

# Emergence and Development of Democratic States (1848–2000)

IB SL Study Guide

---

## Contents

How to Use This Guide

Section 1: Theme 1 — Conditions for the Emergence of Democratic States

- 1.1 What Is a Democratic State?
- 1.2 Conditions That Enabled Democratic Emergence
- 1.3 Comparative Analysis: Conditions Across Regions

Section 2: Theme 2 — The Role of Leaders in Democratic Development

- 2.1 Democratic Leadership and Constitutional Reform

Section 3: Theme 3 — Struggles for Democracy

- 3.1 Civil Rights and Democratic Inclusion

Section 4: Theme 4 — Democratic Crises and Responses

- 4.1 Economic Crises and Democratic Survival
- 4.2 Wartime Democracy
- 4.3 Late 20th Century: Democratic Consolidation

Section 5: Case Study Profiles

5.1 United States: Democratic Development 1865–1965

5.2 United Kingdom: Democratic Development 1867–1928

5.3 India: Democratic Consolidation 1947–2000

5.4 Weimar Republic: Democratic Failure and its Lessons (1919–1933)

5.5 South Africa: Transition to Democracy (1990–2000)

Section 6: Worked Examples

6.1 Model Essay Plan: Leaders and Democratic Development

6.2 Model Essay Plan: Conditions for Emergence

Section 7: Historiography

Section 8: Exam Preparation

8.1 Paper 2 Exam Format

8.2 IB Markband Descriptors (Paper 2 Essays)

8.3 Common Exam Questions and Approach Guidance

8.4 Frequently Confused Terms

Section 9: Question Bank

## How to Use This Guide

- **Paper 2 World History Topic 9** covers how democratic states emerged and developed across different regions from 1848 to 2000
- **Paper 2** is a 90-minute exam in which you write **two essays**, each worth **15 marks** — you may combine this topic with Topic 10 (Authoritarian States) or any other World History topic
- This topic is **identical for SL and HL students** — both sit the same Paper 2 questions. HL students also sit Paper 3 (regional option), but that is separate
- The single most important rule: questions almost always require **examples from more than one region**. Two American case studies (e.g. United States + any Latin American state) will not satisfy the cross-regional requirement unless the question explicitly permits it. Pair case studies from **different regions**: Europe, the Americas, Asia-Pacific, Africa, or the Middle East
- **Exam Alerts** flag the traps that cost marks in essays
- **IB Tips** highlight what examiners reward in extended responses
- **Worked Examples** provide model essay outlines for common question types

**A** *igned to IB History SL/HL World History Topic 9 — current syllabus*

**Videos on this page:** Overview — Democratic States · Conditions for Democracy · Leaders and Reform · Struggles for Rights · Democratic Crises

► **Watch:** Overview — What Makes a Democratic State?

VIDEO

## Section 1: Theme 1 — Conditions for the Emergence of Democratic States

### 1.1 What Is a Democratic State?

A democratic state is a political system in which citizens hold ultimate sovereignty, exercised through free and fair elections, the rule of law, the protection of civil and political rights, and the accountability of government. In practice, democracy exists on a spectrum and develops unevenly: few states arrive at full democracy in a single step.

**Key concepts for the exam:**

| Term                     | Definition                                                                                         | Example                                                                |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Liberal democracy        | Elected government + guaranteed civil liberties + independent judiciary                            | UK post-1928 (universal suffrage); USA post-1965 (Voting Rights Act)   |
| Representative democracy | Citizens elect representatives who make decisions on their behalf                                  | US Congress; UK Parliament                                             |
| Constitutional democracy | Democratic government operating within a written or unwritten constitution that limits state power | Weimar Republic (1919); India (1950)                                   |
| Universal suffrage       | The right of all adult citizens to vote, regardless of gender, race, or property                   | UK: men 1918, women 1928; USA: Black Americans fully enfranchised 1965 |
| Civil rights             | Legal protections for individuals against discrimination and abuse of power                        | US Civil Rights Act (1964); South African Constitution (1996)          |

### ⚠ EXAM ALERT

**Exam Alert:** Examiners do not expect a perfect or modern democratic state as the standard. The question is about **emergence and development** — the movement toward democracy, the conditions that made it possible, the obstacles that slowed it, and the leaders and movements that drove it forward. Avoid imposing a 21st-century standard retrospectively.

## 1.2 Conditions That Enabled Democratic Emergence

The emergence of democratic states is not accidental — identifiable economic, intellectual, social, and political conditions enabled democratic transitions across regions and time periods.

### Industrialisation and Social Change

Industrial capitalism transformed societies in ways that created pressure for democratic reform. As populations shifted from rural agriculture to urban manufacturing, new social classes emerged whose interests were not served by existing oligarchic or monarchical systems.

- **United Kingdom:** The Industrial Revolution (from c.1760) created a large urban working class and a prosperous industrial middle class. Both groups were substantially excluded from the pre-1832 political system, which gave disproportionate weight to rural landowners. The **Reform Act of 1832** began a process of expanding the franchise by enfranchising industrial cities (Manchester, Birmingham) and reducing rotten boroughs — constituencies with tiny electorates. Industrial wealth gave the middle class the resources to organise politically; urban concentration gave the working class the ability to strike and demonstrate collectively.

- **United States:** Industrialisation after the Civil War (post-1865) concentrated economic power in the hands of large corporations (“robber barons” such as Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Morgan), generating the inequality that drove the **Progressive Era** (c.1900–1920) reform movement. Progressives demanded direct democracy mechanisms (the initiative, referendum, and recall), direct election of senators (17th Amendment, 1913), and regulation of monopolies.
- **India:** Colonial industrialisation created an English-educated professional class (lawyers, journalists, civil servants) who became the leadership of the independence movement and the architects of Indian democracy. Jawaharlal Nehru, B.R. Ambedkar, and most of the Constituent Assembly were products of this class.

## Enlightenment Ideas and Revolutionary Traditions

The intellectual heritage of the Enlightenment — natural rights, popular sovereignty, the social contract — provided the ideological framework for democratic demands.

- The **1848 Revolutions** across Europe (France, German states, Austrian Empire, Italian states) expressed Enlightenment demands for constitutional government, representative assemblies, and national self-determination. Though most failed in the short term — suppressed by conservative armies — they permanently established that the demand for democratic participation could not simply be eliminated: it would return, more powerfully, in subsequent generations.
- **France’s Third Republic** (1870–1940): established after the collapse of the Second Empire in the Franco-Prussian War (1870). The Third Republic embedded republican and democratic norms in French political culture through universal male suffrage, a free press, secular public education (Jules Ferry’s reforms, 1881–1882), and the separation of Church and state (1905). The Dreyfus Affair (1894–1906) — the wrongful conviction of Jewish army officer Alfred Dreyfus — became a defining battle between republican democratic values and militarist, antisemitic conservatism, ultimately won by the republicans.
- **India:** The tradition of non-violent resistance (*satyagraha*) developed by Mahatma Gandhi drew on both Hindu philosophy and Enlightenment ideas about human dignity. Gandhi’s campaigns against colonial rule built mass political participation across caste and religious lines, creating the habits of collective political action that sustained Indian democracy after independence.

## Suffrage Movements

The extension of the vote to previously excluded groups — particularly women and racially marginalised groups — was among the most significant democratic developments of the period.

- **United Kingdom — Women’s Suffrage:** The **suffragist** movement (primarily NUWSS under Millicent Fawcett) pursued parliamentary lobbying; the **suffragette** movement (WSPU under Emmeline Pankhurst and her daughters)

pursued direct action — hunger strikes, arson, window-smashing, and the symbolic death of Emily Wilding Davison at the 1913 Derby. The **Representation of the People Act (1918)** gave the vote to women over 30 who met a property qualification; the **Equal Franchise Act (1928)** extended the vote equally to all women over 21. Historians debate whether the suffragettes' militancy advanced or retarded the cause — but the women's contribution to the war effort (1914–1918) is widely considered to have made further refusal politically untenable.

- **United States — African American Voting Rights: The 15th Amendment (1870)** formally prohibited denial of the vote on grounds of race, but Southern states systematically disenfranchised Black voters through poll taxes, literacy tests, grandfather clauses, and violence. The **Civil Rights Movement** (1955–1965) — NAACP, SNCC, SCLC, led by figures including Martin Luther King Jr., John Lewis, and Fannie Lou Hamer — deployed non-violent direct action (sit-ins, freedom rides, marches) to expose the contradiction between American democratic ideals and racial reality. The **Voting Rights Act (1965)** outlawed discriminatory voting barriers and transformed the political landscape of the South within a decade.

## Social Reform and the Welfare State

Democratic states faced pressure not just to extend the vote but to use democratic power to address social inequality — the argument that political democracy without economic reform was hollow.

- **United Kingdom: The Liberal Reforms (1906–1914)** under Lloyd George and Churchill introduced old-age pensions, national insurance, and labour exchanges — the foundations of the welfare state. The **Labour Party's landslide victory (1945)** under Clement Attlee created the National Health Service (NHS), nationalised key industries, and expanded social security. These reforms were explicitly framed as the democratic answer to fascism and communism: proving that democracy could deliver material improvement without dictatorship.
- **United States — The New Deal (1933–1939):** Franklin D. Roosevelt's response to the Great Depression was the most ambitious peacetime expansion of federal government in American history. The New Deal created Social Security, unemployment insurance, agricultural support, banking regulation, and millions of jobs through public works programmes (PWA, CCC, WPA). Roosevelt explicitly argued that without reform, American democracy faced the same threats from extremism that had destroyed Weimar Germany.

### **MEMORISE THIS**

#### **Conditions for Democratic Emergence — ISSS:**

- **Industrialisation** (created new social classes demanding representation)
- **Suffrage movements** (extended participation to excluded groups)
- **Social reform** (demonstrated democracy could deliver material improvements)

- Social/intellectual ideas (Enlightenment, revolutionary traditions, nationalism)

### 1.3 Comparative Analysis: Conditions Across Regions

#### **MEMORISE THIS**

**Conditions for Democratic Emergence — Cross-Regional Comparison:**

| Condition              | United States                                                                                            | United Kingdom                                                               | India                                                                                    | Weimar Germany                                                                        | Southern Europe                                                                                                                          |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Industrialisation      | Post-Civil War industrial capitalism drives Progressive Era reforms                                      | Industrial Revolution creates urban working class demanding franchise reform | Colonial industrialisation creates educated nationalist middle class                     | Rapid pre-WWI industrialisation creates urban working class; war devastates economy   | Mineral wealth drives industrial capitalism; creates racialised working class; post-war democratic emergence despite economic inequality |
| Enlightenment/ideology | Declaration of Independence (1776); Constitution (1787); Reconstruction Amendments; Progressive idealism | Chartism (1838–1858); Liberal tradition; Fabian socialism                    | Gandhian satyagraha + Enlightenment natural rights; Nehru's secular democratic socialism | Weimar constitution (1919) among the most democratic written constitutions of its era | ANC constitution (1954) Free Church of Scotland (1954) Communist Party (1954) principles of negotiated settlement of COI (1994)          |
| Suffrage movements     | Women's suffrage (19th Amendment, 1920); Civil Rights (Voting Rights Act, 1965)                          | Reform Acts (1832, 1867, 1884); women's suffrage (1918, 1928)                | Independence movement as mass political mobilisation; universal suffrage from 1947       | Women's suffrage granted in 1919 Weimar constitution                                  | Non-aligned universality suffrage introduced first democratic elections 1994                                                             |
| Social reform          | Progressive Era reforms; New Deal (1933–39)                                                              | Liberal Reforms (1906–14); welfare state (1945–48)                           | Land reform; caste discrimination legislation; Five-Year Plans                           | Weimar social welfare provisions; labour rights enshrined in constitution             | Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) mechanism for democratic consolidation                                                         |
| External/war impact    | WWI: 19th Amendment partly a reward for women's service;                                                 | WWI: women's franchise linked to war                                         | WWI: Indian soldiers' service generates nationalist                                      | WWI defeat and Versailles create the republic; also                                   | Colonial independence international isolation sanctions                                                                                  |

| Condition | United States                                | United Kingdom                                                           | India                                   | Weimar Germany              | Southern Europe                        |
|-----------|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------|
|           | WWII: Black veterans return demanding rights | service; WWII: welfare state as democratic promise to returning soldiers | demands; WWII: Quit India Movement 1942 | its eventual death sentence | interwar resistance; bringing negative |

►Watch: Conditions for Democracy — Historical Context

VIDEO

## Section 2: Theme 2 — The Role of Leaders in Democratic Development

### 2.1 Democratic Leadership and Constitutional Reform

The development of democratic states depended not just on conditions but on specific leaders who navigated political pressures, built coalitions, and implemented reforms.

#### 💡 IB TIP

**IB Tip:** Paper 2 questions on leaders ask you to assess their role — not simply describe what they did. The strongest essays will address **how effective** leaders were, what their limitations were, and what role broader forces (economic conditions, social movements, war) played independently of individual leaders.

#### Benjamin Disraeli and the Reform Act of 1867 (United Kingdom)

The **Second Reform Act (1867)** doubled the electorate from approximately one million to two million voters by extending the franchise to urban working-class men (householders paying rates in boroughs). It was passed by a Conservative government under Disraeli — a paradox that reveals much about British democratic development.

Disraeli’s motivations were partly calculated: he hoped newly enfranchised working-class men in northern England would vote Conservative out of traditional loyalties, and he wanted to “dish the Whigs” by passing a reform they had failed to deliver. The result was simultaneously a genuine democratic advance and a piece of party political manoeuvring — a reminder that democratic progress rarely has wholly idealistic motivations.

**Significance:** The 1867 Act established the principle that the working-class majority had a right to political representation. Combined with the Third Reform Act (1884), which extended the same rights to rural workers, and the Redistribution Act (1885), Britain moved toward a genuinely representative system — though still excluding women and many men without fixed addresses.

## William Gladstone and Liberal Reform (United Kingdom)

William Gladstone served as Liberal Prime Minister four times (1868–1874, 1880–1885, 1886, 1892–1894) and embodied a vision of democratic government as the instrument of rational moral progress.

Key reforms under Gladstone's governments:

| Reform                   | Year | Significance                                                                    |
|--------------------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Elementary Education Act | 1870 | Created state elementary schools — education as democratic prerequisite         |
| Ballot Act               | 1872 | Secret ballot introduced — ended coercion of voters by landlords and employers  |
| Trade Union Act          | 1871 | Legalised trade unions — organised labour as pillar of democratic participation |
| Third Reform Act         | 1884 | Extended franchise to rural workers — male household suffrage                   |
| Redistribution Act       | 1885 | Single-member constituencies — fairer representation of population              |

**Limitation:** Gladstone's commitment to Irish Home Rule (granting Ireland its own parliament) split the Liberal Party in 1886 and was never achieved in his lifetime, revealing the limits of parliamentary democratic reform when it conflicted with imperial interests and Protestant Unionist opposition.

## Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal (United States)

Franklin Roosevelt was elected in November 1932 as unemployment reached approximately 25% of the US workforce. His presidency (1933–1945) was the most transformative in American democratic history.

### Democratic significance of the New Deal:

The New Deal was not simply an economic programme — it redefined what democratic government was expected to do. Roosevelt argued that political liberty was meaningless without economic security, that democracy had to deliver tangible benefits to ordinary citizens or lose them to extremism.

Key New Deal programmes:

| Programme                         | Year | Function                                                               |
|-----------------------------------|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Emergency Banking Act             | 1933 | Stabilised banking system; restored public confidence                  |
| Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) | 1933 | 250,000 young men employed in national parks and forests               |
| Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA) | 1933 | Farm subsidies to reduce overproduction and raise prices               |
| Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA)  | 1933 | Federal development of hydroelectric power in impoverished rural South |
| Social Security Act               | 1935 | Created federal retirement pensions and unemployment insurance         |
| Wagner Act                        | 1935 | Protected workers' right to organise unions; created NLRB              |
| Fair Labor Standards Act          | 1938 | Federal minimum wage; 40-hour working week; child labour restrictions  |

**Limitations:** The New Deal was constrained by racial compromise. Southern Democratic senators demanded that programmes exclude or segregate Black Americans. The AAA forced Black tenant farmers off land when landlords reduced acreage. The Social Security Act initially excluded agricultural and domestic workers — occupations disproportionately held by Black Americans. Roosevelt refused to support anti-lynching legislation, fearing Southern Democrats would block his economic agenda.

### EXAM ALERT

**Exam Alert:** Do not treat FDR's New Deal as an unqualified democratic success. Paper 2 questions asking you to assess democratic leaders require you to identify both achievements and limitations. The New Deal's racial compromises are a significant limitation — they extended the benefits of democratic governance unequally along racial lines. The most marks-earning essays acknowledge this complexity.

## Jawaharlal Nehru and Indian Democracy (India)

Jawaharlal Nehru served as India's first Prime Minister from independence (August 1947) to his death in May 1964. He was the primary architect of Indian democracy's institutional framework.

### Nehru's democratic achievements:

- **Universal adult suffrage from the outset:** India adopted universal suffrage in 1947 despite widespread illiteracy and poverty. This was a radical democratic commitment — most British observers doubted it was workable. The first general election (1952) was the largest democratic exercise in human history to that date, involving 173 million voters and requiring 2.24 million steel ballot boxes.

- **Parliamentary democracy:** Nehru modelled Indian democracy on Westminster institutions while adapting them to Indian conditions. Parliament, an independent judiciary, a free press, and competitive political parties were all established and defended.
- **Constitutional protection of rights:** B.R. Ambedkar (Chairman of the Drafting Committee) produced a constitution that explicitly prohibited caste discrimination (Article 17 abolished untouchability) and guaranteed fundamental rights including equality before the law, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion.
- **Secularism:** Nehru insisted on a secular state in which religion was a private matter — critical in a country with Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, and Christian populations. This was tested immediately by the Partition violence of 1947, in which approximately 200,000 to 2 million people died in communal massacres. Nehru worked to prevent the Indian state from becoming a Hindu nationalist state.
- **Democratic federalism:** India's federal structure gave substantial autonomy to states while maintaining central cohesion. This managed extraordinary linguistic and cultural diversity (India has 22 officially recognised languages and hundreds more).

#### Limitations of Nehru's era:

- **Emergency powers:** The Preventive Detention Act (1950) allowed detention without trial. Nehru used emergency powers against state governments (President's Rule), raising concerns about centralisation.
- **Kashmir:** India's claim to the Muslim-majority state of Jammu and Kashmir — contested with Pakistan and subject to a UN-mandated plebiscite that was never held — was a democratic deficit Nehru never resolved.
- **Economic democracy:** Despite his socialism, Nehru's mixed economy failed to reduce poverty rapidly. Land reform was uneven; the caste system continued to stratify social and economic life despite constitutional prohibition.

#### IB TIP

**IB Tip:** Nehru is one of the strongest case studies to deploy in essays about democratic leaders because India's democracy was genuinely unprecedented in scale and context. Examiners value the cross-regional dimension — pairing Nehru with a European or American example immediately satisfies the multi-region requirement.

#### Nelson Mandela and Democratic Transition (South Africa)

Nelson Mandela's role in South Africa's transition from apartheid to democracy (1990–1999) is one of the most studied democratic transitions of the 20th century.

**Context:** The apartheid system (formally instituted in 1948) denied political rights, freedom of movement, property rights, and economic opportunity to the Black, Coloured, and Indian South African majority on explicitly racial grounds. Mandela was imprisoned on Robben Island from 1964 to 1990 — 27 years.

### The negotiated transition:

- **F.W. de Klerk's unbanning of the ANC (February 1990):** De Klerk recognised that the apartheid state faced economic collapse from international sanctions, internal unrest, and the end of Cold War rationale for Western support. He released Mandela and began negotiations.
- **CODESA (Convention for a Democratic South Africa, 1991–1993):** Multi-party negotiations produced the Interim Constitution (1993) and agreement on the first non-racial election in April 1994. Mandela's ability to hold the ANC coalition together — including militant youth who favoured armed struggle — and to reassure the white minority that democracy would not mean racial revenge was essential to this process.
- **The 1994 Election:** On 27 April 1994, South Africans of all races voted for the first time. The ANC won 62.6% of the vote; Mandela was inaugurated as President on 10 May 1994. International observers declared the election free and fair.
- **The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC):** Chaired by Archbishop Desmond Tutu, the TRC (1996–2003) offered amnesty to perpetrators of politically motivated crimes who made full disclosure, and provided a forum for victims to testify. The TRC was a unique democratic innovation — trading criminal justice for truth and social reconciliation, attempting to build a common democratic future without re-igniting civil war.

**Limitations:** South Africa's political democracy was not matched by economic democracy. The ANC's **Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR)** policy (1996) adopted market-oriented economics that preserved existing economic inequality. By 2000, South Africa had among the highest rates of income inequality in the world (Gini coefficient c. 0.63). Mandela's critics argued that the negotiated settlement prioritised political transition over structural economic transformation.

#### **MEMORISE THIS**

#### **Democratic Leaders — Comparative Reference:**

| Leader    | Country   | Period    | Key democratic contribution                                              | Key limitation                                                    |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Disraeli  | UK        | 1867      | Second Reform Act — urban working-class franchise                        | Motivated partly by party politics, not democratic idealism       |
| Gladstone | UK        | 1868–1894 | Ballot Act (1872), Third Reform Act (1884), trade union rights           | Irish Home Rule failure; franchise still excluded women           |
| Roosevelt | USA       | 1933–1945 | New Deal — economic rights as democratic rights; Social Security         | Racial compromise — excluded Black Americans from key programmes  |
| Nehru     | India     | 1947–1964 | Universal suffrage, secular democracy, constitutional rights, federalism | Emergency powers; Kashmir; uneven economic development            |
| Mandela   | S. Africa | 1990–1999 | Peaceful transition from apartheid; TRC; non-racial constitution         | Economic inequality preserved; GEAR failed to redistribute wealth |

►Watch: Leaders and Democratic Reform

VIDEO

## Section 3: Theme 3 — Struggles for Democracy

### 3.1 Civil Rights and Democratic Inclusion

The formal structures of democracy — constitutions, parliaments, elections — are necessary but insufficient. Historically, democratic states have included formal democratic institutions while systematically excluding large portions of their populations from real democratic participation.

#### The United States: Reconstruction and Its Betrayal (1865–1877)

The **Reconstruction Era** (1865–1877) was the first attempt to extend democratic participation to formerly enslaved African Americans after the Civil War.

#### Democratic gains:

- **13th Amendment (1865):** Abolished slavery
- **14th Amendment (1868):** Citizenship and equal protection of the laws for all persons born in the United States — including formerly enslaved people
- **15th Amendment (1870):** Prohibited denial of voting rights on grounds of race, colour, or previous condition of servitude
- **Political participation:** During Reconstruction, Black men voted and held office across the South — two Black senators (Hiram Revels and Blanche Bruce from Mississippi), dozens of Black congressmen, state legislators, and local officials

#### The betrayal of Reconstruction:

The Compromise of 1877 ended Reconstruction: federal troops were withdrawn from the South, and Southern states were free to re-impose racial hierarchy.

- **Jim Crow laws** (from 1877 onwards): state and local laws mandating racial segregation in schools, transport, restaurants, hotels, public facilities
- **Disenfranchisement mechanisms:** Poll taxes, literacy tests (administered selectively), grandfather clauses, white primaries, and violence (lynching) effectively removed Black men from the electorate. By 1900, Louisiana had 130,000 Black registered voters; by 1904, it had 1,342.
- **Plessy v. Ferguson (1896):** The Supreme Court's "separate but equal" doctrine gave constitutional legitimacy to segregation for nearly 60 years

**Significance for democratic theory:** The Reconstruction collapse demonstrates that democratic institutions can be formally present while systematically excluding large populations. The 14th and 15th Amendments existed — they were simply not enforced. Democratic development requires not just laws but political will, federal enforcement, and social movements to make formal rights real.

### **The United States: The Civil Rights Movement (1955–1965)**

The Civil Rights Movement is the most extensively documented struggle for democratic inclusion in 20th-century history. It combined mass non-violent direct action, legal strategy, political organising, and international pressure to force the US federal government to honour the democratic commitments of the 14th and 15th Amendments.

#### **Key events and strategies:**

| Event                       | Date        | Significance                                                                                                                                              |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Montgomery Bus Boycott      | 1955–1956   | 381-day boycott of segregated buses; launched King as national leader; economic pressure as democratic tool                                               |
| Little Rock Crisis          | 1957        | Eisenhower federalised National Guard to enforce school desegregation; demonstrated federal power could overcome state resistance                         |
| Greensboro Sit-ins          | 1960        | Student non-violent direct action spread nationally; SNCC formed                                                                                          |
| Freedom Rides               | 1961        | Interracial groups rode interstate buses to test desegregation; met with violent attacks; federal government forced to act                                |
| Birmingham Campaign         | 1963        | Bull Connor's police used fire hoses and dogs on peaceful demonstrators; televised nationally; shocked public opinion                                     |
| March on Washington         | 28 Aug 1963 | 250,000 gathered; King's "I Have a Dream" speech; mass democratic demand for civil and economic rights                                                    |
| Civil Rights Act            | 1964        | Prohibited discrimination on grounds of race, colour, religion, or national origin in employment and public accommodations                                |
| Selma to Montgomery Marches | 1965        | "Bloody Sunday" — state troopers attacked marchers on Edmund Pettus Bridge; televised nationally; provoked passage of Voting Rights Act                   |
| Voting Rights Act           | 1965        | Prohibited discriminatory voting practices; federal oversight of elections in previously suppressed states; transformed Southern politics within a decade |

### EXAM ALERT

**Exam Alert:** Many students describe the Civil Rights Movement as a linear story of progress from Rosa Parks (1955) to the Voting Rights Act (1965). Examiners reward more nuanced analysis: the role of different organisations (NAACP's legal strategy vs. SNCC's grassroots organising), the importance of grassroots local leaders (Fannie Lou Hamer, Medgar Evers, Diane Nash) alongside national figures like King, and the role of media in making non-violent action politically effective. Do not reduce the movement to Martin Luther King Jr. alone.

## Women's Suffrage in the United Kingdom (1867–1928)

The campaign for women's suffrage in the UK is a model case study in democratic struggle because it combined multiple strategies, spanned generations, and involved both moderate and militant tactics whose relative effectiveness historians continue to debate.

### The suffragist tradition (NUWSS):

The **National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies** (NUWSS), led by Millicent Garrett Fawcett from 1897, pursued parliamentary lobbying, public education, and constitutional pressure. It accepted that change required winning over male MPs and public opinion. By 1914, the NUWSS had 500 branches and 100,000 members.

### **The suffragette tradition (WSPU):**

The **Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU)**, founded by Emmeline Pankhurst in 1903, adopted direct action after years of constitutional pressure failed. From 1909 the WSPU escalated through:

- Disruption of political meetings and heckling of cabinet ministers
- Window-smashing campaigns in London's West End (1912)
- Arson and bombing of unoccupied buildings
- Hunger strikes in prison — met by force-feeding, and from 1913 by the “Cat and Mouse Act” (release when near death, re-arrest after recovery)
- Emily Wilding Davison's death at the 1913 Epsom Derby (she stepped into the path of the King's horse during the race; whether her intention was suicide or a dramatic gesture remains debated by historians)

### **The war and its aftermath:**

The outbreak of World War I in 1914 caused the WSPU to suspend militant campaigning; Emmeline and Christabel Pankhurst became vocal supporters of the war effort. Women's contribution to war work — in munitions factories, agriculture, transport, nursing, and clerical roles — made continued exclusion from the franchise politically indefensible.

The **Representation of the People Act (1918)** gave the vote to women over 30 who met a property requirement — a deliberately conservative compromise to prevent women outvoting men (since more young men than women had died in the war). The **Equal Franchise Act (1928)** extended full equal suffrage to all women over 21.

#### **IB TIP**

**IB Tip:** The historiographical debate about WSPU militancy is excellent analytical material for top-band essays. Did suffragette violence advance the cause (by demonstrating the depth of women's commitment and forcing the issue onto the national agenda) or retard it (by alienating public sympathy and providing a pretext for government repression)? Both arguments can be supported from the evidence — this is exactly the kind of debate that earns Band 5 marks.

### **Decolonisation and Democracy: India (1947)**

The transfer of power from British colonial rule to independent India in August 1947 was simultaneously one of the greatest acts of decolonisation and one of the largest democratic experiments in history.

#### **Why India's democratic choice was significant:**

Independence movements did not automatically produce democracies. Many post-colonial states moved toward single-party rule or military government (Pakistan, for instance, experienced its first coup in 1958). India's commitment to parliamentary

democracy, universal suffrage, and constitutional rights was a deliberate and contested political choice.

The **Indian National Congress** under Nehru represented a secular, pluralist vision of Indian nationhood. It competed against the Hindu nationalist **RSS** and the communalist demands of the Muslim League (which had achieved Pakistan). India's 1950 constitution, drafted under Ambedkar's leadership, guaranteed religious freedom, prohibited discrimination by caste, and made universal suffrage the foundation of political authority.

### **Challenges to democratic consolidation:**

- **Partition (1947):** The division of British India into India and Pakistan was accompanied by massive population displacement (approximately 12–15 million people moved) and communal violence. The trauma of Partition created lasting tensions that threatened both states' democratic stability.
- **Princely States:** India absorbed 562 princely states into the Union, some by persuasion, some by force (Hyderabad by military action in 1948). The integration of Jammu and Kashmir — acceded to India but predominantly Muslim and contested by Pakistan — created a permanent democratic deficit and a territorial dispute that continues today.
- **Caste:** Despite the constitution's prohibition of untouchability, the caste system continued to structure social, economic, and political life. B.R. Ambedkar, himself born into the "untouchable" Mahar caste, resigned from Nehru's cabinet in 1951 partly over the slow pace of caste reform.

### **South Africa: The Transition from Apartheid (1990–1994)**

The collapse of apartheid and the establishment of non-racial democracy in South Africa is one of the most significant democratic transitions of the late 20th century.

### **Why the transition succeeded where others failed:**

South Africa's transition avoided the fate of many post-colonial or post-authoritarian transitions because:

1. **Both sides had incentives to negotiate:** The apartheid state could not suppress the ANC indefinitely; the ANC lacked the military capacity to overthrow the regime. The end of the Cold War removed Western backing for the apartheid state without delivering Soviet support to the ANC.
2. **Strong civil society:** South African civil society — trade unions (especially COSATU), churches, civic associations, professional organisations — had sustained resistance through the apartheid years and provided institutional infrastructure for democratic participation.
3. **Mandela's leadership:** Mandela's refusal to abandon the ANC's non-racial principles, combined with his personal authority and his reassurance to the white minority, was politically essential. His decision to be photographed

wearing a Springbok rugby jersey at the 1995 Rugby World Cup (which South Africa won) was a deliberate act of national symbolic politics.

4. **International pressure:** Sanctions, academic boycotts, sporting isolation (South Africa was excluded from the Olympics from 1964 to 1992), and diplomatic pressure — particularly from the United States after the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act (1986) — contributed to the regime's decision that negotiations were necessary.

►Watch: Struggles for Democracy — Civil Rights and Suffrage

VIDEO

## Section 4: Theme 4 — Democratic Crises and Responses

### 4.1 Economic Crises and Democratic Survival

Economic crises are among the most severe tests a democratic state can face. The Great Depression of the 1930s challenged democratic governments across the world and destroyed some of them.

#### The Weimar Republic: Democratic Experiment and Failure (1919–1933)

The **Weimar Republic** (1919–1933) is the most studied case of democratic failure in the 20th century. Understanding why it failed is as important as understanding why other democracies survived — the contrast with the United Kingdom and the United States is analytically powerful.

#### Democratic achievements of the Weimar Republic:

The Weimar constitution (1919) was among the most democratic ever written:

- Universal suffrage, including women — Germany granted women the vote before the UK (1919 vs. 1918/1928)
- Proportional representation designed to include minority voices
- Extensive civil liberties: freedom of speech, press, assembly, and religion
- Strong social rights: protection of labour, welfare provisions
- A **Constitutional Court** (Staatsgerichtshof) as a check on government

#### Structural weaknesses:

- **Proportional representation** produced extreme political fragmentation — the Weimar Reichstag had up to 15 parties in significant numbers, making stable majority government nearly impossible. No government between 1919 and 1933 lasted more than two years.
- **Article 48** gave the President emergency decree powers that bypassed parliament — used extensively by Brüning (1930–1932) and providing the legal template for Hitler's seizure of power

- **The President** was directly elected and held quasi-executive powers (could dissolve parliament, appoint the Chancellor), creating a parallel power centre that enabled Hindenburg to appoint Hitler despite his not winning a parliamentary majority
- **Anti-democratic forces** — the army (Reichswehr), the judiciary, and the civil service had been staffed under the Kaiser and remained largely monarchist or nationalist in sympathy

### Economic pressure and democratic collapse:

The Great Depression delivered the decisive blow. Unemployment rose from 1.3 million (1929) to **6.1 million by January 1933**. The Weimar government's deflationary response (under Chancellor Brüning's austerity) deepened the crisis rather than resolving it — the opposite of Roosevelt's New Deal approach.

As the table below shows, NSDAP electoral support tracked unemployment almost perfectly:

| Election Date            | NSDAP vote share | Unemployed (approx.) |
|--------------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Reichstag May 1928       | 2.6%             | 1.3 million          |
| Reichstag September 1930 | 18.3%            | 3.0 million          |
| Reichstag July 1932      | 37.4%            | 5.5 million          |
| Reichstag November 1932  | 33.1%            | 5.6 million          |
| Reichstag March 1933     | 43.9%            | 6.1 million          |

The **November 1932 decline** (37.4% → 33.1%) is critically important: the Nazis were losing electoral momentum when Hindenburg appointed Hitler in January 1933. The republic was arguably recoverable at this moment if conservative elites had acted differently.

**The lesson of Weimar:** Democratic institutions alone do not ensure democratic survival. They must be defended by political actors who believe in them — and Weimar's conservative elites (von Papen, Hindenburg, the industrialists) calculated that Hitler could be controlled and used. They were catastrophically wrong.

### EXAM ALERT

**Exam Alert:** Do NOT treat the Weimar Republic's collapse as inevitable. Examiners are specifically looking for students who recognise that the collapse was the result of specific decisions by identifiable actors — especially Hindenburg's appointment of Hitler as Chancellor in January 1933 — not simply a predetermined consequence of constitutional flaws or economic crisis. The NSDAP's vote was falling in late 1932; the republic might have survived.

### The United States: Roosevelt's New Deal as Democratic Response (1933–1939)

The contrast between Germany and the United States in the 1930s is one of the most powerful examples of how democratic leadership can respond to economic crisis without abandoning democratic principles.

When Roosevelt took office in March 1933, the US banking system was collapsing (9,000 banks had failed since 1929), unemployment stood at approximately 25%, and industrial production had fallen by nearly half. Many contemporaries believed American democracy would not survive.

Roosevelt's democratic response differed from Weimar's in four key ways:

1. **Expansion rather than austerity:** The New Deal expanded federal spending and employment rather than cutting them, providing immediate relief that stabilised confidence in democratic governance
2. **Institutional innovation:** New federal agencies (SEC, FDIC, NLRB, SSA) strengthened rather than circumvented democratic institutions, creating durable regulatory frameworks
3. **Political communication:** Roosevelt's "fireside chats" (radio broadcasts directly to the American public) built a direct democratic relationship between president and citizens, bypassing hostile press barons
4. **Coalition-building:** The "New Deal coalition" united Southern whites, Northern ethnic minorities, organised labour, African Americans (despite racial compromises), and progressive intellectuals — a broad democratic majority that dominated American politics until the 1960s

**Threats from the right and left:** The New Deal faced opposition from both directions — from business conservatives (who attacked it as socialism) and from populist demagogues such as Huey Long ("Share Our Wealth") and Father Charles Coughlin (anti-Semitic radio broadcaster). Roosevelt navigated between them, using democratic politics rather than authoritarian methods to maintain his coalition.

### **Threats from Extremism**

Democratic states in the 20th century faced threats from fascist and communist movements that sought to use democratic freedoms to destroy democracy itself.

#### **United Kingdom — Oswald Mosley and the British Union of Fascists (BUF):**

Oswald Mosley formed the **British Union of Fascists** in 1932, inspired by Mussolini's Italy. By 1934 the BUF had approximately 50,000 members. The **Public Order Act (1936)** — passed partly in response to the **Battle of Cable Street** (4 October 1936, when London's Jewish and working-class communities physically blocked a BUF march through the East End) — banned political uniforms and gave police powers to ban marches. The BUF never came close to power: Britain's stable democratic institutions, two-party electoral system (which gave no Reichstag-style foothold to extremist parties), and the absence of the catastrophic economic collapse that hit Germany all insulated democracy.

#### **France — The February 1934 Crisis and the Popular Front:**

France in the early 1930s faced significant fascist pressure. On 6 February 1934, right-wing and fascist leagues rioted outside the Chamber of Deputies, killing 15 people and

injuring 1,500. The riot — possibly inspired by the Stavisky financial scandal — was the closest France came to a fascist coup. The left's response was to form the **Popular Front** — a coalition of Socialists, Radicals, and Communists united against fascism. The Popular Front won the June 1936 elections under Léon Blum, France's first Jewish Prime Minister, and enacted significant social reforms (40-hour week, paid holidays, collective bargaining).

**Significance of the Popular Front model:** It demonstrated that democratic parties could form cross-party alliances to defend democracy against extremism — the strategy that Weimar Germany's centre parties never successfully implemented.

## 4.2 Wartime Democracy

### United Kingdom in World War II: Democratic Governance Under Pressure

The United Kingdom's maintenance of democratic governance during World War II (1939–1945) — while Germany, Italy, and the Soviet Union were governed by single-party dictatorships, and while France had fallen and its government collaborated with the Nazis — is a significant case study in democratic resilience.

#### Churchill's wartime coalition:

- The **National Government** (1940–1945) was a genuine cross-party coalition including Labour, Liberal, and Conservative ministers. Clement Attlee served as Deputy Prime Minister; Ernest Bevin managed labour relations as Minister of Labour. This was democracy operating through coalition, not dictatorship.
- Parliament continued to sit, debate, and hold the government accountable throughout the war. Churchill was defeated on several parliamentary votes and survived a motion of no confidence in July 1942 only by a comfortable margin. The government had to justify its strategy to Parliament.
- **Civil liberties:** Some were restricted — Defence Regulation 18B allowed detention without trial for fascist sympathisers (including Oswald Mosley); censorship was imposed on sensitive military information. But these restrictions were significantly less than those in any belligerent dictatorship, and habeas corpus was never permanently suspended.
- **Democratic decision:** In July 1945, with the war in Europe over and the war in the Pacific still ongoing, Britain held a general election. The result was a landslide Labour victory that swept Churchill and the Conservatives from power. A democratic government changed mid-war (the Pacific war continued until August 1945) without institutional crisis — an extraordinary demonstration of democratic resilience.

#### IB TIP

**IB Tip:** The 1945 British general election is an underused but powerful example. That British voters defeated their wartime leader while the Pacific war was still ongoing — and that Churchill accepted the result and left office peacefully — demonstrates the

depth of democratic culture. This contrasts directly with Nazi Germany or Fascist Italy, where no such transfer of power was conceivable.

## United States in World War II: Democratic Tensions

The United States' wartime democracy was not without its democratic failures, the most significant of which was the internment of Japanese Americans.

**Executive Order 9066 (February 1942):** President Roosevelt ordered the forced removal and incarceration of approximately **120,000 people of Japanese ancestry** — two-thirds of them American citizens — from the West Coast into internment camps. The Supreme Court upheld the order in **Korematsu v. United States** (1944), one of the most criticised decisions in the Court's history. No Japanese American was ever convicted of espionage or sabotage.

The internment represents a democratic state using its power against its own citizens on the basis of racial ancestry during wartime — demonstrating that democratic governments are not immune from authoritarian impulses, particularly in periods of fear and emergency.

**Democratic accountability:** In 1988, the Civil Liberties Act formally apologised for the internment and paid reparations of \$20,000 to surviving internees — a rare example of a democratic state officially acknowledging and seeking to make amends for its own democratic failure.

## 4.3 Late 20th Century: Democratic Consolidation

By 1990, the liberal democratic model had demonstrated its resilience in Europe, North America, and parts of Asia. The end of the Cold War appeared to mark, in Francis Fukuyama's phrase, the "end of history" — the universal triumph of liberal democracy. The democratic transitions of the late 20th century — including South Africa (1994) — suggested a "third wave of democratisation" (Samuel Huntington's term).

Yet democratic development remained contested and uneven:

- **India's Emergency (1975–1977):** Prime Minister Indira Gandhi declared a state of emergency, suspended civil liberties, imprisoned opposition leaders, and imposed press censorship for 21 months. The Emergency was the most serious test of Indian democracy since independence. Its significance: democratic norms were strong enough that Gandhi called an election in March 1977 — which she lost badly. India's democratic institutions survived, though the episode demonstrated they were not guaranteed.
- **South Africa's economic inequality:** As noted, political democracy was not matched by economic democracy. The ANC government's embrace of market economics preserved existing structures of economic power, raising questions about whether formal democracy without economic transformation constitutes genuine democratic development.

## MEMORISE THIS

### Democratic Crises — Comparative Summary:

| Crisis                 | Country        | Threat                                       | Democratic response                                                       | Outcome                                                            |
|------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Great Depression       | Weimar Germany | Economic collapse; Nazi electoral surge      | Austerity (Brüning); elite miscalculation (Hindenburg appoints Hitler)    | Democratic collapse; Nazi dictatorship                             |
| Great Depression       | USA            | Economic collapse; extremist movements       | New Deal; coalition politics; direct presidential communication           | Democratic survival; sustained reform                              |
| Fascist pressure       | UK             | BUF; street violence                         | Public Order Act (1936); electoral system insulation; stable institutions | Democratic survival; BUF marginalised                              |
| February Crisis (1934) | France         | Fascist riot; political instability          | Popular Front coalition (1936); cross-party democratic alliance           | Temporary democratic stabilisation; defeated in WWII               |
| World War II           | UK             | External existential threat                  | Coalition government; parliamentary accountability; 1945 election         | Democratic survival and transfer of power                          |
| WWII internment        | USA            | Wartime fear; racism                         | Executive Order 9066; Supreme Court (Korematsu) upheld                    | Democratic failure; partially remedied by 1988 Civil Liberties Act |
| Emergency              | India          | Internal; Indira Gandhi's authoritarian turn | Gandhi calls election; voters defeat her                                  | Democratic resilience; institutions survived                       |

► Watch: Democratic Crises — The Great Depression and Democratic Responses

VIDEO

## Section 5: Case Study Profiles

### 5.1 United States: Democratic Development 1865–1965

Timeline of key developments:

| Year    | Event                         | Democratic significance                                   |
|---------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| 1865    | 13th Amendment                | Abolition of slavery                                      |
| 1868    | 14th Amendment                | Citizenship and equal protection                          |
| 1870    | 15th Amendment                | Right to vote regardless of race                          |
| 1877    | End of Reconstruction         | Withdrawal of federal troops; Jim Crow begins             |
| 1896    | Plessy v. Ferguson            | "Separate but equal" — judicial sanction of segregation   |
| 1913    | 17th Amendment                | Direct election of senators (Progressive reform)          |
| 1919    | 18th Amendment / Volstead Act | Prohibition — democratic overreach; repealed 1933         |
| 1920    | 19th Amendment                | Women's right to vote                                     |
| 1933–39 | New Deal                      | Economic rights as democratic rights                      |
| 1954    | Brown v. Board of Education   | Supreme Court overturns "separate but equal"              |
| 1964    | Civil Rights Act              | Prohibited racial discrimination in public life           |
| 1965    | Voting Rights Act             | Prohibited racial disenfranchisement; federal enforcement |

## 5.2 United Kingdom: Democratic Development 1867–1928

Timeline of key developments:

| Year      | Event                            | Democratic significance                                  |
|-----------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| 1832      | First Reform Act                 | Enfranchised industrial cities; reduced rotten boroughs  |
| 1867      | Second Reform Act                | Urban working-class male franchise                       |
| 1872      | Ballot Act                       | Secret ballot — ended landlord and employer coercion     |
| 1884      | Third Reform Act                 | Rural working-class male franchise                       |
| 1906–1914 | Liberal Reforms                  | Old-age pensions, national insurance — social democracy  |
| 1918      | Representation of the People Act | Women over 30 (property qualification) + all men over 21 |
| 1922      | First Labour government          | Working class gains political power for first time       |
| 1928      | Equal Franchise Act              | Universal suffrage for all adults over 21                |
| 1945      | Labour landslide                 | Welfare state — NHS, social security, nationalisation    |
| 1948      | British Nationality Act          | Commonwealth citizens' right to live in UK               |

## 5.3 India: Democratic Consolidation 1947–2000

Timeline of key developments:

| Year    | Event                                   | Democratic significance                                                                       |
|---------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1947    | Independence                            | Universal adult suffrage from the outset                                                      |
| 1948    | Assassination of Gandhi                 | Democratic stability maintained under constitutional order                                    |
| 1950    | Constitution of India                   | Fundamental rights, secular state, caste discrimination prohibited                            |
| 1952    | First general election                  | 173 million voters — largest democratic exercise in history                                   |
| 1964    | Death of Nehru                          | Peaceful democratic succession to Lal Bahadur Shastri                                         |
| 1966    | Indira Gandhi becomes PM                | First female head of government of a major democracy                                          |
| 1971    | Bangladesh Liberation War               | India supports Bangladesh's independence, regional democratic impact                          |
| 1975–77 | Emergency                               | Civil liberties suspended; democratic resilience demonstrated when Gandhi loses 1977 election |
| 1984    | Sikh crisis; Indira Gandhi assassinated | Rajiv Gandhi wins landslide; democratic succession maintained                                 |
| 1991    | Economic liberalisation                 | Democracy adapts to globalisation                                                             |
| 1998–99 | Coalition governments (NDA)             | Multi-party democracy matures; BJP leads coalition                                            |

## 5.4 Weimar Republic: Democratic Failure and its Lessons (1919–1933)

The Weimar Republic's collapse is studied not simply as a failure but as a lesson in which specific conditions, decisions, and actors matter. It is not a case of democratic inevitability.

### Why Weimar matters for this topic:

The IB syllabus includes the Weimar Republic under Topic 9 (democratic states) — not just Topic 10 (authoritarian states). The Weimar Republic was a genuine democracy with achievements as well as structural flaws. Its failure teaches which conditions democracies cannot survive without — and which responses by democratic leaders make the difference between survival and collapse.

### Key interpretations:

| Historian                                                      | Argument                                                                                                                                                    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Richard Evans ( <i>The Coming of the Third Reich</i> )         | Weimar's collapse required the specific contingency of the Great Depression + elite miscalculation + Hitler's political genius — not inevitable             |
| William Shirer ( <i>The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich</i> ) | Weimar's structural flaws made democratic collapse predictable — proportional representation, Article 48, and German political culture combined to doom it  |
| A.J.P. Taylor                                                  | Focuses on elite decisions — von Papen and Hindenburg's calculated miscalculation in appointing Hitler                                                      |
| Detlev Peukert ( <i>The Weimar Republic</i> )                  | Weimar suffered from a “crisis of classical modernity” — inability to manage the social contradictions of industrial capitalism under democratic conditions |

## 5.5 South Africa: Transition to Democracy (1990–2000)

### Key actors and events:

| Actor/Event            | Role in democratic transition                                                                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Nelson Mandela         | ANC leader; negotiated transition; first democratic president (1994–1999); symbol of reconciliation    |
| F.W. de Klerk          | Last apartheid president; unbanned ANC (Feb 1990); released Mandela; accepted democratic transition    |
| CODESA (1991–1993)     | Multi-party negotiations producing Interim Constitution and electoral framework                        |
| ANC                    | Led democratic movement; won 62.6% in 1994 election                                                    |
| Desmond Tutu           | Chaired Truth and Reconciliation Commission (1996–2003)                                                |
| 27 April 1994 Election | First non-racial election; 19.7 million South Africans voted for the first time                        |
| TRC (1996–2003)        | Offered amnesty for full disclosure; provided victims' testimony; attempted social reconciliation      |
| 1996 Constitution      | One of the most progressive constitutions in the world; Bill of Rights including socio-economic rights |
| GEAR policy (1996)     | ANC adopted market-oriented economic policy; preserved economic inequality                             |

## Section 6: Worked Examples

### 6.1 Model Essay Plan: Leaders and Democratic Development

#### WORKED EXAMPLE

**Question:** “Examine the role of leaders in the development of democratic states.”

**Approach:** This question requires you to argue a specific claim about leaders’ role, supported by two case studies from different regions.

**Essay plan:**

**Thesis:** Democratic leaders were essential to democratic development not merely through formal constitutional reform but through their ability to build coalitions, respond to economic crises, and extend democratic participation to previously excluded groups — though their successes were frequently constrained by the limits of their political coalitions.

#### **Paragraph 1 — Roosevelt and economic democratic reform (USA):**

- Context: Great Depression; 25% unemployment; democratic stability threatened by extremist movements
- Roosevelt’s New Deal as a democratic response: expanded federal role, Social Security, labour rights, financial regulation
- Key argument: Roosevelt succeeded where Weimar failed because he chose expansion over austerity, built a broad democratic coalition, and maintained constitutional governance
- Limitation: Racial compromises — New Deal excluded Black agricultural and domestic workers; Roosevelt refused anti-lynching legislation

#### **Paragraph 2 — Nehru and democratic institution-building (India):**

- Context: Independence from colonial rule; mass poverty and illiteracy; Partition trauma; ethnic and religious diversity
- Nehru established universal suffrage, parliamentary democracy, secular constitution, and federal structure
- Key argument: Nehru’s commitment to democratic institutions was a deliberate political choice against both Hindu nationalism and single-party authoritarian alternatives available to post-colonial leaders
- Limitation: Emergency powers; Kashmir; uneven caste reform

#### **Paragraph 3 — Counter-argument and analytical synthesis:**

- Leaders are necessary but not sufficient: democratic development also required social movements (Civil Rights Movement), structural conditions (industrialisation, Enlightenment ideas), and international pressure (sanctions against apartheid)

- The Weimar case shows that the absence of effective democratic leadership — specifically Hindenburg's appointment of Hitler — could destroy democracy even when institutions formally existed

**Conclusion:** Leaders played a decisive but not deterministic role. Their success depended on their ability to translate structural conditions into democratic reforms, build coalitions wider than existing democratic majorities, and respond to crises without abandoning democratic principles.

## 6.2 Model Essay Plan: Conditions for Emergence

### WORKED EXAMPLE

**Question:** “Evaluate the conditions that led to the emergence of democratic states.”

**Approach:** Argue a hierarchy of conditions — which were most important and why. Use two or more regions.

**Essay plan:**

**Thesis:** While multiple conditions — industrialisation, Enlightenment ideas, social movements, and war — contributed to the emergence of democratic states, the most decisive condition was the development of organised political movements that translated social and economic grievances into specific democratic demands, since structural conditions alone did not automatically produce democratic outcomes.

**Paragraph 1 — Industrialisation (UK and USA):**

- UK: Industrial Revolution created urban middle class and working class excluded from pre-1832 franchise; Reform Acts 1832, 1867, 1884 responded to this new social reality
- USA: Industrial capitalism’s inequalities drove Progressive Era demand for direct democracy mechanisms and regulatory reform
- But: industrialisation alone did not determine democratic outcomes — Germany industrialised rapidly before 1914 without democracy

**Paragraph 2 — Social and suffrage movements:**

- Women’s suffrage movement (UK): NUWSS + WSPU campaigns; war service made exclusion indefensible
- Civil Rights Movement (USA): organised mass action translated formal 15th Amendment rights into real political participation
- Key argument: without organised movements, structural conditions produced no democratic change — Reconstruction’s gains were reversed without sustained organised protection

**Paragraph 3 — The role of ideas:**

- Enlightenment natural rights provided the intellectual framework for democratic demands
- 1848 Revolutions showed that democratic demands, even when temporarily suppressed, permanently entered political discourse
- India: Gandhian nationalism drew on both Western Enlightenment and Indian tradition to build mass democratic political participation

**Conclusion:** All the identified conditions contributed, but social and political organisation was the decisive variable — the agency that translated conditions into democratic outcomes. This explains why identical structural conditions

(industrialisation, Enlightenment tradition) produced democracy in some states and authoritarian alternatives in others.

## Section 7: Historiography

### MEMORISE THIS

#### Key Historians and Arguments — Topic 9:

| Historian         | Work                                        | Argument                                                                                                                                                                      |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Robert Dahl       | <i>Polyarchy</i> (1971)                     | Democracy requires contestation and participation; “polyarchy” (real-world democracy) is always imperfect — the question is how close states come to the ideal                |
| Samuel Huntington | <i>The Third Wave</i> (1991)                | Three waves of democratisation (1820s, post-WWII, 1974–1990s); each wave followed by a “reverse wave” — democracy can be reversed                                             |
| Francis Fukuyama  | <i>The End of History</i> (1992)            | Liberal democracy is the final form of human government; collapse of communism confirmed its universality (though Fukuyama later qualified this)                              |
| Richard Evans     | <i>The Coming of the Third Reich</i> (2003) | Weimar’s collapse was not inevitable; specific decisions and contingencies mattered — avoid determinism                                                                       |
| Taylor Branch     | <i>Parting the Waters</i> (1988)            | Exhaustive account of the Civil Rights Movement 1954–1963; emphasises grassroots organisation and community leadership alongside King                                         |
| Rosemary Foot     | —                                           | Civil rights as international human rights; Cold War context shaped US government’s response to civil rights pressure                                                         |
| Ramachandra Guha  | <i>India After Gandhi</i> (2007)            | India’s democracy was improbable — the conditions (poverty, illiteracy, diversity) suggested it should not have survived; its persistence is a genuine democratic achievement |

## Section 8: Exam Preparation

### 8.1 Paper 2 Exam Format

- **Time:** 1 hour 30 minutes
- **Structure:** Write **two essays** from the questions available across all World History Topics
- **Marks:** Each essay is marked out of **15**; total 30 marks = **25% of final IB grade**
- **Choice:** You may write both essays from Topic 9, or one from Topic 9 and one from another topic (e.g. Topic 10 — Authoritarian States, which pairs well with

this topic)

- **Regional requirement:** Most questions on Topic 9 require examples from **more than one region** — check the wording carefully; if a question says “from different regions” this is mandatory

### EXAM ALERT

**Exam Alert:** The command term matters. “Examine” asks you to investigate (describe + analyse). “Evaluate” asks you to judge and weigh evidence (argue a position with supported reasons for and against). “Discuss” asks you to consider multiple perspectives. “Compare and contrast” requires explicit similarities and differences between cases. Read the command term before writing anything — your essay structure depends on it.

## 8.2 IB Markband Descriptors (Paper 2 Essays)

| Band   | Marks | Descriptor                                                                                                                          |
|--------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Band 5 | 13–15 | Well-structured argument; accurate and detailed knowledge; effective use of historical evidence; balanced analysis; clear judgement |
| Band 4 | 10–12 | Argument present; accurate knowledge; evidence used effectively in places; some analytical weaknesses                               |
| Band 3 | 7–9   | Descriptive with some analysis; knowledge adequate but may have errors; argument not consistently maintained                        |
| Band 2 | 4–6   | Mainly descriptive; limited evidence; argument weak or absent                                                                       |
| Band 1 | 1–3   | Limited knowledge; no real argument; may be irrelevant                                                                              |

## 8.3 Common Exam Questions and Approach Guidance

**“Examine the conditions that led to the emergence of democratic states.”**

- Use two regions: e.g. UK (industrialisation, Reform Acts, suffrage) + India (colonialism, nationalist movement, independence)
- Argue a clear position on which conditions were most important and why
- Avoid a list — the question asks for analysis of causation

**“Evaluate the role of leaders in the development of democratic states.”**

- Compare two leaders from different regions: e.g. FDR (USA) + Nehru (India) or Mandela (South Africa) + Gladstone (UK)
- Address both achievements and limitations
- Argue whether leaders or broader structural forces were more important

**“Examine the methods used by democratic states to deal with the challenges they faced.”**

- Use two case studies from different regions: e.g. UK's wartime coalition + USA's New Deal response to Depression
- Methods: coalition government, legislation, social reform, propaganda, emergency powers
- Address how effective the methods were — not just what they were

**“Discuss the challenges that democratic states faced.”**

- Economic crises (Great Depression), threats from extremism (fascist movements), racial exclusion, war
- Use two regions: e.g. Weimar Germany (failed) + USA (survived — why did one succeed where the other failed?)

**“To what extent was the experience of war significant for democratic development?”**

- UK: WWI → women's suffrage; WWII → welfare state; wartime coalition
- USA: WWII → Black veterans returned demanding rights; wartime internment as democratic failure
- Multi-causal: war was significant but so were pre-existing structural conditions and social movements

## 8.4 Frequently Confused Terms

| Confusion                              | Clarification                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Democratic vs. democratising           | A state may have democratic institutions without being fully democratic — the question is about process and trajectory, not ideal end-state                                                                                                                                                      |
| Suffrage vs. enfranchisement           | Suffrage is the legal right to vote; enfranchisement is the practical exercise of that right. After 1870, Black Americans had legal suffrage but were effectively disenfranchised by Jim Crow mechanisms until 1965.                                                                             |
| Social democracy vs. socialist state   | Social democracy maintains private ownership and market economics but uses the state to ensure social welfare, regulate markets, and reduce inequality (UK Labour 1945). A socialist state moves toward collective ownership of the means of production (the USSR). These are different systems. |
| Coalition vs. consensus                | A coalition government is a formal arrangement of multiple parties sharing cabinet posts (UK 1940–1945). Consensus politics is when parties converge on a shared policy framework without formal coalition (UK post-WWII welfare state accepted by both Labour and Conservatives).               |
| Nationalism vs. democratic nationalism | Nationalism can be democratic (Indian independence movement; ANC) or anti-democratic (Nazi ethnic nationalism; apartheid Afrikaner nationalism). Specify which kind when using the term in essays.                                                                                               |

## Section 9: Question Bank

1. **[Conditions — UK]** The Reform Act of 1832 is described as a significant step in British democratic development. Which of the following most accurately describes its democratic significance?
  - A. It introduced universal suffrage for all men over 21 in England and Wales
  - B. It reduced the political power of the monarchy by transferring executive authority to Parliament
  - C. It extended the franchise to industrial cities previously unrepresented, reduced rotten boroughs, and began the process of aligning political representation with the new social realities of industrial capitalism — while still excluding the working class
  - D. It gave the vote to women for the first time in British history
2. **[Leaders — Roosevelt]** Roosevelt's New Deal is considered a significant development in American democratic history. Its primary democratic significance was:
  - A. It extended the right to vote to Black Americans in Southern states
  - B. It redefined democratic government as responsible not just for political rights but for citizens' economic security — establishing Social Security, labour rights, and financial regulation that proved democracy could respond to crisis without abandoning democratic principles
  - C. It ended racial segregation in federally funded programmes
  - D. It established the United States as the world's leading military power, enabling it to defend democracy internationally
3. **[Democratic failure — Weimar]** A student argues that the Weimar Republic's collapse was inevitable given its structural weaknesses. The most effective historical counter-argument is:
  - A. The Weimar Republic had no structural weaknesses — its constitution was among the most democratic in the world
  - B. Nazi vote share was falling (from 37.4% in July 1932 to 33.1% in November 1932) before Hindenburg appointed Hitler as Chancellor in January 1933; the collapse required specific decisions by elite actors who miscalculated that they could control Hitler — it was not structurally predetermined
  - C. The Great Depression did not affect Germany as severely as other European countries

D. The German army remained loyal to the Weimar Republic and could have suppressed the Nazi movement at any time

4. **[Struggles for democracy — Civil Rights]** Which of the following most accurately describes the relationship between the 15th Amendment (1870) and the Voting Rights Act (1965)?

A. The two documents are unrelated — the Voting Rights Act created the right to vote for Black Americans for the first time

B. The 15th Amendment was declared unconstitutional in 1896 and the Voting Rights Act restored the right to vote

C. The 15th Amendment formally prohibited racial disenfranchisement but was rendered ineffective by Jim Crow mechanisms (poll taxes, literacy tests, violence); the Voting Rights Act provided federal enforcement mechanisms and oversight that made the Amendment's formal guarantee a practical reality

D. The 15th Amendment applied only to newly freed enslaved people; the Voting Rights Act extended its protections to all Black Americans

5. **[Women's suffrage — UK]** Historians debate whether WSPU militancy advanced or retarded the women's suffrage cause in the United Kingdom. The most balanced assessment is:

A. WSPU militancy was entirely counterproductive — it delayed women's suffrage by decades by alienating public and parliamentary sympathy

B. WSPU militancy was the decisive factor that won women the vote — without direct action, suffrage would never have been achieved

C. The evidence suggests mixed effects: militancy kept the suffrage issue on the national agenda and demonstrated depth of commitment, but also provided a pretext for government repression and alienated some moderate supporters; the suspension of militancy in 1914 and women's war service were at least equally important factors in the 1918 partial enfranchisement

D. WSPU militancy had no historical effect — suffrage was achieved entirely through the NUWSS's constitutional lobbying

6. **[Leaders — Nehru/India]** India's decision to adopt universal adult suffrage in 1947 was significant primarily because:

A. India was the first country in Asia to introduce democratic elections

B. Universal suffrage was required by the terms of Indian independence negotiated with Britain

C. It demonstrated that a democratic commitment to universal political participation could be sustained even in conditions of mass poverty and

illiteracy, making India's 1952 election the largest democratic exercise in world history to that date — and challenging assumptions that democracy required high levels of literacy or economic development as prerequisites

D. It gave political power to India's industrialised middle class, enabling rapid economic development

7. **[South Africa — transition]** The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC, 1996–2003) in South Africa represented a distinctive democratic approach to transitional justice because:

A. It prosecuted and imprisoned all perpetrators of apartheid-era human rights abuses

B. It offered full amnesty unconditionally to all participants in apartheid

C. It created a mechanism for trading amnesty for perpetrators who made full public disclosure against the criminal justice process, prioritising truth and social reconciliation over retribution — enabling democratic consolidation without triggering the civil conflict that a full criminal justice process might have provoked

D. It was established by the international community and operated independently of the South African government

8. **[Cross-regional comparison — wartime democracy]** Both the United Kingdom (1939–1945) and France (1940–1944) faced the existential threat of Nazi Germany during World War II. A key difference in their democratic responses was:

A. The United Kingdom maintained democratic governance through a cross-party coalition while continuing parliamentary accountability; France's Third Republic collapsed and was replaced by the Vichy regime, which collaborated with Nazi Germany

B. France maintained a stronger democracy than Britain during the war because its Popular Front tradition provided broader social support for the democratic government

C. Both countries operated similarly — as democratic coalition governments under the constraints of wartime emergency

D. The United Kingdom suspended parliamentary democracy entirely for the duration of the war, operating through emergency executive powers

9. **[Conditions — India]** B.R. Ambedkar's role in drafting the Indian Constitution (1949–1950) is significant for democratic history because:

A. Ambedkar was the first democratic leader to introduce universal suffrage anywhere in Asia

B. Ambedkar, as a member of the “untouchable” Mahar caste, used the constitution to address the anti-democratic nature of the caste system — explicitly prohibiting untouchability and guaranteeing fundamental rights including equality before the law regardless of caste, religion, or gender

C. Ambedkar’s constitution introduced a presidential rather than parliamentary system of government

D. Ambedkar negotiated the terms of Indian independence with the British government on behalf of the Congress Party

10. **[Exam skills — cross-regional requirement]** An IB Paper 2 question asks students to “examine the conditions that led to the emergence of democratic states.” A student writes an essay discussing only the United States — the Progressive Era, the New Deal, and the Civil Rights Movement. What is the most significant weakness of this approach?

A. The United States is not a valid case study for Topic 9 — only European democracies are acceptable

B. The student has not discussed enough American examples — they should also cover Reconstruction and women’s suffrage

C. The essay fails to meet the requirement for examples from more than one region, and examiners will cap the mark at Band 3 regardless of the quality of the American material; the question’s scope demands cross-regional comparison to demonstrate understanding of democratic emergence as a world-historical phenomenon

D. The essay is too long — Paper 2 essays should only cover one example per question

► Show Answers