How nationalism can promote democracy: evidence from South and Southeast Asia

BSG-WP-2015/003

Maya Tudor, Blavatnik School of Government, University of Oxford

Dan Slater, University of Chicago

BSG Working Paper Series

Providing access to the latest policy-relevant research

How Nationalism Can Promote Democracy: Evidence from South and Southeast Asia[1]

By Maya Tudor (University of Oxford) and Dan Slater (University of Chicago)

Abstract

This article offers insight into the ideational underpinnings of democracies by examining the origins of two democratic outliers in Asia as compared with their closest neighbours: India compared with Pakistan and Indonesia compared with Malaysia. We argue that the kind of nationalisms propagated and mobilized by leading political parties during pivotal anti-colonial struggles either provided or denied vital resources for both crafting and consolidating postcolonial democracy. Specifically, where nationalist parties developed ideologies with clear *programmatic content*, these country's prospects for post-independence regime stability were greatly enhanced. Yet it was only where nationalist ideologies were also *inclusive* in character that nationalist parties pushed toward democracy rather than autocracy. In addition to offering a corrective to the predominantly economistic literature on democratization, this essay underscores the democratic dangers of building categorical inequalities into national identities. For countries such as Myanmar currently grappling with democratic transitions, our argument underscores the democratic dangers of legitimating an exclusionary national community.

Please direct any correspondence relating to this BSG Working Paper to
maya.tudor@bsg.ox.ac.uk

---

[1] An earlier version of this article is currently under review as part of an edited volume with Cambridge University Press

I. Introduction and Arguments

India and Indonesia are the two largest and unlikeliest democracies in the postcolonial world. Two of Asia's greatest demographic behemoths have both long been riddled with almost every imaginable hypothesized malady for democratic development, such as severe poverty and inequality, extreme ethnic heterogeneity, violent separatist movements, and putatively "undemocratic" dominant religions. Despite these similarly long odds, India has remained a democracy nearly without interruption since independence, while Indonesia has surprisingly emerged as the steadiest and least endangered democracy in Southeast Asia over the last fifteen years. In the familiar parlance of democratic consolidation, democracy in India and Indonesia today appears to have become "the only game in town."

The same cannot be said for these democratic behemoths' neighbors with whom they arguably share the most in common: Pakistan in the case of India, and Malaysia in the case of Indonesia. Alongside India's virtually uninterrupted democracy, Pakistan has struggled mightily not only to establish democracy as a specific regime type, but also to stabilize any kind of regime whatsoever. Similarly, Malaysia has doubly diverged from Indonesia's regime trajectory. Malaysia is one of the world's longest lasting autocracies, as its dominant party has ruled with the aid of a wide array of authoritarian controls since 1969. The fact that this autocratic arrangement has endured without interruption for nearly fifty years suggests that Malaysia exhibits a kind of regime stability that Indonesia lacks as well.

What are the origins of these divergent postcolonial trajectories, both in terms of regime type and regime stability? In contrast to influential literatures within comparative democratization studies that primarily stress the *economic* origins of regime outcomes,[1] our argument highlights the *ideological* sources of democracy and autocracy in postcolonial Asia. More specifically, we argue that the particular kind of nationalist ideology propagated and mobilized by leading political parties during anticolonial struggles either provided or denied vital resources for crafting and consolidating postcolonial democracy. Where nationalist parties developed ideologies with clear *programmatic content*, as in India and Malaysia, prospects for post-independence regime stability were greatly enhanced. Yet it was only where nationalist ideologies were *inclusive and egalitarian* in character, as was especially true in India and to a somewhat lesser degree true in Indonesia, where nationalist parties pushed toward democracy rather than autocracy.

At a time when unstable polities around the world are struggling to establish democratic regimes, this argument highlights the importance of imagining and codifying expansive conceptions of citizenship. If new regimes define citizens based on creeds rather than ascriptive identities of religion, ethnicity or region, then such definitions serve as bulwarks against the sorts of democratic breakdowns that are driven by social cleavages. If instead, new regimes adopt narrow, exclusionary identities that establish hierarchies of citizenship, our argument suggests that democratic breakdown along the lines of social cleavage is less likely.

The theoretical expectations and the divergent regime trajectories of our cases, as established roughly within the first decade and half of each country's independence, are captured in Table 1.[2] In brief, the combination of inclusive and programmatic nationalism yielded *stable democracy* in India, while a much less programmatic and moderately less inclusive brand of nationalism influenced the emergence of *unstable democracy* in Indonesia. On the opposite side of the regime-type divide, the leading nationalist party in Pakistan was characterized by neither an inclusive nor a programmatic ideology, thus pointing toward *unstable autocracy*. Finally, Malaysia's dominant party had propagated an

ideology that was nearly as programmatic as India's before independence, but far more exclusive and nativistic in character: this helps explain Malaysia's extraordinary experience of *stable autocracy*.

Table 1. Anti-Colonial Nationalism and Early Regime Outcomes

		Programmatic Nationalism?	
		Yes	No
		Yes	No
Inclusive Nationalism?	Yes	**Stable Democracy** (India)	**Unstable Democracy** (Indonesia)
	No	**Stable Autocracy** (Malaysia)	**Unstable Autocracy** (Pakistan)

In addition to offering an ideological corrective to a predominantly economistic literature on democratization, this essay takes seriously the distinctive issues of institutional composition that attended democratization in the postcolonial world. In all of our cases, the key challenge was not so much to adopt procedural democracy upon the colonial exit, since the instant introduction of the formal trappings of democracy was often a precondition for self-rule. The old authoritarian guard had effectively left the stage, and new rulers were quickly tasked with *establishing* regimes marked by universal adult suffrage and codified civil liberties rather than *extracting* democratic gains de novo from authoritarian hands. Unlike Europe, where rising democratic forces had to struggle for political inclusion against resistant monarchical, feudalistic, and moneyed elites, the postcolonial world has often seen such exclusionary forces on the offensive (attacking existing democracy) rather than the defensive (preventing democracy's adoption). We also exemplify the importance of world-historical context by focusing exclusively on democratization arising from decolonization struggles. In so doing, our analysis takes class cleavages seriously while recognizing that Asian colonization intentionally exacerbated identity-based cleavages through practices of divide-and-rule. To craft a democracy from the politicized cleavages that the colonialists had intentionally left behind, it would take a nationalist party that was *both* highly inclusive and programmatic in its ideological bearings: i.e. the kind of party that colonialists had spent decades working to forestall. The

II. Nationalist Ideologies, Political Parties, and Regime Trajectories
Causal linkages between types of nationalism and regime trajectories have remained curiously underexplored in the democratization literature. This is especially peculiar because nationalism and democracy express, in at least one key sense, the same idea of popular sovereignty. It is thus well worth considering whether certain types of nationalism might prove a greater support for democracy than others.

We argue that two distinct questions about the content of nationalism, as initially defined and mobilized by leading political parties during the run-up to national independence, critically impact whether democracy is likely to become established: first, is the nation

imagined inclusively or exclusively?[3] And second, does the ideology of the leading nationalist party specify clear programmatic content that not only identifies a common enemy but a set of specific policies that the independent nation would pursue or is it grounded merely in vague assertions of cultural difference or anticolonial rhetoric? We consider these two features of nationalism – its inclusive and programmatic character – in turn.

We suggest that new nations failing to elaborate egalitarian alternatives to existing feudalistic relationships or defining themselves so as to exclude ascriptive categories of people from the full fruits of citizenship are less likely to establish democracy. Nationalism offers a baseline definition of who is included in the polity and on what terms: Are all ethnic and religious groups treated similarly? Are the political benefits of citizenship applied fairly across society? Is nationalism primarily defined by old feudalistic elites, or by "new men" who decry existing hierarchical relationships? Is a national language chosen that helps unify different ethnic groups, or that effectively asserts the supremacy of one of them over the others? These kinds of questions profoundly shape what kind of *nation* one lives in; they also shape whether that nation is likely to be a *democracy*, since inclusivity is a critical component in any substantive understanding of democratic politics

It is not only income inequality and land inequality that stand as critical barriers to democracy, as stressed in the literature on the economic origins of regimes. Democracy and autocracy are also profoundly shaped by what Tilly calls *categorical inequality*:

> "The term means organization of social life around boundaries separating whole sets of people who differ collectively in their life chances, as is commonly the case with categories of gender, race, caste, ethnicity, nationality, and religion and is sometimes the case with categories of social class. To the extent that such inequalities translate directly into categorical differences in political rights and obligations, democratization remains impossible."[4]

In all societies, of course, different categories of people enjoy divergent "life chances." To define democracy in terms of such life chances, however, would conflate democracy with the benefits it is purported and hoped to produce. It is instead *the translation of categorical inequalities into unequal political access to the state*, therefore, that has such direct and debilitating consequences for democracy. As we show below, categorical inequalities have provided precisely the pretext for procedural democracy's demise in Pakistan and Malaysia.

While it is widely recognized that categorical inequalities can have deep roots in the founding definition of the nation, this recognition is yet to inform our scholarly understanding of political regimes. Greenfeld argues that nationalism can either be *ethnic* or *civic* in character, distinguishing political communities that grant citizenship only to ethnic "sons of the soil" from those where non-coethnic populations merit equal – and not just "immigrant" – political status.[5] Vom Hau has illuminated the important distinction between *liberal* nationalism, i.e. an elite political-territorial understanding of the nation, and *populist* nationalism, which portrays "popular classes….as protagonists of national history."[6] When taken in tandem, then, Greenfeld and Vom Hau suggest that a truly inclusive nationalism must overcome codified stratification between ethnic and religious communities on the one hand, and between traditional, feudalistic elites and "ordinary people"[7] on the other.

We thus argue that the initial definition of the "National Political Community," or that group of people "officially entitled to the rights and responsibilities of citizenship," has important repercussions for democratic prospects. Definitions of national citizenship matter for

regime outcomes because they substantially "vary in terms of how racial, ethnic, and regional identities get configured, and *in what ways certain groups are included or excluded*."[8]

To be clear, we do not claim that inclusive nationalism is either a necessary or sufficient condition for democracy. Our more modest causal claim here is that inclusive nationalism is a "critical antecedent" that *predisposes* a country toward democracy, but by no means makes democracy structurally *predetermined*.[9] This is because when the nation is defined inclusively before independence, it provides pro-democratization forces with a valuable ideological resource that can be deployed when critical decisions are taken about the inclusivity of the political regime after independence. Whenever political forces struggle either to defeat authoritarian rivals or to forge difficult compromises with diverse democratic actors, their prospects will be brighter if the nation is defined inclusively. And whenever the nation is defined exclusively, there exists more latent potential for a country to undergo decisive processes of "de-democratization"[10] than in cases where exclusive forms of nationalism have been historically superseded. Exclusive nationalism is an anvil upon which democracy can readily be destroyed.

For conceptions of citizenship to be enduring, however, they must become embedded in institutions. Like any "ism," types of nationalism cannot become dominant ideological forms within a polity unless they are mobilized into political institutions by collective actors. Both when the type of nationalism is initially defined and when its primacy must be defended against its rivals, we argue, the key actors to consider are *the political parties that led the charge for national independence*. Inclusive nationalism will not arise in the first place unless a political party manages to articulate and channel it through the nationalist movement; and it will not become entrenched as a defining ideological feature of a nation's political life unless the organized forces supporting it within the party system prevail in their initial post-independence struggle for power.

Our second argument is therefore that nationalism's programmatic character critically affects post-independence regime *stability.* This is because elite compromise is aided by the development of programs that both represent and reinforce shared political goals. After independence, the presence of specific and well-developed programs provide a roadmap for governance and thus aid the nationalist party to broker regime stability through forging inevitably difficult compromises across class, ethnic, regional, and linguistic lines.

Nationalist parties are quite particular types of political parties, ones that are created first and foremost to attain national sovereignty. Colonial independence would typically be granted only if and when nationalist movements could craft majoritarian coalitions that substantiated claims of worthiness and preparedness for national independence. The desire to monopolize post-colonial power thus created an incentive to band together and espouse programs that represented the interests of the majority. Yet as the prospect of independence actually neared, competition between social groups intensified. When nationalist movements had already articulated details to their political programs, the parties emerging from those movements proved better able to forge coalitional and constitutional compromises, and therefore broker regime stability.

In sum, across all four relatively poor and similarly unequal economies that we analyze below, a nationalist movement mobilized for independence from colonial rule and grappled with the key questions of state-building and power-sharing in the years immediately following independence. Nationalist movements in India and Malaysia had espoused

programmatic economic and social agendas around which they mobilized majoritarian support before independence. Consequently, they were able to use these programmatic agendas as the basis for stable governance after independence. Meanwhile the nationalist parties of Indonesia and Pakistan, without programmatic platforms enjoying wide elite support, struggled to identify policies that could cement a majoritarian coalition. Although Indonesia initially trended more democratic than Pakistan, the result in both cases was regime instability, culminating by the late 1950s in militarized rule.

III. Nationalist Parties and Regime Trajectories:
South and Southeast Asia in Comparative Perspective

India: Ideological Origins of Democratic Stability
India is an exceptional case of democratic stability in the post-colonial world, a surprising outcome driven by the unusually inclusive identity evolved and unusually specific platforms developed by India's national movement during the first half of the twentieth century.[11] That movement—the Indian National Congress—was first founded by a predominantly urban, upper-caste, western-educated elite in 1885. This elite formed Congress to lobby for the introduction of elections into heretofore-nominated colonial councils and the holding of civil service examinations in colonial India. Initially, Congress only politely petitioned the colonial government for reforms whose fruits would overwhelmingly accrue to precisely that demographic represented in Congress. The colonial government rebuffed these requests by terming Congressmen a 'microscopic minority' that by virtue of its exploitative caste position, was unrepresentative of India's manifold political interests. Thus, Congress turned towards outlining the programmatic parameters of an inclusive and egalitarian nationalism.

A. Inclusive Nationalism Supports Post-Independence Democracy
Over the next three decades, Congress promoted an inclusive nationalism that could legitimate its nationalist bid for independence and the institutionalization of an inclusive national political community would critically support the adoption of defining democratic institutions after independence. At first however, the Congress movement embraced caste hierarchies. A number of critical historical developments enabled and encouraged the turn towards inclusive mass nationalism—the 1905-1911 successful mass demonstrations in Bengal; insubstantial colonial reforms; pervasive rural discontent created by WWI commodity price fluctuations; and the 1917-18 successes of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi in achieving limited redress of colonial policies. Subsequently, Congress adopted Gandhi as its leader and began to try to create an Indian nation that was not only based upon the rejection of colonial rule but that also stood firmly for secularism, economic nationalism, and the public rejection of caste hierarchies.

The inclusive content of the Indian nationalist movement is foremost evidenced by Congress' rejection of publicly-recognized caste hierarchies. Nineteenth century India was characterized by a caste-saturated social fabric in which an individual's caste was recognized and reinforced in all social interactions, preventing the very imagining of equal citizenship that necessarily predicated the acceptance of democratic institutions. Congress mobilized against public distinctions of caste, on roads and at wells for example, in order to help solder together a national community that could refute the colonial claim that Congress did not represent a single nation. Gandhi's early interventions in Kheda and Champaran, his ashram experiments, and eventually Congress altogether under his leadership intensively engaged in 'village uplift' activities, such as providing basic sanitation and educational programs, though its mobilizations varied considerably across space and time. Critically, these public

engagements consistently and symbolically violated the injunctions of caste hierarchies and in doing so, helped to create a public space in which caste hierarchies could be ignored.

Congress' denunciation of caste hierarchies enabled the nationalist movement to stay unified in the face of determined colonial attempts to fracture it and directly led to Congress' eventual institutionalization of universal adult suffrage. The colonial desire to divide the Indian nationalist movement motivated the regime's acceptance of separate electorates for Muslims in 1909, one effect of which was to prevent Muslim masses from joining Congress. In anticipation of a similar fate for lower-caste Muslims, Congress mainstreamed universal adult suffrage as Congress policy in its 1931 Karachi Resolution. When the 1932 Communal Award was announced, it suggested separate electorates for lower-castes, which would effectively cleave off lower-caste Hindus from Congress and undermine the latter's claim to represent a national community. The strong reaction, specifically Gandhi's 'resolved fast unto death,' created the extreme pressure which eventually led Dr. Ambedkar, the leader of the lowest-caste movement, to relinquish separate electorates in favor of caste reservations. Universal adult franchise thus represented a strategic compromise accommodation between myriad social communities, one in which a national identity was carefully and deliberately constructed to be open to all religious, caste, class and regional communities.[12]

The rejection of caste identities in the public sphere went hand in hand with the adoption of a secular approach to nationalism in a country that was three-quarters Hindu. Secular ideals were first written into Congress' founding charter because nationalist leaders were transplanting the liberal ideals in which they had been educated in England to an Indian context. While secular politics were by no means strictly practiced by all Congress leaders, Congress' formal policy by 1931 was nevertheless that it would adopt no constitutional policy to which a majority of either Hindus or Muslims objected and that no Indian citizen should suffer any discrimination 'by reason of his or her religion, caste, creed, or sex.'[13] During the mid-1930s, as electoral competition was regularized in high colonial India, local political disputes regularly assumed religious overtones. But at higher levels of leadership, the Congress movement rejected any codification of or overt reference to Hinduism as defining of national identity.

Another prism through which Congress' nationalism was inclusive was in its choice of a national language in a country that spoke over a thousand languages and in which upwards of thirty languages were spoken by more than a million people each. In 1920, Congress' re-organization created twenty-one linguistically homogenous provinces that would encourage mass engagement in local languages. By organizing through many regional languages, Congress encouraged the possibility that these different languages would gain formal recognition in independent India. National Congress proceedings were conducted either in English or, wherever possible, in Hindustani, the spoken language of northern India. Importantly, Congress made no effort to exclude particular regional tongues from the nationalist movement and explicitly rejected the use of a single official language.

Congress also institutionalized an inclusive national identity through the widespread adoption of *khadi* or homespun cloth which became the uniform of the Indian nationalist movement. Between 1920 and 1947, Congress leaders gave up the wearing of fine western clothing that set them above and apart from rural Indian masses and exhorted Indians of all castes and classes to engage in the spinning and wearing of *khadi*, both in narrative form[14] and through an elaborate organizational infrastructure.[15] The wearing of *khadi* necessarily involved a rejection of the hierarchical distinctions of caste and an acceptance of a space in

which individuals were encouraged to conceptualize of themselves as political equals. Congress' non-violent mass nationalism, because it also encouraged all castes, classes and regions to participate in the nationalist movement on the basis of equality without fear of forcible redistribution, reinforced an inclusive conception of citizenship.

This long-institutionalized, egalitarian nature of Indian nationalism explains Congress' surprising decision to codify universal adult franchise within the Indian constitution. Congress leaders dominated the post-independence Constituent Assembly and hailed from largely upper caste and middle class backgrounds. Comprising an elite demographic, these leaders could have chosen to limit adult suffrage. Yet Congress leaders had organized mass political support through popularizing an inclusive Indian nationalism for decades. Limiting the franchise would therefore have required re-negotiating the terms of national representation, at a clear cost to lower caste/class support, whilst there was little to gain from retrenching upon its inclusive definitions of the Indian nation because Congress' mobilizations had demonstrated its ability to successfully delimit mass mobilization. Because an egalitarian national identity had been long imagined and institutionalized within the movement, the Congress-dominated Constituent Assembly codified universal adult suffrage within the Indian constitution after independence. The egalitarian nature of Indian nationalism critically succored the creation of Indian democracy.

B. Programmatic Nationalism Drives Regime Stability
Congress' mobilization around specific economic and social programs facilitated the speedy adoption of a national constitution, thereby brokering the creation of a stable regime after independence. As India's nationalist movement deftly maintained mass support for decades of anti-colonial agitations (1920-22, 1930-31, and 1942) as well as electoral support in the colonially-sponsored provincial elections of 1936-37 and 1945-46, it articulated a set of programmatic policies that represented the interests of both the urban middle class and dominant peasantry. Since the British government determinedly sought to divide a movement that threatened continued access to its most lucrative colony, Congress was forced to develop both nationalist principles and programmatic policies representing those principles whilst carefully working not to alienate any other social group except the titled landowners that were the firm allies of the British colonial regime.[16]

Congress did this by articulating a well-developed theory of economic nationalism that held that the colonial regime and the drain of wealth from India to Britain was responsible for India's poverty. It thus developed a program of economic nationalism which protested the colonial imposition of higher taxes, an issue germane to those actually responsible for tax remissions, namely the dominant peasantry. Subsequent themes for mobilization in Congress' more national campaigns—salt tax boycotts and mobilization against Indian participation in World War II—resonated more broadly across the subcontinent, underscoring the difference between the interests of the colonial regime and the 'Indian nation'. Over these decades, Congress thus thought in great detail about such specific economic, social and political programs such as import-substituting industrialization, the creation of a national planning committee, the adoption of a fundamental rights resolution, and the kinds of land reform to be undertaken by states.

Congress leaders were able to create and support this programmatic nationalism because such nationalism allowed it to evolve a relatively well-developed party organization that provided for some cohesion of the movement. Beginning in 1920, Congress' organizational structure was rationalized and linguistically homogenized. Party dues facilitated the creation of a robust organization that could discipline party members who strayed from its official

policies. For example, Congress leaders were able to prevent provincial Congressmen opposed to the 1932 Communal Award from openly condemning it.

As evidenced by its overwhelming electoral victories in pre-independence provincial elections, Congress gained the broad support of India's dominant peasantry and with it, the effective support of subordinate social groups controlled via the dominant peasantry's control of land and credit. Indeed, Congress' early successes in gaining colonial concessions motivated the rural middle class to increasingly view the Congress party as a lightning rod for its discontents while risks associated with joining a mass-mobilizing movement for a property-owning class were minimized by the non-violent nature of Congress' nationalist ideology.

Upon independence, the combination of broad majoritarian support, clear programmatic content and robust party infrastructure allowed Congress to quickly create and ratify India's constitution, the institutional hallmark of regime stability. Since over three-quarters of the members of India's Constituent Assembly were Congressmen, Congress effectively controlled the Assembly and Indian constitutional debates reflect surprisingly little division. For example, Congress leaders almost uniformly supported the abolition of large, titled *zamindaris*, the creation of land reform commissions at state levels, and the setting of land ceilings at a high enough level that dominant peasants not be dispossessed. Indeed, the Constituent Assembly only debated whether and what compensation should be offered to large zamindars. Another potentially divisive constitutional debate—between provincial Congress leaders seeking greater powers for provinces and national Congress leaders desirous of greater central power—was largely resolved by appealing to the 'village uplift' goals that had long been part of the independence movement—goals that were reflective of the broad-brush distributive compromises forged during the independence movement.[17] Thus, the presence of programmatic nationalism paved the way for the speedy adoption of the world's longest constitution, one that still governs the world's largest democracy today.

Pakistan: Ideological Origins of Autocratic Instability
Whereas India is one of the postcolonial world's paradigmatic stable democracies, Pakistan is its double opposite: an unstable regime with autocratic tendencies. We argue that this regime outcome is critically enabled by an aprogrammatic nationalism that explicitly embraced an exclusive national identity. Pakistan's nationalist movement—the Pakistan Muslim League—was initially not a nationalist movement at all but rather, a movement created to protect the privileges of culturally and socioeconomically distinct Muslims who were heavily entrenched in colonial power structures. Whilst colonially-entrenched landed aristocrats everywhere were threatened by the mobilization of the urban, educated middle class, they were too divided by hierarchy and language to create a unified political movement. In one area however, the overlapping cleavages of language, religion, region and government patronage incentivized sufficient mobilization to engender, by 1940, a political movement. In 1947, though this movement achieved the creation of the new state of Pakistan, the lack of a programmatic blueprint for governance drove regime instability while the exclusive definition of citizenship fuelled divisive debates that provided ready pretexts for the breakdown of Pakistan's democracy.

A. Pakistan's Exclusive Nationalism Fuels Democratic Derailment

In order to protect historical privileges, the Muslim League began in 1940 to espouse a national identity based upon the claim that Indian Muslims formed a separate nation. While this exclusive nationalism eventually served to legitimate the creation of a separate state, the close association between religion and national identity created hierarchical categories of citizenship that helped to break down Pakistan's infant democracy. Created in 1906 at the behest of a colonially-entrenched Muslim minority, the Muslim League remained a marginal political movement until the 1937 colonially-sponsored pre-independence elections. Congress' overwhelming success in those elections posed an existential threat to the League in two ways. First, those elections clearly signaled the imminence of national independence under Congress hegemony and with it, the disappearance of the colonial patronage that had long underwritten Muslim power in one region of India. Second, those elections demonstrated that, even with separate electorates, the League could not aspire to have influence on independence negotiations unless it represented the two major Muslim-majority provinces of colonial India—Bengal and Punjab.

In order to legitimate its participation in independence negotiations, the Muslim League propagated a nationalism based upon the rallying cry of 'Islam in danger,' utilizing a religious identity to forge alliances in the two crucial Muslim-majority provinces. Because Islam was the only available identity through which these alliances could be created, Pakistani nationalism became inextricably bound up with religion.

Upon independence, the exclusive association between Islam and Pakistani citizenship provided ready fodder for derailing Pakistan's nascent democracy. The close identity between Pakistani citizenship and Islam legitimated religious elites in their assertions of hierarchical distinctions between categories of citizens, enabling them to claim that Muslims were better Pakistani citizens than non-Muslims and that certain kinds of Muslims were better Pakistani citizens than others. Specifically, the first introduction of martial law in Pakistan in 1953, the first step towards the 1958 military coup which definitively ended Pakistan's democratic experiment, was to quell riots that ensued when an Islamic movement sought to remove an Ahmadi Minister from power *on the grounds that he was a non-Muslim* and to otherwise prevent Ahmadi Muslims from assuming top government positions. The short-lived 1956 constitution pronounced 'The Islamic Republic of Pakistan' and specified that the President must be a Muslim and that no law must be passed that was deemed contrary to the teachings of the Quran. Barring the non-Muslim fifth of the population and even certain kinds of Muslims from equal citizenship rights, far from laying to rest debates over the nature of citizenship, have continued to fuel divisive political issues in subsequent decades.[18] Pressure from religious groups, utilizing the close connection between Islam and Pakistani citizenship, have resulted in a series of laws and even constitutional amendments that have further excluded non-Muslims and in a requirement that all Pakistani citizens to declare the Ahmadi prophet an imposter before obtaining a passport. Then and now, a definition of Pakistani citizenship excluding both non-Muslims and certain Muslim sects has provided ready fodder for the derailing of Pakistani democracy.

B. Aprogrammatic Nationalism Feeds Regime Instability

The Muslim League in those two provinces which came to constitute Pakistan reflected the antagonistic class bases that prevented the movement from creating any programmatic content before independence. In order to claim national relevance, the Muslim League came to represent a peasant movement in one Muslim-majority region that, for example, sought radical land reform and tenurial security and a large, absentee landlord party in the other Muslim-majority region of British India that sought to prevent any land reform

measures whatsoever. Because the Muslim League represented two social groups with almost diametrically opposed interests in most matters except a greater voice for Muslims, it was unable to a programmatic blueprint that could help govern the newly created nation. Before independence, these two Muslim-majority provinces—which would together constitute over 90% of the population of Pakistan—effectively papered over their profound economic and political divisions.

Partly because of this lack of programmatic content, the Muslim League possessed little party infrastructure independent of its charismatic leader in those geographical areas that became Pakistan. Obedience to the party's charismatic leader—Mohammed Ali Jinnah— had been the defining characteristic of those who rose within the League. Before 1937, the League was a movement in name only, often unable to garner a quorum for its annual meetings.. The League began to re-organize after the fateful 1937 elections, but Jinnah personally controlled the nominations to party's Working Committee and only centralized power during the remaining years before independence in 1947.   In Pakistan's most important strategic province, the League had enrolled 15,000 members in its six active districts of Punjab, whereas in ten districts, no League organization existed at all.[19] Thus, in contrast to India and Malaysia but much like Indonesia, Pakistan entered independent statehood with a political party that had possessed little in the way of clear policies, powersharing agreements, or organizational capacity to enforce governing agreements.

Once Pakistan came into being, the Muslim League was as dominant in its Constituent Assembly as the Congress was in India. But since the League represented a coalition with incoherent distributive interests, the coalition proved unable to broker compromises on powersharing and key economic policies. On many of the difficult constitution-making questions that India also faced, the Muslim League proved unable to use programmatic content as a blueprint for constitutional compromises.   In the absence of shared programmatic content, Pakistan's governing administrations proved unable to take key governing decisions. Most of the eight cabinets in Pakistan's post-independence decade faltered because they were unable to effectively broker powersharing agreements between the central government and the regions or between the regions themselves. Just as in Indonesia, in the face of governing paralysis, one cabinet after another rose and fell, with the last few cabinets lasting a mere matter of months. By 1958, a military coup marked a new and ongoing chapter in Pakistan's regime instability.

Indonesia: Ideological Origins of Democratic Instability
Like India, Indonesia was an especially unlikely nation before it was an especially unlikely democracy. Despite possessing multiple lines of cleavage along which colonialists could divide-and-rule, Indonesia spawned a remarkably inclusive and egalitarian nationalist movement in the decades preceding independence in 1949. Categorical inequalities were thus not woven into the fabric of the foundling Indonesian nation-state. Yet while the leading Indonesian Nationalist Party (PNI) advanced an ideology that was inclusive enough to support democracy, it lacked the kind of well-formed programmatic ideology that proved so important to assembling majoritarian coalitions in support of a democratic constitution in India. Constitutional and coalitional compromises proved chronically elusive or ephemeral throughout the 1950s, and political stalemate ushered in democracy's destabilization and demise at virtually the same historical moment as in Pakistan.[20]

A. Inclusive Nationalism Supports Post-Independence Democracy
In Indonesia, Dutch rule mean divide-and-rule. This produced state-codified "status gaps" across ethnic groups, racial categories, religious communities, and regional populations.[21] Of

particular importance was the colonial state's favoritism toward non-Muslim and non-Javanese populations, which strengthened regional identities and entrenched local aristocracies in many parts of the "Outer Islands" off Java. Colonial policies also enticed a sizable ethnic Chinese population to settle and thrive, constituting the largest portion of the tiny non-European bourgeoisie by the early 20th century.

It was in reaction to this incipient Chinese business domination that the first stirrings of political organization would commence. The Sarekat Islam (Islamic Union) emerged in 1912 and exhibited a more intensely "anti-Chinese character"[22] than anti-Dutch character, channeling resentment among the "indigenous" (*pribumi*) bourgeoisie over Dutch favoritism toward the "immigrant" Chinese. It still constituted the most explicitly political expression of Indonesia's flourishing Islamic sector, however, as two massive Islamic social organizations arose to foster Islam's internal reform in urban areas (in the case of Muhammadiyah, f. 1912) and to preserve its traditional practices in rural areas (in the case of Nahdlatul Ulama, or NU, f. 1926), but not to pressure Dutch authority for political change or mobilize support across cleavage lines.

Indonesian nationalism would experience its inclusive turn with the advent of the Indonesian National Party (PNI) in 1927 and the proclamation of the *Sumpah Pemuda* (Youth Pledge) the following year. The driving force behind both the party and the pledge was Sukarno, a highly educated and oratorically gifted 26-year-old. The watchword of the Sukarno-led youthful upsurge was "unity," which "acquired a quasi-magical value; only through unity could there be political strength," as "unity was conceived as necessarily inclusive and as the essential core of social energy."[23]

More concretely, the PNI-organized Youth Pledge insisted upon unity across all of Indonesia's cultural divides, most notably language. It famously called for "'One nation with one language, Indonesian; and one homeland, Indonesia.' The language, Indonesian, was to be based on Malay, the lingua franca of the archipelago. There was no serious attempt to adopt any of the regional languages, even that of the Javanese who were the single biggest ethnic grouping, as the national language."[24] Choosing Malay/Indonesian over Javanese aided the PNI-led effort "to break down parochial penchants in Indonesian nationalism,"[25] since "Malay was not associated with any particular ethnic group."[26] It also helped the nationalist movement transcend the class divide, since "Malay conveyed a message of democratic inclusiveness, unlike the more hierarchical Javanese, in which levels of language are used to reinforce status differences between the aristocracy and the lowest class."[27] Although most leading Indonesian nationalists were Dutch-educated and spoke Javanese as their native tongue, they selected Malay/Indonesian as a national language for its inclusive properties across both cultural and class divides.

The PNI-led nationalist movement's commitment to cross-class inclusivity went beyond the politics of language. Sukarno fostered the use of an egalitarian form of address, "Bung," among both PNI leaders and followers. "[T]his mode of address, the Bung, was of great significance since young and old, poor and rich, President and peasant could and usually did address each other with this word. As such, the Bung was instrumental in bringing about a socio-political unity by reducing all to a commonly associated bond."[28] Sukarno also finessed the deep tension between Marxist and non-Marxist nationalists by elaborating "Marhaenism" as an inclusive alternative. Putatively named after a smallholding peasant whom Sukarno met in West Java, Marhaenism ideologically encapsulated Sukarno's "attempt to draw as many groups as possible into the revolutionary struggle along with the proletariat."[29] This counseled direct political ties between PNI leaders and the *wong cilik*

(little people) in both city and countryside, unmediated by the traditional feudalistic ties that Sukarno and his brethren consistently denounced. "We can defeat [imperialism] only by the action of the Kromos and the Marhaens, through nationalist mass action on the grandest scale," Sukarno thundered in a widely circulated 1930 speech. "Therefore we seek to mobilize a force of millions from the masses, to direct the energies of Indonesian intellectuals toward organizing the masses…of the masses, with the masses, for the masses!"[30]

Such pronouncements met a stern response from the Dutch, who banned the PNI in 1931 and sent Sukarno into long-term exile in 1933. Unlike the British in India, the Dutch in Indonesia offered no space for the leading nationalist party to gain political momentum and experience before independence. This exacerbated the PNI's titanic struggles to develop and negotiate a programmatic agenda that could facilitate the PNI's own internal cohesion as well as suture groups together politically across Indonesia's many cavernous categorical divides.

Organized nationalism gained a new lease on life with the onset of World War II. The Japanese invaders released Sukarno and other radical nationalists from prison and gave them leading positions in wartime administration. Yet the Japanese interregnum from 1942-45 also allowed Indonesia's more exclusivist Islamic stream to gain major political headway, as the Japanese fostered the rise of a new organization called Masyumi that transcended the old modernist-traditionalist, NU-Muhammadiyah divide. By the time the war ended, the PNI had been out of commission as an active party for nearly fifteen years, and leading inclusive nationalists such as Sukarno and Mohammed Hatta lacked adequate preparedness, despite their unrivaled authority, to bring their ideological visions to programmatic fruition.

B. Nonprogrammatic Nationalism Feeds Regime Instability
Unlike our other cases, Indonesia had to fight a bloody nationalist revolution to secure independence. This period of *perjuangan* (struggle) from 1945-49 further entrenched the inclusive character of Indonesian nationalism, as the PNI duumvirate of Sukarno and Hatta emerged triumphant upon a wave of mass contention that overwhelmed old colonial-era categorical divides. "The new ideas formed the basis of a new Indonesian culture, pushing aside the influence of the remnants of the 'traditions,'" notes Max Lane. "It was *aksi* (action), *mogok* (strike), socialism and democracy, *sarikat* (union) and *vergadering* (mass assembly) that were central to the vocabulary of the anti-colonial movement, not the folk tales or courtly discourses of the so-called ethnic traditions."[31]

Unfortunately for the near-term fate of Indonesian democracy, this inclusivity was only gained through sacrificing anything resembling programmatic coherence. In the wake of a nationalist revolution that mobilized multiple social forces without any single coordinating body, the diverse panoply of actors, cleavages, and organizations that had populated the Indonesian polity before independence remained central as nationalist leaders tried to forge hard compromises to give postcolonial democracy its legs. In Indonesia unlike India, "no single nationalist party [led] the country through the critical last years of the achievement of independence."[32]

Sukarno's PNI lacked the programmatic coherence, organizational experience, and dominant position that helped Nehru's Congress sustain democracy in India. For all their moral authority, Indonesia's founding fathers were institutionally hamstrung, since "the heterogeneity of its constituent elements made the PNI an unwieldy political

organization."[33] Given his limited organizational assets, it is remarkable that Sukarno could shape the Indonesian nation's form as profoundly as he did.

This is best seen in his successful parrying of intense pressure to define Indonesia as an Islamic state. Much as his ideology of "Marhaenism" had absorbed much of the radical energy of Marxism without alienating anti-communist forces, his notion of "Pancasila" allowed Indonesia to be established in its interim 1945 constitution as a religious state, but not a strictly Islamic one. Translated as "five principles," Pancasila requires first and foremost that all Indonesians express faith in one God, but not necessarily Allah. Married to a Hindu Balinese, Sukarno successfully pressed for Hinduism, Buddhism, and Confucianism to be included alongside Islam and Christianity as formally recognized religions under the Pancasila, despite their non-monotheistic doctrines. By making Pancasila (which explicitly embraces democracy as well as religiosity) the heart of the 1945 constitution, Sukarno had creatively devised a formula that embraced the anti-secularism of Indonesia's Muslim supermajority, but without excluding followers from other world faiths from full membership in the Indonesian nation.

While Sukarno's 1945 constitution papered over deep social conflicts over *religion*, the categorical distinction of *region* proved a more insuperable problem. Here, the national revolution of 1945-49 ironically made the divide deeper. With *perjuangan* centered on Java and pro-Dutch sentiment stronger off Java, the bitter regional cleavage would carry over into postcolonial politics. In its last stab at divide-and-rule, the Dutch imposed federalism on the Indonesian republic as a precondition for its independence. This made federalism an unutterably dirty word in Indonesian politics, as it was cast aside for a unitary state structure almost immediately after independence. Yet merely calling the state unitary could not overcome the huge differences between Javanese and non-Javanese politicians over postcolonial policy choices. Even the foundational alliance between Sukarno and Hatta became recurrently frayed during the negotiations over a permanent constitution from 1950-57; while both PNI godfathers remained inclusive nationalists to their ideological core, differing views on economic policy and the continuing value of mass-mobilizing actions meant that their alliance became symbolic rather than substantive from the earliest days of the republic.

Even if the PNI had been better organized and less factionalized, it still lacked the national reach and majoritarian strength to lead the nation-building process in line with its inclusive ideological vision. Far from being a dominant party, the PNI exhibited almost equivalent political strength as three differently visioned contenders:. The parliamentary elections of 1955 confirmed that none of these four parties could approximate majoritarian strength. Much as in Pakistan, party weakness meant a decade of revolving-door cabinets and constitutional gridlock. Without solid foundations in an inclusive leading nationalist party, Indonesian democracy remained deeply vulnerable to any authoritarian challengers who might arise.

Bereft of a functioning party machinery with which to forge coalitional and constitutional compromises, figurehead president Sukarno could only sit idly by while cabinets crumbled and the constituent assembly floundered throughout the 1950s. For an inveterate unifier like Sukarno, the fractiousness of party politics under parliamentary democracy represented everything he disliked. After a visit to the Soviet Union and communist China in 1956, Sukarno began maligning the gradualism of party negotiations and openly impugning the value of parties themselves.[34] Proclaiming the urgent national need to restore revolutionary fervor by following his all-inclusive but programmatically incoherent ideological formulation

of *Nasakom* – combining nation, religion, and communism – Sukarno seized emergency powers and declared martial law in 1957, in the wake of a CIA-backed regional revolt protesting the leftward tilt, economic mismanagement, and Javanese domination of the national government. Not coincidentally, this fateful *Permesta* rebellion commenced in North Sulawesi, a region where sympathy for the Dutch and support for federalism had been strongest during the revolutionary period. By 1959, Sukarno had claimed broad presidential powers under the old 1945 constitution, disbanded the constituent assembly, and installed what he called "Guided Democracy" in parliamentary democracy's place.

Malaysia: Ideological Origins of Autocratic Stability
While an inclusive but nonprogrammatic nationalism helps explain why Indonesia became an unstable democracy upon independence, Malaysia's doubly divergent type of nationalism – exclusive yet programmatic – sheds light on that country's gradual but decisive shift toward stable autocracy. That Malaysia gained independence in 1957 as a procedural democracy had little if anything to do with nationalism. It was due instead to the colonialists' insistence upon electoral competition as a condition for withdrawal, plus the dominant United Malays National Organization (UMNO) party's overwhelming confidence that it would not lose free and fair elections. As soon as British pressure and UMNO's electoral confidence had waned, Malaysia's dominant nationalist party had no compunction about installing a regime type that better suited its largely nativistic and feudalistic vision of the national community. The subsequent stability of UMNO's authoritarian dominance had much to do with the fact that, even before independence, UMNO and its coalitional allies had forged a clear programmatic bargain about what to do with state power once they had gained it.

A. Malaysia's Exclusive Nationalism Fuels Democratic Derailment
Little repression was necessary to stifle anticolonial mobilization in British Malaya before World War II. The majority ethnic group, religiously Muslim Malays, was ruled indirectly, as the British came to peaceful terms in the late 19th century with multiple state-level indigenous rulers, or sultans. This mode of colonialism preserved and entrenched hereditary rural aristocracies.[35] Yet at the same time, and to a much greater extent than in Indonesia, a massive influx of Chinese migrants dramatically altered the demographic character of "*Tanah Melayu*" (the land of the Malays). Much like the conservative Sarekat Islam in Indonesia and Muslim League in Pakistan, Malay-Muslim aristocrats sought colonial protection and patronage before World War II rather than broadly inclusive reforms. The Malay population remained weakly politicized and regionally compartmentalized in conservative state-level ethnic associations, while the swelling Chinese minority was treated as "sojourners" with no real standing in the colonial polity.

Feudalism and nativism thus went hand-in-hand in prewar British Malaya. The war and Japanese occupation severely rattled this indirect-rule equilibrium, however. While the Malay sultans and their "administocrat"[36] (aristocratic administrators) allies collaborated with the Japanese and saw their privileged positions protected, Chinese Malayans more often resisted and suffered terribly under Japanese rule. When the war suddenly ended in 1945, the upshot was dramatically increased Malay-Chinese conflict and a radical imbalance in political organization across communities: while the Chinese-dominated Malayan Communist Party (MCP) had gained much strength as the leading anti-Japanese resistance movement, the Malay community lacked any organized movement to protect its interests as the British returned.

Considering that massive in-migration had brought the Chinese to practically equivalent size as the Malay population, this Chinese organizational advantage was perceived as existentially threatening to Malay interests. Malay nightmares seemed to come to fruition in late 1945 when the British published a white paper calling for fully equal citizenship for all locally born individuals, be they Malay, Chinese, or other, and for the dethroning of Malay sultans as hereditary rulers. The Malay response was emphatic: hundreds of thousands poured into the streets in early 1946 to reject the British white paper and insist that both that the sultans' sovereign standing and the privileged position of "indigenous" Malays vis-à-vis "immigrant" Chinese be upheld. From these protests emerged UMNO, essentially a new alliance of the fragmented state-level ethnic associations that had existed before the war. UMNO instantly became the most important nationalist movement in British Malaya, and would quickly become its most powerful political party as independence approached.

Confronted with such forceful Malay mobilization, the British had little choice but to accede to Malay demands on the inviolability of the position of the sultans and the principle of "*ketuanan Melayu*" (Malay supremacy). As negotiations on a new constitution for an independent Federation of Malaya proceeded, these principles remained inviolate, ensuring that the new nation would be born with an ascriptively tiered definition of political citizenship in which the feudal Malay ruling aristocracy remained constitutionally ascendant. In Malaysia as in Pakistan, a movement to protect the power of colonially entrenched elites resulted in a type of nationalism that was ascriptively defined.

This was ominous but not immediately fatal for democracy. A majoritarian coalitional compromise emerged during the 1950s, allowing electoral democracy and Malay privilege to coexist as of Malaya's birth in 1957. To understand why this arrangement emerged and why it was so readily repurposed for autocratic stability after the ethnic riots of 1969, one must consider the programmatic ideological content of the bargain upon which UMNO cemented its initial ruling coalition.

B. Programmatic Nationalism Drives Regime Stability
Constitutionally enshrined Malay favoritism did not prevent UMNO from forging a stable majoritarian coalition with parties representing Malaya's Chinese and Indian minorities. "The Alliance" romped to victory in the founding 1955 municipal elections in Kuala Lumpur, and enjoyed a preponderant supermajority in the parliament after independence in 1957. The solidity of this alliance was grounded in its programmatic ideological content, especially its virulent anti-communism and its conservative approach to economic redistribution. Confronted with an MCP-led insurrection throughout the last decade of British rule, elites from all three major ethnic communities coalesced, with active British assistance, in an elitist "protection pact."[37] The bargain was programmatically clear: non-Malay businesses would enjoy protected property rights in a resolutely capitalist and internationalized economic system, and would, in exchange, bankroll both the Alliance parties through campaign financing as well as the Malay-dominated state itself through progressive but not excessive levels of direct taxation. In sum, non-Malays could dominate the economy while Malays dominated the state apparatus and received the lion's share of public goods that capitalist growth made possible.

Malays were assured of continued political supremacy in this programmatic bargain. When this came under challenge, the UMNO-led state set aside its ostensible democratic principles to protect its position. This occurred in 1963 when the formation of Malaysia as an expanded federation brought the Chinese-dominated city of Singapore into the fold, and produced a stern leadership challenge from Lee Kuan Yew's Chinese-dominated People's

Action Party (PAP). Emergency was declared and Singapore was expelled from Malaysia. Then in 1969, the death knell was sounded for procedural democracy when Chinese-led labor parties made huge electoral gains against the UMNO-led Alliance, prompting ethnic riots in Kuala Lumpur and other major cities.

The lesson of the 1969 election and riots was as clear as the programmatic bargain they had undermined. If democracy could not deliver reliable supermajorities to a Malay-led ruling coalition in a nation that was Malay-dominated by definition, democracy was expendable. Authoritarian controls were imposed before Malaysia returned to electoral politics under the leadership of an expanded UMNO-dominated National Front (Barisan Nasional, or BN). The BN promised increased distribution to Malays; yet overall, it represented a reassertion of the original bargain exchanging Malay political domination for lightly fettered capitalism. Exclusive nationalism and programmatic class conservatism have been tightly married since 1969 in one of the world's most durable authoritarian arrangements. So long as democracy threatens to deliver political equality to Malaysia's ethnic Chinese minority – and thereby to overturn the definition of the Malaysian nation as one where Malays are the only true "sons of the soil" – authoritarianism remains seen by UMNO's leadership as a necessary precaution.

IV. Conclusion

Inclusive nationalisms have meaningfully supported the establishment of democratic regimes in India and Indonesia, while their absence has hindered democratic development in Pakistan and Malaysia. Ideological legacies of nationalist mobilization in the early 20th century remain surprisingly relevant in the early 21st.

In recent decades, democracy in India has changed in ways that only underscore how entrenched it is. Perhaps most visibly, Indian democracy has deepened via the gradual decline of Congress' electoral dominance and the dawn of coalitional politics under the aegis of its two competitor parties, Congress and the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP). Every government in power since 1989 has been composed of a coalition of smaller, regionally based parties in alliance with either Congress or the BJP. With the rise of regional and caste-based parties, the political representation of subordinate classes has clearly grown.[38]

An additional tectonic shift in Indian democracy has been the embrace of an identity politics characterized by group-based claims to representation. Propelled by the implementation of reservations for 'other backward castes' in 1989, this shift has likely driven the rise of the Hindu-promoting BJP and even pushed secularist Congress to make accommodations to the Hindu majority. While these changes have edged India closer to replacing its secular nationalism with a Hindu nationalism, even the most stridently Hindu government in the form of Gujarat's Narendra Modi has sought to mobilize electoral support across class and caste lines. Despite a rhetorical commitment to Hindu nationalism, the BJP has made substantial outreach to provide services to lower-caste groups who stand to benefit the least from Hindu nationalism.[39] Thus, despite its shortcomings, Indian democracy today is firmly entrenched through political parties that are vested in its continuation.

By contrast, Pakistan remains perpetually vulnerable to military coups because leading political parties lack the programmatic coherence to broker political stability. This reality is highlighted and perpetuated by a military that is all too ready to intervene to protect its alleged institutional prerogatives. Moreover, all governing political parties and the military have turned to Islam to bolster their legitimacy when unable to govern on the basis of concrete programs, thereby strengthening the link between Islam and Pakistani citizenship.

Exclusive nationalism thus continues to provide fodder for democratic derailment, now not just in terms of a Hindu-Muslim and an Ahmadi-mainstream Islam cleavage, but increasingly in terms of a Sunni-Shia cleavage.[40]

Indonesia was widely perceived to be poised for Pakistan-style regime instability, and not for India-style democratic consolidation, when Suharto's militarized "New Order" was toppled amid the Asian financial crisis in May 1998. Yet the dynamics of Suharto's fall revealed the lingering relevance and potency of Sukarno-style inclusive nationalism. It would be from the Indonesian Democratic Party (PDI), the PNI's successor party, that the strongest challenge to the New Order would arise in the mid-1990s. More to the point, it came from Sukarno's own daughter, Megawati Sukarnoputri, who assumed leadership of the PDI in 1993. When Megawati assumed a critical stance toward the New Order, she was forcibly toppled as PDI head. The public outcry was vehement, prompting a violent crackdown against pro-Megawati protesters in Jakarta in November 1996. Hence when the Asian financial crisis rocked Indonesia in 1997-98, Sukarnoist-nationalist forces were already primed for mass protest, especially in Indonesia's urban universities.

As in the anti-Dutch revolution, the anti-Suharto democratic revolution would see nationalist youth in the contentious forefront. In another key historical parallel, mass mobilization for *reformasi* transcended every imaginable categorical divide, as leading Islamic organizations NU and Muhammadiyah saw their leaders assuming critical postures that rivaled Megawati's. Although Suharto helped unleash state violence against ethnic Chinese urbanites as part of an effort to divide the democratic opposition along Islamic-nationalist lines, he was no more successful at divide-and-rule than the Dutch had ultimately been. To the contrary, mass rapes against Chinese women "produced an unprecedented wave of shock and sympathy from Indonesia's political public," and after Suharto was removed, "the speed of reversal of the heavy-handed assimilationist measures of Suharto was remarkable."[41] Inclusive nationalism has thus been remarried with democratic politics in Indonesia. The fact that Indonesian democracy combines impressive consolidation with low quality is rather efficiently explained by to its historical combination of a dysfunctional party system and inclusive nationalism.[42]

Finally in Malaysia, authoritarianism endures because the persistent exclusions of ethnic nationalism helped prevent the emergence of a powerful multiethnic protest movement during the Asian financial crisis in 1998-99, and have continued to help keep most Malays in the authoritarian UMNO camp in the national elections of 2004, 2009, and 2013. It is no coincidence that Malaysian authoritarianism continues to rest upon the nativistic appeals of its dominant party, while the emergent multiethnic opposition coalition must not merely overcome an impressive battery of authoritarian controls, but the legacies of politics being organized along entirely ethnic lines throughout Malaysia's independent history. No less than in contemporary India, Pakistan, and Indonesia, the postcolonial political regime in Malaysia continues to bear the birthmarks of the young nation's ideological origins.

Beyond Asia, the analysis above has suggested that scholars of democratization should theorize inequality in a more capacious way than they do at present. Citizenship status as well as wealth tend to be unequally distributed across the developing world. Indeed, categorical inequality is typically more perceptible than wealth inequality because, while "ordinary people" may not know how much less money they have than their nation's wealthiest, they are typically quite able to perceive when they are treated as a lesser citizen than their neighbor. Whenever entire categories of people are denied equal access to the

state because they pray to the wrong God, speak the wrong language, or lack the proper hereditary status, democracy is less likely to survive and more likely to be lacking in quality.

[1] Carles Boix. *Democracy and Redistribution*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003). Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson. *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006). Ben Ansell and David Samuels, "Inequality and Democratization: A Contractarian Approach," *Comparative Political Studies,* 43:12 (December 2010), 1543-1574.

[2] Types of nationalism differed across our four cases in both ordinal and nominal terms. For purposes of clarity and brevity, however, we will be stressing nominal rather than ordinal variation and its aggregate effect on regime trajectories.

[3] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, (London: Verso, 1983).

[4] Charles Tilly, *Democracy*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 75.

[5] Leah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003).

[6] Matthias Vom Hau, "State Infrastructural Power and Nationalism: Comparative Lessons from Mexico and Argentina" in *Studies in Comparative International Development* 43(2008), 336.

[7] Nancy Bermeo, *Ordinary People in Extraordinary Times. The Citizenry and the Breakdown of Democracy,* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003).

[8] Evan Lieberman, *Race and Regionalism in the Politics of Taxation in Brazil and South Africa*, (New York: Cambridge University Press 2003), 3-4. Emphasis added.

[9] Dan Slater and Erica Simmons, "Informative Regress: Critical Antecedents in Comparative Politics," *Comparative Political Studies* 43:7 (July 2010), 886-917.

[10] Tilly, 2007.

[11] Maya Tudor, *The Promise of Power: The Origins of Democracy in India and Autocracy in Pakistan*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), Chapter 3.

[12] Separate electorates set aside seats in provincial and central legislatures for the said community and specified that only that community could vote for the said seats. Reserved electorates also set aside seats for the said community but enabled the entire electorate to vote for those seats. With reserved electorates Congressmen could still mobilize across caste lines by putting up an untouchable candidate whereas separate electorates would likely have led lower castes to mobilize separately from Congress altogether.

[13] All India Congress Committee Papers Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, G-60 of 1945–1946. 6–8 August 1931.

[14] Mohandas Gandhi, *Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*. (Delhi: Government of India, 1958),Volumes XX-XXII.

[15] Lisa Trivedi, "Visually Mapping the Nation: Swadeshi Politics in Nationalist India, 1920-1930," *The Journal of Asian Studies,* 62, 1 (February 2003): 11-41 and Tudor.

[16] Dominant peasants were upper caste landowners who presided over a hierarchical village-based patronage network that effectively controlled the political allegiance of a subordinate network of tenants. David Low, (ed.) *Congress and the Raj: Facets of the Indian Struggle 1917 - 47* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006).

[17] Objectives Resolution. *C*onstituent Assembly Debates (Government of India, 1950), Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, Volume I, 5.

[18] Farzana Shaikh, *Making Sense of Pakistan* (New York: Hurst, 2009).

[19] David Gilmartin, 'Religious Leadership and the Pakistan Movement in the Punjab,' *Modern Asian Studies,* 13, 3 (1979): 485-517.

[20] The relative durability of militarized authoritarianism in Indonesia from the late 1950s until the late 1990s cannot be accounted for by reference to nationalist ideology. Its violent exclusions were more a product of the Cold War-era ideological divide (i.e. anticommunism)

than any categorical and ascriptive divides. See Dan Slater, *Ordering Power: Contentious Politics and Authoritarian Leviathans in Southeast Asia*. (New York: Cambridge University Press).

[21] Anthony Reid, *Imperial Alchemy: Nationalism and Political Identity in Southeast Asia*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 68.

[22] Reid, p. 62.

[23] Ruth McVey, *Nationalism, Islam, and Marxism*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Southeast Asia Program, 1970), 5-6.

[24] Max Lane, *Unfinished Nation: Indonesia Before and After Suharto*, (London: Verso, 2008), 18.

[25] George Kahin, *Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1952), 39.

[26] Jacques Bertrand, "Language Policy and the Promotion of National Identity in Indonesia" in Michael E. Brown and Sumit Ganguly (eds.), *Fighting Words: Language Policy and Ethnic Relations in Asia*. (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003), 273.

[27] Bertrand, p. 273.

[28] Harold Sundstrom, *Indonesia: Its People and Its Politics* (Tokyo: Hokuseido Press, 1957), p.135.

[29] Bernard Dahm, *Sukarno and the Struggle for Indonesian Independence*. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969), 344.

[30] Ibid., p. 144. "Kromo" was a commonly used term for average Indonesians before Sukarno introduced "Marhaen."

[31] Lane, p. 21.

[32] Herbert Feith, *The Decline of Constitutional Democracy in Indonesia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1962), 19.

[33] Kahin, p. 156.

[34] Feith, p. 517.

[35] Syed Husin Ali, *The Malay Rulers: Regression or Reform?* Petaling Jaya, (Malaysia: Strategic Information and Research Development Center2013).

[36] Jomo Kwame Sundaram, *A Question of Class: Capital, the State, and Uneven Development in Malaysia*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1986).

[37] Slater, 2010.

[38] Christophe Jaffrelot, *India's Silent Revolution: The Rise of the Lower Castes in North India.* (London, Hurst, 2003).

[39] Tariq Thachil, 2011. "Embedded Mobilization: Nonstate Service Provision as Electoral Strategy in India," *World Politics,* 63(3), 2011, 434-469.

[40] Vali Nasr, *The Shia Revival* (New York, Norton, 2006).

[41] Reid, 76.

[42] Edward Aspinall, "The Irony of Success." *Journal of Democracy* 21:2 (April 2010), 20-34.