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Abstract

Democracy promotion is a foreign policy adopted by governments and international organizations that seek to spread democracy as a political system around the world. While this policy is perceived by some as legal and legitimate mainly by the western democracies precisely the U.S.A; others claimed the opposite that the western democracies do not have the right to exercise such activity. Egypt is one case where the U.S.A planned its AID program in order to save according to the "Egyptians from authoritarianism" under the umbrella of "Democracy Promotion". The present work contends that behind the blog argument that Democracies do not fight each other democracy promotion argument as merely an imperialist, global and beneficial reason. Publicly, the United States pronounced its role as the world’s super-power to spread human rights and democracy in the world (along with other western democracies). In reality, the U.S.A violated such claims and especially through military interventions like that of Iraq. All of that gave the United States of America a hypocritical image which became so clear in recent decades regardless of the efforts done to hide it.
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General Introduction:

Democracy promotion was and is still one of the most important aspects in Western democracies’ foreign policies. The present research paper highlights this American plan and tries to discover the strategies used to apply such a policy. While doing this, the present work intends to discover the real reasons behind the so called “democracy promotion”, if it was created to achieve honest intentions i.e.; protecting human rights and freedoms all around the world or is it just a cover to hide beneficial and strategic interests. For this sake, American presence in Egypt and especially recently is the case in point that highlights the American need to establish and maintain its interests not only in Egypt but in the whole Middle East.

Moreover, the West under the American leadership claim to insure universal human rights, protect human’s dignity and most importantly end authoritarianism. Nevertheless, this research paper aims to prove that the U.S.A is always using the argument of democracy promotion to interfere in any country which best serves its interests as the war on Iraq 2003. In fact, Democracy promotion program seems to have two controversial directions; a pronounced one and an indirect hidden direction. When undertaking this work, the researcher was motivated by several causes. Firstly, the unreasonable war on Iraq, which was launched on the basis of containing nuclear weapons of mass destruction and ending the authoritarian regime of Saddam Hussein. Eventually, the U.S.A entered that country and no WMD were found, instead anarchy and chaos spread all over Iraq. The U.S.A which calls for the protection of human rights for decades; has violated such claims so easily when many innocents were killed. Such actions reveal a hypocritical image about American. In this context, a set of questions comes to mind: why did the U.S.A create this democracy promotion
program? Was it really for the sake of protecting liberties and freedoms all around the world? Or are there any other hidden reasons? And why do nations accept such a policy and even help the U.S.A to realize it?

Secondly, in 2005 the U.S.A started a democracy promotion program in Egypt under the name of human rights and freedoms while at the same time supporting the authoritarian regime (that of Mubarak). Besides, the United States supplied the Egyptian government with billions of Dollars of USAID (directed especially for the military side), but that did not last because after a while the U.S.A reduced such a sum under the Israeli pressure. What is unclear, then, is this double faced relationship. Accordingly, the thesis aims to prove that when the United States chose Egypt, it did so on a strategic basis because Egypt is the door to the Arab world as a whole especially the Gulf nations; where the U.S.A should protect its “Peace Agreement”.

Thirdly, the recent Arab spring and especially that of the Egyptian revolution is a strong evidence of the illegality of the democratic program. The January revolution of 2011 emphasizes that people are the only source of democracy, and only them can end authoritarianism and tyranny. So, what was the United States doing in Egypt since authoritarianism was getting stronger and stronger and the president was in power for nearly three decades? In fact, America did not realize any of its promises, and only insured its global presence and imperialism in the region which generated social problems like: poverty, famine and unemployment.

The primary sources used in this research work are mainly: American governmental publications especially those of the American department of State and the White House, also speeches of some U.S presidents (George. Bush and Barack Obama) and some speeches of members from the U.S administration (a CNN report).
In addition to some interviews like that of Oprah Winfrey with president Bush, also the Al-Ahram newspaper interview with the American ambassador in Egypt (Faltman) and some views of Egyptian politicians and journalists about the democracy promotion program. Besides a book of Alexis De Tocqueville entitled: *Democracy in United States* (1838).

The secondary sources that deal with the subject are primarily political, and deal with the strategies used in the U.S democracy promotion programs. Some provide a set of legal reasons on behalf of the U.S.A; other secondary sources provide some illegal hidden reasons.

By making use of primary and secondary sources and using a descriptive analytical approach, this research paper aims to show two sides in the American foreign policy especially in Egypt

- The real purpose behind the U.S democracy promotion. The U.S.A is using such a foreign policy tool to maintain its own interests i.e.; to preserve its global presence and achieve economic, liberal and imperialist purposes.

- America intends to convince the world that true democracy would be achieved via its own interference.

Concerning the citation, this work has been pursued in the Modern Language Association Format (Documenting Sources in MLA Style: Update a Hacker Handbooks. Supplement Bedford/St. Martin’s Boston: New York.2009).

Concerning the organization of this work, it is divided into three chapters. The first chapter deals with the theoretical and historical background of democracy in
some international contexts and its development over time in the U.S.A. Also, it sheds the light on some important democratic documents and key aspects of democracy.

The second chapter deals with the different types of democracy promotion, the movement of democratization precisely its waves then, it discusses the reasons behind it (declared and hidden reasons), while learning from the Iraqi experience and by the end assessing the Arab democracy through some international indexes.

The third chapter deals with the case of Egypt highlighting how the U.S.A Implemented its Democracy Promotion Program in this key Arab nation, and the illegality of such program illustrating from the revolution of 2011 that opens the way for many closed doors.
Chapter One: Democracy: A Historical Background

Introduction:

“The appeal of the undiscovered is strong in America”, and for nearly three centuries the fundamental process in American history was the westward movement. The American fundamental traits, institutions, even ideals were shaped by this interaction between the wilderness and them. A set of ideals developed in America like non-fatalism and looking for change i.e.: changing from aristocracy to democracy, from racism (slavery) to equality and no longer appealing for the Monroe doctrine and building relations with other nations. Another ideal is the individualistic sense that led to a change in both industrial and economic life. Discovery was always present in the American history, and the U.S.A was the suitable place to realize such an ideal. More importantly, the democracy ideal played a great role in the American foreign policy; it was the result of expansion and touching new frontiers. It was based on giving freedom to individuals and constructing a democratic society (Turner 243-254).

I. Defining Democracy:

The word democracy came originally from the Greek word "Demos" which means the community and "Cratos" which means sovereign power. (Fran et al 303) When we join the words together it means "a government by the people". In most cases via an elected representative legislature, modern Democracy developed out of the French and American revolutions (Ibid).
The Oxford Dictionary gave different interpretations to Democracy. First, it can mean a kind of government where people can decide in it through representatives whom they choose and elect such a kind of democracy is known as the "Western Democracy". Secondly, Democracy refers to nations that promote freedom of speech, religion, public opinion, respect of law and, majority rule (Grother et al 239).

In addition, Democracy can mean the absence of social classes in societies and the existence of equality between citizens. Moreover, its meaning is associated with an organization that is controlled by its members who uphold taking decisions. Such a kind of democracy is known as "industrial democracy". From democracy the word 'democrat' originated to describe a person who believes or supports democracy. From the same word also, the U.S Democratic Party was created to represent one of the major political parties in the U.S.A which adopted liberal policies and social reform (Grother et al 239).

Democracy then can be defined as a system of government in which people can control its powers in a direct or indirect way via representation and free elections. "Direct Democracy" is usually found in some ancient Greek cities such as New England (meetings, in such a democracy people express their opinion in the government publicly). Nowadays, the overlapping majority of the world’s democracies are representative i.e.: indirect democracy in which all citizens participate in government. That idea of representation can be traced back from ancient Greek and later from medieval European institutions (enlightenment Era), to the French and American Revolution," Today democracy has come simply to mean universal suffrage, competition for office and freedom of speech and the press and the rule of law" (Britannica 520).
Watts argued that, democracy can be defined also as being a belief in government by the people according to the majority will. (10) Those selected representatives are characterized by being knowledgeable and involved citizens. Americans in general from their early history had a consensus in supporting democracy that highlights mainly: (Watts 10-11).

- A deep interest in the exercise of power.
- A majority agreement of majority rule and respect for minorities.
- A firm commitment to popular sovereignty.
- A strong support for the rule of law (no one is above the law).
- A dislike and distrust of government.
- A support of politicians, who are capable of expressing the thoughts and feelings of the common man (10-11).

Riker, explains democracy as being:

[A] form of government in which the rules are fully responsible to the ruled in order to realize self respect for everybody. It is a sublime purpose and a system worthy of it. How unfortunate that, (…) the practice of democracy everywhere is so Partial, so hesitant and so in complete. (31)

Riker here viewed the democratic process as being not competent enough to realize the needs of the public as a whole. This is to some extent true because some racial minorities are not fully represented in some democracies. Ancient Greeks such as Aristotle in his Politics described democracy as rule by the whole people or at least a majority (Kevin and Royd 60). It seems that defining democracy is an easy task, But in fact, there are some contradictions while doing so, because some forms of governments in the world are called democratic while in reality they are not like the
German, Italian fascism, even communist regimes and the world’s most developing dictatorships; all of those declare themselves to be true democracies (Kevin and Royd 60).

Defining democracy in the sense of elections is not a complete definition. Firstly according to Samuel P. Huntington (1927-2008) “… democracy has or should have much more sweeping and idealistic connotations. To him, ‘true democracy means liberté, fraternité, effective citizen control over policy, responsible government, honesty, equal participation, power and various civic virtues”(7). It means that mutual responsibility between both citizens and government to maintain one end Equal opportunities for all. Secondly, a democratic government under an incompatible leader, who do not exercise real democracy and expresses the sound of one group only or sometimes he is not chosen via elections. Thirdly, the stability of the political system is an important condition in such contexts for example, in early 1984 the Freedom House classified Nigeria as being free; nevertheless by the end of the same year, a military campaign led to the end of democracy in it. Additionally, The fourth cause is the controversial treatment of non-democracies in terms of dichotomies which means that elements of democracy are the judge here as elections, freedoms and political parties and after assessing it, the degree of democracy could be deduced easily (Huntington 7).

All the Above points share an important key point about democracy which is the representative side. So, democracy is a system of government directed by the popular will rather than by the will of an assumed few. Lincoln’s saying sums it up “… Government of the people, by the people, for the people …” (Ricker 3). Additionally, such definitions of democracy give the impression that the task to have a clear definition for democracy is so complex, controversial and debatable.
Sorensor argued that the meaning of democracy is a complex thing because: “rule by the people involves many complex elements”, and to understand the nowadays meaning of democracy there is a need first for a “theory of contemporary society” that can help in understanding the people’s political needs. Sorensor explains that there are two contemporary notions concerning the subject (10).

The first notion was created by Joseph Schumpeter, which saw that the real meaning of democracy was to participate in the election process i.e.; “mechanism for choosing political leadership”, Citizens can participate in elections to have a political leader as Shumpeter argues that: “the democratic method is an institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of competitive struggle for the people’s vote”. The second conception, created by David Held who had a vision from both liberalism and Marxism and by the end he come up with the fusion of both; democracy and autocracy (Sorensor 11).

II. Origins of Democracy:

There are five famous democratic documents that are worth mentioning. Starting with Athens and the *Funeral Oration* that is a major democratic document if not the basis of Democracy. The Athenian *Funeral Oration*
² Originated by a statesman; “Pericles”. It can be described as “an enology of brave men and of the government for which they fought and died “(Ricker 11). The *funeral oration* helped Athenians during times of crisis and was good for Athenian democracy.

Ricker claimed that another form of democracy originated in England in the 1640’s when a document was needed to organize its social affairs, and that document should be independent from the constitutional strain. Here lies the democratic process
of breaking monarchical power; when an ideological conflict emerged in the
government about who should rule. So “the Agreement of the People” was drafted to
end that problem, which could be described as “a consciously democratic solution”. In
fact, that agreement was not applied but its ideas were exercised later in America in
the 18th century (8).

*The Declaration of Independence* tackled a number of ideals mainly: all
people are equal and have the same natural rights (life, liberty and pursuit of
happiness) and that government's task is to protect people’s rights, if failed to do so,
people have the right. “We hold these truths to be self evident that all men are created
equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights
…Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right
of the people to alter …” (The Longman Group 8).

Ricker viewed that American democracy went out its borders; and is seen in
the French “*Declaration of Rights of Man and Citizens*”. Although that document was
written by monarchists, it can still be included in the democratic process. Another
important document is Lincoln’s “*Gettysburg Address*“, that is a 19th century speech
that became “a classic form of the democratic dogma, not only in his country
[U.S.A] but all over the world” (6-12).
Those previous documents, assert that democracy is more than being just an ideal. It is about methods i.e. governmental institutions and how it is used and practiced by people in a way that fits equality and freedom principles.

1. Key Democratic Ideals:

The U.S.A led the world’s greatest democracies against doctrines of Nazism and Fascism. After the end of the cold war and for the first time in Latin America no military government for nearly half a century there enjoyed democratic peace because the U.S.A helped them to do so (Pomper and Weiner 4).

Democracy in the U.S.A was characterized by certain fundamental principles mainly: Liberty and Equality.

A. Liberty: from the Latin word Liber: free, liberty, liberal. Liberalism in simple words means, any individual’s liberties must be respected and any individual’s dignity should be respected (Watts 20).

The fundamental sense of freedom is freedom from claims, from imprisonment, from enslavement by others the rest is the extension of this sense or else metaphor Strive to be free is to seek to remove obstacles; to struggle for personnel Is to seek to curb interference, exploitation, enslavement by men whose ends are Theirs, not one’s own. Freedom, at least in its political sense, is co-terminus with the absence of bullying or domination (Pomper and Weiner 91).

Libertas meaning Interalia: nondonation, intitlement and ability. Originated from the Creeks and the Romans, and such a definition was maintained in the western
history until the 19th century (Pomper and Weiner 97). In the 1640’s during the English Civil War, the word began to change and refer to individual’s independency from governmental intrusion. The development of political liberty later was a major step toward calling for liberty manifested in a strong attack on slavery as what appeared in the London newspaper (1737); “I suppose it will readily be granted, that all mankind are equally free born; and the Natural Freedom is with great reason highly valued by the whole human race … these Negros never forfeited their liberty, and couldn’t never injured their cruel Lords …” (The Old Whig 1737-38). Later, in the U.S.A the same happened with the Declaration of Independence and also there was the women’s suffrage movement on both sides of the English-speaking Atlantic (Pomper and Weiner 97).

Pomper and Weiner stated that Liberty is one of the most important notions in the Western political concepts especially when these notions create crisis and problems. Liberty in the modern democratic states is characterized by some key features. Firstly, it is merely rhetoric of an ideological nature so became a hard task to define especially in the last centuries. In addition, liberty is a key feature in modern democracies and constitutions that calls only for the rule of law and equality. Liberty is about being free from restrains and obstacles (93).

To understand the rhetorical and ideological nature of liberty it is necessary to describe the ambiguities and controversies surrounding it. the United Nations’ Universal Declaration of Human Rights, contains concepts like freedom and almost all the world’s political systems adjust to such an ideal and none of them legitimate actions like: slavery, sexual and, political oppression although these practices exist in many states. In fact when zooming on the U.S.A, we find that it uses the excuse of
Human Rights, while violating basic freedoms in other nations. Many nations though contradicting to each other claim sponsoring freedom like the Muslims and Hindus in India, or Palestinians and Israelis in the Middle East or like Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland. Each one of them practices freedom in a different way like non-interference, while others like to co-exist with each other (Pomper and Weiner 93).

Traditionally speaking, liberty had a negative meaning which means that a government has no control over individuals under the first Amendment of the Constitution “freedom of speech and religion” (Pomper and Weiner 6). Nevertheless, some scholars (like Nancy Hirschman and Crordon Schochet) argued that freedom is restricted by the social surrounding that is referred to as ’positive liberty’ in which individuals need some organization, like anti-discrimination laws to get real freedom (Ibid). On the other hand, Liberty often contradicts with equality, for example: economic freedom, which happens when governments try to realize equality via using some affirmative action programs that in the same time limits to some extent freedom. For example, when poor candidates enter elections equally with the rich and during voting time poor candidates may suffer from rich’s money influence (Pomper and Weiner 6-7).

To talk about the American democracy (and its principles) in a neutral way, one need to have a neutral writer, the best in this case is Alexis De Tocqueville. Who wrote La Democracy En Amérique, because he believes that the famous American liberty and equality are needed for his people and for all nations.

In the sense of liberty, De Tocqueville³ wrote about freedom of the press in the U.S.A. He argued that freedom is not deputed only in politics but also in public opinion (tradition and habits). He viewed freedom of the press do as a necessary
practice, because it preserves for people’s sovereignty [as the American people think]. So, it seems that the sovereignty of the people and freedom of the press go in parallel (i.e.: correlative institutions). On the other hand controlling the press and the electoral right are completely open to each other. De Tocqueville argued that no one from the 12 million people that lived in the U.S.A at that time could suggest any restrictions on press liberty. De Tocqueville spoke about an article published in the Gazzette newspaper in which the president Andrew Jackson was being described as a tyrant, who had no mercy claim, an evil political gambler and that he would be soon punished for his crimes. From the above we conclude that freedom of the press could be so destructive but at same time freedom cannot exist without it (De Tocqueville Trans Reeve 37).

“Congress shall make no law religion, or prohibit respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, [or of the press]; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances” (U.S Information Agency 2).

Krimsky viewed that the first amendment of the American constitution shows that freedom of the press was a long standing tradition, created by the American founding fathers. Tomas Jefferson argued that if he was to choose between a government and a free press, he would choose the latter (15).

Boyd stated that the Pentagon Papers case, which was published in the New York Times on June 13, 1971 and later under the First Amendment, newspapers was given the right to publish some top secret governmental documents (58). Another
example is the case of Gregory Johnson VS Texas (1989), when he fired the American flag and was held in custody. Justices found that the Texas law was unconstitutional and legally Johnson can do such action. Nevertheless, some courts do not support the freedom of expression. So, a number of watch-dog associations were created to insure the protection of basic civil liberties in the U.S.A (Watts 126). It is clear that Americans loved to exercise freedom of the press from the very beginning; even governments cannot interfere in such a right even if there were conflicts.

**B. Equality:** It is clearly written in the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal"

Its meaning for the American is of worth and not of outcome i.e.; it is more about prospect of advancement than about result (not to look for sociality, ethnicity, gender or religion), but all people have the same chance to prove themselves (De Tocqueville Trans Reeve 306).

Equality is known to be a key component of democracy De Tocqueville described it is as a determining feature of American life. He argued that politically speaking equality between people can implant love of independence in them i.e.: establishing the idea of political in dependence in people’s minds (306). In fact, American history can be read through the evolution of equality (emancipation of slaves, women’s rights and the civil rights movement of the late 20th century). But, many authors argued that class inequality can lead to the American equality, and many scholars viewed that the old form of inequality is replaced by a new one which is class or technological inequality (Pomper and Weiner 98).
Wolf declared that, if those principles need to be realized, some institutions need to be present for the better of America. Any democratic community needs for example political parties and interest groups to express and spread their interests, and the American democracy would face problems if only one institution would work ineffectively. Institutions like: the Congress, the President and the Supreme Court (106-107).

In 1791, the first 10 amendments of the U.S constitution were adopted, known as the Bill of Rights. That later grantees freedoms (of speech, press, and of religion), with the creation of an independent Supreme Court in the United States in 1782 , “…the Supreme Court of the United States as a constitutional court … Is the most significant single contribution the United States has made to the art of government “ (Rehvquist 4). Thus thanks to the existence of the Supreme Court, personal liberties would be more maintained and protected.

In democratic terms as Howard claimed, the legislatures were there to express the voice of the popular will. Nevertheless, even those legislatures could threaten freedom rights but with ideas like separation of powers, checks and balances, and judicial review the legislatures could stand up again to achieve their roles effectively (5). In fact, judicial review can enforce democratic principles like establishing free and fair elections. The U.S count sometimes errors but it asserted the rule of law and spread it among the American citizens.

Another in leading institution that plays a major role in American democracy is the Congress. It holds the responsibility of passing bills, approving security measures and most importantly, granting civil rights to women, minorities and the disabled. Members of the U.S congress involved themselves in highly complex public
policies in order to place the American congress in American democracy (Smith, Roberts and Weilen 1).

C. Elements of Democracy:

Kevin viewed democracy to be characterized by a number of features that cannot be separable from it. The first aspect is connected to people’s ‘popular sovereignty’ (67). Because all of the world’s democracies are supposed to serve the will of the people, they constitute the sovereign political power in a democracy although it differs from one nation to another but in general:

This concept [i.e.; sovereignty] claims that people have the right to create government of their choice and to replace it when they see fit. Legitimacy derives from the democratic will of the people, not from the sovereign or a ruling class defined by birth…all are subjects to government. All should have a say on how it is constructed. (Kevin 67)

The second element; 'elite majority rule', and at the same time respecting minority opinions and trying not to ignore them. Likewise, there should be “a free market of ideas in democracies”. The third democratic characteristic is all about 'equality' and 'citizenship rights' (Ibid). According to Kevin, each citizen in every democracy must have ‘equal political rights’ i.e.; voting cannot be denied to any one, in addition for having the right to run for an office. A fourth aspect in a democracy is 'public opinion' that should be expressed freely and since each democracy must reflect the majority rule, public opinion can affect policy making and shape the democratic culture. The fifth aspect is connected to the rule of the law, because nations that are governed by the law are best governed than those with authority (69).

2. The Development of Democracy in the U.S.A:
De Tocqueville (1805-1859), mentioned in his book *Democracy in the U.S.A*, that Americans in their very beginning (i.e. Anglo-Americans) practiced democracy in their social lives:

The first immigrants of New England. Their equality- aristocratic laws introduced In the south- period of revolution - change in the law of descent-effect produced By this change-democracy carried to its utmost limits in the new states of the west-equality of education. (38)

What is concluded from that quote is that the Anglo-American life was characterized from the early beginning by being democratic. After the establishment of a new government, Americans began to progress economically especially after drafting the Articles of Confederation. Thomas Jefferson⁴, argued that the people favors strong economy and union that led to the American prosperity (the Longman Group 258). In the 1970’s, the U.S.A witnessed an economic boom in terms of population, exports, imports, agriculture, and at the same time mutual relations with foreigners to avoid wars (The Longman Group 258).

By 1803, the U.S.A became the biggest industrial supplier for England (especially when France and England engaged in war against each other). There were tensions and provocations between England and the U.S.A, which led into a war that lasted from 1812 to 1814. Later, especially during the presidency of James Monroe (1758-1831) the two countries made an alliance (The Longman Group 258).

After getting rid from war, the country became more interested in its inside affairs. It changed from “gentlemanly politics” to’ state union' especially in the 1820’s (De Tocqueville Trans Reeve 39). In addition, new economic interests, new institutions and new ideological concepts have developed such as Americanism,
nationalism, individualism and democracy. By the late 19th century, the American
government became the best in the world.

When Americans settled in New England they forgot about aristocracy. What
only ruled the nation was in terms of intellectuality. While on the other hand, some
areas like the south-west of the Hudson River, aristocracy was strong but not strong
enough to match the real meaning of the European aristocracy. At that time, the
American people wanted to exercise authority by themselves, being provoked by the
democratic tendencies. There was only one last step to establish true American
democracy; ‘the law of descent’ because it decreases from land with every coming
generation. The solution was to get rid from the previous laws concerning the
transition of property i.e.: abolition of property qualification. After 60 years, the
societies’ structure changed completely, big land owners almost disappeared and there
were no class divisions as before (De Tocqueville Trans Reeve 39-45).

A sample about the Early American Democracy:

The best case that reveals the practice of democracy is New England, because
in it people were the main source of power. They decided their affairs by themselves,
and the selectmen can realize people’s decisions into action. They act via: “town
meetings, enumeration of the public officers of the township [together with]
obligatory and remuneration functions”. The majority of the administrative work was
in the hands of the selectmen, who worked on behalf of the public will, in everything
they do like building a school they must have the approval. The selectmen in New
England were chosen every year in April or May. Moreover they elect some
magistrate to help in the administrative work. That sample shows that people exercise
authority in America and local governance is the best place were citizens exercise the
ultimate level of direct governance (Ibid 57-60).
III. Democracy in America Recently:

1. Recent Meaning of Democracy:

   Huntington explained that there are three general American approaches that shape the modern usage of democracy. First, it has been defined in terms of 'sources of authority for government'. Secondly, democracy is about the purposes that served the government, and the third one focuses on the procedures for constituting government (Huntington 14). Joseph Schumeter in 1942 in his *capitalism, socialism, and democracy*, considers the ‘will of the people’ as the source of power and the ‘common good’ is the purpose of every individual. Later in the 1970’s have, two separate definitions appeared. On one hand, there is rationalistic, utopian, idealistic democracy definition and on the other there is an empirical, descriptive, industrial and, periodical definition. In the twenty first, century politics of democracy would be practiced in terms of contestation and participation and also the protection of rights like freedom of expression in all of its forms i.e. procedural (14).

2- The New Politics of Democracy:

   Wolf viewed that the twenty first century American democratization became more controversial. During the old politics of democracy, the wealthy for example supported restrictions of franchise while women and minority groups (10).

   There are some traces of that kind of democracy in nowadays American life basing on the fact that many minority groups and immigrants do not enjoy full rights especially civil rights completely. Nevertheless, many states are struggling now to make their constitutions more democratic, “more democracy is better democracy”. Even the conservatives are not using the old politics’ language of democracy anymore; they are now more convicted to the ordinary citizens (Wolf 10).
In this sense the United States, started a new politics of democracy that is characterized by two main features away from the old struggle over franchise. Firstly, the difference between the left and the right is no longer economic but over matters such as morals or religion and it is called ‘culture war’. Secondly, 'competitive culture' which refers in this sense to the revelry and challenge between political parties or candidates so that when one side wins the other it is only the 'best who can win' (Ibid).

3. Democracy and Liberty after the 9/11Events:

It is obvious that the main role of democracy is to protect individual's liberties (in the U.S.A). Thus, the attacks of September 11, 2001 were recognized as a violation over the American freedoms, so the United States responded and started a military campaign under the 'Operation Enduring Freedom'. It is true that when thousands of people were killed during the attacks, individual liberties were violated. However, when the world’s democracies used anti-terrorist measures including intolerance and extremist, which are the opposite of what a liberal democracy stands for i.e.; openness and mutual-respect. After the terrorist attacks, democracy became a threat to freedom and many Arab Americans were mistreated especially in the American airports in addition to secret detentions and the break of secrecy between prisoners and their attorneys when suspected to be terrorists, not only that but also the freedom of information was also violated. Then, Muslims in the U.S now would suffer from what Alexis De Tocqueville called "tyranny of the majority" (Pomper and Weiner 73-74).

Some critics argued that personal liberties are not related to democracy but to Liberalism and some liberal democracies. Feminists and critical race theorists argued the same and viewed that modern American democracy is not for one class sake not
even for a certain race or gender’s sake i.e.; women, minority groups and, poor people may be neglected in such a democracy. An example that represented the failure to protect freedom is PRWORA the 'Personal Responsibility Work Opportunity Reconciliation' of 1996. This policy was a major change in the welfare system via replacing the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (TANF) program with Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). The aim from such reform was to decrease the welfare rolls and save money. Nevertheless the poor classes were badly harmed by such a policy because their voices were silenced (especially the single poor mothers). The rights of those people were restricted because they were seen as lazy and irresponsible. So, when the PRWORA program was activated, it targeted the freedom of the poor and considered them as the problem and not part of the solution. But if those neglected citizens were included in the democratic process, they would participate and new policies would be enacted (Ibid 75).

4. Democracy in the American Foreign Policy:

Foreign policy refers to the underlying activities and connections between two or more states and the development of any foreign policy is effected by domestic affairs. The U.S.A designed its foreign policies under democratic claims to achieve its aims for example, the U.S national security depends on the spread of global economies democracy and human rights. In the same time it helps. Lee Hamilton wondered how the political and economic power of the U.S.A will extend the benefits of the global economy and advance other foreign policy goals (Epstein et al 3). First, there should be a strong domestic economy that will provoke foreign nations to invoke liberalization. Secondly, the free market and open trade must be established, more international economic institutions should be created. Thirdly, there should be an investment in education, and promotion of the law. The role of the U.S.A here is to
help the poor nations via educational exchange, opening a free market trade and, most importantly the promotion of democracy. For instance; most of the African continent’s nations do not enjoy modern manufactures needed in an age of globalization, and here comes the role of the United States to bring up aid, dept relief, technical assistance, loans and, open markets for African goods. (Epstein et al 3).

Democracy promotion became a main aspect in the American foreign policy. Such a policy is approved both by the executive and the legislative branches of the U.S government. Programs were implemented to realize democracy promotion in other countries for example: the House of Democracy Assistance Commission (HDAC), which attributed democratic assistance for twelve countries (Fukuyama 2). The American government decided to start such a policy since WWI, in order ‘to make the world safe for democracy’. Each of the American presidents Reagan, George. W. Bush II and Clinton inserted it in their nation democratic agendas. The U.S.A promoted such a foreign policy on the basis that some countries lack the real practice of democracy and freedom (Ibid).

**Table 1: democracy and freedom by region 2002.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region.</th>
<th>Number of countries.</th>
<th>Number of democracies. (percent of total*)</th>
<th>Number(percent) of liberal democracies FH score 2.5</th>
<th>Average freedom score for region 1974 –2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. Europe and Anglophone states.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28 (100%)</td>
<td>28 (100%)</td>
<td>1.58 1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30 (91%)</td>
<td>17 (52%)</td>
<td>3.81 2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe and former Soviet</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18(67%)</td>
<td>11(41%)</td>
<td>6.50 3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Liberal Democracies</td>
<td>Freedom Score</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia (E, SE and, S)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12 (48%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11 (91%)</td>
<td>8 (67%)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa (Sub Sahara).</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19 (40%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East North Africa.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>120 (63%)</td>
<td>73 (38%)</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab countries</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly Arab countries</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*the current number of democracies as classified by the freedom house, with the exception that Russia is classified as non-democracies.

** Bangladesh, Mali, Senegal, Indonesia, Turkey and, Albania. (Karatnycky).

We conclude from the table above those countries that have the highest percentage of liberal democracies and freedom score are those of Western Europe, 'Anglophone states'. While it decreases in Latin America and the Caribbean, while in Africa (Sub-Sahara, Middle East and, North Africa) the percentage is so low. The countries that have a high level of democracy (like the U.S.A) perceived themselves as the supplier of democracy to those countries that have a lower grade. The United States used many ways 'to promote and spread democracy', one way is via using the military force like what happened in Iraq and Afghanistan or providing poor nations with economic help and good educational programs (Epstein et al 8).

In addition, it is argued by many supporters of democracy promotion (like the secretaries of state Condoleezza Rice and Madeleine Albright) that democracies co-exists together or as it is referred by the “democratic peace theory”. Another argument, is that democracy can prevent terrorism via spreading basic human rights, freedoms (of speech, religion, assemble, associate, press, law order and, effective justice). According to Western Democracies these components can stand up against terrorism and end it and the establishment of the rule of the law can help in
developing economy, because equal opportunities between people can increase their income. Besides, a country that enjoys democratic stability would enjoy with Western Democracies (Epstein et al 9).

Fukuyama argued that democracy in terms of foreign policy can face many obstacles, similarly Jean-Francois argued that democracies’ adversaries are tyrannies (authoritarianism, theocracies and intolerant nationalisms). In addition the main weaknesses of liberal democracies (i.e.; those of Europe and America) are problems of: unemployment, pollution, drugs and crime. (44)
Conclusion:

Democracy or “the rule by the people” is an important aspect in each government in the world, not only in modern times but also in the very early beginning of human history (Athens, Greek and Rome…). However, setting a clear and comprehensible definition for Democracy is not an easy task. This is due mainly to the controversies surrounding it mainly the limited rights and liberties to a proportion of the population while negligence and ignorance of the majority like the poor.

Concerning democracy in the United States of America it was implemented since the foundation of the 13 colonies of America (with the Founding Fathers and the Declaration of Independence). For centuries Americans called for liberty, equality and freedom of speech, which helped them in developing their nation to become the superpower of the world. Therefore, the U.S claims that it has a noble mission that is to spread its ideals via several ways, most importantly 'Democracy Promotion'.
End notes of the first chapter:

1 Was the declaration by President James Monroe in December 1823, that the U.S.A would not tolerate any European nation or South America. Any such interventions in the Western hemisphere would be considered a hostile act by the U.S.A, though the United States would respect the existing European colonies.

2 "when the Spartans advance into our country they do not come alone but with all their allies; but when we invade our neighbors we have little from their own homes…we differ from other states in regarding the man who holds aloof from public life…our constitution is named a democracy, because it is in the hands not of the few but of the many…(other documents: Declaration of Independence, Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizens, the Gettysburg Address and the Agreement of the People could be found in Democracy in the U.S.A by William Ricker 350-357)

3 (1805-1859); French political thinkers and historian best known for his Democracy in America (appeared in two volumes 1835-1840), in the later book he was not a patriotic American nor a democrat, but he was an aristocratic citizen who spent his life serving his country. So, his work was an authentic source concerning democracy.

4 (1743-1826); author of the Declaration of Independence and third American president and founder of the university of Virginia. He voiced the aspiration of a new America as no other individual of his era and he was a public official, historian, philosopher and plantation owner.

5 A philosopher, economist and researcher in the American political sciences.
Chapter Two: Democracy Promotion in American Foreign Policy:

Introduction:

In this century the U.S.A became the lone superpower in the world. After the defeat of the Soviet Union, America did not face problems of security, since it became the world's unilateral power. It is true that China became a great threat economically, but it could not stand up against the United States; on the other hand there is Europe that became a great strategic ally for the U.S.A (especially via NATO). According to Americans, recently there have been a potential economic, military and well being safety threats. The American military threats are realized in the so called "rogue States" and the extremist movements that use nuclear and chemical weapons. The economic threat is seen mainly in the misuse of global oil supplies. So, the new problems that threaten American security became more complex and controversial than those of the cold war. The U.S.A saw that the best solution in order to secure and defend Americans in this century is the promotion of liberal democracy around the world. Some called it and as Samuel Huntington did in his book The Third Wave of Democratization in the 21st century (Henrisken 49-51).

I. Democracy Promotion:

1. Defining Democracy Promotion:

It refers to democracy assistance or democracy building. It is a stand of foreign policy adopted by governments and international organizations that seek to spread democracy as a political system around the world.\(^6\) (Wikipedia the free Encyclopedia)

The U.S.A, since its early beginning maintained diplomacy in its relations. In 1790, Thomas Jefferson (as the first U.S secretary of state) and his staff constructed the nation's first Relations with Britain and France. Nowadays, the United States has relations with more
than 180 nations all around the globe (with over than 250 diplomatic posts). The aim from such activities is to spread the democratic movements and institutions wherever it is needed and end tyranny in the world. The U.S.A pursues such aims via different ways ranging from human rights movements to declaring war (Rice 5).

The U.S department of state sustained “transformational diplomacy”, which will help other countries to transform their futures and declare a democratization government, and respond more to people’s interests (Rice 5). The following table shows the number of countries that received the U.S aid from 1990 to 2003 (Finkel 19).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region.</th>
<th>Total countries in sample</th>
<th>Non-eligible Countries in Region.</th>
<th>Eligible countries in region.</th>
<th>Participants of Democracy assistance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurasia.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle east and the Meaditarian</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total.</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is concluded from the above table that countries that received assistance from the U.S.A are those of Africa, Eurasia, Latin America and the Caribbean and especially the Middle East (i.e. those countries that have the lowest level of democracy). While those with the highest degree like: Europe and North America the percentage of assistance is so low and almost not existing.
2. Types of Democracy Promotion:

In spreading 'Democracy Promotion' as the main American liberal democratic strategy the U.S relied on four main approaches that represent four potential ideal-type policies toward regime (Miller 563-564):

A. **Imposed Democratization:**

Miller argued that the superpower as (the U.S.A), uses force to impose Drastic / comprehensive regime change in the country that needed democratization. This kind of democratization is clearly seen in terms of political, military and economic fields which are known as *offensive liberalism* (563). The best example is the case of the U.S intervention in Iraq 2003 which after the 9/11 attacks represents clearly that kind of offensive liberalism and post-war Iraq illustrates such an 'imposed democratization'. The former American president George. W. Bush II and before the U.S invasion of Iraq stated that the Iraqi regime is accused of supporting terrorist movements and tends to use nuclear weapons for over a decade. He asserted also that such a regime was a threat also against its own people (i.e.: the Iraqis). According to him, such actions threaten not only the U.S.A but also world peace via supplying terrorists with the needed weapons of mass destruction. On this basis, Bush declared:”I will not wait on advance while danger is gathered, I will not stand by as parallel drowse closer and closer” (Crossman).

So, it is the role of the U.S.A to stop such a threatening regime. Secretary of defense Ronald Rumsfeld agreed with the U.S president at that time when he was asked why the United States will launch a war against another country without being attacked by it, he answered that the only solution to stop terrorist attacks is by taking the battle to them (Crossman). Other administration members also claimed the same. Condoleezza Rice said that it make no sense to wait in front of nuclear threats such as that of Saddam Hussein. The National Secretary Adviser and Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz stated that “we
cannot wait for a nuclear, chemical and biological attack to go and find the people who did that” (Crossman).

We conclude that the U.S administration at that time was united to take aggressive action against Iraq. Nevertheless, and despite pre-war claims by the Bush administration, no weapons of mass destruction were found, in addition there is no relationship between Al-Qaeda and Iraq ultimately and seems clear that there are undeclared reasons behind which the U.S.A launched this war and remained in Iraq on the basis of helping Iraqis to construct a democratic government. Such a government, would secretly be a puppet government that grants America all the freedom needed to peruse its real aims in the region.

B. Gradual/ Partial/ Peaceful Promotion:

Peaceful Democracy Promotion refers to Regime change toward democratization in which great powers and international institutions cooperate to build up a suitable political culture for the democratization process like the promotion of human rights, building an independent judiciary and media on state level. This type is not sufficient enough to establish a form of a completed democracy. Such type of democracy is known by Defensive liberalism, and because this promotion is achieved via collective security it is usually found in grand organizations like the League of Nations and United Nations also the NATO and the OAS (Organization of American States) (Miller 564).

For example, the U.N has a great role in approaching democratization policy (Newman and Rich 3). Its agencies, departments and programs have been used to help many nations to draft constitutions and establish independent systems especially the judiciary, enforcing the respect of law separating between military movements and politics and most importantly creating institutions that promote the protection of human rights. But, what makes it truly convicted to democracy is its appeal to save the next generations from the
“scourage of war”, which became U.N’s first purpose. The U.N’s second aim is to promote respect of human rights via implanting democracy for example, Human Rights Committee and the Commission of Human Rights have the mission of inserting individuals “genuine periodic elections” (Newman and Rich 3-7).

The United Nation promoted democracy in many countries including Namibia, Angola, Western Sahara, East Timor; Haiti, Sierra Linka. Kosovo, for example, was driven under a new administration after both NATO troops and the U.N entered the country. The regime change was directed to reform “every institution in Kosovo from the Parliament to the Police and even the educational system”. It worked to create a new administration via creating free local elections. Also, it aimed to protect Kosovo from being exposed as before to the extreme levels of human rights violations in Europe (for more than 10 years) and like Newman and Rich here described the situation as: “the Serbian repression had left more than 10,000 civilian dead; a lot of them women and Children … more than 12,000 houses were destroyed, the economy collapsed, and almost one-third of the territory was sown with land-mines” (285). It is true that the United Nations supported and helped the Kosovo people to stand by themselves, but at the end it was the Kosovos themselves who decided their own future (Newman and Rich (282-300).

C. **Non intervention:**

The grand power stays in a mutual side and do not intervene in the domestic affairs of the non-democratic nations even in some situations when democratization is rejected by using force in the non-democratic nations. Such kind of strategy is known as *offensive realism* and it is based on global hegemony (for instance: Pax Britanica, Pax Romania, and Pax American)\(^7\) (Miller 564).
D. Democracy Removal:

In this kind the U.S.A remove the democratic government in the target country and replace it by a pro-United States authoritarian regime. Sometimes it establishes an authoritarian regime such kind of democracy is known as Defensive realism. Such a policy conducts a stable balance of power (example: the balance of power during the post-1815 concert of Europe) (Miller 564).

The previous four categories can be summarized in the following table (Miller 564):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informing it.</td>
<td>Literary</td>
<td>Liberalism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning the difference between the two variants, Miller established a good point; when differentiating between the realists and liberals concerning policy objectives and means. Realists concentrate more on military security as being the primary goal i.e.: the use of military force. On the other hand, liberals focus on economic and social welfare and human rights via the use of international institutions. Liberals and realists are two opposite poles, nevertheless they both want to achieve the same aim which is restoring security and peace in the world or as it is referred to by “world peace”. Liberals view that if the world is liberalized, peace and security will be maintained they inside illiberal countries as a threat to their security and peace. To change that, liberals used strategies like democratization, economic independence (free market), and international institutions. But, liberals do not agree on the way to achieve their aims because on one side we find that defensive liberals work according to multilateral perspectives. In fact, they believe that the more the U.S operates with international institutions results would be more effective. Also, it will convey the interests of all Americans. On the other side, offensive liberals adopted a unilateralist strategy i.e.: strong hegemonic leadership and they saw the previous strategy as unworthy
and question the quality of international institutions and advocates a unilateral action (Miller 572).

Realists, however have other claims. *Offensive Realists* believe in hegemony i.e.: to achieve peace, the country must increase and maximize its power to be superior to its opponents and the greater the power is the more security would be realized. By doing that the hegemonic power i.e.: the U.S.A, can force others to do what the hyper power wants to achieve without being a threat to its own matters and if so a war will be raised to restore peace and security again (Ibid).

The four above approaches are not enough to achieve security goals for many reasons. These approaches are directed only to maintain beneficial aims on the basis of seeing the other always as being the threat to America and Americans. Moreover, the U.S.A started planting democracy promotion programs only to secure its interests and not to help other nations to develop it. So, the United States of America is considered the leading superpower while many nations are the threat. Actually, real democracy promotion will be practiced only when nations that lack democracy are considered as part of the solution and not treating them as being the only problem. In such case, the U.S.A is undertaking such policy (i.e.; democracy promotion program) to implement hidden reasons. We learn from those types of 'Democracy Promotion' that the U.S.A is acting on the basis of its own will as a milt power. It seems clear, that the U.S whether pursing unrealistic or realist paths, depends on its hegemonic power to impose its ideals under the name of 'Democracy Promotion' to achieve certain undeclared goals.

3. *The Beginning of the Third Wave:*

Samuel Huntington (1927-2008) described the beginning of the third wave as follows:
"the third wave of democratization in the modern world began, implausibly and unwittingly, at twenty-five minutes after midnight, Thursday, April 25, 1974, in Lisbon, Portugal when a radio station played the song ’Grandola vila Morena ’"(Huntington 15). That song was the starting signal for a new military coup in Portugal to get rid from dictatorship (with the leadership of Marcello Caetano) and replace it with democracy (Ibid4). Nevertheless, before discussing the third wave we need first to understand the previous waves i.e.: the first and the second waves.

Huntington discussed the waves of democratization as follows:

A. **The First Wave of Democratization:**

It dates back to the French and American revolutions, though it is a recent concept. It can be found in the U.S.A in its early establishment and precisely in 1828 when the property qualifications were abolished together with the establishment of suffrage. In the next year, nations all around the globe called for suffrage, secret ballots and the establishment of parliaments. That movement toward democracy was seen in many places like: France, Great Britain and some other European countries, by the end more than 30 nations developed some kind of democratic institutions. Nevertheless, that wave of democratization was reversed by the 1930’s and that movement of democracy turned to authoritarianism or transformed to utilitarianism especially in nations that adopted democracy before World War I. from seventeen nations that established democratic governments, only four of them succeeded in keeping it (Huntington 16).

B. **The Second Wave of Democratization:**

It started in World War I, but shortly lived. Democracy was seen in countries like Germany, Italy, Australia, Japan and, Korea. Turkey and Greece also lived the same experience by the 1940’s and early 1950’s, Argentina by the late 1950’s. In addition, the movement reached some new independent states like; India, Sri Lanka, the Philippines and,
Nigeria. Nevertheless, by the early beginning of 1960’s that second wave vanished as a result of a military coups so by the end of 1975 and one third of the 32 democracies of 1958 turned again to authoritarianism (Huntington 16-21).

C. *The Third Wave of Democratization:*

Fifteen years after the Portuguese dictatorship of 1974, there was a change from authoritarianism to democracy in almost thirty nations in Europe, Asia and Latin America. Movements toward liberalization started also and the so called democracy promotion started to appear here. There was some kind of resistance but in general like Huntington described it:”the movement toward democracy seemed to take on the character of an almost irresistible global tide moving on from one triumph to the next” (Huntington 21).

**Some cases about the Third Wave:**

The democratic spread in South Europe was manifested in the establishment of a civilian government in Greece especially in 1974 when elections were held and the monarchical government overthrown forever. In Spain, a new prime minister held the government and developed a new assembly as well as a new constitution in 1978 (Huntington 16). The third wave of democratization spread greatly during the 1970’s into Latin America (with drafting a new constitution in 1978 and holding elections that gave birth to a civilian government for the first time in the nations' history). In Prelude they established an assembly in 1978 and elected a civilian president in 1982. The same happened in Uruguay in 1984, in Brazil in 1974, Honduras in 1982, Salvador in 1984 and Guantanamo in 1985. The wave then reached Asia after being ruled under emergency (for one and half year) by 1977 India they returned to democracy. In Turkey, an anti-terrorist movement was held by the military government in 1983, but later they introduced elections as well as a civilian government. In the same year, democracy was restored in the Philippines and in Korea in 1987. Later the movement reached also the communist world; by 1989 the Soviet
Union, held elections for a national Congress recording the defeat of the communist governments. At the end of the same year, Communism vanished in East Germany, Czechoslovakia and Romania. In Mexico, for the first time the ruling party lost elections in 1988 and the U.S.A ended dictatorship in it. In Africa and the Middle East, there was a transfer toward democracy, Nigeria was militarily ruled but after the movement it was replaced by an elected government in 1979. By the 1990’s some liberalization movements happened in Senegal, Tunisia, Algeria, Egypt and, Jordan. In 1978 South Africa, non-white minorities were approximately allowed to participate in government Decisions. Huntington summarized the third wave of democratization as follows:

In overall the movement toward democracy was a global one, in the fifteen years the democratic wave moved across Southern Europe, swept through Latin America, moved to Asia and decimated dictatorship in the Soviet bloc. In 1974, eight of ten South American countries had more democratic governments… (25)

The following time-line is reconstructed from an original work by Samuel Huntington in his book The Third Wave. Democratization In The Late 21st Century. (1991, 16):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The first wave.</td>
<td>First reverse wave</td>
<td>2nd wave.</td>
<td>2nd reverse Wave.</td>
<td>the 3rd wave of Democratization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nardulli argued that the third wave made 3/5 of the world’s countries democracies and what illustrates that is before 1973 there were 40 out of 150 countries that are described as being democracies (only Pakistan, Sudan and, Russia are not democracies). After 1974,
26 states got their independence and 14 from these countries established democratization and after a period of time other seven countries enjoyed the wave or in other words: ”in all, four of every five states that gained independence from Europe, the United States, or Australia since 1974 are democracies today” (Narder,quote.16). Moreover, even the post communist states, 58% of them adopted democratic regimes. So, it can be said that the third wave of democratization resulted in the union of governments of the world under one form; democracy without being threatened by any rival (16-18).

D. A Fourth Wave of Democratization: 
Nardulli argued also that, it is true that the third wave of democratization reached its highest degree especially by the mid 1990’s. By 1995 the Freedom House recorded 40% of the world’s nations as being free, 32% are partly free and, 82% lacks political and civil freedom. Later in 2005 it recorded 46% free, 30% partly free and, 24% not free, and the writer of the forth chapter of Bruce Russet argued that a fourth wave is realized in the number of democracies, autocracies and Anocracies. In 1946, the number of democracies and autocracies was equal (20 for both), but by 2006 democracies increased to 90 while Anocracies decreased to 25, Anocracies from 30 to 40. There were some democracies that went down like Russia, but in general the democracy level of many countries has increased (63-64).

II. Reasons behind Democracy Promotion: 
A. Declared Reasons:
The American governments declared democracy promotion on the basis that it will be beneficial for the United States, its neighbors as well as the whole world. American administrations view democracy as the only solution to end terrorism and at the same time to develop political and economic prosperity. Another reason that is used by many supporters of democracy promotion is that democratic nations with democracy do not
fight with each other, this is referred as “the democratic peace theory”, for instance there are the U.S.A, Canada and, Mexico. It co-exist with each other via establishing free markets and politically chosen trading partners that seem less threatening (Epstein, Serfino, and Mico 8-9).

Smith argued that: “Working with other countries that had open economies and democratic governments was obviously good for the United States. "The democratic peace theory" opponents believe that leaders of the democratic nations came to power via peace and negotiations and the rule of law (88).

Additionally, democracy promotion opponents, argue that democracies promote economic prosperity. Every true democracy is built under the rule of law that results in stability and equal economic chances for all citizens and that will lead to “economic growth, particularity of per capita income” (Epstein, Safini, and Mico 8). Moreover, if a democratic nation is economically stable, other nations seek to become its trading partners and suitable place for foreign investments not only that treaties are more likely to be signed by good democracies (Ibid).

So, democratic politics can reach economic institutions via the rule of the law in that case there is a need for institutionalized organizations. In this context, Tony Smith argued:

With the influence of these three organizing forces-political democracy, open market economies, participation in multilateral organization- liberal democracies should be reading and able to operate in nets works of mutual reciprocity in handling problems that arise among them short of outright war”. (99-100)
B. Hidden reasons:

The United States of America contains beneficial reasons behind its interventions all around the world under the name “promoting democracy, human rights, and protecting liberties”. In fact, the probable real hidden reason here is to achieve liberal globalization by all means and owning an open market that will work on behalf of the U.S interests especially in the Arab regions. That’s why the U.S.A launched its unreasonable war against Iraq.

In an interview with Oprah Winfrey, George.W. Bush [and also in his book Decision Points declared:

“Mrs. Secretary”. I said. For the peace of the world and the benefit and freedom of the Iraqi people, here by giving the order to execute the operation of the Iraqi Freedom. Under the consequences my words will bring, I had wept with the widows that lost their husbands in the war of Afghanistan…but I had to do what is necessary to protect the country”.(George.W. Bush)

He was asked by Oprah when the U.S.A invaded Iraq, and no weapons of mass destruction were found. He answered that it gave him a seeking feeling because everyone thought that Saddam Hussein owned nuclear weapons; intelligence service, critics of the war especially after the 9/11 even by his own administration. Oprah replied and said that if he knew there were no weapons, have he not declared the war? Bush replied by saying that the U.S inspectors regarded Saddam as equally dangerous to those weapons. In the same time, Saddam had the capacities to construct ones in Bush’s words: “the point I make is that Saddam Hussein in power today will mean the world is better with him gone” (Oprah Winfrey).

When we turn to the U.S media we find that there is some kind of contradiction between Bush’s declarations and what the media announced. The CNN reported, about
Weapons of mass destruction of any kind were not found in Iraq; (that includes no biological labs, no imported yellowcake uranium from Africa moreover the tubes that were found by the American inspectors were not suitable for nuclear weapon buildings) (Crossman).

Watts stated that George.W. Bush used the trauma of 9\11 September to get rid from the doubt about his personality and ability that citizens were having about him (78). It seems that he used the Iraqis to save himself via giving the impression to the American minds that he was a good leader.

Above all, it is concluded that there were hidden reasons behind promoting democracy in Iraq. Bush stated that Iraq contains the raw material to build weapons of mass destruction. On the other hand, in the CNN report, it was proved even by pictures the opposite. The United States of America intervene only to achieve economic globalization especially with the natural resources that Iraq owns (i.e.; oil).

Nevertheless some argued like that the Bush administration launched a good realist foreign policy in Africa or as it is described by him: “the White House declared that the Bush administration’s mission in Africa is to spread liberty, peace and, prosperity” (Raymond and Copson 17). By doing so the United States was inspired by two main security interests; the global war on terror (GWOT) and the protection of oil supplies. The U.S government tried to realize especially in Sub-Saharan Africa after the Bush administration had a reputation of being urgent and unfair regarding foreign policy, a reputation that can lose the U.S.A its international rates. In order to change that the American government promoted “a long-term economic development” that is aimed to decrease poverty rages and incomes increase (Ibid).

Bush administration tended to help the African continent, bettering its economy, get rid from poverty, promoting developments and supplying them with the assistance that
they need. They developed programs such as the African Growth Opportunity Act (AGOA), that can many help Africans to get rid from trade barriers and debt (Copson 23). The United States of America granted Africa nearly $1.7 billion and since 2004 till 2010 the U.S humanitarian aid doubled. Many regarded such increase as a sign for a coming good relation, and describing Bush as "a friend of Africa" (Copson 23).

From the major interesting programs that represented a “major milestone in the U.S relations with Sub-Saharan Africa” is: the PEPFAR; $15billion president’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief 2003(Copson 56). That program, aimed to bring the needed treatment and care to fight AIDs. When the government decided to start such aid program, Bush stated: “today, on the continent of Africa, nearly 30 million people have the AIDS virus- including 3 million children under the age 15 … more than 4 million require immediate drug treatment. Yet across that continent, only 50,000 are receiving the medicine they need … tonight I propose the Emergency plan for AIDS Relief … to help the people of Africa. Many Sub-Saharan countries were in need of such policy like: Botswana, Côte d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia. The PEPFAR was a positive step because according to the Office of the Global AIDS Coordinator, the number of healthy African workers increased (Copson 56).

It is true that the U.S.A did a great job in Africa. Nevertheless when Bush stated his address about the Emergency AIDS program on January 2003, he launched a war against Iraq on March of the same year. It seems to me here that the decision behind the AIDS program was affected by the war on Iraq, that is to say as Copson declared: “many saw the decision as partly designed to show that the U.S foreign policy had a compassionate side and consisted of more than the use of force in pursuit of national interests”. So, the PEPFAR was used to draw the attention of the world
away from the Iraqi war via the use of AIDS programs, but the United States government failed in doing so and the $30 billion spent on the AIDS program cannot be compared to the $318.5 billion spent on the Iraqi war (Copson 57).

What ever the U.S.A did, it cannot hide its unreasonable actions especially with the military intervention. But, Karin Von Hippel in his *Democracy by Force* gave some main reasons behind those U.S military interventions. He stated that before any intervention happened, it was characterized by "inconsistent policy, public waffling, and empty threats". The common reasons that pushed the democratic nations to intervene are mainly; large refugee flows to the developed countries, the media concentration on the human sufferance. In addition, there is the reason of “nasty rulers”, whom despite the warnings directed to them they continued in their illegal actions. Moreover, the problem of increased sanctions. Besides, the U.S.A counts throughout the decision making process about size and power of the target nation. Under such circumstances the United States of America decided to adopt “The Do Something Effect”. Here the democratic government whether the U.S.A or some other western countries choose the military path (169).

Hippel viewed, the increase in refugee flows is as main factor that leads to a military intervention, especially when being next to a democratic nation as what happened in Haiti, Bosnia, Italy and Greece (the refugees came from Albania). Moreover, there was a refugee movement from Sierra Leone to Nigeria and many other South African states. All of those refugees provoked their powerful neighboring countries to intervene and help them. The secret behind why those countries could not stop the refugees waves by themselves is because that process is so expensive, in the same time, it is related to human rights matters so the task cannot be done only by a
powerful developed country. Another important reason is the media coverage, of the world’s crises which had a great impact on policy makers because after the crisis is showed to the public, they become obliged to react back. For example, the CNN coverage of Kurds sufferance after the Gulf War when the public saw pictures of Kurds living in barren mountains, after a while the western democracies reacted back. The same thing happened in Somalia when; “images of starving children were viewed with discomfort by most Americans” so the U.S.A went to help them (169-170).

The next table summarizes some of the common cases including the factors explained above: (Hippel 174).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 months</td>
<td>24 months</td>
<td>38 months</td>
<td>51 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation prior to intervention</td>
<td>Nasty dictatorship.</td>
<td>Civil war leading to state Collapse</td>
<td>Nasty dictatorship</td>
<td>Civil war leading to state collapse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral status</td>
<td>Results over-turned</td>
<td>No election Held</td>
<td>Results overturned by coup</td>
<td>Referendum boycotted by Serbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International US setting</td>
<td>US sphere of influence</td>
<td>Exacerbated by end of Cold War</td>
<td>US sphere of influence</td>
<td>Exacerbated by end of Cold War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee crisis affecting West</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (US)</td>
<td>Yes (Europe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive media</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes!</td>
<td>Yes!</td>
<td>Yes!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peceny, argued that during those military interventions presidents used a set of «pro-liberalization policies»; because their decisions are controlled by security measures in an international level. In addition, if presidents want to work with no liberalization policies, liberals from the Congress will force them to switch to pro-liberalization. So, the United States of America promoted democracy during its military interventions that include: “centric political parties, moderates, reformist interest groups, reduction of human rights abuses, and subordination of the military and civilian authority” (371). The writer explains that there are two possible reasons behind such U.S policy; one of them is attached to security interests that is to make the third world’s states regimes more stable. So, from U.S arguments are related to the security and the congressional ones; “presidents use the promotion of democracy to build domestic political consensus and ‘policy legitimacy’ for the interventions” (Peceny 371).

In this context, Hoppel, gave some reasons behind the U.S military interventions in countries like Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia as media coverage of human sufferance, large refugee flows, and dictator rulers. The writer mentioned that, in Somalia “the U.S reacted too impulsively to the media, instead of utilizing it to the debate …” (372). It seems here, that if a certain humanitarian case did not bring the interest of the media, as well as the public opinion; the U.S.A would not intervene and react back especially in a case that do not benefit it. In addition, the same author declared that: “several of these leaders ‘i.e.; nasty
rulers’ had previously been supported by the U.S government before becoming troublesome including … Saddam Hussein …” (Hoppel 372). It is really astonishing why first helping, and later attacking.

**C. Democratization in the US/UN Agendas:**

Amichai, Risse, and Macfaul viewed Democracy as being a shared value for both the U.S.A and the U.N. In 2002, both of them dedicated their diplomatic and financial powers to enhance political and economic liberty from Marrakech to Bangladesh. So, on both sides of the Atlantic, the two powers (the U.S.A and the U.N) though are totally different from each other regarding “major recent strategic and international questions. Today, Americans are “from Mars and Europeans are from Venus”; they agree on little and understand one another less and less. Nevertheless, nowadays American foreign policy is so attached to implementing democracy in different parts of the world, especially those that adopt autocratic regimes. Eventually, they see it as a threat and like president Bush acknowledged: “the survival of liberty in our land depends on the success of liberty in others lands” (20).

Turning to the other part of the Transatlantic i.e.; the countries of Europe, we find that they are convicted also like the U.S.A to the democratic concept. The National Security Strategy of the United States (ESS) affirmed: “in the world today the fundamental character of regimes matters as much as the distribution of powers among them …” (Amichai et al 21). The same vision was articulated by the European Security Strategy declaring that, the best way to save communities is via spreading ideas about human rights, the rule of the law and international order. Europe became more concerned with democracy promotion and freedom in its international foreign policies, in particular after the 9/11 events (Amichai et al 21).
Now turning to the Middle East we find that, this region became a main aspect but first there should be an understanding of democracy in the Arab world. No two can disagree about the fact that there is an overlapping absence of democracy in the Arab world, in the period between 1976 and 2006, “no single Arab country has been classified as free in the Freedom House Annual Survey” (Amichai 41). Not only that, but the nature of the dictatorship is so high and persisting compared to other non-Arab nations (polity score of Arabs -7.8 compared to -5.2 in non- Arab countries). Ibrahim Elbadawi and Samir Makdissi in their Democracy in the Arab World described as the following:

Beyond the untold human suffering due to the denial of political rights and restrictions on civil liberties associated with authoritarian governance, there are also questions of whether lasting economic growth and equitable, sustainable development are possible in autocratic regimes. The failure of the Arab authoritarian regimes to sustain earlier gains, or at least contain mounting economic and social crisis of the Arab world, have been directly linked to non-democratic and non-participatory nature of the regimes (41).

The writers here convey the idea that because of the lack of democratic institutions in the Arab world, not only basic civil liberties are unsuccessfully sustained they also generated economic and social crisis.

**III. Assessment of Arab Democracy:**

In their work Democracy in the Arab World, the writers assessed the degree Of Democracy in the Arab World on the basis of three sources (Amichai et al 46):

A. **The Freedom House Index:**
It measures political rights (including free and fair elections, political parties' activism ...), also civil liberties (which include freedom of expression, association, and the rule of the law under human rights). The House’s measure is leveled from 1 (the highest level) to 7 (the lowest level). The house considered those from 1 to 2.5 score as being free. Those scores between 2.5 and 5.5 as being partly free, while those from 5.5 to 7 as not free. So, from all of that where is the position of the Arab world. The next table, represents the score of the protection of political rights and civil liberties from 1972 till 2002. It illustrates the real practice of democracy in the Arab world which is almost not existing at all. What is noticed in the next figure is that the only case that is, considered free is: Lebanon and the rest of the Arab countries are considered to be partly free or not free (of course during the sample period). Many of the Arab nations are not free nearly in the period sample including: Iraq, Libya, Mauritania, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Sudan. On the other hand, 40% of the developed nations are described to be free.
Figure: Country years of freedom, 1972 to 2002.
Source: Freedom House.. (Amichai et al 46).

A. The Przworki Global Classification:
It has assessed 141 nations between 1950-1990, by a team of researchers led by Pzeworki (in his *democracy and development* 2000). The classification here is that dictatorship is equal to the non-election of the chief executive and the legislature in addition to the existence of one single party system, and according to such qualification: Yemen, Sudan and, Somalia practiced democracy in a certain period of time (during the period sample) while the rest of the Arab countries are described to be autocracies bureaucracies (Amichai et al 46).

B. Polity IV index:
That Index measured democracy more objectively than the Freedom House index did. It is based on two concepts; “institutionalized democracy” (DEM) and, “institutionalized autocracy” (AUT). The measure here is constructed via subtracting the autocracy score the result score is from 10 (strong AUT) to 10 (strong DEM). The index recorded during the 1960’s a positive change in Arab democratization; during 1963 Morocco went from -5 to -2, Iraq changed from -7 to 0 and in the next year it went from -7 to 0. Until the mid 1980’s, the Arab world experienced ups and downs in polity average, but positively speaking there were changes only in the 1960’s and in the next forty years the Arab world was absent especially with the coming of the third wave (Amichai at all 49-50).

The situation of the Arab democracy and especially in the Middle East became a main interest of the Western democracies (the U.S.A and Europe). The U.S presidents decided to start a “forward strategy of freedom”, and the Bush administration wanted to free
the Arab citizens from their extremist ideologies. Both the American and European governments seek to establish reforms in the Middle East. One of the shared similarities between them is that both of them stood in the face of the autocratic abuses done by the Arab regimes for example. The E.U and the U.S.A implemented “project on the internal management and efficiency of National Governmental Organizations, without making much of an issue of laws restricting civil society’s freedom” it appeared in Algeria, and especially after the re-election of Boutaflika as president in 2004, when both the U.S.A and the French supported him by providing the Algerian government with the armed forces and’ generous new security cooperation ‘in order to help the government defeat terrorism of the Algerian Islamic Group. Nevertheless, the E.U and the U.S.A real objective in Algeria to win it as an energy partners and join the World Trade Organization. Turning to Saudi Arabia, the United States disapproved with the violations of human rights in the kingdom especially in the post 9/11, and started to make efforts like: raising "human rights development". Morocco was seen as a suitable land for reform; and was rewarded by both the U.S.A and Europe it was granted £28 by the European commission and 50% from the American Economic Assistance. Meanwhile a liberalization movement accrued in Morocco calling for improving the legal status of women and, holding fair democratic elections in 2007 (Amichai et al 49-50).
Conclusion:

Democracy promotion became a main strategy in the American foreign policy. As a result, the ‘wave of democratization’ reached many parts of the world and people became convicted to democracy. The U.S.A interfered in many countries under the name of human rights, ending authoritarianism, and establishing true democracy through its 'Democracy Promotion Plan'.

The U.S democracy promotion program seemed so controversial, especially in the last decade because what the U.S.A declared and promised was not realized. For example, when America intervened in Iraq, it promised the Iraqi people that Iraq would be a better than before and would be the idol of a true democratic country for the Arab nations. The U.S and gave them many hopes and fulfilled none of them. So, the United States of America started the democracy program not for the sake of the people but for the sake of it interests and strategies.
End notes of the second chapter:

1 A philosopher, economist and researcher in the American political sciences.

*The concept of democratization:* politically speaking, it refers to a controversial conflict between the democrats and non-democrats. Democratization came to existence when the democrats won over. (Carothes 7)

2 *concept of democracy:* politically speaking, it insures the quality of genuine, competitive elections, and respect for political and civil rights. Those who promote democracy follow the concept of elections and rights; also they support planting democratization institutions like an independent judiciary, strong legislature and so on.

*Electoral democracy:* in such type the elected officials can have authority supported by the military and the police. There is an independent judiciary, legal equality and the rule of law (even over the elected officials) to insure the respect of liberties. There is Freedom of speech or organization; and minority groups are given those rights and by the end the benefit from spreading such democracy for the U.S. is based on the fact that America is threatened by countries that that are not liberal and mostly authoritarian and even have weapons of mass destruction, those qualities could be found in countries such as Afghanistan, Russia, Mexico… (Henrisken 53-54)

4 Pax Romania: the peace Imposed by ancient Rome on its dimensions (1880-85).

Pax Americana: a historical concept of relative peace in the Western hemisphere and later the western world resulted from preponderance of power enjoyed by the U.S.A in the 20th century. Pax Britinaca: was the period of relative peace in Europe in the world (1815-1914) during which the British empire controlled most of key maritime trade routes and enjoyed unchallenged sea power.
Chapter Three: U.S Democracy Promotion in Egypt

Introduction:

It is clear that the United States of America was committed to promote democracy around the world. The Arab world was the first priority especially since the 9/11 events. Egypt as the first ally of the U.S.A in the Middle East was the main target for many reform activities because Egypt has been known as the perfect model of semi-authoritarianism in the Arab region. With 80 million people and because it is the most important ally of the U.S.A in the Middle East many reform activities were pursued by the U.S.A in the name of the Democracy Promotion Program.

I. An overview about the Political System in Egypt:

According to Blaydes, the authoritarian nature of Egypt is connected to one or two explanations. One of them is of an essentialist nature, i.e.; authoritarianism was the result of the surrounding environment including religion and cultural traditions. In the same context, some trace authoritarianism to “antiquity when pharaohs enjoyed a powerful position and power was highly concentrated in a single individual”. The second explanation is related to the influence of bad actions like repression of the prevailing regime and Egypt contained a number of electoral manipulations which later were saved and fixed in the Egyptian political system until modern times (14-17).

To affirm such declaration there is a need to study the level of authoritarianism and democratization in the Egyptian political system from its independence upwards. Mubarak did state that since Egypt got its independence in February 1922, its citizens were fighting to establish true democracy. It began with drafting a constitution in 1923 paving the way for creating parliament people sovereignty, separation of
powers, ministerial responsibility, freedom of the press and civil liberties. That later events could be described as being democratic, but it did not last because by 1952, the coming of the military brought political instability. For instance, the Wafed party was removed and replaced by minority parties. From that we conclude that even though there was a democratic movement in Egypt from 1922 to 1952, it did not succeed to maintain stability in the country. After 1952, monarchy was over in Egypt (with Jamal Abd Alnasir). The Egyptian officers established three main things (Hassan 320):

1. the exclusion of other parties and starting a one party system,
2. the preservation of power under the Elite control,
3. the depolarization of elite’s power.

Nevertheless after the defeat of the Arabs during the Israeli war of June 1967, the Egyptian president AbdNassir changed his strategies and by 1968 he liberalized political institutions and civil liberties. But even though president AbdNassir adopted liberalization, he created a net work of personnel chosen elites; it was a kind of “a political system into-entity that was based on personnel consideration rather than institutionalized norms” (Hassan 320).

After the death of Nassir in 1970, Anwar Sadat came to power bringing with him some changes like: “the rule of law, government by institutions; and political freedom”, Sadat aimed to pave the climate for democracy. The first step toward such thing was Sadat’s establishment of the committee of “the future of political action”. After holding a committee meeting its opponents come up with the decision fact there should be a multi-party system besides the Arab socialist union (ASU) and this what happened in March 1976 with Sadat’s decision to create three political forums; the liberal socialist forum (the right), Egypt’s Arab socialist forum (the center) and the
nationalist progressive unionist forum (the left). Later the three parties competed for
elections and they transformed from forums to Political parties (Hassan 322).

Democracy process in Sadat’s period was backed by opposition movements,
but that was not the problem, and what really backed democracy was when Sadat
ordered the arrest of opposition leaders and journalists (Hassan 222). So, even though
Egypt since the mid 1970’s; “the presidency has remained the most dominate
institution”. After Sadat was assassinated in 1981, Mubarak took government and
decided to transfer the regime from authoritarianism to democratization. The first step
toward such measure was freeing the political prisoners. The challenge that faced
Mubarak was the parliamentary elections of 1984 and of 1987. In 1984, he allowed
his ruling party alongside other parties to participate in elections. In fact the election
of April 1987 was “an important step in the democratization of Egypt” because the
opposition competed against the ruling party during the elections and some denied
parties. Such as Muslims Brothers⁹, in 1995’s legislative elections, the ruling party
(the NDP¹⁰) the National Democratic Party won the majority seats. Nevertheless, in
2000 the 1995 elections were declared illegal by the constitutional court and in the
same year an election was held under the supervision of the judiciary but that did not
prevent the NDP from winning again in 2005 (Hassan 222-223).

Above all, we can conclude that the political system in Egypt witnessed ups
and downs from one president to another, but in general the ruling system was
authoritarian. Though there was some kind of democratization (the emergence of the
opposition as an important feature in the Egyptian political stream).

Elbadawi and Makdisi summarized the previous political events of Egypt from 1960
to 2006 as follows (Albadawi and Makdisi 259):

⁹ Muslims Brothers
¹⁰ National Democratic Party
1960-1967: this period ended in 1967 with the Arab-Israeli war.

1967-1971: this period was characterized by the end of Nasserism, “not only with the removal from the political scene of the ruling elite, which had been determined to maintain its radical domestic and foreign policies”.

1971-1977: during this period was the starting point of economic and political liberalization in Egypt and in January 1977 there was protests against sudden price increases of consumer goods (quote in, Hilal 1978).

1977-1981: the post-protest period was characterized by many tensions, ended with the assassination of President Sadat on 6 October 1981 (quote in, Haykal 1983)

1981-1991: during this period political prisoners were released during the last month of President Sadat’s reign and "expansion of political liberalization under president Mubarak”.

1991-2000: the end of the Gulf War of 1991 opened the way for further economic liberalization in Egypt, but was associated with further shrinking of the political space (quate , kassem 1999, kienle 2001).

2001-2006: in this period some political freedoms were granted, especially after the famous decision of the supreme constitutional decision, to run national elections under the supervision of the judiciary and made an amendment to the constitution in 2005 to allow competitive presidential elections

II. Reasons behind the existing Egyptian Authoritarianism:

Elbadawi and Makdisi gave some aspects that led to the non-existence of democracy in Egypt (265). The first argument according to them was related to political and economic liberalization. If economic power is more developed, the political side will prosper. Egypt during the 1980’s and 1990’s faced many economic problems; it improved a little during the second half of the 1990’s, but in overall it
still suffers economically (like the unemployment of the youth). This socio-economic fact has clear political implications and as argued by the authors: “non-industrial and service oriented development adopted by Egypt since the mid 1970’s … appear to have arrested the country’s democratic transformation” (Albadawi and Makdisi 265-266).

The second argument is connected to the fact that the entrepreneurial groups in Egypt, supported the authoritarian measures. For example: some of the NDP members were entrepreneurs and belonged to business associations, business owners had a great impact on politics because they use the media to influence the public opinion, for instance the AlMasry Alyoum newspaper was owned by an entrepreneur and the writer clarified the point as follows:

It is not surprising therefore, that big business in the country is a major pillar of support for the government of President Hosni Mubarak and that generally business owners are not known to have taken a public position the nascent bourgeoisie in Egypt has become, in fact, a major foundation of support for authoritarian regime. (Albadawi and Makdisi 267-268)

Another important argument is connected to governments fear from Islamists. A fear that could be almost found in all Arab countries that if fair and just elections were held, the Islamists will gain power, and if that will happen hey will end democracy. At the same time, while the government was trying to get rid from the Islamists; civil and political rights were being violated: “fear of Islamists led the government to suspend elections in several professional syndicates since 1992”, many
of those were taken to jail, by the end such action led to increase authoritarianism in Egypt more and more (Albadawi and Makdisi 270-271).

The fourth argument is the external foreign policy, which in the case of (Egypt) is more in the side of authoritarianism. In fact, “the overriding concerns of the western countries did not relate the issue of democracy in the region but rather to how their regional interests, which include both oil and Israel” (Elbadawi and Makdisi 271).

Hassan gave a number of obstacles which faced democratization process in Egypt (327). One of it is the president himself because Egypt is overwhelmed by the dominance of the president who was conceived culturally speaking as a pharaoh and that what gave him the chance to let the government be controlled totally by him. For example, when President Sadat “believed that he was the giver of democracy”, even he established a law by his own and created limits to the democratization process and in such case “the democratization process could be used to facilitate and achieve authoritarian ends”. The second reason is the constitution that gave unlimited power and the continuation of the Paranoiac rule which was granted in 1971 to Mubarak, who used and enjoyed such enormous power and ruled for over than 29 years (Ibid).

Ottaway and Caroths argued that Egypt had the most authoritarian model since the mid-1980’s. Its institutions do not function properly, and despite the fact that there are multiple parties “but by the time of the election the ruling party (the NDP) takes the lead; two thirds of seats”. Moreover, the Muslim Brotherhood party is not allowed to register as a party or participate in elections or even let their members join other parties. Consequently, Egypt became the main target of the American foreign policy in the Middle East, not as an allay but as a place for reforms. This was the best
example of the kind of authoritarian rule in Egypt “the United States took up the issue of political reform in Egypt as a part of a dramatic reorientation toward the Middle East (and toward Egypt), that mission of reform in Egypt started in 2003” (23).

1. **Promoting Democracy in Egypt:**

   Sharp argued that there were many suggestions given by experts concerning the way the U.S.A should act toward Egypt and three main approaches are more commonly used (Sharp 6-7):

   - **A- The Hard Line Approach:** often conducted by democracy promotion supporters who believe that the United States should act directly and publicly on behalf of human rights and political freedom via establishing its aid inside the country.

   - **B- The Quite Approach:** used mainly by policy makers realists, who argued that the U.S regime change should be hidden in order not to effect the bilateral relationship between the two countries that is based on “mutually beneficial trade and investment”.

   - **C- The Multiprouged Approach:** that aims at “promoting democracy and protecting stability in Egypt”. What the United States government can do concerning this point is to: push the Egyptian government to raise “dialogue and compromise between Islamists and secular political forces to take place”

2. **Promoting Democracy from Bush to Obama:**

   Alkbarzadech et al argued that, the Bush initiative i.e.; making a democratic reform in Egypt failed because it was aimed to establish free and fair elections via pushing Mubarak to have a multi-party system during the election period. But this did not happen because Mubarak won the majority votes and many accused him by: “using state recourses to bus supporters to the polls” (12). In addition, the
Brotherhoods were not allowed to participate again in elections. Hence, the US claims to implement democracy in Egypt would not work especially since Bush relied on his biggest ally in the Arab region in order to gain support for the declared war on Iraq (Ibid 13).

Concerning president Obama, it is believed that “the Obama administration would like to ease tensions with the Egyptian government by de-emphasizing democracy assistance” (Akbarzadech 32). President Obama’s speech in Cairo is an important step in the American Democracy Promotion Agenda (Obama’s speech at Cairo). He addressed the issue of tensions between the U.S.A and the Muslim world especially after the 9/11 events (Obama's speech at Cairo). He stated that, in order to change such hostility, the relationship between both nations must change to cooperation and mutual understanding moreover they must openly express what they think about each other. He even quoted from the Quran; “Be Concise of Good and Speak Always the Truth” (Obama’s speech at Cairo). He talked about his Islamic origins from the side of his father (Barak Hussein Obama), then he stated the innovations brought by Muslims in many fields (medicine, music, poetry…) and how they helped nearly 7 million American Muslims to live and get good education and jobs and at the same time enjoying total religious freedom. Obama pointed out that democracy promotion was a controversial issue especially in Iraq, he stated:

Let me be clear, no system of government can or should be imposed by any nation …that does not lesser my commitment however to governments that reflect the will of the people, each nation gives life to this principle in its own way rounded in the traditions of its own people. America does not presume to know what is better for every one ... but I have a mindful belief that all people yearn for uncertain:
things: the ability to speak your mind and have a say of you are
governed, confidence in the rule of low and the equal administration of
justice government that is transparent and does not still from the
people, the freedom to live as you choose … these are not just
American ideas they are human Rights, that is why we will support
theme everywhere … (Obama’s speech at Cairo)

It is clear that president Obama stated that, the U.S.A when first implemented
Aid had the legal right of the promotion of human rights in each country that not
exercise it. The democracy promotion program did not change the unhealthy Egyptian
political environment instead the U.S economic aid was reduced to fit its interests
with Israel.

3. The U.S Aid in Egypt:

A. Economic aid:

Between 2004 and 2009, Egypt received about $ 206.4 million as economic
assistance, but later that aid was decreased as a result of an agreement known as “The
Glide Path Agreement”. It was created in 1989 by the Israeli government and directed
toward the United States calling them to decrease economic assistance while
increasing the military one over a period of ten years i.e.; the reduction of both the
Israeli and Egyptian economic aid, and that what happened ( $60 million decrease in
Israel and $40 million for Egypt). Nevertheless, Egypt did not register any kind of
increase concerning the military side, and after ten years from “the Glide Path
Agreement” nothing changed. In fact by that time the U.S debt to Egypt was more
than the directed assistance (Akbarzadech et al 34).
B. Military aid:

The Egyptian military received $1.3 billion as argued by the defense officials on both Countries (Sharp 31). 30% of the U.S aid to Egypt went to get new weapons because the previous Soviet weapons could be replaced by the U.S machinery. The main U.S military aid towards Egypt was the “co-production of the M1A Abrams Tank. Such investment began in 1985 under the supervision of the U.S.A in Cairo, besides the U.S.A implemented programs like “the Express Defense Article; EDA”\textsuperscript{11}, and “the Internal Military Educational Trading; IMET”\textsuperscript{12}, such programs coasted the U.S.A millions of Dollars (Ibid).

The U.S assistance in Egypt claimed other intentions and wants to achieve some interests especially after reducing its aids precisely after the “Glide Path Agreement”. Akbazedch, Iskator, Macqueen, and Saikal emphasize the same point as follows:

Although it is true that the U.S gives Egypt $1.5 billion a year in aid, half of it civilian and half military, this aid could not be used as a carrot for democratization. First of all, the aid for the most part, actually goes to American corporations, which in turn provide … weapons to Egypt, and cutting it would hurt U.S concerns. Second, the aid is ongoing bribe to Egypt to remain at peace with Israel’s security for the sake of pursuing Egypt with the threat of an aid cut-off … .(12)

The same idea was asserted by Sharp, who argued that the U.S aid towards Egypt is “Symbolic of a strong strategic partnership which directly benefits U.S national security interests”. Furthermore, Egypt is used by the U.S.A as a way to be present militarily in the oil-rich Arab region (31).
4. Some Egyptian Views Concerning ‘Democracy Promotion in Egypt’:

Hafid viewed the Republican American Institution as well as the Democratic American Institution in Egypt as both violating the law and the political stream and in general it challenges every political body in the Arab world (Alahram On Line 2006). Yet it is protected by the legal American wills that had the right to interfere in the local policies of Egypt. The U.S.A saw it was its right and obligation to interfere in the Arab and Islamic affairs in order to make democratic changes; that is what opened the door for governmental and non-governmental organizations to exercise power in Egypt under the name of democracy. In addition, in exchange of the U.S Aid to Egypt, America would be permitted to exercise power in every field. The crisis of closing ‘the Local American Institute’ was a result of American interference and even practice inside Egyptian political parties without permission. On top of all that, the Arab region (especially Egypt) suffered for decades from the rule of authoritarianism and dictatorship, and whenever any idea of democratization is brought to them, they would be supportive to it. That what America did in which it used each opportunity to spread its ideas using ways like Education programs, scientific and technical institutions whenever it controls the minds, the spread of its interests would be an easy task (Alaahram online 2006).

Shender made an analysis of some Egyptian views about the future of U.S democracy promotion from the point of political activists, bloggers, journalists, and analyst (fikra Forum). First, Abed Fattah who is an Egyptian internet activist and blogger and co-founder of the 6th youth Movement, argued that after the “NGC” crisis, the success of U.S democracy in Egypt was too low, because “neither the Egyptian people nor the civil society organizations will trust any U.S backed
democracy programs” (Fikra Forum). Moreover, he advised the U.S.A to let go the
democracy program and go after developing just economy and education programs in
order to gain the trust of the Egyptian people again. The second opinion is of Salem,
who is a famous blogger and political activist and participated in 2011 parliamentary
elections under the Free Egyptian Party. He viewed that democracy promotion should
be ended; “if the U.S.A is truly interested in promoting democracy in Egypt; it should
transfer its democracy aid money to thousands of dollars of college scholarships to
young Egyptians from all over the country” (Fikra Forum).

The third view is developed by Samaan, who is an Egyptian Journalist, who saw that the average men’s opinion in Egypt would be negative; "Leave us in our
situation" (Fikra Forum). Also, Liberals became more skeptical on the U.S operations
precisely after the Bush Freedom Agenda had failed in Iraq. Samaan then shed the
light on an important point which is the U.S.A using a classic strategy (used by the
U.S.A since WWII); the cooperation between the United States and authoritarian rule
(Fikra Forum).

III. the Egyptian People is the Bringer of Democracy (the Revolution of
January 2011):

“What is the perfect day for Hosni Mubarak? A day when nothing happens”.
—Egyptian joke, December 2010 (the Slate Group 2)

“A bunch of incognizant, ineffective young people”
—Egyptian Interior Minister Habib al-Adly on the Tahrir Square protesters, Jan.
25, 2011 (The Slate Group 2)

“Azrael, the archangel of death, comes down to Hosni Mubarak and tells him he must
say goodbye to the Egyptian people. ‘Why, where are they going?’ he asks.”
— Egyptian joke, quoted in “Making Fun of Pharaoh,” Issandr El Amrani. (the Slate Group 8).

1. **The Arab Spring [An Overview]:**

A series of revolutions started in the Arab world and resulted in the exclusion of the most authoritarian leaders in the world. First, it started in Tunisia on 10 December 2010, when Mohammad Bouazazi started fire in his self as a result of being humiliated by a police woman and after few weeks an upheaval started all around the country: “generating a political earthquake across the Arab world” (Brill 1). By 25 January 2011 another uprising took place in Egypt, and called for the end of the president Mubarek’s regime, moreover by the 20th of December of the same year, the Libyan revolution began, and the conflict started between those who were loyal to the president (Muammar Kaddafi) and those seeking to end his government. A fourth break started in Yamane (27 January 2011). At first, was formed from peaceful protests against bad economic conditions, corruption and against the government’s decisions’ to modify the constitution and later they called for the removal of the president (Ali Abdullah Selah). Another revolution began on 19 February 2011 in Bahrain which called for political freedom and equality (mostly for Shea) but later they also called for the removal of the monarch. The wave of revolutions reached Syria by March 15, it was formed from armed protests against the Ba’ath party, and later they called also for President Bashar Al-Assad resignation. Not only that; major protests appeared in Algeria, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco and Sudan, minor protests happened in Mauritania, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Djibouti and Western Sahara (Manhire 4-35).

2. **How it started in Egypt:** (Aljazeera on line)
January 2011: protests started against the social bad conditions (such as: poverty, unemployment and, government corruption) and against President Mubarak rule for over the last three decades.

January 25: Egyptians went to streets in a day called “Day of Rage”, and in downtown Cairo, they called for the down of the ruling party 'the National Democratic Party'. In few hours a conflict took place between the protestors and the police and later the movement spread all over big cities like Alexandria and Mansura. Meanwhile, the Interior Ministry stated an accusation toward the Muslim Brotherhood Party; on the other hand, protesters used the social media to reply and express their opinions.

January 27: Mohamed Albaradei (former head of U.S nuclear watchdog) along with other democracy advocates joined the protestors.

January 28: protestors planned for an upheaval, and the Egyptian government tried to back it via Internet shut off, detaining 20 members of the Brotherhood party, and later confrontations happened between the two sides and 10 civilians died by the end of the day Mubarak resigned from power.

January 29: Mubarek dismissed his Cabinet and refused to give up, the Army joined the field in order to protect museums and artifacts but that did not stop the fire of Egyptian museum. In, the same day Mubarak appointed a vice president for the first time in his reign (Omar Suleiman).

January 31: the president was still refusing to give up the White House addressed that the Egyptian government must solve the problem with the people and must give the people the freedom and justice which they called for. The EU called for fair Egyptian elections, and former president Jimmy Carter said that Mubarak should resign from power.
February 1: Mubarak addressed that he would run re-elections but will not resign promising to modify the constitution especially article 76, and try to improve the social conditions in the country.

February 4: thousands of protesters met at Cairo Tahir Square calling for a ‘day of departure ‘and still calling for the removal of the president. The Egyptian Health Ministry announced the death of 11 people at that time while the United Nations announced the death of 300.

February 11: President Hosni Mubarak finally resigned and handed over power to the army. (Aljazeera)

3. Responses toward the Egyptian Revolution:

Cooper and Worth claimed that, the American president Obama supported the protestors and their revolution. In a telephone call with Mubarak in the evening of February 1, 2011 he advised him to “step down” and the Egyptian president replied aggressively: “you don’t understand this part of the world; you’re wrong”. After a while, Obama addressed claimed: “the end of Mr. Mubarak’s 30 years rule must began now”. So by those last words obama ended a long relation with America’s biggest allay in the Arab region (Kirkpatrick the New York Times).

In January 28, and after the world saw images of clashes between the citizens and the police, the U.S administration claimed it would rethink its programs toward Egypt. Nevertheless, secretary of state Hilary Clinton stated that it was not the appropriate time to raise such a issue. At the begging, the U.S.A did not directly appose Mubarak, but on January 30 Clinton stated: “we want to see an orderly transition so that no one fills a void …” ( Sharp 11).

The American president Obama delivered a speech concerning the issue stating that the Egyptian people achieved their aim toward change via getting
Mubarak out of power. Nonetheless, Egyptian people will face many obstacles which they will overcome for sure in Obama’s words: “for Egypt they have made it clear that nothing less than genuine democracy will carry the day” (President Obama speaks to the Press 2011). The president pointed also to the role of the military during the revolution, which stood in the side of the street. Besides, he stated that in order to stabilize that change so that the Egyptian voices would be heard many important things must be done like; “protecting the rights of the Egyptian citizens, lifting the emergency law, revising the constitution and other laws to make this change irreversible and line out a clear path to elections that are faire and free” (Ibid). The American position is a supportive one and if Egypt needed any kind of assistance the United States will be ready to provide, even they see such democratic transition as an aspiration for them and for the rest of the world. Obama quoted from the Egyptian saying; “for the first time in my life I will account. My voice is heard, even though I am only one person”; and describing it as the true practice of democracy. (President Obama speaks to the press May 2011).

Secretary of state John Kerry stated that president Obama spent $ 1 in May 2011 Billion toward Egypt in order to help in the democratic transition. Additionally, the U.S.A is convicted to mainly: “engines of democratic change in Egypt” (the U.S Department of State). Most importantly, entrepreneurs and youth’s movements the U.S.A help Egypt to stand up economically to enlarge the Egyptian exports toward the United States and such an action will create jobs for a lot of citizens. Such American action gives the impression that America is cares about its biggest Arab allay and want it to go in the path of democracy via helping establishing economic and political stability (U.S Department of State).
In an interview with Alahram, the U.S assistance Secretary of state of Near Eastern Affairs and ambassador Feltman shed light on some controversial issues prior to the Egyptian revolution, especially the U.S.A’s decision for the removal of its assistance program in Egypt (Embassy of the United States). In addition, some U.S civil society organizations were being criticized for interfering in the revolution and Alahram via such interview revealed the position of the U.S.A in such spring (Ibid).

The first question directed to Faltman was about his country’s position concerning the Egyptian revolution from January until the 11th of February also about his support of the disposed president Mubarak. Leaving a negative outlook about the U.S.A. in his answer he mentioned that this issue is too complicated because of the long history that joined the two countries for a long time, but concerning the former president he tackled about American struggle to establish human rights and democracy in Egypt and the fact that the revolution was not against the American existence in the Egyptian land. However, it aimed to enhance the Egyptian political rights and freedoms.

The second question directed to the American ambassador is connected to the U.S interference in “the Egyptian internal affairs like that last assistance to the civil society”. The ambassador answered by claiming that only the Egyptian people can demand the rule of democracy and provide equal opportunities for all, and the role of the U.S.A. in all that is only to hold up the same aspiration and in order to make such support visible, it seems an appropriate thing to share the Egyptians in their claims did i.e.: joining the field with them. Besides, he mentioned that many interacted participants are doing the same (like the E.U). Additionally, the U.S aim from such strategy is only to help the Egyptians stand up by their own via: “training and capacity building to allow Egyptians to be in a better position to cooperate in elections and to
participate in a more democratic system” After all it is for the Egyptians to decide about their future, and the U.S.A seeks to interfere to achieve: “free, fair and credible process”.

The third question was an exclamation mark left in Egypt after the USAID Director leaved Cairo, and whether it was a reaction against the CAF’s general Mohammad Al-Assar at the U.S Institute Peace of Washington who declared that; the Egyptians needed help not interference. Feltman responded by stating that most of the USAID to Egypt is shaped in the military side and concerning the U.S intrusion in the civil society during the revolution, he thought that people can decide what is best for their democratic transition he related the issue of the USAID director leaving the Egyptian capital to be a routine change that happens from time to time (The U.S Embassy).

In a second interview with the same Newspaper (Al-Ahram) another set of questions was given to the U.S ambassador Faltman. The first question was about the recently Egyptian distrust in the American government especially after the revolution. Faltman declared that the U.S.A is troubled by “the wave of anti-U.S sentiments in Egyptian society” because of on behalf of his nation he thinks that, the relation of partnership between the two nations must proceed, and Americans will do their best to reverse that outlook via media in order to prove the good intention of the U.S.A; that is its will “to see a successful Egypt with a government accountable to its people” (Ibid).

The second question was about the responsible behind giving such bad image about America to the Egyptians according to the ambassador’s own view. He declared that the reason was primarily a “natural” one; related to the U.S leading position in the world so in each event fingers are pointed toward it and not only in
Egypt. Another point as he said was the; “the official encouragement of this sort of anti-American sentiment”, which was directed to divert people’s attention from the transition process. The third question was about the Muslim Brotherhood especially after the revolution and whether; the U.S.A is committed democratically to interfere in and if so, what kind of communication it would use. The ambassador answered by claiming that; “it is the interest of the United States to engage in dialogue with the full spectrum of the Egyptian political scene”, while concerning the way they connected with the Muslim Brotherhoods, he stated it would be through officials from both sides (Ibid).

All of the American ambassador’s answers have a strategic and diplomatic weight, and no real answer was given to understand the real interest and intervention of the U.S government in the Egyptian revolution of 2011.

Walt developed ten reasons behind the American interest in the Egyptian Revolution (Foreign policy 2013). The first as he argued is money and because the United States gave each year $2 billion to Egypt; so it should see where that money is going and that can happen only via observing the Egyptian matters. The second reason is America’s reputation because of America’s support for the authoritarian regime gave a hypocritical image about it. So, it had to do something. The third cause as argued by the writer is regional stability, which if absent would affect American interests most importantly the peace treaty with Israel, while the forth motive is the war on terror in which Mubarak was a good “useful” partner moreover, the fifth explanation is connected to America’s Middle Eastern allies (like Jordan and Saudi Arabia) as a result of the Egyptian revolution its interest in the region would be affected. The seventh reason lies in Morality, but if America is trying to promote democracy in Egypt over the last years it would be necessary to care for the ongoing
events. The eighth cause is related to the role of the media that played a great part in the Egyptian revolution and since America is a country of a highly advanced technology it should participate in it. The ninth explanation lies on learning from the Egyptian experience; that democratic change happens only via violence in the Arab world. The tenth rational is Judging Obama in fact if he ignores the Egyptian issue a lot of criticism would be directed towards him; “for turning a deaf ear to the Egyptian people's demands for justice and democracy” (Ibid).

In fact, Walt's explanation seem more rational since they answer clearly why the U.S.A turned its allay i.e.; the Mubarak government. They also clarified this American support to the Egyptian revolution as simply calling for freedom. It is so clear that the United States acts through what serves it best regardless of anything else.

4. **The Outcomes of the Egyptian Revolution:**

In a conference made at Washington D.C, on April 15, 2011 a set of democracy scholars, activists, business leaders and government officials from many countries like Egypt, Tunisia and Philippines met to: examine recent political and social events in the Arab world and study their implications for the development of democracy in the region and the Egyptian revolution of 2011 was a main subject of analysis (Skladony 2).

During the conference, Professor Shahin, a Professor of religion in the University of Notre Dame, explained that the Egyptian upraising was not a result of a chaotic action but caused by a long; “pressure and demands built up over at least a decade” (Skladony 6). What proved his argument is the series of protests that started in 2000 against the hereditary nature of the political system and the emergence of democratic groups like the "Kifaya". Moreover, he clearly stated that the main outcome of the
revolution was the call for freedom and social justice i.e.; universal rights, in his words: “another unique feature, was the transcendent nature of the uprising: it was based not on religion, ideology, or economic-class concerns but on such universal values as freedom, social justice, human rights, and especially dignity” (Ibid).

An important result is the fact that the revolution was led in its major part by the youth, and not by political leaders and big personalities; moreover, it was a peaceful one characterized by the support of the military (Skladony 7).
Conclusion:

The Egyptian nation had a long history of authoritarian rule from its very first begging as a monarchical country. Even after its transformation to a presidential state, Egypt was still in the hands of pharaounic presidents especially during the reign of Sadat Mubarak and even Abed-Nassir. The United States of America used the democracy promotion program as an excuse to interfere in the country under the name of human rights and most importantly democracy and since 2005 it established programs in many fields (education, politics and military).

The so called democracy promotion program had hidden purposes it was directed to protect American self-interests in the region especially with Israel (the Peace Agreement) also to preserve the U.S presence in the Gulf oil region. Even, the U.S NGO's went inside the Egyptian political parties without an official permission and if it was not the media that exposed to this fact, the NGO's would have continued their plan.

When the Egyptian people started a revolution on January 2011, they proved that can make history by their own hand needless of any foreign assistance. They paved the way for establishing a true democracy via disposing the president his tyrannical rule. It is true that this is just the beginning for them and Egypt will face many difficulties but if they can unite like they did in Taher Square they can do anything.
End notes of the third chapter:

1. The wafd party (hizb el–wafd) a nationalist liberal political party in Egypt, Egypt's most influential party for 1920s to 30s.

2. The M B'S: was found in Egypt in 1928 in order to change Egypt from secularism and to word and Islamic government based on sharia law and Muslim principles.

3. The NDP: dominates the political scene in Egypt controlling well over 80% of the seats in parliament. The party is more of a coalition of business and political elites than a coherent and disciplined organization with a unifying ideology (Egypt: background and U.S relations Jeremy M. Sharp).

4. EDA: working under authorities established in foreign association in act of 1961 and the export control act a defense article declared or express by the military department can be offered to foreign governments or international organization in support of O.S national security foreign policy objective (Defense security cooperation agency).

5. IMET: (the international military education and training program) is one instrument of U.S security assistance that provides training and education on a great basins to students from allied and friendly nation. In addition to improving defense capacities (U.S department of state: diplomacy in action).
General Conclusion:

"Democracies do not fight each other", under this claim the world's superpower gave itself what it perceives as "the novelist mission" to democratize authoritarian countries. The U.S.A gave itself the green light to intervene elsewhere for the sake of Democracy, on this basis, the "Democracy Promotion" program, was initiated as a means to bring and instill democracy in the Middle East.

In fact, Democracy is not a new ideal. It has developed over time since the Greek civilization and flourished during both the American and French revolutions. However, Democracy as an ideology came to the fore in recent times mainly since the 20th century. In this sense, the U.S.A claimed that it defeated communism under the leadership of the USSR because it is a democratic country. It argues also, that it has prospered and because the world's leader/hyper power because of its democratic practices. More, the U.S.A claim that wars, terrorism threaten world's peace and security due to the absence of Democracy in many key regions in the world accordingly, it is America's mission to save the world from anarchy and discover via spreading "American Democratization" thoughts via the "Democracy Promotion Program".

The Middle East, the U.S argues, is a key region whose people are oppressed under authoritarian regimes. So, there is a need for a new Middle East shaped by the Democratic Ideal. On this basis, Egypt, that is an important ally for the U.S.A in the region, is a key step for applying the Democracy Promotion Program. Hence, if it succeeds in Egypt, it would certainly succeed elsewhere and Egypt would be the "Arab Idol".
Consequently, the U.S.A perused such a policy neglecting and ignoring that this "Democracy Promotion" plan implies interfering in the domestic affairs of nations if not breaking their sovereignty rights. Two opposing points of view emerged, proponents of Democracy Promotion advocated such a policy on the basis of the following arguments: establishing the rule of law to stabilize world order, implementing justice, and equal right to end authoritarianism and autocracy and setting up the way for fair and just elections and freedom of speech and the press. Furthermore the western democracies used the “democratic peace theory” argument claiming that democracies do not fight against each other, rather they established good economic relations and eventually maintaining economic prosperity. Besides, the U.S.A declared a war on terror i.e.; via such program terrorism will end. However, opponents claim that Democracy Promotion is merely a new means though which the U.S.A gave itself the right to intervene elsewhere and pursue its dominion and hegemonic ambitions over the world.

Egypt, then, is but an example that reveals the true American intervention behind its Democracy Promotion Plan. The U.S.A the Egyptian authoritarian government for decades and Egypt was one of those countries used by the U.S.A to sustain its well being and this time the aim was to preserve its peace agreement with Israel, in addition to be a part of the Gulf reach oil countries. Its biggest allay in the region; Egypt the best suitable place to do that.

The thesis, came to the conclusion that "Democracy Promotion" is just a cover for America's global imperialist interests: Hegemony and controlling the world key-strategic regimes that the enable the U.S.A from putting its upper hand over the most important energy resources in the world.
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### Appendix:

**The Ups and Downs of Political Reform in Egypt**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950s–1960s</td>
<td>Egypt becomes a republic following a military coup. President Gamal Adel Nasser institutes a single-party system and bans the Muslim Brotherhood following a 1954 assassination attempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>President Anwar Al Sadat reinstates limited pluralism, allowing the creation of a few loyal opposition parties and the reactivation of the Muslim Brotherhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>President Muhammad Hosni Mubarak promises greater freedom; legislative elections bring in opposition representation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>Amid terrorist attacks by militant Islamists, Mubarak cracks down on political freedoms. Violence and fraud become widespread in elections; in 1999 the Supreme Court mandates full judicial supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>The ruling National Democratic Party makes a weak showing in elections; Gamal Mubarak rises as a party reformer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>The constitution is amended to allow direct election of the president; Mubarak wins a fifth term. Muslim Brotherhood candidates win 20 percent of seats in parliament.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Constitutional amendments adopt aspects of emergency law, diminish judicial supervision of elections, and outlaw political activity based on religion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### On the Record Support for Democracy in Egypt

“...The great and proud nation of Egypt, which showed the way toward peace in the Middle East, can now show the way toward democracy in the Middle East.”

*George W. Bush at the National Endowment for Democracy, November 2003 and again in the State of the Union address, February 2005*

“The day is coming when the promise of a fully free and democratic world, once thought impossible, will also seem inevitable. The people of Egypt should be at the forefront of this great journey …. So together, let us choose liberty and democracy—for our nations, for our children, and for our shared future.”

*Condoleezza Rice, Cairo, June 2005*

“The Cairo speech to me was perhaps the most important speech that I have given. And it to me says what America stands for and what this Administration stands for and we’re not going to back off that.”

*Condoleezza Rice, interview with al-Arabiyya television, May 2007*

“The United States is also using our influence to urge valued partners like Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Pakistan to move toward freedom … to open up their political systems, and give a greater voice to their people. Inevitably, this creates tension. But our relationships with these countries are broad enough and deep enough to bear it.”

*George W. Bush, Prague, June 5, 2007*

**Source:** Egypt—Don’t Give Up on Democracy Promotion By Michele Dunne, Amr Hamzawy, and Nathan J. Brown Senior Associates, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace June 20071779 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20036
The Warsaw Declaration

The Community of Democracies affirms our determination to work together to promote and strengthen democracy, recognizing that we are at different stages in our democratic development. We will cooperate to consolidate and strengthen democratic institutions, with due respect for sovereignty and the principle of non-interference in internal affairs. Our goal is to support adherence to common democratic values and standards. We will encourage political leaders to uphold the values of tolerance and compromise that underpin effective democratic systems, and to promote respect for pluralism so as to enable societies to retain their multi-cultural character, and at the same time maintain stability and social cohesion. We will also promote civil society, including women’s organizations, non-governmental organizations, labor and business associations, and independent media in their exercise of their democratic rights. Informed participation by all elements of society, men and women, in a country’s economic and political life, including by persons belonging to minority groups, is fundamental to a vibrant and durable democracy.


Democracy assistance in the 1990s

Democracy assistance mushroomed in the early 1990s. With the end of the cold war, the fall of the Berlin Wall, the breakup of the Soviet Union, and the heady acceleration of what enthusiasts were calling the “worldwide democratic revolution”, aiding democracy abroad was suddenly of intense interest to U.S. policy makers. U.S. democracy aid extended rapidly in the early 1990s into Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union, and Sub-Saharan Africa, expanded in Latin America and Asia, and crept into the Middle East. More U.S. actors plunged into the fray and onto the bandwagon. By the mid-1990s, U.S. democracy aid was all over both the developing world and the former communist world and was an accepted part of U.S. foreign aid and foreign policy.


Low-intensity democracy

All over the world, the United States is now promoting its version of “democracy” as a way to relieve pressure from subordinate groups for more fundamental political, social and economic change. The impulse to “promote democracy” is the rearrangement of political systems in the peripheral and semi-peripheral zones of the “world system” so as to secure the underlying objective of maintaining essentially undemocratic societies inserted into an unjust international system. The promotion of “low-intensity democracy” is aimed not only at mitigating the social and political tensions produced by elite-based and undemocratic status quos, but also at suppressing popular and mass aspirations for more thoroughgoing democratization of the twenty-first century international order.

ملخص:

الديمقراطية هي سياسة خارجية تمارسها الحكومات والمنظمات الدولية التي تطرح لنشر الديمقراطية. كنظام سياسي في جميع أنحاء العالم، هذه السياسة استمرت خلال سنوات طويلة بمختلف أشكالها، وأكثرها شيوعًا هو التدريس والتأطير، الذي يمارسه الكامل والمصري، لفترات طويلة من النظام.

هناك الحالة الأمريكية لزرع الديمقراطية في مصر عبر برنامج المساعدة لإنقاذ المصريين من النظام الفاسدي، لكن في الخفاء، تم إبرام اتفاقية أخرى، بدأ هذا العمل بعد أن حاول الترويج للديمقراطية في فساد أداة استعمارية

الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية صرحت بدورها كأعظم قوة في العالم بالإضافة إلى الديمقراطية الأخرى في نشر حقوق الإنسان والديمقراطية، ولكن في الحقيقة الولايات المتحدة هي من هنأت هذه الحقوق، وأظهرت حملاتها العسكرية، كانت التي حدثت في العراق، كل هذا أعطى الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية صورة المناطق، و التي أصبحت واضحة جدا في العقود الأخيرة، بالرغم من الجهود التي بذلت لأخفاء ذلك.
Résumé:

L'idée de la démocratie est une idée politique extrême. Elle est pratiquée par les pays taies développés dans le monde à partir des établissements et des organisations mondiales des droits de l'homme comme un pouvoir politique dans tous les pays du monde.

Où on trouve atte politique dans une grande réussite pour protéger les différents droits de l'homme surtout en Amérique (les États Unis d'Amérique). Mais d'autre pays considèrent que cette idée de la démocratie est une idée d'injustice. Ou ces démocraties occidentales n'ont pas le droit de pratiquer quelques rôles et quelques activités surtout dans les pays sous développés.

Ou on trouve les Américains extrême dans ce pays pour l'aider et le protéger du Gower nem ent du fichisme, mais entre les lignes ils ont beaucoup d'objectifs et d'intérêts là on affirme que cette politique est un outil du colonialisme. Les Etats Unis d'Amérique incite que l'homme a des droits la vie, la liberté et l'égalité, l'enseignement, manger, boire mais au fond de cette politique c'est le contraire ou la lutte contre les droits de l'homme exemple: en Iraq.

T'ont ca a donne aux Etats Unis l'image de l'hypocrite et cette image est devenue très claire pour tout le monde malgré tous les efforts faits par ces pays taies développés.