

ORDULAR ARAP AYAKLANMALARINA NEDEN FARKLI TEPKİ VERDİLER? SİLAHLI KUVVETLERİN KARARINI ETKİLEYEN FAKTÖRLER

ÖZ

Tunus'la başlayan ve daha önce tahmin edilemeyen bir hızda ve yoğunlukta yayılan ayaklanmalar, çok geçmeden neredeyse bütün Arap devletlerini etkisi altına almıştır. Bu kitlesel karışıklıklar her birinde kendine özgü şekilde yaşanmış ve etkileri halen yaşamaya devam etmektedir. Öte yandan, bu ayaklanmaları bastırmakla ilgili emir alan silahlı kuvvetler emrin gereğini yapmaktan, emirlere itaat etmemeye kadar değişen biçimlerde tepkiler göstermişlerdir. Bu makalenin temel amacı, önceki çalışmaların bıraktığı boşluğun doldurulmasını hedefleyerek, yönetimlerde kurumsallaşma ve ordularda profesyonelleşmenin kitlesel ayaklanmalarla karşılaşan askerlerin müdahale etme yönünde emir aldıklarında gösterecekleri reaksiyona nasıl etkide bulduklarını araştırmaktır. İki değişkenin birleşik etkisi Tunus, Mısır, Libya, Yemen ve Suriye örnekleri üzerinde incelenmiştir. Çalışmanın önemli bulgularından birisi, kitlesel ayaklanmalarla karşılaşan orduların müdahale etme yönünde kararlarına ve bu müdahalenin nasıl sonuçlanacağına yönetimde kurumsallaşma ve orduların profesyonelleşme düzeylerinin birleşik olarak etkisinin, ikisinin tek başına etkisinden daha önemli olduğu yönündedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kurumsallaşma, Profesyonelleşme, Arap Ayaklanmaları, Silahlı Kuvvetler, Sivil Asker İlişkileri.

لماذا اختلفت ردود فعل الجيوش على الثورات العربية ؟ العوامل التي أثرت على قرار القوات المسلحة

ان الثورات التي بدأت بتونس والتي انتشرت بصورة سريعة وكثيفة لم يكن بوسع احد ان يتوقعها سلفا، لم تلبث كثيرا الا وقد اخضعت جميع الدول العربية تحت تأثيرها. ان هذه الاضطرابات الجماعية ظهرت في كل منها بشكل خاص بها، ولا تزال تأثيراتها دائمة لحد الان. ومن جانب اخر، فان القوات المسلحة التي تلقت اوامر باخماد هذه الثورات اظهرت ردود فعل تراوحت بين تنفيذ الاوامر وبين عدم اطاعتها. ان الهدف الرئيسي من هذا المقال هو املاء الفراغ الذي تركته الدراسات السابقة، والبحث عن تأثير المؤسساتية في الادارات والاحتراف في الجيوش، على كيفية ابداء الجنود الذين يتلقون اوامر بمواجهة ثورات شعبية او جماعية ردود فعل تجاه هذه الاوامر. وقد تمت دراسة التأثير الموحد لهذين المتغيرين بناء على نماذج تونس ومصر وليبيا واليمن وسوريا. وان احد الامور الهامة التي توصلت اليها هذه الدراسة، هو التأثير المزدوج للمؤسساتية في الادارة وتحول الجيوش نحو الاحتراف، على قرار الجيوش التي تجابه بثورات جماهيرية بالتدخل لقمعها، ومصير هذا التدخل، وكذلك توضيح كون تأثير هذين الامرين اكثر من تأثير الامر المنفرد لكل منهما.

الكلمات الدالة : المؤسساتية ، الاحتراف، الثورات العربية، القوات المسلحة، العلاقات العسكرية - المدنية

WHY ARMIES REACTED DIFFERENTLY TO THE ARAB UPRISINGS? DYNAMICS AFFECTING THE DECISION OF MILITARY

ABSTRACT

The uprisings, which began in Tunisia, have spread at a rapid pace and with an unprecedented intensity. These uprisings have influenced all Arab countries in a variety of ways, followed particular pathways and ended differently. However, the reactions of armies to the orders of their respective governments have varied from loyalty to defection. This paper aims to examine the reciprocal and combined effect of government and military institutions on the issue. The qualitative method with some quantitative figures has been used. The effects of institutionalization of governments and the professionalization of armies have been studied in this article along with the consequences of uprisings in five separate cases: Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Yemen, and Syria. It is found that while instability has indeed occurred at different levels in all of these cases, the interaction of the institutionalization of government and the professionalization of the military have played decisive effects more than the effect of each one on the reaction of armies.

Keywords: Institutionalism, Professionalism, Arab Uprising, Armed Forces, Civil Military Relations

**Cenker Korhan
DEMİR***

* Ph.D., Gendarmerie and
Coast Guard Academy,
Security Sciences Institute,
Ankara, ckdemir@gmail.com.

Ortadoğu Etütleri
Volume 8, No 1,
July 2016, pp.26-57

1. Introduction

The Arab uprisings¹ were sparked by the self-immolation of a Tunisian fruit vendor on 17 December 2010, protesting corruption and ill treatment at the hands of the Tunisian government. The ensuing civil disturbances have spread like wildfire through almost all of the North African and Middle Eastern countries. Nevertheless, the uprisings have not followed the same path, nor have they reached the same ends.

The governments of these countries have reacted differently in countering the threats, though all of them have experienced some level of political or militarily challenges. Some regimes have been able to handle the upheavals more successfully than others and have maintained their stability, while others have suffered greatly in comparison. On the other hand, the most effective instrument at the governments' disposal has been the military; and yet, the response of militaries in countering demonstrations has also varied from one country to another.

One of the questions, which emerged from the uprisings, is why armies² reacted differently to the orders of the regime. Previous research has concentrated on answering this question from two perspectives. One perspective pertains to governmental institutions and their effectiveness, while the other one solely emphasizes the role of armies during the uprisings. However, there has been no adequate research that examines the reciprocal and combined effect of government and military institutions on the issue. This paper aims to fill that gap in discussions centering on the differences of armies' reaction which can be seen as whether loyalty or defection.

The paper, firstly, elaborates on the concepts of the institutionalization of government and the professionalization of armies affecting the decision of armies on whether being loyal or defection. Secondly, these two variables and their relationship are examined further with the case studies focusing on Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Yemen, and Syria. In conclusion, some general observations are presented on the institutionalization of government and professionalization of military in countering instability.³

1 At the outset of the Arab uprisings, the revolts called emotionally as "Arab Spring" by some politicians and academicians. They evoked the upheavals as "the Spring of Nations" in reference to the revolutions across Europe of 1848 or as "Prague Spring" in reference to the revolts in escaping communist winter at 1968 or referring a seasonal change the events of 1989. See, Michael Zantovsky, "1989 and 2011, Compare and Contrast", *World Affairs*, Vol.174, No.2 (July/August 2011), pp.13-24.

2 "Military", "army" "armed forces" are used interchangeably with the same meaning in this study.

3 Nevertheless, this article does not investigate the causes of the uprisings. Some of the countries, which are researched for the article, are in fact wrestling with their own civil wars; and some continue to struggle against armed groups. It is, therefore, difficult to make conclusive assessments before the armed fighting ends; and as in any social research, this paper risks drawing premature conclusions. Furthermore, the international setting or the international linkages of unrest are not examined in this article, though they are indeed one of the significant determinants of how conflicts may end.

2. The Institutionalization of Government

The process of transition from authoritarianism to democracy generates fragile conditions for the upheavals motivated by political grievances in the absence of the institutionalization of governments.⁴ Yet, swift changes in the political and social environment with newly emerged groups have destabilizing effects and threatening potential especially if there is no efficient political institution to counteract this kind of volatility. Huntington states that instability and violence are “in large part the product of rapid social change and the rapid mobilization of new groups into politics coupled with the slow development of political institutions”.⁵ The governments can successfully manage the deteriorating effects or the shocks of the transition by utilizing through developed and competent state institutions.⁶

Several researchers have revealed that there are some generic features of the institutionalized political system. According to one of these researchers, the institutionalization is defined as the adaptability, complexity, autonomy, and coherence of its organizations and procedures.⁷ It is also suggested that governments should embody the rule of law, impartial courts, and election commissions, independent and professionalized journalists, and competent bureaucrats in order to keep their stability.⁸

Moreover, the Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) project aggregates some indicators for the measurement of institutionalization of governments. These include the perceptions of the quality of public services, the quality of civil service and degree of its dependence from political pressures, the quality of policy formation and implementation, and the credibility of the government’s commitment to such policies.⁹

It can be inferred from these indicators that the institutionalization of a state generally allows for the institutional capability to manage disturbing challenges, which may emerge in the international or domestic political environment, and provide stability during all threatening occasions. Besides, if the civilian government is neither effective nor institutionalized, it will be

4 Guillermo O’Donnell, Philippe C. Schmitter, Laurence Whitehead, *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Comparative Perspectives* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), pp.3-6.

5 Samuel Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies* (New Haven: Yale University Press ,1969), p. 4.

6 Ian Bremmer, *The J Curve: A New Way to Understand Why Nations Rise and Fall* (New York: Simon Schuster, 2006), pp.6-10.

7 *Ibid.*, p.12.

8 Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder, “Democratic Transitions, Institutional Strength, and War”, *International Organization*, Vol. 56, No. 2 (Spring 2002), pp. 297-337.

9 Daniel Kaufmann, Aart Kraay and Massimo Mastruzzi, *The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues*, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430, (2010), <http://elibrary.worldbank.org/doi/abs/10.1596/1813-9450-5430> (Accessed at: 12 Jan. 2016).

incompetent to control the military. The failure of executive power may end up a praetorian state in which the military tends to intervene or has the potential to do it.¹⁰ Yet, having vulnerable state structures but having the military as a most coherent organization, the weak or failed states are unwilling but unavoidable candidates to face with these threatening conditions.¹¹

Political transition may cause instability or armed conflict, unless it can be observed and controlled by robust and coherent government institutions. In such an environment, if the military, as a coercive apparatus of government, has not been subordinated to civil authority, it may very well exacerbate the emergence or continuity of the conflict. As Skocpol argues, mass based revolts have not any chance to be successful without the support of government's coercive organizations.¹²

3. The Professionalization of Military

During the fragile political transition process, robust, strong, and professional armed forces are essential organizations for governments to secure the state against possible threats or armed conflicts. Although much of the current literature on civil-military relations pays particular attention to the professionalization of armies, there seems no common understanding on the definition or characteristics of the professionalization. One of the pioneers of the research on civil-military relations, Huntington explains it as the de-politicization of the security establishment, and the complete subordination of the military command to civilian officials. He highlights that the job of military officer has three common characteristics, such as corporateness, expertness, and responsibility.¹³

However, the definition and features of these characteristics have always been interpreted in various ways. For instance, Kamrava describes this type of professionalization in a broader sense; one that encompasses the introduction of modern military equipment and technology into the armed forces, the upgrading of training facilities and procedures, making recruitment and promotions less arbitrary, and developing professional cadres of specialist officers and military experts at various levels and branches of the armed forces.¹⁴

Yet, the dimensions of professionalization have been conceptualized differently. One of these dimensions, the expertness, has been interpreted as mili-

10 Amos Perlmutter, *Political Roles and Military Rulers* (London: Frank Cass, 1981), pp.9-13.

11 According to Perlmutter, "...modern praetorianism is the most conspicuous political arrangement of weak states." See *Ibid.*, p.258.

12 Theda Skocpol, *States and Social Revolutions* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979), p.32.

13 Samuel Huntington, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp.11-18.

14 Mehran Kamrava, "Military Professionalization and Civil Military Relations in the Middle East", *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol.115, No.1 (2000), pp.69-70.

tary effectiveness, and construed its attributes as integration, responsiveness, skill, and quality.¹⁵ Some other researches elaborate corporateness as institutionalism of armies and “institutionalized armies” are characterized by having an organizational identity, as well as career paths determined by meritocratic principles. Institutionalized security organizations are rule-governed, predictable, and they have distinctive organizational culture and character. They tend to be not corrupt nor abuse power and they generally adhere to the rule of law. However, at the other end, there are “the patrimonial security organizations”. These are ruled by cronyism and nepotism, with even discipline and promotion in the army maintained through the exploitation of primordial cleavage or personal relations. Individuals who are part of this type of organization are also against political reforms that might threaten their current organizational exploitation, and they fear the loss of their own personal status.¹⁶ Patrimony leads to corruption and abuse of power, even as it endangers the integrity of military which is an essential attribute of effective armies.

Although there is an ambiguity on the concept and characteristics of professionalization, the differences just refer to semantic interpretation of the term but not in essence.¹⁷ Therefore, this study uses the term “military professionalism” as a generic concept that comprises expertise, responsibility, and institutionalism.

Besides, Huntington’s claim about the professionalization of armies paves the way for the de-politicization of the security establishment and the complete subordination of the military command to civilian officials¹⁸ triggered a long-standing debate over civil-military literature. First of all, the definition has been determined as tautological since his acceptance of ethics of subordination and it is stated that the military’s acceptance of civilian supremacy is a separate and distinct matter.¹⁹

Scholars argue that professional armies are inherently political institutions. Welch emphasizes that armed forces’ participation in politics is inevitable, but the extent and the kind of this participation is a matter of civilian control.²⁰ Janowitz accepts that the armed forces are always politicized at some

15 Risa Brooks, “Introduction: The Impact of Culture, Society, Institutions, and Internal Forces on Military Effectiveness”, Risa Brooks and Elizabeth A. Stanley (ed.), *Creating Military Power: The Sources of Military Effectiveness* (California: Stanford University Press, 2007), pp.1-26.

16 Eva Bellin, “The Robustness of Authoritarianism in the Middle East”, *Comparative Politics*, Vol.36, No.2 (January 2004), p.145.

17 Alejandro Pachon, “Loyalty and Defection: Misunderstanding Civil-Military Relations in Tunisia During the ‘Arab Spring’”, *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol.37, No.4 (2014), p.511.

18 Huntington, *The Soldier and the State*, pp.8-10.

19 Peter Feaver, “Civil-Military Relations”, *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol.2 (1999), p.235; Samuel E. Finer, *The Man on the Horseback: The Role of the Military in Politics* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1988), pp.21-22.

20 Claude E. Welch, (ed.) *Civilian Control of the Military: Theory and Cases from Developing Countries* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1976), p.2.

point and that they try to gain or reinforce their leverage on national security matters.²¹ Likewise, Perlmutter contends that when the military is the most cohesive and politically best organized group in a state, the probability of replacing the regime by military rises.²² It is pointed that when military recognizes itself a professionalized organization, it may claim to serve to state rather than the government in power. The military feels itself most competent structure on security issues and wants to have full authority on the matters of size, organization, recruitment, and equipment of the forces. It expresses its discomfort at having to act against citizens and blames civilian authorities, if ordered to do so.²³

However, the argument that professionalization leads armies' subordination to civil supremacy has been partly supported by other scholars. For example, Welch surmises that focused responsibilities of armed forces estrange them from political system and may result in technical specialization and institutional complexity, which are organizational obstacles to mounting a successful coup as well.²⁴ Likewise, Quinlivan purports that increasing the expertness of military in technical issues while dissolving its corporate identity and corporate loyalty may become a regime coup-proof.²⁵ Bellin adds that when the military is more institutionalized, it will be more likely for the military to disengage from power politics and allow political reform to proceed.²⁶

Besides, some scholars argue that the character of civil-military relations is a matter of negotiation between civil authorities and armies. Schiff suggests 'concordance theory', which states that the behavior pattern of military is determined by military, political elites, and society. According to this approach, the social composition of the officer corps, the recruitment method of armies, and the military lifestyle are among the indicators for achieving harmony among the military, the political elites, and the society.²⁷

However, some factors such as armies' interests and the governments' control strategies might deteriorate the professionalization of military. These interests may emerge as personal or organizational particularly in political, economic, and security issues. Moreover, some of these interests are perceived as existential,²⁸ which might provoke the intervention or defection of armies

21 Morris Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait* (New York: The Free Press, 1960), p.435.

22 Perlmutter, *Political Roles and Military Rulers*, p.21.

23 Finer, *The Man on the Horseback...*, pp.22-23.

24 Welch, *Civilian Control of the Military*, p.32.

25 James T. Quinlivan, "Coup Proofing", *International Security*, Vol.24, No.2 (Fall 1999), pp.131-165.

26 Bellin, "The Robustness of Authoritarianism in the Middle East", p.145.

27 Rebecca L. Schiff, "Civil-Military Relations Reconsidered: A Theory of Concordance", *Armed Forces & Society*, Vol.22, No.1 (Fall 1995), pp.8-12.

28 Steven Cook, *Ruling but not Governing: The Military and Political Development in Egypt, Algeria, and Turkey* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007), pp.17-22.

to protect themselves against these ‘threats’, particularly in mass based political upheavals. As Nordlinger states, the disobedience behavior of armies may be motivated by the inadequate military budget, having less initiative on security issues, and the most importantly feeling threatened for their survival.²⁹ Indeed, it is indicated that the likelihood of defection emerges when the military has been poorly paid, trained, and equipped, and has gained little political influence, particularly in probable political succession.³⁰

Nonetheless, if the military is quite strong and possesses significant power to affect the state structure, there is a possible risk of the military engaging in political intervention or at least having political influence. One can argue that professionalization enhances the autonomy of the military, but if politically unchecked, it can similarly increase the tendency for the military to intervene in the affairs of the state.³¹ Powerful armies may engender another problem as Feaver calls “civil-military problematique” which points to a paradox that the institution created to protect the polity would become a threat to the polity.³² Hence, in order to bring the armies under their control, some governments deliberately weaken military as an institution; some of them overlook the exploitation of armies over economic assets and political positions; and the others let armies to be professional institution with the expectation of lessening leverage on political authority.

The civilian control strategies of military are prevalent in democratic or autocratic regimes with various methods and various intensities. Huntington presumes subjective and objective civilian control measures, whereby the former implies the maximizing of the power of civilian groups, such as government institutions, social groups, and other constitutional forms, against armies, while the latter indicates the maximizing of military professionalism. Although he suggests that objective civilian control makes military politically futile and disinterested by “militarizing the military”, Huntington accepts that the best method to manage unprofessionalized militaries is subjective civilian control.³³ Welch argues that there are two civilian control strategies. The first approach concentrates on organizational essentials of the military institution, while the second one focuses more on the civilian political institutions, particularly on their legitimacy.³⁴ He asserts that civilian control

29 Eric Nordlinger, *Soldiers in Politics: Military Coups and Governments* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1977), pp.66-68.

30 Denis Prieur, “Defend or Defect Military Roles in Popular Revolts”, SSRN, 15 Dec. 2011, p.7, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2115062 (Accessed at: 04 Feb. 2016).

31 Kamrava, “Military Professionalization...”, p.69.

32 Peter D. Feaver, “The Civil-Military Problematique: Huntington, Janowitz, and the question of civilian control”, *Armed Forces & Society*, Vol.23, No.2 (1996), pp.149-178.

33 Huntington, *The Soldier and the State*, pp.80-85.

34 Welch, *Civilian Control of the Military*, p.318.

of armies is never absolute and it mainly comes through the legitimate and effective government organs.³⁵

Furthermore, scholars studying on coup-proofing techniques point some characteristics shared by the states that are prone to military interventions. One of these scholars argues that the exploitation of familial, ethnic, and religious loyalties, the building of security institutions parallel to the regular military, and the development of multiple internal security agencies that monitor the loyalty of the military are among these measures.³⁶ Makara agrees these measures and adds that material incentives distributed to the army may build mutual interest relationship between the regime and military.³⁷ Feaver suggests that various monitoring mechanisms may help lessen the military's tendency to intervene. These mechanisms are audits, investigations, rules of engagement; civilian staffs with expertise and oversight responsibilities; and the media and defense think tanks.³⁸

However, the control strategies that aim to inhibit the intervention of armies to civil politics may instigate various problems such as unity of command, cleavages in organizational structure, and competition within the security apparatus. The institutional integrity problems might have been aggravated particularly in political upheavals; and once the disobedience behavior emerges at these conditions, mass defections can occur, since no part of military wants to be on the losing side.³⁹ Besides, Makara draws attention to an exception in which employing communal ties between regime and military can mitigate these effects and maintain organizational unity.⁴⁰

It should be pointed that the control strategies of militaries have an essential adverse effect on undermining of armies' power. Indeed, the measures taken by governments without enhancing the professionalization of military may result in politicization and ineffectiveness of armies to fight whenever needed.⁴¹ Thus, the important point with regard to military and civilian affairs is that the military has to be strong enough to protect the state and to ensure regime stability, but, at the same time, it has to be professional and institutionalized enough to subordinate itself to the civilian authorities. Additionally, if the military gets respect from the civilian community, and if the

35 Ibid., p. 35.

36 Quinlivan, "Coup-Proofing", p.133.

37 Michael Makara, "Coup-Proofing, Military Defection, and the Arab Spring", *Democracy and Security*, Vol.9, No.4 (2013), p.335.

38 Feaver, "Civil-Military Relations", p.229.

39 Terence Lee, "The Armed Forces and Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Explaining the Role of the Military in 1986 Philippines and 1998 Indonesia", *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol.42, No.5 (2009), pp.646-647.

40 Makara, "Coup-Proofing...", p.335.

41 Quinlivan, "Coup-Proofing...", pp.131-165; Risa Brooks, "Making Military Might: Why do States Fail and Succeed? A Review Essay", *International Security*, Vol.28, No.2 (2003), p.162.

government in turn has the capacity to check the military, then the proper balance between the military and the government may be maintained successfully.

4. The Interaction of Armies and Governments in the Arab Uprisings

The Arab states that ruled by authoritarian regimes for decades and the population generally become accustomed to or at least acquiesced to their governments' will, particularly following instances of severe repression by government security forces when any potential revolt has appeared. Examining this issue from a different perspective, this article looks at behavioral patterns of military on mass based political upheavals, considering the interaction between institutionalization of governments and professionalization of their armies. The interaction of armies and governments in uprisings might vary according to their position in the continuum of two research concepts as seen in Table-1 below.

Table-1: The Interaction of Military and Governments

		Professionalization of Military	
		Very Low-----	Very High
Institutionalization of Government	Very High	It may not be swift and easy to overcome potential security and political problems.	The military forces might be able to suppress an uprising successfully in a relatively short period of time, and pave the way for the institutions of government to ensure political stability smoothly.
	Very Low	Neither military nor government could contain uprisings; civil war conditions emerge.	Uprisings can be suppressed, but it is possible for the military to overthrow the government.

Since the institutionalization of government or professionalization of military is not dichotomous, but they are indeed continuously changing concepts, interpretations on them might fall into anywhere at the levels of “very low, low, medium, high, very high”.⁴² So, the explanations in the cells of Table-1 should be perceived as generic conditions.

⁴² As in any qualitative research, there are some problems in measuring these abstract and inferential concepts. Although there are some indexes to estimate the institutionalization of government, there is no

The comparative case study method is used to deal with this study's problem areas, and five countries (Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Yemen, and Syria) are selected. In all cases, each country suffered from considerable level of uprisings, and each ruler ordered his military and security agencies to suppress the uprisings by force.⁴³ The countries that have experienced uprisings and that were used in this article were presidential monarchies, at least at the outset of the unrest.

4.1. Tunisia

After gaining its independence, Tunisia had two presidents, Habib Bourguiba and Zine al-Abidine Ben Ali, who ruled the country for thirty years and twenty-four years, respectively. They governed the country by controlling the media, and hindering opposition political parties from representing themselves in the parliament.⁴⁴ Also, there were no efficient non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or trade unions and other sectors of civil society have avoided generally direct confrontation with the regime. Ben Ali even fired ministers who showed too much leadership or gained popular support.⁴⁵ Thus, the governance of Tunisia before the uprisings was a prime example of a repressive regime.

The incident, which thrust the Arab world into widespread upheaval, was the self-immolation of a Tunisian vendor. Nobody expected that such an event would spread throughout the country and had such devastating repercussions among the wider Arab population. Although Tunisian security forces were experienced in suppressing previous nonviolent civil resistance, particularly in the southern cities, the intensity and the pace of resistance were beyond any pessimistic prediction at that time. Moreover, the internal security forces, police, and intelligence services had all cultivated new grievances among the people by abusing their authority.

Ben Ali and his family were encircled by the corruption and cronyism claims; in fact, more than half of Tunisia's commercial elites were personally related to Ben Ali or his family.⁴⁶ The corruption was particularly notable in Tunisia due to high unemployment, limited opportunities for economic advancement, and

dataset to measure the professionalization of military. For this reason, quantitative and qualitative data collection methods are used congruously in order to explore and interpret the indicators of two concepts in depth.

43 Zoltan Barany, "Comparing the Arab Revolts: The Role of the Military", *Journal of Democracy*, Vol.22, No.4 (2011), pp.28-39.

44 Lisa Anderson, "Demystifying the Arab Spring", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.90, No.3 (May/June 2011), pp.2-7.

45 Shadi Hamid, "Tunisia: Birthplace of the Revolution", Kenneth Pollack (et al.), *The Arab Awakening: America and the Transformation of the Middle East* (Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 2011), p.113.

46 Anderson, "Demystifying the Arab Spring", pp.2-7.

severe disparities between the relatively wealthy coastal areas and the struggling interior.⁴⁷

Despite the corruption scandals surrounding the president’s family and the many inequalities in living conditions, the Tunisian governmental institutions were working better than the other countries’ comparable organizations in the article. Tunisia had a well-established educational system, a large middle class, and the strongest organized labor movement.⁴⁸ Therefore, the scores relating to Tunisian governmental effectiveness were relatively better than the other countries’ scores noted on the Table-2 below.

Table-2: The Institutionalization of Governments⁴⁹

		Tunisia		Egypt		Libya		Yemen		Syria	
		2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010
Control of Corruption	Est.	-0.1	-0.1	-0.4	-0.5	-1.17	-1.3	-1.02	-1.2	-1.07	-1.1
	Rank	56.46	54.8	41.15	34.3	8.13	5.2	15.79	10	12.92	12.9
Government Effectiveness	Est.	0.4	0.2	-0.27	-0.4	-1.08	-1.1	-1.08	-1	-0.59	-0.6
	Rank	65.55	63.2	47.37	43.1	12.92	12.9	12.44	14.4	34.45	32.5
Rule of Law	Est.	0.2	0.1	-0.06	-0.1	-0.85	-0.9	-1	-1.1	-0.49	-0.5
	Rank	60.66	59.7	54.03	51.2	20.85	19	14.22	13.3	37.91	36.5
Regime Type		-4	-4	-3	-3	-7	-7	-2	-2	-7	-7

As the uprising spread, President Ben Ali tried to repress the protestors by using disproportionate force and even live ammunition. Nonetheless, it never helped lessen the conflict and the situation deteriorated rapidly.⁵⁰ Then, Ben Ali called out the Tunisian Army and ordered it to confront the demonstra-

47 Marc Lynch, *The Arab Uprising: The Unfinished Revolutions of the New Middle East* (New York: Public Affairs, 2012), p.73.

48 Anderson, “Demystifying the Arab Spring”, pp.2-7.

49 Although, the measurement capability is limited since they are based on individual perceptions, these are fairly reliable indicators having been collected from different sources; and they have been used to develop an idea on the institutionalization of government in each specific case. “Control of Corruption” captures perceptions of the extent to which public power is exercised for private gain. “Government Effectiveness” captures perceptions of the quality of public services, the quality of the civil service and the degree of its independence from political pressures, the quality of policy formulation and implementation, and the credibility of the government’s commitment to such policies. “Rule of Law” captures perceptions of the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society, and in particular the quality of contract enforcement, property rights, the police, and the courts, as well as the likelihood of crime and violence. Governance indicators, ranging from -2.5 to 2.5, and in percentile rank terms ranging from 0 (lowest) to 100 (highest) among all countries worldwide. See Daniel Kaufmann et al., *The Worldwide Governance Indicators* (2010). “Regime Type” scores are extracted from POLITY IV Database polity2 indicators, and it ranges from +10 (strongly democratic) to -10 (strongly autocratic). See Monthly G. Marshall, Ted Robert Gurr, and Keith Jagers, *POLITY IV Project Data Users’ Manual*, Center for Systemic Peace (2013), www.systemicpeace.org (Accessed at: 23 Jan. 2016).

50 Noureddine Jebnoun, “In the Shadow of Power: Civil-Military Relations and the Tunisian Popular Uprising”, *The Journal of North African Studies*, Vol.19, No.3 (2014), p.304.

tions. However, the Army chose not to react to the protestors in the manner desired by the president. The Chief of Staff, General Rachid Ammar, had forbidden his soldiers from firing on demonstrators,⁵¹ issued a warning to the Tunisian police that the army would retaliate in kind if the police shot at the protesters,⁵² and expelled the National Guard from areas assigned to the Army.⁵³

It has been argued that the Army was influenced by fears of losing prestige among the population, social esteem, and the integrity of their own organization if they would have fired on unarmed people.⁵⁴ The choice made by the strongest security institution of the state to take side with the protesters proved to be the decisive point in the conflict. As Lynch states, “the very strength of the Tunisian authoritarian state became a weakness, once mobilization reached a critical point.”⁵⁵ Revolts snowballed to such a critical stage that Ben Ali fled to Saudi Arabia,⁵⁶ and the new government was established through free elections under the oversight and the support of Army.⁵⁷ Tunisian military had many opportunities during and after the uprisings to overthrow the government, but it has never attempted to intervene in politics. Jebnoun explains this as a result of army’s spirit of professionalism and political neutrality.⁵⁸

Although it played significant role during the uprisings, the Tunisian Army maintained its position as an independent institution of the state and, therefore, refrained from getting involved in politics. Some have conjectured that the underlying reasons for the Army to have remained neutral were the facts that the Army had not played an essential role in gaining Tunisian independence, that it never experienced combat, and that it had no particular economic or political stake in the regime’s survival.⁵⁹ In fact, Ben Ali had limited the army’s role in security issues as border patrol, disaster relief, and peacekeeping force.⁶⁰ The internal security and intelligence institutions orga-

51 David D. Kirkpatrick, “Military Backs New Leaders in Tunisia”, 17 Jan. 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/17/world/africa/17tunis.html?_r=1 (Accessed at: 11 Jan. 2016).

52 Derek Lutterbeck, “Arab Uprisings, Armed Forces, and Civil-Military Relations”, *Armed Forces & Society*, Vol.39, No.1 (2013), p.35.

53 Jebnoun, “In the Shadow of Power...”, p.305.

54 Risa Brooks, “Abandoned at the Palace: Why the Tunisian Military Defected from the Ben Ali Regime in January 2011”, *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol.36, No.2 (2013), pp.205-220.

55 Lynch, *The Arab Uprising...*, p.75.

56 The Guardian, “Zine al-Abidine Ben Ali forced to flee Tunisia as protesters claim victory”, 14 Jan. 2011, <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/jan/14/tunisian-president-flees-country-protests> (Accessed at: 01 Feb. 2016).

57 David D. Kirkpatrick, “Chief of Tunisian Army Pledges His Support for ‘the Revolution’”, 25 Jan. 2011, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/25/world/africa/25tunis.html> (Accessed at: 03 Jan. 2016).

58 Jebnoun, “In the Shadow of Power...”, p.314.

59 Anderson, “Demystifying the Arab Spring”, pp.2-7.

60 Daniel Silverman, *The Arab Military in the Arab Spring: Agent of Continuity of Change*, 2012, p.20,

nized under the Ministry of Interior (MoI)⁶¹ had been employed in suppressing political upheavals. Besides, in economic terms, Tunisian army has lowest share (1.4 %) in GDP compared with other cases in the article.⁶²

Furthermore, ever since Tunisian independence, the regime had tried to keep the military away from politics by banning any political activities of its members and by enhancing its professional and technical expertise. The term “*la grande muette*” (the big silent one) has been used in Tunisia to describe the Armed Forces, highlighting its discreet nature and its noninterference in public affairs.⁶³ Consequently, the military has remained a relatively professional and largely apolitical force, and free from corruption and cronyism, in stark contrast to the office of the President.

4.2. Egypt

The first signs of protest appeared in Egypt almost one month after the beginning of the Tunisian uprising. An uprising in Egypt, as one of the largest and most populous countries in the Arab world, was sure to have had greater influence on all Arab populations than any other country in the region. Living under similar conditions of corruption, bad governance, and economic grievances, Egyptians had been greatly encouraged by the Tunisian protests to revolt against their own authority.

Some scholars have postulated that the application of neoliberal policies tends to exacerbate the disparities in living conditions between the rich and the poor.⁶⁴ In Egypt, the President Hosnu Mubarak’s family had gained economic and administrative advantages over a lengthy period of time, particularly by acquiring public enterprises and by privatizing government assets. In the political environment, though, as elections had previously attested, the government of Egypt had indeed allowed a limited number of seats in the parliament to be occupied by opposing political parties.⁶⁵ Furthermore, as demonstrated in the Table-2 above, indicators of corruption, government effectiveness, the rule of law, and regime type are all below than those of half of the other countries of the world. A widening disparity between government

<http://politicalscience.osu.edu/intranet/cprw/Silverman%20CPRW%202012.pdf> (Accessed at: 11 Nov. 2015); Pachon, “Loyalty and Defection...”, p.513.

61 There were four different organizations operating in MoI: Department of State Security, Presidential Guard, National Guard, and Police. See Pachon, “Loyalty and Defection...”, p.528.

62 SIPRI, *Military Expenditure Database*, 2014, http://www.sipri.org/research/armaments/milex/milex_database (Accessed at: 12 Jan. 2015).

63 Lutterbeck, “Arab Uprisings...”, p.34.

64 James L. Gelvin, *What Everyone Needs to Know* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp.34-40.

65 Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder, “Democratization and the Arab Spring”, *International Interactions*, Vol.38, No.5 (2012), pp.722-733.

elites and the people and a constrained political environment both added fuel to the fire as sought by the protestors.

When the first protests began, the police were unable to dissolve or even mitigate the effects of the mass gatherings. As a result, the turmoil spread throughout the country's big cities, such as Cairo and Alexandria and the number of people in the protests similarly increased. When the MoI could not handle the demonstrations, Mubarak deployed the Army. However, the police were pulled out of the cities several hours before the Army was able to take control. Consequently, making use of this opportunity, the protestors occupied *Tahrir* (Liberation) Square in Cairo, a landmark that would become the symbol of the Egyptian uprising.⁶⁶

Moreover, the Army had, likewise, not demonstrated any intention to use force against the protests, especially with live ammunition; and further the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces (SCAF) publically declared that they would not use lethal force against the Egyptian people. This was the last option for the President Mubarak to regain control of the streets; however it was lost. The uprisings showed no sign of ceasing until the Mubarak's resignation, yet economy worsened by general strikes and workers' closures of enterprises. Ultimately, Mubarak was forced to leave the Presidency, and he charged SCAF to run the country. SCAF assumed the reins of government until the first elections occurred in a relatively calm environment. Nevertheless, as the transition process dragged on, protests erupted again, appealing for the quick transfer of power to a civilian government.

Even after the Presidential elections, the renewed rioting had not ended by the inauguration of the new president. This new president, Mohamed Morsi, initially belittled the demonstrations and then he fired the Head of the Military Police, the Minister of Defense, the Chief of Staff, and the heads of the Army, the Navy, and Air Forces; and he replaced them with considerably younger officers.⁶⁷ These actions, though, did not help curb the recurring disruptions and mass gatherings and Egyptian Armed Forces eventually ousted Morsi while the riots were taking place on the streets.

Although all three previous presidents of Egypt before the uprisings had been drawn from the ranks of the military, all three of them had attempted to lessen the political ambitions of the Army. The process of demilitarizing the government began under Gamal Abdel Nasser, and was accelerated by Anwar Sadat. They provided the military with a different reason for existence, by making it a major player in the Egyptian economy. The military arguably controls from 35 to 40 percent of the economy and, according to the

66 Gelvin, *What Everyone Needs...*, p.46.

67 Hillel Frisch, "The Egyptian Army and Egypt's 'Spring'", *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 36, No.2 (2013), pp.180-204.

International Monetary Fund (IMF), it oversees almost half of all Egyptian manufacturing.⁶⁸ Mubarak had allowed military to acquire profitable business assets as a way to keep officers loyal,⁶⁹ and attempted to weaken the army by enhancing the power of the police. As Sayigh pointed, just before Mubarak's departure, the MoI had 1.4 million employees.⁷⁰ One of the organizations operating under MoI, the Central Security Forces (CSF), is responsible for checking the military's power.⁷¹

Despite all of these efforts to prevent military's appetite for entering into politics, Egyptian military had never loosened its close interest to politics. Cook called this position of Egyptian Army as "ruling but not governing".⁷² Indeed, the Army ousted the government one more time. It has been argued that one of the main reasons for the *coup d'état* was the worry on the part of SCAF that they would lose a great deal of lucrative holdings. Scholars argue that the military felt threatened from losing economic privileges, since there was a high probability of succession of Hosni Mubarak with his son Gamal. The Egyptian military's decision to side with the nonviolent movement was also shaped by the perception of regime fragility and by the belief that defectors would not be punished.⁷³ Military defected from the regime as whole, because the army figured that the possibility of the fall of Mubarak regime was very soon.

Moreover, researchers asserted that one of the underlining causes of new president's ousting was again the interest of army. Housden argues that essential motives for toppling the new president were his unsuccessful management of the interests of military, civil, and judiciary elites, and his ignorance of grassroots support.⁷⁴ It is contended that the military has protected its economic advantages, retained its budget and governance immunity in the new constitution process.⁷⁵

In terms of personnel and equipment, the Egyptian Army is relatively large and strong in comparison to other Middle Eastern armies. It had 947,500

68 Tarek Masoud, "The Road to (and from) Liberation Square", *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 22, No.3 (2011), p.25; Gelvin, *What Everyone Needs...*, p.62.

69 Ahmed Hashim, "The Egyptian Military, part two: From Mubarak Onward", *Middle East Policy*, Vol.18, No.4 (2011), pp.106-128.

70 Yezid Sayigh, "Agencies of Coercion: Armies and Internal Security Forces", *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol.43, No.3 (2011), p.403.

71 Makara, 'Coup-Proofing...', p.345.

72 Cook, *Ruling but Not Governing*, pp.63-92.

73 Sharon Erickson Nepstad, "Mutiny and Nonviolence in the Arab Spring: Exploring Military Defections and Loyalty in Egypt, Bahrain, and Syria", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol.50, No.3 (2013), pp.342-343.

74 Oliver Housden, "Egypt: Coup d'Etat or a Revolution Protected", *The RUSI Journal*, Vol.158, No.5 (2013), pp.72-78.

75 Makara, "Coup-Proofing...", pp.346-347.

men (including reservists) under arms and 397,000 men (325,000 under CSF) as paramilitary organizations.⁷⁶ But officers' assignments and careers have created a different mixture of professionalism among its ranks. They have been based not only on performance, modernization, and a strong corporate identity, but also on cronyism, patrimonialism, the preferential treatment of some high officers close to the regime, and a strictly apolitical stance.⁷⁷

4.3. Libya

Four days after the overthrow of the Egyptian president, protests began in Libya aimed at toppling Muammar Gaddafi, a former military officer and the ruler of Libya since 1969. Libya had exposed idiosyncratic characteristics under the regime of Gaddafi. Beyond the common corruption and repression, the country seemed as the Libyan leader's own personal asset, including all its institutions as well as its military. Gaddafi had believed in direct democracy, his so-called *jamahiriya* (to rule by the masses), instead of representative democracy. Thus, he had disassembled the representative institutions and had established the "people's congresses". Gaddafi and his family had pragmatically managed the whole government body. By the time of the uprisings, there were no sign of pluralism in Libya, such as trade unions, political parties, or independent media.⁷⁸ As indicated on Table-2, the institutionalization scores for the Libyan government were very low. It was among the worst of the world's governments in terms of corruption, government effectiveness, rule of law, and regime type.

Besides, Gaddafi had established multiple security institutions fearing a *coup d'état*, a common worry throughout Libyan political history. The Revolutionary Committees, the Revolutionary Guards, and the People Guards were among the organizations established mainly to protect the regime and its ideology.⁷⁹ In particular, the members of the Revolutionary Committees had been embedded in every institution in order to ensure commitment and loyalty to the regime; and they had punished and even assassinated many perpetrators involved in attempts at disobedience.⁸⁰ Furthermore, because of Gaddafi's aim at coup-proofing, the strength of the military had been weakened through several different methods. Gaddafi had assigned leaders of the Army by ethnic or religious affiliation, or personal loyalty, but not according to meritocratic principles, and rotated them frequently in order to hinder the cohesiveness of units. As a result of his efforts to largely disable the military, leaders had been subverted, the officers could not develop leadership skills or

76 The International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), *The Military Balance* (2010), pp.248-250.

77 Philippe Droz-Vincent, "The Role of the Military in Arab Transitions", *Panorama* (Med. 2012), pp.136-140.

78 Gelvin, *What Everyone Needs...*, pp.71-72.

79 Lutterbeck, "Arab Uprisings...", p.40.

80 Gelvin, *What Everyone Needs...*, p.72.

cultivate unity between themselves and their enlisted personnel, and therefore, Libyan Army had lost its war-fighting capacity.⁸¹

Once the uprising began, at first the Revolutionary Guards and the police were employed, and then Libyan military were ordered to suppress the protests.⁸² In addition to the regular Libyan security institutions, Gaddafi relied heavily on foreign mercenaries composed mainly from poorer Sahelian countries to quell the uprising.⁸³ The security forces and the military used brutal force, including live ammunition, to crush the rioting.⁸⁴ Nevertheless, the overall ill treatment of the population at the hands of the security forces engendered bitter conditions, transforming the conflict into virtually protracted civil war conditions. In addition to that, tribal loyalties, the institutionalization shortfalls, and severe armed conflict paved the way for the eventual disintegration and defection of the military.⁸⁵

The significant characteristics of Libyan Armed Forces were the frequent rotation of military leaders, centralized structures discouraging personal initiative, and also promotions and assignments based on ethnic and religious affiliations.⁸⁶ The military hadn't got any organizational economic and political interest with the regime, but personal.⁸⁷ For instance, when Libya's uprising began, personnel from eastern Libyan clans defected in their entirety.⁸⁸ The emphasized conditions exacerbated the integrity of military forces. It can be clearly said, with the indications of ineffectiveness and disunity of army, the Libyan army was not professionalized well.⁸⁹ Moreover, the regime survival

81 Under Gaddafi governance, Libya's military became corrupt and ineffective, performing miserably on battlefields in Uganda in the 1970s and Chad in the 1980s. See Florence Gaub, 'The Libyan Armed Forces between Coup Proofing and Repression', *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol.36, No.2 (2013), pp.221-244.

82 Ibid.

83 Lutterbeck, "Arab Uprisings...", p.40.

84 Escalating the level of violence by security forces and mercenaries caused an increase in the defection of military personnel and resignation of ambassadors of Libya in foreign countries and in the mission in United Nations as well. Even it is argued that the pilots who were ordered to bomb civilian protesters in Benghazi fled to Malta in their aircraft. See The Guardian, "Libya defectors: Pilots told to bomb protesters flee to Malta", 21 Feb. 2011, <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/feb/21/libya-pilots-flee-to-malta> (Accessed at: 23 Dec. 2015).

85 Gaub, "The Libyan Armed Forces...", p.235; The Guardian, "Libya: Defections leave Muammar Gaddafi isolated in Tripoli bolthole", 23 Feb. 2011, <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/feb/23/muammar-gaddafi-libya-tripoli-uprising> (Accessed at: 24 Jan. 2016). The most high profile defection within the Libyan armed forces was General Abdul Fatah Younis, Gaddafi's Interior Minister. See Lutterbeck, "Arab Uprisings...", p.40. Libya's ambassador to the United Nations Abd al-Rahman resigned in protest over the reported killing of civilians by denouncing Gaddafi. See Lynch, *The Arab Uprising*, p.169.

86 Gaub, "The Libyan Armed Forces...", p.231.

87 Silverman, *The Arab Military in the Arab Spring...*, p.33.

88 Makara, "Coup-Proofing...", p.353.

89 Ann Marlowe, "Libya's De-professionalized Army Needs Help", 2012, <http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/blog/ann-marlowe/libya%E2%80%99s-de-professionalized-army-needs-help> (Accessed at: 12 Dec. 2015).

was not an important matter for the army especially after seeing the close possibility of fall of Gaddafi regime.

4.4. Yemen

The uprisings in Yemen occurred almost simultaneously with Egypt's unrest, but they had greater similarities with the uprisings in Libya in terms of pre-conditions and underlying causes. When the first demonstrations began in Yemen's capital, Sana'a, at the end of January 2011, a coalition of opposition parties called as the Joint Meeting Party gathered to protest the plan adopted by parliament to eliminate presidential term limits. The President of Yemen, Ali Abdullah Saleh, who was the first president of a united Yemen since 1990, though at first he had not been motivated, offered some concessions to protestors. However, the crowds were not convinced by his remarks. Moreover, shortly after the resignation of the Egyptian President Mubarak, young Yemeni protestors from the universities in Yemen joined the protests and added momentum to the demonstrations.⁹⁰

The Yemeni security services reacted harshly from the outset of the protests, with the most bitter and bloodiest day of the uprisings occurring on 18 March 2011 during which snipers arguably from the Republican Guard and the Central Security Organization (CSO) troops, opened fire on protestors outside Sana'a University killing more than 50 people. This severe reaction backfired and culminated in mass defections and resignations across the government and military,⁹¹ though the Republican Guard, the Special Forces and the Intelligence Organization had largely kept their loyalty.⁹²

The popular and tribal rebellion against the President Saleh was accelerated by the defection of many of Yemen's most senior generals, including powerful General Ali Mohsen, who had been presumed as a successor of Saleh.⁹³ However, before the uprisings began, Saleh's attempts to leave the presidency to his son outraged Mohsen and his clan.⁹⁴ These factional disputes and presidential motives aggravated the tensions. After a long series of protests, Saleh finally agreed to transfer the powers of presidency to his deputy within 30 days, and to formally step down once the new presidential elections occurred

90 Gelvin, *What Everyone Needs...*, p.78.

91 Lynch, *The Arab Uprising...*, p.155.

92 Makara, "Coup-Proofing", p.352.

93 Michael Knights, "The Military Role in Yemen's Protests: Civil-Military Relations in the Tribal Republic", *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol.36, No.2 (2013), pp.278-284.

94 In fact, though, Mohsen and Saleh were the members of the same Sanhan tribe, there were family differences that Mohsen was related to Qadhi whereas Saleh was related to Afaash clan. Mohsen was sitting above Saleh in the Sanhan tribal hierarchy. See Sarah Phillips, "Who Tried to Kill Ali Abdullah Saleh?", *Foreign Policy*, 13 June 2011, <http://foreignpolicy.com/2011/06/13/who-tried-to-kill-ali-abdullah-saleh/> (Accessed at: 21 Jan. 2016).

on 21 February 2012; in exchange, he would receive immunity from prosecution for himself and his family.

Yemen had previously been divided between the north and the south, and had suffered armed conflict for almost 40 years. In 1990, though, the two sides were able to merge into one state, officially called the Republic of Yemen. Due to the weakness or absence of necessary government institutions, however, Yemen had needed to deftly balance the tribal, political, and military affiliations, and to rely on them in order to perform ordinary governmental functions.⁹⁵ These conditions resulted in a situation in which Yemen was labelled as “tribal republic”.⁹⁶ Being aware of the impossibility of enforcement of his will without the participation of tribal forces,⁹⁷ President Saleh had allowed the tribal leaders and their relatives to hold prominent positions in government institutions in order to ensure their loyalty to the unity of Yemen.⁹⁸ Nevertheless, though, they had abused their positions to enrich themselves while the general population had suffered drastically from poverty and unemployment. Corruption, graft and bribery had been common throughout the regime, and it had been estimated that 30% of state revenues had not reached the government coffers.⁹⁹ As might be expected, Yemen had the worst governmental institutionalism scores along with Libya on Table-2.

As previously seen in other cases, President Saleh had also built some parallel security institutions, such as the Republican Guard, Special Operations Forces operating under Ministry of Defense (MoD), and the CSO acting under MoI. These forces were managed by Saleh’s inner circle,¹⁰⁰ and all units in military structure were reflections of complexity and hegemony of clans and tribal coalitions. Armed forces of Yemen were not an effective security apparatus of central authority, and Yemeni leaders have traditionally relied on the tribes to maintain security.¹⁰¹ Accordingly, Yemen military has never appeared as an institutionalized security organization.¹⁰²

95 Gelvin, *What Everyone Needs...*, p.78.

96 Knights, “The Military Role...”, pp.261-288; Khaled Fattah, “A Political History of Civil-Military Relations in Yemen”, *Alternative Politics*, Special Issue 1 (November 2010), pp.25-47.

97 Fattah, “A Political History...”, p.43.

98 Phillips, “Who Tried to Kill...”.

99 Gelvin, *What Everyone Needs...*, p.68.

100 Knights, “The Military Role...”, pp.273-274.

101 Fattah, “A Political History...”, pp.44-45. Besides, the military was not the sole group carrying firearms within Yemen. Yemenis have traditionally possessed more weapons than any other Arab population with the government having no effective authority over these arms. And it has been assumed that Yemen’s tribes hold about four times as many firearms as the country’s state security forces. See Derek Miller, ‘Demand, Stockpiles and Social Controls: Small Arms in Yemen’, *Small Arms Survey Occasional Paper no. 9* (Geneva: Small Arms Survey 2003), p.28.

102 Daniel Steiman, “Military Decision-Making During the Arab Spring”, 2012, http://muftah.org/military-decision-making-during-the-arab-spring/#_cdn13 (Accessed at: 13 Nov. 2015).

Cronyism in the security institutions of Yemen was common, particularly at the top-level of military officials. They had been appointed based on their tribal and familial affiliations, and mostly based on personal allegiances to Ali Saleh. Besides cronyism, corruption among the security forces was claimed to be particularly rampant. It was claimed that military officers derived considerable profits from diesel and food smuggling.¹⁰³

Additionally, military services had been virtually immune from civilian oversight and had operated largely outside the law. According to an International Crisis Group Report, “powerful commanders from the president’s family manage divisions more like private fiefdoms than components of a national institution.”¹⁰⁴ So it is safe to say that the military apparatus of the regime was highly fractured, deinstitutionalized, and ineffective.

4.5. Syria

After gaining independence, the Sunni majority had ruled Syria until 1966 *coup d’etat*; through which the traditional leaders of the Ba’ath party were ousted. Then, after succession of coups, Hafez Al-Assad took over the government and became president in 1971. Since that date, Syria has been predominantly ruled by the Assad family and their religious sect, the Alawites. There have been two presidents of Syria since then; Hafez Al-Assad ruled from 1971 until 2000, and after Hafez Al-Assad’s death, his son, Bashar Al-Assad, inherited governmental control.

In contrast to the deep horizontal fissures among Syrian society, there are no political parties or fractions in Syria except for the ruling Ba’ath party, which is the sole legitimate political organization of the state. The primary function of the Ba’ath party is to defend and sustain the ruling Assad family’s monopoly on political activities. Thus, as Perlmutter argues, “the Ba’ath party has become a party in uniform after the February 1966 coup”.¹⁰⁵

The influence of the Assad family and the Ba’ath party has included not only the political environment but has extended also to the military and business sectors as well. Syria’s private economy is dominated by an exceptionally small group, which has political and familial linkages with Assad family.¹⁰⁶ As shown on Table-2 above, the government’s effectiveness, rule of law, corrup-

103 Knights, “The Military Role...”, p.268

104 International Crisis Group, *Popular Protest in North African and The Middle East (II): Yemen Between Reform and Revolution*, Middle East/North Africa Report No.102 (10 March 2011), p.15

105 Perlmutter, *Political Roles and Military Rulers*, p.33.

106 Michael Doran and Salman Shaikh, ‘The Ghosts of Hama’, Kenneth Pollack (et al.), *The Arab Awakening: America and the Transformation of the Middle East* (Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 2011), pp.232-233.

tion, and regime type scores are all very low, even lower than the scores of Egypt and Tunisia.

The consequences and methods of the uprisings in Tunisia and Egypt have encouraged suppressed people in Syria as well.¹⁰⁷ At the very beginning of protests in Syria in March 2011, several youth, aged fifteen or younger, were arrested by the security forces in the city of Deraa for committing crimes against the regime. Their “crime” was to have written anti-regime graffiti, such as “down with the regime (*nizam*)”, words that ultimately led to their imprisonment and torture.¹⁰⁸ What happened afterwards, though, is more important; one needs to understand the manner of response of the security forces and of the regime to the crowds. These children were held in custody for a very long time and they suffered great physical and mental anguish.¹⁰⁹ As a consequence, their families blamed the government and took to the streets. In reaction, the Syrian security forces forcefully repressed the protests, and killed some of those involved.

However, this incident was just a precursor to how the regime would ultimately respond to other protests. The youth of Syria suffering from high unemployment and low living conditions began to gather in the streets. After these early demonstrations had spread across the country and the participants had surged against the government, the Syrian Army responded in a tougher and more brutal manner than ever before. The Army went so far as to use tanks, snipers, and live ammunition to counter the unarmed protesters.¹¹⁰ Moreover, the government either refused to return the bodies of dead protesters to their families or forced families to bury their dead in private in order to prevent protesters from gathering at funeral processions.¹¹¹ This only increased the anger of people.

Syria maintained a rather homogenous group at the higher levels within the government and security bodies, in contrast to the large sectarian differences among the populace. Under the rule of both Assads, the Alawites dominated Syria’s political system, armed forces, and other security agencies. The homogenizing of army was initiated with the 1963 Baath coup in order to purge Sunni officers from military, and Alawites, Druzes, and Isma’ilis entered

107 Christopher Phillips, “Syria’s Bloody Arab Spring”, pp. 37-42, http://www.lse.ac.uk/ideas/publications/reports/pdf/sr011/final_lse_ideas_syriasbloodyarabspring_phillips.pdf (Accessed at: 02 Feb. 2016).

108 Gelvin, *What Everyone Needs...*, p.103.

109 Agents of the secret police working for General Atef Najeeb, a cousin of President Bashar al-Assad, detained the boys and tortured them by pulling out their fingernails. See Hugh Macleod, “Inside Deraa”, *Al Jazeera*, 2011, <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2011/04/201141918352728300.html> (Accessed at: 14 September 2015).

110 Lutterbeck, “Arab Uprisings...”, p.48.

111 Gelvin, *What Everyone Needs...*, pp.105-106.

Syria's military academy.¹¹² After the late 1970s, officer corps had been subjected to the "Alewitaziton" and to the discrimination policies against Sunni officers.¹¹³ Zisser argued that more than 90% of the generals were Alawites at the time of Hafez Assad's death.¹¹⁴ Additionally, though there were some promotions based on competence rather than loyalty at the junior levels, the positions at senior levels were filled with the people based on their political considerations or personal commitment to Assad.¹¹⁵

The Syrian regime bolstered its repressive power by maintaining multiple security and intelligence agencies, which were ready to counter any religious sects' revolt or the military attempt to overthrow the government. Parallel institutions were created and positioned in the near vicinity of capital to prevent military interventions. The Defense Companies, the 3rd Armored Division, and the Special Forces were among these organizations, and they were subordinated directly to the president.¹¹⁶ Alongside these armed units, Hafez Assad established internal security agencies to monitor military personnel, such as Air Force Intelligence and Military Security.¹¹⁷ These intelligence organizations penetrated military forces through appointment of a security officer to each regiment, brigade, and company of the regular armed forces.¹¹⁸ However, these coup-proofing methods weakened Syrian armed forces.¹¹⁹ As Nassif argues, combat preparedness of military forces had been gradually deteriorated since the early 1990s and it was at the lowest level when the uprisings began.¹²⁰

Besides, the Syrian army had particularly penetrated defense-related sectors of the economy, such as construction, agriculture, and food processing. As previously noted with respect to Egypt, the primary purpose of institutional military economies and the tolerance of officer penetration of the economy were to ensure the loyalty of officers.¹²¹ Another method in maintaining the

112 Quinlivan, "Coup Proofing...", p.140.

113 It is argued that Sunni officers' disaffection with the Asad regime were threefold such as professional, corporatist, and ideational. See Hicham Bou Nassif, "'Second-Class': The Grievances of Sunni Officers in the Syrian Armed Forces", *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol.38, No.5 (2015), pp.626-649.

114 Eyal Zisser, "The Syrian Army: Between the Domestic and the External Fronts", *Middle East Review of International Affairs Journal*, Vol.5, No.1 (2001), <http://www.rubincenter.org/2001/03/zisser-2001-03-01/> (05 Jan. 2016).

115 Lutterbeck, "Arab Uprisings...", p.46.

116 Quinlivan, "Coup Proofing...", p.147.

117 Zisser, "The Syrian Army..."; Quinlivan, "Coup Proofing...", p.151.

118 Nassif, "Second Class...", p.643.

119 Quinlivan, "Coup Proofing...", pp.131-165.

120 Nassif, "Second Class...", p.646.

121 Robert Springborg, "Economic Involvements of Militaries", *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol.43, No.3 (2011), pp.403-405.

loyalty of the military was for government authorities to overlook the smuggling and other illicit profits gained by military personnel.¹²²

Despite their patrimonial characteristics and ongoing civil war, Syrian Armed Forces do indeed have some legitimate combat experience and a relatively capable fighting force.¹²³ Syrian Military has been viewed as a relatively coherent and semi-institutionalized body. Although some defections have occurred over time, they are not commonplace. It is argued that defection was a Sunni phenomenon, since almost no Alawite officer participated.¹²⁴ One of the most important reasons for this argument is the tightly interwoven personnel structure of the ruling circle, security forces, and the military.¹²⁵

5. Institutionalism of Government and Professionalism of Military in the Perspective of Arab Uprisings

In this study, the effects of the institutionalism of governments and the professionalism of militaries on the armies' decisions in Arab uprisings have been scrutinized. The effects of the variables on the cases presented in this study are listed in the Table-3 below.

Table-3: Institutionalism of Government and Professionalism of Military

	Tunisia	Egypt	Libya	Yemen	Syria
Institutionalism of Government	High	Medium	Very low	Very low	Low
Professionalism of Military	Medium	High	Very low	Very low	Medium

Tunisia had the highest degree of institutionalism of government among the examined cases. Though it had relatively independent organizations, Tunisian institutionalism has been assessed as “high” because of the corruption and cronyism concerning the president and his family and because of the repressive manner of governance practiced by the president. In terms of the military, the Tunisian army is relatively small, and has typically remained free from political issues and, as a result, it has never attempted to overthrow the government – a sharp contrast to almost all other countries in the Arab states. The Tunisian military did not have any ethnic, tribal, or sectarian ties to the ruler either. Additionally, the government had kept the army out of political

122 Barry Rubin, “The Military in Contemporary Middle East Politics”, *Middle East Review of International Affairs Journal*, Vol.5, No.1 (March 2001), p.49.

123 Barany, “Comparing the Arab Revolts...”, p. 36; There were 639,000 men (including 314,000 reserve) under arms, and 108,000 men in paramilitary units in 2009. See *Military Balance* (2010), pp.272-275.

124 Nassif, “Second Class...”, p.644.

125 Gelvin, *What Everyone Needs...*, p.103.

and economic issues through legal statutes. Since the Tunisian Army had previously had no interest in economic and political issues and since Tunisia has a relatively institutionalized government, the Army returned to its barracks after the uprising was settled.

Egypt's case provides an example of the higher institutionalism of the military in comparison to the government. The high management levels of government institutions had been allocated to the president's family or his close circle. The dependence of institutions on the President and widespread corruption among the administrative levels both resulted in bad management practices. On the other hand, the Egyptian military has been the most experienced and strongest army in the Arab world. The Egyptian military retained its independent organizational structure with its own promotion and education system, and politicians have not been able to easily intervene in these. However, the deep involvement of the army in the economic realm has decreased its overall professionalism. In fact, safeguarding its interests in financial activities and preserving its organizational structure have both played a significant role in the decision of the Egyptian military to side with protestors in taking over the government.

Libya and Yemen have similarities in the institutionalization of their governments and armies. In both states, all of the national institutions, including the military, have been formed to balance the tribal distribution across various management levels, particularly, in order to hinder their possible revolt against the regime. Yet, Libya had its own management characteristics, which had originated under Gaddafi's rule, configuring the state structure as his own personal asset. As Anderson argues, Libya was a failed state, and the state structure was divided by cleavages of kinship and region.¹²⁶ On the other hand, Yemen had not yet established a coherent and united government structure at the time of their uprisings. It had endured great political unrest and even numerous armed conflicts in the 50 years prior to the uprisings.

However, the military institutions of Yemen and Libya have minor differences. Neither of them has been known as national armies in the traditional sense. The Libyan armed forces were established simply to protect the Gaddafi regime, with high-level leaders of the army being appointed from close family or tribal members of Gaddafi. On the other hand, the Yemeni army has had many shortfalls in terms of professionalism. Both of the Libyan and Yemeni armies have suffered from widely distributed cronyism across the management structure, financial interests in economical activities, and there has been no civilian supervision over both of them. Therefore, these armies have had no real institutional bonds to the military or the government and, as a result, they have preferred to take sides with the winning parties, following mass de-

126 Anderson, "Demystifying the Arab Spring", pp.2-7.

fections once the armed conflict had expanded. Furthermore, these so-called revolutions have led to violent civil war-like conditions, with no robust and coherent government and military institutions to counter them.

Lastly, Syria has been ruled by the Assad family for almost 50 years. The institutions of government, particularly at the highest levels, have been filled by those with familial ties or those from the religious sect, the Alawites, during this period. Additionally, they established a police state with different security institutions for overseeing the daily life of the population. Although Syria has had a repressive governing body made up of those with familial and religious ties, it has had a coherent and relatively robust structure due to these linkages. These institutions and units within the army have stayed loyal to the state, with the exception of a few defections, largely due to the knowledge that the collapse of regime would endanger the integrity of the military. Therefore, the institutionalism of the Syrian government has been assessed as “low”; nevertheless, the professionalism of the army has been noted as “medium”, having legitimate war experience, middle sized organization, and a coherent military structure.

6. Conclusions

The variables discussed in this article have had significant effects on the management of the turmoil in each case, as well as the aftermath. If the institutionalization level of government is higher than the military's, and the professionalization of the military is not high at all, as it was the case in Tunisia, the revolt may indeed end smoothly. The Army has enough coherent structure and capability to tackle the uprisings, and yet it is also prepared to return to its barracks after containing the unrest and maintaining subordination to civilian control. Additionally, the government can manage the transformation process with relatively settled institutions.

However, if the degree of the professionalization of military is higher than the institutionalization of government, as was the case in Egypt, the Army may decide to take over the governmental reins. This is particularly the case when a condition of deadlock is achieved between insurgents and security forces, and then the military may defy the orders of the government in order to pursue its own organizational interests. Once the uprisings are quelled, the military may feel itself to be the best arbiter in the new political environment.

In those cases where the institutionalization of the government and the professionalization of military are very low, as seen in Libya and Yemen, the probability of disorder may become greater than in any other instance. Additionally, if the armies have insufficient professionalism but no capability to contain the revolts, there will be a high probability of armed conflict or civil war. The conditions mentioned above are among the most difficult condi-

tions, that a country can confront, and it may lead to the collapse of the whole governmental structure.

On the other hand, if the army is subordinated to civilian control and it has moderate professionalization, as in Syria, these conditions of low institutionalization of government institutions may again provoke armed conflict or civil war. However, this situation reveals some differences from the previous cases. The Syrian Army, at least a large part of it, has remained loyal, because high-level officers are inextricably linked to the regime. At the same time, if the insurgents are rooted in the population and also have international support, the probability of a protracted armed conflict increases.

Bibliography

- Anderson, Lisa, "Demystifying the Arab Spring", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.90, No.3 (May/June 2011), pp.2-7.
- Barany, Zoltan, "Comparing the Arab Revolts: The Role of the Military", *Journal of Democracy*, Vol.22, No.4 (2011), pp.28-39.
- Bellin, Eva, "The Robustness of Authoritarianism in the Middle East", *Comparative Politics*, Vol.36, No.2 (January 2004), pp.139-157.
- Bou Nassif, Hicham, "'Second-Class': The Grievances of Sunni Officers in the Syrian Armed Forces", *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol.38, No.5 (2015), pp.626-649.
- Bremmer, Ian, *The J Curve: A New Way to Understand Why Nations Rise and Fall* (New York: Simon Schuster, 2006).
- Brooks, Risa, "Making Military Might: Why do States Fail and Succeed? A Review Essay", *International Security*, Vol.28, No.2 (2003), pp.149-191.
- Brooks, Risa, "Introduction: The Impact of Culture, Society, Institutions, and Internal Forces on Military Effectiveness", Risa Brooks and Elizabeth A. Stanley (ed.), *Creating Military Power: The Sources of Military Effectiveness* (California: Stanford University Press, 2007), pp.1-26.
- Brooks, Risa, "Abandoned at the Palace: Why the Tunisian Military Defected from the Ben Ali Regime in January 2011", *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol.36, No.2 (2013), pp.205-220.
- Cook, Steven, *Ruling but not Governing: The Military and Political Development in Egypt, Algeria, and Turkey* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007).

- Doran, Michael and Salman Shaikh, 'The Ghosts of Hama', Kenneth Pollack (et al.), *The Arab Awakening: America and the Transformation of the Middle East* (Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 2011), pp.230-240.
- Droz-Vincent, Philippe, "The Role of the Military in Arab Transitions", *Panorama* (Med. 2012), pp.136-140.
- Fattah, Khaled, "A Political History of Civil-Military Relations in Yemen", *Alternative Politics*, Special Issue 1 (November 2010), pp.25-47.
- Feaver, Peter D., "The Civil-Military Problematique: Huntington, Janowitz, and the question of civilian control", *Armed Forces & Society*, Vol.23, No.2 (1996), pp.149-178.
- Feaver, Peter, "Civil-Military Relations", *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol.2 (1999), pp.211-241.
- Finer, Samuel E., *The Man on the Horseback: The Role of the Military in Politics* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1988).
- Frisch, Hillel, "The Egyptian Army and Egypt's 'Spring'", *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 36, No.2 (2013), pp.180-204.
- Gaub, Florence, "The Libyan Armed Forces between Coup Proofing and Repression", *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol.36, No.2 (2013), pp.221-244.
- Gelvin, James L., *What Everyone Needs to Know* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- Hamid, Shadi, "Tunisia: Birthplace of the Revolution", Kenneth Pollack (et al.), *The Arab Awakening: America and the Transformation of the Middle East* (Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 2011), pp.111-116.
- Hashim, Ahmed, "The Egyptian Military, part two: From Mubarak Onward", *Middle East Policy*, Vol.18, No.4 (2011), pp.106-128.
- Housden, Oliver, "Egypt: Coup d'Etat or a Revolution Protected", *The RUSI Journal*, Vol.158, No.5 (2013), pp.72-78.
- Huntington, Samuel, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957).
- Huntington, Samuel, *Political Order in Changing Societies* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969).

- International Crisis Group, *Popular Protest in North African and The Middle East (II): Yemen Between Reform and Revolution*, Middle East/North Africa Report No.102 (10 March 2011).
- Janowitz, Morris, *The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait* (New York: The Free Press, 1960).
- Jebnoun, Nouredine, "In the Shadow of Power: Civil-Military Relations and the Tunisian Popular Uprising", *The Journal of North African Studies*, Vol.19, No.3 (2014), pp.1-33.
- Kamrava, Mehran, "Military Professionalization and Civil Military Relations in the Middle East", *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol.115, No.1 (2000), pp.67-92.
- Kaufmann, Daniel, Aart Kraay and Massimo Mastruzzi, *The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues*, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430, (2010), <http://elibrary.worldbank.org/doi/abs/10.1596/1813-9450-5430> (Accessed at: 12 Jan. 2016).
- Kirkpatrick, David D., "Military Backs New Leaders in Tunisia", 17 Jan. 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/17/world/africa/17tunis.html?_r=1 (Accessed at: 11 Jan. 2016).
- Kirkpatrick, David D., "Chief of Tunisian Army Pledges His Support for 'the Revolution'", 25 Jan. 2011, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/25/world/africa/25tunis.html> (Accessed at: 03 Jan. 2016).
- Knights, Michael, "The Military Role in Yemen's Protests: Civil-Military Relations in the Tribal Republic", *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol.36, No.2 (2013), pp.261-288.
- Lee, Terence, "The Armed Forces and Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Explaining the Role of the Military in 1986 Philippines and 1998 Indonesia", *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol.42, No.5 (2009), pp.640-669.
- Lutterbeck, Derek, "Arab Uprisings, Armed Forces, and Civil-Military Relations", *Armed Forces & Society*, Vol.39, No.1 (2013), pp.28-52.
- Lynch, Marc, *The Arab Uprising: The Unfinished Revolutions of the New Middle East* (New York: Public Affairs, 2012).
- Macleod, Hugh, "Inside Deraa", *Al Jazeera*, 2011, <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2011/04/201141918352728300.html> (Accessed at: 14 September 2015).

- Makara, Michael, "Coups-Proofing, Military Defection, and the Arab Spring", *Democracy and Security*, Vol.9, No.4 (2013), pp.334-359.
- Mansfield, Edward D. and Jack Snyder, "Democratic Transitions, Institutional Strength, and War", *International Organization*, Vol. 56, No. 2 (Spring 2002), pp. 297-337.
- Mansfield, Edward D. and Jack Snyder, "Democratization and the Arab Spring", *International Interactions*, Vol.38, No.5 (2012), pp. 722-733.
- Marlowe, Ann, "Libya's De-professionalized Army Needs Help", 2012, <http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/blog/ann-marlowe/libya%E2%80%99s-de-professionalized-army-needs-help> (Accessed at: 12 Dec. 2015).
- Marshall, Monthy G., Ted Robert Gurr and Keith Jagers, *POLITY IV Project Data Users' Manual*, Center for Systemic Peace (2013), www.systemicpeace.org (Accessed at: 23 Jan. 2016).
- Masoud, Tarek, "The Road to (and from) Liberation Square", *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 22, No.3 (2011), pp.20-34.
- Miller, Derek, 'Demand, Stockpiles and Social Controls: Small Arms in Yemen', *Small Arms Survey Occasional Paper no. 9* (Geneva: Small Arms Survey 2003).
- Nepstad, Sharon Erickson, "Mutiny and Nonviolence in the Arab Spring: Exploring Military Defections and Loyalty in Egypt, Bahrain, and Syria", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol.50, No.3 (2013), pp.337-349.
- Nordlinger, Eric, *Soldiers in Politics: Military Coups and Governments* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1977).
- O'Donnell, Guillermo, Philippe C. Schmitter and Laurence Whitehead, *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Comparative Perspectives* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986).
- Pachon, Alejandro, "Loyalty and Defection: Misunderstanding Civil-Military Relations in Tunisia During the 'Arab Spring'", *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol.37, No.4 (2014), pp.508-531.
- Perlmutter, Amos, *Political Roles and Military Rulers* (London: Frank Cass, 1981).
- Phillips, Christopher, "Syria's Bloody Arab Spring", pp. 37-42, http://www.lse.ac.uk/ideas/publications/reports/pdf/sr011/final_lse_ideas__syriasbloodyarabspring_phillips.pdf (Accessed at: 02 Feb. 2016).

- Phillips, Sarah, "Who Tried to Kill Ali Abdullah Saleh?", *Foreign Policy*, 13 June 2011, <http://foreignpolicy.com/2011/06/13/who-trying-to-kill-ali-abdullah-saleh/> (Accessed at: 21 Jan. 2016).
- Prieur, Denis, "Defend or Defect Military Roles in Popular Revolts", SSRN, 15 Dec. 2011, p.7, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2115062 (Accessed at: 04 Feb. 2016).
- Quinlivan, James T., "Coup Proofing", *International Security*, Vol.24, No.2 (Fall 1999), pp.131-165.
- Rubin, Barry, "The Military in Contemporary Middle East Politics", *Middle East Review of International Affairs Journal*, Vol.5, No.1 (March 2001), pp.47-63.
- Sayigh, Yezid, "Agencies of Coercion: Armies and Internal Security Forces", *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol.43, No.3 (2011).
- Schiff, Rebecca L., "Civil-Military Relations Reconsidered: A Theory of Concordance", *Armed Forces & Society*, Vol.22, No.1 (Fall 1995), pp.7-24.
- Silverman, Daniel, *The Arab Military in the Arab Spring: Agent of Continuity of Change*, 2012, p.20, <http://politicalscience.osu.edu/intranet/cprw/Silverman%20CPRW%202012.pdf> (Accessed at: 11 Nov. 2015).
- SIPRI, *Military Expenditure Database*, 2014, http://www.sipri.org/research/armaments/milex/milex_database (Accessed at: 12 Jan. 2015).
- Skocpol, Theda, *States and Social Revolutions* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979).
- Springborg, Robert, "Economic Involvements of Militaries", *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol.43, No.3 (2011), pp.397-399.
- Steiman, Daniel, "Military Decision-Making During the Arab Spring", 2012, http://muftah.org/military-decision-making-during-the-arab-spring/#_edn13 (Accessed at: 13 Nov. 2015).
- The Guardian, "Zine al-Abidine Ben Ali forced to flee Tunisia as protesters claim victory", 14 Jan. 2011, <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/jan/14/tunisian-president-flees-country-protests> (Accessed at: 01 Feb. 2016).
- The Guardian, "Libya defectors: Pilots told to bomb protesters flee to Malta", 21 Feb. 2011, <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/feb/21/libya-pilots-flee-to-malta> (Accessed at: 23 Dec. 2015).

- The Guardian, “Libya: Defections leave Muammar Gaddafi isolated in Tripoli bolthole”, 23 Feb. 2011, <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/feb/23/muammar-gaddafi-libya-tripoli-uprising> (Accessed at: 24 Jan. 2016).
- The International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), *The Military Balance* (2010).
- Welch, Claude E. (ed.), *Civilian Control of the Military: Theory and Cases from Developing Countries* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1976).
- Zantovsky, Michael. “1989 and 2011, Compare and Contrast”, *World Affairs*, Vol.174, No.2 (July/August 2011), pp.13-24.
- Zisser, Eyal, “The Syrian Army: Between the Domestic and the External Fronts”, *Middle East Review of International Affairs Journal*, Vol.5, No.1 (2001), <http://www.rubincenter.org/2001/03/zisser-2001-03-01/> (Accessed at: 05 Jan. 2016).