The same critical juncture, different results

A comparative study of Egypt and Tunisia after the Arab uprisings in 2011

Bachelor thesis by Lies Lelij

Leiden University

(BA) Political Science - International Relations and Organizations

Supervisor: Dr. F. de Zwart

Word count: 8366

Table of content

1. INTRODUCTION

On December 17 2010, the Tunisian fruit seller Mohammed Bouazizi set himself on fire. His self-immolation was a desperate reaction to the structural harassment of the Tunisian officials. His action caused a chain of events in the Arab world first known as the Arab Spring and later as the Arab Uprising. There were mass demonstrations all over the region. People demanded bread, jobs, dignity, and even more important "it was cry for accountability, for political freedom, freedom of expression, and freedom of assembly" (Butenschøn, 2015, p. 125). In both countries they demanded the resignation of the oppressors to become more prosperous and inclusive. Only Tunisia succeeded in becoming so, which is seen as one of the rare successes of the Arab Spring. Egypt on the other hand, after a brief period of democratic rule, returned to a more oppressive authoritarian rule than the period before (Hamzawy, 2017). In this bachelor dissertation an attempt will be made to answer the question: what explains the relative success of democratization in Tunisia compared to the resilience of the autocratic state in Egypt after the Arab Uprisings?

A comparison will be made between the countries Egypt and Tunisia. This article will focus on the institutions in both countries to explain the different outcomes. Acemoglu and Robinson's book *Why Nations Fail* gives an interesting theory that can explain the institutional change after the Arab uprisings. There are two reasons for explaining the divergent outcomes via the theory of Acemoglu and Robinson. The first reason is that Middle Eastern authoritarian regimes have proven to be exceptional 'robust' (Hess, 2013, p. 261). Still, radical institutional change happened in both Egypt and Tunisia. Many scholars held this impossible (Bellin, 2012). On the other hand, Acemoglu and Robinson give a convincing theory why this was possible. The second reason for applying the theory of Acemoglu and Robinson is that it also explains the making of more inclusive institutions or why it fails to do so after a critical juncture.

Critical junctures in conjunction with institutional drift

Major institutional changes can occur as a result of the interaction between existing institutions[1] and critical junctures. Institutions can be described as 'rules of the game'. Once in place they tend to persist (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2008). Even though institutions main

---

[1] . Institutions are a set of formal rules (including constitutions), informal norms, or shared understandings that constrain and prescribe political actors' interactions with one another (Gilad, 2018).

characteristic is continuity, they can change. Change often occurs after a critical juncture. Critical junctures are major events that disrupt the existing political status quo. How institutions handle critical junctures is vital in the process of change. This is influenced by institutional drift. Institutional drift means that institutions undergo small random changes that result in the institutions drifting apart (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2013, p. 431). Institutional drift leads to small differences. It is the interaction with critical junctures that can cause radical divergences in otherwise quite similar societies (ibid, p. 432). In sum, the institutions present at the time of a critical juncture were influenced by institutional drift. This institutional drift therefore determines how institutions react during a critical juncture. Which eventually determines the outcome. This doesn't mean that a critical juncture will always result in a successful political revolution or change for the better (ibid, p. 111).

To apply the theory of Acemoglu and Robinson there needs to be a critical juncture. For a juncture to be rated a critical juncture it has to fulfil three stages: a crisis, radical ideational change and radical policy change (Hogan & Doyle, 2007, p. 884). The Arab uprising clearly qualifies. Firstly, there was a major crisis. This showed through the Tunisian and Egyptian people going on the streets in mass demonstrations for political freedom and economic prosperity. This massive mobilization of people in both Egypt and Tunisia was a bottom-up process (Butenschøn, 2015, p. 121). The radical ideational change was the breach with the authoritarian bargain. The authoritarian bargain refers to the relation between the authoritarian ruler and its population. The bargain gave the ruler all the power. In return for the democratic deficit, the people received public services provided by the state, such as security or economic prosperity. The rulers already failed to comply to the authoritarian bargain a long time ago. With the Arab uprising the people finally stood up for their rights (ibid). Some even described the ideational change as 'death of fear' (Aljazeera, 2015, December 16). This ideational change is of importance, because without it the 'rules of the game' won't change. Resulting in no change in the institutions (Gabsi, 2017, p. 14). Lastly, the radical policy change was fulfilled with overthrowing the authoritarian rulers. Marking a clear end of the Arab uprising as critical juncture (Butenschøn, 2015, p. 112). A critical juncture is important according to Acemoglu & Robinson. Nevertheless, there is more needed than a critical juncture for positive change. As Acemoglu and Robinson (2013, p. 101) pose:

> A critical juncture is a double-edged sword that can cause a sharp turn in the
> trajectory of a nation. On the one hand it can open the way for breaking the cycle of

extractive institutions and enable more inclusive ones to emerge, (..). Or it can intensify the emergence of extractive institutions.

Political inclusive vs. extractive

What is positive change according to Acemoglu and Robinson? In their theory, they make a division between inclusive and extractive political systems, in which inclusiveness is the ultimate goal. A politically inclusive state has to have "pluralistic political institutions" and has to be centralized (ibid, p. 80). Centralization refers to the capability of the government to maintain order and stability (ibid, p. 187). The lack of centralization could cause disruption by oppositional groups (ibid, p. 87). The other fundament is pluralistic political institutions. Those are described as "political institutions that distribute power broadly in society and subject it to constraints" (ibid, p. 80). "Instead of being vested in a single individual or a narrow group, political power rests with a broad coalition or a plurality of groups" (ibid). The opposite of inclusive political states are political extractive states. Those states are missing either a plural distribution of power or lack in centralization capability (ibid, p. 430). In extractive states, the political power is often in the hands of a single individual or a narrow group. Often, their power isn't constrained (ibid, p. 80).

Political inclusiveness can be achieved by becoming democratic. Acemoglu and Robinson describe democratization as "the de jure political power is allocated to the majority, so the balance is tilted towards the citizens" (2008, p. 285). Resulting in the power falling in the hands of a broad coalition or a plurality of groups (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2013, p. 80). Egypt and Tunisia underwent a democratic transition. Both countries were very centralized, having until the Arab uprisings a powerful autocratic ruler that was perceived as invincible. All the power was vested in the hands of the autocratic ruler, namely Mubarak in Egypt and Ben Ali in Tunisia, which made it political extractive states. While Tunisia succeeded in the transition to a democracy after the Arab Uprising, Egypt's regime reversed once again into a dictatorship after a brief period of democratic rule. Egypt's democracy was overthrown by a military coup, executed by the army chief Abdel Fattah el-Sisi (Hamzawy, 2017).

Even though Acemoglu & Robinson give an explanation of institutional change via the interaction between the institutional drift and critical junctures, they leave the exact working of it vague. The theory doesn't offer a specific set of requirements in determining the institutional drift, aside from leaving a big part open to contingency (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2013, p. 111). This theoretical gap is filled by the theories of Bellin and Makara. They pose a

specific model for diverging military institutionalization[2]. The focus is on the military because they played a major role in the transition. The military in Egypt blocked the transition, while in Tunisia it supported the transition (Lutterbeck, 2013, p. 35-36). Therefore, the focus will be on the comparison between the military institutions to explain the institutional drift. Providing a theoretical model that explains the institutional drift in the military institutions in Egypt and Tunisia. Bellin poses that the failure or success in the regime transitions towards a more democratic state are not determined by the lack of democratic prerequisites. She states that the robustness of authoritarianism in the region is maintained through the presence of a strong coercive apparatus (Bellin, 2012, p. 128). Makara stresses the factor of motivation of the military apparatus complementary to Bellin's theory.

The institutional drift in the military institutions played a determining role in the outcome of the democratic transition. To illustrate the military's influence on the road towards plurality there will be looked at the role of the labor unions during the transition. The reason to focus on labor unions is because they have the capacity to support the social dialogue held by different interest groups in the country. Even more so, they can play a vital role in the implementation of social dialogue outcomes (Karshenas, Moghadam & Alami, 2014, p. 726). If given the chance to flourish, they form an important representative actor for a big part of the population. Thus, forming an additional actor in the competition for power (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2013). Furthermore, labor unions can constrain the ruler's power with the method of strike to protect workers' rights (Hartshorn, 2015). In Tunisia, the labor unions played a big role in the transition helping in drafting the new constitution (ibid). While in Egypt, the labor unions weren't able to do so, being blocked by the military apparatus (ibid). The success or the failure of the labor unions played a vital role in becoming more inclusive, hence forming an additional interest group represented in the competition for power.

---

[2] In their theory they make a distinction between the *institutionalization* of the military in the country. The institutionalization refers to the professionalism, autonomy and almost bureaucratic characteristics of the military (Weberian). This should not be mistaken for the *institutions* in Acemoglu & Robinson's theory, who refer to the more general institution, which can be described as 'rules of the game'.

Method of research

The method of most similar systems design is used (also known as Mill's Method of Difference). This method was used to find an explanation for the difference in regime outcomes in Egypt and Tunisia. The choice to compare Egypt and Tunisia, apart from sharing the same regional critical juncture, is because they are relatively similar. The neighbouring countries were both former colonies. They both became authoritarian states after its independence (Jebnoun, 2014; Aljazeera, 2013, 4 July). Both countries were autocracies instead of religious monarchies, like Morocco or Jordan (Gallala-Arndt, 2012, p. 141). The demonstrations against the regimes in Egypt and Tunisia therefore didn't form an attack on religion. Making the autocracies more vulnerable in the Arab Uprising (ibid). In addition, both countries lack an abundance of highly profitable resources such as oil, unlike many other countries in the region (Hess, 2013, p. 262).

This bachelor thesis is based on the theory of historical institutionalism, focusing on the dynamics between institutional drift and a critical juncture on the road to political inclusiveness. The second section will illustrate the capacity of the labor unions to play a part in the democratic transition in Egypt and Tunisia. The third section, explains the military institutionalization theory of Bellin and the complementary theory of Makara. In the fourth section the institutionalization theory shall be applied on the military institutions of both countries. In the fifth section a conclusion shall be given regarding the diverging outcomes in Egypt and Tunisia, applying the theory of Acemoglu and Robinson combined with the theories of Bellin and Makara. All the information will be based on secondary literature, using articles, reports, books and news reports.

I conclude that the theory of Acemoglu and Robinson combined with the theories of Bellin and Makara give a plausible explanation of the diverging outcomes in Egypt and Tunisia. Nevertheless, the institutional approach of Acemoglu and Robinson is postdictive. Therefore, it is a method to explain contemporary outcomes, not make future predictions (Hogan & Doyle, 2007, p. 886). This makes generalization of my results difficult. Furthermore, the Arab uprisings an immensely complex phenomenon. I attempted to answer a complicated question about a complex situation in just eight weeks. There has to be recognized that there are many variables that I didn't take into account for example: elections, foreign interference, etc. I focused on the military institution and labor unions for a reason. This doesn't mean that the other factors were less relevant.

2. DIFFERENT OUTCOMES

In this section an overview shall be given of the democratic transition in both countries. As already stated, the focus will be on the labor unions in both countries. Labor unions can form an important instrument in becoming more inclusive. Egypt's and Tunisia's labor unions effect on the transition diverged largely. Therefore, in the next section the democratic transition shall be described, to find out what made the labor unions act differently.

Egypt's transition

In Egypt it was decided to first have democratic elections before drafting the constitution. Between the period of the ousting of Mubarak and the elections, the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces took power to provide stability. The political party of the Muslim Brotherhood, the Freedom and Justice party, and the extreme Salafist Nour Party won about 70% of the seats (Gallala-Arndt, 2012, p. 144). The Islamist dominance in parliament made the secularist afraid. Fearing that their interests and that of the minority groups would be overlooked. In addition, according to Osman there was a general distrust towards the Muslim Brotherhood. Namely the Muslim Brotherhood was first oppressed in Egypt. The radical change in becoming the leading party, made many Egyptians afraid, especially the upper-middle classes (Osman, 2017, p. 79). This polarized Egypt's society, which became an important cause for the instability in the country.

Naturally, the growing fragmentation didn't help Egypt's stability. For many Egyptian citizens the Constitution, drawn up by the Muslim Brotherhood and Salafist Nour Party, seemed like the beginning of a religious state and with that losing the essence of 'Egytianness' (ibid, p. 81). Social groups such as the Orthodox Copts, secularist, liberals, nationalists and leftist opposed the role of the Muslim Brotherhood in drafting the constitution. The Muslim Brotherhood failed to include the ambitions of the youth activists that helped bring Mubarak down (Salamey, 2015, p. 120). The tensions were running high. There started to be weekly confrontations between youth activists and Brotherhood associates. The anxiety for the Muslim Brotherhood and its commencing regime served to polarize and almost "paralyzed" the country (Osman, 2017, p. 96).

The reaction of the labor unions was counterproductive. Namely, they refused to work with the Muslim Brotherhood. This meant that many times labor unions didn't function at all

(ibid, p. 81). The labor unions that did proceed their work, were mostly 'Brotherized', having appointed new members that had connections to the new Muslim Brotherhood regime (Hartshorn, 2015, p. 115). Therefore, many people saw them as an asset of the Muslim Brotherhood. Seeing them as less independent and decreasing their credibility. Which didn't assist in reducing the polarization in society (ibid).

Therefore, in Egypt's transition the labor unions didn't try to ease the tensions in the society, but they made it worse. This was a vital aspect missing in the implementation of the bottom-up movement of the Arab uprising (Butenschøn, 2015, p. 112). They weren't able to help the social dialogue between the divided groups in society (Hartshorn, 2015, p. 100). The groups that first worked together in overthrowing Mubarak, now worked against each other. This eventually led to massive demonstration against Morsi and the Muslim Brotherhood and the ousting of Morsi in July 2013. Which was executed by a military coup (Salamey, 2015, p. 120).

One important factor that influenced the behavior of the labor unions was the military. The labor unions were incapable to establish themselves as an independent actor during the transition. The Egyptian labor unions, and most importantly the ETUF, were viewed as an ally of the old-Mubarak-regime (Hartshorn, 2015, p. 104). The reason for this was that the ETUF officials were connected to the old-regime (ibid, p. 111). To get rid of these old ties, the labor union needed to reform. This reform was set in motion through the appointment of new officials. Samir Radwan set out a new agenda. There were new labor bargains established (ibid, p. 104). Except, this new labor bargain didn't benefit the military. Namely, the strikes that were spreading in the country to ensure the new bargain were bringing instability and it was taking profit away from their businesses and industries. This was especially important to them, because the military owned up to an estimation of 40% of the economy's gross domestic product (GDP) (Makara, 2016, p. 217). This made that the military intervened.

The strikes that broke out affected the military owned industries (ibid). This the military wouldn't accept, which resulted in the military intervening. Their message was clear: " no broad based strikes, no concentration of power in the hands of political leaders, and no sale of "critical" industries" (Hartshorn, 2015, p. 110). Therefore, the military supported a new law which prohibited everything that "makes a stand or undertakes an activity that results in the prevention of, obstruction, or hindering a State's institution or a public authority or a public or private working organization from performing its work" (ibid, p. 111). This didn't actually outlaw strikes, but if broadly interpreted, could categorize them as illegal activities.

Furthermore, the strikes would have to be approved, which wasn't often the case. This took away one of the most important methods of force from the labor unions (ibid, p. 113). In practice, this resulted in the breakdown of many strikes by the military. In which they didn't shy away from the use of violent force to oppress the labor unions (ibid).

Aside from the military interference there was another factor that made them ineffective. Namely competition between the labor unions themselves. There were more labor unions set up that also received financial aid (ibid, p. 142). They worked against each other. The division of the labor unions, formed a lack of an overarching organization that would stand stronger in the process of democratization. Therefore, they were less able to formulate their goals, like in Tunisia. In addition, the competition between the labor unions formed their main priority, leaving less capacity for the support of the democratic transition (Hartshorn, 2015).

Tunisia's transition

Tunisia's change remains the only "success story" in the Arab Uprisings. However, Tunisia's transition hasn't gone smoothly either (Moghadam, 2017, p. 625). Even though, the transition was calmer than in Egypt, the Tunisian society also fragmentated. The polarization between the secularists and Islamist became a deep cleavage in society (Osman, 2017, p. 84). With the democratic election of 23 of October 2011, the moderate Islamist party Ennahda won 41% of the seats (Gallala-Arndt, 2012, p. 143). It had to form a coalition to obtain a majority. A coalition was formed with two secularist parties, the Congress for the Republic and the Democratic Forum for Labor and Liberties. They were called the Troika. Working in a coalition turned out to be difficult, delaying the finalization of the constitution (Osman, 2017, p. 88). The delay showed the deep cleavages between the religious and the secularist elements of the constitution. (ibid, p. 84).

Ennahda recognized the fear that came with the rise of the Muslim Brotherhood. To avoid the same fate of the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, the Ennahda had to give way to a lot of its own ambitions (Salamey, 2015, p. 125). Therefore, they acted in a more reserved way, assuring the opposition that it had no undemocratic intentions. In an official statement, the Ennahda promised that it would not declare the Sharia as state law (Gallala-Arndt, 2012, p. 143). But it wasn't enough, polarization caused tensions to run high. This eventually led to early parliamentary elections in 2014, avoiding a crisis. The departing of the Troika went

relatively smoothly through the efforts of four important groups. Those were the "General Labor Union (UGTT), the Tunisian Order of Lawyers, the Union of Industry, Trade and Handicrafts and lastly the Tunisian Human Rights League" (Abdelmoula, 2015), also called the Quartet. They helped facilitate the national dialogue bringing the groups together and hereby decreasing tension in the Tunisian society (ibid). These measures were vital in reaching a constitutional compromise. Leading to the ratification of a new civil constitution and hereby establishing the democracy (Salamey, 2015, p. 125).

For a successful transition there was needed a constitution that was accepted by the majority and by the Tunisian people. They set up a constitution commission, called the Commission for the Realization of the Goals of the Revolution, Political Reform and Democratic Transition. The commission contained representatives of the civil society in Tunisia and the largest political parties, which also includes the labor unions (Gallala-Arndt, 2012, p. 143). The labor unions were one of the important actors in the transition through the making of the constitution (Hartshorn, 2015). The political absence of the military in the regime change posed an important factor for its success. Hence the success of the labor unions, in particular the UGTT.

The absence of the military in Tunisian politics made all possibilities an option. There was no coercive force blocking their way or trying to influence them. This made the new law proposals of the labor unions untainted (ibid, p. 194). Even more so, the labor unions were able to flourish in Tunisia because it enjoyed protection from the military institutions against any violent forces against them (Salamey, 2015, p. 124). This made the security of the labor unions significantly better than that in Egypt. Where the method of strikes was made almost impossible and oppressed (Hartshorn, 2015, p. 110).

Another factor was that the military wasn't politically involved because it had no economic assets to protect (ibid, p. 198). It also didn't have any historical experience with the oppression of the population and its organizations, this being a mandate of the security apparatus and not the military's (Anderson, 2011, p. 4). Both factors made it possible for the UGTT to take part in the making of the constitution. Helping the transition to succeed (Hartshorn, 2015, p. 100).

In contrast to the Egyptian labor unions, the UGTT has a state independent history. The UGTT was part of the opposition in the demonstrations during the Arab uprisings. Even before the Arab uprising, it was one of the only actors that opposed the former regime. Strikes

were their method of force to reach their goals (ibid, p. 195). With the election of the Ennahda party, also connected to the Muslim Brotherhood, friction and anxiety rose between the secularist and Islamist. The fragmentation in society was similar to that in Egypt. On the other hand, the Ennahda needed to form a coalition to get a majority, while Morsi didn't. The three parties that formed the coalition, called the Troika, shared the executive power over the state (ibid, p. 198). None of these parties held any significant influence over the labor unions (ibid, p. 199). This excluded the Ennahda from the labor unions, which maintained the independence from the regime. This was a factor that helped in staying independent.

The UGTT had an enormous mobilization capacity. Having around a half million of members, forming a vast group that couldn't be ignored. One reason for the higher mobilization capacity was that, unlike in Egypt, it was an actor with prestige. This resulted from having no ties with the former regime. Another reason was that only the UGTT received support from the newly elected regime. Minimizing the disruptive effect of upcoming labor and trade unions, which gave the UGTT the possibility to focus on the democratic transition (ibid). In which it didn't only focus on its traditional role, protecting labor rights, but also on broader subjects such as secularism (ibid, p. 204). The mobilization capability combined with independence made the labor unions an important institution for social change (Salamey, 2015, p. 123). Thus, an important actor during the democratic transition.

The labor unions role in the transition

Both countries struggled with the rising polarization in society, in which secularists and Islamist pitted against each other. While the Egyptian labor unions were politically insignificant during the transition, the Tunisian labor unions were a determining factor in the process of change (Beinin, 2016, p. 14). One of the factors that reduced the tension in Tunisia was the UGTT (Hartshorn, 2015). Which played a vital role in the democratic transition and the making of the constitution. Representing the general 'working' population in the process (ibid, p. 100). Hereby becoming more plural, because it formed an additional actor in the competition for power. The most important reason for its effectivity was that it had the possibility to use force to obtain its goals. The capability to threaten with strikes, gave them an instrument of force.

Another reason for the UGTT's success was the absence of a dominant military institution in Tunisia. In contrast to Egypt, Tunisia's army was not politically involved,

therefore it didn't try to oppress the labor unions. Even more so, it protected the labor unions. It didn't try to take away the power of the labor unions, by breaking the strikes. This helped in keeping an important method of force for the UGTT. Giving the labor unions enough coercive power to become part of the drafting of the constitution. Which has been partly seen as factor for the success of the democratic transition (ibid).

In Egypt the labor unions were incapable to establish themselves sufficiently to implement the ideational change. This was a vital aspect missing in the implementation of the bottom-up movement of the Arab uprising (Butenschon, 2013). They missed a cohesive force to hold the population together during the transition. The laws that implicitly forbade strikes, took away the power of the labor unions. In addition, the lack of an overarching national union made the labor unions in Egypt powerless (Hartshorn, 2015). Making them unable to implement the change needed during the transition (ibid, p. 100).

An vital reason for ETUF's lack of effectivity was the influence the military had on politics. They made the method of strike almost impossible in Egypt, taking away its most important tool (ibid, p. 110). The presence of the military made it impossible for the labor unions to participate in politics. The Egyptian military was too powerful, forming an unequal playing field in which the labor unions couldn't win. This blocked them from truly participating, and therefore in becoming more politically inclusive.

3. THEORIZING INSTITUTIONAL DRIFT IN THE MILITARY

The military has played an important role on the labor unions capability to perform. The question arises, why did the Egyptian and Tunisian military institutions act differently during the transition? In this section the theory of Bellin and Makara will be used to answer this question. They give an explanation for the divergence of military institutions. This divergence, I pose, is the institutional drift that lead to different results.

Institutionalization of the military apparatus

In the Arab Uprisings the military has played a major role in the survival of the authoritarian regimes. In Egypt and Tunisia the army chose the side of the people, and therefore delivering the final blow to the dictators (Makara, 2016, p. 209). Makara and Bellin pose a theory on the behavior of the military. This is determined by the degree of

institutionalization of the military apparatus. The reasoning is that when the army is highly institutionalized it gains in autonomy which affects the relation with the regime (ibid, p. 211).

The institutionalization makes them more independent and less reliant on the survival of the regime (ibid, p. 209). Eva Bellin therefore poses: "The more institutionalized the security establishment is, the more willing it will be to disengage from power and allow political reform to proceed. The less institutionalized it is, the less amenable it will be to reform" (ibid, p. 210). Bellin, Makara and Lutterbeck give specific components that define the difference between an institutionalized or a patrimonial military apparatus, along the lines of a Weberian approach. Institutionalized militaries are characterized as meritocratic, not-predatory, not-corrupt, and serving the nation (ibid, p. 211). The opposite of an institutionalized military institution is a patrimonial military apparatus. They are characterized as based on cronyism, corruption, and serving the interests of individual political or social groups (mostly ethnic or communal) over society (ibid). Makara (2016, p. 212) summarizes patrimonial rule as "The regime receives the military's protection, while the military receives privileged access to the best housing, health care, and control over economic ventures". Because of their close ties to the regime, their organizational survival depends on the survival of the despotic ruler (ibid, p. 212).

There are different patrimonial measures that the authoritarian ruler could use to prevent the army from defecting. The first is patronage distribution. That is providing the army in economic and political privileges, therefore creating incentives to stay loyal. This is a frequent used measure in the MENA-region. Another measure is communal ties. This refers to the employment of a certain ethnic or social group that are regarded as loyal to the regime. Lastly, building multiple layers of intelligence agencies monitoring the military. Those intelligence agencies are mostly directly connected with the ruler (ibid, p. 212).

Concluding, when the military institution is patrimonial, it has close ties with and its existence is dependent on the ruling regime. The control of the ruling regime over the military, provides it with a powerful coercive tool. If the military is institutionalized the regime has less to no power over the military, making it independent (Bellin, 2012, p. 128). The institutionalization of the military effects the plurality of the regime. The reason for this is that when the military apparatus is institutionalized, it is depoliticized. Resulting in the separation of the regime and the coercive power, the military. This creates a more level-playing field in the competition for power. Becoming more open to other groups to compete on an equal scale. This effect showed itself in Egypt, where the military blocked the labor unions method of strike and thereby taking away the labor unions power.

Motivation of the military apparatus

The degree of institutionalization of the military explains why both the military in Tunisia and eventually that of Egypt have chosen the side of the people. But this still doesn't explain why the Tunisian military supported the democratic transition, while the Egyptian military has eventually chosen to block the transition. Therefore, another important aspect is the motivation of the military. Why it acts the way it does. One reasons is that when the military feels marginalized, it can use a crisis situation to break ties with the ruling regime to improve their position. Offering an opportunity to "outflank their competitors and obtain a privileged position in the post-regime political system" (Makara, 2016, p. 215).

A distinction can be made between the more offensive and defensive behavior of the military. The defensive motives can be explained when the military's 'core interests' are threatened. The military will try to seize power, gaining back control over these 'core interests' (Lutterbeck, 2013, p. 30). Offensive motives can occur when it has the "potential to dominate the executive". Which is aggravated when a state is historically dominated by the military through direct rule or close ties to the ruling regime (ibid).

4. MILITARY INSTITUTIONALIZATION THEORY APPLIED ON EGYPT AND TUNISIA

Institutionalization in Egypt

Sadat and his successor Mubarak, tried to minimize the military's influence over national politics. This resulted in the military being shunned from positions in the government. This kept them out of everyday politics, but it still formed a key actor in politics. This was caused by the phenomenon that all the ruling leaders of Egypt were handpicked by, and came from the military officer corps (ibid, p. 36).

The relation between the higher military officers and the former ruling regime formed a protection for the economic power of the military. Egypt's armed forces were notorious for its big influence over the economy, owning up to an estimated 40% of the economy's GDP (Makara, 2016, p. 217). This made the military the most influential and most powerful actor in the country (Lutterbeck, 2013, p. 36). The military had power over a broad range of significant industries and businesses in Egypt, making their power entrenched in society.

This economic power has been justified by the military under the guise of being beneficial for society, relieving the public budget (ibid, p. 37).This was accepted because the military institution was one of the most respected institutions in the country (ibid, p. 36). In addition, nobody could prove the military wrong. The reason for this is that there is no official

record of the military's economic assets. No source can give more than an estimation of the economic share of the military. Making the military unaccountable and unintelligible, even for the former authorities. The lack of transparency has formed an incentive for corruption (ibid, p. 37).

The military also benefitted from "access to the best housing and health care in the country" (Makara, 2016, p. 217). These patrimonial methods were used to buy the military's loyalty towards the regime. On the other hand, like in Tunisia, the Egyptian army declared the protests as legitimate and pledged not to use measures of force towards the demonstrators (Lutterbeck, 2013, p. 37). The military's role has been described as contradictory (ibid), the International Crisis Group cited in Lutterbeck (2013, p. 37-38) posed that "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".

In contrast to the Tunisian military, the Egyptian army didn't support the cause. They tried to put an end to the upheaval, demanding that the protesters return home (ibid, p. 38). Furthermore, the army has used violent methods towards the protesters to stabilize the country. Even though they used less force than the security services. This use of violence didn't happen in Tunisia (ibid). Eventually it sided with the opposition and helped the overthrowing of the Mubarak regime. Therefore, it still played an influential role in the regime change. When Mubarak resigned, the army stepped in its place to fill the temporary power vacuum till the elections (ibid, p. 39).

In sum, the Egyptian military can be described as medium institutionalized, that is with patrimonial characteristics like patronage, corruption, favoritism and cronyism (ibid, p. 36). The former leaders tried to marginalized the military in politics, but it still had a major influence over politics. This was partly established and maintained by the economic power it had obtained through patronage (Makara, 2016, p. 217).

Egypt's military motivation
The Egyptian military has a long history in the country's rule (Aljazeera, 2013, 4 July). Combined with the enormous economic power of the military apparatus, it made them very powerful. On the other side, it gave them a lot to lose. Forming a strong incentive to intervene. In a period of radical change, the military tried to find a way to protect their power. Kahled Fahmy describes their behavior during the aftermath of the Arab uprising as: "The

military is trying to find a formula whereby it can guarantee its position in the post-election Egypt, so it has been trying different tactics" (Horesh & Bollier, 2011).

It first tried working with the Muslim Brotherhood. But this attempt failed. Morsi started taking power from the military. A conflict near Rafah gave Morsi the opportunity to act against the military. First, he removed the commander of the military police. Second, he removed the Minister of Defense, the Chief of Staff and the three head of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. He replaced them with younger more susceptible officers (Hillel, 2013, p. 195). By removing the commander of the military Morsi ended any possible cooperation between the SCAF and the Muslim Brotherhood (ibid, p. 198). The marginalization of the military's political power affected the military's political prestige, one of the military's 'core interests'. The threat this 'core interest' formed a defensive incentive to intervene.

Another 'core interest' was its economic power. This was affected by an important development, namely privatization. Many countries in the region, including Tunisia and Egypt, underwent these economic changes. Since the 1980's these privatization measures were set in to motion. But through the close connection to the former regime, the Egyptian military was able to protect its own businesses and industries from this development (Lutterbeck, 2013, p. 37). With the ousting of the old regime, the economic patronage disappeared. As already Morsi wasn't cooperative towards the military. This threatened the economic power of the military. Giving them another defensive motive to intervene in the regime.

Aside from having defensive motives for interference, the Egyptian military apparatus also has offensive motives. Owning around 40% of the economy's GDP, it gave them the ability to dominate the executive power (Makara, 2016, p. 217). The combination of the historical gained political prestige and economical power gave the military the final say. When Morsi didn't stabilize the economy and didn't respect the military power, the military stepped in (Butenschøn, 2015, p. 125; Aljazeera, 2013, 4 July).

Institutionalization in Tunisia

The Tunisian regime was an authoritarian regime, just like Egypt. However, there has been one important difference. The military institution has been quite exceptional (Lutterbeck, 2013, p. 34). In many post independent states in the region the military had played an important role in stabilizing and ruling the country, becoming dependent on the military. In Tunisia this wasn't the case. Even though the army played a vital role in becoming independent, the new ruler, Bourguiba, didn't have a military career beforehand. In his rule he

used French republican principles, which marked a clear separation between politics and the military (ibid). Bourguiba's decision to subordinate the military in politics was based on the fear that he felt for a strong military and the threat it could pose on his power. Although the successor of Bourguiba had a military background, Ben Ali had more ties to the intelligence services than to the army (ibid). Compared to Egypt this separation between the ruler and the military forces forms an important contrast. This absence in public and political affairs earned them the nickname *La Grande Muette,* the big silent one (ibid).

The military's power in politics has been minimized since the independence of Tunisia. The former president Bourguiba established restrictions on the interference of military in politics. Those were for example, the prohibition to join or form a political organization for members of the army (Jebnoun, 2014, p. 298). The army was left out at the decision-making processes. Their only mandate was protecting the sovereignty by protecting the border (ibid). Aside from the political exclusion of the military, it still played an important political role in connecting the state with its population. This was accomplished through the mandatory military service. Furthermore, the army gave the Tunisian nation a symbol of unity. This was one of the fundaments for building the Tunisian state after its independence from France (ibid, p. 299).

Tunisia's army was also economically marginalized by both Bourguiba and later Ben Ali. Bourguiba provided minimal means to execute its mandate (ibid). At the time of the Uprising the regime spend only 1,4% of its GDP on the military, compared to Egypt with 4,3%, this was very little. In addition, the army had around 35,000 personnel. This was just a fraction if you compare it to the 150,000 employees of the security services, the National Guard and National security (Makara, 2016, p. 217). The military institution was controlled by the Ministry of the Interior and had almost no connections with the ruling elites. The exception was the Presidential Guard, which was under the direct rule of the President. Except for the Presidential Guard, all the security institutions like the military were under paid and underequipped. The obvious reason for this was to keep it from forming a threat for the regime. This caused disgruntlement and frustration under the military (ibid, p. 218)[3].

Aside from having little economic funds, the military was professional and institutionalized, outside the control of the executive power, the authoritarian ruler (Townsend, 2015, p. 7). These characteristics are based on the French model, who were the

---

[3] This didn't result in the army's attempt to gain in influence after the ousting of Ben Ali, which Makara's theory predicts. This shall be further explained in the section of Tunisia's military motivation.

former colonizers of Tunisia. In addition, the military was trained by American institutions (ibid). Which made the distance between the ruling power and the army even wider. Even though the military was professionalized and institutionalized, there was a degree of competition for power that was similar to Egypt. Which resulted in the various intelligence institutions as a "coup-proofing strategy" (Makara, 2016, p. 218).

Ben Ali continued to marginalize the military institution. He set up various security institutions and improved the police security apparatus with economic funds. Which became five times bigger than the military, and was used to execute the rulers policies. This excluded the military of the task to oppress its fellow civilians (Townsend, 2015, p. 7). In addition, he imposed the "iron-fisted policy" oppressing all opposition from the military towards his security-oriented regime (Jebnoun, 2014, p. 302).

It is important to underline the fact that the regime had little power over the military. This gave them the power to refuse orders during the Arab uprising. The first order they refused to execute was to deny the right of a funeral for the fallen demonstrators. The second was that it refused to wear the security forces' uniform. And finally the military General Ammar commanded that any open-fire on demonstrators would have to come from the military command itself (ibid, p. 305). With this last refusal the military defected, placing themselves as guard of the civilian protesters (Makara, 2016, p. 218).

Concluding, the Tunisian military apparatus was highly institutionalized. It was based on a French republican model, which depoliticized the military institution. In addition, they didn't receive economic benefits from the state, keeping their economic power marginalized. Giving them no executive power to interfere in politics. Jebnoun (2014, p. 311) concludes that because the army was highly institutionalized, the uprising and the transition could become a success. It also separates itself from other countries in the region, that don't share this independent and professionalized military history. Townsend adds, that the military supported the civilian governance. With this support and the acceptance of democratic control, the establishment of a representative system and constitution was made possible (Townsend, 2015, p. 8).

Tunisia's military motivation

When the Tunisian army sided with the protesters during the Arab uprisings, there arose claims that the military had political motives in doing so. Trying to gain in political influence. The response of the army was clear. They made an official statement, saying that "[they] will not deviate from the constitution" (Al-Quds Al-Arabi, January 22, 2011, cited in

Jebnoun, 2014, p. 311). This wasn't an empty claim. With the end of the Arab Uprising, the military retreated "to their barracks" (Townsend, 2015, p. 7), giving space for democratic transition to commence (ibid). The question is why did the military decide to stay clear from politics.

One of the reason for interference posed by Makara is, that if the military feels marginalized it can use a crisis to stop this process of marginalization and gain in power and influence. As stated above, the Tunisian military apparatus was marginalized by both Bourguiba and Ben Ali. Their economic funds were minimal and their political power was minimized. This did cause frustration in the military institution (Makara, 2016, p. 218). Still, the Tunisian military apparatus didn't act accordingly to Makara's theory.

One explanation for retreating out of the political sphere after the Arab uprisings is the long history of separation of power of the military institution. The Tunisian military was based on a professionalized French republic model, which goes back even before its independence (Townsend, 2015, p. 7). Therefore, it has never played a political role in the ruling of the country. Since their role was non-existent in the politics, it didn't develop in being one of the military's 'core interests' (Lutterbeck, 2013, p. 30). Therefore, it formed no defensive motive to interfere.

Furthermore, it didn't need to protect the regime to secure its own survival. This resulted from the political and economic marginalization. This forms a big contrast with the other security forces such as the Presidential Guard. That had close ties with the regime and was therefore dependent on the regime's survival. When the Arab uprising started, they were forced to oblige the order of oppressing the protests. This resulted in 78 reported civilian deaths, the actual number of killings estimated higher even higher (Makara, 2016, p. 218).

In sum, one of the reasons why it supported the democratic transition was that it had no close ties to the old regime. In addition, the degree of institutionalization gave no incentives to block the transition. It had been economically marginalized and it didn't have patronage connections to the former ruling regime. Therefore, it didn't create a dominating capacity over the executive power. Giving the military no political or economic means or motive to act offensively regarding the ruling power.

5. CONCLUSION

Acemoglu & Robinson's theory has provided a theoretical model to help explain the different outcomes in the countries Egypt and Tunisia after the Arab uprisings. Major institutional changes can occur through the dynamics between a critical juncture and institutional drift (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2013). The different paths taken after the Arab uprising in Egypt and Tunisia can be explained through the institutional drift of the military institution. As Bellin and Makara state that when a military apparatus is more institutionalized it will more likely support regime change (ibid, p. 210). In direct relation to the institutionalization is the motivation of the military, which determines the actions of the military.

In Egypt and Tunisia the military apparatus were both institutionalized, being professional, based on meritocratic values and, relatively autonomic. Though this description fits the Tunisian military better (Lutterbeck, 2013, p. 36). While being institutionalized, the military of Egypt showed patrimonial characteristics. One of those patrimonial features was the role it played in politics since the independence (ibid). In both countries, the leaders tried to keep the military out everyday politics. Only Tunisia succeeded in this political marginalization. Egypt's military institution played a vital part in the appointment of Egypt's autocratic rulers (Makara, 2016, p. 217). While the Tunisian military didn't share any significant connections with the former regime, being largely depoliticized.

Another import difference caused by the diverging degree of institutionalization was the economic power that was maintained through patronage in Egypt (Lutterbeck, 2013, p. 39). Mubarak tried to buy the military's loyalty by economic protection. Resulting in the Egyptian military owning up to 40% of the GDPs economy, therefore it possessed enormous power (Makara, 2016, p. 217). This formed an important difference with Tunisia, which didn't possess any significant economic power (ibid).

While Tunisia succeeded in the transition to a democracy, Egypt's regime reversed once again into a dictatorship after a brief period of democratic rule (Hamzawy, 2017). The military played a major part in blocking the transition to a more political inclusive regime. On the other hand, in Tunisia the military was an important factor in supporting the democratization in Tunisia (Lutterbeck, 2013, p. 35-36). The institutionalization of the military had everything to do with this divergence in outcomes. The Egyptian army was less open to the pro-reform opposition compared to the Tunisian army (Lutterbeck, 2013, p. 38). According to Abdelmoula (2015), Tunisia could have suffered the same fate as Egypt if the

military hadn't been as highly institutionalized as it was. The Tunisian military institution was depoliticized. It committed itself only to protecting national borders, lacking the incentives to do more than that. While in Egypt the military acted more on its own behalf, having the means and the motives to do so (Makara, 2016, p. 217).

This difference played a vital role in the success of the transition. Namely, the lack of a predominant group in politics, the more plural the power was distributed. Resulting in the inclusion of more equal groups in the competition for power. This made the Tunisian regime more politically inclusive (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2013, p. 103). Partly made possible by the efforts of the labor union the UGTT in Tunisia (Hartshorn, 2015). Being one of the groups that helped in forming the constitution, and hereby making Tunisia more inclusive (ibid, p. 100). In Egypt, this didn't happen. The lack of participation in the transition by the ETUF is caused by many factors. Nevertheless, the presence of the military played an important part. There was no level playing field in the political field through the presence of the military institution in the transition process. The military was the de facto power in Egypt, which blocked any activity that could harm their power (Anderson, 2011, p. 3).

In this bachelor thesis, the different regime outcomes in Tunisia and Egypt can partly be explained by the historical divergence of institutionalization of the military institution. I pose that the institutional drift in the military apparatus was a determining factor in becoming more inclusiveness in Egypt and Tunisia. The reason for this is the absence of political involvement by the Tunisian military apparatus. The military has one very important facet, namely coercive power. In the process of the struggle for power, there has to be a relatively equal level of power between the various groups competing. Giving every group a fair chance at gaining a piece of political power. If the military is participating in this battle for power, it can create an unequal distribution of power. This happened in Egypt, where the military had the final say and chose to block any further process of democratization and with that inclusivity. In Tunisia, the military's political power already marginalized, stayed clear from the political realm due to the institutionalization. Resulting in an equal playing ground. Furthermore, the various groups competing weren't influenced by an almighty power hovering over them. This gave them the space needed to form and formulate the will of the people, becoming more representative towards the population. Hence, making the process more inclusive. Not to say that this made the process of becoming inclusive easy, but it made it possible.

Literature list

Abdelmoula, E. (2015, December 10). *Analysis: How Tunisia saved its 'Arab Spring'.*
Retrieved April 24, 2018, from https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2015/10/analysis-
tunisia-saved-arab-spring-151028083410659.html.

Acemoglu, D. & Robinson, J. A. (2008). The Persistance and Change of Institutions in the
Americas. *Southern Economic Journal, 75*(2), 282-299.

Acemoglu, D. & Robinson, J. A. (2013). *Why Nations Fail: The origins of power, prosperity
and poverty.* London: PROFILE BOOKS LTD.

Aljazeera. (2013, July 4). *Egypt: The army steps in.* Retrieved April 23, 2018, from
https://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/insidestory/2013/07/2013749056218732.html

Aljazeera. (2015, December 16). *The death of fear*. Retrieved April 24, 2018, from
https://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/ragehomaarreport/2011/03/201139939205971
44.html

Anderson, L. (2011). Demystifying the Arab spring: parsing the differences between Tunisia,
Egypt, and Libya. *Foreign Affairs, 90*(3), 2-7.

Beinin, J. (2016). Political Economy and Social Movement Theory Perspectives on the
Tunisian and Egyptian Popular Uprisings of 2011. *Middle East Centre Paper Series,
14*(1), 4-14.

Bellin, E. (2012). Reconsidering the Robustness of Authoritarianism in the Middle East:
Lessons from the Arab Spring. *Comparative Politics, 44*(2), 127-149.

Butenschøn, N. A. (2015). Arab Citizen and the Arab State: The "Arab Spring" as a Critical
Juncture in Contemporary Arab Politics. *Democracy and Security, 11*(2), 111-128.

Gabsi, Z. (2017). Tunisia's youth: awakened identity and challenges post-Arab Spring.
Journal of Middle Eastern Studies, 25(1), 1-20.

Gallala-Arndt, I. (2012, April 12*). Constitutional Reforms in Tunisia, Egypt, Morocco and
Jordan: A Comparative Assessment*. Retrieved from
http://www.iemed.org/observatori-en/arees-danalisi/arxius-
adjunts/anuari/med.2012/gallala_en.pdf

Gilad, S. (2018). *Institution: Political Science.* Retrieved April 10, 2018, from
    https://www.britannica.com/topic/institution

Hamzawy, A. (2017, September 22). *The Arab world needs a new social contract.* Retrieved
    April 23, 2018, from https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2016/09/arab-world-social-
    contract-160920085700072.html

Hartshorn, I. M. (2015). *Corporatism, Labor Mobilization, and the Seeds of Revolution in
    Egypt and Tunisia* (Dissertation). University of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania.

Hess, S. (2013). From the Arab Spring to the Chinese Winter: The institutional sources of
    authoritarian vulnerability and resilience in Egypt, Tunisia, and China. *International
    Political Science Review, 34*(3), 257-272.

Hillel, F. (2013). The Egyptian Army and Egypt's 'Spring'. *Journal of Strategic Studies,
    36*(2), 180-204.

Hogan, J. & Doyle, D. (2007). The Importance of Ideas: An A Priori Critical Juncture
    Framework. *Canadian Journal of Political Science, 40*(4), 883-910.

Horesh, R. & Bollier, S. (2011, November). *Explayiner: Why Egypt Matters*. Retrieved April
    23, 2018, from
    https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2011/11/201111181155455132.html

Jebnoun, N. (2014). In the shadow of power: civil–military relations and the Tunisian popular
    uprising. *The Journal of North African Studies, 19*(3), 296-316.

Karshenas, M., Moghadam, V. & Alami, R. (2014). Social Policy after the Arab Spring:
    States and Social Rights in the MENA Region. *World Development, 64*(1), 726-739.

Lutterbeck, D. (2013). Arab Uprisings, Armed Forces, and Civil–Military Relations. *Armed
    forces & Society, 39*(1), 28-52.

Makara, M. (2016). Rethinking military behavior during the Arab Spring. *Defense & Security
    Analysis, 32*(3), 209-223.

Moghadam, V. (2017). The Semi-Periphery, World Revolution, and the Arab Spring:
    Reflections on Tunisia. *Journal of World-Systems Research, 23*(2), 620-636.

Osman, T. (2017). *Islamism: A history of political islam from the fall of the Ottoman Empire
    to the rise of ISIS.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press

Salamey, I. (2015). Double Movement & Post-Arab Spring Consociationalism. *The Muslim World, 106*(1), 187-204.

Townsend, C. (2015). Civil-Military Relations in Tunisia and Libya through the Arab Spring. *Journal of Defense Resources Management, 6*(11), 5-12.