

Wed Mar 13 POLI 227

HOW

Terrorism

- Primary target is advertising not the actual victims
 - spectacular violence against non-combatant
- Intimidations, publicity: the faults of the regime etc.
- provocation (polarizing a situation)
- Cheap and easy
- Can't win wars using terrorism: need long hard slogs where lots of people die → need revolutionary wars

Urban insurrection

- From centre to periphery/ mixed route in larger urban areas
- Capital is where the regime is the strongest
- Military that is on resurrection side, mixed or not going to oppose

Guerrilla warfare

- Rural mostly: periphery to centre/mixed
- 1. Small-scale hit and run: quick small attacks
- 2. Creation of liberated zones: make authority impossible to control → government free zones where authority passed from government power to insurgents
- 3. Mobile warfare: the more control there is, more support and aggressively come out to seize larger territory
- 4. Almost a full size army now: full confrontation to March on the capital

Power achieved:

- Initial seizure of power
- Counter-revolutionary war: i.e. Bolshevik revolution
- External challenges → revolutions often seen as a hostile system compared to neighbors
 - I.e. Especially after WWI, Canadians sent to help the Tsarist side over the communists, Iranian revolution also
- Internal debates 1) compromise vs. Revolutionary transformation → remove society or just implement certain ideological changes and compromises to reduce strife 2) caution vs. Exporting the revolution → keeping what is already stabilized or spreading ideology to surrounding satellite populations
 - Short-run debates: won by the radicals → now that struggles have been achieved and struggles have been suffered, immediate satisfaction is preferred
 - Cost of being a radical: dislocation of economy, driving gap of the group → transfer of debates toward moderates
- Maturation of the revolution: moderates regain popularity

MILITARY AND ARMY

Burma

Myanmar

Nigeria: afflicted by various coups and military rule as well as civil war

El Salvador

Egypt: arab spring, independence from Britain

Military intervention: why?

- Nature of military allows for strength, organization training and military attitudes is suitable to the purposes
- Civil society: mostly weak civilian institutions and political culture → civilians rejecting military legitimacy = less likely to get coups
- Dependency in economic vulnerability: capitalism development becomes difficult at a certain point: bureaucratic authoritarianism where coups were right-wing pro-capitalist in latin america
- Neopatrimonialism: dominant political elites use state control to consolidate power and control “king of the hill” politics
- Military and upward mobility: social status and power from disadvantaged groups
- Military interests: more involved in politics because civilians are more involved in politics
- Legitimacy crisis, reliance on coercion
- Foreign intervention: need the military to already be disposed to make a coup, can't have solely a foreign interest, need internal interest → US: Saddam Hussein were not able to do it

Huntington's Typology

Breakthrough coups: pro-reform organized by middle ranks of military → heavily recruited from disadvantaged and marginalized populations

- Coup to change society

Guardian coups: upper ranks of military are conservative and using military power to suppress trade unions etc

- More limited objectives, particular military threatened, certain ambitious members want more → but not political change or ideological change
- Short medium range issues
- Not progressive or reformist

VETO coups: