA, THERE WAS A SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHERS WHOSE PRINCIPLES CALL FOR A "RECTIFICATION OF NAMES," Apparently, they felt

that calling things by their correct names was the beginning of political and social knowledge. The question at the center of this terminological controversy is the crucial one with which our investigation must start: how were the upper classes connected with the land in this society where the overwhelming majority were tillers of the soil? Today's scholars of China are working on a similar task, using terms like "gentry," "feudalism," and "bureaucracy." Did their dominance over landed property eventually underpin their power and authority, or was it the result of their near-monopoly on bureaucratic "posts"? In the event that it was a mix of the two, what kind of a combination was it? In order to pave the way for an accurate understanding of how Imperial Chinese society really functioned, it will be wise to address these issues head-on as the argument bears a significant load of present political consequences.

Some Western researchers highlight the Chinese Empire's bureaucratic nature while downplaying the connection between the Imperial service and landed property. In contrast, Marxists, particularly Chinese Communists, treat the Imperial era and even the Kuomintang period as a form of feudalism, meaning a society in which most of the land is owned by landlords whose main interest is to control the population. Such an interpretation serves the dual purpose of suggesting grounds for criticizing the Marxist derivation of political power from economic power and for criticizing modern communist states as a throwback to an alleged form of Oriental despotism. If there is one description that is less accurate than bureaucracy, it would be feudalism. In Imperial China, there was no system of vassalage and only a small number of gifts of land were made in exchange for military services. However, as we will show, the Marxist emphasis on landlordism is well warranted. In conclusion, it appears to me that Western experts are feverishly trying to disprove the link between owning property and holding political power, while Marxists are trying just as vehemently to prove it.

What was the relationship, then? What crucial traits characterized Chinese society during the Manchus, the country's final major dynasty? How did the subsequent growth of China, which culminated in the Communist triumph in the middle of the 20th century, be influenced by these fundamental characteristics? What traits of the Chinese landed upper class contribute to the explanation of why there was no significant movement toward parliamentary democracy when the Imperial system collapsed?

A few straightforward issues jump out, and they are widely accepted.

agreement and that allow us to get a general idea. First of all, the Chinese polity had long before solved the issue of a: turbulent aristocracy bound to the land before our tale ever starts. We are not concerned with the specific steps that led to this great shift, other than to note that the renowned examination system, which enabled the emperor to assemble a bureaucracy to combat the aristocracy, had a role. The T'ang dynasty, which lasted until 907 A.D., saw the examination system in operation. Whether this aristocracy was feudal or the previous stage of Chinese civilization prior to its initial unification under the Ch'in around the third century B.C., hardly much of the ancient nobility remained by the subsequent Sung dynasty. We may easily ignore the concerns of whether a region warrants the moniker "feudal."

On the other hand, it is important to focus on the issue of whether or not a landed aristocracy persistedthe Ch'ing dynasty, as it is often called among sinologists, under a fa ade of administrative centralization during the Manchu period. Everyone would agree that there was a class of affluent landowners, but it would be difficult to determine where to draw the line between wealthy and just well-off. Similar universal agreement on the presence of a class of

officials and academics exists, and again, difficulties in defining boundaries within this group exist, despite the fact that the distinction between those who had an academic culture and those who did not was clear. On the idea that the two groups overlapped and weren't entirely identical, there is also agreement. There were landlords who were at least reasonably wealthy but who had no formal education, and there were degree holders who had no real estate. It's unclear how much of the two overlap exactly.

But to stop here would be to miss the most important points. Even if we knew the precise percentage of people who belonged to both categories, such as landowners and officials or academics, we wouldn't know very much. The proportion of bone and muscle in the human body is not enough information for any physiologist. He is interested in how bone and muscle interact throughout bodily functions. Understanding the relationship between landed property, having a degree, and holding political office in China requires the same sort of understanding.

The family, or more specifically the patrilineal lineage, was the vehicle that connected all of them. The lineage was longer and known as the clan in the agriculturally more productive regions, notably the South. The family functioned as a social mechanism in the way described below. The tradition of investing wealth gained via Imperial service in land persisted long into the modern era. This property was amassed by a guy for the benefit of the family line. Any family with aristocratic aspirations had to support a degree holder or potential degree holder in the fairly legitimate expectation that he would obtain a position of authority and utilize it to further the family's material riches. The scholar completed the cycle by recovering or increasing the family riches via the imperial position and maintaining the prestige of the bloodline. The clan operated in the same manner, even though it was a bigger group with a sizable percentage of straightforward peasants. Although the lowest class of peasant with skill and determination may theoretically attain official status, the lack of a widespread system of popular education often required the student to have affluent family backing for the many years of grueling study. Sometimes an intelligent youngster from an impoverished home might get support from a rich family whose children lacked scholastic potential. One of the most significant aspects of Chinese culture was the relationship between position and riches via bloodline. For these reasons, it is acceptable to refer to this affluent group of scholars, officials, and landowners as the gentry.6 If we carefully consider each of these factors in turn, more significant elements of the link will become apparent.

With no presumption that the landlord played a greater

We may start with him as his importance is lower than the official's. The first issue that comes to mind is how, in the absence of feudal compulsions, he was able to enlist the help of the peasants. Although specifics are sparse and the topic has not yet been thoroughly examined by academics, the overall response is rather obvious: by tenancy arrangements that do not vary in any material respect from those under contemporary capitalism. At least by the start of the nineteenth century, the tenancy was essentially a form of sharecropping supplemented by hired labor.7 The landlord, whose European and particularly English connotations have some persuasive grounds, it seems pedantic to boggle at this word after it has come to be used widely to denote the landed upper class in both China and Russia. For reasons against using it for China, see Ho, Ladder of Success, 40.

See Chang, Gentry for a definition of the gentry that attempts to separate degree-holding from laItdownership. The limitations of confining the term to degree holders are discussed in

Freedman's assessment in Pacific AF- fairs, XXIX, 78–80. Ho, Ladder of Success, 38–41, contrasts Chang on important issues such the social standing of those who paid for degrees and those who had elementary degrees. Due to his little understanding of the economic situation, the book contributes very little to the issues discussed here. He just briefly discusses the secondary issue of commercial riches when discussing money as a factor in social mobility, and he says very little about landed wealth.

Regarding these and other issues, I'm delighted to express my gratitude to Owen Lattimore, who provided me with in-depth written feedback on a previous draft. Several of them that I found to be particularly incisive after reading a number of other sources have been practically verbatim integrated in my essay. The typical defense that he bears no responsibility for the ideas stated here properly captures the reality since the evidence elsewhere appears to me to lead in a different way.

I haven't found a single monographic treatment. In Ho, Population, 117-'z6, there is a short historical and geographic treatment. Also take note of Hsiao, Rural China, 384, 385, and 389; Chang, Income, 117. A has been combed through by Hsiao. a vast amount of information, most of it from local gazetteers, was culled, organized, and quoted as much directly as possible with the minimum amount of commentary. The result is essentially akin to a clipping file from newspapers and travelers' comments on the provided the land, and the peasants provided the work, was clearly a more significant figure in some places than in others. Each received a portion of the produce. Since the landlord seldom produced land in the same manner that a peasant produced labor, we already have one useful indication of the services provided by the Imperial bureaucracy: it ensured his hold over the property. A wealthy peasant who did not want to be an academic,

However, he would labor in the fields like any other person, even if he had expectations for his kid. But the scholar didn't use his hands in his job. Despite the scholarly landowners living. Out in the countryside, they seemed to have had no involvement at all in the actual labor of farming, not even a supervising role, unlike their English and German colleagues. As we will see in due order, their social "position provides the sharpest of all contrasts to the Japanese master. Many of the distinctions between the political destiny of China and Japan, in contemporary times as well as earlier, may be linked to this discrepancy.

As long as one keeps in mind that such materials tend to overemphasize the slightly shady aspect of society fundamental flaws rarely find direct mention except in the infrequent observations of art acute travelers such a book is extremely useful, more useful than the attempts to gather dubious statistics that frequently appear. In accordance with this structure, the landlords had a clear stake in what is amorphously referred to as overpopulation. Peasants in excess raised the rent prices for the landlord. If one peasant was so hungry that he was prepared to offer half the harvest in exchange for land to farm, another who was even more needy may offer a little bit more. Of fact, the relationship was more complex than just this kind of rivalry. He was unable to tighten the screw all the way because of tradition as well as his personal interest in the caliber of his renters. However, a key factor in the circumstance was the landlord's desire to have many peasants as at least possible tenants.

TWQ traits merit further consideration. Population growth would benefit the landlord only if a powerful government was in place to maintain law and order, protect his property rights, and ensure the payment of rent. The Imperial bureaucracy was responsible for this duty. Therefore,

the overpopulation was not just a mathematical ratio of land to men, but rather had distinct economic and political factors in China, Japan, and India. Second, the institutional issues predate the influence of the West by a very long time. Imperial fear that the dike system would be breached by the population tide. Government junks transported it via the Grand Canal under the prosperous Manchu period, a construction marvel on par with the pyramids. The yearly trip of the junks served as a major source of food for the Imperial court, a sizable number of scholar-officials, and a portion of the Imperial armed forces. Grain Tribute System, Hinton, esp. 5, 97. The arrangement draws a telling comparison to Paris's grain supply during the same period of royal absolutism. The Parisian system was incredibly disorganized, beyond of the reach of the law and effective administrative supervision, and it was largely dependent on the money economy's ability to stimulate individual greed.

As previously said, the landlord relied on the Imperial bureaucracy to protect his property rights and to compel the payment of rent in cash or in kind. He used the bureaucracy in a number of other significant ways to further his goals. In order to allow his tenants to produce high-quality crops, the landlord had a keen interest in adequate irrigation. Local landlord families thus applied persistent pressure on the government to build water-control systems; but, they could only do so successfully if one of its members had an academic degree and the official relations that such a degree made feasible. This kind of wire-pulling, which replaces direct supervision throughout the agricultural cycle, seems to be the principal economic contribution of the landlord.

The work of provincial landlord cliques on larger initiatives on a provincial scale. The work of even more powerful cliques with a national perspective was done on imperial ambitions. According to Owen Lattimore, there was a strong minister and a strong group of landowners behind each industrial initiative. These facts, in my opinion, put the ideas of water regulation and Asian bureaucracy into proper perspective. Second, the largest monetary rewards were supplied by the bureaucracy rather than the land itself. Due to equal inheritance distribution in the absence of primogeniture, a rich family can find themselves reduced to poverty in a few generations. Sending someone with intellectual aptitudes into the bureaucracy was the key strategy for mitigating this unfortunate circumstance. This family member might increase the riches by amassing his wealth via for- mally unlawful but socially acceptable corruption.

Purchasing property as an investment and retiring there after a career in politics was a very common practice. Therefore, the bureaucracy served as a different means of extracting an economic surplus from both peasants and city inhabitants, about whom we will talk more in a moment. Although the one could not exist without the other, bureaucracy generally appears to have been a stronger and more effective weapon than landholding. Landed wealth emerged from and was dependent upon bureaucracy for its survival. The opponents of a condensed Marxist perspective have a good case on this front. Last but not least, for the landlord, Confucian doctrines and the examination system legitimized, at least in his own eyes, his superior social status and freedom from manual labor as long as some member of the Lastly, the main function of the Imperial bureaucracy in actual practice was keeping the peace and collecting taxes that were later transformed into books, painting, poetry, concubines, and similar paraphernalia that in other civilizations also make life.

Before the Western invasion, which started in earnest in the middle of the nineteenth century, when internal disintegration had already made one of its cyclical reappearances, the challenge of maintaining peace in China was primarily a domestic one. Overall, the danger from outside was just intermittent barbarian invasions. They adapted to the dominant societal structure after they

had conquered enough territory and established themselves as a new dynasty. Chinese emperors did not have to contend with ongoing military rivalry on roughly similar footing with other emperors throughout the Imperial period. Therefore, unlike in France and even more so in Prussia, the standing army did not consume a significant percentage of the resources of the community or impose a bias on the growth of the state. Even while there were some parallels in a period of deterioration, maintaining the peace wasn't an issue that could be solved by monitoring wealthy barons at home. Instead, it was about avoiding pressuring the peasants too much lest they escape and turn into bandits or fuel an uprising headed by disgruntled upper-class elements [7], [8].

CONCLUSION

In addition to focusing on local and global dynamics, such as economic growth, security issues, and regional cooperation, the study of Asian political processes also takes into account these factors. Some of the world's fastest-growing economies are found in Asia, along with complicated security issues including territorial conflicts and nuclear proliferation. As a result, Asian nations have worked to create regional groups and alliances, like the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), that may foster peace and harmony in the area. Insights into the variables influencing political development and governance in the area may be gained via ongoing study and analysis of Asian political processes. This may contribute to a fuller knowledge of the political difficulties and possibilities confronting Asia in the twenty-first century and can inspire policies and practices aimed at strengthening democracy, human rights, and social justice.

REFERENCES

[1]   V. N. Konyshev and A. A. Sergunin, "Orient is a delicate matter: Military in political processes in Asian countries," *P. (Russian Fed.*, 2019, doi: 10.17976/JPPS/2019.01.13.

[2]   Y. Evron, "Implications of China's Belt and Road Initiative for Japan's Involvement in the Middle East," *Contemp. Rev. Middle East*, 2018, doi: 10.1177/2347798918776712.

[3]   N. Choi, "Women's political pathways in southeast asia," *Int. Fem. J. Polit.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/14616742.2018.1523683.

[4]   Y. Danayiyen, K. Lee, M. Choi, and Y. Il Lee, "Model predictive control of uninterruptible power supply with robust disturbance observer," *Energies*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/en12152871.

[5]   M. Pichler, M. Bhan, and S. Gingrich, "The social and ecological costs of reforestation. Territorialization and industrialization of land use accompany forest transitions in Southeast Asia," *Land use policy*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.105180.

[6]   A. Kazantsev, S. Medvedeva, and I. Safranchuk, "Between Russia and China: Central Asia in Greater Eurasia," *J. Eurasian Stud.*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/1879366521998242.

[7]   L. Mabon and W. Y. Shih, "Urban greenspace as a climate change adaptation strategy for subtropical Asian cities: A comparative study across cities in three countries," *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2021.102248.

[8]   J. C. Lee and S. Kye, "Racialized Assimilation of Asian Americans," *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2016. doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-081715-074310.

CHAPTER 15

COLLAPSE OF THE IMPERIAL SYSTEM

Dr. Sireesha Nanduri, Assistant Professor, Department of Finance,
CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email id-sireesh_n@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The collapse of the imperial system refers to the decline and eventual fall of imperial political structures in various regions of the world. This phenomenon has been observed throughout history, from ancient civilizations such as the Roman Empire to more recent empires such as the Soviet Union. One of the key factors that contribute to the collapse of imperial systems is their inherent instability and fragility. Imperial systems rely on a complex network of political, economic, and social relationships to maintain power, and are often challenged by external pressures, such as economic crises, military conflicts, and social upheaval. As these pressures mount, the imperial system may become increasingly vulnerable to internal divisions and external threats, ultimately leading to its collapse.

KEYWORDS:

Decentralization, Dynastic decline, Extraterritoriality, Imperialism, Industrialization, Military defeat.

INTRODUCTION

One of the system's core structural flaws may have been the lack of any reliable safeguards against such a squeeze. Fair and effective tax collection served the dynasty's interests. However, it had very little staff and minimal resources to make sure that this was done. The individual official, on the other hand, had a tremendous motive to enrich himself as much as possible while abstaining from overt acts of corruption and extortion that would jeopardize his career. This issue merits more investigation. Any effort to develop a sizable bureaucracy in a preindustrial society quickly runs into the problem that it is exceedingly difficult to gather enough resources from the populace to pay salaries and so make officials reliant on their superiors. The way the rulers attempt to overcome this obstacle has a significant influence on the whole social system. The Russian approach, due to Russia's vast geography, was the giving of estates with serfs in exchange for service in tsarist officialdom. The French alternative involved the selling of offices. The Chinese responded by allowing corruption to be more or less open. According to Max Weber's estimate, an official's extra-legal income was around four times his normal wage; a more recent investigator comes up with a far higher estimate of between sixteen and nineteen times the usual compensation. We may be comfortable with the knowledge that it was substantial but the precise sum will likely remain a historical mystery [1]–[3].

Naturally, this technique significantly decreased the efficiency of central control, which fluctuated greatly throughout the course of history. The officer at the bottom of the hierarchy,

administering a hsien, which typically consisted of a single walled city and the surrounding countryside, was in theory in charge of at least 20,000 people and often much more.lS As a short-term solution, it is essentially nonexistent. Tax collection was carried out by runners from the magistrate's office, a low class of persons who were prohibited from passing the exams and improving their lot. They collected their part of the taxes while on the job.19 In the strictest meaning of the word, the system was extremely exploitative in that it extracted more resources from society than it gave back in the form of desired services. On the other hand, it also had to leave the underlying population in large part to its own devices since it had to be exploitative in order to operate at all. There was simply no way to alter people's everyday lives the way current totalitarian governments do, or even to the level that officially democratic ones alter them during a protracted national emergency. As will be covered in more detail momentarily, there were fruitless efforts to govern the people's way of life. However, comparative to neglect and greed, widespread premeditated brutality was beyond the purview of the institution.

DISCUSSION

It will be beneficial to note one additional structural element before going into greater detail about the more particular issues related to the system's last anguish, in part because of its comparative importance to Japan. Particularly in its latter years, the examination system tended to produce an excess of future bureaucrats.21 A sizable number of degree applicants, who served as a bridge between individuals who were eligible to hold office and the ordinary people, were at the bottom of the official ranking system. Experts disagree on the issue of whether or not they should be considered normal gentry members. Their challenging position at the bottom of the privilege ladder is reminiscent of the lowest samurai levels in nineteenth-century Japan. Both provided the building blocks of the challenge to the established order. While a sizeable portion of this population gave Japan much of the drive for modernisation, in China this energy generally wasted itself in futile uprisings and insurrections against the established order. Without a doubt, the examination system's constriction impact contributed to the discrepancy.

However, the causes are far more complex. They are connected to how Chinese society held back modernisation until it was too late for piecemeal acceptance. We may not be aware of some of the more recent components of this enormous issue. The Gentry and the Business World Despite occasional attempts, imperial Chinese civilization never produced an urban commerce and industrial elite similar to that which emerged during the latter stages of feudalism in Western Europe. One of the more evident causes of the difference may be attributed to the empire's effectiveness in unifying the nation. Because they represented a versatile source of power in this multifaceted fight, the merchants in the cities in Europe were able to penetrate the old rural culture. This was made possible by the conflict between Pope and Emperor, between monarchs and nobility. It is significant that Italy, where the feudal system was typically weaker, saw the first breakthrough in Europe.

Additionally, the Chinese examination system turned ambitious people away from "commerce." This characteristic may be seen in one of the later, fruitless attempts at economic development in the fifteenth century. French historian OA goes as far as to claim that the aristocracy and a "grande bourgeoisie financiere" were vying for supremacy at the period, but he adds importantly that this new bourgeoisie was directing its offspring toward the exams.24 Another historian offers the intriguing hypothesis that the spread of printing may have strengthened the mandarinate's capacity for assimilation. Some of the lesser merchants were able to acquire enough literary culture thanks to printing in order to be appointed to a position of authority. Even

yet, the cost of taking the decreased slightly. He offers some compelling proof of the allure of the Imperial service. A few of these businessmen had themselves castrated in order to become eunuchs and hold positions near the king. Those who castrated themselves had an edge over others since they already had the education that regular eunuchs were not allowed to pursue [4], [5].

If one digs a little further, one can easily see that money-making activities posed a significant threat to the scholar officials since they served as a substitute for social rank and a ladder of prestige. No amount of Confucian rhetoric or opulent law could be expected to ever be able to hide the truth that wealthy people could afford to purchase the finer things in life, including even a sizable amount of reverence. If the situation were allowed to spiral out of control, every piece of classical culture that was laboriously gained would be rendered obsolete. At the heart of this clash of cultures and value systems were strong material interests. The Confucian classics provided those who desired it a justification for tradition, which was a weak barrier to commerce. In any case, the gentry were wise enough to ensure that the crisis would not spiral out of control in the near term.

To keep the gains for themselves, they taxed trade. Alternately, they made it a state monopoly and retained control of the highest-paying employment. The most significant monopoly was in the salt trade. The authorities' behavior was mostly opportunistic. Similar to the land, commerce was something to be milked for the cultured upper class. We may see once again how the Imperial bureaucracy was used to transfer resources from the populace to the rulers, who were vigilant in the meantime to suppress any advances that would jeopardize their privileges. It was inevitable that when the Imperial machinery began to deteriorate, which became apparent before the end of the eighteenth century, its ability to absorb and control economic aspects would suffer. Even in full power, the Imperial system could hardly have withstood the new forces eroding it. Because underlying these forces was the military and diplomatic ferocity of the West, which was only restrained when one power's avarice halted its competitors' cupidity. The customary control of the scholar-official had broken down in the coastal towns during the second part of the nineteenth century. There had already developed a new hybrid society in which people with a classical education no longer held sway over power and social standing.

After the Opium War ended in 1842, the compradores expanded over all of China's treaty ports. These guys functioned in a variety of positions as go-betweens between the foreign merchants and the deteriorating Chinese officialdom. Their stance was unclear. They might amass large sums of money via dubious means and live lives of cultivated comfort. On the other hand, many Chinese denounced them as the agents of foreign demons who were destroying Chinese society's foundations.28 From this point on, a significant portion of China's social and diplomatic history is a chronicle of Chinese efforts to control this hybrid society and of conflicting efforts by bigger nations to utilize it as an entry wedge for their economic and political objectives.

The provincial aristocracy, who aspired at the time to use new technology for their own separatist aims, cast a long shadow over Chinese industry when it started to develop independently in a small fashion in the 1860s. The early factories, including arsenals, navy yards, and the like, were only concerned with military issues since they were at the vanguard of society. Because of the rulers' interest in industries that would increase their authority, the scenario superficially resembles the mercantilist period in Western historical history. The distinctions are significantly more significant. The governments in Europe were powerful and continuing to become stronger. The Manchu dynasty was in power in China. Because the commercial and industrial component

was foreign and largely outside of Imperial authority, a mercantilist strategy in the style of a Colbert was unthinkable. Provincial power centers led China's industrialisation drive, with minimal assistance from the Imperial authority.29 Therefore, rather of being a uniting element, it was more disruptive. You may anticipate that any commercial and industrial aspects in the making will resort to the political organizations that really possess real power for protection. If it is the king, it is wonderful since it will increase his power. In contrast, if it's a local official, it won't be. Marxists overemphasize how Western imperialists impeded China's industrial growth. None of this would have been possible without earlier domestic-only repression.

The Chinese business class didn't start to clearly demonstrate an end to government dominance and influence until 1910.so According to a new research, Chinese merchants were even seemed well on their way to independence from reliance on foreigners by the end of the eighteenth century. However, the crucial sectors stayed under foreign hands for a significantly longer period of time. The whole domestic industrial and commercial impetus remained meager. An estimated 20,000 "factories" were reported to have existed in China by the time the Imperial Empire ended. Only 363 of them used mechanical power. Only human or animal power was employed by the others.

As a result, China and Russia both had a numerically limited and politically reliant middle class when they both entered the modern age. As it did in five years, this stratum "moved toward single-handed control over foreign expos, dominance of the maritime customs revenue, monopoly of armaments production, and complete control of the military forces in the northern half of the empire" without developing an independent ideology of its own. Additionally, there was a significant fusion between the aristocracy and metropolitan business, financial, and industrial elites throughout time. In an effort to revive the core of the Imperial system political support for landlordism with a combination of domestic gangsterism and a veneer of pseudo-Confucianism that displays intriguing similarities to Western fascism this amalgam provided the main social underpinning for the Kuomintang, which will be discussed in more detail later. This combination was largely the result of the general inability to make the switch from subsistence to commercial farming. Now our focus will be on the causes of this failure.

Lack of Adoption of C01111erciai Agriculture

A cognitive and psychological argument why the Confucian ideal of idealized leisure was incompatible with the systematic pursuit of profit even in agriculture quickly runs into difficulties. I believe that Western study has overstated the importance of the Chinese upper class's patronizing attitude toward the barbarians of the West. There were certain Chinese gentry members who, as was said in the preceding section, "did not hesitate to do so" when given the chance to adopt the technological civilization of the West and even some of its social customs. One careful scholar noted in a piece about the early stages of Western influence that "a conspicuous phase of the period before 1894 was the initiation of industrial and mechanical enterprises by prom- inent members of the official class, that group ordinarily thought of in the West as composed of arch conservatives."3G The study of Western technology was seen by serious Chinese philosophers of the 1890s as nearly a cure-all for China's economic backwardness, according to a more modern student.86 .Even if there was a cultural barrier to technological advancement, it doesn't seem insurmountable. Since the Chinese upper class did show a great deal of interest in technology for industrial and military reasons, it seems to reason that given how essential agriculture was to their whole way of life, they would show an even

greater interest in it. Instead, they showed little such curiosity, with a few sporadic outliers, limited to programming statements.

A closer look at the material and political circumstances in China at the time the modern world began to have an influence might lead to a more plausible answer. Although China had cities, there was no rapidly expanding urban population with at least modestly distributed and rising income that might serve as a catalyst for market-driven rationalized manufacturing. If the circumstances at a later time is any indication, peasant t-ruck gardening the production of fruit and vegetables that might be carried into the market by hand is primarily stimulated by the presence of a town or metropolis. It's possible that imperial policy throughout the dynasty's early and prosperous years discouraged the development of huge landed estates. Large estates of this kind did rule over parts of the Empire in the second half of the nineteenth century. Although additional research is necessary, it seems that a large estate was often just an amalgamation of smaller ones, meaning that it was made up of more peasants who paid the owner a higher total rent. Here, we go close to the heart of the issue. Chinese landlord-tenant relationships served as a political tool to extract economic surpluses from the peasantry and transform them into the comforts of civilisation. There wasn't much of a need to modify it and maybe even less of a chance to do so in the absence of a sizable metropolitan market. Under the Empire, ambitious and motivated people sought for administrative positions to increase their family's holdings.

Therefore, it does not seem that the Chinese aristocracy had an underlying inability to adapt that prevented them from adjusting well to contemporary society. The absence of motivation and the existence of other, more suitable choices in this historical context were more significant. There wasn't enough of a market for the majority of the time to justify the effort. When and when the market finally emerged, it transformed the aristocracy into political rentiers as opposed to agricultural entrepreneurs. Few people took this action. However, this minority served as the vanguard of a strong historical tendency. It is really difficult to see what more they might have done in light of the circumstances they encountered. The demise of the Chinese gentry, although not the most repulsive governing class in history, has its share of tragedy, just as the collapse of every ruling elite.

Warlords' ascent and the fall of the Imperial System

The conflict between the nobility and the crown has long been one of the deciding factors in politics in all of Europe's major nations. Everywhere, including Russia, one can eventually see the emergence of estates, or Stiinde in German, status groups with a strong sense of corporate identity and widely acknowledged privileges that they jealously defended against other groups and, in particular, the monarch. Depending on the circumstances and period in which it started, the advent of modernisation had a range of effects on this conflict. On the continent, it was far less so or even generally negative, though there was typically at some stage an aristocratic liberal resistance. In England, it was advantageous for the growth of parliamentary democracy.

The Chinese landed upper classes did not establish any strong principled resistance to the Imperial system throughout the time period under study. There were certainly many who used Western parliamentary ideas as intellectual toys, but there was no significant political movement of opposition with roots in Chinese circumstances. There were several conditions that made such a development more likely. The Chinese official class, which includes degree holders who are landlords or not, had a strong sense of corporate identity and privileges and immunities that were widely acknowledged by the public and the Emperor.39 Aristocrats in medieval Europe

established institutions such as privileges, immunities, and a feeling of corporate identity, which some historians believe played a significant role in the movement toward parliamentary democracy. Any similar initiative would have encountered even larger obstacles in China. In Chinese culture, land would not be readily used as a foundation for political power distinct from the political system that made it profitable. The Imperial system was a means of acquiring property as well as a means of making property pay.Because circumstances typically prevented the emergence of a liberal aristocratic opposition, China was less able to respond creatively to a wholly novel historical challenge. This fact also helps to explain one novel aspect of the Chinese case: the central government's almost total dissolution. Under the weight of Western blows, a regime that had many defining characteristics that had survived for centuries, simply broke away in less than a century.

There was undoubtedly a short time when the central government effectively vanished in Russia in response to somewhat comparable circumstances. However, from the standpoint of basic socioeconomic dynamics, Russia's moment of collapse hardly qualifies as more than a passing incident. On the other hand, the last stage of the near-anarchy lasted a lot longer in China. One might date it at the very least from the founding of the Republic in I9I i until the Kuomintang's decisive win in 1927. In addition to being different from the Russian experience, the latter also began a weak reactionary phase that will be covered in more depth later. I'll attempt to highlight a few of the reasons in this part!As the ancient structure crumbled over their heads, I watched in horror and wanted to call attention to how the top layers were able to preserve themselves.

During the last fifty years of its existence, the Manchu government was confronted with a significant problem. On the one hand, it required more money to quell domestic unrest and deal with adversaries abroad. However, it was unable to do so without completely destroying the system of aristocratic privileges. It would have been necessary to promote business and industry in order to generate enough money. It was considerably more difficult to implement such a program since foreigners ran the customs. Raising the government's income would also have required the implementation of an effective taxation system and ending the officials' practice of pocketing the majority of what the government obtained from its subjects. As a result, the government would have had to cut off a significant source of gentry revenue and promote the rise of a social class that would have inevitably competed more successfully more successfully with the aristocracy. Such a route was quite improbable as long as the aristocracy supported the government. In order to pursue policies that he believes will result in more advantages and stronger support for the regime, a cunning and powerful leader like Bismarck can afford to alienate large portions of his constituency. A leader who succeeds in such a wager is guaranteed a prominent position in history textbooks, the "judgment of history" that all politicians invoke. No leader can simply ignore his core base of support and demand that it end its political life. Given the conditions, it is accurate to state that effective reform in nineteenth-century China was improbable, but this does not indicate that the government did not try. Both the government and the aristocracy refused to let themselves be carried away by the current of history. Reform initiatives were made, but their failure highlights the significant challenges the rulers faced.

The T'ung-chih Restoration was the most active attempt and was detailed by Mary C. Wright in an insightful monograph. It lasted twelve years from 1862 to 1874. With a steadfastly retrograde policy, the eminent authorities who oversaw the movement dealt with the issues of domestic rebellion and foreign invasion. One of their key strategies was to work to improve the gentry's standing. They employed tax relief largely to aid landowners while maintaining strict observance

of its economic and legal advantages, restoring the status quo ante in property titles where revolution had upended it. They saw trade and business as "parasitic excrescences" on a well-organized agricultural community. While they were not entirely unaware of the economic and social issues facing their society, they mostly discussed selecting the "right" guy with the "right" character to carry out the "right" deed, with "right" being defined in Confucian terms of course. Such a resurgence of conventional language often happens when the governing class is forced into a difficult situation. The T'ung-chih, nevertheless Restoration was successful for the time being, but this very success could have sped up the end since it temporarily boosted the elements who were most hostile to a major reorganization of Chinese society. The violent destruction of the social and class structures that the Restoration politicians aimed to rebuild may have been facilitated in part by their actions.

The Dowager Empress instituted a rush of changes during the first years of the twentieth century, but these reforms were of a different kind and highlighted a distinct facet of the issue. We can only highlight her initiatives to improve the educational system and eliminate the test system. The throne then declared in 1906 that it would adhere to the idea of constitutional government, however it would not take into action until the nation was ready. In addition to this, she offered some persuasive arguments for reforming the bureaucracy. She fired four of her six ministers in the Grand Council, demonstrating her seriousness when her ideas were met with obstinate resistance.42 Even while this burst of reforming vigor fizzled out and contrasts almost absurdly with this irascible archreactionary and skillful intriguer's prior actions, to brush it off with a grin as a pointless gesture would be to misread a telling incident. Her behavior pattern clearly shows that her true objective was to construct a powerful, centralized bureaucratic government that she would be able to directly manage on an individual basis, approximately in the mold of a Germany or a Japan.48 The key argument for our position is that China lacked the social foundation for such a government, much more so than Russia did. A coalition between segments of the old agrarian ruling classes, which have significant political clout and a precarious economic position, and a newly emerging commercial and industrial elite, which has some economic clout but political and social disadvantages, is the key component of such regimes, as also demonstrated by the experience of Italy and Spain. Native urban business groupings in China at the time were not powerful enough to serve as a beneficial partner for such an alliance. Before such a reactionary effort could be made under new auspices, those of the Kuomintang, with at least some chance of success, a quarter of a century would pass [6], [7].

When significant changes in the status and nature of the gentry were occurring in the later part of the nineteenth century, the ground had already been laid. The material foundation of the scholar-official's position and its importance in Chinese society had been slowly eroding, which had led to the collapse of the Confucian academic ideal and, with it, the conventional system of status in China as a whole. The government's uncomfortable situation, where it is torn between the need for more money and the concern about harming the gentry's position, has previously come to our attention. The measures it took to save face led to the regime's eventual collapse. After the Taiping Rebellion damaged large portions of China, the government looked for new sources of income and widened the back door to state service by allowing more people to buy rank rather than gain it via the traditional method of exams.44 The hierarchy was not swamped by new, rich recruits, but the examination's reputation was almost likely diminished, and a key pillar of the previous system was seriously undermined. The examination system was officially abolished by proclamation in 1905 after efforts to modernize it failed and angered traditional intellectuals

worried that their knowledge would become obsolete. The system teetered for a few years under its own momentum since there was nothing to replace it with.

The gentry increasingly took control of local affairs on their own, foreshadowing the protracted period of anarchy and internecine conflict that did not truly come to an end until the Communist victory in 1849. This occurred as the possibility of exercising the traditional role of the scholar declined and the power of the central government weakened. The aristocracy simply collected their own taxes in several areas of the nation and banned others from paying them to the federal government.45 The Imperial authorities accelerated disruptive movements by instituting the infamous likin, a levy levied on shops and traveling merchants. The tax was an immediate response to the Taiping Rebellion's financial needs, which it was unable to meet via conventional means. It should come as no surprise that a number of Restoration leaders preferred the likin to a higher tax on land. The Imperial government lost control of the levy, but the tax itself continued to assist provide an economic foundation for new regional authorities that served as models for the warlord period [8], [9].

CONCLUSION

Ongoing investigation and study may provide important insights into the causes of imperial regimes' demise as well as the chances and difficulties that present themselves thereafter. This may contribute to a fuller knowledge of the intricate political processes that define our society and can guide policies and practices intended to advance political stability, social fairness, and economic success. Both for the imperial power and the rest of the globe, serious political, social, and economic repercussions might result from the collapse of the imperial order. The fall of an imperial system may sometimes result in political unrest, social unrest, and economic hardship, but it can also provide opportunity for democratic and progressive political reform.

REFERENCES

[1]   E. Sevostyanova and O. Ul'yanova, "'Do not deem the measures taken as violence...': public charity and governance in Transbaikal during the political regime of the ataman G. Semenov," *Genes. исторические исследования*, 2021, doi: 10.25136/2409-868x.2021.10.34223.

[2]   S. Zhao, "Rethinking the Chinese world order: The imperial cycle and the rise of China," *J. Contemp. China*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/10670564.2015.1030913.

[3]   J. Preiser-Kapeller, "Networks and the Resilience and Fall of Empires: a Macro-Comparison of the Imperium Romanum and Imperial China," *Siedlungsforsch. – Archaeol. Geschichte, Geogr.*, 2019.

[4]   Z. Xun, "The discourse of disability in modern China," *Patterns Prejudice*, 2002, doi: 10.1080/003132202128811394.

[5]   P. Stephenson, "Byzantium transformed, c. 950-1200," *Mediev. Encount.*, 2004, doi: 10.1163/1570067043077788.

[6]   J. L. Cucchisi, "The Causes and Effects of the Chinese Civil War, 1927-1949," *Set. Hall Univ. Diss. Theses*, 2002.

[7]   P. R. Williams, "Rethinking disaster-induced collapse in the demise of the Andean highland states: Wari and Tiwanaku," *World Archaeol.*, 2002, doi: 10.1080/00438240120107422.

[8]   C. Reus-Smit, "Struggles for individual rights and the expansion of the international system," *Int. Organ.*, 2011, doi: 10.1017/S0020818311000038.

[9]   J. Fairbank K., "The Cambridge History of China, Volume 9, Part 1, The Ch'ing Empire to 1800," *Cambridge Hist. China*, 2002.

CHAPTER 16

ESSENTIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF REACTIONARY PHASE OF EUROPEAN RESPONSE TO INDUSTRIALISM

Vaibhav Goutham Suresh, Assistant Professor, Department of General Management,
CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id- vaibhavsuresh@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The reactionary phase of the European response to industrialism refers to a period of political and social conservatism that emerged in the 19th century as a response to the rapid social and economic changes brought about by the Industrial Revolution. This period was characterized by a focus on preserving traditional social structures and values, and a resistance to the liberal and democratic movements that were emerging in response to the new industrial order. One of the essential characteristics of the reactionary phase was a belief in the superiority of aristocratic and hierarchical social structures over the new industrial order. Many of the political and intellectual leaders of this period believed that the Industrial Revolution was undermining traditional social relationships and eroding the values of community and solidarity. They sought to preserve these traditional values by promoting a return to pre-industrial social arrangements and limiting the influence of liberal and democratic movements.

KEYWORDS:

Anti-modernism, Aristocracy, Authoritarianism, Capitalism, Conservatism, Feudalism.

INTRODUCTION

The Manchu monarchy was overthrown in 1911, and the Republic was declared in 1912, but these events only provided indirect formal recognition for the reality that local satraps now had the actual authority, which they would hold for at least another 15 years. During this time, significant portions of the once-gentry clung to power either by becoming warlords or by forming alliances with certain militarists. The whole social and cultural system that had given them legitimacy was completely destroyed. Their successors were to be gangsters, landlords, or a mix of the two, a trend that existed in Imperial times but was not fully developed. A mutually beneficial connection existed between the warlord mobster and the landowner. The system of requisitions, taxes in kind and labor, which remained the primary method of forcing the peasants to fund the rural aristocracy, best exemplifies this. As a precursor to the alliance between business organizations and landowners that supported the Kuomintang, merchants also played a role.

Theoretically, the land tax served as the foundation for military requisitions. The system was very adaptable, mostly to the detriment of the peasant, who lost much of the protection he formerly enjoyed from imperial authorities and the code of restricted "legitimate" exploitation a

decline that had already been occurring for some time. The initial estimate of two catties of flour may increase to two and a half, the first estimate of three catties of hay to six, the initial estimate of four carts to sixteen, and so on. Grain traders who worked along with requisition collectors and often acted as landlords' agents might benefit by paying the debt when it became due, then increasing grain prices and splitting the difference between the fixed and market prices. Even after the soldiers had dispersed, continuing collections would sometimes be made. Larger landowners, who were often themselves militarists, typically forced their tenants to pay the requisitions on their behalf.48 There can be no question that there is terrible, man-made pain, even if I suspect the sources from whom this material was obtained may have exaggerated peasant misery [1]–[3].

When the time is right, we can talk about the peasantry's situation, but for now, we can focus on some other aspects of the warlord period. Under the mandarinate, the gentry's relationship to politics was continued via the system of requisitions, in which political authority fostered and encouraged economic power in order to further political power. The central government's dissolution left the landed upper class without one of the key safeguards that had kept Chinese society in its archaic form, albeit by no means free from significant fractures and rifts. According to some experts, the society had recovered in earlier times when a new and thriving dynasty came to power and the nobility and the peasants worked out a new modus vivendi. The twentieth century saw the emergence of new forces, and the old governing class's heirs would eventually turn to new allies without success. That is the story of the Kuomintang, and now we may discuss what happened to them.

Even though China's continued reliance on foreigners and its subordination to agrarian interests forced it to play a very different role than its Western European counterpart by the 1920s, commercial and industrial interests had already begun to play a significant role in Chinese political and social life. A numerically small but politically important portion of the landowners close to the port towns had already started to join with this class and transform into rentiers, as will be shown in more detail in a moment. The urban laborers had also made an erratic and violent entrance onto the historical scene.

DISCUSSION

The Kuomintang started acting under this circumstance. The account of its ascent to power has already been presented in sufficient length for this context. The most important issues for our purposes seem to be the following, notwithstanding the fact that they are still somewhat muddled by controversy. The Kuomintang, operating from of its stronghold in the south, by late 1927 had gained control of a sizable portion of China with significant help from domestic Communists and the Soviet Union. Up until this point, its success had largely been attributable to its capacity to harness and ride the waves of peasant and worker unhappiness. As a result, the social policy of the Kuomintang set it apart from the warlords and provided it an edge over them. There was a moment when people had great expectations that the Kuomintang's troops may defeat the warlords and unite China based on a revolutionary plan.

Although there was a formal union, this was not to be the case. Latent tensions among the many components that a program of nationalist unity had momentarily brought together came to the surface as a result of the Kuomintang's partial success. The landed upper classes, who supplied the armed force's commanders, were more concerned lest the peasants get out of control. Ironically enough, the Chinese Communists backed the gentry's successors at this time on the

grounds that the national revolution took priority over the social one, with some pushing from Moscow.50 The function of the city's merchants and bankers is less apparent. However, they were hardly any more excited than the aristocracy about the possibility of a Kuomintang triumph with a left-wing policy.

Due to a flurry of intrigue and a series of military coups, Chiang Kai-shek, who had strong control over a significant portion of the armed forces, was able to distance himself from the revolution under these circumstances. Chiang turned against the workers at the conclusion of this disengagement, following the traditional pattern of the agrarian-bourgeois alliance. On April 12, 1927, workers, intellectuals, and other people suspected of sympathizing with the Communists were massacred in large numbers by his agents and others present, including French, British, and Japanese police and military forces52. Chiang and his military apparatus, however, were not just a passive instrument of this alliance. Additionally, he went against the capitalists themselves, threatening them with imprisonment and death while confiscating their property and forcing them to take out loans.

Chiang's win marked the beginning of a new era in Chinese politics. The Kuomintang prioritized national unity above political and agricultural reform in both words and deeds. In actuality, this referred to the repression of communism and banditry in order to find a military solution to the agricultural crisis. To claim that this opportunity was doomed from the start would be overstating the case. Both Japan and Germany, a nation that also had to deal with the challenge of national unity, underwent modernization under reactionary aegis and with a heavy dosage of repression. The issues China faced, however, were far more challenging.

Agrarian factors are difficult to describe in any depth due to data gaps, particularly the virtually total lack of reliable statistics, which are far greater in the case of China than in the other nations examined for this book. However, the problem's general contours are pretty obvious. The first thing that has to be said is something bad. After the First World War, China was not a nation where a class of aristocratic proprietors of vast latifundia exploited a vast number of impoverished peasants and landless labour, with the possible exception of certain regions. However, highlighting this truth would significantly alter the perception of what was really happening. China was progressively evolving toward an absentee ownership structure with widening wealth disparities as a result of expanding trade and industry. The coastal regions, particularly those close to major cities, saw the most noticeable alteration. The fact that Chinese agriculture required a lot of manual labor and little in the way of expensive implements or live stock a few wealthy families in the wheat-growing North did have horses is so well known as to hardly need mentioning.

However, tenancy issues were acute in many areas of the interior as well. However, in these areas, they appear to be more the legacy of previous practices than the results of new forces. As per usual, Tawney uses flowing classical writing to place the argument in its political and social context. According to him, the distinctive characteristic of Chinese agriculture was "economy of space, economy of materials, economy of implements, economy of fodder, economy of fuel, economy of waste products, economy of everything except for forests, which have been plucked with prodigal recklessness to the ruin of the soil, and of the labor of human beings, whom social habits have made abundant and cheap."

Without a history of privileged feudal lands, the landlord-tenant relationship had many characteristics of a commercial transaction. However, it was still a preindustrial economic

enterprise that was strongly influenced by regional tradition. Tenancy as a statistical category thus included a broad range of circumstances. Some landlords who took on excessive debt to purchase property may be in a worse situation than many renters. In contrast, those who rented land could be either wealthy individuals with extra money and tools, or else poor peasants with little to no land, whose least misfortune could put them in a situation that was close to slavery56. This illustrates how difficult it is to relate the specific terms "landlord" and "peasant" to any overarching notion of social classes. Nevertheless, one must avoid succumbing to the opposite delusion, which holds that social classes cannot be discussed since the statistics fail to clearly highlight them. A more challenging issue that will be addressed in due order is the degree to which there was an intense class war in the countryside [4]–[6].

It is important to draw the reader's attention to a few statistical estimations. Land in China was nearly totally turned into private property by the first part of the 20th century. Only roughly 7% was controlled by the State. The remaining 93% was mostly in the control of private persons. Approximately three-quarters of this were held by the farmer himself, and approximately one-fourth was rented.57 These numbers would appear to suggest that tenancy was not a major issue. Regional breakdowns provide a different picture. According to the most reliable estimate, ownership made up about seven-eighths of the land in the North's wheat-growing regions58. What little tenancy there was frequently took the form of share renting, which tenants typically preferred in regions at high risk of flood or drought.

One source claims that in a region in northeastern China that eventually came under Communist control, land- lordism was obviously pervasive and deeply ingrained in the social structure. In the South, especially in the rice-growing regions, the landlord was a considerably more significant role. In the rice region as a whole, three-fifths of the land was still held, but throughout numerous provinces, the area of leased property reached forty percent and more.61 Close to the major cities, permanent ownership was uncommon. Here, by the late 1920s, if not earlier, the absentee landlord had established himself as the typical figure.62 The map thus depicts a well-known historical narrative of a society in which commercial influences were eroding peasant proprietorship and concentrating wealth in the hands of a new social formation, a clash between elements of the old ruling class and new elements emerging in the cities.

The Kuomintang's agricultural strategy was one of striving to preserve or restore the status quo since this fusion served as the organization's primary social foundation. Polarization was further exacerbated by the Communist rival's de facto independence. the circumstance and make Kuomintang policies more repressive and conservative. A general description provided by an American academic who supports the Kuomintang is as follows: "The Communists act as the inheritors to temporarily fanatical peasant rebellions: the National Government and the Kuomintang to ascendant mandarinates."63 While undoubtedly not the complete picture, the assessment is nonetheless accurate. On the basis of personal observation, the same academic says elsewhere:

Because it does not encourage rural class warfare, existing class relations persist. The Party and the Government have attempted to implement the land reform projects, but not always successfully or completely. Due to its preoccupation with establishing a national government, a modern army, adequate funding, and eliminating some of the worst evils, like opium, bandits, and Communists, the Kuomintang has tolerated widespread sharecropping, land destitu- tion, usury, and rural despotism. The author of this text takes the Kuomintang's justifications for its policies at its value. The sentence, however, is significant evidence that the Kuomintang was

committed to sustaining the status quo in the rural, which is in and of itself a sort of class conflict. The Kuomintang's inability to carry out a serious overhauling of agrarian relations does not mean that there was no improvement at all. From time to time, the Kuomintang issued decrees and pro- enouncements aimed at improving the condition of the peasantry.05 In some areas, such as Szechuan, there was probably real improve- ment, as the rule of the Kuomintang replaced the exactions of the "warlord.06 In a number of areas, according to an American official report, landlords received an average of one-third of the gross farm receipts, or slightly less than the 37.5 percent set at one time as a ceiling by the Communists and by the Kuomintang in its legisla- tion.07 Liberal elements were able to promote efforts at gradual reform, such as the rural reconstruction movement, that were tolerated as long as they remained "politically " innocuous." The purpose of the reconstruction movement was "to improve the en- tire community without revolutionizing its class structure."OB Simi- lar was the "living social laboratory" of Ting Hsien, a· northern district of 400,000 people where for the first time intellectuals went deliberately to the people.09

Insofar as they fell short of "altering the elites' control of local life," the Kuomintang's reforms were window dressing, according to testimony from both allies and adversaries. There was no doubt about their continued rule in regions unaffected by reform efforts. Even a source as benevolent as Linebarger notes that "Many hsien are under local machines which permit wealthy conservatives to evade tax payments, steal government funds, and repress genuine farmer organization"70. The fall of the Imperial regime in China did not result in fundamental changes in the political and economic role of the landed upper classes across a large portion of the country. They behaved in the same way under the warlords and the Manchus as they did in the loosely united satrapies of the Kuomintang. This fact is made much more evident by sources that are critical of the Kuomintang. One Chinese author notes that the erstwhile aristocracy continued to have political influence in the village when discussing a modification of land regulations that the Kuomintang published in 1937 with the intention of promoting peasant farms.

"It cannot therefore be expected that these gentlemen will carry out with any degree of faithfulness the rental policies of a new law which would tend to loosen the economic strong stranglehold they have on the peasantry."71 Similarly, a study of local government revealed that elective procedures had not been put into effect at the hsien level in the majority of provinces due to both the ongoing political unrest and sabotage of the procedures by both local and national political parties. Of fact, it is quite unlikely that the situation was as dire everywhere as these disparate comments may imply. Given Chiang's deadly repression a few years before, it is notable in and of itself that they were published at all in the early to mid-thirties. Patriarchal attitudes and institutions remained to exist in many locations throughout this time to keep the most egregious types of exploitation under control, according to anthropological studies of many Chinese communi- ties. However, they show the persistence of ex-gentry rule at the local level as a component of the same picture. Thus, they support the idea that the Kuomintang's agricultural policy was an attempt to preserve the status quo.

The degree to which older institutions survived throughout the Kuomintang era varied significantly by location. As previously said, these geographical variations represent various eras of historical growth. Although they fell far short of the ideal of the classically educated gentry, some leading families in remote interior villages were still able to adopt some leisure class characteristics by accepting what would seem to Westerners to be an appallingly low standard of living, such as freedom from physical labor and adherence to a philosophy of contentment,

helped in some cases by opium smoking. Only wealthy landowners were accorded the title of "gentleman" there. The local garrison's ability to extend its protection limited the landowners' influence there as well, which was a major indicator of the times. These facts reveal a lot about the actual relationship between the military force, the bourgeoisie, and the wealthy landlords or neo-gentry during the latter part of the Kuomintang period. Areas on the edge of the county, removed from the police power of the town, "defied the landlords and paid no rent."

The strategic decisions made by the Kuomintang before and during the war with Japan provide more proof of the erstwhile landed upper classes' survival and ongoing political prominence. Commercial and industrial internal situations are widely recognized to exist. Chinese Village, I, 183–186 (C. Yang). According to C, in another hamlet close to Canton. There was one traditional learning instructor without a job, according to K. Yang's book Village in Transition (19). Large landowners did not participate in agricultural labor and resided in the city.

This fact could seem to be related to the Japanese blockade and occupation at first. However, given that the obstruction didn't start until I 937, this can hardly be the whole picture. The ongoing agricultural resistance to China's transformation into an industrial superpower seems to have been a crucial role. Before the war started, China preferred to import whatever equipment seemed essential rather than develop a domestic industrial base, according to a military historian without the slightest Marxist sympathies. Battle tactics also reflected China's social structure, though Liu neglects to draw this rather obvious conclusion. China simply used large numbers of peasants as labor in the lack of more effective weaponry, asking her warriors to be valiant in the defense of the nation. There were a lot of fatalities as a consequence of this "death-stand" mindset. The Chinese are estimated to have lost 28% of their soldiers in the engagements of I 940 alone. One may reply that any preindustrial state trapped in the same circumstances would have suffered about the same ex-perience. However, the same source estimates that an average of 23 percent of all the able-bodied males enlisted in the 8 years of conflict were casualties. This critique, in my opinion, ignores the key point: China's preindustrial status was mainly maintained because the gentry's descendants held onto the actual political power.

Now let's shift our attention to the Kuomintang regime and examine it from the perspective of institutional history in comparison. When we look beyond the specifics, we can see that the two decades of Kuomintang control exhibit some of the key traits of the reactionary phase of the European response to industrialism, including crucial totalitarian elements. As we've previously seen, the Kuomintang's primary social base was a coalition or, perhaps more accurately, a kind of hostile cooperation between urban commercial, financial, and industrial interests and the descendants of the aristocracy. interests. The alliance was kept together by the Kuomintang, which exercised control over the tools of violence. In addition, because of its power over violence, it was able to both directly and indirectly run the government apparatus and extort money from the urban capitalist sector. The Kuomintang paralleled Hitler's NSDAP in each of these ways.

However, there are significant distinctions between the Kuomin tang and its European equivalents in terms of both the social foundations and the historical context. These distinctions aid in accounting for the Chinese reactionary phase's relatively weak nature. One that stands out is China's lack of a significant industrial base. The capitalist component was thus considerably weaker. It is plausible to assume that the Japanese occupation of the coastal cities further diminished the power of this group. Finally, the Japanese invasion successfully stopped China's reactionary phase from becoming one of overseas expansion, as happened under German, Italian,

and Japanese fascism, even if it gave nationalist feeling a clear goal. For these reasons, the Chinese reactionary and protofascist era resembles Franco's Spain more than it does comparable stages in Germany or Italy, where an agricultural elite likewise managed to maintain power but was unable to implement an aggressive foreign policy.

The most remarkable similarities between the Chinese reactionary period and its European equivalents may be seen in the field of ideologies, where practical factors are rather less important. The Kuomintang had associated with the Taiping Re-' bellion throughout its revolutionary period before gaining power. The Party made a U-turn after gaining control and with Chiang Kai-shek emerging as the true leader, identifying with the Imperial system and its seeming effectiveness during the Restoration of 1862–1874,80 a change that is reminiscent of the early actions of Italian fascism. After the triumph, the philosophy evolved into an odd concoction of Confucian ideas and bits of liberal thought from the West. The similarities to European fascism are mostly due to the pattern and nuances of emphasis that Chiang Kai-shek, or those who wrote his doctrinal pronouncements, placed upon these disparate elements. The latter, as is well known, had entered through the influence of Sun Yat-sen, who remained as the most revered ancestor of the movement.

The major diagnosis of China's issues was couched in semi-Confucian moral and philosophical clichés, implying that matters went awry after the 1911 revolution because the Chinese people did not think rationally. In 1943, Chiang said that the Chinese people had not fully grasped the profundity of Sun Yat-sen's dictum that "to understand is difficult; to act is easy," and that they still believed this to be the case. With a few remarks about the Manchu dynasty's weakness and corruption, the sole tangible component of the diagnosis is the damage that foreign dominance and unfair treaties caused in China. The social and economic issues that led to China's present situation are seldom ever discussed. Any forthright disclosure of this would have faced the real danger of alienating upper class support. Thus, Kuomintang theory is reminiscent of European fascism due to its lack of any realistic understanding and some of the factors that led to it. The same may be said regarding Kuomintang's recommendations for future action [7], [8]. The People's Livelihood, a word that functioned in part as a euphemism for the agricultural dilemma, is used occasionally throughout Chiang's semi-official book. However, as we have previously highlighted, not much was really done or even suggested to address the issue. Additionally, there was a ten-year plan for industrialisation, which was really just a question of writing things down. Instead, emphasis was placed on top-down moral and psychological change that lacked social meaning. Chiang Kai-shek sums up the diagnosis and the course of action in the following sentences: According to what has been said, changing our social life is the key to the success of national reconstruction. This change depends on people with vision, willpower, moral conviction, and a sense of responsibility who, through their wisdom and efforts, lead the people in a town, a district, a province, or throughout the entire country to a new way until they become accustomed to it unconsciously. As I've previously said, if young throughout the country are determined to do what others fear to do and suffer what others cannot bear, national and social reconstruction might be readily done. Here, under the strain of the situation, the Confucian notion of a charitable elite has taken on a combative and "heroic" quality. The West is already used to this mix thanks to fascism.

As we observe the organizational structure that this heroic elitism is meant to take, notably the Kuomintang itself, the similarities are even more striking. However, there is a significant difference. The Kuomintang was more in line with the idea of a country at war. The power of its

goals and the moral example of its leaders were meant to thrill everyone equally. Although Sun Yat-sen was the originator of the notion of an inclusive party, it had certain strategic advantages. In the cautious expectation that the Communists would unite with his organization, Chiang kept the door open for them.83 among reality, the Kuomintang remained a relatively tiny minority among the general populace, much like the right- and left-wing totalitarian parties in Europe.

Military dominance was, of course, the stated goal of this moral and psychological reform and its apparent organizational manifestation. Armed force was to be used to promote national security and racial harmony. Chiang repeatedly emphasized that military unification came before any other change. Chiang's primary defense of this viewpoint has a somewhat dictatorial sound. He quotes Sun Yat-sen's opinion that Rousseau and the French Revolution could not serve as role models for China since at the time, Europeans did not enjoy the same level of freedom as Chinese people have now. A frequent analogy of both Chiang and Sun described the Chinese as being like a mound of loose sand and being prime targets for foreign imperialism. Chiang adds, directly quoting Sun, "We must liberate ourselves from the notion of 'individual liberty' and merge ourselves into a powerful cohesive body, like a solid mass made by combining cement with sand,' to oppose foreign domination. Chiang clarifies by saying the following: In other words, it goes without saying that people cannot enjoy excessive liberty as if they were loose sand if the Chunghua country is to be con- sO,lidated into a powerful unit for national defense, as solid as a rock. In order for China to ultimately succeed in this war and, in the postwar period, work alongside the other independent and free nations of the world to safeguard long-term world peace and advance human liberation, she must strengthen her national defense unit. Therefore, neither during a war nor after one, great personal liberty can be tolerated.

In this short analysis of Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang philosophy, three aspects stand out. The first is the virtually total lack of any social or economic plan to address China's issues, as well as a very clear ritualization of denial of their existence. It was mostly rhetorical to speak about "political tutelage" and being ready for democracy. The actual strategy was to minimize disruption of already-established social bonds. Any group of the population that made a good target for blackmail and compelled donations was not exempt from such a program. In American cities, gangsters carry out the same activities without really attempting to alter the social structure on which they genuinely rely.

The second characteristic is what one would refer to as the concealing of the absence of clear political and social goals by ludicrous attempts to restore historic standards in an environment where the social foundation of these principles had long been undercut. We simply need to remind ourselves here that this warped patriotic idealization of the past is one of the key hallmarks of Western fascism because Professor Mary C. Wright has proved this issue persuasively and with a wealth of actual evidence in The Last Stand of Chinese Conservatism. The Kuomintang's attempt to use military force to resolve its issue another key trait of European fascism is the third and final characteristic.

To emphasize these three characteristics is not to equate the Kuomintang with fascism in Europe or prior reactionary movements. Identity is not at question here and has never been throughout history. Our argument is that these parallels form a cohesive totality that is crucial for understanding both China and the dynamics of totalitarian movements in general. In other words, what we have here is not a haphazard collection of minor Chinese characteristics that just so happen to resemble significant European ones. They once controlled the political, social, and intellectual atmosphere in both China and Europe as a unified, multifaceted entity.

The Kuomintang's attempts to steer China toward a modern state through a backwards path were a total failure. In Russia, a similar and more promising endeavor had also failed. This failure served as the direct impetus for and precursor to Communist wins in both nations. Communists were able to establish a world-class industrial power in Russia, while the Chinese death problem is still up for debate. Again, in both instances, peasant uprising and rebellion played a decisive role in steering these nations away from the reactionary or democratic forms of capitalism and toward the communist road of modernization. This contribution was much more significant in China than it was in Russia. Clearly, it is necessary to closely consider the role that the peasants played in these significant transformations [9], [10].

CONCLUSION

Research and analysis are ongoing, and they may provide important new perspectives on the intricate political and social dynamics that defined the reactionary phase of the European response to industrialism as well as on its continuing effect on modern politics and society. This may guide decisions made about practices and policies that advance social fairness, democratic rule of law, and economic success in the contemporary world. The reactionary phase of the European response to industrialism had significant effects on the global community as well. Many of the concepts and principles that developed during this time, such as nationalism and imperialism, had a major impact on the development of European colonialism and the balance of power in the world. Many of the social and political arguments that created the reactionary phase still have an impact on modern political discourse, hence this period's legacy is being felt today.

REFERENCES

[1]   M. Kohn, "Toronto's distillery district: Consumption and nostalgia in a post-industrial landscape," *Globalizations*, 2010, doi: 10.1080/14747731003669735.

[2]   E. Kourliouros, "Planning industrial location in Greater Athens: The interaction between deindustrialization and anti-industrialism during the 1980s," *Eur. Plan. Stud.*, 1997, doi: 10.1080/09654319708720411.

[3]   M. Hechter, G. B. Rush, and R. S. Denisoff, "Social and Political Movements.," *Contemp. Sociol.*, 1972, doi: 10.2307/2062523.

[4]   L. Marx, "Does Improved Technology Mean Progress?," *Technol. Rev.*, 1987.

[5]   M. Bond, "Grassroots Climate Action in Australia: Visions, Practices and Innovation," 2012.

[6]   A. Feenberg, "Escaping the iron cage, or, subversive rationalization and democratic theory," *Democr. Technol. Ethics, Risk, Public Debate*, 1998.

[7]   L. Panitch and B. D. Palmer, "Working-Class Experience: The Rise and Reconstitution of Canadian Labour, 1800-1980," *Labour / Le Trav.*, 1984, doi: 10.2307/25140490.

[8]   W. Ashworth *et al.*, "Reviews," *Econ. Hist. Rev.*, 1969, doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0289.1969.tb00167.x.

[9]   I. K. Rogers, "Without a True North: Tactical Approaches to Self-Published Fiction," *M/C J.*, 2017, doi: 10.5204/mcj.1320.

[10]   S. Harding and R. Nile, "North by North," *M/C J.*, 2017, doi: 10.5204/mcj.1391.

CHAPTER 17

IMPACT OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

Dr. Sireesha Nanduri, Assistant Professor, Department of Finance,
CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email id-sireesh_n@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The impact of commerce and industry on society has been profound and far-reaching throughout history. The rise of commerce and industry has brought about significant changes to social and economic structures, influencing everything from the distribution of wealth and power to the nature of political and social relationships. One of the key impacts of commerce and industry has been on economic growth and development. The expansion of trade and the growth of industrial production have played a significant role in driving economic growth and increasing prosperity, particularly in the developed world. This growth has had important implications for the distribution of wealth and power, with some regions and social groups benefitting more than others.

KEYWORDS:

Capitalism, Colonialism, Commercial Revolution, Economic Development, Globalization, Industrialization.

INTRODUCTION

It is commonly known that peasant uprisings occur often in China. Prior to 1900, Fitzgerald cites six significant ones from China's lengthy history. There were several further local and fruitless ones. While it is likely that some of the factors to be discussed operated during earlier dynasties as well, a point that lies outside the scope of this work and in fact the author's competence, I will attempt to highlight some of the primary reasons why premodern Chinese society was prone to peasant rebellions by limiting the discussion primarily to the latter phase of the Manchu dynasty. Despite this, we should note that they were rebellions rather than revolutions, which means that they did not change the fundamental makeup of the society. Second, I'll attempt to demonstrate how this initial structural flaw allowed for a genuine revolution to occur in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries under the influence of fresh pressures brought on by trade and industry. The whole tale is a stark contrast to India, where premodern peasant rebellions were very few and entirely ineffectual and where modernisation impoverished the peasants at least as much and for as long as it did in China. Even while it is less apparent, the comparison with Japan is equally informative. Because Japanese peasant society was structured differently from Chinese peasant society, the authorities there were able to quell urges toward peasant insurrection created by the progress of modernisation. Their success allowed Japan to adopt a regressive modernization strategy that, like Germany's, led to fascism [1]–[3].

Before going into detail about the Chinese peasantry, it is important to keep in mind that the political system in place in China during the nineteenth century had some serious flaws that were

more appropriately attributed to the nature and organizational structure of the ruling class of officials and landlords rather than the peasantry. I've previously outlined a few reasons why this section of Chinese society has typically struggled to adjust to the contemporary economy. Additionally, there are logically convincing signs that the political system of traditional China has a flaw. The aristocracy need an imperial system that was powerful enough to maintain their dominance over the peasants in their native environment and in their capacity as landlords. At the same time, the local gentry's short-term interests were at odds with the steps required to strengthen the Imperial system. They wanted local matters to be handled in their own manner and were adamantly opposed to paying their fair amount of taxes. There wasn't much the district magistrate could do about this circumstance. Centrifugal pulls increased as corruption increased and the value of the central government became less clear, producing a vicious cycle.

The most significant structural flaws from the perspective of our current issue were a number of inadequacies in the linkages connecting the peasants to the upper classes and to the ruling regime. As previously said, it seems that no function in the agricultural cycle, not even a supervisory one, was performed by members of the gentry that would have qualified them to serve as the community's rightful leaders. In fact, it seems that one of the key differences between a landed gentleman in China and a simple wealthy landowner was that the former avoided any taint of hard work and dedicated himself to learning and the arts. To increase irrigation, the aristocracy did haggle with the government. Even while the peasants could clearly see the consequences and we can be sure that the gentry tried their best to convey to the peasants what they had done for them, this activity could not have been ongoing or regularly repeated by its very nature.

There are a limited number of irrigation canals that may be built in any one location. Additionally, it became increasingly difficult to maintain existing projects in excellent functioning condition and impossible to acquire new ones as the resources available to the central government and even a fair number of local ones dwindled. As one looks for potential economic contributions that would have justified their status, one is reminded of the gentry's well-known control of astronomical knowledge, which is required to determine the time at which to complete the different duties of the agricultural cycle. There are various grounds to suspect that this monopoly was important in the nineteenth century, even if the issue merits additional investigation since, generally, we need more and more conclusive evidence concerning the relationship between the gentry and the peasants.

Peasants always gain a wealth of knowledge about every part of the agricultural cycle, including the ideal times and locations for planting each sort of crop and harvesting it. This is usually because of their own practical experience. In fact, since this tradition is so deeply ingrained via experience and the consequences of departing from it are so high for the majority of peasants, contemporary governments find it very difficult to convince peasants to change their daily habits. Therefore, it appears more probable than not that the astronomers fitted their knowledge to what the peasants already performed rather than the other way around, and that they accomplished nothing in contemporary times that the peasant saw as essential.

DISCUSSION

So what action did the government take to help the farmer? The response that it achieved almost nothing, which I assume is the true one, is one that modern Western sociologists are maybe too prone to reject as impossibly impossible. They do a "rather desparate" search for some "function"

that the institution in issue must fulfill because they reason that any institution that endures for a long period cannot be entirely destructive to people who live under it. However, it seems more realistic to assume that large masses of people, and especially peasants, simply accept the social system under which they live without concern about any balance of benefits and pains, certainly without the slightest thought of whether a better one might be possible; unless and until some significant change occurs.

It is true that when the Imperial bureaucracy was functioning well, as it did in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it maintained law and order, enforcing an objective standard of justice that was far superior to that which prevailed in most of contemporary Europe. However, the administration of justice and the enforcement of law and order had very little impact on the peasants. One can immediately understand how implausible this would be by taking a closer look. Over thousands of people, he was in charge of administering justice in all its cruder forms. His yamen was in the walled town that was the district's administrative center. Nor- mally, he had no direct interactions with peasants. What interactions there were took place via government runners, the underclass working in collusion with the criminal underworld, and were mostly exploitative. It is possible that the magistrate might sometimes get aware of a murder among the peasants. Otherwise, there was obviously little touch.

The family and clan of peasants each had their own systems in place for upholding law and order in accordance with their own standards. Other than to keep robbers and marauders away from their crops, they had little use for the Imperial machinery. But banditry on a big enough scale to pose a real threat to the peasants was essentially the result of exploitative officialdom in and of itself. As its own policies contributed to peasant breakouts, the Imperial administration lost the ability to maintain even a minimal level of order across large portions of China throughout the nineteenth century [4]–[6]. As a summary of the debate so far, it can be said with confidence that neither the government nor the higher classes engaged in any activities that the peasants saw as fundamental to their way of life. Due to this, the bond between the rulers and the ruled was frail and mostly manufactured, and it was susceptible to breaking under pressure.

The Imperial administration attempted to make up for the artificial nature of this relationship in three different ways. One was the system of granaries, which were regional and imperial grain storage facilities that could provide grain to the populace during times of scarcity. Although hunger was not the main factor in peasant uprising, as we will soon enough plainly see, the rulers were quite aware of the link between the two. However, at a time when it was most necessary, the public granary system collapsed and was widely abandoned. The lack of any immediate financial gain for wealthy landowners and members of the aristocracy in selling grain to the government or handing it over for free was likely the key factor. In times of scarcity, people who possessed grain may also sell it to others. Another arrangement was the well-known pao-chia system of reciprocal monitoring, which predates and mimics contemporary authoritarian practices. A pao was made up of ten houses, and its leader was in charge of reporting on how its members were acting. A number of these paos were assigned to groups with duties that were similar to one another, and so on up the ladder. It was an effort to extend the reach of the government's oversight and control below the level of the district magistrate.

The pao system, according to contemporary Chinese scholars, was utterly ineffective. Mutual surveillance got entangled with tax collection, which did nothing to endear it to the peasants. Any such arrangement relies on a large number of average people to function effectively. These people must be both invested in the system to allow them to be forced into the unenviable role of

talebearers and respected by the general public to ensure that they are informed of what is happening. One may assume that Manchu China did not generally meet these requirements. The hsiang-yueh system, which involves giving monthly lectures to the populace on Confucian ideals, is another contemporary totalitarian practice that the third arrangement evokes. Evidently, the custom started in the seventeenth century. Many emperors were really serious about it. There is enough proof that the general public did not and even dismissed the lectures as obscene gibberish. The lecture system, which continued until 1865, developed into hollow formality that was neither taken seriously by the officials who had to deliver them nor by the people who had to listen. Welfare programs as a whole, police monitoring, and public indoctrination serve as a glaring prelude to contemporary authoritarian behaviors. They prove, in my opinion, that the essential components of the totalitarian complex were there in the premodern era. However, the totalitarian complex was nothing more than an ineffective embryo in rural civilizations prior to modern technology making dictatorial instruments significantly more powerful and creating new kinds of receptivity to its appeals.

The clan, which seems to have been somewhat more successful in tying the peasants to the established order, was a fourth connection between the peasants and the upper class. As the reader may remember, the clan was a collection of individuals who claimed to be descended from a single ancestor. The clan had many peasants, even if its aristocratic members managed its business. It had guidelines for behavior that were verbally reaffirmed at the vibrant rituals when all members assembled and visually reaffirmed their membership in a group. Many Confucian principles, including reverence for elders and ancestors, were transmitted to the peasants via the clan. At least these ideas were in line with how peasant life was organized. Because of the importance of accumulated experience in a society where social change is exceedingly gradual, respect for age was undoubtedly one of them. Here, we can see one of the most powerful causes that helped shape peasant conservatism. The sacred space is owned by everyone. gave the tribe its vital economic foundation. Poorer members could be able to rent the land for less money than what the market would bear.

In certain circumstances, this land gave the wherewithal for capable but impoverished clan members to get a classical education and enter the sphere of officialdom, enhancing the clan's collective riches. villages where the clans were well-established. Particularly those where the residents made up a single clan are said to have been significantly more strong and cohesive than others. Clans did not exist everywhere because, although being in the North, they were far more powerful and a manifestation of higher agricultural riches in the South. On the other hand, the clan was nothing more than an extended form of the patrilineal and patrilocal lineage, which was common among the higher classes and had significant patri- archal elements. Therefore, it is plausible to suppose that there were countless smaller lineages that contained both aristocratic and peasant houses and that also served the similar goal of tying rulers and ruled in the other regions of China where clans were not as significant.

Therefore, it becomes clear that the clan and patrilineal ancestry are the only significant connections between the elite and lower classes in Chinese culture. As a result, their significance should not be underestimated. However, the clan had a double edge since it could also act as the main glue binding rebellious factions together, as would become clear in due order. At least for the Manchu era, it appears that the link between rulers and the ruled was generally weaker than in other societies, with the exception of Russia, which was also subject to peasant uprising. This, I would argue, accounts in large part for the fact that peasant rebellion was pervasive in Chinese

society. But may this observable facet of Chinese politics also be explained by structural features of the peasant society as a whole?

Regarding the Manchu era specifically, there is relatively little actual material available. However, a number of anthropologists have conducted thorough fieldwork investigations of contemporary Chinese communities, including those in the interior that are far from outside influences. After leaving out any information that is obviously the result of recent in- fluences, we may deduce something about the previous period from these. There were far fewer instances of numerous villagers cooperating in a common task in a way that creates the habits and sentiments of solidarity.05 It was closer to a residential agglomeration of numerous peasant households than to a live and functioning community, despite the fact that the Chinese village, the basic cell of rural society in China as elsewhere, evidently lacked cohesiveness in comparison with those of India, Japan, and even many parts of Europe. The distinguished anthropologist Fei has claimed that using the hoe in cultivating rice fields has made most of the work very individualistic. "Group work yields no more than the sum of individual efforts," he said. "In the village, the primary unit of economic production was the household, a man with his wife and children. Although less information is available about the wheat-growing North, essentially the same system of intensive human labor on a number of small scattered plots and the same type of village society prevailed there as well.9o Therefore, it is rather unlikely that the technology alone accounts for the relatively weak development of cooperative practices. It also does not increase efficiency very much.

Some cooperation 'did exist, and the brief comments on it in the sources suggest an explanation of why there was not more. Rice culture, to be most efficient, requires large amounts of labor at the time when the young seedlings are transplanted and again at harvest time. In due course we shall see the very effective organization that the Japanese village reached to meet this problem and the very in- efficient one that prevails still in large parts of India. The Chinese met this need in several ways. They might exchange labor among themselves, staggering the dates of planting so that crops would not- reach the same stage of maturity simultaneously and hence allow time to help out one's kin. Exchanges of labor within kinship groupings were considered most desirable.

If the kin could not supply enough labor at crucial points in the agricultural cycle, extra hands were hired. Surplus labor came from three sources. One was from local peasants who had too little land to support their farni- lies. The existence of this group made it possible for those with enough land to compel the others to work for them within the framework of the prevailing social and political system. A second source of labor came from those without any land and a third from men who could not eke out a living from insufficient land in a poorer, distant area. As late as the mid- I930S, many migrant work- ers were of different ethnic origin, drifters who would accept very low pay, keeping local wage rates down. At times a few landless Chinese from another district might settle in the village but, without clan membership and access to a plot of land, they lived alone, outside the stream of village life.

In premodern China, arrangements for the exchange or hiring of extra labor were fluid, temporary, and unhurried affairs. This was true in the north as well as in the south, and as long as labor was abundant and surplus because of the situation just described, it is not surprising that economic cooperation among any group of people in the Chinese village lacked permanence or the institutional basis that still exists in India under the caste system and in Japan in a different form. In stark contrast to premodern Europe and Japan, the main decisions in the agricultural cycle were made by the individual household. There is no evidence of any-families from the

land, and the only regularly occurring activity that required cooperation was the management of the water supply. This often resulted in fights within the village or among several villages.

Since historians of Russia and Japan have stressed the impor- tance of collective responsibility for taxes in producing the solidary villages characteristic of these countries, it is worthwhile drawing attention to the fact that the Imperial system in China also imposed collective responsibility. So far as evidence from a later time inqi- cates, the Chinese system did not produce similar results. Evidently taxation practices are insufficient by themselves to create cohesive village communities, though they are undoubtedly an important factor. For its own purposes, as we have seen, the Empire tried to create solidarity through the pao-chia. The generally admitted fail- ure of the pao-chia in China, and the greater success in Japan of a similar arrangement based on the Chinese model, considerably strengthen the thesis that cohesiveness was weak in the traditional Chinese villages of Imperial times. Quite possibly the impression of casual individualism and minimal organized cooperation may be somewhat exaggerated, due to the need to rely on anthropologists' accounts from fairly recent times. Still it is highly unlikely that the basic structural patterns of village life were fundamentally different in Imperial times from those recently observed. The system of share- cropping and the devotion of the upper class to stylized leisure, with its need for a labor force that it did not have to supervise di- rectly, all point toward arrangements roughly similar to those just sketched here: Thus the political needs of the upper classes com- bined with agricultural practices to generate a combination of peas- ant individualism and surplus labor, leading to a relatively atomistic peasant society.

The village typically had a temple and a number of festivals in which all genuine villagers could participate to some extent, and in the local oligarchy of nos the village had a generally effective means of resolving disputes between residents and preventing explosions from the aggressions that arise in any group of people living in close proximity. I do not mean to imply by these observations that the Chinese was at least a limited sense of community. This feeling of community is shown, for example, by the fact that many towns have stringent exclusion policies. external to the membership. There was not enough land for everyone, and that was the basic explanation.

Another essential principle of Chinese society is shown by this information: possession of land was a requirement for being a full-fledged village resident. We've already seen how the clan used the property as its base of operations. The same is true on a lesser scale inside the family. Since the family was the main source of economic productivity, farming was well suited to having deep and strong family ties.10B Without property, the whole Confucian ideal of filial regard was impossible to maintain and was far weaker among the poorer peasants. In actuality, they often struggled to start a family. Compared to the scenario that remained for a long period in Western civilization, the poor peasants in China had less children, and inevitably, fewer of those children grew up. Numerous them also struggled with infidelity. There were many "bare sticks," or bachelors who were too poor to be married, in modern Chinese towns. In the view of the peasants, whose focus was the family, they were objects of pity and derision. Of course, since it was difficult to Dring them up, it was the poor who sold their children mostly girls but sometimes also boys.

Simply put, having no property implies having no family or religion. That seems to be a bit extreme. Although it was a meager and dangerous job, the landless agricultural laborer had a place in the Chinese village. However, more often than not, landless peasants had to eke out a livelihood by working for their wealthier neighbors. However, the earlier scholarly assumption

that patriarchal morality in China was what kept millions of peasant families together is mostly false. The majority of peasants were unable to attain this patriarchal ideal since it was an expensive aristocratic ideal. When it did exist among the peasants, it was mostly used as an excuse for the petty tyranny that the highly constrained way of life imposed on the peasant family. The Communists were to set off the enormously explosive potential that was built into the Chinese peasant family as soon as possible.

In conclusion, Chinese peasant society seems to have had far lower levels of coherence than other peasant societies, and it appears to have depended heavily on the availability of enough landed property. In conclusion, even if its effects were less directly related to the ownership of property, the caste system in India offered landless labourers a place to call home and linked them to the division of labor within the community. It is challenging to assess the political significance of such differences given that peasant revolts were endemic to tsarist society in Russia, despite the fact that the peasants had constructed strong solidarities organizations. Evidently, there are solidarity groups both in favor of and against peasant uprising; nevertheless, this is a more complex matter that is best left for discussion at a later date.

In China, peasant uprisings were especially frequent, and some of the difficulties and limitations to these insurrections may be traced to the way that peasants lived and the frailties of the bonds that bound them to the upper classes. It draws attention to the socioeconomic inequalities within Chinese society that would become increasingly apparent during the nineteenth century and into the twentieth as poverty spread throughout the whole country. Then the bonds would separate. Pea ants would wander away from their nests, become ban- dits, and then return. The warlord armies would ultimately include them. A spark from an uprising might easily light the immense mounds of human trash that Chinese civilisation let to accumulate. On the other hand, rebellion calls for the dissolution of existing social relationships as well as the development of new bonds of loyalty and solidarity. This was difficult since the Chinese peasants were not used to cooperating with one another outside of the boundaries of the family or clan. When a revolution wants to create a new social system, If some lucky occurrences fortunate in the sense that they had nothing to do with events happening in China itself had not intervened, the Communists may not have found a solution. When we examine the specific forms that violence took throughout the late imperial period and afterwards, these inherently general insights will become more pertinent [7]–[9].

For lack of a better phrase, we may simply define gangsterism as the use of violence to prey on the popula- tion without even the remotest interest in altering the political structure, much alone installing new rulers. Even in "normal" times, the inability of the Imperial bureaucracy to keep the countryside safe and secure made the locals easy prey. It is crucial. to be cautious of accepting the official narrative and romanticizing the robber as a kind helper of the underprivileged. Usually, in order to live in peace, the people would bargain with the ban- dits. Leaders of the local aristocracy often forged alliances with robbers. This is unusual since there were both professional and hereditary bandits. Gangsterism is likely to appear somewhere that the forces of law and order are waning. Gangsterism, which had been ingrained in society as a whole and earned legitimacy due to chivalric ideals, was the primary element of European feudalism. Feudalism is fundamentally incompatible with the effective functioning of a strong bureaucratic system since it developed as a result of the fall of the Roman administrative system. A bureaucracy has to establish a monopoly on victimization and do it in line with a sound rationale, which Confucianism offered in China. As the Imperial system disintegrated into

warlord satrapies that were feebly and briefly united under the Kuomintang, the whole system began to take on more gangster traits and lost favor.

The line between a well-planned uprising and simple, predatory banditry was, in any event, blurry throughout the Manchu dynasty. Gathering a consistent supply of individuals from peasant villages is still inadequate for a revolution, notwithstanding how simple it was to achieve given China's rural socioeconomic structure. That might be an important place to start. It could only sustain banditry by producing a steady supply of new members. If a revolution is to constitute a significant threat, it must create a base of operations that is independent of the authority and must grow continuously. To establish a geographic foundation, it is required to switch the allegiance of whole communities. In China, this meant gaining the help of the local nobles and improving the conditions of the peasants' lives.

Unfortunately, there aren't any excellent books about the great Tai- piirg Rebellion of the 1980s that were published by academics who were aware of social structure issues. However, a study of the Nien Rebellion, which briefly aided the Taiping rebels, is instructive. We can see some of the origins and constraints of conventional revolt in the nineteenth century thanks to this story. Therefore, a few observations on this instance will be beneficial. The Nien uprising, like earlier uprisings of the nineteenth century, was a result of Imperial decline and aided in accelerating and intensifying it. Maladministration and famine were among the direct causes of such epidemics, which were sometimes made worse by severe natural calamities like floods that drove a lot of peasants away from their homes. The widespread disregard for dikes and river control systems contributed to the floods' political and social origins, which went beyond simple natural catastrophes.

Marauders took local defense into their own hands, taxed the populace, and overthrew the government since the Imperial government was unable to defend the small communities against them. The rebels erected earthen barriers around the settlements in the Nien area. Secret societies were crucial in this regard, acting under the guise of supporting the peasants' defense when the communities fought one another. In the meantime, the local aristocracy took command of the local armed forces. By making a compromise and using one local armed unit against another that was openly in rebellion, the central government felt it necessary to further erode its power and authority. These two elements the secret societies and the presence of gentry-controlled armed forces moved revolt outside the realm of simple banditry.

By capturing towns with earthen walls around them, or towns that were already entirely independent of the central government, the Nien expanded their territory. Local leaders were installed in charge as long as they were willing to do so, which seems to have been the norm when they won their cooperation. If government loyalists continued to work in a region, they would be publically humiliated. It is important to note that the clan served as the foundation for the revolutionary organization. The only family that could sustain and attract enough clients were powerful, affluent families. But this was not all; the peasantry's fierce support to their rebel leaders was based on tribal allegiances.

The rebels had a basic economic and social plan, even though they mostly operated via the existing social organization. They understood that feeding hungry people was essential to winning their allegiance. They stressed how their native area produced wheat and barley. Campaigns on the edges of their domain saw a rise in harvest disputes. Possibly influenced by

the Taipings, they implemented a rudimentary kind of land reform by distributing crops evenly and restricting the power of the bigger landowners [10], [11].

CONCLUSION

Finally, culture and identity have been affected by business and industry's influence on society. People have often attempted to express their individuality and distinctiveness in the face of fast social and economic change, and this has often coincided with the advent of trade and industry. Politics and government are two areas where business and industry have an effect. New political power structures have often emerged with the expansion of commerce and industry as economic elites sought to further their interests and influence political outcomes. Political disputes and tensions have sometimes resulted from this, especially in areas where economic progress has not been fairly distributed. The complex social, economic, and political processes that have molded the influence of business and industry on society, as well as the continuous difficulties and possibilities that present themselves in reaction to these changes, may all be understood with the help of ongoing study and analysis. This might influence laws and procedures intended to advance social fairness, economic progress, and political stability in the contemporary world.

REFERENCES

[1]   A. Rizaldi and Z. Madany, "Impact of E-Commerce in Industry," *Int. J. Res. Appl. Technol.*, 2021, doi: 10.34010/injuratech.v1i2.5914.

[2]   A. Shahzad, R. Hassan, N. I. Abdullah, A. Hussain, And M. Fareed, "Covid-19 Impact On E-Commerce Usage: An Empirical Evidence From Malaysian Healthcare Industry," *Humanit. Soc. Sci. Rev.*, 2020, Doi: 10.18510/Hssr.2020.8364.

[3]   M. P. Banerjee And M. V. Sayyed, "A Study On Impact Of Demonetization On E-Commerce Industry," *Int. J. Eng. Appl. Sci. Technol.*, 2017.

[4]   V. Radhakrishnan, "E-Commerce industry and its effect on the world today," *Int. Res. J. Adv. Sci. Hub*, 2021, doi: 10.47392/irjash.2021.026.

[5]   Prof. Lakshmi Narayan. N | Naveena. N, "A Study on the Applications and Impact of Artificial Intelligence in E Commerce Industry," *Int. J. Trend Sci. Res. Dev.*, 2019, doi: https://doi.org/10.31142/ijtsrd26374.

[6]   W. Tang and J. Zhu, "Informality and rural industry: Rethinking the impacts of E-Commerce on rural development in China," *J. Rural Stud.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jrurstud.2020.02.010.

[7]   D. Hendarsyah, "E-Commerce Di Era Industri 4.0 Dan Society 5.0," *IQTISHADUNA J. Ilm. Ekon. Kita*, 2019, doi: 10.46367/iqtishaduna.v8i2.170.

[8]   J. He and C. Liu, "An Investigation on the Impact of COVID- 19 on China ' s E-Commerce Industry," *Des. Eng.*, 2019.

[9]   M. R. Rajasekaran and C. Sudarsan, "The Impact of E-Commerce on Indian Tourism Industry-The Opportunities and Challenges to E-Tour Operators," *Proc. Int. Conf. Tour. Mark.*, 2018.

[10] S. Sahai, R. Goel, A. Venaik, and V. Garg, "Impact of digital commerce on fashion industry to gain customer loyalty," *Int. J. Eng. Adv. Technol.*, 2019.

[11] N. Wilson, "The Impact Of Perceived Usefulness And Perceived Ease-Of-Use Toward Repurchase Intention In The Indonesian E-Commerce Industry," *J. Manaj. Indones.*, 2019, doi: 10.25124/jmi.v19i3.2412.

CHAPTER 18

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON ASIAN FASCISM

Dr. Sireesha Nanduri, Assistant Professor, Department of Finance,
CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email id-sireesh_n@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Asian Fascism refers to the political movements and ideologies that emerged in various Asian countries in the early 20th century and were inspired by European Fascism. These movements often shared similar characteristics, including authoritarianism, nationalism, militarism, and anti-communism. One of the most well-known examples of Asian Fascism was Japan's militarist regime in the 1930s and 1940s, which sought to create a Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere and expand Japan's influence in the region through military conquest. The regime was characterized by a cult of personality around Emperor Hirohito, the suppression of civil liberties and political dissent, and the use of propaganda to promote a nationalist and militaristic ideology.

KEYWORDS:

Authoritarianism, Axis Powers, Corporatism, Empire, Fascism, Imperial Japan.

INTRODUCTION

Here, we see some of the restrictions placed on revolt by the established order, which the Communists would eventually overcome, but not without struggle. The likelihood of any significant change was hampered by gentlery involvement and leadership. Additionally, the Nien system itself was antagonistic since it raided neighboring regions for food sources, making it a predatory system in its own right. This was ultimately fruitless. The reason why not all local groupings affiliated themselves with the rebels is therefore understandable. Some participated in "neutral self-defense," while others even battled with the Imperials.11'1 Similar or perhaps related elements seem to have been at play in the Taiping case. Many locals first thought they were superior to the Imperial emperors. Later, when the rebels failed to make any significant progress and maybe as their demands became more stringent in their fight against the government, they lost a significant amount of public support [1]–[3].

The Imperial soldiers pursued a strictly military strategy against the Nien for a very long period, making vain attempts to demolish the earth barriers. Tseng Kuo-fan, a famous Imperial minister who in Chinese terms resembles Bismarck, eventually won the war by adopting insurgent tactics. Along with other local leaders, he provided the peasants tangible advantages such as assistance with farming and tranquility at a time when they were tired of unrest. In the end, many were persuaded to surrender by the promise of money and food in the government military forces.ll9 The revolt, which had started during the winter of 1852–1853, came to a conclusion in 1868. From the perspective of our issues, one of the most startling aspects is that both rebels and Imperial authorities were able to control the local social structure with about the same degree of ease or difficulty. It seems that "organizational weapons" were ineffective. The complaints of

the peasants were far more fundamental. Both the beginning and the conclusion of the insurrection were influenced by changes in theit loyalties that were, without a doubt, managed and hastened by both sides.

Thus, traditional Chinese society's structure simultaneously encouraged insurrection and severely constrained what it might accomplish. when a Chinese, it could bring down a dynasty. Alternatively, it may turn into a harsher type of tyranny and eventually fade away when the Imperial troops restored some measure of control. A true revolution could only be attempted after the effects of the modern world had begun to chip away at the superstructure in the manner already mentioned. Now let's attempt to comprehend what happened to the peasant, the foundation of this framework, when the modern world arrived.

The peasantry's economic status began to deteriorate throughout the nineteenth century, as seen by the abandoning of tillage, degradation of irrigation systems, and an increase in agricultural unemployment. The geographical variety of China results in exceptions to any generalization, even while traces of the peasant's struggle were evident in almost every section of the empire, perhaps more so in the northern provinces than anywhere else. While some experienced hunger or situations that were very close to famine, certain regions continued to experience wealth and plenty. Cheap Western textiles severely harmed peasant handicrafts, which were a vital complement to the peasants' scarce resources and a method to use spare labor during the lean periods of the agricultural cycle. Up until very recently, conventional narratives stressed possibly overstressed this fact. It is possible that the peasants eventually found other work since artisan activities are regularly highlighted in anthropological studies of modern villages as a modest but essential component of the peasants' survival. In any case, the effects were unquestionably severe for a while in many places. The introduction of opium, which was first fostered by the West and subsequently by the Japanese, disseminated additional moral decay and a refusal to seek reform.

The small village market gave way to the huge urban market in the interim, while the consequences of a market economy gradually permeated more and more rural areas close to coastal towns and along large rivers. The market and a money economy have been established in China for a very long time. Nothing entirely new resulted from these adjustments. The majority of the product still only made it as far as the neighborhood market town or, sometimes, the district city in the 1930s. Even still, the growing influence of the market was sufficient to bring about many of the same social and political upheavals that were seen earlier in European history. The peasant was left behind and his negotiating position eroded as the market changed into a more effective and centralized institution. The peasant often had to sell right away after the harvest when prices were decreasing because they lacked reserves and were barely surviving.

Sea- sonal differences in costs were severe in China, as could be predicted given the country's inadequate storage and transportation infrastructure. The trader and speculator, who was often working with the landowner, benefited from the misfortune of the peasant. Dealers had more financial resources, access to a greater range of knowledge, and combination possibilities than the average peasant. They sometimes had strong guild organization, which set prices and prohibited members of the guild from overbidding. Given the situation, it is understandable why the trader often prevailed over the peasant. As the peasants accrued debt, they were forced to borrow, often at exorbitant rates. When they were unable to make payments, they were forced to turn over ownership of the property to a landlord while continuing to labor the farm for a considerable amount of time. The coastal provinces were most affected by all of these factors.

According to its historian Harold Isaacs, the peasants' >rebellion of 1927, the biggest since the days of the flg-haired Taipings, also erupted there.

The development of a large population of marginal peasants at the base of the social hierarchy in the village was possibly the most significant part of the developments under consideration given the relationship between property and social cohesion. According to recent research conducted locally, they made up at least half of the local population.126 We currently have no means of understanding how large of an increase, if any, this may represent throughout the nineteenth century. On the other hand, it is comparatively obvious that they represented potentially explosive material.127 In addition to living on the verge of famine, they were marginal in the social sense that their connections to the established order had become progressively weaker as a result of the loss of their property. Since these studies had to be conducted in places where law and order and stability still reigned, their linkages to the village were likely less than one would infer from anthropological data. Numerous regions of the nation were either actively undergoing a revolution or were under the authority of bandits. Thus, a land-poor peasants served as the mass foundation for the revolution that started in 1927 and culminated in the Communist triumph in 1949. There wasn't a sizable agricultural proletariat laboring on contemporary capitalist latifundia in China or Russia, which is the cause of much rural unrest in Spain, Cuba, and maybe other countries. It was also different from the circumstance in France in 1789, where there were numerous landless peasants, but where the revolution in the countryside came from the upper stratum of the peasantry, who put the brakes on the revolution when it showed signs of progressing past the confirmation of property rights and the abolition of feudal remnants.

Massive exploitation and poverty by themselves are insufficient to create a revolutionary environment. Additionally, there must be perceived unfairness that is inherent in the social system, such as new demands placed on the victims or a factor leading the victims to believe that previous demands are no longer legitimate. This key component was made available by China's declining upper classes. The gentry had no longer served a purpose and had just evolved into landlord-usurers. Their legitimacy and the Confucian system that had sustained it were both destroyed with the collapse of the examination system. It's questionable how much of this the peasants truly accepted. According to Max Weber, the majority of the populace's religion was a blend of magic and Taoism that was better adapted to meet their demands. Nevertheless, certain Confucian principles did penetrate the clan.

In any event, the self-respect that had provided the previous governing elites with confidence in the face of the peasants had virtually vanished. Numerous dubious elites, racketeers, criminals, and others emerged to fill the void left by the fall of the previous governing class. Private violence became widespread and necessary for the landowners to maintain their grip on the peasants in the absence of a strong central authority. Since they had better protection in the city, many landlords relocated there. The people who remained in the countryside fortified their homes and used weapons to collect their debts and rent.128 Of course, not every landowner was like this. Very possibly a very tiny proportion of people operated in this fashion, but anthropological studies indicate that those who did were probably the most powerful and prominent people in the region. Patriarchal connections and blatant and ruthless exploitation persisted. This was pervasive enough to contribute to the creation of a potentially explosive scenario across much of China, providing the Communists with their opportunity. It is important to note that India has not yet seen a similar decline among the higher classes.

A revolutionary condition did not always entail that a conflagration was going to break out on its own. Chinese statistics provide considerable support for the conservative half-truth that "outside agitators" create riots and revolutions a half-truth that turns into a falsehood because it overlooks the circumstances that make agitators successful. I have seen no evidence of the peasants planning to organize effectively or take action on their own behalf in countless descriptions of rural life. The idea that peasant communities were openly in rebellion before the people who found the situation unbearable fled their home villages is most likely true. Many of them joined bandits, warlord armies, and eventually the Communist forces that were gradually growing as time went on. There weren't many impulsive attempts to do anything inside the historic structures of the community. Similar to the Manchu era, the peasants need outside leadership before they would openly rebel against the established social order. In terms of the hamlet itself, the situation very definitely might have continued to deteriorate until the majority of the populace just perished in the following famine. Many times over, that is precisely what happened.

These findings in no way suggest that the Chinese peasants lacked initiative or bravery, or that they were inherently foolish. Even after accounting for propaganda and revolutionary valor, the conduct of the revolutionary troops shows just the opposite. The implication is simply that, in many instances, the old order's tentacles encircled the person with enough force to prevent him from acting alone or, very often, even from considering such action. The Chinese village's lack of cohesion, which was previously noted in another context, may have aided the Communists by making it easier for a regular stream of recruits to flee to Communist regions. Additionally, it probably made their job of dismantling and changing the previous village structure simpler. Any solid evaluation requires further detailed information. Despite how shaky it was, the community would not spontaneously change the old order. Of fact, all of the significant contemporary revolutions have followed this pattern [4]–[6].

Even the Chinese Communist Party's arrival on this scene of general anguish and deterioration was insufficient on its own to bring about a major transformation. In 19ZI, the Party was established. Thirteen years later, the Communists were forced to leave their major territorial base in Kiangsi and begin the famous Long March to the isolated province of Yenan. Some historians believe that their fortunes were at their lowest point at that time. The only real strength they had shown was their ability to endure; Chiang's five major military offensives between 1930 and 1933 had not been able to exterminate them. However, they had not been able to significantly expand their territoriaI'base or their influence outside of the limited regions they ruled.

The Communists' misguided plan may be partially blamed for their up to this time failure. They didn't start showing any real interest in employing the peasants as the foundation for a revolutionary movement until 1926. The Party continued to attempt to seize control via proletarian uprisings in the cities after the rupture with Chiang Kai-shek in 19271, with catastrophic and terrible results. Even if the rejection of this Marxist organizing principle and the embrace of Mao's peasant-based approach were essential, more was required for success. One thing that had to be done was to have a more tolerant attitude toward the prosperous peasants, albeit there had been adumbrations of this much earlier. Despite how significant all of these improvements were, it is doubtful that they could have prevented the Chinese Communists from achieving a revolutionary triumph on their own. The key component was the foreign conqueror's occupation policies and the conquest by the Japanese.

After the Japanese took over, Kuomintang leaders and landlords relocated to the cities, leaving the peasants to fend for themselves. Second, the peasants were fused together into a solidary mass by the Japanese army's sporadic extermination and cleanup operations. As a result, the Japanese pre- formed two crucial revolutionary tasks for the Communists, namely the eradication of the old elites and the creation of the oppressed's collective unity. This seemingly counterintuitive conclusion is heavily supported by negative data. Guerilla groups failed to advance in areas where the Japanese or their puppet authority provided some kind of protection for the peasants. In fact, the Communists had trouble setting up guerrilla strongholds in areas that had never directly seen the Japanese troops.

As significant as the Japanese contribution was, it must be seen in the appropriate context. It would be absurd to assume that the Japanese and Communists were conspiring against each other in this cooperative war effort. Given the circumstances, the Communists were able to get the upper hand over both the Japanese and the Kuomintang, who had strong inclinations toward collaboration and, of course, did not want to see the War culminate in a social revolution. A revolutionary situation was deepened and brought to a climax by the war. The conflict was an accident from the perspective of Chinese politics and society. It was hardly a coincidence when looking at how political and economic forces interact on a global scale. Similar to the Bolshevik victory in Russia, which some historians believe to be a coincidental result of the First World War, the unavoidable analytical need to isolate certain manageable historical events can result in partial truths that are deceiving and even false unless and until they are later placed back into their proper context.

DISCUSSION

We'll end by making a few observations on how the Communists utilized the village's cleavages to eradicate the last vestiges of the previous order. Fortunately, we have two excellent studies of several communities in the North and the South during the Communist takeover that demonstrate the many phases and issues involved in this process. The Communists were able to establish themselves in the northern village in the Shansi-Hopeh-Shantung- Honan Border Region, where they combined their class fight with nationalist resistance against the Japanese. The wealthier residents of the region, including the last of the Kuomintang power, identified with the Japanese in order to protect their property, giving the Communists the opportunity to combine their at the time very moderate social program with resistance to foreign oppression.

They gradually succeeded in establishing their own political structure in the community on top of the preexisting one. They paired this with a scheme that burdened the wealthier peasants while benefiting the countless impoverished peasants. The program at fire abolished the taxes that had previously funded the coffers of the Kuomintang and divided the additional duties of approximately organizing the rear based on capacity to pay. The new motto, "Those with wealth contribute wealth; those with labor contribute labor," came into use when the Japanese intended to tax the town, sparking a serious issue. The Communists divided the hamlet into rich and poor by posing the dilemma of whether taxes should be paid under the Communist system, which burdened the wealthy, or under the Japanese flat rate. Peasants were being urged by the Communists to conceal their grain in caverns and be ready to flee the region in the meanwhile.

The wealthy were now vulnerable to the possibility that the Japanese might come and seize all of their food since they had not done this. They agreed to the Communist idea as a result. The episode's significance rests in demonstrating how the Communists, like prior revolutionaries,

were able to persuade whole villages and regions to join their cause and submit to their rule, as well as how the Japanese assisted in creating a new sense of unity for the Communists. The Communists, though, went a lot farther. They established new groups among the underprivileged peasants, including the most downtrodden group in Chinese society the women even if they sometimes exploited the outdated and corrupt leadership. Above all, they offered the peasants tangible alternatives to subjugation and famine via their program of local economic self-sufficiency, such as the creation of a cooperative, and in many other ways. Any meaningful land reform might wait, in my opinion. When it arrived, it was coupled with retaliation against complicit parties and previous oppressors. Reading this story makes it simple to comprehend the revolutionary fervor that drove both the Kuomintang's defeat by the Communists and the Chinese people's resistance against the Japanese [7]–[9].

A few years later, Nanching, a little town close to Canton, experienced the Communist revolution—but not by helping the locals fight the Japanese, but rather by bringing it down from above. The former administration was overthrown after a jarring explosion caused by fleeing Nationalist forces breaking up the steel bridge over the Pearl River rattled the village's windows. In a short period of time, well-armed Communist military detachments made their appearance. They placed notices ordering former government officials to continue serving in their current positions until their obligations were completed. Documents were given to new employees. After 10 months, during which not much transpired, the land-reform cadres three men and one woman in their late teens or early twenties appeared. They were dressed in dingy gray uniforms and made an effort to emulate the way of life of the peasants while concealing their affluent urban bourgeois origins. In essence, it amounted to taking land away from the wealthy and giving it to the poor. The outcome was rather different.

Even among the poor peasants, who were the primary immediate beneficiaries but who seemed to be equally unsure as to how long all of this was to last, the main consequence of the Communists' use of categories that reasonably well correlated with the social realities of the village was general uncertainty. Previously, there had been repressed animosity between the two extremes a wealthy, unscrupulous landlord, and his tenants. The whole hamlet was meticulously divided into sections under the new structure, each of which was placed in opposition to the other. One particular feature requires special attention because it provides insight into both Communist strategies and the workings of the pre-Communist period. Instead of redistributing land to the family as a whole, each member received an equal allotment, regardless of age or gender. As a result, the Communists tore the hamlet asunder from the ground up, breaking the link between landed property and kin- ship. The Communists liberated strong antagonisms across class, as well as those of age and sex, by removing or at least significantly reducing the economic foundation for familial ties. The battle did not start until they completed this. grown open and venomous, pitting peasants against landowners, renters against rent collectors, and bullied individuals against their neighbors. The younger generation accused the older generation last. Bitterness was evident even here.14°

A new connection between the hamlet and the national government was created by the Communist dictatorship. Every peasant realized that a national political authority determined how they lived their everyday lives. The Communists pumped c.K. out of the hamlet through this new route. Yang makes projections that are much higher than those of the previous landlord tenant and Kuo- mintang. All these changes were transitory and impermanent, and at the same time, the new and heavier weight was spread far more fairly than it had been before. In a world

of contending armed giants, the core issue of expanding economic output everywhere could only be partially resolved by destroying the old order, establishing new connections with the government, and extorting additional resources from the peasants. That portion of the narrative is not covered in this book. Peasants supplied the dynamite that eventually exploded the old system in China, more so than in Russia. They once again served as the principal impetus for the election of a party committed to bringing about via unrelenting terror a purportedly inevitable period of history in which the peasants would cease to exist.

New Governments Were Put Into Power In Japan, China, And Russia During The Seventeenth Century. the conclusion of a protracted era of internal conflict and chaos. As far as we can ever talk of beginnings in history, the establishing of peace and order in Russia and China was the start of a protracted process that resulted in peasant uprisings. The agricultural bureaucracies in these two nations prevented a class of independent manufacturers and merchants from developing. Without going too much into detail, we may argue that in the absence of a bourgeois revolution, a peasant revolution took place, which paved the way for authoritarian modernisation. However, the growth of Japan took a quite different path, one that was more similar to that of Germany. Even while commercial pressures threatened the agricultural system, neither this country nor Germany can claim to have had a successful bourgeois revolution. Additionally, the Japanese were able to control and divert peasant unrest in order to avert a peasant revolt.

By the third decade of the twentieth century, the results were highly reminiscent to European fascism. What accounts for the divergence between Japan's modernization trajectory and that of China and Russia? Feudalism immediately comes to mind as a potential explanation. If feudalism can even be claimed to have existed at alla point of debate among historians it was a memory that was feeble in both Russia and China. On the other hand, the Japanese form of feudalism persisted far into the nineteenth century. Due to the fact that Japan is the only Asian nation to have developed into a significant industrial power by the third decade of the twentieth century, the idea that feudalism holds the key becomes very alluring due to the vast amount of history that it would help to organize and make more understandable.1 Insofar as feudalism in Japan made it possible for one segment of the old ruling classes to break free and carry out a revolution, However, it is important to understand how and why this was feasible, as well as exactly how modernity as a whole was connected to feudalism in Japan at the time.

It is crucial to keep in mind the limits of our current historical viewpoint while understanding and evaluating this shift. The incomplete nature of Japan's social and economic revolution in a hundred years, or maybe in much shorter time. The relatively little "revolution" of the Imperial Restoration in 1868, in particular, would seem to represent the crux of Japan's tragedy. It is important to remember that contemporary historians have little confidence in Bismarck's ability to successfully blend the old and new in Germany. See Hall, "Feudalism in Japan," IS-51 for a study of the recent parallels and contrasts between European and Japanese feudalism. Although I have not seen any in-depth analyses of the nature of the relationship, the idea that there is a link between Japanese feudalism and its later embrace of Western customs is rather prevalent among Ori- entalists. Edwin O. Reischauer mentions a number of traits of Japanese feudalism that he believes may have facilitated the Japanese society's transition to modern social structures towards the conclusion of his informative article, "Japanese Feudalism," in Coulburn, ed, Feudalism in History.

Strong national consciousness is one of them, and it strikes me as being the antithesis of feudalism. Another, the autonomous expansion of capitalist industry inside feudalism, also refers to the creation of antifeudal institutions as opposed to a feudal inheritance. The Japanese situation, however, does support the idea that capitalism may flourish more readily in a feudal economy than in an agricultural one. Reischauer's list encapsulates the historical heritage of Japan as a whole, not only feudalism in Japan. On the other hand, modern Chinese society shows evidence of progress despite significant challenges and failures. China may overcome Russia if it learns from the errors made by the Soviet Union. Naturally, it is difficult to foresee the future. But at least we may avoid the chauvinism of assuming the best of our own. Treating the Japanese reaction to the challenge of the contemporary world as successful and the Chinese response as unsuccessful is silly.Let's attempt to determine which characteristics of premodern Japanese society contributed significantly to the process of modernisation while keeping these warnings in mind. As the old system crumbled, both vertical and horizontal cracks emerged, and both were maybe as significant. Furthermore, there were notable distinctions between Japanese and Western feudalism. Saying this would be terribly abstract; to understand what these findings truly imply, one has delve into the functioning of the civilization during a given time period.

One of Japan's most well-known emperors, Tokugawa Ieyasu, put an end to the age of feuding nobles and began an era of internal peace by his victory in the Battle of Sekigahara in the year 1600. This official governmental system, called the Tokugawa Shogunate by historians, lasted until the Emperor's Restoration in 1868.2 The major political principle of the Shogunate was the maintenance of peace and order. The rulers and the ruled formed a distinct segment of society. In exchange, when the system was functioning successfully, the peasants benefited from at least a degree of economic stability and political justice. The latter were mostly peasants, who the governing warrior classes considered primarily as a tool to work the land and generate taxes for their benefit. Between 1639 and the arrival of Commodore Perry in 1854, the rulers made every effort to repress any influences that might threaten the established order. These measures included harsh sumptuary edicts and nearly complete isolation of Japan from the outside world. Over time, one of the greatest causes of disturbance and concern for the monarchs were the merchants in the cities, about whom we will speak in due order.

There were substantial ranks and distinctions among the governing factions. The Emperor was a mysterious and reclusive character who, in the end, was only able to transform reputation into actual power for others. Instead of the dispersed feudal institutions of previous European history, the ShOgun controlled the reigns of power in a system that more closely resembled the absolutism of the Roi Soleil. The ShOgun owned between one-fourth and one-fifth of the agricultural land in the nation, along with various branches of the Tokugawa family and his immediate vassals. He derived the majority of his resources from this source. To manage his domain lands, he appointed about forty intendents with regular salaries. As in Western Europe at the same time, there was a strong bureaucratic infusion in Japanese feudalism. It is important to note a few aspects of the Tokugawa form of government. First of all, it constituted an effort to impose some kind of centralized bureaucratic control over a disorganized feudal polity where it was crucial to pit the powerful fiefs against one another. Furthermore, this fragmentation was never fully resolved. Some of the most significant vertical divisions that the Tokugawa polity had to contend with in the middle of the nineteenth century were those that had been covered up by the system put in place in 1600.

With their families, they are estimated to have numbered around 2,000,000 people, or about one-sixteenth of the entire population, on the eve of the Restoration. Officially, they were military retainers of the daimyIi and received an annual stipend in rice from them. Below the daimyIi was the main body of samurai, or warriors, among whom there were wide variations in power and wealth. By giving them stipends, the Tokugawa Shogunate eliminated one of the main causes of political instability in the previous era and cut them off from independent bases of power in the countryside. At the same time, by imposing peace, the Shogunate stripped the samurai of any real function in Japanese society and helped to create a group known as the impoverished samurai, which was a major factor in the Shogunate's eventual overthrow.

The days when a soldier would grow his own property during times of peace had long ago passed. All farmers were required to surrender their firearms as early as IS87, according to Hideyoshi, the renowned commander who contributed to the establishment of the Tokugawa dynasty. In addition to removing the threat posed by an armed populace, the policy was designed to highlight the stability and clarity of class distinctions. As a result, the ability to carry a sword eventually became the primary difference between a samurai and a rich peasant.

When absent from the Shogun's court, the daimyo, or ruler, resided in a castle town with his samurai, or retainers. The castle cities were the regional hubs through which the warrior elite took from the peasants the economic surplus that maintained it in the form of taxes. Few peasant communities were more than twenty miles distant from such a town. The tax-collecting administration essentially consisted of two sets of officials: district judges dispersed across the fief and those who ran the central offices in the castle or neighboring town. In quiet times, at least, the system operated with surprisingly minimal use of force. The powerful feudatories in the fiefs ruled according to their own ideals. They could not, however, build fleets, establish new castles, mint money, or arrange marriages without the ShOgun's approval. The fact that all sixteen of the major Outside Houses that were in existence in 1664 remained to control their respective fiefs up to the official end of feudalism in 1871 indicates the continuation of the fiefs as separate entities. To be true, at first, the Shogun openly meddled in the internal affairs of the fiefs, seizing and transferring vast swaths of land. The strategy of the following Shogun grew more cautious, and interventions in the internal affairs of a fief were considerably fewer, after the middle of the seventeenth century, when the system had been shaken down and the Shogun's position seemed safe.

So, in a nutshell, it was the Tokugawa Shogunate's system of government. As we've seen, it was a centralized and strictly regulated type of feudalism, to the point that one older writer describes it as a police state a label that, in 1900, was undoubtedly far more fitting than it would be in the wake of Hitler and Stalin. The Toku-gawa system was not one out of which was expected to arise the idea and practice of free society as understood in current Western civilisation, despite the fact that this classification today appears unsuitable. Early Japanese feudalism lacked elements that in the West were crucial to its expansion. The element of contract in the feudal relationship between lord and vassal was relatively weak in Japan; on the other hand, the elements of loyalty and obligation to superiors were heavily emphasized. In comparison to its European equivalent, the Japanese feudal tie seems more archaic, subjective, and irrational in Western debates. It depended less than in Europe on written or spoken contract to define individual obligations or privileges and more on unwritten tradition and ceremonial observance; it had the nature of a fictive familial connection, something very extensively employed in Japanese culture. The introduction of Confucian philosophy, which almost gained the status of an official religion,

provided further support for prevailing tendencies in this direction. The Tokugawa system had seen significant degradation by the time Commodore Perry's ships arrived there in 1854. Some of the social elements that finally resulted in the government that dropped its disastrous bombs on Pearl Harbor in 1941 had already been born as a result of the fall of the old order and efforts to protect the privileges of the agricultural class [10]–[12].

CONCLUSION

Other Asian nations' political and social evolution were significantly influenced by Asian fascism as well. For instance, the emergence of World War II in the Pacific was influenced by the advent of fascism in Japan and its expansionist objectives, and the Cold War tensions in Asia were exacerbated by the anti-communist ideology propagated by various fascist organisations in Asia. Numerous Asian nations are still affected by the legacy of Asian fascism, notably in the form of continuing discussions over nationalism, militarism, and authoritarianism. Although many of these nations have subsequently switched to democratic systems of governance, the ghost of fascism still hangs over the political and social landscape of the area.

REFERENCES

[1]   N. Langreiter, "James A. Mangan Hg., Superman Supreme. Fascist Body as Political Icon - Global Fascism," *L'Homme*, 2014, doi: 10.7767/lhomme.2001.12.1.184.

[2]   D. Banerji, "A fundamental shift in the approach to international health by WHO, UNICEF, and the World Bank: Instances of the practice of 'intellectual fascism' and totalitarianism in some Asian countries," *International Journal of Health Services*. 1999. doi: 10.2190/RAB4-D873-99AM-ACJR.

[3]   D. Hedinger, "The Spectacle of Global Fascism: The Italian Blackshirt mission to Japan's Asian empire," *Modern Asian Studies*. 2017. doi: 10.1017/S0026749X17000026.

[4]   J. A. Mangan, "Global fascism and the male body: ambitions, similarities and dissimilarities. (Prologue) / Le fascisme global et le corps masculin: les ambitions, les similitudes et les differences: prologue.," *Int. J. Hist. Sport*, 1999.

[5]   K. Braskén, N. Copsey, and D. Featherstone, *Anti-Fascism in a global perspective: Transnational networks, exile communities, and radical internationalism*. 2020. doi: 10.4324/9780429058356.

[6]   R. Goranowski, "A 21st Century Blueprint for Cognitive Dissonance Reduction as Linguistic Disarmament," *Int. J. Sci. Soc.*, 2011, doi: 10.18848/1836-6236/cgp/v02i01/51512.

[7]   N. Srivastava, "The intellectual as partisan: Sylvia Pankhurst and the Italian invasion of Ethiopia," *Postcolonial Stud.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/13688790.2021.1985235.

[8]   M. Willensky, "Japanese Fascism Revisited," *Stanford J. East Asian Aff.*, 2005.

[9]   C. Prescod, "Black People Against State Harassment (BASH) campaign – a report," *Race Cl.*, 2016, doi: 10.1177/0306396816643046.

[10]   W. Schaffar, "'Trust Me, I Am the One Who Will Drain the Swamp': An Interview With Walden Bello on Fascism in the Global South," *Austrian J. South-East Asian Stud.*, 2018, doi: 10.14764/10.ASEAS-2018.1-9.

[11]   M. Jal, "Introduction: On the new enlightenment," *Theory and Praxis: Reflections on the Colonization of Knowledge*. 2020. doi: 10.4324/9780367809508-1.

[12]   R. Hofmann, "The conservative imaginary: moral re-armament and the internationalism of the Japanese right, 1945–1962," *Japan Forum*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/09555803.2019.1646785.

CHAPTER 19

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON FEUDALISM OF MEDIEVAL

Dr. Shavya Singh, Assistant Professor
School of Education, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email id- shavyasingh@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Feudalism was the dominant social, economic, and political system in medieval Europe, lasting from the 9th to the 15th centuries. The system was based on a hierarchical relationship between lords and vassals, with land ownership and military service forming the basis of the feudal contract. Under feudalism, land was the primary source of wealth and power. Lords, who owned large estates or fiefs, granted portions of their land to vassals in exchange for their loyalty and military service. Vassals, in turn, were responsible for providing military support to their lords in times of war and for performing other duties, such as collecting taxes and administering justice. Feudal society was characterized by a rigid social hierarchy, with lords at the top and serfs at the bottom. Serfs were peasants who worked the land and were bound to the lord's estate. They were not free to leave or pursue other opportunities, and their labor was used to support the lord and his vassals.

KEYWORDS:

Feudal Contract, Fiefdom, Guilds, Hierarchy, Knights, Manorialism, Peasantry.

INTRODUCTION

There were many and intricate circumstances that led to this decay and regeneration. Specialists will undoubtedly continue to disagree for a very long time about their precise nature and relative relevance. However, it would not be too deceptive for our purposes to imply that they fundamentally divide into two categories: serenity and luxury. Peace allowed for the development of a commercial way of life both in the countryside and in the metropolis. Despite being closely monitored, commercial forces severely damaged the feudal edifice. The ability of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Japanese society to contain the polarizing and destructive effects of commerce falls somewhere between these two extremes, just as the Tokugawa system may strike the comparative historian as a species somewhere between the centralized agrarian bureaucracy of China and the much looser feudalism of medieval Europe [1]–[3].

The Tokugawa polity's epicenter emanated serenity and elegance to a significant degree. The ShOgun required the daimyo to spend certain amounts of time in the capital Edo, just as Louis XIV forced his nobility to live at Versailles. The results were comparable in both situations up to a point. The Shogun damaged the standing of his aristocrats while simultaneously bolstering the trade classes in the cities by promoting different sorts of extravagant display. The daimy 0 had higher costs since they had to keep homes in both their hometown and Edo. They had to pay in cash, which they had no power to coin, for their settlement in the capital as well as the expenditures of travel for themselves and a sizable entourage. In order to cover these costs,

daimyo often had to use the merchant's services to carry their extra rice and other local goods to the market, placing a tremendous financial burden on many fiefs. The merchant, on the other hand, relied on the daimyo for political protection, and the feudal nobleman often became reliant on the merchant for financing.

The economic standing of the samurai, which was reliant on the daimyo, is said to have declined during the Tokugawa, particularly after the middle of their rule. But the evidence does not prove anything. Cutting their samurai's stipends was one of the ways the daimyo tried to cover their own costs. Only during the Tokugawa era was it feasible to cut the stipend. The daimyo could afford to exact this sacrifice since they were no longer so heavily dependent on their vassals thanks to the Shogun's security of the peace and his power. There can be little question that the samurai's standing in Japanese society was declining, regardless of their real economic circumstances. Samurai just needed a god's worth of rice to support their way of life as warriors. The Tokugawa era's imposed calm left the warrior without any overtly significant societal obligations. While this was going on, rival prestige systems based on the riches of the merchants started to challenge the warrior qualities. Although the previous ethic was being challenged, a replacement had not yet emerged. Early in the eighteenth century, these shifts started to show their first signs.

Many samurai had tremendous strains on their loyalties as a result of losing their role as warriors and the decline of trade routes, which led to their physical and psychological disorientation. The claim made in the early nineteenth century that "the samurai hate their lords as their worst enemies" due to the practice of cutting stipends may be dismissed as literary hyperbole, but we can be assured that the cutbacks were widely re4 sented.22 The soldiers were forbidden from participating in any kind of business, which made things much more challenging. Even while many people broke the law to make ends meet, the money they made this way could hardly have increased their sense of security as samurai.

Many soldiers simply severed their bonds as a consequence and started to travel, or 'l'onin.A group that contributed to the unrest in the later half of the Tokugawa era were masterless men, who were often prepared for any violent confrontation. The fief of ChasM, which was crucial to the 1868 Imperial Restoration, served as a wonderful haven for the 'l'Onin.24 For these folks, the idea of eliminating the "barbarian" Westerners had a lot of appeal. Many argued that it would be impossible to drive the barbarians out if more ports were opened. We should be forced to adopt their disgusting calendar, fold the left lappet over the right, and write across the page.Thus, the lowest levels of the samurai formed a "lumpenaristocracy," a free-floating source of violence, which might be used for a variety of reactionary goals but was certainly not an English or French-style revolution.

They were distributed quite evenly on both sides in several of the key military conflicts preceding the Imperial Restoration.26 This potentially explosive power, a consequence of the way that Tokugawa had fundamentally transformed the position of the warrior class, may have blown Japanese society at the seams and brought about a return to feudal chaos without the foreign threat and tremendous political ability at the top [3], [4]. These damaging pressures on the previous system came directly from the merchants, if not ultimately. They play a role in Japanese society that is quite similar to that of Jews, including refusing to pay debts. In the later half of the century, the consequence of these measures especially confiscation was merely to make merchants less willing to provide loans.Sl   It was hard to smash the merchants since the aristocracy relied heavily, though not always, on these loans.

It is reasonable that the aristocracy and other educated groups in Japanese society felt resentment against the merchants who sometimes had a grip on certain elements of the nobility. Some Japanese intellectuals held the view that the only useful members of society were aristocrats and peasants, in a manner that is reminiscent of European physiocratic ideas at the same time and anti-Semitism at a later time. The government shouldn't care if merchants fail because they engage in a minor activity, on the other hand.32 As was previously said, the Shogun's government sometimes sought to put these or related concepts into practice. We can see the emergence of the anticapitalist mindset that would be so prevalent in the Japanese fascism in this conflict between a declining military aristocracy and a burgeoning commercial interest.

It would be gravely misleading to focus just on the conflict between the feudal nobility and the merchants, even if it is a very important component of the backdrop to subsequent changes. Japan, in contrast to Western Europe, did not create autonomous towns with charters that explicitly stated their political and legal independence from the local feudal power. There were, perhaps, some promising beginnings in this direction throughout the Tokugawa era. However, when the rule established itself as a centralized feudal system, it suppressed these impulses. The merchants were subject to rigorous restrictions as a result of this "refeudalization," as it is frequently referred to, which carefully enclosed them in the feudal system, where the authorities thought they could not do any damage.s8 The edicts of 1633–1641 had the effect of sealing the country, which limited the initiative of the merchants in part by eliminating the stimulation of foreign connections and rivalry.As we have previously shown, by around a hundred years following the installation of the pax Tokugawa, the primary impetus of commercial expansion had exhausted most of its vigor. After that, there was a propensity to settle down, enjoy the results of one's labor, and hold to tried and true business practices.

DISCUSSION

No additional discussion of the Tokugawa emperors' system of political control over the merchant class is necessary for our purposes. It suffices to say that they were rather successful, especially in the early years, and that as a consequence, the ascent of the merchants to economic dominance was "almost an underground movement.Even if there were times when the Japanese merchant's rage might make a daimyo quiver, these political restraints rendered him a dependent member of society. Naturally, there were considerable differences. Osaka's merchants were less reliant than those of Edo's capital. Additionally, compared to the earlier urban monopolists, provincial traders had a lower reliance on feudal connections for their markets and raw supplies in the later half of the era [5]–[7]. It is also true that certain of the merchants' specific social features and inclinations in the arts and other lighter pleasures of life harken back to pre-Puritan elements of Western commercial society. However, the Tokugawa system was not seriously threatened by this commercial culture, which peaked at the start of the eighteenth century.88 In essence, this tolerable licentiousness, which was mostly contained inside a certain area of the city, acted as a safety valve. If anything, it worked to keep the old system in place rather than toppling it.

For all of these reasons, the feudal ethic permeated Japanese merchants throughout the Tokugawa era. They absolutely failed to create any intellectual position to challenge the conventional viewpoint. E. Herbert Norman looked through a wide range of Japanese writings "to see if anyone had dared to express a sustained and penetrating criticism of the most oppressive aspects of Japanese feudalism, its social rigidity, its intellectual obscurantism, its scholastic sterility, its debasement of human values, and its parochial outlook on the outside

world."40 He was able to locate a few scattered expressions of discontent with the injustices of feudal domination in chronicles and literary works, but he was unable to track down a single significant thinker who launched a frontal assault on the system as a whole.41 My judgment is that psychological variables or any peculiar efficacy of the Japanese value system cannot account for the inability of the Japanese merchant class to establish a critical intellectual stance similar to that developed in the West.42 These hypotheses follow the same logical reasoning as the well-known theory that opium's effects are caused by its "dormitive" qualities. They raise the fundamental question, "Why did this specific outlook prevail when and where it did?," among others. The circumstances under which the Japanese merchant class developed starting in the seventeenth century are what the historical answer to this issue is. The isolation of the nation, the symbiotic connection between the merchant and the warrior, and the long-standing political supremacy of the warrior would appear to be the key components in any explanation of the merchants' limited success.

The military elite first forced a significant amount of the cash that poured into merchant coffers from the peasants. The elements that prevented the Japanese peasants from developing into a revolutionary force on par with their Russian and Chinese counterparts will next need to be covered in some depth. The focus of this debate will be on how the ruling classes understood and were impacted by the peasant issue. The peasantry thus supported the rest of the populace with their taxes, as is often the case in any agricultural state. The warrior aristocracy took advantage of this reality in the past to assert that the peasant was the cornerstone of a healthy society by which they obviously meant one in which the samurai were dominant. This is the typical rhetoric of a rural aristocracy under assault from business interests. Admiring the peasantry was a subliminal jab at the merchant. The often cited sardonic rhymed couplet, "Peasants are like sesame seeds; the more you press, the more comes out," is closer to capturing the true relationship between the samurai and the peasants.48 The Tokugawa had a great esteem for agriculture but very little for agriculturists, as Sir George Sansom notes sarcastically.

The issue of the peasantry and the challenge of building a modern army became entangled in the early 1860s. The answer to this problem has an impact on both the basic nature of society and Japan's independence as a sovereign state. To put it simply, the government had to determine whether or not to equip the populace in order to protect Japan from the enemy outside. It discussed the propriety of this move with its upper administrative authorities in 1863. Excerpts from the responses that have been revealed reveal two primary worries: that the peasants themselves would pose a threat to the existing order and that the daimyo in the fiefs might use this power against the Tokugawa government. Both apprehensions proved to be valid.

In places directly under the administration of the Shogun, particularly in Choti, the officials' influence over the peasants was less than it was in some of the outlying fiefs. Specifically Tokugawa domains included Edo and Osaka, two large cities from which commercial influences flowed. The leaders of ChOshii, on the other hand, were able to maintain their financial independence and avoid falling into the clutches of Osaka moneylenders and merchants thanks to a clever system of budgets and taxes. The peasant base and ancient feudal relationships in Choshii were largely intact for this reason.45 Even though there had been somewhat serious peasant uprisings in ChOshii much earlier, it wasn't until foreign warships bombarded the forts there in 1864 that influential circles in the fief started to believe that reform along Western lines was required, and they advocated that even the peasants should be armed. The establishment of these regiments in Choshii gave the pro-Emperor forces a crucial power basis.48

The "Pacifier and Commander-in-Chief of the Tosa!).do" distributed manifestos to the peasants and traders in these villages and posted plac- cards in conspicuous locations, inviting them to appear before the local Imperial army headquarters and bring accusations of tyranny and cruelty against the former Tokugawa administrators. They notably targeted the poorest people, orphans, widows, and those who had suffered injustice at the hands of the feudal powers. All complaints were guaranteed a thorough and sympathetic investigation, and it was further emphasized that guilty authorities will get justice.

Of course, the somewhat revolutionary thread was hardly the sole input from the peasantry. For a number of reasons, peasants fought on both sides of the Restoration conflict. As we'll see later, there was also a sizable reactionary element that called for a return to a pristine and idealized medieval past, not only among peasants but also among other followers of the Emperor. These elements are intertwined, giving rise to the Meiji Restoration's complex and, at least in the short term, somewhat ambiguous nature. By this time, the reader will have realized that the Restoration wasn't a bourgeois revolution, as some Japanese authors have claimed, but I'm not aware of any Western writers making the same claim. It was a traditional, feudal conflict between the central authority and the fiefs in some of its key characteristics.49 Furthermore, Satsuma, the "Prus- sia of Japan," about which we know relatively less, as well as Gh6snii were the fiefs that spearheaded the fight against the Shogun, where the old agricultural culture and feudal loyalty remained relatively much stronger.

Although these divisions and problems constituted the backdrop of the Restoration, they were mostly absent from the events leading up to it starting about 1860. The Restoration was made into a symbolic act that many parties could embrace for a broad range of conflicting reasons because to the constant danger of violent foreign intrusion. The Restoration was not very significant on its own, and it took some time before it became evident what it meant for the future of Japanese civilization. There was very little evidence of programmatic disagreements amongst clearly defined interest groups in the fights that surrounded it. For these reasons, the story of these years reads to a Westerner like a complicated and pointless labyrinth of intrigues. The reason they seem this way, in my opinion, is because the major players in the ruling class were mostly in agreement about what they desired: the removal of the foreigner and the least possible upheaval to the status quo. According to one widely accepted account, the Emperor wished to use the Shogunate to fight against "extremist" and "disorderly" groups, or anything else that smelled of revolutionary upheaval. As a result, the question changed to: Who should bell the cat? Much of the competition concentrated on who may be credited for pulling off this risky stunt, if it was even possible. Political responsibility was a huge disadvantage for the Shogunate in this conflict. The Shogunate's inability was evident whenever it failed to fulfill a promise that it was unable to maintain, such as removing the barbarian by a certain deadline. Opponents of the Shogun, on the other hand, were inevitably drawn to someone who was "above politics." The drawbacks of exercising political responsibility in a hopeless situation led to the ShO- gun's resounding loss more than any other element.

It could be beneficial at this point to evaluate the reasons of the Restoration in broader terms. The primary one, in my opinion, was the formation of peace and order, which in turn was caused by the partial destruction of the feudal structure by the growth of commerce. Along with the foreign invasion, this deterioration led to issues, and the Restoration was a crucial step in their resolution. The organizations that the Imperial movement drew are largely responsible for the solution's politically regressive characteristics. One was a group of nobles who attended the

Imperial court. Another group included a few disgruntled fief chiefs from areas where it seems that feudal systems were especially robust. Samurai, who were disenchanted with their specific lord but in no way with feudal society as a whole, also contributed significantly. The traditional, conservative businessmen opposed the concept of the nation being opened since it would raise business for them. Despite Mitsui interests being on both sides of the debate, the merchants generally did not take an active role in the conflict. There are very few indications of resistance to feudal systems outside of the peasantry. In terms of doctrine, the Restoration happened under the auspices of conventional iconography, primarily Confucian. As we've seen, there was no intellectual threat to the old system, least of all one that was motivated by profit.

In view of the organizations that backed the Restoration, what is astonishing is not how little the new administration accomplished, but rather how much. As we'll see in a moment, the Meiji government the name of the new regime took a number of significant efforts to remake Japan in the likeness of a modern industrial civilization. Why did this mostly feudal revolution implement a program with so many unquestionably innovative features? The causes are clear and have been stressed by several Japanese historians. Though it's probably a minor impact, there was some change in the nature of the ruling elite. Because Japanese society was divided along both vertical and horizontal lines, a portion of the agricultural ruling elite was able to secede from the Tokugawa regime and carry out a revolution from above. In this case, the foreign danger was important. As a result of its uniting power, the new administration behaved in a manner that protected the advantages of a tiny group of the elite, provided opportunities for others, and ensured the existence of the country. The new rulers of Japan, who were mostly chosen from the pool of samurai who had been suffering under the previous government, confronted two significant issues starting in 1868. A contemporary centralized state was one goal. The second was to establish a contemporary industrial economy. Both were essential for Japan to continue existing as a sovereign nation. When all of these issues were taken into account, a feudal society was dismantled and a modern one was built in its stead.

At least, that is how the issue seems to the social historian who has the benefits and drawbacks of hindsight. It hardly resembles how the issue seemed to others in the same time period. Many people joined the "Restore die Emperor - Expel the Barbarian" campaign in the hopes of establishing a more advanced form of feudalism. Our formulation is both too concrete and too abstract. Too broad in that, for the most part, those who supported the Restoration and the early Meiji eras wanted a modern state that would preserve as many of the benefits the ruling class had enjoyed under the ancien re- gime, taking only the necessary steps to keep the state from collapsing if they did not. Too definite in that it suggests a distinct, cohesive modernisation scheme. The early Meiji Japanese leaders were not dogmatic social theorists who were propelled into the realm of political duty like the Russian Marxists. However, if these requirements are kept in mind, this idea of the mission before the Meiji leaders will assist to sort out crucial historical events, their ramifications, and their connections to one another.

The great Western fiefs of Choshii, Satsuma, Hizen, and Tosa "voluntarily" offered their territories to the throne in March 1869, marking a crucial first step toward the establishment of an effective central government. At the same time, they proclaimed, "There must be one central governing body and one universal authority, which must be preserved intact."This must have been a really ticklish situation. It is obvious that the Restoration of the Night has only resulted in a power shift within the feudal order. So why did these powerful fiefs make this decision? Some historians believe that magnanimity and foresight had a role, but I have my doubts about how

significant they were. Even if this was not the ultimate solution, it may have been far more significant that the daimyo were permitted to keep half of their profits as a result of the lengthy talks that came before this step. A more significant factor was the fiefs' concern that, if they did not take this coordinated action, one set of provincial leaders may replace the Tokugawa. At the time, Satsuma itself nurtured precisely these goals. In other words, competition among those vying for power helped a central authority that was still quite weak.

The government kept the previous feudal lords in control as Imperial legates with the title of governor for the time being because it was not ready to put its newly acquired powers to the test. However, it didn't wait long for it to take the decisive action, proclaiming in a succinct edict in August 187 I that feudal territories would henceforth function as local administrative divisions under the control of the central government. Soon after, in a move reminiscent of the Tokugawa tactics, it forced all of the previous daimyo to vacate their estates and relocate to the capital with their families. The similarities are not only coincidental. The Tokugawa had established the and open talks in their triumph of 1600, which was "not a concession to rising democratic sentiment but a safeguard against the ascendancy of a single feudal group." The administration approved a slew of laws at the same time it was establishing its political identity, but their full impact wouldn't be seen for some time. Their overarching goal was to remove the restrictions placed by feudalism on the free flow of people and products in order to promote capitalist progress. The government established social class equality before the law in 1869, removed regional commerce and communication constraints, permitted crop freedom, and authorized the acquisition of land ownership rights. Even though the Tokugawa began to loosen the bonds of feudalism, land could now be treated like any other commodity and traded like any other, with significant ramifications for the rest of society that we will address in due order.

It was vital to provide significant compensation at least to important members of the old order if these alterations were to be carried out at all peacefully and from above rather than via a popular revolt. When the daimyo surrendered their fiefs in 1869, the government gave them half of their income. Such kindness was unsustainable. The government had little room to manoeuvre. The effort to change treaties in 187 I in a manner that would allow for the generation of greater money failed. The government determined that a compulsory cut in the daimyo and samurai stipend income was required in 1876. Even while everyone save the least significant daimyo got treatment that was relatively favorable, the majority of the samurai and lesser feudal chieftains took a serious hit.58 In essence, the new administration lavishly compensated a select group of its most important backers. However, the Meiji thought it imperative to reject the disgruntled samurai since they were a significant source of the energy that had overturned the previous system.

The decrease in samurai stipends was only the trend's peak. Actually, the destruction of the samurai was well on during the Tokugawa era and was only fully completed during the Meiji period. In Japan, modernization did not entail the annihilation of any portion of the ruling class by revolution. Instead, there was a protracted euthanasia procedure that lasted over three centuries. With the declaration of equality before the law, the social standing of the samurai all but disappeared, albeit they were given the hollow distinction of being called shizoku, or former samurai, which came with no privileges or exemptions. Under the Pax Tokugawa, they had already largely lost their function as soldiers. Conscriptions were instituted in 1873, thereby erasing all of their remaining advantages on that point. Finally, because feudal society was based

on the "working of the land by the peasant and its ownership by the 10rd," the opening up of property rights in land struck to the core of feudal pride and privilege.GO

All of this was hardly what the samurai had anticipated when they decided to assist the Restoration. Very many people who participated in the fall of the Tokugawa undoubtedly intended to change the feudal order in their favor rather than to destroy it.60 Therefore, it should come as no surprise that feudal forces rebelled and assaulted the new government once the significance of its policies had become apparent. The final violent uprising of the old order occurred in Satsuma in 1877. The first organized "liberal" movement in Japan emerged during this last spasm, in fact as a direct result of feudalism's demise. The circumstances could hardly have been less favorable.

After putting an end to the Satsuma Rebellion, the Meiji administration was in charge. It had been able to deconstruct the feudal machinery in only nine years and replace it with the bulk of contemporary society's fundamental structures. In contrast to the leftist revolutions of France in the eighteenth century or of Russia and China in the twentieth, this one was certainly a revolution from above, and it was carried out with very little violence. In any case, it was an impressive accomplishment for a government that had to navigate the conflicts of powerful fiefs, did not have its own army until after 1873, and was, as Sansom notes, more concerned with preserving its own existence than examining the political and social structure of its own country [8], [9].

CONCLUSION

Even though it was a successful system for governing society throughout the Middle Ages, feudalism had several drawbacks. Opportunities for progress were constrained by the tight social hierarchy and lack of social mobility, and the system promoted inequality and injustice. Furthermore, since feudal governance was fragmented, it was difficult to create a centralized state that could handle the intricate social, economic, and political problems of the modern period. Due to the continuation of hierarchical social structures and the concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a select few, feudalism has left its mark on many facets of contemporary society. The feudal structure, however, has largely given way to more sophisticated and dynamic types of social and political organization.

REFERENCES

[1]   A. T. Young, "The political economy of feudalism in medieval Europe," *Const. Polit. Econ.*, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s10602-020-09324-4.

[2]   J. L. Jensen, "The Return Of Medieval Society – Control, Surveillance And Neo-Feudalism In The Age Of The Internet," *Aoir Sel. Pap. Internet Res.*, 2019, Doi: 10.5210/Spir.V2019i0.10986.

[3]   R. Abels, "The Historiography Of A Construct: 'Feudalism' and the Medieval Historian," *Hist. Compass*, 2009, doi: 10.1111/j.1478-0542.2009.00610.x.

[4]   A. T. Young, "The Political Economy of Feudalism in Medieval Europe," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2020, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3592969.

[5]   G. Thoroczkay, "The Appearance of 'Feudalism' and 'Feudal' Forms of Property in Medieval Hungary," *Hist. Stud. Cent. Eur.*, 2021, doi: 10.47074/hsce.2021-1.02.

[6]   B. Stein, "Politics, Peasants and the Deconstruction of Feudalism in Medieval India," *J. Peasant Stud.*, 1985, doi: 10.1080/03066158508438265.

[7]   J. H. Pryor, "*Class conflict and the crisis of feudalism: essays in medieval social history* (review)," *Parergon*, 1991, doi: 10.1353/pgn.1991.0002.

[8]   K. Friday, "The Futile Paradigm: In Quest of Feudalism in Early Medieval Japan," *Hist. Compass*, 2010, doi: 10.1111/j.1478-0542.2009.00664.x.

[9]   S. Reynolds, "Re-Thinking Kinship and Feudalism in Early Medieval Europe," *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, 2007, doi: 10.1093/ehr/cem036.

CHAPTER 20

ABSENCE OF A PEASANT REVOLUTION

Prof. Rita Arora, Professor
School of Education, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email id-ritaarora@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The absence of a peasant revolution refers to the fact that despite widespread poverty, oppression, and inequality, there were no major peasant uprisings in Western Europe during the early modern period. This is in contrast to other regions such as China, where peasant revolts were common during the same time period. There were several factors that contributed to the absence of a peasant revolution in Western Europe. One important factor was the relative stability and strength of the feudal system. Unlike in China, where the central government was weak and local elites were often corrupt and exploitative, the feudal system in Western Europe provided a measure of stability and security for peasants. While they were often poor and oppressed, they had some measure of protection from their lords and could rely on the feudal hierarchy to resolve disputes and provide some level of social order.

KEYWORDS:

Agricultural Revolution, Capitalism, Class Consciousness, Feudalism, Industrial Revolution.

INTRODUCTION

Meiji's success was influenced by a number of things. In terms of self-interest, the new rulers had made excellent use of their opportunity. As we've seen, they risked offending the samurai in the future by making significant material concessions to the daimy iJ. Regarding the reduction of samurai stipends, it is impossible to imagine what else their financial situation would have permitted them to accomplish at this moment. They also avoided being too early drawn into a foreign conflict. At a deeper level of historical causation, the Tokugawa era's actions already undercut the warrior class's authority and paved the ground for a centralized government without simultaneously unleashing any significant potential for revolt. Thus, the Meiji system continued prior tendencies and, as the remainder of our narrative will demonstrate, largely preserved the original structure. Finally, the Imperial institution served as a focal point for essentially conservative tendencies and a framework of legitimate continuity within which to make a number of required reforms, as many Japanese historians have stressed [1], [2].

Before continuing with the study, we may stop to consider the hypothesis with which this began, namely that feudalism is the key to the disparate outcomes of Japan, Russia, and China in modern times. By this time, it may be obvious that achieving what we would today refer to as totalitarian consensus requires using more than just inequalities in internal social structure. There are some intriguing similarities between this and certain American beliefs about communism and counterinsurgency. The Western world's arrival in Japan was a rather sudden event. For many Japanese officials, the superiority of Western weapons and technology became clear very

quickly. The issue of national survival and the need to take adequate action to protect it quickly came to the fore. For the purpose of simplicity, we'll restrict our first comparison observations to China. At first, China seemed to be superior than the West. The representatives of Western civilization may be treated with polite curiosity and contempt by its rulers for a very long time. Westerners were eventually able to establish a sizable territorial footing in China, in part because to this. The weakness of the judicial system only gradually became apparent. The Manchu dynasty faced internal opponents at critical junctures, like as the Taiping Rebellion, and the West made the decision to back them. This decision further delayed the rulers' realization of the risks posed to them. The process of dynasty disintegration had advanced too far to be stopped by the time influential circles had fully realized the risks, let's say by the time of the Boxer Rebellion.

The Chinese bureaucracy would have needed to promote trade and broaden the revenue base in order to successfully address the home and international issues it faced in the later half of the nineteenth century. However, such a program would have challenged the scholar-official's authority and the whole static agricultural system upon which it was built. Instead, when the central machinery crumbled, officials and wealthy families stole local resources. Early twentieth century regional warlords took the role of the previous Imperial administration. One of these larlords may have succeeded the others, uniting China, and launching a politically reactive era marked by some degree of industrial development. At one point, Chiang Kai-shek seemed on track for success. If it had occurred, historians could today be emphasizing the parallels rather than the contrasts between China and Japan. The crucial analogy would have been a section of society isolating itself from the rest in order to seize power and implement a conservative form of modernisation.

But was such a prospect ever really "in the cards," to use the words of a loser gambler? There is no simple solution. Yet again, it was affected by significant elements. In addition to the distinctions between Japanese feudalism and Chinese bureaucracy, the time issue was also present. Chiang had to contend with an aggressively growing Japan as he tried to force China's unification. Additionally, the feudal units in Japan continued to operate under their own identities despite the Tokugawa government's centralization. The Japanese fiefs were autonomous groups that, if cut off from the Tokugawa political system, could have been able to exist relatively well. Their leaders derived the tranquil pleasure of aristocratic privilege from the pax Tokugawa. A handful of the feudatories were easily able to separate and carry out a coup d'état when the system as a whole was suddenly endangered. Thus, the Imperial Restoration has a few traits of a successful revolution.

However, Prussia would make a fairer comparison and one that Thorstein Veblen noted over fifty years ago in his book Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution. The ability of a portion of the landed aristocracy to promote industrialization against the will of its more backward members in order to catch up with other countries, as well as the disastrous culmination of the entire policy in the middle of the twentieth century, are the key similarities, though there are very important differences that will be discussed in due course.Both Germany and Japan have retained major elements of bureaucratic structure from the feudal period. It sets them apart from countries like England, France, and the United States, where feudalism has either been abolished or is not present, and where modernization has advanced rapidly and democratically. These countries are fundamentally and appropriately characterized as those of a bourgeois revolution. Germany and Japan also vary from both Russia and China in this regard since they were agricultural bureaucracies as opposed to feudal polities [3]–[5].

Therefore, neither feudalism in and of itself nor feudalism as a disembodied generic category offers the secret to how Japanese society transitioned into the modern age. Feudalism must also have the unique element of time. Second, the jump was made feasible by the unique kind of feudalism practiced in Japan, one with significant bureaucratic components. One of the driving forces behind the Western type of free institutions was missing due to the unique nature of the Japanese feudal bond, which placed a considerably more premium on status and military devotion than on a freely chosen contractual connection. Once again, the bureaucratic component of the Japanese polity delivered its typical outcome of a subdued and timid bourgeoisie incapable of overthrowing the status quo. the causes of a significant intellectual challenge's absence. The intellectual and social difficulties that sparked the Western bourgeois revolutions were weak to nonexistent in Japan, but they are a part of a larger phenomena that had their roots deeper in Japanese history. Finally, and probably most significantly, the ruling classes were able to control and deflect disruptive forces emanating from the peasants during the transition and on into the age of industrial civilization. There was no peasant revolution, neither was there a bourgeois revolution. Our next objective will be to comprehend how and why it was feasible to subdue the populace.

DISCUSSION

The lack of a peasant revolt in Japan throughout the country's shift from an agricultural to an industrial society may be explained by three interconnected factors. First off, it seems that the Tokugawa taxation system was designed to leave an expanding surplus among peasants who were motivated enough to increase their productivity. In this way, it assisted in boosting output, which started to increase in the latter Tokugawa period and carried on to do so during the Meiji administration. Secondly, the peasant community and the feudal ruler, as well as his historical successor the landlord, had intimate ties in Japanese rural culture, in stark contrast to China. The Japanese peasant community also offered a robust system of social control that included people with real and prospective grievances in the status quo, again in contrast to China. This was true due to a particular division of labor, together with the property, land tenure, and inheritance systems that were in place throughout the late Tokugawa period. Thirdly, this system of institutions demonstrated its adaptability to commercial agriculture by combining repressive mechanisms from the previous order with fresh ones that were suitable for a contemporary society.

The emergence of a new landlord was a crucial component of the changeover. a class, mostly made up of peasants, who exploited the government and rural community's customary methods to extract rice from the peasants and sell it in the market. Additionally, the transition from earlier feudal systems to tenancy offered some benefits for the peasants at the bottom of the social scale. All things considered, fascism had to be sacrificed in order to restore the old order from the past and integrate a peasant economy into an industrial society [6]–[8]. The changeover proved challenging. The ability of the dominating classes to pull it off was sometimes in doubt. There was a lot of violent resistance from the local peasants. The current generation of Western historians has a tendency to downplay the significance of peasant unrest for a number of reasons. It will be prudent to study the available data before going into any further depth on social patterns and relationships in the rural. Illusions of inevitableness may be avoided by taking action immediately away. It did appear to me that a Bourgeois revolution was impossible. There is substantially less evidence to support the idea that a comfortable one was impossible.

As we have seen, there were several instances of peasant violence in the latter Tokugawa years. Even while it is hard to pinpoint the exact causes of many uprisings, much alone the participants' motivations, there is a wealth of data that suggests that commercial interests played a significant role. In many cases, merchants were a major target. For instance, the peasants in the western provinces rose up against the merchants in 1783–1787 following a string of crop failures. The merchants had acquired property in return for the money and products the peasants had borrowed, which allowed them to become landlords. Another time, in 1823, 100,000 farmers revolted in one of the Tokugawa domains due to the corruption of the local administrative officer who was associated with the rice merchants. These officials were acting as representatives of the ruling class and collecting taxes, spying on the farmers, and adding taxes for their own profit. In a comparable major upheaval, local officials' attempts to provoke the dragon deity and beg for a poor crop in order to increase prices seem to have been the immediate causes of the outbreak63. Tenancy conflicts, a kind of conflict that would become much more significant during the Restoration, start to be mentioned as early as the middle of the Tokugawa era or the middle of the eighteenth century64.

The peasants used a variety of weapons in addition to outright violence. Some people "voted with their feet" before they knew about voting, much as their Russian counterparts did, but there were far fewer opportunities in Japan than in Russia. One or more villages abandoning their homes collectively in certain locations became a common occurrence, which is a powerful indicator of the communal spirit of the Japanese village. They entered the nearby "fief" or "province" and petitioned the ruler to let them to stay. his purview. Borton claims that there are records of 106 such desertions, with Shikoku accounting for the majority of them.

Borton's findings made it abundantly evident that the ruling group was facing increasingly serious difficulties as a result of the economic partnerships' encroachment into the country's feudal structure. The feudal master, the merchant, and the burgeoning landlordism were the three principal targets of the peasant violence. The peasant movement was unquestionably hazardous to the degree that these institutions were coming together. The fact that this interlocking was relatively weak in the major geographical foundation of the Imperial movement, the huge fief of Choshii, may have contributed to the Meiji government's ability to weather the storm.

Immediately after the Restoration, the threat persisted for a while. The state land would be split up for the benefit of the peasants, as had been promised. However, they quickly realized that the promise was unfulfilled and that, on top of that, their tax burden would not be reduced. They seemed to have nothing to gain from the new system, which was evident. Agrarian uprisings reached a violent climax in 1873, the year of the new land tax66, which will be further addressed in the context of the issues facing the landowners. Over 200 peasant uprisings occurred in the first ten years of the Meiji administration, significantly more than in any corresponding period during the Tokugawa. Never in the contemporary era, claims T.e. Smith, who never exaggerates the aggressiveness of the peasants, said, "Has Japan been this near to a social revolution.

This reactionary response was particularly prominent in Japan, where many samurai were quick to take advantage of their understanding of peasant psychology and even to set themselves at the head of peasant risings against the government. This was possible because, as we have seen, the peasant movement of these ten years was dominated by "stubborn antagonism to rent, usury, and exorbitant taxa- tion," the typical reaction of the peasant to the intr

The tax reduction of 1877 marked the end of the first and most serious wave of peasant revolt.69 The second outbreak in 1884 - 1885 was a more local affair, confined to mountainous re- gions north of Tokyo, especially noted for the production of raw silk and the textile industry. There peasant households, working under the putting-out system, derived a large part of their income from these sources. After the dissolution of the /iyuto, Japan's early "liberal" movement, certain radical local affiliates, disap- pointed by their leaders' defection and goaded by continuing eco- nomic difficulties, turned to open revolt.70 In one prefecture, Chichibu, the outbreak was severe enough to resemble a miniature civil war and required fairly extensive efforts by the army and the military police to put it down, after it had attracted wide popular attention. One of the related and simultaneous outbreaks, of which there were several, produced straightforward revolutionary slogans and public statements with concrete objectives, such as tax reduc- tion and revision of the conscription law. Yet significantly even this group called itself a patriotic society. Everywhere, however, the government succeeded in suppressing the revolts. Their main consequence was to intensify the split betwe,en the more prosperous elements in the countryside, mainly the new landlords, and the poorer sections of the peasantry.

Out of a population of about 50 million, only about 460,000 were granted electoral rights shortly after the government announced the new constitution in 1689. Rural radicalism would not become a significant issue again until the tenancy disputes that followed World War I. Why were the revolts of the peasants not more serious? To answer this question, it is necessary to look more closely at rural society and the changes that it underwent. They show that there was more than sporadic resistance to the change from the premodern agrarian system to a new one. They also reflect many of the usual difficulties of the transition to capitalism and commercial farming in the countryside. The methods of extracting this surplus formed the core of nearly all political and social problems, and as in any agrarian society, the majority of the economic surplus that supported the upper classes was generated by the Japanese peasants. Professor Asakawa, a distinguished historian of the older generation, has observed that the first issue of village administration under the Tokugawa was the collection of taxes.

At the same time, the Japanese feudal system tightly bound the peasants to their lords.The primary tax was a land tax, which was assessed based on each holding's officially established productive potential rather than the peasant as an individual. Authorities on Japan once held the opinion that, for the most part, the feudal lord of the Tokugawa period used the machinery of village administration "to extract a larger and larger surplus out of the peasantry" in order to push for greater expenditures in the Shogun's capital and elsewhere.78 Detailed investigation of the incidence of taxation in several widely dispersed villages revealed that this was not the case. The result was that the peasant received a bigger sum of money.

Farmers who did not raise the yield of their farms were subject to taxes, while those who did so benefitted. It is simple to see that a taxing system that removed a predetermined quantity of product from each farm each year would have this impact, despite the fact that the specifics of how it operated being unclear. The tax, assessed on the village as a whole in proportion to the lord's assessment of the produce on individual fields, was distributed by the Japanese villagers in an unknown manner. However, there is very convincing evidence that the tax system promoted increased output76. Additionally, there is no sign of any regular transfer of property and associated costs, like what we see in the Russian village. Without any conscious effort, it seems that Tokugawa taxation and agricultural policy, as developed by the ruling elite and the peasants themselves, was a "wager on the strong."

Furthermore, significant obstacles to the development of a revolutionary potential among the peasants were imposed by the structure of Japanese society. Some of these are also present in the way the Tokugawa system of tax collecting is run. Early Tokugawa monarchs separated the warrior from the land, which resulted in the peasant's financial responsibilities to the government seeming more like public taxes to the government than like personal dues to the lord. The earlier personal corvee was gradually incorporated into the corvee for the public, and there were no banalities.77 It's very likely that the appearance of public obligations made it easier for the peasantry to transfer their property from the feudal 'Overlord to the modern state when the time came during the Meiji Reform. Along with these bureaucratic characteristics that distinguished the Tokugawa administration as an imperial "government" above and beyond the peasants, it also maintained even more significant feudal and paternalistic characteristics that allowed the governing soldiers to send its tentacles into peasant life.

The Tokugawa monarchs restored the traditional Chinese pao system of village administration to provide teeth to their system of tax collection and paternalistic oversight of village life. This strategy of breaking up village houses into smaller organizations that took on responsibility for the behavior of their members never appears to have been very effective in China. The early Tokugawa era took it and imposed it on the whole rural and urban population of their domain, even though it had been known in Japan since the major borrowing from China in the seventh century. According to Asakawa, it was ordered for every resident of the village, regardless of position or standing, to be a part of one of these five-man groups, and it was duly obeyed. The five-man group typically consisted of five landholding house fathers who lived close to one another, along with their families, dependents, and tenants. Starting around the middle of the seventeenth century, the practice of having the five-man group swear under oath to carry out the lord's commands repeating them as accurately as possible in the form they were given began to spread.

A new device of public proclamations or the placement of notice boards in the villages urging the peasants to behave well was added to the five-man group. Sometimes in contemporary publications, it is said that since Japanese peasants were so subservient to authorities, these public announcements were nearly enough to maintain peace and order. As I'm attempting to show, there were other, more compelling explanations for this orderliness, which in any case had experienced moments of severe turbulence. However, it is good to take a quick look at the content of one of the messages since it could change the sense of "natural" orderliness. This one, from the middle of the seventeenth century, mentions Buddha, although the tone is very Confucian:

Be respectful to your parents. Taking care of oneself is the first rule of filial piety. If you adhere to the aforementioned rule, Buddha's blessings will be upon you, allowing you to proceed in the correct direction and reap bountiful crops from your land. On the other side, if you start to overindulge and be sluggish, you'll end up penniless and broken and have to turn to stealing. Then the law will seize you, bound you with rope, place you in a cage, and maybe hang you. How devastated your parents must feel if this occurs! Furthermore, as a result of your transgression, you must also punish your wife, kids, and brothers. The advice continues with some observations on the pecuniary benefits of good conduct before concluding with the following insightful admonition:The five-man group and other methods were used to get everyone in the hamlet to care about how each home behaved. Adoption, marriage, succession,

and inheritance were all effectively regulated. Peasants were supposed to keep an eye on Japan as it recovered from its most significant internal crisis since the Satsuma Rebellion.

The incident on February 26th served as a precursor to other political machinations that don't need our attention and the establishment of a totalitarian fadade, all of which occurred between 1938 and 1939. This attempted coup was a defeat for "fascism from below," which was essentially the anticapitalist and popular Right, which was sacrificed to "fascism from above," or, we might say, to respec fascism, the taking over by high government officials of those features they could use and the discarding of popular elements. This analysis, which was made in Japan, was very insightful. Fascism advanced quickly at this point. Radicals were detained, political parties were abolished, and the Imperial Rule Assistance Association a very poor ripoff of a Western totalitarian party was installed in their stead. Japan soon joined the anti-Comintern Triple Alliance, abolished all unions, and replaced them with an organization for "service to the nation through industry. "107 As a result, by the end of 1939, Japan had taken on many of the outward characteristics of fascism in Europe.

Similar to Germany, a great deal of pushing and pulling between conflicting interest groups was hidden under the totalitarian façade. Right-wing extremists never really held power in any nation, but Japan didn't need a blood cleanse to keep them out. Compared to Germany, centralizing the economy in Japan seems to have been more of a farce. Big business in Japan has successfully resisted calls to put money before nationalism. Business thrived greatly throughout the whole of military rule and fascism. From 6 billion yen in 1930 to 30 billion yen in 1941, industrial production increased. Light and heavy industries were in reverse order of importance. Heavy industry's share of total industrial output increased from 38% in 1930 to 73% in 194Z by nominally yielding to government control.2oo the four major zaibatsu companies, Mitsui, Mitsubishi, Sumitomo, and Yasuda, emerged from the Second World War with combined assets of more than 3 billion yen, up from only 875 million in 1930.201

In reality, anticapitalism was nothing more than a minor annoyance for the zaibatsu, which they were mostly able to control until approximately 1936. This was a small price to pay for their aggressive internal repression and global expansion policies, which allowed them to enrich themselves. Fascism, patriotism, reverence for the military, and big business were all necessary for the military and the patriots to carry out their political agenda. The radical agrarians were unable to perceive this or at least refused to acknowledge it. In particular, individuals influenced by Nohon-shugi's views found themselves in an unwinnable situation. These groups had a deeply held animosity for the plutocracy and the old military establishment, whom they saw as the servants of the plutocrats. Some of them even romantically believed in acts of individual terrorism202.

However, they only had an idealistic portrayal of the Japanese peasantry to put them in their place. Radical agrarian ideals were in direct opposition to the demands of an expansionist agenda being implemented by a contemporary industrial society; thus, the more traditional elites had no trouble shoving them away while stealing certain concepts to win over the general public. When the extreme Nazis were exterminated in Germany during the Blood Purge of 1934, it happened very much in the same way, but more abruptly and ruthlessly. If we quickly examine the narrative from the perspective of the army in Japan, the inherent constraints of agricultural rightist radicalism and frantic Emperor worship become even more obvious. Between 1920 and 1927, the sons of small landowners, wealthy farmers, and members of the urban petty bourgeoisie made up around 30% of those joining the cadet corps. There were several instances

of reservists siding with farmers in their conflicts with landowners at this time.208 As a result, a new group with a new social foundation and political orientation had emerged.

The army's older, more aristocratic leadership had at this point started to be replaced. General Araki, who was a leading proponent of "independence" from financial magnates and court cliques by the 1930s, served as their chief spokesperson.2l4 Consistent with this radical outlook, many of them became opposed to modernizing the army, the new emphasis on economic planning, and the adoption of a more advanced technology.2l5. For a brief period of time after 193%, Araki's talk about aid to agriculture caused a flurry among the industrialists. Despite this, he soon changed his tune and started discussing the laziness of the Japanese peasant under the degrading influence of modern temptations. During the war boom of the 1930s, the profits made by the industrialists again disturbed the dissident army group with agrarian ties, which led to the resignation of the war minister in 1940. the army even went as far as to attempt to establish a sham government. Until the Kwantung Army was forced to concede that it could not industrialize the region on its own and would have to use industrial help, even if reluctantly, Manchuria remained mostly an agricultural region. The occupation of North China did not end until the army had learnt its lesson and until the need for industrial support in Manchuria had brought military and commercial interests closer together the army's display. the folly of Japanese rightist agricultural theory and its final reliance on big business is plainly shown by rushing away to escape the modern world. The price big business was able to demand from the agrarian and petty-bourgeois nationalists in the modus vivendi of Japanese imperialism was the abandonment of anticapitalism, in reality if not in words [9]–[11].

CONCLUSION

Overall, the lack of a peasant revolt in Western Europe throughout the early modern period is an important historical fact that highlights the region's distinct social, economic, and political circumstances at the time. Additionally, it draws attention to how intricate and multidimensional social development is and how various geographic and cultural contexts react to the same historical factors. Many historians disagree on whether or not there was a peasant revolt in Western Europe. Some claim that revolt was impossible or unnecessary because of the relative stability of the feudal system and the development of a powerful central authority. Others cite the development of new types of political and social organizations, such as guilds and other groups, as proof that peasants were able to better their conditions without resorting to revolution.

REFERENCES

[1]   S. Popkin, "The rational peasant - The political economy of peasant society," *Theory Soc.*, 1980, doi: 10.1007/BF00158397.

[2]   A. Pearse, "Seeds of plenty, seeds of want: social and economic implications of the Green Revolution.," *Seeds plenty, seeds want Soc. Econ. Implic. Green Revolution.*, 1980, doi: 10.2307/40202008.

[3]   T. P. Wickham-Crowley, "A qualitative comparative approach to latin American revolutions," *Int. J. Comp. Sociol.*, 1991, doi: 10.1163/002071591X00050.

[4]   O. Saito, "An industrious revolution in an east asian market economy? Tokugawa Japan and implications for the great divergence," *Aust. Econ. Hist. Rev.*, 2010, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8446.2010.00304.x.

[5]   S. L. Popkin, "The Rational Peasant," In *The Rational Peasant*, 2021. doi: 10.1525/9780520341623-003.

[6]   J. C. Scott, "Revolution in the revolution - Peasants and commissars," *Theory Soc.*, 1979, doi: 10.1007/BF00158679.

[7]   T. Kovalevskaya, "Fyodor Dostoevsky and the contronym that was the Russian revolution," *Stud. East Eur. Thought*, 2017, doi: 10.1007/s11212-017-9295-8.

[8]   S. Eckstein, "The impact of revolution on social welfare in Latin America," *Theory Soc.*, 1982, doi: 10.1007/BF00173109.

[9]   S. Nefedov, "The food crisis in petrograd on the Eve of the February revolution," *Quaestio Ross.*, 2017, doi: 10.15826/qr.2017.3.242.

[10]   T. Skocpol, "State and revolution - Old regimes and revolutionary crises in France, Russia, and China," *Theory Soc.*, 1979, doi: 10.1007/BF00158678.

[11]   T. Skocpol, "State and revolution," *Theory Soc.*, 1979, doi: 10.1007/bf00158678.

CHAPTER 21

VILLAGE SOCIETY: OBSTACLES TO REBELLION

Dr. Savitri Mathur, Assistant Professor
School of Education, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email id- savitrimathur@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Village societies are often viewed as conservative, traditional, and resistant to change, making them challenging environments for revolutionary movements to gain traction. This is because villages tend to be tightly knit communities with strong social bonds and shared values that make it difficult for dissenting voices to gain traction. One of the primary obstacles to rebellion in village societies is the close social ties that exist between villagers. People in village societies often share close family ties, friendships, and other social bonds that create a sense of community and belonging. This can make it difficult for outsiders to gain a foothold and promote radical political change.

KEYWORDS:

Feudalism, Ideology, Land Tenure, Peasant Rebellions, Political Oppression, Poverty, Religion.

INTRODUCTION

The Mogul rulers temporarily evaded the hazards of an aristocratic challenge on their authority by skimming off the majority of the economic excess produced by the underlying people and turning it into show. The prospects for economic progress, namely the type of economic development that would have overthrown the agricultural system and built a new form of society, were severely constrained by such a use of the surplus. The importance of this concept is shown by the common claim made by Marxists and Indian nationalists that Indian society was poised to break out from the confines of an agricultural economy when British imperialism arrived, but that this potential growth was stifled and perverted. On the basis of the data, which strongly supports the contrary thesis—that neither capitalism nor parliamentary democracy could have developed unassisted from seventeenth-century Indian society this conclusion appears entirely unnecessary.

As we focus on the towns and any seeds of an Indian bourgeoisie there may have been, this conclusion is reinforced. There were some seeds of the Protestant ethic, a much-discussed demiurge of social history, as well as some vestiges of that viewpoint. The Banians are a caste of bankers and brokers, and Tavernier, a French traveler of the seventeenth century, describes them as being so deft and skilled in trade that However, the Indian society at the time was not one where these qualities could find enough room to challenge the dominant mode of production.

There were other cities. Travelers from Europe during the period compared the famous European cities of Rome, Paris, and Constantinople to Agra, Lahore, Delhi, and Vijayawada. But trade and business were not the main reasons these cities existed. They primarily served as governmental

and, to a lesser degree, religious hubs. Merchants and traders were comparatively insignificant. There is no middle class, observes French traveler Bernier upon arriving in Delhi. A guy must either have the greatest status or lead an impoverished life. Of course there were merchants, and they even participated in overseas trade, but by this time the Portuguese had annexed the majority of the gains from this activity.1s Here is a fact that does lend credence to the claim that European imperialism suppressed indigenous modernizing ambitions, but it doesn't strike me as being very conclusive. Additionally, there were artists who focused on creating luxury goods for the rich [1]–[3].

Political and societal obstacles were the biggest hindrances to trade. Some of them may not have been any worse than what Europe experienced at the same time with regard to highway robberies, annoyances, and excessive transit fees. The Mogul legal system lagged behind European law. Because there was no such thing as a "professional lawyer," a business owner who wanted to enforce a contract or collect a debt could not do so. He was had to present his case in person before a legal system that was rife with subjective and capricious characteristics. Bribery was almost universal. Even more significant was the emperor's custom of taking possession of richer merchants' and officials' material possessions as soon as they passed away. From a letter sent by Aurangzeb, the last of the Great Moguls, which traveler Bernier managed to save a section of, Moreland quotes:

We are used to putting seals on a rich merchant or Omrah's coffers as soon as they stop breathing, sometimes even before the life force has left, and beating or imprisoning the household servants or officers until they completely empty the property, down to the smallest gem. There is no denying the benefits of this technique, but can we ignore its unfairness and cruelty? Probably not in all cases did this occur. However, as Moreland drolly notes, commerce must have suffered due to the possibility of an unexpected demand for the whole visible capital at a time when the death of its owner had likely temporarily put the company's operations in doubt. One also wonders whether the emperor consistently and consciously abstains from accelerating human decease, the conclusion of which would be for him such a wonderful occurrence. All of these ideas must have been discussed in the business community and prevented the expansion of trade.

In general, the political authorities in India seem to have acted more like a spider toward a fly than like a cowherd with his cow, a behavior that was common in Europe at the same period. Even Akbar, the most progressive Mogul ruler, lacked a Colbert. The situation was certainly a little worse in the Hindu districts. Even though they were also under pressure to create and spend their riches quickly, local leaders like the governor of a town sometimes adopted a different stance. Overall, I think it is reasonable to say that the establishing of peace and order did not give birth to a situation where the emergence of commercial tendencies could threaten to destroy the agricultural system to the same degree that it did in Japan. That was not possible due to the predatory nature of the Mogul system. Its rulers and officers weren't always more cruel people, but because of the way the system operated, selfish conduct was sometimes the only one that made sense.

DISCUSSION

Over time, the Mogul system was severely damaged by this predatory trait. The Great Mogul received a British stipend when the Mogul rule fell apart in the eighteenth century in the face of weak European armies. A closer look at the relationship between the peasants and the Mogul

bureaucracy exposes some of the causes. Prior to the Mogul invasion, the Hindu system was one in which the peasants paid a portion of their output to the monarch, who decided the amount of his share as well as the procedures for assessment and collection, within restrictions set by tradition, law, and what the market would bear. Because it was already in line with their own traditions, the Moguls took up this arrangement from the Hindu kings with very little modification.24 The Mogul administration concepts, particularly those of Akbar, promoted a direct contact between the peasant and the state. Except for short times and in relatively limited regions, the Mogul rulers never attained this objective. Ideally, both the assessment and the collection of the income were to be controlled from the center via officials who should account in detail for all revenues. It would have needed to be implemented through the hiring of a large group of paid bureaucrats who would report directly to the emperor. Such a plan seems to have been unattainable for this agricultural society's material and human resources. Much as it was beyond what the tsars could do[4].

The most popular approach was to allocate the royal portion of the output in a certain region, as opposed to distributing cash out of the royal treasury directly to imperial officials. The task came with a grant of executive power sufficient to make the necessary assessments and collect the necessary money. The region may be a whole province or just a small hamlet, and the sum to be raised may be used to cover the expense of keeping soldiers on duty or providing some other function. These assignees controlled the majority of the empire throughout the Mogul era, perhaps as much as 78% of its total area. This arrangement not only functioned to collect taxes but also to find soldiers for the army. These two primary functions of the Mogul bureaucracy were carried out by a single group of officials, who were also in charge of maintaining law and order.

This fundamental pattern has several local modifications, the specifics of which we may fairly disregard. As Moreland notes, Akbar's rule was very pragmatic. One aspect, however, warrants attention due to its subsequent significance. "A chief or a raja who submitted and agreed to pay a reasonable revenue was commonly aiIowed to retain his position of authority: one who was recalcitrant or bellious was killed, imprisoned, or driven away, and his lands taken under direct control." The Mogul emperors found it essential to govern and collect taxes via native authority quite often, albeit not always. Zamindars was the collective word for these intermediaries.

There was a great deal of ambiguity due to variations in practice and use. Even if the distinction between them is often hazy, it is nevertheless feasible to divide zamindars into two major groups based on how dependent they are on the central government. A succession of conquests in numerous areas of the nation had resulted in a scenario where members of the conquistador caste had established their own rights to the collection of money from the peasants in a specific region. Many parts of the countryside were peppered with fortresses owned by the local aristocracy, who had their own bands of armed retainers. Although these zamindars had no official position in the Mogul system of tax collection, they were often asked to pay taxes on territories that they themselves claimed comparable rights to.

As a result, they shared tax collection powers with the Mogul administration. In reality, zamindar rights could be traded, split, and passed down through the generations in a manner similar to how bonds and stocks represent claims on the profits of contemporary corporations. The Mogul rulers often fought this subliminal threat to their own dominance and made every effort to integrate the zamindars into their own service. According to Mogul theory, the imperial authority may reinstate or grant zamindari powers whenever it pleased. It's unclear how far this was truly

possible. Other zamindars were somewhat equivalent to chieftains. They were left alone as long as they paid their taxes. The holdings of chiefs and princelings were not insignificant, even if the wealthiest and most populated regions were directly under imperial rule.

As a result, locals made up the empire. Despotisms of various sizes and levels of independence, all of which contributed money to the imperial coffers, exist today. A number of regional aristocracies were created by the lesser zamindars. Despite being divided from families close to the crown due to their status as conquered subjects and being too divided and devoted to their communities to challenge or replace royal absolutism like the English aristocracy, smaller zamindars nonetheless played a significant political role. As the imperial system deteriorated and grew more oppressive, zamindars of all sizes served as the focal point for peasant uprisings. Indian elites and peasants alone were unable to create a workable political entity in India. However, they may penalize foreigners for their mistakes and weaken their position. The peasants carried out these actions both under the Moguls and, with new friends, under the British; similar trends are still visible in the third quarter of the 20th century.

The debate of whether Indian culture had a system of private land ownership has been centered on the word "zamindar." It has been discovered through time that the query amounted to asking what ties existed between men that regulated the materials that everyone utilized to supply themselves with food, housing, and civilization's comforts. The issue is not hard to answer in terms of land, at least in broad strokes. Land was plentiful then, often available for the effort of farming it. Therefore, from the rulers' perspective, the issue was how to get the peasants to grow it. In exchange for protection, an empire subject who inhabited territory was required to provide the monarch a portion of the gross production. Administration under the Moguls placed a strong emphasis on the responsibility of horticulture. Morelnd refers to the incident in which a local ruler used his own hands to sever the head of a hamlet after he failed to plow his land. Even if the scenario is extreme, it nevertheless illustrates the main issue. Private property rights were unquestionably derived from and subordinated to the public responsibility of agriculture. Even now, under drastically different circumstances, this truth has had tremendous impact on social connections on the land.

Shah Jahan pursued a policy of opulence and constructed a number of landmarks, such as the Taj Mahal and the Peacock Throne, whose seven-year construction took place and whose materials are now worth more than one million pounds sterling. Shah Jahan started to expand the realm, although moderately, but Jahangir, the successor to Akbar, wanted to please his Hindu followers and did not strive to expand the kingdom. On the other hand, if the ruler frequently changed assignees from one region to another, the subordinates would be tempted to extract as much as possible from the peasants in the time allotted, cultivation would decline, and eventually, the emperor ran the risk of losing control over his subordinates as the latter developed an independent source of income and a foundation for their power.

Because of the continuous changes in invaders, we first read of agricultural instability under Jahangir in 183. The official said: "Let us draw as much money from the soil, even if the peasant should starve or flee, and we should leave it, when ordered to leave, a barren wilderness." Bernier, who traveled in the middle of the seventeenth century. Bernier may have exaggerated, but there is a ton of evidence showing that his and other travelers' testimony closely matches the information we have about the circumstances thanks to Aurangzeb's commands. Together, they depict a scenario in which the peasants are highly taxed and maintained under rigorous discipline, but at the same time their numbers are declining, in part due to migration to regions

outside the control of the Moguls.85 The assignee's income had to be cut when the peasants departed. An assignee with a brief and uncertain tenure would attempt to make up for some of his loss by putting more pressure on those still employed. Consequently, the process had a cumulative nature. The Mogul system forced the peasants to seek refuge with chieftains who were more or less autonomous since their living circumstances were generally better.

Numerous unbiased sources corroborate Bernier's claim that the peasants experienced less tyranny in these regions. In an unfair competition with the Mogul bureaucracy, smaller zamtfndars also discovered that treating the peasants well worked to their advantage. Therefore, the autonomous authority centers that the Moguls had failed to eliminate served as focal locations for peasant uprisings. Even at the height of the Mogul Empire, revolts were still rather common. The protests became more severe as the Mogul bureaucracy became increasingly repressive and corrupt. Peasants in large regions took up weapons, refused to pay taxes, and engaged in looting. The chieftains who were in charge of the peasants had little desire to make things better for their followers. One allegedly added, "Money is inconvenient for them; give them victuals and an arse clout, it is enough." But the peasants followed them wilfully, maybe out of a mixture of utter desperation and patriarchal and caste attachments. In fact, the declining Mogul system's peasant movements exhibit behavior similar to that of peasants in other societies under the same general conditions of extremely primitive commercial relationships, which are causing their intrusion into an oppressive agricultural system. They do this through a contradictory mixture of patriarchal loyalties, sectarian religious innovation, and outright protest against the injustices of the prevailing order as well as against acts of bloody vengeance and plunder.

The Mogul bureaucratic rule had devolved into a system of small kingdoms that were often at conflict with one another by the middle of the eighteenth century. This was the predicament the British found themselves in when they started to really meddle in the Indian countryside. It is simple to draw the conclusion possibly a little too simply that the dynamics of the Mogul system were hostile to the evolution of either political democracy or economic progress in a manner that resembled the Western pattern. There was no landed nobility that had managed to rebel against the king and obtain independence and luxury while maintaining political cohesion. Instead, if you can call it that, their indiscretion had brought chaos along with it. What little there was of bourgeoisie-like individuals lacked a strong foundation. Both characteristics are linked to a rapacious bureaucracy, which was compelled to grow more domineering as its power waned, and which, by crushing the peasants and inciting them to revolt, brought the subcontinent back to what it had frequently been before a collection of fragmented units engaged in conflict and ready prey for another foreign conqueror.

certain theories for why India did not experience the type of economic and political transition toward capitalism and political democracy that certain regions of Europe did from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century have been provided by the structure of the upper classes and political institutions. The prevalence of poor cultivation, which refers to the practice of using subsistence farming methods rather than capitalist methods, and the absence of formal education are two additional features that have been of the utmost importance. A closer look at the position of the peasants in Indian society will help to explain these features.

Since Akbar's reign, the majority of India's crops and farming techniques have stayed substantially unchanged. In Bengal, rice was notably significant; in Northern India, cereals, millets, and pulses were typically grown; in the Deccan, jowar and cotton were produced; and in

the South, rice and millets were once more significant. The annual monsoon rains were and continue to be necessary for a productive harvest. According to widely accepted works on India, agriculture in the majority of the nation depends on the rains; irrigation helped mitigate this risk to some extent even in pre-British times, though it was difficult to implement nationwide; failure of the monsoon occasionally causes severe famines; these have happened both before and during the British era, with the last severe one occurring in 1945.

In contrast, even with extensive allowance for ethnocentric prejudice in the early British reports, Indian procedures seem expensive and ineffective. Technology also seems to have reached a standstill. Between Akbar's reign until the early 20th century, agricultural tools and methods hardly changed at all.40 The most crucial tool was and is still a light plow pulled by bullocks. Thus, the cow has served as a source of force, sustenance, and fuel as well as a symbol of religious adoration.41 It is extremely possible that knowledge of the benefits of transplanting rice existed earlier than the early nineteenth century, at least in certain regions. However, in contrast to Japan, the organization of the job was so bad that the farmers only got a little amount of benefits. For one district in the northeastern corner of Bengal, Buchanan noted in 1809–1810 that "about half of the whole is finally transplanted in the first month of the season and is extremely productive; five-eighths of the rest are transplanted in the second month and give an indifferent crop; and three-eighths are transplanted in the third month, making such a miserable return that the practice would seem to be bad economy, but the people would be idle otherwise [5]–[7].

Buchanan, one of the few sources that describe agricultural practices at the time, also reveals that rather of rotating their crops, producers in this area sometimes mixed many crops on the same field. He also saw the practice in the region just stated, which was a rudimentary type of insurance43. It was a frequent practice in another location on the banks of the Ganges to plant enormous amounts of seed dispersed on dry dirt without previous soil preparation. No crop grew well, yet relatively few of them failed either. Another habit that sticks out as blatantly different from Japan is this one. It is quite likely that the relative amount of land available over the majority of Indian history prior to the British may have had a significant role in both insufficient agriculture and the form of peasant uprising. There is adequate land in many areas that might be farmed by anyone with the required resources. As we've seen, peasants often fled in great numbers in response to a tyrannical king. According to a recent expert, fleeing was "the first answer to famine or man's oppression." The enormous tracts of uncultivated and badly cultivated land that are regularly reported in reports from the late Mogul and early British eras may be explained pretty well by the combination of tyranny and plentiful land in this manner.

Purnea. Buchanan, a physician and keen observer, tried wherever possible to objectively confirm the Indians' claims rather than taking their tales at face value. He was also free of the worst kinds of national prejudice. He has made in-depth observations of several northern and southern Indian places, which inspires enormous faith. His full name was Francis Hamilton Buchanan, however it seems that some of his material was published as Francis Buchanan Hamilton. This reason is insufficient, even if it is essential. Some regions of India, such as the western Gangetic plain, may have had populations that were comparable to those of the first half of the 20th century under Akbar's rule. Furthermore, farming remained mediocre throughout a huge area of the country long when land became scarce. These findings suggest that social structures on the land may also be crucial to the explanation.

The Indian taxation system is one of them, and it has previously been highlighted. The Indian peasant was primarily a source of income to the ruling elites, much like his counterpart in Japan.

We saw that the Japanese tax was a set assessment on the land that allowed resourceful peasants to retain a surplus. The majority of Mogul and Indian taxes were set at a fixed percentage of the harvest. Therefore, in India, when a peasant grew, he had to pay the tax collector an increasing amount of money. Additionally, there was a built-in temptation to severely tax the peasants under the Mogul taxation structure. This distinction most certainly had a significant impact on the traits of the peasants in the two nations. We are aware that India has experienced this condition for a very long period. The headman, or in certain regions, a council of village elders, served as the general tax collectors, allocating the funds to be collected and the fields to be farmed among the villagers. In India, the overlord had considerably less of an inclination to attempt to control what went on within the village, even if the headman or council served as a buffer between authority and the village in a manner similar to the arrangement in Japan. As long as the money came in, the village notables and the headman were mostly responsible for maintaining peace and order.46 Another factor that contributed to the Indian peasant community's different labor organization from that of Japan is the latter's comparatively low degree of agriculture. Here, the caste system is brought up directly, necessitating a longer conversation. For the time being, it is sufficient to recollect that the Japanese system was mostly based on fictitious familial relationships until it started to shift in the late Tokugawa era.

The Indian system, in contrast, was centered on castes with access to land trading labor and services for food with others who had little to no access. The Indian arrangement was also backed by custom and what we may roughly refer to as traditional feelings, although being closer to the contemporary system of hired labor. It seems to have shared some of the drawbacks of both traditional systems based on emotional allegiances and contemporary ones without their respective benefits, and to have stymied changes in the division of labor as well as its intense application to a particular activity. Though the trend appears obvious, it would be foolish to push this argument too far given how flexible caste is in reality. In the current way, close monitoring was challenging. The cooperation in many close-knit traditional labor groups was the same. The majority of Indian workers fell into the lowest caste and were mostly pushed out of the village due to the label "untouchable." The untouchable were mostly unaware of strikes of the modern kind, in part because workers were divided into several castes, but also because of the "dilution of labor they priesthood," as one contemporary source describes it.47 One of the causes of the careless cultivation was this. Another was the reality that people of higher castes often preferred smaller rewards, with less hassle and monitoring, to attempting to force employees to change their habits while standing over them.

Before discussing caste and its political ramifications further, a few words of caution are in order. The caste system is unique to Indian civilisation, at least in its entire scope. As a result, there is a strong desire to attribute everything else that is unique to Indian culture to caste. This obviously won't do. For instance, caste has been employed in previous research to account for India's apparent lack of religious conflict. However, in current times, religious conflict has reached horrible dimensions while caste has persisted, not to mention Hindu opposition to Muslim proselytism in previous times. Caste and the belief of reincarnation, which is a key component of caste theories, have also been used to explain why Indian peasants seemed to be politically docile and why the contemporary uprising against oppression was so weak. However, as we have seen, this rise played a significant role in the factors that led to the destruction of the Mogul building. In subsequent times, it is still present in some measure. Even yet, there is still overwhelming evidence of submissiveness. There is no point in disputing the role that caste has had in fostering and maintaining this behavior. The issue is understanding the processes that led to passive

acceptance. The typical explanation goes something like this. A person who followed the rules of caste etiquette in this life would be born into a higher caste in the next, according to the reincarnation hypothesis. In the hereafter, being submissive in this life would result in social advancement. For this argument to make sense, we must assume that the common Indian peasants accepted the justifications offered by the urban priestly elites. Maybe to some degree, the Brahmans were successful in this fashion. But it can only be a minor portion of the overall narrative. It is reasonably obvious that the peasants did not passively and fully embrace the Brahman as a model of everything that was good and desirable as far as it is feasible to reconstruct the peasants' attitude toward the Brahmans. Similar to how many French peasants saw the Catholic priest, they seem to have had a combination of admiration, terror, and resentment towards the monopolist of supernatural authority. According to a North Indian saying, "the fiea, the bug, and the Brah- man are the three blood suckers in this world."48 There were valid causes for this animosity since the Brahman demanded money for the village's assistance. "A tradesman cannot start a business without paying a Brahman a fee; a farmer cannot reap his harvest without paying the Brahman to perform some ceremony; a fisherman cannot build a new boat or start fishing without a ceremony and a fee."49 The caste system obviously included secular punishments. And generally speaking, we know that human attitudes and beliefs fail to endure unless the circumstances and punishments that replicate them do as well, or, to put it bluntly, unless individuals benefit from them. Obviously, if we are to comprehend caste, we must resort to these physical supports [8]–[10].

CONCLUSION

Overall, although difficulties to revolt may exist in village communities, they are not insurmountable. Successful revolutionary movements will need to develop strategies to overcome obstacles and form fresh political alliances that can overthrow the present quo while also being cognizant of the distinctive cultural and social dynamics of these civilizations. There have been successful uprisings in village communities despite these barriers. In other instances, rebellion has been provoked by outside forces like economic collapse or political unrest, which have upset the balance of power and allowed for the emergence of fresh political currents. In other instances, charismatic leaders have been successful in galvanizing support inside village cultures and dismantling the social obstacles that have historically made achieving political change difficult.

REFERENCES

[1] K. M. Rusinovic, M. E. van Bochove, S. Koops-Boelaars, Z. K. C. T. Tavy, and J. van Hoof, "Towards responsible rebellion: How founders deal with challenges in establishing and governing innovative living arrangements for older people," *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/ijerph17176235.

[2] C. Cramer, "Inequality and conflict: A review of an Age-Old Concern," *Identities, Confl. Cohes. Program. Pap. Number 11*, 2005.

[3] L. Ndikumana and K. Emizet, "The Economics of Civil War: The Case of the Democratic Republic of Congo," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2005, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.443580.

[4] B. Dewar, "Rebellion, Sargon II's 'Punishment' and the Death of Aššur-nādin-šumi in the Inscriptions of Sennacherib," *J. Anc. Near East. Hist.*, 2017, doi: 10.1515/janeh-2016-0015.

[5]   A. T. Showler and M. Lecoq, "Incidence and ramifications of armed conflict in countries with major desert locust breeding areas," *Agronomy*, 2021, doi: 10.3390/AGRONOMY11010114.

[6]   A. F. Tollefsen and H. Buhaug, "Insurgency and inaccessibility," *Int. Stud. Rev.*, 2015, doi: 10.1111/misr.12202.

[7]   P. Whipple, "Charles F. Walker, Shaky Colonialism. The 1746 Earthquake-Tsunami in Lima, Peru, and its Long Aftermath," *Hist.*, 2009, doi: 10.4067/s0717-71942009000100025.

[8]   B. K. Gills and K. Gray, "People power in the era of global crisis: Rebellion, resistance, and liberation," *Third World Q.*, 2012, doi: 10.1080/01436597.2012.664897.

[9]   O. Berglund and D. Schmidt, *Extinction Rebellion and Climate Change Activism: Breaking the Law to Change the World*. 2020. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-48359-3.

[10]   Y. Abil, "Right Of Rebellion: On The Problems Of Rehabilitation Of Participants In Anti-Soviet Rebellions In Kazakhstan," *InterConf*, 2021, doi: 10.51582/interconf.7-8.10.2021.024.

CHAPTER 22

ENFORCEMENT OF CASTE REGULATIONS

Mrs. Anita Arya, Assistant Professor
School of Education, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email id- anitaarya@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Caste regulations are a set of rules and norms that govern the behavior and social interactions of individuals within a particular caste system. Enforcement of these regulations has been a significant issue in caste-based societies, where individuals' social status and privileges are determined by their caste membership. One of the primary methods of enforcing caste regulations is through social pressure and stigma. Members of higher castes may use their social power and influence to ostracize or punish individuals who violate caste norms, effectively isolating them from the rest of the community. This can include social exclusion, denial of access to resources or opportunities, or even physical violence.

KEYWORDS:

Caste System, Dharma, Discrimination, Hinduism, Karma, Marginalization.

INTRODUCTION

Land ownership was and continues to be the first of these. The idea that Brahmans are inherently superior to all other people is a priestly myth that neither now nor historically corresponds to how the caste system operates. In contemporary communities, the ruling caste is also the economically dominating group. It can be the Brahman caste in one hamlet and the peasant caste in another. Even in those areas where the Brahmans are dominant, this is due to their economic rather than their religious role. As a result, it is clear that caste has always had a less than ideal match between its economic foundation and its religious justification. The highest caste is that which owns the land in a given location; caste only exists in its local expression. Of course, it is risky to make an argument from a contemporary scenario backwards. Prior to the widespread spread of British influence and at a time of bountiful land in modern terms, the economic foundation may have been less overtly apparent. However, it was there. The evidence shows that even in previous periods, the upper castes often owned the finest land and had the power to control the lower castes' labor.

The caste councils, which are made up of a small number of leaders selected from each caste in all of the villages residing in a certain region, served as and continue to serve as the primary official vehicle for the implementation of caste laws. One may discover a hierarchy of these councils in several areas of India. Only the actions of those belonging to the council's own caste are under its supervision. The geographical region for which each caste had a council was probably smaller in earlier times than it is now since transportation was more difficult. Additionally, it wasn't always true that each caste had a council; this was one area where there was a lot of regional variance depending on the circumstances. Additionally, it is important to note that there was no caste council that covered all of India.52 Caste only shows itself at the

local level. The caste system as it now exists, in which members of the lower castes show the appropriate reverence to those in higher castes, is not truly being maintained by any central institution, not even in the village.

The lowest classes controlled their own behavior. People from lower castes have to learn to accept their position in society. The leaders of the lower castes clearly had a significant duty to do on this front. They earned rather concrete benefits for doing so. They sometimes got commissions on the employees' salary from their castes as well as penalties for any caste law violations. Boycott, or withholding of village amenities, was the punishment for flagrant caste discipline violations. Such a punishment was truly dreadful in a society where the individual relied almost totally on these resources, the formalized pattern of cooperation among his neighbors. We'll soon see how the development of the contemporary world has helped to lessen the effects of these penalties [1], [2].

It is difficult to see how and why the lower castes would embrace caste in a manner that would make it operate without more centralized organized penalties without this ubiquitous oversight and indoctrination. Even in a broad and loose sense, it appears to me that caste's diffuseness and the fact that it went beyond the realms that Westerners regard to be "economic" and "political" made up the essence of caste. People across the globe have been observed to have a tendency to create "artificial" distinctions, which are those that do not stem from the requirements of a rational division of labor or a rational organization of authority. Here, the term "rational" is used in the very restricted sense of creating an efficient social mechanism for carrying out an immediate task in a way that allows the group to survive. In Western culture, kids constantly create fictitious divisions. Aristocrats behave similarly when not bound by the demands of tuddling. Since military etiquette in the field is often considerably simpler than it is at headquarters, it is possible that the requirement to complete a specific duty may eliminate artificial differences. It is difficult to understand why some of the most "primitive" nations have a strong predisposition toward snobbishness. Making other people suffer is one of the few reliable and long-lasting sources of human enjoyment, and I assume that this is the root reason even if I am unable to prove it.

Whatever its roots, the fact that caste helped to organize such a broad variety of human activity in India has, in my opinion, had enormous political ramifications. Caste is a structure that efficiently organizes local life and makes people unconcerned with national politics. Government above the village was often an annoyance imposed by an outsider, not a need. It was something to be tolerated with patience rather than modified when things were manifestly out of whack. Government may have come seen as particularly predatory since it had absolutely nothing to do in the community where caste took care of everything. It was not required for the government to maintain order: Marx noted that it played a very modest part in irrigation system upkeep.56 Once again, they were often quite local issues.

Quite striking is the structural difference with China. There, the imperial bureaucracy provided social cohesiveness and was what needed to be altered as the locals endured a protracted calamity. To express the comparison that way, though, only goes so far. In order to gain the economic surplus from the peasants that sustained their status locally and nationally, the local gentry in China required the imperial bureaucracy. Such an arrangement was not essential in India at the local level. It was replaced by laws based on caste. The -zamindar had established himself as a respected member of the community where he lived. He didn't need the central government to assist him in getting his perks from the rural population. Due to the differences in

the two systems, peasant resistance would manifest itself in each in a unique way. In India, the focus was far more on getting rid of government above the village level completely than it was in China, where the major goal was to replace a "bad" government with a "good" one of the same character. And in India, we can hardly say that there is a strong drive in any sense; rather, there is a general direction to things that is dictated by the nature of the community. In general, people did not openly oppose government, but this did happen sometimes.

DISCUSSION

There has been a significant propensity in Indian culture for resistance to the established order to take the shape of simply another caste since caste has embraced such a diverse spectrum of human behavior. The criminal castes that caused the British so much problems in the first part of the nineteenth century, especially the Thugs from whence the English name "thugs" originated, are a prominent example of this. Similar to this, resistance to caste's repressive aspects was likely to be incorporated into the system in the form of an extra caste since caste was reflected so prominently in religious ritual. This conflict arose in part because there was no comparable religious hierarchy.In contrast to Roman Catholicism, there isn't a particularly narrow orthodxy that may serve as a target. Caste, in its concrete embodiment, is therefore a vast mass of locally coordinated social cells that accept innovation by producing another cell, yet it nevertheless is immensely durable and adaptable. This was the end that awaited foreign invaders, including Islamic castes and even ancient Greeks. These too practically formed a different "caste," even though their level of disdain was lower. was on the political power spectrum opposite to that. I had heard that decent Hindus used to always take a long bath to wipe away impurities after engaging with an Englishman in the early days of the British Empire [3]–[5].

However, opposition to the hierarchical structure as a whole was not very common, especially when it took a covert form. The endeavor by a caste as a whole to climb to a higher rung on the ladder of regard and contempt by convincing its members to follow the correct diet, career, and marital customs has been far more common in British times and very likely earlier. The ability to burn widows was a defining indicator of a caste's social advancement. Indian culture also restricted the possibilities of political resistance by offering a type of collective upward mobility that required strong discipline and obedience to standards established by the higher castes. Thus, the System placed more emphasis on each person's obligation to their caste than on their individual rights to rebel against it. What rights there were in opposition to society tended to be caste-specific group rights. The Indian caste system strikes a contemporary Westerner as a bizarrely intensified caricature of the world as Kafka saw it due to its victims' ready acceptance of personal degradation and the lack of a clear target for animosity or explicit center of guilt for suffering. These undesirable traits might, in part, be the result of distortions brought forth by British rule in Hindu culture. Even if this is the case, it is a distortion of characteristics that existed before the British arrived, and their character is undoubtedly a major factor in the following suffering.

In conclusion, I would say that caste as a system of labor organization in the countryside was a factor in bad cultivation, albeit it was by no means the only one. Caste also seems to have prevented political unification much more obviously as the system of power in the local community. Indian society seems to have made major change exceedingly difficult due to its extreme flexibility. It was not impossible, however. The Moguls were really supplanted by new conquerors who were to sow seeds whose harvest neither they nor anybody else could have predicted. It is impossible to talk about how the British affected Indian society as if there had

been a single, consistent factor at work over more than three centuries. Between the reign of Elizabeth I and the 20th century, British society and the nature of the British who immigrated to India underwent significant transformation. The majority of the significant changes occurred approximately between the years 1750 and 1850.

The Honorable East India Company, where the British were still organized for trade and piracy, controlled just a tiny portion of Indian land at the turn of the eighteenth century. They had effectively become India's rulers by the middle of the nineteenth century, with a bureaucracy proud of its history of justice and fairness. Since the historical raw materials were so unattractive a group of merchants who were difficult to distinguish from pirates on the one hand, and a string of failing Orintal despotisms on the other it is almost impossible to understand how the change could have occurred from the perspective of contemporary sociological theories of bureaucracy. One may properly push the sociological and historical contradiction even further: eventually, a state with genuine claims to democracy developed from this similarly unappealing mishmash!

The development process on the "British side of this strange mixture" was, in very broad strokes, as follows. When the traditional Christian medieval civilization began to fall apart and a new, much more secular one began to emerge, a burst of energy was released throughout Europe, and this is when the British began to colonize India for a variety of reasons, including adventure, state, commerce, and plunder. Despite the enormous wealth that might be earned in India, it rapidly "became apparent that a territorial" foundation would be required. The only way to purchase pepper or indigo at a fair price was to leave a man on the spot to negotiate for it when prices decreased during harvest and to keep it until a ship came. The British started to spread further out into the countryside from the depots and forts built for such purposes, purchasing indigo, opium, and jute; controlling pricing so they could trade;

The temptation to take greater actual authority was strong since local authorities' actions were unpredictable and chaotic; of course, this was also true of the drive to exclude other European competitors. As we could see, the Mogul system had already completely decayed. The Great Mogul was reduced to the status of a spectacle with Clive's victory at Arcot in 175 I; Clive's victory at Plassey in 1757 put an end to the possibility of French rule. The Portuguese and the French were flirting with local rulers to overthrow them, so there was at least a defendable aspect to the British acquisition of empire. In response, the British launched counterattacks. By taking the wealth of defeated rulers in order to expand their territory, they made the native people pay a very significant price for their own victory. They eventually changed from commercial plunderers to more peaceful rulers aiming to estab- lish peace and order with the very little armies at their disposal as they took on more geographical responsibilities [6], [7]. This was the progression of the British from piracy to bureaucracy, if in a rough framework. Indian society experienced three interconnected effects as a result: first, the beginnings of an unsuccessful commercialization of agriculture through the establishment of law and order, regular taxes, and property in the countryside; second, the partial destruction of rural handicrafts; and third, an unsuccessful attempt to overthrow the British yoke in the Mutiny of 1857. These three procedures each established the fundamental foundation for events that have occurred up to the present.

Let's start with taxes and then work our way backwards to find the relationships. By the end of the eighteenth century, responsible British officials had largely abandoned the old ideas of acquiring a fortune as rapidly as possible and leaving for home. There is no evidence that they intended to impoverish the nation as much as possible in their quest to build a stable system of

governance. However, their main concern was the same as Akbar's, obtaining a source of income to finance their government without inciting deadly disturbance. Some speculated a little later that India would quickly turn into the next England and a significant market for English products. But this was a very modest movement among the English in India. The British did not stay in India after they had established a significant footing because of commercial motives. The actual one is most likely more easier. Pulling out would have meant admitting defeat without really having it, which, as far as I know, was never seriously contemplated. Additionally, if they remained, they would need to establish a solid foundation for doing so, which would include paying taxes.

Students of Indian affairs refer to the choices of how taxes were to be levied and collected as "settlements," which is a word that first appears pretty odd. However, it is a highly pertinent question given that judgments regarding how to collect the money were in fact efforts to "settle" a difficult set of issues so that the original residents may conduct their daily lives peacefully. The actual settlements were the result of British policy, assumptions, the makeup of Indian culture, and the local political climate at the time. These factors all changed greatly throughout time and space.60 There is no need to go into detail about some of the major differences because they gradually lost significance as deeper economic and social trends played themselves out over the course of the remainder of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth. Their position in relation to the overall trajectory of Indian social development is crucial for our investigation. In a nutshell, settlements marked the beginning of the whole rural transition process, which saw the issue of parasitic landlordism significantly exacerbated by the enforcement of law and order and the related property rights. More importantly, they served as the foundation for a political and economic system in which the foreigner, the landowner, and the lender appropriated the peasantry's economic surplus but failed to invest it in industrial development, eliminating the possibility of following Japan's path into the modern era. Of course, there were further challenges, as well as maybe more paths India might have taken to embrace modernity. However, the agricultural system that resulted from the blending of British rule with Indian rural life was sufficient to completely eliminate the Japanese alternative [8], [9].

See Stokes, English Utilitarians, Part II for a thorough investigation of the English assumptions. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, Baden-Powell set out to portray these tax collecting procedures in a way that was suitable for British administrators, but he discovered that three hefty volumes were not enough. Check out his Land Systems. While Stokes, English Utilitarians, 105 says that Baden-Powell sometimes overdoes the empirical components of British method, I find that without sufficient knowledge of the topic to make a conclusive conclusion. The prominence of English notions in Stokes' analysis is excessive. The Permanent Settlement, which went into force in Bengal in 1793, was the earliest and most significant of the settlements historically. On the British side, it was an effort to keep the money while avoiding the challenges of enforcing a complex native taxing system that they hardly understood.

Additionally, it was an odd attempt to introduce the entrepreneurial landowner, who was then at the pinnacle of his power for "progress" in the English countryside, to the Indian social scene. As we have seen, the crucial aspect of Indian administration was the use of zamindars, the local tax collectors who stood between the monarch and the farmer. An official property owner was not a zamindar while the Mogul system was functioning effectively. As things deteriorated, he assumed de facto control in a manner reminiscent of a Chinese warlord from the twentieth century. Lord Cornwallis, the British Governor-General, believed he saw in the zamindar a social

specimen who, theoretically, might develop into an enterprising English landlord who would clear the country and establish prosperous cultivation if he were given the assurance that, in the future, he would not be taxed out of existence for his pains, as he undoubtedly would have been under the Moguls. The English were insistent for this reason. on permanently settling the matter. The zamindar was given a property right under the new administration that was expected to be s. He continued to be a tax collector as he had been under the Moguls at the same period.

The British took nine-tenths of the money the zamindar received from his peasant tenants under the terms of the Permanent Settlement, leaving the zamindars with the remaining one-tenth "for their trouble and responsibility."61 However, the Permanent Settlement's legal framework turned out to be more successful at generating income than most human endeavors. As a consequence, many zamindars lost control of their territories, and what we would today refer to as collaborators took their place. The phrase "Res spec natives" started to catch popular among the British. About 40% of the land in significant areas of the permanently settled area had changed hands in this way by the middle of the nineteenth century, which is to say, just before the Sepoy Mutiny.62 Dispossessed zamindars were one of the major causes of the Mutiny, whereas the newly established ones were a storm anchor for the British power. As the population increased and rents rose during the eighteenth century, the former in turn transformed into a sizable number of parasitic landlords while their tax burden remained constant.

It's crucial to understand that British policies in Bengal and the Permanent Settlement did nothing more than hasten and intensify the tendency toward parasitic landlordism. This new social creature was not produced by it. The primary problems with Indian agricultural culture predate the British period, according to a highly illuminating portrayal of Bengal in the year 1794. These problems include lazy landowners, the numerous layers of tenant rights, and a class of selfless workers. These issues have become "moderately acute" in the densely populated river valleys due to a capitalist economy. They were far less severe in areas of the interior far from the market. The landowner there was still hiding from the tax collector.

I found no evidence that the landlord had turned into a parasite in the opinion of the locals or the British in Buchanan's three-volume travelogue through Madras. There was just a little debt issue. Southern India is the region of the nation where the other principal style of habitation eventually began to predominate extensively, despite the existence of agricultural workers and even slaves in certain parts. This one is referred to as ryotwari since the money was obtained directly from the peasants as opposed to using middlemen. This had also been a Mogul practice in several regions. The Permanent Settlement's unsatisfactory results, a healthy dose of paternalism, and English economic ideas about the need for a strong peasantry and the purported parasitic nature of their own landlords, most notably as expressed in Ricardo's theory of rent, all contributed to this outcome as well as the decision not to make the rates permanent. More significant, in my opinion, was the absence of zamindars in the Madras region, where the model was implemented in I 8 I 2, making it impossible to reach a settlement. From the perspective of the current investigation, the main significance of the Ryotwari settlement is negative: it did not prevent the emergence of parasitic landlordism, which over time became a problem in many parts of southern India as it did in the North. This situation came about primarily because the local chieftains made the mistake in this area of opposing the British, who destroyed them while pensioning off a few. As previously mentioned, although there are significant differences between the various types of settlement in contemporary literature and more recent historical

accounts, these differences tended to become less significant over time as the effects of increasing population density and property security became more pronounced.

Generally speaking, at the time, the British dominion's first gift was peace and property, which began a long process of transformation in the villages of the subcontinent. The second gift came in the form of textiles, a byproduct of England's industrial revolution, which from around 1804 to 1830 inundated most of the Indian countryside and wiped out a portion of the local handicrafts. The townspeople who produced high-quality items or the villages, particularly those in Madras, that had developed a market-specific textile industry faced the brunt of the pain. The typical village weaver who produced coarse products for local use was mostly unaffected. Although the impact on Indian society appears to have been most severe in the I830S, the import of textiles persisted into the nineteenth century. Indirect consequences included sending town weavers back onto the land and reducing the chances for urban employment.

Ironically, the statements by English officials compiled in the work of an Indian official and scholar, Romesh Outt, appear to be the origin of the thesis, shared by Indian nationalists and Marxists, that India was a manufacturing nation whom the British reduced to an agricultural one for selfish imperialist reasons. British officials in charge of Indian affairs vigorously defended Indian interests, but to no avail. The argument is absurd in its bare form. Not modern manufacturing, but rather handicrafts, were eliminated, and India at the time of the growth in handicrafts was still mostly an agrarian country. Further, the damage occurred before the emergence of contemporary monopoly capitalism. But to reject the argument in this casual way is insufficient. Even if incorrect theoretical implications have been made from the pain, it was still very much there. Additionally, as we will see in due order, it is true that the British did, to some degree, obstruct the growth of industry in India.

The majority of Indian society was, of course, rural, so taxes and textiles combined to deliver enough of a shock that the Mutiny seems to the contemporary historian to be fairly understandable. The shocks continued after those that were just briefly described. The epidemic had a number of significant immediate causes, including several more ones along the same lines. A kind of land settlement that was halfway between the zamindari and the ryotwari was implemented in the northern and western regions of India by 1833. Similar occurrences occurred in the state of Oudh. Wherever feasible, it supported corporate village groupings over landlords, holding these groups jointly accountable to the government for the income. The British drove out the local landed elite there, a group of tax farmers who collected money from the villages and made their living from the difference between what they took in and what they gave to the local government. When the Bengali army learned that the British had annexed their country, they were in for a shock. The final and most direct cause of the outbreak was the infamous greased-cartridge rumor, which claimed that the soldier using the new rifle had to deliberately eat cartridges that had been contaminated with pig and cow grease.

Many writers have been persuaded by the liquidation of the landed elite in Oudh, along with other evidence, to believe that their resentment was a major factor in the Indian Mutiny. They have also compared the British government's pro-peasant policies before and after the Mutiny. To Tins, this situation seems to be another example of a somewhat exaggerated partial truth concealing a more significant and comprehensive reality. Such an approach obscures a greater degree of continuity between British policy's sources and consequences. It was characterized by a paternal attitude toward the peasants and the idealistic and self-serving idea that their authority could and should come from and be justified by the strong and simple people. even though the

advantages to peasants are questionable, this was a strong element in British policy during the occupation. Although class ties were crucial in the countryside, they don't make sense until they are considered in the context of a bigger picture. Caste and religion are inextricably linked to agrarian circumstances, particularly in India, where they all came together to create a unified institutional complex. The main cleavage in Indian society that the Mutiny revealed was one between a deeply offended or" thodoxy supported through clear material interests and a lukewarm attitude among those who either benefited from British policy or were not too deeply disturbed by it.71 Hindus and Moslems were on both sides in large numbers, and in Oudh the peasants rose with their former masters to present a united front.

The Indian society posed a fundamental threat as a result of the West's intrusion because its emphasis on business and industry, secular and scientific outlook on the physical world, and emphasis on demonstrated competence in a job rather than inherited status were incompatible with an agrarian society based on caste and its religious sanctions.

Generally speaking, a widow in Bengal "was usually tied to the corpse, often already putrid; men stood by with poles to push her back in case the bonds should burn through and the victim, scorched and maimed, should struggle free." At least throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the lady often died with her husband. Males who murder women are hanged. The British resisted taking more than occasional action against sati for a very long time out of concern for inciting local resentment. Under British controp, it wasn't fully eliminated in the major districts until 1829.4 The narrative was not finished there, nor is it finished altogether. Those who are aware that it is still done in current times have informed me that even the most ardent supporter of the idea that all cultures are equally valuable may be put to the test by such a ritual.

Despite being inconsistent, the official British attitudes toward religion were enough to worry the orthodox, both Hindu and Muslim. On the one hand, the British government annually spends a significant quantity of money on mosque and temple upkeep. On the other hand, they accepted Christian missionaries on a large scale and in certain localized cases even welcomed them. The missionaries assert that they had 313 stations and 22 organizations, but only women who could read and write would become widows.76 Such evidence suggests that one of the main reasons for Indian animosity toward the British was that the Europeans interfered in various ways with the sexual and personal prerogatives of men, which are highly stressed in Hindu civilization. This fact does not rule out the dominance of older women in many domestic situations, however.

Additionally, the demands of British daily life in the army, the railroad, and the jaiss all of which had just recently been developed before the Mutiny raised suspicions that the British planned to abolish the caste system, which served as the foundation of Hindu society. It's hard to tell how deeply ingrained Hindu sensitivities were and still are on this subject. It's possible that Westerners tended to overstate the significance of these attitudes because of certain brief instances when castes coexisted peacefully.77 But once the match was lit, it was evident that the British invasion as a whole had produced enough combustible material to start a blaze. The populace seems to have been prepared to rebel in various locations, particularly central India, but was suppressed by local authorities. The major social forces supporting the British seem to have been a blend of the old elite, represented by local princes, and the new elites, who had grown up under British protection. mostly in the heart of India. The British were able to withstand the conflagration in part because The Mutiny had the appearance of a succession of spontaneous combustions.

It is impossible to see how the Mutiny could have been anything other than what it was given the presence of the English as conquerors and the primary bearers of the new culture. India has little chance of evolving along Japanese lines after its setback. Anyhow, such a possibility seemed so distant that it hardly merits serious thought. This is not a result of how well-established the immigrant was. It would not seem crazy to speculate that the English may have been pushed away. The main issue is that, in the case of India, a reactionary response was forced by the foreign presence. To be united on its own, as was the case in Japan, under dissident aristocratic auspices with some assistance from the peasants, India was too split, too amorphous, and too large. Over many years, a civilization had developed that made centralized authority mostly obsolete and maybe even innately parasitic and predatory. Around the middle of the nineteenth century, rebellious aristocracy and peasants in India were able to cooperate.They could not, as in Japan, employ modernity to drive away the foreigner because to their fervent dislike of modernism. Before the British were expelled, 90 more years would elapse. Even while new elements joined the picture in the meantime, the reactionary aspect of the campaign to force them out remained quite potent, severely impeding later attempts to transform into an industrial society.

After putting an end to the Mutiny, the British were able to impose law and order and a passable semblance of governmental unification on India for almost a century. There were political unrests, which grew in frequency and severity after the First World War, and in the end, total unification was not attained. Despite these limitations, India had years of calm from 1857 to 1947, which stand in the starkest contrast to the rest of the world's history. A policy of law and order supports those who already have advantages, even those whose privileges are not particularly great, but its cost is another story. Such was the outcome of British strategy in India, notwithstanding the fact that it started other, more profound factors in action, although slowly. The Indian upper classes in the countryside, as well as local princes and bigger landowners in many, but not all, regions of the nation, were the major pillars of British control. There was a British permanent advisor at the courts of the more powerful princes who managed "foreign" connections and minimally meddled in local concerns.

The British mostly cooperated with whoever forces were in power after the Mutiny in the territories under their own control.so The inclination to depend on the higher classes in the countryside has some significant political repercussions that should be noted straight immediately, albeit they will need more explanation. As it gradually emerged over the course of the nineteenth century, this trend alienated the professional and commercial classes, the new Indian bourgeoisie. The English presence prevented the establishment of the typical reactionary alliance after the German or Japanese models by dividing the landed upper classes from the weak and ascendant urban leaders. This might be seen as making a significant contribution to the ultimate formation of a parliamentary democracy in India, at least on par with the diffusion of English ideals among the professional classes in India. The concepts could hardly have become more than literary toys without at least some favorable structural circumstances. Finally, the presence of the British forced the Indian bourgeoisie to make a deal with the peasantry in order to build a strong basis. How this fairly odd accomplishment was accomplished and some effects [10]–[12].

CONCLUSION

Despite the difficulties in implementing caste laws, major efforts have been made to combat and eliminate caste-based prejudice. Greater equality has been advocated and the power structures of

caste-based societies have been contested via social movements, grassroots activity, and legal actions. However, there are still many obstacles to overcome, especially in nations where the caste system is still firmly ingrained in social and cultural institutions. The religious and cultural importance of the caste system is another aspect that helps ensure that caste laws are upheld. People may feel a strong feeling of responsibility to follow caste rules and to impose them on others in communities where the caste system is seen as being divinely established or firmly rooted in the culture. Due of this, it may be difficult for people to question the system, even if they personally disagree with its ideas.

REFERENCES

[1]   "Abstracts of Papers Presented at the 2019 Annual Meeting," *J. Econ. Hist.*, 2020, doi: 10.1017/s0022050720000273.

[2]   B. S. Golub and J. Hansen-Lewis, "Informal trading networks in west Africa: The Mourides of Senegal/the Gambia and the Yoruba of Benin/Nigeria," *Informal Sect. Francoph. Africa*, 2012.

[3]   A. J. Gross, "Legal Transplants: Slavery and the Civil Law in Louisiana," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2011, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.1403422.

[4]   K. R. Johnson, "Hurricane Katrina: Lessons about Immigrants in the Modern Administrative State," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2011, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.1003842.

[5]   M. K. Nabli and J. B. Nugent, "The New Institutional Economics and Economic Development: An Introduction," in *The New Institutional Economics and Development: Theory and Applications to Tunisia*, 1989.

[6]   S. Boonen and J. Billen, "Caste regulation in the ant Monomorium pharaonis (L.) with emphasis on the role of queens," *Insectes Soc.*, 2017, doi: 10.1007/s00040-016-0521-z.

[7]   M. R. Warner, K. Kovaka, and T. A. Linksvayer, "Late-instar ant worker larvae play a prominent role in colony-level caste regulation," *Insectes Soc.*, 2016, doi: 10.1007/s00040-016-0501-3.

[8]   M. R. Warner, J. Lipponen, and T. A. Linksvayer, "Pharaoh ant colonies dynamically regulate reproductive allocation based on colony demography," *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.*, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s00265-017-2430-1.

[9]   R. Hanus, V. Vrkoslav, I. Hrdý, J. Cvačka, and J. Šobotník, "Beyond cuticular hydrocarbons: Evidence of proteinaceous secretion specific to termite kings and queens," *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, 2010, doi: 10.1098/rspb.2009.1857.

[10]   Y. Masuoka, K. Toga, C. A. Nalepa, and K. Maekawa, "A crucial caste regulation gene detected by comparing termites and sister group cockroaches," *Genetics*, 2018, doi: 10.1534/genetics.118.301038.

[11]   L. Mao, G. Henderson, Y. Liu, and R. A. Laine, "Formosan subterranean termite (Isoptera: Rhinotermitidae) soldiers regulate juvenile hormone levels and caste differentiation in workers," *Ann. Entomol. Soc. Am.*, 2005, doi: 10.1603/0013-8746(2005)098[0340:FSTIRS]2.0.CO;2.

[12] B. P. Oldroyd and B. Yagound, "The role of epigenetics, particularly DNA methylation, in the evolution of caste in insect societies," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2021. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2020.0115.

CHAPTER 23

ESTABLISHMENT OF A PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY

Dr. Anil Bundela, Assistant Professor
School of Education, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email id- anilbundela@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The establishment of a parliamentary democracy involves the creation of a political system where power is divided among various branches of government and citizens have the right to participate in free and fair elections to choose their representatives. In a parliamentary democracy, the legislative branch of government is responsible for creating laws and policies, and the executive branch is responsible for implementing them. The process of establishing a parliamentary democracy involves several key steps. The first step is the drafting of a constitution that outlines the structure of government and guarantees basic rights and freedoms for citizens. This constitution may be the result of a democratic process, such as a constitutional convention or referendum, or it may be imposed by an external power, such as a colonial power.

KEYWORDS:

Constitution, Elections, Human Rights, Independent Judiciary, Liberalism, Multiparty System.

INTRODUCTION

In addition to establishing law and order throughout the eighteenth century, the British also significantly increased irrigation and railways in Indian civilization. It would seem that the most crucial conditions for the development of commercial agriculture and industry were satisfied. However, little growth there was ended up being sickly and abortive. Why? I believe a key component of the solution is that, in Japan, the painful early phases of industrialization were paid for by the economic excess created in the countryside, which pax Britannica only allowed the landlord and, more recently, the money lender to pocket. The English were not in India as foreign invaders to bring forth an industrial revolution. They did not impose taxes on the countryside in the Soviet or Japanese styles. As a result, parasitic land lordism grew far worse under Anglo-Saxon justice-under-Iaw than it was in Japan.

It would be ludicrous to hold the British solely responsible. Many pieces of evidence many of which were covered in the section before this one indicate that this plague was ingrained in India's own social structure and customs. It was only able to grow and take root more thoroughly across Indian culture during the two centuries of British rule. More precisely, because of the rivalry for land, pax Britannica encouraged population growth and rent increases. Although the new legal and political framework of property rights enforceable in British courts contributed to giving the landlord new tools, it is likely that, up until relatively recently, the landlord relied more on traditional sanctions through caste and village organization to increase his profits. I would propose this specific way of collecting the economic surplus in the countryside and the subsequent inability of the state to divert this excess toward industrial expansion as important

links in a convoluted chain of historical causation that explains India's ongoing backwardness. Are more significant than some of the other often presented causes, like the caste system's operation, the inertia of related cultural traditions, the lack of entrepreneurial skill, and others.

Although these factors have contributed, there are reasons to believe that they are a byproduct of the above-discussed manner of collecting the excess. Caste barriers are clearly on the verge of disintegrating in localities where there has been a push toward a more robust market economy, even in rural regions where caste is considerably stronger. In general, the top stratum of the village elite seems to maintain caste for their personal gain and the reasons previously mentioned. I'll attempt to illustrate everything in due time, although in broad strokes. Either of two things might occur when one attempts to go through the specifics of contradicting and shaky information. The evidence may be chosen to create an argument that flows too smoothly to be real, or the assurance may vanish into a jumble of disparate data. There isn't much an author can say about this issue to convince a skeptic who is really persuaded. However, it would be useful to note that throughout my research on this time period in Indian history, I had a sneaking suspicion that the parasite landlord could very well be a fabled social species made up by semi-Marxist and Indian nationalist authors. It required a lot of evidence the most significant of which I will attempt to convey now to persuade me that he was genuine [1]–[3].

It may be worthwhile to begin by discussing some exceptions to the assumption that India has undergone a significant commercial revolution in agriculture. Although India did not develop into a plantation colony producing raw commodities for sale to nations with more developed economies, there were a few small steps in this direction throughout the nineteenth century and earlier. Cotton farming has been used by Indians from very early times. The second quarter of the nineteenth century saw the commercialization of jute, which had previously been farmed for local use. The list is completed by indigo, tea, and pepper. The ways they were grown varied from something that was almost a simple plantation to agricultural putting-out systems where advances were made to tiny individual growers.

This semi-plantation economy remained limited in terms of area and participants. Otherwise, the development of political democracy may have encountered completely insurmountable challenges. After studying the American South, there is no need to struggle over this argument. The inability of the plantation system to establish a dominating position in India is somewhat explained by a mix of foreign competition, geographical, and sociological reasons. Indian cotton was unable to compete with American cotton; it's possible that this was caused by the suffocation of native textiles before our Civil War, but it's unlikely. The indigo trade was destroyed by the discovery of synthetic colours. Jute was only ever cultivated in Bengal and Assam, yet it's not impossible that it was grown elsewhere else. The biggest drawback seems to be societal in nature. The putting-out system's agricultural variant is ineffective because it is difficult to regulate the actions of many small growers.

On the other hand, a simple plantation system that uses slave or semiservile labor would probably need a powerful repressive regime. With time, it became more difficult for British or Indian resources to build one on a significant scale. Land started to exhibit some of the traits of a produced good as it had elsewhere in the globe under comparable circumstances when British power became firmly entrenched. At least it could be purchased and sold if it couldn't be replicated for market sale like pots and pans. It came to have a monetary worth, and as population pressure increased in safe environments with strong property rights, this value increased rather consistently. Competent observers quickly saw the growth in population after

the Mutiny. There are several strong cues indicating the process had started far earlier. The Famine Commission of 1880 said that there was evidence of a rise in land prices across India during the previous 20 years. Although the process occurred across India, Sir Malcolm Darling provides some startling statistics that demonstrate this point, mostly from the Punjab.

Changes in the function of the moneylender an important character in the rural scene with whom it is now required to get acquainted were brought about by the partial entry of the market and the increase in land prices. He had been there for a while and wasn't just recently produced by British authorities. There are hints that little to no money was used in economic transactions in the pre-British settlement. In several regions of the nation, the caste of artisans is still compensated for its services with a certain percentage of the harvests. On the other hand, taxes were often paid in cash even during the reign of Akbar and perhaps much earlier. The moneylender now has a foothold in the local economy. Though it wasn't always the case, it was often the case that he belonged to a distinct caste. In the era of the Moguls, it was common to hear peasant laments about having to sell their crop at cheap prices in order to subsequently purchase part of it at high rates out of need.84 In the conventional economy, he served two crucial roles.

He first performed the function of a primitive balance wheel to balance out periods of shortage and prosperity. The peasant might ask the moneylender for a loan of food when his own stores ran low, with the exception of severe famines. Second, when the peasant required money to pay taxes, he was the usual source of funds. Naturally, he was not motivated to do these activities just for personal gain. On the other hand, it seems that the original village society set restrictions on extortion that were less effective under later circumstances. The customary punishments of a close-knit society also worked to guarantee the loan, allowing the moneylender to extend substantial amounts of money with a minimal amount of formal security. Overall, it seems that everyone involved has been at least somewhat satisfied with the situation.

It is noteworthy to note that Hindu law does not share Western opposition to the pursuit of interest [4]–[6]. Prior to the arrival of the British, the moneylender often sought the peasant's harvest rather than the land, which was plentiful and of little value in the absence of a cultivator. This situation persisted well into the second half of the nineteenth century, which is when land values started to rise and British property protection through the courts started to gain traction. The Mutiny and the subsequent rise in reliance on men of means and standing in the countryside strengthened this trend.88 At this time, the moneylender started to alter his strategy and tried to take control of the actual land, leaving the peasant in charge of cultivating it and earning a consistent income.

The worst of this crisis occurred between 1860 and 1880. The Deccan Agricultural Relief Act, which was passed in 1879, was the first effort to restrict transfer rights and safeguard peasants. Other portions of India enacted laws like to this during the course of the remainder of the nineteenth century. The main stipulation has been the ban on land transfers to non-cultivating castes, or money lenders. The major result was a reduction in the peasantry's already constrained access to credit and a promotion of the emergence of an affluent peasant class among the cultivating castes that could provide loans to their less fortunate neighbors. The Famine Report of 1880 makes it clear that the issue was already serious and had assumed the form that it would take for many years to come, even though there are no statistics to show what percentage of the land formally transferred from the cultivator's hand to those of the moneylender or wealthy peasant. The moneylender often belongs to a non-cultivating caste in much of the nation, and in

the Punjab, they are more likely to be Hindus than Muslims. Since the village shopkeeper has been the archetypal character for a long time, the legal transfer had little impact on the agriculture system as a whole. The former farmer still owned his land and used part of the excess to pay a hefty rental fee in place of interest on his loan. This pattern has persisted for quite some time now. Competent observers believe that despite the lack of data, the propensity for cultivators to lose control of their land persisted during the Great Depression and was only temporarily reversed during the Second World War's boom.

DISCUSSION

As a result, one of the primary outcomes of limited modernisation has been to transfer the financial gain from agriculture into new hands. In the Punjab, yearly interest on debt for the agricultural population in the late 1920s was 1 04 rupees per head, compared to a land revenue rate of 4 rupees. A significant portion of this debt was owing to the more affluent peasants rather than just the moneylender. Even though this group made up one in every four income-tax payers in the I920S, moneylenders weren't living the high life either. Even though these numbers are rough, they show that Indian peasants were producing a sizable surplus and that this excess was not going to the government. The Indian peasant was going through a lot of the hardships associated with early capitalism accumulation, but Indian society was not getting anything out of it.

The unit of cultivation did not consolidate when the loan was turned over to the moneylender. There was no significant enclosure movement in India. Additionally, it did not result in any advancements in farming methods. Agricultural practices and equipment have remained very archaic up to the present. According to a letter by an Indian authority just after the Second World War, the deshi, or native, plow and other equipment are not much different from those used 1000 years ago. The charmay is a little harsh. For a catalog of technological innovations some rather significant in one hamlet, see LeWIS, hamlet Life. At this point, it would be wise to stop talking about India as a whole and instead focus on the history and characteristics of landlordism in various regions of the nation. We may start with Bengal since there, as we've seen, the core issues existed before the full force of British influence. By demonstrating that the parasitic landowner sometimes carried out economic activities and that parasitism permeated the peasants as a whole, the information from this region both softens and strengthens the stereotype of the parasitic landowner.

The zamindars of Bengal "did have a role in removing the garbage that constituted such a significant part of the rural environment in that region about 1 800, although a hardly laborious one. They primarily achieved this by applying various pressures to the pea- ants. For instance, they often persuaded somewhat untamed tribes to settle and remove the waste by exempting them from the rent. The zamindar used legal means to evict these tenants as soon as the land was recovered and replace them with more capable tenants who were prepared to pay high rates. The za11lindar is said to have increased his rent by a factor of two between the hours of 1800 and 1850 by the use of this method and others, including as extra taxes on the tenants. After about 1850, the zamindars essentially assumed the status of tenants-at-will and were little more than rent collectors, contributing nothing to the advancement of agriculture or the development of cultivation. The British took action to address the problem soon after the Mutiny.

They were able to do so because Bengal had avoided the harshest consequences of the Mutiny, making it unnecessary to appease the landlord class, which was already well-entrenched. The

British attempted to provide the renters some kind of security with a number of tenancy statutes starting in 1859. Other regions of India have approved laws along such lines. The key argument in favor was that occupation rights were established and protected against eviction after twelve years of continuous cultivation. In response, landlords often kicked out residents before the 12-year tenure was over. The new law also made tenancy rights transferrable, much like other property rights. Where this occurred, sub-letting became more prevalent as a result of the rivalry for land. As each peasant discovered that using his or her right to sublease was more profitable than cultivating the soi, many of them became petty rent receivers.1.101 The chain of tenancies and subtenancies got longer and longer until it reached amazing lengths in certain areas of this region as the gap between what the government collected in taxes and what the pressure of competition for land would create in the form of rent increased.

The older literature on the subject of land tenures conveys the idea that if there are many middlemen between the landlord, who collects land income, and the farmer who really cultivates the land, the weight of rent is greater on the peasant. This is not the situation. The significant disparity between the rate of rent paid by the farmer and the income or tax paid by the landlord is the only factor contributing to the vast number of intermediaries. Democracy in Asia: India and the Price of Peaceful Change discovered that the rents paid in regions where the stacking of tenancy rights was excessive were lower than in many other parts of India in the 1940s. Even further, the Commissioners said that "there would be justification for enhancements rather than reductions of rent in Bengal."Opinions may vary on the last point, lo8. But one thing becomes obvious. Many aspects of the economic "surplus" were not completely scraped off by the wealthy rentier. Instead, the struggle for land divided it among numerous people, the bulk of whom were not affluent.

The rural landowner in India is more than just the wealthy and carefree recipient of rent, as the Indian census officials are eager to stress out. Even if he is barely making ends meet, he is not contributing financially.lo4 A significant majority of those who rely on land rentals are probably widows or old, infirm, and decrepit landowners without adult sons who are unable to cultivate the property themselves and must instead rent it to others.105 In certain places, absentee landlords may include village employees, cobblers, barbers, washermen, caterers, and others.I am not aware of any statistics that would allow me to estimate the number of "poor landlords" in the different categories previously mentioned. They undoubtedly outnumber the affluent rentier by a large margin. Additionally, not all landlords should be seen as completely para- sitic, that is, as having no impact on society economically or in other ways, like the professions [7], [8].

Any unbiased evaluation of the issue must take into account all these revisions to the parasitic landlordism theory. The disinterested social scientist must, however, use extreme caution when determining what they really imply. By highlighting outliers and data gaps, there is a significant propensity to deflect criticism of the existing quo, making it seem as though the main issue either doesn't exist or is the result of an overactive imagination. In this case, it is as obvious as it is possible to be that parasitic landlordism was a genuine issue. The number of impoverished individuals who were able to squeak beneath its protection and scratch out a meager living does not serve as a sufficient justification for a social institution that was fundamentally inefficient and impeded economic advancement. The extremely high likelihood that a tiny, rich sector received the lion's share of landlord income is not lessened by the fact that poor landlords significantly outnumber wealthy ones and by the lack of accurate information on the distribution of income within this sector.

Let's have a look at what has happened in southern India regions where the British collected taxes from peasant communities directly under the ryotwari settlements rather than via intermediaries. We can start by taking a look at the Madras Presidency in the last decade of the nineteenth century, which roughly corresponds to the region that Buchanan traveled through ninety years earlier. We can do this by using the perspective of an early Indian official in the British service, the Inspector General of Registration, who published a Memorandum on Madras' development over the previous four decades in 1893.The author, whose benefactor he was, was undoubtedly a fair-minded academic official who was eager to demonstrate as much advancement as possible under the British. However, the image he presents is one of a tiny, very affluent landed aristocracy that wastes its money on litigation and frivolous spending while dominating a large population of destitute peasants. A third to a quarter of the 90 million acres in the Presidency, or 2 7 Yz millions, were owned by 849 zamindars. Each of the fifteen zamindars controlled close to 500,000 acres. There were almost 4,600,000 peasant landowners with ry otwari tenure below them.108 According to the author's calculations, a peasant family would need around eight acres in order to be able to support themselves without having to labor for others. The typical holding was just little more than 3 Yz acres, and somewhat less than a quarter of people had to scratch out a livelihood by working for others. no Again, these estimates, which are based on returns from land sales, should be viewed with skepticism. But I don't see any reason to disagree with the overall impression they provide. Similar to Bengal, many of the ancient landed families had lost their estates between 1830 and 1850 due to their inability to pay their taxes at a time of low grain prices. Evidently, others benefited.111 According to Buchanan's sketches from the early nineteenth century and Raghavaiyangar's I 893 Meorandu11Z on Madras, the main effects of British rule were the scarcity of land for the peasants and the emergence of a small, extremely wealthy, and slothful class of landlords.

Around the same period, it was said that Bombay lacked any significant landowners similar to zamindars in other regions of India. the majority of rural residents Did peasants give the government their land rent directly? The writers of the 1880 Famine Report, on the other hand, observed that many peasants had a propensity to sublease their farms and live off the gap between the rents they got and the money they paid to the government. This data reveals the same set of characteristics once again, including a growing population, a rise in land demand, and the creation of a class of petty landlord rentiers from the peasants. The problem with tenancy quickly became apparent. Up to the end of the British rule, subtenants in ryotwari districts lacked legal protection, including Bombay and portions of Madras. In 1939, campaigns to defend customary rights got under way.113 By 1951, it had been standard practice to downplay the possibility of a landlord issue. Nevertheless, the writers of the 1951 census noted the presence of a class of big landowners in the Bombay neighborhood along with other fascinating features. Among those who received farm rent, about a third reported a supplementary source of income. Both findings point to a tight relationship between urban business interests and landlordism, maybe akin to that seen in Chinese port cities.

We may wrap off our geographical survey by examining a portion of the Punjab, a former wheat-growing region that is now a part of Pakistan. The Punjab is instructive because it is home to the Jats, a caste of peasants who, while having a martial heritage, are excellent growers. The Punjab is another area where the British early on introduced extensive irrigation. Sir Malcolm Darling, a superb and compassionate observer, reminds us that the landowners were centered along the Indus valleys when he describes the situation in the 1920s. The Fam- ine Commission of 1945 estimated that 2.4 percent of the owners held 38 percent of the land.1116 These landlords are

primarily described as extravagant and without interest in improving their property, caring only for sport and their rents.1l7 In the 1880s, the British literally made the desert bloom through a sizable irrigation project and settled it with peasants. The British intended for the last group to become landed gentry, but these peasant owners became absentees, and that component of the experiment failed. The situation was not entirely bleak, however. Darling discusses progressive and business-minded landlords from the towns at one point. They did not originate from the old classes of landowners that British administration normally aimed to protect. This indication implies that some kind of capitalist revolution in agriculture was not entirely out of the question in India, especially in light of what is known about the transfer of land out of the hands of the old local elite in other regions of India. It would be wiser to think about the consequences of this statement later, together with initiatives to start a voluntary agricultural revolution that were started during the Nehru period.

By itself, the statistical data does not allow for any conclusion on whether or not there was a rise in the number of renters throughout the British period. The major problem is that a peasant often owns one plot while renting one or several others. Therefore, variations in the methods employed to gather data at various times lead to enormous changes in the findings that completely mislead the actual situation. an increase appears quite plausible in view of the undeniable growth in population and the fight for land. The next census, taken in 1951, revealed an astonishing reversal of this trend, which cannot be taken seriously as evidence and is almost certainly the result of a change in the definitions of tenant and owner. It is also not unquestionably true, as some Indian nationalist writers are inclined to claim, that the material situation of tenants worsened during the British era. Tenancy alone is not evidence, and in any event, a comparable relationship predated the tenancy by a great distance. Once again, the population rise is the most significant fact. We might interpret this finding as strong support that degradation did indeed place, especially when combined with the lack of any significant technological advancement in agriculture.

Furthermore, it is hard to determine with any degree of statistical accuracy how much the new British legality and the rise in market significance sped up the process of consolidating ownership of landed property within a smaller number of individuals. Many areas of India had large holdings before the British arrived. By the time the British left, they were reportedly quite uncommon123. The sole statistical data on India as a whole comes from a survey conducted between 1953 and 1954. The likelihood is that the study reports a significantly lower degree of concentration than was the case at the end of the British period because the zamindari system was being abolished at the time and there would, on account of this, have been a substantial premium on concealing the size of one's holdings from prying officials. However, it's important to note the primary findings. 14 to 15 million rural Indian families, or around one-fifth of them, lacked land ownership. Less than an acre was owned by half of the rural families. Their percentage of the land was barely 2%. In all population zones, the top 10% of rural households held 48 percent or more of the entire area, which is at the top of the scale. The picture that emerges is one of a sizable rural proletariat, about half the rural population, a small class of rich peasants, not much more than an eighth of the population, and a tiny elite. Big landowners, however, let's say those above 40 acres, owned only about a fifth.

The growth of the rural proletariat seems to have been the primary British influence on changes in rural social organization. This stratum is mostly made up of agricultural landowners who are either landless or have a small piece of land that effectively ties them to the landlord. We are

unable to determine the extent of the growth in this category since comparisons between censuses are exceedingly dangerous due to changes in categorization methods. In an effort to get around these obstacles, one researcher came to the conclusion that the number of agricultural laborers rose from about 13% in 1891 to about 38% in 193, then leveled off because farms were now simpler to operate with family labor thanks to India's growing population.

The landless or almost landless in India are not the result of a widespread expropriation of the rural population. It is also without question that they are very underprivileged. It has long been a common practice among the outcastes who work as farm workers in one part of Uttar Pradesh to consume grain that has been cleansed from animal excrement. About a quarter of the people in the area are claimed to engage in the activity, which is apparently not seen to be abhorrent. This is undoubtedly an extreme case. However, let it serve as an illustration of how civilized man may degenerate even in a tranquil environment. The typical scenario is already quite awful. Despite how offensive these assumptions about the rural proletariat are, they are strong enough to withstand the weight of this argument. There is a clear need for further study into the history of the lower strata of the Indian countryside since it is opaque. One would even hesitate to assert that their relationship to their employers altered substantially during the British era. That the lowest strata are not a direct result of Pax Britannica will need emphasizing.

The conversation returns to the primary subject it started with as a result of the shocking suffering of the lowest strata of Indian rural life. India has not yet had a peasant revolution, despite the fact that Indian farmers have endured just as much material hardship as Chinese farmers over the last two centuries. Differentiations in their social structures previous to the Western invasion, as well as vast disparities in the time and nature of that influence, point to a few potential causes. However, up until now, solely as a bour Enquiry, I, 19, finds that approximately a third of rural households were agricultural workers, and of them, half were landless. Violence has been a component of the reaction. Thorner and Thorner point out that the Enquiry focussed on technical elements of sampling to the almost full disregard of social reality, which brings harsh criticism to the techniques of data collection. The classifications and breakdowns are either meaningless or, worse yet, gravely misleading.

The Nonviolent Connection of the Bourgeois to the Peasantry

Earlier in this story, it was necessary to draw attention to the obstacles the Indian social structure had put in the way of commercial growth prior to the arrival of the Europeans: the caste system, the insecurity of property, the obstacles to its accumulation, the value placed on opulent display, and the insecurity of property. There were some positive factors in the equation as well. Luxury has often encouraged certain types of trade elsewhere. However, native trade was not intended to be the solvent that would dissolve India's ancient agricultural civilization. Even banking achieved a high height of growth. To a very limited degree, the British occupation, its destruction of textile handicrafts, and its cautious attitude toward commercial interests that would compete with its own may be blamed for the lack of a commercial and industrial revolution. However, despite their best efforts, the British were unable to stop the establishment of a contemporary corporate elite in their own country. The evidence does not also show that they made a significant effort to stop it.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, when transportation advancements made it possible to import machinery and opened up access to wider markets, indigenous industries, particularly cotton and jute, started to become more significant.129 By the 1880s, India had a distinct

commercial and industrial class of the modern variety. She also took a class for voice professionals. Because British legality and the British bureaucracy in this country provided one adequate outlet for talent and ambition, lawyers were among the first and most significant members of the modern bourgeoisie to make an appearance on the Indian scene. It's also possible that the law was amenable to the Brahman tradition of authority and metaphysical speculation. About forty years later, dignified British visitors could talk well of the Indian merchant princes whose homes were on Malabar Hill in Bombay and inform us that they owned the majority of the money in the cotton industries in Bombay and the jute mills close to Calcutta.

In these groups, skepticism about the advantages of the British link initially appeared. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, business interests in England were concerned about Indian native competition. Indian traders believed that the potential for expansion was limited by free trade. For a very long time, they sought protection, subsidies, and opportunities for the monopolistic exploitation of the Indian market.1s2 This led to a rift between the commercial classes in India, who felt constrained by their ties to England, and the landed elite, who were the main beneficiaries of British rule after 1857. This division ultimately resulted in Independence. The political ramifications of the divide were enormous. The British presence in India prevented any such coalition from occurring, which helped to establish a parliamentary democracy elsewhere where we have observed that an alliance between "powerful segments of a landed elite and a rising but weak commercial class has been a crucial factor in producing a reactionary political phase in the course of economic development." However, there is more to the story than that, as the commercial classes were also connected to the peasantry through the nationalist movement. To comprehend this paradoxical connection between the most developed and the most underdeveloped, it is necessary to briefly discuss some significant moments in the history of the nationalist movement and carefully examine Gandhi's writings and speeches.

In the same year, 1885, both the Indian National Congress and the first Indian Chamber of Commerce were established. Before the First World War, the Congress just served as a "timid annual gathering of English-speaking intelligentsia." Although there were short instances when other forces were able to put the relationship with commercial interests into the background, it eventually remained one of the key factors defining the Congress's position. For instance, B.G. Tilak rose to prominence as the head of a violent nativist reaction before the First World War that drew its inspiration from India's turbulent history. Part of the reason for this move toward violence was a result of general dissatisfaction with the Congress's strategy of polite but ineffectual petitions. Tilak's influence allowed the Congress to embrace Swaraj's objective in 1906, which was then described as the "system of government obtaining in the self-governing British colonies."

In the Karachi Resolution on Fundamental Rights of 1931, when the Congress adopted a tepidly socialist and democratic policy, another strain of radicalism this time with socialist overtones was to subsequently influence the official position of the Congress. These theological gusts had little impact in the lack of political accountability, while corporate interests served as a restraining ballast. More importantly yet, the presence of the British invader enforced a degree of unity that spanned from the Westernized and moderately radical intelligentsia through the business community to the politically engaged peasants, calming down internal conflicts and causing them to subside. The Indian National Congress began to transition from being an exclusive club to a popular movement at this period. The Congressmen went to the rural population the next year, just as the Russian Narodniki did in the 1870s. From this point until the

conclusion of World War I and the ascent of Gandhi to the position of the movement's undisputed leader at its session in Nagpur in 1920.

Gandhi's nonviolent agenda seemed to provide intellectuals like Nehru with a path out of the deadlock caused by two approaches that had so far shown to be equally ineffective: the brutality of a Tilak and the ineffectual constitutionalism of the Congress's previous past.137 Gandhi's message resonated with Hindu culture and did it in a manner that did not endanger established interests in Indian society while still inspiring the nation to rebel against the British. Even the landed upper classes were not the target of direct assault, despite the fact that they dreaded him, as we will see in a minute. It is doubtful that Gandhi made a conscious Machiavellian decision to exclude any aspects of economic radicalism. His personal motivations are irrelevant to us. Gandhi's agenda, as outlined in his many writings and speeches, is what is important and illuminating. From the outset of his active leadership until the conclusion of his life, his basic principles exhibited a remarkable degree of consistency in their broad strokes.

Less widely known to educated Westerners is Gandhi's program's social and economic component, which is embodied by the fabled spinning wheel and defined by the word "Swadeshi." Gandhi gave the following definition of the word in 1916: "Swadeshi is a condition of non-violent non-cooperation, often known as passive resistance.I must confine myself to practicing my ancestral religion, which is the use of my immediate religious surroundings, in order to meet the criteria of the definition; if I find it lacking, I should serve it by making up for its shortcomings. Similar to this, I should make advantage of the native institutions that are already in existence in the realm of politics. If we adhere to the Swadesbi concept, every village in India will practically be a self-supporting and self-contained entity, trading only those necessities with other villages where they are not locally producible. If there are neighbors who require a healthy occupation, it would be your and my responsibility to identify them and educate them how to fulfill our needs when they are unsure of how to continue. Gandhi wanted to go back to an idealistic time when the Indian village society was free of some of its most overtly oppressive and degrading characteristics, including untouchability.

Gandhi's views on property, as embodied in the principle of trusteeship, were closely tied to the concept of Swadeshi. Again, it is best to let the Mahatma speak for himself: Assuming I have accumulated a respectable amount of wealth through inheritance or trade and industry, I must realize that all of that wealth does not belong to me; rather, what belongs to me is the right to an honorable livelihood that is on par with that of millions of others. The community owns the remainder of my money, which must be utilised for the sake of the community. When the socialist theory was presented to the nation on the wealth owned by zamindars and governing chiefs, I said that they would eliminate these protected groups. Despite their affluence, I want them to become less enamored with themselves and their possessions and to descend to the level of those who make a living through work. The worker must understand that the rich man is less the owner of his riches than the worker is of his own, namely, the ability to work.

The remark you just read was made in a 1939 newspaper story. Five years before, he had been questioned about his tolerance of private property, which seemed to conflict with his commitment to nonviolence. His response was that individuals who gain money but do not freely utilize it for the sake of humanity must be given some slack. When questioned further about why he did not support state ownership in lieu of private property, he said that, although it was preferable to private ownership, it was unfavorable due to violence. He said, "It is my fervent

conviction that if the state restrained capitalism via violence, it would get entangled in the sins of violence itself and fail to cultivate nonviolence at any point in time.

Obviously, the owners of property including the landed nobility, who were often hostile to him would find nothing particularly alarming in this view. He firmly defended this position, criticizing the violent tactics of the peasant movement as "something akin to fascism" in 1938: As far as I can tell, Gandhi took his position that the zamindars should be expropriated to its furthest point in 1946, when he implied that not every Congressman was an angel and suggested that an independent India might fall into the hands of unjust people who would abolish the zamindars. Even on this occasion, he was eager to express the wish that Congress would be fair because "otherwise, any good it might have done would vanish in an instant."

The fundamental focus of Gandhi's policy was the resurgence of traditional rural India, as suggested by the concept of Swadeshi. Gandhi's true allegiance was to the peasants, and it was they who embraced his cause with the greatest fervor. They wish to live only if they can live, as he noted in 1933. My extremely basic intellect is limited to the little spindle of the small wheel that I can easily manufacture and take about with me from place to place. He believed that all parties could come to an agreement and work together to improve the town without regard to politics. Gandhi never considered that keeping India's rural areas would commit the majority of its people to a life of filth, ignorance, and discomfort. He believed that industrialism only fostered violence and materialism. In his view, rather than deserving hatred, the English were the victims of modern civilisation.

Gandhi's love of the countryside had antiurban and even anticapitalist connotations, as is typical of retrograde idealizations of peasant life. This viewpoint has a solid foundation in Indian experience. Gandhi was deeply affected by reports of British manufactured goods destroying Indian rural handicrafts, particularly weaving. In 1992, he passionately refuted the well-known assertion that the English had given India the advantages of a legal system of governance. For him, the law was only a means of hiding a cruel exploitation. He said that no amount of figure-juggling could hide "the evidence the skeletons in many villages present to the naked eye." If there is a God above, I have absolutely no doubt that this potentially unparallel act against mankind will result in answers from both England and the city people of India. The similar idea appears in many of his previous talks.

He primarily saw village improvement as "an honest attempt to return to the villagers what has been cruelly and thoughtlessly snatched away from them by the city dwellers." When there weren't enough people to complete the job, mechanization was a good solution. Contrarily, it was bad. "Strange as it may seem, every mill generally is a menace to the villagers," the poet wrote. Such views could hardly have won the support of the nationalist movement's affluent financiers. While Gandhi's backing of the workers in the Ahmedabad strike at the close of World War I may have enraged yet other people, wealthy merchants were outraged by the admittance of untouchables into his ashram. On the surface, it seemed paradoxical that the rich urban classes should have provided support for the nationalist revolution while the landed nobility, on whose behalf he gave a number of consoling declarations, were largely hostile.

When we consider that the whole Swadeshi or local autonomy program was, in fact, a "buy Indian" policy that served to reduce the competitiveness of British products, a portion of the paradox vanishes. Gandhi's philosophy on the dignity of work also has positive features from the perspective of the rich classes. Political strikes violated his principles of nonviolence and

noncooperation, hence he was against them. It doesn't take much intelligence, he said in 1921, to see that using labor for political purposes before workers are aware of the political climate of the nation and are willing to work for the common good is very risky. He advised "the necessity of thinking a hundred times before undertaking a strike" even in cases of economic strikes. He also thought that strikes would be replaced by the notion of arbitration as labor grew increasingly organized and educated. These concepts were expressed in a statement released in June 1934 by the influential Working Committee of the Congress, which denounced socialist concepts including the seizure of private property and class conflict.

Gandhi's beliefs therefore fed the affluent urban elites' mills while having some recognizable elements of peasant rebellion. His theories successfully countered the radical ideologies of the West, which served to mobilize the people in the independence struggle and give it strength and efficacy while also ensuring the safety of those with property.

Gandhi was essentially the voice of the Indian peasant and village craftsman. There is a ton of proof that they enthusiastically responded to his request. As we will see in the next section, this group as a whole was experiencing widespread suffering as a result of the encroachments of capitalism on top of their pre-existing woes. As a result, the same resentments that in Japan found some of their release in the Young Officers' Movement and superpatriotism, found quite another outlet in India under Gandhi in a distinct kind of nationalism. Their commonalities, though, are at least as significant as their differences. Both used a romanticized past as their example of the ideal society. Both were unable to comprehend the issues facing the contemporary society. This verdict may come out as severe in the instance of Gandhi. Gandhi has been seen as a sympathetic figure by many Western liberals who are troubled by the horrors of contemporary industrial civilization, particularly because of his emphasis on nonviolence. This compassion, in my opinion, just serves as more proof of contemporary liberalism's ill health and its inability to address the issues facing Western civilization. Modern technology is here to stay and will soon expand over the rest of the planet, if one thing is at least guaranteed. Perhaps as clear is that, whatever shape the ideal society may eventually take, it won't resemble Gandhi's image of an independent Indian hamlet supported by a local craftsman spinning a wheel.

The nationalist movement was given a quietist twist by nationalist leaders and the way class relations were structured under British rule, which tended to quell any revolutionary aspirations among the peasants. Other considerations were also significant, particularly the fact that the lower classes of the peasants were divided along caste and language lines yet remained bound to the established order by customs and small pieces of property. However, the English's effort to downplay the level of disorder under their reign and throughout the transition to independence, together with the spotlight cast on Gandhi, have helped to partially hide the degree of genuine violence that did occur. The Indian peasant has not been treated in precisely the same passive manner as it formerly appeared to be throughout the last 200 years. Despite being a difficult undertaking given the sources now at hand, examining the conditions under which peasants have resorted to organized violence may provide some insight on the elements that have, in general, prevented its occurrence.

CONCLUSION

Finally, the establishment of a parliamentary democracy requires a commitment to democratic values and principles. This may involve creating a culture of democracy where citizens are encouraged to participate in the political process and to hold their representatives accountable. It

may also involve the creation of a free and independent media that can inform citizens and hold the government accountable. The establishment of a parliamentary democracy also involves the creation of a legal framework to protect individual rights and freedoms. This may involve the creation of an independent judiciary to interpret the law and ensure that the government operates within the bounds of the constitution. It may also involve the creation of laws and institutions to protect the rights of minority groups and to prevent discrimination. The establishment of a parliamentary democracy is a complex process that requires the commitment and participation of all citizens. However, when successful, it can provide a framework for stable and effective governance that promotes the rights and freedoms of all citizens.

REFERENCES

[1]   "Introduction: Stabilising Fragile Democracies and Party System Development," in *Stabilising Fragile Democracies*, 2020. doi: 10.4324/9780203430132-7.

[2]   J. R. I. Cole and M. Bayat, "Iran's First Revolution: Shi'ism and the Constitutional Revolution of 1905-1909," *J. Interdiscip. Hist.*, 1994, doi: 10.2307/206717.

[3]   Y. S. Lestari, "Ombudsman: Suatu Kajian Analisis," *J. Public Policy*, 2019, doi: 10.35308/jpp.v2i2.767.

[4]   D. Gaus, "Discourse theory's sociological claim: Reconstructing the epistemic meaning of democracy as a deliberative system," *Philos. Soc. Crit.*, 2016, doi: 10.1177/0191453714567733.

[5]   I. Khambule, A. Nomdo, B. Siswana, and G. Fokou, "Coexistence as a Strategy for Opposition Parties in Challenging the African National Congress' One-Party Dominance," *Politikon*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/02589346.2019.1682784.

[6]   G. Prevost, "The New Spain," *Worldview*, 1983, doi: 10.1017/s0084255900047884.

[7]   S. Birch and J. Dennison, "How protest voters choose," *Party Polit.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1354068817698857.

[8]   T. Desrues and E. Gobe, "'We don't want to be governed like this anymore': protest democracy as an expression of a crisis of governmentality in post-revolution Tunisia," *Br. J. Middle East. Stud.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/13530194.2021.1996333.