

Land Reforms and Revolutionary Groundwork in Iran and Russia: A Comparative Analysis Based on Skocpol's Structural Theory

Hamid. Shamseddin^{1*}, Jahangir. Karami², Mehdi. Ahouei³

¹ PhD student, Department of Iranology, Faculty of World Studies, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

² Associate Professor, Department of Russian Studies, Faculty of World Studies, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

³ Associate Professor, Department of Iranian Studies, Faculty of World Studies, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: hamid.shamsodin@alumni.ut.ac.ir

Received: 2025-05-01	Revised: 2025-07-24	Accepted: 2025-08-05	Published: 2026-03-01
EDITOR: Tahereh Ebrahimifar Head of Sociology Department, Faculty of Arts, Helwan University, Cairo, Egypt. Email: Tah.Ebrahimifar@iauctb.ac.ir			
REVIEWER 1: Nabeel Bani-Hani Faculty of Education Specialization, Wasit University, Wasit, Iraq. Email: nabeelhani@uowasit.edu.iq			
REVIEWER 2: Shehzad Raj School of Law, Universiti Geomatika Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Email: shehzadraj@geomatika.edu.my			

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The question “How did land reforms in Iran and Russia lead to the creation of revolutionary foundations?” is strong, but the subsidiary questions are listed without a clear link to the theoretical framework. Align these sub-questions explicitly with Skocpol’s three structural factors for better theoretical integration.

The discussion of Skocpol’s theory states “Skocpol argues that ‘revolutions...’” but lacks a citation page range beyond “p. 21.” Provide exact page numbers for each direct quotation to strengthen scholarly rigor.

The long historical review of Qajar-era Iran contains valuable detail, but the density of historical events may obscure the direct link to the 1962 land reforms. Consider condensing less directly relevant background to maintain focus on the reforms.

The discussion of Kennedy’s doctrine would benefit from a clearer explanation of how the “flexible response” strategy specifically translated into the White Revolution’s implementation mechanics, beyond general policy influence.

The explanation of public communication strategies in rural areas is descriptive but lacks analysis. Add an evaluative remark on whether these communication efforts mitigated or exacerbated rural discontent.

The Russian case is rich in religious detail but could be improved by connecting religious disaffection more clearly to political mobilization, using evidence from peasant movements.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The critique of Skocpol's neglect of ideology is important but underdeveloped. Expand this critique with supporting literature on ideological drivers in revolutions, particularly in Middle Eastern and Eastern European contexts, to strengthen originality.

The review of Iranian studies cites multiple authors in quick succession (e.g., Hooglund, Alavi, Keddie) without synthesizing their convergences or divergences. Add comparative commentary to show how these works collectively frame your study's contribution.

The claim of a "clear gap in systematic comparative studies" is valid, but should be substantiated with a brief review of why existing comparative works are insufficient (e.g., methodological limitations, time-period mismatches).

The Peter the Great reforms are recounted in detail, but the link between his reforms and the eventual 1861 land reforms is implied rather than explicitly traced. Strengthen the causal bridge.

The description "final changes were made in favor of the landlords" is important but vague. Specify the nature of these concessions (e.g., land allotment sizes, redemption payments) to deepen the comparative detail.

The statement "transformed two key concepts: loyalty to the Tsar and anti-clericalism..." is compelling, but requires citations from primary or secondary sources demonstrating this ideological shift among peasants.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.