

Journal of Political Studies

Vol. 33, No. 1, January–June, Summer 2026, pp. 39–59

Establishing the Will–Time Equilibrium Framework: Chronos, Kairos, and Collective Will in Revolutionary Transformation

Osama M. Abu Nahel 

Professor of Middle Eastern Studies, Department of History and Political Sciences, Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences, Al-Azhar University - Gaza (Palestine)

Correspondence: osamabunahel@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study presents the Will–Time Equilibrium (WTE) framework as a perspective for understanding revolutionary transformation. It contends that revolutions cannot be fully comprehended just through structural crises, political possibilities, resource mobilization, or collective action; these factors gain explanatory relevance only when examined within the framework of their temporal progression. The framework encompasses three essential concepts: Chronos, the long-term accumulation of grievances, institutional pressures, and societal expectations; Kairos, the critical moment when historical potential becomes actionable; and collective will, the ethical, social, and organizational drive that transforms potential into political transformation. Rather than limiting WTE to a predetermined formula, the study establishes it as a conceptual framework for examining the alignment or misalignment across many dimensions. The examination of the trajectories of Cuba in 1959, Iran in 1979, and the Arab uprisings of 2011 reveals that enduring transformation transpires only when historical accumulation, opportune timing, and coordinated collective will converge.

Received:
March 03,
2026

Revised:
April 02,
2026 & May
17, 2026

Published:
June 17, 2026

Keywords: *Will-Time Equilibrium (WTE), Chronos, Kairos, Revolutionary Temporality, Collective Will, Political Transformation..*

1. Introduction

Revolutions are very intricate occurrences within the social sciences due to the interplay of structural forces, political opportunities, cultural significances, organizational capacities, and collective sentiments. No singular cause can comprehensively elucidate the genesis of revolutionary circumstances, their occurrence at specific junctures, or the varied consequences that ensue. Classical and current theories have offered substantial insights into these dynamics. Structural frameworks have emphasized state disintegration, class dynamics, budgetary crises, and institutional fragility (Skocpol, 1979). The resource mobilization hypothesis underscores the importance of organization, leadership, networks, and the

accessibility of both material and symbolic resources (McCarthy & Zald, 1977). Political opportunity theories emphasise the presence of opportunities in the political landscape, rifts among elites, and variations in repression or accessibility (Tarrow, 2011). Collective action theories suggest that revolutions emerge from contentious interactions, mobilization, and the progressive transformation of social relations (Tilly, 1978; McAdam, Tarrow, & Tilly, 2004).

Nonetheless, despite these contributions, a fundamental problem remains inadequately theorized: the interplay between time and collective will in revolutionary transition. Current methodologies recognize duration, crisis, opportunity, or mobilization, although they rarely consider time as an active analytical element. Time is often perceived as a simple sequence of occurrences, rather than as a dynamic force that influences grievances, modifies expectations, forms meanings, and establishes historical political possibilities. Historical sociology demonstrates that temporality is crucial for the evolution of social action, memory, expectation, and institutional transformation (Elias, 1993; Koselleck, 2004; Abbott, 2001; Sewell, 2005). This comprehension has not yet been adequately integrated into a framework that elucidates the interplay of long-term accumulation, pivotal moments, and collective will in revolutionary movements.

This study fills the gap by establishing the Will–Time Equilibrium (WTE) framework. The framework is based on three interrelated concepts: Chronos, the cumulative temporality that enables the progression of structural complaints, institutional tensions, political exclusions, and social expectations that arise over prolonged durations. It later transitions to Kairos, the qualitative moment when historical potential becomes executable, sometimes prompted by a triggering event, a legitimacy crisis, a symbolic rupture, or a sudden breakdown of authority. Ultimately, it analyses collective will and the ethical, social, emotional, and organizational competencies through which individuals transform accumulated pressure and historical potential into political action. The primary claim is that revolutionary transformation can only be comprehended through the simultaneous examination of all three dimensions.

The WTE framework does not aim to supplant structural, mobilizational, or political opportunity theories. Instead, it restructures their understanding of the temporality of revolutionary transition. The structural problem may help clarify the escalation of discontent, although it does not explain why the breach occurred at a particular point in time. Political opportunity may elucidate the development of a window for action; nevertheless, it fails to account for why certain actors may exploit it while others cannot. Resource mobilization may elucidate organizational capacity, although it fails to encompass the significant historical evolution of collective will. WTE thereby amalgamates components that current theories often consider in isolation: long-term accumulation, the timely moment, and the collective capacity to act.

The study problem can be stated as follows: *how does the interaction among Chronos, Kairos, and collective will shape revolutionary outcomes?* More specifically, *why do some revolutionary situations produce durable transformation, while others result in short-lived uprisings, missed opportunities, fragmented transitions, or violent collapse?* The study argues that divergent outcomes are influenced not solely by structural conditions or political moments, but by the degree of alignment or imbalance among temporal accumulation, critical timing, and

Establishing the Will–Time Equilibrium Framework: Chronos, Kairos, and Collective Will in Revolutionary Transformation

organized collective will. When these dimensions meet, transformative change is more likely to attain profundity and permanence. When one or more elements are weak, fragmented, or mistimed, revolutionary processes may remain incomplete or collapse into alternative trajectories.

This study builds upon a relevant iteration of the WTE framework that examined discrepancies in revolutionary outcomes. This study, however, redirects attention from application to theoretical underpinnings. The aim is not to provide a predictive equation or deterministic model, but to elucidate the conceptual framework of WTE and to demonstrate how Chronos, Kairos, and collective will function as interpretive categories in comparative analysis. The framework is analytical instead than statistical, and explanatory rather than mechanistic. Its significance resides in elucidating the will-time framework of revolutionary transformation without constraining revolutions to rigid causal equations.

The study's relevance is fourfold. It redefines time as an active dimension of political evolution rather than a passive backdrop. Secondly, it articulates the concept of collective will as a capacity that is temporally produced rather than a spontaneous expression of fury or mobilization. Third, it differentiates political opportunity from Kairos by conceptualizing the revolutionary moment as a qualitative, symbolic, and temporal opening, rather than simply a change in power dynamics. Fourth, it provides a comparative interpretive framework that elucidates why analogous revolutionary pressures might yield disparate outcomes.

The study employs a theoretical and comparative-historical approach. The WTE framework was produced through conceptual research and is applied interpretively to specific cases: The Cuban Revolution of 1959, the Iranian Revolution of 1979, and the Arab uprisings of 2011. These cases are not meant to serve as comprehensive histories, but rather as analytical contexts that clarify the framework's explanatory capacity. The comparison elucidates distinct patterns of will-time alignment: instances where accumulation, moment, and collective will converge; instances where the moment emerges without adequate organizational or temporal depth; and instances where collective will remains disjointed despite significant structural pressure.

2. Literature Review

Revolutionary studies have developed through various important theoretical traditions, each clarifying a distinct facet of revolutionary transformation. Structural methodologies have emphasized state disintegration, budgetary crises, class dynamics, and institutional fragility as pivotal elements for transformation (Skocpol, 1979). The resource mobilization thesis highlighted the importance of organization, leadership, networks, and the capacity of movements to obtain and utilize both material and symbolic resources (McCarthy & Zald, 1977). Political opportunity theory emphasizes the importance of opportunities in the political arena, splits among elites, alterations in repression, and variations in access to institutional power (McAdam, 1985; Meyer, 2004; Tarrow, 2011). Theories of contentious politics and collective action demonstrate that revolutions develop through dynamic interactions among challengers, authorities, and extensive social networks (Tilly, 1978; McAdam, Tarrow, & Tilly, 2004).

Despite their advantages, these approaches sometimes overlook the temporal development of revolutionary potential. Structural theories elucidate the buildup of crises, although they fail to clearly articulate the causes of rupture at specific historical junctures. Political opportunity perspectives recognize opportunities but frequently reduce the revolutionary moment to a mere change in political conditions rather than conceptualizing it as a qualitative temporal configuration. Critics of political process theory contend that these interpretations may diminish the importance of culture, passion, agency, and significance in contentious activities (Goodwin & Jasper, 1999). Resource mobilization theory acknowledges organizational capabilities but often treats collective will only as an instrumental or organizational variable, overlooking its evolution through memory, anticipation, ethical commitment, and historical experience.

The sociology and philosophy of time provide a foundation for overcoming this limitation. Elias (1993) characterizes time as a social construct based on patterns of coordination, expectation, and collective governance. Koselleck (2004) formulates a historical semantics of time by analysing the interaction between the "space of experience" and the "horizon of expectation," illustrating how substantial changes emerge from the tensions between historical accumulations and future anticipations. Gurvitch (1964) underscores the diversity of social times and rhythms, whereas Zerubavel (2003) accentuates the significance of temporal organization in shaping collective memory and meaning. Aminzade (1992) contends that historical sociology must perceive time not merely as a sequence but as an analytical component that affects causation and process. Abbott (2001) contends that social processes need an examination of temporality, sequence, and duration, whereas Sewell (2005) demonstrates how historical events transform social structures by reinterpreting the interplay between contingency, temporality, and action.

These perspectives regard time as a dynamic factor in social transformation. Nevertheless, they do not autonomously present a theory of revolutionary transformation that links long-term accumulation to the critical moment of action. The distinction between Chronos and Kairos is analytically advantageous. Chronos signifies the aggregate historical duration during which grievances escalate, institutions deteriorate, expectations evolve, and collective meanings are formed. Kairos, conversely, signifies the qualitative moment when historical potential transforms into action. Political opportunity theory examines this second dimension; nevertheless, it generally views the moment as a political opening rather than as a temporal-symbolic configuration shaped by historical accumulation, significance, and agency.

A concept of collective will introduce an additional dimension. Rousseau (1993) characterised the general will as an ethical manifestation of the common good, while Durkheim (1976) associated collective power with moral density and communal social representations. Arendt (1963) subsequently defined collective action as the capacity to initiate a "new beginning," linking political action to the formation of historical time. Ibn Khaldun's concept of *'asabiyyah*¹ within Arab and Islamic intellectual traditions highlights the time buildup of social cohesion in the ascendance and deterioration of political structures (Ibn Khaldun, 2005).

¹- Social Cohesion/Group Solidarity.

Establishing the Will–Time Equilibrium Framework: Chronos, Kairos, and Collective Will in Revolutionary Transformation

Intellectuals like Al-Kawakibi (2006), Bennabi (1986), and Al-Jabri (2009) examined the interplay between collective consciousness, historical agency, and the prerequisites for social revolution.

The literature on collective will integrates this concept within a temporal framework that elucidates the creation of will, its activation, and the factors contributing to its success or failure at critical moments. In various revolutionary studies, will manifests as mobilization, organization, ideology, or emotional energy. These traits are important; yet, they do not fully include the temporal development of will as a social skill that evolves during Chronos and attains historical significance only upon encountering Kairos.

The Will–Time Equilibrium (WTE) framework reconciles this disparity by integrating three variables usually regarded separately: long-term accumulation, qualitative moments, and collective will. It does not supplant structural, mobilizational, or political opportunity theories. Instead, it provides an interpretive synthesis that reorganizes their results regarding the temporal development of revolutionary transformation. From this viewpoint, revolutions do not occur solely because of the aggregation of grievances, the advent of chances, or the mobilization of participants. They become transformative when historical pressures, a critical moment, and a coordinated collective will meet in a state of temporal alignment.

The contribution of WTE is in redefining revolutionary transformation as a will-time process. It elucidates why structurally analogous crises can yield disparate results, why opportunities may be overlooked, and why social mobilization may be transient without temporal depth or organizational coherence. The framework creates a conceptual link between Chronos, Kairos, and collective will, synthesizing historical sociology, revolutionary ideologies, and the sociology of time.

1.1. Philosophical Foundations of Revolutionary Time: Chronos and Kairos

Time plays an essential role in the analysis of social and political transformation. Revolutions do not merely occur throughout time; they are molded by time itself. They emerge from extensive cycles of accumulation, although they also depend on critical moments when historical opportunities for action arise. The differentiation between Chronos and Kairos provides a significant basis for comprehending revolutionary transformation as a gradual process rather than an abrupt occurrence.

Chronos denotes linear, cumulative, and sequential time. In revolutionary circumstances, it refers to the prolonged period during which grievances intensify, institutions lose legitimacy, expectations evolve, and mass consciousness gradually develops. This is a phase of accumulation rather than disruption—a slow interval in which conflicts emerge, and conditions for transformation develop. Both classical and contemporary theories of social time clarify this aspect. Aristotle's conceptualization of time as a sequence provides a foundational philosophical framework (Aristotle, 1984). Elias (1993) defines time as a social construct based on cooperation, anticipation, and regulation. Koselleck (2004) demonstrates that historical transformation emerges from the conflict between accrued experience and anticipated futures, whereas Ricoeur (1984) highlights the narrative function of time in maintaining continuity and collective identity. From this viewpoint, Chronos

surpasses conventional duration; it embodies the historical framework within which revolutionary circumstances arise.

Kairos, in contrast, denotes the qualitative moment when historical potential becomes executable. Kairos manifests as interruption, decision, and potential transformation, in contrast to the slow unfolding of Chronos. Kairos, derived from Greek rhetoric as the optimal moment for action (Smith, 1969), signifies in social analysis the juncture at which accumulated pressures coalesce into opportunity: a legitimacy crisis, symbolic rupture, triggering event, abrupt decline of authority, or significant surge in public confidence. Political opportunity theory addresses this concept by highlighting openings within the political landscape (McAdam, Tarrow, & Tilly, 2004), whereas Kairos extends this notion by conceptualizing the revolutionary moment as a temporal-symbolic arrangement where accumulated meanings, expectations, and collective energies intersect.

The lack of Kairos inside Chronos may result in persistent tension or an underlying crisis without respite. The lack of Chronos in Kairos may provoke sudden uprisings lacking historical relevance and durability. The revolutionary moment attains political effectiveness only when it corresponds with existing historical conditions and when collective will transform potential into organized action. Sewell's examination of historical events as structural transformations demonstrates how contingent occurrences modify social connections by their interaction with established structures (Sewell, 1996). Goldstone's research demonstrates that structural crises are insufficient without the existence of agency, mobilization, and a collapse of authority (Goldstone, 2014).

Within the WTE framework, revolutionary time is neither entirely linear nor entirely instantaneous. The phenomenon arises from the interplay of three dimensions: the continuation of accumulation, the disruption of the crucial moment, and the collective will's capacity to act. Chronos establishes the conditions, Kairos unveils the opportunity, and collective will transform potential into change. The deficiency or inadequacy of any of these characteristics elucidates why many revolutionary circumstances stay unresolved, why others result in ephemeral uprisings, and why only specific instances evolve into enduring transformations.

This viewpoint transcends interpretations that see time as an impartial backdrop. Time serves as a dynamic dimension of revolutionary causality, influencing complaints, opportunities, expectations, and the action potential. Revolutions are not merely the result of structural pressures or abrupt opportunities; they are temporal processes in which historical accumulation, critical timing, and social agency must intersect.

The connection between accumulation and immediacy. Their transforming significance depends on their connection to collective will. Chronos can produce tension without rupture if a critical moment does not occur. Kairos may produce transient uprisings if it lacks historical depth. Even when Chronos and Kairos converge, revolutionary potential may remain unrealized if the collective will be weak or fragmented. Transformation achieves depth and permanence solely when accumulated conditions, a critical moment, and unified group intent converge.

Modern sociology and philosophy endorse this perspective. Gurvitch's concept of multiple social rhythms, Zerubavel's examination of temporal organization and collective memory, Arendt's perspective on revolutionary action as the capacity to

Establishing the Will–Time Equilibrium Framework: Chronos, Kairos, and Collective Will in Revolutionary Transformation

initiate a “new beginning,” and Sorokin's cyclical theory of civilizational transformation collectively suggest that change is inherently shaped by temporality (Gurvitch, 1964; Zerubavel, 2003; Arendt, 1963; Sorokin, 2017). These concepts establish the groundwork for WTE: time is not merely the context of political activity, but a fundamental condition that makes historical action feasible.

The differentiation between accumulation and critical moments; yet, it does not inherently elucidate why certain periods become transformative while others stay unutilized. This is when communal intent becomes essential. An advantageous occasion is inadequate if individuals lack the ethical, social, and organizational capacity to capitalize on it; likewise, collective will cannot yield enduring change if disconnected from historical evolution. In WTE, Chronos lays the groundwork, Kairos generates the opportunity, and collective will convert potential into organised historical action.

3. Collective Will in Social Thought

The collective will be crucial in elucidating revolutionary transition, since it is the mechanism by which historical conditions are converted into political action. Long-term accumulation may create pressure, and a critical moment may present an opportunity; nonetheless, transformation cannot occur unless stakeholders possess the ethical, social, emotional, and organizational capacity to collaborate effectively. Consequently, collective will should not be confined to mere spontaneous fury, transient mobilization, or organizational preparedness alone. It is more accurately perceived as a social capability that evolves and manifests its efficacy during a critical historical juncture.

The philosophical origins of the concept of will can be traced via classical and contemporary political thinking. In Aristotle's ethical theory, action is associated with reasoned decision and moral direction, indicating that will be not simply desire but a deliberate ability aimed at significant objectives (Aristotle, 2004). Rousseau subsequently proposed the concept of the general will as an ethical manifestation of the common good and a basis for political legitimacy (Rousseau, 1993). Hegel linked will to historical progression, contending that freedom is realized through social and political institutions over time (Hegel, 2001). In contrast, Nietzsche underscored the will as a transformational power that may contest traditional values and established systems (Nietzsche, 2007). Notwithstanding their divergences, these intellectuals concur that will be not a mere inert psychological impulse but a dynamic force associated with action, significance, and transformation.

Sociological theory concerning social relationships, moral intensity, legitimacy, and collective representations. Durkheim's examination of collective conscience illustrates how social organizations produce moral energies that surpass individual intentions, evident in rituals, crises, and episodes of collective fervor (Durkheim, 1960; 1976). Weber's analysis of legitimacy and authority elucidates the structuring of collective will via charismatic, conventional, or rational-legal modalities of control (Weber, 1978). Mannheim's concept of utopian consciousness highlights the ability of collective future perspectives to reshape political imagination and social action (Mannheim, 1954). Arendt's theory of action is especially relevant, since she links collective political action to the capacity to initiate a “new beginning,” so connecting volition to the creation of historical potential (Arendt, 1963).

In the Will–Time Equilibrium (WTE) framework, Chronos denotes the aggregate historical time during which complaints, institutional conflicts, and collective expectations progressively develop. Kairos signifies the opportune moment when historical potential becomes accessible for action. Collective will embody the ethical, social, and organizational ability by which individuals convert cumulative pressures and favorable circumstances into political action. WTE is not a static formula but a dynamic coordination of temporal accumulation, critical timing, and social agency.

In revolutionary studies, collective will have frequently been addressed indirectly. Resource mobilization theory conceptualizes will through the lenses of organization, leadership, and mobilizational ability (McCarthy & Zald, 1977). Political opportunity theory associates mobilization with openings in the political landscape but neglects the temporal development of will that empowers actors to capitalize on these possibilities (Tarrow, 2011). Structural theories elucidate how crises undermine regimes and foster conditions conducive to revolt; nonetheless, they frequently neglect the subjective, ethical, and historical dimensions of collective agency (Skocpol, 1979; Goldstone, 2014). These methodologies are beneficial; nonetheless, they inadequately elucidate the maturation of collective will, the reasons for its efficacy at some junctures, or the factors contributing to its fragmentation at other times.

This distinction between Chronos and Kairos. The collective will does not fully manifest at the moment of rupture. It is produced by accumulated experiences, shared memories, ethical grievances, political vision, organizational networks, and anticipations of change. In this context, will encompasses a Chronos dimension as it evolves across time. It encompasses a Kairos dimension, since it attains historical efficacy only when players can recognize and capitalize on a critical moment. A society may harbor deep complaints without fostering a unified intent; similarly, a moment of rupture can arise without adequate collective capacity to effectuate enduring political transformation.

Within the WTE framework, collective will can be defined as a temporally established ethical, social, and organizational capability through which actors transform cumulative pressures and historical opportunities into collective political action. This definition transitions the notion from a psychological or mobilizational category to a temporal-transformative framework. Collective will transcend mere protest and the strength of fury. It is the ability to maintain action, structure significance, coordinate agency, and convert a favorable moment into a historical occurrence.

This analysis clarifies distinct innovative results. In regions where Chronos is strong and collective will be weak, crises may persist without change. When Kairos emerges inside a disjointed collective will, the result may be a fleeting uprising or a missed opportunity. When collective will be organized, temporally evolved, and proficient at capitalizing on opportunities, revolutionary transformation is more likely to achieve profundity and permanence. The following section elaborates on this idea by redefining revolutions as will-time processes shaped by the convergence of structure, temporality, and collective action.

4. Revisiting Revolutions Across Time: Between Structure, Will, and the Critical Moment

Traditional theories on crises, political opportunities, resource mobilization, and collective action. These perspectives have significantly improved understanding of the causes contributing to regime decline, the mobilization of social movements, and the dynamics of contentious interactions. Structural methods emphasize persistent limitations such as state fragmentation, financial crises, institutional fragility, and social inequality (Skocpol, 1979). The resource mobilization concept underscores the importance of organization, leadership, networks, and the ability to use both material and symbolic resources (McCarthy & Zald, 1977). Political opportunity theory emphasizes the presence of openings within the political landscape, divisions among elites, and alterations in repression or accessibility (Tarrow, 2011). Theories of disputed politics illustrate that revolutions arise from the dynamic interactions between challengers, authorities, and broader social groups (Tilly, 1978; McAdam, Tarrow, & Tilly, 2004).

However, these methodologies frequently dissociate structural factors from the temporal dynamics that render them politically successful. The structural crises may elucidate the accumulation of grievances, although it fails to understand why rupture transpires at a certain period. Political opportunity may elucidate the emergence of a window for action; nevertheless, it does not comprehensively account for why certain players successfully capitalize on that time while others do not. Resource mobilization may elucidate organizational capacity; yet, it frequently neglects the more profound temporal development of collective will. In this regard, current theories elucidate significant facets of revolutionary transition; nonetheless, they fail to cohesively incorporate structure, temporality, and agency into a singular interpretive framework.

The will-time view enables the comprehension of revolutions not as discrete events but as processes influenced by the interplay of accumulated conditions, critical moments, and collective agency. Chronos encapsulates the prolonged aggregation of complaints, institutional conflicts, legitimacy crises, and social anticipations. Kairos encapsulates the critical moment when accumulated forces become amenable to action. Collective will embody the ethical, social, emotional, and organizational capabilities that enable individuals to convert historical potential into political action. From this viewpoint, revolution is not generated solely by accumulation, nor by a singular event, nor by will alone. It arises when these dimensions converge.

In the presence of Chronos but the absence of Kairos, a prolonged crisis may persist uninterrupted. When Kairos emerges without adequate historical context or organizational readiness, the result may be a fleeting uprising. When Chronos and Kairos coexist, however, the collective will be fragmented or feeble, and the opportunity may be disregarded or overshadowed by dominant systems. A revolutionary transition achieves durability and institutional depth solely when cumulative conditions, critical timing, and coordinated collective will align.

Recognizes the importance of structure, opportunity, resources, and mobilization; nevertheless, it questions how these elements attain effectiveness through temporal alignment. Structural constraints require time for development, political opportunities involve actors capable of seeing and capitalizing on them, and collective will demand both historical background and vigorous mobilization. The

investigation transcends the simple presence of complaints or the rise of opportunities; it assesses whether the intersection of historical forces, opportune conditions, and collective action enables transformation.

WTE serves as an interpretive framework elucidating revolutionary transformation through the dynamic interaction of Chronos, Kairos, and collective will. It does not reduce revolution to a mechanical formula; instead, it conceptualizes it as a will–time process in which historical accumulation, critical timing, and organized agency converge to shape results. This section shifts from conceptual reconstruction to the formal development of the WTE framework.

5. Developing the Will–Time Equilibrium (WTE) Framework

To delineate the Will–Time Equilibrium (WTE) framework, it is essential to contextualize it within the predominant theories of revolution. This comparison aims not to supplant current theories but to elucidate the particular analytical void that WTE fills: the amalgamation of long-term temporal accumulation, critical historical events, and collective will under a unified interpretive framework. This stance expands upon discussions in political opportunity and political process theory, addressing criticisms that these approaches frequently neglect culture, emotion, agency, and meaning (Meyer, 2004; Goodwin & Jasper, 1999).

Table 1: Positioning the WTE Framework in Relation to Prominent Revolutionary Approaches

Theoretical Approach	Conception of Time	Position of Collective Will	Explanation of Revolutionary Timing	Analytical Limitation	WTE Contribution
Structuralism	Time appears mainly as long-term structural accumulation	Collective will is not central to the explanation	Revolutionary timing is linked to the maturation of structural crises	Gives limited attention to the decisive moment and the agency that activates accumulation	Reconnects structural accumulation to Kairos and collective will
Resource Mobilization	Time is linked to organizational development and mobilizational capacity	Will appears mainly as organizational readiness	Revolutionary action depends on resources, leadership, and networks	Does not fully theorize the temporal formation of will or the symbolic meaning of the moment	Links organization to temporal accumulation and historical possibility
Political Opportunity	Time appears as a contingent opening in the political environment	Will is treated as a response to opportunity	Revolutions emerge when political opportunities open	Tends to emphasize political openings more than long-term accumulation shaped by and collective will formation	Reinterprets Kairos as a temporal-moment shaped by accumulation and will
Collective Action / Contentious Politics	Time appears through sequences of interaction and escalation	Agency is central but context-dependent	Revolutionary dynamics emerge through interaction among challengers,	Does not fully integrate time as an explicit causal dimension	Connects interaction and agency to a broader

Establishing the Will–Time Equilibrium Framework: Chronos, Kairos, and Collective Will in Revolutionary Transformation

			authorities, and publics		will–time logic
WTE Framework	Dual temporality: Chronos and Kairos	Collective will is ethical, social, temporal, and organizational	Transformation depends on the alignment of accumulation, moment, and will	—	Provides an interpretive framework for explaining divergent revolutionary outcomes

Elucidates that the Will–Time Equilibrium (WTE) framework is founded on established methodologies rather than dismissing them. Their unique contribution is the reorganization of ideas through a will-time framework that links structural accumulation, qualitative moments, and social agency.

The following content integrates these elements into a unified interpretive framework that clarifies revolutionary transformation as a temporal process. The objective is not to create a deterministic or quantitative model of revolution, but to clarify the relational logic that regulates the interaction of long-term accumulation, key timing, and collective agency.

The WTE framework can be characterized as a dynamic state where cumulative historical time, qualitative moments, and collective will converge, facilitating the possibility of revolutionary transformation that is potentially enduring. Chronos denotes the prolonged aggregation of grievances, systemic tensions, institutional deficiencies, and social anticipations. Kairos denotes the critical moment when historical possibility becomes available for action. Collective will denote the ethical, social, emotional, and organizational capability by which individuals convert cumulative pressures and favorable circumstances into political action. WTE does not represent a static formula, but rather a state of alignment among temporal accumulation, crucial timing, and coordinated collective agency.

Addresses a fundamental constraint in revolutionary theory. Structural approaches elucidate the accumulation of crises but frequently inadequately address the timing of rupture. Political opportunity theory elucidates the emergence of a moment but sometimes diminishes it to a mere contingent political opportunity, neglecting a more extensive temporal-symbolic framework. The resource mobilization theory elucidates organizational capability but fails to comprehensively address the temporal development of collective will. WTE aims to link these aspects by enquiring how accumulation becomes operational, how moments become transformational, and how collective will achieves historical efficacy.

The structure is based on a triadic relationship. Chronos establishes the historical domain of transformation; nonetheless, mere accumulation may remain unaddressed in the absence of a pivotal moment. Kairos presents an opportunity, although the moment may elapse without effect if not seized by a coordinated communal will. The collective will engage the connection between accumulation and moment; but it cannot effectuate lasting alteration if it is disconnected from historical context or exists beyond a feasible temporal framework. Revolutionary transformation relies not on the isolated existence of any singular constituent, but on the extent of congruence among all three.

Between the three dimensions can be conceptually articulated as:

$$WTE = f(\text{Chronos, Kairos, Collective Will})$$

Need to be regarded as an interpretive expression rather than a mathematical equation. The objective is to emphasize that revolutionary outcomes are influenced by the interplay of several aspects, rather than by a straight or mechanical causal chain. A significant degree of structural accumulation does not inherently lead to revolution; a critical moment does not inherently result in transformation; and collective will does not guarantee success unless it is positioned within the appropriate temporal context. The framework's explanatory significance resides in its ability to demonstrate how various dimensions converge, diverge, or misalign.

The interplay between Chronos, Kairos, and collective will produce various revolutionary patterns. In the absence of Kairos, the presence of Chronos and collective will may lead to an extended buildup without disruption. When Kairos manifests without adequate historical context, the result may be a transient insurrection. When Chronos and Kairos coexist yet collective will is feeble or disjointed, the opportunity may be overlooked or subsumed by prevailing structures. Revolutionary transformation gains depth, persistence, and institutional consequence only when Chronos, Kairos, and collective will converge.

Table 2: *Between Will–Time Alignment and Revolutionary Outcomes*

Pattern	Chronos	Kairos	Collective Will	Likely Outcome
Full will–time alignment	Strong	Strong	Strong	Durable revolutionary transformation
Accumulation without rupture	Strong	Weak	Strong/latent	Prolonged tension or unresolved crisis
Moment without depth	Weak	Strong	Weak/unstable	Short-lived uprising
Missed moment	Strong	Strong	Weak/fragmented	Incomplete transformation or regime reproduction

of this matrix is not to forecast revolutionary events mechanically, but to offer a framework for comparative analysis. It assists in determining which dimension—Chronos, Kairos, or collective will—is deficient, nonexistent, disjointed, or improperly timed in a specific revolutionary context. In this regard, WTE serves optimally as a diagnostic instrument: it elucidates why analogous structural pressures may result in divergent trajectories, why certain opportunities are capitalized upon while others are forfeited, and why specific movements attain lasting transformation while others remain transient or fail prematurely.

The framework functions via four interrelated mechanisms. The initial phase is preparation, during which complaints, expectations, and shared significances amass over time. The second is recognition, wherein agents perceive a time as historically conducive to action. The third is appropriation, when collective will convert that moment into structured political action. The fourth aspect is institutionalization, whereby revolutionary action either attains a lasting structure or fails to transcend the initial disruption. These processes illustrate that revolution is not simply an isolated event, but a process that commences well before the rupture and persists in its aftermath.

Establishing the Will–Time Equilibrium Framework: Chronos, Kairos, and Collective Will in Revolutionary Transformation

WTE thus enhances revolutionary theory by conceptualizing revolution as a will-time continuum. It regards time as a dynamic dimension of transformation, collective will as a temporally developed capacity, and the revolutionary moment as exceeding a mere contingent political opportunity. The framework incorporates the findings of existing theories into a more comprehensive interpretive structure instead of displacing them. Its significance resides in elucidating how structure, temporality, and agency interact synergistically to facilitate or hinder revolutionary transformation.

6. Applications of the Will–Time Equilibrium (WTE) Framework: Comparative Illustrations of Revolutionary Pathways

Use the Will–Time Equilibrium (WTE) framework to analyses specific revolutionary cases, demonstrating how the interplay of Chronos, Kairos, and collective will elucidate diverse revolutionary trajectories. The objective is neither to furnish comprehensive historical narratives of each example nor to assert a formal empirical evaluation of the framework. The cases exemplify varying patterns of will-time alignment, partial alignment, and disruption.

The cases were selected because they represented divergent revolutionary trajectories. The Cuban Revolution of 1959 and the Iranian Revolution of 1979 exhibit significant alignment in terms of long-term accumulation, essential timing, and organized collective will. In contrast, the Arab uprisings of 2011 exhibit more disparate and fractured patterns, wherein significant periods of upheaval did not usually result in lasting transformation. This distinction enables the WTE framework to elucidate why revolutionary results may differ, despite seemingly analogous grievances, mobilization, and chances.

employs an interpretive comparative-historical methodology, centered on three primary enquiries: Did long-term structural, political, and symbolic accumulation yield a robust Chronos? Did a critical historical event create a Kairos in which transformation became feasible? Was the collective will adequately have organized, coherent, and capable of transforming potential into political action? These enquiries advance the study beyond singular-factor explanations and towards a relational comprehension of how time, moment, and agency converge.

The Cuban Revolution of 1959 exemplifies a case of robust will-time synchronization. The Batista administration was characterized by pervasive corruption, economic reliance, social inequality, and diminishing legitimacy, collectively constituting a formidable Chronos (Gott, 2005). From 1956 to 1958, guerrilla warfare, urban turmoil, military defections, and the regime's erosion of authority culminated in a critical Kairos. The July 26 Movement simultaneously offered a structured collective determination that could convert fragmented frustrations into enduring revolutionary action (Pérez, 2006; Sweig, 2002; Foran, 2005). Cuba exemplifies how cumulative conditions, essential timing, and organized agency can converge to effectuate enduring revolutionary transformation from a WTE perspective.

The Iranian Revolution of 1979 serves as a significant illustration of alignment. Decades of repression, unequal modernization, cultural resistance, and degradation of legitimacy have engendered a profound Chronos. From 1978 to 1979, widespread protests, oil strikes, elite disintegration, cycles of mourning, and the erosion of state

power culminated in a significant Kairos (Kurzman, 2004; Parsa, 2000; Abrahamian, 1982). Iran was characterized by a comprehensive, symbolically cohesive collective will, anchored in religious networks, mosques, bazaars, shared significations, and leadership adept at converting fragmented discontent into organized revolutionary momentum. In WTE words, Iran demonstrates how collective will becomes historically impactful when it can seize a mature temporal opportunity. This evaluation pertains to the revolution's potential for regime change and institutional consolidation, rather than a normative appraisal of its subsequent development.

The Arab uprisings of 2011 demonstrate a more disjointed trend. Throughout the area, discontent had amassed due to authoritarian governance, unemployment, corruption, inequality, and crises of legitimacy, but the timing differed by country. Tunisia exhibited significant economic and political accumulation; Egypt amalgamated concerns with institutional continuities that constrained consolidation; Syria, Libya, and Yemen merged grievances with coercive state apparatuses, splintered opposition, or fragile institutional foundations (Bellin, 2012). The self-immolation of Muhammad Bouazizi in Tunisia served as a significant Kairos that swiftly transcended national boundaries. This dispersion can be perceived as a modular political phenomenon, wherein instances of dispute traverse contexts and redefine expectations of potential action (Beissinger, 2007). The collective will throughout the uprisings was inconsistent: emotionally charged, influenced by fear, rage, dignity, and optimism, yet frequently disjointed and devoid of cohesive leadership (Pearlman, 2013; Tarrow, 2011; Brownlee, Masoud, & Reynolds, 2015; Bayat, 2017).

Tunisia attained a comparatively robust alignment among accumulation, momentum, and collective will, elucidating its initial transformation, despite subsequent instability and regression. Egypt underwent a significant Kairos and extensive mobilization; yet, the collective will have lacked institutional organization, permitting established entities, particularly the military, to regain authority. In Syria, Libya, and Yemen, significant grievances and instances of rupture were eclipsed by force, fragmentation, external intervention, or state disintegration. In Syria, the dissemination of protests was influenced by moral identity and cascades in high-risk environments, demonstrating that collective resolve can become emotionally heightened while remaining susceptible to forcible interruption (Pearlman, 2018). The Arab uprisings illustrate that Kairos alone cannot ensure lasting transformation when collective will be fragmented or when coercive institutions interfere with the will–time relationship.

Table 3: *Comparative Implementation of the WTE Framework in Selected Revolutionary Cases*

Case	Chronos	Kairos	Collective Will	WTE Pattern	Outcome
Cuba 1959	Strong	Strong	Organized/strong	High alignment	Durable revolutionary transformation
Iran 1979	Strong	Strong	Unified/strong	High alignment	Radical regime transformation and

Establishing the Will–Time Equilibrium Framework: Chronos, Kairos, and Collective Will in Revolutionary Transformation

					institutional consolidation
Tunisia 2011	Strong	Strong	Medium/partially organized	Partial alignment	Initial transition with later fragility
Egypt 2011	Medium/strong	Strong	Broad but fragmented	Interrupted alignment	Incomplete transformation
Syria, Libya, Yemen 2011	Strong/varied	Strong	Fragmented/unstable	Ruptured alignment	Conflict, collapse, or authoritarian reconfiguration

Elucidates three key analytical contributions of the (WTE) framework. The framework differentiates between the emergence of a revolutionary moment and the establishment of a lasting revolutionary outcome. A potent Kairos may facilitate transition; however, it does not ensure it. Secondly, the framework emphasizes collective will as the intermediary factor that transforms cumulative pressures and historical opportunities into structured political action. Third, it elucidates varying outcomes without attributing them solely to the severity of the problem, the intensity of the protest, or the sheer presence of opportunity. Cuba and Iran exemplify significant will-time alignment, whereas the Arab uprisings of 2011 reveal that critical moments can result in incomplete, unstable, or violent outcomes when collective will is disjointed or when coercive and institutional frameworks hinder transformation.

The significance of these cases resides not in validating the framework statistically or predictively, but in illustrating its interpretive utility. WTE assists in discerning the success or failure of the revolutionary process: in the maturity of historical accumulation, in the identification and appropriation of the critical moment, or in the organizational and symbolic coherence of collective will. The framework provides a diagnostic perspective for comprehending both revolutionary transformation and revolutionary incompleteness.

7. Theoretical and Methodological Contributions, Limitations, and Prospects for Future Research

Emphasizes the relational alignment of long-term accumulation, timing, and organized collective agency above explanations of revolutions that rely solely on structural crisis, political opportunity, mobilization, or leadership. This section summarizes the key theoretical and methodological contributions of WTE, acknowledges its shortcomings, and outlines possible directions for further research.

The primary theoretical contribution of WTE is the reconceptualization of time as an active element in revolutionary transformation. Revolutions do not merely occur over time; they are formed through cumulative temporal processes and critical historical opportunities. Chronos encapsulates the incremental development of grievances, institutional tensions, memories, and expectations, whereas Kairos signifies the critical moment when these collected conditions become actionable. WTE enhances the sociology of time by positioning temporality as central to revolutionary analysis (Elias, 1993; Koselleck, 2004).

The second contribution pertains to the concept of collective will. The concept perceives collective will not as impulsive rage or transient mobilization, but as a temporally established ethical, social, and organizational capability. It evolves through collective experience, ethical outrage, political vision, connections, and anticipations of transformation, achieving historical significance only when it can identify and seize a critical moment. This interpretation expands upon Arendt's conception of communal action as the ability to instigate a new beginning, contextualizing that ability within the temporal framework of revolutionary agency (Arendt, 1963).

The third contribution is the differentiation between political opportunity and Kairos. Although political opportunity theory has been crucial in elucidating openings in the political landscape, elite divisions, and variations in repression or access, WTE frames the revolutionary moment more comprehensively as a temporal-symbolic opening. Kairos is not simply a political opportunity; it represents a moment where accumulated meanings, expectations, fears, and desires converge into a historically significant case. This contrast elucidates why not every political opportunity culminates in revolution, and why certain occasions gain transformative potency while others fade without enduring impact.

Methodologically, WTE provides a comparative interpretative framework for analyzing revolutionary trajectories. The matrix does not forecast outcomes mechanically, nor does it depend on static numerical indicators. It determines whether a certain example exhibits alignment, partial alignment, or rupture among Chronos, Kairos, and collective will. This approach facilitates the comparison of revolutionary success, incomplete transformation, missed chances, and state collapse without simplifying these outcomes to a singular causative component.

The framework also opens important trajectories for future operationalization. The conceptual formulation $WTE = f(\text{Chronos}, \text{Kairos}, \text{Collective Will})$ should be interpreted not as a rigid mathematical equation, but as an analytical representation of the interplay between the three dimensions. Future research may establish more accurate indicators for each dimension, such as the duration and depth of accumulated grievances, the intensity and symbolic significance of triggering events, the organizational coherence of collective will, and the ability of movements to institutionalize revolutionary action. This endeavor necessitates meticulous methodological adjustment and must refrain from simplifying intricate historical processes to mere quantitative metrics.

Numerous constraints must be recognized. The collective will be intrinsically challenging to quantify due to its amalgamation of ethical, emotional, organizational, and symbolic facets. The evaluation frequently depends on qualitative interpretation, discourse analysis, organizational evidence, and historical assessment. Secondly, temporal factors are intricately intertwined with structural, economic, and political variables, as long-term accumulation is influenced by institutions, resources, and power dynamics. Third, recognizing Kairos presents methodological difficulties, especially in revolutions characterized by numerous turning moments instead of a singular pivotal moment. Fourth, the framework has thus far been exemplified by a restricted set of situations, indicating that its generalization should be analytical and context-dependent rather than statistical.

A further limitation concerns external intervention and coercive disruption. In certain instances, the internal dynamics between accumulation, momentum, and

Establishing the Will–Time Equilibrium Framework: Chronos, Kairos, and Collective Will in Revolutionary Transformation

collective will may be disrupted by military intervention, regional pressures, foreign alliances, or severe repression. These considerations do not undermine the WTE framework; rather, they illustrate that will-time alignment functions within larger domains of power. Future applications should thus investigate how external entities and coercive institutions alter or impede the interaction among Chronos, Kairos, and collective will.

The future advancement of WTE may unfold in various trajectories. One path is comparative expansion through supplementary revolutionary instances across various areas and historical periods. Another application of the theory is non-revolutionary types of transformation, including reformist movements, democratic transitions, labour mobilization, anti-authoritarian campaigns, or institutional transformation. A third approach involves methodological enhancement through the creation of qualitative and mixed-method indicators that can delineate the emergence, activation, and institutionalization of collective will. A fourth avenue is theoretical integration with extensive discussions in historical sociology, political sociology, social movement theory, and the sociology of time.

Revolutionary transformation, its interpretive framework may also apply to non-revolutionary contexts. The interplay of long-term accumulation, critical moments, and collective will elucidate overarching patterns of social and political transformation, encompassing progressive reforms, institutional openings, and popular movements that do not inherently aim for regime change. Such applications necessitate tailored indications and meticulous consideration of context. The framework should be regarded not as a general theory of political transformation, but as a versatile interpretive lens for examining instances where time, agency, and social transformation converge.

In summary, the WTE framework enhances revolutionary theory by elucidating the interplay between historical accumulation, crucial timing, and social agency. Its significance resides not in providing a deterministic formula, but in elucidating why analogous crises may yield disparate outcomes, why certain opportunities are capitalized upon while others are overlooked, and why collective will occasionally engenders lasting transformation while at other times remains disjointed or subsumed by prevailing structures.

Conclusion

This study has established the Will–Time Equilibrium (WTE) framework as an interpretive method for revolutionary transformation. The primary assertion is that revolutions cannot be sufficiently elucidated solely through structural crises, political opportunity, resource mobilization, or social action. These aspects are crucial, although they acquire enhanced analytical significance when assessed in relation to long-term accumulation, key timing, and collective will.

The framework establishes three interconnected concepts. Chronos denotes the accumulation of historical time, during which complaints, institutional tensions, legitimacy crises, and social expectations progressively develop. Kairos denotes the qualitative moment when historical potential becomes available for action. Collective will denote the ethical, social, emotional, and organizational capability by which individuals convert cumulative pressures and favorable circumstances into

political action. Revolutionary transformation is not generated by any singular dimension in isolation, but rather by the extent of alignment among these factors.

The study illustrates, through comparisons of Cuba in 1959, Iran in 1979, and the Arab uprisings of 2011, how WTE elucidates varying revolutionary trajectories. Cuba and Iran exhibit significant will-time alignment, when historical accumulation, critical events, and coordinated collective will coalesce to effectuate lasting transformation. In contrast, the Arab uprisings exhibit more fragmented patterns, as significant disruptions did not typically result in stable revolutionary outcomes due to an unequal collective will, insufficient institutionalization, or interference from coercive and structural forces.

The value of WTE is not in presenting a definitive formula or a universal theory of revolution, but in furnishing a diagnostic and interpretative framework. It elucidates the reasons for varying outcomes of analogous crises, the factors that contribute to the seizing of certain moments while others are overlooked, and the circumstances under which social mobilization evolves into a sustained revolutionary process as opposed to remaining sporadic, disjointed, or co-opted by prevailing systems. The framework conceptualizes revolution as a will-time process influenced by the interplay of temporality, agency, and historical potentiality.

The study concurrently recognizes the limitations of the framework. The collective will be challenging to quantify accurately; Kairos may be contentious or plural rather than unique; and external interference, coercive institutions, and international circumstances may disturb the internal dynamics among accumulation, moment, and will. Consequently, WTE needs to be regarded as an analytical and context-dependent framework rather than a definitive explanatory model.

Subsequent research may enhance the concept by incorporating additional comparative instances, more nuanced qualitative indicators, and potential mixed-method approaches. It can also be modified for non-revolutionary kinds of transformation, such as reform movements, democratic transitions, labour mobilization, and institutional transformation. Such extensions would enable the framework to transcend its original revolutionary emphasis while maintaining its fundamental insight: social and political transformation achieves historical efficacy when the convergence of accumulated time, critical events, and collective will occur.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- [1] Abbott, A. D. (2001). *Time Matters: On Theory and Method*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [2] Abrahamian, E. (1982). *Iran Between Two Revolutions*. Princeton University Press.
- [3] Al-Jabri, M. A. (2009). *Takwīn al-‘aql al-‘arabī* [The Formation of the Arab Reason]. (10th ed.). Beirut: Center for Arab Unity Studies. [In Arabic].
- [4] Al-Kawakibi, A. (2006). *Ṭabā’i‘ al-istibdād wa-maṣāri‘ al-isti‘bād* [The Nature of Despotism and the Destruction of Enslavement]. (3rd ed.). Beirut: Dar al-Nafa’is. [In Arabic].
- [5] Aminzade, R. (1992). Historical sociology and time. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 20(4), 456–480. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124192020004003>
- [6] Arendt, H. (1963). *On Revolution*. London: Penguin Books.
- [7] Aristotle. (1984). *The Complete Works of Aristotle*. (Book IV. (J. Barnes edited). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- [8] Aristotle. (2004). *Nicomachean Ethics*. (R. Crisp Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [9] Bayat, A. (2017). *Revolution without Revolutionaries: Making Sense of the Arab Spring*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- [10] Beissinger, M. R. (2007). Structure and example in modular political phenomena: The diffusion of Bulldozer/Rose/Orange/Tulip revolutions. *Perspectives on Politics*, 5(2), 259–276. journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S1537592707070776
- [11] Bellin, E. (2012). Reconsidering the robustness of authoritarianism in the Middle East: Lessons from the Arab Spring. *Comparative Politics*, 44(2), 127–149. <https://doi.org/10.5129/001041512798838021>
- [12] Bennabi, M. (1986). *Shurūṭ al-nahḍa* [The Conditions of the Renaissance]. (A. Shaheen Trans.). Damascus: Dar Al Fikr for Printing, Publishing, and Distribution. [In Arabic].
- [13] Brownlee, J.; Masoud, T. & Reynolds, A. (2015). *The Arab Spring: Pathways of Repression and Reform*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [14] Durkheim, É. (1976). *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. (J. W. Swat Trans.). London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- [15] Durkheim, É. (1960). *The Division of Labor in Society*. (G. Simpson Trans.). Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe.
- [16] Elias, N. (1993). *Time: An Essay*. Oxford; Cambridge, MA.: Blackwell Publishers.

- [17] Foran, J. (2005). *Taking Power: On the Origins of Third World Revolutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [18] Goldstone, J. A. (2014). *Revolutions: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- [19] Goodwin, J., & Jasper, J. M. (1999). Caught in a winding, snarling vine: The structural bias of political process theory. *Sociological Forum*, 14(1), 27–54. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021684610881>
- [20] Gott, R. (2005). *Cuba: A New History*. New Haven, Conn.; London: Yale University Press.
- [21] Gurvitch, G. (1964). *The Spectrum of Social Time*. Dordrecht: Reidel Publishing Company.
- [22] Hegel, G. W. F. (2001). *Philosophy of Right*. (S. W. Dyne Trans.). Kitchener: Batoche Books Limited.
- [23] Ibn Khaldun, A. (2001). *The Muqaddimah [Ibn Khaldun's Introduction]*. (Vol. 1, K. Shahada edited). Beirut: Dar al-Fikr. [In Arabic].
- [24] Koselleck, R. (2004). *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- [25] Kurzman, C. (2004). *The Unthinkable Revolution in Iran*. Cambridge, Mass. and London, England: Harvard University Press.
- [26] Mannheim, K. (1954). *Ideology and Utopia*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc.
- [27] McAdam, D. (1985). *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [28] McAdam, D., Tarrow, S. & Tilly, C. (2004). *Dynamics of Contention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [29] McCarthy, J. D. & Zald, M. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A Partial Theory. *American Journal of Sociology*. 82 (6). 1212-1241. <https://doi.org/10.1086/226464>
- [30] Meyer, D. S. (2004). Protest and political opportunities. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 125–145. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.30.012703.110545>
- [31] Nietzsche, F. (2007). *On the Genealogy of Morals*. (Carol Diethe Trans.). Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [32] Parsa, M. (2000). *States, Ideologies, and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of Iran, Nicaragua, and the Philippines*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [33] Pearlman, W. (2013). Emotions and the microfoundations of the Arab uprisings. *Perspectives on Politics*, 11(2), 387–409. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592713001072>

Establishing the Will–Time Equilibrium Framework: Chronos, Kairos, and
Collective Will in Revolutionary Transformation

- [34] Pearlman, W. (2018). Moral identity and protest cascades in Syria. *British Journal of Political Science*, 48(4), 877–901. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123416000235>
- [35] Pérez, L. A. (2006). *Cuba: Between Reform and Revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [36] Ricoeur, P. (1984). *Time and Narrative*. (Vol. 1. K. McLaughlin and D. Pellauer Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [37] Rousseau, J. (1993). *The Social Contract and Discourses*. (G. D. H. Cole Trans.). London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc.
- [38] Sewell, W. H. (1996). Historical Events as Transformations of Structures: Inventing Revolution at the Bastille. *Theory and Society*. 25 (6). 841-881. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00159818>
- [39] Sewell, W. H. (2005). *Logics of History: Social Theory and Social Transformation*. University of Chicago Press.
- [40] Skocpol, T. (1979). *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [41] Smith, J. E. (1969). Time, Times, and the 'Right Time': Chronos and Kairos. *The Monist*. 53 (1). 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.5840/monist196953115>
- [42] Sorokin, P. (2017). *Social and Cultural Dynamics: Study of Change in Major Systems of Art, Truth, Ethics, Law, and Social Relationships*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- [43] Sweig, J. E. (2002). *Inside the Cuban Revolution: Fidel Castro and the Urban Underground*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [44] Tarrow, S. G. (2011). *Power in Movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [45] Tilly, C. (1978). *From Mobilization to Revolution*. New York: Random House.
- [46] Weber, M. (1978), *Economy and Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- [47] Zerubavel, E. (2003). *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.