#### Section 5

#### **Announcements:**

- Please make sure that you upload your essay to the dropbox. I won't actually be looking at these, but we are having everybody do this so that we can randomly choose some to be sure no cheating has been happening.
- Please do this by 11am tomorrow
- We will do a short survey at the end of class

## Marx

- What's the argument?
  - "the modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long course of development, of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and exchange"
  - With greater technology, greater masses, same low wages and work conditions
  - "Communism deprives no man of the power to appropriate the products of society; all that it does is to deprive him of the power to subjugate the labour of others by means of such appropriation" (141)
  - "Bourgeois notions of freedom, culture, law...whose essential character and direction are determined by the economical conditions of existence of your class" (141)
  - Wants to do away with "bourgeois property," not all property. "When, therefore, capital is converted into common property, into the property of all members of society, personal property is not thereby transformed into social property." Want to do away with individual property being transformed into bourgeois property ("buying and selling" → a "collective product," "only by the united action of all members of society, can it be set in motion.)
- What are the mechanisms by which the Communist revolution will come about?
  - Technology increases/advance of industry → increasing masses of workers → overthrow of government
- Is Marx entirely critical of capitalism, or does he think there are good things about it too?
  - Overthrew feudal relations
- So what types of countries should have revolutions? Why do we tend to see peasant revolutions?

### Davies

- What's the argument?
  - Gap between expectations and what you get (relative deprivation)
    → revolution
  - "Revolutions are most likely to occur when a prolonged period of objective economic and social development is followed by a short period of sharp reversal...The actual state of socio-economic development is less significant than the expectation that past progress, now blocked, can and must continue in the future." (6)
  - Countries having modernization, increased freedom followed by economic downturn, sometimes repression, war losses
- To what extent is Davies responding to Marx?
  - He is. Asserts that its not the worst off that lead revolutions
- According to this theory, when should we expect to see revolutions?
  - When growth followed by a slump
    - But we have economic crises all the time.

# Skocpol

- What's the argument?
  - State collapse (w/ the pressures of modernization) + Peasant insurrection (ability to organize) →
  - "If administrative and military breakdown in a modernizing agrarian bureaucracy were to inaugurate social revolutionary transformations, rather than merely an interregnum of intra-elite squabbling, then widespread popular revolts had to coincide with and take advantage of the hiatus of governmental supervision and sanctions" (146).
  - "where regionally-based cliques of landed magnates were ensconced within nominally centralized administrative systems, the ability of the state elites to control the flow of tax resources and implement reform policies was decisively undermined. By their resistance to the mobilization of increased resources for military or economic purposes in modernization crises, such landed cliques of officials could engender situations of acute administrative/military disorganization – potentially revolutionary crises of governmental authority" (142).
  - In China, urban radicals mobilized, but in France and Russia, peasants could rebel on their own

- What does Skocpol mean by the "potential autonomy of the state" in her theory? What view is she arguing against in proposing such a role of the state in her theory of social revolutions? What exactly is the state potentially autonomous from, and what are the implications?

## Selbin

- What's the argument?
  - "People's thoughts and actions are the mediating link btw structural conditions and social outcomes. Structural conditions, moreover, do not unconditionally dictate what people do; instead they place certain limits on people's actions or demarcate a certain range of possibilities" (126)
  - Leaders and their use of culture → revolution
- Skocpol cites a quote from abolitionist Wendell Philips: "Revolutions are not made; they come." Do you agree? Would Skocpol? Marx? Davies? Selbin?
  - Are Skocpol and Marx purely structuralist?
  - o Is this Selbin argument purely voluntarist?
- Do you think Selbin has a point? Are the other theories too structuralist? What is the role of leadership?
- Is the Arab Spring an example of revolutions? Why don't we see revolutions in other countries in the middle east? Can revolutionary regimes become democracies?

## **DO SURVEY**

\_