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Extended Abstract

1. Introduction
Since the late 1970s, a number of social scientists have paid attention to centralized state powers in capitalist societies and state autonomy theories (Giddens, 1985; Mann, 1986; Skocpol, 1979). Developmental states have evolved around some specific historical events during the 1870s, including two historical trends, namely, The Prussian Empire Conquest over Napoleon III, and the beginning of Meiji Reforms in Japan (Kazemi, 2015). Through the elimination of development obstacles, Bismarck and Meiji states (i.e., classic developmental states), as two typical examples of this developmental model, established the related infrastructures and context of national development known as “revolution from above” in Moore parlace (Moore, 1993).
The aftermath of World War II, formation of Eastern Block, and finally, beginning of the Cold War, all together, transferred the geographical field of developmental states to the East Asia (Kazemi, 2015) which in its turn created central core of developmental state in this region. The transfer of developmental states model to the other developing countries in the middle east, Africa and latin America, is the concrete evidence for the emergence of some new developmental states embedded in the situations like changing the environment of global economy, vanishing the cold war, and feeling a pressure toward democratization.

2. Theoretical Framework
One can trace the ideas related to the developmental states in some scholars’ works who have the reputation in classic economic history (e.g., List, 1841; Gerschenkron, 1962; Marx, 1979) and, especially, in institutional economy and sociology (e.g., Johnson, 1982; Evans, 1995,2010; Leftwich, 2000; Cohli, 2004;
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Routley, 2012; Amsden, 1992; Wade, 1990; Cohli, 2004; Wong, 2004; Block, 2007). The elaboration and outlining of the notions of aforementioned scholars is a suitable analytical tool putting the light on the new developmental states in some manners as follow:

- Crossing of East Asian stereotypical image as the unique experience of developmental states
- Considering the variable environment of the global economy as an international structural status
- Transferability of developmental states, i.e., the diffusion of these states to the other regions of the developing world
- The social origins of developmental states

From the 1990s afterwards, the global socio-economic trend has transformed the developmental states through their historical evolution and expanded their geographical domain and functional diversification. Hence, discussing the new developmental states like Iran, Brazil, and Turkey is a prevailing debate nowadays.

3. Methodology

The developmental state as a notion has been based on two critical sociological theories, i.e. the Weberian political theory (Weber, 1991), and the Neo-Marxists’ emphasis on the relative autonomy of the capitalist state (Marx, 1979). Thus, this notion has been formed as the most contested development approach, and under the perspective of institutionalism and new dependency schools of thinking. The analysis of developmental states as a specific theory-based work drawing from this idea that a state is as an autonomous institutional body (state-oriented theory), is aimed to provide a transparent and consolidated understanding of causal settings observed in the history of states.

As state-oriented theorists (e.g., Skocpol, 1979) argue, historical-comparative research is the most appropriate method since it combines research strategies, namely, nominal comparison (i.e., an explanation of causes of a unique sequel by eliminating any potential circumstance) and narrative comparison or tracking process (i.e., perceiving the occurrence process or tracing the causal sequence of a chain of events) (Taleban, 2009).

Among the several characteristics that the new developmental states have [for more details see: (Johnson, 1982); (Leftwich, 2000); (Chang, 2010); (Evans, 1995); (Chang, 2010); (Routley, 2012); (Johnson, 1982, 1987); (Wade, 1990); (Beeson, 2004); (Routley, 2012); (Haggard, S., Kang, D. & Moon, C., 1997); (Leftwich, 2000); (Tilly, 1975); (Waldner, 1999); (Cohli, 2004); (Mkandawire, 2007); (Evans, 2010); (Sandbrook, R., Edelman, M., Heller, P., 2007)], there are seven features that make a good context for comparing the post-war developmental states in Iran, and are as following:
• Developmental elites,
• Developmental nationalism,
• Developmentalist militias,
• Developmentalist bureaucracy,
• The semi-autonomous state apparatus,
• The weak civil society,
• and the state capacity of economic resource controls

4. Findings

The reason for studying Iran as a new developmental state in the Middle East and in comparison with other countries is the need for understanding its state-oriented development process and historical modernization. The Iranian modernization trend since Qajar era (i.e., the mid-nineteenth century) had an authoritarian essence, and Qajar state played a main role in embarking that trend. In addition, Iranian elites have received developmental role of states in contemporary Iran. Furthermore, the critical role of states in Iran during the Pahlavi (1925-1941), top-down modernization, specially during the economic reform-restructuring trend in post-war Iran after the 1990s, are the manifestation of developmentalism on the basis of state agency.

Although some Iranian scholars (e.g., Nabavi, 2011) have categorized Pahlavi I, and II states (1304-1357) as developmental states, and some others have compared Iranian post-war states as developmental states with some similarities with East Asian countries (Delforouz, 2014), this study’s emphasis is on the main features of developmental states, including developmentalist elites, developmentalist bureaucracy, and control of economic resources via state, which are the absent circles in contemporary Iran development process.

The absence of above features describe why even with the overwhelming presence of the given trends like Pahlavi’s state-building that has been emerged from dependent formation during the 19th century in Iran, state-building continuity in post-revolutionary Iran, the presence of developmental militia groups, and economic pragmatism of a state owning all the natural resources, yet, a new developmental state has not been flourished, instead we face with the unique formation of beurucracy and authoritarianism that were made during the 20th century in Iran.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

Brazil, Malaysia, Turkey, and Iran are new developmental states models refer to developmental states transferability, international structural context, and historical-global trends. Although, the main features of new developmental states are absent in Iran, international structural context behind these ideal types are more or less the
same. Since the 1990s, international trends and contexts like, globalization, the end of Cold War, and East Asian financial crisis have provided necessary conditions for Developmental state Model for transferring to the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America. Thus, the global socio-economic environment changes along with the pressure to the democratization have introduced “Global South” including Iran, Turkey, South Africa and Brazil and others as the new cases of developmental states. On the other hand, the demise of the Eastern Block and entering the Post-Cold War era as a determinative variable have created post-socialist DS in China. Just like former generation of Dses, new developmental states are affected by international determinators and their geographical, social, and historical trends.
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