



10-1-2014

From Brinton To Goldstone: A Scientific Civilizational Perspective On The Theory Of Revolution

Vlad Alalykin-Izvekov

Stephen Satkiewicz

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/ccr>

Recommended Citation

Alalykin-Izvekov, Vlad and Satkiewicz, Stephen (2014) "From Brinton To Goldstone: A Scientific Civilizational Perspective On The Theory Of Revolution," *Comparative Civilizations Review*: Vol. 71 : No. 71 , Article 8.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/ccr/vol71/iss71/8>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the All Journals at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Comparative Civilizations Review by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

From Brinton To Goldstone: A Scientific Civilizational Perspective On The Theory Of Revolution

Vlad Alalykin-Izvekov and Stephen Satkiewicz
vlad_ai@yahoo.com; ssatkiewicz@yahoo.com

“Revolutions are the locomotives of history.”
Karl Marx

“The revolution, like Saturn, devours its children.”
Pierre Victorien Vergniaud

“Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable.”
John F. Kennedy

INTRODUCTION

In order to adequately investigate the complex and volatile phenomenon of revolution, we ought to place it within a relevant scientific field of knowledge. The theoretical and methodological foundations of such a field, named Civilizational Science, have been developed by Vlad Alalykin-Izvekov (Alalykin-Izvekov, 2011).

The analysis of the phenomenon of revolution and its theory draws on the work of prominent social scholars and thinkers, including Pitirim Sorokin, Arnold Toynbee, Leo Trotsky, Crane Brinton, Samuel Huntington, Charles Tilly, and Jack Goldstone. The goal of the investigation is to produce an empirical framework of the phenomenon of revolution that is explanatory and open to repeated application and testing. After laying out theoretical premises and illustrating them with examples of four revolutions from the period between the 17th and the 20th century, the authors analyze the unfolding Ukrainian Revolution and present plausible scenarios of future developments.

Sections on “Civilizational Science Perspective on the Phenomenon of Revolution,” “Theory of Revolution in the Context of Civilizational Science,” and “Case Studies of Revolutions” were written by Vlad Alalykin-Izvekov and the section on the “External-type versus Internal-type Revolutions” was written by Stephen Satkiewicz.

THE CIVILIZATIONAL SCIENCE PERSPECTIVE ON THE PHENOMENON OF REVOLUTION

One of the perennial features of sociocultural development is the phenomenon of revolution. Its underlying conditions, causes, symptoms, stages, sociocultural dynamics, consequences, and other relevant aspects are still poorly understood and, as a result, many people suffer during those often horrific events. Yet, as a careful scientific analysis

convincingly proves, it is often possible to explain and predict those phenomena as well as to alleviate some of their most terrible consequences.

Let us consider this phenomenon in the context of Civilizational Science in search for answers on the causes, conditions, symptoms, stages, sociocultural dynamics, and consequences of revolutions.

THEORY OF REVOLUTION IN THE CONTEXT OF CIVILIZATIONAL SCIENCE

Defining Revolution

Charles Tilly differentiates between a coup, a top-down seizure of power, a civil war, a revolt, a rebellion and other occurrences that do not transform justification for authority, political institutions or economic and social structures, and a revolution which does just that. (Tilly, 1995:15).

Samuel Huntington agrees, noting that a coup d'état in itself changes only leadership and perhaps policies; a rebellion or insurrection may change policies, leadership, and political institutions, but not social structure and values; a war of independence is a struggle of one community against rule by an alien community and does not necessarily involve changes in the social structure of either community. (Huntington, 1977: 264).

Jack Goldstone highlights the significance of the universal human quest for social justice. Of all social upheavals, the scholar notes, only revolutions combine *all* the elements of forcible overthrow of the government, mass mobilization, the pursuit of a vision of social justice, and the creation of new political institutions (Goldstone, 2014: 9).

Thus we arrive at a general definition of the phenomenon of revolution as a strategy of struggle for a certain vision of social justice, which at minimum leads to mass mobilization, the change of government, and the creation of new institutions.

Revolutionary Conditions

Scholars agree that revolution is a complex process that emerges from the social order becoming frayed in many areas at once. Jack Goldstone writes: "This is how revolutions arise – over time, a society shifts from a condition of stable equilibrium to unstable equilibrium. Then, even a small disorder can set off an accelerating movement toward greater disorder and the overturning of the existing regime." (Goldstone, 2014: 15).

This thinker points to a general agreement among social scholars regarding the five elements that create an unstable social equilibrium from which revolutions can arise: 1) national economic or fiscal strains; 2) alienation and opposition among the elites;

3) widespread popular anger at injustice; 4) an ideology that presents a persuasive shared narrative of resistance; and 5) favorable international relations. (Goldstone, 2014: 16-18).

When these five conditions coincide, the normal social mechanisms that restore order in crises are unlikely to work. Instead, societies where these conditions prevail are in an unstable equilibrium, where any untoward event can trigger escalating popular revolts and open elite resistance, producing a revolution. (Goldstone, 2014: 19).

Structural and Transient Causes of Revolutions

Scholars define the structural causes as long-term and large-scale trends that undermine existing social institutions and relationships. They include: 1) demographic change; 2) shift in the pattern of international relations; 3) uneven or dependent economic development; 4) new patterns of exclusion or discrimination against particular groups; and 5) the evolution of personalist regimes. (Goldstone, 2014: 23).

According to Crane Brinton, examples of these types of causes may be the following:

- long and unresolved struggle between the monarchy and the lesser nobility over political power and revenues;
- exploitation of the peasantry, and a huge gap in the standard of living between rich and poor;
- gradual and long-range effects of the Commercial and Industrial Revolutions bring about change;
- rise of the middle class based on urbanization, and mercantile, and industrial growth;
- rise of the working class (19th century or later);
- structural unemployment and re-employment created by changes in modes of production caused by industrialization;
- more "enlightened" philosophy and greater political awareness as a result of more widespread education, greater expectations, and ideas of equality and liberty;
- immediate factors which trigger unrest and unleash the revolutionary process usually include economic problems associated with war, financial indebtedness, privation among the lower class, an inefficient and corrupt government; and
- crisis, usually of a financial nature, dividing the ruling elite and paralyzing the government. (Brinton, 1965: 27-66; 250-252).

The transient causes are contingent events or actions by particular individuals or groups that reveal the impact of longer term trends and often galvanize revolutionary

oppositions to take further action. Among those may be, for example, spikes of inflation, defeat in war, riots or demonstrations that challenge state authority. In addition, state responses to protest can trigger wider protests. (Goldstone, 2014: 24). Still, it is the structural causes which create the underlying instability that scholars treat as the fundamental causes of revolutions. (Goldstone, 2014: 25).

Uniformities in Revolutions

Crane Brinton observes that the discernible uniformities in the revolutionary processes are usually as follows:

- 1) although the society as a whole may be on a relative economic upswing, the general ineptitude and inefficiency of the governmental machinery usually causes major financial difficulties;
- 2) lack of social mobility for the middle classes;
- 3) definite and bitter class antagonisms;
- 4) transfer of allegiance of the intellectuals toward social change;
- 5) many members of the ruling class lose faith in their old traditions and habits and/or become decadent; and
- 6) ineptitude in using force to suppress the revolution. (Brinton, 1965: 250-253).

In a kind of Hegelian *modus operandi*, the life-career of these tectonic events may resemble the movement of a giant pendulum, moving from the Right (“The Old Order”) to the Middle (“The Moderates”) to the Left (“The Radicals”), and then back to the Right (“The Thermidor”). (Brinton, 1965: IX-X)

One of the characteristic features of revolutions is the so called “dual power” (sometimes referred to as “two-fold power,” “double sovereignty,” or “two-power regime”). It reflects the moment of historical tension when two powers stand poised against each other: that of the faltering state which represents the declining social forces and that of the revolutionary institutions which speak in the name of the new. Among those who first investigated this important phenomenon was Leon Trotsky. Analyzing the English, the French, the Russian, and the German revolutions, the legendary revolutionary considers the whole revolutionary process through the prism of this concept, as a kind of a dialectical struggle of opposites in the recurring revolutionary cycles. (Trotsky, 1976)

As for the leaders, in the opinion of Eric Hoffer, revolutions are prepared by “men of words” brought to fulfillment by “fanatics,” and finally again reduced to the “measure of ordinary societies” by the “practical men of action.” (Brinton, 1965:117)

“Western-type” versus “Eastern-type” Revolutions; Revolutionary Alliances

Among a wealth of other innovative ideas, Samuel Huntington brings into the theory of revolution a concept of “Western-type” and “Eastern-type” revolutions. Other terms identifying those two patterns of state breakdown are “central collapse” and “peripheral advance.” (Goldstone, 2014: 27)

Huntington notes: “The Western revolution moves through the collapse of the established political institutions, the expansion of participation, the creation of new institutions. More elaborately, in Brinton’s terms, it evolves from the fall of the old order, through the revolutionary honeymoon, the rule of the moderates, the efforts at counter-revolution, the rise of the radicals, the reign of terror and of virtue, and, eventually, the Thermidor.

“The pattern of the Eastern revolution is quite different... In the Western revolution the revolutionaries come to power in the capital first and then gradually expand their control over the countryside. In the Eastern revolution they withdraw from central, urban areas of the country, establish a base area of control in a remote section, struggle to win the support of the peasants through terror and propaganda, slowly expand the scope of their authority, and gradually escalate the level of their military operations from individual terroristic attacks to guerrilla warfare to mobile warfare and regular warfare.

“Eventually they are able to defeat the government troops in battle. The last phase of the revolutionary struggle is the occupation of the capital.” (Huntington, 1977: 271-272).

The thinker goes on to explain that while the “Western-type” revolutions are usually directed against the highly vulnerable traditional regimes amidst dire financial and sociopolitical troubles, the “Eastern-type” revolutions are typically directed against at least partially modernized regimes, in which circumstances no quick revolutionary victory is possible. (Huntington, 1977: 273-274).

He also highlights the importance of a complicated interplay of various social forces and circumstances for a revolution to occur. He notes:

A revolution necessarily involves the alienation of many groups from the existing order... One social group can be responsible for a coup, a riot, or a revolt, but only a combination of groups can produce a revolution. Conceivably, this combination might take form of any number of possible group coalitions. In actuality, however, the revolutionary alliance must include some urban and some rural groups. The opposition of urban groups to the government can produce the continued instability characteristic of a praetorian state. But only the combination of urban opposition with rural opposition can produce a revolution. (Huntington, 1977: 277).

“External-type” versus “Internal-type” Revolutions

It is also important to distinguish between "External" and the "Internal" revolutions. "External" would convey revolutions that are conducted against external authorities, i.e. within the context of anti-colonial struggles. This would apply to the American Revolution as the archetype but also to other anti-colonial revolutions. "Internal" might be called revolutions against the internal authority of a country, and both the French and Russian revolutions would be archetypes of such.

A characteristic common to the theoretical definition of revolution is to distinguish it from other major forms of social and political unrest. Samuel Huntington for example, distinguishes revolutions from “insurrections, rebellions, revolts, coups, and wars of independence.” (Huntington, 1977: 264). Charles Tilly further differentiates revolutions from civil wars. (Charles Tilly, 1995: 15) While this is valid, it leaves open the potential neglect of the complex historical realities that revolutions have often been intertwined with, other forms of unrest. Insurrections have been important in inciting several revolutions; coups have often marked the key transitions from one stage of a revolution to another stage. In addition, revolutions have often been marked by civil wars between different factions fighting for control, and it is also undeniable that throughout history revolutions have often occurred within the context of wars of independence.

It may therefore be important for Civilizational Science, given its multi-paradigmatic nature, to further categorize revolutions based upon their possible close relationship to other forms of social and political unrest. This would especially be vital to any proper comparative study and analysis of various revolutions.

One proposed way to achieve this goal is to categorize revolutions based upon the nature of the Old Order that it is being directed against. Within this context, revolutions can be classified as being either Internal or External in nature.

We define Internal Revolution as *a revolution that occurs within a given social and political entity and is largely directed against the domestic authority of the Old Order.* The French Revolution can be classified as a paradigmatic example of an Internal Revolution. The Old Order was perceived as a domestically imposed form of tyranny (countrymen oppressing fellow countrymen), and the revolutionary forces sought to change or overthrow this order by replacing it with a transformed society. These forms of revolutions are often closely connected with insurrections, coups, and civil wars.

We define External Revolution as *a revolution that occurs within a given social and political entity and is largely directed against the foreign authority of the Old Order.* The American Revolution can be classified as a paradigmatic example of an External Revolution. The American colonies were governed from afar by Britain, and the Old Order was perceived as a foreign-imposed tyranny (foreigners oppressing fellow

countrymen). Thus, independence from Britain was vital to the overthrow of the Old Order. These forms of revolutions are closely related to, if not inseparable from, wars of independence.

Revolutionary Waves

In 1961 Arnold Toynbee addressed the continuing effect of the American Revolution on contemporary societies. His message was that the principles of the American Revolution continue to reverberate through the centuries to this day. The eminent scholar compared them to Sputnik, traveling around the globe and affecting more and more countries, nations, and peoples along the way. Toynbee ended with a quote from Thomas Jefferson, who famously said that "the disease of liberty is catching." (Toynbee, 1978: 234-237).

In fact, revolutionary ideas do travel, often in waves. A revolutionary wave is a series of revolutions occurring in various locations in a similar time period. In many cases, past revolutions and revolutionary waves may inspire current ones, or an initial revolution inspires other concurrent "affiliate revolutions" with similar aims. Colin J. Beck elucidates: "It has long been recognized that revolutions come in waves, particularly those that are most transformative (e.g. Arrighi, Wallerstein, and Hopkins 1989; Goldstone 1991, 2001, 2002; Katz 1997; Kurzman 2008; Markoff 1995, 1996; Merriman 1938; Tarrow 1998; Tilly 1993). Historical accounts of revolution and revolutionary waves often stress the commonality of ideological claims and the forces of cultural change across the national boundaries as an explanation of their origins (e.g. Bailyn 1967; Chartier 1991; Godechot 1965; Palmer 1954, 1959; Sewell 1985, 1996; Sharman 2003; Wuthnow 1989). On the other hand, sociological explanations of revolution and revolutionary waves tend to place their origins in cross-national processes, for instance as war, economic pressure, and demographic change challenge state stability (e.g. Arrighi and Silver 1999; Boswell and Dixon 1990, 1993; Foran 2005; Goldfrank 1979; Goldstone 1991; Hung 2009; Skocpol 1979; Tilly 1993) or as contention diffuses across societies from an initial event (. e.g. Katz 1997; Markoff 1995, 1996; Tarrow 1993, 1998)." (Beck, 2011: 167-168).

Phases of Revolutions

Pitirim A. Sorokin distinguishes two "inseparable" stages in the revolutionary process: the "1st Stage" and then the "2nd Stage," or "Reaction". According to the scholar, the first stage involves disintegration of existing legal, moral, religious reflexes, while the second one sees their reconstruction on a new basis. (Sorokin, 2008: 30; 155). N.A. Berdyaev agrees: "All revolutions ended with reactions. This is – unavoidable. This is – the law. And the more violent and furious were the revolutions, the stronger were the reactions." (Berdyaev, 2007: 457).

Crane Brinton subdivides Sorokin's first stage of a revolution into two phases: "Moderate" and "Radical" and adds one more – the "Thermidor." Thus, the "classic" four-stage formula of the revolutionary cycle is born (Brinton, 1965:IX-X). Those stages are as follows:

Phase One - The Old Order

The Old Order usually features an autocratic regime with few or no social mechanisms to represent the emerging classes or new social forces.

Symptoms of the Old Order decaying are:

- 1) the state is economically weak, the government has deficits and must heavily tax;
- 2) the state is also politically weak, the government is ineffective and cannot enforce its policies. There is often an inept ruler on top of the governing hierarchy;
- 3) transfer of allegiance of the intellectuals;
- 4) antagonism between the old regime and the disenfranchised classes;
- 5) financial breakdown;
- 6) growing protests against the old government;
- 7) inept use of force by the government while repressing the rebellion; and
- 8) "dual power."

Phase Two - Moderate Regime

A revolution begins with the moderate phase led by the upper middle class, as well as some elements of the upper classes.

Symptoms of this stage are: 1) moderates attain power, 2) a legislature is elected which may share power with a monarchy or an elected executive; 3) a constitution and other documents typical of a representative government are issued; 4) moderates have to struggle with the counter-revolutionary forces on one side and with the radicals on the other; 5) the moderates may also have to fight an internal and/or external war.

Phase Three - Radical Regime

In the radical regime phase, unless there are already existing institutions and experience related to representative government, a loss of control to radical populist demagogues may occur.

Symptoms of this phase are: 1) radicals take control, usually in a coup d'état; 2) the legislature is usually dominated by a dictator, dictatorial faction, or a revolutionary council; 3) this period is accompanied by violence and attempts at the total control of a society; and 4) a war (civil and/or foreign) may ensue or continue.

Phase Four - Counter-Revolutionary Regime (“Thermidor”)

Instability during the radical phase leads to a counter-revolutionary phase involving return to power of the upper middle class and some elements of the upper classes. If this government is unstable, the situation may result in a dictatorship.

Symptoms of this period include: 1) radicals are repressed and moderates gain amnesty; 2) slow and uneven return to “normalcy” is seen in everyday affairs; 3) rule by a tyrant; and 4) aggressive nationalism.

Among permanent changes caused by the revolution there are usually the following:

- removal of a government based on the inherited privileges;
- establishment of a more representative government, based upon a sense of nationalism;
- government and its bureaucracy become more efficient and rational, as well as less bound by tradition;
- feudal practices are eliminated, and farmers become landowners;
- and other sweeping administrative and legal changes occur.

These changes may vary, depending on factors such as culture, institutions, historical experience, foreign intervention and wars, and the influence of neighboring countries. That there is variation in the typical underlying conditions, causes, symptoms, phases, sociocultural dynamics, and consequences of the “great revolutions” is evident.

Let us now illustrate these theoretical uniformities by taking a brief look at five revolutions: the English, the American, the French, the Russian, and, as an example of a “revolution in progress” - the Ukrainian Revolution.

CASE STUDIES OF REVOLUTIONS

The English Revolution

The Old Order: before 1628.

England is a parliamentary monarchy. King James I, and then Charles I, come into a political conflict with the parliament over revenue raising.

Moderate Phase: 1628-1641.

In 1628, the parliament passes the Petition of Rights which requires its approval of any taxation imposed by the king. Charles I adjourns the parliament and rules without it for eleven years.

When, in 1639, a rebellion occurs in Scotland, King Charles convenes the parliament in order to finance the raising of an army. Once again, the parliament refuses to cooperate. When the king orders the parliament to adjourn, the parliamentary leaders decline. This act of defiance brings an end to the period of political maneuvering, both sides take up arms, and a Civil War follows.

Radical Phase: 1641-1660.

In the Civil War, an army led by Oliver Cromwell, a leader in the parliament and a Puritan, is victorious. The parliament tries the king for treason, convicts and executes him. Cromwell establishes a military dictatorship, and Puritanism becomes the state-supported religion. The majority of the ruling elite of the English people, however, does not accept Cromwell's rule and the dictatorship survives only until his death in 1658.

Thermidor: 1660-1688.

The parliament re-asserts its authority after the death of Cromwell and invites the son of King Charles I to return from exile and to take the throne as King Charles II. The new monarch realizes limitations on the power of the king and works cooperatively with the parliament, finding allies among its conservative faction.

After a successful reign, Charles dies in 1685 and is succeeded by his brother, James II. When James begins to follow a policy of arbitrary monarchical power, and prepares to raise his son, the heir to the throne, as a Catholic, the parliament acts against him. He is deposed in 1688 as a result of the bloodless "Glorious Revolution." The parliament issues the English Bill of Rights (1689) and then invites a new king to the throne. Thus, despite a temporary return of the Stewarts to the throne, the parliament asserts its

supremacy over the king, and it becomes clearly recognized in England as the supreme power in a constitutional monarchy.

The American Revolution

The Old Order: until 1763.

In Crane Brinton's words, "the American case is somewhat different. Here we have an inept, *colonial* government in London, but not an inept native ruling class." (Brinton, 1965: 89). In fact, the aristocratic and middle class leaders of the English colonies are among the most privileged of leadership elites in the 18th century. The English parliament is not exercising direct rule over the colonies since each colony has its own elected legislature with considerable political influence.

Moderate Phase: 1763-1775.

The end of the Seven Years' War leads the British government to try to raise revenues from the colonies. Colonial protest against the Sugar Act, the Stamp Act, the Townshend Acts, and the Tea Act leads to a standoff. The determination of the English government to enforce its will upon the colonies causes a series of political conflicts over a dozen years.

Radical Phase: 1775-1783.

According to Crane Brinton, "this period was not reached in the American revolution, though in the treatment of Loyalists, in the pressure to support the army, in some of the phases of social life, you can discern in America many of the phenomena of the Terror ..." (Brinton, 1965: 254).

Nevertheless, the Revolutionary War ensues when the British try to enforce their rule with the army and navy, and it lasts until they realize that they cannot impose their will upon the colonies. The war creates conditions which lead to the Declaration of Independence. The Declaration includes statements of a number of Enlightenment principles, such as equality of opportunity under the law and the contract theory of government. These ideas, radical at the time, challenge fundamental class inequalities, including that of inheritance as the basis for power and privilege.

The Continental Congress writes the Articles of Confederation, creating a weak central government without revenue-raising powers, while the former colonial legislatures write constitutions for thirteen separate and sovereign states.

Thermidor: 1783-1800.

Colonial resistance is effective because the rebel leaders are educated, articulate people who are experienced with government. The war has to be fought until the British government realizes that it cannot overcome obstacles of a well-organized rebellion on the other side of the ocean. Foreign powers, most notably the French, play a substantial role in the outcome. All these circumstances provide an opportunity for the rebel leadership to establish a government based upon the liberal ideals of the Enlightenment.

After the war, the revolutionary leadership soon realizes that the central government is too weak to protect the interests of people (especially the leadership who were property owners), and they write a new constitution, creating a federal government with taxing and other powers of a sovereign state. The new constitution is tested in the first administration under President George Washington when a tax rebellion is put down. The election of Thomas Jefferson as president in 1800 demonstrates that the new system can survive a change in power from one elected party to another.

A system is established which recognizes validity of elections as the basis for power. On the other hand, the same leadership elite, wealthy owners of property who had control of colonial legislatures before the revolution, dominates both political parties after the revolution.

The French Revolution

The Old Order: until 1789.

France is an absolute monarchy devoid of virtually any forms of representative government. The ruling class with its outdated government machinery is facing mounting socioeconomic and sociocultural challenges.

Among the causes of this revolution are: 1) growing financial crisis; 2) new ideas of the Enlightenment and new means of distributing the written word; 3) growth of the middle class, which lacks political power; 4) large gap in wealth between rich and poor; 5) privileged aristocracy which refuses to shoulder a share of the financial burden; 6) depression during the year 1789; 7) shortages of food and as a result, soaring food prices; 8) unemployment and over-population in Paris.

Moderate Phase: 1789-1792

King Louis XVI tries to raise revenues by calling the Estates General into session. It last met in 1614 when it was organized into three estates – nobility, clergy, and the third estate (everyone else). Since according to the existing rules each estate has one vote, an impasse develops over the voting. The Third Estate, now larger, insists that each delegate

should have one vote. France is in a depression, and soaring food prices bring great privation and hardship. Paris, especially, is a hotbed of unrest. The king calls out an 18,000 man army, which inflames tempers and fears in the city.

When representatives of the Third Estate are barred from the assembly hall, they refuse to leave and proceed with their meetings in the nearby tennis court. Popular uprising occurs when a mob breaks into the Bastille on July 14, 1789. The rebellious leadership of the Third Estate organizes to defend the city, while constituting themselves as the National Assembly. Under pressure from leaders in the city, who argue that the presence of the army outside Paris is a source of panic and hysteria among Parisians, the king disbands the army. The leaders of the National Assembly, supported by popular protest in the streets of Paris, successfully defy the government of the Old Regime. France becomes a constitutional monarchy. While the National Assembly writes a constitution and publishes the Declaration of the Rights of Man, popular discontent leads to a march on Versailles by unemployed workers. The king and his family are placed under a house arrest in the nation's capital.

In the meantime, the inability of the National Assembly to address the nation's economic and other problems causes them to lose control to more radical elements. Fear of foreign invasion provokes hysteria as well as concern about traitors. Meanwhile, rumors of the collapse of the monarchy have reached the countryside, where peasants begin to rise up against the landlords and claim the land as their own. The revolution spreads throughout France and is beyond the control of the revolutionary leadership in Paris. New and more radical leadership in Paris replaces the Assembly and forms the National Convention.

Radical Phase: 1792-1795.

As a volunteer army is raised to defend France against invasion, the People's Courts hold summary trials of thousands of suspected traitors. The National Convention, intimidated by the Paris mob, tries and executes the king, while a patriotic army marches off to the tune of "La Marseillaise." The revolution has stirred up a new sense of nationalism, one which greatly strengthens France in opposing the aristocratic governments of Europe. But the National Convention cannot control the course of events any more than the Assembly had. Rival factions vie for popular support, each accusing the other of treason and dragging the vanquished opposition to the guillotine.

Thermidor: 1795-1815.

Demands for order and stability lead to the overthrow of the radicals and assumption of power by a new, more conservative leadership. A new constitution is written providing for restricted suffrage which benefits the well-to-do. The Directory, an executive

committee, attempts to rule. Beset by threats from the aristocratic groups on the one hand, and by radicals supported by street demonstrations on the other, the Directory calls on the army to defend them against overthrow.

Napoleon, a brilliant young officer, seizes an opportunity to rise quickly in rank and rapidly maneuvers himself into power. He is successful in rallying the new patriotism of Frenchmen to his support, while he unites the country after a decade of civil strife. Napoleon presides over completion of the “Code Napoleon,” produced to replace the Old Regime’s outdated accumulation of regulations. He also reaches the “Concordat” with Roman Catholic Church, giving it control over religious affairs in exchange for undisputed mastery in secular concerns.

Summarizing his accomplishments, Bruce Porter notes: “As First Consul and later Emperor, Napoleon consolidated the three main gains of the Revolution: rationalization, centralization, and secularization.” (Porter, 1994: 134).

Napoleon now rules over a France which is more powerful than it has ever been; however, he is a military man, looking for military solutions to international problems. Failing to negotiate peace with England, he plunges Europe into a decade of war. Napoleon's military genius and French national enthusiasm lead to a series of military victories over Austria and Prussia. By 1808, he rules over most of continental Europe.

The British blockade is countered by the Napoleon's Continental System, which seeks to prevent trade between England and the continent. Those two measures combine to disrupt commercial interests and retard economic growth. In the meantime, a rebellion in Spain, supported by an English army, creates even more problems for Napoleon.

The Russian refusal to cooperate with the Continental System provokes Napoleon into an invasion of Russia. But even the occupation of Moscow does not induce the Russians to accept surrender. Napoleon is forced to abandon the ravaged city and hastily retreat in the midst of the Russian winter. Harassed by the re-grouped Russian army, the remains of his *Grande Armée* are all but utterly destroyed in the process.

Uprisings against Napoleon in Austria and Prussia throw Napoleon back to a defense of French borders. He finally faces military defeat at the hands of the coalition armies. With Napoleon permanently exiled, the victorious powers restore the Bourbon dynasty to rule in France, which has become a constitutional monarchy.

The Russian Revolution of 1917

The Old Order: before 1905.

At the dawn of the 20th century Russia is a vast empire in the first stages of industrialization with an absolute monarchy at its helm. As is usually the case in the early stages of industrialization, working conditions are horrendous and the working class is terribly exploited. The largest part of the population, the peasantry, is also notoriously oppressed in spite of some improvements since the abolition of serfdom.

An impatient intelligentsia, motivated by the example of Western Europe, desires rapid political change. The czarist government opposes it, while encouraging the country's industrialization. This explosive combination ensures that, driven by the irresistible forces of modernization, the cumbersome juggernaut of the empire is now hurtling toward self-destruction.

Moderate Phase: 1905-1917.

The 1905 "Bloody Sunday" massacre of a peaceful demonstration in Saint Petersburg triggers nationwide strikes, which paralyze the economy. The emerging political forces organize a common front against the government, making demands for establishment of a constitution and a legislature. However, with the czar's government controlling electoral rules and assuring that an obedient legislature is created, the country misses a chance to develop a more representative political system.

Next, World War I creates a crisis of such proportions that the monarchy cannot meet the challenge. Massive demonstrations and strikes lead to efforts by the Duma to form a Provisional Government, which intends to govern until a Constituent Assembly can be elected. In the meantime, as a result of the grass roots political organizing, the Soviets are formed and now constitute a separate governing body from that of the Duma ("dual power").

Since the Provisional Government and the Soviets represent different social forces, their decisions often contradict one another. In the meantime, peasants begin to rise up and seize the land, while soldiers, most of whom are peasants, begin to desert the army in increasing numbers.

While most in the Provisional Government are moderate leaders who attempt to carry out a liberal revolution, the majority of the Soviets are members of the Social Democratic Party, a Marxist organization, expecting the socialist revolution to follow the liberal revolution. In April, 1917, Lenin arms a radical faction of the Social Democratic Party, the Bolsheviks, with a consistent plan of action to which they adhere unremittingly.

The effort by the Provisional Government to continue the war effort steadily erodes its support. Using this vacuum of power, the Bolsheviks carry out a successful revolt in November, 1917. Following the coup, they consolidate their control over the Soviets, and, since the Bolsheviks are in the minority in the newly elected Constituent Assembly, the Red Guard dissolves it by force.

Ludwig von Mises sharply observed: “Lenin dispelled by force of arms the Constituent Assembly. The short-lived “liberal” interlude was liquidated. Russia passed from the hands of the inept Romanovs into those of a real autocrat.” (Mises, 1981: 502).

Radical Phase: 1917-1921.

This period, which coincides with the whole duration of the Civil War in Russia, begins with the seizure of power by Bolsheviks, and involves an armed power struggle between the Bolsheviks and several rival groups.

The war effort against Germany collapses and the new Soviet government is forced to accept terms of the humiliating Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. The country then faces three years of devastating civil war as the “Reds” defend themselves against several “White” armies. The civil war is accompanied by foreign intervention representing several outside powers.

In the end, although the Russian economy is disrupted and the Russian people face a massive famine, the Bolsheviks hold on to power with ruthless determination, establishing a one-party dictatorship.

Thermidor: 1921-1985.

Crane Brinton notes:

Thermidor in Russia has been complicated and prolonged. We may perhaps regard the period of war communism, 1917-1921, as the first main crisis of the Russian revolution. With the New Economic Policy of 1921 began Russia’s Thermidor. Lenin’s death and the subsequent rivalry between Stalin and Trotsky led up to a second crisis, or rather relapse during convalescence, which we may date at the more acute periods of violent enforcement of the first Five Year Plan. But as many an observer has noted, this secondary crisis lacked the hopeful idealism of the first, lacked its improvisations and its adventures, lacked its active foreign and White Guard enemies, and looks ... much like characteristic acts of the “tyrants” who came to power during other “Thermidors” – the Cromwellian settlement of Ireland, for instance, or the Napoleonic enforcement of the Continental System. (Brinton, 1965: 207).

Brinton observes “a similar moral let-down, a similar process of concentration of power in the hands of a ‘tyrant’ or ‘dictator,’ a similar seeping back of exiles, a similar revulsion against the men who had made the Terror, a similar return to old habits in daily life.” (Brinton, 1965: 235).

Perhaps, it would be logical to divide the long “Russian Thermidor” into several stages, possibly “Stalin’s phase” (1924-1953), “Khrushchev’s phase” (1953-1964), and “Brezhnev’s phase” (1964-1982).

Since the end of the 20th century the world may be witnessing the unfolding of the Russian Revolution of 1985, which could have been a precursor, as well as an integral part of the Revolutions of 1989. The phases of it would be as follows:

1. The Old Order: before 1985.
2. Moderate Phase: 1985-1989.
3. Radical Phase: 1989-1999.
4. Thermidor: 1999-Present.

If so, Russia would be now in the Thermidor stage of its Revolution of 1985, while Ukraine may be seen passing through the Radical Phase of its Revolution of 2004.

Extrapolation and Falsifiability of the Scientific Civilizational Perspective on the Theory of Revolution

According to Karl Popper, any theory must at least in principle be falsifiable (for example, proven to be wrong under certain circumstances) in order to be considered scientific. In other words, a scientific theory cannot be labeled as such if it is not fundamentally refutable. But, nevertheless, because scientific theories yield predictions, even if some of the predictions happen to be inaccurate under certain conditions that does not mean that they cannot still serve as useful approximations. (Popper, 2004).

Let us see how these assumptions may apply to the civilizational perspective on the theory of revolution.

Recent scholars have noted that since the mid-1980s a number of factors have improved the prospects for nonviolent resistance overturning regimes. These developments include:

- 1) global norms have moved strongly in the direction of requiring elections for regimes to claim legitimacy;
- 2) new mass media have made it easier for the opposition almost everywhere to acquire and disseminate evidence of regime abuses;

- 3) the rise of an international network of activists to provide training in nonviolent resistance methods has empowered opposition movements; and
- 4) the end of the Cold War has reduced the willingness of the great powers to intervene militarily so as to keep rulers in power against the wishes of their own people (Goldstone, 2014: 105).

There was hope among scholars of revolution that because these developments had proven their effectiveness in the case of the successful anti-communist revolutions in the former Soviet Union and its allied states of Eastern Europe, as well as in the subsequent “color revolutions,” therefore revolutions might have now become less violent worldwide. (Goldstone, 2014:105). Perhaps sadly, though, the formula “Old Order - Moderate Phase - Radical Phase - Thermidor” outlined above appears to be reasserting itself on the world stage. In fact, some of the “non-violent” revolutions of today may merely be representing but one stage in the classic revolutionary process.

Jack Goldstone elucidates: “Most of the countries that have had “color” revolutions have not made a swift and certain transition to democracy. Instead, they have had to struggle with corrupt elites who retained their economic power, weak political parties, unreliable judicial systems and factional struggles. In many of them some backsliding and authoritarian tendencies have emerged. Even color revolutions thus conform to the general pattern of revolutions, in which the fall of the old regime is only the start of a revolutionary process that may take several years or even decades to fully unfold” (Goldstone, 204: 116).

Let us consider, for example, a “revolution in the making” presently unfolding in the Ukraine. After briefly analyzing the history of the revolution, we will present three plausible scenarios of future developments within two phases.

The Ukrainian Revolution of 2004

The Old Order: before 2004.

Ukraine is a historic land with a unique and rich culture, which displays influences of many civilizations. Not even mentioning Ancient Greece, Ancient Rome, Byzantine, and the Vikings, various parts of the country have been provinces of the Polish-Lithuanian, the Russian, the Austro-Hungarian, the Prussian, and the Ottoman empires, and, subsequently, of the Soviet Union. Nonetheless, despite the ever-present pressures for cultural conversion emanating from the various colonial powers, Ukrainian culture, art, and literary language remained Ukrainian, undergoing a domestic process of rapid development and refinement, especially during the 19th and the 20th centuries.

The first attempt to gain status as an independent state arrives in 1917, when the Declaration of Independence on June 23, 1917 leads to the appearance from 1917 to 1921

of the predecessor of modern Ukraine - the Ukrainian People's Republic (Ukrainian National Republic). Subsequently, a civil war and a foreign invasion follow. In 1921 most of what is now Ukraine is annexed by the Soviet Union.

On August 24, 1991 the Act of Declaration of Independence of Ukraine is adopted by the Verkhovna Rada (Ukrainian parliament). It re-establishes Ukraine as an independent state; however things do not go well. While the corrupt and inept government balances precariously between the lure of Europe and a Russian policy of “carrots and sticks,” Ukraine descends to the level of the second poorest country in Europe. The nation’s Gross Domestic Product, which had been roughly equivalent to that of Poland in the 1980s, now becomes but one fourth of the level of its western neighbor.

Moderate Phase: November 2004 - February 2014.

The “Orange Revolution” erupts between late November 2004 and January 2005. It is a series of protests and political events that takes place in the aftermath of the run-off vote of the 2004 Ukrainian presidential election, a process marred by corruption, intimidation, and fraud.

This phase of the Ukrainian Revolution, which follows the disputed second round of the 2004 presidential election, leads to the annulment of the result and a repeat of the round. The leader of the opposition, Victor Yushchenko, is declared President, defeating Victor Yanukovich. The results of the “Orange Revolution,” however, are largely cancelled by the subsequent decade-long infighting between the moderates of various political brands. The economy is paralyzed by warfare among the oligarchs, pervasive corruption, and political infighting.

Jack Goldstone elaborates: “In Ukraine, Yushchenko spent his presidency in a fruitless power struggle with his former ally Yulia Tymoshenko. By 2006 Yanukovich had returned as prime minister, and members of Parliament were shifting their allegiance from Yushchenko to the opposition. In the 2010 presidential election, in which Yanukovich, Yushchenko, and Tymoshenko all ran, Yushchenko received less than 6 percent of the vote, with Yanukovich emerging as the winner. Once in office, Yanukovich restricted press freedoms and put Tymoshenko in jail, prosecuting her for abuse of office and other crimes. It was almost as if the Orange Revolution had not occurred” (Goldstone, 2014: 116). On the night of November 21, 2013 the “Euromaidan” bursts into existence. It is a wave of demonstrations and civil unrest which surges first in Kiev, and then in other cities. At the heart of the crisis is the decision of the Yanukovich government to stop the process of signing the Ukraine–European Union Association Agreement. This stage of the Ukrainian Revolution begins with public demands for closer integration with Europe, which rapidly evolve into stands for better government and against corruption. As a result of the standoff, the process of forming the “dual power” structures commences in Kiev as well as in other cities and regions.

Radical Phase: February 2014 - Present.

The “Euromaidan” protests turn bloody with over 100 protesters sacrificing their lives in February, 2014. Following a sudden departure of President Victor Yanukovich, the parliament moves to seal a deal with the European Union. Almost immediately, the country faces the prospect of a civil war, as well as foreign invasion. Crimea, which became a part of Ukraine in 1954, is swiftly annexed by Russia, which is pursuing its resurgent geopolitical interests.

The Western-leaning interim government has to deal simultaneously with “counter-revolutionary forces” (Russia plus disaffected ethnic Russians living in the eastern and southern regions of the country) and with the “revolutionary radicals.” (The “Right Sector” and others). Thus, it faces a threat of an external as well as an internal war. Further, while the interim leaders succeed in swiftly securing loans and assurances of support from the West, the separatist movements in the south-east of the country, along with both the massing of Russian troops along the eastern border and heavy-handed Russian negotiating tactics involving the manipulation of energy prices, foreshadow trouble ahead.

Starting in April, 2014, waves of pro-Russian demonstrations surge into a dozen eastern and southern Ukrainian cities. These soon escalate into a siege of government buildings amidst calls for parts of Eastern and Southern Ukraine to secede and join Russia. Diplomatic talks between Ukraine, Russia, the US, and the European Union in Geneva fail to achieve any meaningful results. With the pressing concern of an armed rebellion in the south-east of the country, Kyiv launches a “counter-terrorism” offensive. Next, two eastern regions announce their “independence” and armed conflict erupts.

As always, the unfolding of the revolutionary process is full of sudden “shifts and rifts” including a number with possible global implications. Especially important are two: the catastrophic crash of a Malaysian airliner over Eastern Ukraine on July 17, 2014, killing all aboard, and an attempt by right-wing radicals to storm one of the world’s largest nuclear plants, located in the Ukrainian city of Energodar, on May 17, 2014.

All this signals a combustible new phase along the volatile geopolitical fault line between Europe and Russia.

Possible Scenarios:

“Optimistic.” As a result of unprecedented diplomatic efforts, a “win-win” formula is reached between Ukraine, the West, and Russia regarding the future of the country. The civil war and further annexation beyond Crimea are avoided. Following fair and transparent elections, national pride is kindled as a new government is elected which derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. A new constitution, predicated

upon political accommodation, guarantees an equal social status to all ethnic groups. Militarily, the country is non-aligned, similar to Austria, Switzerland, and Finland.

“Muddle through.” A period of instability ensues, characterized by the Cold War-like rivalry between the West and Russia.

“Pessimistic.” Radical tendencies, starting with abolition of the Russian language as one of the Ukraine’s official languages, increase, lead to unrest. Political power in Kiev is usurped by the right-wing extremists who are ready to use any option at their disposal, including the “nuclear card.” Alternatively, the ethnic Russian separatists rule supreme in the east and the south of the country. A civil war follows. In addition to Crimea, Russia annexes parts of eastern and southern Ukraine, which it re-names *Novorossiia* (New Russia). Ukraine is subsequently partitioned between the West and Russia.

Thermidor: As of the time of writing the timeframe is unknown.

Possible Scenarios:

“Optimistic.” A relatively brief period of turmoil before returning to stability. A charismatic leader such as Abraham Lincoln or Nelson Mandela emerges, leading the process of Ukrainian unification. Investments pour in from the West and from Russia, as well from the East and from the South. Having become the “Switzerland of Eurasia,” Ukraine fulfills its historic mission as the “meeting place” for dialogue between the world civilizations.

“Muddle through.” A slow and uneven return to “normalcy.”

“Pessimistic.” During a prolonged civil war in Ukraine and in Russia, sparked in part by rivalry between the West and Russia, both Ukraine and Russia disintegrate into multiple separate ethnic regions. In the process Russia (or some of its parts) becomes a Sparta-like “petro-dictatorship” with a warrior mentality, aggressive, “trigger-happy,” competing for vital resources. All of northern Eurasia becomes a geopolitical “black hole,” reminiscent of Europe during the era of the religious wars in the 16th and 17th centuries or the Balkans during the 19th century.

The West is greatly weakened by this struggle. Already, there are predictions that the E7 countries (a group of seven countries with emerging economies) may have larger economic output than the G7 countries by 2020. (Dunkley: 2013) As a result, resurgent civilizations with large populations and cohesive cultural unity (China, or India, or others) rule the day.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Revolution as a strategy of struggle for liberty and social justice arises during periods of social and cultural change and crisis.
2. The scientific study of revolutions goes on as scholars continue to analyze their nature, causes, stages, characteristics, and consequences.
3. Fundamental ideas of scientific civilizational theory and scientific revolutionary theory correlate with and complement each other.
4. Within the framework of Civilizational Science the underlying conditions, causes, socio-cultural dynamics, and consequences of revolutions can be analyzed, modeled, and to a certain degree, predicted.
5. The “classic” four-stage formula of revolutionary development – running from Old Order to Moderate Stage to Radical Stage to Thermidor – remains applicable. Some of the “non-violent” revolutions of today may represent a stage in that process.
6. By making the phenomena of revolution more “intelligible” and predictable, a scientific civilizational analysis may help to mitigate some of revolution’s worst consequences.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alalykin-Izvekov, V. (2011) “Civilizational Science: The Evolution of a New Field,” *Comparative Civilizations Review*, 64, Spring, 103-116.
- Beck, C. (2011) “The World-Cultural Origins of Revolutionary Waves: Five Centuries of European Contention,” *Social Science History*. 35:2.
- Berdyayev, N.A. (2007) “The Philosophy of Inequality” In: *The Philosophy of Freedom*. (in Russian Language). Moscow: AKT.
- Brinton, C. (1965) *The Anatomy of Revolution: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Dunkley, E. (2011-01-13). "China to overtake US by 2018 – PwC," *Investment Week*. Incisive Financial Publishing Limited. Retrieved 2012-04-16.
- Goldstone, J. (2014). *Revolutions*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Huntington, S. (1977) *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Mises, L. (1981). *Socialism: An Economic and Sociological Analysis*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics.
- Popper, K. R. (2004) *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. London and New York: Routledge Classics.

- Porter, B. (1994). *War and the Rise of the State*. New York: The Free Press.
- Sorokin, P. (2008). *Sociology of Revolution*. (Russian Language). Moscow: Astrel.
- Tilly, C. (1995). *European Revolutions: 1492-1992*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
- Toynbee, A. (1978). "The Shot Heard Round the World" In: *Arnold Toynbee: A Selection from his Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Trotsky, L. (1997). "Dual Power," In: Howe, I. *Essential Works of Socialism*. New Haven: Yale University Press.