

в противоположность эволюции, постепенному изменению». – URL: [https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc\\_philosophy/3184/РЕВОЛЮЦИЯ](https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc_philosophy/3184/РЕВОЛЮЦИЯ)

(2) «Пашинян объявил, что в одиночку стартует из Гюмри и начинает шествие по стране через все крупные города. Идею пешего хода он позаимствовал у Махатмы Ганди». – URL: <https://www.politanalitika.ru/v-zone-osobogo-vnimanija/smi-pashinyan-armyanskij-gandi-vremya-pokazhet-m/>

#### ЦИТИРУЕМАЯ ЛИТЕРАТУРА

Алиев 2000 – *Алиев М.Г.* Согласие как проблема социальной философии: Дисс. ... докт. филос. наук. М., 2000. – URL: [www.dissercat.com](http://www.dissercat.com)

Барлыбаев 2016а – *Барлыбаев Х.А.* Солидарология. Философия солидарности. – Уфа: Китап, 2016.

Барлыбаев 2016б – *Барлыбаев Х.А.* Введение в философию солидарности. М.: Научная библиотека, 2016.

Барлыбаев 2017 – *Барлыбаев Х.А.* Солидарная экология в системе индиглокальных отношений // *Философские науки.* 2017. № 7.

Нысанбаев 2017 – *Нысанбаев А.Н.* Становление глобальной этики взаимопонимания // *Вопросы философии.* 2017. № 8.

Эйнштейн 1949 – *Эйнштейн А.* Мир, каким я его вижу. – URL: [https://republic.ru/books/samoe\\_prekrasnoe\\_chto\\_tolko\\_mozhet\\_vypast\\_nam\\_na\\_dolyu\\_eto\\_tayna-923830.xhtml](https://republic.ru/books/samoe_prekrasnoe_chto_tolko_mozhet_vypast_nam_na_dolyu_eto_tayna-923830.xhtml)

#### ARMENIAN «REVOLUTION» IN THE CONTEXT OF SOLIDAROLOGY

*Kh.A. BARLYBAEV*

*Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Science*

#### Summary

The article considers logical and historical links between the development of solidary relations investigated by solidarology and revolutionary processes that took place in the Republic of Armenia in the spring of 2018. These connections are due to the fact that the quintessence of studies of the theory of solidarology is the conclusion that, in opposition to conflicts, the priority development of solidary elements in public relations and ensuring their transformation by peaceful means; so-called “revolutionary” processes in Armenia had a peaceful, non-violent character, so in essence they were not revolutionary in the proper sense of this concept, but a moment of progressive evolutionary transformations in the country according to the laws of solidarology. The main argument in favor of such a statement is that not a single drop of blood was shed in these events, no violence against the personality and no collapse of public life as a whole were noticed, most

decisions were made on a compromise, mutually satisfactory basis, and no one was subjected to political repression neither by “prerevolutionary” authorities, nor by “winners” in the confrontation. Therefore, the Armenian “revolution”, due to its specificity, requires a special scientific and philosophical analysis and artistic interpretation.

The new scientific and philosophical discipline of solidarology believes that in solidary relations the personal interests of the subjects of relations are transformed into a single, universal interest in the striving of everyone towards a common goal, good and harmony. This phenomenon in the Armenian “revolution” found practical expression in the fact that the single idea of “everyone and all” of its participants was a change in the current situation, and so there was a need to change power in the country peacefully, without any violence. One of the leaders of the movement, N. Pashinyan, understood it in time and came forward with the goal of uniting all for joint actions. The social thrust of this movement, the ability to provide effective social progress, the cultural and civilizational consistency of the goals and tasks of the “revolution” must become the subject of a special analysis as its consequences and further developments become clear.

**Keywords:** solidarology, conflictology, solidary relations, conflicts, revolution, evolution, nonviolence philosophy.

**Barlybaev, Khalil** – D.Sc. in Philosophy, D.Sc. in Economy, Professor, Leading Research Fellow at the Department of Bio- and Ecophilosophy, Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences.

*hbarlybaev@rambler.ru*

Translation into English by: **Ivanova, Oxana** – Central Department of Translation.

**Citation:** *BARLYBAEV Kh.A.* (2018) The Armenian “Revolution” in the Context of Solidarology. Translation into English by: Ivanova, Oxana – Central Department of Translation. In: *Philosophical Sciences*. 2018. Vol. 4, pp. 7-26. DOI: 10.30727/0235-1188-2018-4-7-26.

One withstands the invasion of armies;  
one does not withstand the invasion of ideas.

*Victor Hugo*

History knows the cases where revolutions were defined by the names of those nations that committed them. Classically anti-feudal was the English revolution of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, specific social revolutions were the French (19<sup>th</sup> century) and Russian (20<sup>th</sup> century) ones. There were also many other national revolutions, such as Chinese, Turkish,

Mexican, etc. At the edge of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, there were revolutions with flower-fruit-colourful (tulip-apricot-orange) names, though they all also had certain specific elements of national character.

In spring 2018, the whole world watched in amazement the unique socio-political phenomenon – a revolution of a new type, which could be called Armenian after the country where it took place. The most wonderful thing was that these processes did not look like a revolution as such, it did not repeat revolutionary scenarios from other countries.

A common characteristic of all revolutions is the cataclysm carried out by them, the change of political power or at least the introduction of significant changes into social relations. Moreover, it was common for all the revolutions that took place before the Armenian one that they were all characterized by propensity towards conflict bloody confrontations of different degrees: the whole families of sovereigns were executed, kings were executed even in enlightened Europe, there were rivers of blood, millions of people died in subsequent civil wars and internal strives, a lot of material assets and pieces of cultural heritage were destroyed, and a long period of cataclysms took place in the lives of entire nations (1).

In contrast to it, the peculiarity of the Armenian Revolution of 2018 was in the fact that for the first time in the history of mankind nothing of the kind took place, not a single drop of blood was shed, no violence against the personality or the collapse of social life as a whole was noticed. And if there are a lot of researches carried out, mountains of books written, thousands of plays staged, and an endless number of films shot about bloody revolutions, then the Armenian revolution, due to its specificity, requires special scientific, political, sociological, cultural analysis, philosophical thought and further depiction in the world of art. Without false modesty, the author of these lines can claim that in his researches he provided the evidence of the need for social transformations exactly as it turned out to be during the spring revolution in Armenia. Here we mean research papers devoted to the philosophy of solidary relationships within the framework of the theory of solidarology [Barlybaev (2016a), Barlybaev (2016b)].

A new scientific and philosophical discipline, solidarology, was suggested by the author of these lines as an addition to the theory and scientific and educational discipline of conflictology, which is being developed from the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The history of mankind is located in the atmosphere of two subsystems of an integral system of

social relations – conflicts and solidarity. These two types of relationships, while constantly colliding, interlacing and supporting each other, run like a golden thread through the history of mankind. Everyday life acts as a synthesis of these two forms of relationships, which exist there in potential and alternately implemented state.

The essence, content of conflicts, their types, classification, causes and resolution methods are studied by conflictology quite well. A significant contribution to the development of conflictology as an independent scientific trend was made by the conflictologists of the St. Petersburg school of Conflictology. However, like any interdisciplinary science during its formation period, conflictology does not yet meet the system requirements stated for scientific theory, it is divided into a number of private conflictologies closely connected with the specifics of the sciences that develop them. At the same time, the main problem of modern philosophy and science is that the study of solidary relations as a paired category to conflicts receives no proper attention, and in this case conflictology acts as a unilateral science that studies only the negative aspects of social life. Without studying solidary relations as a counterbalance and supplement to conflicts, conflictology cannot be called a full-fledged science.

According to the today's theory of solidarology, by experience of the whole history of mankind, it can be noticed that violent social revolutions bring unimaginable privations, sufferings, destructions and sacrifices. Up to now, these processes were considered as inevitable and even legitimate ways to resolve social contradictions. But today's level of intellectual, spiritual and moral development of a modern human allows us to hope that people will learn to manage the transformation of their social relations so that they are not accompanied by such cataclysms. Moreover, the history saw almost a single example – but wonderful and very successful one – of the triumph of the philosophy of nonviolence – Mahatma Gandhi, who was active almost simultaneously with Lenin and Stalin, but, unlike them, used methods of nonviolent resistance, and thus managed to achieve the independence of his country from the British colonialists and lay the foundations of Indian national identity based on his principles. It is indicative that M. Gandhi did not recognize the revolution of 1917 in Russia due to his position of the philosophy of nonviolence. Another remarkable fact is that the Soviet Union, which was formed on the basis of violent revolutionary principles, eventually collapsed, and India, once colonial and begging, multinational and diverse India,

largely following the precepts of Mahatma Gandhi, today can serve as the example of peaceful, democratic and relatively harmoniously developing state for many countries.

Nowadays it is evident even without any special proofs that humanity should abandon all violent ways of transforming and regulating social relationships, replace the idea of a world revolution that dominated European and Russian minds in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century with the concept of global social evolution, make it the leading idea for the coming centuries. In other words, it must be a social evolution managed by society itself. In today's conditions, the path in this direction lies through: the desire to prevent and overcome existing international conflicts; the elimination of the threat of nuclear war; the end of the arms race; reduction and bringing to the minimum of necessary defence capabilities; elimination of any deprivations, destructions, human victims and violent acts in the process of social transformations; gradual elimination of social disparity in the world; fight against escalating environmental threats; the shift away from a "consumerist society" to the rationalization of needs and consumption; the provision by various countries of mutual assistance for the preservation and development of national traditions, cultures, languages; creation of conditions for the improvement of humans, the formation of a multifaceted creative personality, etc.

If the idea of the "global revolution" as a process did not have a definite scientific and philosophical ground, the concept of global social evolution as a special form of action must be based on the development of objective laws of contemporary global social development. The etymology of the phrase "global social evolution" (from Latin *Globus* – "sphere", *socium* – "general", *evolutio* – "extension, progressive development") means the development of new social relations between the people on a scale of the globe. Since the task and goal of a humanistic scientific and philosophical statement of the issue and management of world processes should be not the development of revolutionary, violent, conflict relations, but, on the contrary, the capacity to overcome and avoid them, then we should agree that the category "global social evolution" mainly characterizes the development of global solidary relations. Unfortunately, the world is still very far from such decisions and is now still at the same level as described by Albert Einstein in the year 1949: "The inventive human genius has given us so many benefits during the last couple of years that if the political organization kept up with the technical progress, life would be happy and carefree.

But so far all these achievements, which were worthwhile, are in the hands of our generation – and it is like a razor in the hands of a three-year-old child” [Einstein 1949].

Based on the example of combating international terrorism and drawing our attention to the urgent need to abandon violent methods of solving global problems, the well-known philosopher from Kazakhstan A. Nysanbaev states that “a military force should not be opposed to terrorism which is directed against humanity and against nature – in this way terrorism cannot be defeated. We need another irresistible force – goodwill, good human morals, spirituality” [Nysanbaev (2017), 15].

In view of above mentioned, the Armenian revolution of solidarity is not actually a revolution but a kind of an impulse of the evolutionary development of modern civilization. Its leader, Nikol Pashinyan, is already compared with Mahatma Gandhi in various sources (2). Such comparison is very well-judged when pointing out certain distinctive nuances. The above mentioned victory of the philosophy of non-violence of M. Gandhi also took place on the background of the relatively peaceful collapse of the colonial system in the world. Thus, a separate analysis of the role of these two factors in the victory of the Indian revolution is required. In the case of the Armenian Revolution, on the contrary, its peaceful, non-violent character showed itself in the context of contradictory, violent and in many ways provocative “coloured” revolutions which took place in the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. But comparison with those also needs a special analysis that can reveal that the peaceful and non-violent nature of the Armenian revolution was based primarily on the self-consciousness and sensible activity of the nation as a whole, and not on the influence of external sources or only on the internal political struggle between the parties. Opposite statements do not come out of universal, but from opportunistic, utilitarian, mercenary positions.

The theory of solidarology states that a solidary attitude is a state of mutual intellectual and spiritual harmony, as well as the process of coordinated life activity of two or more subjects where identity, personal intentions and consciousness of subjects converge, completely “merge” with the interests and consciousness of their communities and form a unified, universal interest, the aspiration of each and every person to achieve a common goal, well-being and harmony. Such relations, depending on the socio-economic nature of the historical era, can be characterized by either compensatory or gratuitous character: before modern stage of the society development, they were mainly of

a compensatory nature, and current trends show that in the nearest future they can acquire a gratuitous, altruistic character. Moreover, historically, gratuitous were solidary relations within the primitive tribes and clans, and later the same was seen in different communities. Until now, intra-family solidary relations are gratuitous.

For the definition stated above, the notions “consent” and “agreed” have the key meaning. The scientific and philosophical literature does not pay much attention to their analysis. One of the rare studies devoted to these notions is the doctorate thesis of M.G. Aliev “Consent as an issue of social philosophy” in synopsis to which the author writes: “By its nature, consent refers to the class of complex objects of cognition, to which both general scientific and actually philosophical methods, ideas and principles are applicable. Specialized methods of cognition are not sufficient for an adequate understanding of the consent, it is still necessary achieve philosophical reflection... Consent is in some ways close to harmony, symmetry, correspondence, balance, coincidence, identity, correlation, practicability, but at the same time it differs from them, occupies a qualitatively fixed place in the system of universal properties of existence” [Aliev (2000)]. The term “solidarity” has the right to take its “qualitatively fixed place” in the above mentioned list of uniordinal concepts. The essence of this place is that “solidarity” is not only “on a par” with all these values, but also acts as an integral concept, embraces and contains each of them in itself.

A person is thrown into the ocean of solidary relationships well before his birth, and then during his life as well, and this continues even after death. The provisions stated above may at first sight seem to be a beautiful and utopian legend. But this is such an utopia, without the implementation of which the future of humanity is impossible. In the article describing solidary relations in the nature protection (*Philosophical Sciences*. 2017. Vol. 7) we stated the following: “The concept of ‘solidary ecology’ here denotes a system of relations where people live in solidarity, in mutual consent, cooperation and mutual assistance for the common good both with nature and with each other, thus ensuring the safety and systemic integrity of: a) nature in accordance with biosphere laws and b) human society relying on the principles of humanism and environment-friendly activity. Nowadays the absence of such a solidary ecology in the world is the main cause of actually increasing destruction of the systemic integrity of the natural environment in the near-Earth space due to the expanding human activity which causes significant deviations from the

natural patterns of biosphere development. The absence of solidarity between people, not only in case with nature protection, but also in all other spheres: politics, economics, law, ethics, management, etc., is even more widespread cause of human civilization degradation” [Barlybaev (2017), 113]. If we look at today’s international situation, then we see that this assertion does not require any special evidence: the world is suffocating and is being torn in numerous conflicts of different nature, it really needs renewed, refreshing relationships characterize by mutual solidarity, cooperation and the ability to create peaceful civilization in future.

Thus, the socio-philosophical aspect of the connection between the theory of solidarology and the Armenian revolution goes far beyond their direct correlation. Philosophy raises and justifies the idea that solidarity relations are more preferable for society in comparison with conflict and destructive relations if regarding them as subsystems forming an integral social system; it provides the social sciences with a methodology for analyzing these relations in order to reveal their essence, content, forms, patterns of formation and development, etc. Here peaceful, non-violent revolution acts as the culmination of solidary relations, giving rise to new forms and next stages of their development. In other words, such a process may be called “peaceful revolution”, “revolution of nonviolence”, “revolution of indulgence, compromise and tolerance”, “revolution of solidarity”.

The specificity of the correlation between the theory of solidarology and the Armenian revolution proceeds from the deepest reasons of the solidarity of the Armenian people towards the neighbouring nations, and mainly towards Russia. In other words, the internal solidarity of the people logically and naturally unfolds into external solidary relations and ties. It should be mentioned that, in recent memory, the majority of the great Armenians succeeded mainly due to their joint, solidary life in the Russian and later in the Soviet “family” of nations.

It can be assumed that since the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century Armenia and Russia are leading a compensated and sometimes absolutely gratuitous solidarity life. Compensatory nature is seen in the fact that each of the parties at the same time follows its specific, quite natural interests. And the gratuitousness is in the fact that Russia has repeatedly provided necessary disinterested assistance to Armenia during difficult periods of its life, and Armenia took part in all major battles and peaceful actions of Russia, and for two centuries already it is

considered as an important geopolitical outpost on Russian southern borders. Solidarity on the part of the Armenian people was also seen in the fact that the personal intentions of his numerous representatives merged with the all-Russian interests, they served for Russia with good faith and fidelity, they contributed for its glory and prestige, made a worthy contribution to the treasury of Russian science, culture and values which are common for all civilizations. On the other hand, with the help of this they got access to a world cultural space, where they could develop and demonstrate their talents.

Thus, based on the example of the Armenian revolution, it may be affirmed that above stated content of solidary relations has found its tangible embodiment. The united impulse of the Armenian society showed itself those days, expressing complete merge of personal intentions of citizens with the common, universal interest of the nation as a whole, in the aspiration of everyone to achieve common goal, well-being and harmony. Such an idea and goal, that is to say for “each and every” was to change the current situation, and to do this, it was necessary to change power in the country, and Nikol Pashinyan was able to understand and express this idea, create a common goal for the whole society, and then unite all people for joint actions which were to become real. Here we draw attention to the peaceful and non-violent character of this “revolution”, on the brilliant fact that it confirms Mahatma Gandhi’s philosophy of nonviolence. Its subsequent social character, ability to ensure effective social progress, cultural and civilizational substantiality of goals and objectives is the subject of a special systematic analysis which depends on the consequences of this revolution and the further processes of socio-cultural, economic, political development in the republic.

Solidary actions of such character not accompanied by bloody confrontations are a rare case in history. Except the unique social experience of Mahatma Gandhi, one can recall the exploits of Martin Luther King in the USA, Olof Palme in Sweden, Nelson Mandela in South Africa, Vaclav Havel in the Czech Republic, each characterized by its own peculiarities. The common thing is the fact that the peoples followed the leaders who had previously gained experience in the longstanding political struggle and trials.

The Armenian Revolution of Solidarity was a kind of continuation to such tendency, but with its own peculiarity – here is the not a well-known leader who led the people, but the spontaneous actions of the people helped to choose a personality capable of and worthy to lead them. It is difficult to foresee how this leader will cope with the issues facing him and the country after the revolution, or how the Armenian people will develop their country further on, but the historical fact which took place can already serve as a classic example of a peaceful, non-violent social actions which can be an example for other nations to follow.

#### NOTES

(1) Encyclopaedic dictionary of philosophy states: “The revolution (Late Latin ‘revolutio’ – turn, change) 1) revolution in the field of science, art, fashion; 2) a sudden, violent change in the existing socio-political system – as opposed to evolution, which is a gradual change”. Available at: [https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc\\_philosophy/3184/РЕВОЛЮЦИЯ](https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc_philosophy/3184/РЕВОЛЮЦИЯ)

(2) “Pashinyan announced that he would start alone from the city of Gyumri and cross the country through its major cities. He borrowed the idea of walking on foot from Mahatma Gandhi”. Available at: <https://www.politanalitika.ru/v-zone-osobogo-vnimania/smi-pashinyan-armyanskij-gandi-vremya-pokazhet-m/>

#### REFERENCES

Aliev M.G. (2000) *Consent as a Problem of Social Philosophy*. Thesis for a Scientific Degree of D.Sc. in Philosophy. Available at: [www.dissercat.com](http://www.dissercat.com)> Philosophical Sciences> Social Philosophy (in Russian).

Barlybaev Kh.A. (2016a) *Solidarology. Philosophy of Solidarity*. Kitap, Ufa (in Russian).

Barlybaev Kh.A. (2016b) Introduction to the Philosophy of Solidarity. Nauchnaya Biblioteka, Moscow (in Russian).

Barlybaev Kh.A. (2017) Solidary Ecology in the System of Indiglocal Relations. In: *Philosophical Sciences*. 2017. Vol. 7, pp. 111-125 (in Russian).

Nysanbaev A.N. (2017) Formation of a Global Ethic of Mutual Understanding. In: *Voprosy Filosofii*. 2017. Vol. 8, pp. 11-19 (in Russian).

Einstein A. (1949) The world as I see it. Available at: [https://republic.ru/books/samoe\\_prekrasnoe\\_chno\\_tolko\\_mozhet\\_vypast\\_nam\\_na\\_dolyu\\_eto\\_tayna-923830.xhtml](https://republic.ru/books/samoe_prekrasnoe_chno_tolko_mozhet_vypast_nam_na_dolyu_eto_tayna-923830.xhtml) (Russian Translation)