

UDK 316. 423. 3:316. 48] – 027. 511  
Professional article

## THE REVOLUTIONS IN THE FUTURE - THE FUTURE OF THE REVOLUTIONS<sup>1</sup>

Mitko Kotovchevski, Blagica Kotovchevska<sup>2</sup>

*Abstract:* The paper “The Revolutions in the Future - the Future of the Revolutions” will present a complex theoretical picture, will scan the revolutions from within and will show its forms and methods of operation of the final goals for a “radical reconstruction of the social and economic relations.” The analysis will compare all previous revolutionary experiences in order to prove that all revolutions (with the exception of the new instant revolutions - velvet, orange, “excavator”, “umbrella”, etc.) are violent, but not all violence is revolutionary. Parallel to this goal we will present the complex causes of revolutions, especially the analysis of the new views on the causes of revolutions (analysis of all essential factors for the upraise of revolutions). For full clarification of the phenomenon of the revolution, we will present the teachings of the greatest scholars and theorists of social processes and revolutionary situations, the types of political violence and the forms of application of murderous force within society. The analysis will be completed by presenting a complete image of the contemporary trends and forecasts of the revolutions in the future, more precisely the future of the revolutions in a deeply uncertain and confronted world.

*Keywords:* revolution, conflict, global security, society.

### 1. Notional-terminological determination of the revolution

Etymologically, the word revolution originates from the neo-Latin word “revolution” which denotes a turn around, flying in, circular movement. The word revolution in the epochal work of Copernicus *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium*, published in 1543, is used to denote the circular movement (“turnabout”) of the celestial bodies in an exceptionally limited-determined function of the astronomic term. Although the “astronomic use” of the term revolution assumes an existence of a specific regularity, the term used in this context implies specific meanings that were not neutral in regard to the social problematic and conditions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paper presented at International Scientific Conference *Facing Social Traumas: A Challenge for Sociological Research*, Faculty of Philosophy, within Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, Skopje 23-24 April, 2015.

<sup>2</sup> e-mail: serafimova@abv.bg

The correlation between the term “revolution” and social sciences appears in specific disputes from the 8<sup>th</sup> century when it gradually received specific political overtone and portent.

The first use of the term revolution, when it was assigned content that was completely similar to the modern one, according to one anecdote, happened on July 14, 1789.<sup>3</sup>

Regardless of the fact how true this claim of historians really is, it is important that after the Great French Bourgeois Revolution, this term finally got its political-social and philosophic meaning in the newly created historical, cultural and civilizational ambience when France, Europe and the world would never again be what they were until then.

The revolution is a complex process with numerous radical and dramatic episodes of political change. With revolution, that is, with the revolutionary changes, a rejection of some established order is performed. Essentially, the revolution represents “rejection of some established order, whereby the state power is transferred from one leadership to another, often accompanied by radical reconstruction of the social and economic relations.” (Маклин 2002:306-307)

In addition, revolutions are “processes that also include competition between the elites and mass mobilization.” (Маклин 2002:307)

It is important to point out that revolutions are not single events, rather they are processes, more precisely, revolutions are complex processes where “the central power of the society loses the ability to apply its laws on a major part of the population or the territory” (Милер 2002:371).

In the revolutions that are the result of many years of almost imperceptible deposition of their causes, the different involved groups, including the previous government, fiercely fight to establish themselves as a central authority. Revolutions seem to occur spontaneously, although they have deep internal and external roots.

The fight for power of the opposed sides is often manifested in a form of widespread civil war, quick coup or long guerilla war with terrible consequences, that is, with numerous human and material losses. However, in terms of polemology, there is a delamination between revolutions and occurrences such as riots, rebellions, coups d'état etc.

One of the essential objectives of the opposed sides is the creation of new political, and often new economic institutions, in order to replace the old ones in the function of “radical reconstruction of the social and economic relations.”

---

<sup>3</sup> When the Bastille prison fell on July 14, 1789 and the King Louis XVI exclaimed “Why, this is a revolt!”, the Duke de la Rochefoucauld Liancourt replied, “No, Sire, it is a revolution.”

Using the metaphor of the revolution as a disease, Brinton expressed this viewpoint in a very picturesque manner: "We would refer to revolution as a type of fever... In the society, approximately during a generation before the outbreak of the revolution, that is, in the old regimen, signs of the upcoming disease can be found."

Strictly speaking, these signs do not represent the symptoms entirely, because when the symptoms are fully developed, the disease is already here. It is better to describe these signs as previous signs, hints for the percipient diagnostician that the disease is on its way, however that it still has not gained ground to be a disease. Then comes a period when symptoms are manifested almost in their entirety and when we can say that the revolutionary fever has started. The disease does not have proper course, rather, through progress and stoppage, it comes to the most critical condition, which is often accompanied by delirium, the rule of the strongest revolutionaries, rule of terror. The crisis is followed by a period of appeasement, accompanied by default by occasional return of the fever. In the end, the fever is gone and the patient recovers, maybe strengthened with an experience in some regard, immune to a similar attack, at least for a while, however, certainly not transformed into a new man" (Brinton, 1965:16-17).

The three typical aspects of revolution – the collapse of the state, the competition among the aspirants for central power and the creation of new institutions do not emerge in clearly separated stages and in consistent order. Also, it is difficult to reveal the beginning and the end of revolutions, while history also knows about periods of revolutionary situations that did not end with real revolutions. Each of the pointed aspects affects the others, however it is also affected by the other aspects of revolution.

"The collapse of the state which is a result of bankruptcy or a military collapse may lead to fight for the power between the opposed aspirants for power; this model happened in the English, French and Russian revolution. On the other hand, the competition for power and the building of alternative institutions may lead to collapse of the country. The competitors for the central power may start by organizing their followers and by creating new ones (parallel, author's note) institutions primarily of a small scale, in order to cause, and possibly reject the central power; the Chinese and Nicaraguan revolution followed this model. The collapse of the country, the competition for the central power and the building of new institutions thereby create revolution, as threads of a tapestry or as atoms in a molecule: it is an independent combination of parts that make an entirety" (Милер 2002:371).

The most prominent representatives of the sociology of revolutions (the period between the two World Wars), Lyford Edwards, George Petty and Crane Brinton, tried to determine specific regularities in the stages of revolution, that is, its typical cycle or the order of stages which is typical for the revolutionary process.

In addition, the three aspects of revolution “may emerge separately or in partial combinations: the collapse of the country without fight for the central power occurs in movements for secession, peasant uprisings and urban riots; the collapse of the country and the competition to build new institutions with no attempts emerges in the dynastic civil wars (such as the Wars of the Roses); the competition and the building of institutions occurs without the collapse of the country in coups and reformatory movements” (Милер 2002:371).

The essential differences between revolution and other types of political violence and forms of application of murderous force arise exactly from the inserted, previously presented combination of all three aspects.

From a political point of view, revolution is a phenomenon that contributes to an important change in the existing government and society. Still, not always, and not every political change is a revolution. For example, when after a specific coup the power is seized by a specific group of leaders and in a situation when the country or the society are less affected by that action (act), revolution does not happen, that is, the government that came to power in this way, cannot be called a revolutionary government.

Revolutions are violent by nature, however the politically motivated violence is not the same as revolution. Although such type of violence may be used as an asset for achieving revolutionary objectives, it can also represent a manifestation of the social dissatisfaction (strikes, riots and demonstrations) or governmental fear and insecurity (persecutions, “disappearances” of people and raids directed towards the suppression of the activities of the opposition). According to these conclusions, all revolutions (excluding the new instant revolutions – velvet, pink, orange, “log”, “bulldozer”, “Arab Spring “ etc.) are violent, however not all violence is revolutionary.

Before 1789, the word revolution had the meaning that was closer to its literal meaning “returning to the previous condition of things.” A new meaning of the term appeared with the French revolution, that is, the new modern meaning of the term “revolution” took the position of its previous meaning – terminological determination.

Instead of representing themselves as advocates that remove the temporary estrangement and the “ones” who return the traditional order (“return to the previous – initial state of things”), the leaders of the French revolution wanted to discredit the entire regime and to create – to begin a new era of political and social revolutions that would imply the beginning of a new time.

Since the beginning of the French revolution in 1789, the idea of “revolution” gained modern and essentially different context that its previous one. The new idea about the “revolution” started to imply not only opposition to tyranny, but also the establishment of a completely new organization of the society whereby the process of creation of a new time – new epoch would begin. The French revolution was essentially a bourgeois revolution that opened the problems of the fall and the replacement of older forms of social organization.

This attitude would become dominant in the opinions of the two most influential thinkers of the revolution of the nineteenth century – Marx and Tocqueville.

An idea was promoted in this period that the revolution is a required agent for change and that such change leads to increased freedom, whereby it arises that revolutions are progressive and useful. “If Marx inspired tradition that observes revolution as progressive and useful – “locomotive of history”, Tocqueville inspired circumspection, noting that revolution often strengthens the power of the country instead of weakening it”.

In the subsequent revolutionary practice, the circumspection that was inspired by Tocqueville was proven as very justified because “the revolutionary countries” – the revolutionary regimes sometimes became furious, they escaped social control and they produced huge waves of uncontrolled “revolutionary violence”.

Repeating Tocqueville’s pessimism, Weber feared that history leads to growth of an irreplaceable and non-destructive bureaucratic state that would place individuals in an “iron cage” of the bureaucratic rule.

In this regard, Freud indicates an interesting assertion according to which the revolutionary crowds act irrationally, looking for feelings of powerlessness and dissatisfaction for being attached to a leader and following him wherever he leads them. Also, Le Bon specifically dealt with the violence of the revolutionary crowds and ascribed the violence to the mass disorientation and irrationality.

The most prominent representatives of the sociology of revolutions - Lyford Edwards, George Petty and Crane Brinton tried to determine specific regularities in the stages through which revolutions pass, that is, to determine the issues of periodization, the stages and the dynamics of the revolutionary process. These authors tried to prove that these stages are “natural” for every revolution.

Unlike Brinton who used the metaphor of revolution as a disease, a type of fever, in a quite picturesque manner, Edwards points out the viewpoint that every revolution begins with denial (retraction) of the loyalty of intellectuals to the old regime and the transfer of this loyalty to the new type of society which is yet to be established. The very revolution represents a form of reintegration of the society that is not characterized by weakening, rather by gradual strengthening of the government. The fall of the old regime leads to increased movement, to a short-term period of spreading of optimism, to reduction of the number of conventional forms of offences. In this period, the radicals stand out within the lines of the revolutionaries, which thanks to their unity and commitment to the ideals, acquire control over the government and ruling forcibly, they achieve the goals set. This is followed by the famous period of terror where the lives of people become an insignificant item in the efforts to create a new type of society and government. Finally, because human nature is not in position to stand the intensiveness of this period, another return to the normal state occurs, often under the same rulers as before the revolution.

Although both Brinton and Petty developed a similar “scenario” by the example of the French revolution, still they were more careful in the indication of the differences between the French form and the experiences of the English, American and Russian revolutions. In this regard, it is important to point out that neither in the English, nor in the American Revolution major changes in the class structure of the society did occur, same as the English revolution was not preceded by a “desertion” of the intellectuals, neither had it led to rule of terror. Also, the American Revolution does not denote a victory of the final current, nor terror, Thermidor or the occurrence of a dictator who establishes order.

Although Brinton, Edwards and Petty tried, with certain success, to develop “the natural history of revolutions”, which indicated consequential sequences of events, it was confirmed that every revolution, despite the specific “regularities” that it inevitably and historically follows, still is a “story of itself” with numerous specifics, with a separate genesis, that is, separate roots of its occurrence and manifestation. However, in their study they said very little about the reasons why revolutions occur, that is, what are the essential reasons for their continuous occurrence throughout history. Their merit is that they indicated that the term revolution can be determined only by mediation of the term of great revolutions, that is, through the fundamental changes in the structure, political order and values of a society.

Unlike their followers, they indicated that they deal only with great revolutions, and not the occurrences that remind of revolution only after some peripheral distinctions (rebellions, riots, coups etc.).

## **2. The differences and the relation between military onlicts and revolution**

In this regard, a question inevitably arises about the difference between war (but also the other forms of mass application of armed violence) and the revolution. The answer is relatively simple and precise – in no case we can equalize war and other armed conflicts with revolution. Even when revolution is characterized by mass application of armed violence, it is never only a war (or other form of armed conflict). The revolution is a transition or an attempt for a transition from one social quality to another (radically different social quality) – a total negation of the old social order. It is its social determination that is primary and essential in the explanation of revolution. Only with the explanation of the armed phenomenon of revolution as a war, the precise and complex explanation of revolution will be impossible. In the history of revolutions there are situations (the Yugoslav revolution) when simultaneously a war (anti-fascist) and revolution (socialistic) take place, while the Vietnamese revolution was anti-feudal, anti-colonial, anti-imperialist and socialist.

As it is known in history (especially in recent contemporary history), the identification of war with revolution represented a theoretical basis for the

established practice of imposing or “keeping” of the revolution by means of external (interstate) war or military intervention. It was expressed before and during the period of the Cold War, when there were attempts for the “export” of the revolution of the “bayonets of the Red army” – a historical mistake that would be expensively paid by the USSR, the Warsaw Pact and “socialism as a world process”, that is, socialism according to the Soviet model. If in the past there were attempts to make nations happy with a revolution through the “bayonets of the armed forces”, that is, through the “revolutionary guards of socialism”, today there is a new practice of realization – imposing of democratic (counter) revolutions in the countries with “disobedient” and “non-democratic regimes” with much more sophisticated and more subtle “non-violent” methods, and sometimes on the wings of the “democratic” tomahawks (Tomahawk missiles) or by applying the “humane” depleted uranium. “The revolutionary history” repeats, only the methods of its realization change – keep step with the challenges and the achievements of the new times.

According to the words of Mao Zedong, a revolution represents “leveling of accounts”, it grows as a war and it is ended as a battle. “A revolution is not a gala dinner, it is not a literary work, nor a drawing or an embroidery; it cannot be realized with so much elegance, tranquility and delicacy or with so much gentleness, kindness, courtesy, reservedness and soulfulness. The revolution is an uprising, an act of violence whereby one class is eliminated by another class.” (Rapport sur l’enquête menée dans la Hounan 1927)

The connection between war and revolution announces the first axiom of Clausewitz, which from the maximal strain of forces, makes the method of every “final fight”, they will be joined when the essence of the war will be disclosed in the second axiom – the primate of defense.

In the analyses about the separation of revolutions, from the *Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics*, we will also present the distinction between political and social revolutions. “The political revolution leads to changes of the character and the state power, as well as to changes of the very statesmen. It lasts as long as the monopoly of control and force of the old power are not destroyed, and until the new hegemonic group does not establish new state power. It may cause counter-revolution, and sometimes even restoration” (Маклин 2002:307).

Social revolutions, which are much rarer, have been defined in the same dictionary as revolutions where “political and social transformations occur, class fight and pressure for radical changes from below. This mobilization can also be manipulated by other actors in order to achieve their goals that may be contrary to the goals of the public masses. The inclusion of social transformations depends on the intensity of the class fight, the nature of the class order, the strategy, the organization, the leadership of the revolutionary forces and the sustainability of the ones in power.” (Маклин 2002:307)

According to the study of Karl Marx, who refers to revolutions as “locomotives of history”, the intensification of class conflicts inevitably leads to the so called “epoch of social revolution.” Marx also considered that major part

of the social revolutions will be violent, with a specific reserve – an opportunity for peaceful transition in several mature democratic countries (Great Britain, USA).

On the basis of the study of Johnson, who tried to examine and systematize the causes of the revolution, we will also present his typology of revolution (Johnson, 1964). In his typology of revolutions, Johnson takes four measures as a point of departure:

- the objectives of the revolutionary activity (the government, the regime, the society);
- the identity of the revolutionaries (masses, elites, both);
- the objectives of the revolutionary ideology (reformist, nationalist, eschatological etc.) and in the end
- the answer to the question whether the revolution has spontaneous character or whether it presents a calculated matter.

On the basis of these measures, Johnson considers that there are six types of revolutions:

- **jacquerie**, a spontaneous peasant rebellion that does not deny the legitimacy of the regimens and delivers his demands to the traditional authorities;
- **millienaristic rebelling** that may be encouraged by the same type of dissatisfaction as the jacquerie, which, however, is directed towards a completely new order and rests on the “aid” of the supernatural forces (the Savonarolan rebellion in Florence – 1494 and the Anabaptist rebellion in Munster 1533-1535);
- **Anarchist rebellion** that represents a reaction against the change or the modernization and strives the reestablishment of an idealized order (Vendee);
- **the Jacobin communist revolution** which is characterized by fundamental social change and discontinuity in social development (the French and the Russian revolutions);
- **conspiratorial coup**, based on the action of the narrow elite imbued by oligarchic and sectarian ideology that encourages social changes in a violent way (the revolutions in Egypt and Cuba), and
- **military mass rebellion**, that is, Guerilla war which is typical of the 20<sup>th</sup> century wherewith specific elite is led, inspired by an ideology that connects the elements of nationalism and the Marxist viewpoint of the world.

Johnson’s typology of revolutions implies two more things. Primarily, specific revolutions can have specific characteristics – specifics that do not belong to only one type of revolution. Second, in the background of this developed typology of revolutions there is a more profound separation into



different types of revolutionary transformations in two basic forms: a rebellion and a revolution in the narrow sense of the word (Johnson 1966:135-149).

On the basis of all previously presented information about the types of revolutions, as well as the basic criteria of their classification, we can conclude that the best would be to distinguish the revolution primarily in comparison with all social occurrences, and particularly the ones that are similar, rather than determining the differences of the differences of the different types of revolutions (which are numerous, contradictive, and sometimes even quite inaccurate). What is most relevant for this issue is to learn what is revolution, its essence, its roots, causes and consequences, and then everything else, which implies that the existing differences between revolutions will be treated as methodological, ideological or geographical varieties of, basically, one and only type of occurrences, an only relevant social phenomenon in different historical contexts).

### **3. Revolutions in the future – the future of revolution**

In the history and theory of revolutions, there are essentially two basic revolutionary traditions, the American and the French one. The American Revolution was a limited revolution with limited goals (according to numerous authors – an important prerequisite and factor for its success). The leaders of the French revolution, unlike the more realistic duplicate, perceived the Revolution no differently than a radical and complete change of the social, political and moral structure of their own country.

From political point of view, the revolution includes an important change of the national government. Such changes became everyday occurrences in many parts of the world during the modern era.

The question (questions) whether the revolution is desired or not, was had instigated a fierce debate until the late 17<sup>th</sup> century when Edmund Burke pointed out the dangers related to revolution and when Thomas Paine pointed out its contributions. Prior to this, John Locke had a more modern attitude: in his opinion, revolution is necessary and justified when the government is becoming oppressive.

“After we started to have huge, political dreams – it seems that we experience disappointments. The French Revolution encouraged the reactions of millions of people and admired all the people who participated in this Revolution. It seemed as if a new era was dawning”.

Soon later, one of its earliest fans, William Wordsworth, wrote a bitter deplorable song, the Preludium, due to the enormous damage that the revolution left behind. The Russian Revolution, which started as “the ten days that shook the world”, for many, a generation later, became God who failed.

This story, so clear about the leaders of the French and the Russian revolutions, endlessly repeated during some other political events that we call

“revolutions of the contemporary world” (Волерстин 2002: 9). However, despite all these contradictions and dilemmas, revolutions were and remain still an important element in the history of the modern world system because important parameters were changed in the manners how the world system developed as an entirety.

After the greatest French and Russian revolutions, we can discover some huge changes in the geoculture of the world system that are a consequence of the two large revolutions, changes that reflected in the secular trends of the world system as an entirety. “And this is also true, even if it is said that revolutions have “failed” – in the sense that revolutionary governments (and the governments that came immediately after them, and who claimed, or were considered that they are their successors), were ruined by counter-revolution” (Волерстин, 2002:17-18).

In the end, one essential question simply imposes: “Are revolutions probable or inevitable in future?” However, before we answer this important question, it is necessary to answer another question – “Will the people in power voluntarily delegate their privileges?” The answer is no, of course. They never did. According to Immanuel Wallerstein, sometimes they may assign part of the privileges, but only to keep most of the privileges to themselves. “The people in power in the contemporary world were never as rich and powerful so far. And the people who do not have any power (or at least a majority of them), never felt so bad. Polarization is more expressed than ever before, which means that the noble denial of privileges is the most probable outcome” (Волерстин 2002:94).

In this regard, as an answer (quite an acceptable one), Wallerstein provides an answer (conclusion) according to which ... “during the period of fifty years, a new order would emerge, which would be formed as a function of everything that will be done within this internal – by the ones in power in this current system – or by the ones who do not have powers.”

Today, when revolutions, that is, the conducting of revolutions, is hindered to a great extent, practically almost impossible, the resultant of these “blockages” naturally transforms into a total prevention of the historical maturation of some peoples. Their organization on the principles of freedom and democracy as they desire (in accordance with all their historical and cultural particularities) is permanently hindered, however it is not fully extinguished. If the revolution is being increasingly prevented and held down in all possible ways and by applying all modern technologies, it is becoming increasingly essential and vital. However, for the people and the individuals who are cramped by the “grips of modern givers” – who obviously hold them down even more, the air is becoming most necessary. Their eyes are most probably eternally directed towards the sun, towards the air and towards freedom, and revolutions will become increasingly necessary, predictable and inevitable in the new constellation of historical and civilizational relations.

#### 4. Conclusion

In the light of these “strange” conclusions about the “phenomenon called revolution” at the beginning of the twenty first century, Machiavelli’s attitudes quite correctly resound, and who observed revolution in a pragmatic way, as a risk that was rightly incurred by rulers if they were weak and tyrants. He advised that they can keep their power if they avoid fatal combinations of mistakes.

Its majesty - revolution will continue to encourage all people who hope to realize some essentially more rational, more righteous and better world than the one where we live in now. The demands for moral and righteous equality for all people, as well as the demands for freedom are and will be eternal, same as the revolutions, which will remain eternal as long as their twin – domination lasts.

Or, more precisely, the new types of revolutions knock on the doors of modern civilization. The central revolutionary demand of all epochs: complete and free self-management, that is, definitive abolishment of all forms of socially regulated and supported domination, still resonates in the words (the message) of Marx expressed in the Communist Manifesto – “The free development of every individual is a precondition for the free development of all. Revolution – revolutions as a response to all injustice – a product of modern societies, regardless of the assets that would be realized, will remain current until the essential determination of the human is performed. All revolutions in history are initiated with only one goal, which is exactly the essential determination of the human, and which will continue to be realized until it is fully affirmed. It is the certainty that every power is unjust, because no power created the life of any human. As long as this “certainty” exists, as long as there is injustice, exploitation and domination, until then we would have „Revolutio – ante portas”!!!!!!

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Brinton, C. 1965. *The Anatomy of Revolution, revised and expanded edition*. New York: Randon House.
- Johnson, Ch. 1964. *Revolution and the Social System*. Stanford: The Hoover Institutin, Stanford University.
- Johnson, Ch. 1966. *Revolutionary Change*. Boston: Little and Company Brown.
- Волерстин, И. 2002. *Ушйойисшйичка или Исшйорискише избори на 21-иошй век*. Скопје: ТЕМПЛУМ.
- Маклин, М. 2002. *Концизен оксфордски речник за шйолийшйика*. Скопје:МИ - АН.
- Милер, Д. 2002. *Блеквелова енциклопедшйа на шйолийшйичкашйа мисла*. Скопје: МИ-АН.

## РЕВОЛУЦИИТЕ ОД ИДНИНАТА – ИДНИНАТА НА РЕВОЛУЦИИТЕ

**Митко КОТОВЧЕВСКИ**  
**Благица КОТОВЧЕВСКА**

*Апстракт:* Трудот *Револуциите од иднината – иднината на револуциите* ќе презентира комплексна теоретска структура, ќе ги истражи револуциите однатре и ќе ги покаже своите форми и методи за оперирање со конечните цели на „радикалната реконструкција на општествените и економските односи“. Анализата ќе ги компарира претходните искуства од револуциите со цел да докаже дека сите револуции (со исклучок на новите инстант револуции – кадифена, портокалова, „багер“, „чадор“, итн.) се насилни, но не секое насилство е револуционерно. Паралелно со оваа цел ќе бидат презентирани комплексните причини за револуциите, особено анализата за новите гледишта за причините за револуции (анализа на сите суштински фактори за појавата на револуциите). За целосно расветлување на феноменот револуција ќе ги презентираме учењата на најзначајните научници и теоретичари за општествените процеси и револуционерните ситуации, типовите на политичко насилство и формите на примена на убиствена сила во општеството. Во овој контекст, новиот бран на „револуционерни теории“ – теории за револуциите, типови (варијанти) на револуции и, за прв пат, социолошкиот и полемолошкиот аспект (аспектот на воената социологија) ќе бидат презентирани и одредени сите типови форми на примена на убиствена сила, или „рангирање“ на „крвавите патишта за остварување на целите на револуцијата“. За целите на оваа студија значајно е да се одвои дел за конфликтологијата и да се споредат разликите помеѓу воениот конфликт и револуцијата. Анализата ќе биде комплетирана со презентирањето на целосна слика за современите трендови и предвидувања за револуциите во иднината, попрецизно, иднината на револуциите во длабоко несигурен и конфликтен свет. За целосно да се комплетира сликата за „новата“ револуција, неизбежно е да се одвои краток, но значаен дел за новиот тренд – контрареволуцијата на цивилизациско ниво – современа и модерна опасност со сериозни последици за глобалната безбедност.

*Клучни зборови:* револуција, конфликт, глобална безбедност, општество.