James Madison University
JMU Scholarly Commons

Senior Honors Projects, 2010-current

Honors College

Spring 2017

The fourth wave of democratization: A comparative analysis of Tunisia and Egypt

Ariel M. Dunay
James Madison University

Follow this and additional works at: https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/honors201019

 Part of the Comparative Politics Commons, International Relations Commons, Islamic World and Near East History Commons, Near and Middle Eastern Studies Commons, Other International and Area Studies Commons, and the Political History Commons

The Fourth Wave of Democratization:

A Comparative Analysis of Tunisia and Egypt

_____

An Honors College Project Presented to

the Faculty of the Undergraduate

College of Arts and Letters

James Madison University

_____

by Ariel Marie Dunay

May 2017

━━━

Accepted by the faculty of the Department of Political Science, James Madison University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Honors College.

FACULTY COMMITTEE: HONORS COLLEGE APPROVAL:

_____   _____
Project Advisor: Manal Jamal, PhD   Bradley R. Newcomer, Ph.D.,
Associate Professor, Political Science   Dean, Honors College

_____
Reader: Keith Grant, PhD
Assistant Professor, Political Science

_____
Reader: John Hulsey, PhD
Associate Professor, Political Science

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

I would first like to express my sincere thanks to my advisor, Dr. Manal Jamal, and my readers Dr. Keith Grant and Dr. John Hulsey, for providing me with instrumental feedback and invaluable support in guiding me through the difficult process of writing a senior thesis. I would also like to thank Dr. Jonathan Keller and Dr. HakSeon Lee for being wonderful 499 professors and listening to the moans and groans of all of us writing honors theses. I also would like to thank the Department of Political Science and its open academic culture that has allowed me to explore ideas across disciplinary boundaries.

My three semesters completing this project would not have been the same without the support of my closest friends. Thank you for letting rant about deadlines, changing tides of the Middle East, and my inability to read sources in Arabic, as well as not being too angry when I have had to cancel plans at the last minute to finish something. Thanks also for all of the distractions, dinners, drinks, and mutual support all of these years.

Finally, I would like to dedicate my thesis to my parents whose support has been unwavering throughout my college career and without whom I would never have had the courage to take on a thesis. Senior year would not have been the same without your care, love, and "you can do it!" speeches over the phone, for which I will always be grateful.

Introduction

Waves of democratization have been studied and analyzed since the very first wave in the early 19th century. History has since seen two more waves, the second following the Allied victory in World War II and the third involving the monumental democratic transitions in South America in the 190s. After this third wave of democratization, researchers began to theorize on the regional and global trends that would lead to a wave that would reach the Middle East. Perhaps it was the strict control of the press that stopped protests from growing into national movements, or the oppression of opponents that dared to speak out against incumbent regimes during that third wave in the 1980s.

The popular uprisings that began in Tunisia and spread throughout the Middle East in December 2010 caused mass speculation over whether it was the inauguration of a "fourth wave," the beginning of the end of authoritarian rule in the region. What came so strongly and abruptly in Tunisia followed in Egypt, as the whole world watched the regimes come down. For so long had the people that participated in the Arab Spring been denied political and religious freedoms, justice free of corruption, and economic opportunities that it was time for change.

Five years later, the paint has dried. The initial enthusiasm for democracy and a new start for Arab Spring countries has faded, leaving a dissatisfied populace seeking an answer to the question of what comes next. Since the very first days that words of freedom were shouted in public squares, the Arab Spring has been widely studied and analyzed due to its unprecedented feats. What should come next is an analysis of the continuing challenges that countries face in democratizing and how to coalesce longstanding disagreements within these societies with the expectation to democratize quickly. Therefore, this thesis seeks to contribute to the literature on democratic transition and this so-called "fourth wave" of democratization in Tunisia and Egypt.

Despite their similar beginnings, the transitions in Egypt and Tunisia had vastly different outcomes, with various explanations from economic limitations to a lack of camaraderie during constitution building. While these explanations are conceivable, they are not mutually exclusive. The goal of this thesis is thus to understand which factors are most important in a country's transition to democracy, but also how they contribute to each other. I chose to look at two cases, Tunisia and Egypt, who had popular uprisings as a part of the Arab Spring because of their commonalities at the outset of the transition period and their subsequent deviation. While Tunisia is seen as having made progress towards democracy, Egypt has slid backwards into an era of decreased political freedoms, arguably a state that is now less free than it was under Mubarak's regime.

The existing literature on democratization identifies many compelling factors that influence whether a country transitions to democracy, or at least some version of it. The most relevant independent variables are the role of the military in the transition process and thus in the government that forms after a transition, economic conditions, and social movements. After comparing the factors that contribute to the success of democratization, I will analyze the state of democracy in both Tunisia and Egypt as my dependent variable. By explaining the circumstances in both countries, the hope is that the relationship between the variables and the democratization process will be clear.

As a result of the Arab Spring, speculation has turned to states who have developed similar patterns of oppression and restricted freedoms, coupled with comparable precipitating events such as large civilian movements or protests over government corruption. Analyzing which conditions precipitate a greater likelihood of success in a democratic transition is key in understanding what will happen to countries who are either in the process of removing an

incumbent regime or considering the possibility. As countries continue to push for democratic reforms or a complete transition to democracy, these factors must be monitored to determine whether the democratic transition will be successful.

The thesis will first discuss literature on democratic transition and the variables important in the process. It will provide in depth background of each variable and its historical role in democratic transitions. The next section will focus on the methods, including why I chose the two cases, why comparative case studies are best for this kind of analysis, and the data operationalization methods for all of the variables. The next section will shift to the Tunisia case study where I will assess how each variable related to their success, followed by the same style of analysis for the Egypt case. The analysis chapter will include reflections on the variables discussed, distinguishing one that was more important to successful democratic transition than the others. To ensure clarity in comparing the two cases, Tunisia will always the first country addressed within each variable, followed by Egypt. The thesis concludes with ways that the research could be improved, predictions for both states moving forward, and other observations about the global fourth wave of democratization.

Literature Review

The goal of this chapter is to examine the theories and ideas surrounding democratic transition and provide literature that focuses on transition from authoritarian or mixed regimes. The three axes that I will relate to democratic transition are the military, economics, and social movements. I will start by examining various accepted definitions of democracy. Then I will delve into the research surrounding democratic transition and how each of my independent variables can affect a transition. My hypotheses will be based within these political, economic, and social factors, of which their conclusions can be applied to other cases.

Democratic Transition

Democratic transition is defined as the "interval between one political regime and another" (O'Donnell and Schmitter 1986, 6). It is thus the intermediate period that begins with the dissolution of the authoritarian regime and ends with the establishment of a democratic government (Cortona 1991). For my study, I will be using Stradiotto and Guo's (2010) definition of democratic transition. This is defined as a "political process of movement aimed at establishing a democratic political system…, promoting democratic values and goals, tolerating opposition, allowing bargaining and compromise among different political forces for the resolution of social conflicts, institutionalizing the pluralist structures and procedures by which different political forces are allowed to compete over the power, regularizing transfer of power, and engaging in the fundamental transformation of political structure," (2010, 10).

Modernization theory and its conflicting research have been central elements of transition literature in the last decade. Formal models of democratic transition analyze how political institutions change via democratization (O'Donnell and Schmitter 1986). Transition itself is the product of strategic choice by elites (Acemoglu & Robinson 2006) although another motivation

for transition is the threat of revolt (Acemoglu & Robinson 2006; Boix 2003; Smith 2005). To prevent mass violence, elites often find that their best option is to democratize and hope for an equal distribution of power during elections. Cooperation between incumbents and the opposition is the best way for reform to progress because it limits violence and allows true democracy to take hold.

Some argue that transition through the breakdown of an old regime through uprising creates a smoother transition than cooperation, as the new government can hold free elections and the former elites are left to fend for power in the democratization process. Munck and Leff (1997) argued that reform through rupture was the easiest method of transition because it leads to a complete shift in a country's way of thinking about governance and political participation. However, removal of elites in a swift or violent process denies the ability to have amicable dialogue that would look to create relationships with the new government. Regime cooperation is the leading method to attain high post transition levels of democracy and thus violence is not favorable to democracy.

Yet, this can prove problematic. In Brazil, the impetus for change originated both within and outside of the incumbent elite as part of an early liberalization movement that sought to broaden the support of the authoritarian regime. When an opposition campaign took off in 1984 demanding popular elections, the military rulers prolonged the transition until 1990. The new regime was democratic, but the elements of change that protestors had hoped would be adopted in the new constitution fell short of expectations. Post transition politics were marred not by people who refused to participate in a democratic system, but by conflicts within the new democratic rules adopted during the transition (Munck & Leff 1997, 348). For instance, the first legislative election involved 19 parties in 1990, eliminating the prospect of a majority in the

chamber and in the country in general. While they emerged a competitive democracy, the old

elites had the ability to shape continuing talks over the new constitution and "reenter politics

through the institutional opening created by the roundtable agreement," (Munck & Leff 1997,

349). While democracy was achieved on paper, it was not the image of Brazil that the opposition

had hoped for.

Another notable case of transition was in Chile. The impetus for change came from a

group outside of the ruling military class and the incumbent president General Augusto Pinochet.

Because of being denied from inciting a regime change, opponents of Pinochet were forced to

advance their ideas within the existing system at the time. They forged a coalition in order to

combat the ruling class from the outside, effectively creation competition in the political system

(Valenzuela 1995, 62-7). The coalition, however, was forced to bend to conditions of Pinochet's

regime, such as accepting Pinochet's role as army commander in chief following his ouster, as

well as granting many other military powers. They were thus made to accept a limited version of

democracy, as the old elites still exhibited a high control over the democratic transition process

and new constitution (Munck 1994). By constraining what the future government would look

like, Chile's former regime and mode of transition affected post transition politics moving

forward, shaping the institutions that were meant to move towards democratic consolidation.

These modes of transition exemplify the difficulties that can come from social

movements who push for inclusion in the political arena, but then face conflict with both the

outgoing regime and between themselves. The government structures that emerge from

transitions often come from long periods of negotiation, as all parties feel as though they then

have a "right" to get in their thoughts and opinions on policy (Munck & Leff 1997, 357).

Democratic transition balances the backlash from former leaders, those who feel that they have

been slighted under the former regime, and those who want nothing but peace, all while upholding a commitment to democracy. Thus, defining what it means to be a democratic government is important in analyzing democratic transition.

For the purposes of this paper, I will be using Robert Dahl's concept of modern democratic government as my definition for successful democratization (Dahl 1998, 90). He used the following six institutions to categorize the ideal democratic system and the institutional provisions that are the ideal system (Dahl and Lindbloom 1953): (a) elected officials, (b) free, fair, and frequent elections, (c) freedom of expression, (d) alternative information, (e) associational autonomy, and (f) inclusive citizenship. We must keep in mind as political scientists that it is not possible to hold governments to this imperfect ideal and apply every institutional criterion. Dahl did not intend governments to be held to such a high degree; instead, he wanted to identify states that were changing to become democratic.

Hegre et al (2001) found that many efforts to transition to democracy result in a middle range of the democracy scale and thus are difficult to quantify. We see autocracies that attempt to liberalize, but never cross the threshold to become democracies. This is especially difficult when using indexes like the Polity Index to evaluate if a transition has been successful. This index cannot be used in this thesis for instance as it does not account for all of the democratic institutions detailed by Dahl. There is then a risk of overestimating the degree of democratization and incorrectly categorizing non-democratic systems as having transitioned to democracies (Munck 2009). For the Arab Spring, a large portion of the countries that pursued democracy fell into civil war and thus their governments are almost impossible to compare to established democracies. Polity also lacks data on states with less than 500,000 inhabitants therefore not

representing microstates, which make up a large percentage of the world's democracies (Anckar 2008).

Another widely used tool to measure political freedoms is the Freedom House Index. The "Freedom in the World" index has been published regularly since 1972, used to examine levels of democracy based on political rights and civil liberties (Freedom House 2016). This data will support my analysis of Dahl's institutional factors of democracy, as it takes into account the institutions that he outlined would be necessary for a system to be considered democratic through their own assessment.

Many scholars have also focused on the issues of consolidation of regimes rather than pure transition to democracy (Di Palma 1990; Linz and Stepan 1996). This field of research looks at countries that are already considered somewhat democratic and evaluates increasing democratic ideals within the existing system. While this is important, much of the world is still undemocratic and thus understanding transitions and what factors contribute to them remains a subject worth studying. Most information about the nuances of democratic transition is unable to be applied to many cases because of how unique each case is. Further empirical analysis, specifically cross regionally, is needed in the field as a whole to counter conflicting views of what makes up a transitional period.

Defining success often comes in many forms and cannot be held to the same standard across different cultures and regions. The very idea of success can be subjective and it is imperative to hold countries to widely accepted definitions when evaluating the success of their transition to democracy. It is because of this subjectivity that I will not be evaluating the quality of the democracies after their transition, but instead whether or not transition was "successful." In the midst of this analysis, it will be clear which case has had a more successful transition to a

democracy. In the next section, I will be outlining my independent variables and describing why they are important factors in democratic transitions.

Independent Variables

The Role of the Military

With fewer than one in four democratic transitions occurring under stable autocratic leadership since 1875, the way in which authoritarian leaders are able to control the populace is important in democratic transition literature (Miller, 2012). Miller's argument was that this idea of fragile and unstable regimes being key components of democratization has been overlooked in democratization studies, particularly how they control their armed forces. Recognition of how authoritarian regimes rule and the cohesion of such administrations is an interesting element to democratization literature because it is difficult to measure cohesion (Bratton and van de Walle 1997; Levitsky and Way 2010; O'Donnell and Schmitter 1986; Smith 2005; Way 2005). There is a need for further research on post civil war democratization, looking at the incentives of all groups-- government, rebel groups, domestic population, international actors—and how they play into postwar regimes.

For the purposes of this thesis, I will be looking beyond government structure and analyzing how the role of the military within the government can shape the success of democratic transition. The military is an important actor within a strong regime as they can influence political liberalization (Huntington 1981; Bellin 2004). When a regime has a large military, they are less likely than non-military regimes to hold elections due to their ability to repress opposition movements (Geddes 2005). The government can use the military as a tool against actors who promote democracy, as they have more to fear from the distribution of power during democratization. The military also benefits from low political freedoms as closed systems

give the military a clearer path to influencing domestic politics (Bellin 2004, 145). In a more democratic government, the military must fight with other actors for influence, which reduces their absolute power.

In contrast, when military groups feel that not enough resources are being allocated to them, they are less likely to support the regime in preventing democratization (Pion-Berlin, Esparza & Grisham 2014). They see a democratic system as being one in which they have a fair share in the resources, or at least a say in how resources are distributed. If they are prevented from having a seat at the table under an authoritarian government, they would be less willing to support such a regime, which is supported by literature that relays how the military refusing to back the regime is seen often in democratic transition (Lee 2009). Therefore, a military that is separated from the government and not as involved in political dealings at the national level is more likely to remain independent during a transitional period.

H1: If the division between the military and government is clear, the country is more likely to successfully transition to a democracy.

Economic Conditions

Scholars have proposed conflicting ideas regarding the fundamental role of economics in the emergence of democracy. Most recognize that economic conditions, particularly income inequality, play a role in protests and uprisings, but their continuing role in democratization is highly debated. There is conflicting research over which economic variables to measure, as well as whether there is a positive or negative relationship with democracy, which is important to discuss before choosing one to argue for.

Conflict theory states that one of the prime factors of democratization is low-income inequality (Dahl 1973 [1971], Muller 1997; Muller and Seligson 1994). Boix (2003) agrees with this assessment, suggesting that equality and democratization are positively related. However, Boix used data from only the 1950-1990 period, driving the conclusion that inequality supports autocracy while equality supports the formation of democracy. Meltzer and Richard's (1981) theory on regime change is that it is driven by elites' fear of redistribution of power under democracy. As income inequality increases, elites worry about the demands for social spending of median voters. They are concerned that democratization would involve the complete redistribution of income and power. Low inequality means that the median voter will demand less in the future. In an equal system, elites would rather accept the moderate redistribution that comes with democratization than deal with repressing the public under autocracy.

On the other hand, Acemoglu and Robinson (2006) think that an "inverted U" shape relationship exists between inequality and democratization: A country is most likely to transition to democracy at middle levels of inequality. They argue that democratization is unlikely under extreme inequality because there is little demand for increased civil liberties and thus a middle point will involve compromise between the rich and poorer classes. However, A&R relied solely on case studies to prove their analysis. Each case (country) was selected to represent a particular political path, written in a narrative style that makes the comparison too simple and lacking empirical analysis.

In opposing analyses, contractarian political theory and neoclassical theory prove that democratization is best understood as the rising median class trying to gain credible commitments from the incumbent elites. Kuznets (1955) predicted decades ago that economic development ran parallel to rising income inequality, which has been confirmed by many

economic historians over time. Inequality rather than equality created pressure to liberalize in the United Kingdom in 1867. The UK was growing at a very rapid rate with increasingly high income inequality. There were high levels of intergroup inequality due to a growing middle class and the effects of the industrialized economy. The wealthy were earning a large share of national income, but the middle class was outpacing the poorer classes. This was a large contributing factor of the United Kingdom democratizing in the late 19th century.

When evaluating which theory to test, I also looked at Bourguignon and Morrisson's (BM) (2002) comprehensive data set that includes 55 countries from 1820-1992. An analysis of these variables found that going from the 3rd to 97th percentile on income inequality makes democratization four to six times more likely, one to five percent in a given year (Ansell and Samuels 2010). This data also disproved A and R's theory as it found that higher levels of inequality rather than middle levels have higher probabilities of transitioning to democracy. Since there is an abundance of data on income inequality and democratization but every scholar seems to come to a different conclusion, I decided to combine certain elements of economic conditions and create one sole variable labeled intergroup inequality made up of three components: unemployment, inequality of opportunity, and infrastructure inequality.

Before exploring unemployment, it is important to highlight the argument that education can positively affect the political development and democratization of nations (Dewey 1916; Lipset 1960). A large body of research corroborates that those with more education are more likely to participate in political life, from simple acts like voting, to more public forms of activism such as protests and rallies. The relationship is still found even when accounting for age, gender, and income level. There are exceptions, such as in India, where there are low levels of education and high political participation, but the focus here is on how it relates to

democratization. The effects of the positive relationship between education and political participation are not always seen in countries that fail to provide the skills relevant to the needs of the country (Huntington 1968, 48). Unemployment before a democratic transition is notably high in most cases, which creates a situation in which there is an excess of graduates and little job creation.

Davies (1962) posited an interesting theory that rising expectations in educational level could turn into political violence if the increased education was not met with increased economic opportunity. Courbage and Todd (2007) and Pack (2007) tied this observation to the Arab world, predicting that the jump in educational opportunities between 1980 and then would lead to an increased propensity to engage in political activities, particular those who had received more education. While I will not be focusing on education directly because there are outlying cases, I will discuss unemployment and its affect on democratization.

Campante and Chor (2012) analyzed whether education and poor economic conditions lead to political change using research from WorldStatesmen.org on country leader turnover. They focused on unemployment data between 1990 and 2009, finding that executive change is positively correlated with the unemployment rate. They also found that a combination of increases in education and weak labor markers (high unemployment) is associated with a greater likelihood of regime change in a cross-country regression (Campante and Chor 2012, 182). Combining this research on education, the lack of substantial employment opportunities at the time of the uprising, and the propensity for change will prove how frustration over unequal conditions can lead to further democratization.

Many factors that affect inequality in general cannot be captured in traditional inequality data. Some of these factors are more qualitative, such as the overall quality of services rendered

such as public health, education, transportation, or electricity (Ianchovichina, Mottaghi, & Devaragan 2015). The same goes for the types of jobs in an economy, not just that a person is employed. For instance, as people drop out of the search for work, they are no longer included in unemployment statistics. While this may seem like a good thing, it may not reveal the true nature of the situation as there could be structural economic problems that are forcing people to discontinue the search for work (Ianchovichina, Mottaghi, & Devaragan 2015). Public safety, the fairness of a justice system, and corruption are also large components of people's lives that contribute to quality of life. All of these factors contribute to economic conditions and the perception of inequality.

Drawing on conclusions made by Thomas Hobbes, the state is seen as the provider of public goods and services. They exchange security with legitimacy and output from the public, effectively ensuring a lasting role of the state and limiting the role of non-state actors in fulfilling those basic needs (Oppenheimer [1907] 1990, 47). When a state in unable to ensure these basic needs, the public is less likely to support the legitimacy of the incumbent government, especially when they fail to provide equal resources.

A state is more likely to develop and sustain democracy if its mass public believes this type of government to be worthwhile and effective (Almond and Verba 1963; Diamond, et al. 1990;). However, Qi & Shin (2011) went on to argue, "favorable orientation toward democratization is useless if the disposition or willingness to engage in direct action does not exist," (2011, 242). In applying this to the Tunisia and Egypt cases, consistent inequality could have caused the mass public to pursue an alternative institution, inadvertently pursuing a more democratic state. This idea will be applied to both cases and determine whether intergroup inequality unintentionally can lead to a more successful transition to a democracy.

H2: Countries that have high inter-group inequality of economic conditions leading up to a transition are more likely to successfully transition to a democracy.

Reduced effectiveness of public institutions affects the legitimacy of the state moving forward in a democratic system. In some countries, political transition requires an economic move towards more free market policies, such as in Eastern Europe in the early 1990s. Habernas (2001, 79) posited that, "as markets drive out politics, the nation-state increasingly loses its capacities to raise taxes and stimulate growth, and with them the ability to secure the essential foundations of its own legitimacy." It is more important than ever, then, to instill some economic reform at the beginning of the new transitional government, ensuring that economic liberalization will be at the forefront of policy objectives moving forward.

While progress at the macro level may take a while to take effect, legislation and policy making must at least begin to address the issues in a way that is comprehensive and conducive to solutions rather than just identifying the causes of the problem. Making attempts to solve problems at the forefront of public concern mean that the new administration is taking into consideration the wants and needs of the public, moving towards a democratic system rather than one that only favors those are the top.

H3: Countries that introduce fiscal reform policies early in the transition period are more likely to successfully transition to a democracy.

Social Movements

Social movements by simple definition are mobilization efforts as a form of applying pressure on a governing body to achieve legitimate social, political, and/or economic goals. The convergence of multiple groups varying in social class, ethnicity, and education level produces collective action on a national scale (Younis 2000). By attempting to expand access to political power, movements become democratization initiatives, whether they seek a unified state with their opponents or one without them. Mobilization is simply the mass collectivist attitude that brings people into the political sphere and has them act as representatives of social movements (Glenn, 2003). This collective process of mobilization is what sets the stage for successful democratization. The extent of social movements in their political context allows them to play a role in bringing about a democratic transition.

O'Donnell and Schmitter (1986, 18) argue how democratization "involves a crucial component of mobilization and organization of large numbers of individuals." They use a cyclical model of democratization, arguing that in the early phases, possible opposition parties are not very active because of the element of fear and cost in opposing authoritarian rule. Over time, the inability to live under oppressive circumstances and anger outweighs the costs of mobilizing, leading to a "resurrection of civil society." An engaged civil society can increase the state's ability and propensity to democratize through helping social movements convey concerns from below in a productive way. After the transition, a period of demobilization occurs that brings society back to democratic normalcy. Democratic transitions are thus likely when there are strong and active social movements.

Democratization studies looking at the so called "third" wave of democratization showed that no processes were exclusively pursued by elites, but rather broadly based campaigns involving wider parts of the mass public (Caper & Taylor 1996; Diamond 1993). Notable cases

include South Korea or Czechoslovakia where regime change was spurred by mass demonstrations. These democracy movements were invariably civil and political rights movements (McAdams et al. 2001), as are most social movements.

Moore (1966) analyzed the role of agency and class in regards to the political outcomes of transformed system. He argued that democratic systems, in order to be successful, must eliminate class distinctions from peasants to bourgeoisies to elites. People are then not as limited by their economic label and are able to join in alliances with other groups. Alliances depend on the political autonomy that classes receive from each other and the state (Younis 2000, 24). However, he does not account for class formation and how groups' form to advance desired political goals, and on the other end, misses the key point that democratic outcomes can look different in different societies. There is also little to no role that agency plays in political systems at the formal level. While he considers the origins of class alliances in advancing similar political goals, he fails to address how social movements are able to accomplish this.

In the 1970s, collective attempts to overthrow or influence institutions of the state became largely studied. The dominant approach to studying movements was Resource Mobilization Theory (RMT). The idea behind RMT was that if a group was given access to and control of resources, they would be able to launch a challenge against incumbent regimes, even if they didn't agree on what resources were important (Younis 2000). The underlying theory behind it was that if the powerless in society are that way because of a lack of resources, which prevents them from overcoming their powerlessness (McAdam 1999, 22-23). Yet, cases persisted of resource-poor groups who had succeeded in achieving their political goals. The narrative of the powerlessness of resource poor groups versus the elites fell short of being applicable to societies in which the aggrieved groups had latent power and leverage to use in

achieving political change. Moving away from class distinctions when analyzing national liberation movements will help to conceptualize why groups and alliances form.

In Argentina, the occupied factory movement proved that the pursuit of economic equality and opportunity within the existing political system led to a more democratic state. When factories were faced with a federal government that would rather pay unemployment benefits than attempt to salvage failing factories, workers responded by taking over and operating them as worker-controlled collectives (Ranis 2010). It is important to note that in their case, factory workers did not internationally sidestep the state and look to create a new political system at the federal level. They fought instead to push for laws that would improve worker conditions and employment standards through factory takeovers, empowering those who had taken severe pay cuts or lost their jobs. Argentinians never wanted to change the state structure of Argentina, but instead build alternative institutions at the intersection of capitalist and political society. They effectively changed their status from factory worker producers to the elites running the factories, all while treating them as worker collectives. Pushing for economic democracy in an unequal environment can thus be a precursor to democratization, translating issues with capitalist markets to political participation, and the quality of democracy within a political system (Bowles 1991, 15-16).

McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald (1996) look towards mobilizing structures to explain how social movements were able to succeed. They defined them as "collective vehicles, informal as well as formal, through which people mobilize and engage in collective action." Giugni (1998, 374) looked at the structure of social movements to predict what kinds of movements are more successful in achieving political goals, arguing that more organized movements are more successful than unorganized ones. Centralization is key for communication and organizational

conservation (Staggenborg 1989, 597-599), as movements that are seen as more formal and controlled encourage further public participation.

The establishment of collective identities that crosscut existing cleavages is important in social movement literature, especially when relating mass demonstration to later democratization. For Mouffe (2005, 360), this means that identities are not created within the political process, but as precursors in human society. She strengthens this by stating that the function of democracy is therefore, "to provide institutions that will allow them to take an agonistic form, in which opponents will treat each other not as enemies to be destroyed, but as adversaries who will fight for the victory of their position while recognizing the right of their opponents to fight for theirs," (Mouffe 2009, 52). This means that during a protest or uprising, groups can see each other as part of the same political movement, while understanding that they are each autonomous and have their own interests.

It is important to note, however, that consensus through dialogue is a key component of a liberal democracy. Young (2000, 178) described the possible conflicting nature of the public sphere: "If some of the interests, opinions, and perspectives are suppressed [in the political process]… or is some groups have difficulties getting heard for reasons of structural inequality, cultural misunderstanding, or social prejudice, then the agenda or the results of public policy are likely to be biased or unfair." Theoreticians highly value the role of deliberation such as Mansbridge (1996, 46-47): "Democracies also need to foster and value informal deliberative enclaves of resistance n which those who lose in each coercive move can rework their ideas and their strategies, gathering their force and deciding in a more protected space n which way or whether to continue the struggle." The role of participation and positive emphasis on dialogue had become recognized a component of new liberal democracies.

H4: The presence of organized and formal social movements makes a country more likely to successfully transition to a democracy.

H5: Countries that have social movements which are able to establish and keep collective identities make a country more likely to successfully transition to a democracy.

Methodology

Case Selection

The democratic transitions in Tunisia and Egypt had similar causes, but their state of democracy today is very different. This begs the question of what factors led to their different outcomes. Tunisia's uprising was the first in the Middle East during what became called the Arab Spring in 2011. Egypt soon followed, with similar grievances of corruption, economic instability, and a lack of government transparency. Both were people's movements, which was distinctive in two countries that were being ruled by harsh, authoritarian leaders with a history of oppressing protests. Many observational studies group together the success of Tunisia compared with another state that had an uprising, such as Egypt, Libya, or Syria, and compare their transitions, which demonstrates how useful an argument such as this one can be in identifying successful democratization factors.

When comparing any two states that transitioned to democracy and determining which factors led to success or not, it is useful to pick states that have as much in common as possible. Holding certain variables constant, it is easier to focus on the variables that caused differentiating outcomes. Tunisia and Egypt are two countries that had similar beginnings, but separated along the trajectory of their transitions to democracy, now very different in their level of democratization. Tunisia is now considered the most successful democracy in the Middle East/North Africa region, while a military president now rules Egypt with oppressive policies continuing.

Comparative Case Studies

Using two cases allows me to take the conditions that existed in one country and apply them to a similar process in another country. It highlights the significance of contextual factors and specific circumstances that exist in each country, while seeking commonalities between the two. Using qualitative data helps to deepen the cases while using contemporary information. It is also difficult to quantify certain variables that I believe are the most compelling, such as the active role of the military in the government structure and the presence of social movements.

Data Operationalization Methods

Dependent Variable: Democratic Transition

In terms of my dependent variable, I mentioned in my literature review the difficulty in placing a value on the success of a democracy. I will be using the Freedom House "Freedom in the World" index as one method to evaluate whether democracy has been achieved in Tunisia and Egypt. Denk and Silander (2012) explained how the scale is weighed:

> Based on the data, this study will categorize states as 'free', 'partly free', or 'not free'. These divisions are based on the average values registered for the states in two indexes. One index concerns political rights and freedoms, while the other focuses on civil rights and freedoms. Based on the levels of rights and freedoms states are allotted a score between one and seven. When a state's average value for both indexes falls between 5.5 and 7.0, the state is considered non-democratic (not free). A state receiving the value of 1.0 to 2.5 is considered democratic (free). States falling within the range of 3.0 to 5.0 are categorized as partly free.

Questions that are asked in the political rights category include: *Are the head of the executive and legislative bodies elected in free and fair elections? Is there an active opposition party that is allowed to participate in elections?* Questions in the civil liberties category include: *Is there a media outlet that is free and independent of the state? Do citizens have the right to choose their own religion, protest, and receive a fair trial?* (Kenig 2013). These questions

incorporate Dahl's necessary institutions for a system to be considered democratic and the score that comes from them will determine if Tunisia and Egypt are considered democracies. While I rely on his conception of transition, I am using Freedom House's scale to evaluate democratic quality.

In order to present the scores in a way that is fruitful to determining current democratization, I will use the most recent data from Freedom House. It is possible that both countries could keep their "free," "partly free," or "not free" status while making a smaller adjustment on the scale. It is expected that there will not be a large shift from 2011 until now simply because of the short span of time between the uprising and today. Any fluctuations will be noted, even if the countries official rank did not change.

Role of the Military

The factor that I will focus on for the role of the military in the government will be evaluating the extent to which they were separate from the government, how they participated in the creation of a new government, and their role today. I will be looking for whether military officers had positions of power in the government or if they had any business interests that were state-run or publicly owned. I will also note whether the military has had a historical role in the ruling class or if there have been military coup's in the last 20 years. In looking at the uprisings, I will evaluate if the military was more on the side of the exiting government, if members were active protestors, or if they took more of a neutral stance. I will use primary sources of military officer testimony, as well as newspaper and scholarly articles to evaluate how they were perceived by outside observers.

In regards to if the military participated in the creation of a new government, I will evaluate whether they had a stake in the creation of a new Constitution. Analyzing their involvement in this process precludes how much they are involved in the government today, as any particular powers or decisions set aside for the military in the new Constitution will be analyzed. I will also look at the role of the military in the government structure today, analyzing the current leadership and how it came to power, if military officers have roles in the formal government, and any other elements of the military that have contributed to the state of both states today.

Economic Conditions

I will focus on inter-group inequality and its continuation through a transition period to evaluate economic conditions and their effect on democratization. After reviewing the literature regarding income inequality and the success of countries when they transition to a democracy, I found that the argument was not strong enough to argue either way. While income inequality can be used as a variable for why a popular uprising occurs, it is not shown to have an effect on the success of a democratic transition because of the difficulty in measuring it in conflict ridden societies. It is difficult to compare countries because of a lack of comprehensive data on income and wealth in Arab Spring countries. Respondents in a survey may, for instance, under report expenditures or leave out illegal or informal accumulated wealth. It is better to form a more comprehensive definitions that be argued as having a clear effect on success of democratization.

I will analyze the types of jobs that exist in both countries and how this affects unemployment, and in doing so, paint a picture of the economy in the years leading up to the uprising and the years following. An analysis of the state of intergroup inequality will help in analyzing any disruptions in the growth of each state's GDP, as well as how spending affects

inequality. This will reveal any structural issues with the economy and provide a base for evaluate how economic policy affects democratic transition.

I will focus on the lack of equality within the distribution of resources between groups during the pre-transition period, including public services and housing, and how it carries over to the transition period. The data for this section will come from survey data from the Gallup World Poll. It includes at least 1,000 randomly selected respondents over 15 years old and is representative at the national level (Arampatzi et al. 2015). Life satisfaction is based on the Cantril Ladder (Cantril 1965). It asks on a scale of 1-10 (or on which step of a ladder) a person feels at present, with a higher value indicating that a person feels closer to their ideal life. The question used is "*Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with your standard of living, all the things you can buy and do?"* which pertains to how people feel about living conditions, infrastructure, health services, and community safety (Arampatzi et al. 2015, 15).

Lastly, a government's willingness to introduce economic liberalization policies to promote economic prosperity in an equal way will be taken into consideration as a determinant of success. While there is not a clear way to measure the success of liberalization policies because of the recency of transitional governments, I will look at whether legislation has been proposed, any new alliances or coalitions that have been formed regarding economics, or if any government structure changes have been made to attempt to improve domestic economic conditions.

Social Movements

Research showed that the aspects of social movements that are the most important are their structure (being organized and formal) and how well collective identities are able to transfer into a new democratic system. In order to evaluate the organization and formality of social

movements, I will be focusing on qualitative aspects of how well managed the movements were during the popular uprisings, if their demonstrations garnered support from large crowds, and the relative opinions of them from outside sources. I will also touch on the origins of the organizations, if there are any notable divisions within groups themselves, and the legacy of the movement in contemporary society.

In evaluating collective identities, I will be looking at the period from after the uprising to today. I will analyze the role that they have had in the government creation process and if any have impeded democracy moving forward. I will also evaluate if alliances that existed during the uprisings still exist and to what degree.

Case Study: Tunisia

Background

 The history of the Jasmine Revolution has to begin at the start of Ben Ali's presidency. Ben Ali's coup in 1987 was part of a larger movement in the late 1980s to reform the political systems of the Middle East. Early on, his cabinet promoted the sanctity of human rights, democracy, and law. Ben Ali's reforms in the first year of his presidency included granting amnesty to thousands of political prisoners and the ratification of the UN convention on torture. He was seen internationally as promoting the middle class and opening up Tunisia to international tourism, a vibrant part of their economy. His pro-Western attitude and open-market friendly approach to policy at the start of his first term made him a popular president internationally.

 The honeymoon period of his first few years in office did not last. Domestically, his secular policies were driving Islamists underground and denying any involvement in political life. During the 1989 elections, Ben Ali refused to acknowledge Hisb an-Nahda, later the Renaissance Party, the largest Islamic organization in the country. This denial highlighted the growing divide between Ben Ali's secular policies and the growing Islamist population, as protests began soon after his party won every assembly seat. Repression tactics followed, with late night raids and searches becoming common in Tunis in the early 90s. By 1992, opposition repression tactics included manipulating the press, surveillance and phone tapping, passport confiscations, beatings, and some assassinations of popular Islamist leaders (Alexander 1997, 35-6).

 Additionally, corruption became increasingly apparent even at the highest levels of governance. In 2006, the U.S. Ambassador to Tunisia reported that more than half of Tunisia's commercial elites had familial ties to Ben Ali's family, a network known as "the Family"

(Anderson 2011). His efforts to break civil society left a legacy of fear in the Tunisian people, as the elevated risk of protest made organized action that much more difficult. The collective question for labor unions and Islamist organizations for the next 30 years therefore went from "How can we earn representation in the constituent assembly?" to "How do we remove Zine al-Abidine Ben Ali from office?"

One event lit the spark: in December 2010, a street fruit peddler lit himself on fire in front of a local municipality office in the small town of Sidi Bouzid. Less than an hour before, a police officer had harassed him and demanded a bribe or else she would confiscate his produce and fine him (Landolt & Kubicek 2014, 991). Anti-government protests about socio-economic conditions and corruption in reaction to Bouazizi's death swept through Tunisia. Ben Ali tried to placate union groups and unemployed college graduates with promises of creating jobs, regulating food prices, and increasing political freedoms. The protests continued from December 2010 through the first month of the year and called for his immediate resignation. He then placed the country under a nationwide state of emergency, with the military taking over the role that the police had. Curfews were set up in Tunis and the main airport was shut down. Ben Ali went on TV multiple times continuing to offer concessions, even saying that he would not run for reelection and would step down as president in three years time. He said that he would try to lower the prices of basic goods such as milk and bread, would push for even more liberalization, and deepen democracy.

Nevertheless, Ben Ali's fall came soon after—on January 14, 2011, just four weeks after the martyrdom of Bouazizi, he transferred his power to the Prime Minister Mohamed Ghannouchi, a holdover from the previous regime, and fled to Saudi Arabia with his family. However, the interim government was not popularly supported, as protestors were frustrated at

the lack of substantial reform in the months following the uprising. Distrust remained between liberals (secularists) and Islamists, as both sides believed that they held the key to protecting the ideals of a prosperous Tunisia. Nonetheless, they demanded a new constitution be drafted and Ghannouchi's government be replaced.

On February 27, 2011, Beji Caid Essebsi took over as temporary prime minister after Mohamed Ghannouchi and his government resigned. He focused on forming a government free of the repressive ideologies of Ben Ali. Essebsi first established a 170 member High Commission for the Realization of Revolutionary Goals, a forum meant to ensure that the country would move forward from its period of political turmoil and make sure that every voice was heard (Landolt & Kubicek 2014). Throughout this process, professional organizations, political parties, and labor unions pressed the government for some role in the transition and constitution building process. They formed a Committee to Safeguard the Revolution, made up of the Tunisian General Labour Union (UGTT), Congress for the Republic, Tunisian Workers' Communist Party, and Ennahda, all groups that will be shown to have tremendous impact on Tunisia's transition (later in 2011, this group was combined with the High Commission and renamed the Ben Achour commission, named after its president). Together, they promised to work together via consensus and give recommendations to the interim government, the first formal body to recognize that cooperation was the key to Tunisia's democratic transition.

In April 2011, the commission established a formal framework or the democratic transition, deciding on a popular election that would elect members of a constituent assembly, as well as not organizing a presidential election early on. This ensured that Tunisia would be first governed by consensus through the constituent assembly, creating greater cooperation and

allowing for debate rather than extremism. They also set a date for their dissolvent (after the first national constituent assembly elections), giving sole power to parliament.

The electoral system of Tunisia hosts one-round proportional representation elections, meaning that meant that any single party gaining a complete majority was unlikely at that time, especially with the reemergence of opposition political parties after the lift of Ben Ali's repressive tactics. The Progressive Democratic Party, one of the only remaining parties that had ties to the old regime, barely received any votes (Landolt & Kubicek 2014, 994). The Ennahda Party won 89 seats out of 217 in the assembly and thus was made to form a coalition with two secular parties: the Congrés pour la République, a center left political party and Ettakol, a social democratic party, together called "Troika" (El Sharnoubi 2012). Ennahda's Hamadi Jebali became prime minister, Congrés's Moncef Marzouki became president, and Ettakol's Mustapha Ben Jaffar became the speaker of the assembly (Ghanem 2016, 23).

Factors that Led to Democratic Transition
1. Role of the Military

A key difference between the Egyptian and Tunisian revolutions was the role of the military in the democratic transition. Referring back to previous literature, regimes that have a large military that is part and parcel of the regime are less likely to transition to a democracy because the military has an incentive to remain loyal to the regime, blocking any protests or movements towards democratization. This phenomenon played out in the Tunisia case, as the Tunisian military had no strong ties to the government, a clear division of influence and power, and thus when the time came, they defected. It is critical to understand the role of the military in the transition and moving forward to understand the level of democracy each country has achieved today.

Unlike active militaries in other countries in North Africa and the Middle East, the

Tunisian military had upheld a historical legacy of not engaging in conflict, having never fought

in a war (Kirkpatrick 2011). Looking back to the legacy of President Habib Bourguiba in period

before Ben Ali, the mission of the military became focused on national development rather than

engaging foreign states (Taylor 2014, 74). The military organized disaster relief, led youth

programs focused on civic participation, and remained a popular entity. Under Ben Ali, this

tradition of keeping the military separate from political life continued and was heightened, as

Ben Ali worked to strengthen his own police forces and limit that of the military. They received

much less funding than other North African states, funneling more money to the National Guard

and his own internal security forces (Taylor 2014, 75). Ben Ali had used his own police force to

crack down on opposition parties during the 30 years of his regime; yet, he let the military

remain independent.

At the start of the transition, the military was made up of 36,000 members, containing

army, navy, and air force personnel (Cook 2011). Participation in the Tunisian military is

mandatory, as at age 20, every citizen has to enlist in one year of military service. Historically,

officers have been apolitical, as President Bourguiba and President Ben Ali disallowed any kind

of political participation. Denying them access to the highest level of politics in Tunisia was a

deliberate measure to distance officers and other military leaders from obtaining any kind of

cabinet positions.

In the initial stages of demonstration involving confrontation, the Tunisian army avoided

direct involvement and instead tried to minimize violence. However, they soon intervened to

stop Interior Ministry forces from dispersing crowd of protestors. Made up of the police,

National Guard, and presidential guard, Ben Ali's domestic security forces were four times the

size of the military and more trained for direct conflict (International Crisis Group 2011, 2-3). Ben Ali had sought to build a strong force, quadrupling the police and security forces through the 1990s. Of all of the groups, the 5,000 strong National Guard were the most trained and ended up being the main protectors of the regime (Erdle 2010). A completely separate body from the military, Ben Ali's security forces had an entirely different structure and hierarchy than that of the military. While the National Guard and other parts of the Interior Ministry were loyal to the regime because it was their sole source of income and directive, their size limited them from being able to keep Ben Ali's government in power.

The key moment when the regime realized it was in its final days was when Army Chief Rachid Ammar refused orders to shoot civilians. The army stopped the police from using lethal force against protestors, but then told Ben Ali that they would not protect him (Stepan & Linz 2013). They also began helping find and arrest key officials and add force backing the power transition to then-Prime Minister Mohamed Ghannouchi. It seems that at that point, Ben Ali realized that he had no control over the military and had to flee the country (Kirkpatrick 2011).

Some speculation has been raised about why Ben Ali's security forces all together were not able to stop the protests. Before the uprising spread to all parts of Tunisia, it was centralized and could have been contained like so many others had, particularly the labor protests in 2009 and 2010 in the southern mining reason of Gafsa. One argument is that the national police was not prepared to handle the volume and nature of the protests, as police were not hired based on their skills to help abate an uprising. The timeline was also very short, as the situation was explosive enough to have swept across the whole country in a matter of weeks. The fuel to the fire was the mobilization of social groups, which I will discuss later in the Tunisian case, and no security force was capable of containing the level of unrest once they became involved.

Ultimately, the military chose to support the democratic transition and not engage in talks regarding the new government and constitution. There have been various opinions over why the military ultimately decided not to back Ali. Nepstad (2011) argued that the Tunisian military specifically is one of the poorest in the region and its members come from all socioeconomic classes, therefore they had no allegiance to the regime. Why would they choose to back a government that gave them so little resources to do their job? Cook (2011) emphasized that the tradition of the military was to remain independent and focus on stability and security rather than a particular political agenda. Their interests in the revolution would not have been to come out on top as the new leaders of the state, but to uphold safety and security for the Tunisian people as they had always done. They weighed both sides and ultimately concluded that the bloodshed and violence that would come from oppressing such a large protests would not benefit Tunisia as a whole. Brooks (2013) cited instances in which senior military officers were killed in freak accidents, notably General Ammar's predecessor, which many believed led back to Ben Ali.

Had General Ammar sided with the Ben Ali regime, the outcome of the revolution could have been very different. If the military remained loyal to the government, the state could have been plunged into a civil war like in Syria in which some civilians chose to defend the current regime and participate in counterdemonstrations. The body count would then have been insurmountable and democratization would be a far-flung dream of the revolutionaries. In January 2011, RCD Secretary General Mohamed Ghariani and his local party ranks defected and joined a labor union organized protest calling for the resignation of Ben Ali. His explanation said it best: "No one wanted to defend the president any longer," (ICG 2011).

2. Economic Conditions

Tunisia has long been considered a middle-income country. Major sectors include textiles and the tourism sector, in addition to the burgeoning oil and gas sectors. Before the uprising, Tunisia was growing around 3 percent per year (Ghanem and Shaikh 2013). Grievances that were voiced during the uprising regarded deep structural issues in their economy, particularly corruption at the top of food chain and unequal access to resources (Devarajan & Mottaghi 2015). Weak institutions led by corrupt leaders and free-rider practices limited the growth of the private sector, as money went into the hands of businesspersons connected to Ben Ali family. What resulted were few good jobs created under Ben Ali and inefficient public services and infrastructure (Devarajan & Mottaghi 2015).

It seems that the uprising in Tunisia was not cause by economic inequality, but by growing need for quality, paying jobs. There were no large changes in socio-economic level. The difference was that at the same level, standards of living became much lower as public services and government accountability deteriorated. Rather than economic inequality, there was inter-group inequality (Ianchovichina, Mottaghi, & Devaragan 2015).

Many have sourced the high unemployment rates of the educated in Tunisia to the inefficient state that disallowed independent business activity from the state before the uprising (Ammous and Phelps 2011; Cassidy 2011). The increase in education, especially those who had completed primary and secondary schooling, led to a populace that could channel their time towards political action and participation. When you combine this with a lack of employment, you are left with a growing population of people that are not only educated, not only unemployed, but also who now have a reason to participate politically.

Literature about mass grievances from the late 80s to mid-90s was driven by the idea that grievance alone could provide motivation for demonstration and protest, such as Opp (1988). In

Verbe, Nie, and Kim (1987, 161), they argued that "a group [that is] particularly motivated by a sense of grievance… may become much more active than its socioeconomic level would predict." It is nearly impossible to discount this theory when looking at protests during the Arab Spring.

Unemployment in Tunisia has averaged 15.5 percent since January 2015 and youth unemployment was as high as 36 percent for those aged 15-24 in 2014 as the push for increased jobs continues (Ghanem and Shaikh 2013). In the phosphate industry in the south, the government signed legislation to create almost 3,000 new jobs in order to end protests and boycotting (Amara & Markey 2016). 86 percent of those polled in 2016 (1,207 adults) rate the economy as bad or somewhat bad (International Republican Institute 2016). 29 percent believe that employment should be the top priority for the government and that creating jobs should be their top spending priority.

While the democratic transition period has allowed for the emergence of a flourishing civil society in Tunisia, the economy has still struggled. Since the uprising, the economy grew only 2.3 percent in 2014 and .8 percent in 2015 (Ghanem 2016). Political tensions and terror attacks on tourists have halted the growth of the tourism sector, which makes up eight percent of GDP, and affected production in the oil and gas industries (Ianchovichina, Mottaghi, & Devaragan 2015, 53). The fiscal balance has worsened due mostly to the impacts of the terror attacks in 2015, although reforms have begun to improve security. The public sector today makes up 13.5 percent of GDP, a remnant of the Ben Ali era (Amara & Markey 2016). Tunisia faces a huge challenge next year, as it must come up with $450 million a month to pay its public employees.

Other than terrorism, the problem has been how to stimulate employment and growth. The government has tried to kindle GDP growth by increasing public spending, but it leads to increased deficit spending and perceived stagnation in standards of living. Tunisia's fiscal deficit went from 1.1 percent of GDP in 2010 to nearly 7 percent in 2014 (Ghanem 2016). Looking at statistics of life satisfaction and quality of life in Tunisia from the Gallup World Poll shows a rise in dissatisfaction, particularly with the availability of affordable housing, public transportation, health care, and availability of quality jobs. Deterioration in average life satisfaction was mostly driven by an increase in the percentage of people dissatisfied with their living conditions, particularly the middle 40 percent (Ianchovichina, Mottaghi, & Devaragan 2015). On the Cantril Scale, of the 2,048 respondents, the average score for life satisfaction was 5.17 (Gallup World Poll 2013). In Tunisia as well as in other developing countries that underwent uprising, worsening infrastructure inequality, poor labor market conditions, and rampant corruption drove the poor levels of social dissatisfaction.

In the first year following the transition period, economic reforms in Tunisia were a large part of the discussions within the coalition government. Yet, the transition of power between 2011 and 2014 made interim leaders hesitant to undertake large reform measures (Reuters 2014). They did take on deficit spending in order to fix the domestic economy, as well as hold leaders accountable for making economic prosperity the top concern. In July 2016, the incumbent prime minister was ousted by Parliament in a vote of no confidence. The President and his cabinet along with the rest of Tunisia's lawmakers were dissatisfied with the lack of progress Essid had made regarding economic reforms. There was an agreement between the four ruling groups in Parliament that change was needed, especially with unemployment remaining so high (Al Jazeera 2016). President Essebsi named Youssef Chahed as the new Prime Minister, putting him

in charge of the new national unity government (Al Jazeera 2016) and has since attempted to make Tunisia an attractive investment for foreign actors.

While Tunisia has not had prosperous economic growth since the beginning of the transition period, there have been steps taken to improve economic conditions. It remains to be seen if those attempted improvements will make a difference to the average Tunisia's life satisfaction due to it only having been five years since the uprising. It seems that the presence of intergroup inequality has neither helped nor hindered with the transition to democracy, while efforts to help Tunisia grow have yet to take hold and have an affect.

3. Social Movements

The size of the protests that occurred in 2011 was unprecedented in a country that had no history of popular uprising, as Tunisia was seen as an unshakeable authoritarian state. I argue that three groups in particular brought on the transition to democracy when they embraced each other's concerns as their own and started the catalyst for a large-scale revolution. The sectors of social movements that I will evaluate are Islamists, secular opposition groups, and labor unions.

A. Islamist

In Tunisia and many other Arab states, there has long been an argument between secularists and Islamists over who should run the state. Long before the reign of Ben Ali, modern nationalism arose in the early 1900s as a part of a growing secular sentiment to protect national sovereignty (Ghanem 2016, 9). However, post independence governments did not believe in democracy. The idea of elites collaborating with colonial powers was enough to discourage the democratic model and thus the focus of new governance became the separation of church and state (Ghanem 2016, 11).

Islamists were inspired by the popular support of the Muslim Brotherhood, created in Egypt in 1928, and created the Movement of the Islamic Tendency in 1981. After changing their name to Ennhahda (*renaissanc*e in Arabic), most leaders in the group were jailed by President Ben Ali and stayed dormant until the uprising in 2011.

One of the things that set Tunisia apart from other countries that underwent an uprising in 2011 was the collective presence of social movements, particularly labor unions, who were able to push Ennahda towards compromise and remain connected. While this move angered hardliner members, it was seen by the rest of the world as a concession to preserve peace and stability. Islamist voices across the MENA region have commented on the relationship between democratic systems and Islam, especially noting that the idea of "Western democracy" will never work. Theologian and Egyptian Salafi Abu al-A'la al-Maudidi abridged this concept, stating, "that if an Islamic society consciously resolves not to accept the *shari'a*, and decides to enact its own constitution and laws or borrow them from any other source in disregard of the *shari'a*, such a society breaks its contract with God and forfeits its right to be called Islamic," (Maudidi 1983, 13-14).

The role of Islam in politics still stands as an active part of Tunisian politics. Some believe that Islamist parties pose a threat to the stability of the liberal democracy that has thus far stood strong in the face of a growing secular versus Islamist divide. Even within Ennahda, there have been divisions between the older and younger generations. The younger members are more politically active, seeing Ennahda as "a political party at the service of society with a politics of democratic governance," (Crisis Group, 2012). The other current sees Ennahda as "a movement that has a global, cultural, educational and political Islamic mission based on preaching: a complete Islamic project that cannot be reduced to its political component." The consequences of

this divide are that members of Ennahda who are dissatisfied with the concessions that they have had to make to remain in power will leave and join a radical Salafi party. The hope is that moving forward, conflict will be avoided as Ennahda brings its base back together and remains more centrist.

An example of how Ennahda has changed in Tunisia was during negotiations of the new constitution in 2012 which they rejected the adoption of Sharia law. Hardline Islamists considered this a defeat, but modern secular parties considered it a smart move (Landolt & Kubicek 2014). It has been argued that one of the reasons that they were so flexible was that by the time that the constitution was to be outlined, the Muslim Brotherhood government had fallen in Egypt. The Islamists realized that the key to survival and remaining at the negotiating table was to work with the secular leaders in forming the new government (Ghanem 2016, 23).

The August 2012 constitution draft was filled with multiple versions of certain sections that were the most contentious, but was overall a good show of consensus between the various secular and Islamist groups that had been at the negotiating table. The two versions had differing support: the one backed by Ennahda had a parliamentary system, while the secular parties backed a draft that outlined a semi-presidential state, with both recommending proportional representation for parliamentary elections (Landolt & Kubicek 2014). Two principles of Islam, consensus (*ijma)* and consultation (*shura),* are evident in the new Constitution, institutionalizing religion in a way that also aligns with the principles of democracy (Parray 2011, 20). Article 59 of the Constitution implicitly references these ideals by outlining the role of opposition parties:

> The opposition is an integral element of the Chamber of Deputies
> and shall have the rights that enable it to undertake its tasks in
> parliamentary work. The opposition is guaranteed an appropriate
> and effective representation in all the Chamber's structures and
> internal and external activities, and it shall be given the presidency
> of the financial affairs committee or the foreign affairs committee

and the role of rapporteur within one of the two committees. It shall have the right to establish and head an investigation committee per year. Its duties include active and constructive participation in parliamentary work (Jasmine Foundation 2014).

This Article articulates the importance of the opposition by giving it power to impact major policy by either leading an investigation committee or two other important committees for Parliament. By having a weaker party oversee such large parts of the state's affairs, the Constitution ensures that decision-making must be taken seriously and that consensus must be reached, thus protecting the voice of the opposition.

B. Secular Political Opposition

Political parties are valuable actors in the political system, as formal and organized parties indicate that democracy is working. They are symbol to the electorate that there are channels open between the people and the government. Political parties in Tunisia have been strongly coalition parties or Islamist parties in general, as 98 percent of Tunisia is Muslim after all. While they did not have as much of a role in the uprising, they have had a very active role in the state-building process since 2011.

By 2009, Ben Ali's party the Constitutional Democratic Rally (RCD) had near-total control over the national assembly and within local government (Arieff 2011). Ben Ali was elected for a fifth term in October of that year in an election seen as unfair by international monitors and which top opposition parties boycotted, despite a reported 89.4% turnout. Journalists, bloggers and international groups attempting to report on the state of affairs in Tunisia were constantly monitored, victim to physical assault and even jail time. Amnesty International (2010) reported that Tunisian authorities were "subverting" human rights

organizations and other groups by "infiltrating them and provoking turmoil." The censorship regime was in full effect.

Historically, there have been many other political parties: The Progressive Democratic Party (PDP), Ettakol, the Congress Party for the Republic (CPR), the Free Patriotic Union (UPL), Tunisian Workers Communist Party, and other smaller coalition groups (Bollier 2011). The RCD, Ben Ali's former party, was banned in 2011 and their top officials were prohibited from running for office. Elections for the National Constituent Assembly in October of that 2011 were a groundbreaking achievement for the region, with a 51% turnout and praise from international election monitor for transparency and fairness (Ghanem 2016, 22).

Ennadha was the winning party, capturing enough votes to have a plurality but not a majority. Ennadha was very careful about protecting their power. Ben Ali had outlawed Islamist groups from forming political parties during his reign, so they were eager to be able to help form policy again. However, they watched as newly elected Egyptian President Mohamed Morsi, a Muslim Brotherhood member, won, and began to crack down on the secularists who had oppressed his group. From the onset, Ennadha did quite the opposite of Morsi's administration by reaching out to secularists and other coalition partners in forming the renewed state. By having Moncef Marzouki, a secular human rights advocate, as president, they ensured that their coalition would be as fair and representative as possible.

C. Labor Unions

The Tunisian General Labor Union (UGTT) played a key role in the removal of Ben Ali. Formed in 1946, the UGTT has expanded and contracted throughout the years of Habib Bourguiba and then Ben Ali's rule (Bishara 2014). Throughout the 90s, the UGTT restrained workers activism and was loyal to Ben Ali's campaigns. Three smaller trade unions emerged: the

Tunisian General Labor Confederation in 2006, which championed giving workers representation at the top level. In 2013, they were 50,000 members strong (Bishara 2014). The Union of Tunisian Workers was formed by a previous Secretary general, but well to internal corruption. A third federation, the Organization Tunisienne du Travail, has always been associated with the Ennahda Party, but has denied all links with the Islamist party. These posed a threat to the strength and power of the UGTT, but its legacy of independence and strong base have kept members and retained its large financial resources.

Even before the suicide of Bouazizi that ignited the flame of revolution, social unrest had broken out in the small mining region of Gafsa in the south of Tunisia. High unemployment caused economic grievances caused six months of protests. The government sent in the army to aid local police, who arrested 38 people for armed rebellion and assault of police officers (Arieff 2011, 18). Some believe that this protest and its reemergence in early 2010 was the precursor to the December-January revolution. While the UGTT did not support the 2009 Gafsa mining revolts, they actively participated in the 2011 anti-Ben Ali protests.

One thing to keep in mind is that the Jasmine Revolution that led to a formal democratization process was not organized or planned. Tunisian civil society was weak under Ben Ali due to oppression tactics and the fear in people to join a banned opposition party. Democracy was born mostly "from scratch," (Landolt & Kubicek 2014). After the removal of Ben Ali, the role of the UGTT as a national actor became negotiating several rounds of political dialogue between those slated to form the new government. They also have taken up human rights issues of their "constituents," helping mitigate the ongoing battles faced in Tunisia.

The importance of opposition parties in Tunisia was extremely important to the builders of the new Constitution, as Ben Ali had eliminated most channels to express dissent under his

regime The ability to protest is now seen as a way for citizens to demand government protection of minorities, having fully found their power in a democratic system. It highlights four key principles: the importance of opposition voices, the freedom of speech, social equality, and an increased role of Islam (Kirkova & Milosevska 2014). Post-Arab Spring Tunisia did face some tension when Islamists and secularists had to create the new Constitution, but the development of a multi-party system was something that all parties agreed on from the start, especially in a parliamentary system.

The four groups that made the transition possible were given a Nobel Peace Prize in 2015 for their efforts in reconciling Tunisian secular and Islamist society to form the new Constitution, facilitating effective dialogue. During 2013 and 2014, the National Dialogue Quartet-- made of up the UGTT, Tunisian Confederation of Industry, Trade, and Handicrafts, the Tunisian Human Rights League, and the Tunisian Order of Lawyers-- helped facilitate dialogue between the various groups who wanted a stake in finding political compromise (Faiola 2015). Without their centralization and formality, the nation may not have found a solution to the polarization between secularists and Islamists that is the source of their success in the path to democratization.

What we see in Tunisia is that the coalitions and commissions that made consensus possible in forming the new government and constitution are what made democracy thrive. The cooperation between secularists and Islamists led to a long lasting bridge that has remained the narrative for every step they have taken to make Tunisia as prosperous as it can be. Democracy stems from the people's desires to have a say, and the leadership of Tunisia has made this possible. What we may now expect in Tunisia is the continuation of economic reforms and the further building of civil society through the collaboration of its diverse social movements.

Case Study: Egypt

Background

Looking back, what separated Mubarak from his predecessors was his ability to transcend

diplomatic negotiations with a newfound sense of purpose for Egypt in the region. What had

previously been decades of isolationism and a focus on nationalism evolved into a foreign policy

of cooperation and a return to the Arab fold, marked by Egypt's readmission to the League of

Arab States in 1989. Breaking out from the shadow of those before him, Mubarak's leadership

was long unchallenged, consolidating his power through his influence over Parliament.

In 2005, USAID invested in Egyptian civil society organizations that were working on

making elections fair and free, expanding human rights, and other topics that the Egyptian

government failed to address (Bell 2009). In the State Department's 2007 *Country Report on*

Human Rights Practices, the Egyptian government's respect for human rights "remained poor,

and serious abuses continued in many areas,"(Country Report on Human Rights Practices 2007)

Mubarak was incensed by the USAID initiatives and criticized President Bush's aid programs,

citing them as being outside of the law. After long negotiations, a thin arrangement was

established that allowed the US to fund certain civil society organizations under their strict NGO

law code (Hawthorne 2016, 10) Nevertheless, the arrangement dissolved after the Egyptian

government yet again denied certain groups from monitoring human rights abuses and the Bush

administration was forced to fund unregistered groups operating outside of the law. Another

agreement was attempted, but disagreements persisted, as Mubarak wanted increased

endowments for programs under government control, while the Bush administration pushed for

reform-linked cash transfers (Hawthorne 2016, 11).

Mubarak nonetheless remained a strategic ally for counterterrorism purposes until

February 2011, when protestors took to Tahrir Square demanding an end to corruption, poor

economic conditions, and the removal of Mubarak as president. Tens of thousands of Egyptians came together in the streets, undeterred by security forces. Mubarak attempted to shut down the Internet to sever communication and thus limit organization. Instead, people became curious about the Internet's shutdown, coming out into the streets to discover what the cause of the unrest was. This worked against what Mubarak had hoped for, as days later, the Muslim Brotherhood and other large political parties pledged their support to the movement (International Crisis Group 2011). The military then refused to stop the protests, and as Marc Lynch described, "Once Mubarak lost the military, the real focus shifted to the political bargaining and brinksmanship among the protestors, the military, the Mubarak regime, and international actors, primarily the United States," (Lynch 2012). Just one month after the fall of Ben Ali in Tunisia, Mubarak stepped down.

The very nature of the uprisings went from removing Mubarak to moving earnestly towards democratization, increased freedoms, and improved economic conditions for all. While most of Egypt came together for the Tahrir Square protests, their reasons for being there were varied. Some were tired of the violent abuses of Mubarak cracking down on dissident; others were frustrated by the corruption of the political system and network that led back to Mubarak's family.

The Supreme Council of the Armed Forces (SCAF) then took over the transition, beginning the tumultuous process of creating a new constitution. A legal committee came up with proposed amendments, the main provision of which was to have presidential and parliamentary elections before drafting a new constitution. This first transition design was supported by the Muslim Brotherhood, who believed that it was the quickest way to gain a seat at the drafting of the constitution. Secularists opposed the referendum because there was no

provision to "check" the balance of the military and also believed that it was too early for elections, as the Muslim Brotherhood was the only group organized and mobilized enough to put forth candidates (Al-Arian 2014.) Nonetheless, the referendum passed.

Two weeks later, the military unilaterally released a 63 article constitutional declaration, laying out the SCAF's plan for the transition. They added vague articles, removed amendments that they did not like, and changed the wording of ones that the legal committee had finalized after weeks of deliberation (Al-Arian 2014). The Muslim Brotherhood continued to support the process, as they believed that elections were the best next course of action for Egypt. Up to the first parliamentary and presidential elections, neither the Muslim Brotherhood nor the secularists trusted the other.

Activists remained skeptical of the 2012 elections, as the Brotherhood celebrated the presidential victory of Mohamed Morsi and a strong parliamentary victory, winning a majority in both the upper and lower houses. Egyptian author, Ahdaf Soueif (2014), commented in his 2014 memoir on the tough choice for Egyptians in the election: "We were in the terrible position of having to choose a president who was either a MB [Muslim Brotherhood] candidate or a military remnant of the Mubarak regime." The situation severely deteriorated in November 2012 when President Morsi announced a new constitution, one that made him and his cabinet untouchable and privy to almost any power he so chose, (Birnbaum 2012).

By June 2013, a coalition of secularists, Islamists, Christians, and even police personnel called on the military to again depose the president and take over. They took his constitutional declaration as the Muslim Brotherhood attempting to seize more power and putting their interests above that of the rest of Egypt. The opposition also argued that President Morsi's cabinet was unrepresentative of the Egyptian people and thus would forsake genuine efforts to move Egypt

towards a free and equal society (Hussein 2012). One month later, the democratically elected Mohamed Morsi was removed from power and the military once again held control of the state (Soueif 2014, 224).

The ouster of Morsi allowed the military to reignite their plans for Egypt while beginning a repressive campaign against senior Muslim Brotherhood leaders. They then designated them as a terrorist group, an action that was received negatively by the public. The military continues today to accuse and arrest Muslim Brotherhood members, with little evidence to prove criminality. The public has begun to question the motives of the military and if they truly intend on moving forward in the democratic transition.

Factors That Led to Democratic Transition
Role of the Military

By far, the largest factor in whether Egypt has achieved democracy is the role of the military in Egypt's government. Unlike in Tunisia, the Egyptian military has a history of intervening and shaping political affairs; in 1952, free officers in the Egyptian army took power via a coup, ousting the king and replacing his authority with that of General Gamal Abdel Nasser (Cook 2007, 63-5). Under his authority and guided by his military background, he concentrated his power by focusing on Egyptian nationalism, expanding Egypt's authority as one of the leading countries in the region (Woltering 2013). When he died in 1970, Anwar al-Sadat, a senior officer of the Free Officers and former vice president, took over as president. His liberalization policies were not embraced by the Egyptian people, resulting in the bread riots of 1977, rising inequality and unemployment (Karawan 2011, 44). He was assassinated by a group of Islamists in 1981, succeeded by Hosni Mubarak who had been his vice president. He too had

military connections, having been a commander in the Egyptian Air Force before becoming VP. From Egypt's installation, the military has participated in the political process every step of the way.

During the protests, the military was not particularly active in standing behind the protestors, but also refused to outright remove them from public squares and streets. The International Crisis Group commented, "Throughout the protests, the army played a consistently ambiguous role, purportedly standing with the people, while at the same time being an integral part of the regime they were confronting. It found itself almost literally on both sides of the barricades,''(International Crisis Group 2011). Yet, the official view of the Egyptian army is that it sided with protestors from the beginning of the demonstrations against the Mubarak regime (Al Ahram Weekly 2011). By not effectively choosing a side, they stood in the way of protestors attempting to push for democracy and at the same time could not be counted as an ally of the Mubarak regime.

The status of the military in the eyes of the Egyptian people was similar to how Tunisians viewed their own military before and during the uprising—as protectors of the Egypt and as a separate entity from the entangled 'deep state' that Mubarak had strengthened during his presidency. The Egyptian armed forces are a professional group in which members are chosen based on their abilities and achievements rather than because of their social class, with a historical legacy of professionalism and institutionalization like the Tunisian military (Aclimandos 2011). However, they do have a mandatory selective service for all males between 18 and 30 for at least a year and a half, as well as a nine-year reserve (CIA 2010; Azzam 2012, 2). Many Egyptians revered the military, as they were considered the most well respected institution in Egypt based on opinion polls are highly institutionalized (Droz-Vincent 2011, 18).

Despite a respectable and well-known military, Egypt has had a corrupted system of public officials that has proven problematic and gotten worse over time. Bribery of public officials for things like obtaining a driver's license or a marriage certificate is commonplace, often costing more than double the official payment (Anderson 2011). Even before the uprising, the national police were seen as corrupt and only protecting those who paid. Mubarak was always loyal to this group and chose to invest in his security forces over the military.

At the core of Mubarak's fear mongering network was the Ministry of the Interior, in charge of Egypt's National Police, Central Security Forces, and the State Security Investigations Service (SSI). Despite its humble beginnings under Sadat's regime, this network grew especially large throughout the '70s and soon became an indirect method of controlling society. At one point, it was said that these forces extended to 1 million people (Barany 2011, p. 28). The most brutal of these forces was the SSI, becoming the symbol of Mubarak's regime across the country (Lesch 2011, p. 40). In 2002, the United Nations Committee against Torture highlighted 'the widespread evidence of torture and ill treatment by the [SSI]'. Unsurprisingly, the official side of the SSI was disbanded in 2011 after the ousting of Mubarak.

On the other hand, the military is run by generals who came to power during the 1967 and 1973 wars with Israel, earning respect among the Egyptian populace through it's interwoven role in civil society. They have become a strong economic actor, as Mubarak pushed them from the political table in the later years of his presidency. He allowed them to acquire large business holdings as a way to keep officers loyal to him (Hashim 2011), always keeping a close eye on the military. They were not in favor of the implementation of privatization policies that would dismantle their accumulation of wealth. The economic interests of the military were never in a growing private sector, but the continuation of operating with a large public sector (Anderson

2011). This is a key difference from the Tunisia case, as military leaders did not have the same integral and intertwined role in the economy as in Egypt.

The military business complex was vital as any state institution (Nepstad 2013, 342). They controlled most of the food industry such as olive oil, milk, and bread, making their existence tied to that of Egypt's. They also have expanded into the electronics, infrastructure, and tourism industries. Their business network is difficult to measure, but it is estimated that it is between 10 and 40 percent of GDP (Stier 2011). Thus, the military had a stake in the stability of their businesses and of Egypt in socioeconomic terms, another reason to consistently want a voice at the negotiating table.

At the end of Mubarak's decline, the military was more suspicious than ever that a business elite connected to Gamal Mubarak, the former president's son, had been reaping the benefits of a prosperous Egypt while leaving its everyday citizens in poverty (Anderson 2011). In the months before the uprising began, the New York Times put out an article that described that "the single most powerful institution" in Egypt was facing its "toughest test in decades, an imminent presidential succession," (Cambanis 2010). The military did not like him; he had never served in the military and was scene as part of the higher-ranking business class who would never truly understand how to manage the country (Barany 2011, 32).

When it came to their role in the uprising, the military took an ambiguous position. At the beginning, they called the demands of the protestors "legitimate," and pledged not to "use force against the Egyptian people,"(AFP 2011). Some officers even joined the demonstrations in Tahrir Square (Reuters 2011). On January 29, soldiers refused to shoot at protesters, giving a public statement just days after that they would not use force to end the protests (Black, Shenker, and McGreal 2011). They had a choice in this regard, weighing what the public reaction would

be if they had followed Mubarak's leadership and shut down the protests. It was in their best interest to back the majority and ensure that widespread violence did not erupt.

There seemed to be a disconnect between the military and the protestors from the beginning. Mubarak went on television and gave speeches in the early days of the occupation of Tahrir Square, giving concessions to the protestors such as not running in the next election and transferring powers to his newly chosen vice president. The demonstrations only grew in size, as the protestors did not consider this enough. While the military acknowledged the legitimacy of the claims of the protestors, they did not understand why protestors refused to accept Mubarak's concessions. They called upon the protestors to return home, stressing "the need to resume regular work in state institutions and to resort normal public life," (Egyptian Armed Forces 2011).

When power was eventually transferred to the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces (SCAF), some suggested that this move alone was enough to ruin Egypt's chance of a successful transition to democracy (Bayat 2012). Made up of nineteen military officers, the group had existed before the uprising but had not had a regular role in the political process (Albrecht & Bishara 2011). The SCAF ruled Egypt without legislative or executive restrictions for more than a year. However, protest leaders issued a demand called the "People's Communique No.1" the day after Mubarak stepped down, calling for a coalition government to be made up of four civilians and one sole military member (Reuters 2011). The SCAF instead quickly dissolved the most recent constitution from 1971 as well as the main legislative bodies. It stated in February that it would "temporarily administer the affairs of the country for a period of six months or until People's Assembly, Shura Council and Presidential elections are held," (New York Times 2011).

The amendments made to the constitution were put to a referendum vote in March and with a 41% turnout, they were passed with 77% in favor (Ahram 2011). Bu two weeks later, the SCAF passed its own declaration that granted itself unrestricted legislative and executive powers (Albrecht & Bishara 2011, 16-17). Yet in October of 2011, 89.8% of Egyptians surveyed said, "they trust the SCAF to lead the transition period after the revolution," (Daily News Egypt 2011). The SCAF continued to hold power, much to the dismay of civilians who were kept out of the transition process. This led to regular protests against the "military regime" (Sayigh 2013). The interim government brutally cracked down on the anti-government demonstrations killing dozens of protesters in 2011 and 2012 (Saikal 2011, 538), prompting Amnesty International (2011) to call the situation worse than conditions under Mubarak.

Later that year, parliamentary elections were held, a mere six months after they were planned. Participation was historically high for Egypt, with 56% participation on average between the three rounds of voting for the lower house (IEFS 2013; Azzam 2012; Irshad 2012). Despite the Muslim Brotherhood winning a majority in both houses, The Supreme Constitutional Court (SCC) dissolved them due to a "technicality" less than a month before SCAF was set to hand over the government (Kienle 2012, 536).

In May 2012, Mohamed Morsi of the Muslim Brotherhood won by just 51.7% of the vote (IFES 2013). He drafted a new constitution, but was ultimately unable to bring all of the various parts of Egyptian society together. Amidst public unrest, he was disposed by the military just one year after taking power. After Morsi was removed, the military suspended his constitution (Freedom House 2014) and created their own via a panel of jurists, adopted in January 2014. Later that year, the former minister of defense and commander of the armed forces Abdel Fattah El-Sisi was elected Egypt's president.

Civilian leaders essentially deprived themselves of involvement in the democratic transition due to placing trust in the hands of the military, which retrospectively seems to have been a fatal error. The Egyptian military experience sheds light on the effect of transitional governments on the future of democratic transition. While other countries have had successful democratic transitions that are rooted in a military takeover, Egypt does not seem to follow that model.

Economic Conditions

Before the uprising, Egypt was growing at 5 percent a year (Ghanem and Shaikh 2013). Mubarak introduced market-based reforms that sought to increase privatization and deregulate the public sector. In response to the global recession, he negotiated a domestic stimulus that would make up for the lost investment in the private sector and in exports. He wholeheartedly tried to embrace neoliberal thought via an Open Door Policy that would attract foreign investment and create new wealth (Joya 2008). However, the wealth of the country from tourism, remittances from Egyptians abroad, the Suez Canal, and foreign aid (Ajami 2012) never trickled down to the general population. Yet, a large number of people were frustrated by the deteriorating economic conditions in both rural and urban parts of the country, fueled by a rising unemployment rate and a lack of exclusive government policies. With few newly created jobs, youth unemployment was over 25% (World Bank 2007) as frustration became aimed at a system that seemed rigged in favor of a well-connected elite. Rising unrest in Egypt before the uprising was thus centralized around mounting frustration about inequality—not of income, but in access to basic services and employment, similar to that of Tunisia.

An important distinction must be made here about Egypt's economy. One significant factor that was a large part of the economy since 1996 was the informal sector. This part of the economy was made up of non-agricultural and often unskilled jobs (Ersado 2012). Despite having a lower importance in the region, it has trended upwards in Egypt in a volatile way. The availability of public sector jobs represents a low share of total employment growth before 2011. Private sector employment grew, but only within the low productivity service sector (World Bank 2007). Given the decreasing availability of formal employment opportunities, the informal sector acted as an abyss for people entering the labor force. Unstable, unregulated, and low-paying jobs have replaced the skilled labor market. This is especially shocking when looking at the relationship with the level of education in Egypt during this same period, effectively an inverse relationship. As the informal sector expanded, those with higher levels of education were less likely to be hired for those jobs (World Bank, 2004). Thus, the expansion of education was met with poor labor market conditions and poor employment-to-population ratios.

The informal sector did and continues to provide employment opportunities as a source of income, but does not provide quality and stable employment due to a lack of regulation. Workers are not given standardized minimum wages, insurance of any kind, social security coverage, or even contracts (Beinin 2010). Socially, it is still important in Egypt to obtain an education and rise in socioeconomic class via a well-paying job. The dynamic between a lack of formal sector employment opportunities and a rise in unstable jobs has created barriers for young people graduating from universities who come from low socio economic backgrounds. Their families don't have the ability to get them a job due to lack of connections and corruption within the formal sector, resulting in frustration and pressure on educated people entering the labor market for the first time.

Inequality of opportunity is the largest issue that Egyptians faced before the 2011 uprising. This foundation going into the democratic transition highlighted the government's inability and unwillingness to generate economic growth for all Egyptians, connecting inequality to poor institutions (Chong & Gradstein 2007). Kandil (2012) described Egypt's situation in the last decade, detailing how poverty increased due to increasing exclusive government policies, reinforced by high levels of inequality. Egypt had a high GDP deficit before the Arab Spring of 8.2 percent of GDP, which rose to 12 percent in 2014. This ultimately creates an unsustainable model for the Egyptian state in which "development proved to be profoundly destabilizing, dislocating millions of citizens in the rush to cities, raising the visibility of a detested new class of crony capitalists and creating expectations of mobility that were impossible to realize," (Kandil 2012, 16). These findings lend credence to the hypothesis that intergroup inequality gives more resources to the elites and at that same time decreases the relative costs for the poor to mobilize.

Infrastructure inequality was more prevalent in Egypt than in Tunisia, as housing in Egypt saw the same rise of informality that the labor market faced. For those in the middle, lower middle, and working classes, "affordable housing" was separated from the rest of Cairo pushing into the desert. The government let the informal market control new housing construction and build on agricultural or state land, which is against zoning and construction laws (Denis 2006). 80% of all housing construction after 2006 was informal, with 10.5 out of 16.2 million inhabitants of the Greater Cairo Region living in informal and unsafe housing (Sims & Sejourne 2008). In the poorer informal housing areas, crime, pollution, Islamism, and "danger" supposedly run rampant (Denis 2006) and those who live there are considered uncivilized (Singerman 2009). The government had denied the mere existence of these

communities, much less given them their fair share of public services, thus intensifying their grievance against the regime. Regional differences of rural-urban disparities were also more significant in Egypt than in Tunisia, accounting for 20 percent or more of expenditure inequality (Ianchovichina, Mottaghi, & Devaragan 2015).

The poor and middle class were dissatisfied with decreasing standards of living, as the government shifted its focus (and budget) to providing for the upper class. People became frustrated that even if they worked hard, they could not share in the gains of large Arab firms, as profits were not put back into the community (OECD, 2009). Gallup World Poll data showed that on the 10 point Cantril Scale, the average score reported from 1,628 respondents was 4.88 in the 2009-2010 period. Referring back to Tunisia, early literature had stated that grievance alone could cause motivation to protest and become active in protests. Campanta and Chor (2012) at first disagree with the literature, arguing that pure grievance alone was not enough to fully explain the data. They argue that in many cases, the public could be angry about the economic conditions of the country, but not willing to take action if the time and effort needed to participate in protests is too high. Yet, in the Egypt case, people were more willing to devote their time in energy because they had little to lose, effectively no cost.

When we combine education and poor labor market conditions, the variables are associated with an increased propensity towards political protest (Campante & Chor 2012, 179). A poll conducted by the International Republican Institute in April 2011 found that 64 percent cited "low living standards/lack of jobs" as their main motivation for partaking in the recent protests. 41 percent said that they "have trouble feeing [themselves] and [their] family and buying even the most essential things for survival." Together, the combination is a clear root cause of protests in Egypt and element of the transition to democracy.

At the outset of the transition period, the SCAF was less concerned with macroeconomic stability and more concerned with garnering support over its role in the transition government (Springborg 2011). The unemployment rate had hit the highest level in 10 years of 12 percent unemployed, 75 percent of whom were between the ages of 20 and 30 (Nowar 2011). In order to combat this in the 2011-2012 budget, they directed the finance minister to raise public sector wages by 15 percent, hire some 450,000 new temporary civil service workers (a measure that Mubarak had undertaken to try to salvage his reputation in his last year as president), and expand the subsidy bill supporting the energy industry (Abdel-Razek 2011). A member of the SCAF was quotes as saying that the reputation of the SCAF and upholding a "nationalist image" took precedence over commitment to sound economic management that would propel Egypt out of debt from post-revolution spending (Walberg 2011).

In terms of actual reform, there has been a lack of substantial restructuring that would indicate a break from the cycle of authoritarian control over the economy. The most important aspects of government control were overlooked by the SCAF due to their inability to manage the economic challenges that Egypt faced after the overthrow of Mubarak. They showed little awareness of the problem and offered no reassurance to both the public and the private sector that reform would a part of the move towards a freely elected government (Springborg 2011). In short, at the outset of the transition period, little economic reform was introduced at the local or state level that would precede a successful democracy.

Social Movements

The power of Egyptian social movements in the transition to democracy was unlike Egypt had seen in 20 years, garnering international attention through visuals of the flag burning

in Tahrir Square. Scholars and researchers missed how a supposed weak and disconnected society could overwhelm and disseminate a rooted regime like that of Mubarak's. They underestimated how differing social groups would unite under a common banner, effectively ousting one of the most long-standing dictatorships in the Middle East.

Each social movement that participated had it's own set of rules and institutionalization, but was separated by their individuality and existence on the periphery. They had strong bases, but individually were not strong enough to give Mubarak reason to be concerned. Younger members of the Muslim Brotherhood had tried to broker cooperation between the informal labor movement and political opposition, but were not in position of leadership and could not convince those higher in the hierarchy to join a collaborative coalition (Clarke 2014). The uprising in Tunisia is what changed the atmosphere in Egypt. Once Ben Ali stepped down, Egyptians too believed that mobilization and political change could be possible. The risks did not seem as high as before, and for the first time, there was a reason to go from marginal players on the periphery of Egyptian society to an established network.

While everyday citizens participated in the protests at the end of January 2011, the large scale events were organized and led by brokers linked with the following three sectors: the Muslim Brotherhood (and other smaller Islamist groups), political opposition groups based in Cairo, and informal labor unions.

A. Islamist

With roots spanning back to its formation as an Islamist nationalist group in the late 1920s, it had been banned under President Nasser in 1954 (Ezzat 2011) and key members were jailed under Mubarak in 2008 and 2009, (Trofimov 2009). Members believe in two basic

principles: that there is no divide between the state and Islam—all affairs should be conducted based on sharia law. This means that gender equality is virtually nonexistent (men and women should have different schools and workplaces) and censorship of un-Islamic media is rampant. The second is seeing the Arab world as one huge Islamic caliphate, free from the intervention of imperialist nations and expanding beyond just Egypt (Ghanem 2016).

In the most recent decade, the Brotherhood has stood by democracy promotion efforts in the region, rejecting violence during uprisings. Wickham (2013) argued that members have become very involved in political life, encouraging debate and dialogue in the most traditional of forums. However, despite labeling themselves as a social and political movement, the Muslim Brotherhood was designated a terrorist organization under current President Abdel-Fattah El-Sisi. His administration as well as numerous Egyptian scholars have argued over the degree in which the Brotherhood's strict observance of sharia law can be reconciled with democratic governance, and whether the Brotherhood has truly made an effort to embrace these new values.

As the largest Islamist group in Egypt, their role in the transition is extremely important to whether democracy has been achieved. While the Brotherhood is chapter based with no real multinational body, they keep in touch and influence each other without being necessarily centralized (Jones 2012). However, not all of its members are fully embedded in its beliefs. Some are tied to the organization through ideology but all members and leaders due not have a synthesized opinion of what the Brotherhood stands for.

The Brotherhood has become an integral part of Egyptian life in some regions due to their reputation in local communities of providing basic services in health care and education (Jones 2012). The government's inability to provide these services, as well as with jobs to put money on the table, alienated many Egyptians during the years leading up to the uprising.

Providing for the basic needs of a society on a small scale is much easier than running a bureaucratic system of health care and national education, which is one of the criticisms of Islamist groups once they take power.

Because of the divide in ideology and history of being repressed under previous regimes, senior leadership was reluctant to join with other social movements in the push for a new government structure and preferred to engage in social outreach for its own programs (Clarke 2014, 387). A smaller sect of the Brotherhood thought it would benefit the organization to engage in politics through opposition and protest of the Mubarak regime. They began to reach out to the Kefaya movement at the outset, as well as with the 6 April Youth. These actions were not as accepted by more conservative leaders, but were allowed as long as they did not violate official positions (Tammam 2011).

At the time of Mubarak's exit from Egyptian politics, the Muslim Brotherhood was the most organized political group in Egypt. They were able to put forth a presidential candidate in the first democratic election in decades as well as run for assembly positions in 2012 once they were legalized as a political party (Pew 2014). Elected via popular election, Mohamed Morsi won Egypt's first presidential election since the uprising in 2012.

Instead of bringing together the various groups who participated in the 2011 protests, Morsi and his new administration made up of Muslim Brotherhood members pitted Islamists against non-Islamists in perhaps a way of getting back at years of oppression under Mubarak's rule. What should have been an open forum bringing in old and new allies as well as international observers from the UN or other international bodies was instead a closed conversation between other Islamist-aligned groups. He attempted to find a balance of military control by dismissing the then SCAF leader Mohamed Hussein Tantawi in August 2012 but

promising to give more privileges to the military in the constitution he was in the process of drafting. Yet, limits on political participation combined with the alienation of Egyptians from the political process angered labor unions and other parties that had participated in the protests.

The role of Islamic groups in the democratization process is perhaps the most important in all of the social movement groups. Reconciling Arab conservatism and liberal democratic values is the most difficult task that modern democratic transition literature tries to solve. Can Islam and its conservative base be merged with the liberal democratic principles that became the voice of reason during the Arab Spring?

B. Secular Political Opposition

Political opposition groups, made up of former members of political parties that were jailed or ousted under Mubarak, had been trying to challenge his regime throughout the 2000s. The culmination of their efforts was Kefaya, a collection of political leaders from a variety of ideologies created in 2003 (Clarke 2014, 384). During the months before the 2005 election, they organized a number of protests against Mubarak, garnering support from thousands of new followers (el-Mahdi 2009). However, Central Security soldiers often shut down their protests and they were not ultimately able to mobilize in a coherent way. Although Kefaya was one of many opposition groups, they stood out as the strongest.

Urdal (2006) argued that younger people are more prone to committing acts of political protest, especially ages 25-39. While this may seem like a high age bracket, it is the new entry-level age for those entering the labor market in the prime of their working years (Campante & Chor 2012, 179). A new generation of youth activists were inspired by the Kefaya, forming their own group called the 6 April Youth, named for an unsuccessful workers strike that they had tried

to lead (Maher 2014). Despite the failure, they stayed connected with Kefaya using social media, namely Facebook, and maintained relationships that would become part of the core of the 2011 protests.

Before that though, they organized a number of smaller campaigns with limited success. Collective action was difficult with internal rivalries, little devoted resources, and the lack of an established network outside of Cairo (Clarke 2014, 385). Three events stand out in 2009 and 2010 that were able to bring the opposition in and create a sustained movement. In 2010, Mohammed El-Baradei, the former director of the International Atomic Energy Agency, announced that he would run for president and push for full democratic reform. In creating the National Association for Change (NAC), he would bring together veteran leaders and those from the Kefaya movement (Clarke 2014, 385). The second event involved the murder of a young man in Alexandria at the hands of two crooked police officers. The group organized a series of protests in front of the Interior Ministry demanding an end to torturous tactics at the hands of the police (Ebab 2010). The third was the Parliamentary election in 2010 that had reported extensive fraud and in which most opposition parties boycotted the election.

C. Labor Unions

Labor in Egypt has had a historic place in Egyptian history. From 1998 to 2010, close to 4 million Egyptian workers participated in over 3,000 strikes and other collective protest actions (Beinin 2011, 191). They were independent from the formal political parties and opposition groups, having their own goals and interests related to worker's rights (Mady 2013).

In 2007, the Land Center for Human Rights published a study called "Protest in the Face of Savagery," a report that detailed hundreds of kinds of protests. In the following years, the

Center reported over 500 protests through 2009 and another 187 through December of 2010.

Besides protesting over low wages and the high prices of basic foods, many cited the failure of

reforms as a reason for the suffering of the greatest number of Egyptians, as in 2010, 25.2

percent of the population lived below the poverty line. This is a rise from the 21.6% in 2008 and

16.7 percent in 1999 (Central Agency for Mobilization and Statistics 2013).

Labor unions saw the uprising in Egypt as the perfect opportunity to organize further

beyond individual workplaces and industries. They formed a single union around a pervious 300

smaller unions called the Egyptian Federation of Independent Trade Unions (EFITU). Made up

of informal workers groups and NGOs dedicated to workers rights, this sector had long been a

part of Egyptian society, from medical technicians to teachers. In addition to the ETIFU being

formed, the Egyptian Democratic Labor Congress (EDLC) was also formed during the uprising

with a similar member base. Each has received recognition from international labor

organizations, promoting democracy within their own leadership. They advocated for substantive

democracy, and in February of 2011 adopted a statement of "Demands of the Workers in the

Revolution" saying,

> If this revolution does not lead to the fair distribution of wealth, it is not worth
> anything. Freedoms are not complete without social freedoms. The right to vote is
> naturally dependent on the right to a loaf of bread (Abu 'Ayta et al. 2011).

Unions have faced a number of obstacles in navigating post-uprising Egypt, particularly attacks

from the SCAF and Muslim Brotherhood. They are unable to exert strong influence in the

executive branch and have been met with resistance when trying to push for legal reforms

(Bishara 2014, 3). They have also encountered backlash following workers' strikes and protests.

The ETIFU are not to be confused, however, with the state-sponsored Egyptian Trade

Union Federation (ETUF) representing more than 3 million blue and white-collar workers

(Posusney 1997). The ETUF discouraged Egyptian workers from participating in protests, but workers nonetheless participated in strikes and protests nationwide. They were outraged—over the abuse of their bosses, torture by police and the Interior Ministries forces, corruption at all levels, unemployment, declining standards of living, and more. These concerns were brought together by the slogan used in Tahrir Square: "Bread, Freedom, Social Justice" (*al-'aysh, al hurriyya, al-'adala al-igtima'iyy*a) (Beinin 2012, 20).

With a monopoly over workers representation, they controlled legislation affecting union rights, especially regarding law no. 35 (1976) that bans the establishment of more than one union per industry. This means that independent unions cannot collect membership fees or be recognizing by employer administrations (Bishara 2014). The push for reform of these measures has been met with resistance, as neither the SCAF nor Morsi's government indicated that they would pass new trade union laws. The SCAF also decreed that protests that disrupt work were unlawful via Law 34 of 2011. The military government that came into power after the ouster of Morsi enacted more policies tied to union rights to organize and threatened jail for those who participated in strikes (Bishara 2014, 4). In the absence of the ability to remain independent, there have been divisions over personal differences and strategies within both the ETUF and ETIFU that have made it more difficult to exist and separately advance their goals.

Together, these three bodies were able to strategically influence Egyptian civil society and create a bond between disparate groups with the same underlying goals. However, the convergence of these networks was temporary. Following the Parliamentary elections, the three groups went back to being autonomous and once again limited their activities to the interests of their organizations. Even if they were ultimately unable to push for a successful transition, they were a pivotal force in overthrowing the Mubarak regime. There has been a need for some kind

of coalition or alliance to form the foundation for a successful democratic government like in

Tunisia.

Analysis

      The purpose of this study was to identify the factors that influence democratization and lend success to democratic transition. Having examined two case study chapters, Tunisia is clearly the country that has had a more successful transition to democracy. It is also clear that the ole of the military in the government transition process was the most influential in determining success. I will analyze why it is that this factor was the most influential while also touching on the other variables.

      The table below describes the presence of each variable and its relation to democracy. The first column identifies the independent variable, while the second identifies a specific component that can be measured. The third column describes what conditions exist that would lead to a more democratic system. Under the Tunisia and Egypt columns, the state of each independent variable is described on a scale fitting to each component.

Table 2: Independent Variables and Outcomes

Factors	Components	More successful transition would indicate:	**Tunisia**	**Egypt**
Role of the Military	Role of the military in political life before the uprising	No role in political life	Weak role	Historical role, very involved
	Role of the military during the uprising	Defected against the regime	Defected, helped with ouster	Defected, helped with ouster
	Role of the military today	Not involved in political life	Not involved	Very involved
Economic Conditions	Inter-group inequality	High group inequality	High group inequality	High group inequality
	Fiscal liberalization	Introduction of fiscal reforms	Introduction, but little progress	None
Social movements	Structure	Organized	Yes	No
		Formal	Yes	Yes
	Collective Identity	Forged an alliance that remained through state building	Alliance remained	Alliance dissolved

Role of the Military

H1: *If the division between the military and government is clear, the country is more likely to successfully transition to a democracy.*

The defection of the Tunisian military and their separation from political life is what ultimately led to Ben Ali's fall and civil military relations today, having a cross over effect on the success of Tunisia's transition to democracy.

When Ben Ali realized how serious the protests were becoming in 2011, his final attempt at restoring order was to deploy the army into the streets of Tunis. As they had never acted as domestic security actors, the military was more than reluctant to use force against the protestors. By limiting the roles of military leaders in state institutions, keeping the defense budget to the smallest marginal degree, and not giving the military generally suitable resources compared to

other militaries throughout the region, military leaders had nothing to lose by choosing to not support Ben Ali. They were not a risk of further penalty or restrictions to power by turning from ambivalence to supporting the protests, as they had already been marginalized and did not rely on his regime to remain operational. Because the Tunisian military had little to gain from defending such an oppressive leader, it positioned itself in a way that allowed the revolution to continue and the transition to democracy to begin without interference.

In Egypt, the military had been becoming dissatisfied with Mubarak and did not initially stand in the way of the uprising. They sought solely to keep order and urged protestors to go home for safety reasons. All participation by military members was to ensure their own legitimacy among the Egyptian people, not to back Mubarak's regime as he scrambled to hold onto power. They remained highly trusted by the Egyptian people, being an institutionalized force and having a historical legacy of rule, and when the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces (SCAF) took control of the state, citizens were ready for what they thought would be a quick transition to democracy.

Another factor that came into play for both countries was the president's own separate security forces. In Tunisia, Ben Ali called upon the police to use force from the beginning, using some live ammunition, but mostly tear gas and beatings to dispel protestors (Amnesty International 2011). However, they were not strong enough as a police force to contain the volume of people that participated in the uprising. The Interior Ministry was simply not prepared for the scale of the protests, ultimately not partaking in the uprisings as a suppressive force. Egypt's "deep state," their own Interior Ministry, was not as involved in the uprising. Its structure is similar to Tunisia's, made up of the National Guard and police force, but also has the backing of a number of national intelligence services that were used to help the police. While

they did not have as much of a documented presence during the uprising, they have certainly

played a role in the state-building process during the transition.

The role of the military moving forward in the democratization process is the second

crucial element that separates Tunisia from Egypt. Egypt's "deep state" has remained a large part

of the governing body, less willing to let go of power in the transition that followed the uprising.

A referendum was passed in March of 2011 that set up term limits and other standard state

policies, set up by the SCAF (Londono & Fadel 2012). The first cycle of parliamentary elections

in November 2011 put the Muslim Brotherhood in the majority, but soon after, the Supreme

Constitutional Court declared them invalid. When Morsi won the election in the days following,

his parliamentary backing was thus nonexistent. The SCAF had already given itself absolute

authority, thus at the outset of Morsi's win, the "deep state" had began the process to undermine

his rule (Hubbard & Kirkpatrick 2013).

When the military retook control of the government in 2013, President el-Sisi claimed

that the military did not intend to have a lasting political role. However, the question of when the

next election will be held or even what it will look like has yet to be answered, causing skeptics

to wonder if military rule will persist and if the road to democratization has ended. When you

add in the fact that the military largely still has vested economic interests, there seems to be little

motivation for them to change much of anything. The military and its role in the democratization

process is what had halted any movement towards a free and fair society in Egypt.

While Egypt was scrambling after Morsi's removal, Tunisia was preparing for its first

democratic presidential election. A commission was given the task of outlining the next steps for

Tunisia, choosing to have popular elections for members of the Constitutional Assembly, those

who would write and approve a new Constitution (Stepan 2012, 92). The military did not

participate in the formation of the newest Constitution, but had supported the interim government without taking an official position. If they had been as involved as the Egyptian military in the formation of the new government structure, it is likely that Tunisia too would have been delayed in having a presidential election and more conflict would have arisen.

They key takeaway from this variable is that civil-military relations under an autocratic regime are key to understanding whether military forces will defect or protect a leader to keep him in power. Fortunately for Tunisians, Ben Ali's military benefited marginally less if had tried to defend the regime, and acted in a way that let the democratic transition run its course. For these reasons, I can conclude that *if the division between the military and government is clear, a country is more likely to successfully transition to a democracy.*

Economic Conditions

H2*: Countries that have high inter-group inequality of economic conditions leading up to a transition are more likely to successfully transition to a democracy.*

While income inequality was not found to have significant influence on the success of democratization, high inter-group inequality was persistent in both Tunisia and Egypt and seems to be a factor in democratization. Grievances against the lack of equality in the distribution of resources and access to public services that were voiced during the uprising needed to be answered and people hoped that democracy would be the response. In Tunisia, dissatisfaction had amounted to protest, being the main call to arms for many who participated in the uprisings. The lack of substantial jobs and employment opportunities following an increase in education in the region led to the push for a democratic system and one that would solve their economic problems. In Egypt, unemployment was also a major issue. While there were and are a large

number of jobs being offered in the unregulated, unstandardized informal sector, they are not conducive with the education level of those who take them.

The Gallup World Poll data showed that there were similar levels of dissatisfaction with basic services and standards of living in both countries and continue to be, 5.17 and 4.88 on the ten-point scale in Tunisia and Egypt respectively. Indirectly, inequality of standards of living is enough to push people to want democracy and influence public opinion of the economy.

Since intergroup inequality was present in both cases and at similar levels according to, it is difficult to maintain that its existence leads to a more successful transition. In Tunisia, inequality was based more on the lack of jobs in general, not simply well paying ones. Conditions have also not shown substantial improvement under transitional governments, despite some changes in finance leadership. In Egypt, the military SCAF government failed to follow through on promises to create more public sector jobs and let public services and infrastructure deteriorate following Mubarak's exit. While there was intergroup inequality in both cases, it is not a determinant of the success of a democratic transition.

H3: Countries that introduce fiscal reform policies early in the transition period are more likely to successfully transition to a democracy.

Tunisia's government attempted to address the issues that plagued the years leading up to the popular uprising, but held back on passing legislation, favoring waiting on a president to create comprehensive reform. High unemployment of educated young people was one of the main complaints during the uprising, as the economy has generally created low-skilled jobs that highly educated Tunisians are made to take. Efforts to address socioeconomic grievances have been undermined by perceptions of security. Attacks on tourists visiting Tunisia's famous

beaches have discouraged tourism, affecting the livelihood of those involved in that sector as well as the oil and gas industries (transportation).

Egypt has had no push for reform in recent years. Under the SCAF government, economic improvement was second to state stability. Under Morsi, the economy remained relatively unchanged, even worsening by some measures (Kienle 2015). He kept promising to create new jobs in the public sector as well as increase funding for public investment in infrastructure, but it was curtailed by increases in sales tax and subsidy cuts (Al-Masry al-yawm 2013). Yet, Egypt's economy grew despite the absence of a regulatory system or any kind of effort to be transparent in its institutions. Conditions remain poor in this regard, as a lack of transparency means that business owners can give employment to their relatives or to those who can help them bypass regulations. The lack of equality in the little reform that has been made in Egypt goes against the very problems that those who stood in Tahrir Square had hoped to change.

By not attempting to explicitly address the socio-economic grievances that led to the uprisings, proposed policies backed by nothing but ambiguity were doomed to fail in Egypt. Reform is more difficult when you consider current President El-Sisi's stake in the economy, as his military officials have little to gain and much to lose from any kind of reform agenda. The lack of substantial reform stands in the way of Egyptian democracy when you consider that the policies implemented since military intervention have continued to cater only to those whose support matters.

While economic reform measures in Tunisia have not yet had a change to prove successful or unsuccessful, their existence and importance to President Essebsi's government is what makes Tunisia more successful than Egypt. President El-Sisi's government and officials in

Egypt have interests so intertwined with the state's economy that suggesting any sort of change is much more slow moving than in Tunisia. This contributes to their stagnation in moving towards a free and equal democracy, enough to prove that *countries that introduce fiscal reform policies early in the transition period are more likely to successfully transition to a democracy.*

Social Movements

H4: The presence of organized and formal social movements makes a country more likely to successfully transition to a democracy.

The role of labor unions in Tunisia's transition is another one of the key reasons that it is acknowledged as the strongest democracy in the region. Protests were facilitated by a combination of the UGTT, political opposition groups, and other smaller Islamist and union groups. The UGTT itself facilitated a strike that was a major force in Ben Ali's final departure, playing a pivotal role in extending the protest to all parts of Tunisia. This stands in contrast to just a few years earlier, when in the mining region of Gafsa, miners revolted after their jobs were handed off to a string of regime-connected individuals (Angrist 2013). The difference this time was the mobilization of the group, coming together in an organized way to advocate for the Tunisian people (Marzouki 2011). Thanks to the expansion of social networking and television, the movement went from just a labor movement to disputing the regime itself.

While the Egyptian labor movement was fragmented and lacked substantial control over labor organizations, Tunisia's labor unions were active in pursuing political goals by mitigating conflict and helping to move along the democratization process. Thus, I conclude that *the presence of organized and formal social movements makes a country more likely to successfully transition to a democracy.*

The difference in Egypt is that the social movements present during the uprising were disjunctive. Each group had its own rules and institutionalization, and although they came together to protest in 2011, they did not sustain a network throughout the transition period. While some Muslim Brotherhood junior members attempted to broker cooperation between the various groups, a coalition was not formed like in Tunisia. Older members were reluctant to join in with other social movements due to lack of real incentive. Kefaya, a political opposition group that had been active during Mubarak's regime, sponsored smaller protests that did not gain traction, but were still notable under the oppressive government. Labor unions in Egypt had not had a historical role of being prominent protest actors, but did organize to form a Federation of Independent Trade Unions (EFITU) in 2011. Together, the Muslim Brotherhood, small political opposition groups, and labor unions formed a temporary coalition to ouster Mubarak. Perhaps if they had remained converged and not returned to autonomy, a triadic parliament system could have been formed that would have transitioned to a successful to democracy, similar to Tunisia. Thus, *countries that have social movements who are able to establish and keep collective identities make a country more likely to successfully transition to a democracy.*

Dependent Variable

The time that has elapsed since the Arab Spring makes it difficult to determine how democracy has changed in Tunisia and Egypt. An even shorter amount of time has passed since the first elections. I will try to examine how the various factors discussed have affected democracy by presenting the Freedom in the World index by Freedom House. Based on two categories, political rights and civil liberties, a ranking is given from 1 (best) to 7 (worst) and the average of the scores is calculated to determine whether a country is: "free" = score between 1.0 and 2.5, "partly- free"= score between 3.0 and 5.0, and "not free" = score between 5.5 and 7.0.

The first score in each set is of political rights, while the second is for civil liberties. The gray boxes highlight scores that indicate a "not free" rating, the yellow boxes highlight a "partly free" rating, and the green box indicates a "free" rating.

Table 3: Freedom House Scores, 2010-2017

Countries/Years	2010	2011	2013	2014	2017
Egypt	6, 5	6, 5	5, 5	6, 5	6, 5
Tunisia	7, 5	7, 5	3, 4	3, 3	1, 3

An examination of the scores of Tunisia and Egypt produces interesting findings. As expected, both scores have improved after the uprisings. Even more interesting is how Egypt's score went unchanged until a rise in political rights in 2013. Although the election of Morsi was in the summer for 2012, it is possible that this score is indicative of the first presidential election that Egypt had. People felt as though they were having their voices hear for the first time being able to participate and vote in an election that was free and fair. However, it returned to its former score after the ousting of President Morsi when the military retook power under President el-Sisi.

Tunisia as the most successful case has gone from being "not free" to "free" since 2011. The most recent Tunisia data indicates that the political rights score indicative of a "partly free" rating while the civil liberties score indicates being "free," so it is on its way to being considered fully free (Freedom House still gave Tunisia a "free" rating in 2017). Tunisia began with a higher score for both measures, indicating less freedom, and became freer than Egypt has been since 2010. Where there was significant improvement for Tunisia, the ranking for political rights

improved more than that of civil liberties. This can be explained by the lack of time that has passed, as the political process can be easily changed (free elections that are competitive) while changes in civil liberties and perceptions of rights are much slower (Kenig 2013).

Has the Arab Spring caused democratization in Tunisia and Egypt? It seems that for Egypt, the outcome remains uncertain in the midst of a military run government. The transition of states from authoritarian regimes to secular regimes is faced with the challenge of time and the question of whether increased democratization will lead to economic prosperity. Despite Tunisia being the stronger democracy (free and fair elections, presence of opposition parties, regular transfers of power), it is still plagued by many of the same economic issues that caused the uprising. More needs to be done to ensure the prosperity and conservation of Tunisia's accomplishments and Egypt should continue to look upon Tunisia as a model.

Conclusion

While the Middle East region was not new to protests and demonstrations, the Arab Spring was a different phenomenon. Six years after the Arab Spring, scholars still posit reasons for why some countries were more successful in democratizing than others. Even if it was considered the "fourth wave" of democratization, only Tunisia came out as a successful democracy. Conflict is rampant in Syria, a failed state exists in Libya, and authoritarianism has returned to Egypt. Yet, the varying trajectories of each country that underwent an uprising were not needed to explain the Arab Spring. Their individual differences are what led to differing outcomes, as explained by this thesis. We cannot understand a country's democratization process without knowing the embedded institutions and structures that make Arab Spring countries what they are, broadening the view that the Arab Spring uprisings were one singular movement.

The purpose of this thesis was to examine and analyze the factors that can contribute to successful transitions to democracies, comparing the two cases that initiating the global conversation about a fourth wave of democratization: Tunisia and Egypt. The two cases present different outcomes for transitions that began with the same motivations and circumstances. Tunisia's progress is in its path to democratization has the most to do with the role of the Tunisian military, the ability of coalitions to form and remain strong, and the government's willingness to partake in economic reforms. The cooperation between Islamist groups and secularists has had a major impact on the predictions for other Middle Eastern countries and has stood as a model for the future of democracy in the MENA region. Egypt's democratic transition has stalled since the military once again took power. Tensions still exist between the Muslim Brotherhood and the military, as both disagree with the direction that Egypt should take moving

forward. Yet, the military shows no signs of giving up power in the near future, causing concern for Egyptians and the international community.

Both countries are at critical points in their democratic transitions, which are far from over. While Tunisia has reached a level of cooperation between its various groups, economic issues are still prevalent and terrorism has causes societal unrest. In order to develop further, it will have to continue pushing for economic reforms while monitoring the extremist threats from groups like the Salafi Jihadists. Egypt will have to address the current role of the military and its roots in the economy, as well as the lack of substantial economic reform under the current regime. The factors of the role of the military in politics, how economic reform can ensure democratization, and the cooperation of Islamist and secularist groups create new implications about the ability of Muslim countries to democratize.

References

"15 Egypt Army Officers Join Protesters." 2011. *Reuters*, 11 February.

Abdel-Razek, Sherine. 2011. "Not Good Enough." *al Ahram Weekly*, 16–22 June.

Acemoglu, Daron, and James Robinson. 2006. *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy.* New York City: Cambridge University Press.

Aclimandos, Tewfik. 2011. "Egyptian Army: Defining a New Political and Societal Pact" *Aljazeera*, 24 February.

Al-Arian, Abdullah. 2014. "Islamist Movements and the Arab Spring," in *Beyond the Arab Spring*, ed. Mehran Kamrava. London: Hurst & Company Publishers.

Alexander, Christopher. 1997. "Back from the Democratic Brink: Authoritarianism an Civil Society in Tunisia." *Middle East Report* 205 (Oct.-Dec.): 34-8.

Almond, Gabriel and Sidney Verba. 1963. *The Civic Culture.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Amara, Tarek and Patrick Markey. 2016. "Tunisia PM Pushes Broad Reform Package, Talks With Unions." *Reuters,* 30 September.

Ammous, Saifedean, and Edmund Phelps. 2011. "Tunisians Set Off on the Road from Serfdom." Financial Times, January 24.

Amnesty International. 2010. "Tunisia Urged to End Subversion of Groups Critical of the Authorities." 12 July.

Anckar, Dag. 2008. "Microstate Democracy Revisited: Developments In Time and Space." *The Open Political Science Journal* 1: 75-83.

Anderson, Lisa. 2011. "Demystifying the Arab Spring: Parsing the Differences Between Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya." *Foreign Affairs* 90 (3): 2-7.

Angrist, Michele P. 2013. "Understanding the Success of Mass Civic Protest in Tunisia." *The Middle East Journal* 67 (4): 546-64.

Ansell, Ben and David Samuels. 2010. Inequality and Democratization: A Contractarian Approach." *Comparative Political Studied* 43 (12): 1543-74.

Arampatzi, Efstratia, Martijn Burger, Elena Ianchovichina, Tina Röhricht, and Ruut Veenhoven. 2015. "Unhappy Development: Dissatisfaction with Life in the Wake of the Arab Spring." Paper prepared for the IARIW-CAPMAS Special Conference

"Experiences and Challenges in Measuring Income, Wealth, Poverty and   Inequality in the Middle East and North Africa" in Cairo, Egypt.

Arieff, Alexis. 2011. "Political Transition in Tunisia." *U.S. Congressional Research Service. RS21666.*

"Army Pledges No Use of Force during Tuesday's Protests." 2011. *Almasry/Alyoum*,   31 January.

Beinin, Joel. 2010. "Egyptian Workers Demand A Living Wage." *Foreign Policy*, 12 May.

Beinin, Joel. 2011. "A Worker's Social Movement on the Margin of the Global Neoliberal Order, Egypt 2004-2009." In Joel Beinin and Frédéric Vairel, (eds.) *Social Movements, Mobilization, and Contestation in the Middle East and North Africa.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Beinin, Joel. 2012. "The Rise of Egypt's Workers." *Carnegie Endowment for Inernational Peace*, June.

Bellin, Eva. 2004. ''The Robustness of Authoritarianism in the Middle East: Exceptionalism in Comparative Perspective.'' *Comparative Politics* 36 (2): 139-57.

Bell, Jaqueline. 2009. "Audit of USAID/Egypt's Democracy and Governance Activities." *USAID.*

Berman, Sheri. 2007. "How Democracies Emerge: Lessons from Europe." *Journal of Democracy* 18(1): 28-41

Bermeo, Nancy. 1997. "Myths of Moderation: Confrontation and Conflict During Democratic Transitions." *Comparative Politics* 29(3): 305-22.

Birnbaum, Michael. 2012. "Egypt's President Morsi Takes Sweeping New Powers," *The Washington Post*, 22 November.

Bishara, Dina. 2014. "Labor Movements In Tunisia And Egypt: Drivers Vs. Objects Of Change In Transition From Authoritarian Rule" *Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik,* Berlin.

Boix, Carles. 2003. *Democracy and Redistribution*. New York City: Cambridge University Press.

Bollier, Sam. 2011. "Who are Tunisia's political parties?" *AlJazeera* 27 October.

Bowles, Samuel. 1991. "What Markets Can—and Cannot-- Do." *Challenge* (July-August): 11-16.

Bratton, Michael, and Nicolas van de Walle. 1997. *Democratic Experiments in Africa: Regime Transitions in Comparative Perspective.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Briki, Raouia. 2016. "Notes on Tunisia's New National Unity Government." *Project on Middle East Democracy*, 31 August.

Brownlee, Jason. 2007. *Authoritarianism in an Age of Democratization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Campante, Filipe R. and Davin Chor. 2012. "Why was the Arab World Poised for Revolution? Schooling, Economic Opportunities, and the Arab Spring." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 26 (2): 167-88.

Cantril, Hadley. 1965. *Pattern of Human Concerns*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University

Casper, Gretchen and Michelle M. Taylor. 1996. *Negotiating Democracy* Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Cassidy, John. 2011. "Prophet Motive." The New Yorker, February 28.

Central Agency For Mobilization And Statistics. 2013. "Egypt: Arab Republic Of Egypt." *Central Agency For Public Mobilization And Statistics.*

Cook, Steven A. 2011. "The Calculations of Tunisia's Military." *Foreign Policy*, 20 January.

Cortona, Pietro Grilli. 1991. "From Communism to Democracy: Rethinking Regime Change in Hungary and Czechoslovakia." *International Social Science Journal* 43(2): 316.

 "Country Report on Human Rights Practices." 2007. *Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor*.

Dahl, Robert A. 1973 [1971]. *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Dahl, Robert A. 1998. *On Democracy.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Dahl, Robert A. and Charles Lindbloom 1953. *Politics, Economics and Welfare.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dalton, Russell J. 1988. *Citizen Politics in Western Democracies*. Chatham: Chatham House.

Dalton, Russell J. 2004. *Democratic Challenges, Democratic Choices.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Denk, Thomas and Daniel Silander. 2012. "Problems In Paradise? Challenges To Future Democratization In Democratic States." *Institutional Political Science Review* 33 (1): 25-40.

Devarajan, Shantayanan and Lili Mottaghi. 2015. "Towards A New Social Contract." *MENA Economic Monitor*, The World Bank.

Dewey, John. 1916. Democracy and Education. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Deyo, Frederic C. 1987. *The Political Economy of the New Asian Industrialism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Diamond, Larry. 1992. "Promoting Democracy." *Foreign Policy* 87: 25-46.

Diamond, Lary, Seymour Martin Lipset and Juan José Linz. 1990. *Politics in Developing Countries.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Di Palma, Giuseppe. 1990. *To Craft Democracies: An Essay on Democratic Transition.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Doyle, Michael W. and Nicholas Sambanis. 2006. *Making War and Building Peace: United Nations Peace Operations.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Egyptian Armed Forces. 2011. "Communique´ No. 2." 2 February.

Ehab, John. 2010. "ElBaradei Leads Anti-Torture Rally." *Al-Jazeera*, 26 June.

el Sharnoubi, Osman. 2012. "Tunisia Opposition Fear Ennahda Power Grab." *Ahram Online,* 17 January.

el-Mahdi, Rabab. 2009 "Enough! Egypt's Quest for Democracy." *Comparative Political Studies*, 42 (August): 1011–39.

Erdle, Steffan. 'Tunisia: Economic Transformation and Political Restoration." In *Arab Elites: Negotiating The Politics Of Change,* edited by Volker Perthes. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishing.

Erdle, Steffan. 2010. *Ben Ali's 'New Tunisia' (1987–2009): A Case Study of Authoritarian Modernization in the Arab World*. Berlin: Klaus Schwartz.

Ezzat, Ashraf. 2011. "Muslim Brotherhood Breaking Free of Nasser's Long Ban on the Group." *Veterans Today: Military and Foreign Affairs Journal*, March.

Fortna, Virginia P. 2009 "Where Have All the Victories Cone? Peacekeeping and War Outcomes in Historical Perspective." Prepared for the Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Toronto, Canada.

Foweraker, Joe & Todd Landman. 1997. *Citizenship Rights and Social Movements.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Freedom House. 2017. "Freedom in the World Report: Methodology Section." *Freedom   House*.

Geddes, Barbara. 2005. "Why Parties and Elections in Authoritarian Regimes?"   Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association,   Washington, DC.

Ghanem, Hafez. 2016. "Spring, but No Flowers." In *The Arab Spring Five Years Later: Toward Great Inclusiveness*. Brookings Institution Press.

Gibson, James L. 2001. "Social Networks, Civil Society and the Prospects for   Consolidating Russia's Democratic Transition." *American Journal of Political   Science* 45(1): 51–69.

Giugni, Marco G. 1998. "Was it Worth the Effort? The Outcomes and Consequences of   Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 371-93.

Glenn, John K. 2003. "Contentious Politics and Democratization: Comparing the Impact of Social Movements on the Fall of Communism in Eastern Europe." *Political   Studies* 51: 103-20.

Goldstein, Eric. 2011. "Dismantling the Machinery of Oppression." *Wall Street Journal*, 16 Feb.

Gurses, Mehmet and David Mason. 2008." Democracy Out Of Anarchy: The Prospects   For Post-Civil-War Democracy." *Social Science Quarterly* 89 (2): 315-36

Hadenius, Azel and Jan Teorell. 2005. "Cultural and Economic Prerequisites of   Democracy: Reassessing Recent Evidence." *Studies in Comparative International   Development* 39: 87–106.

Hawthorne, Amy. 2016. "Rethinking U.S. Aid to Egypt." *Project on Middle East Democracy*.

Hegre, Hâvard, Tanja Ellingsen, Scott Gates and Nils Petter Gleditsch. 2001. "Toward A Democratic Civil Peace? Democracy, Political Change, and Civil War, 1816-   1992." *American Political Science Review* 95(1): 33-48.

Henry, Clement H. and Robert Springborg. 2011. "The Tunisian Army: Defending The Beachhead Of Democracy In The Arab World." *Huffington Post*, 26 January.

Hofferbert, Richard I. and Hans-Dieter Klingemann. 1999. "Remembering the Bad Old   Days: Human Rights, Economic Conditions and Democratic Performance in   Transitional Regimes." *European Journal of Political Research* 36(1): 155–74.

Huang, Reyko. 2008. *From War to Democratic Peace? Democratization After Civil War, 1945-1999.* Unpublished Manuscript, Department of Political Science, Columbia University.

Huntington, Samuel. 1968. *Political Order in Changing Societies.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Huntington, Samuel. 1981. *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil–Military Relations.* Cambridge: Belknap Press.

Hussein, Abdel-Rahman. 2012. "Egyptian Assembly Passes Draft Constitution Despite Protests." *The Guardian*, 30 November.

Ianchovichina, Elena, Lili Mottaghi and Shantayanan Devarajan. 2015. "Inequality, Uprisings, and Conflict in the Arab World." *Middle East and North Africa Economic Monitor.* Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Inglehart, Ronald. 1997. *Modernization and Postmodernization.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, Ronald and Christian Welzel. 2005. *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

International Crisis Group. 2011. "Popular Protest in North Africa and the Middle East: Egypt Victorious?" *Middle East/North Africa Report*.

International Crisis Group ICG. 2011. "Soulèvements Populaires en Afrique du Nord et au Moyen-Orient (IV): La Voie Tunisienne" ["Popular Uprisings in North Africa   and the Middle East (IV): The Tunisian Way"] Rapport Moyen-Orient/Afrique   du Nord [Middle East/North Africa Report].

International Republican Institute. 2016. "Tunisians Believe Country Is Headed in Wrong Direction; Pessimistic on Economy, Concerned over Terrorism." *Center for Insights in Survey Research,* 13 January.

Karl, Terry L. & Phillipe Schmitter. 1991. "Modes of Transition in Latin America, Southern and Eastern Europe." *International Social Science Journal* 128: 269–84.

Kaufman, Robert R. 2009. "The Political Effects of Inequality in Latin America: Some Inconvenient Facts." Comparative Politics 41 (3): 359-7.

Kenig, Ofer. 2013. "Has the Arab Spring Led to Democracy? A Study of Two   Comparative Idices." *The Israel Democratic Institute,* 9 July.

Kennedy, Ryan. 2010. "The Contradiction of Modernization: A Conditional Model of
        Endogenous Democratization." *Journal of Politics* 72(3): 785-98.

King, Stephen J. 2011. "Remarks on the Socio-Economic Causes of the Uprising."
        Presented at the "The Breakdown of Autocracy in Tunisia" Conference.   Washington,
        DC., 9 February.

Kirkpatrick, David D. 2011. "Chief of Tunisian Army Pledges Support for the   Revolution."
The New York Times, 24 January.

Kuznets, Simon. 1955. "Economic growth and income inequality." *American Economic   Review*
45: 1-28.

Land Center For Human Rights. 2007. "Protest In The Face Of Savagery." *Economic and
        Social Rights Series.*

Landolt, Laura K. and Paul Kubicek. 2014. "Opportunities And Constraints: Comparing   Tunisia
And Egypt To The Coloured Revolutions." *Democratization* 21 (6): 984-   1006.

Lee, Terrence. 2009. ''The Armed Forces and Transitions from Authoritarian Rule
        Explaining the Role of the Military in 1986 Philippines and 1998 Indonesia.''
        Comparative Political Studies 42 (5): 640-69.

Levitsky, Steven, and Lucan A. Way. 2010. *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes
        after the Cold War.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Linz, Juan J.. & Alfred Stepan. 1996. *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation:
        Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe.* Baltimore: Johns
        Hopkins University Press.

Lipset, Seymour. 1960. Political Man: The Social Basis of Modern Politics, New York:
        Doubleday

Lynch, Marc. 2012. *The Arab Uprising: The Unfinished Revolutions of the New Middle East.*
        New York: Public Affairs.

Mady, Abdel-Fattah. 2013. "Discontent Revolution and Democratization in Egypt in a
        Globalizing World." *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 20 (1): 313-37.

Maher, Ahmed. 2014. "What Really Happened To The Egyptian Revolution." *The
        Washington Post*, 4 June.

Mansfield, Edward D & Jack Snyder. 1995a. "Democratization and The Danger Of   War."
        International Security 20(1): 5-38.

Mansfield, Edward D. & Jack Snyder. 1995b. "Democratization and War." *Foreign Affairs*
        74(3): 79-98.

Mansfield, Edward D. & Jack Snyder. 2002. "Democratic Transitions, Institutional
        Strength, and War." *International Organization* 56(2): 297-337.

Mansfield, Edward D & Jack Snyder. 2005. *Electing to Fight: Why Emerging Democracies*
         Go to War. Cambridge: MIT Press.

McAdam, Doug. 1999. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970.*
        Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald. 1996. *Comparative Perspectives*
        On Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, And Cultural
        *Framings.*Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mietzner, Marcus. 2014. "Successful and Failed Democratic Transitions From Military   Rule in
Majority Muslim Societies: The Cases of Indonesia and Egypt."   *Contemporary Politics* 20(4):
435-52.

''Military Calls Egyptian People's Demands 'Legitimate'." 2011. *AFP*, 31 January.

Miller, Michael K. 2012. "Economic Development, Violent Leader Removal, and
        Democratization." *American Journal of Political Science* 56 (4): 1002-20.

Moore, Barrington Jr. 1966. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. Beacon Press.

Mouffe, Chantal. 2009. *The Democratic Paradox*. Lonton: Verso.

Muller, Edward N. 1995. "Economic Determinants of Democracy." A*merican Sociological*
        Review 60 (6): 966–82.

Muller, Edward N. and Mitchell A. Seligson. 1994. "Civic Culture and Democracy."
        American Political Science Review 88(3): 635–52.

 Munck, Gerardo L. 1994. "Democratic Stability and Its Limits: An Analysis of Chile's   1993
Elections." *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 36: 1-38.

Munck, Gerardo L. and Carol Skalnik Leff. 1997. "Modes of Transition and
        Democratization: South American and Eastern Europe in Comparative   Perspective."
Comparative Politics 29: 201-362.

Nepstad, Sharon E. 2011. *Nonviolent Revolutions: Civil Resistance in the Late 20th Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Newton, Kenneth. 2001. "Trust, Social Capital, Civil Society and Democracy." *International Political Science Review* 22(2): 201–14.

Norris, Pippa. 2003. *Democratic Phoenix.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nowar, Nesma. 2011. "Restraining Unemployment." *al Ahram Weekly,* 2–8 June.

O'Donnell, Guillermo, and Philippe Schmitter. 1986. "Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies." In O'Donnell et al., eds., Transitions from Authoritarian Rule, Part 4: 1- 78.

O'Donnell, Guillermo, Philippe Schmitter, and Laurence Whitehead, eds. 1986. Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Prospects for Democracy. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Olson, Mancur. 1993. "Dictatorship, Democracy, and Development." *American Political Science Review* 87 (3): 567-76.

"One year after Morsi's ouster, divides persist on El-Sisi, Muslim Brotherhood." 2014. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center.

Oppenheimer, Franz. 1907 (1990). *Der Staat. Eine soziologische Studie,* Berlin: Liber tad Verlag.

Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development. 2009. "Ownership Structures in MENA Countries: List Companies, State-Owned, Family Enterprises and Some Policy Implications," Paris, France: OECD.

Pion-Berlin, David, Diego Esparza and Kevin Grisham. 2014. ''Staying Quartered: Civilian Uprisings and Military Disobedience in the Twenty-first Century.'' *Comparative Political Studies* 47 (2): 230-59.

Putnam, Robert D. 1993. *Making Democracy Work.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ranis, Peter. 2010. "Argentine Worker Cooperatives in Civil Society: A Challenge to Capital-Labor Relations." *WorkingUSA*, 13(1): 77–105.

Rosenstone, Steven J., and John M. Hansen. 1993. Mobilization, Participation and Democracy in America. New York: MacMillan.

Rose, Richard. 2001. "A Divergent Europe." *Journal of Democracy* 12(1): 93–106.

Rustow, Dankwart A. 1970. "Transitions to Democracy: Toward a Dynamic Model."
    Comparative Politics 2(3): 337-63.

Sambanis, Nicholas. 2000. "Partition as a Solution to Ethnic War: An Empirical Critique of the
Theoretical Literature." *World Politics* 52 (4): 437-83.

Shin, Doh C. 1995. "The Quality of Mass Support for Democratization." *Social Indicators
    Research* 35 (3): 239-53.

Smith, Benjamin. 2005. "Life of the Party: The Origins of Regime Breakdown and
    Persistence   under Single-Party Rule." *World Politics* 57: 421-51.

Soueif, Ahdaf. 2014. *Cairo: Memoir of a City Transformed*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Springborg, Robert. 2011. "The Political Economy of the Arab Spring." *Mediterranean
    Politics* 16(3): 427-33,

Stier, Ken. 2011. ''Egypt's Military-Industrial Complex.'' *The Times*, 2 September 2

Stradiotto, Gary A. and Sujian Guo. 2010. "Transitional Modes of Democratization and
    Democratic Outcomes." *International Journal on World Peace* 27 (4): 5-40.

Tammam, Hossam. 2011. "Back to the Future." *Al-Ahram Weekly*, 29 October- 4 November.

Taylor, William C. 2014. "The Tunisian Military's 'Ambitious Support' of the Arab
    Awakening." In *Military Responses to the Arab Uprisings and the Future of Civil-
    Military Relations in the Middle East*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

''The Army's Side of the Story.'' 2011. *Al Ahram Weekly*, 14-20 April.

Trofimov, Yaroslav. 2009. "Muslim Brotherhood Falters as Egypt Outflanks Islamists."
The Wall Street Journal, May.

Valenzuela, Samuel J. 1995. "Democratic Consolidation in Post-Transitional Settings:
    Notion, Process, and Facilitating Conditions," in *Between States: Interim   Governments
and Democratic Transitions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Verba, Sidney, and Norman H. Nie. 1987. Participation in America: Political Democracy and
Social Equality. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press

Walberg, Eric. 2011. "A Force to Move Mountains." *al Ahram Weekly*, 7–13 July.

Wang, Marian. 2011. ''Egypt's Post-Mubarak: Key Facts on the Military's Long-Standing
    Role.'' *Pro Publica*, 11 February.

Way, Lucan A. 2005. "Authoritarian State Building and the Sources of Regime
      Competitiveness in the Fourth Wave: The Cases of Belarus, Moldova, Russia, and
      Ukraine." *World Politics* 57: 231-61.

Welzel, Christian. 2006. "Democratization As An Emancipative Process: The Neglected Role
Of Mass Motivations." *European Journal of Political Research* 45: 871-96.

Wickham, Carrie Rosefsky. 2011. "The Muslim Brotherhood and Democratic Transition in
Egypt." Mid*dle East Law and Governance* 3: 204–33.

Wood, Elizabeth Jean. 2001. "An Insurgent Path to Democracy. " *Comparative Political Studies*
34(8): 862-88.

World Bank. 2004. "Unlocking the Employment Potential in the Middle East and North   Africa
– Towards a New Social Contract." Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Young, Marion. 2000. *Inclusion and Democracy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.