A Comparison of the Egyptian Revolutions of 1952 and 2011

A Comparison of the Egyptian Revolutions of 1952 and 2011

By

Muhammet Musa Budak

A Comparison of the Egyptian Revolutions of 1952 and 2011

By Muhammet Musa Budak

This book first published 2022

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

The states which were structured in the Middle East after World War I, especially by Western powers' intervention, have not met the basic necessities people expect from their governments. Demands such as equality before laws, the economic means to live with dignity, and the right to political participation received no response from governments. Such demands for rights came in different forms, like revolutions with wide social support, military coups or power struggles amongst the ruling elites.

In this regard during the 1950s there were revolutions and military coups in many middle eastern countries, especially in Egypt which was a pioneer throughout the region. The aforementioned demands were the main motivation of these social events. But generally they were led by minor social segments with Arab nationalistic and socialist motives and did not meet people's expectations in the end. Initially, Western powers were very reluctant to approach these revolutionary regimes, then an interest-based cooperation was established. At the beginning of the last decade, people's demands for basic rights and freedoms in the region's countries increased without any or with only minor responses from governments, making it an insufferable era. This situation championed social pressures for change. "Revolutions" in the region and their outcomes again questioned whether progress or deterioration would be achieved, like the outcomes of the 1950s revolts. In this book, the revolutions in these two different time periods will be comparatively examined and the reasons for social revolt underlined. Egypt has been chosen as a case study, despite many countries in the region having gone through similar processes, as it is the most populated and holds a great deal of influence in the region as whole.

This book was prepared based on my PhD dissertation which I submitted at Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University in Turkey. After an intensive period of several years, 2013 to 2018 was a time of intense learning for me, not only in the scientific arena, but also on a personal level. I would like to reflect on the people who supported and helped me so much throughout this period.

Firstly, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor Prof. Mustafa Sıtkı Bilgin for the continuous support of my PhD study and related research; for his patience, motivation, and immense knowledge. Besides my

INTRODUCTION

The 2011 Arab uprisings across the Arab world directed the attention of the international community to the Middle East once again. Millions of people took to the streets to demonstrate against their autocratic regimes. This was an important indication of the Arab people's desire for change, along with an opportunity to restore their dignity. Although over time these movements weakened, they brought back discussions of politics, the economy, social organisms and civil-militia relations. To understand this phenomenon, various theories, including revolutionary ones started to be discussed.

"The Arab uprisings" were not only significant for the Arab world, but regional and international actors with investment in the region also carefully followed their developments. As expected, with the ousting of the autocratic leader of Tunisia, Ben Ali (after a 23-year reign), and the influence of the mass demonstrations, fundamental changes across the region occurred (Rose, 2011). This ousting of an Arab leader in Tunisia through mass uprisings triggered opposition movements in other Arab countries, alongside an increasing expectation that the fundamental changes that occurred in Tunisia could be repeated. With this growing sentiment in the region, the events that took place in Tunisia were repeated in countries such as Egypt, Yemen, Libya, and Syria.

Egypt is distinguished from these other countries because of its lead character in the Arab world and its significant role in international politics (Hamid, 2011). Due to Egypt's history, its social and military structure, its long-standing close diplomatic affairs with the West (particularly the United States), and the concerns of Western and regional countries regarding the potential dangers arising with new governance, the anti-Mubarak protests that started in Egypt on January 25, 2011 attracted significant curiosity at a global level (Mudge, 2011).

World leaders and the media followed the demonstration by hundreds of thousands of people at Tahrir Square cautiously. The future of Egypt and whether Hosni Mubarak – the oppressive ruler of Egypt for over 30 years – backed by the army and the US would be ousted, as in the case of Ben Ali of Tunisia, was perceived as a salient debate on the agenda of world leaders and by the public. As the initial debates on Mubarak's future were being

intensified, the end of the US support and the Egyptian army's stance towards the establishment resulted in the toppling of the Mubarak regime. However, the toppling of the Egyptian regime and the change of power in Egypt is not similar to the Tunisian case as the significance and impact of a power change in Egypt is much more concerning and important.

There are various reasons as to why the events in Egypt were of greater concern for the region and the world. First of all, the large population of Egypt, with over 80 million people, makes it the most populous country of the Arab world. Furthermore, the historical background of Egypt, in terms of its political, military and cultural elements, has allowed Egypt to serve as the leader of the region. It has been argued that a democratic transition in Egypt after Mubarak would also greatly influence other Arab countries due to Egypt's leading role and soft power within the Arab states. Others have gone further to state that without Egypt, democratization in the Arab world is impossible (Hamid, 2011). Another important element to consider when examining Egypt is the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Egypt plays a vital role in the peaceful settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and provides stability in the Middle East. This is due to Egypt's (along with Jordan and Saudi Arabia's) close relationship with Israel and the US. The geographical location of Egypt makes it the pathway for Palestinians to connect with the rest of the world, bestowing Egypt with a key geostrategic importance as well.

Taking the salience of Egypt into consideration, it is imperative that the uprisings in Egypt should be examined, particularly concerning how they developed, their consequences on the country and the region, and their possible future trajectory. To understand the "Arab uprisings" it is critical to comprehend and analyze the important political waves in the region from the breakup of the Ottoman Empire to the present day. In order to better understand the uprisings, the Arab Revolutions of the 1950s and 1960s in the Middle East are valuable as objects of study as well. Such analyses could provide essential knowledge for our understanding of the "Arab uprisings" and their future direction.

The end of the Pax Ottamana by the First World War (1914-1918) created political turbulence in the Middle East, particularly impacting Arab countries (Şahin, 2011). A century since the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, the fragile political structures in the region continue to exist. Originally, the Arab leaders in the region assumed that they were going to gain full independence with the decisions taken at the 1919 Peace Conference and the 1920 San Remo Conference. The Arab Rebellion led by

nationalist leaders and backed by France and Britain against the Ottoman Empire did not produce the expected results. Therefore, the results of the first rebellion were not as the Arab leaders desired. It was in fact the initial stages of the construction of a new Middle East. As the political structures of the Middle East were reshaping, the Arabs were not able to achieve their independence.

The newly formed Arab states were either under the direct mandate of France or Britain, or under the control of other patronage states. France and Britain held power in the political structures of the region and did not only define and shape the boundaries of the physical borders of the area but also selected the governing elites of the region. The political order that was established in the Arab Middle East continued until the Second World War.

The transformations that occurred in the post-Second World War Middle East indicate the start of the second phase of major political changes for the region. The dominant post-World War One status quo started to dissolve during the 1940s and 1950s, culminating with the Arab Revolutions in the 1960s (Bradley, 2011). Through this process several monarchic regimes of the region collapsed and were replaced by republics (such as Egypt [in 1952] and Iraq [in 1958]) (Lenczowski, 1980).

To fully understand the developments in the region and particularly in Egypt it is important to study revolutionary theories. Since revolutions take place throughout a long and complex causal relationship, it is and has always been difficult to understand the causes of revolutions (Brinton, 1965). Numerous social scientists have examined cases around the world to explain revolutions and have utilized various data sets along with an examination of the conditions of the period to produce research methods to elucidate them. The development and expansion of technology, the transformation of power relations, economic innovations, global interactions, and social change have all played a role in different periods of revolutions around the world (Davies, 1962). The new revolutionary environments that emerged due to the conditions mentioned above necessitated new analysis according to the spirit of that particular period. Looking at the English Revolution, with its relatively weak communication networks; the role of the radio in the Filipino Revolution; or the limited transport facilities in the French Revolution or the Russian Revolution, where the railway was intensively used; all revolutions to a certain degree exert new and unique elements (Levine, 2013).

Focusing on the revolutionary context enables us to understand the causal processes that give rise to revolutions, which is ultimately more useful than concentrating on a fixed and deterministic point in history in the hopes of finding clues about the rise and fall of revolutionary factors. Furthermore, not taking into consideration the environment and spirit of the time means the examination is lacking in the structural causes of revolutions, such as the integration of a country into the world system and how it functions within this system (for example its reaction to the Structural Adjustment Policies [SAPs]) or the impact of the internal structure of the state and its role in international politics. Many theories of revolution also focus on economic conditions, social expectations, and demographic changes in a country. Tilly (1978) explains that, "The basic theory predicts action from interests. Some are assuming interests and dealing with the political processes which lead from organized and conflicting interests to revolution" (Tilly, 1978, p. 191). Revolution theories, then, provide us with an understanding of the phenomenon of revolutions – how they surface, their network links and their interactions. Such theories not only try to explain and understand the motivation of the actors rebelling but also to comprehend the timing and success of the revolutions themselves. Beining and Vairel (2011) add to this by emphasizing that the puzzle lies in understanding courage "in the absence of opening opportunities" for mass mobilization. Examining the processes as well as the outcome allows the researcher to include in their analysis the stories of the people involved in such events.

This book examines Egypt and the "1952 Nasser Revolution" as a case study, comparing it with the "Egyptian Revolution of 2011" to better understand them both. The central research questions this book attempts to answer are: What are the reasons for the social movements/revolutions that (re)occur in the Middle East? And what are the causes that have driven these movements? Furthermore, the study aims to explore the role of leaders and structures leading to the movements in 1952 and 2011. What are the similarities and differences between the two uprisings? This book realizes that, as in every revolution, the Egyptian revolutions also have characteristics according to the context of the time. Within this framework and in light of theories of revolution, similar mass mobilization occurrences in Egypt at different periods will be evaluated and compared. Although there are historical studies on such mass uprisings, a gap exists in the literature regarding comparisons between the events of 1952 and 2011. The two uprisings this book focuses on have previously been extensively studied by historians and regional experts. A large and rich literature exists for researchers to employ in an attempt to make a novel contribution based on

the previous accumulation of evidence. This is an ideal situation for the social scientist who will inevitably draw from secondary sources such as research monographs and collections already published by the relevant historical or cultural specialists. The comparative historian's task and the authorship of original scholarly work do not lie in revealing new data about large periods or diverse spaces surveyed in comparison, but – and this is where their value lies – in establishing the interest and prima facie validity of an overall argument regarding the causal regularities across various historical cases (Neuman, 2011, pp. 464-506).

It is not feasible nor realistic for a comparativist researcher to undertake primary research for each of the cases being examined, as this would entail an immense timeframe and require a diverse ray of skills. Instead, the comparativist must aim to examine and systematically investigate specialists' publications and works that deal with the particular case or issue with the theoretical logic of the comparativist method. It is the job of the comparativist to seek out and define works of specialists with an analytical and critical lens to figure out how such works fit into the originally envisioned project under study. Most importantly, throughout a comparativist analysis the researcher must be as systematic as possible when searching for information in all the cases involved, keeping in mind that the works of specialists will usually concentrate on various topics of the same issue. The work of the comparativist only becomes practicable after large amounts of primary research have been accumulated regarding the relevant topic(s) of investigation and the issue he/she is attempting to research and elucidate (Skocpol, 1979).

Within this framework, this book aims to examine the Egyptian Revolution of 2011 in light of its discussions on the basic tenets and characteristics of the revolution that took place in 1952. It is understood that the Egyptian revolutions, similar to other revolutions in the region, have their own defining characteristics and differ from their predecessors depending on the zeitgeist.

In this respect, the first chapter of this book will review the literature related to the theories and historical analysis that explain revolutions from a critical perspective. The assumptions and findings from theoretical discussions used in the study of previous revolutions will be highlighted and examined to see if the elements in these previous revolutions are congruent in the explanations of the revolutionary movements in Egypt. Having said that, it is important to keep in mind that although some similar elements – such as methods, procedures, actors and dynamics – may be seen, generally they

show variance according to the particular time and place of revolution. Due to these differences, an approach that may have explanatory power in one example may not be fit or functional in explaining another instance. This book employs such literature to develop a background for the creation of new theoretical contributions in the field of sociological revolution theories.

Through the course of the examination of the Egyptian revolutions, this book aims to understand the context, causes and processes that lead to revolutions and to contribute to revolution studies by identifying what elements and actors are influential throughout revolutionary processes. Although many analyses have been made regarding revolutions throughout history, an in-depth investigation of each revolution according to the conditions of their particular time and place is vital in order to understand civil uprisings, the ousting of governments, the transformation of ideologies, and the role of actors in revolutions. The Egyptian revolutions exemplify many new elements regarding how such events emerge, the instruments employed during them and the actors involved. Therefore, the study of the Egyptian revolutions becomes particularly salient for revolution studies because it exemplifies the relationship between internal and external actors and impacts in terms of socio-economic causes and the ideological foundations that motivate revolutions and social events. This book particularly tries to explore how appropriate it is to classify these social events in the category of "revolutions".

To understand the revolutionary process in Egypt, this book also benefits from explanations by theorists such as Theda Skocpol, Fred Halliday, Thomas H. Greene and Jack A. Goldstone who emphasize the structural elements in revolutions. The extensive works of John Foran (1997) on revolutions in third world countries will be employed in this book in making comparisons between the Egyptian cases and other similar examples.

Revolution studies and its contributions within the framework of international relations as a discipline will also be examined in this book. The significance of social revolution does not only apply at the national level but in certain instances gives rise to models and ideals of great international impact as well, especially when the transformed societies are deemed geopolitically important or are an actual or potential great power.

Proceeding the review of the literature on the sociological theories of revolutions and its evaluation considered through the lens of international relations, the book will move forward to examine the two uprisings in Egypt. By employing the insights gained from the theoretical approaches

and the historical analysis, it will continue in the next chapters by examining the elements behind the 1952 and 2011 revolutions through an analysis of the socio-economic causes, the attitudes of international actors through the revolutionary process, the dominant figures who carried out the revolutions, and the ideological motivations and foundations of the movements themselves. It will attempt to explain in detail how the revolutions unfolded by looking at the socio-economic reasons behind the revolutionary process in Egypt with a focus on the role of international actors, the social structures that gave rise to such movements, and the ideological foundations adopted by the leaders of the revolution. It is important to evaluate and examine this literature because it enables us to develop the building blocks required for the next section, in which the similarities and differences between the 1952 and the 2011 revolutions are examined.

The following (fourth) chapter will focus on an examination of the similarities and differences between the two revolutions to advance knowledge about Middle Eastern politics in general and sociological theories in particular. The goal is to employ social theories of revolutions to advance knowledge in the discipline of international relations by examining the two revolutions in Egypt. The 2011 Revolution in Egypt proved that a revolutionary takeover emerges when the constant exclusion of opponents from the political system through oppressive means is combined with chronic economic difficulties and widespread social injustice. Under the rule of Hosni Mubarak in Egypt, there were severe pressures on opposition groups and a growing income injustice which eventually led to the uprising of the social masses, culminating in all out rebellion. This point in the revolutionary process is explained by Antonio Gramsci as "the process of reviving the masses", one "initiated by removing the political passivity and [their] moving to the active position [by] expressing their demands in a collective way" (Gramsci, 1971, p. 210). In other words, the popular uprising that was mobilized as a constituent part of the revolution was initiated by a mass movement in a sudden and spontaneous manner containing groups from all segments of society – this exemplifies the traditional definition of a revolution as accepted in the literature (Telci, 2017). However, when looking at the Free Officers Revolution in 1952 we notice that the methods used and the leading figures are different from those of the uprisings in 2011, even though similar issues are shared between both.

The salience of including an analysis focused on Middle Eastern politics and international relations lies within the examination of the similarities and differences between the two periods – the main aim of this book – which can provide an insight into the future of Egypt and the region. The mere

realization that the revolutions have causal factors that are both internal and external (Halliday, 1990) makes an analysis within the framework of international relations an inevitable inclusion. The internal causes that emerge during the two periods show resemblances to one another; these include unstable political repression, the advent of economic problems, the reality of structural social injustice, the growth and persistence of pessimism amongst the youth, and corruption within the political system (Sowers & Toensing, 2012). In comparing the periods of 1952 and 2011 we see that the conflictual environment created by the global political structure and the international hegemonic powers are different but are assessed to be similar due to the similar imperial motives of the superpowers in both periods. In addition to the abovementioned direct factors that impact revolutions, the expansion of globalization and the increased interaction this has brought in the development of communications technologies has decreased the importance of physical space and brought the local and global close to each other. Although all these factors in some manner impact and shape the revolutions in both periods, the most significant difference between the 1952 and the 2011 revolutions lies in the cadres that dominate the revolutions and their differing ideological bases and influences.

CHAPTER ONE

REVOLUTION THEORIES AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The 2011 Arab uprising has led to the rethinking of topics within the social sciences, such as revolutions, social movements, revolts, military coups and forms of resistance. The phase of rethinking such concepts has also impacted and influenced theories of revolutions. During the initial stages of these mass mobilizations, the media was quick to label these movements under the umbrella category of the "Arab Spring" (Keating, 2011). In contrast to the preceding periods, the rethinking process of revolutions took into consideration the role of militaries, popular social movements, the politicization of youth and the proliferation of social media use by the public.

The Tunisian and Egyptian cases reveal the importance of developing theories regarding the revolutionary processes that can assist in our understanding of how revolutions emerge, the factors leading to demands for change socially and politically, the emergence and actions of actors and the driving ideologies behind such mass movements. These areas of study enable the researcher to better understand the rise, success/failure and outcome of these sorts of major social movements. They also help in the understanding of the political and social change that may or may not occur due to revolutions. More importantly, these factors and their study highlight the gaps in theories of revolutionary processes such as the lack of importance given to circumstances and conjunctures.

The goal of this chapter is to explore the analytical tools provided by theories of revolutions and to employ these tools to understand the Egyptian Revolutions of 1952 and 2011. This chapter underlines the utility in revolution theories, but also puts forth the need to develop new theorizing about these uprisings, both to add to the body of revolution theories and to better recognize the new elements of revolutions.

Revolution Theories

A review of the literature reveals a variety of definitions of the word revolution[1]. The word itself has its roots in Latin, in a term which was used in the field of astronomy for a very long time with no connection to its contemporary meaning. Since the 17th century, it has acquired its meaning of denoting upheavals in the political and social sphere. Therefore, naming any social event as a revolution also necessitates examining the sociological and political phenomenon of revolution as a concept (Kafkasyalı, 2011).

In terms of defining a revolution, many revolutionary theorists have proposed different definitions of their own. The defining characteristics of revolution involve the nature of violence during its timespan, the individuals and segments of society who carry out the revolution, and the duration the revolutionaries hold onto power (Foran, 1997).

Another important characterization of revolutions or rebellions is the legitimacy crisis in society that provides an initial foundation for them. Although sociologically revolutions naturally point to a legitimacy crisis in society, their definition in contrast defines revolutions as a "non-constitutional overthrow of an established government" which "us[es] power in an unlawful way" (Johnson, 1982, pp. 88-118). During and proceeding revolutions, the established order no longer becomes legitimate in the eyes of the mass public, and therefore, a search for a new legitimate government and a constitutional arrangement is sought after. This process causes conflicting goals amongst the established power holders (who want the status quo to continue) and the revolutionary forces (who try to breakdown the existing power structure to replace it with a new one). This conflicting era is normally seen in the pre-revolutionary period – typically described as a revolution pretext or condition: it is a time in which an established order of power (a state) and a revolutionary power force coexist (Güngör, 2007).

---

[1] For different definitions and discussions about "Revolution" see Goldstone, J. A. & Useem, B. (1999). 'Prison Riots as Microrevolutions: An Extension of State-Centered Theories of Revolution', *American Journal of Sociology*, 985-1029. Halliday, F. (1990). 'The Sixth Great Power: On the Study of Revolution and International Relations', *Review of International Studies*, 207-221. Stinchcombe, A. L. (1999). 'Ending revolutions and building new governments', *Annual Review of Political Science*, 49-73. Schock, K. (2005). *Unarmed insurrections: People power movements in nondemocracies*, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press. Tilly, C. (2006). *Regimes and Repertoires*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

The conceptualization and definition of revolution in western sources and linguistic terms correspond to specific areas. For example, according to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2017), revolution refers to a "fundamental change in political organization; especially: the overthrow or renunciation of one government or ruler and the substitution of another by the governed" or an "activity or movement designed to affect fundamental changes in the socioeconomic situation". The Oxford English Dictionary defines revolution as, "A forcible overthrow of a government or social order, in favour of a new system". The Cambridge Dictionary further defines it as a "change in the way a country is governed, usually to a different political system and often using violence or war". Looking at the definitions of revolution from western sources exemplifies how it is viewed by the West as a means to a radical change which occurs in the political and social arena in a violent way. The reason for such a definition in the West is understandable as the early revolutionary movements were mostly experienced in the western world and often violently (Kafkasyalı, 2011).

The modern forms of revolutions, especially the first examples experienced within Western political structures, also started to be experienced in eastern societies in the 20th century. The initial history of revolutions in the West dates to the Dutch Uprising of 1566. This event can be classified as the beginning of revolutionary movements. It had all the defining elements: economic crisis, social tensions, revolutionary alliances and the role of the clergy – all elements that were also visible in the revolutionary movements in the following years. The revolutionary tradition in the West continued during the proceeding periods with the British Revolution of 1649, the American Revolution of 1763-91, the French Revolution in 1789-99, the 1848 Revolutions, and the Russian Bolshevik Revolutions of 1917. Examining and exploring these revolutions throughout the 20th century, sociologists, historians, psychologists, political scientists and international relations researchers have developed in-depth analyses and a sizeable body of literature in this area of study. Researchers have tried to pinpoint what it is about revolutions that are unique in comparison to other forms of political and social change. Most commonly the answer to this question involves the act of violence that accompanies change, as well as the rapidness and the intensity and depth of change brought forth by revolutionary uprisings (Tilly, Giugni, & McAdam, 1999).

Research and studies on revolutions/social movements/uprisings are more in line with historical analysis and explanations due to their complexity and context-specific elements. These studies generally examine social factors that contribute to regime change which is usually carried out utilizing

violence (Foran, 1997; Skocpol, 1994; Tilly, Giugni, & McAdam, 1999). Some of the most discussed issues (Zorlu, 2016) have been: group formations within these mobilizations (Sotirakopoulos & Sotiropoulos, 2013), policing responses of power (Grinberg, 2014), "collective identity creation" in the squares (Castells, 2012), "direct democracy practices" (Dhaliwal, 2012), "democracy from below" (Porta, 2014), the interconnectedness of global struggles (Sotirakopoulos & Sotiropoulos, 2013), and economic prosperity and regime support (Magaloni & Wallace, 2008; Lynch, 2012).

Ted Robert Gurr (1971) identifies the basis of revolutions in his book *Why Men Rebel*. Gurr claims that the foundation of every revolution is its elements of "organized political violence". According to the political scientist Samuel Huntington (1986), revolution denotes "the changing of the values and myths of a society, political institutions, social structures and the administrators in a sudden, fundamental and violent way". Huntington in defining revolutions emphasizes, as with Gurr, the word "violent". The sudden change of the social and political structure of a society with a movement from the base need not inevitably be violent, however. Revolutionary historian Charles Tilly (2006) defines revolution as, "the supremacy of the group that is supported by a significant segment of the society in the struggle of the two different groups who are struggling to seize the government of the state". Python Sorokin (1925), taking a psychoanalytic approach shows that when pressure on the administration becomes unbearable people try to carry out a revolution and this is the primary cause of revolutions. Sorokin argues that a revolution may take place as a result of both psychological and physical constraints on individuals and the public; these include freedom, hunger, poverty and other forms of economic strains which have negative effects on a broad segment of the society but do not necessarily include all of society (Telci, 2017).

The traditional definition of social revolutions to which the French, Russian and Chinese mass movements adhere to, as defined by Skocpol (1994), is the following: "Social revolutions are rapid, basic transformations of a society's state and class structures; and they are accompanied and in part carried through by class-based revolts from below". Within this framework, a theoretical debate emerges as to who the actors of these radical changes are and to what extent they matter in our characterization of events as a 'revolution'. This aspect of our theoretical deliberation might be the only one that is inspired by the region of study, particularly from the 1923 changes in Turkey and the 1952 Revolution in Egypt (along with similar events in Peru and Japan). Ellen Kay Trimberger (2003) argues that there may be two categories of revolutions, depending upon the actors and the

method(s) they employ to reach their aims. Trimberger further states that deep and radical transformations do not necessarily come from below and they do not have to involve acts of violence. Revolutions could also be carried out top-down through elites rather than the mass public – Turkey and Egypt are examples that can be grouped into this category of revolutions. Overall, Timberger found that "there cannot be a general theory of revolution (or social change) applicable to all societies at all times" (Akder, 2013).

Revolution studies in the social sciences developed through various kinds of approaches and traditions. It is this literature developed through the years and shaped according to the experiences of numerous revolutions that is being researched by prominent experts of revolutionary studies. The theories of revolution developed by researchers can be divided into three major groups or approaches.

Researchers such as George S. Pettee (1938) and Crane Brinton (1965) examined different revolutionary processes to try to find commonalities and similarities. The first type of approach involves a historical perspective where revolutions are compared through general typography to highlight the similarities between them. These descriptive studies (circa 1900 to 1940) aimed to identify and determine the impact of different revolutionary processes and the accompanying demographic and social change during the distinct stages of the revolution.

In a contrary fashion, disregarding the processes entirely, the second approach (circa 1940 to 1975) aimed to explain revolutions through an investigation of the degree of social strain in each society. This approach is structural and as such emphasizes the structural elements of the revolutionary process. Writers such as Chalmers Johnson (1982), Ted Robert Gurr (1971), Charles Tilly (1978) and S. N. Eisenstadt (1978) explain that sociological unrest, social injustice, conflict, and modernization are psychological processes that impact revolutions.

The novel situation and elements which emerged through the revolutions in Iran, the Philippines and some of the countries of Eastern Europe resulted in turn in actor-based analysis in revolutionary theory. From about 1975 onwards, this third tradition began to dominate the field, emphasizing holistic and comparative analysis intended to explain the causes as well as the diverse results of revolutions. The actors' explanations and perspectives suggested that revolutions are part of social movements which are themselves the products of human action, thereby emphasizing the need to

examine actors to fully understand revolutions. Skocpol (1979) has been the prominent figure articulating the views of the third generation of theories of revolution. In her opinion, regardless of the role of marginal elites throughout the revolutionary process, the major factors that make revolutions possible are the structural and systemic variables of states and the international system. This approach views regime stability as the normal condition and any breach of this status quo because of conflict is understood to be an abnormal condition (Goldstone, 1980). Therefore, this theoretical approach aims to identify the factors and conditions that undermine the stability of the regime and the factors that lead to popular mobilization.

Nevertheless, Goldstone argued some 20 years later – and thus after numerous other revolutions – that Skocpol's argument was insufficient in explaining this social phenomenon adequately. Goldstone divided modern revolutions into two categories resembling the political versus social distinction, but took the argument beyond that to classify them as "the colour revolutions and the radicalizing revolutions". Colour revolutions refer to revolutions that occur in industrialized countries with relatively moderate economic disparity and are usually founded on a wide alliance which results in the change of political elites and regime type but not in radical social changes. Radical revolutions in contrast take place in societies with great economic disparity and gaps between the classes. These revolutions tend to be violent through their revolutionary processes and may include civil and international conflicts that further radicalize the actors and consequently lead to authoritarian structures and regimes (Goldstone, 2001).

Contingency theory assumes that society is in a state of peace as its normal condition. According to this theory, collective political violence and its radical form such as revolutions are not in the normal category of political competition. Thus, this train of thought adopts the idea that revolutions do not belong to normal social conditions and, furthermore, can be explained as accidents within the political and social structure (Güngör, 2007).

In direct opposition to contingency theory, inherency theory assumes that the political person is in a constant search for power not peace. The fundamental aim of individuals is to increase and maximize their influence and power over decisions. Hence, this theory suggests that collective violence is a natural reaction to conventional conditions. Both the relative deprivation theories of revolution and the system-level theories of revolution examine revolutions in the context of contingency.

Contingency theories of collective violence are based on the notion of systemic breakdown where the relatively stable interdependent elements of society at some point start to provide negative entropy or the dissolution of that order. Inherency theories claim that revolutions need to be seen as a continuum of revolutionary processes. The typical defining characteristic of inherency theory is that it depends on the conceptualization that revolutions occur when the conditions are met and mature. For inherency theory, the central problem takes place around what prevents extreme conflict as compared to contingency theory's consideration of what causes it (Bal, 2014).

Another argument is raised by McAdam et al. (2001) who claim that despite its important contributions, the general structural framework of the third-generation approach – in which structural weaknesses of regimes were considered the basic prompts of revolutions – lacked the provision of detailed analysis or did not provide significant weight to actors and to their roles, strategies and interactions with one another. Many scholarly works on revolutions then started to identify this theoretical deficit. Goldstone (2001, p. 139) highlights the requirement for the fourth generation of revolution theories to move away from stability as the departure point and give greater importance to the role of group identification, leadership, networks, coalitions, ideologies, foreign powers and elite interaction in the process of producing revolutions. As with Goldstone, and indeed around a similar time, McAdam et al. (2001) recognized and pointed to the need for a fourth generation of revolutionary theories as well.

Yet, McAdam et al. (2001) stated that even with the corrective contribution of the new approach towards a more cultural focus, which "grants more attention to the role of human agency and cultural construction in the emergence of revolution" (p. 194), this theory still did not avoid some of the similar drawbacks of the third-generation theories of revolution. Comparable to the third generation of scholarly work, the researchers who employed the novel approach concentrated too heavily on social revolutions and negated the analysis of the "transformative mechanisms that produce revolutionary outcomes out of revolutionary situations" (McAdam, Tarrow, & Tilly, 2001). Thus, these researchers ignored the elements mentioned by Goldstone (2001) as differentiating between successful social revolutions and failed ones and between social movements, rebellions and series of protests.

McAdam et al. noted that there is an inclination to mix revolutionary origins with revolutionary processes or trajectories (the course of action after a

revolutionary context rises) as a common weakness of the fourth-generation revolution theories. Although fourth-generation theory provided increased attention to agency, it failed to properly analyze the critical interactions and connections between agency and revolutions. To overcome these weaknesses of revolution theory, McAdam et al. (2001) articulated a more refined perspective termed 'contentious politics'. They contended that the concept of contentious politics is applicable to a wide spectrum of collective movements that are contentious in nature. These movements included revolutions, rebellions, nationalist movements and social movements. The concept is an exploratory model that seeks to identify mechanisms and processes in different episodes of contentious politics (Bal, 2014).

The categorization and classification of revolutions in the last three hundred and fifty years have led to the development of various theoretical approaches and paradigms. All these theories bring to bear new and different interpretations on the causes of revolutions, on their formation and development, and on their consequences. These theories can be placed into groups or sub-sections, including (Kafkasyalı, 2011):

- Natural history;
- Social system;
- Modernization;
- Player centred;
- Structural; and
- Marxist and relative deprivation theories

Each of the theories mentioned examines different factors of revolutions with varying perspectives and faces and evaluates them with a critical lens.

Marxist and Relative Deprivation Theories

According to Karl Marx – one of the most cited scholars in revolutionary studies – the revolutionary process takes place between the dialectical forces of the working class and the bourgeoisie. Marx further states that the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is intensified with the increase in the number of working-class individuals and this, Marx claimed, leads to class conflict. Marx argues that the seized rights of the working class in a capitalist economic order, where the proletariat are greatly disadvantaged, will lead to revolutionary movements through a political organization (Gurr, 1971). In this respect, the working class will rebel and try to overthrow the capitalist world system through their struggle with the bourgeoisie or the capitalist elites.

Marx further deepens his analysis by arguing that revolutions are likely to take place when the existing political and social systems and elites interfere with the economic structure and its development. Karl Marx traced such economic development through various stages from feudalism to capitalism to socialism and eventually to communism. As the means and modes of production change with the development of technology and economic changes in an industrialized capitalist society, a conflict develops between the new urban industrial working class and the ruling bourgeoisie class. Marx claims that the significance of labour will eventually supersede that of money or ownership of capital. While the bourgeoisie tries to maintain its control of the government and economy, the working class becomes frustrated and the growing levels of exploitation lead the working class to revolution. Following the working-class revolution is what Marx posited as the dictatorship of the proletariat which means the control of the government. Many different versions of Marxist theory developed over the years but they all postulated the need for a revolution at certain times in economic history (Defronzo, 2015).

The basic elements of Marx's theory can be identified easily but it is important to remember that the elements of Marxist theory are open to interpretation. Marx understood revolutions in terms of class-based social movements growing out of systemic and structural contradictions that develop historically and in a conflictual manner. For Marx, societies are defined by their mode of production or a combination of their socio-economic forces of production, class relations of private ownership and surplus accumulation. The relations of production are of the utmost importance. The generation of an emerging mode of production within the confines of an existing one (e.g., of capitalism within feudalism, of socialism within capitalism) creates a dynamic basis for the growth of the unity and consciousness of each proto-revolutionary class through ongoing struggles with the dominant class. Thus, leading up to the European bourgeois revolutions "the means of production and exchange, on whose foundation the bourgeoisie built itself up, were generated in feudal society" (Skocpol, 1979).

Revolution, according to Marx, is accomplished when the self-conscious class rises to become the revolutionary class. The revolutionary class, as could be the case with others as well, could have allies during the rise-up. For example, the working class may coalesce with the peasantry, however, these collaborations are not fully class conscious nor politically organized at the national level. Revolution in the Marxist sense, if successfully achieved would mark the transition from one mode of production to another,

which itself marks the transformation of the old order with that of the new social relations of production, new political and ideological forms, and ultimately the triumph of a new revolutionary class. Marx undoubtedly sees this as progression within society. He views revolutions then as founded on class-conflict, with the modes of production creating these conflicts ultimately transforming through revolutions one mode into another (Skocpol, 1979).

Inspired by the works of Marx and Tocqueville, Gurr and James Davies developed the theory of relative deprivation. The relative deprivation theory of revolutions also includes, unusually, collective violence. Gurr's theory (1971) of relative deprivation, revealed through his work within the framework of revolution theories, can be considered as follows: relative deprivation theory is a social psychology model that deems neither the relationship between leaders and followers nor the psychological characteristics of the leaders themselves as the source of revolutions. Rather, this theory concentrates on the establishment of a relationship between the expectations of people and what they receive. This sort of approach explains how groups react to structural and systemic conditions. More specifically it explains revolutions as the result of the collective expectations of a group, community or society and the frustration of not meeting those expectations as due to structural obstacles. It can be better explained by imagining how personal depression may lead to suicide while the collective anomie, depression or frustration of a community results in revolution. Sudden and great changes put people in positions they have never previously been exposed to which creates novel ideas in people and drives them into taking on new roles resulting in a collective shock effect. This shock effect, without proper integration and treatment, leads to chaos and social violence.

Relative deprivation is defined as the difference between the value expectations of the players and the value capacities. The emphasis here is on the role of poverty within a society. Relative deprivation theory explains revolutionary activity as the unfulfilled expectations of people which then cause frustration and consequently aggression. The revolutionary process from this perspective is seen to be focused on the rapid economic and social change that people experience. However, destructive relative deprivation happens at the breaking points defined as the J curve, which takes place when revolutions happen. The growing accumulation of reluctant violence is the environment in which revolutionary violence can emerge. But this accumulation is not a result of a natural flow. It means it is a development and a process; not an inevitability, but a possibility (Gurr, 1971).

Furthermore, relative deprivation theory suggests that revolutions are explosions of society caused by the elimination of peaceful politics under abnormal conditions. However, even when accepting this explanation for revolutions, the theory lacks in explaining their consequences. Due to the rigid focus of this theory on expectations and capacities, a revolutionary action is at all times in motion but without bringing forth an actual revolution. This entails that the theory is built on a probability factor and that revolutions are accidents.

Relative deprivation theory explains revolutionary phenomena as events that bring about a collapse of the system, unlike evolutionist approaches which claim changes arise as part of the normal functioning of a society within a system. The state of revolution is the collapse of the state of peace. To clarify further, it is the distribution of society that leads to the state of war. Gurr classifies revolutions into two categories: political violence and civil war (Güngör, 2007). Other theories try to explain revolutions by examining the psychology of the players involved, something we shall move onto now.

Player-Centred Revolution Theory

Player-centred revolution theory is based on an investigation of the psychological behaviour of the actors involved and attempts to seek answers to questions such as "Which type of individuals or groups tend to participate in a revolutionary act and what is their reason for doing so?" The player-centred approach breaks down the psychology of revolutionary behaviour into two levels of analysis. The first level is aimed at the revolutionary individual while the second level of analysis takes as its referent object the mass/group psychology (Güngör, 2007). The foundations of the player-centred revolutionary theory can be traced back to Freud's ideas. Freud finds that the structure character of all groups is based on the neurotic relationship between leaders and their followers.

Researchers have studied various revolutionary leaders within the framework of the first level of analysis (the revolutionary individual) and tried to identify common factors in the political-structural psyche of revolutionary leaders. For example, in a study of the biographies of revolutionaries such as Lenin, Trotsky and Gandhi, researchers found that all three leaders showed common psychological elements. The generalizations made to answer the questions of "how revolutionary personalities form" and "what type of people become revolutionary leaders and why" are not definite and convincing. However, the revolutionary leaders' father-son similarities and

common illnesses that both have experienced through their psychological development are cited, such as the Oedipus complex, though these explanations have been intensely criticized and rebutted (Gurr, 1976).

At the level of social psychology, which is the second level of analysis, individual or community expectations have been taken as the sources, and the fact that expectations have not been met is presented as the core source of revolutionary movements. Revolution is thought to be the result of the disappointment and aggressiveness that occur due to these unfulfilled expectations (Greene, 1990). In fact, Marx and Engels' theory of revolution was based on this. They claimed that the increasing misery of the industrial working class would eventually reach the point of despair and rebellion would become inevitable. Davies (1962) and Gurr (1971, 1976), who see the unfulfilled expectations of society as the most important reason in explaining revolution, have studied various revolutions, moving from the basis developed by "relative deprivation theory" which was inspired by Marx and Tocqueville (Kimmel, 1990). This model was applied to the 1776 American, 1789 French, and 1917 Russian revolutions successfully and revealed the relationship between revolution and poverty. However, this model, which was applied to the revolutions based on deprivations, was criticized for not being able to explain revolutionary processes as a whole (Kafkasyalı, 2011).

Natural History Theory

Natural history theorists (Edwards, 1927; Pettee, 1938; Brinton, 1965) believe that revolutions are continuous and varied. They have examined the 1640 British, 1776 American, 1789 French, and 1917 Russian revolutions to find that there are common processes that all revolutions must pass through. Natural historians advocate that: a) the basic features of the development of an appropriate environment for the emergence of a revolution; b) the realization of a revolution; and c) the new system to be born after the revolution are all the same, and the turning points between these three can be explained as follows:

> "1 - A society's intellectuals, most of whom once supported the existing regime, turn against it.
>
> 2 - The old regime tries to save itself from revolution by tempting reforms that ultimately fail to protect the old order.
>
> 3 - The revolutionary alliance that eventually takes power from the old government is soon torn by internal conflict.

4 - At first the post-revolutionary government is moderate.

5 - When moderate revolutionaries fail to fulfil expectations, more radical revolutionaries gain control.

6 - Radicals take more extreme actions to fulfil revolutionary aims, employing coercive methods against those who resist or threaten the fulfilment of revolutionary goals.

7 - Eventually pragmatic, moderate revolutionaries replace the radicals." (Goldstone, 1986, pp. 2-4)

Social System Theory / Functionality Theory

Social system or functionalist theory is based on the social structure of human society and emphasizes that the social structure is a system which operates in accordance with the needs of society. The social organization develops on its own and produces order and harmony within it; thus, situations of conflict, chaos and disorder are explained as expressions of anomalies (Kimmel, 1990). Revolutions from this perspective occur when the social system cannot meet the requirements of its participants and is incapable of providing them with their basic needs and tasks. The belief is that the social system is a functional system and revolution can only be brought by violence that breaks this structure. If changes within the social system are forced through violence then this is classified as a revolution; therefore, revolution here is considered a phenomenon that is brought forth with violence. Hence, revolution should be examined in light of the theory of radical change which states that it cannot be carried out without violence (Greene, 1990).

The systemic analysis of revolutions asserts that revolutions are based on two groupings of reasoning (Johnson, 1982). The first one is the pressure created by the unbalanced social system: a society must be built on changes for its continual existence. Within an unbalanced society, weaknesses of government can only directly contribute to the revolution. This means that the integration of the system is based on the application of force increased during a period of change. The second reasoning is based on what society should do with the talents of its legitimate leaders; if leaders are not able to develop policies that will keep the confidence of the (non-pervasive) actors within the system, then the loss of authority will follow (Kafkasyalı, 2011).

Once the authority is lost, the use of force by leaders will no longer be considered legitimate (Güngör, 2007). Whether or not leaders can successfully

use the army in order to prevent unrest within society could lead to the possibility of a third cause. Revolution is generally seen as an act of influence acceleration that deprives leaders of the use of their powerful weapon, the army. The uprising within the army which makes governments unable to use one of their most powerful instruments causes the escalation of revolutionary processes. Consequently, the social system / functionalist approach formulates the analysis of a revolution as follows: "Power weakness + Loss of authority + Accelerator = Revolution" (Johnson, 1982, p. 109).

According to the system theory, society is free from revolution as long as its culture (set of beliefs and attitudes) and its realities are in harmony. When a society is homeostatic in balance, it must continuously receive an animator from its members or from outside, an action which causes the necessary adjustments to the division of labour and cultural structure. When a system continues with its culture and its surroundings simultaneously, it continues to make necessary changes without the risk of revolution. Social systems that were once in equilibrium can move out of order in certain ways. Revolution in this sense refers in particular to the form of the changes that took place in France in 1789, Russia in 1917, and China in 1949. The only reason why revolutions erupted within these societies was that the non-revolutionary changes had already been unsuccessful; thus, revolution is not the same as ordinary social change but is a form of social change at the same time. The radical changes in the United States during the New Deal, the process of shifting Japan from a feudal society to a modern state, and the changes that the British government has undergone in response to industrialization were all achieved without revolutionary situations (Güngör, 2007).

Again, it is important to highlight that conflict and radical changes are not inherent components of a functioning social system. Therefore, conflict in all its forms, revolutionary or not, is seen as a problem that needs to be fixed or opposed. The emergence of modern revolutions is seen as an unprecedented or novel development and transformation, in contrast to natural or inevitable changes (Güngör, 2007).

The theory of social systems, also called the theory of extrema, views society as being in a state of peace. According to this approach, collective political violence and its extreme forms, such as revolutions, are not normal or natural decisions of political expression or competition. Therefore, from this train of thought revolutions do not belong to a normal social condition, rather they are an outburst of an abnormal condition. Hence, revolution is