

Negative Impacts of Revolutions: the Cause of Wars and Crises

Rekurd S. Maghdid¹, Badariah Haji Din², Hozan Abdulrahman Hasan³ and Bestoon Abdulmaged Othman⁴

Abstract--- *From the very beginning of the establishment of empires and dynasties, some people revolted against the authorities. The concept of revolutionism has become well-known when revolutionists made a series of revolutions one after another. This concept has shaped a significant impact on the political stability, economic development and mutual trust. This phenomenon has been encountered through the humanity history which varies in terms of the way of occurrence, duration, place, reason behind it and the outcomes although it has brought great changes in many aspects. Because of the effectiveness of revolutions and its impacts on all the sectors of world, some scholars have conducted studies on the reasons, outcomes and motivating ideology of the revolutionism. Thus the main purpose of this study is to discuss how the ideology of revolutionism became causes of wars, political crises, economic crises and lack of trust between powers. The paper describes revolutionism and illustrates the beginning of revolutionary waves in certain territories. Furthermore, this work explains the outcome of the recent revolutions in the Middle East especially. Ultimately, the paper ends by designing some conclusions as well as identifying areas to be taken into consideration for further research.*

Keywords--- *Revolution, Revolutionism, War, Conflict, Crisis, Economic Crises, and Political Crises*

I. INTRODUCTION

Due to the sudden and fundamental change that the revolutions bring in governing the world, many studies have been conducted. Early works about revolutions have mainly discussed the agricultural, industrial, and political events in the Western Europe [68]. Meanwhile, the recent studies analyze economic, political, and social changes as well as other global changes. This study, apart from discussing the early revolutions, examines the modern events in the world that created conflicts, crisis and lack of trust. In any case, the three types (agricultural, industrial and ideological revolutions) involve a change that transforms society to its essence [3, 20]. Therefore, revolutions are planned developments to bring a massive positive change. Moreover, all of the types occur in the world from time to time. The first two types, agricultural and industrial revolutions, are considered as peaceful ones that may take a long time to succeed [7, 32]. On the other hand, the third one can aggressively and peacefully be held. Ideological revolutionists reacted differently. Gandhi was very peaceful in protesting against the British colonization and he

¹Department of Administration and Economy, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University Park, Koya-Erbil, Kurdistan Region-F.R., Iraq. E-mail: rekurd.sarhang@koyauniversity.org

²School of Government, College of Law, Government and International Studies, Universiti Utara Malaysia, 06010 Sintok, Malaysia. E-mail: badariahhdin@uum.edu.my

³Diplomacy and International Relations Department, Lebanese French University, Erbil, Iraq. E-mail: hozan@lfu.edu.krd

⁴Department of Business Administration, Koya Technical Institute, Erbil Polytechnic University, and Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia. E-mail: bestoon2011@yahoo.com

succeeded in achieving his aims and objectives. Che Guevara, by contrast was a radical ideological revolutionist and in the same way he and his followers succeeded in obtaining what they tried to gain. It is true that he chose military revolution in order to free some territorial regions in the Latin America but still he did not neglect negotiations and other peaceful means to achieve this freedom [14]. Although some revolutions resulted the creation of superpowers such as USA and Arab countries or allies like Warsaw Pact and NATO with positive impacts on the economic developments and political stability, this study includes the negative impact of revolutions.

II. THE CONCEPT OF REVOLUTION AND TYPES OF REVOLUTION

A. *An Introduction to Revolution*

Revolutions, firstly, start at home when someone rebels a member of that house. This member may include the head figure of the family or anyone else that has a different and opposing attitude towards the way of life or an action. That is a simplest style of revolutions. Many people from many eras and from different territories analyzed the events of history that have changed the ruling systems of empires, kingdoms and even republics from different perspectives.

Social theorists analyzed the revolutions that changed the international system and economy in the social hierarchy from sociological thinking. Some other studies regarded these attempts in a psychological nature[20, 59]. Nonetheless, all the theorists are in harmony with the fact that revolutions change at least a very important part of a framework that affects every individual's life. Therefore, a revolution is a fundamental shift in an organizational or governmental or systematic structure that can be staged peacefully and aggressively within a very short or long period of time.

The aggressive revolutions, which can mostly be encountered in the third World Countries and countries that are not independent, change the whole system of the individuals' lives and countries' strategies[68]. Even they may send the former leaders' relatives into exile or even sometimes kill them, such as what happened in the African countries. By contrast, the peaceful revolutions, although take much more time than the aggressive ones, are more successful because these revolutions last more and will not destroy any succeeded institution in the country. It just makes reform in the corrupted sections in the country.

When a change is needed, revolutions occur everywhere and also when a completely different thinking takes place in an unsettled governmental or systematic structure revolutionists start to revolt. Sometimes, a revolutionary ideology spreads as a wave to the neighboring countries and nationally or religiously related ones. For instance, when some general members of Egypt Army staged a social, idealistic, political and nationalistic coup d'état, other territorial countries that were in the same nationality and religion followed the same path[33], like what happened in Iraq in 1958.

To determine whether a regime is revolutionary or not, international community and scholars pay more attention to what that regime calls itself. Moreover, other revolutionary governments' and systems' interpretation to that revolt should be taken in consideration. As Mark Katz, in his modern analyses on revolutions and revolutionary waves, noted this point "Self-definition alone cannot always be relied upon: it is possible that a regime may declare

itself to be revolutionary when it is not in order to obtain support or avoid being the target of powerful revolutionary states”[33]. Katz’s statement of the recognition of revolutions is useful since he focuses more on who recognizes a given regime as revolutionary, than self-determination. Actually, if other entities in the territory do not look at that regime as revolutionary, the regime cannot succeed in its missions.

Due to revolution’s large scope in the way of ruling and influence on the world, many people with different mainstreams defined this term. Some give a broad definition to the term “Revolution” while some others have a narrower definition to it. Crane Briton gives a very wide definition of revolution by which he claims that revolution is a “drastic, sudden substitution of one group in charge of the running of a territorial political entity by another group hitherto not running that government”[7]. So, to Brinton and those who are in harmony with him, revolution includes any movement or action to change a government responsible in a specific territory.

In contrast, other scholars like Theda Skocpol have a narrow definition to revolutions. Skocpol suggests that revolutions should be related to a social perspective including “...rapid, basic transformations of a society’s state and class structures”[54]. Furthermore, in her study on revolution, Skocpol notes that because societies stage revolutions, these revolutions transform social and political structures of nations. On the other hand, some scholars focus on what revolutions achieve rather than how and why they are held. Those scholars argue that revolutions are sudden and violent change of a system ruling a specific political entity to another group that is dropped from administration[33].

B. Types of Revolutions

As there are various and contesting definitions of revolution, there also are different types identified by the experts working on the subject. Scholars have different perspectives towards the types of revolutions. Some claim that there are five kinds of revolutions, which are: rural, urban, coup d’état, from above and from without. Nevertheless, some other scholars, such as Skocpol, Crane, and Katz, think that “Islamic neo-fundamentalist groups have adopted a sixth revolutionary strategy, which may be called revolution “by osmosis”[33]. Indeed, there are three massive kinds of revolutions, which are agricultural, industrial, and ideological revolutions. Others (what are so called kinds) are sub branches of these three types. All these three types are the same in their objectives and framework, by which each of them is a change that occurs rapidly and massively, leading to a fundamental transformation of society. They could be economic, political, and social revolution [5].

In any case, the three types (agricultural, industrial and ideological revolutions) involve a change that transforms society to its essence. Therefore, revolutions are planned developments to bring a massive positive change. Moreover, all of the types occur in the world from time to time. The first two types, agricultural and industrial revolutions, are considered as peaceful ones that may take a long time to succeed [7]. On the other hand, the third one can aggressively and peacefully be held. The agricultural revolution includes how human beings interacted with the nature. How they started to make changes in agricultural sector. How they revolted to domesticate wild animals and undomesticated lands. This revolution belongs to 10000 years ago when a group of people found their lands fruitless or deserted and they started to migrate from their places to somewhere else. This agricultural revolution has seen different revolutions in itself.

The first revolutionists revolted against an expired idea. Later on, farmers became a great power in the world. Farmers combated against racism, persecution, and oppression, therefore, even if other entities do not recognize them as revolutionary they are still revolutionists because they are against a bad or at least they try to stop something from getting worse. Furthermore, any group of political, economic, religious or social regime needs to take the role of agricultural revolution into consideration and they have to make agricultural reforms so that their revolutions succeed [9]. That is why in most of historical revolutions farmers took a great role in revolting against emperors, kings and presidents[7]. Examples of this type in history include “Neolithic revolution” the agricultural revolutions in Europe, sub-Saharan African countries and India where farmers were head figures.

The agricultural revolution continues up until now but it became a dynamic to other revolutions. This preceded by another revolution in which the latter one became a part of it. The industrial revolution appeared in the late 18th century as a massive change in agriculture, manufacturing, mining and transport that had a huge impact on socioeconomic state of world[48]. This revolution is considered as the beginning of the implication of powerful states occupation of the third world because with the development of industries weapon manufactures increased as well. Therefore, each state wanted to increase its interests on account of others. This became an energetic drive to ignite more coup d'état. First, it started in UK and France but later it spread to the whole Europe and then it get around the whole world. This revolution started within rural areas (countryside)[48]. It began with using new machines in the farms which was taboo because some people, especially some undeveloped tribes, could not get access to them. Next, it went to the urban areas (or much narrower spaces in the country).

These days, industrial revolution is a part of every changing aspect from around the world. Technological devices have vital roles in the performance of coups d'état and bringing new brainstorm or new ideas. Although some people accuse this type of revolution as a mean to destroy the peace process due to its easiness in getting the products of that revolution but it is an essential factor in maintaining peace [19]. Since its aim is to develop the entire world and make life easier, it can be measured as a necessary figure of sustaining the status quo in a safe and peaceful circumstance.

Because people are different in many aspects mainly in their thinking towards the happened and happening events differences have appeared. Therefore, every different thought leads to a change and all changes are regarded as revolutions. The Agricultural and industrial revolutions, indeed, stemmed out from the differences of the perspectives; therefore, the third kind of revolution can be called Ideological Revolution [36]. This type of revolution occurs everywhere, no matter whether it starts in rural or urban areas because it involves any aspect that is related to daily life. The ideological revolution is more important than other two types due to its ability in changing the roots of any corrupted or useless system that rules a region or a state.

Ideological revolutionists reacted differently. Gandhi was very peaceful in protesting against the British colonization and he succeeded in achieving his aims and objectives. Che Guevara, by contrast was a radical ideological revolutionist and in the same way he and his followers succeeded in obtaining what they tried to gain [40]. It is true that he chose military revolution in order to free some territorial regions in the Latin America but still

he did not neglect negotiations and other peaceful means to achieve this freedom. Nonetheless, he had a Marxist perspective but since Marxism is an ideology then it should be regarded as ideological revolution[14].

III. ROOTS OF REVOLUTIONS AND EARLY RELATIONS BETWEEN GREAT POWERS

A. The Roots of Revolutions

Revolutionism is a term that has affected every side of individuals' and societies' political and economic life. For each action there is a reaction or many reactions. Whenever a phenomenon occurs in a specific territory that occurrence may change the whole system of the state. For revolution, since it is a fundamental change in the ideology of officials and head figures in states, it has a great impact on the growth of the international politics and economy. Sometimes revolutions are so rapid and wavy that includes other neighboring states. Moreover, those rapid revolutions can be traced to particular dates such as 1789, 1848, 1917, or 1968 [56]. Some other times, those revolutions take more time and cannot attribute to a specific date, such as religious revolutions like the one happened in Iran in 1979, which was a revolution that took a long period of time, to some extent affected other territorial states as well as world economy.

The French revolution affected the governmental system in the region. She inserted a new governing systematic term into the international politics and it became the collapse of some of the systems such as empires and kingdoms. Since this revolution introduced nationalism to some of the occupied nations, she subsided religious beliefs especially in the Muslim countries. Therefore, this was preceded by a revolutionary wave against empires and kingdoms. From that time, the Ottoman Empire began to be calmly revolted by different nationalists especially Arab nationalism and the Turkish one [58].

The success of the French Revolution brought a wide range of revolutions in the Europe, such as revolutions in Italy, Germany, Hapsburg Empire, Switzerland and it also affected Spain [30]. Moreover, the French Revolution did not only influence the Western Europe (neighboring countries) but it was preceded by the American upheaval and more Eastern Europe (Poland) as well [26]. These tensions and chaos led unsettlement in the international politics of world and as Fred Halliday claims "constituted a crisis of the international system as a whole, leading to both the first internationalized war of revolution and counter-revolution and indeed to the first global or world war".

The late 18th century and the beginning of 19th century were regarded as the short term success of each system. The French Revolution's age was not more than two decades because Louis XVIII returned to the throne of the aristocracy system in France [15]. Though this period was a short-term resistance, still it could affect Germany and Italy regardless of the radical differences of nationality. By the end of this lack of ideological settlement, after 1948, longer terms of resistant in the frame work of revolutions came to existence.

B. Early Political and Economic Relations between Great Powers

Many factors affected the evolution of international politics and world economy. Since other factors are, in one way or another, related to revolutions, the most important factor is revolutions. Nonetheless, vice versa is true. That is, world political system and world economy have affected revolutions. It is taken for granted that due to the

influence of revolutions, the world's map has seen many transformations, from multi-polar system to bi-polar one, and from bi-polar to uni-polar. Revolutions, however, trace back to more than 1000 years ago but the specific date, as revolutionary theorists claim, is to be belonged to the French Revolution in 1789, which took a revolutionary nationalist wave to other countries.

Between the mid-eighteenth century to the late eighteenth century, the international relations were between great powers, which were Great Britain, Austria, France, Russia and Prussia [9]. Because the international politics, at that time in Europe, were based on wars; the relations between every two or more than two countries had changed. On the other hand, some of very powerful states in Europe came to alliance with each other. The relations between countries before every revolution were different from the relations after the revolution. Ruling systems in states had good economic and political links with several specific countries in that territory and had tensions with some other in the same region [45]. So as to have political influences on each other, the allying countries had intelligent and economic relations with each other. Therefore, the allying states prohibited any trade activity with the none-allying or anti-alliance countries.

These alliances became the beginning of melting or assimilating some of those powers. For instance, the Kingdom of Sweden, Spain, the Dutch and the Ottoman Empire formed an alliance with each other but these alliances had dissolved some countries like Sweden and it had lessened the power of the Ottomans [9]. The French revolution ruptured some of the relations; therefore, this revolution changed most of the equations. Nonetheless, this revolution changed the governmental system of the state, it also changed some of the relations but it did not change the multi-polarity of the world politics. The world remained in its normal way which was multi-polar system. States were challenging to obtain their interests on the account of others, but still the international politics and world economy were influenced by several powerful entities.

The agricultural developments and the industrial inventions overlapped with the French and American upheavals. Since these upheavals brought the world politics to a barbarian and bourgeois hierarchy, the ideological revolutions extended to every part of the world [36]. Some of the fundamental nationalist groups supported their interest in capitalism by monopolizing other third world. On the other hand, other perspectives showed their interest in a more social and equal life for individuals this thinking was very well supported by the communism. These two ideologies brought revolutions to the international politics and this mainly affected the international relations because it was impossible for a communist country to have any political or economic relations with other capitalist countries [47]. Furthermore, these two perspectives led the international politics to a bi-polar rather than a multi-polar world system.

IV. CRISIS AND REVOLUTIONISM, THE CAUSE OF WORLD WARS AND ECONOMIC CRISES

A. Concept of Crisis

The origin of the concept of crisis belongs to a Greek word (Krisis) which expresses pronouncement or selection. It depends on a variety of usage, according to the topic of the researcher's method. Crisis is an antithetic state which used only in negative situation [50]. Although, the definitions are similar in defining the outcomes of crises, they are different in their concentration. Some of them focused on the dimensions, or victims, or time or place of the crisis.

Mitroff, and Anagnos (2001) [43] suggest that crisis is an event having potential of impact on the whole organization. Meanwhile, it can be classified as a major crisis only when it affects a big part of a corporation. Moreover, Coombs (2014) illustrated that the major crisis is termed as a huge number of human lives, economics, property, fame, regular health as well as well-being of a Corporation. The performance of a Corporation become affected and it hampers the result when it becomes realized an unpredictable state that threatens important prospect of publics.

Some researchers relate the definition of the concept to time, or place, or victims, or solutions, or outcomes or even size of the damage. For example, Fink (1986) [18] described crisis as a turning point in which an organization leads to better or worse. Furthermore, some other scholars argue that crisis is a serious case with a strong negative result hampering an organization, company and the existing stakeholders, products, services or the fame of the organization. It hinders usual trade performances and foretells the persistence of the organization at the same time [17]. Meanwhile, according to [52] crisis is a particular, accidental and unusual corporation based circumstance or string of states that occurs extreme uncertainty and threat or perceived threat to an organization elevated priority target.

B. Causes of Crisis

Having knowledge of the cause of crisis helps managers in finding proper, quickest and easiest solution with fewer efforts[61]. Meanwhile, scholars in crisis suggest various reasons and sources of crisis because of the nature, scope, time and location of occurrence of the crisis[25]. Generally, according to the investigations of most of the researchers, most of the crises may arise as a result often reasons (the causes of crisis are fragmented in the literature; the followings are brought out from the investigations of different studies):

C. Misunderstanding

It refers to an error in receiving and understanding the information available on the coming crisis facing the organization. Several factors create misunderstanding of the issues that the organization encounters, such as: lack of information and warning signal of the issue[13], inability to collect the information, or inability to link information to the crisis, and interference and confusion of information and conflict of the sources of the warnings[63].

Misjudgment and Misestimating

Misjudgment and Misestimating means that information gives contrary value, appreciation and meaning to the reality. They are among the most common causes of crises in all areas, particularly in political and military areas [49]. Misjudgment and Misestimating include: exaggeration of the information about the crisis, excessive self-confidence or high expectation, influenced by fake slogans (such as we are the best, we are the strongest), underestimating other parties in the crisis, and lack of reasonable analysis of information on the crisis [16].

Mismanagement

This type of management is the most dangerous to the administrative entity because it causes destruction of the organization's capabilities. Perhaps, this explains the causes of the administrative crises in the organizations of the Third World countries. When the organizational structure or the governmental system deteriorates, it should be

expected that disasters and crises occur [42]. Some crises arise due to random management, lack of strategic planning and lack of communication (or administrative conflict) between departments or managers [12]. Nonetheless, apart from strategic plan and effective communication, an active follow-up or scientific control is needed[29]. Moreover, lack of guidance for orders, information and lack of coordination threatens the status of the organizations.

Clash of Interests and Goals

When opinions or interests and goals differ, conflicts arise between individuals or between departments or between managers, which may lead to disasters and crises[39]. Each party sees this work from its angle, which may not be compatible with the other party. Each of the conflicting stakeholders works to find a means of pressure to suit their interests. Several reasons create clash of interests and goals. Firstly, differences in the culture and personality of the parties to the conflict as well as differences in organizational, cultural, gender, type, and income backgrounds. Secondly, lack of mutual respect and disrespect for power lines and organizational relationships. Thirdly, the absence of mechanism and system in solving disputes[11].

Human Faults and Lack of Experience

It means mistakes due to the inability, lack of experience or willingness of the parties to the crisis to deal with the realities of the crisis[13]. In general, lack of experience in the project and inappropriate professional qualities put employees, managers or the organizations in trouble, leading the organization to the risks and crises [51]. Moreover, lack of focus on work and ignorance can repeat human errors. Therefore, adequate study for the job is needed to cope with the nature of the crisis.

Rumors and Sensations

Rumors are recruited in a certain way, and therefore they are surrounded by a series of false information, announced at a certain time, within a specific climate and environment, and through a specific event that triggers the crisis. Rumors and sensations are the outcomes of confusion of officials, climate with limited information and mass tensions[10].

Desire to Extortion and Power Exhibition

The lobbyists, as well as the stakeholders, use such methods in order to reap the unfair advantages from the administrative entity. Ivlevs and Hinks (2015) argue that interest groups' style is to create successive crises in the organization and create a series of crises that force the decision makers to obey their interests. The interest groups expose the leaders (top management) to psychological, physical and personal pressures due to the existence of conflict of interest and the desire to destroy others or destroy other organizations so as to show power in front of others[6].

Lack of Trust

Lack of faith in others and lack of confidence in people working around the organization, and may inspire lack of trust in the whole system, such as lack of confidence in the senior management or organization[37]. Some scholars suggest that lack of trust originate from low income, low morale or motivation as well as lack of interest in

work[24]. In addition to that, other scholars such as [44] belong trustless to tyranny and dictatorship in administrative work, concern and fear of the actions of the regime and appeasing presidents and resorting to political tricks.

Intentional or Planned Crises

Sometimes the top management and leaders try to produce problems and crises to camouflage larger crises. It is an attempt to distract from a real crisis by triggering imaginary crises[66]. In the developing countries, authorities plan to make troubles and crises to gain achievements immorally at the expense of others. That is, people are to be busy to solve the new crisis, neglecting the real crisis.

Wars and Conflicts

It has been experienced that wars and conflicts can affect countries' governance procedures. Some crises emerge due to the chaos originating from the wars and conflicts appeared in the country [38]. Apart from the destructions that wars bring, they need financial supports to continue. Furthermore, the aftermath of conflicts remains for a long time by which the organization can be easily affected due to the shortages in other sectors [5].

D. Ideological and Industrial Revolutions Causing the World Wars

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the world had seen several powerful states with different ideologies. At that time, Japan, China, USSR, USA, UK, France, Germany, Italy, and to some extent the Ottoman Empire were struggling with each other in order to have more colonies in the world. In most of these states, ideological and industrial revolutions could have affected in rewriting the states' economy and politics. Some countries came to alliance with each other in order to defeat an ideological revolution that was thought to be a threat on the world politics. Therefore, "war-making and preparations for war created the major structures of the national state" [57].

Due to these tensions and the emergence of fundamentalist nationalism and capitalism, an ideological revolution came to existence which was Marxism. This revolution was first seen in the heart of Russian Empire, Moscow. This ideology has firstly been traced back to literature by which the work of some writers, like More Thomas, was regarded as extremely socialism [19]. Nonetheless, the visible owner of this ideology as an international revolution was Karl Marx. Marx was not only against the Russian Empire, but he declared his school's disagreement against economic, social, and political system of the world. Therefore, the Marxist ideology can be seen as a revolution that created several economic, social and political instabilities in the world.

Marxists claimed that the socioeconomic structure, multi-classes, and political divisions should be changed in their roots. Since, at that time, every people could not participate in constituting the states' politics, the Marxists revolted in most of the Asian countries and Eastern Europe to oppose capitalism and bourgeoisie [45]. These ideas brought the global politics into a deep competition in order to diminish each other. Thus, Marxism with its rivals made the international community divided into multi-polar system since there were different attitudes towards this school inside communist entities.

Both of ideological and industrial revolutions pushed the great powers to have interest in making wars so as to achieve their interests in a specific region or in the whole world. In the early twentieth century, as the revolutionary

ideologies emerged, the world politics became multi-polarity. Each one of the UK, France, Germany, Russia, China, Japan, and the USA with their different ideological and industrial revolutions attempted to pose their intentions on other countries [8]. Therefore, the world was faced with two world wars in the early and mid-twentieth century. Destructive and taboo weapons were used in these two world wars. Consequently, millions of people were killed and emigrated.

Marxism, later on Leninism and Stalinism was spread in many neighboring and non-neighboring states. Some of the countries that followed this mainstream allied USSR, in its ideological conflict, violently accepted this kind of socialism. Some other states, by contrast, peacefully followed the USSR in its campaign against welfare states. Therefore, it can be inferred that the early nineteenth century was the beginning of the east-west conflicts that transformed the global politics into bi-polarity rather than multi-polarity[37]. That is, the two ideologies, Capitalism and Marxism, led the world politics in to a cold war in the world of bi-polar political system.

E. The Cold War Period and the Emergence of Crises

By the end of the World War I and World War II, each one of the Soviet Union and the USA made efforts to change the bipolarity of the world system by defeating one another. Thus, they tried to lead other territorial neighboring countries. The USA tried to do so by urging particularly the European countries to revolt against the idea of Communism, and far countries generally [8]. This was firstly because the Europe was the base of the growth of the world economy. Secondly, Europe was geographically between the two great powers. Thirdly, Europe has had great historical and economic influences on Africa and the Middle East. Therefore, the USA tried to collect the European countries under the NATO, an international defense organization, led by USA herself in the mid-twentieth century [8]. At the beginning the USSR asked to be a member in that organization, but the USA refused that idea.

The fundamental principle of Communism was classless and stateless society with a common ownership of the means of property. With this perspective, the USSR started to help socialist revolutions to achieve their independence from the powerful dominations such as UK and France. The US capitalist ideology, on the other hand, supported the anti-communism movements and upheavals [64]. That is, the Cold War between the Soviet Union and the USA affected the world politics and economy. Therefore, it can be inferred that the ideological revolutions have created political instabilities, economic crises and crises of lack of trust from mid-twentieth century until now.

Political Crises

The revolutionary ideologies of Communism and Capitalism have created political instabilities in most of the regions in the world. In the mid-twentieth century, China saw a very big civil war in number of participants in the world [14]. The West called that civil war coup d'état. Communists, by contrast, propagated that it was a great revolution. Mao Zedong, the founder and chairman of the Communist Party in China, established the main principles of Communism with respect to China's social situations at that time [21]. The conflicts were between the Communists and the Kuomintang, the ruling party in China at that time [21].

The result of that civil war was establishment of two defacto states of the Republic of China in Taiwan (ROC) Iceland and the People's Republic of China in the mainland (PRC). Each of these two states proclaimed that their government is legitimate and the other is fake [46]. They did not have any political or economic relations with each other. Furthermore, the international community was splitted to pro-PRC led by the communist ruling states and pro-ROC led by the Western countries. Therefore, due to the people's revolution in China, the world politics has encountered a split between western states and the eastern ones.

China was not the only case, the same story repeated in Korea. A civil war began in that country in early 1950s and resulted of establishment of two Koreas (Republic of South Korea and Republic of North Korea)[47]. Due to Communism's borderless society, this ideology was seen as international. The international Communism began to spread other states involving Middle-East and Western Europe [8]. They began with Iran and Egypt. In Iran, the Communists helped Mohammad Mosaddeq to be the prime minister of Iran. On the other hand, the West, USA and the UK, opposed him and they supported FazlollahZahedi to remove Mosaddeq from power by a coup d'état in August 1953 [23]. Moreover, in Arab countries, the East became pro-nationalists. In 1952, Jamal Abd al-Nasir staged a coup d'état and the Free Officers finished the ruling system of the country, Kingdom.

The Egyptian nationalist revolution was followed by several revolutions and attempts to change ruling figures in the region. After Egypt, countries like Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Libya, the Sudan, and Algeria (against French 132 year of occupation) have seen revolutions [68]. Since these revolutions were during the Cold War period, each of USSR and USA through economic, military and intelligent (logistic) means supported their allies in the Arab world. The Middle East had many importances for both sides. Firstly, Israel had lobbies in the western states, so the West wanted Israel to be safe. Secondly, geographically Middle East had a strategic position in the world. Thirdly, the growth of the world economy depended on oil, and the Middle East was rich of oil. Therefore, each of the USSR and USA tried to keep their interests safe and have more influences on the Middle East [38].

In addition to the political crises emerged by the conflicts between Communism and Capitalism, the Arab Spring in the first decade of the twenty first century is another example. In 2011, a revolutionary wave occurred in the Arab countries, starting with Tunisia and then moved to Libya, Egypt, Bahrain, Yemen, Syriaand now happening in the Sudan and Algeria [22]. The direction of the Arab Spring revolution was changed to bloody civil wars. Thousands of people killed or migrated in Libya, Syria and Yemen because the great powers, Russia, USA, China and EU attempted to change the direction of the revolutions towards their interests. Furthermore, the undemocratic regimes of Egypt, Bahrain, and Tunisia have been changed to the military stable systems coming after coup d'états [28]. Therefore, the examples of the ideological revolutions in the Twentieth century and the Arab Spring prove that due to the interests of the great powers the direction of the revolutions goes to the political instabilities.

Economic Crises

In most of the revolutions, the three types of revolution (agricultural, industrial and ideological revolutions) involve a change that moves society to its essence. That is, revolutions are planned developments to bring a massive positive change. Although the agricultural and industrial revolutions are considered as peaceful ones that may take a long time to succeed, they made huge changes in the economy of the countries and the whole world [65]. By the

changes of agricultural and industrial revolutions many problems occurred. For instance, the changes of the agriculture sector in in the UK in the 18th century made upheavals and movements in the country [15]. Furthermore, the industrial revolution in the Europe created an undulation of unemployment in the continent that started peacefully and had aggressive outcomes [55]. Therefore, although agricultural and industrial revolutions involve transformations that bring positive changes, there are several examples proving that such revolutions have had negative impacts on the economy.

The ideological revolutions, on the other hand, can aggressively and peacefully be held. Ideological revolutionists have differently reacted. Gandhi was very peaceful in protesting against the British colonization and succeeded in achieving his aims and objective [27]. Meanwhile, Che Guevara with his Marxist ideology, by contrast was a radical ideological revolutionist and in the same way he and his followers succeeded in obtaining what they tried to gain [40]. It is true that he chose military revolution in order to free some territorial regions in the Latin America but still he did not neglect negotiations and other peaceful means to achieve this freedom. Both of Che Guevara's and Gandhi's revolutions have had negative impacts on the economy of their countries and the colonist countries.

In addition, the Soviet Union supported the socialist European states as well as the revolutions in the Latin America and in neighboring states of the USA. For the Soviet Union, Europe is geographically important. Further, the USSR tried to take advantage of the natural resources and scientists of Europe. In the meantime, in the Latin America, the USSR tried to jeopardize the USA interests, and this made economic problems in most of these countries. Moreover, the Soviet Union wanted to lessen the USA stresses on the neighboring states of the USSR. Therefore, the Soviet Blok gathered the social countries in the region under the Warsaw Pact as a response to the establishment of NATO [41]. So any threat on any of the members of the Warsaw Pact or the NATO was measured on all the countries.

Although each one of NATO and Warsaw Pact are political and military organizations, the economic relations between all the countries split between these two blocks [58]. That is, most of the formal trade relations were between the allied states with each other rather than with non-allied ones. This division in the international politics and economy, as pros and against, led the world political and trade system into a severe ultimatum of so called Cold War between the Soviet Union and the USA [53]. Therefore, the world was economically, politically and militarily split between the West and the East polar.

The last Iranian Islamic revolution and Arab Spring are two best examples of revolutions that destroyed the economy of the states. The late seventies' Islamic revolution in Iran, although held against injustice and corrupted system, had negative and severe economic outcomes on Iran [1]. Moreover, the Arab Spring is a destructive revolution that brought the Arab countries back to 20 years [4]. According to the last estimations of World Bank each one of Syria, Yemen, and Libya have recorded more than 300 trillion dollars losses due to the conflicts emanating from the revolutions in these countries [2]. Further, people in Egypt, Tunisia, the Sudan and Algeria are suffering from poverty, unemployment and economic inflation due to the negative consequences of Arab Spring[4]. Thus, the revolutions have had negative impacts on the economic crises in the most of the regions in the world.

Lack of Trust

The aggressive competitions, including political and economic challenges, between the powerful countries emanating from ideological revolutions lead to different perspectives to the centralization of states. Therefore, revolutions “can be understood as movements of resistance against those domestic efforts to centralize” [34]. However, during that period some of the powerful countries were partially against this wave of revolution. For instance, a country like Germany was not against the revolution’s ideology but she was against the threats of the military and economic expansion that put the German territorial interests in jeopardy [8]. Thus, it can be said that ideological revolutions created the lack of trust between world economic and political powers. That is, great powers have been afraid of the aftermath of the ideological revolutions and the crisis of lack of trust between the world powers started to boom out.

The Cold War between the Soviet Union and the United States of America lasted decades until the collapse of the USSR in 1989. Due to the impact of the communist revolution on the international community’s position another term emerged into world diplomacy which was anti-revolutionism [8]. Though German’s Hitler was a great threat on the whole world, the triumph of Stalin was not considered as the success of democracy in the world since the extreme expansion of Communism jeopardized other ideologies [31]. The ideological and geographical expansion of the USSR led other non-communist states to aggressively oppose any upheaval that was near to socialism. Therefore, each of USSR and the West supported the upheavals and revolutions in the territories of each other’s interest, such as, Korea, China, Vietnam and Arab world.

The international Communism began to spread other states involving Middle-East and Western Europe [8]. They began with Iran and Egypt. In Iran, the Communists helped Mohammad Mosaddeq to be the prime minister of Iran. On the other hand, the West, USA and the UK, opposed him and they supported FazlollahZahedi to remove Mosaddeq from power by a coup d’état in August 1953 [23]. Moreover, in Arab countries, the East became pro-nationalists. In 1952, Jamal Abd al-Nasir staged a coup d’état in which the Free Officers finished the ruling system of the state, Kingdom.

Although Free Officers were not communists, the USSR supported them just because king Farooq was extremely pro-West leader. Moreover, this revolutionary coup d’état caught the “imagination” of other states to concentrate on nationalism and socialism [33]. This nationalist revolution gave the West a point of view that Arab states were about to ally themselves with Palestinians and they threatened the security of the West’s representative in the region, Israel [62]. From that time, Communism and Capitalism transformed their conflicts to the far territories. That is, they ignited the fire of revolutionism in the countries allying the other side. Nevertheless, these efforts were dangerous for the evolution of the world economy and the international security system as the crisis of lack of trust created the sense of threat on the national security for each country.

The crisis of lack of trust between the USA and the USSR was not treated although Khrushchev’s message paved the path to end the Cold War. Then, this led to collapse a powerful pole, Communism, in the world and transform the global politics in to uni-polarity [35]. The Communism was diminished in most of the European countries and the USSR did not or could not resist the revolutionary waves that involved USSR, even. Therefore, since 1989 the

international politics remained in the uni-polarity of the USA. Nevertheless, the collapse of the USSR did not produce trust of political and military stability between the West and the East [67]. The Russian supports to Assad's regime in Syria and the US aids to Syrian opposition is a good example to prove that the historical conflicts between these two revolutionary powers created the root of lack of trust between great powers [60]. Therefore, according to all these examples of ideological clashes and revolutions it can be inferred that ideological revolutions has negatively affected international relations.

V. CONCLUSION

Due to the importance of the subject, having direct impact on all the sectors of world politics, many scholars with different mainstreams have given different definitions to the concept of revolutions. Crane Brinton have given a broad definition to the concept arguing that revolutions are sudden and drastic attempts to change the ruling group in a territorial political status by another non-ruling group. Theda Skocpol, by contrast, has narrowly defined revolutions consuming that it is has to do with social perspective. That is, revolutions, again, are rapid and basic transformations from a social status or structure to another one.

Three main types of revolutions, agricultural, industrial, and ideological revolutions are explained in this study. Although all three types are explained, the main focus of this study is on the latter. The ideological revolutions have aggressive outcomes mainly happening in the third world states by which the whole system of the peoples' life and political entity's strategies are going to be changed. The main reason behind the aggressive revolutions is that the ruling politicians do not accept any change, therefore the other not running group that government revolt aggressively. Moreover, sometimes ideological revolutions are peaceful taking a long time but more successful because their main aim is not destroying the whole system, wherein only corrupted sectors are going to be reformed.

This study has also explained the main ideological revolutions in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries that have created conflicts, wars, crises as well as cold wars between East and West. This work has identified the outcomes of the main ideological revolutions in which political and economic crises, and lack of trust left between the great powers. Furthermore, this study has illustrated that revolutionism has created a wave of revolution. When a revolution occurs in a particular country, other neighboring countries encounter the same wave of revolutions, like what happened in the Arab world in 1950s and the Arab Spring in 2010s. The consequences of such revolutions are very severe and destructive by which civil wars, economic crises and dictatorship occur in these countries. Therefore, such sudden and fast changes have negative results.

Due to the importance of the revolutionism, scholars should make more studies on the consequences of aggressive revolutions in the future. Such research helps politicians and opposition parties, especially in the third world countries, to focus on peaceful long-term revolutions rather than aggressive ones. Moreover, future studies should concentrate on the developments of the Middle East for having strong influence of the future of world political system. The researchers ought to discuss the main reasons of Arab uprisings so as that authorities attempt to make reforms before disastrous conflicts appear. Finally, scholars have to make studies on the crises and causes of crises wherein several causes of crises belong to wars and conflicts that may occur due to aggressive revolutions especially in the developing countries.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alini, E., & Alini, M. (2018). The effects of the Islamic Revolution on the structure of political power in Iran (1978-2005). *Revista Publicando*, 5(15), 1559-1582.
- [2] Alkhawani, M. A. (2016). *The impact of the leadership styles on crisis management: A study at Yemen private and public institutions*. Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Utara Malaysia.
- [3] Allen, F. (2010). An overview of the crisis: Causes, consequences, and solutions. *International Review of Finance*, 10(1), 1-26.
- [4] Arampatzi, E., Burger, M., Ianchovichina, E., Röhrich, T., & Veenhoven, R. (2018). Unhappy development: Dissatisfaction with Life on the Eve of the Arab Spring. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 64, S80-S113.
- [5] Balabanova, E. (2017). *Media, wars and politics: Comparing the incomparable in Western and Eastern Europe*. Routledge.
- [6] Boin, A., Stern, E., & Sundelius, B. (2016). *The politics of crisis management: Public leadership under pressure*. Cambridge University Press.
- [7] Brinton, C. (1965). *The Anatomy of Revolution*. New York: Vintage Books.
- [8] Brogi, A. (2018). Ending Grand Alliance Politics in Western Europe: US Anti-communism in France and Italy, 1944–7. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 53(1), 134-157.
- [9] Bukovansky, M. (2002). *Legitimacy and power politics: the American and French Revolutions in international political culture*. New York: Princeton University Press.
- [10] Carlson, M., Jakli, L., & Linos, K. (2018). Rumors and refugees: how government-created information vacuums undermine effective crisis management. *International Studies Quarterly*, 62(3), 671-685.
- [11] Comfort, L. K., Sungu, Y., Johnson, D., & Dunn, M. (2001). Complex systems in crisis: Anticipation and resilience in dynamic environments. *Journal of contingencies and crisis management*, 9(3), 144-158.
- [12] Coomb, W. T. (2014). *Ongoing crisis communication: Planning, managing, and responding*. Sage Publications.
- [13] Coombs, W. T., & Holladay, S. J. (2010). Examining the effects of mutability and framing on perceptions of human error and technical error crises: Implications for situational crisis communication theory. In *The handbook of crisis communication* (p. 18).
- [14] Dunn, J. (1989). *Modern Revolutions*. Cambridge University Press.
- [15] Esdaile, C. J. (2018). *The Wars of the French Revolution: 1792–1801*. Routledge.
- [16] Farazmand, A. (2017). Crisis and Emergency Management: Theory and Practice. In *Crisis and Emergency Management* (p. 1). London: Taylor & Francis Group.
- [17] Fearn-Banks, K. (1996). Crisis communication theory and ten businesses hit by news for making crises. *Global business trends*, 55-62.
- [18] Fink, S. (1986). Crisis management: Planning for the inevitable. *American Management Association*.
- [19] Fitzpatrick, S. (2008). *The Russian Revolution*. Oxford University Press.
- [20] Friedrich, C. J. (2007). *Revolutions*. New York: Aldine Transaction.
- [21] Gay, K. (2008). *Mao Zedong's China*. 21st Century Books, ISBN 0-8225-7285-0.
- [22] Geddes, A., & Hadj-Abdou, L. (2018). Changing the path? EU migration governance after the 'Arab spring'. *Mediterranean Politics*, 23(1), 142-160.
- [23] Ghani, C. (2001). *Iran and the rise of Reza Shah*. I.B.Tauris.
- [24] Green Jr, P. I., Finkel, E. J., Fitzsimons, G. M., & Gino, F. (2017). The energizing nature of work engagement: Toward a new need-based theory of work motivation. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 37, 1-18.

- [25] Habibullah, M. S., H. Din, B., & Abdul Hamid, B. (2016). Good governance and crime rates in Malaysia. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 43(3), 308-320.
- [26] Halliday, F. (1999). *Revolution and World Politics*. Macmillan Press LTD.
- [27] Hart, D. M. (2019). *Indira Gandhi's India/h*. Routledge.
- [28] Hassan, M., & Shalaby, M. (2019). Drivers of Tolerance in Post-Arab Spring Egypt: Religious, Economic, or Government Endorsements? *Political Research Quarterly*, 72(2), 293-308.
- [29] Heath, R. L., & O'Hair, H. D. (2010). The significance of crisis and risk communication. In *Handbook of risk and crisis communication* (pp. 17-42). Routledge.
- [30] Hobsbawm, E. (1962). *The Age of Revolution, 1789-1848*. New York: New American Library.
- [31] HUSAIN, M. Z., & LIEBERTZ, S. (2019). Hitler, Stalin, and Authoritarianism: A Comparative Analysis. *Journal of Psychohistory*, 47(1).
- [32] James, N. A. (1992). *The Cuban missile crisis revisited*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- [33] Katz, M. N. (1997). *Revolutions and Revolutionary Waves*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- [34] Kimmel, M. S. (1990). *Revolution: A Sociological Interpretation*. Great Britain: Polity Press.
- [35] Larson, D. W. (2018). Kennedy and Khrushchev. *Diplomatic History*.
- [36] Linda Frey and Marsha Frey. (2004). *The French Revolution*. USA: Greenwood Press.
- [37] Lins, K. V., Servaes, H., & Tamayo, A. (2017). Social capital, trust, and firm performance: The value of corporate social responsibility during the financial crisis. *The Journal of Finance*, 72(4), 1785-1824.
- [38] Maghdid, R. S. (2016). The Impact of Peace and Conflict in Cyprus on Turkey's International Relations. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies (IJHCS) ISSN 2356-5926*, 3(2), 1058-1075.
- [39] Maitlis, S., & Sonenshein, S. (2010). Sensemaking in crisis and change: Inspiration and insights from Weick (1988). *Journal of management studies*, 47(3), 551-580.
- [40] McCormick, G. H., & Berger, M. T. (2019). Ernesto (Che) Guevara: The Last "Heroic" Guerrilla. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 42(4), 336-362.
- [41] McDermott, K., & Stibbe, M. (Eds.). (2018). *Eastern Europe in 1968: Responses to the Prague Spring and Warsaw Pact Invasion*. Springer.
- [42] Mitroff, I. I. (1994). Crisis management and environmentalism: A natural fit. *California management review*, 36(2), 101-113.
- [43] Mitroff, I. I., & Anagnos, G. (2001). *Managing crisis before happen*. New York: American Management Association.
- [44] Mohammadpour, I. (2016). Analysis of the Role of the Press in the Egyptian Revolution of 2011. *J. Pol. & L.*, 9, 145.
- [45] Newton, K., Stolle, D., & Zmerli, S. (2018). Social and political trust. *The Oxford handbook of social and political trust*, 37.
- [46] Nong, H. (2018). The Applicability of the Archipelagic Regime in the South China Sea: A Debate on the Rights of Continental States' Outlying Archipelagos. *Ocean Yearbook Online*, 32(1), 80-117.
- [47] Novokmet, F., Piketty, T., Yang, L., & Zucman, G. (2018). From communism to capitalism: Private versus public property and inequality in China and Russia. In *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, Vol. 108, pp. 109-13.
- [48] Overton, M. (2002, September 19). *Agricultural Revolution in England 1500 - 1850*. Retrieved June 13, 2018, from BBC.
- [49] Parker, R. B. (1993). *The Politics of Miscalculation in the Middle East*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- [50] Preble, J. F. (1997). Integrating the crisis management perspective into the strategic management process. *Journal of Management Studies*, 34(5), 769-791.

- [51] Remmer, K. L. (1990). Democracy and economic crisis: the Latin American experience. *World Politics*, 42(3), 315-335.
- [52] Seeger, M. W., Sellnow, T. L., & Ulmer, R. R. (1998). Communication, organization, and crisis. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 21(1), 231-276.
- [53] Shearman, P. (2018). Russian Foreign Policy Since 1990. In *Russian Policy toward the United States* (pp. 111-133). Routledge.
- [54] Skocpol, T. (1979). *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [55] Stearns, P. N. (2018). *The industrial revolution in world history*. Routledge.
- [56] Terry, B. (1989). *Revolution in the World-System*. New York-London: Greenwood Press.
- [57] Tilly, C. (1985). *War making and state making as organized Crime*. Cambridge University Press.
- [58] Tilly, C. (2018). How empires end. In *After Empire* (pp. 1-11). Routledge.
- [59] Tolz, V., & Newton, M. (2019). *The USSR in 1990: A Record of Events*. Routledge.
- [60] Uludag, M., & Molyneux, J. (2018). Imperialism, Russia and Syria. *Irish Marxist Review*, 7(21), 31-41.
- [61] Von Mises, L., & Greaves, P. L. (2006). *The Causes of the Economic Crisis: And Other Essays Before and After the Great Depression*. Auburn: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- [62] Williams, B., & Morrison, M. (2018). The enemy of my ally is my friend? *New Zealand International Review*, 43(2), 23.
- [63] Wolbers, J., Boersma, K., & Groenewegen, P. (2018). Introducing a fragmentation perspective on coordination in crisis management. *Organization Studies*, 39(11), 1521-1546.
- [64] Woods, C. (2018). Seditious Crimes and Rebellious Conspiracies: Anti-communism and US Empire in the Philippines. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 53(1), 61-88.
- [65] Xu, M., David, J. M., & Kim, S. H. (2018). The fourth industrial revolution: opportunities and challenges. *International journal of financial research*, 9(2), 90-95.
- [66] Zappettini, F., & Krzyżanowski, M. (2019). The critical juncture of Brexit in media & political discourses: from national-populist imaginary to cross-national social and political crisis. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 1-8.
- [67] Zaslavsky, V. (2018). The Soviet Union. In *After Empire* (pp. pp. 73-96). Routledge.
- [68] Zimmermann, E. (2011). *Political Violence, Crises and Revolutions*. New York: Routledge