

## Why Did the Arab Spring Fail?

### Was it a Revolution?

Ouael Sarsour\*

PhD candidate at Aegean University of Greece, School of Social Sciences. Department of Sociology. University Hill, 81 132 Mytilene.

**\*Corresponding Author:** Ouael Sarsour, PhD candidate at Aegean University of Greece, School of Social Sciences. Department of Sociology. University Hill, 81 132 Mytilene.

**Abstract:** This study aims at examining Arabic Spring that no one expected to happen in the Arab world, triggering dreams of freedom before this avalanche rolls in most countries in which many hopes were dissolved. This historical event changed the face of the entire area. The Middle East witnessed the rapid collapse of regimes from which it seemed impossible to get rid of. This political and geographical earthquake that shook the region starting in 2011 was called the "Arab Spring" and it led to mixed results. I will try in this research to examine and clarify what was this event, its causes and effect, but also the consequences.

Observing and monitoring the situation of the so-called Arab Spring in the countries of the Middle East and North Africa, it becomes clear that the process of revolution in these countries was mainly aimed at the collapse of the political and military systems and the reconstruction of new regimes. The main slogans in Tunisia and Egypt as the people want to overthrow, or the military regime collapses. The aim was for that people's revolution to bring about change in the government's political systems. While a real revolution leads to a radical change in the political, economic and social reality of a people and in the long run, there will be a change in the structure of a society's thinking and in the redistribution of wealth and new political forces. Perhaps this is one of the causes of the failure of the Arab recovery that was not a complete revolution in terms of objective.

The revolution from social tonight is defined as the fundamental change of the situation in a particular country in the institutional structures of society, such as the changes that arise and will change a society, from a dominant model to a new model that coincides with the principles, values, ideology and goals of the revolution and can be violent and bloody, as it can be peaceful and can be sudden, fast or slow and gradual. Crane Brenton defines the revolution in his book "Anatomy of a Revolution" as a dynamic process characterized by the transition from one social structure to another social structure. Harry Eckstein defined it as "attempts to change with the use of force or the threat against government policies or rulers or an organization". Peter Ammann believes that the revolution is a temporary ora long-term interruption of the state's monopoly on power, accompanied by a reduction in obedience.

Yuri Karazinsees the revolution from the point of view of Marxist literature in the analysis of social development and argues, that the meaning and functioning of the social revolution can only be understood when we look at the history of society for what is as a continuation of socio-economic formations and the revolution is a form of transition of power from one formation to another in the revolutionary classes.

The conflicting elites, who turn against each other, in a country are trying to give legitimacy to their movement by saying that it is a revolution that stems from the popular will and seeks to achieve it. The coup is the transfer of power from the hands of some to another small group belonging to the same first category that controls the government or at least it is similar to it, officially using violence without bringing about a change in the state of political power in society or in the distribution of the revenues of the political system.

The reasons for a revolution are multiple, there are those that limit the causes of the revolution to economic factors. Among the most important supporters of this are Saint Simon, Marx and the left. St.

Simon sees the historical development of human groups as a permanent struggle between the economic classes in society between enemies and non-enemies, while Marx believes that revolution is a natural and inevitable stage in the life of societies. Marx emphasizes the production and distribution relationships that lead to a series of revolutions leading to the proletariat revolution. In the same direction there are found supporters of the theory of underdevelopment, arguing that underdevelopment is a determining factor for change and thus revolution becomes inevitable, as oppression and burning of discontent can create a revolutionary atmosphere. Other causes are due to injustice to the people and successive decades oppression, due to the control of the elite in the capacities of the people, which led them to waves of underdevelopment and poverty. The injustice and tyranny that depend on the security services increased and what increased the Arab world's discontent was triple tyranny, political tyranny, social tyranny and economic tyranny.

- Political tyranny is known as the monopoly of a government that prevents popular divisions and different political forces from participating in power.
- Social tyranny is the result of the absence of social justice and the control of a limited group over the possibilities and exclusion of the majority of the social structure, which leads to social injustice and diseases in society as a result, the citizen believes, does not express this status.
- Economic tyranny is the monopoly and the close relationship that arises between money and power, which has led to the concentration of capital and revenue in a number of limited and few people at the expense of the majority, which increases poverty and reduces growth.

Revolutions have different shapes and directions, of the most important are:

- The American Revolution (1775-1783 A.D.), which had the character of a national liberation movement for independence from British rule without bringing about significant changes in the social structure.
- The French Revolution in 1789 ended the rule of King Louis XVI and created a democratic system and set the slogans of freedom, equality, as it was based on a constitution defining the rights and obligations of citizens and the separation between executive, legislative and judicial powers.
- The Russian Revolution in 1917, which not only removed the Tsar, but also brought about fundamental social changes, such as the abolition of the individual property system.
- The Chinese Communist Revolution in 1949 acquired lands from feudal rulers and spread them to farmers and achieved free education.

In third world countries, revolutions were directed directly at colonialism and aimed at achieving sovereignty and independence, and this type of revolution is called "national revolutions" as in Algeria, where the revolution led to an armed struggle against French colonialism that lasted for seven years in which Algerians lost more than a million people. Latin American countries present another example of revolutions that have managed to change tyrannical leaders, without accompanying fundamental changes in government systems or in the social structure of the state. This type of revolution is called "revolutions against power" because it has a limited goal of overthrowing the existing government. In some cases these revolutions were moved to higher stages and turned into political or social revolutions.

In the analysis of the revolutions, Plato sees the Republic as, the conquest of power by the crowd, to resemble the rebellion of the sailors against the captain, as each of them asserts the right of command, without learning this art, with what it entails in the battles that arise. Aristotle inherited the same conservative attitude towards the revolution from his teacher. Although he devoted an entire chapter of the book (politics) to an analysis of the revolution in the various regimes, he begins to analyse the causes of the revolutions, until he comes up with methods of prevention and preservation of the entity of the state. For Aristotle, revolution is nothing but an evil that must be protected from its beginning. Mistakes are always found in the principles by which negligence leads to the disclosure of issues.

Leo Strauss explains this conservative attitude towards revolutionary change in classical political thought within the philosophical traditions of that same thought. The political philosophy of Plato and Aristotle is characterized by what he calls traditional utopianism which emphasizes the existence of a

distance between the theoretical ideal and practical reality, which makes the achievement of the optimal system of governance dependent on a coincidence that may or may not be achieved and no one thought it would be achieved. However, this does not lead to the abandonment of the concept of an optimal system of governance, but rather opens the door from the philosophers' point of view to the possibility of introducing real reform in any system of governance in reality. Marx gave legitimacy to the revolution as a method of political movement, in order to change the existing conditions to create an ideal system and granted it legitimacy as a tool for political, social and economic change, within the framework of a historical-social philosophy that bridges the gap between ideal and reality.

The theory of creative chaos is based mainly on what the American Samuel Huntington called the vacuum and stability and expressed it by saying It is the gap that the citizen feels between what is and what should be. While the size of the gap is reflected in stability in one way or another and its vastness creates frustration and discontent in society, which works to destabilize political stability, especially if social and economic freedom is lacking. This is explained because there are different views of what has happened in the Arab world, some consider it a revolution as explained above and some believe it was creative chaos, which is based on an American ideology derived from two main ideas; the first one created by Francis Fukuyama, entitled "The End of History" in which the world is divided between a historical world with many upheavals and wars, which is not integrated into the American democratic model and another post-historical world, which is liberal democrat in the American way and believes that the factors of nationalism, religion and social structure are the most important obstacles to democracy. The second idea was formulated by Huntington under the title "clash of civilizations", taking into account these conflicts. The divisions in the world will be the source of civilization. Although the two ideas disagree with each other, they do agree on the need to build a new world order, led by the United States. The theory of creative chaos centres around the stable and solid obstacle that the Arab world represents against American interests in the region, given the spiritual and religious origins of the peoples of these countries, that is based on the Arab people not being subjugated to American Western colonial arrogance and the decision-making centres, which adopted a series of measures and procedures , to secure dominance in the Arab world, that is characterized, according to the theory, as an ideological oil-rich world that poses a direct threat to the interests of the United States. Creative Chaos uses military force to change regimes, as happened in Afghanistan and Iraq and by adopting the threat of using violence, which contributes to the internal security turmoil of the Arab world and ignites religious feelings and uses them to create Chaos as in Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Libya, Tunisia, Palestine, Sudan and Somalia. Therefore, revolutionaries in all countries must know that not all chaos is necessarily creative. Rice sees it as being, the road to revival and the road to reform. But there is the black chaos that destroys and does not build, devotes itself to revenge, does not seek to build, acts impulsively according to fantasies and illusions that are not always true.

The Arab Spring started in the Arab countries in 2011 with the vision of freedom and democracy. In reviewing and evaluating the harvest of the Arab wave of change, it is necessary to dwell on the characteristics and specificities of this wave, described as the (Arab Spring) and whether there is a difference or similarity between the cases in order to determine the nature of this concept and to determine the extent of the revolution. The Arab world with strong popular movements in 2011 aimed at a radical change of regimes and conditions in some Arab countries. The first spark started in Tunisia and escalated rapidly and toppled the regime in a few days. The message was clear that excessive violence is no match for a popular revolution, so the spark quickly spread to Egypt, that initially sided with the hardliners of the revolution and so the change demonstrations broke out and succeeded in two weeks and a few days in overthrowing the regime leaders. The success of the revolution and the rapid collapse of the military regimes has been transferred to Syria, where the protests have turned into a destructive war, in many ways a civil war, but the Syrian president remains in power thanks to his allies. In Morocco, the "February 20 Movement" of 2011 was included with superficial reforms, while in Algeria the protests started in 2019. In Libya the rebels divided into countless militias and fought, which led to the fragmentation of the country, with the bloody conflict fueled by external intervention on a large scale. Yemen, in turn, entered a civil war with external influences.

The expected fruits of the "Arab Spring" have not blossomed as people expected. In 2019 the American writer Noah Feldman wrote a book on the subject with the "Arab Winter", a term that

appeared here and there with the militarization of revolutions, the rise of religious extremism and the outbreak of wars and conflicts with the exception of Tunisia. The fall of regimes and the sound of violence has increased on the one hand, and on the other hand, democratic reforms have not taken place. The main demands of the demonstrations will be reiterated. History shows that revolutions usually require many difficult years to achieve their goals. Below we briefly mention the important events of the Arab Spring in the Arab countries.

**In Tunisia**, after the collapse of the previous regime, the mechanisms and priorities changed when most parties agreed to elect a National Constituent Assembly, that will draft a new constitution and organize national elections. Legislative and presidential elections until the constitution is drawn up. Agreement was also reached to set up a temporary body "the supreme body for achieving the goals" despite criticism, while pursuing political reform and democratic transition and engaging civil society organization.

**In Egypt**, keeping the army away from the protests and the political situation has resulted in President Mubarak being in a very difficult position, almost alone, and if we count the calls from the Americans, the Gulf Cooperation Council and the international community for him to step down. That is why Mubarak decided to entrust the management of the country's affairs to the Supreme Armed Forces Council and the President of the People's Assembly. Mubarak used the expression abandonment of the presidency of the republic, not resignation.

**In Libya**, despite the regime's efforts to deter the protesters, the state of insurgency by the army and the NATO military incursion with the support of warplanes led to the collapse of Gaddafi's army, which was killed in the town of Sirte. The regime ended and the army in Libya was disbanded and Libya entered a long and difficult phase due to the spread of many tribal militias as fighting between them began.

**In Yemen** protests erupted on 11 February 2011, demanding the termination of the regime of President Ali Abdullah, calling for reforms of the political system and the achievement of democracy. The protests spread to most Yemen cities, and security forces repelled them. The army failed along with the absence of political consensus and the killing of Ali Abdullah, created many complex problems. In the transitional phase, political dialogue has not achieved a strong central policy that ends the divisions.

**In Syria** on March 15, 2011, demonstrations broke out in the city of Daraa in Hauran with the same demands as the other Arab countries. The events in Daraa were a spark that started in other major cities, while the government's reaction was the intervention of the army, police and security services. The formation of the "Free Syrian Army", that had a lot of support from Turkey and other NATO countries, political and financial support and the media and from countries of the Arab Gulf, prompted President Assad to ask for help from his allies Russia and Iran and the country turned into a real civil war.

**In other countries**, such as Kuwait, Oman, Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Algeria, Jordan, Jordan, Iraq, Algeria and Mauritania, the patterns and shapes of the protests vary and of course they have varied, while the size of these protests and their degree of spread is less.

Arab spring is closer to the incomplete revolution to the creative chaos as some people point out, there are three key factors that led her to failure (with the exception of Tunisia) and failure to achieve its goal: First, the leading group was neither clean, fresh nor new, it was the continuation of the previous regime with that it implies this to political wear, but also their participation in the old regime and in some cases were active members such as the Minister of Justice Larger. Amp bd Alzaleel of Libya for many years of Gaddafi, was the head of the demonstrations. Secondly, the slogans of the revolution were more emotionally and the ideologies and proposals were absent to how it will be the next day, falling the military regime without predicting what kind of constitution, and governance propose, the same applies to the slogan "Bread, Freedom and Social Justice" how, criteria and methods will also apply what economic-social context will follow. Thirdly, the people the folk layers that participated in the demonstrations, from one, did not appear to be ready for long-term strength even a short-term effort to change and, on the other hand, did not show ready for democratization, more wanted to change the political persons who were political for over 30 years with a little better management of financial statements, too much the rupture and discharge from the system itself.

Looking at old and modern revolutions, it is clear that the most important prerequisites for the success of the revolutions are:

- The will and determination between the revolutionists.
- The module of revolutioners and coherence between folk forces.
- The ability of the Revolution Leadership Group, which is responsible for decisions.
- The presentation of the alternative political solution with new proposals.
- The awareness and participation of the people to achieve the goals of the Revolution.

Finally, considering and analyzing the events played by Arab Spring, we can say: it is unlikely in the short term to collapse regime regimes in the Arab world as a whole quickly, as held in Eastern Europe, despite the unity of the countries in language, history, culture, the religion. Revolutions have prospects for change, but existing political systems, thereby hinder the existence of a change model. On the other hand, we find that political conflicts are likely to rotate, either later on life and living issues.

In light of the revolutions, the termination of dictatorship, corruption, creating basic rights, and promoting greater freedom, justice and democracy.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Wafaa Lutfi. The Revolution and the Arab Spring. Theoretical look. <https://www.asharqalarabi.org.uk/markaz/d-21-05-2012.pdf>.
- [2] Mahmoud Ali. Revolutions: Their Concept and Nature And their types. [https://www.academia.edu/35962004/%D9%85%D9%81%D9%87%D9%88%D9%85\\_%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AB%D9%88%D8%B1%D8%A7%D8%AA\\_.pdf](https://www.academia.edu/35962004/%D9%85%D9%81%D9%87%D9%88%D9%85_%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AB%D9%88%D8%B1%D8%A7%D8%AA_.pdf).
- [3] Plato, The Republic, New York: Dover Publications.
- [4] Aristotle, Politics, New York: Dover Publications.
- [5] Sources of conflict. Highlights from the managing chaos conference. G. M. Tamis & Samuel P. Huntington. Identity and Conflict. Robert Kaplan. Jessica Tuchman Mathews. The Coming Anarchy and the Nation-State under Siege. U. S. Institute of Peace.
- [6] Francis Fukuyama. The End of History? 1989.
- [7] Huntington Samuel. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of world order. Free Press 2002.
- [8] Seventh Arab Report for cultural development. The Arab Thought Foundation. First edition 2014. <https://www.knowledge4all.com/Temp/Files/0bcb0de3-f197-40d0-a885-87ac319825ec.pdf>.
- [9] PhD. Essam Abdel-Shay. Arab revolutions. Causes, pathways, and possibilities. <https://www.albayan.co.uk/Fileslib/articleimages/takrir/2-9.pdf>.

### AUTHOR'S BIOGRAPHY



**Ouael Sarsour**, was born in 1972. He studied Business Administration in University of Macedonia (Thessaloniki- Greece). Holder of a postgraduate degree in European Societies and European Integration on the topic of the dissertation: "The refugee crisis from 2015 onwards", of the Sociology department- School of Social Sciences - Aegean University in Mytilene. Since April 2020, in the same department- school in Aegean University he has been doing his Doctorate on "The factors that affect the social integration of Arab refugees and immigrants in Greece". Professionally, worked in Finance and administration while now in Intercultural mediation.

**Citation:** Ouael Sarsour. "Why Did the Arab Spring Fail? Was it a Revolution?" *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education (IJHSSE)*, vol 8, no. 6, 2021, pp. 56-60. doi: <https://doi.org/10.20431/2349-0381.0806008>.

**Copyright:** © 2021 Authors. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.