George Lawson
Revolution, non-violence, and the Arab Uprisings

Article (Accepted version)
(Refereed)

Revolution, Non-Violence, and the Arab Uprisings

George Lawson, London School of Economics

Abstract
This article combines insights from the literature on revolutions with that on non-violent protest in order to assess the causes and outcomes of the Arab Uprisings. The article makes three main arguments: first, international dynamics were the precipitant cause of the Arab Uprisings; second, because the region's 'neo-patrimonial' regimes were particularly vulnerable to shifts in state-military relations, the hold of elites over state coercive apparatuses played a decisive role in determining the outcomes of the revolutions; and third, the organizational character of the protest movements, including their use of information and communication technologies, helped to raise levels of participation, but limited their capacity to engender major transformations. Of particular interest to scholarship on non-violent movements, the article demonstrates the ways in which, as the revolutionary wave spread around North Africa and the Middle East, protestors in states outside the original onset of the crisis overstated the possibilities of revolutionary success. At the same time, regimes learned quickly how to demobilize their opponents. The lesson is clear: the timing of when movements emerged was just as important as their organizational coherence and levels of participation.

Contact details
George Lawson
Associate Professor, Department of International Relations
London School of Economics
London WC2A 2AE
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 20 7955 6028
Email: g.lawson@lse.ac.uk

Revolution in the Contemporary World[1]

There are two main ways of approaching the study of revolution in the contemporary world – and they are both wrong. On the one hand, revolutions appear to be everywhere: on the streets of Cairo and Damascus; in the slogans of anti-austerity protestors; and in the potential of new technologies to reshape people's lives. But can revolution really be popular protest, campaign against inequality, and technological breakthrough at the same time? This issue is further complicated by a second equally common, but apparently contradictory, meme – that revolutions are irrelevant to a world in which the big issues of governance and economic development have been settled. As Arno Mayer (2001: 3) puts it, in the contemporary world, revolutions appear to offer 'little promise and pose little threat'. With the passing of state socialism in the Soviet Union, it is supposed, revolutions appear more as relics of a bygone age than as important points of reference. Both of these positions are untenable. While the former makes revolution so all-encompassing that it becomes an empty term without substantive content, the latter is overly complacent, failing to see the enduring appeal of attempts to overturn existing conditions and generate alternative social orders. The Arab Uprisings of 2011 are the latest reminder of the consistent appeal of revolutionary struggles.

To point to the enduring appeal of revolutionary struggles does not mean homogenizing the experience of revolutions. Revolutions are not static objects of analysis, but processes that change in modality across time and place (Motyl 1999: 23; McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly 2001: 13; Tilly 2006: 9). Revolutions have been conducted by nationalists in Algeria, communists in Afghanistan, Russia, and China, radical military groups in Ethiopia, peasants in Mexico, Islamists in Iran, and students in Egypt. At the same time, the concept of revolution exists in every major language group in the world. A full study of its etymology would need to take in the Greek concepts of *epanastasis* (revolution), the Arabic terms *inqilab* (to rotate) and *thaura* (revolution), the notions of *mered* (rebellion), *hitkomemut* (uprising), *meri* (revolt), and *kesher* (plot) in classical Hebrew, the Chinese word *geming* (change of life, fate, or destiny), and the Latin verb *revolvere* (to return) (Halliday 1999: 29-35). Probing deeper into the European meaning of the term reveals further diversity. In Ancient Greece, the idea of revolution was linked to a circular movement contained within Aristotle's trinity of democracy,

oligarchy, and tyranny. In the Middle Ages, the concept was used to denote a return to a pre-existing order. During the nineteenth century, the republican revolutions of America and France became seen as archetypal, reaching their apogee in the 1848 'Springtime of Nations'. Following the emergence of communism, revolution became associated with inevitable, violent ruptures from one type of social order (capitalism) to another (socialism). After the collapse of the Soviet Union, many commentators argued that revolution had conjoined with reform programs to generate a new category of 'refolution' (Garton Ash 1989, 1990), or reconnected with older notions of return, as captured in Jürgen Habermas's (1990) notion of 'rectifying revolutions'. In the present day, as noted above, the study of revolution is increasingly caught between two extremes: denigration on the one hand; catch-all term on the other.

Two preliminary points can be drawn from this brief survey: first, revolutions shift in modality according to their temporal-spatial context; and second, revolutions remain important sites of struggle (and, potentially, important tools of analysis) in the contemporary world. But what form do contemporary revolutions assume? This article brings together the literature on revolutions with that on non-violent protest in order to assess the most recent wave of revolutions: the 2011 Arab Uprisings. It makes three main arguments: first, international dynamics were the precipitant cause of the Arab Uprisings; second, because the region's 'neo-patrimonial' regimes were particularly vulnerable to shifts in state-military relations, the hold of elites over state coercive apparatuses played a decisive role in determining the outcomes of the revolutions; and third, the organizational form assumed by the protest movements, including their use of information and communication technologies (ICTs), helped to raise levels of participation, but limited their capacity to engender major transformations. These arguments shed light on the changing character of contemporary revolutionary movements; they also help to elucidate their strengths and weaknesses.

Revolution and Non-Violent Protest
What were the main causes of the Arab Uprisings? Research highlights three main factors that lead to the emergence of revolutionary situations: changes in international relations, such as degrees of dependent development, shifting client-patron networks, and the emergence of novel transnational discursive fields (Goldfrank 1979; Skocpol

1979; Hobsbawm 1986; Halliday 1999; Lawson 2004, 2015; Adamson 2005; Foran 2005; Beck 2011; Tarrow 2012; Goldstone 2014a; Ritter 2015); the vulnerability of certain types of regime, particularly neo-patrimonial orders that combine personalized rule with a degree of legal-rational functioning (Eisenstadt 1973; Mann 1984; Chehabi and Linz eds. 1998; Goodwin 2001; Goldstone 2009; Bunce and Wolchik 2011); and a systemic crisis rooted in a conjuncture of political-coercive, (relative) economic, and symbolic crisis (Halliday 1999; Goldstone 2003; Lawson 2004; Foran 2005; Goldstone 2014a). However, revolutionary situations rarely lead to successful revolutions. Again, research highlights three main dynamics that lie behind successful revolutions: levels of state effectiveness (Goldstone 1991, 2001, 2003; Goodwin 2001; Foran 2005); the hold of an elite over the coercive apparatus (Russell 1974; Moore 1978; Tilly 1978, 1995; Goldstone 1991; Bellin 2012; Nepstad 2013); and the organizational coherence of an opposition through the use of 'social technologies' ranging from revolutionary stories to networks of social movements, political parties, labor organizations, and places of worship (Tilly 2006, 2008; Selbin 2010; Alexander 2011; Tarrow 2012).

This last point is worth particular consideration. It is often noted that there is little 'adhesive' within contemporary revolutionary movements that can act as the binding agent of a new social order (e.g. Dunn 2008: 25). This means that, for all the amendable conditions for revolution in the contemporary world, and for all the willing capacity of many publics around the world to demand radical change, there is little sense of what an alternative order would look like once such trajectories are underway. To the contrary, contemporary revolutionary movements, from the Maidan movement in Ukraine to Hong Kong's Umbrella Movement, tend to be diffused rather than centralized in character (Foran 2003; Beissinger 2007).[2] These movements promote self-organization and autonomous action, eschewing the need for a vanguard party that will organize protest and mobilize people to action. Such a configuration resembles the structure of many other contemporary radical movements from Spain's *Indignados* ('Outraged') to various 'First Nations' alliances. All of these movements endorse resistance to existing conditions. But few have a sense of how this resistance is to be realized or what would happen if their actions were to be successful. In other words, the dilemma facing revolutionary movements in the contemporary world is not *whither* struggle, but to what *end* these struggles lead (Halliday 2003; Callinicos 2008).

A focus on the organizational logics of contemporary revolutionary movements provides a segue into debates around non-violent protest. Scholarship interrogating the rise and impact of non-violent movements has made clear that such methods are not new (Zunes 1994; Ackerman and Duvall 2001; Karatnycky and Ackerman 2005; Nepstad 2011; Roberts and Garton Ash eds. 2011). At the beginning of the twentieth century, revolutionaries in Russia, Iran, Turkey, and elsewhere sought radical change not through violent overthrow, but through struggles that shifted sovereignty away from imperial courts towards representative assemblies, written constitutions, and legal-rational bureaucracies (Sohrabi 1995; Kurzman 2008). This form of struggle, sustained via civil rights campaigns in parts of South Asia, southern Africa, and North America, has become increasingly regularized since the 1970s. Of the 67 authoritarian regimes dismantled between 1972 and 2002, over 70% were the result of non-violent uprisings (Nepstad 2001: 4-5). A key conduit here is the work of Gene Sharp (1973), which highlights the potential of around 200 methods of non-violent action, from the withdrawal of labour to the imposition of boycotts. More recent work has focused on the 'non-institutional', transgressive dimensions of non-violent protest, such as occupations, which take place outside formal legal channels (Schock 2005: 6). Advocates stress the advantages of non-violent repertoires in: widening participation and broadening coalitions (Chenoweth and Stephan 2011); ratcheting-up international pressure on incumbents (Ritter 2015); and inducing defections within the ruling elite, thereby weakening the 'sanctioning power' of the state (Nepstad 2011, 2013). As a result, it is claimed, non-violent campaigns have been twice as successful as violent struggles (Chenoweth and Stephan 2008: 9). These strategies have been adopted – and adapted – by a range of contemporary revolutionary movements, from those that ousted state bureaucratic regimes in Central and Eastern Europe in 1989, to the 2011 uprisings in North Africa and the Middle East.

As the literature on non-violent protest has developed, it has taken two main forms. The first concentrates on dynamics within opposition movements. For Wendy Pearlman (2011), non-violent strategies can only be sustained by a movement with high levels of internal cohesion. An 'organizational structure of cohesion' enforces discipline (ensuring restraint, heightening credibility, and enhancing solidarity), cultivates clear

strategies (infusing participants with a clear sense of collective purpose), and promotes resilience (particularly in the face of regime coercion) (Pearlman 2011: 11-12, 22; also see Nepstad 2011: 131-3). A fragmented movement, by way of contrast, has a greater chance of becoming violent (Pearlman 2011: 14-20). Erica Chenoweth and Maria Stephan (2011: 17, 82) argue that the 'strategic advantages' of non-violent protest lie in its capacity to mobilize mass publics and delegitimize adversaries. The staying power of diverse, mass participation movements, it is argued, can prompt 'loyalty shifts' within state security services that, in turn, increase the likelihood of success (Chenoweth and Stephan 2011: 46-50). A second strand of literature is more 'structural'. Daniel Ritter (2015), for example, sees the international context as crucial to the capacity of non-violent movements to engender change. Ritter (2015: 5) emphasizes the ways in which an international context characterized by the 'iron cage of liberalism' traps authoritarian states into accepting at least the rudiments of democratic practices, from holding elections to permitting the formation of human rights councils (also see Levitsky and Way 2010; Bunce and Wolchik 2011). Although these practices are intended to be little more than a 'façade', their unintended consequence is to open up authoritarian regimes to scrutiny from domestic and international audiences (Ritter 2015: 63). If authoritarian regimes are to maintain the material benefits of ties with Western states, from arms to aid, then they must open up a space for non-violent opposition to emerge – the structural context of *international* liberalism provides an opening within which *domestic* non-violent opposition can mobilize. Sharon Nepstad (2011: 129-31) complements Ritter's analysis of the structural factors that 'open the door' to non-violent protest movements through attention to the actions of state security forces. For Nepstad (2011, 2013), it is these actions that largely determine the success or failure of non-violent movements. Defections from, or the unreliability of, security forces are far more likely when opposition protests are non-violent, particularly if this is combined with coercive forces that have little stake in the regime and that share forms of identity with opposition movements, such as a common religion or ethnicity (Nepstad 2013: 339, 342-3).[3]

This article combines the literature on non-violent protest with existing work on revolutions in order to assess the causes and outcomes of the 2011 Arab Uprisings. It does so by highlighting the centrality of three causal factors: first, the role of

international dynamics in providing the context for the revolutions; second, the critical nature of the hold of elites over state coercive apparatuses; and third, the ways in which opposition movements maintained high levels of participation, in part because of their use of information and communication technologies, but lacked sufficient cohesion to foster projects of state transformation. Taken together, these three factors illustrate the need for analyses that stresses the role of international context, coercive solidarity, and the organizational coherence of an opposition – in that order. The next section of the paper discusses these factors in turn. The conclusion extends this analysis by assessing the divergent outcomes of the Arab Uprisings and what their trajectories tell us about the place of revolution in the contemporary world.

International dynamics

The first contention of this article is that international dynamics acted as the precipitant cause of the 2011 Arab Uprisings. This section concentrates on Egypt both for reasons of space and because Egypt is, for most observers, the 'pivotal case' (Bunce 2013) within the 2011 revolutionary wave. There are three ways in which international dynamics fuelled the 2011 uprising in Egypt. First, client-patron relations destabilized the legitimacy of the Egyptian state. Most notably, Egypt's ties to the United States and Israel were deeply unpopular amongst the general public. In the years leading up to the Arab Uprisings, Egypt was the second largest recipient of US aid (worth around $1 billion dollars per year in military aid alone), one of the main sites for the torture and rendition of suspected al-Qaida suspects, and a backer of Israeli policies in the region, including the blockade of Gaza.[4] These policies generated a sense of alienation between the regime and the people. According to the 2010 Pew Global Attitudes Survey, 82% of Egyptians strongly disapproved of the United States (up from 69% five years earlier). Opposition to the regime's support for the US and Israel also found its way onto the street: there were large scale protests in solidarity with the second Palestinian intifada in 2000 and even larger protests following the onset of the 2003 Iraq war. These protests helped to forge ties that, in turn, sustained the 2011 uprising (Gunning and Baron 2013; Cole 2014; Ritter 2015).

A second international component of the 2011 uprising in Egypt can be found in the reforms instituted by the Mubarak regime in response to international dynamics.

During the 1990s, pressure from international financial institutions to 'open up' saw the Mubarak regime institute a range of neoliberal policies: the reduction of tariffs, the abandoning of interest rate controls, and the removal of import quotas (Dodge 2012; Tripp 2013; Cole 2014). This served to intensify state dependence on Suez, aid, remittances, and tourism, making the Egyptian economy more susceptible to international markets. A dip in commodity prices during the mid-1990s forced the state to further leverage its debt and reduce public expenditure. The subsequent austerity measures prompted a decline in living standards for much of the population, even as a 'network of privilege' (many of whom were associated with Gamal Mubarak, the President's son), used personal connections with state brokers to secure lucrative contracts (Cole 2014: 36-42). The conspicuous consumption of this elite network meant that they were increasingly seen as a minority caste operating outside, or on top of, civil society. At the same time, worsening living standards stimulated opposition around the loss of dignity (*al-karama*) associated with the degrading of social conditions (Alexander 2011: 5-8). Between 2004-8, Egypt went through the most sustained period of labor unrest in its history: over 1.7 million Egyptians took part in nearly 2000 strikes (Ritter 2015: 160). Although the scale of this unrest dropped in the years immediately preceding the 2011 uprising, the significance of the strikes lay in the forging of robust opposition networks and the challenges these posed to state authority (Beinin and Vairel 2013; Gunning and Baron 2013; Cole 2014).

The implementation of neoliberalism in Egypt went hand-in-hand with the implementation of 'façade democracy'. Following the end of the Cold War, democracy promotion assumed a higher profile for many Western states, particularly the US, and international organizations (Levitsky and Way 2010; Ritter 2015). Although democracy promotion was often 'low intensity', it led the Mubarak regime to permit the formation of a number of human rights groups. It also led to the holding of multi-party elections. These elections were not 'level playing fields' – to the contrary, competition was 'real, but unfair' (Levitsky and Way 2010: 5). But even if incumbent power was skewed through control of the media, superior spending power, intimidation, and, occasionally, outright coercion (Levitsky and Way 2010: 13, 62-6, 72), Mubarak's regime was nonetheless forced to recognize a legal opposition. In the 2005 elections, the Muslim Brotherhood won every parliamentary seat in which they entered a candidate. Even

given an environment of deeply circumscribed competition, opposition victories became a regular feature of Egyptian politics during the late 2000s. In November 2010, allegations of vote rigging by Mubarak's National Democratic Party (NDP) intended to limit its electoral defeat only served to further weaken Mubarak's position. In turn, these defeats marked a shift in opposition strategies away from direct confrontation with the state towards the embracing of formal constitutional and democratic procedures (Ritter 2015: 131). In sum: the structural conditions forged by changing international dynamics constructed a new operating environment that served to delegitimize the regime and prompt a shift in opposition strategies (Ritter 2015: 132). This not only raised levels of day-to-day opposition to the Mubarak regime, it also served to make processes such as elections much more important. Opposition movements watched closely as authoritarian regimes were ousted through the ballot box in Serbia, Ukraine, and Georgia during the 2000s. The high degree of leverage enjoyed by Western states and international organizations over the Egyptian state regime meant that such dynamics also worked to destabilize the Mubarak regime (Levitsky and Way 2010: 71-2).

The final way that international dynamics served as the precipitant cause of the 2011 uprisings was through the power of example, whether this came about through demonstration effect or deliberate emulation (Beissinger 2007; Patel, Bunce, and Wolchik 2011; Weyland 2012). In the post-Cold War era, revolutionary waves appear to be intensifying as liberal markets, democratization, and ideas of individual autonomy (as vested in the human rights regime) foster a set of transgressive repertoires that threaten the hold of authoritarian regimes (Beck 2011; Beissinger 2014). The Arab Uprisings were the latest in a long wave of revolutions that encompassed the collapse of communism in Eastern and Central Europe as well as later movements in Serbia, Georgia, Ukraine, Lebanon, and elsewhere. In early 2011, the demonstration effect of the protests in Tunisia and Egypt spread quickly around the region and beyond, spurring movements in Mauritania, Djibouti, and Sudan as well as those in Bahrain, Syria, Yemen, Oman, Libya, and Jordan. This effect was sustained by the transnational diffusion of revolutionary repertoires, whether through impersonal networks (such as forms of media) or the personal connections fostered by protestors in different countries (Bunce and Wolchik 2007: 93-7; Tarrow 2012: 174). These transnational

networks circulated strategies, slogans, and forms of organization. They also formed part of a 'transnational public sphere' that fostered a unified set of 'Arab issues' (Lynch 2011: 302; Lynch 2012: 10-1). Media outlets, from *al-Jazeera* to the independent Egyptian newspaper *Al-Masry Al-Youm*, reported where the mainstream media could not, evading state capture and helping to galvanize new solidarities (Lynch 2011: 309; Lynch 2012: 11). In this way, a new media environment served as a direct interface between publics and elites, helping to promote solidarities between opposition groups in different countries and, in turn, working as 'emotional triggers' that decreased fear of the regime, while heightening feelings of hope and solidarity within opposition movements. All around the region, protestors chanted 'We are not afraid' during 'Days of Rage' intended to foster not just domestic uprisings, but a transnational revolutionary wave (Bellin 2012: 136; Pearlman 2013).

The role of the coercive apparatus

Opposition groups around the region were, therefore, given space to manoeuvre by the 'expanded access' fostered by shifts in international ties and the 'unstable alignments' that arose from the failure of regimes to cope effectively with these shifts (Tarrow 2012: 78-80; also see Ritter 2015). But international dynamics did not cause the revolutions by themselves. Crucial to the emergence of the revolutionary wave in 2011 was the weakening of the region's 'neo-patrimonial' regimes, which combined personalized rule with a degree of legal-rational functioning (Eisenstadt 1973; Weber 1978[1922]). For many years, these regimes appeared stable, so much so that a good deal of the literature on the region revolved around the resilience of authoritarianism in the Middle East (e.g. Bellin 2004). However, over time, patrimonial rule, personality cults, and the use of arbitrary force failed to substitute for the lack of institutional buffers between exclusionary states and civil societies (Bellin 2004: 145-6). The lack of intermediate associations between state and society meant that elites were insulated from the people, finding few effective channels by which to meet grievances and institutionalize contestation. This served to 'hollow out' state-society relations, making regimes vulnerable to surges of discontent from below. Such discontent, ranging from strikes to assassinations and from flash mobs to occupations, was a regular feature of contentious politics in the region, even if its main effect was to strengthen the position of the security apparatus. States in the region could subjugate their people, but they

lacked the institutional depth to regulate society efficiently. In short, they were 'fierce', but not 'strong' (Ayubi 1995: xi).

This combination of changing international dynamics and state vulnerability combined to generate a systemic crisis in many states in the region, as illustrated again by the example of Egypt. Before the 2011 uprising, the legitimacy of the Egyptian state rested on three main pillars: the 1952 revolution; the role of the military in freeing Egypt from Western hegemony (particularly the nationalization and subsequent conflict over Suez); and the 'socialist development' policies pursued by Nasser, during which the state took over the planning, coordination, and management of production. This had the effect of demobilizing social forces, including private landholders and the bourgeoisie, by using land reform and industrialization as tools for exerting state authority over economic activities (Dodge 2012: 6-7).[5] It also led to reasonable levels of state-led growth, fortified by price subsidies that made basic commodities affordable to the majority of the population. State income was further generated through aid, particularly from the US, which as indicated above, paid handsomely in exchange for Egypt's recognition of Israel following the 1979 Camp David Accords, its opposition to Iran, the suppression of Islamists (including the execution of the 'Islamist Lenin' – Sayyid Qutb), and the regular passage of US warships through the Suez Canal.

As also noted above, a range of international dynamics, including the state's embracing of neoliberalism and its turn to 'façade democracy', served to eat away at the legitimacy of the Mubarak regime. A vast security establishment was constructed on the back of two million informants, who underpinned an extensive system of policing, state security, and state-sponsored gangs (*baltagiyya*). At the same time, demographic changes (particularly population growth) placed additional burdens on the state. By 2011, around one third of the Egyptian population was aged 15-29 (Shehata 2011: 28; also see Cole 2014). This exerted considerable pressures on job markets, just as the state was becoming more neoliberal, more personalistic, and more repressive. In 2009, unemployment in the region reached nearly 25%; many more were in informal, insecure work (Goldstone 2011: 12; Gunning and Baron 2013: 149). Unemployment rates were even higher amongst young people and disproportionately felt within the middle class – college graduates in Egypt were ten times more likely to have no job as

those with only a primary school education (Goldstone 2011: 12). Short-term triggers added to the sense of state failure. Between 2008-10, food prices increased by over a third (Dodge 2012: 11; Gunning and Baron 2013: 134). The simultaneous removal of food subsidies (the bread subsidy alone cost the state $3 billion per year) fuelled resentment against the regime; over two-fifths of Egyptians lived at or below the poverty line (Abdelrahman 2013: 574; Gunning and Baron 2013: 131). Despite the decline in its economic sovereignty after two decades of neoliberal reforms, the legitimacy of the Egyptian state was tightly bound with its capacity to guarantee a basic standard of living. It was, therefore, particularly susceptible to such crisis. To most Egyptians, it seemed like the state had abandoned the poor for the sake of the rich.

By 2011, Egypt, like many other states in the region, was home to a neo-patrimonial state sustained by 'repressions, payoffs, and elite solidarity' (Quandt 1998: 30). Networks of crony capitalists secured profits through personal connections, while the majority of the population had seen their living standards fall, often quite dramatically. State and society were held together only through an extensive coercive apparatus – and it was this apparatus that largely determined the fate of the protests. While state, military, and security services remained aligned, Mubarak's position was stable. If this alliance fractured, then his position was far more tenuous. Despite this vulnerability, the Egyptian regime was slow to respond to the threat posed by the December 2010 protests in Tunisia, even after the Tunisian President Zine Ben Ali stood down on 14th January. On 25th January, protestors called for a 'Day of Rage', chosen because it was a national holiday (Police Day) marking the anniversary of a massacre of police officers by the British in 1952. From this point on, protests spread in both breadth (reaching Alexandria, Suez, Ismailia, and other parts of the country) and depth (upscaling from tens of thousands to hundreds of thousands of people). Although protestors formally embraced non-violence (*silmiyya*), resistance was shown to state forces and the *baltagiyya*, not least in the popular quarters of Cairo, by organized groups of soccer fans ('Ultras'), and in the mass burning down of police stations around the country (Ismail 2012; Dorsey 2012).[6] Many hundreds of protestors were killed by state security forces (Holmes 2012: 397-9; Gunning and Baron 2013: 2).

As protests intensified, Mubarak's hold on power was weakened by contradictory dynamics of concession and repression. On the concession side: the President promised to resign at the end of his term of office; on the repression side: violence against protestors escalated. These contradictory dynamics served to splinter the coercive apparatus, sapping Mubarak's support within the police, his party, and the military. Large numbers of police failed to show up for work, took off their badges, or went over to the protestors. On 5th February, the entire executive committee of the NDP was forced to resign, including Gamal Mubarak. As the protests escalated, the military pursued a 'double game': permitting protests to continue (so as to weaken the position of state officials vis-à-vis the military), while simultaneously containing them (so as to restrict the capacity of the protests to radically reshape military prerogatives) (Stein 2012: 24). However, the removal of Gamal Mubarak and his associates from formal positions of authority reduced the need for intra-elite competition. At the same time, the close association drawn between the protestors struggle and the military (as in the notion of the 'one hand' shared by the people and the army against the regime) pushed the military closer to the protests (Stein 2012: 24). At first, the military refused to fire on the protestors and protected them from state-sponsored violence, albeit selectively. But on 10th February, the military publicly endorsed the people's 'legitimate demands'. Mubarak resigned the next day. The head of the General Intelligence Service, Omar Suleiman, was left to oversee a transfer of power to the Supreme Council of Armed Forces, which opened negotiations on a new constitution and elections.

These events make clear two points. First, the patrimonialism of the Mubarak regime made it vulnerable to both elite fracture and surges of discontent – it was despotically strong, but infrastructurally weak (Mann 1984; Goodwin 2001). The gap between rich and poor, and state and society, plus the everyday brutality of the security apparatus, made the regime susceptible to extended contention from below. Such contention was a regular feature of Egyptian political life for many decades; it took increasingly acute form during the 2000s (Beinin and Vairel 2013). During this period, the regime was held together through a combination of elite pacts and shared rents. This highlights the importance of a second, linked, point: the defection of the Egyptian military made Mubarak's position untenable (Bellin 2012: 130). By early 2011, the effectiveness of the Egyptian state, like that of many of its counterparts in North Africa and the Middle East,

had been eroded through shifts in international relations, rising levels of inequality, corruption, cronyism, and widespread contention. In this context of weakening state effectiveness, the defection of the armed forces was crucial. Where this took place (as in Tunisia and Egypt), autocrats were ousted. Where the military and the regime remained united, protests were either decompressed (as in the Gulf monarchies) or became bloody (as in Syria). These divergent outcomes are the subject of the final section of the paper. For now, it is worth noting that autocrats in the region often sought to coup-proof their regimes by constructing security apparatuses that could counter-balance the military (Bou Nassif 2014). However, even as this strategy reduced the likelihood of coups from above, it made autocrats vulnerable to popular surges from below by reducing the stake of the military in the regime. In Egypt, for example, the spoils of the 'military economy' were unevenly distributed. While high-ranking officers benefitted directly from their close relationship with state and corporate elites, junior officers and the rank-and-file were left out of the spoils. This, in turn, made them more likely to defect in the face of concerted opposition movements (Nepstad 2013: 342-3, 345).

The organizational character of opposition movements

As noted in the previous section, it is often claimed that contemporary revolutionary movements lack the coherence of previous movements. Indeed, over recent years, there has been a pronounced shift away from the hierarchical vision espoused by vanguard revolutionary parties towards a flatter structure associated with popular coalitions.[7] Unsurprisingly, therefore, the coalition that deposed Mubarak was made up of disparate forces, including labor groups, urban youths, students, professionals, and religious groups, which were only loosely organized.[8] But if, as argued by much of the literature on non-violent protest, organizational coherence is critical to the success of popular coalitions (e.g. Pearlman 2011), how can relatively flat, somewhat amorphous movements be sustained? Interrogation of the ways the opposition coalition in Egypt attempted to construct a coherent movement provides a number of insights into this question.

During the 2011 Arab Uprisings, it is argued, popular coalitions were unified in large part through information and communication technologies (e.g. Brooke 2011; Howard and Hussain 2011; Simmons 2011; Walgrave, Bennett, Van Laer, and Breunig 2011;

Hussain and Howard 2013). Particularly important in this respect was the role played by 'wired cosmopolitans', mostly young, well-travelled, technologically savvy professionals, who coordinated opposition activities and translated local events for foreign media. Three-quarters of the social media traffic around Egypt's '25 January' revolution came from outside the region, while 90% of tweets about the uprising originated from outside Egypt (Aday, Farrell, Lynch, Sides, and Freelon 2012: 11-13); Brym, Godbout, Hoffbauer, Menard, and Zhang 2014: 269-70). The coordinating role of these wired cosmopolitans, and ICTs more generally, is a crucial issue in assessing the organizational character of the protest movements. If they are unable to sustain unity, popular coalitions are unlikely to generate programmes of state transformation, even if they succeed in ousting an unpopular ruler. Indeed, mass participation, often hailed as a necessary cause of both non-violent protest and democratic outcomes (e.g. Chenoweth and Stephan 2011), may act *against* the fostering of organizational coherence. Without a means of uniting a fragmented, often hastily constructed opposition, the impact of protests is likely to be limited. In short: opposition requires organizing. For some analysts and protestors, ICTs were this organizational vehicle during the 2011 protests, providing a means through which messages were shared, grievances were aired, and abuses were documented (Howard and Hussain 2011: 36; Cole 2014: 8-13). For ICT enthusiasts, technologies have the capacity to perform several key functions: overcome collective action problems, reshape political opportunities, connect previously fragmented sites of opposition, and mobilize people to action (Ayres 1999; Bennett *et al* 2008; Brooke 2011; Simmons 2011; Walgrave *et al* 2011; Bennett and Segerberg 2013). In this way, ICTs are said to have transformed the organization, vision, and strategies of Arab protest movements. By fostering movements out of reach of formal sites of political authority, particularly the state, and by sharing information both immediately and without official sanction, it is argued that ICTs provide the 'digital scaffolding' for a new type of politics (Simmons 2011: 590; Hussain and Howard 2013: 64).

As with the adoption by many Arab opposition movements of non-violent strategies, the connection between ICTs and mass protests does not begin with the 2011 uprisings. Cell phones and text messages played an important role in the 'Orange Revolution' in Ukraine in 2004. And social media began to be seen as a major influence on mass uprisings following the extensive use of YouTube during the 2007 'Saffron Revolution'

in Burma, the 2009 'Twitter Revolution' in Moldova, and the 'Green Revolution' in Iran later that year. Such associations were given extra impetus by a high-profile speech in 2010 by US Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton (2010), who argued that 'the spread of information networks are forming a new nervous system for our planet'. The Internet, Clinton claimed, provided the first ever 'global networked commons'. Comparing bloggers to dissidents and social media to samizdat, Clinton (2010) argued that the Internet 'is like Radio Free Europe on steroids'. She went on to announce a range of policies designed to break down 'virtual walls' and secure 'Internet freedom'. Leading advisers such as Alec Ross and Jared Cohen were charged with pursuing this '21st century statecraft' (Cull 2013: 134). There were well-publicized visits to Iraq (where the retinue included Jack Dorsey, founder of Twitter) and Colombia, where officials met with Oscar Morales, the web designer who used Facebook to generate a campaign against FARC guerrillas.

The Arab Uprisings, therefore, fit smoothly within existing academic and political understandings of the relationship between ICTs and democratization. But to what extent did such technologies help to cohere opposition groups? Once again, it is worth examining the case of Egypt. There is little doubt that Facebook played some role in organizing protests in Egypt. The Facebook group *Kulina Khaled Said* ('We Are All Khaled Said'), established in commemoration of a blogger murdered by Egyptian police in 2010, gathered hundreds of thousands of members, many of whom took part in demonstrations against the regime. The widely circulated autopsy photo of Khaled Said served a mobilizing function comparable to the video of Nedā Āghā-Soltān, the Iranian protestor shot dead by police during the 2009 'Green Revolution', which became a potent point of connection between protestors inside the country and transnational networks. Such points of connection usually circulated outside formal media outlets, whether public or private, many of which were distrusted by Arab publics. These informally circulated videos, photos, and messages served as 'information cascades', highlighting regime brutality and fuelling a sense of outrage (Lynch 2011, 2012). They also acted as connecting nodes between otherwise disparate networks, energizing empathetic cascades that ratcheted up pressure on elites to 'do something' (Walgrave *et al* 2011: 329). During major events, such as the removal of Hosni Mubarak, these

cascades helped to foster sharp spikes in the use of digital media (Hussain and Howard 2013: 57; Brym *et al* 2014: 270).

Such dynamics certainly worried Arab states. At the end of January 2011, the Egyptian government required the country's main Internet Service Provider's (ISPs) to disable their networks. The government also asked Vodafone for details on subscribers and used the network to send out pro-regime texts. After five days, however, the government lifted its blockade, seeing the ban as igniting rather than suppressing dissent. In other words, more people came onto the streets once the Internet had been disabled. This is a puzzling outcome given claims about the necessity of ICTs in mobilizing protest. Some protestors may have been able to workaround the blackout via smartphones or alternative means of communication (Lynch 2012: 90). For the most part, though, the shutdown worked. But if protestors are supposed to have *required* ICTs in order to solve collective action problems, connect disparate networks, and coordinate activities, it is curious that protests in Egypt intensified during the period in which the Internet was disabled.

Perhaps this is not such a puzzle. As even the most animated cyber-enthusiasts accept, digital data leaves an audit trail, one that can be used for surveillance and censorship as well as for autonomy and transparency (e.g. Brooke 2011: 233-5; Lynch 2011: 306; Hussain and Howard 2013: 50, 60). Social media is often appropriated by authoritarian governments in order to trace protestors, spread propaganda, and monitor the activities of protest groups. This is something that many activists appear to recognize. In January 2011, a pamphlet entitled 'How to Protest Intelligently' was circulated widely amongst protest groups in Egypt. The pamphlet explicitly asked protestors not to use Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, or other websites because, 'they are all monitored by the Ministry of the Interior'.[9] After the 2009 Green Revolution, the Iranian government formed a cybercrime unit charged with countering the 'American led cyber-war' and arresting those guilty of spreading 'insults and lies' about the regime through the Internet (Morozov 2011: 10). The Chinese government has constructed a 'Great Firewall' around the Internet and has become adept at initiating 'online blockades'. A number of authoritarian states are well versed in carrying out 'Distributed Denial of Service' attacks, while the Internet has proved to be a valuable source of authoritarian

propaganda. Vladimir Putin's United Russia party, for example, enjoys an extensive online presence, using the Internet as a tool for spreading its messages. In short, autocratic regimes are skilled practitioners when it comes to adopting 'networked' techniques of surveillance and control (MacKinnon 2011; Morozov 2011).

On the one hand, therefore, ICTs can help to coordinate revolutionary protests. On the other hand, they can be used equally well to disrupt these protests. To put this another way, the utility of ICTs depends on how they are embedded within wider fields of action. At times, ICTs serve as 'echo bubbles' rather than 'tools of connection', amplifying in-group communication and reinforcing existing sentiments (Pariser 2011; Aday *et al* 2012). This means that ICTs can foster a dialogue of the deaf as easily as they encourage a unifying narrative. And even this dialogue takes place unevenly. Internet penetration rates in North Africa and the Middle East in 2011 were not particularly high. Fewer than 8% of Egyptians were registered Facebook users in April 2011, while 131,000 had active twitter accounts (0.15% of the population); less than 10% of Egyptians say that Internet news sites or social media were their principal sources of information during the 2011 uprising (Brym *et al* 2014: 269-70). This may be a strategically important minority (Howard and Hussain 2011: 47), but such figures still suggest that a digital divide is in operation which is a long way removed from hopes of fostering a single virtual commons. Nor is there evidence that the ways in which ICTs 'internationalize' protests by connecting local struggles with transnational circuits had a pronounced effect on domestic elites (Brym *et al* 2014). Those who see ICTs as valuable instruments of mobilization would do well to concentrate less on social media (which are rarely used) than on cell phones (which are commonplace). And they would do even better to relax assumptions about the *requirement* of ICTs to revolutionary movements. ICTs are good at generating 'weak ties' – networks of (often fleeting) acquaintances that 'likes' or 'shares' the same tastes (Della Porta and Mosca 2005). They are less good at fostering 'strong ties' – the deep connections of solidarity and commitment that undergird collective protest (Gladwell 2010; Bennett and Segerberg 2013: 50). This latter form of connection, best forged through personal ties of kinship and friendship, or in the midst of struggle, is not easily made. To the contrary, it costs. And it is not something that ICTs foster easily.

The grander claims of cyber-enthusiasts do not, therefore, stand up to scrutiny. Revolutions always contain tools of communication: stories, rituals, banners, songs, cartoons, graffiti, and posters that mobilize protest through affective cultural performances (Selbin 2010; Tarrow 2012; Tripp 2013). Sometimes these symbolic repertoires are articulated through words, such as 'patriot' or 'citoyen', which acted as tools of certification denoting who was inside and outside the French revolutionary struggle (Tarrow 2012: ch. 10). Contemporary examples include the 'Days of Rage' that became critical points of identification during the Arab Uprisings. At other times, such repertoires are articulated in verse and song – the importance of the Egyptian guitarist Ramy Essam, the Tunisian hip-hop artist El Général, and the Syrian musician Ibrahim Qashoush to the Arab Uprisings take place within a longer tradition of revolutionary protest music (Clover 2009). Whichever form such tropes take, the key point is that analysts of opposition movements should direct attention to the message rather than the medium. During the Arab Uprisings, it was not ICTs *per se*, but the integration of these technologies within wider communicative ecologies based on strong, personal ties of trust that enabled protests to cohere (Bennett and Segerberg 2013: 88, 196). Most often, protestors gained their information through face-to-face communication or via word-of-mouth messages, the most trusted mediums of all.

This analysis yields two points. First, like many contemporary revolutionary movements, the organizational character of the popular coalitions in North Africa and the Middle East was predominantly horizontal and decentralized. This made them highly participatory. But participation came at a price. Although good at galvanizing protests against incumbents, these movements were less successful at turning mass protests into coherent, enduring opposition forces. As a result, post-uprising pacts were made out of the reach of the popular coalitions that had been at the heart of the protests. Second, the use of ICTs had a range of effects, from connecting local and transnational networks to helping construct a new 'ecology of dissent' made up of an 'associational cluster' of activist networks (Bennett and Sederberg 2013: 199). Crucially for the purposes of this article, although ICTs helped to raise levels of participation and, to some extent, co-ordinate protests, they did little to foster coherent, sustainable oppositional movements that would allow protestors to maintain pressure on their respective regimes. At times, ICTs proved to be a useful means of mobilizing protestors.

But they did not help with the task of generating coherent movements able to sustain protest over the long haul.

This speaks to a broader issue of direct concern to the literature on non-violent protest. As noted in the previous section, some scholarship in this tradition points to the importance of generating large, diverse coalitions (e.g. Chenoweth and Stephan 2011); others stress the need for internal cohesion within the protest movement (e.g. Pearlman 2011). The analysis presented in this article suggests that each part of this literature is looking at different aspects of the same protest cycle. The former helps to explain why some revolutionary movements in North Africa and the Middle East were able to oust authoritarian regimes – the despots who led these regimes served as a common enemy and, thereby, a temporary point of unity around which diverse coalitions could mobilize. The latter makes clear why, after autocrats had been ousted, many movements were unable to consolidate their victories. The diversity of the coalition that helped them succeed in the first phase of the struggle worked against them in the second – participants shared a common short-term goal (to oust the dictator), but not a long-term vision of how political, economic, and symbolic relations were to be reforged. As a result, even when autocrats were overthrown, the aftermath of the revolutions saw elites sidestep revolutionary coalitions, decompress their challenge, or engage them in violent struggle. The result, as the next section shows, was considerable divergence in terms of the outcomes of the revolutions.[10]

Revolution, Non-Violence and the Arab Uprisings

The three issues discussed in the previous section – international dynamics, the role of the coercive apparatus, and the organizational character of opposition movements – help to explain both why the Arab Uprisings took place and why many of them have been unsuccessful. If the 'minimum condition' (Hobsbawm 1986; Stinchcombe 1999) of revolutionary success is the takeover of the principal means of production, means of violence, and means of information in a society, only Tunisia has passed this threshold. Despite widespread concern about the gradual pace of change in Tunisia, the Ben Ali regime has been ousted, a new constitution is in place, multi-party elections have been held, the military has been confined to barracks, the political police has been disbanded, and a range of commissions have been established to tackle corruption and related

activities. These are no small measures. In Egypt, by contrast, events since the overthrow of Mubarak have demonstrated the salience of 'old politics' over 'new politics' as the military, existing parties, mosques, and other entrenched interests have dominated the political landscape. In Yemen, although President Saleh was forced to resign in early 2012, demands for further concessions and, in some areas, secession speak to the likelihood of ongoing contention. Libya too is undergoing a period of considerable civil strife, although this does not match the scale of the bloodshed in Syria, where the failure of protestors to oust President Bashar al-Assad has led to the onset of a brutal civil war, one that has been internationalized by the emergence of 'Islamic State', whose military campaigns in Syria and Iraq has prompted intervention by Western states.[11] Bahrain's uprising was crushed by a combination of monarchical obduracy and Saudi force. Through the vehicle of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), the Saudi's sent troops and police into Bahrain in order to secure the regime against protest, following this with large supplies of petrodollars in an attempt to appease protestors. The Saudi's also gave Jordan a $1 billion 'gift' and offered a $4 billion 'grant' to Egypt, while mollifying domestic unrest through a reform package worth around $100 billion (Lynch 2012: 131; Matthiesen 2013: 129; Brownlee *et al* 2015: 54). GCC states also stoked sectarian identities in an attempt to divide opposition coalitions (Matthiesen 2013; Wehrey 2013). This threefold strategy of repression, aid, and sectarian polarization was initiated in a number of Gulf Monarchies, including Kuwait, Morocco, and Jordan, with similar results: the decompression of protest. Together, GCC states promised (even if they did not always deliver) billions of dollars of aid around the region, while simultaneously clamping down on opposition groups and mobilizing sectarian affinities in a counterrevolutionary strategy that acted as a brake on the uprisings.[12]

Overall, therefore, the immediate outcomes of the 2011 uprisings can be split into four main groups: first, successful revolution (Tunisia); second, mixed outcomes in which autocrats have been deposed, but transformation has been limited (Egypt, Yemen); third, the decompression of protest through a combination of 'authoritarian upgrading' (Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Kuwait, Morocco, Jordan) (Heydemann 2013); and fourth, the emergence of violent polarization (Libya, Syria). As noted above, no state in the region bar Tunisia meets the minimum criteria of revolutionary change, let alone the

'maximum condition' of revolutionary success, understood as the systemic transformation of economic, political, and symbolic institutions (Hobsbawm 1986: 24). All in all, two-thirds of the region's autocrats have survived the uprisings and even where they haven't, as in Libya, Syria, and Yemen, the outcome has been ruinous (Geddes, Wright and Frantz 2014: 326). In many cases, 'dissidents made the first noises, but soldiers had the last word' (Brownlee *et al* 2015: 63).

In addition to the factors outlined in earlier sections of this article, there are two main reasons for this lack of success. First, revolutionaries in states outside the original onset of the crisis overstated the possibilities of revolutionary success. The uncertainty generated by the ousting of Ben Ali in Tunisia generated 'cognitive shortcuts': the propensity to place too much weight on dramatic news from elsewhere and the drawing of firm conclusions from relatively sparse information (Weyland 2012: 920-4). This is a common theme in revolutionary waves, but it was heightened in 2011 by two additional factors: the despotic character of states in the region, which meant that they had few institutional filters through which to channel information and meet grievances; and the relatively weak organizational capacity of the protest movements, as documented in the previous section. Second, once the wave had begun, regimes learned quickly. Oftentimes, revolutionary waves become less successful the further they travel from their original point of instigation (Beissinger 2007; Patel, Bunce, and Wolchik 2011; Della Porta and Tarrow 2012; Weyland 2012). This is the case for three reasons: because revolutionaries enact their protests in increasingly inhospitable settings; because authoritarian regimes learn how to demobilize their challengers; and because authoritarian state-society relations do not disappear overnight. In this sense, the Tunisian uprising was successful not just because of favorable international dynamics, the defection of the coercive apparatus, or the relative coherence of its opposition, but because it was the *first* such struggle in the region.

This analysis suggests that those studying both revolutions and non-violent protests should be concerned less with the *fact* of the emergence of a revolutionary wave than with the *timing* of its emergence. This, in turn, provides two particular lessons for those working on non-violent protests. First, to date, much civil resistance theory and practice has focused on ways to oust authoritarian rulers. Less attention has been paid to what

happens after rulers have been deposed. The divergent outcomes of the Arab Uprisings make clear that just as much attention should be paid to developing post-conflict visions and strategies as there is on constructing opposition movements. It is one thing to oust a dictator; it is another to construct viable economies and systems of governance. Wendy Pearlman (2011) has noted the importance of organizational coherence to ousting dictators. But this is just as important to the post-struggle stage. In the aftermath of a successful revolution, diverse coalitions must be molded into well-ordered movements that are able to govern. Key to their success is the articulation of a clear vision that is able to go beyond opposition and sustain a new government. Second, those non-violent protest movements operating once a protest cycle is underway should be aware that autocrats are sometimes fast learners. As a result, techniques and strategies that work in the early stages of a revolutionary wave are unlikely to work once the wave is underway. In these circumstances, rather than replicating earlier techniques and strategies of contention, protestors will need to innovate in order to keep pace with autocratic learning.[13]

That the outcomes of the 2011 uprisings have been, in the short-term, one of largely unsuccessful revolution speaks to a broader set of questions about the place of revolution in the contemporary world. In general terms, the 2011 uprisings bare a family resemblance to the 'negotiated revolutions' that have become regular features of the post-Cold War world (Lawson 2004, 2005). 'Modern revolutions', a form of social transformation that emerged in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and, it is argued, declined in the late twentieth century, are often defined as 'rapid, basic transformations of a society's state and class structures, accompanied and in part carried through by class based revolts from below' (Skocpol 1979: 287). The core feature of modern revolutions was that they sought to transform political, economic, and symbolic fields of action simultaneously. Negotiated revolutions, by contrast, seek to transform political and symbolic fields of action, but without a concomitant commitment to a program of economic transformation (Lawson 2004, 2005).

There are five main components of negotiated revolutions: their origins in a systemic crisis in which the role of the coercive apparatus is decisive; their rejection of armed confrontation; their formal acceptance of non-violence; their welcoming by liberal

international actors; and their fostering of weak rather than strong states (Lawson 2004: 227-34; Lawson 2005: 482-91). All five of these components have been present, albeit in varying degrees, in the 2011 Arab Uprisings. First, the neo-patrimonial structure of regimes in the region made them vulnerable to changes in international relations, the defection of the coercive apparatus, and popular mobilization. What made the 2011 uprisings distinct from previous protest cycles was the defection of the coercive apparatus – without the support of the military, figures like Ben Ali and Mubarak could not survive. In contrast, where the military remained allied to state elites, regimes were able to endure. Second, even though protestors in some states forcibly deposed their regimes, few opposition coalitions had the capacity to engage the state in armed confrontation. In part, this was because of the illegitimacy of violence through its association with the security apparatus. In part, it was because the opposition, with the exception of Libya and Syria, did not contain a faction willing to take up arms in a concerted way.[14] This, in turn, links to a third point – the formal association of the movements with non-violence. This embracing of non-violent repertoires made the Arab Uprisings more palatable to liberal international actors – the fourth characteristic of negotiated revolutions. As Barack Obama put it in the aftermath of Mubarak's removal from office, 'it was the moral force of nonviolence – not terrorism, not mindless killing, but nonviolence … that bent the arc of history' (in Ritter 2015: 169). Although support for the uprisings varied from case to case, there was a general sense amongst liberal international actors that the uprisings were legitimate, both in terms of their goal of ousting despotic regimes and in their formal support for non-violence. Finally, because of the limited organizational capacity of opposition movements, even when depots have been ousted, state transformation has been limited. If the 'robustness' of authoritarianism in the region has been broken, the outlook for democratization is, at best, patchy (Bellin 2012).[15]

The Arab Uprisings, therefore, share a familiar revolutionary heritage. In sociological terms, they sit largely within the framework established by the 1989 negotiated revolutions that ousted state socialism in Central and Eastern Europe, even if they depart from this schema in their lower levels of negotiation and higher levels of violence. In terms of wider currents of revolutionary theory, the 2011 uprisings belong to a stream of thought that both reinforces the legacy of 1989 and predates it. In broad

terms, both the Arab Uprisings and the collapse of state socialism can be said to sit within a family of 'civilizing and democratizing' (Selbin 2010) revolutions whose roots can be traced to the American Revolution of 1776. This places them within a distinct revolutionary tradition, one associated not only with 1776, but also with the 1848 'Springtime of Nations'. This tradition has further historical echoes, not least in the 'constitutional revolutions' that took place during the early part of the 20th century in Russia, Iran, Portugal, Mexico, China, and the Ottoman Empire (Kurzman 2008). As noted in the introduction to this article, these cases served as the wellspring of later movements associated with non-violent protest. In the short-term, the constitutionalists were overthrown by an alliance of military elites, business groups, and great powers, in most cases after extended periods of civil strife. However, even if the revolutions of 1905-12 were defeated in the short run, their main rationale (political liberalization) was more successful in the long run. That may also be the case for the 2011 Arab Uprisings. As a whole, the region is stuck between fragile pacts, illiberal renewal, and unmet grievances. The 'deep state' that characterizes the institutional connections between power brokers in the military, the state, the security services, and the private sector will not dissolve easily.[16] However, these connections will have to cohabit with (at least partial) democracies and (at least partially) reformed monarchies in a volatile environment in which alliances are being renegotiated (Lynch 2012: 9). At the same time, mobilized publics appear willing to maintain 'pressure from below' in an attempt to secure lasting changes to the status quo. The conflict between authoritarian elites and democratic publics is likely to be a regular feature of political life in the region over upcoming years – the outcomes of the 2011 Arab Uprisings will be unfolding for some time to come.

REFERENCES

Abdelrahman, Maha. 2013. "In Praise of Organization: Egypt Between Activism and Revolution." *Development and Change* 44(3): 569-85.

Ackerman, Peter and Jack DuVall. 2001. *A Century of Non-Violent Conflict*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Adamson, Fiona. 2005. "Global Liberalism Versus Political Islam: Competing Ideological Frameworks in International Politics." *International Studies Review* 7(4): 547-69.

Aday, Sean, Henry Farrell, Marc Lynch, John Sides, and Deen Freelon. 2012. *New Media and Conflict After the Arab Spring*. Washington. DC: United State Institute for Peace: Retrieved 2nd September 2014 (http://www.usip.org/files/resources/PW80.pdf)

Alexander, Jeffrey. 2011. *Performative Revolution in Egypt*. London: Bloomsbury.

Ayres, Jeffrey M. 1999. "The Cyber-Diffusion of Contention." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 566(1): 132-43.

Ayubi, Nazih. 1995. *Over-Stating the Arab State*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Bayat, Asef. 2013. *Life as Politics* 2nd edition. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Beck, Colin. 2011. "The World-Cultural Origins of Revolutionary Waves." *Social Science History* 35(2): 167-207.

Beissinger, Mark. 2007. "Structure and Example in Modular Political Phenomena: The Diffusion of Bulldozer/Rose/Orange/Tulip Revolutions." *Perspectives on Politics* 5(2): 259-76.

Beissinger. Mark. 2014. "The Changing Face of Revolution as a Mode of Regime Change. 1900-2012." Paper Presented at the Comparative Workshop on Mass Protests, LSE, 13-14th June.

Bellin, Eva. 2004. "The Robustness of Authoritarianism in the Middle East." *Comparative Politics* 36(2): 139-57.

Bellin, Eva. 2012. "Reconsidering the Robustness of Authoritarianism in the Middle East." *Comparative Politics* 44(2): 127-49.

Beinin, Joel and Frédéric Vairel. 2013. *Social Movements, Mobilization, and Contestation in the Middle East and North Africa,* 2nd edition. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Bennett, Lance, Christian Breunig, and Terri E. Givens. 2008. "Digital Media and the Organization of Anti-Iraq War Demonstrations in the US." *Political Communication* 25(3): 269-89.

Bennett, Lance and Alexandra Segerberg. 2013. *The Logic of Connective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bou Nassif, Hicham. 2014. "Generals and Autocrats: How Coup-Proofing Predetermined the Military Elite"s Behavior in the Arab Spring." Paper Presented at the 110th American Political Science Association Convention, Washington D.C. September.

Brooke, Heather. 2011. *The Revolution Will Not Be Televised*. London: Heinemann.

Brownlee, Jason, Tarek Masoud, and Andrew Reynolds. 2015. *The Arab Spring: Pathways of Repression and Reform*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brym, Robert, Melissa Godbout, Andreas Hoffbauer, Gabe Menard, and Tony Huiquan Zhang. 2014. "Social Media in the 2011 Egyptian Uprising." *The British Journal of Sociology* 65(2): 266-92.

Bunce, Valerie. 2013. "Rethinking Diffusion: 1989, the Color Revolutions, and the Arab Uprisings." Paper presented at the London School of Economics, 4th February.

Bunce, Valerie and Sharon Wolchik. 2007. "Transnational Networks, Diffusion Dynamics, and Electoral Revolutions in the Postcommunist World." *Physica A* 387(1): 92-9.

Bunce, Valerie and Sharon Wolchik. 2011. *Defeating Authoritarian Leaders in Postcommunist Countries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Callinicos, Alex. 2008. "What Does Revolution Mean in the Twenty-First Century?" Pp. 151-64 in *Revolution in the Making of the Modern World*, edited by John Foran, David Lane, and Andreja Zivkovic. London: Routledge.

Chehabi, H.E. and Juan J. Linz eds. 1998. *Sultanistic Regimes*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Clinton, Hillary. 2010. "Remarks on Internet Freedom." Speech delivered at The Newseum. Washington DC. 21st January. Retrieved 23rd September 2014: http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/01/135519.htm

Cole, Juan. 2014 *The New Arabs*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Cull, Nicholas J. 2013. "The Long Road to Public Diplomacy 2.0: The Internet in US Public Diplomacy." *International Studies Review* 15(1): 123-39.

Della Porta, Donatella and Sidney Tarrow. 2012. "Interactive Diffusion: The Coevolution of Police and Protest Behavior." *Comparative Political Studies* 45(1): 119-52.

Dodge, Toby. 2012. "From the Arab Awakening to the Arab Spring." LSE IDEAS Special Report: 5-11.

Dorsey, James M. 2012. "Pitched Battles: The Role of Ultra Soccer Fans in the Arab Spring." *Mobilization* 17(4): 411-18.

Dunn, John. 2008. "Understanding Revolution." Pp. 17-26 in *Revolution in the Making of the Modern World*, edited by John Foran, David Lane, and Andreja Zivkovic. London: Routledge.

Eisenstadt, S.N. 1973. *Traditional Patrimonialism and Modern Neopatrimonialism*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Foran, John. 2003. "How Might the Revolutions of the Future Have Better Endings? Pp. 271-83 in *The Future of* Revolution, edited by John Foran. London: Zed.

Foran, John. 2005. *Taking Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Garton Ash, Timothy. 1989. *The Uses of Adversity*. London: Penguin.

Garton Ash, Timothy. 1990. *The Magic Lantern*. London: Penguin.

Geddes, Barbara, Joseph Wright, and Erisa Frantz. 2014. "Autocratic Breakdown and Regime Transitions." *Perspectives on Politics* 12(2): 313-31.

Gerges, Fawaz. 2013. "The Islamist Moment: From Islamic State to Civil Islam." *Political Science Quarterly* 128(3): 389-426.

Gladwell, Malcolm. 2010. "Small Change: Why the Revolution Will Not be Tweeted." *The New Yorker*. 4th October: 42-9.

Goldfrank, Walter L. 1979. "Theories of Revolution and Revolution Without Theory." *Theory and Society* 7(1): 135-65.

Goldstone, Jack. 1991. *Revolution and Rebellion in the Early Modern World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Goldstone, Jack. 2001. "Towards a Fourth Generation of Revolutionary Theory." *Annual Review of Political Science* 4: 139-87.

Goldstone, Jack. 2003. "Comparative Historical Analysis and Knowledge Accumulation in the Study of Revolutions." Pp. 41-90 in *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*, edited by James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goldstone, Jack. 2009. "Rethinking Revolution: Integrating Origins, Processes, and Outcomes." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa, and the Middle East* 29(1): 18-32.

Goldstone, Jack. 2011. "Understanding the Revolutions of 2011." *Foreign Affairs* 90(3): 8-16.

Goldstone, Jack. 2014a. *Revolutions: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goldstone, Jack. 2014b. "Why the Arab Revolutions of 2011 Are True Revolutions: Implications and Prognosis." Paper Presented at the 18th World Congress of Sociology, Yokohama, July.

Goodwin, Jeff. 2001. *No Other Way Out*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gunning, Jeroen and Ilan Zvi Baron. 2013. *Why Occupy a Square?* London: Hurst.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1990. "The Rectifying Revolution and the Need for New Thinking on the Left." *New Left Review* 183: 3-21.

Halliday, Fred. 1999. *Revolution and World Politics*. London: Palgrave.

Halliday, Fred. 2003. "Utopian Realism: The Challenges for "Revolution" in Our Times." Pp. 300-9 in *The Future of Revolution*, edited by John Foran. London: Zed.

Hamid, Shadi. 2014. *Temptations of Power: Islamists and Illiberal Democracy in the New Middle East*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heydemann, Steven. 2013. "Syria and the Future of Authoritarianism." *Journal of Democracy* 24(4): 59-73.

Hobsbawm, Eric. 1986. "Revolution." Pp. 5-46 in *Revolutions in History*, edited by Roy Porter and Mikuláš Teich. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holmes, Amy Austin. 2012. "There are Weeks When Decades Happen: Structure and Strategy in the Egyptian Revolution." *Mobilization* 17(4): 391-410.

Howard, Philip and Muzammil Hussain. 2011. "The Role of Digital Media." *Journal of Democracy* 22(3): 35-48.

Ismail, Salwa. 2012. "The Egyptian Revolution Against the Police." *Social Research* 79(2): 435-62.

Karatnycky, Adrian and Peter Ackerman. 2005. *How Freedom Was Won: From Civil Resistance to Durable Democracy*. Washington. D.C.: Freedom House.

Kurzman. Charles. 2008. *Democracy Denied, 1905-1915*. Cambridge. MA: Harvard University Press.

Lawson, George. 2004. *Negotiated Revolutions*. London: Ashgate.

Lawson, George. 2005. "Negotiated Revolutions: The Prospects for Radical Change in Contemporary World Politics." *Review of International Studies* 31(3): 473-93.

Lawson, George. 2015. "Revolutions and the International." *Theory and Society* 44(4): 299-319.

Levitsky, Steven and Lucan Way. 2010. *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes After the Cold War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lynch, Marc. 2011. "After Egypt: The Limits and Promise of Online Challenges to the Authoritarian Arab State." *Perspectives on Politics* 9(2): 301-310.

Lynch, Marc. 2012. *The Arab Uprising*. New York: Public Affairs.

Lynch, Marc. 2014. "Introduction." Pp. 3-7 in: *Reflections on the Arab Uprisings*, edited by Marc Lynch. Washington D.C: POMEPS Studies No. 10.

McAdam, Doug, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly. 2001. *Dynamics of Contention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacKinnon, Rebecca. 2011. "China's 'Networked Authoritarianism'." *Journal of Democracy* 22(2): 32-46.

Mann, Michael. 1984. "The Autonomous Power of the State." *Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 25(2): 185-213.

Matthiesen, Toby. 2013. *Sectarian Gulf: Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, and the Arab Spring that Wasn't*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Mayer, Arno. 2001. *The Furies: Violence and Terror in the French and Russian Revolutions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mecham, Quinn. 2014. Pp. 21-5 in *Reflections on the Arab Uprisings*, edited by Marc Lynch. Washington D.C: POMEPS Studies No. 10.

Moore Jr., Barrington. 1978. *Injustice: The Social Bases of Obedience and Revolt*. London: MacMillan.

Morozov, Evgeny. 2011. *The Net Delusion*. London: Allen Lane.

Motyl, Alexander. 1999. *Revolutions, Nations, Empires*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Nepstad, Sharon Erickson. 2011. *Nonviolent Revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nepstad, Sharon Erickson. 2013. "Mutiny and Nonviolence in the Arab Spring." *Journal of Peace Research* 50(3): 337-49.

Pariser, Eli. 2011. *The Filter Bubble*. London: Viking.

Patel, David, Valerie Bunce, and Sharon Wolchik. 2011. "Fizzle and Fireworks: A Comparative Perspective on the Diffusion of Popular Protests in the Middle East and North Africa." Paper Presented at the SSHA Conference, Boston, November.

Pearlman, Wendy. 2011. *Violence, Nonviolence, and the Palestinian National Movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pearlman, Wendy. 2013. "Emotions and the Microfoundations of the Arab Uprisings." *Perspectives on Politics* 11(2): 387-409.

Quandt, William. 1998. *Between Ballots and Bullets*. Washington D.C.: Brookings.

Ritter, Daniel. 2015. *The Iron Cage of Liberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, Adam and Timothy Garton Ash, eds. 2011. *Civil Resistance and Power Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Russell, D.E.H. 1974. *Rebellion, Revolution, and Armed Force*. London: Academic.

Schmidt, Eric and Jared Cohen. 2010. "The Digital Disruption." *Foreign Affairs* 89(6): 75-85.

Schock, Kurt. 2005. *Unarmed Insurrections*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Selbin, Eric. 2010. *Revolution, Rebellion, Resistance: The Power of Story*. London: Zed.

Shehata, Dina. 2011. "The Fall of the Pharaoh." *Foreign Affairs* 903: 26-32.

Simmons, Beth. 2011. "International Studies in the Global Information Age." *International Studies Quarterly* 55(3): 589-99.

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France. Russia and China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stein, Ewan. 2012. "Revolutionary Egypt: Promises and Perils." LSE IDEAS Special Report: 23-7.

Stinchcombe, Arthur. 1999. "Ending Revolutions and Building New Governments." *Annual Review of Political Science* 2: 49-93.

Tarrow, Sidney. 2012. *Strangers at the Gates*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tessler, Mark. 2014. "Political System Preferences After the Arab Spring." Pp. 30-5 in *Reflections on the Arab Uprisings*, edited by Marc Lynch. Washington D.C: POMEPS Studies No. 10.

Tilly, Charles. 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tilly, Charles. 1995. "To Explain Political Processes." *American Journal of Sociology* 100(6): 1594-1610.

Tilly, Charles. 2006. *Regimes and Repertoires*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tilly, Charles. 2008. *Contentious Performances*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tripp, Charles. 2013. *The Power and the People*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Varol, Ozan. 2012. "The Democratic Coup d'état." *Harvard International Law Journal* 53(2): 292-356.

Walgrave, Stefaan, Lance Bennett, Jeroen Van Laer, and Christian Breunig. 2011. "Multiple Engagements and Network Bridging in Contentious Politics: Digital Media Use of Protest Participants." *Mobilization* 16(3): 325-49.

Weber, Max. [1922] 1978. *Economy and Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wehrey, Frederic. 2013. *Sectarian Politics in the Gulf: From the Iraq War to the Arab Uprising*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Weyland, Kurt. 2012. "The Arab Spring: Why the Surprising Similarities with the Revolutionary Wave of 1848?" *Perspectives on Politics* 10(4): 917-34.

Zunes, Stephen. 1994. "Unarmed Insurrections Against Authoritarian Governments in the Third World: A New Kind of Revolution?" *Third World Quarterly* 15(3): 403-26.

---

[1] Many thanks to Amnon Aran, Daniel Ritter, Nawal Mustafa, Neil Ketchley, the *Mobilization* peer reviewers, and especially Sharon Nepstad for their insightful comments on earlier drafts of this article. Thanks also to participants at presentations of the paper at LSE, Reading University, the International Studies Association convention in San Diego, the Social Science History Association conference in Toronto, and the World Congress of Sociology in Yokohama. The paper is much improved for its exposure to these various forms of public scrutiny.

[2] The obvious exception is the revolutionary strand of political Islam, which often combines hierarchical organization with an equally hierarchical vision (Bayat 2013: ch. 12).

[3] The opposite condition also holds – those militaries that share a deeply embedded identity with a ruling elite are unlikely to defect. The obvious example in the context of the Arab Uprisings is Syria (Brownlee, Masoud, and Reynolds 2015: 55-8, 61).

[4] Unsurprisingly, the US was slow to fully endorse the protests against Mubarak. The initial message from the White House was that the US supported a 'managed' or 'orderly' transition rather than a popular revolution (Holmes 2012: 400; Gerges 2013: 415-6; Tripp 2013: 99).

[5] At the same time, the military became a powerful economic actor in its own right, controlling up to 15% of the Egyptian economy (Varol 2012: 346). The military ran farms and factories (often using conscripts as free labor), and owned a considerable portfolio of real estate.

[6] These examples illustrate that, although non-violence was a prescribed tactic of the protest movement, elements within it were willing to use violence. The balance to be struck between violent and non-violent protest was much discussed within the protest (Lynch 2012: 91-6; Cole 2014: 151; Gunning and Baron 2013: 193-201). It is important to note that, in the Arab Uprisings and elsewhere, there is often no straightforward either-or between violent and non-violent strategies. Indeed, these strategies have often existed side-by-side within the same protest movement (as in South Africa's African National Congress) or have developed from one to the other (as in the Philippines during the 1970s and 1980s). In any assessment of this issue, the central issue revolves around whether there is a *formal* embrace of non-violence by the *main* strands of the opposition. For most, but not all, protest movements in the Middle East and North Africa during the 2011 uprisings, this condition holds.

[7] Again, radical Islamist groups provide the main exception. However, these groups tended not to be the main factions within opposition coalitions, even if the legacy of the

uprisings has been in many cases to strengthen the position of Islamists around the region.

[8] Crucial in this respect was the role of the Muslim Brotherhood, which formally joined the uprising at the end of January and thereafter took a leading role in protecting the protestors against the police and *baltagiyya* (Gunning and Baron 2013: 175).

[9] At other times, protestors used ICTs as decoys, while real demonstrations were organized through word of mouth (Gunning and Baron 2013: 284).

[10] My thanks to Sharon Nepstad for pushing me on some of the arguments in this paragraph.

[11] The existence (and relative success) of 'Islamic State', alongside other branches of radical Islamism, illustrates that the long-term association between revolutionary ideologies, hierarchy, and violence remains a potent force in the contemporary world.

[12] This brake is likely to be short-lived: by solving one problem (mass protests), states have generated a new one (the re-ascription of forms of categorical difference). They have also excluded Islamist parties from formal politics, with the exception of Ennahda in Tunisia and Morocco's Justice and Development Party. The result of this exclusion, along with a decline in public support for Islamist parties, is likely to lead to a further radicalization of Islamist groups (Mecham 2014).

[13] Again, my thanks to Sharon Nepstad for emphasizing the importance of these points.

[14] Crucial here was the extent to which revolutionaries, including Islamists, felt that their goals could be achieved through a one-off historic compromise, as was the case in Tunisia. Where radical secularists were pitched in 'exclusionary' conflicts with virulent Islamists, as was the case in Libya and Syria, such compromises did not take place (Goldstone 2014b). On the general 'modernization' of Islamist parties, see: Gerges (2013); Hamid (2014); Ritter (2015).

[15] Around 75% of those polled for the 2014 Arab Barometer favored democracy as a system of governance, including 85% of Egyptians (Tessler 2014: 31). However, it is also clear that many Arab publics are somewhere between suspicious and fearful of Islamism, hence the wide support for the 'restoration of order' by various authoritarian forces around the region (Lynch 2014: 5, 7).

[16] This is no surprise. Personalist regimes are the least likely form of authoritarian governance to be replaced by democracies and the most likely to require violence to do so (Geddes *et al* 2014: 324-6).