

Journal of Peace, Development and Communication



Volume 05, Issue 03, Sep 2021
 pISSN: 2663-7898, eISSN: 2663-7901
 Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36968/JPDC-V05-I03-09>
 Homepage: <https://pdfpk.net/pdf/>
 Email: se.jpdc@pdfpk.net

Article:	Theoretical Interpretation of Revolutions, Evolution of Concepts and Diversity of Questions: Discussion on the perspectives of Marx, Tocqueville, Weber, Theda Skocpol and Ellen Kay Trimberger
Author(s):	Ihsan B F Idrees Department of International Relations, Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia
	Muhammad Saud Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social & Political Sciences, Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia
	Asia Ashfaq Department of Humanities & Social Sciences, Bahria University, Pakistan
Published:	30 th Sep 2021
Publisher Information:	Journal of Peace, Development and Communication (JPDC)
To Cite this Article:	Idrees, I, F, B., Saud, M., & Ashfaq, Asia. (2021). "Theoretical Interpretation of Revolutions, Evolution of Concepts and Diversity of Questions: Discussion on the perspectives of Marx, Tocqueville, Weber, Theda Skocpol and Ellen Kay Trimberger." <i>Journal of Peace, Development and Communication</i> , vol. 05, no. 03, 2021, pp. 126–137, https://doi.org/10.36968/JPDC-V05-I03-09
Author(s) Note:	Ihsan B F Idrees is serving at Department of International Relations, Universities Airlangga, Indonesia Email: ihsanidrees1@gmail.com
	Muhammad Saud(Corresponding Author) is serving at Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social & Political Sciences, Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia Email: muhhammad.saud@gmail.com

	<p>Asia Ashfaq is serving at Department of Humanities & Social Sciences, Bahria University, Pakistan</p>
--	--

Email: asia.ashfaq@hotmail.com

Abstract

Is the era of revolution is over? Thus only a long historical and theoretical concepts optic can shed light on the discussion of revolutions. This paper seeks to simplify some of the theoretical concepts of revolutions, the major approaches are the classical phase, Karl Marx, Tocqueville, and Max Weber, while challenge of modernization theorist are Huntington and Tilly. This paper formulise the evolution in these concepts from one era to another. In addition, it explained the reasons for the revolutions, as well as explaining the role of the actors, and trying to clarify the reasons that led to the diversity of theories such as structural Analysis by Theda Skocpol and Ellen Kay Trimberger. Furthermore, it is notable that the development of concepts of theoretical analysis depends on the key aspects, and on the focus in analyzing the role of different actors, as well as on linking the different roles of these actors and the reasons for the revolution. Of course, there are still many theories that attempt to explain the revolution and make it a social phenomenon linked to scientific and objective reasons.

Keywords: Theory; revolutions, concepts; classical phase, civilisation; approaches

1.1 Introduction

The revolution as a social, political, and even historical phenomenon also occupied a large part of theoretical interpretations in both political science, social science, economics and sometimes psychology and anthropology. Just as revolutions have evolved throughout history, theoretical concepts that attempt to explain the revolution in a specific time have also developed, and ultimately lead to a set of changes or consequences. Therefore, most political sociologists began in the recent period to differentiate between three phases to explain the phenomenon of the revolution, the phase of revolutionary origins, the practical steps of the revolutionary processes, and the consequences or results of the revolutionary outcome, and there are different theoretical tendencies trying to explain what happens in each of the three phases (Kimmel, 1987).

Perhaps the main difference between the various theoretical approaches is a difference in the questions asked and in determining the main actor in the events. There are theories concerned with questions such as when the revolution will take place, some theories questions about the ability to mobilize and lead the revolutionaries, and others focused on the structure of the state and the nature of the relationship between elites in order to provide answers to questions such as: How is the revolution based? Also, the identification of the actor or the actors usually varies depending on the scientific perspective, so we find sociology usually concerned with analysing the role of the individual and the role of collective entities in creating a state of change, while political science is concerned with focusing on the role and structure of the state and the role of elites and the nature of the relationship between some of them.

Since theories that explain the reasons for the revolution, its continuation, and the quality and nature of the transformations and the changes that occur after them, are many theories, it is difficult to put all this theoretical production in one study for several reasons. This article is trying to address a set of theories that represent the main trends in "revolution science" in a somewhat simpler way than the usual academic form of theoretical material. But it is important to realize that there are many theoretical approaches that the study will not address due to limited focused on theorist. The theories mentioned in this study are the most famous and most common in political science, sociology and political sociology.

1.2 The Classical phase (Marx, Tocqueville, and Max Weber)

Scientists in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were interested in studying the phenomenon of "revolution", and the model that was taken into account as a model of revolution at that time was the model of the French Revolution in 1789. Throughout the nineteenth century, the French Revolution remained the most influential model, event, and fame in Europe at the time, although a number of revolutions occurred in the nineteenth century in Europe, but it did not provide the scale of change that presented in its model (Forrest, 1995).

It is difficult to start talking about the theoretical interpretations of the revolution without referring to one of the works that had and still has influence on all theories of revolution science that came after it, the manifesto of the communist party, written by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in 1848, remains until now a starting point for understanding the movement of change and transformation of societies in general. Marx and Engels put forward one of the most important theoretical concepts to understand the movement of history, especially European history from the Middle Ages until the nineteenth century, which is the concept of mode of production. According

to Marx and Engels, the mode of production is the relationship between the productive forces (the workers) and the relations of production (the ability to organize), a relationship that results in a number of unavoidable contradictions, and then the revolution occurs when these contradictions reach a stage in which the ownership of the production tools changes from Layer to another. The revolution in Marxist theory is inevitable, so long as the different social classes struggle with each other over ownership of the means of production, which is an endless struggle. Accordingly: Human history has shifted from one fact to another depends on changing the mode of production from one to the other, such as feudalism and the bourgeoisie, and revolution occurs when a social class can impose a new mode of production on society, or in the theoretical sense, when a social class can change the relationship between it as a productive force and the way it is organized As production relationships. So, we see that the main concepts presented by Marx and Engels are the concept of class struggle and the imperative of revolution as a result of this struggle or the disappearance of one of the conflicting classes from existence. Since it is difficult to criticize the ideas and concepts that came out in the Marxist theory, as this is a long matter, the stop will be at the main ideas related to the revolution. The revolution in Marxist theory was a useful phenomenon to free the exploited social classes from the domination of the classes that exploited them by possessing the means of production (Tucker, 1978).

In the same year 1848, Alexis de Tocqueville's book, *the old order and the French Revolution*, was published, but Tocqueville viewed the French Revolution differently from that adopted by Marx and Engels. The two agreed that the revolution had managed to destroy the old aristocracy and rid of the laws and practices associated with feudal society, but what Marx saw as the beginning of a new social revolution in which the proletarian class was rid of the bourgeois class, Tocqueville saw it as a victory for the central state. The revolution in Tocqueville's theory was not just an attempt to replace an old government with a new one, but rather aimed primarily at changing the social structure that existed before the revolution, and changing the habits, practices, and beliefs that were associated with power and governance in the minds of citizens. However, the way to present a new paradigm of power was to build a new, massive, and centralized new structure or power that would control all channels and elements of power, and that structure was the state or central government that all elements of power are concentrated like the one that appeared after the French Revolution. And then Tocqueville put forward different ideas from those put forward by Marx, the revolution at Tocqueville was not a sign of the liberation of a suppressed social class, but it was the reason for the emergence of the concept of the central government that came to fill the power vacuum that occurred as a result of the revolution's elimination of the social construction that prevailed at some point Before the revolution (De Tocqueville, 2010).

Perhaps Tocqueville did not have the effect that Marx had, but what Tocqueville brought about the emergence of the central authority after the revolution was a first nucleus of what Marx Weber proposed after that. Tocqueville and Weber agreed that the revolution was one of the ways to increase the power of the "state" and its central authority, but he was the first to propose that the revolution be linked to the authority of a leader who possesses 'charisma', so that this leader is responsible for mobilizing the masses, challenging the traditional authority, and leading the process of overthrowing the old regime (Weber, 2009). An example of this model was the revolutions led by people such as Lenin, Zapata, Castro, Mao, Khomeini, and Mandela. But the main idea that Weber put forward, unlike the idea of a leadership character, was the idea of bureaucratic apparatuses, and Weber believes that the only way for the continuation of 'charisma' authority is for this authority to be reflected in established political institutions so that they are

more powerful and more resistant to change than the systems that preceded them because bureaucratic institutions turn to A social structure that is difficult to get rid of, which is evident in many bureaucratic bodies and institutions in different countries. Perhaps the Egyptian bureaucratic system is the best proof of this.

1.3 The Challenge of Modernization (Huntington and Tilly)

The French Revolution is no longer the main model to follow in studying the science of revolution, as was the case in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Most of the theories of the revolution proposed now, which were written during the twentieth century, resorted to multiple models of the revolutions of the twentieth century due to the difference of these models from the French revolution model, there was the Mexican Revolution in 1910, the Russian Revolution in 1917, the Turkish Revolution in 1919, and the revolutions of Vietnam, Bolivia, and Cuba in the 1950s and 1960s. And, as both Tocqueville and Weber predicted, these revolutions led to the emergence of a more powerful, centralized, and more dependent state model that dependent on a huge bureaucratic apparatus. But these revolutions did not follow the infiltration proposed by Marx and Engels, as they were not revolutions seeking to rid themselves of bourgeois rule or capital, but most of these revolutions, which were mainly socialist revolutions, occurred in countries that were at the beginning of the phase of modernization of their economies. That is why sociologists and politicians began to ask questions about the relationship between the modernization phase and the revolution. The theories that appeared during this period did not see any direct relationship between modernization and the establishment of the revolution. Modernization does not necessarily lead to revolution, but the main idea was in the fact that the modernization phase leads to a change in the balance of power between the conflicting powers over power within any society, and this change in the balance of power, it is a major reason for the revolution (Kamrava, and Kamrava, 2005).

1.1.3 Samuel Huntington

In 1968, Samuel Huntington presented his book *The Political Order in Changing Societies*, his theory linking modernization with revolution. Huntington believes that one of the most important dimensions of "modernization" is the increased demand for political participation by members of society, and when there are groups in society that do not have the right to political participation, and do not even have any way to be part of political power in the future, these groups begin to demanding change and opening up the political field, which could lead to the revolution. Perhaps one of the most important things Huntington provided was the precise definition in which he described the "revolution" and how he clearly distinguished between the "revolution" and the uprising, the military coup or the mass movement. According to him, the revolution is a fundamental, sudden, and violent change in values prevailing within society, in political institutions, in the social structure, in leadership, and in government activities and policies. Hence, the model on which Huntington builds his theory is the model of the social revolution or the grand revolution, the names they used to call them historically influential revolutions due to the magnitude of the change that brought them like the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution, the Chinese Revolution, and the revolutions in Mexico and Cuba. Military coups or uprisings may change the political leadership and policies, and sometimes a change in political institutions may occur, but only the revolution can bring about a change in the social structure of society such as changing the ruling social class and changing the relationship of social classes within society with each other. Therefore: agreement on the scientific designation of what happened in Egypt in

January 2011 and June 2013 does not depend on the numbers that participated or even the amount of violence practiced in each of these events, but the designation depends mainly on the extent of the change that each of these two events brought about (Huntington, 1970).

Huntington sees a direct correlation between "modernization" and the revolution, or, more precisely, he sees the revolution as an actual embodiment of what is meant by the process of "modernization." The revolution not only expresses that a person has the ability to change the environment around him, whether in society or the state, but he also has the right to do so whenever he wants. It is important during the discussion of Huntington's ideas that he explained is the meaning of the term political development, and what is meant by political development is to increase political awareness and its expansion or reaching new groups within society so that these groups are more eager to political participation, and readier to mobilize and social gatherings. As a result of increased political awareness, some political institutions are beginning to emerge within societies. These institutions are usually independent and complex in their internal structure. The political basis of the revolution is the rapid and effective proliferation of this political awareness, the mobilization of new groups within society and their gathering them for political participation, these changes happen quickly so that old political institutions cannot contain this increase in groups willing to participate in politics. In line with Huntington, the revolution is an explosion of political participation. But in order for the revolution to be completed, you need to enter a second stage in which the institutional building begins or the institutionalization of a new political system through new political institutions. A successful revolution needs to merge between political mobilization and political institutionalization. Huntington believes that the measure of the success of the revolution is the extent of the independence and stability of the political institutions that have emerged as a result of the revolution, and the size of the real political power that these institutions enjoy (Huntington, 2006).

1.2.3 Charles Tilly

English thinker Charles Tilly is one of the most important figures of political sociology, especially revolution science, as Tilly is one of the first scientists to try to explain the phenomenon of social movements. He also had important comments on the ideas and theses brought by Huntington, which link directly between modernization and revolution. To be more specific, Tilly argues that the terms "modernization" and political instability need a more precise definition of the definitions that Huntington came up with, and Tilly also believes that the use of modernization as a concept is in fact is a research orientation rather than a detailed theory that tries to predict a future pattern of revolution. When Tilly began his theoretical conclusions, he focused more on the actors of the revolution than the general context of society and the state that characterized Samuel Huntington's theory. So, that existence and success of the revolution, depended on the availability of resources for the various actors in it. According to Tilly of the Revolution, it occurs when groups in society have sufficient resources to pressure the government or the system by demanding change, and at the same time the government lacks the resources to allow it to either bring about or suppress this change. It is from this vision and this assumption that Tilly's theory came to be known as the Resource Mobilization Theory, a theory that mainly depends on the collective work organized by different groups in society and the dispute of these groups with the state. Resources according to Tilly include money or financial ability, human resources, expertise, availability of information, and leadership (Tilly, 2017).

Tilly also explains some of the political situations that usually occur before the revolution, and these political conditions or circumstances include first: Strong groups compete for power and challenge existing powers by proposing alternative policies. Second: A reasonable number of people are convinced of the ideas these groups present. Third: The government's inability to meet the demands for change or suppress the groups that submit these demands. And there is one last factor that is one of the most important factors that help or support the establishment of the revolution, which is the existence of some kind of alliance between citizens and these groups that challenge the existing authority, and this alliance may be a type of political organization or organized collective action (Tilly, 1973).

1.4 Structural Analysis (Theda Skocpol and Ellen Kay Trimberger)

The structural analysis presented by the Skocpol and Trimberger theory is based on what Karl Marx put forward about the fact of domination of social classes over one another is the most important component of the social system, and that the struggle between classes is the direct cause of the revolution. Structural analysis seeks to study the pattern of interaction between different political actors, the relationship between the state and the elites, between the owner and the worker, and between states and each other in an international context, as the sum of these interactions in fact represents the structure of the state and society. Both Skocpol and Trimberger believe that the reasons for revolution are always related to the state structure or the structure of society (Skocpol and Trimberger, 1977).

Although clear influence of Skocpol and Trimberger by what Karl Marx's statement in his theory, however, they clearly state that Marx's theory, despite its validity, is no longer sufficient to answer the new questions that have become related to the revolution in all respects. Therefore, structural analysis is based on three basic principles. First, is dealing with the state as a major player that cannot be reduced to one conflict or one dimension? Second is the necessity of an analysis of the situation of the working class before and after the revolution, a structural analysis based on studying the social structure of this class, whether it be workers or peasants. Third is to focus on competition between countries (especially in the military sphere) in the context of the global capitalist system.

Hence, by looking at these three principles and the resulting questions, it can be realized that the structuralist theory sees that the causes of the revolution lie in the sum of the relationships that represent the structure of the state and society as the relationship of the social classes to each other and the state's relationship with the elites, the relations between the state and the working class, which throughout the history of the revolutions of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was a major reason for the revolutionary movement, to achieve independence and change, finally, the relations between the state and the rest of the countries within the global system where usually (It is also a note based on revolutions in the last two centuries) International pressure is more influential in determining the future of revolutions and drawing the road map followed by the revolution, than internal pressure to change the system of government or to achieve greater freedoms and rights. In the Arab Spring there are enough models that explain how international pressures are effective in determining the future of revolutions. There are cases of direct intervention such as Bahrain and Libya, and there are cases of pressure through the state's position in the world system and the existence of international and regional interests that countries are obliged to uphold, and perhaps what happens in Egypt since January 25, 2011 is a perfect example of this type of pressure and its impact (Skocpol and Theda, 1979).

Despite the relevance of the ideas brought about by the structural theory that appeared in 1978 in a study of Skocpol and Trimberger, and the fact that most of the questions posed by this theory are still important questions, but the development in the patterns of political systems is accompanied by an evolution in the concept of the revolution, and therefore we need a similar development in the questions posed. That is why turning to what Jacques Goldstone put forward in 1986 on revolutions under modern dictatorships (Skocpol and Theda, 1977).

1.5 Revolutions in Modern Dictatorships (Jack A. Goldstone)

Goldstone believes that the concept of the state in itself or in a broader sense the concept of the ruling power changes from one place to another and from an era to another, the revolution against traditional monarchies or empires, such as what happened in France and Russia, differs from revolutions that are based on regimes represented by the "state" in its modern sense. Perhaps the main reason for this difference is a set of state vulnerabilities that make the country more vulnerable to revolution, which of course differs from the set of weaknesses that were affecting the monarchy systems, for example. There is no doubt that the development of the concept of the state itself and building the principle of legitimacy on the basis of non-inheritance made the dictatorship state a completely different system of government from the dictatorships of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Modern dictatorships usually depend on some institutions such as parliament and constitutions, and sometimes depend on democratic practices such as elections and referendums, but the real authority remains in the hands of a central institution such as the armed forces, or the ultimate authority is ultimately in the hands of one individual as was the case with Muammar Gaddafi, Saddam Hussein, Bashar al-Assad. Goldstone believes that the reasons for revolution in this type of country need to be revealed through a careful study of the state's structure and the set of weaknesses that make the country more vulnerable to the revolution. Consequently, Goldstone did not depart from structural analysis, as studying the structure of the state remained at the top of its analytical and theoretical tools, but what Goldstone presented was the link between the establishment of the revolution and the quality of the state and the weaknesses and vulnerabilities of different types of countries (Goldstone, 1991).

Goldstone begins with the definition of modern dictatorships, it uses the concept of a new dictatorship and is the earliest translation of the term Neopatrimonial state that Goldstone uses. The new dictatorship is the countries that witnessed some modernization, but power remained in the hands of one individual or a small group of individuals. These individual exercises power through a democratic system that includes the presence of parliament, political parties, a constitution, elections, and of course the holder of absolute power controls the course of the process almost Democracy, election results, interpretation of the constitution to serve personal interests, and the size of space allowed for political parties (Goldstone, 2003).

In such countries, the masses are usually not politicized, while the elites often occupy a place in the political sphere. These dictatorships always seek to separate the different elites in order to control all the existing elites (such as economic, political, and military), making opportunities for union of the elites with each other more difficult, and then you can impose their control on a large number of masses that are not politicized more broadly, and therefore it is natural The authority deals with the elites in methods such as divide and rule, stick and carrot (Goldstone, 2003).

Modern dictatorships have a variety of weaknesses due to the nature of their system of government. First: Since the system or the state relies on supporting the elites rather than the mass support, care is taken to link the state with the elites very important, since the presence of differences between the different elites and the state may be a fatal mistake committed by the system, as these differences make the elites come out of support space of the authority thus, increases the number of forces opposing the regime, and the number of elites supporting it decreases. Second: The state must maintain a delicate balance between the different elites so that it avoids the exit of one of these elites from the system of government formulated by the regime, and achieving this balance is not an easy matter. Third: Since the people or the masses are usually non-politicized and lack effective political organizations, the state is almost inexperienced in dealing with collective action that depends on mobilization, and therefore modern dictatorships have a clear weakness in dealing with the mass crowd that often threatens the stability of an authority the system. In this case, the regime resorts to force due to the lack of political solutions to the regime's refusal to expand the political field. In this case, the position of the military elite is extremely important to the system, as it is they who control direct dealing with the mass crowds. To simplify this idea, we can look at the Egyptian case in January 2011, the Libyan case in February, and the Syrian case in March of the same year. In the three models, the position of the military elites against the regime was different from what had a direct impact on the regime's survival or its downfall (Goldstone, 2003).

In spite of the success of many modern dictatorships in staying in power for many years, and some of them continue until now without facing any challenges that represent popular opposition or mass movements, this does not mean that these countries do not have weaknesses, on the contrary, weaknesses continue to exist. Consequently, the state is more vulnerable to revolution over time. Also, the passage of time is usually one of the most important factors that weaken the state's ability to face political challenges that rely on educational and mass tools.

Goldstone explains that there are some situations in which modern dictatorships may find themselves in it, and these conditions usually lead to disturbing the delicate balances that the regime is keen to maintain, and thus the system is more vulnerable to the revolution, so, these political, economic or social situations are considered threats to the continuation of the state as it is and the stability of the system. Perhaps the first of these situations is the difficulty of achieving the required balance between the different elites in light of the continuing process of economic growth. With the increase in foreign investments and the ruler's dependence on them as one of the sources of resources, the ruler needs to take care of the interests of foreign investors and satisfy them, in order to continue to pump resources. Usually, the process of satisfying foreign investors is done at the expense of the local elites, and then losing the delicate balance and increasing the opportunity for a dispute between the state and one of the elites. Second: With the expansion in the size and power of the state's bureaucratic apparatus, this bureaucratic machine enters into conflict with traditional institutions or groups present in society such as unions or religious institutions. Third: With increasing temptations to monopolize and control the available resources by the ruler, his family, or a group of those close to him, the size of the benefits and gifts that the ruler granted to the elites that support him will decrease, and thus the relationship between the ruler and the elites will shift from a relationship whose main strength is the political support of the ruler, to A relationship based on the hostility of the elites towards the ruler. Fourth: With the same logic of the previous point, the regime may resort to relying on external support from international powers, which is the support that the regime pays for from the resources that were supposed to be

distributed to the local elites who support the regime, and consequently again begins the conflicts and disputes between the regime or the ruler and the elites the localities that affected by the supremacy of foreign interests above their own. Fifth: Any decline in the economic ability of the system may lead to a violation of the network of benefits obtained by the ruling elites. Finally, in the event that the elites allied themselves with each other and were able to overcome the differences that the regime was keen to maintain and nourish, this alliance usually leads to the revolution (Goldstone, 2011).

It is obvious from the above discussion that Goldstone attaches the highest importance to the relationship between the ruling regime and the elites in society, especially the military elite and the economic elite. He also argues that dictatorial regimes are unable to deal politically with mass action as a major factor in bringing down the existing order in modern dictatorships. Finally, Jack Goldstone concludes that the merger or coincidence between the elite coup against the ruler, and the movement of the masses is a collective movement, necessarily leading to the revolution and entering a stage of transformations in political institutions, economic institutions, and the pursued policies.

1.6 Conclusion

This paper, tried to simplify theoretical concepts somewhat so that theoretical analyzes are not exclusive to students of political science and sociology. Also, this paper, of course, did not present all the theoretical works that attempted to explain the causes of the revolution, but the group that the study deals with represents the main trends in the theoretical field of revolution science. It is notable that the development of concepts or tools of theoretical analysis depends mainly on the development of the questions asked, and on the focus in analyzing the role of different actors, as well as on linking the different roles of these actors and the reasons for the revolution. Of course, there are still many theories that attempt to explain the revolution and make it a social phenomenon linked to scientific and objective reasons. Perhaps the main reason for the diversity of theories is the diversity and continuous development in the revolutions themselves. For example, the independence movements and the revolutions that took place in Eastern Europe led to the emergence of new theories that depend on explains the idea of a 'political revolution'. There is no doubt that understanding the reasons for the revolution varies from one model to another and from one era to another, and therefore we usually resort to using more than one theoretical concept to try to explain the reasons for the revolutions. For example, we can combine Charles Tilly's concept of "resource mobilization", and the concept of a neo - patrimonial state that Jack Goldstone used as a cornerstone of the theoretical construction that brought it. It is most likely that with the continued study of revolutionary models in the Arab world, and the continued development of tactical methods and revolutionary practices, we may able soon see new theoretical conclusions that have emerged specifically to explain the last wave of the Arab Spring revolutions.

References

- De Tocqueville, A., 2010. *The old regime and the French revolution*. Anchor.
- Forrest, A.I., 1995. *The French Revolution* (pp. 110-132). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goldstone, J.A. ed., 2003. *States, parties, and social movements*. Cambridge University Press.
- Goldstone, J.A., 1991. *Revolution and rebellion in the early modern world*. University of California Press.
- Goldstone, J.A., 2003. Comparative historical analysis and knowledge accumulation in the study of revolutions. *Comparative historical analysis in the social sciences*, pp.41-90.
- Goldstone, J.A., 2003. Revolutions in Modern Dictatorships. *Revolutions: Theoretical, Comparative, and Historical Studies*, pp.69-75.
- Goldstone, J.A., 2011. Understanding the revolutions of 2011: weakness and resilience in Middle Eastern autocracies. *Foreign Affairs*, pp.8-16.
- Huntington, S.P., 1970. Political order in changing societies. *VRÜ Verfassung und Recht in Übersee*, 3(2), pp.257-261.
- Huntington, S.P., 2006. *Political order in changing societies*. Yale University Press.
- Kamrava, M. and Kamrava, M., 2005. *The modern Middle East: a political history since the First World War* (p. 2005497). Berkeley: University of California press.
- Kimmel, M.S., 1987. *Revolutions: Theoretical, Comparative, and Historical Studies*.
- Skocpol, T. and Theda, S., 1979. *States and social revolutions: A comparative analysis of France, Russia and China*. Cambridge University Press.
- Skocpol, T. and Trimberger, E.K., 1977. Revolutions and the world-historical development of capitalism. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, pp.101-113.
- Tilly, C., 1973. Does modernization breed revolution? *Comparative Politics*, 5(3), pp.425-447.
- Tilly, C., 2017. Does Modernization Breed Revolution? In *Collective Violence, Contentious Politics, and Social Change* (pp. 55-70). Routledge.
- Tucker, R.C. ed., 1978. *The Marx-Engels Reader*.
- Weber, M., 2009. *The theory of social and economic organization*. Simon and Schuster.