

# Three whys of the russian revolution assignment

[History](#), [Revolution](#)



Three “ Whys” of the Russian Revolution Why did Tsarism fall according to Pipes? Firstly, as to answering the question Why did Tsarism fall? , unlike revisionists, Pipes argues that the fall of Tsarism was not preordained, there is no specific explanation or reason by itself to answer this question. Pipes uses the example of an apple tree(pg. 9); “ When you shake an apple tree and apples come cascading down, what “ causes” them to fall? Is it the shaking of the tree? Is it the ripeness of the fruit which would have made them fall down, sooner or later, anyway?...

In dealing with human events, we find similar levels of explanation, from the most specific to the most general, and it is next to impossible to ascertain which of them determines the outcome. In other words it can state that Tsarism collapsed because it was meant to fall, or because it was falling already, or the actions that made it fall. It starts of by stating how people believed Tsarism would last a long time, and even mention that not even Lenin predicted the fall of Tsardom (pg. 12). One of the strong reasons Pipes disagrees with the historians who believe that the revolution was inevitable.

Pipes said one another reason would be, that the intellectuals were the ones who told the government the complains of the people. Therefore when they did it, they would appeal for a change in the governmental system. While the peasants just wanted immediate changes for their own interest. An example that occurred was Bloody Sunday, which not only workers put the intellectuals create a petition, and cause the first Russian Revolution.

Another major factor that contributed to the end of the Tsardom was the lack of feudalism, all of the power in the country concentrated mainly in the “ hands” and on the crown of the tzar.

<https://assignbuster.com/three-whys-of-the-russian-revolution-assignment/>

Like pipes explains with his philosophical metaphor the Russian state at the time was just like a bunch of wires together and as soon as one of them would split the whole the thing would crumble down and fall apart. That is what happened to Russia. Also because the tsar was an autocrat most of the time didn't have much to say as it shows in (pg. 17) " the population was a mere object of state authority. One of the strongest factor, according to Pipes, it was especially political issues, Intelligentsia was the strong reason for the all of Tsardom, because they took the advantage from the governments weakness to advance to get what they wanted and have more demands. Concluding some extra example would be that in the Russia village could " not find enough land to employ all those living in it" and resulted them to be in an " explosive mood", because of the problem with lack of land. What is Pipe's central thesis? The central thesis is clearly stated on page 8 ; " my thesis is precisely the opposite to that advanced bu the revisionists, which by now is virtually obligatory in Western universities.

I shall argue that there was nothing preordained about either the fall of tsarism or the Bolshevik power, seizure. In fact, I feel that the latter was something of a fluke, but that, once it occurred and the totalitarian machine was in place, then the rise of Stalin became virtually a foregone conclusion. " In other words in a sentence conclusion, the revolution wasn't predictable at all. Where does Pipes fit on the political spectrum? I believe Pipes is a Right wing conservative to a moderate extent. As a reader I have noticed this for two specific reasons.

He far from agrees with the thesis stated but the revisionists and the soviet union. Pipes make it look as if the scholars and intellectuals of Russia have been brainwashed to a certain extent where they actually come to believe that bolshevik revolution was a genuine result that forced itself to an accomplishment. He also makes it clear that anti communism is should not be mistaken as something that holds traces of fascism or even the most radical social national. Richard Pipes is definitely not a marxist which gives as more clue for him to be a right wing.

Pipes firmly states that it was somehow a matter of chance and fate combined that led the bolsheviks to actually take over that day in october, and he argues that it was one event in particular the night right before that contributed to the final result: communism. He argues that if Lenin wouldn't have faked drunk to get passed the police that actually attempted to stop him probably Tsardom wouldn't have met its demise, but it did. This is exactly the opposite of what brainwashed revisionists believe.