Jeffery Paige's comparative sociology

[redacted]
Brown University

POLS 2090 • Final Paper
October 26, 2017

INTRODUCTION

Jeffery Paige's two major works, *Agrarian Revolution* (1975) and *Coffee and Power* (1997), both of which revolve around the themes of social mobilization, class relations, and changes in political systems, are separated by 22 years. Although Paige's main research interests stayed the same, his methodological approach to comparative study of politics and his theoretical sources have undergone some changes. These changes may well be a result of an intellectual's re-orientation within the discipline due to changing perspectives, new experiences, and other particularities of a life course. However, a more careful look upon the context of such intellectual shifts might give clues about the broader transformation of the discipline of comparative politics and sociology.[1] This essay, then, has the dual task of delineating the main trajectories of Jeffery Paige's scholarly work, particularly in terms of its theoretical approaches and methodological tools, *and* explaining how it resonates within the broader context of American comparative politics and sociology.

In the following, first I will summarize the theories developed in the two books, and then I will discuss the theoretical and methodological innovations of both, underlining Paige's evolving perspectives. I will conclude the paper by drawing parallels between Paige's scholarship and the broader disciplinary developments within comparative politics.

[1] Due to my personal training, throughout the paper, I will mostly refer to sociological canon instead of that of political science. This will inevitable influence the points I highlight in Paige's work and the discipline of comparative politics in general.

THEORIES

AGRARIAN REVOLUTION

In Agrarian Revolution, Paige looks at the relationships of production in the agricultural world. His argument is that depended on the principle sources of income, cultivators (peasants, small-holding farmers) and non-cultivators (landowners who extract surplus through land and/or workforce) adopt different kinds of political behavior. In other words, Paige's main question concerns the relationship between the sources of income for cultivators and non-cultivators *and* the types of social mobilization.

His research design involves representing the independent variables and the actors in dichotomies. The independent variable, sources of income, captures whether the actors gain their livelihood through wages/capital or land. Similarly, actors consist of cultivators and non-cultivators. This approach gives Paige four categories, each representing a distinct form of agricultural class relationship as well as forms of possible social mobilization.

As much of the Marxist scholarship, Paige associates land ownership with conservatism in the case of both elites and small-holding peasants. For the former, extent of political power depends on the area of land under control. Since crop prices are determined mainly by world commodity markets, technical improvements to increase efficiency in the production process does not seem to be a priority. In addition, low quality of the labor force makes such investments precarious and costly. Therefore, the agrarian elite, in order to compensate for its weak economic resources, rely on traditional political structures. The agrarian elite's alliance with the conservative political actors and military, as well as the legal constraints placed upon land ownership keep the peasantry in a submissive position (Paige 1975, ch. 1).

A similar effect of land ownership on political behavior can be observed in the case of small-holding peasants. According to Paige, land-ownership is the primary reason behind the isolation of farmers, who fail to establish bonds of class solidarity among themselves. In contrast, small-holding farmers compete with each other in order to preserve and enhance their private property. The bleak outcomes of losing their lands and becoming landless farmers reduce the desirability of taking risks to a great extent. Another reason for their passivity is that upward mobility seems achievable. When this happens, small-holding farmers tend to associate more with the ruling class, and isolate themselves further from the lower strata of cultivators, hence creating some kind of a *peasant aristocracy*.

As it is clear now, Paige recognizes capitalist market actors as the progressive force in history. Commercial and industrial elites extract surplus not directly

through land, but through market exchange and processing. In this case, the productivity of the land, rather than its area, is the primary concern. Therefore, technical improvements in production methods as well as a skilled labor force is desirable. Since these elites control a great economic power, their reliance on traditional political structures is not essential. Agrarian proletariat, who, as a class, earns their lives through a low and universal wage, is also less influenced by the conservatism from the private ownership of land. Similar work conditions experienced by the each individual of the class and relatively less coercive labor processes enable this class to build class solidarities.

The class positions and their corresponding socio-political characteristics outlined above, help Paige explain the types of conflict emerging from the confrontation of ruling and working classes. The land-land scenario, where both non-cultivators and cultivators derive their income primarily from land, involves the rarest of social mobilization among the 4 cases (Paige 1975, 40–71). This is due to the peasants' usual state of disorganization and the high repressive capacity of the landlords. In the rare instances when such peasant mobilization occurred, they usually ended up with quick disbanding and the massacre of peasants, such as the case in Peru in 1932. Such backlashes later become embedded in the collective consciousness of the agricultural producers, reducing the chances of future rebellions. Thus, the success of farmer rebellions in land-land scenario depends more on external forces, such as a national war, which restricts political and military capacity of the landlords, or the intervention of revolutionary parties, which might introduce peasants with a new sense of class solidarity. In sum, the risks involving in rebelling against the ruling class is too high for the peasant. And, the only way the landlords deal with such mobilizations is through brutal repression.

Repressiveness of the landlords is closely related to their dependency on land. Since their political and economic power depends on the land area they control, the only way to appease peasants is land re-distribution, which in practice means giving up a significant share of their power. Land, then, is agrarian elite's *raison d'être*, which they must protect under all cost. In contrast, the capitalistic elite, in cases of worker dissidence, can make wage or commodity related concessions to workers. In Paige's understanding, and here where he diverges critically from Marx's propositions on proletariat's political goals, the main types of conflict under the circumstances in which industrial or commercial elite is the ruling class usually revolve around the demands for better wages, better working-conditions or greater accessibility to commodity markets. Therefore, workers' demands neither endanger the capitalistic elite's existence as the ruling class, nor undermine the existing political system.

Agrarian elite's inability to make concessions render wage-earning peasants movements inherently revolutionary. Their demands threaten the elite's existence because the agrarian elite does not increase its surplus through technical improvements of productivity or capital investments. A concession to the agrarian workers means a significant loss of economic power on their part. Similarly, workers' demands involve redistribution of land, and relatedly changes in the legal system that would enable them to own lands and claim collective rights. Under land-wage scenario, then, peasant mobilization threaten the dominance of the agrarian elite as well as the traditional political system. When they are successful, they constitute, in Paige's terms, *agrarian revolutions*.

In the book, after discussing his theory of agrarian revolution extensively in the first chapter, Paige tests his theory statistically at a global level. Later chapters include case studies to demonstrate empirical consistency of his theory. The case of Peru represents a case of agrarian revolt, which involves hacienda workers' failed mobilization against landlords. The cases of Angola and Vietnam represent agrarian revolutions; however, of different types. Interestingly, Paige develops a much more nuanced theory of agrarian revolution as compared to other configurations.

Paige defines two main kinds of agrarian revolution, driven by different ideologies: nationalism on the one hand, and socialism on the other. First, he distinguishes land-wage relationships in the context of sharecropping systems from those that depend upon migratory labor. Sharecropping systems represent agricultural economies that are fully integrated to capitalism. In the migratory labor system, however, the peasant work as a wage earner only seasonally, and then produce for subsistence in their traditional community. Thus, the migratory peasant's proletarianization is limited, and he/she still remains attached to land to some extent. Additionally seasonal work makes developing worker organizations more difficult. In this case, organizational capacity of peasants is gained through the traditional community of peasants. If the community elites feel that its subsistence economy is undermined by labor relations in the plantation, they may revolt against landowners. This type of mobilization occurs mostly in the colonial context, hence the dominant ideology of such peasant movements is nationalism. In the book, the case for agrarian nationalist revolution is Angola.

Sharecropping systems are more prune to agrarian socialist revolutions. Paige undertakes a further categorization within sharecropping systems. In the centralized sharecropping systems, such as cotton production, due to strong control of the landowner over workers, worker organization is less likely. In decentralized sharecropping systems, such as rice production, there is a greater room for organized forms of class solidarity. According to Paige, this theory explains the Vietnamese

rice cultivators' revolution in the Mekong delta.

COFFEE AND POWER

In Coffee and Power, Jeffery Paige examines the diverging political behaviors of the coffee elite, and the political outcomes of guerrilla organizations in Central America during the 1980s. There are two main questions the book attempts answering. First, why did the coffee elite chose to oppose the revolutionary movement of FMLN in El Salvador, avoided the revolutionary crisis of the 1980s in Central America and adopted a social democratic outlook, and supported Sandinistas on their way to power in Nicaragua? Second, despite the different political choices made by the coffee elite, how did all three countries ended up with neoliberal democracy (Paige 1997, 9)?

Similar to *Agrarian Revolution*, Paige's account of Central American history is primarily based on class analysis. Using statistical data, Paige measures the rate of agricultural productivity in coffee plantations and the area of land controlled by the coffee elite in each country. Similar to his earlier book, he associates the land area controlled with the traditional agrarian elite's power, and agricultural productivity with the power of agro-industrialist coffee elite. He repeats his statistical analysis for two time periods: Between 1920 and 1950, and between 1950 and 1980(Paige 1997, 60–84). In the first time period, he finds that in all cases except Costa Rica, the agrarian elite hold the majority of lands. Within this era, only in Costa Rica, where small holding farmers, rather than the coffee elite, controlled the majority of agricultural land, democratic institutions were able to develop. Other countries were ruled by military or civilian dictatorships.

Comparing pre and post-war Central America, Paige shows the rising agricultural productivity levels in all cases. In the political arena, this translates into an increased political influence of the agro-industrialist fraction of the coffee elite. With the 1970s, further penetration of market forces into traditional economies, increased production of beef, sugar, and cotton also limited the land-based power of the agrarian elite. An important consequence of further integration to the world capitalist system was the mass displacements of peasants, whom later constituted a class of their own, what Paige calls "the semi-proletariat".

Based on the class analysis, it is perhaps easiest to account for the coffee elite's political behavior in the case of Costa Rica. Coffee production in the country was mainly in the hands of small producers, and the conservative coffee elite was much less powerful than the other cases in the book. During the early 40s, Calderon government passed a series of laws that enhanced workers' rights, enacted a social secu-

rity system, and henceforth was recognized as the father of Costa Rican welfare state (Paige 1997, 141–43). Against the protestations of the coffee elite, the Communist Party declared its alliance with Calderon and had an impact on state policies for some years. In 1948, ex-military Jose Figueres orchestrated an armed uprising against government. After 2 months of bloody civil war, Figueres, backed by the coffee elite and the middle bourgeoisie overthrew the government and established a junta regime for 3 years. Surprisingly, Figueres' policies, such as a ten-percent tax on wealth and nationalization of banks, undermined agrarian elite's economic and political position even more. Such reformist policies have continued after Figueres, resulting in a highly marginalized agrarian upper class, and empowered agro-industrialists. Abolishing of the national army further cemented Costa Rica's allegiance to electoral democracy (Paige 1997, 146–47). The absence of an armed rebellion, a long legacy of a welfare system, elites' commitment to liberal democracy, and marginalization of the traditional conservative centers of society (the agrarian elite and the army) played important roles in avoiding the overall turbulent atmosphere of Central America during the 1980s.

By contrast, in El Salvador, the coffee elite adopted an authoritarian-conservative ideology and a militant anti-communism. The turning point was 1979 military coup. In a reaction to increased FMLN activities and urban riots, and fearing a similar outcome as in the Sandinista revolution in Nicaragua, mid-ranked radical military officers took over the political power. In a series of decrees, the junta severely restricted the economic base and political influence of the coffee elite. With the establishment of INCAFE, all coffee exportation was taken under the control of the military government (Paige 1997, 195). The coffee elite, agrarian and agro-industrialist factions alike, turned to other sections of the military for support. With the support of certain army branches, commanded by intelligence officer D'Aubuisson, there emerged a wave of violent oppression toward the left. D'Aubuisson later founded the ARENA, which transformed from ardent anti-communist political party with a dream to go back to the pre-1979 order, into a reformist one who made peace with FMLN, hence sacrificing the coffee elite's demands. The conflict between the agrarian and the agro-industrialists factions of the coffee elite emerged only in the late 1980s. By then, despite the agrarian faction's continuing anti-communism, a stronger agro-industrialist faction was united under the idea that for business to go on civil war must come to an end. In sum, the unification of the factions against the left after the 1979 coup might be understood as a outcome of the agro-industrialist section's continuing dependency on the agrarian. Their split, and the growth of a more liberal viewpoint among agro-industrialists required another decade.

As opposed to other cases, Nicaragua is characterized by the absence of well-

defined social classes, and the greater involvement of foreign capitalists in the country's economy. For the first half of the 20th century, the bourgeoisie lacked a class-based ideology and could claim a limited political power (Paige 1997, 179). In stark contrast to El Salvador and Costa Rica, Nicaraguan coffee elite was outside the main political power centers. On the backdrop of their marginalization, when the conflict between FSLN and the Somoza dictatorship rose, and later transformed into violent repression by Somoza over civil society including the coffee elite, the latter chose to take sides with the rebellion. Under the Sandinista revolutionary government, the coffee elite's isolation has continued. Sandinistas' state centric accumulation policies, confiscation of the property of growers, control over markets showed that the revolutionary government and the coffee elite had different views on the "mixed economy" they had previously agreed upon. In 1984, the regime adopted electoral democracy, and after the defeat of Sandinistas' economic policies and losing the popular election of 1990, agro-industrialists emerged as the winning camp.

In all cases, agro-industrialists' dominance in the beginning of the 90s, increased US-IMF pressures towards a liberal economy, and the more liberal trend of the global markets brought forth neoliberal democracy as the common path. Defeat of leftist movements and ideologies was a necessary condition for this to happen. However, the necessary split between the agrarian elite fractions, Paige argues, was made possible by the armed insurgencies of the left (Paige 1997, 320).

JEFFERY PAIGE'S INTELLECTUAL JOURNEY

I. THEORY

A. MARXIST INFLUENCES

The analytical standpoint in both works has a Marxist core. Paige extensively exploits the toolkit of Marxist class analysis to develop his theories. While *Agrarian Revolution* almost exclusively relies on Marxism in its theoretical propositions, *Coffee and Power* hangs on to Marxism while still flirting with alternative perspectives. A very clear indication of Marxism's influence on Paige's work is progressive qualities bestowed upon the actors of capitalism. In both books, commercial and industrial factions of the agrarian ruling class are recognized as progressive entities, and positioned in contrast to the land-based agrarian class, which is described as immobile, authoritarian, and conservative. The arguments about the conservatism and authoritarian tendencies of landed aristocracy and of small holding peasants clearly resonate with Marx's analysis in "The Eighteenth Brumaire" (Marx 1852).

Furthermore, sticking with the classical propositions of Marxism, Paige derives the political and often the ideological tendencies of classes from their class positions, in other words, their relative positions vis-a-vis the means of production. Especially in *Agrarian Revolution*, it is clear that social classes are exclusively defined in economic terms, and their culture and political orientation and strength are deduced from their economic activities.

A second parallel, which may not be considered Marxist in strict terms, but definitely resonates with Marxist ideals, is that Paige gives unequivocal importance to the grassroots political activities of the subaltern. Even in *Coffee and Revolution*, which primarily examines elite political orientations, Paige emphasizes, over and over again, that argo-industrialists' split from the agrarian faction could not have been achieved without the leftist insurgencies.

A third parallel is the recognition of social conflict, and more specifically of class conflict, as the catalyst of historical change. In *Agrarian Revolution*, Paige tries to examine what kinds of class confrontations could lead to a regime change. A break from the traditional feudal relationships of production necessitates, according to Paige, a successful bottom-up mobilization of lower classes, and weakening, if not annihilation, of traditional upper classes. In *Coffee and Power* as well, Paige recognizes organized force of lower-classes as a precondition for the development of liberal markets and democracy.

B. DIVERGENCES FROM MARXISM

In *Agrarian Revolution*, Paige poses two main criticisms to classical Marxism. First, as opposed to Marx's emphasis on the critical role of the urban proletariat in the transition from feudalism to capitalism, Paige argues that it is not the urban proletariat but the wage-earning agricultural workers who are the driving force behind burying landed aristocracy and traditional forms of coercive labor with it. Second, the geography of revolutions is not the developed world, but the underdeveloped one. This proposition does not falsify Marx himself, but rather it seems to be suggested against the early 20th century Marxists who sought the potential of a socialist revolution in the metropolis areas of industrialized countries. An additional but minor criticism of classical Marxism can be seen where Paige gives priority to de-centralized sharecropping laborers over centralized laborers in the making of socialist revolution. In opposition to the Marxist argument that the high density of proletariat in labor enclaves can make organization and hence revolution easier, Paige brings forth the argument that such concentration of working population in production centers can actually make social control easier and render workers more dependent on the ruling

class.

In Paige's later work, *Coffee and Power*, divergences from the classical Marxist axioms are clearer. First, as opposed to *Agrarian Revolution*, he decides that the term "class" is inadequate to capture the social position of agricultural dynasties. These big and historical families derive their social power not only from existing economic structures and relations of production, but also from their influence on politics, their control over institutions and the legal system, and the traditional elements of the national culture. Therefore, he refers to them as "agrarian elites" instead of "agrarian upper classes" (Paige 1997, 53). This change in terminology also means that the political maneuvers of the elite is recognized to be more flexible (in the sense that they are not automatically given by their class position) and require a deeper analysis. Related to this first point, in *Coffee and Power*, Paige shows a renewed interest in elite political behavior. In this sense, large-scale political changes do not only depend upon the class position of upper classes or the organizational capacity of workers. Instead, elites' political behaviors and choices in times of critical junctures matter a lot.

Third, ideas, culture, and ideologies are taken to be autonomous causal forces. Case studies in *Coffee and Power*, do not benefit only from historical sources but also from over 50 interviews with economic and political elites. Through these interviews, Paige tries to assess the cultural significance of coffee production in the national histories of the countries under study. For instance, he argues that the legacy of 19th century liberalism in Costa Rica intensified the importance of "social harmony" for all social classes and facilitated the rise of the welfare state in the first half of the 20th century (Paige 1997, 219–22).

Fourth, as opposed to *Agrarian Revolution*, in *Coffee and Power*, Paige gives greater importance to the roles played by armed guerrilla organizations instead of independent mobilization of lower classes. In other words, formal organizations with established ideologies are deemed to be more important in the political roles they play than grassroots mobilization of the subaltern. These guerrilla organizations, and in a Leninist sense vanguard parties, Paige argues, assume the roles of absent classes, such as an absent bourgeoisie or an absent proletariat, to bring about regime changes.

2. METHODS

In both of his works, Paige's main goal is to develop theories that could explain large-scale political developments in multiple cases. Chosen cases work to show the empirical consistency of the suggested sociological theories. Thus, instead of

a more bottom-up approach, where empirical research reveals some common patterns between the cases before developing a full-fledged theory, Paige, in my opinion, chooses a more theory-driven research procedure.

While Paige's approach relies heavily on Marxism as the previous section argued, Paige's theory-building often incorporates ideal-type construction following Max Weber. Characters of Paige's books, agrarian elites, agro-industrialists, wage-earning farmers, small-holding peasants and others represent an approximation to reality, a conscious exaggeration of their distinctive qualities (Weber 1978).

While Paige can be considered first and foremost a qualitative comparative sociologist, a long chapter of *Agrarian Revolution* is devoted to a global level quantitative analysis of agrarian movements. In *Coffee and Power*, Paige again uses statistical data to explore and compare the class composition of his cases of interests. Especially in the case of *Agrarian Revolution*, the use of mixed methods greatly enhances and supports his main theses, and bestow a certain level of generalizability upon them. From a wider perspective, Paige's blending of different research methods, from archival research to interviews, and from statistical analysis to theory-building makes him a rare cross-paradigmatic example in the discipline of comparative sociology.

A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF PAIGE'S WORK

From *Agrarian Revolution* to *Coffee and Power*, we see wide-ranging differences in the style, theories, and methods of Paige's comparative work. Agrarian Revolution is a Marxist work, and it remains loyal to much of the principle tenets of classical Marxism from start to finish, keeping alternative approaches at bay. On the other hand, Coffee and Power is much more heterogeneous in its use of social theories, while still preserving a Marxist core.

The first thing I would like to highlight in this section is Paige's evolving perspective on Marxism and relatedly on class analysis. In Agrarian Revolution, we see that classes are defined in their relations to the means of production. Furthermore, their ideological tendencies and political behaviors are more or less derived from such economic positions. In Coffee and Power, we see that Paige gives up the so called "class reductionism" and adopts a more heterodox approach. Political behavior and ideologies of ruling classes are not directly derived from their economic positions, but they are treated as outcomes of changing political circumstances, of long legacies of national culture and critical turning points, and of strategic alliances. Analyzing the different political outlooks of the same class in different geographies allow Paige to view ideologies and identities in flux.

Second, Paige's class analysis in Agrarian Revolution based squarely on **class positions** and **class conflict**. In fact, it can be argued that Paige is looking exactly at the relationship between the two. As a consequence, the main historical drama within his narrative is between upper and lower classes. In contrast, in Coffee and Power, the themes of class positions and conflict are relegated to a secondary status in his analysis. Instead, **class alliances** and **class fractions** gain priority. With this new orientation in class analysis, Paige is able to present a more multi-dimensional portrait of social classes. Rather than two diametrically opposing forces of lower and upper classes, the point of interest shifts towards the relationships between class fractions, such as agrarians and agro-industrialists. Moreover, Paige introduces us to the cases where unlikely social classes, who were supposed to be in conflict under normal circumstances, can build up alliances against a common foe or for a common purpose.

A third point with regard to Paige's changing views on Marxism is the recognition of the autonomous causal impact of ideologies. In *Coffee and Power*, by viewing ideologies not as a simple reflection of the economic structure, but with their independent causal force, Paige points at the limits of Marxist class analysis in explaining the problematics of his research.

However, despite this recognition, Paige has a hard time empirically showing the autonomous causal impact of ideologies in his book. Although, he develops a strong framework of class analysis early in the book, his dealing with the subject of ideology in case studies seems to be without any theoretical guidelines. Only in the last two chapters, Paige returns to explain the role of ideology in the development of market relations and democracy. Still, his definition of ideology does not break away from the Marxist conception of *ideology as mystification*. Furthermore, he assesses his interviews with the elites as their narrative construction, which, according to Paige, tries to hide or legitimatize their domination of lower classes. In sum, despite his attempt, Paige oscillates between taking ideology as an autonomous force and taking it as a reflection of class positions. In the absence of a theory of ideology that can match his class theory, it was difficult for me to understand how his discussions on ideology contribute to the development of his argument or explain what remains unexplained by class analysis.

Between the two books, it is also possible to take notice of some significant changes in Paige's methodological approach. My biggest criticism of Paige's methodology in Agrarian Revolution is that he does not clarify how he had chosen the particular cases the book is based upon. The reader had no way of knowing the commonalities of Peru, Angola, and Vietnam, other than that they are all located in the undeveloped world. In the same vein of thought, Paige does not adopt Millsian meth-

ods in his research design. While this is of course not a necessity, it could have been useful in building more systematic comparisons. Instead, what Paige chooses to do is to demonstrate the empirical validity of his theories through examples that fit his theories.

In *Coffee and Power*, Paige is much more clear about how he has chosen the cases and what method he adopts in case selection and comparison. The countries he has chosen are different in most aspects, but the political and economic regimes they have ended with circa 1990 are the same. Thus, it can be said that Paige adopts Mill's *method of agreement* (Lijphart 1971), armed insurgencies being the independent variable and neoliberal democracy being the dependent variable. Similarly, geography of comparison moves toward countries (Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and El Salvador) located in close proximity, which limits the intervention of endogenous and confounding variables.

PAIGE'S WORK IN THE CONTEXT OF THE DISCIPLINE

In this section, I will suggest that two broad transformation in social sciences, and particularly in comparative politics, namely the emergence of neo-Marxism and the Weberian turn, informed and corresponded with Paige's intellectual trajectory.

Influence of neo-Marxism (ie. Poulantzas 1978) on Jeffery Paige's work can be observed through his varying class analyses in between *Agrarian Revolution* and *Coffee and Power*. In the first, as I have argued above, Paige exclusively relies on the basic tenets of classical Marxism. In this book, class positions and class conflicts are his primary preoccupations. Political behavior and ideologies seem to be taken as direct reflection of actors' economic position. In *Coffee and Power*, however, he gives a much more nuanced and dynamic account of social classes. Class alliances and class fractions become the focal point of his analysis. Similarly, Paige seems to be less strict about following the Marxist structure-superstructure dichotomy. For instance, political behavior seems to be an outcome of the strategic considerations of actors rather than their class positions. In other words, Paige embraces a less structuralist perspective.

The Weberian turn of the 1980s in social sciences (ie. Evans, Rueschemeyer, and Skocpol 1985) seems to be influential in Paige's thinking as well. This is obvious in his changing perspective on the roles of the state and ideologies. In *Agrarian Revolution*, the state emerges only as a repressive tool of the ruling class, the agrarian aristocracy. The outcomes of class conflicts depend upon the economic bases of classes and their organizational capacity. The state is not considered as a variable in

the class war. However, in *Coffee and Power*, although the state continues to represent some class interests above others, it emerges as an autonomous actor, which may or may not go along with the demands of the upper classes. In Nicaragua, for instance, the coffee elite's alliance with the revolutionaries can only be understood through their common grievances towards an oppressive state. Both the increased influence of neo-Marxism and Weberian approaches had an influence on Paige by making him more nuanced about the relative autonomy of the state.

Moreover, in contrast to *Agrarian Revolution*, where elite ideologies have limited explanatory value, in *Coffee and Power*, Paige strives to incorporate the role of ideas in his analysis of historical change. In line with the Weberian dictum that ideas can have an autonomous causal impact on major historical processes, Paige tries to combine economic and ideological explanations for the elite political behavior. In addition to the importance he gives to the causal role of ideologies, Paige's focus on elite political behavior itself seems to suggest that he gives some credit to elites' indispensable roles in regime transitions. Despite his perspective's increased leniency towards alternative perspectives, Paige remains committed to Marxist approaches more than anything else. This is clear in his insistence that agro-industrialist faction couldn't have separated itself from the conservative agrarian elites without the intervention of the armed insurgents. In his perspective, transition to democracy is still primarily an outcome of the struggle of working classes, and not of elite strategies.

More specifically in the study of revolutions, *Agrarian Revolution* corresponds to what Goldstone calls *the second generation of revolutionary analysis*. Here, represented primarily by the groundbreaking work of Moore (1966), the main approach of the comparatists was to expand the classical Marxism to highlight the once neglected rural working class in the making of revolutions. Despite the many similarities between Moore's *Social Origins* and Paige's *Agrarian Revolution*, it is interesting to see that there is not even a single reference to Moore in Paige's book. Instead, Paige tackles with Moore's theory extensively in his later book, *Coffee and Revolution*. Here, he states his agreement with Moore that the agricultural world of relations of production, rather than the industrial one, has been the focal point of revolutions. However, he disagrees with Moore that capitalist bourgeoisie was the main facilitator of revolutions, and claims that it was rather the rebellions from below. I find Paige's criticism here a little bit unjustified, because for both authors a coercive agricultural labor system, strengthening of capitalist forces, and a rural uprising seem to be all necessary conditions for a revolution. Prioritizing any of the above causes of revolution seems to be matter of personal taste, and not grounded substantially in empirical evidence.

Goldstone evaluates Theda Skocpol's *States and Social Revolutions*(1979), as the

bridge between the second and the third generations of revolutionary analysis (Goldstone 2001, 140). In the third generation, the state and ideologies come to the foreground as the primary explanatory variables of revolution, although class analysis still remains in comparative scholars' toolkit. Another characteristic of the third generation is its recognition of contingency in the outcomes of revolution, which goes hand in hand with attenuating the structural biases of analysis. Such recognition of contingency in elite political behavior and attention to ideological factors are evident in Coffee and Power. In his case analysis, Paige relies more in the historical narrative than a pre-given theory to explain why the elite sided with the rebels, stayed neutral, or opposed them. However, Paige falls behind the standards of the third generation in several aspects. Compared to Skocpol's *States and Social Revolutions*, for instance, Paige gives much less attention to the state as a autonomous actor (Although the state shows up more frequently in Coffee and Power than Agrarian revolution). More critically, however, the army plays almost no part in Paige's revolutionary theory. In Skocpol's theory of revolution, on the other hand, weakening of the army through a defeat in war is a necessary condition for revolution. The army, as the powerful protector of the conservative order, is indeed a big negligence in Paige's theory.

CONCLUSION

Overall, I think the main weak points of Paige's scholarship are due to his rather extreme commitment to Marxist perspective. This commitment resulted in a limited attention to the role of the state and an underdeveloped theory of ideology as autonomous causal factors behind social revolutions. In this sense, Paige was unable to keep up with the third generation of revolutionary analysis emerged during the 1980s.

However, there are many brilliant elements in Paige's work that stood out and definitely opened the path for later generations of comparative scholars. First, in both of his works, Paige offers a testable and extremely nuanced theory of regime transitions, something that is comparable in its diligence to Moore's theory of revolutions. Second, rather than surveying the main contours of case histories, Paige provides the reader with a much detailed narrative of his selected countries' paths of development. He is, in this sense, a better historian than many of his fellow comparatists. Third, especially in *Agrarian Revolution*, he demonstrates a great competence in using qualitative and quantitative methods together. Therefore, he can be considered as a good counter-example to methodological specialization's negative

influence on the discipline. Fourth, he strives to push Marxist class analysis to its limits and achieves to show its explanatory value. Fifth, Paige's work offers a substantial alternative to the popular elite-induced regime transitions (ie. O'Donnell and Schmitter 1986).

Jeffery Paige's work has not received the acclaim claimed by Moore, Skocpol, O'Donnell, Schmitter, Stepan, Przeworski, Evans, and other big names of comparative politics. In this sense, *the test of time* was less forgiving for his academic legacy. However, as I have tried to argue in this essay, this was less to do with the quality of his work, and more to do with the pace and trajectory of developments in the discipline. Although not a *model of excellence*, Jeffery Paige was among the last to defend Marxian approaches to comparative politics through his painstakingly nuanced and complex works.

REFERENCES

Evans, Peter, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol. 1985. *Bringing the State Back in*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goldstone, Jack A. 2001. "Toward a Fourth Generation of Revolutionary Theory." *Annual Review of Political Science* 4: 139–87.

Lijphart, Arend. 1971. "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method." *The American Political Science Review* 65(03): 682–93.

Marx, Karl. 1852. "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte." In *Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. New York; London: WW Norton & Company, 594–618.

Moore, Barrington. 1966. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston MA: Beacon Press.

O'Donnell, Guillermo, and Philippe C. Schmitter. 1986. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions About Uncertain Democracies*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Paige, Jeffery M. 1975. *Agrarian Revolution: Social Movements and Export Agriculture in the Underdeveloped World*. New York: The Free Press.

———. 1997. *Coffee and Power: Revolution and the Rise of Democracy in Central America*. Harvard University Press.

Poulantzas, Nicos. 1978. *Political Power and Social Classes*. London: Verso.

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, & China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weber, Max. 1978. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.