

Revolution in the 21st Century: A Close Inspection of the New Factors to Consider in Modern Day Appraisals, Changes, and Epilogue

Daniel Ghazal

Abstract:- Revolutions as historians know are the brutal forced shift of the political and socioeconomic course of a nation. It changes systems from monarchy to secular democracy, communist to capitalism (or the other way round), theocratic regimes into secular and so forth. Revolutions go into decline as humanity proceeded into the 21st century despite the greater means that people have from education to information and communication. The study inspects the key aspects that makes protests fall short from becoming revolutions and the key changes in the political standards that asks an ever increasingly harder to break the ruling system apart. The new systems of governing are based on the separation of power which in one side of the coin ensures that tyrannies will not get hold of ruling but can allow for cluster of political groups to abuse the political and electoral system thus locking up state governance in the hands of a corrupt few, however through having corruption accusation gets also divided amongst those who share similar powers in the government or parliament. The mentality of the intellectuals in the modern day and age under the influx of consumerism as well has changed from wanting to change one's own state's political reality into preferring to shift one's life to a different country where the revolutions already succeeded and human rights are celebrated. Extremists, armed or not, who do have the readiness to engage in striking means to reshape the state's reality in today's world would rather seek to submit to the existing system and influence the ruling system from within. Intelligence agencies and unseen forces did not exist in the past as they do now and are observant tirelessly and studying the societies' attitude to predict and urgency's and address them even before they materialize

I. INTRODUCTION

In today's time where democracy prevails over the many countries in the world, there is more inclusion to people's will and thoughts. Representation of the people is very beneficial because it stops the ruling classes from abusing the country's resources for their own interest. So the interest of all social classes is considered, demotivating politicians from taking their rights by force as it used to happen previously with the absolute monarchies and feudal systems.

A revolution in essence and view differ from one theorist to another but they all agree that it's the violent uprising that the people in a state get involved in to remove the governors from power and replace them with a new

system of ruling and that it is a result of social and economic unrest (Brookings, 1998). Arguably the latest successful revolution that reshaped the internal structure of a country and reformed its foreign affairs was the Iranian revolution in 1979. That revolution changed the face of Iran from secular pro-western country to an extremely religious nationalistic anti-western country (Thomas Erdbrink, 2019 NYT).

In the first world countries there are separatist movements that are at motion yet either depressed or take a democratic constitutional steps towards independence. For example, Catalonia is the most violent separatist movement that was seen as the most violent since the establishment of the EU (BBC news 2017). The much more peaceful movement was the Scottish movement for independence where there was a referendum issued to ask the people in Scotland if they wanted independence with a simple majority favoring remaining part of the UK, later Brexit the new attempt for a referendum was deemed as unconstitutional by the British courts (Foci, 2021). That common factor for both separatist movements in Europe is that they were deemed as unconstitutional by the state authority. In the vast majority of Europe the states gave up their sovereignty for the better mutual economic, security and mobilization between the member states. Also there are not that many revolutions that we particularly hear about often nor strong separatist movements in the third world after the year 2000.

The only prominent split was the split of Sudan into Sudan and South Sudan after a civil war and long tensions, not a revolution or a separatist movement with a political plan. The referendum that led to the split was held by the US Aid which made the act of split in itself a democratic step (Angela Stephens, 2011). Other than the Sudan Split no major splits occurred not in the first nor in the third world so one country in the world for two decades experienced an uprising that led to the independence of a new state as a result of a civil war. This fact is enough to tell that revolutions and separatist movements have reduced and changed in nature in the recent days if they do still exist after all as some might consider. Also with the evolution of politics today the nations that push forward for their own self-governing now are federations instead of having complete independence and new ruling system. That regional autonomy might be the trend that will continue all over to be used by opposed forces.

The recent years have witnessed relative international peace after having one hegemon dominating the international scene. Even for some reason the intra state conflicts decreased especially revolutions and separatist movements. Could it be that the traditional struggles that drive people to

the streets have been solved? Or is it that people no longer blame their own nation for economic and social struggle and now see these struggles as their own? And does globalization have to do with the intra state peaceful condition?

II. ANALYSIS AND ELABORATION

A. Monumental Revolutions & origins

The liberal attitude introduced by the French revolution has reshaped the character of the citizen and this ideology spread into many other countries. This ideology changed the concept of politics and life based on the individual's initiative and own work and gives the state and ruling authority a lot of legitimacy and power to hold the society together and maintain law and order. From here, the economic wellness of the individual became the individual's problem blaming his poverty on one's own success or failure rather than on the state's (king's) policy and taxation as it was before, with the belief that the leading cause of revolution is poverty and hindered social progress. It also suggests that system preserving power is seductive and not repressive in nature. Meaning that in the past if working conditions are unfair and wages are insufficient the worker knows who the enemy is it would be his employer that repressed his rights and the king or royalty that is taking away their money through high taxes. Instead, the one to blame for the harsh living conditions in the neo-liberal era is unknown as the decision making process in the state is distributed within the layers of institution that host the divided power of the state. So there is no one identified antagonist to revolt against deeming revolutions fruitless (Byung-Chul Han, 2015).

A good example of a revolution that restructured a country inside out is the revolution in Iran in 1979. It was an important revolution that many consider to be the last phenomenal revolution is the Iranian revolution or that reshaped not only Iran, but the entire Middle East and US foreign policies. It dates back in 1979 when the uprising fought against the dictatorship of the US backed Shah and was replaced by a completely different course that is the radical religious course. The completely new course restructured the secular institutions into religious compliant ones, in particular the courts that became compliant with the sharia law (Iran Chamber society article). Also on a societal level the dress code for women in particular changed to become the religion compliant veil. Power is then given more to the Shia Islam clerics that play the key roles of the nation headed by the supreme leader who is a high rank clergyman himself. That revolution was an unexpected surprise for the US intelligence CIA that had it expected it to come by, it would have definitely acted fast in redirecting its course and diluting its momentum.

B. The standardization of Contemporary States & extremist

The states are now much more standardized and intricate that it is hard for outsider and non-conformers to be able to change the system let alone overthrow the regime. Many political parties out of power and non-state actors are everywhere ready to make use of any uprising and claim the causes and ambitions of the uprising their own robbing the young revolutions from their momentum and direction; like

ISIS and the free army in Syria that stole the revolution and the followers of Hezbollah that infiltrated in the Lebanese uprising breaking the gatherings apart with other political power that tried "riding the wave of the revolution" attempting to make it their own.

Revolutions back in the European kingdoms and empires worked because the enemy of the revolution is known, the socioeconomic factors are there and there is no other internal political powers to bank on the revolution's purpose and stir its wheels, the society had the time and possibility of recollecting itself and organize itself in a cohesive manner to push forward their own political ideologies. Today that is hardly possible because there is not much time given to materialize the revolution into a political power before intervention starts coming from every corner.

The extremists in nearly all states now adopt a new strategy to reshape the political structure of their countries. They try to take power through democratic legitimate way like the right wing nationalistic parties in Europe are no longer anti EU but rather support the idea of having the European union but would now want to modify its policies instead of overthrowing the system from their countries (Susi Dennison). Also is the case with Hezbollah who pushed towards being included into the system through getting into the parliament and government instead of being outside of power and overthrowing everything. ISIS and on the other hand is a terrorist organization that attempted overthrowing the regime all together and it failed from doing so and is today almost nonexistent. The terrorist organizations need to be less violent and seek to get into the system to control because they can exist outside the system only in the time of war and chaos after which they lose their legitimacy and influence.

It can be argued that Taliban succeeded only with the help of force after the US left Afghanistan (Avanhika Panchapakesan, 2021), but that same terrorist group even though it overthrew the last government, it will need to restructure itself to fit into the system to rule properly instead of reforming the entire system to rule properly. Because in the end this terrorist group needs the conformity of the citizens to legitimize its power and cannot exterminate opposition forever. So if it is to succeed, it needs to comply with constitutional laws and procedures and to know how the previous system was functioning. But of course the western powers are going to interfere again defeating the purpose of all revolutions and work on ensuring their own eastern interest to gain scores in the unspoken about US-China cold war.

C. Globalization's impact

Globalization had to do with intrastate stability around the world. It is not only about international intervention in the severe internal conflicts that depletes the revolution but there outside factors do help in maintaining peace. International trade ensures the good peaceful intentions of the states in two channels one is the increased benefits of bilateral interdependence and integration of the counties into the global market (Jong-Wha Lee and Hyun Pyun Ju, 2009). While the first channel is about the lesser likelihood of having

two warring trading partners, the other suggests that the citizens and businesses within a country, particularly troubled ones, have the opportunity to sell products and receive services from abroad without having to demonstrate on the street and ask the local authorities for utilities that can be reached online with the help of the internet, and so decreasing the ability of the state to completely boycott trade and all relationship with its enemies.

Globalization puts forward the notion of universal citizenship and recognizes that all people are equal in rights, dignity and stand on equal social ground. "... Recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family" (charter of the United Nations & the Universal declaration). That puts forward the equality among all people without any distinction based on race, culture, gender and religion that affects the concept of revolution. The existence of international bodies that ensure the rights of the people, in particular the marginalized, eases out their suffering and normalizes the troubles that they are facing in their countries again disarming them from the crucial factor needed for a revolution that is "they have nothing and they have nothing to lose" which is a driving mindset for revolutions. In effect the UN along with other bodies assist the humanitarian cases in tyrant countries that if they had been left alone they would have brutally revolted asking for their basic needs and right and so go for a revolution. But this assistance, though it is needed for survival, has the bad effect of keeping the dictatorships unharmed and unbothered by internal opposition that then looks for their needs elsewhere with the food parcels and other services.

Globalization also facilitated the mobility of capital and people where in a troubled country people can apply for migration, move their business and families elsewhere, and acclaiming that there already are developed countries where people worked hard on making them developed and respectful for human rights. That is more sensed in bordering countries that chose to form a unity with the states like the European Union where people can travel with no restrictions within member states. Also is the case in the United States where the people can travel with relative ease from one state to another and many cases are like that where countries share historic, economic and strategic ties. So why trouble changing one's own country when he can restart a prosperous life elsewhere. People are no longer willing to risk their lives in changing the system in their countries because they are aware that such a track will take time longer than their own lifetime so they will not live to see the change that they are not sure of its outcomes anyway considering that people can simply leave everything behind to a different place. That is exactly what is happening with the migrant crisis where many Syrian, Iraqi and Afghani families are traveling to Europe through Belorussia, which is problematic on many levels, taking life risks to cross the borders rather than attempting to hang eth political system in Syria as they earned that they cannot do so because they will be exterminated. Today the states are backed up with intelligence agencies that to have their ready made plans to execute in case of any security threat even if it was a revolution that asks for rights, it will

have interference from these intelligence agents again redirecting the revolutions and separate the not yet united people that are attempting to establish a common ground to work on

III. CONCLUSION

What can be concluded for all of the mentioned is that there are less of a reasons for the revolutions to occur. That is due to the fact that with the liberal thought prevailing in the majority of the countries, the person's happiness and misery depends on one's own work, discipline and education rather on the policy of the country. Also revolutions and separatist movements are not very welcomed in the eyes of the foreign states where the outsider does not know whether the outcome of these movements will come with a state that guarantees the interest of the foreign states or not, so they would rather keep the old system functioning as it is to guarantee its own interest within the country because the revolution will need time to materialize only to enter to an anarchic stage then reorganization then formation of a new constitution and new system all that takes time and comes with no guarantees so the foreign states would rather guarantee their interest within the older systems. Also the crucial elements that led to revolts are no longer there. That is the centralization of the power in the hands of one enemy to the revolution and the luxury of the time needed for the revolution to bear fruits.

The best recent example to the challenge that division of power throws at the revolutions is the Lebanese uprising on 17 October where large demonstration happened where almost half of the population participated in the first days of it for the rightful causes of decreasing the unfair taxes on free communication services along with a hand full of demands that have always been put off by the ruling elite. The uprising subsided because there is no one single target that caused all of the injustices to tackle and remove from power, had it been a king responsible he would have been removed from power, that is why the revolution had the slogan "all means all" (the entire ruling class) which comforted the ruling elite because the danger coming from the people is split among all of them and so they are not individually under a scary danger to be forced out of office. Like that they all stayed in power causing the uprising to fall short on becoming a revolution as nothing changed on the political, social and economic levels.

We can conclude that revolutions are disarmed from the key motives to be raised in today's day and age. The first is the economic reason is now not blamed much on the failure of the governors, two it is hard to detect against whom the revolution is going to take place. Also, it is more complex than that. What if we had the case where there is still one ruling authoritative person in power that is to blame for the state failures and his personality centralizes the entire governing body of the state like the case in Syria? Well even though the start of the revolution people demanded freedom and rights, the international players intervened to prevent the revolution from scoring any achievements because they are interested in keeping the political ruling system as it is as they do not know what is to be expected from a new state had the revolution been successful, as the international influences

have their own political agendas, fears, and cards to play. So to guarantee their interests in the countries abroad, the powerful players will intervene in all uprising framing them and make them lose their course. As it happened in Lebanon as well where the French initiative came to Lebanon not to support the rights of the revolution but to give the ruling class a chance to work together again to address the uprising's concern and the ruling elite will be then supported by the French president.

The luxury of time for the revolutions to yield good results is not there as soon as a revolt would happen the foreign countries will support the old system but the enemies of the former regime will join forces with the new uprising. So intervention internal and external will take the steering wheel of the revolution to make use of the momentum for their own interest leading the revolutions away from their original track as he case with the Arab Spring where the democratization process that was taking place through revolutions in many countries led actually to the extremist groups to reach the power like the Islamic brotherhood in Egypt and Libya instead of yielding secular democratic systems. As it was always complete crushed by the state army in Syria and its allies. Even the extremist or terrorist groups now understand the need to submit to the system to gain power instead of completely opposing and endlessly fighting the country that they want to control.

The final factor to conclude is globalization with the information age combined with the ever evolving technology led the individual's attentions and needs being satisfied outside of what is his country doing and can, with the better mobilization brought forward, move at any time to any place in case the person's own country is no longer satisfying one's own needs and ambitions.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Britannica.com. (n.d.). *revolution | politics*. Encyclopedia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/revolution-politics>
- [2]. Erdbrink, T. (2019, February 11). *The Iran Revolution at 40: From Theocracy to 'Normality.'* The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/02/10/world/middleeast/iran-revolution-40.html>
- [3]. BBC News. (2017b, October 27). *Catalonia: Did voters face worst police violence ever seen in the EU?* <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-41677911>
- [4]. A. (n.d.-b). *Separatism in Europe: causes, foci - politics 2022*. Agromassidayu.Com. <https://eng.agromassidayu.com/separatism-v-evrope-prichini-ochagi-view-516076>
- [5]. Stephens, A. (2011, September 1). *Two Sudans: The Separation of Africa's Largest Country and the Road Ahead | Archive - U.S. Agency for International Development*. USAID. <https://2012-2017.usaid.gov/news-information/frontlines/sudan-south-sudaneducation/two-sudans-separation-africa%E2%80%99s-largest>
- [6]. Han, B. (2015, October 23). *Why revolution is no longer possible*. openDemocracy. <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/transformation/why-revolution-is-no-longer-possible/>
- [7]. Dennison, S. (2019, May 7). *Anti-Europe Parties Aren't Anti-Europe Anymore*. Foreign Policy. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/05/07/anti-europe-parties-arent-anti-europe-anymore/>
- [8]. *The Quad: Examining the Taliban's rise to power in Afghanistan, tensions with the US*. (2021, September 18). Daily Bruin. <https://dailybruin.com/2021/09/18/the-quad-examining-the-talibans-rise-to-power-in-afghanistan-tensions-with-the-us>
- [9]. Pyun, J., & Lee, J. (2009, March 21). *Globalization promotes peace*. VOX, CEPR Policy Portal. <https://voxeu.org/article/globalisation-promotes-peace>
- [10]. United Nations, & Bachelet, M. (2016). *Global Citizenship: A New and Vital Force*. United Nations. <https://www.un.org/en/chronicle/article/global-citizenship-new-and-vital-force>
- [11]. Iran Chamber Society. (n.d.). *History of Iran: Islamic Revolution of 1979*. https://www.iranchamber.com/history/islamic_revolution/islamic_revolution.php