HUMANITIES INSTITUTE
Peter N. Stearns, Ph.D.

THE GOVERNMENT IN HISTORY

Contents

Introduction

Introduction

Definition Dictionary definitions emphasize that government involves a system of social control in which a group of people is given the right to make and enforce laws and carry out other collective tasks, usually including military activities. This is admittedly quite general. As the first chapter suggests, distinguishing between societies that have governments, and those that do not, is often difficult. Judgments are further complicated in situations in which other groups in society share in tasks that are usually assigned to governments: for example, cases in which governments do not assert a monopoly over the maintenance of armed forces (as in feudal societies). Still, the emphasis on an identifiable group and basic responsibility such as defining and adjudicating laws and other collective functions provides an initial focus.

History Historians have been interested in government since the idea of formally recording the past came into being – witness the Greek historian Thucydides, who was primarily interested in chronicling the structure and activities of city-state governments in a time of crisis. Charting what governments or particular government leaders have done fills many history textbooks today, while also providing a common focus for historical biographies. To be sure, some recent historical fields, such as social history, have tried to move away from undue focus on government, arguing that many ordinary people shape their lives in interesting and important ways partially apart from official circles. But there is no death of historical coverage of governments in many different societies, and many periods of time.

Focus Historical treatment of government as subject, somewhat apart from the more familiar narratives of government activities – such as wars – or struggles for government authority, arguably centers on four subjects. First, and most familiar, is the form of government (again, a fascination from classical Greece onward): is the government a monarchy, tyranny, oligarchy, democracy or some blend of categories? Shading off from this, as a second topic, is personnel: is government primarily staffed, at least as the upper levels, by a hereditary aristocracy, or more widely open to talent; at what point do key groups such as women gain any access? A third topic, at least as important as the first though frankly less familiar, involves functions. What activities does a government take on (and what does it largely stay away from)? Analysis of government functions really involves figuring out what roles governments assume in people's lives, and the points at which ordinary people have significant contact with government. A subset topic involves finance: as a government seeks to define its sphere of activity, how does it manage (or try) to cover the costs. Finally, there is the issue of geographic scope. Does a major society seek a government that will cover its whole territory (the predominant historical trend in China) or is government divided into smaller geographical units (down to the frequently-important city-state level, or in modern times nations).

Back to history All four of these topics reveal major variations in governments from one region to the next – a comparative chart today would emphasize a range of different forms, from democracy to monarchy; obvious distinctions in geographic range, though now with a clear preference for nation-states; significant differences in sources of personnel (at this writing, the Taliban in Afghanistan for example seems bent on removing female government officials); and important variations in function. Even more clearly, governments have varied crucially over time in all four of these aspects – witness, for example, the intriguing decline of monarchy as a preferred form in modern history, or the wider advent of civil service programs to reduce favoritism in government appointments, or the rise of the assumption that governments should bear primary responsibility for education. A history of government, shorn of too much narrative detail on particular features of legislation or military activities, seeks to chart and categorize changes in the four major aspects of government, and their mutual relationships, over time.

Major time periods The chapters that follow provide basic summaries of government characteristics in the principal geographical regions organized in terms of fairly standard world history periods. Thus initial chapters deal with societies that, over a long span of human history, had no governments – leading into the so-called stateless societies that lasted into modern times; and then the rise of government, beginning with ancient Sumeria around 3500 BCE (and other early governments in the river-valley civilizations). Several chapters then deal with the different approaches to governments developed in the major classical societies, several of which established traditions about government form and scope that would last into later periods as well –with traces visible still today. A third cluster of chapters (beginning with #7) take up governments in the postclassical period (roughly 500-1450 CE), in which more societies developed the

capacity for government and in which many governments contended with new developments such as the spread of missionary religions. Governments in the early modern period, 1450-1750, highlight a revival of empire (both land-based and the newer phenomenon of overseas empires). Finally, sections on the long 19th century and then the contemporary period features the rise of often bitter and literally revolutionary quarrels about government form and function – including the substantial triumph of the republican form – plus a host of functional changes associated with the advent of industrial society.

Study questions

1. Why is the definition of government a challenging assignment?
2. What are the four major features of government, and how do they interrelate?
3. What are some basic differences between modern and premodern governments?

Further reading

Lawrence Krader, *Formation of the State* (Prentice-Hall, 1968)

Keith Faulks, *Political Sociology: a critical introduction* (New York University Press, 2000)

ANCIENT PERIOD

Chapter I: Societies before Government

 Basics Most human societies, during most of human history, did not have formal governments. They provided leadership and rule-making and -enforcement functions in other ways, without establishing or designating a particular institution. The pattern is fairly obvious in hunting-and-gathering societies, that predominated from the origins of the species until the advent of agriculture. But even many agricultural societies, well into recent times, did not set up explicit governments.

Hunting and gathering Hunting and gathering groups were, and are, characteristically fairly small – 40-60 people, half of whom are children, with adults frequently related to each other. In this setting leadership functions could be quite informal. Decisions were made by groups, if not all the adults involved. Women, whose work as gatherers was vital to the economy as a whole, were typically included in the discussions. Elders might wield particular authority because of their experience and memory, in societies that depended entirely on the oral transmission of knowledge.

Rules and enforcement Hunting and gathering societies develop clear rules of behavior, without the need for formal laws and regulations. Rules may apply to sexual behaviors or selection of marriage partners, or the admission of young men into the hunting group, or permissible and forbidden foods, or even the acceptability or unacceptability of boasting – the range is characteristically extensive, though because there is characteristically little or no sense of private property and little or no inequality some issues more common in complex societies were largely avoided. The rules are sanctioned by tradition, with no active sense that they were explicitly created or subject to legislative revision. Enforcement is a matter of group consensus, with heavy reliance on shaming as a punishment for transgressions and, even more because of the emotional pain involved, a deterrence for misbehavior. Hunting and gathering societies are typically highly regulated, with individual nonconformity discouraged, without the need for government.

Murder rates Downsides of the absence of government probably show up in the relatively high murder rates characteristic of many hunting and gathering societies. This is a difficult and debated subject, because direct evidence is thin (though the number of bashed-in skulls found in archeological sites make it clear that murder was an issue). Further, different societies – based on different social rules and ecological conditions – had different rates. Nevertheless, it is clear that unsanctioned violence was considerable in stateless societies, and that revenge responses constituted a common phenomenon as well.

Stateless societies As the next chapter shows, the rise of agriculture ultimately created conditions in which many societies could form – arguably, needed to form – governments. However, this was not an immediate development. In the northern Middle East, where agriculture originated, several millennia

passed between the rise of agriculture and the emergence of government. And a number of successful agricultural societies continued to do without government well into modern times – perhaps particularly in some parts of western and central Africa.

Challenges involved Agriculture did generate at least two changes that would ultimately conduce to the formation of governments. Populations increased, actually quite rapidly, and the characteristic agricultural agglomeration, the village, was noticeably larger than the typical hunter-gatherer band – 300 people or more (though still half of them children), instead of a few dozen. Informal decision-making arguably became more difficult, the impulse to designate particular leaders more pronounced. Many agricultural villages thus did identify one or more holy men, or shamans, responsible for organizing key rituals – a potential step toward government.

How stateless societies managed Still, agricultural conditions did not automatically generate government. Stateless societies continued to rely heavily on informal, inherited behavioral norms, enforced by consensus and shaming – including potential banishment for offenders. Elaborate kinship ties, carefully identified and passed from one generation to the next, helped provide organization and order in the absence of government institutions – this was a key feature of many stateless societies in Africa. Disputes were characteristically handled by the village group, often appealing to the judgment of elders in the community – with verdicts accepted (usually) because of a desire to remain in good standing with the group. Stateless agricultural societies generally produced a range of subsistence crops – rather than specializing – which reduced social stratification. But even many early cities, like Catal Huyuk in Anatolia, with 5000-10,000 inhabitants, provide no evidence of formal government institutions.

The Gender factor Even stateless agricultural societies developed levels of gender inequality well beyond the patterns of hunting and gathering groups. Norms reducing the status of women gradually added to the overall list of conventions. In the process, however, women's role in informal governance or dispute management – beyond the family level – characteristically diminished – which may have had the effect of simplifying decision-making without requiring the designation of fulltime leaders.

Nomadic herding societies Along with agriculture, the domestication of animals generated another human economy that was different from hunting and gathering. Nomadic herding groups were usually small enough that institutionalized leadership was unnecessary; and they did not produce the kind of economic surplus that would have supported this kind of institutionalization in any event. However, the historical record makes it clear that, at least occasionally, unusually strong leaders could emerge, with clear governance power even without a larger institutional apparatus.(The obvious example, from the 13th century, was Chingghis Khan and his power among the Mongols, after quarrels over leadership position early in his life.) And some historians believe that certain nomadic groups, particularly in parts of central Asia, did develop some clear government structures, though never with great elaboration.

Theoretical implications Increasing scholarly recognition of the human capacity to flourish (at least in many respects) without government, the maintenance of stateless societies even amid changes such as the rise of agriculture, and the recency of government itself as a human phenomenon have contributed to lively discussions about the need for a state. Earlier Marxist and anarchist arguments about the state as an invention of human inequality, and about the possibility of doing away with the state in a communist or anarchist utopia, gain new dimensions.

Study questions

1. How did stateless societies settle disputes?
2. How did stateless societies characteristically make decisions?
3. Why did agriculture not automatically generate the need for government?

Further reading
Raymond Hames, "Pacifying Hunter-Gatherers," *Human Nature* 30 (2019)

David Graeber, *Fragments of an Anarchist Anthropology* (Prickly Paradigm Press, 2004)

James C. Scott, *The Art of Not Being Governed: an anarchist history of Upland Southeast Asia* (Yale University Press, 2009)

Chapter 2: The Advent of Government

Context There is little question that the world's first formal government emerged among the city states of Sumer around 3500 BCE. Unfortunately, no one chronicled the innovation – which doubtless emerged somewhat gradually from more informal leadership in any event. We do not know whether people actually registered on the change or what the priorities were among several possible motivations. The development did occur as part of a cluster of changes: somewhat larger and more numerous cities (though still in the 10,000 population range), reflecting an increase in agricultural surplus and growing trade (though most of the inhabitants still depended on near-subsistence agriculture). Introduction of the wheel and the use of bronze metals improved production instruments and had implications for warfare. The advent of writing, though initially in cumbersome pictographs that required years of mastery, facilitated record-keeping and bureaucratic communication, both vital to the emergence of government (though later, some societies, notably the Inca, did generate governments without writing).

Social structure By this point relatively advanced agricultural societies, like Sumer, had produced a class structure including a landowning minority – an incipient aristocracy, or as they called themselves "free men" – along with a majority of workers, peasants, and slaves. This upper group might particularly support governments as a means of facilitating property protection and defending privilege in other respects. It also stood ready to supply at least a portion of professional government staffing – as military leaders or judges, for example – a prime perch for younger sons, for example. Whether the small number of boys who were sent to learn the script came from this group exclusively, or were simply sponsored by them, is unclear. But it is obvious that the advent of government and class structure were deeply intertwined – as would remain the case. In the case of Sumer, urban governments also helped organize the exploitation of peasants in the surrounding countryside, who were kept clearly subservient.

Motivations Several issues may have prompted the conversion of informal leadership into a small government. Rates of internal violence and revenge may have generated concern. More probably, the need for more concerted social action on what today would be called public works fueled change. This was an irrigation-intensive economy, along the Tigris and Euphrates rivers, which already required coordination to make sure water was shared. Coordination could evolve into some official oversight as well as the desirability of more formal rules or laws. Cities needed public resources for monuments and walls – we know that the early Sumerian cities were heavily fortified. Finally, the states warred frequently, which could produce needs not only for fortifications but for a more formal structure to identify military leadership and a core group of semi-professionals.

Role of religion Evidence suggest that the first urban governments were sponsored by priests. This group already had a leadership position. Its needs for public support and temple-building could motivate efforts at more formal organization – to collect funds and oversee projects. Unquestionably priests sponsored the first training in literacy, and in many agricultural societies for centuries religion would generate the kind of education that in turn produced potential government officials. In this context it is not surprising that early political leaders – here and in many other cases – began invoking divine power as a source of legitimacy: the rulers were anointed by the gods, or were gods themselves. This reflected religious origins but also the need to provide as much justification as possible for rulers who, after all, were making new claims to power.

Warriors Fairly early the reins of government were taken over by the military upper class, though still with close ties with priests. This became the normal source for kings, and references to conquests and prowess in battle became a standard feature for many rulers (though some would seek a picture of successful peacekeeping). With this, conquest of neighboring city states launched a larger regional government in the Tigris-Euphrates region. And then subsequent conquests created even larger empires covering much of the Middle East, like the Babylonian or later the Hittite, running roughshod over a variety of subject populations. Growing numbers of people were introduced to formal government through this kind of expansion – though they usually retained some kind of government even in periods when empire receded. A precedent was set for large regional states in the Middle East that would persist, periodically, into the 20th century.

Government functions The Mesopotamian state had three clear functions. The need for military defense and, sometimes, expansion, was central. The public works role persisted, in building fortifications but also monuments, plus some roads and port facilities. From the outset Sumerian cities had also sponsored law codes, and this function was expanded, most famously by the Babylonian emperor Hammurabi (the code was created between 1755 and 1750 BCE). This code, initially invoking divine sponsorship, sought particularly to protect property rights, including damage caused by renters or other disruption; stipulations in these categories were quite detailed. But crimes against persons were also delineated, in the interests of reducing private revenge; punishments for crimes like assault were calibrated by social class. Family law was also a highlight, reinforcing patriarchal power though with provision meant to insist that husbands provide support for wives.

Government limitations There was much this early government did not attempt to do. While the state might assist in trying to assure food supplies for cities, there was no welfare system. Economic functions were limited to public works. Interest in punishing crime did not extend to maintaining a police force. Accusations had to come from subjects, which is why great attention was paid to punishing falsehoods. Limitations on policing, and the absence of extensive prisons, help explain why many punishments were both harsh and public, like loss of a hand for a thief and many public executions: absent elaborate detection and enforcement, it was vital to provide vivid examples of potential fate.

Resources Early governments sought a variety of revenue streams, particularly challenging before the introduction of money and in an economy where it required eight farmers to support ten people overall. Traders were taxed for a portion of their produce, with punishments for evasion (which must however have been quite frequent). Rulers had extensive landed property, and many subjects were required to provide work service on the estates. Even funerals required a payment to the state, in the form of a domestic animal or some produce. By 2500 BCE governments in the region were keeping elaborate tax records – one of the key uses of writing, and a source of bureaucratic employment. Still, resources were often slender – which was one reason early states so often resorted to conquest as a means of paying the troops through spoils of war. (Until fairly recently it was standard to allow soldiers who conquered a city at least three days to plunder – even under enlightened leadership.)

Other states Governments were also developed early on in Egypt, with even more emphasis on monument building and religious sponsorship. It is not clear that another early civilization, in the Indus river valley, had formal government or not, though it certainly had elaborate cities. China would begin to generate a government tradition, initially along the Yellow River, by the 2nd millennium BCE. Most of these introductions were independent of Mesopotamian example, but over time both example and conquest would help spread the idea of government to other regions—for example, in southern Europe.

Study questions

1. What caused the rise of governments?
2. Why were early governments and rulers heavily dependent on religion?
3. What was the relationship of early government to the class structure?
4. What were the main functions of early law codes?

Further reading

Bruce Trigger, *Understanding Early Civilizations: a comparative study* (Cambridge University Press,2014)

Jonathan Valk and Irene Marin, eds., *Ancient Taxation: the mechanics of extraction in comparative perspective* (New York University Press, 2021)

Chapter 3: Persia

The Classical period Several major regions of the world developed somewhat more elaborate societies, in comparison to the river-valley civilizations, beginning in the centuries after about 1000 BCE. Their development in turn forms the principal feature of the classical period of world history, in which these key regions evolved characteristic features – such as the emergence of Hinduism in India – that would continue to flourish for many centuries, and in some cases to the present day. The formation of distinctive

approaches to government was part of this process. In all cases, the classical societies experimented with expansive empires – extending a process that had already been visible in Mesopotamia, but now often applied to larger territories – but other political structures and cultures were advanced as well. Classical societies benefited from the political precedents already established by river-valley civilizations, though their geographical focus shifted somewhat. They also featured some tools and weapons that reflected the advent of the use of iron – introduced around 1500 BCE – which offered some improvements in productivity and lethality over previous instruments, though the conversion to iron was gradual.

Persian Empire The Persian Empire is somewhat distinctive among the classical societies, because its legacies were somewhat less clear thanks to the later arrival of Islam and periods of Arab control. The Empire in some ways constituted simply a later version of the various conquest regimes that had spread through the Middle East from the Sumerian city-states onward. However, the power and expanse of the Empire created a relevant political memory for present-day Iran. The empire was territorially larger and arguably more aggressive than many of its predecessors. And, most to the point, it developed a number of new organizational features and functions that added to the characteristics of government.

Chronology and expanse The Persian (or Achaemenid) empire began to take shape in the 7th century BCE, with a series of conquests under Cyrus the Great, who proclaimed himself emperor after having served previously as a regional king. Various successors continued to expand the empire – though as usual with hereditary empires and monarchies the quality of particular rulers varied considerably, and some were decidedly less interested in military goals than others. Under Xerxes I, early in the 5th century BCE, the empire stretched from the Balkans in the west, to the Indus River valley, and included Egypt and much of the Caucasus (as far as the Aral Sea) as well. This was the largest empire ever constructed to that point, covering 2.1 million square miles. The empire was finally defeated by Alexander the Great in the 4th century, and while successor regimes arose in and around presentday Iran they never achieved the size of the original.

Innovations in government To maintain this territory, which embraced a wide variety of ethnicities and languages, a variety of innovations were essential. Basically, Persian rulers managed a combination of centralized, bureaucratic rule, including a large professional army with at least 10,000 troops, with accommodations to internal diversity. Different regional sub-units, or *satraps*, each had a governor of its own, with a military commander (responsible for recruitment) and state secretary (responsible for record-keeping) reporting to the governor. There were variously 20 to 30 satraps in all.

Taxation and monetary policy Tax policy was tailored to the economic potential of each satrap, with taxes levied primarily on subject peoples. Babylon for example (at the highest rate) annually paid in a large amount of silver plus enough food to sustain the army for four months. Egypt had a lower silver payment but a larger grain requirement. It seems likely that the government also sponsored private sales of slaves and levied what was essentially a sales tax on each slave sold (possibly the world's first sales tax). The Empire also introduced standard gold and silver coinage, another first.

Expansion of functions Beginning with Cyrus the government also expanded its public works functions beyond any previous precedent. It sponsored an impressive road network that helped link other parts of Asia to the Mediterranean. While this was designed partly to facilitate troop movement, it also highlighted commerce. Cyrus also spaced inns along the major routes, each about a day's ride from the other, another boon to merchants. Cyrus also introduced the world's first postal system, another interesting extension of the functions of the state. Under later emperors the government also embraced the religion of Zoroastrianism and also introduced a standardized solar calendar that is still used in Iran. Not all of these functions were sustained by later regimes, particularly when Alexander the Great's empire devolved into separate regional entities, but the precedents were significant.

Decline Ultimately the empire foundered partly because the tax exactions became excessive, burdening the economy as a whole. Subject territories were paying in a massive amount, supporting the huge army, the central government, plus lining the pockets of regional governors. (Alexander the Great was able to seize the equivalent of $2.7 billion from royal coffers alone, which he plowed back into the general economy through expanded public works and monuments.) Nor was there any effort to create imperial cultural unity, which ultimately affected military cohesion as well, with the troops drawn from so many

separate ethnic identities. Finally, territorial overexpansion brought successful resistance and rebellion, first in frontier areas such as Greece – neither the first or last case in which government military ambitions were not carefully calibrated to durability over time.

Study questions

1. How did Persian rulers adapt government to the demands of its unprecedentedly large territory?
2. Why was a postal system now seen as a relevant function of government?
3. What brought the Empire down?

Further reading

Pierre Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander: a history of the Persian Empire* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002)

Maria Brosius, *A History of Ancient Persia* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2021)

Chapter 4: Classical China

Overview China and the imperial state emerged in several stages beginning as early as the 12th century BCE. Ultimately, by the end of the classical period, the Chinese had constructed a large territorial empire and established the tradition (not always successfully sustained) that government and Chinese territory should be one and the same. It had created a unifying political culture, in Confucianism, that particularly sustained the upper class throughout the empire – a marked contrast to the Persian Empire in this regard. And it had created a variety of government functions including, but surpassing, the basic trinity of military, law and judicial structure, and public works.

Early dynasties Regional kingdoms began to form in northern China from about 1766 BCE onward (though earlier dynasties may have preceded.) This was associated with the earliest evidence of writing in the region. Aside from this early origin, it is not clear that there was anything particularly noteworthy about the government involved: the main point was the establishment of a tradition of an imperial state that could survive any particular dynasty – a point frequently emphasized by later historians. This idea of imperial continuity was enhanced when the Zhou dynasty unseated the Shang in 1122. To justify their usurpation, the Zhou developed the idea that the emperor had a divine mandate – was in fact the Son of Heaven. The concept would be used to emphasize the god-like power of the emperor, but it also had a distinctive twist compared to other assertions of divine sponsorship. The Chinese Son of Heaven concept embraced the notion that the gods supported a particular dynasty only when it responsibly served society. The mandate could be withdrawn if this responsibility was not served – but then it would apply to an appropriate replacement. In fact, the Zhou government was not particularly powerful, frequently distracted by regional wars and checked by the powers of the landed aristocracy. But the claim of a special mission for the imperial government could be embellished in the future. (The idea would also be taken over in Japan and Vietnam, but with less nuance, more simple assertion of god-like status.)

Political culture Under the Zhou, three major schools of thought developed. Daoism was a religion that emphasized spirituality and balance in life; it was not usually overtly political, and could in fact combine with philosophies that paid more attention to the state – though there were some episodes of Daoist rebellion. The great innovation was Confucianism, which emphasized the goal of stability and prosperity in this world. In Confucian doctrine, the state assumed central importance as the anchor of an ordered society, with appropriate deference due to the emperor. An upper class should be ready to serve the state, expecting obedience from the mass of the population in return for which it would rule wisely, in the general interest. The family, a microcosm of the wider society, would serve as a training ground in hierarchy, deference and responsibility. Finally, at odds with Confucianism, the Legalists placed greater emphasis on raw state power, essential to keep people in line. While Legalism ultimately lost out to Confucianism in terms of government support, the two systems might combine to shape policy in practice. The main point was the strong emphasis, in Chinese culture, on the centrality of government and a value system that would support it, as well as helping to shape a social structure strongly oriented toward public service (for the upper class) and obedience. The political-cultural combination provided distinctive service to the Chinese government in the classical period and well beyond.

Territorial expansion The Qin dynasty forcibly unseated the increasingly enfeebled Zhou regime in 221. Its principal emperor, Qin Shi Huang, introduced a number of new features to Chinese government. Supporting Legalism, he actually attacked Confucian ideas as too soft. More to the point, he advocated a forceful central government that would effectively end the disorder of the later Zhou, backed by a strong military. He vigorously expanded government functions, undercutting the aristocracy and administering the peasantry more directly. Public works blossomed, including a major road system and the beginnings of massive, earthen defensive wall. Reforms of the writing system, currency and weights and measures were designed to stimulate the economy. Above all, the Qin greatly expanded imperial territory, conquering other regional kingdoms and extending government control to the south – even for a time into what is now Vietnam. From this point onward the Chinese government would typically claim control over the entire Middle Kingdom (and sometimes beyond), creating a massive territorial base.

The Han The ruthlessness, and heavy taxation, involved in Qin initiatives provoked considerable backlash, as the Qin gave way to the Han dynasty at the end of the third century, opening approximately 400 years of successful rule – including maintenance and consolidation of the expansive imperial territory. Han success would further consolidate the tradition of strong government in China, while removing some of the rough edges that the Qin had introduced. Several major features are worth noting.

Confucianism and cultural support Han emperors actively supported Confucian scholars (after briefly flirting with Legalism), and sponsored school programs (mainly for the upper class) that instilled Confucian values. This emphasis was extended to the newer southern territories, helping to build an upper class imbued with some common principles that were, in turn, aimed at supporting a stable and responsible government. While the Han did not seek full linguistic unity, it did promote Mandarin for the upper class throughout the empire. And the government helped relocate some northern Chinese to the south, with a similar goal of encouraging imperial integration (this is a policy still pursued in China, as with the relocation of Han Chinese to the northwest).

Functions The Han maintained the wide government functions already initiated by its predecessors – creating the most active state in the classical world. Standardized coinage helped promote commerce. Elaborate public works now included the construction of a massive north-south canal that helped coordinate the economies of two rather different agricultural regions. The government subsidized practical scientific research (including work in astrology). It organized granaries to protect cities against famines. A major law code was combined with an extensive court system, actively aimed against a variety of crimes – including some against women; and the effort was bolstered by a formal police force (possibly the oldest in the world).

Structure and foreign policy At the outset, the Han took over an organizational structure involving a number of regional kingdoms, but these gradually lost independence in favor of the activities of a centralized bureaucracy. Given the size of the empire – it took 30 days to reach the outlying areas from the capital – it would be misleading to suggest detailed integration, but the effort was extensive. The Han faced a variety of military challenges, but ultimately extended imperial territories. However, this was not on balance a highly militaristic regime. The Han worked to conciliate nomadic groups on its western border through gifts and marriage alliances, and (on the whole) avoided war where possible. This was in keeping with the most prominent Chinese work on warfare, Sun Tzu's *Art of War* (5th century BCE) and differed, on the whole, from the military-diplomatic policies of some other classical societies (including Persia).

Bureaucracy and training Under the Han the Chinese bureaucracy was the largest in the world, and the Chinese pioneered in both training and recruitment. The government-sponsored Imperial School, at its height, had 30,000 students, and there were feeder schools in many cities – all emphasizing training in classical literature and Confucianism. Most bureaucrats were recruited by personal connections within the landed upper class – though they were formally trained. The Han also experimented with an examination system that would produce some additional recruits. Through this, a small number of talented young men from the lower classes, whose education was often sponsored by a local magnate, could reasonably hope to enter the bureaucracy. Fueled by the nature of the Han state and the values of Confucianism, service in the educated bureaucracy became the highest social goal, easily outstripping business success and forming the fabled scholar-gentry class (or Mandarins).

Legacy The Han dynasty was toppled by invasion in 220 CE, after a period of decline. Over three centuries of invasion and civil strife ensued, before a dynasty was restored in the 6tn century. But the basic features of classical Chinese government were remembered, and valued, which is why they were substantially restored and embellished when conditions permitted. The capacity for restoration was itself distinctive, testifying to the classical achievement and setting parameters for Chinese imperial government for centuries to come.

Study questions

1. What were the most distinctive features of the Chinese system of government?
2. Why was such a large bureaucracy sought and maintained?
3. How did government and empire come to be so closely intertwined in the Chinese tradition?

Further reading

Mark Edward Lewis, *The Early Chinese Empires: Qin and Han* (Harvard University Press, 2010)

Ronnie Littlejohn, *Confucianism: an introduction* (I.B. Tauris, 2010)

Su Li, *Constitution of Ancient China* (ed., Zhang Yongle and Daniel Bell) (Princeton University Press, 2018)

Chapter 5: India/South Asia

Overview Of all the classical societies, India left the least clear mark in terms of government traditions and roles. There are several reasons for this: the huge subcontinent saw a variety of political structures during the classical period, with a great deal of local variation. Despite two major empires, a tradition of unified government was not established. Nor did Indian intellectuals devote a great deal of time to political issues – in contrast to both China and the Mediterranean – though there were some discussions. This does not mean that India was badly governed, and certainly the periods of great cultural creativity and expanding trade show that political conditions did not hold the civilization back in any systematic way. But the approach was distinctive. The subcontinent simply relied more heavily on social and cultural frameworks than on political ones.

Context Indian structures emerged gradually after about 800 BCE, including the elaboration of a priestly religion that ultimately developed into Hinduism. The subcontinent was dotted with small regional kingdoms and other states. The strong religious emphasis gave an unusually prominent place to the priestly Brahmin caste, which ultimately gained the highest social rank. This already suggests a level of interest in spiritual matters and ritual that might overshadow political focus, though the Brahmins did sometimes play and political role; and religious epics tended to sanction monarchy as the preferred political form. Great attention was devoted to the creation and elaboration of the signature caste system, as means of organizing social and assigning economic roles and rules for interaction. In a real sense, caste regulations (though supported by regional states in the north) did some of the work that legal codes and bureaucratic arrangements did in other societies, helping to explain, again, why political focus was somewhat diffuse.

Political writings Between the 4th and 3rd centuries BCE, a major teacher and intellectual, Chanakya (often known as Kautilya_) authored a basic political treatise, the *Arthashastra.* The work reflected political developments during India's first great empire, the Mauryan, and may have influenced imperial policy. The treatise paid great attention to monetary and fiscal policies, international relations, and war, and outlined the principal duties of a ruler. It may have built on earlier texts by various authors, suggesting the need to clarify political principles in India during a period of state formation. The treatise emphasized the importance of public works such as forts and irrigation systems, to help regions respond to disasters like famines and wars, and insisted on the fundamental importance of political knowledge. It assumed a monarchical government: the best king is a wise king, carefully educated to the duties of state. Officials must be chosen carefully, based on the king's personal knowledge of their integrity and moral character – this was not a formula for an elaborate bureaucracy. Rulers were urged to treat subjects kindly and tax sensibly, to win their favor; a considerable section was devoted to the role of the

state in prosecuting crime. Frequent warfare was assumed, though peace preferred; a long section (reflecting conditions in the Mauryan empire) was devoted to spying. Overall, this was a major political text, influential at the time and affecting later authors. Sometimes compared to Machiavelli's work, because of the amount of attention to tactics for staying in power, it differed in emphasizing the importance of overall welfare and prosperity. However, it was lost at the end of the classical period (rediscovered only in 1905), which limited its role as a durable guide in India's government history.

Decentralization and variety During long stretches of the classical period, the subcontinent was divided into a host of political entities, and it was never centralized entirely. Localism and regional diversity formed one of the governmental legacies of the classical period. Many of the smaller units were monarchies, which comported with the assumptions provided in most Hindu epics and also the major law code (the code of Manu) developed after 200 BCE (where the king was a key figure in the overall caste structure). (This was an influential code revolving around the caste system, rather than the legal activities of any particular state.) Monarchs and their staffs, including the military, were drawn largely from the *kshatriya* or warrior caste (which along with the priestly caste constituted about 20% of the population). The caste was responsible for military success but also good governance in times of peace. Initially, in fact, the caste was given top billing, but lost this position to the Brahmans as religion became more important – a revealing shift, in terms of government. Recent scholarship has made it clear that, amid varied regional jurisdictions, republican forms sometimes flourished as well – monarchy was not universal. Usually, these seem to have been governed by assemblies of warriors, but on occasion the merchant caste may have participated; and it is possible that participation even involved a somewhat democratic element (though among males of appropriate castes). This kind of alternative was most common in city-states, but occasionally showed up in larger regional agglomerations. In contrast to classical Greece, however, these alternatives were not given much attention in political theory.

Imperial tradition Classical India nurtured two periods of imperial rule, both rather brief and involving an uncertain legacy. The first, Mauryan, dynasty was the most impressive, forming partly in response to invasions by Alexander the Great's forces in the northwest. Launched around 322 BCE, it survived, though amid increasing decentralization, until about 185 BCE; at its height, it embraced the majority of the subcontinent and formed the largest unit ever developed before the British period in the 19th century. Its extent helped solidify the caste system. This was a period of considerable prosperity. Mauryan emperors, though warrior-conquerors, devoted careful attention to administration, setting up a provincial structure that may have reflected Persian precedent. Each of four provinces had a royal administrator, assisted by a council. The government took responsibility for coinage. The taxation system was carefully defined and reasonably equitable. Mauryan rulers sponsored a major highway across much of the northern part of the empire, a boon to commerce aided as well by vigorous efforts to eliminate brigandage. The regime supported a large army and an extensive espionage system. It was also backed by a substantial bureaucracy, dealing with matters ranging from international relations to municipal hygiene. Under the last great Mauryan emperor, Ashoka, the regime turned away from war, after the ruler witnessed massive slaughter in a key battle, and began sponsoring Buddhist missionary efforts. But the Mauryans declined rather rapidly after Ashoka, and left little direct legacy. Their success in setting up effective local governments, particularly in the cities, with boards responsible for economic activities, weights and measures, hospitals and schools, even tourism, may help explain why Indian society continued to function reasonably well even without an overarching imperial structure.

The Guptas Much later and separately, a Gupta empire emerged (4th century-6th century CE). As with the Mauryans, the empire developed through a series a conquests: individual rulers boasted of conquering as many as twenty other kingdoms. Indeed the Guptas introduced more military innovations than the Mauryans had, including fuller use of cavalry. The empire was divided into ultimately 26 provinces, each with an administrator and an advisory council. By the 6th century the empire began to disintegrate, fueled by usurpations by provincial leaders and invasion from the outside. Its passing left little legacy – though the period itself had been prosperous with important artistic and intellectual achievements. India fell back into a welter of smaller entities, some of which recalled some of the Gupta administrative arrangements, while others were more purely localized.

Aftermath India after the classical period had no particular difficulty maintaining its cultural and social legacy, with majority Hinduism and the caste system both spreading southward in the subcontinent. The

mercantile tradition remained strong as well, though rising competition from Arab merchants in the Indian Ocean posed some problem. But there was no widespread or successful effort to revive internal empire. This meant that India was vulnerable to periodic internal warfare, and also to invasion from outside – now, particularly, by Islamic forces from the west. On the other hand, many local units remained quite successful, with a tradition of responsibility for a variety of services (supported as well by the occupational assignments of the caste system), back by competent administration.

Study questions

1. What was the main focus of Indian political theory? What were its limitations?
2. How do religion and the caste system help explain the patterns of government on the subcontinent during the classical period and beyond?
3. Why did India leave such a different political legacy from that of classical China?

Further reading

Romila Thapar, *The Penguin History of Early India: from the origins to AD 1300* (Penguin, 2015)

Upinder Singh, *A History of Ancient and Early Medieval India* (Pearson, 2016)

Chapter 6: Greece and Rome

Overview Greek and Roman contributions to government centered particularly on the array of government forms attempted at various times and in various places. Monarchy was a frequent staple, sometimes sliding into tyranny; aristocratic assemblies were widely popular; and several Greek states introduced a form of democracy. Finally Rome ultimately offered one of the great examples of empire, interestingly partly coterminous with the Han dynasty in China. The importance of these various forms was enhanced by the frequent commentary by political theorists and historians. This illustrated the high level of political interest at the time, while also contrasting with Chinese preference for a single form of government. It also facilitated a legacy, as later societies could look back on the Greco-Roman experience to sift through a variety of possibilities for government organization. Greece and particularly Rome also contributed to ideas about government function, including the centrality of a legal system.

Greek City-States City-state governments began to form in Greece (including settlements elsewhere in the eastern Mediterranean) by around 800 BCE, from a previous period based on more scattered villages. The peninsula's mountainous terrain accounts for the separation among several hundred units, that usually fiercely guarded their independence. Greeks had a sense of their larger culture, but did not strive for political unity. Internal rivalry and warfare were common, though alliances also formed. Many city states began as monarchies, but on the whole rule by aristocratic oligarchies was more widespread. Tensions with the landowning aristocracy sometimes generated one-man rule, or what the Greeks called tyranny (without the modern repressive implications), governing with more popular interests in mind. After a period of tyranny Athens, one of the more influential city-states, formed a distinctive democracy: citizens met in an assembly to decide policy; officials were chosen from among the citizenry at random, serving short terms; and citizens were also responsible for military service. The majority of Athenians, however, were not citizens – women, slaves, and foreigners were not included; and behind the scenes some aristocratic politicians added some stability to the system. Still, there was no question that this was an innovative form of government, copied by a number of other city states for several decades. Quarrels over the form of government between Athens and the more tightly-controlled state in Sparta contributed to a major war for influence at the end of the 5th century, which ultimately led to the decline of the whole Greek system.

Roman forms of government Like Greece, Rome began as a republican city-state, after gaining freedom from an earlier monarchy in the 5th century BCE. Though there was no written constitution, the institutional structure was quite clear. Primary authority rested with an aristocratic Senate, responsible for legislation that was normally accepted by lesser magistrates; the Senate had fundamental budgetary power. Senators were selected from among the magistrates, who were in turn chosen by assemblies elected by the wider group of citizens – providing a partial democratic element that was further enhanced by the election of tribunes who were supposed to provide balance to the power of the Senate. The

magistrates' initiatives were controlled in several ways: the most powerful positions had short terms of office, and in many cases two officials served in each position, providing checks on any individual. The whole system represented a clear example of checks and balances between government branches and, indirectly, between the landed aristocracy and the wider group of citizens. Tensions between these social groups, plus the growing role of military generals as the Republic expanded through frequent warfare, ultimately brought the republic down and led to the establishment of the Empire. Imperial rule supplanted the republican decision-making apparatus, though some earlier institutions were retained without significant power. Emperors began to claim religious authority as well as primary control over military and other policy decisions, guided by a rather informal group of advisors. Early emperors held various audiences and assemblies in which citizens could present concerns, but the imperial government rested increasingly on the authority of the military – which came to have a predominant role in the selection of emperors. While emperors often sought to name their successors, often from within their family, transitions became increasingly uncertain, dependent on military approval.

Empire and law Unlike the Chinese, Romans did not seek to develop a bureaucratic state that would embrace the whole empire. And while the empire did support a polytheistic religion, it did not really attempt a farther-reaching cultural integration. Only in the 4th century, with the effective adoption of Christianity by the state, did this approach begin to change, but by then the empire was already in decline. Even at the highpoint of empire, many localities retained significant government authority – even their own king – subject however to imperial policy. As the Empire declined, thanks in part to overexpansion, a second administrative capital was established in Constantinople (in the early 4th century CE). From the later days of the Republic, Rome began to appoint a group of governors to oversee major provinces, but these were few in number. During most of the imperial period, overall political unity was retained through careful central control of the military and through the extension of Roman law. Roman law, as it evolved from the Republic onward, was a massive array of statutes regulating crime, family property, slavery and slave status, typically privileging the landowning class. Roman citizens throughout the empire were supposed to be able to claim access to courts of law, but here too, in many regions, local rules had primacy. However, in 212 citizenship was extended to all inhabitants of the empire, which generalized legal practice to some extent. Several emperors undertook major codifications of the law, which further bolstered the prestige of the legal system and its subsequent legacy in Western Europe and the Byzantine Empire alike. Roman taxation was another intriguing system that combined central needs, particularly to support the military, with the patchwork quality of the empire overall: taxes varied by locality (including in-kind payments in areas where a money economy was less well established), though on average individuals paid in about 2-5% of income; customs duties on trade (including the sale of slaves) provided much of the state's revenue.

Pax romana and public works From the later Republic onward, military conquest became a key feature of Roman politics, going well beyond the earlier interest of many Greek city-states in military expansion. The prestige of the military, and under the empire the imperial emphasis on celebration of conquest, was noticeably different from the priorities in Han China. Long periods of internal peace, celebrated under the heading of the *pax romana,* were accompanied by steady fighting on various frontiers (particularly in the east and north), which among other things recurrently provided spoils to support the military. Public works, along with law and conquest, formed the other hallmark of the Roman state, again with precedents from the Greek city-states. Structures were distributed widely through the empire, including public baths and amphitheaters as well as a massive road system (aimed particularly as facilitating troop movement) and Mediterranean ports. While neither Greece nor Rome innovated fundamentally in the list of government functions, careful administration, plus public works such as the aqueduct system and state-sponsored entertainment, was responsible for sustaining up to a million people in Rome at its height.

Political theory Much of the impact of government in the classical Mediterranean was amplified by the importance and variety of political theory. In addition, historical work, from Thucydides onward, privileged accounts of political developments and changes in organization of the state. Launched by the Athenian philosopher Plato, Greek theory emphasized the importance of wise and ethical leadership, while detailing the merits of various forms of government (often favoring some kind of enlightened aristocratic rule and frequently criticizing democracy). Roman political theory, particularly through the writings of Marcus Cicero, highlighted the importance of checks and balances in the republic and emphasized the

importance of the rule of law. Cicero emphasized the presence of an overarching, rational natural law, which no human law should violate, while insisting as well on legal equality and liberty.

Legacy The later impact of Greek and Roman government innovations was far more diffuse than in the case of China, and in some ways even India, because of the diversity of forms involved plus the depth of the collapse of the Roman system in the West. Arguably, some of the limitations of Greek and Roman government, particularly in the organization of empire, contributed to a more varied legacy as well: the simple fact was that, despite the vivid memory of the glories of Rome, Roman government structure was never recaptured in Western Europe. However, Roman institutions were preserved more directly in the smaller Byzantine Empire, with particular emphasis on codified law and the power of imperial administration (supported as well by links to the Orthodox Church). In the West, legacy (aside from memories of empire) highlighted selective revivals, rather than direct continuity – though the structure of the Catholic Church clearly emulated Roman administration. Thus Roman law regained prestige in the later Middle Ages. Ideas of democracy and division of powers, from Athenian precedent or Ciceronian theory, were retrieved from the 17th century onward, though without intending replication in detail. Some Greek political theory has also been seen as contributing to later totalitarian government structures.

Study questions

1. Should Greece and Rome be seen as the origin of modern democracy?
2. How do the political legacies of the classical Mediterranean compare with those of China?
3. What were the most distinctive governmental features of the Roman Empire?

Further reading

Aloys Winterling, *Politics and Society in Imperial Rome* (Wiley, 2010)

Ian Morris and Walter Scheidel, *The Dynamics of Ancient Empires: state power from Assyria to Byzantium* (Oxford University Press, 2009)

Stephanie Budin, *The Ancient Greeks: an introduction* (Oxford University Press, 2009)

Irving Zeitlin, *Rulers and Ruled: an introduction to classical political theory* (University of Toronto Press, 1997)

POSTCLASSICAL PERIOD

Chapter 7: China and the Postclassical Period

The postclassical period After the fall of the great empires, Han, Rome, Gupta, formation of massive empires became less common for several centuries. Partly this reflects the arrival of newer regions onto the civilization map, where there was simply neither sufficient experience nor resources to build the most ambitious political structures (sometimes, despite certain efforts). Partly it reflected the chaos that followed imperial collapse, where it proved difficult to pick up the pieces – an obvious factor in Western Europe and to an extent India. A final element, however, involved the rise and spread of missionary religions – Buddhism, Christianity and Islam – that might take attention and leadership away from the secular realm and divert resources as well. How governments interacted with religion, particularly religions they could not fully control, became a more important factor in the patterns of government more generally than had been the case in the classical period. In many societies, for example, education became even more decisively a religious preserve, and while this could still generate suitable government officials there was potential competition for attention.

Postclassical China: overview China was in most respects a political outlier, re-forming a powerful empire and refining its institutions still further. After several centuries of disruption, core features of the Han dynasty were restored (though under new dynasties) and then elaborated. The challenge of religion was, ultimately, addressed head-on, with renewed Confucianism the clear beneficiary. China also benefited from rising trade (carried mostly by Arab and other merchants) and manufacturing, generating new wealth, larger cities, and more substantial tax resources. China in the period featured two major

dynasties, the Tang and Song, followed by a brief and (to many Chinese) unpleasant interlude of Mongol control.

Religion Christianity and Islam were not major factors in postclassical China. Islamic armies were turned back on the western frontier, and a handful of Arab merchants in southern coastal cities were tolerated without great difficulty. Only a trickle of Christians, mainly Nestorians, sought entry. Strong governments, particularly under the Tang, set up border check points in the west along the Silk Roads, making unwanted entry more difficult for people without appropriate documentation. Buddhism was another matter. It spread widely from the late classical period onward, aided by trade contacts with India and by deteriorating conditions after the fall of the Han. Many Chinese were converted, and restored dynasties, notably the Tang, for a time welcomed the religion, seeing it as a source of cultural support. Chinese Buddhists largely responded by emphasizing their loyalty to the state and family values, modifying traditional Buddhist precedent in the process. But Confucianists were suspicious of Buddhism as unduly spiritual and apolitical, a distraction from secular and family goals, and a considerable diversion of resources. The Tang dynasty about-faced, and began to persecute Buddhists, seizing many monasteries. They did not eliminate a Buddhist minority but they eliminated its political potential. This was a truly interesting response, a clear precedent, reflecting but also promoting the primacy of government in cultural and religious affairs.

Bureaucratic innovations: Tang Tang rulers commanded the scene from 618 ti 907 CE. In foreign policy, they combined additional territorial conquests with diplomatic missions, seeking and obtaining tribute from various neighboring governments, while also offering gifts and marriage alliances (an old policy). The government sent emissaries as far away as India and the Middle East. The regime carefully regained control over the inception point of the Silk Roads, eagerly fostering trade. Early on the dynasty introduced an elaborate law code, though building on prior precedent, that stipulated a variety of crimes and a graded series of punishment from caning with bamboo to death (the severity of punishments varying with the status of the victim). The code long survived in China and was imitated in neighboring territories like Vietnam and Japan. The Tang reestablished roving regional sheriffs, who began to introduce new forensic methods into the detection of crime. Regions were divided into prefectures, with local magistrates under the prefect; military districts were divided similarly. Roving commissioners were sent around to keep an eye on the regional officials. Administratively, the Tang set up several key ministries, over areas like the military, justice, recordkeeping, finance and public works – another arrangement that lasted for centuries. This was a far more centralized system than the Han had established, with no semi-autonomous regional rulers. One department, headed by the Censor-in-Chief, sought to keep an eye on the behavior of the other top officials and ministries. Massive record keeping reflected the need for a systematic approach to taxation, and also served to help regulate property claims. The Tang also undertook a systematic census The bureaucratic examination system was revived and restored, emphasizing tests based on the Confucian classics with essays required on governance and even poetry. But appearance and behavior were evaluated as well, which gave a particular advantage to upper-class candidates. But the tests were in principle open to almost all males, and some mobility did occur. The Tang expanded the state-run secondary school system, topped by a National University, to offer relevant training (again however, only to a minority). The Tang also promoted equality of inheritance, as a means of cutting down the independent power of landowners by preventing the undue expansion of estates. Overall, the Tang represented an active imperial government, bolstered by a number of administrative innovations and the characteristic large bureaucracy – large at least by the standards of the time. While a number of powerful rulers represented the dynasty at points, the system could run without a strong emperor.

The Song Ruling from 960 to 1279 (though in the later part of the period, overseeing a truncated empire), the Song largely maintained Tang policies though with less interference in economic activities, more reliance on private initiative. Principal innovations involved new welfare efforts and the further development of the examination system. The government sponsored some retirement homes, public clinics and paupers' graveyards. The postal system was beefed up to encourage efficient communication throughout the empire. The merit-based examination system gained greater attention, and really began to open the bureaucracy to talent from various social levels – though sons of aristocrats had continued advantages, prompting resentments among other educated groups. Early in the dynasty about 30,000 students stood for exams annually, but by the end of the dynasty the number had soared to 400,000. The

central bureaucracy itself employed about 20,000 people, but there were also jobs in local administration and other areas – including tutoring. Funding for the training system expanded considerably.

Mongols and after Mongols overturned the Song in the late 13th century, reestablishing unity in the Chinese empire. Mongols continued to use existing Confucian bureaucrats, but they were widely resented as barbarian upstarts. And procedures like the examination system were dropped for a time. After the defeat of the Mongols however, the Ming dynasty restored most of the political precedents that had been established by the Tang and Song. The Mongol period, vital in other aspects of world history, adds little to the history of government because of its short span, though it would strongly affect foreign policy for countries like China and Russia during the subsequent period.

Study questions

1. What were the most distinctive features of Chinese government under the Tang and Song?
2. Why did bureaucratic service carry such great prestige?
3. Why would the Mongols not seek to undo the basic administrative system?

Further reading

Dieter Kuhn, *The Age of Confucian Rule: the Song transformation of China* (Harvard University Press, 2009)

Zhenping Wang, *Tang China in Multi-Polar Asia: a history of diplomacy and war* (University of Hawaii Press, 2013)

F.W. Mote, *Imperial China, 900-1800* (Harvard University Press, 2000)

Chapter 8: Japan

Overview: Japan in the postclassical period constituted one of several cases in which an effort to build a more ambitious government structure ultimately failed – because of internal resistance and arguably a lack of sufficient prior political experience. Japan began sending missions to China in the 6th century. Over time, the result brought Japan a writing system (adapted to a very different spoken language); Buddhism and a variety of artistic forms; some influence from Confucianism; and a variety of more advanced technologies. Not surprisingly, a deep interest in the Chinese state seemed to offer another compelling opportunity, but imitation foundered after several decades, leaving Japan with a decentralized feudal system and a distinctive political legacy of its own.

Government origins Agriculture and iron technology were introduced rather suddenly to Japan via migrations from the Asian mainland. An early result was the formation of many, possibly hundreds, of regional kingdoms. Warfare and negotiation gradually created a more unified state, in the centuries after 250 CE, and a hereditary line of emperors (who still exist today as the world's oldest dynasty).

Chinese influence Growing contact with China brought efforts to establish Confucian values for officials and even an attempt at a merit-based bureaucracy, in the 7th century. Further reforms after 645 aimed at further centralization. The government claimed ownership of all land, to be distributed equally to farmers, and compiled a registry of households to serve as the basis for taxation. The government began to construct a grandiose capital (now the city of Nara), while also promoting Buddhism in response to a series of natural disasters.

Decentralization From 794 onward the power of the central state declined steadily – though it sponsored a number of cultural achievements in art and literature. Internal power struggles and the increasing isolation of the emperor led to neglect of administration. A variety of nobles and Buddhist orders seized land, reducing available tax revenues and support for the military. Landowners, again including many Buddhist factions, began to set up military forces of their own, recruiting the famous *samurai* soldiers and effectively establishing a decentralized, and often fractious, feudal system. Internal warfare became common.

Kamakura shogunate and after Military success brought one clan to power after 1185. The emperor, now largely a figurehead though invested with religious symbolism, named one leader a *Shogun,* exercising some central power despite the continued existence of various local armies. The system, which would be reproduced more successfully around 1600, bore some resemblance to feudal monarchies in Western Europe, in that there was some central authority but without extensive government functions. Feudal lords came together twice in the late 13th century to defeat a threatened Mongol invasion, but the effort depleted the shogun's financial base and actually led to further decentralization. Shogunates continued in name from the 14th century onward, but any central power depended on negotiations with powerful regional lords, called *daimyos*, who frequently disobeyed central directives. Civil wars were frequent, and by 1477 hundreds of regional feudal states dotted the islands. A number of rival Buddhist temples also set up their own armies, effectively forming part of the feudal system. This was the political pattern in place when the Portuguese first arrived in Japan (by a seafaring misadventure) in the middle of the 16th century,

Legacies This checkered political experience did not prevent periods of considerable economic and demographic growth and cultural creativity, though the worst civil wars clearly took a toll. The continued existence of the emperor and the precedent of shogunate rule were features that would later be revived and reworked to generate more effective government, though the feudal system survived in principle until 1868. Japanese feudalism resembled its entirely separate though coterminous Western counterpart in many ways, a clear response to the absence of effective central control combined with a strong landed aristocracy and an equally strong military ethic. Peasant-serfs depended heavily on the protection the daimyos could offer, in return for labor service and taxation in kind. Japanese feudalism was however somewhat different from its Western analogue. Samurai solders were more fully dependent on the regional lords than were Western vassals on their aristocratic superiors; they had less control over their own land and resources. This may account for the fact that Japanese feudalism did not generate a tradition of consultations between lords and vassals that, in the West, would ultimately produce the first version of a parliamentary system. Japanese feudalism, in contrast, more fiercely emphasized group loyalty, the unwavering devotion of samurai that could, among other things, lead to ritual suicides when a lord was defeated in battle. Many historians believe that this tradition of group loyalty would later contribute to the organizational culture of industrial Japan, in contrast to the more individualistic business operations in the West.

Study questions

1. Why were Japanese leaders drawn to the idea of a strong central state, but why were they unable to follow through?
2. What was the relationship between shogun and emperor?
3. What were the chief legacies and results of the Japanese feudal system?

Further reading

Conrad Schirokauer, *A Brief History of Chinese and Japanese Civilizations* (Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2013)

Jeffrey Mass, *The Origins of Japan's Medieval World* (Stanford University Press, 1997)

Chapter 9: India/South Asia

Overview The political history of India during the postclassical period is dotted with the rise and fall of a variety of regional empires, in various parts of the subcontinent—but not a great deal of fundamental innovation in government. Many of the regional surges were short-lived. Considerable localism persisted, with republics and small monarchies. Religion remained an important political variable. The majority of regional rulers were Hindu, but some were attracted to Jainism; and there were disputes among various approaches to Hinduism. Many rulers were fairly tolerant, but it was not uncommon, when a regional state expanded through warfare, to see attacks on rival religious groups and destruction of religious sites. On the more positive side, many regimes sponsored important cultural initiatives, including temple building but also support for religiously-based education. Beyond this complex and varied pattern, two developments warrant particular attention.

Delhi sultanate The Delhi Sultanate formed as a result of invasions by an Islamic Turkic group, and lasted from 1206 to 1526. At its height, this empire covered most of the subcontinent, though it declined as a result of counterattacks by Hindu kingdoms plus the formation of some smaller Islamic states. The sultanate is credited with integrating India more fully into larger patterns of trade and cultural exchange. From a governance standpoint, two features were particularly noteworthy. (It is also worth mentioning that a woman briefly held power, one of the rare instances in traditional Islamic governments.) The rulers imported more Persian government principles, organizing more centralized administration aimed particularly at raising resources for military support. This included, ultimately, levying a special tax on nonMuslims. Economic intervention increased, again compared to more typical Hindu states, with heightened penalties for businessmen who disobeyed regulations – including price controls in the public markets. Various goods were banned as unnecessary luxuries, save through special license, and a network of informers was employed for enforcement. Agricultural taxes soared as well. Sultans frequently saw themselves as religious representatives, called upon to suppress Hindu activities (and also, later, to resist Mongol invasions, which the regime managed successfully). Prohibitions on anthropomorphic representations in art were enforced. At times, there is no question that the government attacked and destroyed a number of Hindu temples and Buddhist shrines – in some cases building mosques using the same sites and construction materials. (There is no question as well that the regime contributed greatly to the essential eclipse of Buddhism and Buddhist educational institutions on the subcontinent.) However the overall religious policy was not consistent; Hindus were frequently recruited into the bureaucracy, and at times the regime subsidized Hindu religious activities. A common pattern involved temple destruction as part of regional conquest, followed by subsidized reconstruction when stability was restored. On a smaller scale, the Delhi Sultanate promoted increased Muslim presence in India but also some fusion with the family patterns of upper-caste Indians. Needless to say, the religious policies of the Sultanate remain a vigorous bone of contention among Indian historian and politicians at a time of renewed Hindu-Muslim tension in India.

Regimes in the south At various points during the postclassical period, larger regional governments emerged in the south, in partial contrast to earlier patterns where smaller units predominated except when an empire successfully expanded from the north. The establishment of the Vijayanagara Empire was particularly noteworthy, on the heels of the expansion and then retreat of the Delhi sultanate and in the effort to restore Hindu rule. The large regional empire took shape in the mid-14th century and retained vitality for about two centuries, before a period of decline. This was a tolerant regime, protecting Hinduism but adopting Islamic procedures in the royal court. A substantial Muslim minority flourished. As the Vijayanagara declined, a number of effective though smaller monarchies sprang up the south. Overall, improvements in government in the region furthered commercial growth and cultural innovation.

Study questions

1. Why do the policies of the Delhi sultanate lend themselves to contemporary dispute?
2. Why and how did Hinduism and Hindu political regimes hold on so well despite Islamic invasion?
3. Was the postclassical period, on balance, not one of major political innovation, compared to developments in other regions of Asia?

Further reading

Peter Jackson, *The Delhi Sultanate: a political and military history* (Cambridge University Press, 2003)

Richard Eaton, *India in the Persianate Age* (Penguin Books, 2019)

Chandra Salish, *History of Medieval India, 800-1700* (Orient Longman, 2007)

Chapter 10: Government in the Middle East/North Africa: the Caliphate

Overview: During most of the postclassical period the dominant government in this region was the Caliphate, which at its height ruled an empire from present-day Pakistan in the east to Morocco and Spain in the west. The Caliphate went through three main phases: its early period centered on the need to identify succession to the Prophet Muhammed, who left no male heirs; the Umayyad dynasty (661-750 CE), based in Damascus, which loosely guided the process of Arab conquest; and the Abbasid dynasty,

which began in 750 and was effectively demolished with the Mongol invasion of Baghdad in 1258 (though rulers fled to Cairo and continued to claim religious authority). Abbasid emphasis rested on internal consolidation and efforts to suppress a variety of internal challenges; but it was under the Abbasids that Arab Islam enjoyed the greatest mercantile prosperity and cultural creativity.

Key issues Arab Islamic government was not particularly original in terms of administrative structure. It also faced recurrent problems of succession, with bitter quarrels and sometimes outright bloodshed among siblings competing for power. This aside, the most important features of this government were: 1. The familiar one of seeking to maintain such a large territory, and under the Abbasids the gradual loss of ground to breakaway regions (particularly in North Africa and Spain); 2. The complex issue of the role of Islam in the state; and 3. The establishment of distinctive economic and particularly social policies, extending the state's welfare function.

Formation The term caliph most commonly meant "successor to the prophet of God", but the minority Shia group insisted that the caliph should be appointed by God from the descendants of the Prophet. Early caliphs were elected by a council of tribal leaders, which some hold to be an early form of Arab democracy. But this system ended with the triumph of the Umayyad dynasty, which introduced the principle of heredity. It was this transition that prompted the Shia revolt, in favor of Muhammad's son-in-law. Subsequent Arab conquests made the Umayyad caliphate the largest empire the world had seen to that point (5.17 million square miles at its height), and the sixth largest in human history. But the Umayyads were ultimately unseated by rebellions by a variety of groups, including Shiites but also non-Arab Muslims, leading to Abbasid triumph and relocation of the capital to Baghdad).

Administrative system Ummayad rule was very loosely organized (even more than Roman rule had been), with great latitude for local systems and administrative structures including tolerance for the sizable religious minorities of Christians and Jews. Abbasids, with greater Persian involvement, tightened up somewhat. Typically a grand vizier was appointed to oversee administration, with regional emirs taking charge under his direction; 24 provinces were established. Over time, Viziers often wielded greater power than the Caliphs, many of whom devoted themselves to a life of indulgence and the often intricate patterns of court intrigue (including the special role of eunuchs, castrated men initially hired to guard the wives and concubines of the ruler but who could gain wider powers within the court apparatus). No clear system of administrative recruitment or training was established. While education expanded rapidly, it was under mosque control for the most part. Under the Abbasids particularly, many non-Arabs and even non-Muslims gained a role in the bureaucracy. Local and regional governments maintained prior traditions by building and maintaining roads and operating an extensive postal system – the post office in Baghdad even had a map showing distances between major cities (though mailmen served as spies as well). Considerable latitude continued to extend to local governments, though gradually the role of Arabic in record-keeping gained ascendancy. Throughout the Arab caliphates, recruitment of a reliable military force was an essential feature of the state, sometimes including the use of slaves as soldiers.

The role of Islam Unlike Christianity, Islam was born in close association to the state: Muhammad was primarily a prophet and religious leader, but he sought and gained firm control of local government, and this linkage was passed on to the Caliphate. There was no question that, in Islamic political theory, the primary role of the state was promotion and protection of the faith and enforcement of Islamic law. The *Qur'an* made few references to the Arab term for caliph, but it clearly suggested that the office was established by God. Other passages emphasized the importance of religious rule: "So govern the people by that which God has revealed (Islam), and follow not their vain desires, beware of them in case they seduce you from just some part of that which God has revealed to you." Many later Arab theorists continued to emphasize the religious functions of the ruler, along with more general obligations of personal piety, provision of justice, and concern for public welfare. They also frequently insisted on the importance of having a single leader for Islam. The same line of thinking stressed the role of the state in enforcing the Sharia, or Islamic law, and even the necessity to rise up against a ruler who was not fulfilling his religious functions. However, this approach was complicated by several factors, in theory and in practice. Interpretations of Sharia law could vary. Many rulers, as noted, were not personally pious nor primarily interested in religious enforcement, but this did not necessarily prompt revolt. The Prophet himself had said that Muslims could live under a nonMuslim state (even concealing their religious identity if necessary), for after all religious, not political goals were primary for a faithful Muslim. A related tension

surrounded the concept of *jihad,* or struggle. For many early Muslims, particularly through the Umayyad period, this could mean active military efforts against unbelievers (though the Prophet had also warned against efforts to convert by force). More commonly, it came to mean defense against attacks on Islam or, even more widely, a personal struggle to maintain a virtuous life – in this latter case, not intimately connected to government at all. From the 8th century onward most political theorists emphasized the more harmonious aspects of Islam over the confrontational. Overall, the Islamic approach to the state was and remains complex, not totally unlike tensions which arose under Christianity despite a different initial base.

Economic and welfare functions Effective caliphs quickly realized that economic prosperity was vital, if only to provide adequate tax revenues. They frequently claimed basic land ownership, with private property a delegation from the state and therefore subject to taxation and regulation alike. The real estate tax was central to government finances, though other levies, including taxes on the sale of cattle, were involved as well. Resistance to taxation did occur, but was put down by military force. The collective approach did not prevent the rise of a market economy, but it could lead to interventions, for example to deal with periods of scarcity or to handle limited resources. The government established a central monetary system, replacing a welter of local currencies. Islamic emphasis on charity had clear implications for government. Tax revenues were used in part for state-sponsored support for the poor including widows, the elderly, orphans and the disabled. This was an unprecedented extension of state functions, and an important innovation.

Cultural role For the most part, the flowering of science and literature, as well as religion was independent of the state, though the government did encourage missions to place like India to seek out useful knowledge and technology. Nevertheless, some Abbasid rulers tried actively to support rational inquiry, even punishing scholars who tried to insist on faith alone. However, this government stance declined after the 9th and 10th centuries. Some historians have argued that state intervention in intellectual life, and then the turn away from cultural diversity, played a role in the larger decline of cultural creativity toward the end of the Arab caliphate.

Loose ends Regional rebellions against the Abbasids led to the formation of more localized caliphates, some even before the Mongol invasions, claiming many of the same governmental principles though without the ability to point to overall Islamic leadership. Ultimately the principal claim to the caliphate passed, in the 16th century, to the Ottoman regime, but much later, in 1924 and after the Ottoman collapse and the rise of the secular Turkish republic, the office was abolished altogether. Some have speculated that this left the door open to renewed and sometimes dangerous claims to the mantle of caliph.

Study questions

1. What were the main complexities in the Islamic approach to government during the postclassical period?
2. Why and how did the role of jihad change during the course of the postclassical caliphates?
3. What were the main functions of government during the period of the Arab caliphates?

Further reading

Patricia Crone and Martin Hinds, *God's Caliph: religious authority in the first centuries of Islam* (Cambridge University Press, 1986)

Hugh Kennedy, *The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphates: the Islamic Near East from the 8th to the 11th centuries* (Routledge, 2004)

Ira Lapidus, *History of Islamic Societies* (Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Chapter 11: Eastern Europe in the Postclassical Period

The issue of Christianity Government in both eastern and western Europe in the postclassical period was strongly affected by the rise of Christianity. But the political implications of Christianity are not easily summarized, with challenges somewhat different from those involved with Islam. Christianity was

launched separately from the Roman state and was recurrently persecuted by the state, from the crucifixion of Christ onward. Deeply pacifist originally, Christians normally refused to serve in the Roman army. Gradually the church began to build a structure separate from the state. However, in 313 the Emperor Constantine famously accepted Christianity and began to treat it effectively as a state religion, among other things interfering directly in doctrinal controversies. Christians for the most part welcomed the shift, now free from persecution and benefiting from state sponsorship – adherence grew rapidly. Military service was now accepted (a change the Emperor insisted upon). From this point onward Christian leaders might welcome state support, including effort to repress religious dissent, and, in turn, actively defended the state essentially as readily as did Muslims. But the notion of separate goals, and a separate set of precedents, persisted as well, occasionally intruding on affairs of state and even provoking occasional resistance (though Christian leaders, like their Muslim counterparts, normally urged obedience unless the state was egregiously flouting religion).

Orthodox Christianity These complexities were less marked in Eastern Europe than in the West. Eastern Orthodoxy resisted the sway of the Roman papacy – the institution most clearly capable of standing separate from the state – and in the schism of 1054 renounced papal authority altogether- - one of the main causes of the rift. Orthodox church structure remained somewhat apart from the state, but the gap was narrow. In the Byzantine Empire, the most powerful government unit in the region through the postclassical period, the government appointed top church officials, essentially operating as a theocracy. Imperial law stipulated that subjects must be Christian, with others regarded as "mad and foolish persons" and heretics (though in fact there were many of them, including a Jewish minority, throughout the imperial period). Christianity was one of the key cultural props to the Empire, and the government saw protection and financing of religion as a basic function. In the 8th and 9th centuries the government became directly involved in an iconoclast controversy, periodically seeking to ban the worship of icons but then pulling back amid popular protest; ultimately a settlement restored the position of icons. The government also sponsored many religious buildings, including the great Sophia cathedral.

Byzantine government Despite the contention that this empire was simply a continuation of Rome (the idea of a separate Byzantine label occurred after the fall of the empire; previously, it was simply called the Roman Empire), in fact administration changed considerably. (Among other things, Greek replaced Latin as the official language of state.) Emphasis on the emperor and his divine appointment increased; a senate institution remained but was powerless. Regional units, or *themes,* were regularized and their leaders wielded both civil and military functions. Byzantine bureaucrats proved fairly adaptable, though they depended heavily on support from the imperial court. Jobs in the upper bureaucracy constituted a clear path to aristocratic status, though there was competition from the existing nobility as well. (Despite the label "byzantine" applied to unwieldy bureaucracy, it is not clear that the actual administration was particularly cumbersome.) In terms of functions, besides religion, the Empire emphasized its role in jurisprudence; Justinian, an early emperor, issued an extensive revision of the Roman law code, which had great staying power. Much attention went to warfare, both aggressive, as the empire tried but failed to recapture more Roman territory, and then defensive. Diplomacy gained a new role as the Empire struggled, often quite successfully, for survival: a "Bureau of Barbarians" oversaw relationships with other states as well as information-gathering and outright spying. The appointment of diplomatic envoys, and the reception of representatives from other states, constituted one of the important innovations of the Empire, later influencing diplomatic practices in other parts of Europe. The state also regulated internal and foreign trade, and maintained a monopoly on the issuance of coinage. A great deal of attention was devoted to provisioning the capital, Constantinople, seeking to keep down the price of grain – along with religion and diplomacy, perhaps the government's most distinctive function.

Legacy Byzantine government practices and claims influenced other states in the Balkans – often in direct rivalry with the empire. The ultimate defeat of the empire by the Ottoman Turks, during the 15th century, led obviously to a major religious change, but the Turks also maintained a number of administrative practices. In the long run, however, the most important imperial aftermath involved the development of the Russian monarchy.

Government in postclassical Russia Government in what is now western Russia and Ukraine – or Kievan Rus' – was a new phenomenon as Slavic peoples settled to agriculture and trade increased. The state operated from the 9th century until the Mongol conquests of the 13th, constituting a loose and fairly

loose federation of various Slavic and other groups under the Rurik dynasty. At its height in the 10th and 11th centuries the monarchy was able to decree Christianity as the official religion and issue the region's first law code. Though kings like Vladimir claimed considerable powers (he was the convert to Christianity who ordered his subject to follow suite), royal rule depended on collaboration of regional nobles and a number of municipal governments (one of which, Novgorod, ultimately split away as an independent republic). Byzantine influence showed, however, not only in conversion to Orthodox Christianity and close church-state relations, but In claims to royal authority and ultimately to the idea of empire – though this would emerge more clearly after the Mongol period when Russian rulers, now centered in Moscow, took on the title tsar, or Caesar.

Study questions

1. How did the government implications of Christianity and Islam compare?
2. What were the most distinctive government features of the Byzantine empire?
3. How was the Russian state different from the Byzantine during the postclassical period?

Further reading

Michael Angold, *The Byzantine Empire, 1025-1204: a political history* (Longman, 1997)

Steven Runciman, *The Byzantine Theocracy* (Cambridge University Press, 2004)

Chapter 12: Western Europe

Overview The postclassical period helped establish some durable or at least recurrent features in Western government, including the persistent rivalries among various monarchies and feudatories. Despite one imperial effort, internal competition and frequent warfare marked the Western political tradition after the fall of Rome. Most of the period was marked by the importance of feudalism, reflecting an inability to form effective government structures at a more complex level; most kings were essentially figureheads beyond their own small region. Compared to many Asian societies, and also the Byzantines, West European government remained rather rudimentary through the whole period; and of course in much of northern Europe it was in fact a fairly new institution. But feudalism proved to be a building block that gradually allowed the construction of somewhat more successful central monarchies; yet it also served as the basis for the emergence of the first iterations of the institution of parliament. Western Europe was not the first region to develop formal councils that could serve as a check on monarchs, but the early parliamentary tradition arguably proved particularly promising. Overall, political developments in the postclassical centuries center on forms of government and geographical coverage; there were few innovations in function, and indeed governments struggled to recapture some standard functions during much of the period.

Charlemagne and the failure of empire Conquests by a Frankish king, Charlemagne, in the decades around 800 CE, briefly created a large state, after several centuries of decentralized rule following the fall of Rome in the West. The empire included present-day France, the Low Countries, western Germany and northern Italy. The pope gave Charlemagne the title of Emperor (partly to establish that a secular ruler was subject to religious authorization). The new government took a number of measures, for example establishing a more stable currency. Charlemagne established a palace school and encouraged Christian monasteries to expand their educational functions. Actual administration, however, was decentralized – because of limited resources and lack of trained officials. Emissaries were sent out from the capital, but outlying areas were ruled by separate lords. An annual council brought this group together, and here the emperor could lay out policy; but in later years the council largely focused on complaints from the nobility. Most important, the empire could not hold together: over time, heirs split it into separate units. The idea of an empire persisted in Germany and parts of Italy: the so-called Holy Roman Empire would last until the early 19th century. But this was not an effective government, as Germany and Italy largely devolved into separate regional and city states. Voltaire correctly noted that this was not holy, nor Roman, nor an Empire. More effective governments would gradually develop elsewhere, particularly in France, England and later Spain; though independent city states in Italy forged particularly effective administrative units that would ultimately serve as the framework for the Renaissance, with far wider functions than feudal or royal states managed in the period.

Role of the church Christianity played a complex role in West European government. Early in the period the Roman Pope established a separate power base, ruling a regional state around Rome itself (of varying size): this provided some protection from control by secular rulers. For the most part, church and state worked in harmony throughout much of the region. At key points, kings and lords actively accepted a religious mission: thus the French king headed a force that attacked a religious heresy in southern France, while at the end of the 11th century many rulers responded to the pope's appeal for a crusade to free the Holy Land from Muslim control. But secular and religious authorities could be at odds as well. At many points the Church tried to restrict endemic warfare, as well as seeking to protect religious authorities from attack, through the Peace of God and Truce of God movements (with limited results). A famous controversy in the 12th century pitted the Pope against the Holy Roman Emperor: the latter had assumed the right to name bishops and use them as state functionaries, and the Pope intervened, excommunicating the emperor and forcing him to back down. In other words, the notion of some religion-state separation, which placed limits on the authority of the Western state, has real merit, though it should not be overdrawn.

Feudalism Through much of the period, but particularly until the 11th or 12th century (with Charlemagne's empire as partial interruption), feudalism was the dominant political form throughout most of the region. The collapse of Roman authority, plus intermittent invasions from groups like the Vikings, led local landlords to form their own militaries, offering protection to lesser lords and peasants. Most peasants were serfs, regulated by a combination of village councils and their landlords. Lords themselves, able to afford horses and weapons, typically grouped in a hierarchy, pledging loyalty and military service as vassals to a regional superior in return for defense. Vassals typically made some token payments to the lord; they were supposed to advise him; and in return the lord helped adjudicate disputes, even providing a jury of peers in some instances, and of course sought to defend from attack. The system was imperfect, incapable of preventing frequent disorder and served as a source of many regional wars among feudal rivals. Over time, however, it did improve stability in some regions. As conditions improved, small cities began to redevelop as well. Some were ruled by feudal lords, but a number of independent urban governments emerged as well, another political element.

Feudal monarchies Many parts of Europe remained locked in this decentralized system through the postclassical period and beyond; this was particularly true in Germany, but also the Low Countries. But in France and England, and later Spain after Christian "reconquest" from Islamic rule, more effective monarchies gradually developed. In France, the king was essentially just a major feudal lord at the outset, though with vague claims to greater authority. Gradually, and particularly from the 12th century onward, kings were able, through conquests and marriage alliances, to acquire more territory and make a number of other lords their vassals. Control of their own landed estates gave them a revenue base (only gradually would wider taxation become possible, with the feudal lords largely exempt). With this, kings could gradually hire some officials of their own, mainly from townspeople, while still depending on nobles for much local administration. Small military forces complemented what could be raised through feudal loyalty. The king even established a French navy, and began calling himself King of France rather than King of the Franks. Kings also began to expand a small network of law courts, offering royal justice instead of relying on more local jurisprudence. Revival of interest in Roman law encouraged a wider judicial function as well. Limited public works – for example, building defensive walls around Paris – and some charity to the poor complemented the expanding government role. Feudal monarchy in England was somewhat better organized after the conquest by Norman forces in 1066: the king was able to name sheriffs as royal officials in outlying regions. Here too, however, the king ruled only in some balance with powerful feudal lords. Only later for example would the state be able to claim monopoly of force against the feudal tradition of separate regional militaries. Not surprisingly, the feudal heritage also imbued most kings with a strong sense of military mission, not only in defense of royal prerogatives but in competition with other rulers. A long, recurrent war between England and France was one result of this orientation.

Parliaments The feudal tradition also explains the rise of parliaments. Expanding royal claims butted against the belief that vassals should have some voice through councils with the lord – and that the lord had no right to impose additional levies on the lords. As early as the 11th century, a parliament formed in Barcelona to advised the ruler of Catalonia – laying some claim to be the first such body in world history. More influential was the emergence of parliament in England. Early in the 13th century an unpopular English king, embroiled in war the France, sought to raise additional revenues. His nobles rebelled, and

defeated royal forces in 1215, forcing the king to accept the Great Charter (Magna Carta). This document restricted royal power in several ways (protecting not only the feudal lords, but town governments and Church leaders as well), with some vague references to more general rights. It stipulated that a Council should be established, whose permission would be essential for any additional taxation. While this was not directly followed up, a first English parliament did meet in 1265. Similar bodies arose in France (and also several separate French provinces), many German regions and elsewhere. These were not modern bodies. They met irregularly, depending on royal initiative, and many countries experienced long periods when central parliaments were not called at all. Membership was divided by three or four estates: nobles, leading churchmen, and top town officials fleshed these out. There was no suggestion of wider democracy. However, a tradition was established that imposed some limits on royal authority at the time, at least periodically, and that would be expanded later on.

Evaluation This was an early stage in the development of the Western state, and by many measures much of Europe was badly ruled through much of the period, though with some improvements over time. Some historians have recently claimed that Europe's divisions were a blessing in disguise, encouraging creative competition and innovation compared to the more stable empires in other parts of the world. Relatively limited government authority gave freer rein to businessmen and other innovators. The system also, however, encouraged disorder and war, not only in this period but long afterward.

Study questions

1. Why did Europe depend so heavily on a feudal political system?
2. How were some kings able to carve out greater authority amid feudalism?
3. What were key differences between medieval and modern parliaments?

Further reading

Jena-Pierre Poly and Eric Bournazel, *The Feudal Transformation, 900-1200* (Holmes and Meier, 1991)

Clifford Backman, *The Worlds of Medieval Europe* (Oxford University Press, 2003)

John Watts, *The Making of Polities: Europe, 1300-1500* (Cambridge University Press, 2009

Chapter 13: Sub-Saharan Africa

Overview This was a major period in African political history, particularly through the establishment and expansion of several important states in West Africa. A government tradition had already been set in the northeast along the upper Nile, partly in relationship to the Egyptian state, and a Christian monarchy in Ethiopia continued to flourish in the postclassical period. At the same time, large stretches of the subcontinent remained stateless, some with hunting and gathering societies, others with flourishing agricultural economies but without formal government. A few states arose about which information is lacking: a major fortification called Great Zimbabwe, in the southeast, must have served as an important royal capital, in a city that may have housed 10,000 people; but there is no further record, and the kingdom ultimately failed for some reason. But along much of the Indian Ocean coast new trading activities prompted important local governments, while the West African empires constituted the most striking innovation.

Ethiopia Successive Ethiopian kingdoms in the period, following the collapse of more expansive governments in Axum, were frequently isolated because of the spread of Islam in surrounding territories. At one point the government was clearly a theocracy. At another, a major kingdom actually did not establish a capital city, but moved among tent complexes. Though beleaguered, Ethiopia did send emissaries to Jerusalem, where they had contact with European crusaders, and after the collapse of the crusades at one point dispatched a large delegation to various parts of Europe, seeking help against Muslim encroachments. This was a lively period in Ethiopian history, but less in terms of government than religion and art.

The Swahili coast Expanding trade with the Middle East formed the basis for at least 35 city-states along the Indian Ocean coast. All were monarchies, ruled by a sultan; some clearly sponsored significant public works, building some of the largest structures in the whole subcontinent. Bureaucrats were drawn from

the large merchant class. Interestingly, with one exception, the city states made no effort to conquer the neighboring African interior, instead relying entirely on trade relations. The network would be violently disrupted by the Portuguese in the 16th century.

West African kingdoms: Ghana Increasing trade between West Africa and North Africa, and particularly the introduction of the camel in the 3rd century CE, formed the basis for more complex societies. The empire of Ghana began to take shape from about 300 onward, though its origins are not clear (and in general, direct records are lacking for the whole period). Rulers began to accumulate considerable, power and pomp – the latter long a feature of African monarchies. When they held audiences to hear grievances from their subjects, they wore splendid garments and were surrounded by many gold objects, with hosts of pages in attendance. Their revenues derived from taxes on trade and from control over gold production; kings claimed possession of all gold nuggets, leaving gold dust for wider use. Kings also developed some control over vassal states, in what was, overall, a decentralized regime. (Some historians have compared this to European kingdoms in the same period, though the African states were larger and lacked formal feudalism.) Bureaucrats were drawn in part from the royal family, but later Muslim officials began to gain ground (some directly from North Africa) – because they had greater experience and also brought literacy. But the state never developed a religious mission, as most subjects remained polytheist, and education remained largely local and oral.

Mali It is not clear why Ghana declined – though the formation of rival neighboring monarchies may have played a role. By the 13th century another empire took shape, with the military expansion of a local kingdom. The Empire of Mali became the largest territorial unit in West Africa, famous for the wealth of its rulers – displayed among other things in the famous pilgrimage of Mansa Musa to Mecca in 1324-6, where the amount of gold he brought with him prompted significant inflation to Egypt. Like Ghana, the empire ruled over a number of vassal states, whose rulers, defeated in battle, retained power on condition of loyalty to the emperor. A periodic "great assembly" brought delegates from many different clans, presumably with some powers of advice. Government reforms included measures to improve the treatment of slaves and prisoners. Local villages and towns also elected their own leaders, though only from certain families, with little interference from the central state. At the regional level, appointed governors did receive direction from the imperial government, though here too selection was reflected separate regional procedures, not central appointment – though the officials were subject to approval by the emperor and might be replaced if he found them unreliable. Even currencies were regional rather than empire-wide. Government revenues centered on taxing all trade in gold, copper and salt. The emperor commanded a full-time army, and each region was required to fill its quota of soldiers. Even more than Ghana, imperial administration employed a large number of Muslim officials, responsible among other things for considerable record-keeping.

Legacy Mali began to decline in the 15th century and disappeared entirely two centuries later, increasingly challenged by rival kingdoms. But the political tradition of West Africa persisted, as a number of regional monarchies formed, again frequently emphasizing a combination of royal splendor with administrative decentralization in practice, with government functions focused on provision of justice (including elaborate royal audiences) and military activities, along with protection of trade. Some historians have argued that the tradition of royal splendor would survive in a valuation of "Big Man" rule in African politics. After 1500, the existence of strong states in many parts of West Africa limited and conditioned activities by European traders who had to negotiate their entry.

Study questions

1. What were the principal forms of government that developed in sub-Saharan Africa during the post-classical period?
2. Why were most governments either fairly local or considerably decentralized?

Further reading

Dierk Lange, *Ancient Kingdoms of West Africa* (J.H. Roll, 2004)

Nehemia Levtzion and Jay Spaulding, *Medieval West Africa: views from Arab scholars and merchants* (Markus Wiener, 2003)

Chapter 14: Pre-Columbian Government in the Americas

Overview Many parts of the Americas did not have governments during the postclassical centuries, even in areas where some agriculture was practiced (often along with hunting). Most tribes in North America determined leadership through kinship relations (often, on a matrilineal basis; and women sometimes served as leaders directly). There was no settled state. Exceptions, of course, focus attention on the great civilizations of central America and the Andes. Here, important government structures developed. Because they were later almost literally decapitated by Spanish invasion and the ravages of epidemic disease, they did not leave a clear political legacy for the regions later on. And, on the whole, the governmental institutions were less impressive than the cultural and economic achievements of these regions, operating as they were with an essentially Neolithic technology. Key features of government recalled elements common in the Middle East and Egypt in the early civilization period, including the emphasis on the divine qualities of rulers.

Mayans Mayan government combined a belief in the god-like qualities of rulers (along with the important role for priests in the government hierarchy), substantial reliance on the aristocracy as the source of subordinate officials, and considerable decentralization. Mayan governments took shape as independent city states, ruling the surrounding countryside, rather than any overarching imperial structure. Rulers were usually drawn from a single family, with women occasionally taking the role on the basis of inheritance if the next king was not yet adult, or was away for war. After about 250 CE, or what is called the Classic period, there were as many as 72 separate city-states, though not necessarily at a single point in time. Governments concentrated on judicial functions and local public works (including roads and temple building); while there was no professional military, military service was required when necessary. Over time, while the lack of political unification did not prevent cultural cohesion and extensive internal and external trading, it almost certainly contributed to the decline of the Mayan system.

Aztecs Aztec rule, developing fully in the 15th century, continued the pattern of considerable decentralization. Conquered vassal states and their leaders were allowed to maintain operation, conditional on paying tribute to the Aztec rulers – a system that provoked a level of resentment that, later, contributed to the weakness of Aztec response to Spanish invasion. The city-state system essentially continued, with Aztec expectations simply an overlay, with local kings representing the ruling aristocratic dynasty. Villages under city-state rule chose their own headmen for local administration. After 1428 the Aztecs did apparently develop a small central bureaucracy – needed among other things to keep tribute records. The attribution of god-like status to the ruler continued in this system. The principal Aztec leader, or *Huey Tlatoani,* concentrated on external affairs – tribute, diplomacy and expansion – while another official, a close relative, handled the administration of the capital city. Both officials, though not priests, had important religious ritual tasks. A four-person aristocratic council provided advice. The central government also established some supervision – including military supervision – over the tribute states, mainly to assure the collection and storage of tribute. Because local nobles were exempt from tribute payments, they often collaborated with the system. Like the Mayans, the Aztecs emphasized a written law codes, which specified various types of crimes (including nudity and drunkenness) and the appropriate punishments, which were only to be administered by state officials. Appeals from local courts to more centralized courts were possible. Ultimate judicial authority rested with the Huey Tlatoani, who was responsible for appointing lesser provincial judges.

Incas As with the Aztecs, the Inca empire was imposed by force, expanding rapidly from about 1000 CE onward. Inca government lacked a writing system, and kept tax records through an intricate system of knotted ropes, with decimal calculations. But this intriguing constraint did not prevent a variety of government functions – including even relocating some conquered populations to improve territorial integration. As in central America, tribute payments from conquered regions were required. But in return the Inca government facilitated food exchange and storage (vital in a mountainous terrain), state-sponsored religious feasts and rituals, and employment on public works (including an elaborate road network covering 40,000 kilometers). Kings were hereditary, and at points two may have shared rule; queens also had considerable powers, particularly in selecting the heir to the throne. The ruler, or *Sapa*

Inca, was regarded as divine, and after death was mummified and "consulted" on affairs of state. However, conciliating the nobility was vital despite the emphasis on great power (a council of nobles provided advice), and occasionally a king was deposed and even assassinated. The ruler also provided charitable assistance to the populace, and maintained a second title as "Lover and Benefactor of the Poor". Approximately 80 regional administrators oversaw locally-recruited governments, reporting in turn for four overall regional governors. Military garrisons were scattered through the vast empire to assure control. The government conducted annual censuses for tax purposes, and the officials involved were overseen by inspectors. This was, in sum, an impressive government system. But it was imposed by force, by a rather small Inca population ruling up to 10 million people. As with the Aztecs, the combination of compulsion and tribute antagonized many local groups, which in turn facilitated Spanish conquest and the surprisingly rapid collapse of the empire in the 16th century.

Study questions

1. What were the major characteristics of the decentralized political systems of central America?
2. What were the main functions of the central American state?
3. How did the Inca government system differ from its central American counterparts? What features were similar?

Further reading

Ross Hassig, *Aztec Warfare: imperial expansion and political control* (University of Oklahoma Press, 1988)

Michael Smith, *The Aztecs* (2nd ed, Blackwell, 2009)

EARLY MODERN PERIOD

Chapter 15: Government in the Early Modern Period

Gunpowder empires The early modern period, 1450-1750, saw the emergence of an unprecedented number of major empires. These included the overseas colonial holdings of the major European powers in the Americas plus a few parts of Asia and Africa, but also new, land-based empires in Russia, India and the Middle East. The contrast with the previous period, where the imperial form was more unusual and emphasis rested on the large number of decentralized regional regimes, was striking. The common denominator was the use of guns to conquer new domains. But this thrust also involved a challenge, to figure out how to administer the holdings once acquired. Hence, an unusual opportunity to explore innovations in government. At the same time, it is important to recognize the very different durabilities of the new empires: Mughal and Safavid empires rose and fell within the period, in contrast to the greater staying power of the Ottomans and, even more, of Russia – here is an interesting comparative topic.

Empire and nation Most of the new empires were what would now be called multinational: this was particularly true in the Middle East. But the early modern period also saw the emergence of suggestions of the nation-state – a state in which political and proclaimed cultural boundaries coincided. (Historians debate whether nations go back earlier in time; certainly there were suggestions of a nation in the much earlier Jewish state, or in China.) Emerging nation states were particularly notable in Europe, but Japan – another center of considerable political change – began to assume some characteristics as well. Nationalism was not yet in play, with its greater challenge to any multinational ideal, but the makings of a debate over the relationship of state and culture was arguably taking shape.

Religion Religious functions for government had been a striking feature of the postclassical period, though with precedents earlier. These did not disappear. The Russian government maintained important roles in the Orthodox Church. China's government continued to avoid any single religious commitment, but it certainly saw the regulation of religion as a key function. Even more obviously, religious functions loomed large in the three great Islamic empires. On the whole, however, religious roles began to ease a bit. This was most obvious in Western Europe, where the exhaustion of the religious wars led to the introduction of greater (though still limited) tolerance and a definite reorientation of the state toward other functions (though religious duties remained). Some historians believe that the Islamic empires, by failing

to make a turn away from religion toward some of the newer issues in world affairs, made a crucial mistake.

Modernity? The label early modern suggests, accurately, that this period saw the emergence of more "modern" characteristics in world history – for example, a measurable movement toward greater globalization – but with the huge qualification that this was still early. This tension certainly applies to government. Some governments began to take on some new functions – for example, in education or in economic infrastructure. Peter the Great, Russia's great ruler in the period, is typically called a "modernizer" in Russian history books. But the label should be used with huge caution. Governments were still constrained by economies that were still largely agricultural. Most still defined their functions in terms of military activities (defensive or aggressive or both), judicial activities and public works (plus, sometimes, religion). There were only limited breakthroughs beyond this.

Western Europe This was a period of major change in European governments, as the next chapter details. Feudalism declined, state functions expanded; and European states became involved in greater military competition, within Europe and around the world. But while many key developments were new in European history – the expansion of state bureaucracies, for example – they were not all pathbreaking at the global level. European patterns partly represented an effort to catch up to government features that had already been established elsewhere, most obviously in China (and some Europeans were aware of this contrast). Identifying genuine innovations is something of a challenge, though there are some opportunities. In other words, any sense of a special place for Europe in the analysis of early modern governments may be misplaced. The region's fundamental innovations rested more in the realm of military technology, trade expansion and cultural change.

Study questions

1. What are some major differences between government trends in this period and those that predominated in the postclassical centuries?
2. What is a multinational empire? A nation state?
3. Why might religion decline somewhat as a government focus?

Further reading

Peter N. Stearns, *World Past to World Present* (Routledge, 2021)

Merry Wiesner-Hanks, *Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge University Press, 2013)

Chapter 16: Western Europe

Decline of feudalism In many regions, the powers of monarchs and central governments expanded at the expense of regional feudalism. The process actually began with Renaissance Italian city states, where the feudal system had never taken strong root. By the 16th century a number of northern rulers were expanding their functions (the term Renaissance monarchs is sometimes used), including gaining fuller control over military activities. Growing use of canon reduced the options for feudal armies. Nobles retained important powers and functions, continuing to provide much of the bureaucracy including military leadership. But other bureaucrats were recruited as well, and in places like France ennobled bureaucrats stood alongside the more traditional "nobility of the sword".

Religion The Protestant Reformation and then the religious wars gave governments new religious functions – but in the long run reduced the political role of religion. Different rulers devoted massive time and resources to the support of one or another of the religious factions, through the middle of the 17th century. In Lutheran regions, the state supported the church directly, appointing leading clerics and providing financing; the same became true for the Anglican church in Britain. Calvinists and Catholics remained somewhat more separate; but the Catholic church found it needed to accept more state support, particularly in France. But the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) in Europe and then the religious settlement in Britain (1688) reduced religious strife, and some measure of tolerance developed in places like Holland, England and even Lutheran Prussia. Religion no longer became an explicit cause of war within Europe – a huge change – and government interest in other functions expanded.

Colonial expansion First with Portugal and Spain, but soon with several other countries colonial expansion and policy became a growing government concern. Support for navies and naval ventures grew. In Britain and Holland, and to an extent France, private companies actually conducted the trade and even a good bit of the military activity, with state support. The bureaucracies of East India companies, with thousands of staff members recruited increasingly for aptitude rather than family connections, innovated more quickly than many governments did – providing something of a model in the process. And of course colonial expansion was a major source of new revenue.

Mercantilism and war By the 17th century, mercantilist doctrine became fashionable. Mercantilists assumed that countries were locked in competition, and that gains for one meant losses for another. Frequent warfare became a weapon in this competitive process, but economic policy was a vital component as well. Mercantilists urged governments to promote expansion of the internal economy and its export prowess, seeking to limit imports except as they came from the country's colonies. France became the clearest exemplar of mercantilist policy, as the state set new regulations for manufacturing while also cutting back internal tariffs to promote a national market. But Britain played the game as well, for example introducing high tariffs on Indian cotton cloth in 1733 to protect Britain's own infant industry. Governments began to pay much greater attention to road and canal building, particularly in the 18th century. While religious wars ended, other kinds of warfare remained a central function of kings and their governments – overseas and within Europe as well. France, particularly, conduced recurrent series of wars in the later 17th and early 18th centuries, expanding territory and reducing the military capacity of neighboring regions such as (decentralized) Germany.

Absolute monarchy By the 17th century a number of monarchs began claiming absolute power – as with the famous "I am the state" quote by France's Louis XIV. The nobility was further trimmed: Louis built his great Versailles palace to preoccupy nobles with court functions and intrigues, distracting them from their regional base. Other rulers in central Europe soon followed this lead. The central state began sending representatives to the provinces to exercise government functions directly. Bureaucracies expanded and became more specialized, with businessmen recruited to head up financial units – a process some have called bureaucratic rationalization. New functions gained attention, besides the greater attention to military and public works ventures (plus more systematic taxation). Many governments set up scientific academies to promote research. The French also established an institute to watch over the purity of the French language. From the Renaissance onward, promotion of the arts became a standard monarchical function. Some governments even began to build larger prisons, creating new options for the punishment of crimes. Military policy itself showed the growing role of the state. Officer ranks were more carefully defined; armies began to arrange their own provisions, rather than living off the land; uniforms and other insignia were standardized; medical care and even pensions were organized. In all this the power of medieval parliaments declined: they were often not called into sessions for many decades, though regional assemblies persisted.

The parliamentary option In the Netherlands, independent after 1648, and ultimately in Britain a different monarchical form developed, though some of the functional changes were put in place as well. Parliamentary power was enhanced and earlier limitations were eased: most notably, the legislatures began to meet regularly rather than depending on royal summons. Contests for parliamentary votes became more important, and the monarchs themselves, depending on parliamentary approval for funding, appointed ministers of state from the leading parliamentarians—some of whom gained a greater policy role than the kings themselves. The notion of limited monarchy and a representative legislative assembly drew approval from intellectuals even in countries like France. Europe was at this point divided on how the government should be organized. In no case were parliaments democratic (though a hint of democratic arguments did emerge in the 17th-century English civil wars). Voting right were limited to a segment of the properties group, and aristocratic upper houses had considerable power. In England, the government also sponsored a revision of the Poor Law; while welfare was not yet seen as a major state function, it did get some attention.

Enlightened despotism In Prussia and Austria in the 18th century, reforming monarchs carried the ideas of absolute monarchy a step further, arguing that the king and his state should take on a variety of new measures to improve society. They revised law codes to limit excessive punishments. They sponsored new technologies and new crops, seeking to stimulate economic growth. This was a brief and limited

experiment, but it furthered the general process of partially reconsidering the functions of the state (though many enlightened despots were also eager warriors).

Education Education expanded rapidly in early modern Europe, but not primarily because of state responsibility. However, the state did become involved, setting the basis for what would be a more substantial redefinition of the government and its contact with ordinary citizens in the 19th century. In several Protestant countries the government directed religious authorities to expand schools, providing funding – this was true in Scandinavia and Scotland most notably; and in return for support they participated in setting standards and inspecting outcomes. In Prussia after the mid-18th century, Frederick the Great sketched a full school system, with attendance requirements, state-sponsored examinations and support for teacher training. This was a striking innovation. Many governments also set up new training institutes for bureaucrats. Most governments in the 18th century provided formal training for military officers, particularly those dealing with artillery, navigation and fortification. France established schools for civil engineers (Roads and Bridges).

Political theory and public opinion From the religious wars onward, debates over appropriate government forms and functions became a major intellectual preoccupation. A growing number of intellectuals, particularly by the time of the 18th-century Enlightenment, urged governments to shake off religion and establish greater tolerance. They urged new freedoms for press and assembly. They sought more rational and limited punishments for crimes. While many intellectuals supported enlightened despotism and the idea of government activity for the public good, there was also interest in parliaments and some talk of democracy. Something like a discipline of political science took shape. At the same time, growing literacy and greater prosperity encouraged some portion of the general public to begin to take an interest in political matters. Something like a measurable public opinion emerged, capable of putting pressure on governments. Thus a sporadic campaign against slavery and the slave trade generated petitions with tens of thousands of signatures, as well as marches and other manifestation, from the mid-18th century onward. Here were important new factors in the conduct of government.

Nation state Obviously, Europe did not develop a unified government – nor were there significant efforts in that direction. The expansion of government and limitations on feudalism did however create a clearer outline of the nation state—a government that would cover a cultural region, with mutual interaction and support between culture and politics. (Note that definitions of national culture are always partially invented and artificial.) More efficient governments thus created more effective national frontiers, as between France and Spain. Sponsorship of a more national market and national literatures moved in the same direction. The nation state idea was not yet fully articulated, partly because so many monarchs claimed that they owned the state, but it was germinating – along with the recurrent wars that pitted states against each other. At the same time, however, recurrent conferences, beginning with Westphalia, further the idea that the rulers of European nation states could also periodically talk with each other to resolve or reduce conflict.

Study questions

1. In what ways did feudalism decline and what were the results?
2. What were the most important changes in government functions?
3. What were the main features, respectively, of absolutist and parliamentary monarchies?
4. Was Europe becoming a cluster of nation states?

Further reading

Benjamin Kaplan, *Divided by Faith: religious conflict and the practice of toleration in early modern Europe* (Cambridge University Press, 2007)

John Merriman, *A History of Modern Europe,* v. I (3rd ed., Norton, 2009)

E.N.Williams, *The Ancien Regime in Europe: government and society in the major states, 1848-1789* (Pimlico, 1999)

Chapter 17: Government in the Americas

Overall Spain's rather rapid conquest of much of Latin America and the Caribbean posed an obvious challenge for government, after a few decades in which conquerors like Columbus had a fairly free hand. The Spanish began to organize a response by the first decade of the 16th century, and ultimately laid out a rather comprehensive administrative framework (Portugal did similarly in Brazil, somewhat later). But the colonial government was plagued by the problem of finding enough bureaucratic personnel. It also suffered from the concentration on turning a profit (and the related temptation of local officials to enrich themselves). The Spanish did bring government to many regions that had lacked the structure previously, and they introduced some new efforts at justice. Their efforts also left an important legacy for the region even later on, when independence was achieved.

Structure As soon as the Spanish crown realized the potential wealth of the Americas, it began to trip to tighten its grip. A new Chamber of Commerce (House of Trade) was established in 1504, along with other regulations designed to make sure that Spain controlled all trade to the from the new colonies (though piracy and smuggling complicated this effort over time). The Chamber also tried to make sure that Spaniards who emigrated were Christians of long standing, organized taxation on trade, keeping elaborate records. Governors for each region were appointed directly by the monarchy, with some subordinate officials for particular tasks; they had military as well as civil powers. Quickly also, from 1511, the Spanish set up a network of judicial courts (*audiencias),* taking this function very seriously. By mid-century two viceroyalties were set up (in Mexico and Peru), though this was expanded in the 18th century. Various officials were also dispatched to oversee taxation. Finally, as revenues expanded, other officials were hired to administer subregions within the viceroyalties. Administrative responsibilities deliberately overlapped, as the monarchy sought to avoid too much concentration of power in any one office. And inspectors were periodically dispatched to check on colonial officials as well.

Personnel While major officials were drawn from the Spanish nobility (care was taken not to create a privileged nobility in the Americas), staffing beneath that level could be a problem. The Spanish expanded their universities to generate more personnel. Over time, colonials of Spanish origin were also appointed to mid-level posts. But from the outset clergy were widely used as well, sometimes doubling up in their functions. And key functions were largely handled by the church in any event. Thus a series of universities were established in the Americas, with royal authorization but run by (often rivalrous) religious orders. At the local level many new cities replicated administrative structures from Spain, including a town council. But where indigenous local institutions existed they were also utilized, staffed by the indigenous noble class – though these units declined in importance as disease decimated the local population. Finally, by the 17th century fiscal constraints prompted the government to put a number of positions up for sale, which obviously weakened the quality and independence of government and created greater changes for nepotism and self-interest. Even the Peruvian vice-royalty was up for sale at one point.

Justice and rights Spanish monarchs took the task of governing the indigenous population seriously, at least in principle. Conversion to Christianity was an explicit function of the colonial state, but neither the state nor the church pressed too hard – relatively few trials for heresy occurred, for example. Peaceful conversion was the key goal, with some latitude for a fusion between traditional beliefs and the Catholic faith From key missionaries came reports of mistreatment of the native population by early conquerors, including effective enslavement, and the state began to move against this with the Law of Burgos, 1512-3, which forbade indigenous slavery. A variety of laws sought to follow this up, and in 1550-1 a formal debate (in Valladolid) was conducted about the rights of colonial peoples, the first of its kind in Europe and, according to some historians, an early milestone in generating ideas of human rights. The worst abuses were curbed, prompting a settler revolt which was put down.

Limits on authority The effective authority of the state was limited in many ways, beginning with the issues of personnel. Missions established by various religious orders had sweeping powers in their region, including control over labor. While the most exploitative estate system was tamed, colonial landowners continued to run the haciendas with little oversight into their treatment of local labor. Indigenous people did sometimes take complaints to courts, but their success was limited and only a handful of abuses were directly contested at all.

Bourbon reforms In the mid-18th century, under a new royal dynasty in Spain, the government sought to regain greater state control. Creoles, or locals of European origins, were largely removed from administrative posts, replaced by officials from Spain. The state also sought to restrict the powers of the Church, with somewhat less effect – this would be a lingering issue in Latin American politics. (Similar moves occurred in Portuguese Brazil.) These reforms improved administrative quality and also promoted economic growth, but also created massive grievances among the Creoles, the setting from which independence movements would ultimately emerge.

British North America The British government took a far lighter role in the administration of its colonies than Spain did. Several colonies were established and administered by trading companies. Settlers themselves set up local governments, often with a legislative assembly. This provided some colonists with a more consistent political experience than was true in Latin America by the 18th century. At the same time, as in Latin America, actual government functions were often quite limited, giving great power to groups such as the slaveholding planters in the South.

Study questions

1. What were the main challenges the Spanish faced in establishing colonial administration?
2. What were the principal purposes and effects of the Bourbon reforms?
3. How did the Spanish government seek to deal with the indigenous population? What were the constraints involved?

Further reading

John Lynch, "The Institutional Framework of Colonial Spanish America," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 24 (1992)

J. H. Elliott, *Empires of the Atlantic World: Britain and Spain in America* (Yale University Press, 2007)

James Lockhart and Stuart Schwartz, *Early Latin America: a history of colonial Spanish America and Brazil* (Cambridge University Press, 1983)

Roger Merriman, *The Rise of the Spanish Empire in the Old World and the New* (4v, Macmillan, 2018)

Chapter 18: Russia

Expansion From the effort to remove Mongol control, a new Russian state formed around the princes of Moscow, one of whom would soon claim the title of Caesar (tsar). This was an expansionist state, focused particularly on pushing into Central Asia – where, along with Chinse and Ottoman gains – nomadic peoples were subject to formal governments for the first time. But military expansion also took Russia westward, where it would soon become a factor in European affairs. And expansion also moved east, reaching the Pacific. The result, gradually, was one of the great land empires in world history, which raised obvious questions about territorial government. Russia began to border other great powers, such as the Ottomans, China and east-central European states like Poland. This heightened the state's focus on military strength and recurrent expansion.

Tsar and aristocracy In the Caesarian tradition, tsars claimed great power. Control over the Orthodox Church was a major source of support, and periodically the government sought to introduce a variety of religious reforms. But the tsar also claimed a legacy from the khans, to appeal for support from the Muslim minority. From the 16th century onward, the government also issued important codes of law. However, in fact, the great empire was governed in a rather decentralized fashion, with great reliance on the nobility as sources of bureaucrats and military leaders, but also local rule through serfdom. Serfdom had spread initially as peasants sought landlord protection from the Mongols, but now it became more extensive, giving landlords political as well as economic control. Nobles progressively gained greater rights to punish recalcitrant serfs, while overseeing local courts of law. Overall, Russian government involved a careful tension between tsarist claims and military control, and the power of the aristocracy. Recurrent quarrels occurred, as tsars sought to punish powerful nobles or nobles revolted; but on the whole the aristocracy accepted an obligation for loyal state serves, particularly in the military, in return for controlling their estates. The central government had some loyal professional bureaucrats as well, while a

council represented the aristocracy informally. Great attention was devoted to taxing peasants and merchants, who were carefully regulated. Finally, from the late 16th century onward, the tsar developed a secret police force, later called the Okhrana, to identify and suppress opponents of the regime, often through torture. This was a pattern that would continue in Russian government through a variety of subsequent regimes.

Later reforms At the end of the 17th century Peter the Great introduced a series of reforms, often labeled modernization. He introduced new controls over the aristocracy, among other things requiring them to adopt Western dress and hairstyles. He cut back the old council, relying on a new, smaller body instead. And he recruited more bureaucrats from the small middle class, reducing reliance on aristocratic service. He also sought to improve the training of the aristocrats themselves, requiring education in mathematics and other subjects. And he further subordinated the church. His model was Western absolutism, and he did regularize the definition of some government offices. He also launched a new scientific academy and the first universities in Russia. With all this, government structure was not modified too fundamentally. Aristocrats' powers over serfs expanded still further, including the possibility of capital punishment. Emphasis on military expansion continued, with often frantic efforts to assure necessary tax revenue. In the 18th century Catherine the Great would continue cultural outreach to the West, but she also set up a censorship system to regulate access to Western books, seeking to avoid the increasingly controversial political ideas stemming from the Enlightenment.

Study questions

1. In what ways did the government depend on the aristocracy?
2. What were the main functions of the Russian state?
3. What was the main thrust of Peter the Great's government reforms?

Further reading

Nicholas Riasanovsky and Mark Steinberg, *A History of Russia* (9th ed.,Oxford University Press, 2018)

Lindsey Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great* (Yale University Press, 1998)

Chapter 19: The Middle East: the Ottoman and Safavid Empires

Overview The Ottoman empire took shape in the 14th and 15thn centuries, as Ottoman Turks established leadership and expanded a network of conquests in the Balkans and present-day turkey, ultimately, in 1453, seizing Constantinople and effectively destroying the Byzantine Empire. Conquests continued for many decades, expanding the empire to Egypt and North Africa, the Mediterranean coast, and the entire Balkan region. Safavid conquests pressed into Iran in the early 16th century, creating another major Middle Eastern empire and a tense border with the Ottomans that gave rise to recurrent warfare. The Ottoman empire survived far longer than the Safavids, who faded by the early 18th century; Ottoman rule, ultimately outlasting the duration of the Roman empire, extended into the 20th century though amid increasing constraints.

Military recruitment Both empires came to depend heavily on military forces raised from Christian territories. The Safavids utilized slave soldiers brought in from Russia, some of whom gained great political influence. The Ottomans raised a significant military force, the Janissaries, by enslaving and converting young men from the Balkans – some of whom also rose to positions of considerable political power. Both empires depended considerably on military expansion. For the Safavids this came to a rather abrupt halt after a major defeat by Ottoman forces. Ottoman expansion continued into the late 17th century, when two efforts to capture Vienna failed – leading to a prolonged period when Austrian and particularly Russian forces began to cut into Ottoman territory. Both empires found it difficult to adjust to the end of military growth.

Palace culture Both empires generated an elaborate palace culture, with a large harem of wives and concubines, who often contributed to an atmosphere of considerable intrigue. Safavid rule, particularly, deteriorated by the later 17th century thanks to the indulgent lifestyle. Both empires sponsored considerable artistic and cultural activity. Safavid rule helped establish Farsi as the dominant language of

the region. Under the Ottomans, though Arabic and Persian were widely used, Turkish gradually gained ground.

Religion Initial Safavid rulers were deeply committed to Shia Islam, and made this the religion of state – a new element in Persian politics. Shia scholars were brought in from other areas. Religious and civil law were intertwined. The government supported Shia missionary efforts and a network of schools – in which the emperor was supposed to be praised on a weekly basis. Grants of land created an upper class dependent on the state, where religious loyalty was assumed. The Safavids were quite tolerant of most religious minorities, including Christians and Jews, but oppressed the Sunni population. Overall, religion and state became closely intertwined, a legacy that continues in this region today. For their part the Ottomans were Sunnis, and the conflict with the Safavids was in part a religious dispute. Ottoman sultans claimed the title of Caliph. Here too, religious minorities were tolerated, including an important Orthodox Christian group, but the Shia minority was persecuted. Religious goals, around the distinct versions of Islam, loomed large for both empires. As the Safavid dynasty weakened, it was in fact briefly replaced by an Islamic republic, of Shia religious officials bent on a theocratic state, though this fell quickly to outside invasion.

Safavid administration The Safavid Shah, or emperor, maintained firm control over his administration in the early decades. Bureaucrats were recruited by merit, and carefully supervised (and not infrequently replaced) – this was not a hereditary aristocracy. Every office was overseen by an official who reported directly to the Shah. A prime minister served the Shah, and under him were specialized agencies responsible for revenues, the system of justice, and the military. Provincial and local administrators served under the central state. In cities, artisan and merchant guilds gained considerable power, introducing a somewhat democratic element into what was otherwise an autocratic system. Under the early Safavids, the government revived the Persian tradition of substantial public works, with highways and inns designed to encourage commerce., with guards employed to prevent brigandage. (Poor people were allowed to stay as long as they wished in the inns, without payment.)

Ottoman administration The Ottoman state defined its purposes as the expansion of Islam through conquest, internal security, and application of Islamic law (however, minority communities administered their own courts and laws). The Sultan was in charge of the state, and the office remained in a single dynasty, the House of Osman, throughout the empire's existence – an unusual dynastic span, with new sultans chosen from among the previous sultan's sons. Palace schools trained future administrators. A variety of offices served under the Sultan, with officials selected and supervised by the Grand Vizier, the chief officer with considerable powers independent of the Sultan. Provincial governors had great authority, and occasionally rebelled against central control. Local authority was considerable, even in law, and the empire frequently accommodated special local administrative traditions. The Ottomans paid more attention to the organization of the treasury and bureaucratic record-keeping than other Islamic regimes, and effectiveness in this category contributed greatly to the overall success of the empire. The government played a direct role in organizing settlers to underpopulated territories, expanding cultivation, and it also operated extensive public works. It did not, however, widely encourage large-scale capitalism, seeing the economy in terms of the financial and political interests of the state.

Limitations: a debate Some historians argue that despite great success, particularly for the Ottomans, the Middle Eastern Islamic empires must be faulted for failing to take adequate account of the growing dynamism of the neighboring European powers. Their empires traded actively with Europeans, giving their merchants special legal privileges in an atmosphere of free trade (a contrast with East Asian policy at the same time). But little account was taken of innovations in commercial practice or the rise of science. The Ottoman regime did not even allow a printing press to be set up in the empire for fear of its impact on Islamic orthodoxy (the first press was in fact for Christians). Sultans did import some European doctors, which was ironic since their knowledge was not noticeably superior to that of local physicians, but otherwise there was no significant cultural interchange. Whether this was a crucial failure, given the success of the regime, can be debated, but it would obviously weaken the empire's ability to respond to industrial Europe in the 19th century.

Study questions

1. What were the religious policies of the two empires? How did the empires help politicize the dispute between the Shia and Sunni versions of Islam?
2. What were the major functions of the state besides religion?
3. Should the empire be faulted for their failure to import more Western ideas and practices (as Russia was doing in this period)?

Further reading

Roger Savory, *Iran under the Safavids* (Cambridge University Press, 2007)

Martin Sicker, *The Islamic World in Decline: from the Treaty of Karlowitz to the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire* (Greenwood, 2001)

Donald Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge University Press, 2005)

Colin Imber, *The Ottoman Empire, 1300-1650: the structure of power* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2009)

Chapter 20: The Mughal Empire in India

Overview This was the third great Islamic empire during the post classical period. Like the others in the Middle East, it took shape initially through invasions of an outside group – in this case, Turkic Muslims – using guns made familiar in previous warfare. The empire developed and expanded fairly consistently during the 16th century and into the 17th, ultimately covering considerable territory in the subcontinent but never the whole. Decline set in the later 17th century, and the empire was moribund by the mid-18th, as India opened increasingly competition between French and British trading companies, each with government backing. The last Mughal holding collapsed entirely in the 1840s.

Structure Under the early emperors the government took on administrative features now familiar both in this region and in the Middle East. Several provinces (*Subah0* were established, each with a governor. Initially twelve in number, their ranks expanded with the empire itself. The Mughals operated from a number of different capital cities over time, and also from a large armed camp which highlighted the ongoing military emphasis..

Functions The government was active on a variety of front. Public works engagement was particularly impressive, with a massive road network and a specialized administrative department. . Standardization of currency also contributed to rapid economic growth. On the other hand, taxation rates, particularly for the peasantry, were oppressively high – and the requirement that they be paid in silver encouraged more market participation, which could be challenging. More informally, the Mughals encouraged considerable change in art and architecture (with the Taj Mahal a notable example), and even in cuisine, with new influences, particularly from Persia, interacting with Indian patterns.

Religion Ruling a majority Hindu population, early Mughal emperors were widely tolerant. Hindus were employed in the bureaucracy, and the government subsidized some temples and religious activities – while also supporting Islamic ventures. The Emperor Akbar was particularly noteworthy, summoning scholars from various religions and even projecting the possibility of a new, more encompassing faith.. Later emperors, however, began to see an explicit Islamic mission for the state. Bureaucratic recruitment narrowed, and there were outright attacks on Hindu buildings. This mixed record continues to be a matter of debate in Indian politics, with Hindu nationalists highlighting the examples of intolerance and violence (though the continued use of the Taj Mahal as a national symbol represents an interesting complexity). The religious issue also warrants comparison with the Islamic empires in the Middle East, where arguably the religious focus created certain policy limitations.

Role in decline Imperial decisions undoubtedly contributed to the surprisingly rapid decline of the dynasty by 1700. Hindu resistance grew, as did attacks by independent Hindu princes. The taxation rate became increasingly burdensome, and despite earlier growth the economy began to falter – though new British measure to limit Indian industrial imports did not help. Most obviously, the Emperor Aurangzeb simply pressed military expansion too far, creating a military structure that was unsustainable. As a result, the Mughal legacy consisted more clearly of cultural achievements and the mixed religious record than of durable changes to the system of government.

1, What were the main functions of the Mughal government?

2. How did religious policy change, and with what results?

3. Why is the Mughal legacy currently a matter of political debate?

Further reading

Joe Gommans, *Mughal Warfare: Indian frontiers and highroads to empire, 1500-1700* (Routledge, 2002)

Stephen Dale, *The Muslim Em;pres of the Ottomans, Safavids and Mughals* (Cambridge Unifversity Press, 2009)

Annemarie Schimmel, *The Empire of the Great Mughals: history, art and culture* (Reaktion, 2006)

Chapter 21: East Asia

Overview The early modern period did not see a huge change in the basic structure or purpose of imperial government in China, though there were some interesting developments and a few new problems. Two dynasties divided the period, the Ming and Qing; the latter was introduced by Manchurian rulers who however quickly adopted Chinese political characteristics without major disruption. Political innovation was greater in Japan, where the Tokugawa shogunate introduced greater internal peace and stability from approximately 1600 onward. Governments in both countries developed successful policies in dealing with Western traders (policies that were quite different from those of the Islamic empires and Russia), though Japan opted for greater isolation than China did.

Ming dynasty Until its decline in the mid-17th century, the Ming government provided an unusually stable period in Chinese history. Administration of the provinces was carefully organized, with officials responsible for civil and for military affairs, and for surveillance. Beneath the provincial level were prefectures and then smaller units, each with a chief appointed official. Several roving officials periodically checked on provincial activities, reporting to the imperial administration. At the top, six major divisions were responsible for justice, the military, public works, revenues, personnel and ritual. The Ming reestablished recruitment from the rigorous examination system, which in turn focused on Confucian texts. The government organized a network of schools and teachers to feed into this system, with teachers evaluated every nine years. At the same time, the exam format became increasingly stylized and the whole system encouraged a conservative intellectual approach.

Policy orientation Fairly in the dynasty, in 1439, the decision was taken to end the great expeditions through the Indian Ocean. The government concentrated instead on building the modern Great Wall, to prevent nomadic invasion of the sort that had occurred with the Mongols, plus building a great new capital in Beijing. While Chinese merchants continued to be active in Southeast Asia, China depended for wider trade on the growing activities of Western merchants. These were carefully regulated, confined to entry through the Portuguese-controlled port of Macau. The imperial court also interacted with Jesuit missionaries, esteemed for their knowledge of science and their advanced clocks; but there was no serious cultural exchange. Under the Ming even this connection was broken in the early 18th century. The Catholic Pope insisted that Jesuits pull back from adopting Chinese costumes and habits, and in retaliation the government turned against the missionaries and any Christian converts. Qing emperors also launched new territorial expansion, acquiring Tibet (in reaction to a new regime that seemed threatening) and in the northwest.

Qing dynasty The Qing innovated in administration primarily by having dual Manchu and Han officials in key offices. Otherwise the Ming apparatus was largely retained, though administration had to expand to the new territories where direct imperial and military control substituted for the normal regional apparatus. The bureaucratic examination system probably became more challenged, with candidates often trying to write examination answers out in advance, guessing at the questions which tended to be repetitious; and cheating may have increased. The Qing also expanded a Ming policy of celebrating women known for good and virtuous behavior, for example including widows who did not remarry, seeking to bolster the

conservative Confucian family system. While Qing dynamism declined toward the end of the 18th century, this was still a viable regime; recent scholars have noted that its business and taxation policies were actually more favorable to economic activity than their counterparts in places like Britain. The results is a new debate over the extent to which Chinese government should be held accountable for the divide that was opening up with the increasingly dynamic early industrial economy of the West.

Tokugawa regime The Tokugawa clan gained control over most of Japan after victory in the endemic feudal wars, forming a government (under the figurehead emperor, who had virtually no real authority) in 1603. The regime was able to end internal conflict while retaining the feudal class in principle; each major feudal lord administered a province, but under some central authority; and some separate government officials operated as well, as the regime established a hierarchy of offices independent of the feudal system. The control of the central Shogun increasingly superseded separate feudal authority. And the central administration directly operated foreign policy, coinage, weights and measures, and public works. The feudal lords pledged loyalty to the Shogun. But normally each regional administration had considerable leeway, even in taxation policy, while carrying out public works and maintaining military order. All of this was a substantial departure from the political system of earlier centuries, and it underwrote growing internal economic prosperity. At the same time, in keeping with the new political tone, Confucian ideas spread more widely, though the government also supervised Buddhist and Shinto activities.

Foreign policy for several decades prior to the Tokugawa, Portuguese trade and missionary activity had attracted considerable Japanese interest. Briefly under the Tokugawa a mission was actually sent to Spanish America, in the interests of trade. But in 1835 the regime pulled back, introducing the Seclusion Laws. . It feared the example of Spanish control of the Philippines, and the larger threats to Japanese culture and its feudal military structure. Christian missionaries were attacked. The regime decreed that only Chinese, Korean and Dutch ships could enter Japanese harbors, and then under strict limitations. Japanese were not allowed to travel abroad. For over two centuries the Tokugawa managed to make this policy work, without significant internal or external challenge.

Study questions

1. How did Japanese and Chinese foreign policies compare?
2. What were the main continuities, in China, from previous systems of government?
3. How was the Tokugawa shogunate able to establish greater internal stability?

Further reading

Conrad Totman, *Tokugawa Ieyau: Shogun* (Heian International, 1983)

Yonlin Jiang, *The Mandate of Heaven and the Great Ming Code* (University of Washington Press,2011)

Kenneth Pomeranz, *The Great Divergence: China, Europe and the making of the modern world economy* (Princeton University Press, 2000)

19TH CENTURY

Chapter 22: Government in the Industrial Age

Overview Full-fledged industrialization began with developments in Britain at the end of the 18th century. Other Western societies joined in by the early 19th century. Japan and Russia entered the process at the end of the 19th century. Then after World War II the Pacific Rim and then China, India and other players launched their own industrializations. By the early 21st century, well over half the world's population was involved in industrial or rapidly industrializing societies. While economic and technological changes held center stage, industrialization, and preparing for industrialization, also involved a variety of shifts in the nature of role of government. Before dealing with more specific regional developments through the 19th and then 20th centuries, some points about the contrasts and continuities between the industrial and the preindustrial state can be ventured.

Government as cause For quite a while, historians paid great attention to the role of the state in causing industrialization in the first place, particularly in Britain. This approach has declined with the realization that other governments, as in China, were at least as well organized – but no industrialization initially resulted. The British advantage rested on colonial holdings and scientific culture more than the state. However, the British government in the 18th century did expand canals and roads, while ordering industrial supplies for the growing navy. It established a central bank and set up a much more formal patent office. Tariffs on foreign manufactured goods encouraged British factories, particularly in cotton textiles. Government role in later industrializations expanded still further, for example normally in establishing or at least promoting a new railroad system. (Thus while the British government had facilitated railway land acquisition, the French and German governments built the rail network directly.) Japanese and Russian industrializations depended even more heavily on the state, for example in setting up factories directly in key industries. The same pattern applied to Pacific Rim industrializations. Governments do not explain the timing of industrialization alone, but their involvement was critical particularly in "latecomer" cases – of course including China at the end of the 20th century.

New functions Government functions and personnel expanded everywhere, to help prepare for industrialization and then to respond to some of its results. (Only Britain and Norway briefly shrunk their governments in the 19th century, in response to liberal beliefs in more free enterprise; but these were anomalous cases and lasted a few decades at most.) Law codes had to change to accommodate new issues, including more complicated property and corporate law. In addition to the expanded public works function – as in helping to set up railways – governments fairly quickly added factory inspections, toward minimal safety standards and some protection of child and female labor; these were initially cursory, but they expanded with time. Responsibility for public health increased, with new programs for sewage disposal and, later in the century, centers to assist with infant care. Organization of commercial fairs and industrial expositions became a standard feature, beginning with Britain's Crystal Palace exhibit in 1851. Formal patent offices were established more widely – very quickly, for example, in the new United States. Though the function was not entirely new, professional policing became a responsibility – in some cases, as in Britain, for the first time in any formal sense (the famous British force was organized in the 1820s by prime minister Robert Peel – hence, bobbies). Perhaps most important, though there were a few limited precedents, governments assumed responsibility for education, setting up school requirements, standards for teacher training, and so on – as Japan did with its ambitious Education Act of 1872. Beginning with Germany in the 1880s, governments haltingly organized new welfare systems, with protections for accident and illness, old age and unemployment; here too, innovations started small but expanded over time. On another front, many governments began to expand their capacity to require military service, and military spending rose rapidly in many industrial states. Obviously in all these categories specific programs depended on time and place, but the overall pattern was clear. And this meant not only larger governments, but more contact between the state and ordinary people on a variety of fronts – even in such basic matters as a requirement to acquire a marriage license.

Facilities and personnel These changes interacted with new industrial technologies, initially particularly the railroad and the telegraph, which permitted more rapid communication and movement around a large territory. To this soon would be added typewriters and other duplicating devices, vital to a larger bureaucracy. Personnel expanded everywhere and in most cases, as in the West after the 1850s, this was accompanied by civil service reforms which introduced merit examinations rather than heredity or personal connections (as China had already done in the past). Corruption and favoritism remained problems, but professionalism was enhanced overall, and bureaucracies no longer depended on aristocratic birth. Though with some earlier precedents, tertiary training for future bureaucrats also expanded – including a larger array of military training schools but also new programs in public health, statistics, agricultural research, modern languages and so on; another responsibility for the state.

Form of government Here, no single "industrial" model prevailed, but there were innovations. One scholar has argued that, with more people living in cities, better educated, and with wider contacts with the state, government either had to allow greater popular voice – that is, approach some kind of democracy – OR establish new forms of authoritarianism (sometimes with a façade of popular participation). This may seem to be an overgeneralization, but it is worth attention. Certainly government forms changed quickly in many industrial or industrializing societies. Though this became clearer in the 20th century than in the 19th, monarchies had difficulty adjusting to the demands of industrial society –

sometimes because they staked too much on protecting the landed aristocracy, as in prerevolutionary Russia. With few exceptions, republics, rather than monarchies, became the order of the day as industrialization gained ground. World War I would also reveal the unprecedented organizational capacity of the industrial state, in organizing the economy, requisitioning labor, issuing propaganda, and policing against dissent. This would feed directly into new kinds of authoritarianism in the 20th and 21st centuries. Disputes about the form of government became an important issue in many parts of the world, in part in the effort to adjust to the needs of an industrial society.

Nation state Another clear political trend coterminous with the advance of industrialization was a preference for the nation state, rather than subnational units or multinational empires. Sometimes the trend connected directly with industrialization. Thus German national unity in the 19th century was prepared by a tariff union, in turn motivated in part by a desire to advance industrial opportunities. In many other cases, the nation state seemed logical in part because of the industrial success of European nation states. Connections should not be pressed too far: industrialization was not the main cause of the spread of nation states, and many nations states proved to be too small to provide appropriate markets – hence, particularly after World War II, the growing efforts to link nation states in larger tariff unions.

Conclusion Industrial implications for government were most significant in the area of functional change and organizational capacity. Overall, industrialization or the effort to industrialize provided a loose framework, within which a variety of specific developments took shape within individual countries. There were, however, some common trends and needs, within which more detailed political developments would take shape over the past 250 years.

Study questions

1. What kinds of new functions does industrialization require of the state?
2. What was the role of the state in initiating industrial revolutions?
3. What are the connections between the advance of industrialization and the decline of monarchy?

Further reading

Peter N. Stearns, *The Industrial Turn in World History* (Routledge, 2017)

Alexander Gerschenkron, *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective* (Harvard University Press, 1962

Chapter 23: Western Europe and the Settler Societies

Long 19th century Many world historians use the idea of a "long" 19th century as part of their overall periodization: the notion is that key characteristics (including initial industrialization) began to take shape in the second half of the 18th century, setting in motion trends that would persist into the early 20th. These trends would include the new surge of Western imperialism, which was already taking shape with increasing British control of India. The long 19th century would also be defined in part by the revolutions that burst forth in the final quarter of the 18th century and would unleash a new, sometimes violent, debate about the nature of government that would also run through the ensuing decades; French decisions about government form would not really coalesce until the 1870s and 1880s, for example, after the initial ferment of the revolution of 1789.

Geography The core of "the West" continued to center in Western and Central Europe. However, many political movements – including liberalism – and government innovations were also shared by the British-dominated settler societies of the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. These societies faced frontier conditions different from those of Western Europe, and the extension of government to new areas, and the role of government in dealing, usually harshly, with indigenous people further differentiated the settler societies. But many trends were shared, particularly in terms of the form of government organization with the rise of parliamentary regimes and the expansion of the vote.

Age of revolution The "age of Atlantic revolution", from 1776 to the final major risings in 1848, had a variety of implications for government. The risings sought new restrictions on government interference in a variety of areas, emphasizing a new program of human rights. Governments should no longer restrict

speech, assembly, religious freedom or the press. In the French Revolution, emphasis also highlighted the elimination of aristocratic legal privilege: government service should be "open to talents". Monarchies should either be eliminated or restricted by new legislative bodies, with significant authority; these in turn should derive from a wider suffrage, though still usually defined in terms of property qualifications (and definitely entirely male). These were huge changes, though many were incompletely achieved. In the process some government functions also expanded. Again in France the revolutionary government mandated the metric system, another major government shift though responsibility for weights and measures was not entirely new. Legal codes were reconsidered, to limit the crimes subject to capital punishment. Government responsibility for schools increased, though not yet to the point of universal requirements. The French government set up a variety of new technical schools, to improve bureaucratic recruitment and spur the economy.

Consolidation European revolutions in 1830 and 1848 largely maintained the basic goals, often objecting to interference with the freedom of the press or undue religious influence. The revolutionary mood spread into central Europe. After 1848, and the formal defeat or eclipse of the revolutionary thrust, attention turned to consolidating previous gains, often with new compromises among liberals and conservatives. Most governments now supported religious freedom, including freedom for Jews. They granted considerable press freedom, though police interference continued and many governments, even in liberal Britain or the United States, extended censorship over sexual content in the name of essentially Christian moral values. The Importance of parliaments was confirmed – though in France not until the 1870s. In unified Germany parliamentary powers were limited by the power of the emperor to appoint chief ministers. At this point however attention largely turned away from the form of government, around which there was now considerable agreement, toward growing social and military issues.

Democracy Democratic voting rights expanded gradually, though for a brief moment the radical phase of the French revolution established universal manhood suffrage. In Britain three separate reforms, from 1832 to the 1880s, gradually established nearly universal manhood suffrage. Several northern states in the United States opened to universal suffrage from the 1820s onward, and then the end of slavery extended democratic rights (in principle) nationwide. French suffrage was assured from 1848 onward, and the German compromise included wide suffrage but with a three-class voting system that provided greater power to the propertied group. Italy did not move to democracy until after World War I. By the later 19th century, the big new voting issue involved women, as feminist agitation increased widely. New Zealand was the first nation to move, in 1893, though several American western states innovated even earlier. Women's suffrage was still an open issue by 1914, though trends were becoming clear, particularly in countries with a Protestant background.

Religion The religious function of Western governments declined considerably, as the commitment to greater religious freedom suggested, but there were complexities. The United States established separation of church and state early on, though government policies, as in the schools, favored a loosely Protestant ethical approach. Change came harder in Europe. The French Revolution worked to reduce the power of the Catholic Church, seizing many church lands and at one point trying to enforce oaths of loyalty from priests. Later regimes however increased the Church role, particularly in primary education, until a firmly secular system was established in the 1880s. Further quarrels in the 1890s led to more definitive separation and a commitment to the French Republic as a secular state. British conflicts over the role of the Church of England, particularly in schools, extended beyond the 19th century. Germany sought to reduce the role of the Catholic Church (in a religiously divided nation) in the 1880s, and the Italian state frequently conflicted with the papacy as papal territories were stripped away with national unification. Again the trend was clear, but not surprisingly, given the importance of religious functions in the past, the change was difficult and contested.

Nationalism The French revolution heralded the new phenomenon of popular nationalism, symbolized by the creation of the world's first national anthem. The idea was that now that the state belonged to the people, rather than a monarch, the people owed it active national loyalty. Nationalism spread widely in Europe and the United States, and soon beyond, helping to motivate Italian and German unifications. Nationalism gave established nations a new source of political loyalty, and it was frequently played up in the schools. But nationalism could also constrain the state, particularly supporting foreign policy ventures

in the name of national honor. Popular nationalism, trumpeted by the mass press, pushed states into some imperialist ventures that might otherwise not have been undertaken by the later 19th century.

Functions The two great expansions of the functions of the Western state in the 19th century involved mass and secondary education and social insurance. Efforts to extend state schooling at the primary level dotted the first half of the century; in the United States, these centered on states and localities (mainly in the north), but national governments took the lead in Europe. Germany already had the framework of a system. France sketched a growth in public schools in 1833, but fleshed out a fully national system, and compulsory attendance requirement, only in the 1880s. State support for secondary schools and universities grew as well; in the United States the federal government established public universities in every state in the nation. Social insurance emerged from the 1880s onward, in response to industrialization and new pressures from rising socialist movements. These were not the only developments, however. New legislation limited hours of work for women and children, and ultimately men, followed by some factory inspection efforts. Later in the century governments moved to agree on national time zones to facilitate transportation. Beginning with city governments, the state began to take responsibility for establishing and maintaining parks. The list was considerable, and growing.

War and collaboration After the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, the major states of Europe moved to promote greater European peace, beginning with the fairly statesmanlike Treaty of Vienna in 1815. This did not prevent later conflicts, particularly around the national unifications, but in fact European war became far less common than had been the case in the early modern period. However, this was replaced in part by the new round of imperialist expansion in Africa, Southeast Asia and Pacific Oceania, which was supported as well by more government military spending and larger standing armies (on the continent). At the same time European governments took the lead in a variety of new international collaborations (often including the United States). New agreements provided postal coordination, allowing international mailing for the first time; the international time zone agreement; international patent protection; coordination of weather statistics; congresses aimed at limiting the spread of epidemic disease – here too the list was considerable and growing, arguably modifying (though not balancing) the spread of nationalism in defining government policy.

Study questions

1. What were the main government changes that resulted from the various revolutions?
2. How and why did democratic voting systems spread?
3. What were the main changes in government function during the long 19th century?

Further reading

Nicholas Barreyre and Claire Lemercier, "The Unexceptional State: rethinking the state in the nineteenth century (France, United States," *American Historical Review* 126 (2021)

Peter Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer and head Skocpol, eds., *Bringing the State Back In* (Cambridge University Press, 1985)

Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution, 1789-1848* (Vintage, 1962)

Chapter 24: Latin America

Independence Most Latin American nations gained independence from Spain in the second decade of the 19th century. Independence wars were led by Creoles, who in turn were inspired by the revolutionary ideals and examples of France and the United States as well as their own grievances at being shut out of government posts during the later 18th century. For its part Spain was distracted by the Napoleonic invasions and unable to respond forcibly. Brazilian independence took a more convoluted path but began to take shape soon afterward. Most Caribbean countries remained colonies, but Haiti strikingly rebelled both against French control and slavery, winning independence and emancipation around 1800.

Goals Most independence leaders, like Simon Bolivar, hoped not only for independence but for a liberal, constitutional and parliamentary state that would guarantee the basic freedoms, including religion. A few of the new nations briefly considered monarchy but all became republics. There was no appetite for

democracy – Latin American liberals lacked confidence in the masses – but they did support voting with property qualifications.

New nations problems Political reality complicated the intentions of the founders. New Latin American states encountered several problems that would prove characteristic of many new nations. First, few leaders had political experience – here, colonial exclusion proved costly. Disagreements broke out over boundaries. Bolivar, for example, had hoped for a large state extending from Colombia into the Andes, but he soon had to accept fragmentation; the same disappointment occurred in central America. Economies were hard hit, for with independence British industrial goods began to flood the market, displacing domestic manufacturing. Bitter disputes also occurred over specific issues. Liberal leaders intended to restrict the power of the Church, for example in education, but they were confronted by a conservative coalition of Church authorities, landlords and military leaders. The result was a series of policy disagreements and frequent instability.

Forms of government Through the 19th century and beyond, many Latin American countries experienced frequent changes of regime. Periodically, authoritarian leaders, or *caudillos,* seized the reins, sometimes with popular support, sometimes backed by the conservative coalition; *caudillismo* was a recurrent pattern in a number of countries, including Mexico. At the same time, periods of liberal leadership were important as well, which meant that issues such as church-state relations tended to fluctuate. Few states attempted major social or economic reforms, leaving landlord power largely unchecked.

Functions Given resource contraints and political instability, Latin American governments did not venture the kind of functional expansion that occurred in Western Europe. However, there were some important developments, particularly in the second half of the 19th century. A number of governments expanded public works commitments, most obviously in railroad development. Several took a lead in encouraging greater industrialization, though the assignment was difficult given continued Western pressure to exploit natural resources and the need to borrow capital from Western banks. However some societies, such as Argentina, made some progress. A number of government initiatives centered on efforts to reform certain aspects of popular culture – often through legal changes. Thus in Mexico, courts of law began to impose stricter penalties for infanticide, in contrast to earlier courts that often recognized how frequently women fell victim to sexual violence. Around 1900, several societies began to attempt a new crackdown on prostitution, in part in reaction to global concerns about Latin American involvement in what was called the "white slave trade". Though somewhat quietly, major changes occurred in education – despite frequent tensions between liberals and the Church. Mexico City for example set up compulsory primary schools for both boys and girls after 1842, and by the end of the century almost a third of all Mexicans were literate, and almost as many women and men – quite a high figure compared to most nonindustrial societies.

Foreign policy Though independent, Latin American governments faced continued pressure from Western Europe, particularly in matters of trade and finance. Interference from the United States, particularly in Mexico and Central America, increased. On the other hand, relations among the Latin American nations themselves were largely peaceful, with the major exception of a war between Paraguay and its neighbors between 1864 and 1870. This aside, Latin American militaries tended to concentrate on internal politics, where they sometimes had an outsize role. Buy war or preparations for war did not figure strongly in government functions – another contrast with a number of other regions during the long 19th century.

Study questions

1. What are characteristic "new nations" problems, and what are their common political results?
2. How did the Latin American independence wars compare to revolutionary movements in Western Europe?
3. What were the main goals of Latin American liberals?
4. What were the main similarities and differences between Latin American governments and their European counterparts?

Further reading

Jeremy Adelman, *Sovereignty and Revolution in the Iberian Atlantic* (Princeton University Press, 2009)

David Bushnell and Neil MacAuley, *The Emergence of Latin America in the Nineteenth Century* (2nd ed., University of Michigan Press, 1995)

Chapter 25: Imperial Government in India

Imperialism and government The vast expansion of Western empires in the 19th century raised issues of governance that were somewhat different from those faced by countries like Spain in the early modern period. Most obviously, with partial exceptions for southern Africa and Algeria, the new holdings did not gain large European populations. And while there was considerable missionary effort (particularly in Africa), church officials did not assume the kind of administrative duties that their counterparts had done for Spain and Portugal earlier. Nor (except in Oceania) was there massive population decline due to disease. These facts meant that 19th-century administrations could be stretched thin – even more than had been the case in the early modern colonies. This in turn could limit the range of reforms that imperial officials would undertake, particularly given the risk of local opposition. Decisions about how to recruit and train locals to participate in government loomed larger than had been the case before – beginning with the question of how many might be considered suitable in the first place. At the same time, imperialist regimes in the 19th century were explicit about one claim: the natives in the areas under their control were not ready to govern themselves, if indeed they ever would be. The racist "white man's burden" concept placed great emphasis on the West's superior political capacity. All of these issues played out in the changing pattern of government in British India, where the Raj ultimately gained control over virtually the whole subcontinent – arguably the largest regime, geographically, in India's history.

Before 1857 From an administrative standpoint, British rule in India was conducted through the British East India Company until 1857. The Company controlled a fair amount of territory directly, but also formed alliances with a host of local princes – a few of whom had regional governments of their own. The system excused the British from actually setting up a colonial government. However, from the end of the 18th century the British actually set governing policy, with the East India Company serving as agent. And this led to a series of sweeping reforms. Most obviously the British established new rules for landed property. In one region they established a new set of landlords, with peasants as tenants obligated to substantial rent payments (from which the landlords in turn would meet tax obligations to the state). In two other regions the British claimed they confirmed individual land ownership for peasants (replacing earlier village controls) – but this system was complicated by the high tax rates established. Rural poverty measurably increased. Other reforms somewhat more gingerly took on several Indian family customs. The practice of *sati*, in which in some Hindu regions widows threw themselves on their dead husbands' funeral pyres, was banned – and a new group of Indian reformers, though wary of British rule, agreed with this change. Efforts were made to improve the property rights of widows, and there was discussion about trying to limit child marriage. Deeply-rooted customs like the caste system were not attacked, but the British did believe that they could use government in introduce a number of improvements in Indian society. Finally, it was in the 1850s that the government began to promote railway developments, to improve access to Indian raw materials and to facilitate the movement of troops.

After 1857: structure Government structure and policy changed considerably after 1857, when a massive Mutiny by Indian troops, both Hindu and Muslim, called British rule into question; the rising was put down only with great difficulty, though local princes and landlords remained largely loyal to the British. At this point (1858) the British took over government directly, ending the East India Company's role. Earlier arrangements with local princes were firmed up by more formal treaties, though their territories, collectively, covered about a third of the subcontinent. The army was reformed, to promote greater loyalty among the troops. In London, the British organized an India Office, appointing a governor general to oversee the colony, reporting directly to Parliament. About 1500 civil servants were sent out to various parts of the subcontinent. Vowing to improve relationships with Indian civilians, the administration began to recruit a cadre of Indians into the lower levels of civil service, even encouraging them to adopt partially Western dress. By the 1890s manners books began to be written to instruct this minority in how to interact socially with Westerners. Provincial councils were established, with Indian members, and the same was true for municipal administrations. A reform act in 1909 introduced elections for the Indian representatives, who previously had been appointed (the electorate, however, was a minority of upper-

class Indians). However, Indians were carefully kept out of the higher administrative levels. A civil service examination system undoubtedly improved the caliber of top officials, but the exams were only administered in Britain and by 1890 only one Indian had managed to win through.

Policies The British pulled back from major reform efforts in the wake of the Mutiny. No further land reforms were undertaken, though several Governors-General did reduce taxation rates. Social reform was largely abandoned, as the British queen promised to respect Indian traditions. On the other hand many governors-general remained active in promoting public works, including facilitating telegraph communications and expanding irrigation systems And key elements of the British law code were applied to India, including one measure outlawing homosexuality; Indian courts were reorganized along British lines, with English as the official language. Several British officials built public clock towers in Indian cities, to promote a "modern" sense of time (a move which prompted some local counterattacks). And there was some effort to promote education, though initiatives here were rather modest (compared for example to developments in Latin America).

Evaluation Not surprisingly, the effects of British rule remain widely debated. Some Indians did gain new government experience, even with elections. But the numbers were few, and British paternalistic control remained paramount. Reforms, even in the later period, can be variously interpreted. Many, as in the public works sectors, were designed to facilitate imports of British industrial goods and exports of cheaper Indian products. While later administrations paid some attention to the plight of peasants, major problems, including periods of famine, were not effectively addressed. And from another standpoint, British hesitancy post-Mutiny left a number of traditional practices untouched that arguably should have been addressed.   Not surprisingly, British policies led to the growth of Indian nationalism. The Indian National Congress formed in 1885, though its efforts long focused more on seeking a greater role for Indians in the administrative apparatus, not only outright independence. But foundations were being laid for a more vigorous effort after World War I. Finally, British policies post-Mutiny included vigorous efforts to divide Hindus and Muslims; the provinces of Bengal was even divided on religious lines. Here too were seeds for the future.

Study questions

1. What were the main differences in governance conditions for colonies in the 19th century compared to the early modern period?
2. What were the main changes in British policy after the 1857 Mutiny?
3. Why, and on what basis, do most current evaluations emphasize the drawbacks and inadequacies of British policies in India?

Further reading

Jan Morris and Simon Winchester, *Stones of Empire: the buildings of the Raj* (2nd ed., Oxford University Press, 2005)

Sashi Tharoor, *Inglorious Empire: what the British did to India* (Penguin, 2017)

Stanley Wolpert, *A New History of India* (8th ed., University of California Press, 2008)

Chapter 26: Imperial regimes in Africa

Timing and geography The race for empire in subSaharan Africa accelerated after the 1860s, fueled by competition between Britain and France but with Germany now also a player, and Belgium participating as well. Successful wars and treaty arrangements gave Europeans control over virtually the whole subcontinent. Liberia, governed by former slaves from the United States, remained independent. The longstanding Ethiopian kingdom withstood a war with Italy in 1896, though the Italians would return in the 1930s. The new European holdings were still developing their governments by the late 19th century (except in older centers in South Africa and Angola). Virtually all the colonies were carved up without regard for African ethnic or religious divisions, a factor that would complicate administration of the colonies and, even more, the success of independent governments once decolonization began in the second half of the 20th century. Overall, the full imperial period would last only about a century. It did see

the notion of formal government more widely introduced in the subcontinent, including some sense of the major functions involved and lower-level administrative experience for some Africans. But, in what was still a predominantly rural, agricultural society, many government initiatives were far too limited to have great impact on ordinary life.

Governing approaches British administration in most of the colonies was rather decentralized. For a time, some colonies were ruled by trading companies, rather than the government itself. Ultimately, each colony had a governor general appointed from London. But control of much of the territory devolved to a network of African chiefs, who wielded considerable power on condition of accepting colonial rule. In several colonies, such as Nigeria, the British also pitted ethnic groups against each other, favoring those who were particularly loyal (the Belgians did the same in some of their holdings, creating durable resentments that would burst out, for example, in the Rwandan genocide of the 1990s). The French approach was more centralized, though for a time new colonies were simply administered by the military. In the 1890s however the government began to rein in the military, establishing a federation of West African colonies with a single minister based in Dakar, reporting directly to Paris, with viceroys under him for each of the individual colonies The French also created local units, or *cercles,* headed by a French official overseeing a number of villages, in principle with absolute authority. However, Africans served as village and canton leaders, responsible for collecting taxes and administering customary law, with the right to arm a small number of guards. Finally, as a few Africans completed higher education in France, they were regarded as "evolved" and granted French citizenship, even serving in government or military within France itself – another difference from the British approach which the French regarded as evidence of their superior approach to race.

Functions The main goals of most of the colonial governments involved maintaining stability, appropriate tax collection, and opportunities for Western businesses, ranging from mining to the processing of sugar cane; this latter goal could inspire some road and railway development. Some reforms were instituted, notably an effort to abolish slavery; however essentially compulsory labor continued in many colonies, most notoriously the Belgian Congo. Some measures introduced more Western-style family laws, usually designed to bolster the authority of husbands. But efforts to combat polygamy and, in the northeast, female genital mutilation, were not pushed very vigorously, for fear of rousing opposition. British officials sometimes sought to punish Africans accused of cruelty to animals, ironically subjecting them to whipping. Colonial governments sponsored or encouraged some schools, though much of this was left to the initiative of missionaries. (Efforts were somewhat more extensive in South Africa, but aimed primarily at the White population.) By 1900 a sufficient number of Africans were educated in European languages to serve as lower-level officials in the colonial administrations, though opportunities were more limited than in India at the same time. After World War I, under more pressure to demonstrate responsible concern, educational efforts expanded. The British set up a commission to work on African education, and the French began to expand a primary school system, even sending out officials to recruit children against initial village opposition. Some public health measures were also introduced, if only to provide greater protection for the Europeans involved. Between the wars also, many colonial regimes began to face more varied opposition, including the emergence of some nationalist agitation (in South Africa, the African National Congress had actually been launched in 1912), which led to heightened police efforts and prison terms for some leaders – a pattern that would accelerate during the first years after World War II.

Study questions

1. How did the imperial approach to government in Africa compare to that in India? What were the implications of the differences for post-colonial governments?
2. How were the major colonial administrations organized? What were the major differences between the British and French approaches?
3. What were the principal limitations on government functions?

Further reading

M. E. Chamberlain, *The Scramble for Africa* (3rd ed., Taylor and Francis, 2011)

Alice Conklin, *A Mission to Civilize: the republican idea of empire in France and West Africa 1881-1917* (Stanford University Press, 1983)

Ann McClintock, *Imperial Leather: race, gender and sexuality in the colonial context* (Routledge, 1995)

Chapter 27: Russia

Outside the West, Latin America and the empires The big government question for countries outside the direct orbit of early industrialization, revolution, new independence or colonial status was: what had to be changed to counter growing Western power, in order to preserve some measure of freedom of action. (Or for some: how could major change be avoided, so that baasic political and social traditions could be preserved.) Debates over reform measures and their limitations provide a common thread to political developments in Russia, the Middle East, China and Japan – though the specific patterns varied widely. Russia sought to avoid the reform debate in the first half of the 19th century, despite some internal pressure, but then turned to a mix of change and repression which, among other things, set the stage for the nation's participation in World War I and the ensuing revolution.

Overall The first half of the 19th century saw little fundamental change in Russian government, with a concerted effort to maintain conservative policies in the face of growing liberalism in Western Europe. Traditional attempts at military expansion continued, mainly at the expense of the Ottoman Empire; but Western nations increasingly sought to limit the gains. Loss in the Crimean War forced a major policy review, leading from 1861 to a two-decade reform period in which a number of changes were introduced, in structure and policy alike. Fundamental shifts were limited however, and the reform period came to a close in 1881, leading to a final period of renewed repression.

Conservative bulwark The government largely sought to maintain the status quo after the Napoleonic wars. A rising by liberal nobles was put down in 1825, and Polish nationalist agitation was suppressed. The practice of exiling or imprisoning political dissidents expanded. In 1849 Russia polished its conservative bona fides by intervening against a revolution in Hungary, on behalf of the Habsburg monarch. The tsar continued to maintain fundamental power, aided by his ministers; governorships administered the various provinces. Control over top appointments in the Orthodox church continued. However, Russia's tradition of military expansion was increasingly complicated by British and French opposition, eager to avoid too much Russian intrusion into the Middle East. Gains against the Ottoman Empire were frequently modified in great power conferences. In 1854 the French and British intervened against the latest Russian move, winning a difficult regional war in the Crimea.

Reform era Loss in war convinced Russian leaders that changes were needed, if only to keep pace with the West. Serfdom was the key target, as reformers had long urged: and even tsarist ministers now agreed that a more flexible labor force was needed. The system was abolished in 1861, but with payment requirements that continued to antagonize the peasantry; the regime was committed to defending the aristocracy, even amid change. Other reforms affected the legal system: punishment were scaled back and an independent judiciary established on a Western model (however, this independence was subsequently curtailed). Abolition of serfdom required major innovations in local government, since the aristocracy no longer controlled the peasantry directly. Local and provincial councils *(zemstvos)* were elected, with a weighted class voting system that gave disproportionate power to the aristocracy and wealthier townsmen. The councils exercised considerable power over taxation, public works, schools and medical care in their areas, providing some real political experience to new categories of Russians. Overall, the government also began to encourage school expansion, which however proceeded slowly, and sponsored major projects such as railroad development, including the ambitious trans-Siberian railway.   The economic minister began actively to promote industrialization, with considerable success.

After 1881 Most of the reforms were vigorously opposed by conservative factions, including the established bureaucracy which resented intrusions on its domains. Then in 1881 the anarchist assassination of the tsar brought the reform era to a halt. Police repression increased. The government pressed for replacement of regional languages with Russian, and tolerated violent attacks on groups such as the Jews. Zemstvo powers were curbed by the provision that any actions were subject to veto by the provincial, state-appointed governors. Support for industrialization continued, however, under the energetic Sergei Witte, who at one point served as prime minister. Russia's foreign policy woes

continued, despite successful alliances with France and ultimately Britain plus some territorial acquisitions at China's expense. The Russians lost a war against rising Japan, in 1905, which led to a significant revolution. Briefly, the tsar had to agree to an elected parliament (Duma) with legislative powers; however, he retained the power to dismiss the body, and within a few years the autocratic system was in effect reestablished. Russian dependence on foreign policy success, to compensate for the loss to Japan, led it to support Serbia (a fellow Slavic nation) in its nationalist dispute with the Habsburg empire in 1914, which in turn brought Russia into World War I.

Evaluation Clearly, under pressure, the Russian system was capable of some significant initiatives. However, it sought to avoid major changes at the top, ultimately even restricting concessions to local government; and it aligned itself solidly with the unpopular aristocracy. Most historians believe that its balancing act was doomed even before 1914, particularly when it pulled back from the political changes briefly induced by the 1905 Revolution while also failing to address the ongoing concerns of the peasantry. Heavy reliance on the secret police kept the lid on for a time, but the government could not rise above the additional pressure generated by the hardships of the world war.

Study questions

1. Why was Russia incapable of introducing a parliamentary monarchy?
2. What were the principal changes achieved during the reform decades?
3. To what extent did the government cause its own revolutionary demise?

Further reading

Hans Rogger, *Russia in the Age of Modernisation and Revolution, 1881-1917* (Routledge, 1983)

Alexander Pulanov, *Russia in the Nineteenth Century: autocracy, reform and social change, 1814-1914* (University of North Carolina Press, 2005)

Chapter 28: The Ottoman Empire

Overview Efforts by the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century deserve close comparison with patterns in Russia. Pressed by Russia as well as the West, the Ottomans actually began a long series of reform moves earlier than Russia did. And, as in Russia, some of the moves were significant. But the Ottomans were on the whole less successful in using the government to promote major change; most obviously, industrialization proved elusive. Like Russia, however, the Ottoman effort also came to a halt in favor of renewed autocracy, a move that began to fail even before the empire became involved in World War I. Here are two important cases, in sum, where government proved incapable of introducing the changes necessary to preserve the regime.

New challenges The first three decades of the 19th century brought a number of new crises, besides the increasingly unfavorable military balance with Russia. Serbian nationalists (inspired by French revolutionary principles) rebelled in 1804, and ultimately the Ottomans had to acknowledge an independent state. Greece rose up in 1820, and again won out with some support from the European powers. Egypt (already briefly conquered by the French in 1798) became increasingly independent, while the Wahabi Muslim kingdom (precursor of Saudi Arabia) seized territory to the south. The sultan still assumed his traditional powers, recurrently issuing edicts reminding his subjects of his compassion as a servant of God. But the traditional system was beginning to collapse amid the various pressures of new nationalism and religious diversity. In European circles, the fragile empire was increasingly referred to as the "sick man" of Europe.

Reforms The first moves, understandably, focused on modernizing the military. The old Janissary system of recruitment was abolished, in 1826, more modern forms of conscription introduced, while European advisors were brought in to help with training and restructuring. Then in 1839 the Tanzimat reform era began in earnest. The government reorganized the banking system. Support for traditional guilds gave way to promotion of new kinds of factories. New types of public works included building a telegraph network, and a new Ministry of Post was set up in 1840. The government established several new schools, including an unprecedented training program for female teachers. And an Academy of Sciences

was set up, in 1861. On the other hand, only .2% of public funds were being devoted to education in 1860, which suggested no real functional redefinition had occurred. A great deal of effort went into the law code and judicial system. Many laws and punishments were revised, along more Western norms. While religious matters were still referred to traditional courts, a new secular network was set up alongside this, open to subjects of any religion. The goal was to reduce religious distinctions and establish a common citizenry. Finally a new constitution was issued in the 1870s, creating a representative parliament for the first time. (No major social reforms were attempted, in contrast to Russia; for example, the situation of women was left essentially unchanged. It is also important to note that the Ottomans, unlike the Russians, were saddled with massive debts, and frequently subject to manipulation by Western banks.)

Retreat Reform efforts came to a screeching halt in 1878, though a few changes (particularly in law) persisted and would contribute to the much more ambitious reforms introduced in Turkey after 1923. As in Russia a few years later, conservative resistance, in this case including a sense by some Muslims that the state was failing its religious duties, plus the difficulty of abandoning autocratic power, led to a decisive end of the reform era in 1878. The new parliament stopped meeting after two years. The regime turned to a policy of repression, highlights by recurrent and brutal attacks on ethnic minorities such as Bulgarians and Armenians. As the situation deteriorated – with further Balkan territory lost, and a major defeat by Russia – a group of Turkish nationalists (Young Turks), backed by elements in the military took charge in 1908. The sultan was reduced to a figurehead in what was essentially a constitutional monarchy, but the new regime itself became entangled in additional military conflicts and ultimately decided to take the gamble of entering World War I on the side of Germany. In the wake of further military defeat the empire formally came to an end in 1923, and the Middle East was further fragmented. Here was a major case in which, among other things, the forces of nationalism undermined one of the classic multinational empires.

Study questions

1. What were the major reforms? How do they compare to Russia's reform efforts?
2. Why did the reform era end?
3. What was the role of nationalisms in undoing the Ottoman state?

Further reading

Caroline Finkel, *Osman's Dream: the story of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1923* (Basic Books, 2005)

Evgeny Finkel and Scott Gehlbach, *Reform and Rebellion in Weak States* (Cambridge University Press, 2020)

James Gelvin, *The Modern Middle East: a history* (2nd ed., Oxford University Press, 2008)

Chapter 29: China

Collapse China in the 19th century, particularly from the 1830s onward, provided an example of governmental collapse, overwhelmed by a variety of crises and unable to introduce significant reforms. The pattern is unexpected, given China's history of effective government, though of course there had been intervals previously as in the transitions from one dynasty to another. The range of problems in the 19th century was in some ways unprecedented. But the nation was also victim of the failure of some of the systems that had long supported effective rule, notably in the increasing rigidity and corruption of the Confucian bureaucracy. The result was, first, the ultimate collapse of the long tradition of imperial rule, as revolution began in 1911; and, second, the memory of a "century of humiliation" that continues to affect Chinese policy today.

Problems In 1839, after the government declined a British request to open the country to trade – including trade in opium, which the British sought to import from South Asia – a small Western force defeated the Chinese military, the first of several setbacks against Western attacks. As trade increased, not only in opium but in cheaper Western factory goods, China's balance of trade, favorable for many centuries, turned to deficits. At one point, a treaty, imposed by force, even required that the Chinese government translate all state documents into English. At the same time, massive population growth was

increasing rural poverty and land hunger, compounded by an unusual drought. Then in midcentury a massive, bloody rebellion took years to suppress, and then only with Western assistance.

Response At crucial points, the Chinese government was hampered by difficulties in imperial succession, as emperors-to-be had not yet reached adulthood. Confucian bureaucrats largely resisted major change, making China's efforts by far the feeblest of all the traditional states. The examination system, which had already deteriorated, was producing officials who looked to the past, their quality reduced also by frequent cheating.

Reforms In 1861, as a new emperor ascended the throne at the age of 5, a group of reformers did manage to gain control for a few years in what was called the Tongzhi Restoration. Diplomatic initiatives were concentrated into a single office for the first time. The army and navy modernized, with the importation of Western weapons and armaments factories. But these moves did not go very far, and they were predicated on the notion that they would suffice to preserve an otherwise unchanged Confucian regime. In the final decades of the century, Western nations and Russia seized large strips of territory, mainly in the form of long term leases; and China lost a humiliating war with Japan, ceding control over Korea. This led to a final reform effort in 1898, aiming at restructuring the bureaucracy, appointing new officials, and changing the education system. Bureaucratic opposition stalled further changes, and some reformers were executed. But a few reforms endured, and in 1905 the examination system was finally abolished, a huge move. Plans were underway to draft a constitution, and elections for provincial assemblies were held for the first time. In the meantime, however, a number of liberals, many educated abroad, pressed for more sweeping change. Then the death of the emperor and the succession of another minor, in 1908, set off a series of uprisings in 1911, affecting the majority of the provinces. Imperial rule was abolished in 1912, as China, now a republic, launched what would turn out to be over 30 years of struggle to determine the shape of a durable new regime.

Study questions

1. Why did China fail to introduce significant reforms during the 19th century?
2. Was China's "century of humiliation" due more to government failures or to external pressures?

Further reading

Robert Bickers, *The Scramble for China: foreign devils in the Qing Empire, 1832-1914* (Penguin, 2011)

Michael Gasster, *China's Struggle to Modernize* (2nd ed., Alfred Knopf, 1988)

Chapter 30: Japan

Special features Japan's response to the Western challenge, as it presented itself forcefully after 1853, was unusually successful, and government initiatives and internal reforms were at the heart of the response. The pattern may seem unexpected, particularly in its contrast to China. Japan, though more isolated, had the advantage of a past tradition of imitation (from China) that may have provided inspiration, including the realization that imitation did not have to mean loss of identity. The Tokugawa Shogunate, though not without problems by the early 19th century, was relatively stable, another contrast with China at that point. Further, Japanese contacts with Dutch traders expanded somewhat in the later 18th century, providing more knowledge of developments in European science. The Japanese government did not seek change, and it debated response for over a decade: but then it jumped in vigorously.

The spur In 1853 an American fleet landed in Tokyo Bay and demanded that the Japanese open their markets. This was followed by British and further American visits, and a few episodes of limited bombardment. The result was a fifteen year debate, and near civil war, between factions that hoped to maintain the status quo and those that argued that Japan must reform to deal more effectively with this new threat. The reformers won, and a new emperor in 1868, called Meiji, or the enlightened one, launched a period of rapid change that, fairly quickly, led to the early stages of Japanese industrialization. In essence, the government, aided by a some segments of the samurai class and a new group of entrepreneurs, took the lead in quietly revolutionizing Japanese society. (Note: the idea of government-

guided "revolutions from above" most clearly applies to 20th-century cases, such as Turkey, but it may fit the Japanese experience as well.)

Form of government For starters, the Meiji government abolished feudalism and other legal inequalities. The shogunate ended and was replaced with direct imperial rule – after centuries in which the emperor had been a shadowy religious figurehead. A new charter urged the formation of "deliberative assemblies" to allow expression of public opinion, while in principlel all positions now were open to talent ("the common people…shall be allowed to pursue his own calling"). A new council of state was established, along with a new system of local administration, and office holding was limited to four years. Many former officials, including nobles, were still utilized, but the government set up new prefectures to administer the nation's regions. Reform discussions continued into the 1870s, though there were also a number of popular protests that were put down with force; laws severely limited criticism of the government in the press and also popular gatherings (where police presence was required). An independent judiciary was established, and new regional assemblies established. Great debate occurred, at the ministerial level, as to which Western government model to follow. Initial partisans of the British or American models gradually lost ground, in favor of the more limited German approach to parliamentary democracy. Finally in 1889 a new constitution clearly established a mixed parliamentary and absolutist model. The emperor named the chief ministers, though the prime minister in fact had considerable authority. An imperial Diet included an elected house (with franchise limited by property qualifications, to about 1% of the total) and an upper house with a mixture of nobles and imperial appointees. Furthermore, control of the military was kept largely separate. Even with these limitations, however, political parties began to emerge, usually operating in a spirit of compromise.

Functions From the outset the new state paid great attention to taxation, with a number of administrative reforms. The needs of an expanding government (most particularly, the growing navy) required additional measures, and in 1889 the Japanese enacted an income tax – one of the first in the world not as a temporary wartime measure. This began to replace primary dependence on taxes on land and liquor. A host of legal changes were introduced. In family law, concubinage was outlawed. In 1872 the government decreed adoption of the Western clock – a huge change in popular habits that was quickly carried through. Public health measures expanded, quickly resulting in population growth. In 1872 the government decreed compulsory primary education for both boys and girls. A centralized national system was sketched, with 250 regional districts. Full implementation was delayed by resource constraints and some popular resistance, plus a shortage of qualified teachers, but by the 1890s most children were in fact attending government schools; literacy increased rapidly. The government also set up a number of new secondary schools and universities, from which most of the expanding bureaucracy were recruited. Rigorous examinations (and some fees) were required for university entrance, but graduates could be assured of solid government jobs. Finally, the government moved actively to promote economic growth. It rapidly created a railroad network, and set up a number of model factories, particularly in armaments and heavy industry; Japanese industrialization proceeded with a mixture of state and private initiative. Along with all this, the military was expanded and modernized, and the size of the bureaucracy grew steadily. A real functional transformation occurred, in the space of just a few decades.

Nationalism and religion Complementing these rapid changes was a distinctive mix of nationalism, emperor worship, and religion. During the 1870s a number of European and American advisors were employed to help guide the new school system, but at the end of the decade the government shifted gears, emphasizing the importance of community and national loyalty in the schools. Western materials on civics and ethics were replaced. Even in the 1870s the government backed a new effort to promote the Shinto religion, and this initiative expanded steadily. Emperor worship became a key part of state dogma, and Japanese history was massaged to suggest that this emphasis dated back to the nation's origins. Promotion of a rather traditional family structure, with women enjoined to serve as "wise mothers", complemented this ideological approach. Obviously, the Japanese were creating a distinctive combination of an effective modern state with a special kind of nationalist ideology.

Foreign policy These various changes were accompanied by another innovation – an activist, aggressive foreign policy, imitating contemporary patterns in Western Europe. Successful wars against China and then Russia gave Japan the beginnings of an empire, particularly through control over the Korean peninsula; and further appetites were directed toward China.

Study questions

1. Why did Japanese authorities place such emphasis on emperor worship and Shintoism?
2. What kinds of compromise were reflected in the structure of the state, by 1890?
3. What were the main functional changes for the government?
4. Was this a "revolution from above", orchestrated by the Meiji state?

Further reading

Donald Keene, *Emperor of Japan: Meiji and his world, 1852-1912* (Columbia University Press, 2002)

W.J. Macpherson, *The Economic Development of Japan, 1868-1941* (Cambridge University Press, 1995)

Rotern Kowner, *The Impact of the Russo-Japanese War* (Taylor and Francis, 2009)

Chapter 31: The Contemporary State: developments in the past century

Overview In many ways, the world history of government since about 1914 emphasizes the growing conversion to the general industrial features that had been taking shape earlier (particularly in the West and Japan), now simply applying to a larger number of regions, and with greater intensity. More and more governments began actively striving for industrialization, and introducing many of the reforms needed toward this end. Thus the Turkish state, under new nationalist leadership, managed a host of changes that the Ottoman Empire had simply failed to consider seriously. Further advances in relevant technology – for example, the introduction of radios and telephones, both speeding communication among various levels of government and allowing new forms of contact between state and citizens – worked toward the same end. However, the past century also ushered in a number of additional factors that must be considered along with the industrialization of the state.

Revolutions The 20th and early 21st centuries have experienced an important new round of revolutions. In contrast to the earlier Atlantic revolutions, these did not feature liberal goals so prominently (some exceptions for the Mexican revolution and the Arab spring). Rather, they placed greater emphasis on the importance of the state not just to assure the revolution, but to remake society in a number of fundamental respects. This statement applies both to Marxist risings, the most common kind, and to Iran's Islamic revolution. In other words, contemporary revolutions have not only changed the state, they have tended to expand its functions.

Monarchy and its alternatives A combination of revolutions and defeats in war have devastated monarchy as a form of government, beyond figurehead level. This process began in the 19th century, but now has become virtually universal. Emperors yielded in the wake of World War I and II defeats. This eclipse has widened the global debate over what form of government should replace monarchy. Democracy was a popular option briefly after World War I, somewhat more durably after World War II (Japan, Italy, Germany, India), and then in the major wave from the 1970s onward (the whole of the European Union; most of Latin America; key parts of Southeast Asia; a number of African countries including post-apartheid South Africa; and then much of the former Soviet Union). However, various kinds of authoritarianism have also been a popular option (particularly in the 1930s; in the wake of postwar decolonization; and again during the second decade of the 21st century). Tensions and alternations between these government forms play a vital and ongoing role in contemporary political history.

Total war The two world wars have often been called "total wars "—really the first in human history. That is, they involved government mobilization of most sectors of society. Consumer choices yielded to government rationing. Labor was commandeered, with new government cooptation of unions. Business decisions were at least partly supplanted by government mandates; some key services were nationalized, at least temporarily. Also under government auspices, new planning occurred concerning postwar welfare measures and race relations (this was truer in the second world war than in the first). From the government also came a barrage of nationalist propaganda, painting the enemy in the harshest terms. And finally, police powers were extended, with many freedoms at least temporarily suppressed. Total war clearly demonstrated the kind of organizational capacity the industrial state now possessed. And some of these models persisted outside of war itself – thus Lenin notoriously admired Germany's World War I measures and sought to incorporate some of them in his revolutionary Russian state. Fascist leaders did

the same. The United States would adopt some partial "total war" measures in response to the Cold War and then terrorism. Here was another new ingredient in the nature of the contemporary state.

Decolonizaton One of the most important shifts in the 20th century political framework involved the replacement of imperialism with decolonization. A few hints of this occurred after World War I. While European holdings expanded in the Middle East, they were now technically provisional mandates. Not colonies. A few imperialist giants made some moves toward liberation, as the British did with Egypt and the American promised for the Philippines. But for the most part the interwar period features more confrontations between imperialists and nationalist forces. After World War II, however, the situation changed quickly, with independence for South and Southeast Asia and the Middle East coming fairly quickly and then Africa from the late 1950s to the 1990s. Some important colonies remain, as in Oceania and the Caribbean, though in some cases with apparent popular acquiescence. And semi-imperialist interventions have continued periodically, as in the Middle East and West Africa.   But the number of new nations has soared massively, with a number of familiar opportunities and problems attached. Here is a huge change in the framework for contemporary government.

Globalization Political globalization began in the later 19th century, with the variety of international conventions dealing with the treatment of prisoners of war, postal service, patent protection and the like. This trend continued after World War I. While the League of Nations managed no real constraints on government foreign policies, individual agencies, like the International Labor Office, did work for new agreements in key areas of social policy. However, disarmament conferences really did influence naval policies. Several historians point to the Kellogg-Briand pact of 1928, outlawing war, as a milestone in international law: obviously it has no effect on policies leading up to World War II, but it may have become more influential in recent decades in dramatically curtailing aggressive war and territorial acquisition. More obviously, global political developments after World War II became an important element in the conduct of individual governments, without of course displacing national sovereignty. Thus public health agencies interact seriously with the World Health Organization. Governments collaborate in designation world historical sites. By the 21st century government begin to shape some policies around global environmental agreements, though this is at best a work in progress. United Nations human rights declarations are routinely incorporated into national constitutions, and sometimes have real effect. All of this is complemented by other aspects of global governance. The rise of International Non-governmental organizations like Amnesty International (1961) or Greenpeace put real pressure on government policies concerning the treatment of political prisoners or labor abuses. Finally, other agencies such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank profoundly influence national economic policies, particularly among some of the less developed nations. The General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT, 1947ff) and then the World Trade Organization (1995) seriously condition national economic policies. And major regional agreements, most notably the European Union, also modify national sovereignty. Political globalization is also contested: many nations seek to block the INGOs, several refuse to sign international agreements (the United States is notorious in this regard, the only country not to sign the convention on the rights of the child for example). Nevertheless, globalization becomes a serious new factor in characterizing contemporary governance.

Study questions

1. What does "total war" mean and how does it affect government even beyond wartime?
2. Why has the 20th-21st century period seen so many changes in government forms around the world?
3. How can globalization be factored into the political history of the past century? Is it a serious factor, or mainly window-dressing?

Further reading

Raymond Aron, *Century of Total War* (Praeger, 1981)

Peter N. Stearns, *Globalization in World History* (3rd ed., Routledge, 2019)

Raymond F. Betts, *Decolonisation* (2nd ed., Routledge, 2004)

Chapter 32: Western Europe and the United States

Interwar crisis Most Western governments performed badly between the wars. They did not handle the economic Depression constructively, and they failed to respond to the growing threat posed by Nazi Germany. Several factors were involved. World War I had created massive economic problems, and it also killed many potential young leaders; fatalities were highest in the rank of lieutenant. Many governments became more defensive, as in the United States which retreated to isolationism. Many government officials lacked adequate training in economics. Further, particularly in the 1930s, increased partisanship paralyzed decision-making. Centrist political parties declined, and at the extremes communist and far right parties added to confusion. All of this complicated responses to the Depression, which often centered on government retrenchment and new tariffs barriers, both counterproductive. Aggressive acts by Nazi Germany drew no vigorous reply, only a futile hope for compromise. Some exceptions involved Scandinavia and the United States, where governments did begin to expand welfare protections and other economic efforts to deal with some effects of the Depression. Overall, however, it would take World War II to galvanize Western governments into more constructive action.

Fascism From key parts of the West came the experiment with fascist governments, first in Italy, then Germany and to an extent Spain. Fascism involved a vigorous renunciation of the premises of liberal government. Instead, the state and its leader were to become to sole focus for popular loyalty, and the source of most policy direction. As Benito Mussolini put it, "Everything within the state, nothing outside the state, nothing against the state." Fascist governments practiced what the Nazis called *Gleichschaltung,* or leveling, subjecting virtually all institutions to state control – particularly, political parties and trade unions. School curricula were revamped to emphasize loyalty and nationalism, and youth groups provided additional guidance. Some church activities were limited. Political police intimidated potential opposition, and many protest leaders were imprisoned or worse. At the same time, the state maintained constant propaganda, using radio, films and mass meetings, railing against potential enemies. (Fascism depended on a variety of new technologies, particularly in media.) Voting occurred, but only for official political parties. Government intervention in the economy increased, for example in the automobile industry, and increased armaments production added in. Governments also began to organize mass leisure for workers, building cheap resort buildings for example on the Baltic coast. And of course in Germany the government began to organize systematic oppression, and ultimately extermination, of the Jews. This kind of government has been called totalitarian because of the effort at total state control. The term is no longer current, partly because it became part of dbious Cold War rhetoric, partly because we increasingly know that even the fascist states did not try for total control. They were cautious, for example, with the Catholic Church, and gave considerable latitude to big business and the landed aristocracy. Still, this was a distinctive innovation in the history of government, largely defanged by the losses of World War II but with some potential legacy later on.

Postwar Western governments: form Throughout the West after World War II, parliamentary democracies were revived or restored. This trend included Germany and Italy, now reconstituted under allied supervision. It would later spread to Spain, Portugal and Greece, giving the West the most homogeneous political structures arguably since the Middle Ages. Differences remained in particulars: France, for example, was far more centralized than federal Germany or the United States.

Postwar functions Here the big development was the emergence of the full welfare state, with governments providing an increasingly elaborate safety net with protections for the elderly, the unemployed, the ill; state-run medical systems or medical insurance became the norm except in the United States. Family protections increasingly included provision of day care centers, legislation providing periods of parental leave, and direct payments to families with young children. Government sponsored housing programs expanded, a major feature in Britain. Economic intervention increased, including reliance on trained economists (as in the United States with the establishment of the Council of Economic Advisors). Many states launched formal economic planning; many took over sectors such as railways and mines. State-run universities expanded, giving qualified students considerable support. These developments depended on increased taxation, including new devices such as value-added taxes. Bureaucracies expanded, and many governments were increasingly operated by highly specialized officials called technocrats. These developments provoked some pushback, and in the United States the full welfare/planning state apparatus did not emerge at all. By the 1980s as economic growth slowed,

some states cut back a bit on welfare arrangements (this was most notably true in Britain, where free university tuition for example was replaced by considerable fees). But in most cases the basic apparatus held up, and often seemed to contribute to considerable popular wellbeing.

Foreign and military policy Headed by leaders in countries like France, postwar European states made a concerted effort to correct the tensions that had led to two world wars. The big effort centered on constructing systems of economic coordination that would reduce nationalist impulses and anchor Germany in a European concert. The result was a series of moves ultimately yielding the European Union, embracing most European countries and providing policy coordination not only in economic matters, but in free movement of labor and even (for some members) a common currency. The Union developed its own technocratic bureaucracy, centered in Brussels, issuing regulations in a variety of domains. European states also, in some cases reluctantly, abandoned most of their colonial holdings and, particularly after the Cold War, dramatically reduced military expenditures, often to well below 2% of Gross National Product. Leaders boasted that they were creating a new kind of civilian state, focused on domestic prosperity. In this regard the United States was quite different. It participated actively in helping to create new international agencies after World War II, abandoning isolationism. It encouraged greater European unity. But, pressed by the Cold War (which its leaders may have exaggerated), it became increasingly militaristic, with high levels of military expenditure, recurrent weapons innovation, and frequent participation in war. For better or worse, these policies helped excuse European allies from comparable military commitments, an odd and possibly precarious balance.

Environmental policy By the 21st century many Western governments were beginning, though hesitantly, to add a new function: intervention toward environmental protection. (Sweden was the first country to call for international action in this area, in the 1970s). To some extent this extended earlier responsibilities, for example in maintaining parks and developing public works. But it also involved new forms of regulation, as in rules regulating automobile fuel emissions and even projecting a complete end to gasoline-powered vehicles by some future date. Individual governments, as in Holland, were also developing new approaches to managing the impact of rising ocean levels. Here, clearly, was an important if uncertain new frontier for governments.

Study questions

1. What were the major innovations of the fascist state?
2. What were the main symptoms of government failure in the interwar West?
3. What were the principal innovations in the Western state after the war?
4. What were the main differences between Europe and the United States in postwar government policy?

Further reading

Sheila Fitzpatrick and Michael Geyer, eds., *Beyond Totalitarianism: Stalinism and Nazism compared* (Cambridge University Press, 2008)

Robert Paxton and Judith Hessler, *Europe in the Twentieth Century* (5th ed., Wadsworth/Cengage, 2011)

Francis G. Castles et. al., *The Oxford Handbook of the Welfare State* (Oxford University Press, 2010)

Chapter 33: Soviet Union, and Russia/ Eastern Europe

Revolution and early steps The Russian Revolution of 1917 ended the tsarist regime for good, another huge move in the establishment of new republics. Despite a period of civil war as the revolutionary government consolidated, the new regime took quick steps to expand government functions in several ways. New clinics provided medical care, especially for pregnant women and children, as the state began to take new responsibility for health. School systems expanded at all levels, as the government aimed for universal educational requirements. True to communist principles, the state also seized businesses and private property, aiming at government direction of the economy. Faced with resistance, the regime stepped back, and in the New Economic Policy provided greater leeway for some private enterprise. Vigorous discussion occurred also about changes in law, including immediate provisions for gender

equality and greater access to divorce. Finally, older personnel were replaced by new communist loyalists, some from worker or peasant backgrounds. Throughout the Soviet period, many people of humble origin managed to rise to positions of political power – including the last major leader, Mikhail Gorbachev.

The Soviet regime: form of government The constitution of 1924 set up in principle of federation of republics, designed to represent the major regions and nationalities. Beneath them were local soviets based in towns, villages and factories. Each constituent republic sent representatives to the All-Union Congress of Soviets, in theory the sovereign legislative body. It was however dominated by the Communist party, which in turn received its direction from the central Politburo in Moscow (restored as capitol city). The 1936 constitution replaced the Congress with the Supreme Soviet. It also established an array of human rights and democratic procedures in principle, including regular national elections based on full universal suffrage. Rights included a variety of social measures such as care in old age, housing and cultural benefits – not included in the standard Western rights category – along with proclamations of freedom for religion and press. In practice the regime tightened Party control and that of its General Secretary, Josef Stalin. As to standard freedoms, Soviet law stipulated that "before these freedoms can be exercised, any approved writing or assembly must be approved by a censor or licensing bureau" – to assure ideological leadership. The constitution was widely cited in propaganda as a pinnacle of democracy. In its later stages, after Stalin's death in 1953, the Soviet system was also noteworthy for negotiations and disputes within the Politburo around selection of sometimes rather lackluster successors, a weak point of the system particularly by the 1970s.

Functions Under Stalin, from the late 1930s onward the state seized control of the entire economy. It issued detailed Five-Year plans, focused primarily on advancing industrial growth, which did indeed proceed rapidly. The state directed factories, setting production quotas. It ran the major department store chain. It seized the land from peasant proprietors, establishing collective farms again under Party direction and with production goals; this measure required brutal suppression of peasant resistance. The Party also regulated cultural life, producing many public monuments and supporting a new Socialist Realist style that glorified workers and peasants. More modern artistic styles were outlawed as Western and decadent. Although scientists received many benefits, they too were regulated for orthodoxy. In schools, workshops and propaganda the regime worked to reduce religious adherence, though it was somewhat cautious in dealing with the Muslim minority. As in Nazi Germany the government also arranged vacations spots for workers, particularly along the Black Sea coast. The overall result was probably as total a state as had yet been constructed.

Repression Along with masses of positive propaganda and injunctions against enemies of the state, the communist system revived and greatly expanded the tsarist network of secret police. Police informants were even stationed in hotels to monitor visitors; foreigners were carefully accompanied by official guides. The regime made wide use of Siberian prison camps for political dissidents. And it executed large numbers or real or imagined opponents outright, particularly under Stalin, who conducted a number of purges even within the Party, often after elaborate forced public professions of guilt. After Stalin's death the system loosened somewhat, with fewer executions but more confinements to psychiatric hospitals.

Foreign policy Policy in the 1920s and 1930s was somewhat circumspect, though the regime harbored major grievances about East European territories that had been lost in the postwar settlement. Eager to oppose Nazi Germany, which had vowed eastward expansion, the Soviets tried to win Western cooperation in the 1930s but finally gave up and formed a brief alliance with Hitler, hoping to regain territory in Poland and elsewhere, only later to engage in the major national struggle of World War II. Postwar, the Soviets set up a buffer zone of controlled communist states in Eastern Europe, most of whom adopted government structures and policies similar to those of the USSR. (Between the wars, most East European nations, in a roster of newly-independent states, had fallen back to conservative authoritarian regimes after brief experiments with parliamentary democracy.) Cold War conflict with the United States brought massive investment in new weaponry, including a new space program, as well as ambitious diplomatic initiatives in other parts of the world. Often accused of aggressive tendencies, the regime was actually fairly cautious, engaging only in one (abortive) military effort in Afghanistan. However, it did intervene forcefully to retain its hold in Eastern Europe, putting down several protest movements in Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

Collapse Despite huge successes in industrialization and in improving public health and educational levels, the regime was in trouble by the mid-1980s. Military expenditures were an inordinate burden in a still-industrializing economy. Bureaucratic control limited economic initiative, and production quotas led to no small about of deceptive reporting. Hoping to shake things up a new General Secretary in 1985, Mikhail Gorbachev, sought to allow somewhat greater political openness and freedom, while decentralizing economic decision making. New armaments agreements with the United States reduced Cold War tensions. But the new measures overall simply opened the door to new protests, particularly in the East European states which began, in 1989, to declare independence – with no Soviet response. A military coup against Gorbachev failed, but he resigned in 1991 and the Soviet Union itself broke up.

Post-Cold War Eastern Europe Most of the new or newly-freed East European states became parliamentary democracies, and many ultimately joined the European Union. Only Belarus held out under "Europe's last dictator". However, by the second decade of the 21st century some East European states – most notably, Hungary and Poland – demonstrated more autocratic tendencies, reducing freedom of the press and judiciary, commandeering the major media, and limiting political protest. Opposition to immigration and to gay rights, along with greater support for religion, marked the new approach – making the region something of a political question mark. In the Balkans, the collapse of another communist regime led to a number of small new states and considerable military and ethnic conflict in the 1990s, still not fully resolved in the early decades of the 21st century.

Post-communist Russia Reduced in territory and resentful of its lost power, Russia suffered through considerable economic hardship and political uncertainty in the 1990s, as it established, technically, a democratic system with competing political parties. Many state businesses were sold off, creating however a new economic oligarchy. Under a new president, Vladimir Putin, from 1999 onward the regime became steadily more authoritarian while technically preserving democratic forms – one of the great examples of what seemed to be a new style of elected authoritarians capable of generating considerable public support. Control over the major media and use of the secret police were combined with attacks on political opponents, with many jailed or murdered. No longer communist, the regime touted its role as a bastion of Christian conservatism, supporting the Orthodox Church, limiting gay rights, supporting a conservative family structure with new laws making protest against domestic abuse more difficult. Military spending went up (at the expense of pledges toward economic development), and the regime began engaging in new (often highly popular) foreign policy ventures – particularly in the Middle East – while also seizing the Crimea from Ukraine. Not a few observers were remined of elements of the pre-Soviet Russian political tradition.

Study questions

1. What were the main functions of the Soviet state?
2. What were the main accomplishments of the Soviet system? What were the principal weaknesses?
3. What have been the main features of East European (including Russian) states since the fall of communism?

Further reading

Joseph Rothschild and Nancy Wingfield, *Return to Diversity: a political history of Eastern Europe since World War II* (4th ed., Oxford University Press, 2007)

Ted Grant, *Russia, from revolution to counterrevolution* (Well Read Publications, 1997)

Robert Service, *History of Twentieth-Century Russia* (2nd ed., Harvard University Press, 2001)

Chapter 34: Latin America

Overview Generalizations about political patterns in recent Latin American history are quite difficult; different countries have had different experiences. On the whole the first half of the 20th century tended to highlight authoritarian rule, often populist in tone, though there were major exceptions. Since the 1970s more democratic, parliamentary forms have prevailed, though again with exceptions. Through the century

Latin American governments (under various regimes) tended to expand their functions, particularly in adding new welfare efforts and greater involvement in economic development. Despite the frequent importance of the military in politics, aggressive policies were rare, and a number of regional trade and human rights agreements emerged from the interwar period onward. United States interference in Latin America was an important political constraint, involving direct intervention against a number of leftist governments.

Particular episodes A number of small revolutions occurred, in a variety of Latin American countries (Brazil, the Andes). The Mexican revolution of 1910 was a particularly important rising, featuring liberal protests against a longstanding authoritarian regime along with considerable peasant and urban worker unrest. By 1917, a partial compromise was reached with reduction of the power of the Church and partial but not nationwide land reforms. In 1920 a single political party, the National Revolutionary Party, gained control: independent political activity was repressed, but a single six-year term limit on the president avoided the drawbacks of more traditional one-man rule. The new regime highlighted popular culture, including indigenous culture. The revolution had some influence on political movements in other Latin American countries. The Cuban revolution in the late 1950s, again against a dictator, ultimately led to a communist regime that emphasized education and public health advance, across racial lines, while repressing political dissent. Some linkage developed with Marxist protest efforts in the Andes region and later in Venezuela. A somewhat different transformation occurred in Costa Rica in 1948. After a brief civil war the government abolished the military and declared a policy of peace. This led to decades of stable civilian rule and a leading role in global human rights discussions, along with considerable economic development.

Major populist regimes A number of Latin American countries expanded their manhood suffrage in the period between the wars, though property or literacy requirements remained in some cases, and there was a certain amount of oscillation. Several stable parliamentary governments emerged, for example in Uruguay. But there was a strong tendency to form authoritarian, populist regimes, often after a period of instability or radical protest. In Brazil Getulio Vargas served as president for most of the period 1930-1951, seizing power as a provisional president and then holding on either through elections or simple assertion of authority. Opponents were handled through a mixture of negotiation and imprisonments. Under Vargas a host of new social measures included child labor laws, pension support for the elderly plus disability insurance, and regulations on workers' vacations –all giving him a reputation as the "father of the poor". The state began to take a more active economic role, supporting coffee prices and agricultural diversification; introducing a policy of "import substitution", where tariffs protected local manufacturing operations; and promoting a major steel industry. In Argentina Juan Peron, an army officer, held power frequently in the 1940s and 1950s, sometimes by fiat, sometimes through popular election. Here too, new measures sought to tackle poverty and protect workers, while opponents were violently suppressed amid severe limits on freedom of expression Several industries were nationalized, and the regime also sought to update the nation's infrastructure. At the same time the Peronist political movement (which would outlast Peron himself) took on some fascist trappings.

Democratization From the 1970s through the 1990s, the vast majority of Latin American countries became multi-party democracies, in many cases replacing previous military regimes. Mexico abandoned its one-party system in the 1990s. Support from the European Union and the United States contributed to the trend, which was also based on a belief that liberal regimes would promote economic growth. Several governments experimented with Truth and Reconciliation commissions, to call earlier regimes to account and promote national healing. On the whole the liberal-democratic trend continued into the 21st century, but more authoritarian regimes returned in a few cases, most notably Venezuela. And governments in some parts of Central America experienced new problems in controlling criminal gangs and cartels, many associated with drug trafficking. The overall political influence of the Church continued to decline – a few nations even legalized abortion, despite Catholic opposition; and a more socially-conscious movement emerged within the Church itself. State-run education systems brought nearly universal literacy, while governments successfully sponsored other movements, for example to promote birth control.

Women's political role Postwar Latin American government also began to include strong participation by women. A few countries had granted women's suffrage between the wars, as with Ecuador in 1929, but now it became standard. Several countries, including Mexico, added provisions requiring that a certain

proportion of elected officials be female. A number of women gained top political office (Chile, Nicaragua, Brazil, Argentina). Even more impressive was the high rate of officeholding in legislatures and local governments. By the 21st century women were holding over a quarter of all political positions, well above the global average and easily surpassing levels in the United States.

Study questions

1. What were the characteristics of populist authoritarian regimes.
2. How did the Mexican revolution compare to revolutions in China and Russia in the same period?
3. What were the main functions of the Latin American state in the 20th century?

Further reading

Thomas Skidmore, Peter Smith and James Green, *Modern Latin America* (8th ed., Oxford University Press, 2013)

Peter Winn, *Americas: the changing face of Latin America and the Caribbean* (3rd ed., Pantheon. 2006)

Kurt Weyland, Raul Madrid and Wendy Hunter, eds., *Leftist Governments in Latin America: successes and shortcomings* (Cambridge University Press, 2011)

Chapter 35: Sub-Saharan Africa

Independent states Independence came to subSaharan African nations in various ways from the 1950s onward, though active nationalist agitation was always involved. Many colonies saw nationalist leaders arrested in the years following World War II, only to emerge as heads of new states as decolonization took hold. A few bitter struggles were involved, particularly in southern Africa where White settler minorities tried to retain power. On independence, most new nations issued constitutions assuring elections and a variety of human rights. However, these systems usually crumbled fairly quickly in favor of one-man, one party, or military rule. For the new governments faced a variety of severe problems. Economies were not robust, and Western economic interests continued to wield great power (though some nations, in policies known as "indigenization", tried to promote local ownership); many countries, trying to advance industry, neglected the larger agricultural sector. National boundaries had been defined by imperialists, not by historical communities; a number of countries, such as Nigeria, faced break-way civil war, put down only with difficulty. Many of the new nations also had few leaders with extensive political experience. Hence the tendency to assert more authoritarian control, sometimes with dictators who clung to power for decades. In the 21st century Islamic terrorist groups posed a problem in parts of West and East Africa.

Democratization By the 1990s, a number of key countries moved toward greater democracy, allowing some competitive elections and even transfers of power. Western influence played a role here. So did United Nations human rights campaigns, for example in the area of women's rights, which sometimes elicited more liberal government policies. Nigeria and Kenya were two countries where democracy took greater hold. Some countries, like Liberia (which chose the region's first female president) even recovered from a period of civil war to establish an elected government. Transformation was particularly dramatic in South Africa. A long period of deeply repressive White minority rule, from the 1920s to the 1990s, yielded to a peaceful transition and the election of Nelson Mandela as first democratic president. The nation proclaimed a "rainbow coalition" in an effort to encourage new racial harmony. With all this, however, the subcontinent remained divided; many countries had "elected" presidents who held on for one term after another, despite constitutions that stipulated term limits. Repression of opposition candidates and rigged elections were common.

Truth and reconciliation Though the concept had been pioneered in Latin America (though some claim it was actually first attempted in Uganda in the 1970S), several African nations followed periods of conflict with "truth and reconciliation" commissions, in which representatives of past regimes could admit their misdeeds, clearing the air, often without subsequent punishment, while previous victims could reclaim some dignity. South Africa under Mandela provided the most striking example, after the racist repression of the White minority, but Rwanda undertook a similar effort after a brutal genocide episode in the 1990s.

Failed states At various points, and well into the 21st century, some African nations became what began to be called failed states. The problem occurred in some other regions, but was most pronounced in parts of Africa. Essentially, because of economic weakness, frequently compounded by droughts and famines, but above all because of bitter civil strife, central governments ceased to exercise any real power. Their military and police power was matched or surpassed by factional forces. A host of services, including public health, essentially collapsed. In the worst cases, turmoil was so severe that even international humanitarian agencies had to abandon their efforts. Refugees fled into neighboring countries and beyond. The failed state was not a new problem in history – parts of Western Europe after the fall of the Roman empire showed similar symptoms – but it was striking in an age in which, generally, governments were taking on a central social as well as political role.

Coordination Soon after decolonization began, many new nations began to collaborate toward promoting democracy and human rights. The Organization of African Unity formed in 1963, with a grandiose goal of "eradicating imperialism and colonialism from the continent". The institution transformed in 2001, as the African Union, with a sharper focus on the promotion of democracy. In both its manifestations the organization helped arrange, often in cooperation with the United Nations, a number of policing efforts to try to promote stability in member nations after internal civil wars.

Functions Not surprisingly, African nations generated no major functional innovations in the decades after independence. Efforts focused on public health, the judiciary, public works and military defense. Few countries undertook significant external aggression, though there a few areas of inter-state conflict. South Africa, notably, after apartheid, drastically scaled back its military forces and became the only country in the world to abandon nuclear weaponry once achieved. Several governments experimented with land reform, a delicate issue in southern Africa given extensive White ownership. A number of governments managed considerable success in expanding school systems and also promoting birth control (often in tandem with efforts to combat the AIDs epidemic) – Kenya was a prime example.

Study questions

1. What were some of the principal "new nations" problems in many new African countries?
2. What is a failed state?
3. What were some of the leading successes of key African governments?

Further reading

Frederick Cooper, *Africa since 1940: the past of the present* (Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Ali Mazrui and Michael Tidy, *Nationalism and New States in Africa from about 1935 to the present* (Heinemann, 1984)

Robert Rotberg, *When States Fail: causes and consequences* (Princeton University Press, 2004)

Chapter 36: The Middle East/North Africa and Central Asia

Overview The various countries in this region had diverse political experiences in the century after World War I. A fairly consistent thread, though with important exceptions, was the absence of commitment to multi-party democracy. Key parts of the region were held as European mandate territories after the war, with boundaries that were arbitrarily determined between the British and French without great regard for political viability – an ongoing problem. Full decolonization was completed after World War II, though in the case of Algeria only after bitter struggle. Political patterns in the region were also strongly affected by outside interference, drawn by the importance of oil and more general Cold War, or post-Cold War, rivalries. Finally, a number of major internal wars affected key parts of the region: several wars pitted the new nation of Israel against neighboring Arab states; a major conflict in the 1970s involved Iran and Iraq; after 2014 Saudi Arabia and Iran conducted a brutal proxy war in Yemen. Generally, nations in the region maintained unusually high military budgets, urged on by arms exporters in the United States, Russia and elsewhere.

Forms of government This was the only large region where monarchy persisted strongly, and in some cases, as with Jordan, the monarchies themselves were new. Saudi Arabia, the Arab Emirates and other

Gulf nations, and Morocco were the key cases in point. Egypt however cast off a rather weak monarch in the 1950s, and earlier the collapse of the Ottoman Empire completed the end of hereditary rule in Turkey. The new nation of Israel committed to democracy quickly after World War II, but amid huge complications concerning the political rights of many Palestinians; Turkey, authoritarian between the wars, gradually moved toward greater democracy. The Arab Spring risings in 2010 aimed at greater democracy and commitments to human rights, but they quickly failed except in Tunisia. During most of the period most countries in the region were ruled by an authoritarian strongman and/or a single party; this was the form of government reestablished in Egypt after the Arab spring, and preserved amid bitter civil war in Syria. In Iran, ruled by a monarch during much of the 20th century, the 1979 revolution established an authoritarian theocracy but with somewhat competitive elections for officials operating under the supervision of the leading Ayatollah. In the central Asian nations that gained independence with the 1991 collapse of the Soviet Union, authoritarian regimes emerged quickly, often in continuing cooperation with Russia. Finally, internal strife and outside interference combined in the 21st century to create essentially failed states in Lebanon, Yemen and Libya.

Religion   Religion and religious strife continued to play an outsize role in many of the region's governments. This was a key theme in the unusual Iranian revolution of 1979, where opposition to a failing autocrat initially included liberal and Marxist elements that were simply overwhelmed by Islamic conservatives. The regime would go on to enforce a moderately strict version of Islamic law, for example in matters of women's dress. The Saudi Arabian government continued to sponsor a religious police, regulating dress and habits and severely limiting entertainment options; this approach began to ease slightly in the second decade of the 21st century. Saudi officials also underwrote Islamic initiatives in other countries, in the region and also in South Asia. Over time Israel, initially rather secular, committed increasingly to Judaism. Lebanon was bitterly divided among Christians and Sunni and Shiite Muslims. Iran after the revolution supported Shiite movements in a number of countries, including Lebanon and Yemen. In contrast, in several countries authoritarian leaders worked to control Islamic political movements, often providing important protections for religious minorities: this was true in Iraq before the 2003 American invasion, where a Sunni leader presided over a majority Shiite nation; in Egypt; and in Syria. Here the religious thrust was an important factor as an opposition movement – as with the Muslim Brotherhood, established In Egypt in 1928. Finally amid the chaos of American invasion of Iraq plus civil war in Syria, the so-called Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) emerged in 2014, briefly ruling a considerable stretch of territory and subjecting it to a particular version of Islamic law, with great cruelty to many women and religious minorities. Movements of this sort also sponsored recurrent terrorism in the region and beyond.

Important markers Western powers had planned to carve up Turkey after World War I along with the rest of the defunct Ottoman Empire, but this was thwarted by a powerful Turkish military movement under Mustafa Kemal (Ataturk). Turkish majority rule was established, amid some bitter strife with Greek and other minorities and considerable forced population relocation. Ataturk then proceeded to set up a strong authoritarian government bent on "revolution from above". Under government leadership, a secular school system expanded rapidly; the Turkish language was shifted to a Latin alphabet; decrees altered styles of dress, with men required to wear Western-style hats; and the state sponsored a number of new factories while setting tariffs to protect national industry. Ataturk set up a parliament and introduced women's suffrage, in 1927, but a single People's Party effectively excluded any opposition. Islamic influence was curtailed, though not suppressed. Over time, Turkey would evolve toward greater political openness, with competitive elections in the later 20th century alternating with periods of secular military rule; but in the 21st century Islamic influence began to increase and a new leader introduced more authoritarian measures – one of several examples of this trend in the world at large. Other major developments in the region included the "Suez crisis" of 1956: a new regime in Egypt seized control of the Suez Canal from British and French authorities and, with backing from the United States and the Soviet Union, held off a threat of attack. Egyptian management of the Canal proved quite successful from that point onward. Another important milestone involved the creation of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting States (OPEC) in 1960. During the first half of the twentieth century, the region's oil resources had been dominated by Western companies. New or stronger national governments after World War II managed to wrest control away from foreign ownership; oil revenues began to flow back into the region, with huge results in places like Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states. The formation of OPEC (predominantly

though not exclusively Middle Eastern) introduced greater ability to manage supply and pricing. Governments in oil-rich countries began to utilize oil revenues to expand urban development and create new universities, along with a great deal of personal enrichment for the upper class.

Study questions

1. What factors contributed to the pervasiveness of authoritarianism in the Middle East and North Africa?
2. What was the role of Islamic movements in the politics of the region?
3. How did Ataturk's Turkey represent a revolution from above?

Further reading

James Gelvin, *The Modern Middle East: a history* (4th ed., Oxford University Press, 2014)

Peter Mandaville, *Global Political Islam* (Routledge, 2007)

Keith Watenpaugh, *Being Modern in the Middle East: revolution, nationalism, colonialism and the Arab middle class* (Princeton University Press, 2007)

Feroz Ahmad, *The Making of Modern Turkey* (Routledge, 1993)

Jason Brownlee and others, *The Arab Spring: politics of transformation in North Africa and the Middle East* (Oxford University Press, 2013)

Saeed Rahnama and Sohrab Behdad, eds., *Iran after the Revolution: crisis of an Islamic state* (I.B. Tauris, 1995)

Chapter 37: South and Southeast Asia

Overview Decolonization, taking hold in these regions from 1946 onward (Philippines), led to a variety of government forms, and diversity has persisted. Straightforward authoritarianism has faded in the region, except in Myanmar where a brief democratic episode has given way to renewed military rule and political suppression. Religion is a less important factor in the region than is true in the Middle East, though Pakistan is an exception, and Brunei is essentially an Islamic monarchy. Several other majority-Islamic countries, such as Indonesia, pay some attention to religious rules but with less intensity. Southeast Asia is also characterized by an important regional institution, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. Formed in 1961 as a Cold War grouping, the organization has evolved to manage a number of regional issues with a distinctive spirit of compromise, called the ASEAN way; it also has taken a firm stance against the presence of nuclear weapons. South Asia, in contrast, is more involved in regional conflict.

Authoritarianism to democracy. Several countries emerged from colonial rule with a brief pledge of parliamentary democracy, only to give way to an authoritarian ruler. This was the pattern in both Indonesia and the Philippines. In turn however, in the 1980s, substantial democracy returned, with genuine political competition – part of the larger democratic wave of the late 20th century. Malaysia in fact introduced a parliamentary system partly modeled on Britain from independence onward, though freedom of the press has been an issue. The Philippines, after toppling its dictator in the 1980s, did elect a more authoritarian president in the 21st century, but he pledged to step down of his own accord. Pakistan is something of an intermediate case. The nation began in 1947 as a secular republic, after the biter split with India; but it declared itself an Islamic republic in 1956, with increased pressure from Islamic political groups. Periods of democratic rule have alternated with military control. The nation of Bangladesh split away from Pakistan in 1971, as a result of democratic protest; this country, a secular republic, has a democratic parliamentary form of government. Singapore offers another distinctive case. The city-state has had an elected government since independence in 1965. However the government exercises tight control over the political process. Singapore also has been a leader since the 1990s in protesting the unduly Western slant of international human rights efforts, arguing that regional definitions should allow for greater emphasis on community cohesion and prosperity, less on individualism.

Vietnam This is a nation forged through a combination of anti-colonial national independence movement and communist revolution, winning through finally in the 1970s. After a brief adjustment period the government introduced a policy similar to that of China, with strict political control but considerable latitude for private enterprise in business though under overall state guidance. The neighboring country of Cambodia went through a post-independence period under a brutal dictator responsible for substantial genocide until Vietnamese intervention and a period of United Nations administration led to a new but milder form of authoritarian rule.

India: government form Indian nationalists still debate the many shortcomings of British rule (though many Indians partially disagree), including the grudging and slow inclusion of Indians in the actual administration under the Raj. Nevertheless, when India actually set up its own government in 1947, it quickly replicated many features of the British system. A two-house legislature was established, based on universal suffrage, with an independent executive and a separate, often powerful, judiciary. The elected prime minister serves as principal executive True to Indian tradition, and regional realities, the government was set up on a federal basis, with 25 states and a few other territories. In the states, as well, a parliamentary system operates. Law codes continue to be based heavily on British precedent, though important modifications have been introduced including a measure repealing the outlawing of homosexuality.. India's basic government structure has survived quite well, with a particularly impressive capacity to organize elections for up to 900 million voters with a minimum of corruption or violence – makIng the nation by far the largest democracy in the world, and by now one of the more stable.

Functions Government functions have been fairly standard for a modern regime (qualified of course by the federal system). Basic infrastructure has received great attention, including a recent initiative to expand access to sanitary toilets. The government has worked hard to expand education and promote industrial development, including establishing an import substitution policy to limit imports of items like automobiles in favor of national manufacture. Government support for the "Green revolution" was also an important move. Early on, the new nation abolished the caste system – a huge reform– and over time the government has attempted to support opportunities for the former lowest caste, the *Dalits,* through access to higher education and some government posts – with mixed success. Promotion of women has also been important, with measures taken to protect their independence in voting (seeking to prevent interference by fathers or husbands) and more recently to assure a certain percentage of elected posts for women. Legislation has also sought to limit child marriage while the judiciary has attacked domestic violence – though in both cases with qualified success. In other words, the government has taken an active hand in social issues and even social restructuring. At the same time, limitations have also been important: an effort in the 1970s to promote birth control had to be modified in face of popular opposition. In religion, the nation was established as a secular republic, with religious freedom. However, Hindu-Muslim tensions have been a recurrent problem and in the 21st century, under a new Hindu Nationalist prime minister, government measures against Muslims, including police raids at Muslim universities, have become more common (along with growing restrictions on the freedom of the press). On another front, while the government has historically tried to avoid foreign entanglements, it has maintained a large military force while also establishing nuclear capacity, refusing to sign onto the international non-proliferation agreement. Recurrent clashes with Pakistan and China have fallen short of major war. In the 21st century India has lagged behind Chinese military and economic expansion, creating a growing issue for the future. Finally, the government has yet to establish a very clear position on the environment, a crucial issue in a huge nation that burns a great deal of coal and faces considerable atmospheric pollution.

Study questions

1. What are the varying roles of religion in the governments of South and Southeast Asia?
2. What is the Singaporean argument on human rights?
3. Why have a few countries in the region, headed by India, had distinctive success in maintaining democratic political forms?

Further reading

Marc Gilbert, *Southeast Asia in World History* (Oxford University Press, 2017)

Ramachandra Guha, *India After Gandhi: the history of the world's largest democracy* (Picador, 2007)

Paul Brass, *The Politics of India since Independence (*(2nd ed., Cambridge University Press 1994)

Chapter 38: East Asia

Overview The nations of East Asia have had diverse political experiences over the past century. North Korea, freed from Japanese control but under Soviet influence, developed a strongly authoritarian family dynasty, which also managed to create a powerful military apparatus. South Korea and Taiwan underwent a somewhat familiar transition from authoritarian to democratic. Japan, after loss in war and American occupation, became a stable democracy. China came under communist control in 1949 and has maintained a strongly authoritarian regime, but with a number of shifts in policy and governance. The region may despite diversity display some core unity around a residue of Confucian values that emphasize stability and community cohesion – on strong display in the well organized regional response to the Covid pandemic of 2020-1. In another interesting similarity, in the 21st century regimes in the region struggled against population stagnation or decline without permitting much immigration.

Japan After authoritarian military rule during the 1930s and World War II years, Japan under American occupation became a democracy, with female suffrage. Emperor worship was banned, and the emperor became a ceremonial figurehead. Parliamentary democracy proceeded in Japan without major disruption, with considerable freedom for press, religion and the like. During much of the postwar period, while there was political competition, the Liberal Democratic Party dominated, meaning that negotiations within the party were often more important than inter-party transitions. The Japanese system was also noteworthy for the close relationship between government and business – what some competitors referred to as "Japan, Inc." Government support for business helped propel the economy forward, making Japan at one point the world's second largest economy. By the 1980s, government measures helped the nation deal with considerable environmental pollution, with air quality improved in major cities. The government also renounced militarism: Article 9 of the new constitution disavowed war, and while Japan did ultimately build a military force it was clearly defensive in nature, with public opinion (for the most part) firmly resisting fuller military development. By the 21st century Japan was facing new problems of population decline; here, government measures to encourage more female participation in the labor force and provide assistance in child care had more inconclusive results.

"Pacific Rim" Taiwan came under control of the Chinese Nationalist government in 1949, as it was forced out of China proper – though the People's Republic continued to claim Taiwan as part of its territory. Initially, the new regime established authoritarian controls. Similarly in South Korea, its independence reestablished, an authoritarian regime took hold; this extended past the period of the Korean War, when North and South Korea clashed (with great power participation) with ultimately inconclusive results (though military expenditures remained high on both sides). Strong governments in both South Korea and Taiwan helped support rapid industrial growth, as the Pacific Rim became one of the world's most dynamic industrial regions. By the later 20th century and into the 21st, both countries evolved toward functioning democracies, with multi-party competition and considerable protection for individual rights. The city-state of Hong Kong, under British rule, also established a functioning democracy. The British ceded Hong Kong back to the People's Republic of China in 1997, which in turn pledged to maintain the existing structure – "one country, two systems". However increasing repression within China spread to Hong Kong by 2020, and competitive democracy effectively ended.

China: government form The Chinese communist party won out, establishing the People's Republic of China after prolonged civil war, in 1949, and quickly launched the process of building an authoritarian state. Competing political parties were banned, with a few token exceptions. As in the Soviet Union, party control extended widely; party representatives even oversaw each university. Mao Zedong, the revolutionary leader, maintained his ascendancy until his death , with a number of purges of potential opposition. After his death, the system changed to some extent: leaders served for fixed terms, with an orderly transfer of power. To be sure, a major democratic protest in 1989 was put down with great force, in what is sometimes referred to as the Tiananmen Square massacre. Early in the 21st century, however, there were some indications that the regime was informally loosening its hold, with more open political discussions on social media. However, a new president, Xi Jinping, took over in 2013 and quickly

imposed greater controls. Anti-corruption campaigns put new pressure on top officials and business leaders alike, with a few imprisoned outright. Access to international social media was curbed through what was called the "Great Firewall", and media systems within China were carefully monitored. Propaganda increasingly emphasized nationalist themes, along with abundant praise for the leader. The tradition of limited terms was scrapped, as Xi set up the possibility of ruling for life; and Xi's political writings were elevated to the status of those of Mao himself. Most notably, the regime began to utilized advanced technology, including facial recognition systems, to increase the monitoring of ordinary citizens and "private" life.. This was an important (possibly ominous) extension of the powers of the authoritarian state.

China's government: functions Immediately on taking power, like the Soviet Union before it, the new regime began extending school systems and public health facilities, quickly establishing an effective government role in these areas – ultimately including rapid expansion of the university network. Other reforms were introduced: the government finally ended footbinding once and for all, and it also moved against arranged marriage, in favor of more individual choice. Building on but extending earlier traditions, the regime also worked to establish careful controls over culture. Government propaganda extolled the regime and its leader. Movies and other media were carefully monitored, initially to avoid Western influences. In the 1960s, Mao orchestrated the so-called Cultural Revolution (1966-76), forcing many intellectuals and professionals to do rural labor, limiting the universities, attacking traditional cultural monuments, all designed to assert power and undermine the Confucian tradition. By the 1970s this disruptive effort ended, university prestige was reestablished, and selected Confucian traditions were treated with greater respect (the regime even established a "Confucius Institute" to extend soft power operations abroad, teaching Chinese language and literature). Over the longer term, considerable cultural supervision remained. Religion was carefully monitored: a new Buddhist-like movement, the Falun Gong, was persecuted; Christian groups needed government approval to function publicly (this included a special agreement with the Catholic Church); in the 21st century the regime cracked down on the Muslim Uighur ethnic group in the northwest, setting up compulsory reeducation camps and blocking traditional religious practices (while also moving Han Chinese settlers into the region). The new regime was characteristically fairly cautious in foreign and military policy, though it intervened against United States involvement in the Korean War. Mao did insist on a nuclear role, claiming that otherwise China would be "bullied". And under Xi, military expenditures increased considerably; a network of bases was established in the South China Sea; aggressive moves on the frontier with India increased, as did threast to Taiwan. Under Xi as well the Chinese launched a "Belt and Road" initiative in 2013 to extend infrastructure into central and southeast Asia, plus parts of Africa and Europe, to extend Chinese economic operations and, arguably, expand political influence as well. Finally the regime began to crack down on adverse publicity in other countries, using economic sanctions to counter what it saw as dangerous criticisms in areas like human rights policies.

Economic and demographic policy Mao attempted several different economic policies, aimed at industrialization and self-sufficiency. Initially, government support for heavy industry imitated the Soviet approach. Then a "Great Leap Forward" policy sought to take advantage of the huge population by emphasizing small manufacturing operations. The effort failed (though many Chinese may have gained useful new experience), which is one reason Mao then turned to the Cultural Revolution as distraction. In the later 1970s, however, the regime moved to a new approach. While state controls over the economy remained tight, private enterprise and even foreign business gained new latitudes (along with unprecedented openness to international visitors and advisors, with many Chinese allowed to study abroad). China seemed to be pioneering a combination of authoritarian politics and a relatively open economic system, even joining the World Trade Organization. The results were spectacular, in rapid economic growth, urbanization, and reduction of poverty. Along with this the regime imposed a unique system of demographic control, to end excessive population growth and its drag on the economy: many families were limited to a single child, and some women were forced to abort or were even sterilized as part of this process. In the 21st century the regime encountered growing problems with choking pollution and began haltingly to develop a new environmental approach. It also faced population ageing; birth rate limitations were eased, but it was not clear that the regime could actually motivate a significant increase in the birth rate. Here, along with the effort to extend great power status, were clear issues for the future.

Study questions

1. Did government systems and policies in East Asia demonstrate any common features?
2. What have been the many changes in the governance system in communist China since 1949?
3. Do government systems help explain the unusual economic success of most East Asian nations in the past half-century?

Further reading

Kerry Brown, *China's World: the global aspirations of the next superpower* (I.B. Tauris, 2017)

Jonathan Spence, *The Search for Modern China* (Norton, 1991)

William Beasley, *The Rise of Modern Japan* (3rd ed., St. Martin's, 2021)

Bruce Cumings, *Korea's Place in the Sun: a modern history* (Norton, 2005)