

Does Poverty Lead To Revolutionary Action?

Posted on September 25, 2019

Poverty, State Capacity, and the Origins of Revolutionary Protest

The protest movement, which began in Europe in the middle of 2010, suddenly spread to the countries of the Arab world, where, because of the lack of democratic mechanisms of struggle, it took the form of armed confrontation. Without going into details, let us proceed to determine the place of these basic concepts in the current protest movements that have gripped today's Europe and Asia. In the vast majority of cases, people are aware that no country in the world can effectively fight this social phenomenon.

If the state does not have the opportunity, then do not escape poverty. It is universal. One country differs from another only in poverty. Therefore, there is an objective opinion that poverty is a disease of society which must be treated together. In principle, poverty does not lead to revolutionary action. It is one of the natural states of human society, and most people treat it with understanding. The only exception to these rules is the riot of the hungry as a result of extreme poverty. It usually does not last long, often does not require the replacement of existing authorities, and does not have a clear political program. They will rebel until they are satisfied. Examples of this are easily found in African and Asian countries, although the level of poverty in Europe and the US is also high – up to 20% of the population. Dictatorship is a historical tradition of governing the state, and not every monarch is theoretically bad.

The history of the creation of states, even in Antiquity, can confirm this opinion. This option has not lost its importance today. The idea of changing the dictatorship differs from the riot of the hungry in that it does not always have a successful end and is associated with the complete destruction of the country's governance system. From the dictatorial habits of the supreme authority, no country and no people are insured since the dictator is also one of us, and he also has human vices. Only his actions are invariably reflected in the social and psychological state of society.

Political Injustice and Economic Discontent

Today, there are enough dictators and monarchs. They get on even with democratic societies. In some monarchies, the structure of the relationship remains the same – the crowned man and his subjects. The monarch, in the figurative sense of the word, retains power over property and souls on its territory. At the same time, monarchs remain outside the democratic processes taking place in their kingdoms, for example, in Great Britain, Sweden, Denmark, and Japan. Although monarchs and

their families stand above the laws of society, nevertheless, they are also being overthrown (Iran, Libya, Ethiopia, Somalia). But along with this, as a rule, these overthrows are the work of ambitious politicians in the country and abroad who intend to divide the monarch's property. (Gurr, 1970) This usually all ends, and then begins a more difficult stage – the creation of a new state instead of the destroyed, but – without the crown. Here comes the aid of the so-called democracy, which has many options, including the form of a “dictatorship” of democracy. However strange it may sound, it has a place to be. In Greece, France, Portugal, on behalf of democracy, they robbed, destroyed, burned hundreds of cars and commercial objects, government buildings. Everything was done allegedly within the framework of a “high European democracy”.

According to numerous media criteria, it can be concluded that the “democratic” authorities in Greece, Spain, Portugal, Iceland and many other EU countries plundered the state treasury for a long time, appropriated the money of taxpayers, and to this day, none of the “robbers” responsibility. In such countries, the change of government does not change anything significant. This is the biggest defect of European democracy. A system that allows the appropriation of budget money. Corruption, as an important and active part, remains. In this case, such actions, in fact, are generated by the very essence of democracy, which is more calculated for the role of consciousness in action. The main actors of corruption closely cooperate with democratic values. As a result of the events taking place in European countries today, a social explosion is inevitable. Unfortunately, the East has outstripped Europe in this matter and has taken on a load of social protests that can not serve as a tool for Western countries. Levels of consciousness are different; in fact, it determines the difference between protest movements in the West and East, including Africa. However, in all cases the question “what to do?” It remains the problem in Western democracy.

Human Agency, Social Order, and the Limits of Revolution

As for injustice, the most important component of the protest wave is purely human property, and it appears in accordance with the position of the authorities. It can be mitigated or even, if it is possible in principle, to get rid of it. It is inherent in almost any authority. There is no country where everything happens within the framework of justice in the full sense of the word. People usually get used to this way of thinking, i.e., halfway justice, and poverty and fear make people look at it through their fingers. Only blatant injustice can set in motion the animal component of man. Then, united, people destroy everything that comes their way indiscriminately. The responsibility and fear of death, strict laws and strength can not prevent the manifestation of this hidden feeling. Once awakened, it initiates destructive actions for a long time. Injustice, more than all other factors of actions against the authorities, generates hatred and anger, and they lead to a dead end, where everyone becomes indifferent to everything, and his actions in such a situation are aimed only at destruction. There are almost no options.

However, blindly chasing after justice, a person does a lot of stupid things and does not achieve his goal. (Davies, 1962) He himself creates injustice, turning it into a mirage, an illusion. He loses control over himself, his actions become dependent on the mass of the same people who think that in this way it is possible to overcome injustice. In such cases, even partial elimination of injustice towards society can bring real benefits for a long time. On a wave of relatively incomplete injustice, of course, a partial solution to the problem of poverty and dictatorship is also possible because it gives hope for the best. However, tough security measures against those who want a just, equal treatment of all citizens can lead, and in fact, lead to the destruction of illusion and hope.

Knowing all this, you come to the conclusion that everything should have a strict sequence – the word, the action and the observance of the conditions available in the voiced truth. Only stage-by-stage and consistency can preserve public confidence. Trust, like sugar, is a tattered little price. Against the background of injustice, distrust is an important, exciting factor, and it is almost impossible to overcome it. Trust, by its nature, is capable of regeneration if only there were appropriate conditions. Intentions, words, and actions are the basis of justice and the core of the relationship between government and society. Violation and, as a result, neglect of these constituent elements of stability can lead to tragedy. An example of the internal life of the Arab countries, if we exclude a powerful external factor, gives us a lot of useful information about this. It once again proves that the revolution is maturing, where, in principle, justice is ignored. By preserving justice, one can count on an understanding of society as a whole. Ultimately, the victory goes to the right, not to the one who has the power, but to the one who owns the truth. In addition, being together, strength and truth can count on an unconditional, lasting and stable victory. In this victory, everyone is interested – both the government and the citizen as the basis of any society.

References

Gurr, T. R. (1970). *Why men rebel*. Princeton University Press.

<https://press.princeton.edu/books/paperback/9781594519140/why-men-rebel>

Davies, J. C. (1962). Toward a theory of revolution. *American Sociological Review*, 27(1), 5–19.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/2089714>