



MINISTÈRE DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPÉRIEUR ET DE LA
RECHERCHE

**ÉCOLE DES HAUTES ÉTUDES EN SCIENCES
SOCIALES**

54 Bd Raspail - 75006 Paris

EHESS Summer school 2017:
Rethinking the concept of revolution

Seminars:

Sexual Revolution

Political Revolution

Symbolic Revolution

Economic Revolution

With the participation of:

Laboratoire d'Excellence

tapsis

Transformation de l'État
politisation des sociétés
institution du social

Academic Directors :

Prof. Eva Illouz

Prof. Gisèle Sapiro

EHESS Summerschool 2017

The study of the “longue durée” and the study of “Revolutions” have long been two of the holy grails of the social sciences: how structures perpetuate themselves and how they shift or collapse are, arguably, two central questions of the social sciences. The EHESS is famous for having produced path-breaking works on both topics (thanks to Fernand Braudel or François Furet, to mention only two of the most obvious examples). However, in light of recent world events (from the Arab Spring to the Internet Revolution), and because 2017 is the one-hundredth anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, the EHESS would like to devote its Summer School to the study of Revolutions. How do we study Revolutions and what are their social and anthropological ramifications? These are the two broad set of questions that we will ask during two intensive weeks of discussion.

There are at least two kinds of revolutions: the “effervescent” ones which seem to “irrupt” on the scene of history, unplanned and unforeseen, (e.g., Berlin wall; Arab Spring). But they can be also the end point of long-term, invisible processes which coalesce around phenomena that become visible or around “moments” in which structures change (as with Raymond Williams’ “long revolution” in culture). In both cases – effervescent or invisible – revolutions are expressions of social change: we speak of the Industrial Revolution to refer to a new mode of economic production and circulation that was slowly put into place throughout a still debated long or short period but came into full view in the 19th century. We speak of the French Revolution to refer to the overhaul of the feudal system and the establishment of a new political order, both of which seemed to happen overnight, but which in fact took a large part of the 18th and 19th centuries to gel. We speak of the Sexual Revolution to denote the rejection of religious morality in matters of sex and gender roles and its replacement with a new ethics of pleasure and the politics of gender. It has also become common after Thomas Kuhn to speak about “scientific revolutions,” and Bourdieu forged the concept of “symbolic revolutions” to designate the subversion of artistic norms and models.

Revolutions thus help formulate questions about the nature of social change: what constitutes a qualitative social change? What causes economic and social structures to crumble, entire populations to imagine and demand new modes of governance? How do artistic movements and scientific paradigms establish new ways of seeing and thinking?

Revolutions interrogate our perception of historical time and our understanding of models of historical causality. They also interrogate the role of individuals vis-a-vis social structures. Lastly, the role of collective memory in the construction of our representation of revolutions as such also has to be taken into account.

These questions and many others will be at the intellectual core of the **EHESS Summer School “the Unity of the Social Sciences?”** “Revolutions” requires the expertise of the entire gamut of the Social Sciences and is an interdisciplinary concept *par excellence*. A panoply of leading researchers will address from within their specific areas of specialty a variety of theoretical and empirical questions such as: What constitutes a social rupture that turns into a revolution? Are all social ruptures revolutionary? How do the different disciplines of the social sciences define and study the revolutionary? Is there agreement across the social sciences as to what constitutes a Revolution? Do ideas merely accompany revolutions or do they provoke them? Are elites or the “people” responsible for revolutions or an alliance of both? How do we distinguish between mere crisis and long-term revolutions?

These questions are frequently examined in a number of different disciplines: history, sociology, political science, economics, legal studies, and anthropology. The four seminars that will structure the workshop will offer interdisciplinary approaches to four empirical themes: political revolutions (Hamit Bozarslan); sexual revolutions (Eva Illouz); economic revolutions (Sébastien Lechevalier); and symbolic revolutions (Gisèle Sapiro).

SCHEDULE

Arrival: Sunday July 2nd 7 pm: Welcome cocktail at CIUP

Week 1: July, 3-7

	Morning: Sexual Revolution	Afternoon: Political Revolution	Evening
Monday 3	9:00 Welcome by the President of EHESS: Pierre-Cyrille Hautcœur 9:30-12:30 Eva Illouz: Seminar Introduction Elizabeth Armstrong: “Are Hookups Bad for Women?”	14:00-17:00 Hamit Bozarslan: Seminar Introduction Sophie Wahnich: “The emotional dynamics of revolutionary events”	
Tuesday 4	9:30-12:30 Clyde Marlo Plumauzille: “Sexuality in struggle: feminism, prostitution and revolution.”	14:00-17:00 Alain Blum: “Russia: The Revolution(s) of 1917”	
Wednesday 5	9:30-12:30 Rainer Maria Kiesow: “Everything you always wanted to know about revolution - in matters of sex and of law.”	14:00-17:00 Ivan Ermakoff: “Political Revolutions and Collective Alignments.”	
Thursday 6	9:30-12:30 Eva Illouz: “The rise of Casual Sex or Has the Sexual revolution Gone Wrong?”	14:00-17:00 Hamit Bozarslan: “Revolutionary Configurations in the Arab World”	
Friday 7	9:30-12:30 workshop	14:00-16:00 workshop	

All seminars of the 1st week will take place at the EHESS, 105 Bd Raspail 75006 Paris, room 13

Lecture at Amphi Furet, 105 Bd Raspail

All readings are available online.

Week 2: July, 10-14

	Morning: Symbolic Revolution	Afternoon: Economic Revolution	Evening
Monday 10	9:30-12:30 Gisèle Sapiro: Seminar Introduction	14:00-17:00 S. Lechevalier: Seminar Introduction	17:30-19:00: Lecture Roger Chartier (<i>TBA</i> Collège de France). Do Books Make Revolution(s)?
Tuesday 11	9:30-12:30 Kapil Raj: “Revolutions in Science: A Mid-20th Century Invention and its Subsequent History”	14:00-17:00 Pierre-Cyrille Hautcœur: “Industrial revolution, industrious revolution or growth? How economists reframe the history of modern capitalism”	
Wednesday 12	9:30-12:00 Esteban Buch: “Schoenberg’s Atonal Revolution”	14:00-17:00 Nicolas Barreyre: “An Economic or a Political Revolution? The New History of Capitalism and the U.S. Rise to Superpowerdom”	
Thursday 13	9:30-12:30 Frédérique Matonti: “The Politicization of Structuralism around May 68”	14:00-17:00 Francis Chateauraynaud: “The impacts of emerging technologies between endless controversies and permanent revolution. A sociological view of the continuous reframing of the future of science and society”	19:00: Cocktail
Friday 14	French National Day		

All seminars of the 2nd week will take place at the EHESS, 96 Bd Raspail 75006 Paris, room Lombard
All readings are available online.

Sexual Revolution (1st week morning)

Seminar leaders: Eva Illouz, Elizabeth Armstrong

Invited speaker: Rainer Maria Kiesow, Clyde Marlo Plumauzille

July, 3^d 2017 **Elizabeth Armstrong – “Are Hookups Bad for Women?”**

Sex outside of committed relationships-referred to as "hooking up" by academics and journalists is common among American young people. Many suggest that the rules of this game favor men more than women. This lecture will examine the extent the prevalence of hooking up among young people, the extent to which it does-or does not-disadvantage women, and the cultural dynamics that structure this practice.

Required readings:

- <https://contexts.org/articles/is-hooking-up-bad-for-young-women/>
- Hamilton, Laura and Elizabeth A. Armstrong. 2009. “Gendered Sexuality in Young Adulthood: Double Binds and Flawed Options.” *Gender & Society*. 23:589-616.

July 4th, 2017 **Clyde Marlo Plumauzille – “Sexuality in struggle: feminism, prostitution and revolution”**

From a reflection on my work on prostitution during the French Revolution (1789-1799), this presentation seeks to explore how feminist theories engage with the issue of sexuality and struggle to define what constitute women's sexual emancipation. Framing the analysis around the concept of agency, it will elaborate on control and power relationships as well as on the margins of individual liberties that shape the experience of sexuality for prostitutes in revolutionary Paris.

Required reading:

- Gayle Rubin (1984) “Thinking sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality” in *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*, ed. Carole S. Vance, Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 267–319.

July 5th, 2017 **Rainer Maria Kiesow – “Everything you always wanted to know about revolution – in matters of sex and of law”**

In ‘The Trial’ (Franz Kafka) K. sees in the law books only pornographic reproductions; the lawyer remains a mystery, and K. never comes to see a judge, only pictures; the painter Titorelli confuses K. with his explanations of the process, and the prison chaplain tells a peculiar story. In the modern world of the trial, law no longer has significance. It is law as law through law. It is pure validity. And it enables decisions—the two men at the end of the story ‘observed’ K’s death as ‘decision.’ In Sacher-Masoch's story and Deleuze's commentary

erotic games are matters of contract. Which place and significance (sexual and juridical) revolutions could have in this landscape of law's absence (Kafka) and law's presence (Sacher-Masoch) will be discussed in the class. Hopefully the discussions will not be masochistic.

Required reading:

- Gilles Deleuze and Leopold von Sacher-Masoch (1991) *Coldness and Cruelty & Venus in Furs*, Zone Books.

Additional reading:

- Franz Kafka, *The Trial*

To watch:

- Orson Welles, 'The Trial'

July 6th, 2017 **Eva Illouz – “The rise of Casual Sex or Has the Sexual revolution Gone Wrong?”**

This lecture continues Elizabeth Armstrong's study on women and sexuality.

It inquires in the meaning of a free sexuality for women, and especially with the ways in which consumer culture and Internet technology have reframed their sexuality for the last decades.

Required reading:

- Eva Illouz (2012) *Why Love Hurts*, Cambridge: Polity press, Chapter 2.

Political Revolution (1st week afternoon)

Seminar leader: Hamit Bozarslan

Invited speakers: Alain Blum, Ivan Ermakoff, Sophie Wahnich.

Karl Marx, and in his wake the Marxist tradition formulated the hypothesis of a specific, “European form” of revolutions which found one of its last expressions in the 1848 French and Continental revolutions. More than hundred years after Marx’s death, the rather conservative American historian of revolutions also insisted on the specific, European pattern of revolutions before suggesting that by the turn of the 19th Century, the revolutionary contests switched from the “North” and the “West” to the “South” and the “Est” (Russia, Persia, the Ottoman Empire, China, Mexico...). After the fall of the socialist regimes in Europe between 1989 and 1991, many other scholars thought however that “age of revolutions” was definitely over.

The Arab revolutionary configurations of 2011 in the Arab world, but also the –albeit – marginal revolutionary passions that one can observe in Europe and in the United States, have however justified the late French historian François Furet’s precautionous approach, insisting on the role of the equalitarian passions in the turn of the 21st Century. This “coming back” of the revolutionary contests and expectations have however also renewed one of the “classical” questions of the “revolutionary studies”: how can we define a “political revolution”? Why the French, Russian and Iranian revolutions did develop eschatological projects, aiming at the re-foundation of the humankind by the suppression of the sources of its “alienation” and “degeneration”, while others have limited themselves to the establishment of a “democratic uncertainty”? How could we define the regime changes resulting from a prolonged armed struggle? How could we analyze the subjectivities of the revolutionary moments? How could we analyze the revolutionary contests leading to the formation of less and more stable dictatorships, as that was the case in the Arab world in the 1950s and 1960s? Could H. Arendt’s distinction between “social” and “political” revolution be useful in order to build pertinent ideal-types?

Our seminar on the “political revolutions” will try to offer some analytical and conceptual tools to analyze the “revolutionary enigma” since the second half of the 19th Century, bringing in a dialogue a political scientist with an historian, a demographer and a sociologist.

July 3^d, 2017 **Sophie Wahnich – “The emotional dynamics of revolutionary events”**

Within the swarming of events that constitute de French revolution, some events are also more consequential than others, in order either to consolidate/fortify a revolutionary situation or on the contrary to weaken it, or even more to turn upside-down a frailty into a forthcoming power. That is why, in order to understand how its actors make a conscience of experiencing a historical event for themselves, we must not only study the sequencing of facts but also a sequencing of emotions; and in order to understand these emotions, the stratification of the experiences of the actors or spectators that establish these emotions are also historical variables.

On the subject of temporalisation of the event one must quote Koselleck's assertion in *Future Past*: "there is no history or event that was not first constituted by lived experiences and expectancies of acting and suffering men" (p. 308). These lived experiences are those that constitute the present of the history of mankind, but also those that were stocked within each one of them at the time of the event.

The principles of historical reasoning must therefore take into account a temporalisation that is itself stratified, a complex one, not simply chronological and diachronic. Time in the historical event makes loops, stasis, remanences that can be good or bad. If, more often than not, the processes of intensification or acceleration of the times are mentioned, the feeling of uncertainty comes about just as much from these moments when time, far from racing onwards, seems to be hesitant or even be suspended or worn out. It is not time any longer. If the French Revolution as a whole has obtained the definition of being a historical event *in fine*, the making of it will have been uncertain, discontinuous and its creative power and irreversibility will only be noted eventually, even sometimes in the discontinuity of underground moments and completely unexpected resurgences.

Required reading:

- Sophie Wahnich (2015) "Genesis and Structure of Historical events. The revolutionary break: analysis of the presents of history and construction of the historical event", in *Divinatio* (Sofia) 39-40, pp. 117-129.

Recommended readings:

- Sophie Wahnich (2012) "The emotions of the demand for Terror", in Id. *In Defence of the Terror, Liberty or death in the French Revolution* (London: Verso), chapter 1, pp. 21-35.
- Sophia Rosenfeld (2009) "Thinking about Feeling, 1789–1799", *French Historical Studies* 32(4): pp. 697-706.

July 4th, 2017 **Alain Blum – "Russia: The Revolution(s) of 1917"**

The interpretations of the revolution (s) of 1917 (February, October) are numerous, seen as a succession of two revolutions, as a single revolution to be taken as a whole, as a popular movement followed by a *coup d'état*, or the transition from a bourgeois revolution to a proletarian revolution, and so on. Other interpretations insist on the revolutions "in the center", "at the periphery of an Empire", or in "the provinces". These divergent interpretations are all the more important given that 1917 is not only a major political event of the 20th century but also as a model of the Revolution, which has strongly inspired many political practices, protests, representations. In this session, we will first examine these divergent interpretations, before analyzing the relation between the history of this revolution throughout the year 1917 in different political, social, economic, cultural... field. In the second place, we will try to understand how and why the year 1917 has changed the very symbolic meaning of the concept of revolution within different historiographical traditions.

Required Reading:

- S.A. Smith (2015) “The Historiography of the Russian Revolution 100 Years On”, *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 16-4, p. 733-749.

Recommended readings:

- Donald Raleigh (2015) “The Russian Revolution after All These 100 Years”, *Kritika* “Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History”, 16-4, p. 787-797.
- And the whole issue of *Kritika* (2015) “Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History”, 16-4,.

July 5th, 2017 **Ivan Ermakoff – “Political Revolutions and Collective Alignments”**

The dynamics of revolutionary situations crucially depend on how groups react to bids for state power that subvert political institutions. Sequences of challenge and counter-challenge are punctuated by moments of high contention that probe these groups' political capacity. Of particular significance are junctures at which the groups under challenge reassert their capacity, renounce it or collapse as sites of collective action. From this perspective, the clue to the dynamics of regime breakdown, or consolidation, lies in the group processes that emerge in these moments of confrontation. The purpose of the session will be to theorize these group processes in light of two cases: August 1789 in France and March 1933 in Germany.

Required readings:

- Ermakoff, Ivan (2008) *Ruling Oneself Out. A Theory of Collective Abdications*. Durham: Duke University Press. Preface, chapter 1, chapters 5-6.
- Ermakoff, Ivan (2015) “The Structure of Contingency,” *American Journal of Sociology*, 121(1), pp. 64-99.

Recommended readings:

- Tackett, Timothy (1996) *Becoming a Revolutionary. The Deputies of the French National Assembly and the Emergence of a Revolutionary Culture (1789-1790)*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Introduction (pp. 3-15), chapters 4 & 5.
- Patch, William L. (1998) *Heinrich Brüning and the Dissolution of the Weimar Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 280-300.

July 6th, 2017 **Hamit Bozarslan – “Revolutionary Configurations in the Arab World”**

Almost half a decade after the fall of Zin al-Din Bin Ali in Tunisia and Hosni Mubarak in Egypt, we have enough distance to reevaluate these events and their transformative effects on the Arab and the Middle Eastern societies. In this session, which will propose a macro-level analysis, we will try to understand the post-2011 changes both in their historical and spatial

contexts and in comparison with some past revolutionary break-ups in the world history. We will first focus on the past historical cycles in the Middle East and suggest that only such a broad perspective will enable us to take into account, simultaneously, long-term historical continuities and short-term discontinuities observed in the Middle East since 2011. In the second place, after having briefly described the situation of the Arab world in the years 1990-2000, we will focus more restrictively on the Tunisian and Egyptian cases where a series of structural conditions have facilitated the revolutionary mobilizations. Thirdly, we will suggest that as some previous revolutionary process in the world history, the changes in Tunisia and Egypt have exerted reel regional domino effects, but that the contests which took place in other Arab countries had to face, each time, very specific historical trajectories, social, ethnic and sectarian fabric, and peculiar power relations. Finally, will propose some comparisons between the Arab revolutions and some previous democratic revolutions in the recent history, as well as between the ongoing historical cycle and the past ones.

Required reading:

- Bozarslan, Hamit (2015), “Arab world and Middle East 2010-2015: from revolutionary configurations to the state of violence” in J. Karakoç, (ed.), *Authoritarianism in the Middle East. Before and After the Arab Uprisings*, New York: Palgrave, pp. 67-91.

Recommended readings:

- Beinin, Joel & Frederic Vairel eds. (2011), *Social Movements, Mobilizations and Contestations in the Middle East and North Africa*, Pale Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Gerges, Fawaz A. ed. (2014), *The New Middle East. Protest and Revolutions in the Arab World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kienle, Eberhard & Nadine Sika ed. (2015), *The Arab Uprisings. Transforming and Challenging the State Power*, London: I.B. Tauris.

Symbolic Revolution (2nd week, morning)

Seminar leader: Gisèle Sapiro

Invited speakers: Kapil Raj, Frédérique Matonti, Esteban Buch

This course questions the uses and relevance of the notion of revolution for literary history, art history, and the history of science. Widely used in literature and in the arts since the 19th Century, the notion of revolution, which was borrowed from the political realm in the wake of the French Revolution, was introduced in science during the first half of the 20th Century and theorized by the philosopher Thomas Kuhn in order to challenge the linear conception of the evolution of science. According to Kuhn, contradictions between evidence and theory do not suffice to convince researchers to change their theoretical framework. Kuhn distinguishes two phases: the phase of normal science, during which science evolves through accumulation within a paradigm and the revolutionary phase, when a new theoretical framework challenges the established one, requiring the « conversion » of researchers to the new paradigm. The analogy to religion also suggests that paradigms are partly incommensurable, opening the question of the social conditions under which they are adopted, and the struggles their confrontation can entail. The course will examine the relevance of this model in science as well as in literature and in the arts. Bourdieu's concept of symbolic revolutions and other analytical models of change will be discussed. While historicizing the uses of this concept of revolution in the arts and sciences, the course will explore, through a dialogue between a sociologist and a historian, a musicologist and a political scientist, concrete case studies on Manet, Flaubert, Schönberg, and structuralism. The latter will also allow us to question the relationship between symbolic and political revolutions.

July 10th, 2017 **Gisèle Sapiro – “Introduction to Symbolic Revolutions”**

The concept of “symbolic revolutions” was coined by Pierre Bourdieu in order to designate radical change in fields of cultural productions, such as the literary and artistic fields, or the scientific field. Drawing from the model of political revolutions, from which the very notion of revolution and that of avant-garde are borrowed, the fields of cultural production tend to evolve through revolutions since Romanticism, which imposed the principle of originality as a requirement in order to achieve full recognition as an artist. However, one should distinguish revolutionary claims and subversive intent from actual symbolic revolutions, like the one carried out by French painter Edouard Manet, which changed the prevailing categories of aesthetic perception. Such a revolution results from an encounter between long term transformations of the conditions of artistic production and the dispositions (*habitus*) of a singular artist or a group who give tangible form to the new potentialities inscribed in these transformations. The course will present and discuss the concept of symbolic revolutions in Bourdieu's field theory, through his analysis of the cases of Manet, Flaubert and Baudelaire. We will compare Bourdieu's approach to Kuhn's description of scientific revolutions and reflect on the analogies and differences between the different fields under scrutiny.

Required readings:

- Pierre Bourdieu (1983) “The Field of Cultural Production or the Economic World Reversed”, *Poetics* 12, 311-356.
- Pierre Bourdieu (1993) “Manet and the Institutionalization of Anomie”, in Id., *The Field of Cultural Production*, ed. Randal Johnson, Cambridge: Polity Press, 238-253.

July 11th, 2017 **Kapil Raj** – “**Revolutions in Science: A Mid-20th Century Invention and its Subsequent History**”

Contrary to what one might imagine, the idea of the ‘Scientific Revolution’ of the 16th and 17th centuries, the founding moment of modern science for all historians, is actually a very recent invention, dating back to the eve of World War II, an idea that gained currency only in the 1950s and 1960s. After briefly tracing the history of the general notion of revolution and the evolution of its meaning in the late 18th century, this session will discuss the post World War II circumstances in which it was imported into the history of science and the Eurocentric effects the new narrative has had not only on the discipline itself, but also on the construction of a Transatlantic Western alliance that marked the second half of the 20th century.

Required reading:

- Roy Porter (1986) “The Scientific Revolution: A Spoke in the Wheel?” in Roy Porter & Mikuláš, eds., *Revolution in History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 290-316.

July 12th, 2017 **Esteban Buch** – “**Schoenberg’s Atonal Revolution**”

In 1908 in Vienna, Arnold Schoenberg composes his first atonal pieces, i.e. a music that, for the first time in history, does not imply – as tonal music does – the hierarchical predominance of one single note (the tonic) over the other notes of the chromatic scale. Adding to previous controversies on the deviant and “monstrous” character of Schoenberg’s compositions, these atonal pieces are strongly resisted by professional critics and by most members of the audience, who actively take part in scandals against the composer's artistic influence. In 1911, in his Theory of Harmony, Schoenberg illustrates the limits of the tonal system with a political metaphor, by comparing tonality to a kingdom dominated by the tonic chord as “king”, and by advocating for a “harmony without passport” where “vagrant chords” would undermine the king’s power. Thus, the historical record shows that the notion of atonal music having a revolutionary meaning, now current in the historiography of twentieth century music, originated in these scenes in fin-de-siècle Vienna, where the composer and his critics co-performed an artistic upheaval, symbolically linking music and society.

Required reading:

- Leon Botstein (1999) “Schoenberg and the Audience: Modernism, Music, and Politics in the Twentieth Century”, in *Schoenberg and His World*, ed. Walter Frisch, Princeton: Princeton University Press, p. 19-54.

July 13th, 2017 **Frédérique Matonti – “The Politicization of Structuralism around May 68”**

In 1971, in the new edition of his *Critical Essays*, Roland Barthes presents the year 1966 as a “central landmark”. Indeed, from the point of view of publications, 1965 and 1966 are the privileged years. In 1966, *Les Mots et les choses* by Foucault; *Écrits* by Jacques Lacan; *Critique et vérité (Criticism and Truth)* by Roland Barthes and *Théorie de la Littérature* were released. Prefaced by Roman Jakobson, the latter gathered essays by Russian formalists, considered to be precursors of structural linguistics. It was also in 1966 that the *Cahiers pour l'analyse (Journal for Analysis)* was launched. Published by the Circle of epistemology of the Ecole Normale Supérieure, this journal was had a triple focus: semiology, works of Jacques Lacan and works of Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser. A year before, in 1965, the far left publisher François Maspero had released two books by Althusser: *Pour Marx (For Marx)* and *Lire le Capital (Reading Capital)*. All these texts were gathered, by their critics, under the label of “structuralism”. And, on the eve of May 68, structuralism became a sort of marker of political radicalism. Being intellectually in the vanguard, which meant being structuralist, became the synonym of being radical from the political point of view.

The course will focus on this process of politicization, i.e. the way in which some social agents redefine their activities within other spheres, intellectual or literary, as political. Three questions will be examined. First, what precisely, in the trajectory and in the work of the first intellectual producers of structuralism, allowed for a political interpretation? Secondly, what, in the works of the second generation of structuralists, made the politicization possible. Finally, two politicizing interpretations will be compared: one developed in the news magazines, the other by the committed students.

Required reading:

- Louis Althusser (1969) “Marxism and Humanism”, in Id. *For Marx*, Penguin Press.

Economic Revolution (2nd week, afternoon)

Seminar leader: Sébastien Lechevalier

Invited speakers: Pierre-Cyrille Hautcœur, Nicolas Barreyre, Francis Chateauraynaud

This course discusses the concept of revolution from an economic perspective. Revolution is a concept that is in fact very rarely used by economists. It refers either to industrial (and technological) revolutions or to the economic impact of (mainly political or social) revolutions. A good example of the difficulty for economists to mobilize the concept of revolution appears in their references to the structure of revolutions by Thomas Kuhn. There are however important contributions from economic thought that cannot be ignored. A first one comes from Marxism and its attempts to build an interpretative history of episodes such as the industrial revolution, the French revolution and on-going social, economic and political transformations in the 19th Century that should/may lead to the next revolutionary episode and ultimately to the collapse of capitalism. A second one can be found in the work of Joseph Schumpeter that puts innovation (or technological revolution) at the center of economic dynamics; it offers an explanation why capitalism may not collapse. Finally, Karl Polanyi does not discuss the concept of economic revolution by itself but offers an alternative thinking in his *Great transformation* (1944); it emphasizes the tensions between the development of market economy and the social context in which it is embedded.

These three insights are discussed in the 4 contributions that compose this course. A first one introduces the concept of institutional change from a political economy perspective and applies to different examples of economic revolutions. The two following seminars refer to two major episodes of economic history, namely the industrial revolution in Great Britain and the transformation of US capitalism at the turn of the 20th century. A final contribution adopts a sociological perspective on new technologies and their meaning for the relations between science and society.

Required reading:

- Bronfenbrenner Martin (1971), “The ‘Structure of Revolutions’ in Economic Thought”, *History of Political Economy*, 3 (1): 136-151.

July 10th, 2017 **Sébastien Lechevalier – “A political economy perspective on economic revolutions, crises, and transformation” (Introduction to Economic Revolutions)**

In this introduction, we adopt a political economy perspective on the concept of economic revolution. It allows us to reconcile different understandings of it (e.g. technological revolution, industrial revolution, collapse of socio-economic systems) by mobilizing the concept of institutional change. It leads us to also discuss alternative concepts, such as crisis and transformation. In order to illustrate this theoretical discussion, we mobilize various examples such as Japan’s Meiji revolution, the current economic transformation in China or technological revolution that occurred in the Silicon Valley or that may happen in the field of robotics. A key message is that any interpretation influenced by economic functionalism is

very poor to understand these episodes and that our conceptual effort should converge towards the understanding of the interactions between social, economic, and political dynamics.

Required readings:

- Amable B. And S. Palombarini (2009), *A Neorealist Approach to Institutional Change and the Diversity of Capitalism*, *Socio Economic Review*, 7(1): 123-143.
- Introduction of Streeck W. & K. Thelen ed. (2005) *Beyond Continuity. Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies*, Oxford University Press.

July 11th, 2017 **Pierre-Cyrille Hautcœur – “Is revolution a concept adapted to economic transformations? The case of the industrial revolution in Britain”**

We will examine the recent literature on the industrial revolution in terms of the confrontation between approaches at different scales and scopes, and focusing on different activities, and use this overview to discuss the origin, fate and usefulness of the concept of revolution in economics.

Required readings:

- Allen Robert C. (2009), “Engels’ pause: Technical change, capital accumulation, and inequality in the British industrial revolution”, *Explorations in Economic History*, doi:10.1016/j.eeh.2009.04.004.
- De Vries Jan (1994), “The Industrial Revolution and the Industrious Revolution”, *The Journal of Economic History*, 54 (2): 249-270.

July 12th, 2017 **Nicolas Barreyre – “An Economic Revolution? The New History of Capitalism and the Making of American Economic Might”**

The years between the Civil War and the First World War has long been seen as the crucial period of transformation of the United States into the first economic power in the world. Economists used to talk about the “second industrial revolution” in the western world, but in American history especially this was seen as a time of radical change. In the 1920s already Progressive historians told the story of how businessmen, unshackled by the abolition of slavery, took power and imposed a capitalist order. Labor historians followed the rise of industries and the struggle of the new proletariat. Business historians chartered the rise of corporate behemoths and a new managerial class. And yet political historians and economic historians converged to talk of a receding state and *laissez-faire*, as if the government did not intervene and the courts simply ensured the “natural” market would work.

The recent surge of a “New History of Capitalism” in the U.S. is reshaping this old perspective in new directions, with attempts to reconceptualize the historical trajectory of the country by linking it to cultural and social dynamics that were previously seen as outside the purview of economic history. We will thus explore the newer, and tentative, historical and

historiographical debates, with their promises and their limitations. And we will reflect together about economic transformations not only in terms of capital, labor and production, but also in terms of politics and power. Economic revolution *as* political revolution.

Required readings:

- Kramer, Paul A. (2016) “Embedding Capital: Political-Economic History, the United States, and the World.” *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 15, no. 3, : 331–62.
- Schneirov, Richard (2006) “Thoughts on Periodizing the Gilded Age: Capital Accumulation, Society, and Politics, 1873-1898.” *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 5, no. 3, 189–224.

July 13th, 2017 **Francis Chateauraynaud – “The impacts of emerging technologies between endless controversies and permanent revolution. A sociological view of the continuous reframing of the future of science and society”**

Since a more than a decade, emerging science and technologies, like genetics, nanotechnologies, synthetic biology, algorithms based on big data, the third wave of artificial intelligence, new forms of energy, recent spatial discovering are supposed to produce a definitive rupture both in the production of scientific knowledge and in the ways by which players or stakeholders interpret, in everyday activities, economic and social transformations. Many actors speak of a new “technological revolution”, pulled by the pervasive digital networks. In order to analyze the rhetorics of rupture and revolution in the technoscientific fields, and to assess their real impacts on contemporary devices and practices, the session will address technological issues through three key movements: *the types of alarms and controversies* arising from or around technological projects or promises; *the new distribution of knowledge* and the ongoing redefinition of relationships between “science” and “society” ; *the conflict of temporalities* between, on the one hand, the dominant idea of an unescapable acceleration, connected to an intensification of economic competition, implying an urgent need to innovation, and, on the other hand, the necessity of a long term politics, with many regulations based on public concerns on health and environmental issues, demographic processes, inequalities or sustainable development - for instance we will look precisely the use and meaning of the so-called “green economy”.

By looking to technological trends with a pragmatic approach of social processes, we can upgrade the famous Ulrich Beck’s theory on “risk society”. We will show, in particular, how controversies and conflicts around science, technology and economy reveal alternative visions of the future. These visions are not only argumentations or narratives: they really inform and transform, on the ground, activities and practices by creating new sources of concern, of care or attention – as it is the case within agroecological practices or in the use of renewable energies or civic technologies developed by citizen groups or communities.

The current global perspective on risks that threaten our industrial civilization provides a top-down view of how the socio-technical system generates environmental risks and influences the types of knowledge required to describe and manage those risks. However, it can be dangerous to assume that local conditions follow global trends. In fact, the local scale also creates new problems and solutions, with the various articulations between the multiple scales posing a challenges for policy makers tackling systemic risks.

Most of the case studies developed by GSPR researchers during the 15 last years will be involved in the presentation and the discussion : controversies on the future of nuclear energy,

conflicts around genetically modified organisms (GMOs), pesticides and endocrine disruptors in chemicals, debates on nanotechnologies, mobilizations against shale gas exploration and exploitation, concerns and policies on climate change and biodiversity (with the question of geoengineering), doubts on electromagnetic fields consequences, etc. A quick overview of methodological aspects, focusing on socio-informatics modelling for controversy studies, could be included, depending on the main interest of the participants.

Required readings:

- F. Chateauraynaud (2016) *Towards a new matrix of risks: learning from multi-scale controversies*, in European Environment Agency, *Report of the EEA Scientific Committee Seminar on emerging Systemic Risks*, Copenhagen, 24 February 2016 (https://www.academia.edu/28978125/Towards_a_new_matrix_of_risks_learning_from_multi-scale_controversies_FC_2016)
- F. Chateauraynaud (2015), *Environmental Issues between Regulation and Conflict. Pragmatic Views on Ecological Controversies*, Paris/Freiburg, Document GSPR, 2015 (https://www.academia.edu/18187109/Environmental_Issues_between_Regulation_and_Conflict_Pragmatic_Views_on_Ecological_Controversies_FC_2015)
- F. Chateauraynaud & P. Zittoun (2014), “The future they want – or do not want: Shale gas opponents vs. proponents between local motives and global scenarios”, paper for IPA congress, Wageningen, July 2014 (https://www.academia.edu/10047245/The_future_they_want_or_do_not_want_Shale_gas_opponents_vs._proponents_between_local_motives_and_global_scenarios_with_Philippe_Zittoun_July_2014)