The Content of Democracy

Nationalist Parties and Inclusive Ideologies in India and Indonesia

Maya Tudor and Dan Slater

INTRODUCTION AND ARGUMENTS

India and Indonesia are the two largest and unlikeliest democracies in the postcolonial world. Southern Asia's two 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 shared handicaps, 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 both India and Indonesia today appears to have become "the only game in town."

What lessons might we learn from this surprising commonality in contemporary democratic robustness against similarly long odds? Despite the obvious importance of these two cases for world democratization, political scientists are yet to inquire whether India's and Indonesia's parallel outperformance of democratic expectations might have broader implications for democratization theory.

The primary argument developed herein is that India and Indonesia possess a shared but heretofore unrecognized historical source of democratic strength: *the inclusive ideology of their founding political parties*. As leaders of incipient nationalist movements, India's Congress Party and Indonesia's Nationalist Party (PNI) responded to the historically specific imperatives of colonial rule by mobilizing active and direct support across

class lines. By denouncing traditional, hierarchical social structures as well as the ethnic and religious divisions that had long underpinned colonial practices of divide and rule, leading nationalists in both India and Indonesia laid the ideological groundwork during the first half of the twentieth century for a broadly inclusive notion of popular sovereignty. Empirically, we seek to establish that, in both India and Indonesia, inclusive conceptions of citizenship emerged through the historical imperatives of nationalist mobilization. Theoretically, we posit that ideological inclusivity constitutes one of the key pillars of modern democracy.

To be sure, an inclusive conception of national identity on its own is insufficient to propel the development and deepening of democratic institutions. Democracy is not just grounded in ideas, but in a set of institutions that embody those ideas. Thus, our second argument is that for democracy to be sustainably established, *ideologically inclusive nationalist parties must be sufficiently organized to craft winning majorities and to withstand forces seeking to impose authoritarian exclusions* along categorical lines of class, ethnicity, region, language, caste or religion.

In India, the dominant Congress Party developed the organizational capacity necessary to broker hard constitutional compromises that furthered its inclusive ideological principles during India's critical first decade of independence (1947–1957). Though it trod lightly around the combustible controversies surrounding caste, it led the way in creating a public space in which categorical distinctions of caste, class, and religion were rejected in order to maintain the unity and strength of the nationalist movement. Inclusivity thus gained institutional as well as ideological footing in India, with favorable path-dependent consequences for democratic politics after independence.

In Indonesia, by contrast, the PNI failed in virtually the same time period (1949–1958) to develop the necessary political organization and leadership structures to translate its inclusive nationalist vision into lasting democratic institutions. This left the Indonesian political elite rife with internal divisions and incapable of mobilizing the reliable majorities necessary to stabilize democracy through constitutional and coalitional compromises during Indonesia's first decade of independence.

If nationalist party weakness best explains *why* Indonesian democracy failed in the late 1950s, inclusive nationalism itself provides important clues as to *how* it failed. In a pattern that would be repeated in India during the Indira Gandhi-led Emergency of the mid-1970s, Indonesia's parliamentary democracy collapsed when a populist leader performed a leftist autogolpe to establish strongman presidential rule. Sukarno's

Guided Democracy (1957–1965) was not authoritarian because it was exclusionary, but because it brooked no procedural constraints on the executive. While inclusive nationalism provides a powerful check against the exclusion of whole categories of peoples within the national political community, it offers no immunity whatsoever from presidential power grabs. Hence our third argument in this chapter is that *in cases characterized by inclusive nationalism, democracy is more likely to break down through a failure of executive constraints than through a forcible demobilization of mass politics.*

This leaves us with a final puzzle of India and Indonesia's historic regime divergence. While Indira's Emergency ended quickly and Indian democracy was rapidly restored, Sukarno's Guided Democracy was terminated in a right-wing authoritarian bloodbath, after which the Indonesian military put democracy into the deep freeze of the "New Order" period (1965–1998). Yet if Indonesia, like India, gained independence under the banner of a relatively inclusive brand of nationalism, from whence came the authoritarian exclusions that decimated political inclusivity in the 1960s and kept Indonesia authoritarian until the late 1990s?

Herein lies our final argument, that the refraction of the international struggles between the Soviet Union and the United States for spheres of influence onto domestic contexts was crucial to explaining divergent patterns of democratic breakdown across time. Even in cases where inclusive nation-building processes attenuated the kind of "categorical inequalities"[1] that pointed countries toward authoritarianism rather than democracy, the imposition of Cold War imperatives upon varied domestic contexts could produce new patterns of ideological exclusion upon which authoritarianism could rest. It was thus of vital importance for democratic development in South and Southeast Asia that the latter region became a frontline in the global war against communism while the former did not. When communism gained enough organized strength in Indonesia in the mid-1960s to credibly threaten to seize national power, it produced a cataclysmic clash between highly mobilized pro-communist forces and virulently anticommunist forces in the military and in Islamic organizations.[2] In this historical context, the relative inclusivity of

---

[1] Charles Tilly, *Democracy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
[2] Although the Indonesian military was a predominantly Javanese institution, this would not greatly influence the character of the anticommunist crackdown, which mostly constituted an intra-Javanese, rather than interethnic, conflict.

Indonesian nationalism was violently conquered by the extreme exclusivity of Cold War anticommunism. Yet this authoritarian victory was specific to the world-historical moment. When the Cold War ended and the communist threat expired as an ideological justification for authoritarian exclusions in Indonesia (as elsewhere), the descendants of Indonesia's original nationalist movement were free to lead a second successful people's revolution for popular sovereignty: the democratic *reformasi* movement of 1998. In other words, the changing international environment interacted with durable nationalist notions of political identity to make India's democratic trajectory much smoother than Indonesia's.

Our analysis proceeds as follows. In the next section, we specify our two key independent variables: the *ideological content* and *organizational strength* of leading nationalist parties, highlighting how ideological inclusivity serves as one of democracy's key pillars and why democratic stability requires not just the right kind of dominant ideas (which both India and Indonesia largely possessed) but the right kind of dominant party organizations (which only India possessed). Because we examine cases where nationalist identities were evolved in order to further elite interests within the context of the international imperatives of colonialism, our key scope condition is decolonizing cases in the post-World War II period. Our third section traces how similarly inclusive nationalisms and divergently robust parties came into being and shaped India's and Indonesia's regime trajectories. While India's nationalist ideology and regime trajectory had become established as early as the 1950s,[3] Indonesia would exhibit clear convergence in its type of nationalism, but not its regime type, between the 1940s and 1990s. It was only with the end of the Cold War that a democracy movement could ride a second wave of inclusive nationalism to victory in Indonesia in 1998.[4] We emphasize that the current robustness of democracy in Indonesia thus has ideational roots that are as historically deep as India's, even though it did not come about in the same sort of unbroken manner.

Our chapter complements the themes of this special volume in several respects. First, it takes seriously the distinctive issues of institutional composition that accompanied democratization in the postcolonial

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

[4] Dan Slater, *Ordering Power: Contentious Politics and Authoritarian Leviathans in Southeast Asia* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

world. In Indonesia and India, the key challenge was not to install procedural democracy upon the colonial exit, since the formal electoral trappings were a precondition for self-rule. The old authoritarian guard had effectively been defeated, and new rulers were quickly tasked with *establishing* regimes marked by universal adult suffrage and by codified civil liberties rather than *extracting* democratic gains de novo from authoritarian hands. Unlike democratization in Europe, where rising popular forces had to struggle for political inclusion against resistant monarchical, feudalistic, and moneyed elites, the postcolonial world has often seen exclusionary forces on the offensive (attacking a tentative but existent democracy) rather than the defensive (preventing democracy's adoption). We also exemplify the importance of world-historical context in two ways: by focusing on the dialectic between colonial governments and specific social groups that arose at a particular moment in history to shape the consequent emergence of inclusive nationalism; and by considering how the Cold War presented unique historical obstacles to democratic inclusion, even in nations that were quite inclusively defined. Finally, our analysis takes class cleavages seriously while recognizing that Asian colonization intentionally exacerbated identity-based cleavages through practices of divide and rule. To overcome the daunting combination of politicized cleavages that the colonialists had left behind, it would take a nationalist party that was both highly inclusive and cohesively organized: that is, precisely the kind of party that colonialists had been working so fervently to forestall.

NATIONALIST PARTIES, INCLUSIVE IDEOLOGIES, AND REGIME TRAJECTORIES

Although nationalism is more an expression of an imagined identity than of a specific ideology,[5] *types* of nationalism are inevitably infused with ideological content. Of particular interest to us in this chapter is the degree of *inclusivity* articulated and mobilized within the dominant nationalist narrative in a country. Modern-day democracy is increasingly understood in terms of two distinctive features that often exist in tension with each other: inclusivity and constraints.[6] Since the national narrative offers a baseline definition of who is included in the polity and on what terms,

[5] Benedict R. O'G. Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983).
[6] Dan Slater, "Democratic Careening," *World Politics* 65, 4 (October 2013), 729–763.

this narrative critically influences whether all ethnic and religious groups within the state's geographical limits are treated similarly before the law and whether the political benefits of citizenship are more likely to be applied fairly across society. Specifically, if a given definition of the nation excludes whole ascriptive categories of people from the full fruits of citizenship, we argue that this exclusion has negative repercussions for the likelihood that a democracy will emerge and sustain itself over time.

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 *disposes* a country toward democracy, but by no means makes democracy structurally *determined*.[7] An inclusive definition of the nation both provides a bulwark against antidemocratization forces and equips pro-democratization forces with a valuable legitimation resource during subsequent political struggles. Though nationalism is just one potential source of identity, the prospects for pro-democratic forces will be brighter if the nation is defined inclusively. Whenever the nation is defined exclusively, there exists more latent potential for a country to undergo decisive processes of "de-democratization"[8] than in cases where exclusive forms of nationalism have been historically defeated.

We thus code pre-independence nationalisms on a continuum of inclusivity to exclusivity based on the following criteria. First, did the dominant nationalist movement explicitly and consistently espouse a vision of nationhood that transcended specific religious, ethnic, regional, or other ascriptive identities? Second, did the nationalist movement make commitments to embrace and accommodate the linguistic demands and interests of multiple communities during the independence struggle, instead of imposing the language of a politically dominant community? Third, did the dominant nationalist movement assertively attempt to provide representation not just for highly educated "new men" but for working, peasant, and other popular sectors? To the extent that the answers to these questions are affirmative, we suggest that the articulated nationalism can be termed inclusive.

For these nationalist conceptions of citizenship to become enduring, however, such conceptions must become embedded in institutions. Like any "ism," types of nationalism cannot become dominant ideological

---

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

[8] Tilly (2007).

forms within a polity unless they are mobilized into enduring political institutions by victorious collective actors. To be sure, advocates of inclusive nationalism may have to reckon with proponents of more exclusive approaches to defining the nation at later historical junctures. But both when the type of nationalism is initially codified 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 enough in their initial struggles for power that inclusive ideologies become codified in such institutions as founding constitutions, which subsequently provide an enduring democratic resource.

Specifically, we argue that the level of party organization before independence is key to understanding whether post-independence democratization was relatively stable. We employ the following criteria to establish whether the dominant political party could be termed "organized" at independence. First, did the dominant political party have a well-established grassroots presence? Second, did the dominant political party have an established organizational means of reconciling competing interests of grassroots supporters? And third, did the dominant political party's executive decision-making body possess some autonomy from both its top leader and its grassroots bodies? Unless leading nationalist parties were able both to channel their ideological visions in predictable and coherent ways, and to translate their leadership in the pre-independence era into continued leadership during the period after independence, their felicitous ideological effects on democratic development could not be fully institutionalized.

NATIONALIST PARTIES AND REGIME TRAJECTORIES: INDIA AND INDONESIA IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

We now detail how our arguments find empirical support in our core cases of India and Indonesia.[9] In the next section, we begin by briefly surveying

---

[9] As we are especially interested in this volume in illuminating pathways toward consolidated democracy in the postcolonial world, we focus exclusively on "positive cases" in which inclusive nationalism succored post-independence democratization and democratic endurance. We discuss "negative cases" of relatively exclusionary nationalism and authoritarian political dynamics in Pakistan and Malaysia elsewhere.

the dauntingly heterogeneous cleavage structures that nationalists in India and Indonesia confronted around the turn of the twentieth century as they began to mobilize mass movements for self-rule. Colonialism established a baseline of extreme indigenous disorganization and divide-and-rule machinations against which our definition of "inclusive nationalism" must be assessed. The second section details how nationalist parties spearheaded movements to transcend colonial-era "categorical inequalities" in their efforts to oust the imperialists and claim power. But while both India and Indonesia incubated nationalist parties with enough mass appeal to lead a successful movement against colonial rule, they diverged dramatically in their capacity to forge democratic compromises under self-rule. Our third section traces how, before and during independence, Congress succeeded, but the PNI failed, to assemble majoritarian coalitions in support of democratic constitutions to consolidate the inclusive promise of each country's nationalist struggle.

Our fourth subsection offers a historically grounded explanation for why democratic breakdowns and reemergences took the pattern they did in India and Indonesia, centering on considerations of nationalist party strength. Intriguingly, democracy initially broke down in both cases in parallel fashion. When Sukarno disbanded the deadlocked constitutional assembly and declared a highly presidentialist regime of Guided Democracy in 1957, he did so through a populist, leftist autogolpe. Democracy did not collapse because Sukarno sought to reimpose colonial-style authoritarian exclusions, but because he wanted to cast aside all procedural constraints against full mobilization of the nation's masses against his conservative foes both at home and abroad. Similarly, Indira Gandhi's Emergency was a populist effort to mobilize the Indian masses in a bitter intra-partisan dispute. India and Indonesia both saw democracy collapse, not because their leaders rejected their nations' or parties' historic commitments to cross-categorical *inclusion*, but because populist rulers sought to remove or diminish democratic *constraints*.

Both countries' bouts of populist authoritarianism would be brief, but they would end in diametrically opposite ways. In India, democratic elections removed Indira from power as the constitutive democratic elements of inclusivity and constraints were rejoined. In Indonesia, by contrast, Sukarno's pro-communist turn ended with a brutal and murderous right-wing counter-coup, as the Suharto-led New Order regime arose to demolish Sukarno's mass-mobilizing regime. This was due to the emergence of new categories of exclusion in Indonesian politics against

the global historic backdrop of the Cold War. It was not only that anticommunist exclusion trumped the inclusions mobilized by nationalist parties, however. It was that the putatively atheistic character of global communism directly collided with the resolutely nonsecular (if also not exclusively Islamic) principles of Pancasila, Sukarno's founding national ideology. With the Indonesian nation defined in a manner in which heterodox believers and nonbelievers held no recognized place,[10] organized communism proved to be an ideology that its foes perceived they had to exclude through authoritarian rule.

In the fifth and final empirical subsection, we consider the lasting and contemporary implications of inclusive nationalism for Indian and Indonesian democracy. In India, democracy has long been consolidated in the sense that it is truly considered "the only game in town." Even as single-party dominance has given way to a less predictable era of coalition and identity-based politics, the ideological promise of full political inclusion originally mobilized by India's nationalist movement has been both increasingly realized through the mobilization of its backward and middle castes and under threat from the rise of Hindu-centered identity politics in the last several decades. In Indonesia, the disappearance of the Cold War's ideological exclusions enabled direct descendants of its nationalist movement to pursue a second revolution for popular sovereignty that drew upon inclusive conceptions of nationalism created and codified in the independence era. The sudden and remarkable triumph of democratic forces in Indonesia in 1998–1999 has been accompanied by surprisingly little talk of authoritarian retrenchment. Thus, in the fifteen years since the tumultuous popular overthrow of Suharto, Indonesia has seen democracy become "the only game in town" almost as assuredly as in India. To be sure, the endemic weaknesses in its party system mean Indonesia could still easily bring another authoritarian populist like Sukarno to power, just as party weakness did in the 1950s. Yet with the Cold War long gone, it is much harder to imagine Indonesia anointing another exclusivist authoritarian.[11]

---

[10] Jeremy Menchik, "Productive Intolerance: Godly Nationalism in Indonesia," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 56, 3 (July 2014), 591–621.

[11] Controversies over commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the 1965 massacre (which were just erupting at the time of final writing) are illustrative. On the one hand, the calls from politicians as powerful as the vice president to silence voices critical of the military's actions exemplify the most authoritarian streak remaining in Indonesian politics. On the other hand, the contemporary irrelevance of communism to Indonesian political organizations means there is very little risk that this virulent anticommunist sentiment will produce regime-wide effects as it did during the Cold War.

Division and Disorganization under Colonialism

In British India and the Dutch East Indies, as elsewhere, imperial rulers worked feverishly to ensure that colonized peoples would be too socially divided and politically disorganized to mount a challenge to colonial hegemony. Where the forerunners of India and Indonesia differed from most other colonies was in the raw scale of their territories and the sheer diversity of their populations along every imaginable marker of identity. This provided British and Dutch imperialists with a vast array of salient cleavages along which they could divide and rule. Before they were especially unlikely democracies, India and Indonesia were especially unlikely nations.

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the British expanded and consolidated their colonial Indian empire through divide-and-rule tactics that forestalled solidarity among the indigenous population. Hinduism, the religion of over three-quarters of the subcontinent, provided excellent fodder for this strategy, dividing as it did rural society (Hindu and Muslim alike) into ranked, endogamous caste strata. The recognition of an individual's caste status in overwhelmingly rural colonial India conditioned social life, dictating hierarchical social interactions in nearly every public and private sphere.[12] Outside of a few urbanizing pockets, the social fabric of colonial India was characterized by centuries-old social divisions that appeared to be particularly inhospitable soil for growing egalitarian conceptions of citizenship.

The British colonial regime incorporated and codified social hierarchies as it sought allies in its bid to extend and stabilize its rule over colonial India. Census documents deliberately delineated between caste Hindus, scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, sub-castes, and religions.[13] Though census officers often struggled to draw clear religious distinctions between the erstwhile Muslim rulers of India and Hindus in the large areas with a syncretic religious tradition, they treated these communities in politically distinct ways that were central to the stability of colonial rule. For much of the nineteenth century, these divide-and-rule tactics were effective at forestalling effective political mobilization.

The earliest challenge to British colonial rule in India came from a distinct social group that reflected and reinforced religious and regional hierarchies

---

[12] John H. Hutton, *Caste in India: Its Nature, Function and Origins* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951).
[13] Government of India Census of 1931.

rather than transcending them. The founding members of India's eventual nationalist movement (the Indian National Congress) were overwhelmingly urban, English-educated, Brahman lawyers – a demographic that probably numbered just a few hundred in a geographical entity encompassing 300 million at the turn of the twentieth century.[14] Founded in 1885 by this minute elite in order to more effectively lobby for colonial employment opportunities, early Congressmen were high-caste Hindus who observed hierarchical caste restrictions. Such practices, because they precluded egalitarian interactions even within politics, directly impeded the imagining of an inclusive that is fundamentally premised upon equal citizenship. Nor were early Congressmen overly concerned with mass nationalism, embracing as they did literacy restrictions on the franchise. For the first decades of its existence, then, India's nascent nationalist movement remained internally divided and politically disconnected from the vast majority of the indigenous population.[15]

Dutch colonial rule in Indonesia was based on similar practices of divide and rule as British rule on the subcontinent. These produced a series of "status gaps" across ethnic groups, racial categories, religious communities, and regional populations.[16] Given Indonesia's spectacular demographic diversity along all of these dimensions, raw material for such colonial codifications and stratifications was almost limitless. Of particular importance was the Dutch colonial state's systematic political favoritism toward non-Muslim and non-Javanese populations, given its justifiable fear of resistance from Indonesia's majority Muslim and plurality Javanese quarters. This had the important effect of strengthening local aristocracies in many parts of the "Outer Islands" off of Java, while the hereditary aristocracy in Java itself was largely incorporated into colonial state employment rather than cementing its social and political power through large private landholdings.[17] Colonial policies also enticed a sizable ethnic Chinese population to settle and thrive in the Dutch East Indies, constituting the largest portion of the tiny non-European bourgeoisie by the early twentieth century.

It would be in direct reaction to this incipient Chinese domination of the local business sector that the first stirrings of political organization would

---

[14] John R. McLane, *Indian Nationalism and the Early Congress* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977).
[15] Bruce T. McCully, *English Education and the Origins of Indian Nationalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940).
[16] Anthony Reid, *Imperial Alchemy: Nationalism and Political Identity in Southeast Asia* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 68.
[17] Richard Robison, *Indonesia: The Rise of Capital* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1986).

commence in Indonesia. Of particular importance was the Sarekat Islam (Islamic Union), which emerged in 1912 to become "the first politically based native Indonesian nationalist organization" and "built a membership of over three hundred and sixty thousand in four years."[18] Yet it exhibited a more intensely "anti-Chinese character"[19] than anti-Dutch character, channeling resentment among the "indigenous" (*pribumi*) bourgeoisie over Dutch favoritism toward the "immigrant" Chinese. Like many early nationalist movements, the Sarekat Islam primarily sought intensified colonial patronage rather than any quick colonial retreat. It still constituted the most explicitly political expression of Indonesia's flourishing Islamic sector, however, as two massive Islamic social organizations – the Muhammadiyah (f. 1912) and Nahdlatul Ulama (NU, f. 1926) – arose to foster Islam's internal reform in urban areas (in the case of Muhammadiyah) and to preserve its traditional practices in rural areas (in the NU's case), rather than to pressure Dutch authority for political change.

Dutch colonialism in Indonesia afforded a narrower space for indigenous political mobilization and organization than British colonialism did in India. The broadly apolitical and conservative character of Islamic activism in Indonesia was largely a function of the Dutch colonial state's capacity and willingness to repress any actions it considered too political or radical. This was most clearly seen in the crushing of the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI) virtually upon its inception in the mid-1920s (while the Indian National Congress was alternatively repressed and conciliated). With the PKI's violent demise, no highly organized group existed in Indonesian civil society that endorsed a highly inclusive notion of citizenship transcending familiar categorical divides. It would only be with the meteoric rise of the Indonesian Nationalist Party (PNI) after 1927 that a truly inclusive ideological formation would reshape the colonial political arena, while still confronting a level of repression and intolerance that surpassed anything Congress confronted in India in the same period.

Nationalist Parties as Ideological Spearheads of Inclusion

In most colonial states during the first half of the twentieth century, emergent urban elites seized upon the rise of new ideological currents and the declining legitimacy of colonial rule to propound nationalisms

---

[18] Harold Sundstrom, *Indonesia: Its People and Its Politics* (Tokyo: Hokuseido Press, 1957), 75.
[19] Reid (2010, p. 62).

that strategically justified their access to political power. In doing so, new groups evolved notions of citizenship that helped to mobilize mass support. In India and Indonesia, the challenge of colonial divide-and-rule tactics in such diverse polities was overcome by promoting egalitarian conceptions of citizenship that served to reconcile the varied demands of regions, castes, and religions.

In colonial India, Congress evolved from a hierarchical organization based on caste and educational exclusions to a nationalist party that promulgated a broadly inclusive notion of citizenship on the eve of independence. Because the pervasive institution of caste hierarchically ranked all social interactions, forging an inclusive concept of citizenship required the creation of a public sphere in which would-be citizens could interact on the basis of equality. Congress' initial recognition of caste hierarchies had undermined its pursuit of self-governance because the colonial regime justified its ongoing rule by positing that colonial India was only a motley assembly of despotic social relations unfit for representative political institutions.[20]

Strategically adapting, Congress transformed from an organization representing a fraction of the new urban middle class to an organization that represented broad swathes of Indian society during the 1920s and 1930s. By independence, the nationalist movement was a political movement whose body and leadership no longer represented a single class or even a subset of a class. Congress' organizing cleavage was pro- and anti-colonial and the most vaunted class divides – such as capital and labor in the urban areas as well as village big men and poorer peasants in rural areas – were broadly reconciled within the nationalist movement.[21]

Congress' efforts to ban the public recognition of caste untouchability best illustrate how it reinterpreted traditional social identities in such a way as to promote an inclusive national identity, at least in principle. In 1920, under the new leadership of Gandhi, Congress expended considerable effort to create public spaces where the lowest-ranked castes or untouchables could be thought of as Indian citizens.[22] Untouchables were the lowest-ranked members of the Hindu caste hierarchy, technically those without caste status. Representing about 10 percent of the

[20] Ravindra Kumar, "Class, Community or Nation? Gandhi's Quest for a Popular Consensus in India," *Modern Asian Studies*, 3, 4 (1969), 357–360.
[21] Tudor (2013, Chapter 4).
[22] Lloyd I. Rudolph and Susanne Hoeber Rudolph, *Postmodern Gandhi and Other Essays: Gandhi in the World and at Home* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006).

population, untouchables were discriminated against on roads, at wells, and in other common areas, either by prohibiting access or by granting differential access on substandard terms. A fully inclusive national identity therefore necessitated the reform and re-imagining of religious hierarchies.

Under Gandhi's leadership, Congress slowly but surely embraced a more egalitarian conception of citizenship by rejecting the public recognition of Hindu untouchability. Beginning in 1920, some Congressmen joined Gandhi in campaigning against the public discrimination of untouchables, often modeling egalitarian public behavior in ashrams where, for example, all members used and cleaned the same toilets, irrespective of caste. Since toilets were heretofore only cleaned by untouchables, such behavior was a clearly visible marker of the rejection of untouchability. Initially, Gandhi did not promote the private rejection of caste in such matters as dining or marriage but specifically campaigned against the *public* recognition of untouchability as immoral and proper and in fact contradicted by the sacred texts of Hinduism. That same year, Congress passed a resolution formally abolishing untouchability.[23]

What began as a rhetorical commitment on the part of Congress in order to legitimize access to colonial power increasingly created a public sphere in which the concept of egalitarian citizenship was even possible – a Herculean accomplishment given the all-pervasive recognition of caste hierarchies just a decade earlier. Through processes of moral consciousness-raising, persuasion, and institutionalization, Congressmen agreed to small behavioral modifications such as discarding separate kitchens, which progressively opened to way to mainstreaming more radical gestures, such as wearing homespun cloth in order to symbolize national unity.[24] Over the subsequent decades, Congressmen who had strictly observed caste strictures began to steadily eschew the public recognition of caste.[25] The rejection of caste hierarchies was part and parcel of a whole slew of programmatic commitments to village "works," including programs of health, sanitation, and education that Congress was heavily involved in promoting.[26]

---

[23] Indian National Congress, 1920. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of Congress. Nehru Memorial Museum and Library.

[24] Jonathan Freedman and Scott Fraser, "Compliance without Pressure: The Foot-in-the-Door Technique," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 4 (1966), 195–202.

[25] Rajendra Prasad, *Satyagraha in Champaran* (Delhi: Navajivan Publishing House, 1949), 98.

[26] To be sure, these changes hardly signaled the disappearance of caste as a social phenomenon. But trying to wholly reject caste practices would have been tantamount to rejecting

Congress consistently rejected caste distinctions and codified these commitments within the party. That this was true is especially evident when Congress eschewed employing caste hierarchies in order to meet short-term political goals.[27] For example, when the colonial government granted political reform but simultaneously proposed separate electorates for untouchables in 1932, Congress leaders rejected the Communal Award on the grounds that it forestalled prospects for national unity. Universal adult suffrage became mainstreamed as official Congress policy this same year. Over the next decade and a half, though gradually and haltingly, caste equality in public spaces came to critically define Indian nationalism. While the rejection of caste hierarchies in public spheres did little to attenuate the pervasiveness of caste divisions elsewhere in social life,[28] this egalitarian public sphere was critical to the emergence and consolidation of an electoral democracy in post-independence India.

Though the public rejection of caste hierarchies was perhaps the most important manifestation of the inclusivity and programmatic content of Indian nationalism, it was by no means its only manifestation. Congress' economic boycott of British mill cloth and visible embrace of homespun cloth through the spinning wheel was costly in terms of time and money. Thus it was all the more remarkable that homespun cloth was embraced across India's entire socioeconomic spectrum, including the urban lawyers that formed the top layer of Congress leadership.[29] Most famously, of course, Congress' three anticolonial mass mobilizations focused their discontents not just on general anticolonial mobilization but targeted specific laws or policies that united Indians such as the diminution of land revenue burdens in *ryotwari* areas, the abolition of salt taxes, and the right to declare war. At the same time, and in contrast to many contemporaneous independence movements, Congress developed policies of accommodation between various sectors of society on questions of trade, economic planning, budget allocations, and relations between

---

Hinduism altogether and therefore to throw large segments of the population in direct opposition to Congress. Instead and crucially for the purposes of formalizing democratic institutions after independence, Congress established a public space where caste hierarchies were not recognized, a substantial accomplishment in that time.

[27] Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, *Young India*, February 16, 1921.

[28] Indeed the high-caste status of Congress leaders is in many ways what allowed those leaders to effectively harness the forces of social change.

[29] A. Appadurai, *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 313; Lisa N. Trivedi, "Visually Mapping the 'Nation': Swadeshi Politics in Nationalist India, 1920–1930," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 62, 1 (February 2003), 11–41.

capital and labor.[30] These were all examples of the ways in which India's nationalist movement gave substance to an inclusive conception of citizenship.

To be clear, Congress initially articulated this inclusivity because doing so promised the possibility of political power. And to be sure, Congress leadership was not inclusive electorally, fatefully misjudging the need for dialogue with the Muslim League because of the latter's weak electoral showing in the 1937 elections. But in an international context where the British colonial empire legitimated its rule by proclaiming that liberty must be earned before it can be enjoyed,[31] progress toward attaining self-governance necessitated mobilizing a broad and united front against a colonial regime that was ever-ready to wield divide-and-rule tactics. The educated, urban middle class leading Congress thus strategically evolved a nationalism that was based not just in opposition to colonial rule but that was defined by a programmatic commitment to political equality.

Indonesian nationalism would experience its dramatic inclusive turn with the advent of the PNI in 1927 and the proclamation of the *Sumpah Pemuda* (Youth Pledge) the following year. The charismatic driving force behind both the party and the pledge was Sukarno, a highly educated and oratorically gifted 26-year-old son of an aristocrat and schoolteacher from Indonesia's second-largest city: Surabaya, East Java. In the wake of the PKI's repression by Dutch authorities, Sukarno and his fellow urban "academic activists"[32] were well positioned to build the PNI as a less polarizing leading alternative. The watchword of the 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."[33]

More concretely, the PNI-organized Youth Pledge insisted upon unity across all of Indonesia's cultural divides, most notably in terms of language.

[30] Richard Sisson and Stanley Wolpert, *Congress and Indian Nationalism: The Pre-Independence Phase* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).

[31] Still inscribed at the entrance to the colonial government buildings built in New Delhi between 1912 and 1931 are the words "Liberty will not descend to a people. A people must raise themselves to liberty. It is a blessing that must be earned before it can be enjoyed."

[32] Stefan Eklof, *Power and Political Culture in Suharto's Indonesia: The Indonesian Democratic Party (PDI) and Decline of the New Order (1986–98)* (Copenhagen: NIAS Press, 2003), 27.

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

It famously called for "One nation with one language, Indonesian; and one homeland, Indonesia." The language, Indonesian, was to be based on Malay, the archipelago's lingua franca, which "was not associated with any particular ethnic group."[34] 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."[35] In ethnic and regional terms, choosing Malay/Indonesian over Javanese aided the PNI-led effort "to break down parochial penchants in Indonesian nationalism."[36] It also helped the nationalist movement "reach the Indonesian masses,"[37] 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."[38] Despite the fact that 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 was not limited to the politics of language choice. Rhetorically, 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."[39] Ideologically, Sukarno finessed the deep tension between Marxist and non-Marxist nationalists by elaborating "Marhaenism" as an inclusive indigenous alternative. Putatively named after a smallholding peasant named Marhaen whom Sukarno met in West Java, Marhaenism ideologically encapsulated Sukarno's "attempt to draw as many groups as

---

[34] 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.

[35] Max Lane, *Unfinished Nation: Indonesia before and after Suharto* (London: Verso, 2008), 18.

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

[37] Kees Groeneboer, *Gateway to the West: The Dutch Language in Colonial Indonesia, 1600–1950* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1998), 236.

[38] Bertrand (2003, p. 273); Eschewing Dutch was important in a similar respect: "Dutch would never be able to function as a unifying language, because, like Javanese, it was much too difficult" (Groeneboer 1998, p. 212).

[39] Sundstrom (1957, p. 135).

possible into the revolutionary struggle along with the proletariat."[40] 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!"[41]

   Such radical ideological pronouncements met a stern response from the Dutch colonialists, who banned the PNI in 1931 and sent Sukarno into long-term exile in 1933. Unlike the British colonial regime that alternatively engaged and imprisoned Indian nationalist leaders, the Dutch in Indonesia offered no space for a charismatic nationalist leader and his party vehicle to gain political momentum and organizational experience. This only exacerbated the PNI's titanic struggles to mobilize and institutionalize support across Indonesia's many cavernous categorical divides. Organized nationalism gained a new lease on life with the onset of World War II, however, as 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 to 1945 also fostered new divisions within the nationalist camp, particularly between leading collaborators such as Sukarno and Mohammed Hatta – the top Javanese and non-Javanese figures in the PNI, respectively – and leading resisters to Japanese occupation such as Sjahrir.[42] The war also allowed Indonesia's Islamic stream to gain major political headway vis-à-vis the left-nationalist front, as the Japanese fostered the rise of a new organization called Masyumi that transcended the old traditionalist–modernist, NU–Muhammadiyah divide. By the time the war ended, therefore, the PNI had been out of commission as an active party for nearly

[40] Bernard Dahm, *Sukarno and the Struggle for Indonesian Independence* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969), 344.
[41] Ibid., 144; "Kromo" was a commonly used term for average Indonesians before Sukarno introduced the term "Marhaen," which thereafter "dominated political discussion in Indonesia" throughout the nationalist struggle. Anwar Khaidir, *Indonesian: The Development and Use of a National Language* (Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press, 1980), 21.
[42] Tuong Vu, *Paths to Development in Asia: South Korea, Vietnam, China, and Indonesia* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

fifteen years, and leading inclusive nationalists such as Sukarno and Hatta may have enjoyed unrivaled authority, but not unrivaled organizational strength, to put their ideological visions into practice.

Organizing Democracy: Nationalist Parties and Post-Independence Compromises

In the years immediately following World War II, India and Indonesia gained independence from colonial rule. Nationalist movements played a central role in defining the new regimes of the sovereign nations they had helped to create. Yet the critical question was less whether democracy would be *adopted* than whether it could be *sustained*. Only in India was the leading nationalist party strong enough to give inclusive nationalism an effective institutional grounding. Though both India's Congress and Indonesia's PNI had propagated inclusive nationalisms, Congress succeeded, but the PNI failed, to build a stable majoritarian coalition in support of a democratic constitution.

A window into the differential organizational capacities of respective political parties between India and Indonesia is the constitution-making process of each country upon independence. This is because the creation of respected rules for sharing power between groups and the elites who represent them within a constitution is often considered the sine qua non of a stable regime and because early constitutions serve as regular reference points at subsequent critical junctures. Immediately upon independence, constitution-making in India proceeded smoothly because the Indian National Congress served as the locus of reconciliation for competing interests and because the presence of definite programmatic commitments formed the basis for the resolution of divisive issues. The Indian National Congress was *the* organizing force within the Indian Constituent Assembly, forming approximately three-quarters of the 300-plus members of the Constituent Assembly. The sheer dominance of Congress within the Assembly, as well as the presence of most of its eminent leaders, allows us to view Constituent Assembly decisions as largely reflective of its ability to forge compromise and maintain coalitional support.

A constitution governing an extraordinarily diverse electorate was rapidly adopted because Congress relied upon party procedures that were legitimated prior to independence. When Congress leaders agreed among themselves on constitutional issues, they facilitated party consensus through discussion and accommodation. Given the prolonged nature

of the anticolonial struggle and the necessity of forging an institution that could contest and win provincial elections, party rank-and-file members were both programmatically and organizationally primed to seek compromise in the pursuit of broader political goals – this is in fact what they had done throughout the colonial period by accepting and following the decisions of top-level Congress Party leaders.

Borrowing from their deep study of other constitution-making bodies, Congress leaders created a separate organizational forum to allow its members to freely debate constitutional matters before they were formally brought to the Constituent Assembly and entered into the public record. Nevertheless, debate over constitutional matters frequently assumed acrimonious form.[43] During its sessions, Constituent Assembly or Congress leaders continually stressed the importance of persuasion rather than strong-arming, which was exactly how the party had created consensus in the pre-independence decades when maintaining a common front against the colonial regime was crucial to the movement's long-term success.

If the persuasions of leadership did not suffice to broker agreement, the established habit of agreeing to resolve differences within the party itself as well as the organizational structure of the party further facilitated compromise. First, important issues – such as the expropriation of private property or the recognition of linguistic states – were deliberately left until the end of the Constituent Assembly's work at the behest of its key leaders, allowing for most of the constitution to assume shape before the most difficult issues were tackled. Congress' president led the Assembly, assuring the primacy of the party over the constitution-making process, meaning that the Assembly was insulated to some extent from being used as a means to pursue specific Congress policy goals. Congress also employed a whip, though it is a mark of the party's habituation to compromise that the whip was only occasionally utilized.[44] These institutions and such tactics were all evidence of an organizational capacity honed during the pre-independence struggle.

In addition to these consensus-creating institutional features of the party, programmatic commitments articulated before independence facilitated constitutional consensus on democratic norms because those

[43] Granville Austin, *The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation* (Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1971), 23.

[44] *Constituent Assembly Debates of India*, Volume X, 3–7. Nehru Memorial Museum and Library.

commitments were substantively inclusive. For example, when debate ensued over what powers should be allocated to the central versus provincial governments, Constituent Assembly members were reminded that only a strong central government would be able to effectively implement those village uplift programs, including the abolition of untouchability, that had formed the programmatic basis of the Indian independence movement.[45] As a result of its established rules and procedures, then, Congress could quickly come to consensus on power-sharing agreements, thereby ensuring regime stability. And as a result of the inclusive nature of its nationalism, core democratic features such as universal adult franchise and an elected chief executive were adopted within a constitution that, twenty-one months from 1975 to 1977 notwithstanding, have formed the basis for a consolidated democratic regime in the nearly seven decades since independence.[46]

Unlike India, Indonesia had to fight a bloody nationalist revolution against its European overlords to secure independence. Although the greater resistance of Dutch than British officials to indigenous mobilization had long left Indonesia's PNI organizationally hamstrung vis-à-vis India's Congress, the pivotal and violent period of *perjuangan* (struggle) from 1945 to 1949 more deeply entrenched the inclusive character of Indonesian nationalism. 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 anticolonial movement, not the folk tales or courtly discourses of the so-called ethnic traditions."[47] Yet for all its ideological fervor and mobilized inclusivity, Indonesia's was ultimately a national revolution, not a social revolution.[48] The diverse panoply of actors, cleavages, and organizations that had populated the Indonesian polity before independence thus remained central as nationalist leaders tried to forge hard

---

[45] Kavalam M. Panniker, *Hindu Society at Crossroads* (New Delhi: Asia Publishing House, 1961), 63.

[46] Tudor (2013, Chapter 5).

[47] Lane (2008, p. 21).

[48] Benedict R. O'G. Anderson, *Java in a Time of Revolution: Occupation and Resistance, 1944–1946* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1972).

compromises to give postcolonial democracy its legs.[49] In Indonesia unlike India, "no single nationalist party led the country through the critical last years of independence."[50]

Sukarno's PNI sorely lacked the internal cohesion, professional experience, and dominant position that allowed Gandhi and Nehru's Congress to sustain democracy in India. In fact, when the first hard compromises had to be hammered out as to how an independent Indonesia would be governed, in the wake of Japan's sudden surrender in August 1945, the PNI did not even formally *exist*. Banned in 1931, the PNI would not formally be reconstituted by Sukarno and Hatta until 1946, when the nationalist revolution against the Dutch was in its full and chaotic throes. 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."[51] The closest thing Indonesia had to a strong party organization as of Japan's surrender was not the PNI but Masyumi, which the Japanese had constructed from the massive Islamic organizations of NU and Muhammadiyah. Nationalists like Sukarno and Hatta would lead the revolution in line with their inclusive ideological visions,[52] but Islamically – oriented social forces posed an enormous categorical distinction – that of religion – for inclusive nation-builders to overcome.

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 in which all Muslims were obliged to adhere to syariah law. Much as his ideology of "Marhaenism" had absorbed much of the radical energy of Marxism without alienating anticommunist 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,

[49] Vu (2010).

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

[51] Kahin (1952, p. 156).

[52] For an argument that Indonesia's nationalist struggle was inclusionary and accommodating of diversity and difference to its own detriment, see Vu (2010, Chapters 3 and 7).

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. What Pancasila still explicitly excluded, however, were believers in "heterodox" faiths such as Ahmadi and Shia Muslims as well as atheists: a categorical exclusion that would have deadly reverberations when the "atheistic" PKI reemerged as a major political force in the 1960s. In subtle but significant distinction to India's secular nationalism, therefore, Indonesia's was resolutely a "Godly nationalism."[53]

While Sukarno's 1945 constitution papered over deep social conflicts on the question of *religion*, the categorical distinction of *region* proved a more insuperable political problem. Here, the national revolution of 1945–1949 ironically made the divide deeper. With *perjuangan* centered on Java and pro-Dutch sentiment scattered in various, largely Christian areas of the Outer Islands, it was inevitable that the bitter regional cleavage would carry over into postcolonial politics. In its last, desperate stab at divide and rule, the Dutch insisted that federalism be imposed on the new Indonesian republic as a precondition for its independence in 1949. This made federalism an unutterably dirty word in Indonesian politics. 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 to 1957; 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 more symbolic than substantive from the earliest days of the republic.

The regional problem loomed large in Indonesia's fragmented parliamentary politics from 1950 to 1957. Even if the PNI had been internally better organized and less factionalized, its core problem was that it lacked the national reach and majoritarian strength to institutionalize its inclusive ideological vision. Far from being a dominant party, the PNI exhibited almost equivalent political strength as three contenders: the Islamic Masyumi and NU, and the re-emergent PKI. The parliamentary elections

---

[53] Menchik (2014).

of 1955 confirmed that none of these four forces could approximate majoritarian strength. Nationalist party weakness meant a decade of revolving-door cabinets and constitutional gridlock.[54] Without solid foundations in an inclusive leading nationalist party capable of hammering out constitutional and coalitional compromises, Indonesian democracy remained deeply vulnerable to any authoritarian challengers who might arise.

To sum up, the inclusive or exclusive content of nationalism conditions a dominant party to be more or less amenable to creating equal rights for its citizens upon independence. Indian and Indonesian nationalism involved espousing and institutionalizing political equality. Before independence, India's and Indonesia's nationalist movements had separated religious, regional, and linguistic identities from the defining core of citizenship. In doing so, they created a public sphere within which political equality was rhetorically and behaviorally embraced.

Unraveling Democracy: Divergent Regime Breakdowns in Inclusive Nationalist Settings

If India and Indonesia both boast inclusive nationalisms, then why did democracy experience breakdown in both cases? We argue that India and Indonesia both saw democracy collapse not because their leaders rejected their nations' or their parties' historic commitments to cross-categorical inclusion, but rather because populist rulers sought to diminish democratic constraints. Against backdrops of party debility, in fact, populist authoritarianism credibly appeared to Indira Gandhi and Sukarno and their most devoted followers to be a vehicle for fulfilling the inclusive promise of Indian and Indonesian nationalism: a promise that weak-party democracy was increasingly failing to fulfill.

The first substantive challenge to India's stable democratic trajectory came when Congress' leadership crisis resulted in the party's de-institutionalization. After the critical post-independence years, India's democracy ably weathered the myriad challenges of new statehood, most notably reorganizing the nation along linguistic lines. The general elections of 1952, 1957, and 1962 were widely viewed as exemplary and continually returned Congress to power. Following Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru's death in 1964, another prominent nationalist figure succeeded Nehru. But his sudden death in 1966 catapulted Congress into

---

[54] Feith (1962).

an organizational crisis not seen since well before independence. At the behest of powerful, conservative regional leaders, Nehru's daughter, Indira Gandhi, was chosen to lead the party because she was viewed as a pliant figurehead. But as Indira followed in her father's socialist footsteps and asserted her power, the tenuous accommodation between socialist and conservative factions of Congress erupted in 1969. Congress thereafter split in two: a break-away socialist Congress faction acknowledging Indira Gandhi's leadership and an old guard of conservative party bosses who maintained the original Congress Party networks.

In order to consolidate her rule in the absence of grassroots party machinery, Indira attacked institutional constraints on her rule while still maintaining and even elevating inclusionary appeals to the Indian masses. For example, one of her first acts after the 1971 election was to undermine the judiciary by passing the 24th and 25th constitutional amendments, the effects of which were to weaken the power of the judicial branch to control constitutional amendment procedures as well as to eliminate protections for those negatively impacted by nationalization programs.[55] Her infamous 1975 campaign slogan was "India is Indira and Indira is India." Indira's increasingly autocratic governance culminated in India's darkest political hour since independence – the twenty-one-month period of autocracy known as the "Emergency." Under the pretense of addressing unrest instigated by the political opposition, Indira declared a state of emergency in which civil liberties and political freedoms were suspended. During this time, many members of her political opposition were arbitrarily arrested and personal freedoms were widely curtailed. At the same time as Indira undermined one aspect of democracy, the rule of law, she elevated the importance of another aspect, the rule of numbers. In an attempt to circumvent the intermediary layers of party bureaucracy, Indira Gandhi employed a populist campaign slogan of *garibi hatao* (abolish poverty), which appealed directly to the numerically larger and socioeconomically subordinate lower castes. In doing so, Indira succeeded in winning a large mandate in the 1971 national elections.

Indira's undermining of civil and political constraints did not last long, however. Misjudging her popularity, Indira Gandhi called fresh elections in 1977 and was roundly defeated. Indira's opponents had largely campaigned by reminding voters that they were choosing between democracy and dictatorship, underlining specific policies such as sterilization

---

[55] Christophe Jaffrelot, *India's Silent Revolution: The Rise of the Lower Castes in North India* (London: C. Hurst, 2003), 140.

campaigns in rural areas and the media censorship in urban areas.[56] Indeed, the opposition Janata Party gained the largest percentage of votes ever gained by a non-Congress Party and Congress even lost the election in its regional stronghold of Uttar Pradesh. If India's democracy had been endangered during the Emergency, however, the decisive rejection of Indira's autocratic turn re-affirmed Indian democracy, not only by turning out the offending autocrat but by reaffirming that its most powerful party could lose an election and peacefully relinquish power.

Indonesia's initial democratic breakdown resembled India's populist autogolpe more than a conservative military coup. Bereft of a functioning party machinery with which to forge coalitional and constitutional compromises, figurehead president Sukarno could only sit by idly 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.[57] Proclaiming the urgent national need to restore revolutionary fervor by following his all-inclusive ideological formulation of *Nasakom* – combining nation, religion, and communism[58] – 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. Parliamentary democracy in Indonesia thus died at Sukarno's own hands, much as Indian democracy's only experience with breakdown was at the hands of Indira Gandhi.

Though Sukarno's authoritarian maneuvers occurred with the active support of the Indonesian military, his was not a right-wing or exclusionary autogolpe. The military itself was deeply split between pro-communist

[56] Prithvi N. Dhar, *Indira Gandhi, the Emergency, and Indian Democracy* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2000).

[57] Feith (1962, p. 517).

[58] On the roots of Sukarno's *Nasakom* ideology in the 1920s, see McVey (1970).

and anti-communist wings, and Sukarno's aim was to bypass Indonesia's dysfunctional party system by building a populist alliance with both the PKI and leftist elements in the military. The problem, as Sukarno saw it, was not that the party system was mobilizing unsavory popular elements, but that it was failing to mobilize the people (*rakyat*), especially politicized youth (*pemuda*), aggressively enough.[59] The Guided Democracy period saw the PKI unleashed in both city and countryside, as well as the seizure of Dutch properties as the next stage in Sukarno's nationalist revolution. If anything, democratic breakdown in Indonesia in the late 1950s marked the boiling over of inclusive nationalist energies that had their roots in the ideological character of Indonesian nationalism, not an exclusionary effort to bottle up such mass inclusion.

Yet for Sukarno as for Indira Gandhi, populist authoritarianism meant confronting implacable organized rivals without an effective party organization of one's own. Initially this meant parties that wished to see the restoration of electoral democracy, such as the Islamic parties Masyumi and NU. Their own historic commitment to democratic inclusion became compromised, however, because of their rising fear that national elections would mean an outright victory for the rising PKI. In the Indonesian context of "Godly nationalism," a communist takeover had not only dire economic implications for Islamic social forces in Java and beyond but even more terrifying religious implications. As comparatively inclusive as it is, Indonesian nationalism does not countenance nonbelievers. The Cold War emergence of communism as a global political force that must be repelled thus interacted with a longstanding religious limitation on nationalist inclusivity to make possible the rise of an exclusionary and enduring authoritarian regime.

It would be in direct response to what the military defined as a failed PKI-led coup in 1965 that this type of regime would emerge. Suharto's "New Order" regime was founded upon a vast anti-communist coalition,[60] and enshrined with catastrophic levels of anti-communist bloodshed, both at the hands of the military and of Indonesia's Islamic social organizations.[61] It is critical to appreciate, however, that authoritarianism

---

[59] Sukarno's own words upon declaring Guided Democracy convey his ideological rejection of democracy's constraints, not its inclusivity. "I do not want to become a dictator, brother and sisters … That is against my spirit. I am a democrat … But my democracy is not liberal democracy" (quoted in Feith 1962, p. 518).

[60] Slater (2010).

[61] John Roosa, *Pretext for Mass Murder: The September 30th Movement and Suharto's Coup d'Etat in Indonesia* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006).

had never been perceived as necessary in Indonesia to exclude any particular ethnic, regional, religious, or class group from seizing power through democratic means. It took the Cold War, with its imperative for exclusion of communism by anti-communist forces, to bring exclusionary authoritarianism to Indonesia.

"The Only Game in Town": Inclusive Revolutions, Democratic Consolidation, and New Challenges

From a longue duree perspective, inclusive nationalisms in India and Indonesia have meaningfully supported the entrenchment of democratic politics. The ideological legacies of nationalist mobilization in the early twentieth century thus remain surprisingly relevant in the early twenty-first.

Since the return to full-fledged democratic politics in 1977, democracy in India has changed in ways that only underscore how firmly entrenched it is. Perhaps most visibly, Indian democracy has deepened via the gradual decline of Congress' electoral dominance. In tandem, the 1977 election removing the Congress Party from power and the 1980 elections peacefully returning Indira Gandhi to power highlighted how the institutional grip of India's nationalist party was loosening. These successive elections showed Indian democracy, by the standard criteria of two transfers of power between competing parties, to be fully consolidated.[62] In 1984, when Indira was assassinated, her son Rajiv Gandhi won a large margin of sympathy votes on behalf of Congress to become India's prime minister. But after a series of corruption scandals during his tenure, the 1989 national election again turned Congress out of power. With this election, the unchallenged hegemony of Congress rule at the hands of Nehru scions thereby drew to a definitive close.

The dawn of coalitional politics under the aegis of its two competitor parties, Congress and the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), also evinces India's robust democratic nature. Congress' ebbing dominance became evident in the 1989 election because, though Congress remained the single largest party, it won fewer than half the seats it had won five years earlier. Yet which party the vote was actually for remained unclear, since that election brought to power a coalition of minority parties with no single party even nearing the threshold for a parliamentary majority. Nine years later, in 1998, the BJP won enough seats to form another coalition

---

[62] Samuel Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991), 266–267.

government, over which it presided until its defeat in 2004. The Congress-led UPA coalition retained power from 2004 until the advent of the BJP-majority government in 2014. Between 1989 and 2014, every government in power has been composed of a coalition of smaller, regionally based parties in alliance with one of the two major parties. With the rise of regional and caste-based parties, the political representation of subordinate classes has clearly grown.[63] The rise of coalitional politics represents a deepening of democracy in which formerly marginalized social groups and regions have been drawn into the orbit of genuine party competition.

A final tectonic shift in Indian democracy over the past several decades has been the embrace of an identity politics characterized by group-based claims to representation and state patronage. This shift was propelled forward by the implementation of reservations for "other backward castes" in 1989, which has promoted the fortunes of the Hindu-promoting BJP and has even pushed a historically secular Congress Party to make accommodations to the majority-Hindu population. These changes have edged India closer to replacing its secular nationalism with a Hindu nationalism, a tendency that has started undermining India's inclusive credentials. At the same time, as the chorus of political voices protesting recent religious violence attests, the historically inclusive basis for Indian nationalism has provided critics of anti-Muslim violence with powerful constitutional and ideational resources. Despite its shortcomings, Indian democracy today is firmly entrenched through political parties that are vested in its continuation and through the social attitudes of a broad spectrum of the electorate.

Indonesia appeared to be poised for regime instability, and not for India-style democratic consolidation, when Suharto's "New Order" was toppled amid the Asian financial crisis in May 1998. Indeed, the commonly held view throughout the 1980s and 1990s was that if Suharto were to fall, he would inevitably be replaced by another military man.[64] Yet the dynamics of Suharto's fall – and even the practices of Suharto's regime itself – revealed the lingering relevance and potency of Sukarno-style inclusive nationalism. To be sure, the regime's predominant political modus operandi was one of repression and exclusion. The lower classes were to have no vehicle for autonomous mobilization; Islamic social forces were expected to embrace Pancasila and refrain from anti-regime

---

[63] Jaffrelot (2003).
[64] Harold Crouch, "The Perils of Prediction: Understanding the Indonesian Transition, 1998–99," in Abdul Rahman Embong, ed., *Southeast Asian Middle Classes: Prospects for Social Change and Democratization* (Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 2001).

political action; and the ethnic Chinese minority faced unprecedented official discrimination, as the New Order "regime began in a revived mood of great hostility to all things Chinese, presumably based on its sharp reaction against Sukarno's closeness to Beijing and a virulent anti-communism which provided the legitimation for Suharto's rise to power."[65] Yet the Indonesian military's claim to legitimacy also rested on its leading role in the anti-Dutch revolution. Partly as a result, Suharto continued to espouse a categorically inclusive type of nationalism throughout his thirty-plus years in power. Even though the New Order had emerged in direct reaction against Sukarno's populist excesses, Sukarno's "unitary ideal was kept sacred and central by the military-based regime of General Suharto."[66]

This lingering inclusive nationalism was clearly expressed in the authoritarian party system. Suharto not only fostered the emergence of an official government party with impressive cross-class membership, Golkar, but also engineered the creation of two "semi-opposition"[67] parties to participate in (if not vigorously contest) national elections in the early 1970s. These parties were direct and obvious, if neutered, legatees of the PNI (the Indonesian Democratic Party, or PDI) and Masyumi (the United Development Party, or PPP). These were not democratic vehicles in any meaningful sense, since they were engineered for purposes of authoritarian control rather than popular representation. Yet the mere fact that Suharto saw a need for these parties' creation revealed his keen attentiveness to the inclusive energies of both Sukarnoist nationalism and political Islam, and his determination to harness those enduring energies for authoritarian purposes.

It would be from the 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 began assuming a more 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 July 1996. Hence when the Asian financial crisis rocked Indonesia in 1997–1998, Sukarnoist-nationalist forces were already primed for mass

---

[65] Reid (2010, p. 70).
[66] Reid (2010, p. 45).
[67] Edward Aspinall, *Opposing Suharto: Compromise, Resistance, and Regime Change in Indonesia* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005).

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. And 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."[68] Inclusive nationalism has thus been remarried with democratic politics in Indonesia, though the enduring exclusion and recurrent targeting of "heterodox" believers remain troubling blights on the Indonesian body politic.[69]

Since Suharto's fall, Indonesian democracy has combined impressive consolidation with low quality.[70] The combination of a dysfunctional party system and inclusive nationalism provides a helpful lens through which to understand this otherwise puzzling outcome. The muting and marginalization of exclusionary voices calling for an outright return to Suharto-style authoritarian repression is a clear product of both the end of the Cold War and the historically inclusive articulation of Indonesian nationalism. With communism no longer a threat, there is no longer any basis in Indonesia for categorical exclusions necessitating authoritarian rule.

On the other hand, the threat of authoritarian populism, justified by the abject failure of elitist leading parties to fulfill the inclusive promise of Indonesian nationalism, remains as relevant today as it was in the late 1950s. This is the best way to understand the disturbing political reemergence of Prabowo Subianto, Suharto's former son-in-law, who was purged from the military after Suharto's fall for his leading role in the outgoing regime's worst human rights abuses. Prabowo ran in 2004 for the leadership of Indonesia's authoritarian successor party, Golkar, but was soundly defeated. He then founded a new party in 2008 with

---

[68] Reid (2010, p. 76).
[69] Menchik (2014).
[70] Edward Aspinall, "The Irony of Success," *Journal of Democracy* 21, 2 (April 2010), 20–34.

unmistakable populist overtones called Gerindra (an abbreviation of Great Indonesia Movement). By running for vice president on the same ticket with Megawati in 2009 and by relentlessly invoking revolutionary symbolism in his own failed bid for the presidency in 2014, Prabowo has recognized that the most likely path to a popular majority in Indonesia is by echoing the ghost of Sukarno, not Suharto. While Cold War-era exclusions have expired in Indonesia, the nation's revolutionary-era inclusionary impulse has not.

CONCLUSION

The central purpose of this chapter has been to provide a novel historical explanation for the puzzling contemporary consolidation of democracy in the unlikely cases of India and Indonesia. Our explanation has centered on the critical roles played by founding nationalist narratives, the organizations that articulate and mobilize around such ideologies, and the world-historical contexts within which these mass mobilizations unfolded. While our focus on the inclusivity of nationalist ideology may be novel in accounting for regime trajectories, the fact that political parties proved to be the vital collective actors represents a more established causal claim. Variation in party strength not only helps explain variation in authoritarian durability, as the recent literature on authoritarianism in comparative politics has stressed. It also profoundly shaped the prospects for inclusive democracy to gain institutional footing in India and Indonesia, today the two largest democracies in the postcolonial world, in the decades immediately following independence. For India, dominant party organization that propagated and institutionalized an inclusive national identity that transcended narrow class interests as well as parochial ascriptive identities was the most important force behind the creation and consolidation of Indian democracy. In Indonesia, for all the historical twists and turns its regime has undergone since those pivotal 1950s, the inclusive legacies of revolutionary nationalism continue to buttress the strength of Indonesian democracy to the present day.

These arguments and findings suggest the potential benefit of more tightly pairing the questions of nationalism and regime development in future research, though more research is needed into how exclusionary nationalism might shore up authoritarianism.[71] Theoretically, the

---

[71] For the kind of extensive historical process-tracing of these divergent outcomes in Pakistan and Malaysia that we lack space to provide here, see Tudor (2013) and Slater (2010).

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 tends 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.