



OBSTACLES OF DEVELOPING DEMOCRACY IN NORTH AFRICA WITH EMPHASIS ON EGYPT

¹Idriss Hassanpour, ²Hamid Sarmadi, Ph.D., and ¹Javid karimi

¹M.A of International Relations, Islamic Azad University, Bonab Branch, Iran.

²Lecturer of Islamic Azad University, Bonab Branch, Iran. (Corresponding Author).

¹M.A of International Relations, Islamic Azad University, Bonab Branch, Iran.

Corresponding Author: Hamid Sarmadi, Ph.D

Abstract: Egypt has been one of the most significant players in North Africa and the Middle East area over the past decades, which, considering its active history, could be the initiator of noteworthy developments in the region. After the revolution against Mubarak, the country took a democratic transition with the formation of elected institutions, the drafting of a new constitution, and the election of an elected president, however this failed due to a gap between the currents that played a role in overthrowing Mubarak. And the remnants of the previous regime played a role in this direction by making the domestic economic situation more critical, and with the military coup in Egypt, it entered a dark period. Hence, the transition to democracy has been challenged regardless of lots of efforts over the years. So, the present article targets addressing the question of what are the obstacles of developing democracy in Egypt. The current article attempts to pay attention to the historical and political background Economic, political and cultural considerations to identify how mentioned factors can act as obstacles to the transition of democracy and its development in Egypt.

Keywords: Democracy, North Africa, Egypt, Modernity. Authoritarianism, political culture

Introduction

Just contrary to many other countries and regions in the world in the past, Arab countries, comprising Egypt, did not move towards democratic reforms, particularly after the collapse of the Eastern Bloc, which concluded to the spread of authoritarianism to democracy, which is prominent as the waves of democratization. The concept of "Arab exception" and literature on the incompatibility of Arab culture with democracy became. Sadat "and authoritarianism" Hosni Mubarak "has failed to provide the grounds for the realization of democracy. Popular movements in early 2011, largely aimed at overthrowing authoritarian rulers and establishing democratic governments in Egypt and Tunisia, raised sparks of hope

for a transition to democracy in the Middle East and North Africa. It has experienced a wave of Islamic awakening and the seizure of power by the Supreme Military Council, the short-term rule of Mohamed Morsi and the return of the regime to the military in recent years. Despite all these developments and a long history of intellectual and ideological thinking, it failed to pave the way for the transition from the authoritarian regime of Hosni Mubarak to democracy and, despite social revolts against authoritarianism, led to military domination of power. In this regard, the main question of this article is as follows: Despite the intellectual and practical efforts of the Egyptian people over the past decades, why did they fail to

Academic Journal of Current Research

An official Publication of Center for International Research Development

Double Blind Peer and Editorial Review International Referred Journal; Globally index

Available www.cird.online/AJCR: E-mail: AJCR@CIRD.ONLINE



achieve democracy? In other words, what are the reasons for the lack of development of democracy in Egypt?

In answer to this question, it must be acknowledged that economic factors such as inequality in the distribution of wealth, class divisions, unemployment and widespread poverty are political factors including the authoritarianism of former and current rulers, lack of political participation and cultural factors including identity crisis, human rights and development. Democracy has been established in this country. Egypt not only failed to bring society to maturity and progress, but also faced several economic, political and social crises. The method of our research in this article is explanatory. Using library data and statistics published by various international organizations, we seek to understand this.

1- Theoretical framework: Democracy

Democracy, "majority rule", is the hallmark of a rule of law that emerged in the wake of the Enlightenment in the West; the core of democracy is that the members of the society that created a country are not subjects, but citizens with equal rights; That they play a decisive role in political decision-making, that is, in determining and regulating government relations; That the representatives and holders of government positions - that is, the rulers who represent the citizens - are politically responsible and accountable to the citizens - that is, the governed. Political sovereignty in a democracy must arise from the people, that is, from the sum of citizens who are politically equal in rights. It is not permissible to exercise sovereignty in a centralized way, but it should be done based on and by different activities and organizations, especially institutional and legal - divided and limited. The word democracy is a combination of the two Greek words (Demos) meaning common people and "Krato" meaning power, government, administration and sovereignty. Therefore, the literal meaning of democracy is the rule of the people (democracy). The word entered the English language in the 16th century through the French word *democratic*.

The term democracy, which is the most common term in political science, has no clear definition and evokes a floating and slippery concept. "As the value of democracy became more sublime, its meaning was lost in the noise of different interpretations," says American scholar Russell Hans. (Mackenzie, 1375: 172). The most common definition of democracy, given the literal meaning of the word, is provided by Abraham Lincoln. Democracy means "the rule of the people for the people and by the people" (Alam, 1997: 294)

This definition may seem ambiguous, but the history of democratic thought is complex and suggests conflicting perceptions. In this definition, the word *people* is used three times, but who are the people? The inference of the word *people* has evolved throughout history. In Greece, slaves, women and foreigners were not considered people. In the French Constitution of 1791, the right to vote belonged to those who paid a certain amount of taxes. In European countries until the end of the nineteenth century, women were not part of the people and did not have the right to vote. In some democracies, the illiterate were barred from voting. (Madani, 1993: 205).

1-1- Huntington: Waves of Democracy

Samuel Huntington has undoubtedly been one of the most prominent and controversial political scientists in recent decades. The book *Political Order in Transformed Societies*, which has now become one of the classic books on comparative politics, is the main focus of Huntington's discussion in this period. And takes the form of their government, but also of the degree of their government. What matters most is the difference between governments in terms of social participation, legitimacy, organization, efficiency, and order, and this difference takes precedence over distinctions such as the difference between democracy and authoritarianism. After making such a statement, Huntington becomes an evaluator of one of the main themes of the modernization literature, the notion that socio-economic modernization inevitably leads to the



political development, stability, and establishment of democratic governments. What Huntington, however, states is the complete opposite of this article.

Huntington's main concern in the second period of his intellectual career was democratization. That's why his original articles and books in the late 1980s and early 1990s are all about that. He has an innovative input in this area, as in his previous discussions. Huntington first introduces the concept of the "wave" of democratization. Huntington's analytical view contrasts with other analyzes of democratization, whose unit of analysis in this field are single political regimes and do not consider transitions as a single analytical unit.

From Huntington's point of view, there have been three waves of democratization so far; It covers the first wave from 1828 to 1926. This wave also followed the return wave from 1922 to 1942. The second wave lasted from 1943 to 1962, after World War II. This wave also faced a return wave from 1958 to 1975. The third wave began in 1974 with a coup d'état in Portugal and swept through southern Europe. He went to Latin America, crossed it, and then to Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and the Eastern Bloc. Before discussing why the third wave of democratization began, Huntington makes a few points about explaining democratization. He says that undemocratic regimes are more likely to give way to other undemocratic regimes than to democratic ones (Huntington, 2009: 59). They are different. Moreover, even the factors that make a democratic regime work may be different from the factors that make it strong and stable. On this basis, it can be said that democratization simply consists of three stages: 1) the end of the authoritarian regime; 2) Establishment of a democratic regime and 3) Strengthening of a democratic regime. The causes of each of these stages may also be conflicting with the causes of the other stage. Huntington then points out that there is no single factor in explaining democratization in all countries or in a single country. There is no need for any special factor for democratization.

Democratization is the result of a combination of several causes, and this combination also varies from country to country. After explaining the reasons, Huntington explains how the democratization process works. In this way, he distinguishes three forms of democratization: first, the process of transformation that takes place when the elites in power take the lead in establishing democracy themselves. The process of disintegration also occurs when opposition groups take responsibility for the establishment of democracy, and at the same time the regime disintegrates and is overthrown. The third process, or displacement, also occurs when the attainment of democracy is the result of joint action by the regime's elites and the opposition. Which of these three ways to go depends on the balance of power between the four main groups: the regime's hardliners and reformists, and the democratic moderates and revolutionary extremists in the opposition. If the government is more powerful than the regime, the reformists from the extremists and the moderates from the extremists, the process of transformation will proceed. If the opposition is stronger than the government and the democratic moderates are stronger than the extremists, the process of disintegration will proceed, and if there is a relative balance between the government and the opposition and the moderate reformists are relatively stronger than the other two groups, the transition process can proceed. Samuel Huntington lists some characteristics for politics in Third World countries. Lack of institutionalization, widespread corruption, organized violence at all levels and social strata, the role of the military in political power and naked confrontation, political games. Huntington counts third world countries. He discusses democratization in Third World countries, saying that the expansion of democracy depends on economic growth (the formation of the middle class and the free market), a diverse social structure, and a culture of tolerance necessary for the acceptance and growth of democracy. . Huntington addresses the priorities of



democratization after stating the features and preconditions. In other words, Huntington seeks to implement the growth and consolidation of democracy in several stages so that its one-time entry does not cause chaos. According to Huntington, the first and most important issue for third world countries is the formation of a national identity. Is.

First: By this perspective, the formation of national identity does not mean the disappearance of sub-identities. Rather, sub-identities are one of the preconditions for the acceptance of democracy. According to Huntington, the formation of national identity takes precedence because national identity leads to a general consensus on the formation of a national institution. Until national identity is formed, it will not be possible to accept democracy. National identity and convergence, and the existence of common cultural and social values and elements, enable the people to come to an agreement on a democratic agreement. Therefore, national identity is important and fundamental in the age of multiplicity of identities. But there should be no inverted understanding of national identity. The formation of national identity does not mean the denial of sub-identities, but national identity means the preservation of sub-identities and the definition of common values for society. Common values that may exist in all subcultures of society.

According to Huntington, **the second priority** in third world countries is institution building. Since there is widespread corruption in third world countries, illegitimate violence is taking place at all levels of society and the confrontation of political actors is naked, we need an institution that be able to manage these issues. For example; only a national institution, and in Huntington's words, an institutionalized state, can remove violence from society. Of course, Huntington does not want any government to be formed, but he does say that government should be institutionalized in Third World countries.

Otherwise, it will not be possible to grow and consolidate democracy.

The third and final issue for Huntington is increasing political participation. "Political participation creates chaos before an institutionalized government is formed," Huntington says. That is why political participation must be at the last stage, in addition to being one of the most important pillars of democracy. It also strengthens democracy and strengthens democratic institutions. Therefore, political participation is the last and most fundamental issue for the growth of democracy and political development. (Ibid.)

2- Historical background: Democracy in Egypt

Ancient Egypt is a civilization in northeastern Africa in the Nile Valley that existed between 3,000 BC and the conquest of Egypt by Alexander the Great. The civilization of ancient Egypt is an example of empires built on the principle of irrigation. The rulers of ancient Egypt were called Pharaohs. The civilization of ancient Egypt was formed in 3150 BC, when the two kingdoms of Lower Egypt and Upper Egypt reached political unification under the reign of the first Pharaoh. Ancient Egypt came under the rule of foreign powers, including the Achaemenid Iranians, several times during the long period of its civilization. The beginning of the formation of powerful governments in Egypt was not a unified rule, but in the last decades leading up to the third millennium BC Egypt was ruled by local rulers in the southern and northern parts. With the arrival of a king named Mans, Egypt was united for the first time and the first dynasty was formed. According to Manotto, the capital of Egypt at that time was the city of Tennessee, which has not been found today. Since no evidence of the existence of a king named Mens has been found, some Egyptologists believe that this legendary king must have been the same Narmer depicted on his famous tablet while uniting the two Egyptians. Narmer arose from the city of Abydos in Upper Egypt. Historians believe that the history of ancient Egypt began



at this point and was ruled by 31 dynasties or royal families until the fourth century BC, when it was conquered by Alexander the Great. From the very beginning of history, Egypt has been under foreign invasion and domination, from the Achaemenid and Byzantine Empires to the rule of the Fatimids and the Ottomans, and finally became part of the French and British colonies. They became an independent and legal state and became the first country in the Arab world to gain independence. The overthrow and the military took power. Due to its antiquity and civilization, Egypt is the center of gravity and the symbol of the Arab world. (Hafizian, 1389: 2).

Politically, Egypt came to power in 1952 with a bloodless coup by young army officers against its king, King Farouk. With the death of Nasser in 1970, his deputy, Mohammed Anwar Sadat, came to power. After the formation of the constitutional monarchy in Egypt, the first attempts to establish democracy were made during this period. At that time, democracy was an attractive ideal for the emerging elites of society in Egypt. But in general, these democratic experiences were based on the unreliable foundations of democracy, and this democratic order could not offer much to the majority of Egyptian society. 1386: 43).

In 1980, Egypt became a country that, while presenting an image of a multi-party democracy, became de facto monarchy and gave Sadat the title of Little Farouq. After the assassination of Sadat, his deputy Hosni Mubarak came to power. The political regime headed by Hosni Mubarak since 1981 inherited a political system based on Arab nationalism with a militaristic approach that followed Jamal Abdul Nasser and Anwar Sadat. However, this political system had undergone dramatic and significant changes in the pursuit of its principles and goals throughout its life history. Mubarak's policy of tolerance gradually shifted to authoritarianism in the 1980s. Since the early 1990s, he has restricted political and civil rights in the country, severely repressed the free press and media, banned opposition parties, especially the Muslim

Brotherhood, and banned any political movement outside the official framework of his policy. Suppressed. Due to these restrictions and widespread interference in the electoral process through fraud, repression and intimidation, the parliamentary elections of 1990, 1995 and 2005 led to an unprecedented victory for the ruling party, the National Democratic Party (Paciello, 2011: 27).

During Mubarak's rule, it is in fact a time of confusion and trouble for Egypt because Mubarak is very cautious and conservative. Mubarak's 30-year rule is divided into two parts. He initially stated that he intended to move towards a more open political system, and in this regard made changes to the constitution. During this period, he led Egypt to a semi-democratic democracy, but he continued to work harder to consolidate his power, and the best way to avoid pressure for more democracy is not to have any democracy at all. During this period, although political and economic reforms were taking place, but all of these were political games to deceive public opinion, Mubarak tried harder to establish an authoritarian government.

Marina Ottawi calls her government an established authoritarianism, that is, while portraying society and politics as having a playful space, there is no such thing, but even the government through secret police and military force over politics and economics. It has control over both society and its people

Two years after the Egyptian revolution, it became clear that the Egyptian political rulers are still seeking to unify and marginalize their opponents, and not to try to divide the political arena among all. Egypt's political leader after Hosni Mubarak inherited three types of absence of personalities, institutions and policies from Mubarak's era. These gaps created obstacles to democracy. The lack of personalities to carry out public responsibilities was a gap that deepened during the Mubarak era, and when the Morsi wanted to fill these gaps with the Brotherhood forces, these gaps became apparent, but the Brotherhood was not sufficient in number and merit. As a result, the people who



were trusted by the ruling current were relied upon, and no attention was paid to their lack of competence. This caused the idea of participation in the management of government affairs to be targeted from the heart. Regarding the existence of a vacuum in the institutions, the January 25 revolution completely showed that the presence or absence of the parliament, the parties, the judiciary, the police and the administrative apparatus are not different. And instead of trying to form institutions without politicization after the revolution, the number of dissidents increased, and observers always criticized the Muslim Brotherhood for employing all members of the movement. The political vacuum also indicates the inefficiency of the government system among the citizens and their dissatisfaction. The democratic system responds quickly to the demands of the society, but in Egypt, during the two years after the revolution, the people of this country saw a great political vacuum. Key sectors such as health, education, transportation, employment, security, and taxation have been harmed by the government's inability to serve the people. This frustrated the people and ignited their anger. In the light of such problems, the opportunity for a democratic transition in Egypt will not be easy.

3- Obstacles to the development of democracy in Egypt

Extensive revolutionary developments and movements in the North African region, including Egypt, which were formed with the aim of the rule of law, political and social freedoms and achieving a high level of socio-economic prosperity and elimination of discrimination and inequality, not only democratic transition means establishment The new processes and procedures did not lead to and deepen democracy, but to failure (formal political reform or the reproduction of a new form of authoritarianism) in finding the answer to this theoretical question at three macro levels (economic development, political development). And culture in Egypt is examined.

1-3- Economic factors

Democracy and how to stabilize in Egypt are inextricably linked to the development and economic issues of this country. Studies show that neoliberal policies in Egypt not only did not lead to the expansion of democracy, but also to economic growth that led to the decline of class growth, a class that did not enjoy freedom, and also because of corruption and discrimination in the ruling system every day. Witnessed an increase in class divide (Hafezian, 2009: 19). Although socially and culturally, this class has the feelings and expectations of a prosperous middle class, and in terms of social status, character and diagram, it is in the position of the middle class and also has a civic behavior and culture; College education; Familiarity with new technology and modern media and knowledge of world news, but economic poverty and unemployment force that class to live like the poor.

1-1-3- Unbalanced development

Development has been one of the main challenges of the Egyptian governments from the time of Nasser to Mubarak and even after the revolution and the rule of Mohamed Morsi. Basically, the degree of capability and efficiency of each government is measured by its economic performance and ability to achieve development; because its direct impact on public life is clearly visible. In the meantime, if the government can take effective steps towards economic growth and prosperity, it will undoubtedly be more stable. However, Egypt's economic development, following a long period of increased development and economic growth, suddenly overturns its economic system at maturity. Many believe that the Egyptian revolution won thanks to the workers' strikes in Tahrir Square. The April 2, 2011 movement was also launched using social media on the Internet by a group of predominantly educated young Egyptians who called for a nationwide strike on April 6 in support of the striking workers. The Egyptian government continued the food subsidy system in an effort to finance the country in an effort to reduce the negative



impact of rising prices and growing dissatisfaction among the Egyptian people; but this small subsidy did not cover the price of expensive food (Cristina, 2011: 8). Therefore, the protesters demanded a change in the political system as the key to solving the problems. People believe that the first step in restructuring the economy was to overthrow the Mubarak regime, which received all the proceeds. All profitable industries and factories were in the hands of the government or the Mubarak family. A Gallup poll in the months before the revolution showed that despite a 1 percent increase in GDP, only 6 percent of Egyptians expressed satisfaction with the current economic situation. The total revenue of the Egyptian government in 2009 was approximately \$ 47 billion, while its expenditures in the same year amounted to about \$ 64 billion.

The debt-to-GDP ratio of the Egyptian government is approximately 80% of GDP, making it the 17th largest country in the world. The official inflation rate in the Egyptian economy for 2010 was about 13 percent, which shows an increase of about 1 percent compared to 2009. Bank interest rate, which was 12.3% in 2008; in 2009, it was reduced to 8.5 percent.

Egypt's total exports in 2010 were about \$ 25 billion, making it the 64th largest country in the world. Egypt's total imports in the same year are estimated at \$ 46 billion. In 2010, the country's economic growth reached 6%; 2% growth over the previous year. On the other hand, rising inflation is pushing food prices (Saeedi, 1390: 49). The figures of the Central Bank of Egypt for early 2011 show that the country's total foreign debt has reached \$ 35 billion which is the highest level in more than five years. Between 2009 and 2010 alone, foreign debt rose 7 percent. Therefore, in the eyes of the Egyptian people, the Egyptian revolution is a process to challenge the structure of the country's economic development and to move towards overcoming problems such as high budget deficits, high debt rates, high unemployment rates, high poverty rates

and low living standards. None of this happened during and after this revolution. (Hosseini, 2001: 111)

2-1-3- Extensive poverty

Egyptian government corruption led to an unjust distribution of wealth and a marked increase in social divisions. The wide gap between rich and poor is one of the most important aspects of the Arab political environment (Abolhassan Shirazi and Rasouli, 1390: 22), the range of poverty increased from 16.7% in 2000 to 22% in 2008. In 2000, only 1.2 percent of the poor lived in absolute poverty; but in 2008, the figure rose to 5 percent. In 2008, about 25 percent of the government budget was spent on food, energy and subsidies, which damaged Egypt's finances (Kinniment, 2012: 1). During this time, however, other countries were reducing poverty. The level of absolute poverty and inequality in this country is staggering compared to these countries. In 2004, the poverty rate in Egypt was 8.3 percent; At the same time, the rate was less than 2 percent for Jordan, 3 percent for Turkey and 9.9 percent for Saudi Arabia. One of the most thought-provoking statistics about the Egyptian people in 2011 is the country's 40 percent poverty rate. In fact, they earn \$ 1 or less a day. According to the World Bank, in 2010, more than three million Egyptians fell below the poverty line in a matter of months. Living conditions among the majority of this population are only close to survival. On November 11, 2011, Egypt's foreign exchange reserves fell by about 40 percent. It was during this period that food prices reached a critical point, which certainly contributed to political instability (Zinkina 2011: 157). During Mubarak's rule, food subsidies alone fell by more than 11 percent, and in the year leading up to Revolutionary uprising, food prices in Egypt rose another 11 percent. This rapid rise in prices meant an increase in the country's poor. These figures sounded the alarm against the legitimacy of the Mubarak regime; Because the path of poverty always ends in tension and instability of the system. In this regard, poverty reduction strategies and



policies should have been at the top of the Mubarak government's agenda and given the people ample opportunity for upward mobility. If no plan or action was taken and the number of poor people increased every day.

3-1-3- Systemic corruption

One of the most important charges against Mubarak and his sons was economic crimes and their combination with political crimes. His specific charges, such as corruption, were just the smallest example of his economic charges. Egypt ranks 54th in the world in terms of corruption. Corruption among the lower and middle classes in Egyptian society is the reason for the low income of the employees, who number more than 6 million people. Improper economic policies that have not been ineffective in impoverishing the people are among the factors that make these classes ready to accept bribes. And other abnormal behaviors to a great extent. According to Transparency International, the following are some of the problems in fighting corruption in Egypt.

- Conflict between interests and political interference in the work of the Anti-Corruption Board,
- Disruptions in anti-corruption institutions, including the dependence of these agencies on the executive branch;
- Lack of active tools to support reporters in cases of corruption;
- Weakness in the tools of proper implementation of laws and bills;
- Government pressure on civil society organizations and press freedom (Korski and Witney, 2011: 143)

2- 3- Political factors

The transition to democracy or even the beginning of the process of democratization is influenced by many factors, some of which have been pointed out by various scholars according to their theoretical tendencies. In fact, authoritarian government and closed political space, militarism. Lack of political participation in Egypt are independent variables that have challenged stability based on democratic motives. The lack of an efficient civil

society and authoritarian structure is something that has been seen in Egypt for decades.

1-2-3- Closed political space

One of the factors accelerating revolutions is the closure of the political space of countries. The former Egyptian presidents were also a kind of military institution, and their characteristic feature was that they did not allow any rivals to be present in an atmosphere of security and terror. The situation in Egypt and the armed struggles of the Islamist opposition had begun. It gave the Mubarak regime the necessary pretext to suppress opposition forces and close the political space, and even after the cessation of hostilities in the 1990s, the state of emergency was extended over the next decade. Two political and social forms emerged: the political protest began with the start of the second Palestinian intifada in 2000 and moved into the country with the establishment of the Egyptian Movement for Change of Sufficiency.

The movement of Kefayi was small and limited, and in the post-2004 protests it showed limited public mobilization power, but the type of activities and performance of its young leader; In other words, Ayman al-Nour, which became the biggest challenge facing Mubarak in the 2005 elections, played a significant role in spreading the culture of protest in Egyptian society. In fact, the government's lack of response to the call for change and the restriction of political protests and its sensitivity to this form of protest, gradually led to the emergence of a new phenomenon of social protests in Egyptian society. As a result, social protests spread alongside political protests, and from 2004 to 2011, protests rose vertically and horizontally in Egyptian society. The protesters announced trade union and minor demands to prevent repression. (Ahmadian, 2005: 38).

2-2-3- Political participation

Egypt was a country where the state of emergency prevailed for many years. In addition, the authoritarian government had destroyed the strong link between the



citizens and the possibility of informal participation was taken away from the society, but the Mubarak government to show and present a favorable image of itself in the international community some forms of political participation such as presidential elections. Republic; Parliament and party activities were limited to one candidate and one particular political party. In 2005, the first presidential election in Egypt was held with several candidates, but in this election, the complete result was clear. The lack of freedom and fair elections means that the turnout in the elections decreases because people are skeptical of the political system.

The lack of political awareness of Egyptian citizens makes them not feel that they are political rivals and are able to influence politics; Combining citizens who feel influential in politics relative to citizens who do not feel the same. And the political system's response to their demands is an important reason why activists denounce their failures in protest and do not participate in the formal political process (Dalton and Welzel, 2014: 7) when Egyptians went to the polls in November. An important aspect was their ability to make optimal choices in their interests. So in the context of Egyptian society, this is difficult for voters for four reasons:

The first reason is that for many years the authoritarian government has accustomed the citizens to not knowing anything and therefore they did not know which party and political group could better serve their interests. Due to the mental and practical history of authoritarianism in For many years, the minds of the Egyptians had been deprived of the possibility of recognizing any choice.

Reason 2: After the fall of Mubarak's government, a group of parties came to Egypt, which led to the formation of various coalitions that disintegrated again. They serve.

Third reason: The majority of the parties have so far not presented any solution or plan for the problems that Egypt is facing, and this leaves the Egyptians unable to comment.

Due to the lack of party history. Institutionalism, the weakness of civil society, had left them without a decision.

Reason 4: The electoral system in Egypt's major parties is based on a proper representative on the electoral constituency, not at the national level, and this prevents Egyptian voters from always considering which party better serves their interests slowly.

Hosni Mubarak had described the conditions for running in the elections in such a way that it would be difficult for any political rival to enter the political arena. In addition, party laws prevented the real possibility of representatives other than members of the National Democratic Party coming to power. An example is the 2005 presidential election, in which he won the election with 87 percent of the vote, despite the presence of several candidates running against him. Similarly, in the 2005 parliamentary elections, the National Democratic Party controlled the elections by buying votes, effectively challenging free elections. Although the Muslim Brotherhood candidates were allowed to run more freely in the 2005 elections, it was the National Democratic Party that won a two-thirds parliamentary majority, with the Muslim Brotherhood winning only 88 candidates, or 20 percent. From all seats to parliament (Sullivan, 2009: 39). The Muslim Brotherhood is said to have won so many seats in parliament under international pressure, especially under George W. Bush, to create a democratic Middle East and, consequently, North Africa. Because the main idea here was to manage violence through the entry of religious political forces into politics and to minimize the suppressed anger of Islamist institutions and parties by entering the political arena. In the 2007 parliamentary elections, none of the Brotherhood members won seats, prompting the Muslim Brotherhood to boycott the elections in local elections, which even banned the registration of members of opposition groups and parties. The November 28, 2010 parliamentary elections also saw widespread and unprecedented violations of opposition



rights, leading to the arrest of hundreds of Muslim Brotherhood activists, unprecedented violence, and a sharp increase in pressure on the media. This resulted in nothing but the victory of the National Democratic Party in this election, which won the vast majority of seats in parliament. However, these developments had formed a negative mental background of the Mubarak government in the minds of the Egyptian people. The important thing about Egypt is that the protesting activists do not seem willing to participate in formal political processes (Bhuiyan, 2011: 19). In other words, political activists in Egypt are reluctant to join formal political participation processes. They do not and believe that if they are outside the system of formal political participation, they can be more influential in politics. These results are likely to be rooted in Egypt's past and people usually have a deep suspicion of the political system (Salanova, 2012: 28).

3-3- Cultural factors

The Egyptian people, as a leading people in the Islamic world, especially in the field of thought and civilization, during the years of Mubarak's rule, faced a serious conflict in terms of their culture and identity, and therefore worked to restore their lost identity. This reconstruction was reflected in the protests that eventually led to the fall of the Mubarak regime. However, post-Mubarak developments have so far shown that identity and cultural divisions are one of the challenges to the development of democracy in this country.

1-3-3- Identity crisis

During the decades of the rule of Nasser, Sadat and Mubarak, the Egyptian political system went through different periods and various gaps were created in the Egyptian political society. These kinds of gaps were dense and overlapping, reinforced each other, and further weakened the Egyptian political system. In the meantime, what played a key role was the emergence of an identity crisis in Egyptian society. Lack of representation of the values of Egyptian society by the government as a Muslim-

majority country; instead of trying to create a new human being, identity and society, efforts have been made to form tribal and tribal relations, and in a sense, sub-identities in line with the goals and aspirations of the government and the political system. As Jamal Abdel Nasser used Arab nationalism, which was a mixture of Arab socialism and ethnicism, to advance identity projects and gain power (Hopkins, 2010: 189).

The state apparatus had equipped its repressive machine in many Middle Eastern countries, including Egypt, in such a way that the persecution of Islamist groups had become a common feature for them. But these groups did not interrupt their struggle in any way. Their history of working against opposition to dictatorships and social activities and doing charity work had given them many followers. Their intellectual and organizational efforts over more than half a century were such that the Egyptian social body reached a consensus on the formation of a crisis in their religious and Islamic identity. Muslim protesters believed that "political Islam" was a model for development and life and could be used to formulate a plan for human life in the present century. This gap in the "interpretation of religion" was a structural gap in the Egyptian political system. Because the rule of Mubarak and his predecessor did not recognize such an approach at all.

Returning to Islamic identity caused psychological insecurity and an identity for the people of the region due to the fatal blow dealt to the body of the ruling religion by the governing bodies. The rulers either expelled Islamic views in the management of social and political affairs, either practically or theoretically, and this challenged the Islamic identity of the Egyptian people. The Islamic narrative of the daily lives of the people was marginalized. The variables that shaped Islamic behavior were eliminated through regional governments. People came to the stage to reconstruct it in order to emphasize their



difference from others in addition to dependence (Azzam, 2011: 44).

2-3-3- Human rights

Democracy and human rights are a new form of social life rather than an ideological version; it's a kind of logic and language for today's pluralistic coexistence and a relatively satisfactory way of resolving disputes. In a 2003 study, 16 Arab countries in the Middle East and Africa ranked lower than 26 Muslim countries in terms of citizenship and human rights. Are the most classified. Despite their strong interest in democracy, especially in countries such as Egypt, people have always avoided widespread political participation because they had little confidence in the influence of popular vote in determining their own political destiny. In fact, undermining the reference to the real votes of the people and the lack of influence of the votes on the political destiny of the people of the region, had created a feeling of inferiority and lack of respect between the political government and the people. This sense of respect is of paramount importance in the theory of ontological security, because individuals value dignity as much as their material interests, and any disruption in the reproduction of a sense of respect and honor among social actors can lead to the accumulation of hatred and ultimately violence. Lead. Of course, this feeling does not arise only from the unrealistic and dramatic political participation of the government, but also other elements are involved in this. Various colors had faded or completely colorless. The result of these conditions has been the marginalization of the genuine and powerful capacities of the societies of these countries and the feeling of humiliation in the people. Human Rights Watch said in 2017 that 15 Egyptian, African, and international organizations had stated that the Egyptian government was witnessing the worst human rights crisis in decades, while effectively cracking down on dissidents and legal activists. Many Egyptian and international institutions are not allowed to operate freely in Egypt. In addition to not respecting or protecting human

rights in Egypt, the Egyptian government is working to undermine the independence of the African Human Rights Committee. Egyptian authorities also confiscated the property of prominent human rights activists in the country and their organizations and banned dozens of them from traveling, retaliating against them and human rights defenders for cooperating with international and regional human rights watchdogs, including news agencies and experts. Adopted internationally. In late 2018, Egyptian authorities arrested a number of citizens for meeting with the UN Special Rapporteur in Egypt, demolished their homes and banned them from traveling.

Result

With the revolution of January 25, 2011, it seemed that Egypt was in a different political phase than in the past, but a few years after the Egyptian revolution, it became clear that the transition to democracy was not going in a better direction than in the past. . Initially, the government was transferred from the military to the civilian population, and those who were politically marginalized returned to power. The beginning of a kind of political movement caused Egypt to focus on public issues from the point of view of its private life. But this experience was also multifaceted, and despite the great opportunities, it faced difficult challenges. This showed that the change of agents and governments in different periods since the independence of Egypt did not have much effect on the transition to democracy in Egypt, but the problem of democracy in this country was structural and was examined in three major dimensions. The lack of a good ruler, the authoritarianism of the political system and its permeability, along with poverty and inequality and all kinds of social helplessness, cause a rift between the nation and the government, especially the youth and the government. Livelihood; Identity; Legitimacy and efficiency led to revolutionary developments in these countries. Captive dictatorial societies such as Egypt have always had poor social ties and organization; Links that the government did not allow



to be formed or established at a time when the suppression of civil society parties and institutions had dampened citizens' hopes for change.

Persian References

Abolhassan Shirazi, Habibullah and Rasooli Mina (2011): Anatomy of the Egyptian Movement, Encyclopedia of Political Science

Ahmadian, Hassan (2011), Egypt's Transition from the Authoritarian Regime, Factors and Backgrounds, Foreign Relations Quarterly, Winter, No. 4.

Ottavi, Marina (2007), Transition to Democracy or Quasi-Authoritarianism, translated by Saeed Mirtorabi, Tehran, Qoms Publishing.

Hafezian, Mohammad Hossein (2009), Government, Elites and Development in the Middle East, Tehran: Vice Chancellor for Research, Islamic Azad University.

Hosseini, Mokhtar (2001), Strategic Estimation of Egypt, Tehran: Abrar Contemporary Publications

Alam, Abdolrahman: (1997), Foundations of Political Science, third edition: Tehran, publication.

Madani Jalaluddin (1372), Principles and generalities of political science, Tehran, author's publication

Hopkins and Saad Bahar (2010), Egyptian Culture, Translator, Sarat Translation Group, Regional Studies, No. 3

Huntington, Samuel: (2009), The Third Wave of Democracy at the End of the Twentieth Century, translated by Ahmad Shahsa, Tehran, Others Publications: (1996), Introduction to Political Ideologies, translated by M. Qaed, first edition: Markaz Publishing.

Jan Mackenzie et al. (1996), Introduction to Political Ideologies, translated by M. Ghaed (First Edition: Markaz Publishing, 1996), p. 172

English References

Azzam. Maha, (2011), “Islamism: Extremists or Democrats?”, in: Conservative Middle East Council the Arab Spring: Implications for British Policy

Dalton, Russell J. and Welzel, Christian, (2014), “Political Culture and Value Change”, Available at: www.socsci.uci.edu

Dworkin, Anthony, Korski, Daniel and Witney, Nick, (2011), Egypt's Hybrid Revolution: a Bolder EU Approach, May, www.ecfr.eu

Khatib, lina (2013) Street art and the Egyptian , Revolution Strategic sectors, Culture & society Mediterranean. Yearbook

Paciello, Cristina Maria, (2011) Political of Challenges and Changes: Egypt y Technical MEDPRO, Transition, o Report Technical MEDPRO, 4/may

Salanova, Regina, (2012), Social Media and Political Change: The Ccase of the 2011 Revolutions in Tunisia and Egypt, Barcelona, Institute Catala International Per la P