

HOW TO MAKE A REVOLUTION?

Tigran Sargsyan

We shall first of all understand the definition of revolution. The word “revolution” originated from the late Latin “*revolutio*” or *rotation, upheaval* also meaning a profound, qualitative change in the development of nature, society or consciousness. Revolution suggests a fulminating transition from one qualitative state into another, manifesting a fundamental regularity in the development of nature, society or mentality.

Anytime we use the definition of “revolution” as applied to social processes we shall realize where the qualitative change of the society in question or, in broader sense, of the subject matter, takes place. The examples of the Ukrainian Orange Revolution, the Georgian Rose Revolution and the Kyrgyz Poppy Revolution demonstrate that sometimes revolution is understood not as a qualitative change of the society but as a power shift under physical pressure of the society; and the public at large is not concerned about a new ideology, policy, economy or, to be more exact, development ontology¹, but rather about the individual and the ruling elite.

Thus, willing to perform qualitative changes, the masses often act in support of the revolution and in doing so they cause a power shift unaware that their needs and necessities lie in an altogether different dimension and can not be satisfied by a revolutionary power shift. Indeed, shortly after the revolution, the society realizes that its efforts to bridge the gap between the owned and the desired have come to a standstill, and the situation is aggravated by the political strife between the ones who seized power and the ones who were stripped of it. Hence, a radical power shift that takes place without real qualitative changes in the satisfaction of needs can hardly be considered a revolution since no pivotal change has

¹ **Ontology**, a teaching in classical philosophy dealing with the nature of being that functions as a basic element in the philosophic system. Ontology is equivalent to metaphysics as a system of universal mental definitions of being. Essentially, ontology reflects the picture of the world that conforms to a certain level of cognition of the reality and ascribed to the given epoch as well as to the system of philosophic categories characteristic of this or that philosophic tradition. In this respect, any philosophic and theoretical system is based on a certain ontological concepts which form its stable substantial foundation and are subject to change in accordance with the development of knowledge. (Editor’s note).

actually taken place. Other people with old ontological foundations come to power which can be hardly called a pivotal change.

Obviously, when speaking about the need of revolution, the focus should be on the pivotal change (on the new ontological basis), and on the type of qualitative self-organization criteria and mechanisms of societal activity changed as a result of the revolution, rather than how some forces have come or will come to power and what their properties should be.

Also, one should comprehend the essence of the revolutionary process concentrating on its all phases.

The first phase of the revolutionary process is most covert and suggests the generation of the revolutionary idea (new ontology.) Such an idea can be engendered in the mind of one man or in a group of individuals. This idea is put to the test; knowledge is accumulated and the verity of the idea is recognized.

Let us make a small digression and note that man's essence is his faith: in God, his nation, idea, and future. Without faith, man is reduced to a dangerous subject who corrupts the society, kills synergism, and denies the rules of coexistence. It is impossible to build a harmonious society without faith since it becomes impossible to live in accord with oneself.

Thereafter, the idea propagates among broad masses of people, and new, mostly informal institutions come into being (second phase.)

The institutional memory about changes, developments and ideas is shaped in these institutions.

Here one shall realize that when speaking about the emergence of new institutions we mean the appearance of new relations, new subjects, new skills and knowledge created within the framework of new ontology.

Sooner or later, these institutions inevitably come into conflict with the institutions functioning under the old ontology. Clashes ensue, causing real downfall (third phase.) It is this downfall that is related to the arbitrary actions of a group of individuals which possess or gets hold of the reigns of power; these actions are aimed at change and development which, as a rule, we call revolution.

Let us consider the chart demonstrating all the phenomena discussed above (see Appendix 1.)

Obviously, a revolution can be brought into being only when the society is ready to appreciate the new ontology and we clearly see a contradiction between the content and form of organization of the society. This contradiction can be manifested in one of the two following scenarios:

- Scenario 1 suggests a content change in the society that calls for a change in its organizational form;

- Scenario 2 suggests a change in the form of societal organization that will cause a change in its content.

To grasp the essence of Scenario 1, let us quote a passage from *Powershift* a much-talked-of book by Alvin Toffler: “300 years ago the industrial revolution lay the foundations of a new system for the creation of material values. Factory chimneys arose where once upon a time there were fields... Lastly, wherever steam engines and factory chimneys appeared, they were ubiquitously followed by political changes. Monarchies collapsed or were preserved to attract tourists by ceremonies... In a nutshell, the emergence of the new system for the production of material values undermined all the strongholds of the old power system, ultimately changing family life, business, policy, state structure and the world order in general... The ones who struggled to control the future used force, wealth and knowledge.”¹

A. Toffler demonstrates the process of qualitative transition from the pre-industrial form of society to its industrial form considering the latter in terms of the post-modernist theory. The emergence of a new system of material values brings about a ground-breaking process that triggers revolution (downfall.)

This example illustrates Scenario 1 where the change in content of the society causes the change of its organizational form.

To comprehend Scenario 2, one can refer to the recent history of Armenia, i.e. the 1991 revolution when the Armenian people rejected the socialist form of societal organization under the Soviet empire in favor of the capitalist societal organization under independent Armenian statehood. However, the first years of independence obviously demonstrated and to some extent still demonstrate that in terms of content the society is not ready to perceive the new ontology based on the liberal democratic principle of freedom which also suggests that everyone is responsible for one's decisions, life and future.

Now let us answer to the question as to why revolution does not take place in Armenia (especially in the context of renewed pre-election process), why during the election campaign the society is entirely indifferent to the political processes and does not attempt to make changes?

Continuing this train of thought, we come to the conclusion that actually there is no contradiction between the governance system shaped over the 15 years of existence of the Republic of Armenia and the Armenian society's needs and necessities. There is no social class (or it has not reached the critical point) that will act as the foundation for the development of Armenia's new ontology.

¹ Alvin Toffler, *Powershift*, 2004, p. 32.

Adaptation dominates in the society that is partially caused by objective reasons such as high poverty rate of the populace and low educational level. Often the policy entirely lacks ideology and programmatic approach, while trade is thriving in the economy, which as a basic process, is characteristic of not industrial but pre-industrial societies. In other words, the independent state is neither our essence, nor the essence of our society.

What shall be done to pull ourselves out of the swamp by our own hair like Baron Munchausen? Obviously, a revolution is needed in our minds.

A revolution in the mind is the shaping of a new vision in the Armenian society that does not yet exist in the minds but is however feasible.

We believe three domains can be singled out.

Domain 1 is the manifestation of the supreme thought (transcendental domain.)

Domain 2 is the discovery of patterns in historical events and global ground-breaking processes, and, on the basis of the latter, formation of rational society within the mainstream.

Domain 3 is the realm of myth; here certain dogmas dominate that are transformed into rules of behavior and principles of society building.

We always have a choice as to in which domain to work.

In Domain 1, typologization of mentality is needed and the elaboration of one's own paradigm (development ontology.) a leader or a group of individuals must emerge who would be inspired and would possess an enormous desire to implement their own designs.

This leader convinces the society that his ideas are veritable and feasible, and being governed by the supreme idea, he leads the society to revolutionary changes. The leader's main resource is his personal persuasion which is contagious for all the others. First, the surrounding people blindly believe him, then they become the carriers of his idea and proliferate it among larger masses. As a result, qualitative changes take place in the society as it happened in Singapore.

Domain 2 requires acquisition of knowledge and development of strategy to apply this knowledge on one's own. The advanced development paradigm is executed in this domain. In other words, based on the experience of developed countries and the ways of achieving results, we enrich our knowledge, introduce mass training on all levels and attempt to introduce *best practices*. However, we do this not by mere emulation but through essential changes. This is the road Armenia has taken nowadays.

In Domain 3 we shall modernize our own mythology. In this domain we acquire knowledge from our own past, the historical memory of the nation. We

reveal our values, norms, dogmas and the way of life. We abide by these rules, turning our rules of behavior into a corner stone. By development we mean the comprehensive introduction of principles and rules taken from our mythology of society building. That is the road taken by Iran.

Which road out of the above three shall the reader take?

I suggest the following dictum for the benefit of concerned readers:

“History begins in the future.”

Thesis 1. World history of nations is a struggle for the people’s vision of the future. Only those nations prevail that are capable of creating and recognizing this vision. And, divinely, the vision comes and possesses the nation...

Thesis 2. This vision must be feasible. If it is not feasible then it is not a vision. The prerequisite for the feasibility of the vision is that the latter possess the minds of the elite, and the elite must lead the nation and the people.

Thesis 3. The history of victors is always written in the light of the future. History is always revisited and rewritten in terms of the future. One shall take from history only what helps to go forward and matches the vision of the future. The ability to work with the past enables us to create the future.

Thesis 4. Nowadays, the main problem of the Armenian society is the lack of a uniform vision of the future. The alienation of the society, which is objective by nature, can be overcome only by the leaning towards the future and not the past.

Thesis 5. The elite and leaders will be the ones who see this vision, the individuals who will be convinced by and believe in it, and will sacrifice the most precious for it. Hence, they will be able to engage others into this vision. The elite shall see the future today and dedicate their life to it. Only then others will trust and follow them, although not immediately. This is the road to revolution. This is the essence of revolution.

Thesis 6. Obviously, the lack of alternative to the present-day authorities is due to the lack of alternative vision of the future. The calls for power shift are directed to the past and not to the future and will not do any good. The alternative to the present-day authorities can be only those who follow this track: confidence – special vision of the future – precise definition of the fundamental theses of this future.

Thesis 7. Working in the dimension of the past is tantamount to building a concept for the achievement of the past. In transition economies power becomes non-alternative because the society is incapable of uniting around the vision of the future. There are no serious institutions capable of drafting the future.

It is impossible to work in the dimension of the past and to compete with state structures since the gap in resource potential is obvious.

Thesis 8. Presently, there is no party or NGO except the government that can put forward a professional and comprehensive a plan of socio-economic development for this country. No matter who comes to power, this plan will have no alternative since it is in the *mainstream*.

Thesis 9. Alternative is a challenge to the world, a revolution in thinking, and there are no such heroes in Armenia. There are people who strive to come to power, to realize the only existing and executed plan. Hence, the struggle is to best implement the current plan and not the plan for the future. Whoever comes to power, will do what has been done to-date, for the better or worse, but the executed plan will remain the same.

Thus, we must revisit and reconsider our history and having solved our self-identification problem, build a new society. We must change in essence, not in form. The requirements to the rules of being and behavior must be acceptable, desirable and applicable for the majority. We must feel comfortable and protected thanks to the elaboration of our norms of living on our own. Only then we can say that this is our society and essence.

P.S. The intelligent man is only the one who struggles for the integrated perception of the world.

The clever man is the one who can predict the future on this basis.

The wise man is the one who can live in harmony with his perception of the world.

April, 2007

Appendix 1

Downfall chart

