

A Sociological Study of Authoritarianism in Qajar Era

Masoumeh Motlaq¹

Department of Sociology, Islamic Azad University, Arak Branch, Iran

Ako Ahmadnezhad

Department of Sociology, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran

Received 18 February 2016

Revised 17 May 2016

Accepted 10 June 2016

Abstract: *The present study aimed to answer the question that Qajar government as a political system was an authoritarian government? This study deals with the outcomes of Qajar Authoritarianism and the impact of effective historical-geographical conditions of Iran on emergence or continuance of Authoritarianism. Authoritarianism in this study is not a one-dimensional structure and it is composed of some elements as imposing violence, illegitimate governance and illegal issues. This study is document-historical design and all the existing documents regarding study are study population. The present study is one of the applied studies in which the data are collected as note taking and the data are analyzed by qualitative method. The evaluation of factors in Authoritarianism of the study shows that Qajar era was Authoritarianism not totalitarian with negative economic, political and social outcomes for the society on that era and for future generation. Based on the results of study, we can say that these policies caused the collapse of this regime. This study showed that by review of history, without any bias and prejudice of a specific movement, based on social sciences theories, we can identify the reasons of occurrence of phenomenon and avoid its repetition in future (experiencing).*

Keywords: *Authoritarianism, Totalitarianism, Power, Legitimacy.*

Introduction

The main issue of political sociology is evaluation of the mutual relations between state power and social forces. It is possible the social forces can resist against power or participate in it or they can be faced with political passiveness. On the other hand, the governments may suppress social forces outside power field or gather them in power arena (Bashiria, 2003). If governments lose their power, they are turned into unstable governments and the governments need support and people satisfaction to legitimize their power. The type of government on a society can have positive and negative outcomes for the society. Dictator, authoritarian governments are authoritative governments as their power prevented the presence of social forces.

As in the studied government (Qajar), imposing power without legitimacy and by force is the important part of its political system, there were also some phenomena as political, economic and social non-development and we can say the role of government system of authoritative type is obvious in social, political and economic deprivation. The study, evaluation and analysis of the past history can help us in prediction, planning and management to cope up with negative outcomes of a political system and creating a progressed and free society. Ignoring a negative social phenomenon at present time can create wide changes over time and its elimination or prevention are time consuming and costly. No society can continue life without being influenced by its past and there are some elements of the past based on social changes in the present time of societies and the social action can be challenging. The past presets good tools for the study of present time for the researchers and probable predictions can be fulfilled. We need the study of behavioral models of social relations of the previous millennium to evaluate the society perception and Iran history (Rezaghali, 2013).

¹ Email: m_motlaq@iau-arak.ac.ir (Corresponding Author)

Authoritarianism simply is referred to the belief to government “power (up)” or imposing this type of government without people satisfaction (Heywood, 2010) and it can include negative impacts making the society involved. Authoritarianism in this study is not a single-dimensional structure and it is composed of some elements as imposing violence, illegitimate governance and illegal issues. The basis of involving factors on formation of Authoritarianism structure is legitimacy, authority and law components as in democratic systems but there is not such law in authoritative governments. The main theory in this study regarding Authoritarianism is Jürgen Habermas and Andrew Heywood theory considering Authoritarianism as negative authority, power without considering citizens satisfaction. There are some periods in Iran history based on suppression, killing, oppression and full elimination of rivals, without any ruling or management managing the society based on specific reasoning or logic. This trend was also observed in Qajar era and it was also observed in Pahlavi era. This study answers this question raised based on theoretical model as whether Qajar government is an authoritative government (compared with different theories as authoritarian and dictatorship theories) and by considering geographical and historical conditions, we evaluate whether historical-geographical conditions can be important in creating Authoritarianism. Finally, based on historical documents and sociology analysis, the most important outcomes of Authoritarianism can be referred.

Theoretical Framework

In this study the governments are divided into demographic and authoritative based on the type or power application. Based on the title of study, authoritative governments are the second type. In sociological study of Authoritarianism we should evaluate the features of this type of government. Due to a few studies regarding this term, we focus on the elements in democratic governments but we cannot observe them in authoritative governments. Based on the theoretical model of this study, a democratic government has authority, legality and legitimacy elements and in most of authoritative governments, we don't have some of them or all of them entirely. We are obliged to apply this type of theoretical model in various theories in politics, sociology and political sociology.

Regarding power, Jürgen Habermas and Andrew Heywood have similar theories regarding its definition. By separating power and authority, Habermas defines power as the ability to attract obedience but authority means the right of execution of some rules and managing the affairs. Heywood in a wide meaning defines power as the ability to achieve good result but in politics, power is the ability of influencing the others behavior as not requested by them. Thus, power in politic field is defined as: Power, ability of using violence against others to achieve their obedience to achieve a good result for the benefits of power authorities. By using the concepts of Marx Weber and Hannah Arendt regarding authority, Habermas referred to the interpretive approach of Weber of authority concept and based on this approach, authority is used in referring to any power system or social control and it is legitimate by the people dealing with it. Thus, based on the mentioned meaning, authority has close relation with legitimacy of political system (power system or social supervision). In this meaning, Authoritarianism of a system or institution doesn't mean considering the attention to special method of governing and it means in each nation, there is special attitude to obedience on them (Nozari, 2001).

According to Habermas, authority in politics means the right of applying definite actions including the right of approving the rules and another law associated to the governance of country. Bashirie defines authority: “Authority has two aspects: One is appeared in governance and rule and another one in obedience of citizens of rules. Based on this view, a stable government needs stable authority. We cannot achieve obligatory decisions and rules without authority. Without authority, various social and political powers are the source of instability conflict in political life. In the new era with the crisis of trans-social sources, the power legitimacy is challenged and the only way to produce authority is resorting to people governance (Bashirie, 2014).

Regarding the evaluation of legitimacy, despite Weber analysis, Habermas has a normative interpretation of it. He considers the legitimacy of each political system depending upon the agreement of involved people in a free discussion as comprehensive as the required people can agree regarding

the mentioned system. In the views of Richard Lavental and David Bitam, as Andrew Heywood emphasizes mostly, like Weber he considers legitimacy model based on legal procedures and other formal and legal procedures but Habermas emphasized on radical-democratic procedures. Richard Lovental writes: The legitimacy of a durable political system in a new industrial society requires a definite legal system defining the executive method of decisions about policies and hiring people. Second, there should be a wide value agreement between mass of people and political elites (as including partial differences in value system inside elite group and the mass). Third, among the mass obedient upon government, it should be assured that executive methods of a definite system lead to the selection of elites and taking the decisions as considering the successful action consistent with common values (coser and Rosenberg, 2008).

David Bitam considers the following items necessary to legitimize a political power:

1. Achieving and applying political power based on formal rules (legal legitimacy)
2. The accepted social beliefs justify the appropriate source of authority, real goals and criteria of government (power norm).
3. The commanders besides recognizing the authorities prefer it to other legal systems and are satisfied with the underlying authority (Nash and Scott, 2009).

Regarding law, this paper follows the definition of Peter Gudrich as..." Law is the norms issued by legal hierarchy or approved as institutional. In this professional definition, the law rules with legal norms are constituents of national law system and their legal authority is directly based on membership in this system and then content legal legitimacy or their actual determination can be considered (Outhwaite and Bottomore, 2013). According to Habermas, the term Authoritarianism is negative despite the term authority and is not depending upon the obedience right and it refers to the method of having this right and strong desires for interference in managing the citizens (Nozari, 2001). Heywood considers authoritarianism imposing government on people without their satisfaction and distinguishes between authoritarianism and authority. He believes authoritarianism is government from the above and authority based on legitimacy is belief from bottom and from people. Authoritarianism is based on power, legitimacy and authority theories without law, legitimacy and authority components. We can say some theorists as Jürgen Habermas, Lui Moro Doblens, and Mills didn't consider authoritarianism directly and in their studies in social, political fields performed some discussions about authoritarianism. Regarding comprehensive theories, we cannot refer to the specific theorist.

For example, Doblens writes: In the best cases, the definition of authority is similar to the definition of power plus an attribute as "formal", "Legitimate" or "legal. In other words, authority is the power recognized by the people in a group or society and it is opposite to illegitimate power (Dublen, 1997). The necessity of the study of elements and legitimacy and authority in democratic system can reduce the weakness of the study of authoritarianism. It should be said, authoritarianism is different from totalitarianism. Totalitarianism is extreme form of authoritarianism; it means that totalitarian regimes form violence aspect is much recognized than authoritarianism. Paul S. Sandrol considered some differences between authoritarianism and totalitarianism as ..." Based on this comparison, we can say authoritative systems due to the lack of guiding ideology, the tolerance of multiplicity, lack of power to gather the total population to fulfill the national goals and power in definite part have much space for private life (Sandrol, 2009).

As it was said, the questions of the paper include:

- 1- Was Qajar government one of authoritarian regimes?
- 2- Are historical-social backgrounds of Iran important in emergence of authoritarianism?
- 3- What are the outcomes of Qajar authoritarianism for Iran society?

The Theoretical Model of Authoritarian Regime

The consistency of this model doesn't guarantee the governance of an authoritarian government (despite democracy system with three sides of authority, legitimacy and law), and each of the

components alone is the adequate and required condition for the survival of these governments. The three components are strong form of authoritarianism and it can be mentioned as totalitarian regimes. By violence, we can achieve power and governance of a country and by ignoring the public dissatisfaction and opposing groups, we can suppress any riot. The society dissatisfaction indicating illegitimate governance can be manifested as riot, strike or disorder in public order, not participation in elections, criticism of government in mass media. In this model, if there are some rules, due to the power of this class, monopoly and suppression of opposing people are only for show off and new rules are approved for the benefit of dominant class.

Dissatisfaction (non-legitimacy) Violence Review of Literature

By referring to central library of Iran and social sciences library (Tehran University) to introduce the records in this era and in Qajar era, it can be said there is no thesis based on specific frameworks regarding authoritarianism in Qajar era and the books regarding authoritarianism based on specific period depends upon general acceptance of authoritarianism as totalitarian government. For example, Mohammad Nozari in the thesis (2008) as “bureaucratic- authoritarian regimes and social economic change” evaluated the positive and negative relation between authoritarianism of Reza Shah era and socio-economic changes by bureaucratic- authoritarian governments of Odanel and answered these questions whether Reza Khan government was an authoritarian bureaucratic government or not? Whether it had the features of a bureaucratic-authoritarian government. Ali Akbar Khadrizade (2001) in the study “contrast of authoritarianism and constitutionalism in second and third parliament (1330 - 1332 AH) had the same trend. Also, Shoja Ahmadvand (1995) in the study “the authoritarian structure of monarch governments in Iran and political culture was not an exception.

If we separate the concept of authoritarianism and Qajar era and evaluate each of them alone, in recent years, in terms of published books of local authors and the translated works, there are valuable books and articles in this regard useful in terms of content and concept. Theodor Vestalin the book “post-cold war of Africa” like other scientists in political era believes that in the 20th century, undeveloped African countries have achieved new form of government different from its traditional one. Even Vestal believes that in 20th century, authoritarianism is different. Vestal considers authoritarianism a type of government in which power is centralized only on a few people and all the decisions are taken by the dominant party. According to him, authoritarian regimes have some features as this system can resist against the changes: 1) Control from above parties and improving military force to restore security of system and society, 2) The mastery on society via bureaucracy system, 3) Controlling the oppositions and local critics, 4) Creating entire loyalty via sociability of various groups (Vestal, 1999).

Iwan Chrastive, the chief of managing board of freedom strategies in Sufie of Bulgarian and one of the members of human sciences institution in Vienna in the study “conflict in new authoritarianism” published in 2011 in “democracy journal”(at first this paper was presented as speech), investigated three main questions:

- 1) Why authoritarian governments are remained in democracy era?
- 2) Why political sciences didn't predict the survival of these governments,
- 3) Why keeping contemporary authoritarianism is hard?

He concentrated his observations on Russian experience. Dr. Mohammad Homayun Katouzian in the book “Iran, short-term society and three other papers” investigated historical problems of economic and political development of Iran. The origin of this study was its historical background. Thus, we can study social background of Iran on that period (according to the views of Dr. Katouzian to after and before constitutionalism revolution). In the two first papers, Katouzian investigated Iran history before constitutionalism and believed that legitimacy and succession, non-importance of property and life of people and the problems of development made these changes short in historical structure of Iran society and this also led into the lack of political and economic development in Iran. Ali Rezaghali in the book “Sociology of Autocracy: A Sociological Interpretation of the story of Zahhak in shahnameh” based on Ferdowsi story, the story of Zahak and serpents had a sociological analysis of

Iran society in the fourth and fifth centuries in Iran. Although the book refers to fourth and fifth century AH, Rezagholi believes that the reasons of long era of dictatorship in Iran political and thought system are in the history of this country and to move to a free and equal society, we are obliged to have logical study, without judgment, without valuation, sociological study.

Research Method

Based on the nature and purpose of study, this is a historical-document design investigating the past condition of Qajar government. The study population in this study is all study documents of Qajar era as books, historical documents, papers, theses, study designs and journals. This study as an applied design attempted to raise basic questions regarding Qajar government and its outcomes and achieved important theories to plan a suitable government based on culture and economy of a geography and society to have positive and considerable outcomes for society. This is a library and document study as it is historical. Thus, written reports, historical documents, the researches and journals are the most important source of data collection. Based on the questions and theoretical framework we can refer to the books, theses and various analyses presented from social theorists and local and international studies and classify the items in definite titles. Qualitative method is used for data analysis. Based on the historical nature of the present study and lack of quantitative variable, statistical methods for findings analysis is not possible and the criteria in qualitative analyses are wisdom, logics, thinking and reasoning.

Data Analysis

It always seemed that lack of political, economic and social development of Iran society or lack of entering modern world based on modernity standards and requirements are rooted in the history of this country at least in the recent 500 hundred years from the beginning of Safavid era. In recent years, various works are published in various political, economic and social fields dealing with the various changes of Iran history. Generally, in these works, we can refer to two common points in terms of criticism in the past changes. First the weaknesses and problems of governments in Iran and its comparison with west society and second emphasizing on the role of colonialism in these weaknesses. The third view of the study believes that authoritarianism as totalitarian government by illegal power is the important factor of non-development of a society. The formation of authoritarianism is the effect of other conditions. In this study, authoritarianism is not the only factor of deprivation, it is an important structure created in various historical, cultural, economic, political and social conditions. Based on the available documents, we can say authoritarian governments create the systems as existing based on development factors, the factor of political, social and economic deprivations (except some cases as Singapore model). Thus, this study is not considering the importance of development and it is mostly about authoritarianism as the main reasons of non-development.

Authoritarianism

Authoritarianism refers to the governments governing despite their satisfaction. In this type of government, specific person or group as a political party can manage a small group of politicians or a military group via a process as coupe and revolution and govern as a dictator to eliminate individual freedom and social law. Authoritarianism term is derived from authority. Despite authority emphasizing on achieving legitimate power, it has not legitimacy from the view of people and by eliminating individual freedom, fighting against democracy and freedom can suppress those opposing. The monarchy, dictatorship, oligarchy, personal, military governments, single party, conservatives, Fascists and traditional and modern despotisms are different types of authoritarian regimes. Various factors can be involved in emergence of authoritarianism and in new political knowledge, to evaluate these factors or explaining authoritarianism, it is compared with democracy concepts. Achieving power via illegal and non-democratic ways as via violence, coercion, plunder, succession crisis, cope, war and even revolution, increasing the interference of government in various political, economic, social, religious and educational levels, inconsistency of government policies with public culture and ignoring the people requests and applying unlimited power by law are the factors creating authoritarian governments. Other important factors are the success of government to meet the needs or requests of majority of people. The government by its success in creating economic welfare or success

in increasing the social and political participation can achieve the support of majority of society and it is the basic factor in legitimacy of a political system. Ivan Krastev in the paper “Paradoxes of new authoritarianism” explained a good example of different authoritarian government types and based on his successes is the example of soft authoritarianism (Singapore model) or vegetarian authoritarianism. He believes that “Russia is an interesting case because it highlights the key features of the new competitive authoritarianism. Russia’s regime is only moderately repressive. Putin’s authoritarianism is a “vegetarian” one. While political repression exists and human rights organizations state torture and hurting of journalists and other opposing parties of government, it is fair to say that most Russians today are freer than in any other period of their history. They can travel, they can freely surf the Web (Ivan Krastev, 2011).

The emphasis on governance law and not law governance, unlimited political tenure of the leader or ruling party and power monopoly , avoiding the parties formation and opposition groups, control of society and citizens by education institutions (what should people learn or not learn), mass media (determining what the newspapers should write or not write or what Radio and TV should broadcast or not broadcast), the role of job creation and government investment and its control on all cultural, political and social aspects, equipment of all resource and facilities to solve legitimacy crisis in various levels (system, policies and people), tendency to nationalism, using all resources and state structures and violence tools in the change of traditional and deprived society to a modern society, lack of responding to the citizens regarding their actions, show off of election system and law and life style of citizens as they lose their identity are the features of authoritarian governments. Is historical-social background of Iran important in emergence of authoritarianism? (The effective social, cultural and economic factors on authoritarianism dominance): In Iran, we have always observed different authoritarian governments based on the mentioned definitions of authoritarianism. The historical periods in Iran have observed traditional dictatorships, monarchy, oligarchy, totalitarian governments and they included some definitions as Asian despotism, orientaldespotism and water despotism. The governments of NadershahAfshar, Safavid, Qajar or government of Turkish, Mongols and Arabs in Iran, we only observed plunder, robbery, blood shedding, chaos and etc.

Iran history is based on specific features and if we don’t assume as authoritarian factors, this country is susceptible to violence governance. Briefly, we can refer to some of the features. The different geography conditions of this country determined its population and its dispersion. Drought and famine and contagious diseases in the dry regions provided the ground for riots or occupation of neighboring good countries. After occupation of these regions, formation of a totalitarian government was a necessity. This country was in the middle of great invasions of different tribes and races and caused that Iranian governments tried to have great militarized or extended emperors. Thus, militarized areas were the necessary condition to achieve power and protecting it. Due to its geographical situation, Iran was the migration location of various races and tribes. These regions were invaded by many enemies and managing the country without an authoritarian government was not possible but central governments in Iran extended their power range and were turned gradually into totalitarian regimes hurting the defenseless tribes (Zikfrid, 1975).

Heterogeneous population textures of Iran from race, ethnicity and religious aspects can be effective historical factors in formation of authoritarianism. EzatollahNozari also referred to the Economic history of Iran (Qajarie):” All tribe groups are divided into tens of groups as different in terms of methods and life style and enmity. This variety was one of the main factors of dominance disorder dividing it into various parts and it is one of the reasons of lack of deep unit in government and continuous local disorder (Nozari, 2011). We can also refer to the governance of traditions based on destiny and magic, heterogeneous population texture (urban, nomadic and rural), Iranians behavior to accept dictatorship culture. There is no theory regarding Iranians behavior indicating the totalitarian more of people in this country but many authors and researchers consider Iranian society a society with totalitarian morale.

Sariolghalam repeatedly referred to this issue in his books as: authoritarianism gene” From theoretical aspects, the life style of Iranians is authoritarianism system as its depth is as we can evaluate it in Iranian behavior at genetic level (Sariolghalam, 2013).

The Theoretical Reasons indicating the Authoritarianism in Qajar Era

Coercion or illegitimate power

Aghamohammad Khan Qajar defeated Lotfalikhan and achieved power. By arresting and mutilating the rest of Zand dynasty, he eliminated any threat by the Zandie government. Aghamohammadkhan was also killed in bed by two of his servants as sentenced to death. After Mohammad Mirza took throne, some of his uncles protested. Naseredinshah after taking throne tried to kill him out of the riot of his son, AbasMirza at 9 years old and it was prevented with the interference of Russian and English ambassadors and he was banished. These are some historical examples of Qajar era indicating the power achieving and keeping it. “The collapse of a totalitarian government didn’t change totalitarian system as it was not imagined for this system and there was no mechanism to transfer power. Such event as the result of “chaos, revolution and plunder inside and outside the country led into the chaos and killing and people from any social class desired the totalitarian government to eliminate one of the rivals and create a new totalitarian government (Katouzian, 2012).

The lack of law or formal and informal contracts and procedures

In chaotic societies, without any formal and informal contracts, chaos can be increased. At high government levels, this disorder is for the benefit or at loss of government. The benefit is created as any person from any class can take power. According to Rezagholi, the tendency for governing in Iran was the most important and main condition of taking power. This person is at loss if there is no security to continue governance and it is possible that he is killed by another riot or chaos. In constitutionalism era, law enters political knowledge of Iran as a reliance center for political system stability or civil society participation in political affairs (although there was political knowledge already!). According to some Iranian historians and theorists in political and historical fields, Iran history can be divided into before and after constitutionalism. This goal is an important factor for major changes in all levels of Iran society. In 1906, Iran constitution determined the work methods and rules of law for government. For the first time in Iran history, “constitutional” government was a set of rules defining the executive power and determined the rights and duties of government and society exactly. Such revolution was not occurred in Europe as imposing power in European communities was dependent upon legal limitations, the higher the authoritarianism of governments and the higher the limitation of rules on government and society relations among social classes, these limitations were also imposed (Katouzian, 2012). If the king had no power before constitutionalism revolution and decision making was based on personal tendency, family benefit in country affairs, by constitutionalism revolution, the king power was limited and by participation of civil society and various opposition groups, the society was moving to the trend common in west but the future path of society and government of Iran was not as the westerns had in 400 years. The governments after constitutionalism as its main index was legality were in the same way the chaotic governments took. There were two main conditions in Iran history distinguishing the history of this country politically from western history and created the conditions increasing authoritarianism.

a. The succession and monarchy conditions

Various historical-analytic books considered this issue that succession or supporting the legitimacy of taking throne did not exist before constitutionalism revolution in Iran. If in the west, first child was appointed as a successor, in Fatalishah Qajar era, after the death of his son, Abbas Mireza, Mohammad Mirza was appointed as a successor despite the opposition among the other sons and his uncles protested after Mohammad Mirza took throne. In feudalistic governments and in European monarchy-dictator systems taking power after renaissance, legitimacy and succession rules were fixed. First child rule was fundamental solving succession problem in late feudalism governments and in dictatorship governments. This rule was also true regarding ownership. The closest person to that European Duke

or Count had the equal right to the wealth of his father as the closest person to king to take the throne. The closest person in both cases was the first son or the closest remaining relative (Katouzian, 2012). Rezagholi writes: Western governments not protected due to civil basics and stable economic, social, political and cultural bases by military forces and talent of the governor, by declining political power, nobody could take the power easily. Normally, royal families were not killing the king and the also the commanders couldn't do it and the entire political system was formed as the social system was supporting it (Rezagholi, 2013).

b. Non-establishment of aristocrats

The aristocrats had some features that even formation of west capitalism system is attributed to it. According to Katouzian, aristocrats with their position in west political system shared power with the government and avoided the power monopoly by king. In other words, economic power is one of the restricting political power and aristocrats with economic power can reduce king power monopoly . According to Bashirie, despite east, in the west, aristocrats had land ownership rights and much autonomy compared to central rulers. Aristocracy in various countries had specific position. Compared to medieval era or totalitarian governments, in ancient history with simple political structure, aristocracy had no specific position in political system and government. In Feudal governments of Medieval era, wealthy aristocrats had important role in political power. This importance was as in the periods, their power was reduced, the riot of some of the strongest aristocrats and legal authorities created disorder in governments (Katouzian, 2012).

“In Iran, based on patrimonialism features and Iranian despotism, there was no patrimonial aristocracy with legal privilege to restrict king power. Based on the family foundation of political power, the rank of aristocrats was associated to the close relation with king family and close relation with political decision making as court. According to the reasoning of Weber regarding patrimonial governments, the control of administrative and military tools of society is more than the control of economic sources as the source of political power. In Qajar era. the aristocrats power was dependent upon the relationship with royal family, position in court and land ownership. Thus, the duties of state rule, local military commander and tax collector were performed by one person and in Iranian monarchy, the major part of land was dedicated to government delegating it to the wealthy people and patrimonial aristocracy was not appeared in Iran (Bashirie, 2003).

Legitimacy Crisis

Based on coercion theory and illegal power, the lack of succession, non- patrimonial power and lack of aristocrats as the result of disorder, all the governments in Qajar era had no legitimacy in theoretical authoritarianism sector. The importance of legitimacy from people was as even in the governments before Qajar, the kings and rulers tried to achieve it by any way. After controlling political power, the kings attempted to attract the support of clergymen to support them on the behalf of God. For example, if Fatalishhah was a good king and was respected as a religious person by clergymen, in Mohammad Shah era (1849-1834), the tension between the court and religious men was increased. At first, the religious men believed that Qajarie as the king of Islam and Shia nation tried to defend Islam against the pagans but later it was considered a government collaborating with pagan powers, the powers trying to eliminate Islamic community of Iran. Thus, in the early 20th century, religion was separated from political dominance (the lack of religious support of Qajar government) in Iran community and the clergymen later tried to interfere in politics due to the collaboration of Qajar government with foreign powers.

The disconnection between elites and society

Legitimizing king totalitarian power and reducing his power, regularity of despotism, modification of religious rules by various methods, establishment of justice center of people against government for the first time, considering equal social rights for religious minorities, abolishing torture, reducing the interference of executive power in judgment were all performed by Amirkabir. But the problem was as he made some reforms in Iran as a person not as a party. Amirkabir never searched for the support of people of his actions and he decided and performed all the actions. On the other hand, he was not appointed by people and no person supported him. The ministry period of Amirkabir shows this reality

that there was no relation between elites and citizens. The wealthy people were only having fun in royal palaces or European trips, Fatalishah and Naserodinshah had many wives and harems with many maids, chariots and facilities. In this era based on the social and cultural structure of the country, the one taking the power didn't listen to any support or consultation.

Oriental despotism theory (water despotism)

Oriental despotism is referred to despotism in eastern or Asian countries. In this political system, aristocrats have no autonomy and the king can put this class in pressure or eliminate it. According to Iran history experience, this class is changed after the king is changed. Unsuitable climatic conditions, dry land and great deserts in these regions need artificial irrigation utilities. It is obvious the necessity of economical use of water in east requires the centralized power of government. Shortage of water is mostly observed in oriental areas compared to west areas. Based on this dryness, population dispersion is different in various regions. It means that beside the rivers and highly water regions (easy well digging), much population lives. The increasing population in these regions leads to development of villages. It means that water is a factor in which population growth is dependent upon it. Organizing irrigation system (digging well, Qanat and drainage system) was costly and farmers couldn't afford it. The farmers asked the government to provide this money and they were dependent upon the government. Over time, great part of agricultural fields were owned by government and created suitable conditions for establishment of totalitarian governments. Iran as a big country with water shortage, it means that production problem is based on water not land. Thus, the villages had no extra production and they were isolated. Also, the society was dispersed and it was not possible to create independent feudalistic power based on the ownership of one or some villages. On the other hand, a mobile military force could gather the extra production of major part of country and was turned into a government based on extra volume. This military mobile force was provided by tribes (Katouzian, 2011).

The lack of conception of government-nation

Antony Giddens believes: "Wherever there is political system of government (some institutions as parliament or congress beside the authorities and employees of civil offices) and rule on definite land and provide its power by legal system and military forces to perform their policies, there is government. All modern communities are government-nation. It means that modern communities are the governments in which the mass population is the citizens considering themselves as a member of a unified nation. Government-nations are created in various periods in various parts of the world (e.g. US in 1776 and Czech Republic's in 1993) (Giddens, 2008). Government-nations have the features making them different from non-industrial or traditional civilizations. Governance is the most important feature as referred here. In tradition civilizations or governments, there is no border between these countries and central government couldn't dominate all its governance on the entire country. According to Giddens, using the term governance for these civilizations is not a suitable term as governance is referred to the countries under control with definite boundary and the government should have the required authority. The historical example of this issue is observed in Qajar era. John Foran cited from ervandAbrahamian: Qajar rules on a weak society as balanced based on the policy "separate people and rule" and this needs permanent military or fully equipped bureaucracy. Thus, it can be said Qajar government was smaller compared to Safavie government...Qajars were totalitarians without any tools. These shadows of God on earth, their orders were ignored in the remote areas; the main king was trembling out of fear against the armed protestors. These ruthless rulers were ruling by the permission of states commanders, religious leaders and local authorities (Foran, 2013). By extending the term government-nation with tribe and nomadic system of Iran history, Sariolghalam believes that: For centuries, Iran history was affected by emergence, declining and collapse of nomads. In all areas of Iran, various nomads were increased based on weather consistency and geography and they were obliged to use their forces to suppress another tribe and in this way, their gradual victory caused the dominance on the entire areas of Iran. Thus, the continuity of nomadic and tribe system in Iran political arena, delayed the fulfillment of the concept of government and nation as its new meaning (Sariolghalam, 2012).

This should be said that nationalism has close relation with government-nation concept. The lack of national emotions against foreign people invasion to the country can eliminate the cultural, social and historical heritage of the society by its simplest form. Although, nationalism is led into authoritarianism in definite examples in contemporary world (Ataturk in Turkey), in the history of a country like Iran, it could avoid many outcomes of authoritarianism. "Qajar kings delegated customs office and mint houses and state positions to solve various financial crises. In the second half of 19th century (1179-1279 solar calendar), the states government was delegated to earn much money. The bid winner in state ruler position attempted to achieve various incomes via various taxes. In 1893, Aminolsoltan, the minister told Lasels, minister of Britain, don't expect us any patriotism, there is no such thing in the country, there are only personal benefits and greed, nobody should interfere with other affairs (Foran, 2013).

The presence of colonialism and invading forces in the countries with long authoritarianism history

In a colonized country like India, by the direct interference of colonial country, Britain, despotism system was dominant on society suppressing any riot of people to be released of dominance and no colonialist can dominate on the people of a country. In a colonized country like Iran, colonialists by indirect interference, obliging the rulers via threatening to attack, giving privileges to these rulers or by conspiracy were ruling these countries. In this country, any protest against colonialism of enemy or protest against the kings was encountered with the indirect and direct interference (military) of these countries as the interests of these countries and rulers were keeping this power by any tool. By avoiding the developing progress of Iran in Afghanistan and by military power to achieve diplomatic and strategic goals, England established its commercial superiority in the half 19th century (1179-1279 solar calendars). Like Iran, Afghanistan had important role for Britain as the government between India and Russia. In the 50 years period during 1863-1914, many privileges were given for exclusion of raw materials and infrastructural development from Iran government to Russian and England citizens and relevant governments. These privileges including railway construction, telegraph line, shipping in river, operation of mines and state jungles and etc. (a good example is Tobacco privilege) were encountered with wide protests and they were cancelled by giving costly fines to the country. Although in terms of interests in Iran, Russia and England were opposites, their agreement against the increasing invasion of belligerent Germany caused that "Russia occupied some areas of Iran and finished constitutionalism revolution (1911-1906) and increased its political dominance in Iran and Britain was silent to these actions and attempted to establish a stable government in Iran to take out oil and have access to India via Iran (foran, 2013).

What are the Authoritarianism Outcomes of Qajar for Iran Society?

Today, in the social and political sciences studies, one of the most important factors evaluating authoritarianism is development and non-developed concept. Detailed researches regarding authoritarianism show that third world, developing and undeveloped countries are the most common types of authoritarian regimes. Development means achieving social and economic progress via changing the non-development conditions (low production return, stagnation and poverty) in the countries named "poor, undeveloped, underdeveloped or developing. Economic growth is the necessary condition (not adequate) for social progress as it provides basic needs as suitable food, health and housing (eradication of absolute poverty) as we can add other required conditions for perfect life of people as public access to education, civil freedom and political participation (coping up with poverty or relative deprivation)(Outhwaite and Bottomore, 2013). By monopoly of power, the dominant class considers itself as the owner of all relevant decisions in political, economic and social fields. The gap between government and people cannot provide people requests and the government gets weaker. Above legitimacy crisis, the government should pay much to provide suppression force after dissatisfactions. If low production return, stagnation and poverty are the bases of non-development, Iran in Qajar era was non-developed. Achieving social and economic progress via changing the non-development conditions as low production return, stagnation and poverty requires people participation, market economy and liberal market and establishing law and the lowest interference of government in socio-economic arenas.

In Authoritarian regimes, the competition between the society members is eliminated and social status, wealth and position of people depend upon their close relation to power sources. Thus, any attempt, thought, innovation are eliminated and only close relation to this social class determines the success of people in society. Monopoly in all fields is a factor to absorb close people and eliminating the other people.

In the early 20th century, foreign companies controlled all export sectors except opium, dried fruit and walnut and due to numerous foreign goods in Iran markets, due to their cheap price, some efforts as establishing new factories were failed and market authorities were at loss. Although, the contact with the west increases the profits of many tradesmen, it increased the gap between retailer tradesmen and Qajar government and foreign powers of enemy. Weaving lost its important aspect against imported fabric from England (1860-1870). Handicrafts (1820-1890) were declined. The collapse of hand-made weaving industry affected other relevant jobs as dye, cleaning and separating sectors. This also affected Kolahmalan, Shoe polishers and wood carving and tradesmen of these goods left the city.

Even with the establishment of some factories for industrial production by machine equipment in Iran, as small factories of paper making, glass, gunpowder, sugar, soap, bullet, soft drink, spinning and etc. in 1850 and 1860, Iran economy encountered stagnation due to the lack of coping up with foreign trading. The factories with considerable successes in Iran belonged to foreigners. The oil company of England in Iran, fisheries of Caspian sea and fabric factories of Russia, brick, wood, arms, carpet weaving and construction industry of German were the factories with high profit and numerous workers. In these factories, the wage of Iranian and foreign workers was different and Iranians were paid less. The wage of old workers, women and children was very low. Fleor believed that on that period the working hours, health conditions, wage and social status were terrible.

The economic and financial crisis of Qajar era, increasing weakness to western governments and their weapons and economy, foreign borrowing, giving privileges to foreigners, reduction of money value and corruption of sale of state positions were economic factors causing lack of legitimacy in Qajar era. The influence of foreign governments in remote areas from Tehran, increasing the attacks of bandits and separation of religious and political legitimacy sources in a space without reasonability and law had great influence on decreasing totalitarian power of Qajar kings and had also great influence on the increasing failure of government. Increasing people dissatisfaction, collecting heavy taxes, oppression, weakness of authorities and court, weakness of central government, unemployment in cities, reduction of wages, high price of food, reduction of affordability of people, dissatisfaction of various groups as religious people and elites, retaliation of religious minorities and great ethnicities, great influence of colonialism to establish the benefits, the lack of formal or informal principles of succession issue, plundering of court authorities, yielding to foreign power and accepting heavy borrowings, the conflict between government authorities, the riot of some clergy men against government and court and freemasonry movement, the activity of religious new minorities namely Babian and Azlian, to form retaliation and the defeat of influence of Shia clergymen, the interferences of England government, the support of ottomans of constitutionalism followers and invading the conflicting borders with Iran, economic poverty, prostitution, corruption, famine, hunger and insecurity were all the outcomes of mismanagement, illegality, reasoning and etc. encountering Qajar government with legitimacy crisis and then collapse (Tobacco movement, Constitutionalism movement and etc.). According to Foran (2013), in the first half of 19th century, there were many political conflicts, disorder and civil wars. Namely in 49 years period of Naseroldin Shah Government and cited in Ashraf and Hekmat, there were 169 cases of riot and civil war. Foran believed that "...the mean life expectancy...in Iran in 1900 was less than 30 years and it can be said in the early 19th century (1179-1279), in constitutionalism revolution, urban population generally and workers, craftsmen and urban poor people specifically were injured by the materialistic problems in life (Foran, 2013).

Conclusion

In the present social and political studies, political sociology and political sciences are close to each other and some theorists believe that political sociology as a wide field covers the entire political sciences and by eliminating the differences between these fields, political sciences is more sociological now. Thus, sociological study of authoritarianism can be evaluated by these two fields as exactly. The term authoritarianism is regarding the expression of the feature of regimes or governments ruling by violence and they don't have democratic principles. In an authoritarian government, the government rules people without their satisfaction and it has political, social and economic power monopoly and eliminates social and individual freedom of people. In this government, rulers are not obliged to respond to people or those voting to them and they suppress the political opposition and eliminate political parties. Power, legitimacy, authority and law are the elements important in authoritarianism issue. These issues are evaluated by various theories in theoretical framework. As it was said, any era observed various political, economic and social changes of the previous periods. Thus, the social and historical conditions in Iran were effective on emergence and continuity of authoritarianism in Iran. Different geographical conditions in Iran, militarized governments, ethnical, racial and religious heterogeneity of Iran population, the governance of traditions based on destiny culture, imbalanced population distribution of Iran community, specific Iranian behavior were the effective factors on Iranian authoritarianism. Nomadic social culture and government nature of Iran delayed the fulfillment of national unity among various masses in Iran plateau for some centuries and some concepts as national governance, nationalism and etc. entered Iran political literature later than other regional countries. The entire Qajar era is full of violence, force, killing, plunder and war, king considered the entire country as his property and people has his own slaves. His decision was law and there was no personal force out of his authority. The ability to provide warriors and suppression, plunder could lead to political success for any person. The lack of law in this country provided that the ruling was the main factor to taking power. Qajar family took throne based on disorder and lack of law and this chaos weakened the government bases. Qajar government had no legitimacy. The lack of legitimate power, succession component, lack of patrimonial nature of throne and lack of aristocrats made all Qajar era governments encountering with the lack of legitimacy.

The lack of social labor division between city and village and full self-sufficiency of these units and economic dominance of central government on merchants, urban economy and their plundering via imposing financial pressures and the interference in activities of kings and authorities of trading in Qajar era provided serious barriers to collection of commercial capital and finally industrial capital and avoided the development of strong aristocrat class. In the current era, authoritarianism is evaluated by developed and non-development concepts, the major forms of authoritarian regimes are seen in third world and undeveloped countries. Low production return, stagnation and poverty are the components observed on majority of authoritarian governments. According to Henry Bernstein, economic growth is required (not adequate) condition for social progress as it provides basic needs as suitable food, health and housing (coping up with absolute poverty) and then we can also add other conditions for perfect life of people as public access to education, civil freedom and political participation (coping up with poverty or relative deprivation). Creating legitimacy crisis via people dissatisfaction from government weakens the government. Above legitimacy crisis, the government should pay much to provide forces and suppression of dissatisfactions. The monopoly of job creation and investment by government, ignorance and lack of growth of private sector, development of dependency culture on government, no stabilized thought, society benefits, national interest, reasoning, thoughtfulness and calculation of the profit and loss based on competition principle and division are other authoritarianism outcomes.

References

1. Abrahamian, Ervand, 2012. A History of Modern Iran. Translated by Mohammad EbrahimFatahi. Tehran. Nashre Ney.
2. Azdanloo, Hamid. 2009. Introduction to basic concepts of sociology. Tehran. Nashre Ney.
3. Bashirie, Hossein. 2003. Political sociology: The role of social forces in political life. Tehran. Nashre Ney.
4. Bashirie, Hossein. 2014. Training political knowledge (basics of theoretical politics and establishing). Tehran. NegaheMoaser publications.
5. Coser, Lewis. Rosenberg, Bernard. Collector. 2008. Sociological Theory: a book of reading (translated by FarhangErshad). Tehran. Nashre Ney.
6. Foran, John. 2013. Fragile resistance: Social transformation in Iran from 1500 to the Revolution. Translated by Ahmad Tadayon. Tehran. Cultural services institution of Rasa.
7. Giddens, Anthoy. 2008. Sociology. Transalted by Hassan Chavoshian. Tehran. Nashre Ney.
8. Heywood, Andrew. 2010. Politics. Translated by AbdolrahmanAlem. Ney edition. 2010.
9. Katouzian, Homyun, 2012. Despotism, Democracy and national movement. Tehran. NashreMarkaz.
10. Katouzian, Homyun. 2011. Iran short-term society and three other papers. Translated by AbdollahKosari. Tehran. Nashre Ney.
11. Nash, Kate- Scott, Alan. The Blackwell companion to political sociology. Translator, Mohammad Khezri and FaramarzTaghiloo, Tehran. Strategic studies research.
12. Nozari, Ezatollah. 2011. Iran social history: From the beginning to constitutionalism. Khojaste publications.
13. Nozari, Hosseinali. 2001. The review of Habermass. Tehran. Cheshme edition.
14. Nozari, Mahmood. 2008. Authoritarian- Bureaucratic regimes and socio-economic change. MA thesis. Tehran.
15. Outhwaite, William. Bottomore, T.B. Collector. 2013. Twentieth-Century social thought the Blackwell Dictionary. Translated by Hassan Chavoshian, Tehran. Nashre Ney.
16. Rezagholi, Ali. 2011. Sociology of elite elimination. Tehran. Nashre Ney.
17. Rezagholi, Ali.2013. Sociology of Autocracy: A Sociological Interpretation of the story of Zakhakin shahnameh. Tehran. Nashre Ney.
18. SariIghalam, Mahmood. 2012. Iranian authoritarianism during the QajarPeriod. Tehran. Farzanrooz edition.
19. Sariolghalam, Mahmood. 2013. Political culture of Iran. Tehran. Farzanrooz publications.
20. Sondrol, P. C. (2009). Totalitarian and Authoritarian Dictators: A Comparison of Fidel Castro and Alfredo Stroessner. . Journal of Latin American Studies
21. Vestal, Theodore M.(1999). Ethiopia: A Post-Cold War African State. 1999