

JAROMÍR MRŇKA (ED.)

**BEYOND THE REVOLUTION  
IN RUSSIA  
NARRATIVES - CONCEPTS - SPACES**



**100 YEARS SINCE THE EVENT**

KAROLINUM PRESS

Karolinum Press is a publishing department of Charles University  
Ovocny trh 560/5, 116 36 Prague 1, Czech Republic  
[www.karolinum.cz](http://www.karolinum.cz)

INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMES

Siwiewcova 2, 130 00 Prague 3, Czech Republic  
[www.ustrcr.cz](http://www.ustrcr.cz)

© Edited by Jaromír Mrňka, 2021

Editor-in-chief: Vanda Vicherková

Translations and editing: Steve Coleman, Simon O'Flynn, Hynek Zlatník

Layout by Jan Šerých

Set the Czech Republic by Karolinum Press

First edition

The original manuscript was reviewed by Daniela Kolenovská and Karel Svoboda

ISBN 978-80-246-4858-3 (Karolinum Press); 978-80-88292-95-1 (ÚSTR)

ISBN 978-80-246-4859-0 (Karolinum Press, pdf); 978-80-88292-97-5 (ÚSTR, pdf)



Univerzita Karlova  
Nakladatelství Karolinum

[www.karolinum.cz](http://www.karolinum.cz)  
[ebooks@karolinum.cz](mailto:ebooks@karolinum.cz)



# CONTENTS

---

Acknowledgments	7
-----------------	---

---

## **Introduction**

Beyond the Revolution in Russia <i>Jaromír Mrňka</i>	10
Revolution as “History’s Locomotive” or a Tool for Scientific Analysis? <i>Miroslav Hroch</i>	14
Russian Political Reform – the Solution to the Crisis of the Russian State? <i>Radomír Vlček</i>	31

---

## **Part 1: Narratives**

The Role of the Russian Intelligentsia and the Decembrists in the First Half of the 19 <sup>th</sup> Century as the Predecessors of the 1917 Revolutionaries <i>Anežka Hrebíková</i>	58
The Image of the Russian Revolution in the Work of Aleksandr Blok <i>Hana Kosáková</i>	73
From Platonov to Aitmatov; from Eisenstein to Abuladze (The Image of the Revolution in Soviet Literature and Film) <i>Hynek Škořepa</i>	87
Representation of the Upheavals in 1917 Russia in War Museums <i>Andrea Brait</i>	114

---

## **Part 2: Concepts**

Beyond Revolutionary Declarations. Direct Implications of the Bolshevik Revolution <i>Adam Bosiacki</i>	134
We – the Revolution, We –the Scythians, We – the Proletkult <i>Olga Pavlova</i>	147
Stalin for the Revolution, the Revolution for Stalin. The Actual Role of Joseph Stalin in the Bolshevik Revolution vs. How He Benefited from It during His Rule <i>Weronika Hanna Kulczewska</i>	160

The Revolutionary Year 1917 in the Russian Political Discourse and the Current Russian-language Historiography <i>Michal Šmigel, Viachaslau Menkouski</i>	<b>180</b>
---	------------

---

**Part 3: Spaces**

Dismantling Constructivism: Critique of the City-Machine, the Scientific Socialist Utopia of Soviet Modernisation <i>Rachel Pacheco Vasconcellos</i>	<b>210</b>
--	------------

Let There Be Light! What Cured the Tsarist Russian Peasantry of Analphabetism – Revolution (1917) or Evolution (Catalysed by the Tsarist Railways)? <i>Sylvia Szttern</i>	<b>232</b>
--	------------

Being a “Revolutionary Artist” after 1917 <i>Marija Podzorova</i>	<b>262</b>
--	------------

Post-peasantry Russia: the “Alienated” Spaces. How have the Media Affected This Phenomenon? <i>Evgeniya Petrova</i>	<b>282</b>
---	------------

Class Wars: The Relevance of the Bolshevik Revolution and the Actualisability of Socialism <i>Siyaves Azeri</i>	<b>299</b>
---	------------

---

List of Authors	<b>312</b>
-----------------	------------

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The book is an outcome of the conference “Beyond the Revolution in Russia: Narratives – Concepts – Spaces. 100 Years since the Event” that took place at the Faculty of Arts of Charles University in Prague between 7 November and 9 November 2017. The History Students’ Association of the Charles University Faculty of Arts (FFabula – Spolek studentů historie FF UK) organised the conference with generous support from the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes and the Faculty itself. Namely, we would like to express our greatest thanks to the then Dean of the Faculty, Assoc. Prof. Mirjam Friedová, and to the deputy director of the Institute, Mr. Ondřej Matějka.

During the centennial of the Russian revolution, this event was the only international scientific gathering in the Czech Republic. The conference brought together junior and senior scholars from both the Czech Republic and other European countries, together with Russia and, surprisingly, also one participant from South America. We are most grateful to everyone involved in the organisation of this exceptional event, particularly to all our volunteers, participants, and contributors to this book.



# INTRODUCTION

# BEYOND THE REVOLUTION IN RUSSIA

JAROMÍR MRŇKA

One hundred years ago, the revolution in Russia opened up totally new horizons. The outbreak of a socialist revolution in one of the least industrially developed European regions was for contemporaries as surprising as the destabilising potential of new revolutionary thoughts and practices. The experience of revolution directly influenced the development of the East-Central European region in the immediate aftermath of the Great War (World War One). Its consequences were fully manifested, for instance, in young successor states of the Austrian Empire: Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. The legacies and images of the Revolution were already evolving dramatically by the time Soviet rule was established in the late 1920s, which also took place under the rapidly changing Stalinism in the 1930s. Moreover, Stalin's conception of the Revolution directly shaped the reception and interpretations of these events in the newly established sphere of Soviet power in the Eastern Bloc after World War Two. Nevertheless, the image of the revolution was important not only for the countries under state socialist regimes but also for liberal democracies. To quote a classic, the spectre of communist revolution haunted both liberal and conservative governments at the time of the Great Depression as well as during the many crises of the Cold War. Therefore we were interested not only in the immediate influence of revolutionary events, but also focused on the transferring and transforming function of ideas, concepts, and practices of the Revolution both within the Russian, or rather Soviet, Empire, and in the East-Central European region.

In order to overcome the persisting distaste for the study of the Revolution in post-communist societies after 1989, we wanted to open up an entirely new perspective on the Revolution. This conception should have been different from the ossified mental patterns of dogmatic Marxism-Leninism that formed the canon under state socialism. We also did not want to get stuck in a traditional empirical description of events, typical for old-fashioned political history. We wanted to step out beyond the Revolution in Russia. For this reason, we tried to render the Russian revolution in its ambiguity between the event itself, the medium-term social and economic transformations, and the long-term reconfiguration of the spaces of power and politics. We saw the Revolution as a complex restructuring of the people's existence – as an event in itself – and simultaneously as a multi-layered process of the

ongoing (re)interpretation of this historical moment by different individuals and in the various worlds of meaning – as an event unto itself. According to this understanding of the Revolution, we distinguished three independent fields connected with different analytical subjects, i.e. narratives, concepts, and spaces, and we also followed this line in the basic structure of our book. The following introductory chapter **Revolution As “History’s Locomotive” Or a Tool for Scientific Analysis?** by Miroslav Hroch considers a general theory of revolutions. He draws on the background of the Revolution in Russia to show that the most important condition of revolutionary “success” was the existence of a revolutionary situation, and attempts to justify his consensual concept of revolution through the typology of European revolutions. For Hroch, political reforms are not always complete contradictions of revolutions; on the contrary, each is inseparable from the other. It is more than natural that Radomír Vlček focused his final introductory chapter **Russian Political Reform – the Solution to the Crisis of the Russian State?** on the genealogy of the political reforms in the Russian Empire before the eve of the 1917 Revolution. Vlček also convincingly shows that the final attempt to open the Russian administration to modern ways of thinking failed due to hesitation on the part of the Tsar.

The first part of the book, devoted to different narratives of the Russian Revolution, deals with various historiographical concepts, layers of interpretation, and especially with the transformation of images of the Russian revolution in art and also in the current politics of memory. Anežka Hrebiková opens the topic with her chapter **The Role of the Russian Intelligentsia and the Decembrists in the First Half of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century as the Predecessors of the 1917 Revolutionaries** Illustrated by the case study of Russian intellectuals, Hrebiková strives to deconstruct the traditional explanatory patterns of the dogmatic Marxian historiography in order to connect the roots of the Russian revolution again with the generation formed by the Decembrist revolt of 1825. The role of Russian intellectuals continues in the second chapter entitled **The Image of the Russian Revolution in the Work of Aleksandr Blok**. In the work of this outstanding symbolist poet, Hana Kosáková found an image of the Revolution as a punishment for Russian intellectuals for their failure in the nation’s history. The people and the masses, who should, according to Blok, replace them in the leading position, became the creative force of destruction. In some of Blok’s texts the triggering of revolutionary violence is connected with the final culmination of history on the way towards a new era for humanity, whereas in others he shows the Russian revolution as a time of turmoil. The connection of traditional Russian culture with the horizons of the art newly opened by the Revolution also constitutes the main topic of the following chapter **From Platonov to Aitmatov; from Eisenstein to Abuladze (The Image of the Revolution in Soviet Literature and Film)**. Hynek

Skořepa follows the different images of the Revolution and its possible alternatives through the transformation of art from various avant-garde movements towards the production of late socialist realism. The final chapter of this part takes us completely to the present day, when Andrea Brait turns our attention to the **Representation of the Upheavals in 1917 Russia in War Museums**. Although the year 1917 was a crucial turning point in World War One, it remains underrepresented in the museum exhibitions of Central and Eastern Europe.

The second part of the book strives to capture the different concepts that emerged as a result of the Revolution or, on the contrary, to analyse various concepts and discourses bound to the Revolution. The focus lies particularly with the Russian concept of revolution, its reception and discourses about the Revolution in Eastern European intellectual space. In the first chapter, **Beyond Revolutionary Declarations. Direct Implications of the Bolshevik Revolution**, Adam Bosiacki examines the first concepts of law that Bolsheviks enforced in their political system immediately after the Revolution. Despite the obvious lack of sources, Bosiacki reconstructs a totally new revolutionary legality as a closed system based on the Lenin's idea of law as an instrument of repression against enemies. According to Bosiacki, although a whole range of them was officially adopted under Stalin's rule, these legal concepts were already rooted in the vast transformations of civil war – in the praxis of war communism. The period of time between 1917 and 1922 is also crucial for the following chapter **We – the Revolution, We – the Scythians, We – the Proletkult** about the novel by the Russian writer Yevgeny Zamyatin. Analysing this first piece of modern anti-utopian literature, Olga Pavlova identifies two fundamental concepts – the decline of Western industrial civilisation, and the perverted praxis of the proletarian revolution in Russia. This perversion is usually associated with the later rule of Joseph V. Stalin, whose role in the Revolution used to be underestimated. On the contrary, Weronika Kulczewska questions these opinions in her chapter **Stalin for the Revolution, the Revolution for Stalin. The Actual Role of Joseph Stalin in the Bolshevik Revolution vs. How He Benefited from It during His Rule**. According to her, the Revolution played a significant role in Stalin's networking, and later enabled him to seize power. Finally, Michal Šmigel' and Viachaslau Menkouski analyse the Revolution as a subject of contemporary Russian politics of memory. The chapter **The Revolutionary Year 1917 in the Russian Political Discourse and the Current Russian-language Historiography** shows that even though the Bolshevik coup remains an unchallenged crucial event in Russian history, the professional and public interpretations remain ambiguous.

The third part of the book is based on an idea that the Revolution opened up totally new spaces beyond the actual course of affairs, topographies, and events. The future-oriented expectations of contemporaries at the beginning

of the 1920s were important, such as in the field of urbanism and architecture. This becomes evident in the chapter **Dismantling Constructivism: Critique of the City-Machine, the Scientific Socialist Utopia of Soviet Modernisation**, where Rachel Pacheco Vasconcellos approaches Russian constructivism as a modern ideology of the production of space. Nevertheless, Vasconcellos came to the conclusion that the scientific socialist utopia of the city-machine never surpassed the abstractions of the capital. The spatial dimensions of the processes connected to the Revolution are also crucial for the following analysis by Sylvia Sztern. In the chapter **Let There Be Light! What Cured the Tsarist Russian Peasantry of Analphabetism – Revolution (1917) or Evolution (Catalysed by the Tsarist Railways)?**, Sztern argues that although the decline of illiteracy is usually explained by the Soviet reforms and industrialisation under Stalin's rule, the tsarist railroads played a far more important role in the process of opening rural areas up to the modern world. However, the Revolution also opened up a completely different imaginary space for the artists who had not experienced these ground-breaking moments personally, setting in motion a cognitive-cultural revolution. In her chapter **Being a “Revolutionary Artist” after 1917** Marija Podzorova explains that the Revolution gave rise to new motifs on the international scene. Western artists saw it as an opportunity to link their aesthetic research to political commitment, thus manifesting their revolutionary aspirations for international solidarity and the new approaches of the avant-garde as politically engaged art. Revolution affected not only contemporaries but also the survivors after the collapse of Soviet rule. In the final chapter **Post-peasantry Russia: the “Alienated” Spaces. How have the Media Affected This Phenomenon?**, Evgeniya Petrova presents a study of contemporary Russian everyday life and identifies the media as a crucial post-soviet factor for the alienation of peripheries following historical causes, e.g. collectivisation and resettlement.

In order to enter all the possible spaces connected with the Revolution, to cover all the legacies, and to capture the revolutionary events in all their plurality, at the very end of our book we present a chapter from the field of current Marxian political philosophy that really does go beyond the Revolution. In his chapter **Class Wars: The Relevance of the Bolshevik Revolution and the Actualisability of Socialism** Siyaveş Azeri explores the crucial role of Vladimir I. Lenin's thoughts in converting Marxian revolutionary theory into political praxis. Despite Azeri's enthusiasm, even though the ideals of the Revolution live on in the hopes of many oppressed people and shape the persistent legacy of the events of October 1917, we have to remark that the immense crimes committed by various communist regimes of the past and millions of their victims certainly remain an inexcusable dark side of revolutionary ideas. Even one hundred years after the event, this reminds us that one's dreams easily become another person's nightmares.

# REVOLUTION AS “HISTORY’S LOCOMOTIVE” OR A TOOL FOR SCIENTIFIC ANALYSIS?\*

MIROSLAV HROCH

Very few terms have been and still are used with so much controversy and with so many different emotions as the term “revolution”. There is perhaps no other term that is used with such a contradicting evaluation and in such different contexts. However, this does not concern the word itself, but the reality which it describes. It is hard to resist the temptation to recount the prehistory of the notion here, from Copernicus’ *De revolutionibus coelestis* to the often quoted reply heard by Louis XVI after the fall of the Bastille in 1789: *No, Sire, it is not a revolt. It is a revolution.* And it was after the French Revolution that the fervour stirred for the first time, linked with this notion and the tumult of the following two centuries that it marked. There have been repeated conflicts between those who were for, and those who were against the revolution.<sup>1</sup>

As early as in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century one group saw revolution as a notion for events which moved the course of history forward, and in their eyes revolution was synonymous with progress and the liberation of man and citizen. This opinion found its metaphor in Marx’s well-known statement about revolutions as history’s locomotives.

For the other group, revolutions were a criminal violation of law and order, an uncontrolled outbreak of passion, violence, which led to cruelty and barbarism, events that should never have happened.

Both camps were and were not right. Enough historical evidence could be found to support each of the two opinions. It depended on the point of view from which the facts were selected, i.e., whether the observer identified himself with the revolutionaries and their objectives, or with the victims of revolution, be they prominent figures of the old regime, or countrymen-traditionalists. This was a rather transparent polarity within which the notion of revolution somehow found its place during the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and even its

---

\* The chapter presented herein is an abbreviated and materially reworked version of Chapter 7 of the author’s book, HROCH, Miroslav: *Hledání souvislostí. Eseje z komparativních dějin Evropy [Looking for Contexts. Essays on the Comparative History of Europe]*. SLON, Praha 2018, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.

<sup>1</sup> The changes of the notion of “revolution” in the European region were discussed quite thoroughly by Karl Griewank, cf. GRIEWANK, Karl: *Der neuzeitliche Revolutionsbegriff. Entstehung und Entwicklung*. Böhlau, Weimar 1955. As far as the author knows, this unsurpassed work is still mostly unknown to English-speaking authors.

opponents appeased themselves with the fact that revolutions in the past had for ever changed the life of countries or nations. This can be best proven by the fact that even opponents of revolution accepted that the founding of the United States of America was the result of revolution, or that the revolutionary *Marseillaise* became the French national anthem.

As time went on in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and began to approach our present age, the differentiation became more complicated, as other revolutionary changes came on the scene, the most troublesome of which being the October Revolution. When the term "revolution" also came to be commonly used for historical twists that were seen as positive, such as the American Revolution, many observers, especially among politically involved commentators, felt that the same term could not be used for such a dignified act as the founding of the USA and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen on the one hand, and the groundbreaking and violent events brought by October 1917 in Russia on the other. So the meanings of terms such as "coup d'état", "putsch", or "seizure of power" that have been used and are still in use rather as synonyms for "revolution", were made up-to-date in Czech as well as in other languages.

The polarisation of opinions became yet more complicated. It was easy for those who considered revolution to be a contemptible form of change to have the term denote changes which they condemned. However, they hesitated to use it for changes that they welcomed, for instance, to call the Prague 1989 overthrow the "Velvet Revolution". In contrast, those who considered revolution as a driving force for progress used the term to denote changes which they welcomed, and rejected its use for events that they disagreed with; according to them the term "Velvet Revolution" is wholly acceptable. The core of the problem, however, lies not in words, i.e., in terminology, but in the content and definitions of this term. Which event, which change really does deserve to become the subject of dispute, or: how to define "revolution"?

This crucial question also had to be addressed by those serious researchers who still felt the need to keep using the term "revolution" in their work, even to refer to revolutionary changes they disagreed with. Owing to this, many studies were written between the wars and especially after World War Two, whose authors approached the study and comparison of revolution as a subject of observation which is neutral in value.<sup>2</sup> With most of them especially the "classic" revolutions became the subject of observation – the English Glorious Revolution of 1689, the American Revolution, the French

---

2 The understanding of the notion of "revolution" actually differed: 1. According to the opinion on the form of change; was it a form of a sudden violent upheaval, or a process? 2. According to the change that it brought: was it the political system that changed, or was it the whole social system? In the former case, political revolution is spoken of; in the latter, social revolution.

Revolution of 1789, the European Revolutions of 1848, the Russian Revolution of 1917 and the Chinese Revolution of 1949. Every author admitted that there have been many other less revolutionary upheavals, but in specific cases their opinions differed: How many revolutions were there actually in Spain in the 19<sup>th</sup> century? Was the establishment of Czechoslovakia in 1918 actually a revolution? Did February 1948 bring changes in Czechoslovakia which were of revolutionary nature? Can the revolution of 1848 also be seen as a revolution although it was suppressed? If the overthrow of the fascist regime in Italy was a revolution, was Mussolini’s assumption of power the same a quarter of a century earlier?

What is to be done with this confusion of terms? We have three options. The first is unrealistic: to get rid of the term “revolution” and implement in its stead several codes – letters or numbers, the first of which would denote the general characteristics of the change and the following would specify its date, location and the nature of the changes it brought.

The second option is realistic. Let us leave the notion of “revolution” in place as referring to changes we like, which we approve as bringing progress, and, in the spirit of postmodern relativism, leave the choice of such events to the individual preferences of each user; on the contrary, let everyone use pejorative terms to refer to the historical changes which he rejects. However, this approach would be appropriate for a political commentary, but difficult to apply for scientific analysis.

I see the true solution in trying to neutralise the good old notion of revolution in its value, which means to define it most intelligibly on a consensual basis so that it becomes a tool objectivising the analysis of historical processes and transformations. I would describe this option as scientific.

However, someone may object at this point: Do we really need such a term to become a tool for scientific analysis? This objection would be valid to a certain degree only if we were to reduce history to microanalysis and refuse to study an individual’s fate in the context of great social changes. But if I consider history and the closely linked field of historical sociology, and other social sciences, too, to be sciences on the transformability of history and the causal connections which determined historical change, such an objection would be nonsensical for me. I therefore assume that a definition of the notion of “revolution” must be found that is as consensual as possible.

The presumption for such an attempt is to verify whether it is possible to free oneself of the emotional burden and find a “neutral” definition of the notion so that it could be made into a useful analytical tool.<sup>3</sup>

---

3 The author proposed such an approach for the first time in 1995 in his article: HROCH, Miroslav: Zur Typologie der europäischen Revolutionen. Einige Überlegungen zur nicht bestehenden

First, it is in the interest of such a neutralisation to eliminate two important and prominent emotional characteristics of revolution. Critics of revolution primarily see it as an *a priori* bloody and violent event, hence unnecessary or even harmful. Secondly, on the other side of the evaluation scale, there is the identification of revolution with progress, the idea that progress can be achieved especially through revolutions or the threat of revolutions.

Looking for a generally applicable definition, we must begin with the characteristics that all or most authors agree on.<sup>4</sup> Firstly, it is generally assumed that revolutions had their agenda, and were based on the idea that not only should those in power be replaced, but primarily that the general circumstances should be changed. Therefore they strove to bring about a quick social or political change of a principal nature, a **change in the political system**, or of the social structure. It is also agreed that such a change was not the result of a decision of those who ruled, but came about against their will, i.e., by **violating the established legal or constitutional order**. Such a change would not be possible without force, but not only those changes which took the form of **applied violence** against the so far ruling state enforcement apparatus should be deemed to be revolution. Often the mere **threat** of violence was sufficient. The level of cruelty of the violent conflicts in the course of the revolution was not usually decided by the bloodthirstiness of the leaders of the revolution as much as by the nature and intensity of resistance from those against whom the revolution was aimed.

A revolution defined as a system change based on the intention to modify the existing state of affairs can be easily distinguished from the palace revolutions or uprisings and folk revolts which were to satisfy the objectives of the relevant groups by partial benefits, such as uprisings of peasants, apprentices or other professional groups. Such revolts can be found in the history of perhaps every continent. The revolutions described above, on the other hand, were originally a phenomenon that has only been seen in modern, or modernising, Europe. It is actually a specific aspect of European history that at a certain time Europeans began to hold the opinion that man does not necessarily have to passively endure his "valley of tears" but can, and should, seek to improve the conditions in which he lives. Such an improvement can be brought about by gradual pro-reform work of the rulers, but also through a quick change achieved through revolution by the ruled.

If we speak about a quick change, the speed is gauged by the nature and substance of the revolutionary change. It proceeded more quickly where

---

Diskussion. In: MACK, Karlheinz (ed.): *Revolutionen in Ostmitteleuropa 1789–1989*. Verlag für Geschichte und Politik – R. Oldenbourg Verlag, Wien – München 1995, pp. 20–30.

4 Such a consensual opinion has been formulated most recently e.g. by James De Fronzo in the first chapter of his *Revolutions and Revolutionary Movements* (Routledge, New York 2018, 1<sup>st</sup> ed. 2015).

a change of the political system was primarily involved, i.e., with a political revolution. On the contrary, if it was a social revolution, too, i.e., when the revolution also brought about a change in the social system, the takeover of power – the political revolution – was a primary prerequisite; however, the actual social change could follow subsequently in stages, for instance, by means of reforms, which were in fact carried out by the new holders of political power.<sup>5</sup>

Such a distinction between the political and social revolution implies that the aforementioned broad definition could cover a broad range of different events, distinguished not only by the time they happened, but also by their objectives and arguments. However partial these differences are, for a specific event to be analysed it must be made clear to which it belongs and what its specifics are. A rough classification would ideally be made through typology which, however, must be based on a comparative approach. This is the only way that we can forestall the scholastic disputes over what still is and what is no longer a revolution. Moreover, we will avoid the risk of being accused of comparing the incomparable.

One of the rudimentary rules in applying the comparative method is, besides the need for a clear definition of the subject of comparison, also the choice of a suitable criterion which, in comparing specific revolutions, will help to characterise what they have in common and where they differ. Depending on which criterion we apply, every revolution will attain more than one characteristic, implying where it falls in the context of society's modernising transformation. I have already alluded to the first criterion. As the comparison criterion, I used the nature of the revolutionary changes, the sphere they affected. I used this to distinguish the political revolution from the social revolution which, however, incorporates a political revolution as a necessary prerequisite if it has to occur.

The relevance of all these criteria is not always the same. The most important ones are those that distinguish revolutions according to what system they intended to change, against what and against which social situation they were aimed.

As far back as at the dawn of the Early Modern Age, many conflicts arose that cannot be classified as mediaeval upheavals and uprisings. Discussion

---

5 As early as in the 1920s many American authors, evidently influenced by the Bolshevik revolution, held the opinion that the notion of revolution must be used primarily to denote fundamental social and, if necessary, economic changes. Cf. for example HYNDMAN, Henry M.: *The Evolution of Revolution*. Boni and Liveright, New York 1921; YODER, Dale: *Current Definitions of Revolution*. *The American Review of Sociology*, Vol. XXXII, 1926–1927, pp. 433–441; EDWARDS, Lyford P.: *The Natural History of Revolution*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1927. At the end of the 1930s George S. Pettee termed social revolution the third, and the highest, degree of revolution, cf. PETTEE, George S.: *The Process of Revolution*. Harper & Brothers, New York 1938 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1971).

was rife as to whether the Hussite Revolutionary Movement, German Peasants’ War or the uprising of a group of Castilian communities against Charles V can be termed Early Modern revolution. The dispute was especially about whether the changes those events aimed to bring about were really changes in the system. If we were to classify them as revolutions, we would have to devise for them a specific type of Early Modern revolution, which had no lasting effect. The first indisputable change in the political system was enforced by the Dutch merchant bourgeoisie in its fight against Spanish rule in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century. An even more radical end to the old regime was demanded by the English Puritan Revolution in 1640–1660: it replaced the monarchy with a republican system, attempted to establish a constitutional order, and in the *Agreement of the People* it established the first project to enable those of non-noble origin to participate in the rule of the state. It was defeated; however, its main objective, i.e. to replace absolutism with the system of elected representatives following fixed rules, was achieved permanently owing to the English Glorious Revolution in 1688–1689.

These early revolutions were an overture to the “classical” revolutions of the long 19<sup>th</sup> century, which were directed against the rule of absolutism and feudal privileges and which established civil rights in society and liberated the capitalist market business from feudal regulations. These principles, inspired by the European Enlightenment, were first enforced in the English settlements in North America. However, the example and inspiration for the European continent was the French Revolution. It influenced the revolutionary changes in Italy and Spain, and its influence continued in 1848–1849, when it contributed to the transformations that were taking place in Central Europe, from where the notion of revolution as the bearer of progress originated. This second type of revolution is one of the most well-known types and there is therefore no need to discuss it in greater detail here.

As the fosterlings of this perception of a revolution, we will find ourselves in difficulties if we have to use the same term to denote those political changes which turned against civil society and against the liberal and democratic political system in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This, the third type of revolution, had two variants:

One of them, which we may describe as fascist (also including the Nazi revolution), was undoubtedly aimed against civil society and established an authoritative system instead of the liberal system.<sup>6</sup> However, its effect on private capital and entrepreneurship was limited, and was therefore

---

6 Such a broader understanding of revolution, which also includes a fascist revolution, is no longer exceptional among contemporary authors. Cf. for example the aforementioned work by J. DeFronzo, further GOLDSTONE, Jack A.: *Revolutions. A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press, Oxford 2014; SANDERSON, Stephen K.: *Revolutions. A Worldwide Introduction to Political and Social Change*. Routledge, Abingdon – New York 2015.

undoubtedly a political revolution by nature. This variant faded from Germany and Italy during World War Two and only survived in Spain.

The other variant was a social revolution, of which the October 1917 Bolshevik Socialist Revolution is considered the prototype. However, this classification is not as indisputable in this case as it tends to be presented. In formal terms, it really destroyed the democratic political system established shortly before by the February Revolution. However, this system did not have enough time to become fully entrenched against the centuries-old Tsarist autocracy in Russia. The October Revolution was actually the culmination of the liquidation of the Tsarist political system, which was a relic of feudalism, and in this sense had something in common with the “classical” civil revolutions. What makes it different from these revolutions was clearly expressed both by political means, i.e., by establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, as well as by its social content, which, besides the beginnings of civil society, also destroyed the nascent capitalist entrepreneurship. The failed revolutions of 1918–1920 in Germany and Hungary were then purely anti-civil, drawing inspiration from Russia. Fully in line with the anti-civil programme were the successful revolutions after World War Two, which the Soviet system generated purposefully and which include February 1948 in Czechoslovakia on the one hand, and the communist revolution in China on the other hand.

The fourth type of revolution is the opposite of the third: revolutions directed against authoritative systems; fascist first and later, around 1990, also against communist systems.

One peculiar type of revolution is usually considered to comprise those which deposed the colonial rule of European powers in Asia and Africa and which generally tried to establish, in their countries, something similar to a liberal democracy. In some cases, such as in India or Egypt, the change became the established system. In other cases, however, these revolutions enabled the emergence of a communist revolution, namely in China, Korea and Vietnam.<sup>7</sup>

In typological terms, revolutions can also be distinguished by other criteria: the differences between revolutions when we compare the objectives that they had declared, and their true results, provided of course that they were successful.

But otherwise, what is the measure of success for a revolution? In theory, the revolution may have won, but still fell short of realising its objectives – this is where the phenomenon of the so-called stolen revolution belongs, such as the July Revolution in France in 1830. The revolution might also have

---

7 These revolutions are addressed by the majority of contemporary researchers who focus on the topic of revolution. However, this is a topic very far from the European matters on which we are focusing, and I therefore take the liberty of leaving these opinions aside.