

Trevor Eck
Honors Thesis
Rough Draft

Arab Spring in North Africa: An Analysis of Foreign Influence and Revolutions in Egypt, Libya, and Tunisia

Abstract:

This paper examines the role foreign influence had on the outcomes of the 2011 Arab Spring Revolutions in Egypt, Libya, and Tunisia. Foreign influence primarily came from the US, European states such as the UK and France, and Gulf States such as Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and UAE. Influence includes but is not limited to financial assistance, diplomatic pressure, and in Libya's extreme case military intervention. Outcome of the revolution is determined by examining the state of each government before and after the 2011 revolutions. This paper studies why each of these three states had different levels of foreign influence throughout their transitions from longstanding dictatorships to the current governments that run each state today. It also studies why Tunisia, which had very little foreign influence, developed into a free and democratic state while Egypt and Libya ended up with another autocratic regime after many states played a role in their revolutions. It explains that the pressure the West faced to overthrow autocrats Qaddafi and Mubarak along with the lack of desire to engage in a third national building enterprise led to an overthrow of the original governments without a foundation to develop a new government. This along with the Gulf States' interest in increasing their regional power led to the failure of both revolutions as Egypt returned to an autocracy and Libya turned into a failed state with multiple governments at war. While Tunisia, who had little foreign intervention successfully transitioned from an autocracy into a free and democratic state.

Introduction:

At the end of 2010, a Tunisian street vendor named Mohamed Bouazizi set himself on fire to protest the oppression of Tunisia's Ben Ali regime (Callaway and Harrelson-Stephens 2014). The martyrdom of Bouazizi sparked revolutions in Tunisia and many other Arab states in the Middle East and North Africa. These revolutions known as the Arab Spring, provided the opportunity for many states in the region to overthrow their longstanding autocratic regimes and replace them with democracies. At the time there were few democratic states in the Middle East

and North Africa, so this indicated there was a possibility that the Arab Spring marked the beginning of the region's democratic transition (Lynch 2018). But this was not the case as most states failed to overthrow the autocratic governments in place and returned to conditions similar to before Arab Spring (Lynch 2018). Some states such as Egypt and Libya, overthrew the autocratic governments in power in 2011 but failed to replace them with democracies. Only Tunisia was successful in replacing their longtime dictator with a stable democracy.

This paper will examine some of the factors that caused Tunisia to have the only successful transition to democracy and freedom while Egypt and Libya overthrew their leaders and the revolution failed to make the same transition. The primary factor it will review is the amount of foreign involvement in both the revolution and the transition process. This foreign involvement includes but is not limited to the amount of interest states had in each state both economic and humanitarian, economic pressure or support, rhetorical support or opposition by state leaders, and in the most extreme cases military intervention (Phiri and Matambo 2017). The actors' involvement that this paper will examine will be states such as the United States, United Kingdom, France, and members of the Arab League, specifically Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and UAE. It will also analyze the role of international organizations such as NATO and the UN. It will determine how these actors influenced the outcome of the revolutions in Egypt, Libya, and Tunisia.

The outcome of the revolution will be determined by the current conditions in each state. The outcome will be defined by how democratic and free each state ended up after their respective revolutions. This will be determined by examining the Freedom House's Freedom of the World Index for all three states. Not only will the type of government be reviewed, but if there is even a functional government in place will factor into a state's success or failure. That is

because in Libya's case, there are multiple governments claiming legitimacy while deeply entrenched in a civil war for control of the state (Boduszyński 2015).

The hypothesis being tested in this paper is if a state has a higher level of foreign intervention during a revolution and post-revolution rebuilding process, then the state is less likely to become a free democratic state after the revolution. This is because foreign intervention in revolutions hinders a state's ability to properly create a democracy. Either states are intervening for their own interest or states are trying to assist in creating a democracy but lack the proper information or influence on the rebuilding state. A less likely alternate hypothesis is that if the amount of foreign involvement in a revolution increases, the chance the state becomes free and democratic remains the same. Based on the current condition of Libya, it is extremely unlikely that foreign intervention was helpful in developing freedom and democracy during these revolutions. They currently are in a bloody civil war and on the verge of failed statehood so if there was foreign intervention, it either had no impact or hurt the state ((Boduszyński 2015). Foreign intervention may have no impact on the outcome of revolutions and the likelihood of free democracies forming maybe entirely dependent on domestic factors, regardless of the foreign factors involved.

Overall this will reflect how foreign intervention was ultimately harmful during Arab Spring Revolutions. Since Tunisia was the most isolated state and the most successful while failed transitions in Egypt and Libya faced intervention from a variety of different actors, and Libya even endured military intervention, shows that there is a possibility that foreign involvement hindered these states' pursuit of democracy (Moghadam 2017). This could be because the foreign involvement was only beneficial to the interests of the actors intervening. The West could have been more inclined to intervene in Libya because of the presence of oil and

the established notorious reputation of dictator Muammar al-Qaddafi for being a thorn in the West's side for decades along with having a poor human rights record (Khan and Mezran 2016). In Egypt, the Gulf States possibly saw an opportunity to destabilize a traditional power in the region and Western powers had yet another opportunity to oust another dictator in Hosni Mubarak (Collins and Rothe 2012). Immediately after Mubarak was overthrown, hardline Islam began to rise with the Muslim Brotherhood as it is likely that both intervening groups did not want Egypt to turn into an extreme Islamist state, viewing military autocracy as the preferable alternative (Arena 2016). Tunisia faced very little such external influences and ultimately became a democratic and free state. This is probably because the Tunisian people had strong institutions in place during their revolution that helped them during their transition. Since they had no foreign powers assist them in overthrowing Ben Ali, they needed to establish stable and organized opposition themselves, leaving a foundation for a successful state post revolution (Mullin and Shahshahani 2012). The transition was not seamless, and it is still not fully complete today, but having them work through the issues themselves is better for long term success.

Determining if foreign intervention hurt the Arab Spring revolutions in North African states is significant in determining future international policy for when states undergo revolutions. If it is found that foreign influence hindered these states, it could question traditional liberal ideals about how democracies needs to actively spread democracy around the world. It could show that it is best for a state's long-term development to naturally overthrow their autocrat rather than having other states help. US intervention in both Afghanistan and Iraq failed at the nation-building phase and the revolution in Syria has turned into a massive proxy war because of the number of actors now involved in the conflict. This could display that staying out

of a domestic conflict could lead to democracy, even in regions such as MENA that have not seen much democratic success.

Literature Review:

There has been some prior literature on the role of foreign involvement and some of the negative consequences of foreign intervention. Phiri and Matambo focus on foreign intervention in Africa. They argue that Africa has been so reliant on Western (UN Security Council, EU, US, UK, France) foreign involvement that it has ultimately been harmful for their development (Phiri and Matambo 2017). This has prevented African states from solving their own problems which has hindered their ability to solve future problems and stunted the growth of Africa (Phiri and Matambo 2017). With the West always solving Africa's problems, Africa cannot develop on their own since they have always relied on the West to intervene and solve their problems (Phiri and Matambo 2017). This makes sense because if states are often depending on foreign intervention they will not build up the capacity to deal with the problems themselves. So, when future problems arise they will struggle with them more since they lack the experience of solving problems. This supports the hypothesis that foreign intervention ultimately hurts a state's ability to create a free democratic post-revolution.

Not only do Phiri and Matambo discuss how Western intervention has hindered Africa's growth, they also examine why the West will intervene in some African conflicts but not others. They explained that the West will only intervene in African security conflicts if it helps their economic interests (Phiri and Matambo 2017). If African security was paramount over Western economic interests, the French would not have immediately left tiny resource poor Rwanda when the Rwandan Genocide broke out (Phiri and Matambo 2017). Smaller states such as Rwanda have often been ignored by the West while resource rich states such as Libya often face Western

intervention (Phiri and Matambo 2017). Prioritizing Western economic interests over African interests led to poor results in African conflicts. It has led to multinational corporations depleting African states of their natural resources which takes away from African industry and prevents their economic growth (Phiri and Matambo 2017). These economic factors are detrimental for the growth of African states because the loss of African industry at the expense of the West prevents African states from having the economic muscle to deal with their own conflicts (Phiri and Matambo 2017). Also, since the West is primarily interested in economic gain during intervention, their intervention might not be helpful in dealing with the conflict.

The findings of Albornoz and Hauk correspond with the idea that states will only intervene if their economic interests are at stake. They analyzed the US involvement in civil wars and found that they were much more likely to intervene in a civil war if it would benefit them economically (Albornoz and Hauk 2014). This analysis also determined that foreign intervention in civil wars would often prolong these conflicts. That is because it was always uncertain how much the third party would intervene so one side would never truly know the capability of their opponent (Albornoz and Hauk 2014). The intervening state often does not give a full commitment to ending the conflict as they only will assist to the point in which their economic benefit of intervening outweighs the cost of war (Albornoz and Hauk 2014). These commitment problems were also troublesome for the side receiving the foreign help because they were not sure how much the third party would help them and if they help they were receiving was serving their best interest in the conflict.

This economic driven intervention can lead to policy decisions that further hinder the conflict state. Since the West is intervening for economic gain, they will often support the side that will help their interests rather than the side that is best for the state at war (Phiri and

Matambo 2017). The West will sometimes prop up regimes that are unpopular with the people within that state just to preserve Western economic interests (Phiri and Matambo 2017). This will prevent the intervention from gaining popular support which causes the propped regime to ultimately breakdown after the West leaves (Phiri and Matambo 2017). It is already difficult for Western intervention to gain popularity in African states because the people will link the intervention with colonialism (Phiri and Matambo 2017). This phenomenon of harmful interventions occurred in Somalia in the 1990's where a proxy war broke out and destabilized Somalia, and it occurred in Libya during Arab Spring where the West created a power vacuum by helping rebel groups overthrow Qaddafi (Phiri and Matambo 2017). Foreign actors will only intervene in revolutions if their interests are at stake, whether they be economic or strategic. This could lead to a poor outcome of the revolution because foreign actors will only be looking out for their interests, not how the revolting state ends up.

Western states will often act under the neoliberal framework and intervene to protect their interests under the disguise of promoting democracy. The United States will promote the spread of democracy and social justice to protect their foreign political and economic agenda (Collins and Rothe 2012). Collins and Rothe used the revolution in Egypt as an example of when the US put their interests over democratic ideals. Before the Arab Spring Revolution in Egypt, the US and its allies supported the repressive Mubarak regime (Collins and Rothe 2012). The US provided Egypt with \$2 billion per year since 1979 of military aid to secure an ally in the Middle East and have access to the Suez Canal (Collins and Rothe 2012). At any point from this time, the US could have put economic pressure on Mubarak to treat his people better, but they never did (Collins and Rothe 2012). After protests broke out, President Obama was hesitant to turn on Mubarak and waited until the Egyptian people were ready to overthrow him (Collins and Rothe

2012). After Mubarak was overthrown the US gave Egypt billions of dollars in aid to prevent their economy from collapsing and to keep a traditional ally stable, thus protecting US interests in the region (Collins and Rothe 2012). The US also initially supported Morsi until the Islamic fundamentalists were winning the elections, as having Islamists in power in Egypt would be harmful for the US (Collins and Rothe 2012). The idea of fake liberalism in which the West tells the rest of the world they are promoting democracy and freedom while looking out for their interests is evident in the Arab Spring. It was especially obvious in Egypt as the US was more focused on propping up governments that kept a traditional ally stable instead of actually nation building and promoting democratic values.

Although most of the literature about foreign intervention in revolutions is about intervention from the West, there are some sources that believe that the West and traditional liberal democratic values are losing influence. The argument was that the world influence of democracies has decreased since the 1990's (Plattner 2015). That is because in the 1990's the world system was extremely unipolar with the US and its allies as the only major world power after the collapse of the Soviet Union (Plattner 2015). These democracies have been slowly losing influence because of the rise of strong non-democracies such as China, Russia, and Saudi Arabia (Plattner 2015). This is significant because it could cause weaker states to transition towards autocracy when going through regime change if they are under the influence of a strong autocracy (Plattner 2015). The US and its Western allies were not the only ones involved in the Arab Spring. Middle Eastern autocracies such as Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and United Arab Emirates were heavily involved in both Egypt and Libya during their revolutions (Lynch 2018). They were involved to increase their influence over their regional rivals and to overthrow leaders that they disliked (Lynch 2018). Most literature that focuses on foreign intervention in Arab Spring

Revolutions only studies the influence of the West and does not take into account the influence of states within the region.

There was also the idea that foreign intervention would have little impact on the spread of democracy, especially in the Arab Spring. This was the belief that the West could not implant a Western democracy in a MENA state because they would need to develop their own MENA version of democracy (Gaffar 2017). This is not saying that democracy is not possible in the region, but they will create a democracy that is different than the traditional Western model. Democracy takes a long time to develop and spread and this region was put at a disadvantage for developing democracy because of how colonization separated groups with European-drawn borders (Gaffar 2017). The lack of democracy in the region is often attributed to the idea that Islam and democracy are incompatible (Gaffar 2017), but that is not the case as there are Muslim democratic states outside of the MENA region and popular opinion polls taken in the region have resulted in favorable responses for democracy and the relationship between Islam and democracy (Bratton 2003), (Gaffar 2017). After the Arab Spring, it would make sense for the states that just experienced revolution to take a long time to develop into a stable democracy. That is because the states experiencing revolution were often under autocratic rule for decades, so they lack a democratic foundation. Their neighbors in the region are also not democratic so these states had no regional model to base their new governments off of. Foreign involvement cannot really hinder democratic development because the democracy in the is in its infancy stage. But this is not the case as Tunisia developed into a democracy around 5 years after they overthrew Ben Ali.

The current literature can help justify the hypothesis that foreign intervention hindered the revolting states. That is because it can explain why foreign actors are deciding to intervene in these revolutions in the first place. The articles explain that states will only intervene if their

interests are at stake (Phiri and Matambo 2017). Their interests can be either economic or strategic, and both the West and the Gulf states will intervene to protect them (Lynch 2018). Not only does this explain why states will intervene, it also explains why this intervention can be harmful. Since states are only intervening to pursue their own interests, they are not really looking out for the state they are intervening with and are not worried about their outcome (Phiri and Matambo 2017). States will not fully commit to one side of the conflict while pursuing their interests, which escalates and prolongs the conflict (Albornoz and Hauk 2014). Even if states were not just looking out for their own interests and the West was truly trying to spread democracy their intervention could have still been harmful. It is difficult for democracy to spread in a region where there is little democracy and the people in the area must create their own variation of democracy for it to be successful (Gaffar 2017). This would lead to an unsuccessful outcome for the West attempting to implement a Western democracy into a MENA state because the MENA states are not creating their own form of democracy (Gaffar 2017). There is some literature potentially justifying the alternate no-impact hypothesis if the West had good intentions. Plattner argued that democracy has lost some of its world influence so Western intervention in Arab Spring maybe ineffective because of the loss of power of the West (Plattner 2015). But Plattner also discusses the rising power of autocracies such as Saudi Arabia, who was involved in Arab Spring revolutions looking out for their interests in the region (Plattner 2015). So even if Western influence has no impact, the primary hypothesis could still be proven by the influence of the Gulf States.

There is not much literature on the effects of foreign intervention by both the West and strong Middle Eastern states on the outcome of Arab Spring Revolutions. Most literature also just examines one state such as Libya, Egypt, or Syria. The one state that successfully

transitioned into a democracy, Tunisia is often overlooked. This paper will compare Tunisia with the two more discussed North African States; Libya and Egypt and determine how foreign intervention differently shaped each revolution. It will analyze why there were different levels of foreign intervention in each state and determine how these different levels helped or hindered democratic development after the Arab Spring Revolutions.

Research Methodology:

This paper will take a qualitative approach to determine the impact of foreign intervention on the outcome of Arab Spring Revolutions. It will examine three case studies: the revolutions of Egypt, Libya, and Tunisia. The case studies will be compared using Mill's Method of Disagreement. Mill's Method of Disagreement explains that if subjects being compared have different outcomes and have many conditions in common except for one, then the one difference is the cause for the different outcome (Mill 1843). The case studies are similar because three states are predominantly Muslim states in North Africa that underwent revolutions in 2011 after decades of autocratic rule. The similar geographic location and similar political and demographic conditions within each state allows their revolutions to be comparable. Not only did the three states experience revolutions during the 2011 Arab Spring, they were all ultimately successful in overthrowing their respective autocratic regimes, unlike many states in the Middle East and North Africa during the Arab Spring. This allows for a useful comparison between the three states to determine how each state fared post-revolution and if each state developed a government more favorable to its people after the revolution.

One major difference between the three states is the amount of foreign intervention that occurred during the revolutions and throughout the post-revolution nation building. The amount of foreign intervention is the independent variable as each of the three states experienced a

different level of it throughout Arab Spring. Foreign intervention will be defined as the amount of involvement another state or international organization had in the outcome of the revolution. These foreign states primarily include but are not limited to: the US, UK, France, Saudi Arabia, UAE, and Qatar and the international organizations include the UN Security Council and NATO. These were the primary actors involved and it is important to determine how both the West and strong Middle Eastern states influenced these revolutions because most works focus on one or the other.

Before determining the amount of foreign intervention, the term foreign intervention must be defined. Foreign intervention is when another state acting either unilaterally or collectively under an international organization actively attempts to change the outcome of the revolution or the post-revolution nation building process (Phiri and Matambo 2017). This includes providing economic support to opposition groups or to the newly formed government, providing arms to opposing groups, rhetorically supporting the revolutions or new governments in speeches made by state leaders, providing humanitarian aid, assisting in the creation of the new government, incentivizing a group to attempt to overthrow the government, and providing military support during the revolution (Phiri and Matambo 2017). Most if not all of the activities listed above occurred in at least one of the case studies during Arab Spring. Each state being studied experienced a different number of scenarios listed above at different severities.

To determine which state had the most foreign intervention, there needs to be a scale that defines the severity of foreign intervention. This scale will include the number of states involved with the revolution and the extent to which they get involved. The quantity will be separated into four possible categories: none, low, medium, and high. None will occur if no foreign states are involved with the revolution. Low will occur when either Western states or Middle Eastern states

intervene either unilaterally or with an international organization. Medium will occur when both Western and Middle Eastern states are involved either unilaterally or as a collective with an international organization. High will occur when both are involved and when states are acting unilaterally and with an international organization (UNSC, NATO, Arab League). The level will increase as states from different regions are involved because Western States and Middle Eastern states generally had different interests when deciding to intervene. The addition of international organizations and unilateral states for the high level occurred because it would indicate that unilateral or collective action was not enough for a state to accomplish its goals.

Severity of the intervention will be taken into account along with the quantity as it is possible that one state could be heavily involved with one revolution and have a greater impact than a bunch of states being barely involved in another revolution. This severity depends on the type of involvement along with how much each foreign actor gets involved. For example, economic involvement would be considered more severe as more money is given to the case study state. Also, supplying opposition groups is less severe than actual military intervention since putting their own people on the line indicates a higher degree of involvement. So to determine the amount of foreign involvement within each case study, it is important to consider how a state is getting involved, how many states are getting involved, and the severity of the involvement.

The dependent variable is the outcome of the revolution. This will take into account the state of the governments that are currently in power in each of the case studies. Current governments are being studied to show the impact foreign involvement had on the formation of the new governments. Technically, the outcome of each revolution was the same since each one led to the autocrat being overthrown, so this paper takes the new government into account

regarding outcome. This will be studied by examining Freedom House's Freedom of Government variables in each state from 2004-present. Freedom House measures the freedom of a government annually with a 7-point scale, with 1 being the most free and 7 being the least. They rate three variables on this scale: freedom, civil liberties, and political rights and determine if a state is free or not free on the score of each variable. This will go all the way back to 2005 even though Arab Spring occurred in 2011 to give background on how democratic and free each government was before the Arab Spring. How democratic and free each government turned out is a great indicator on outcome of a revolution because the purpose of these revolts was for the people to gain more individual rights and freedoms from the oppressive autocratic governments in power. A state will either be successful and transition into a free democracy after Arab Spring or will revert back to an autocracy. The outcome would also be considered a failure if the state reverted back to another revolution, has multiple governments declaring legitimacy, or is considered a failed state. Although having an autocratic government is far from ideal, it is a better result than a failed state that has no government.

The Rise of Democracy in Tunisia:

It is appropriate to begin with Tunisia since it was the origin of Arab Spring. The movement began in December of 2010 when a street vendor named Mohamed Bouazizi set himself on fire to protest the Tunisian government (Callaway and Harrelson-Stephens 2014). This act sparked largescale protests across all of Tunisia as a fight against the poor conditions within the state (Callaway and Harrelson-Stephens 2014). President Ben Ali constantly restricted the human rights of his people by arresting and torturing political opponents and human rights activists (Callaway and Harrelson-Stephens 2014). The poor human rights conditions along with government corruption and poor economic conditions were why Tunisians protested the Ali

regime after Bouazizi's martyrdom (Callaway and Harrelson-Stephens 2014). These protests eventually led to Ben Ali's resignation in January 2011 as hundreds of people were killed throughout the revolt (Mullin and Shahshahani 2012).

The people fighting for more rights received almost no support from foreign states during and after the revolution. Although it may seem like Western democracies such as the US and states EU would want a democracy in the MENA region, they did not actively assist the Tunisian people (Mullin and Shahshahani 2011). The US and EU even supported the Ben Ali regime during its time in power because Ali was an ally in the Bush administration's war on terror (Mullin and Shahshahani 2011). They overlooked Ali's numerous human rights violations and poor treatment of his people to protect their security interests in the region (Mullin and Shahshahani 2011). The US even praised Tunisia for passing an antiterrorism law in 2003 which Ben Ali used to target his political opponents and other threats to his autocratic power (Mullin and Shahshahani 2011). From a strategic standpoint, the US focus on the war on terror led to their support of the Ben Ali regime so it makes sense that they would not come assist the Tunisian people in overthrowing him even when Ali was completely against the democratic principles that the US stands for. Either outcome of the revolution would be favorable for the US as a democracy in a region with few democracies would form or a longtime strategic ally would retain power. Not taking a side would prevent the US from losing favor with the eventual winner of the revolution and they could still work with Tunisia to pursue their interests.

The United States was not the only state to avoid intervention during Tunisia's revolution because of prior commitment to the Ali regime. France also decided not to help the Tunisian rebels in favor of Ben Ali (Attir and Laremont 2016). This was because of Ali's declaration as an ally in the war on terror. The French government even offered to help Ali put down the rebellion

by sending troops (Attir and Laremont 2016). For France during Arab Spring their domestic politics became a factor that determined possible intervention. For example, the French president decided to intervene in Libya because his approval rating was low, and the majority of the French people favored the overthrow of Qaddafi (Attir and Laremont 2016). The Tunisian Revolution occurred before the Libyan revolution so the political landscape in France must have changed during that period. The French people must have been more aware of the Libyan Revolution because it is unlikely that a presidential approval rating would decline drastically in a few months span and even if it did decline, the president would not miss an opportunity to increase approval.

Overall foreign intervention from both the West and Middle Eastern states was low because of a lack of interest from foreign states. Since Tunisia was relatively isolated and lacked oil production, other states did not focus on their revolution (Moghadam 2017). The isolation prevented Tunisia from being as important to the security interests of the West, since it was farther from the Middle East than the other two states being studied. It also led to less interaction between Tunisia and the Gulf States so there was less of a rivalry between them. Regarding a lack of oil, this decreased the economic interest as oil is a major industry in the MENA region. The lack of oil meant there was less at stake economically for Western states because they did not have to intervene to protect any industry. It also decreased the economic interest of the Middle Eastern states because they did not have the need to destabilize a rival exporter to increase their own oil profits.

From 2004-2018, Tunisia transitioned from “not free” to “partly free” all the way to “free.” According to Freedom House Tunisia was not free from 2004-2007, receiving a 5.5 out of 7 for freedom, a 5 out of 7 for civil liberties, and a 6 out of 7 for political rights (Freedom House

2004-2007). Tunisia became even more oppressed in 2008 as between 2008-2011 it scored a 6 for freedom, 5 for civil liberties, and 7 for political rights (Freedom House 2008-2011). This decrease in freedom occurred because the constitution was changed so that Ben Ali could seek reelection for a 6th term and proceeded to win that election with almost 90% of the vote (Freedom House 2009). After Ben Ali was overthrown in January of 2011, they held parliamentary elections in October of the same year in which the Islamist party won the plurality of the votes (Freedom House 2012). These elections were originally supposed to occur in July of 2011, but the interim government decided to postpone them until October because there were economic and infrastructural issues that could have prevented a free election (Sadiki and Bouandel 2016). It is possible that if foreign states were involved, they could have rushed the Tunisian parliamentary elections because they would want to see Tunisia transition into a democracy as quickly as possible. The isolation prevented Tunisia from feeling any pressure to transition which allowed them to take their time to get it right. This free parliamentary election and the overthrow of the longtime autocrat helped Tunisia transition from not free to partly free. They remained at partly free from 2012-2014 with a freedom score of either 3 or 3.5 during that time, a civil liberty score between 3-4, and a political rights score of 3 (Freedom House 2012-2014).

Tunisia made the full transition into a free state in 2014 with the drafting of a new constitution, a free presidential election, and another round of parliamentary elections (Freedom House 2015). These events were huge in Tunisia's development into a democracy because the outcome of the election showed that its young democracy had lasting power. The state created a constitution with strong democratic values and had its first peaceful transition of power as the secular liberal party won more seats than the Islamic party (Sadiki and Bouandel 2016). The

constitution was able to develop, and this transition of power was so peaceful because of the relationship between the major political parties. While the Islamist party was in power they often cooperated with rival political parties (Yumitro and Estriani 2017). Since these parties had a working relationship, it made it much easier for the Islamist party to give up power. It was impressive that the Tunisian people were holding their government accountable and used participation in democracy to fix state problems. The Islamic party was ousted because there was a rise of religious extremism and violence and they ultimately failed to promote social justice (Sadiki and Bouandel 2016). The Tunisian people immediately bought into their new democracy and through democratic participation used it to demand social justice changes that they were calling for since Arab Spring. This helped Tunisia gain the free status in 2015 and keep it ever since as their freedom score ranged from 2-2.5, the civil liberty score was 3, and their political rights score ranged from 1-2 from 2015-2018 (Freedom House 2018). With a low level of foreign intervention Tunisia successfully transitioned into a free democracy.

The Fall of the Qaddafi Regime and the Rise of Civil War in Libya:

The revolution in Libya received much more international attention than the one in its western neighbor Tunisia. Protests in Libya occurred in February of 2011 and the West immediately became involved in the revolution (Selim 2013). In late February, the United States aligned itself with Libya's Transitional National Council (TNC), which was the primary opposition against Qaddafi to gain influence over the new government when the Qaddafi regime eventually fell (Selim 2013). On March 17, 2011 the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 1973 which called for a no-fly zone over Libya and allowed for foreign states to intervene in Libya to protect the Libyan civilians and develop a ceasefire between the Qaddafi regime and the rebels (Security Council 2011). But by the time this resolution was adopted

French troops were already involved in Libya and fired on Qaddafi's troops possibly prior to the resolution's adoption (Attir and Laremont 2016). Britain was also already involved in Libya before the resolution was adopted so both states decided to intervene militarily before seeking receiving international approval (Attir and Laremont 2016). A possible reason as for why France was leading the charge in Libya was because of their domestic politics. At the time president Sarkozy's approval ratings were extremely low and some people in his administration believed that this intervention would boost his public approval (Attir and Laremont 2016). This desire to increase domestic favor could explain why France was one of the leaders of NATO's military intervention in Libya.

Britain and the US were the other two major leaders in NATO's airstrikes against Libya. During this military operation, they ended up not following the guidelines set by the Security Council Resolution by siding with the rebels instead of trying to stop the fighting (Selim 2013). Although the goal of the resolution was to create a ceasefire that would protect civilians, the US rejected an African Union ceasefire proposal that was accepted by the Libyan government (Selim 2013). After they sided with the rebels these major powers shifted the focus of the military intervention from humanitarian intervention to overthrowing Qaddafi (Selim 2013). This shift occurred because the West wanted to protect their interests in Libya and they believed a pro-Western regime propped up by them would better suit their interests than Qaddafi. Before the rebellion, the US already had poor relations with Qaddafi which made them believe he was unreliable to serve their interests in the region (Hana 2017). Most of these interests were economic as Libya is a major oil exporter and most of the economy was dependent on oil (Khan and Mezran 2016). Not only was there a massive oil industry, it was collectivized by Qaddafi so private companies in Libya were not generating wealth from the oil industry (Khan and Mezran

2016). Overthrowing Qaddafi could provide more opportunities for Western companies in Libya because they could tap into Libya's massive oil reserves. Also, it would be in the best interest for the West to have a shorter rebellion, so Libya could resume normal oil production. When the fighting broke out, oil production in Libya decreased drastically (Khan and Mezran 2016). This would incentivize Western states to intervene to end the rebellion quickly, so Libya can get back to exporting oil and no longer harm their interstate trade, especially France who was Libya's sixth largest trading partner (Hana 2017). This economic factor along with prior negative interactions with Qaddafi made Western states much more interested in Libya than Tunisia, since Tunisia lacked the oil capacity of Libya and Ben Ali was a traditional Western ally.

The Western powers were not the only states involved in Libya. Some of the Gulf States attempted to use the conflict in Libya to spread their regional influence. Similar to the US some of the Gulf States: Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and UAE had poor relations with Qaddafi, so these states saw the Arab Spring revolution in Libya as an opportunity to overthrow him (Lynch 2018). These states used their media influence to highlight Qaddafi's various human rights violations, which pushed the West to intervene (Lynch 2018). The Arab League also passed a resolution that influenced the UN to support international humanitarian intervention (Lynch 2018). These states were also involved during the intervention as Qatar even provided military support in the form of airstrikes and elite troops (Boduszyński 2015). Although not every Gulf State provided direct military support like Qatar, they were indirectly involved with the conflict by arming rebel groups (Lynch 2018). This destabilized Libya even more because Qatar and UAE were supplying different rebel groups and continued to supply them long after the overthrow of Qaddafi (Boduszyński 2015). This prevented one group from having enough military capability to take over the entire state of Libya and defeat the other rebel groups, thus prolonging the civil

war. With both the West and Gulf States being involved in the Libyan revolution by acted both unilaterally and through international organizations such as the Arab League, NATO, and UN Security Council there was a high level of foreign involvement in Libya.

Libya's Freedom House score slightly improved from 2004 to 2018 because it would have been statistically impossible for Libya to regress. From 2004-2011 Libya scored all 7's for freedom, civil liberties, and political rights making it as not free as possible (Freedom House 2004-2011). They remained not free in 2012 but transitioned to partly free in 2013 and 2014 with a freedom score of 4.5, a civil liberty score of 5, and a political rights score of 4 during both years (Freedom House 2012-2014). This increase in freedom occurred because in 2012 after the fall of the Qaddafi regime the new Libyan state held parliamentary elections (Freedom House 2013). The liberal party won a plurality of the votes in this election while Libya's Muslim Brotherhood affiliate finished in second (Freedom House 2013). Although this seemed like a step in the right direction for Libya, this newly created Congress ultimately lacked enforcement power and the civil war escalated as the Eastern part of the state attempted to create their own government (Freedom House 2014). The escalation of the civil war led to Libya's reversion back to a not free state in 2015 and they have remained not free since with a freedom score between 6-6.5, a civil liberty score of 6, and a political rights score that ranged from 6-7 (Freedom House 2015-2018). The different warring tribal groups could not reconcile as the civil war continued and Libya ended up turning into a failed state (Aras and Yorulmazlar 2016). The fact that Qatar and the UAE were still providing arms and funding to different rebel groups mThe United Nations attempted to prop up one of the governments, but it was not widely recognized throughout the state as law and order within Libya eventually broke down (Freedom House 2016). This war eventually became three sided and the civil war along with the chaos it brought

still continues in Libya today (Freedom House 2018). Although Libya had extremely minor improvements in their Freedom House scores, these improvements were not enough to classify the revolution as a positive one. That is because the scores are still extremely poor as Libya is still classified as, “not free” and the state is currently in a three-way civil war that has descended Libya into failed statehood.

Overall the high foreign intervention in Libya’s revolution ended up harming the state. That is because both the West and the Gulf states that intervened had different interests and reasons for intervening. The Gulf states saw this revolution as an opportunity to overthrow a rival in Qaddafi and to expand their influence in the Middle East (Lynch 2018). The Gulf States had no desire to create a democratic Libya because they are autocratic and having democracies in the region could hinder their influence on their own people. Not only did they want to harm their rival Libya, some Gulf States used the revolution to fuel the rivalries with each other. Qatar and UAE armed different rebel groups during the rebellion against Qaddafi and during the civil war that broke out after Qaddafi was removed from power (Lynch 2018). Since these states turned the revolution into a proxy war, they were not concerned with the outcome regarding if the Libyan people installed a government that the people wanted. They were only concerned with overthrowing a rival and putting a regime in place that would benefit their interests.

This could be confirming evidence of Plattner’s theory that powerful autocratic states are gaining more influence on the world stage and the world power of the United States and Western democracy is in decline. If the West intervened in Libya to purely help the Libyan people overthrow a ruthless dictator and transition into a free state, they were ultimately used by the Gulf States. Since these states used the media to turn the West against Qaddafi and then pushed the Security Council to pass Resolution 1973, it is possible that these autocracies were driving

the foreign intervention in Libya. Either the Gulf States got the West to help them gain more influence in the MENA region or the West intervened for political and economic gain. If the West decided to intervene to protect their oil interests and increase their approval ratings, then the Libyan Revolution would fit more into Phiri and Matambo's theory that western intervention in Africa under the false pretense of democracy building has only been harmful for African states (Phiri and Matambo 2017). There is also some evidence of this because after Qaddafi was overthrown, every government backed by the West was rejected by the Libyan people. For example, the parliament that was elected a year after Qaddafi was overthrown had absolutely no enforcement power, which led to part of the state trying to form its own government and intensifying the civil war (Freedom House 2014). Also, the UN tried to prop up one of the governments and most of the Libyan people did not recognize its legitimacy (Freedom House 2016). Either the West intervened in Libya to spread democracy which was undermined by the power struggle of the Gulf States showing a declining influence of democracy, or the West intervened to pursue political and economic interests while exploiting a weaker African state. Regardless of the motives behind intervention, it was not in the best interest of the Libyan people as their state failed and became plagued with civil war.

The Egyptian Revolution and its Regression back to Autocracy:

The Arab Spring revolution in Egypt occurred shortly after protests in Tunisia broke out. In January 2011, Khalid Said was beaten to death in police custody and gruesome pictures of his body were released on social media, causing unrest among the Egyptian people (Callaway and Harrelson-Stephens 2014). The Egyptian people quickly used social media to organize protests that began on January 25, 2011 in Tahrir Square (Collins and Rothe 2012). These protests lasted until mid-February until President Mubarak eventually decided to step down (Collins and Rothe

2012). Mubarak tried to concede some of his power by announcing he would not run for reelection, but the protesters persisted until his resignation (Collins and Rothe 2012). He eventually resigned because of the powerful Egyptian military's decision to side with the protestors and top military officials ended up taking over the interim government after Mubarak's resignation (Arena 2016).

This military interim government called the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces (SCAF) was immediately backed by the United States (Selim 2013). The US originally publicly supported Mubarak because he was an ally for the past 30 years, but the Obama Administration decided to call for his resignation when they realized the people were going to overthrow him (Arena 2016). With this longtime ally pushed out of power, the US needed to forge a relationship with the new government to protect their interests in the region. These were primarily security interests as the US was especially concerned with protecting Israel and its 1979 peace treaty with Egypt (Selim 2013). The US had the ability to heavily influence the SCAF because of the large amount of aid the US sends to Egypt and a large percentage of that aid goes to the Egyptian military (Selim 2013). According to Selim, the US gave the Egyptian military \$1.3 billion in 2011 alone (Selim 2013). The military had received aid from the US since 1979 after the Camp David Accords (Arena 2016).

The US then attempted to help Egypt transition into a democracy. They began working with the Muslim Brotherhood and helped Mohammad Morsi become president after elections were held in June 2012 (Selim 2013). According to Selim, the Muslim Brotherhood claimed Morsi's victory when only 52% of the vote was reported and the US backed their illegal maneuver because the Brotherhood guaranteed that Morsi would promote US interests (Selim 2013). This promise was backed as Morsi helped negotiate a ceasefire between Israel and Hamas

in 2013 (Arena 2016). The US supported Morsi even though some of his policies were undemocratic. Morsi severely weakened Egypt's judiciary and made the newly created constitution much more Islamic (Arena 2016). But the US continued to provide millions of dollars in aid because he was fulfilling US interests in the region. The Morsi government was eventually overthrown by the military in 2013 and Chief of the Egyptian Armed Forces Abdel Fattah el-Sisi took over as the leader of Egypt (Arena 2016). The United States never recognized it as a military coup, and only slightly held back aid which was reinstated a year and a half later (Arena 2016). Although President Obama rhetorically supported a free Egypt, the US continued to cooperate with and send millions of dollars in aid to multiple governments that oppressed the Egyptian people in order to protect US security interests in the region.

The United States was not the only state involved in Egypt during Arab Spring to protect their interests. The Gulf States were also involved in Egypt to preserve their influence in the region. They intervened after Morsi and the Muslim Brotherhood took over Egypt because they saw the Brotherhood as a rival to their Sunni Muslim supremacy (Aras and Yorulmazlar 2016). Saudi Arabia led the charge because they did not want Arab Spring to spread to their state and undo their power and influence in the Middle East (Aras and Yorulmazlar 2016). They also did not want the Muslim Brotherhood in power because they wanted to halt the rise of a rival Sunni group that could possibly threaten their influence (Aras and Yorulmazlar 2016). There was evidence of this dislike for the Brotherhood when Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and UAE pledged to bailout Egypt's economy if the military overthrew Morsi (Bellin 2018). The day after the coup, these states sent \$12 billion to Egypt to help the state overcome its economic woes (Bellin 2018). Like in Libya, the Gulf states intervened in Egypt to preserve their regional power and influence.

With the intervention of both the Gulf States and the US, the level of foreign involvement in Egypt can be classified as medium. This involvement mostly occurred through unilateral actions to preserve their interests in Egypt during the turmoil and there was little collective intervention through international organizations. There was also no direct military intervention like there was in Libya. The Egyptian military was strong enough to carry out foreign interests since they were strong enough to overthrow the government twice in two years. Most of the foreign intervention came through financial means as the US and Gulf States provided this strong military with much needed economic relief and funding for the military itself.

Egypt's freedom score remained about the same for the entire period studied. From 2004-2012, Egypt was not free and had a freedom score of 6 in 2004 and 5.5 from 2005-2012, a civil liberty score of 6 in 2004 and 5 from 2005-2012 and a political rights score of 6 from 2004-2012 (Freedom House 2004-2012). This period was during the Mubarak era and he acted as a typical autocrat by silencing and imprisoning critics along with keeping Egypt in a constant state of emergency (Freedom House 2009). They were only partly free in 2013 as freedom, civil liberties, and political rights were all 5 out of 7 (Freedom House 2013). This is because of the elections held in 2012 which were considered partly free as Morsi won the presidency and the Muslim Brotherhood took over the majority in parliament (Freedom House 2013). They reverted back to being not free in 2014 and remained not free as they scored between 5.5 and 6 in freedom, 5 and 6 in civil liberties, and 6 in political rights (Freedom House 2014-2018). This is because the military overthrew the partially democratically elected Morsi and reverted back to authoritarian rule (Freedom House 2014).

Egypt demonstrates the harm that foreign intervention had on these revolutions. The protests on Mubarak and the beginning of the revolution had potential to turn Egypt into a free

democratic state, but this was wiped out by the strong military presence (Yumitro and Estriani 2017). Some literature only blames the strong military as the reason behind Egypt's revolutionary failure, but the military was not the one making the decisions. The decisions were being made by the US and the Gulf States and they simply used the military as a tool to put in place Egyptian governments that suited their interests. The military initially did not want to overthrow Morsi because it would destroy the economy and they only did it after the Gulf States promised to bail them out (Bellin 2018). Initially, they were on the Egyptian people's side when they removed Mubarak from power. The US ultimately enabled the military's undemocratic behavior by providing so much aid to the non-democratic SCAF and not cutting off aid to the Sisi regime when it became an autocracy. The US could have limited or even cut off military and economic aid at any point, but they were too concerned about their strategic interests to do so. Even a moderate level of foreign involvement proved problematic for a state going through a revolution.

Results:

Case Study	Region	Pre-Arab Spring Government Status	Decades of autocracy before Arab Spring?	Was the Pre-Arab Spring gov overthrown?	Level of Foreign Involvement	Outcome of Revolution	2018 FH Status
Tunisia	North Africa	Not Free	Yes	Yes	Low	Transition to Democracy	Free
Libya	North Africa	Not Free	Yes	Yes	High	Civil war and failed statehood	Not Free
Egypt	North Africa	Not Free	Yes	Yes	Medium	Reversion back to autocracy	Not Free

Tunisia had the least foreign intervention during their revolution and experienced the most success while Libya and Egypt had high and medium levels of foreign intervention and their revolutions ended up failing. This supports the first hypothesis that if a state has more foreign intervention during a revolution, then it is less likely to become a free democratic state. The lack of foreign intervention allowed Tunisia to develop their own type of democracy and take as much time as they needed to develop it. Since Tunisia is isolated, there were no foreign interests at stake when they revolted so other states felt no need to intervene (Moghadam 2017). This prevented a foreign actor from quickly propping up a government that the people did not support, which occurred in states whose revolutions were influenced by foreign actors. It allowed the new government to form into something that the people of Tunisia wanted to create, which supports Gaffar's findings that these MENA states need to create their own form of democracy in order to successfully transition into one (Gaffar 2017). Their revolution was truly based on the principles of democracy and social justice because they successfully transitioned into a democracy after the revolution. The Islamic and secular political parties were able to naturally find common ground and work together to provide a free democratic government to the Tunisian people (Selim 2013). The cooperation between the two parties supports Bratton's theory that Islam and democracy are in fact compatible and helps reject theories that believe the two cannot coexist.

Both Libya and Egypt experienced more foreign intervention and ultimately had unsuccessful revolutions. Although it is unclear if these states would have transitioned into free democratic states if they were left isolated, foreign intervention definitely hindered their ability to transition. That is because the foreign intervention occurred primarily to protect the interests

of the foreign actors and not assist the revolting state. In Libya, the Gulf States used the Arab Spring to topple the Qaddafi regime and attempt to gain regional power and influence over each other. The West was either involved to promote democracy, for their own political and economic interests, or a combination of both. This involvement led to a quick overthrow of Qaddafi, but it hurt Libya in the long run because after the fall of Qaddafi the rebel groups began fighting a bloody civil war to determine who would control the state. This failed revolution in Libya confirms some of the ideas of both Phiri and Matambo and Plattner. It reinforces Plattner's theory that autocracies are gaining world influence because the Gulf States had such a prominent role in shaping Libya (Plattner 2015). It confirms Phiri and Matambo's idea that Western intervention is not well received in African states because the rebel groups would not recognize the government propped up by the United Nations (Phiri and Matambo 2017).

In Egypt, there was less foreign involvement than in Libya, but they still failed to create a free democratic state. The main foreign actors were the US and the Gulf States, and they did not need to intervene militarily or use international organizations like in Libya. That was because of the stability of the Egyptian military as these states would just pay the military to carry out their interests. The large amount of aid the US gives the Egyptian military immediately gave them leverage in Egypt after the fall of Mubarak (Arena 2016). Instead of prioritizing a true democratic transition, they focused on creating a government that would serve their security interests and maintain good relations with Israel (Arena 2016). The US were so concerned with these interests that they would often turn a blind eye when these Egyptian government exhibited autocratic tendencies (Arena 2016). This influence along with the influence of the Gulf States that wanted to increase their regional influence and stop the Arab Spring helped Egypt revert into an autocratic government.

This proves the primary hypothesis that if there was more foreign intervention in a revolution, then it would be less likely that it would become a free democratic state. Since Tunisia experienced the lowest foreign intervention and transitioned into a free democracy, while Libya and Egypt had higher levels of intervention and reverted to autocracy. All three states are in the same region in the world, had revolted against decades of autocratic rule at the same time, and overthrow the long serving autocrat, making most of the domestic factors surrounding the revolution relatively similar. Level of foreign involvement was the major difference in all three revolutions as one of the major domestic differences is the power of the military. This only separates Egypt as their military had much more influence on their revolution than Libya and Tunisia (Yumitro and Estriani 2017). Although Egypt's military was much more powerful than the militaries of the other two case studies and overthrew the government twice in two years, the military was not acting on its own (Arena 2016). The military was essentially an agent of the US because of the millions of dollars in annual aid the US sends to the military, so the Egyptian military was carrying out the goals and interests of foreign actors such as the US (Arena 2016). The Gulf States also used the Egyptian military to carry out their interests in the state (Bellin 2018). Therefore, the military in Egypt became a product of foreign intervention and a mechanism used by foreign actors to change the outcome of the revolution in Egypt. Since the military can be incorporated into foreign intervention, most of the factors in the three states beside level of intervention are similar. Thus, it can be determined that the hypothesis was supported because foreign intervention was a hindrance on freedom and democratic growth for the revolutions studied.

Conclusion:

When the Arab Spring broke out in 2011, the West became optimistic that the MENA region would successfully transition from their longtime autocracies to free democratic states. This was not the case as seven years later Tunisia became the only democratic state. The rest either became autocracies again, or worse declined into a failed state plagued by civil war. This paper took an important look on how foreign actors shaped these revolutions and contributed to either democracy, autocracy, or failed statehood. It found that isolated Tunisia benefited from their isolation while states with more foreign influence such as Libya and Egypt had their democratic growth hindered by foreign actors. This was because most of the foreign influence came from the autocratic Gulf States who were trying to use the revolutions to increase their influence on the region. Also, the Western states that intervened were often involved to protect their political and economic interests and that often took precedent over democracy building. These findings are significant because if states or international organizations decide to intervene in a transitioning state for truly liberal purposes, it would be best for them to analyze how other states are getting involved and what interests they may have in the conflict. It also shows that autocratic states in the Middle East such as Saudi Arabia are gaining power and influence over the MENA region. This could also be helpful in analyzing the impact on foreign actors in the current Syrian civil war and determine how they have hindered possible state growth.

References

Albornoz, F., & Hauk, E. (2014). Review: Civil war and U.S. foreign influence. *Journal of Development Economics*, 110, 64–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2014.05.002>

Aras, B., & Yorulmazlar, E. (2016). State, region and order: geopolitics of the Arab Spring. *Third World Quarterly*, 37(12), 2259–2273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2016.1205442>

Arena, Maria do Céu Pinto. (2017). Changing foreign policy: the Obama Administration's decision to oust Mubarak. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, 60(1), e020. Epub November 21, 2017. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0034-7329201700121>

Attir, M. O., & Larémont, R. R. (2016). Euro-American foreign policy, the fall of the Qaddafi regime, and the consequences for migration. *Journal of the Middle East & Africa*, 7(1), 85–100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21520844.2016.1152572>

Bellin, E. (2018). The Puzzle of Democratic Divergence in the Arab World: Theory Confronts Experience in Egypt and Tunisia. *Political Science Quarterly*, 133(3), 435-474. <https://doi.org/10.1002/polq.12803>

Boduszyński, M. P. . (2015). The external dimension of Libya's troubled transition: the international community and ‘democratic knowledge’ transfer. *Journal of North African Studies*, 20(5), 735-753. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13629387.2015.1081462>

Bratton, M. (2003). Briefing: Islam, Democracy and Public Opinion in Africa. *African Affairs*, 102(408), 493. Retrieved from <https://libproxy.albany.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=10585503&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Collins, V. E. & Rothe, D. L. (2012). United States Support for Global Social Justice? Foreign Intervention and Realpolitik in Egypt’s Arab Spring. *Social Justice*, 39(4), 1–30. Retrieved from <https://libproxy.albany.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ssf&AN=95567178&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Freedom in the World Report Egypt (2004-2018). Freedom House. Retrieved from: <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2018/egypt>

Freedom in the World Report Libya (2004-2018). Freedom House. Retrieved from: <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2018/libya>

Freedom in the World Report Tunisia (2004-2018). Freedom House. Retrieved from: <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2018/tunisia>

Gaffar, A. (2017). Democratization and the Arab Spring: A Theoretical Perspective. *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 28(3), 112–130. <https://doi.org/10.1215/10474552-4216443>

Hana, V. (2018). Beyond the Revolution External Actors in Pre- & Post-Revolutionary Libya. *Review of Current Research. Obrana a Strategie* , 2017(2), 101-116. <https://doi.org/10.3849/1802-7199.17.2017.02.101-116>

Harrelson-Stephens, J., & Callaway, R. L. (2014). You Say You Want a Revolution: The Arab Spring, Norm Diffusion, and the Human Rights Regime. *Human Rights Review*, 15(4), 413–431. Retrieved from <https://libproxy.albany.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=pi f&AN=PHL2234475&site=eds-live&scope=site>

KHAN, M., & MEZRAN, K. (2016). (Rep.). Atlantic Council. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep03479>

Lynch, M. (2018). The New Arab Order: Power and Violence in Today's Middle East. *Foreign Affairs*, 97(5), 116–126. Retrieved from <https://libproxy.albany.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=rch&AN=131527251&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Mill, J. (1843). *A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive: Being a Connected View of the Principles of Evidence and the Methods of Scientific Investigation*, Volume 1. John W. Parker. Oxford University (Digitized 2006). Retrieved from <https://books.google.com/books?id=y4MEAAAQAAJ&vq=method%20of%20agreement&pg=PA454#v=twopage&q&f=false>

Moghadam, V. (2017). The Semi-Periphery, World Revolution, and the Arab Spring: Reflections on Tunisia. *Journal of World-Systems Research*, 23(2), 620-636. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5195/jwsr.2017.724>

Mullin, C., & Shahshahani, A. (2012). The legacy of US intervention and the Tunisian revolution: promises and challenges one year on. *Interface*, 4(1), 67-101. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.681.1365&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Mullin, C., & Shahshahani, A. (2011). Western Complicity in the Crimes of the Ben Ali Regime. *National Lawyers Guild Review*, 68(2), 122–125. Retrieved from <https://libproxy.albany.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=72335609&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Phiri, S., & Matambo, E. (2017). Foreign Intervention Predicament in Africa: Deploying Fanonian Psychoanalysis. *Journal of Pan African Studies*, (9), 322. Retrieved from <https://libproxy.albany.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsglr&AN=edsgcl.517879867&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Plattner, M. F. (2015). Is Democracy in Decline? *Journal of Democracy* 26(1), 5-10. Johns Hopkins University Press. Retrieved November 8, 2018, from Project MUSE database

Sadiki, L., & Bouandel, Y. (2016). The Post Arab Spring Reform: The Maghreb at a Cross Roads. *DOMES: Digest of Middle East Studies*, 25(1), 109–131. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dome.12079>

Selim, G. (2013). The United States and the Arab Spring: The Dynamics of Political Engineering. *Arab Studies Quarterly*, (3), 255. <https://doi.org/10.13169/arabstudquar.35.3.0255>

United Nations Security Council. (2011). Resolution 1973. The United Nations. http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1973%20%282011%29

Yumitro, G., and Estriani, H. (2017). The Quo Vadis of Democratization in Post-Egypt Arab Spring. *CIRR*, 23(79), 157-188. <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.libproxy.albany.edu/eds/detail/detail?vid=1&sid=101335f1-55cc-4c10-8330-b63a361c3242%40sessionmgr104&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#AN=edsdoj.9ab78b21f1b444eba25b5de71bb48217&db=edsdoj>

