

## 第 10 章 Arab armies in transition

Yezid Sayigh

### Introduction

Nearly sixty years after overthrowing the monarchy, the armed forces again assumed power in Egypt in February 2011, after refusing to help extend President Hosni Mubarak's 30 years in power. Weeks earlier, the Tunisian army sealed the fate of President Zine al-Abidin Ben-Ali by refusing to crush the popular opposition to his autocratic rule. In both countries the armed forces were the midwife of political transition: in Egypt they subsequently assumed power, whereas in Tunisia they retreated to the backstage, but in both cases they endorsed and protected the beginnings of democratization, involving the formation of new interim governments, general elections, and the first steps in drafting new constitutions.

Elsewhere the picture has been less smooth, and considerably more violent. The Libyan army fragmented when faced with a spontaneous, popular uprising that started weeks later, as some units defected to the rebel cause or stood on the sidelines, while others fought for Colonel Mu'ammarr Qadhafi and his regime. The result was a confused and bloody battle between pro-government "security battalions" and rebel militias that was only decided by the external military intervention of NATO, under the combined mandate of the League of Arab States and the United Nations. Over since six months after the Qadhafi regime's downfall, Libya's new interim government remained unable to unify up to 100 rebel militias or rebuild a single national army.

In Yemen, the armed forces remained unified, but several senior commanders openly warned President Ali Abdullah Saleh against suppressing the protests, deployed troops to protect the unarmed demonstrators in the streets of the capital, Sanaa, and eventually called on the president publicly to step down. A stalemate ensued as the president relied on the counter-balancing support of key military and security units commanded by his sons and nephews, but civil war was narrowly averted, in part due to the active diplomatic intervention of the Gulf Cooperation Council. Saleh managed to cling stubbornly to power until he was voted out of office a whole year later, in February 2012.

And in Syria, the bulk of the armed forces remained loyal to President Bashar al-Asad – or at least stayed in their barracks – as of March 2012, even as he ordered its best-trained and best-equipped units to suppress that country’s uprising by brute force. The majority of the rank-and-file are most probably hostile to the regime and are believed to suffer low morale, but most of those defecting to the opposition – figures vary widely, from as low as 4,000 to as high as 40,000 by early 2012 – have been lower-ranking soldiers or conscripts from poor regions of the country. Few senior officers were known to have defected, in an army of 250,000-300,000 men with a large officer corps, and no entire units. The relationship between the armed forces and the regime today appears to be a mirror image of the relationship during the bitter confrontations with the Palestine Liberation Organization and its local Leftist and Muslim allies in Lebanon in 1976, and, even more importantly, with the Syrian branch of the Muslim Brotherhood in 1976-1982. Then, army morale and cohesion suffered and a significant number of officers deserted, were subjected to military trial, or were placed in retirement, but the regime was ultimately able to secure army loyalty in order to mount the major military offensive that defeated the insurgency conclusively in the Hama massacre of February 1982, which 5,000-20,000 largely unarmed civilians were killed in a mere three weeks.

These varying roles and responses by the national armed forces to the twin challenges of popular uprisings and subsequent political transition in different Arab countries reveal the manner and degree of the institutionalization of the armed forces into authoritarian systems. Alfred Stepan’s work on Latin America is pertinent here, specifically his distinction between the military as an institution – in which it maintains a formal, bounded relationship to the state as a means of protecting its autonomy and professionalism – and the military as government – in which it is directly involved in political life and becomes part of a ruling regime structure.<sup>1</sup> The contrast may be represented in terms of the exercise of constitutional powers and obligations, versus the operation of informal arrangements and multifaceted or multilevel relations across institutional boundaries.

Institutionalization in the Arab case can be seen in three main forms: the embedding of armies in power structures and ruling elites, their intertwining with police forces and internal security agencies, and their functioning as social welfare systems for core constituencies, which has moreover spurred the rise of parallel “military economies”. Each of these has implications for democratic transition: determining whether the armed forces – especially the senior officer corps –

will support or block deeper political liberalization; how the relationship between the military's primary role of national defence can be disentangled from that of maintaining domestic law and order, which requires a parallel demilitarization of the police and internal security services; and whether genuine economic reform and social transformation will ensue, forging new class alliances accordingly.

Whatever position the armed forces take on each of these questions, what is most striking is that their long period of clear subordination to powerful presidents-for-life is over. The transitional period will necessarily involve a renegotiation of civil-military relations in each and every Arab state undergoing transition, but what has become obvious is that the armed forces have been drawn back into the center of national politics. They may withdraw from direct involvement, but this will be only partial. It is perhaps the greatest irony of the very event that ushered in a democratic opportunity in these countries – the popular uprisings of 2011 – that it has also reactivated the political role of the military, whether formal or informal.

### **The authoritarian legacy**

It is tempting to generalize about the military, and about civil-military relations, but the Arab states do not share a single model of either. Indeed, some Arab states are more similar to non-Arab states than to each other. Comparisons are drawn more frequently between Egypt on the one hand, and Turkey or Pakistan on the other, for example, and in certain respects the Egyptian military resembles its Indonesian counterpart more closely, in terms of its political roles and economic activities. The bifurcation between regular army and national guard in Saudi Arabia parallels, at least in outward form, the division between regular army and Islamic revolutionary guard in Iran, while the complex sectarian and/or ethnic balances and dynamics of the Lebanese or Iraqi armies are evocative of pre-1971 Pakistan or pre-civil war Nigeria, and possibly of them even today.

Nonetheless, it is possible to identify a number of common issues and themes that have evolved in various Arab states. The first is the need to question the assumption in classic military sociology literature that the civil and the military occupy clearly-demarcated spheres. This is rarely true in the Arab states, where the blurring of boundaries between the two, and between the formal and the informal, is more prevalent. Blurring is true even of Egypt, which boasts one of the region's oldest professional, modern armies, but in which the special, often highly personal, and informal

relationship between the army command and the president has been critical to regime maintenance for 60 years. Elsewhere in the region, the armed forces and society have penetrated and “captured” each other, as specific communities (whether based on religion, ethnicity, or region) have dominated particular military commands or branches, or as the latter have infiltrated national economies, engaging in both licit and illicit enterprises and embedding themselves in domestic political-business elites and cross-border networks and trade flows.

Second, civil-military relations are always – in all countries, not just Arab ones – shaped by the wider political, economic, and social systems in which they are embedded. The armed forces clearly perform very different functions in more democratic or pluralist political systems compared to authoritarian ones, as can be seen by the generally non-interventionist stance of the Lebanese army despite a 15-year long civil war, 24-year Israeli occupation, and 29-year Syrian control, in contrast to the dominant role of the army in shaping the modern history of neighbouring Syria, which has similar sectarian and ethnic diversity. The armed forces also relate very differently to civilian power even in authoritarian cases, as evident from Iraq, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Egypt, and Tunisia.

Furthermore, behind the outward appearance of stability and stasis in most of these countries, civil-military relations continued to evolve over the past two decades or more, in subtle but significant ways, as neo-liberal economic policies have deepened and as the regional strategic landscape and international security agenda have changed. On one hand, the frequency of coups d'état and experience of direct military government in the 1949-1970 period was replaced by an apparent retreat of the military from politics and subordination to civilian leaders for the next 40 years, until 2011. Previously, overt military intervention was mostly ideologically-driven – prompted by anti-colonialism and the pursuit of social justice or redistribution of wealth – reflecting broad social transformations that had been underway since the 1930s and 1940s, and often leading to land reform and economic nationalization. But during the long phase since 1970, armies generally became more conservative, shifting towards preservation of budgets and other material interests, and resisting change, while in some cases also benefiting increasingly from business opportunities opened up by liberalization and privatization.

Third, common to all cases is that Arab authoritarian regimes built themselves over a period of

several decades, and so all domestic spheres – political, administrative-legal, economic, and social – adapted accordingly and structured themselves around dominant power relationships. The precise forms vary, but in every case the coercive apparatus of state became deeply embedded in the structure of government at all levels, from the presidency down to urban neighbourhoods and rural villages. This is naturally especially true of the internal security sector – the police and security services (including intelligence agencies) – but this also implicates the armed forces as well, for reasons discussed below. At the very least, military employment has become a major part of maintaining social constituencies, and so when combined with equally large security sectors, this became a key part of regime survival strategies.<sup>2</sup> As a result, any type or degree of reform and restructuring of existing civil-military relations will necessarily affect and disturb many long-established societal interests, even as it opens up opportunities for positive change as well.

### **Institutionalization I: Embeddedness in social structures and ruling elites**

In all the Arab countries undergoing transition – and indeed throughout the Arab region – executive power is frequently concentrated in narrow networks of family members, senior bureaucrats, and business cronies. In many cases, moreover, this additionally involves extensive intermeshing between ruling elites and the military. This might not seem, at first glance, to apply in Egypt and Tunisia, where society is generally more homogeneous and where the professional character and formal institutional autonomy of the armed forces made them more willing, and able, to ease their incumbent presidents-for-life – Mubarak and Ben-Ali – from power. But the Egyptian military has been “organically integrated with the leading economic, administrative, and political groups” in the country since soon after the creation of the first republic in 1952.<sup>3</sup> During the last 20 years under Mubarak its penetration of the state apparatus and of the civilian economy arguably came to exceed in scope and scale the original “military society” formed under Egypt’s first president, Gamal Abdul-Nasser.<sup>4</sup> Even in Tunisia, where the army remains largely insulated from social and political currents, regional affiliations have always been the basis for implicit “clans” among senior commanders, and potentially for alliances with competing business factions formed on similar regional lines.

Elsewhere, intermeshing between ruling elites and the military both depends on, and is reflected in, the reliance of presidents and kings alike on family members to head key military commands, as is evident in the republican regimes of Libya, Syria, and Yemen and in the monarchic regimes of

Qatar and Saudi Arabia (which have obviously not undergone uprisings or rapid transition). Furthermore, armies are often built around, and shaped by, communal or regional loyalties, making their cohesion and effectiveness hostage to those loyalties. In Bahrain, for example, the monarchy has promoted a Sunni Muslim bias in the armed forces and the exclusion of the Shi'i Muslim majority of the population as a means of resisting domestic pressures for democratization; this form of discrimination was a major factor in the uprising that took place there in 2011, and that continues to erupt periodically despite Saudi-backed repression. In fellow monarchy Jordan, which has experienced a slow-motion uprising over the past year, a de facto policy of exclusion of Palestinians has been in place since the 1970 civil war, with the army instead representing the East Bank population, especially that of rural areas and the under-developed, tribally-based South.

To the East of the Arab region, the pre-2003 Iraqi Army contained a large number of Shi'i Muslim Arabs, including in ranking positions, but Sunni Muslim Arabs, especially and clansmen from then President Saddam Hussein's home town Tikrit and its region, predominated in the army-within-the-army formed by the Republican and Presidential Guards; since 2003 ethno-sectarian affiliation has been a primary determinant of whether or not Iraqis will join the Army, which regional brigades they enter, and whether or not they will obey commanders who are not from the same ethnicity or sect. And today, nine years after the United States invasion that toppled Hussein and introduced meaningful democratic process, the incumbent prime minister, Nouri al-Maliki, has asserted his direct, personal authority over the army\* – alongside the internal security services and the local government structure – once more accumulating concentrated executive power to a high degree.

These patterns are also evident elsewhere. Tribal and regional alliances are both important in Libya, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen, to the extent that tribal relations may be said to have penetrated both the armed forces and the state. Certainly in Libya, tribal and regional militias are highly resistant to plans to dissolve and merge them into a new national army, and similar tensions run deep under the veneer of formal unity of the Yemen armed forces, which nearly went to war with each other in 2011. Sectarian identity remains central in Lebanon, where the army has undergone several models of separation and integration of units and the officer corps along sectarian lines. Sectarian and

---

\* This refers to Arab units and provinces, not Kurdish ones, which are under the control of the Kurdish Regional Government.

regional identities are no less important in neighbouring Syria: army personnel are drawn from all communities, with a natural preponderance of the majority Sunni Muslims in the general population, but minority 'Alawi Muslims dominate certain key units and commands, while senior Sunni officers are drawn heavily from the southern Houran region, to balance against fellow Sunnis from the main cities and the North. Identity politics of sect and region will no doubt dominate, and seriously complicate, the reform or reconstruction of a new army once the Syrian crisis ends.

Mutual distrust between ruling elites and certain communities helps explain the reliance on foreign personnel to fulfil military missions in some Arab countries. Bahrain has repeatedly recruited Sunni Muslims from other Arab countries and, reportedly, from Pakistan, to serve in its armed forces, so as to avoid recruiting Bahraini Shi'is. Libya went further, paying Lebanese and Palestinian parties to provide militiamen to help fight its border wars with Chad in the 1980s, and training an Islamic Legion to operate in the Sahel and, more recently, to help defend the Qadhafi regime against the Libyan uprising. The lack of nationals willing to join the military in the small, affluent populations of the Gulf monarchies is another factor prompting the hire of foreigners: Kuwait relies heavily on *bidoon* (stateless) personnel, while in the UAE and KSA non-nationals on contract are mid-level officers, advisors, and Air Force ground crews.

### **Institutionalization II: Intertwining of the agencies of coercion**

The second main aspect of the institutionalization of national armed forces into authoritarian systems is their intertwining with other coercive agencies of the state: the police, intelligence services, and other internal security forces. Most Arab states maintain numerous, and large, agencies tasked with the maintenance of public law and order, fighting crime, and asserting regime control. To take the most prominent cases for which relatively reliable data is available: the Egyptian Ministry of Interior has 1.4 million employees (police, armed security forces, border guards, informers), while its Saudi counterpart has 750,000; Tunisia has 120,000 internal security personnel; the Political Security Organization in Yemen has a strength of 150,000, and it is only one among several agencies engaged in internal security and policing; and the reconstructed (internal) Iraqi Security Forces have 415,000-600,000 personnel of all types. In most of these cases, internal security forces outnumber the armed forces by a wide margin.

Intertwining has been driven almost entirely by regime protection. It is evident, for example, in

assigning the army a constitutionally defined role in undertaking an internal security role, in addition to its main mission of external defence. At the same time, measures taken from the 1970s onwards to protect regimes against military coups d'état – coup-proofing – resulted in a proliferation of intelligence agencies that were initially set up to monitor the army, and then to monitor each other. Massive increases in oil revenue and in the circulation of various forms of capital and rent within the region made this possible, contributing, predictably, to further massive expansion in the number of people employed in the military and internal security sectors. This went hand in hand with increases in military pay, especially for the officer corps, a range of generous allowances and subsidies (food, housing, consumer goods), and continued heavy spending on procurement and infrastructure.

Regime protection also prompted the formation of paramilitary internal security agencies, often fielding heavy weaponry. The Ba'th Party's Popular Army and Fedayeen Saddam provided this role in pre-2003 Iraq, as did the more heavily-armed and professionally-trained *sarāyā al-difā'* (Defense Companies) and *sarāyā al-Sirā'* (Struggle Companies) in Syria. Libya's Revolutionary Guards were intended to perform a similar role, as were the more tightly-organized Security Battalions, which spearheaded the Qadhafi regime's counter-attacks during the 2011 conflict. This is mostly a phenomenon of republican regimes, but the National Guard in Saudi Arabia arguably performs the same function in a monarchic setting. What also distinguishes most of these paramilitary formations is that they have often been commanded by close male relatives of state leaders.

It should moreover be pointed out that most Arab police forces and internal security services are military in origin and, even today, in nature. Their organization, training, and ranks – and their uniforms and armament – remain based for the most part on military models, and their operational culture is predominantly militaristic. The “war on terror” has further militarized internal security, again blurring the distinctions between external defence, public law and order, and regime protection and consequently between national armed forces and domestic police and intelligence agencies. In numerous Arab countries, new police units have been created or old ones retooled for counterterrorism: SWAT teams, commando-type Special Forces, and dedicated counterterrorism battalions. These units answer to a variety of constitutional or de facto authorities – in some cases coming under ministries of interior, in others under parallel structures reporting to state leaders,



whether directly or indirectly – dividing in effect along factional or partisan allegiances.

Most countries moreover already have paramilitary gendarmeries, which historically have been used to pacify and police rural areas. Such forces number 60,000 in Algeria and 50,000 in Morocco, while virtually the entirety of Lebanon's Internal Security Forces are in fact gendarmes rather than police. Jordan created an independent General Directorate of Gendarmerie in 2008, and even the non-state Palestinian Authority and Kurdish Regional Government in Iraq have transformed former guerillas into armed constabulary units with US training.

The intertwining of national armed forces and domestic police and intelligence agencies has several implications. First, it reveals the hybrid nature and purposes of the state's coercive apparatus: the military and internal security spheres are rarely demarcated clearly. This complicates establishing civilian control or democratic governance of either. The implication of armies in internal security and regime protection may have adverse effects, however: some armies evince unease over the excesses of internal security agencies and of predatory presidents-for-life. Outright distaste with brutality was apparently a factor in the role played by the Tunisian army in evicting President Zine al-Abdin Bin-Ali in January 2011, and was also expressed privately by Egyptian officers cited by United States diplomats in the Wikileaks cables from 2008. Armies may also desire to reduce the confusion of roles with militarized domestic security and intelligence agencies and curb the latter's autonomy, as occurred in Brazil's *abertura*. For these and other reasons, armies may endorse controlled transition to more liberal politics.

### **Institutionalization III: Social welfare and military economies**

The above underlines the extensiveness of military and security employment. In turn this reveals a central social welfare function of military employment as a significant source of job security, basic income, healthcare, and pensions and post-service benefits – especially when employment in the police and internal security services is also taken into account. Over the past two decades, regimes have used military and security employment to shield core social constituencies that provide crucial support from the impact of deepening economic liberalization and privatization. As the latter processes have accelerated, the proportion of populations living at or below the poverty line has grown in many countries, reaching 40 per cent in Egypt and Jordan, for example. Military and security employment does not offer its beneficiaries affluence by any means – indeed it does not

even provide full protection against declining living standards as economies privatize and reform – but it slows and cushions the worst impacts, whereas growing numbers of their compatriots experience widening income disparities and descend into poverty.

The scale of the social welfare function is evident from the combined personnel numbers of armies and domestic police and intelligence agencies: 1,870,000 or more in Egypt\*, 850,000 in Iraq, over 200,000 in Jordan, 950,000 in Saudi Arabia. These figures represent significant percentages of national labour forces, even more so of active labour forces, which are directly subsidized by the state. The figures also point to the importance of military and security employment for household income in a large number of families in every country. This form of social welfare complements, and overlaps with, others: much of the financial burden of maintaining large armies and domestic police and intelligence agencies is obscured by accounting for it under the budgets of other ministries, such as health, housing, and finance (for pensions). Military social welfare may even spawn its own patronage systems: the Saudi Arabian Ministries of Defense and Civil Aviation, Ministry of Interior, and National Guard, which are all headed by royals, function as “states within the state”, each with its parallel security forces and parallel infrastructures in housing, education, and health.<sup>5</sup>

Maintaining these social welfare systems imposes a growing burden on public finances, which for many countries is already beyond unaffordable. Some have responded by allowing the army to engage in commercial and economic activities. This originally arose as part of coup-proofing strategies by regimes in 1970-2010, and gave rise in several cases to new types of “military economy”. At one end are the parallel “officer economies”: Egypt, where there was no civilian control or oversight; then Sudan and Yemen, where the military economy operated as a de facto franchise of the ruling elite; followed by Syria, in which the armed forces and security services have run massive and lucrative black market activities since the 1970s; and lastly Algeria, in which senior army commanders exercise de facto, albeit hidden, control over strategic sectors of the formal economy, most notably, though not exclusively, gas and oil.<sup>6</sup>

---

\* Egypt had 469,000 men in the armed forces, 479,000 reservists, and 72,000 in paramilitary units in 2011. If the number of 1.4 million under the ministry of interior is correct, then the overall number for military and security personnel comes to 2.42 million.

In Egypt, for example, the army has developed what is often described as an “economic empire”, legally sanctioned by the state. It runs factories that produce everything from ovens and clothing to car tires and commercial vehicles, manages hotels and tourist resorts, and operates bakeries. Initially the services and goods produced were intended for army rank-and-file only, but over the past two decades they have been increasingly on offer to the civilian market.<sup>7</sup> The army now competes directly with the private sector in the economy, taking advantage of its abundant supply of cheap labor, tax free status, and reduced import duties, while retaining all its profits, ostensibly to improve conditions for its rank-and-file – although the benefits have accrued almost exclusively to the senior officer corps in reality.

In Syria, on the other hand, the army is known to have been involved for decades in black market activities on a massive scale: especially during its long deployment in Lebanon in 1976-2005, but also across the borders with Iraq, Turkey, and Jordan. Tolerance of illicit economic activity has been a means both of compensating for inadequate budgets and low pay, and of integrating senior commanders into regime networks.

Yemen offers a third example, in which the president and his close family control the country’s largest economic conglomerate through the military pension fund of the army, maintaining large stakes in diverse areas of production, services, and external trade. Not only have similar cross-border flows and networks appeared in other Arab countries and also implicated the military – in Algeria, for example – but they have moreover drawn in counterparts in neighbouring countries and even generated regional vested interests in the survival of the incumbent regimes.

In a medium position are Jordan, Oman, and Morocco: where intermittent, discretionary patronage is doled out by monarchs as royal “favours” – officers receive shares in privatized companies, for example, or serve on boards and state committees, thereby securing supplementary incomes and benefits. Only at the other end of the scale, in the GCC petro-monarchies, Tunisia, and Lebanon do ruling families or civilian leaders exercise effective control of the military, especially in the richer economies that can afford more generous salaries and better service conditions.

Careful inspection of the various military economies shows that they have generally been inefficient providers of social welfare. In fact, there appears to be a negative correlation between

the military-based social welfare function and regime survival in most of the Arab countries that witnessed popular uprisings in 2011: in Egypt, Yemen, and Syria, the military economy predominantly served top commanders and senior officers, to the deep resentment of mid-level and junior officers, not to mention the non-commissioned ranks; the Tunisian and Libyan armed forces had long been marginalized, and consequently resented the self-aggrandizing behaviour of state elites and favoured security bosses; and in Bahrain the social welfare function has benefited one social community to the deliberate exclusion of another, an observation that may also be made of Jordan, which has experienced continued, simmering unrest.

Clearly, preservation of the military economy is an important factor in countries undergoing transition; this is most obvious in Egypt, but struggles over oil-funded state resources are already a central feature of post-Qadhafi politics in Libya, where the transitional government is struggling to find ways of funding the compensation or integration of an estimated 120,000-200,000 militiamen into a new national army that has yet to be designed and built.<sup>8</sup> An even greater challenge will no doubt similarly affect post-crisis Syria as the governing system that eventually emerges seeks to regain control of, and rebuild, the national economy, inevitably clashing with the country's extensive black market economy. Not only were the armed forces and security services deeply implicated in the parallel economy, but many of the armed rebels now confronting the Asad regime were also involved in smuggling or other illegal businesses and activities. Even if the latter are excluded from analysis, the formal military economies are important not only to senior officers – and even to the ordinary rank-and-file in some cases – but they underpin household income for much wider social constituencies as well.

In all these cases, and for all these reasons, the army may resist reforms that threaten to curb or end its economic activities, whether directly or through privatization of state assets and services from which it derives rent or market access. Indeed, it is more than likely that armies will resist coming under formal, routine audit by the cabinet, parliament, or ministries of finance, let alone withdrawing from the civilian economy altogether. There is a paradox: the army desires domestic stability so that it may remain outside politics, yet will seek to guarantee its budget and protect its private economy. Though not an issue in wealthier Arab countries – such as the GCC petro-monarchies – where armies have little autonomy and do not engage in independent economic activity, wider attempts to separate political decision-making power from economic ownership may

generate new tensions and challenges, with knock-on effects for civil-military relations.

In general, protection of budgets and social welfare may determine the attitude of armies towards democratization, while possibly also leading to divergence and fissures within armies along lines of seniority of rank, generation, and models of professional formation and socialization, and the associated factor of external relations (i.e. the sources of training, doctrine, and normative values). Post-transitional governments can only dismantle deeply-entrenched military economies if they are able to generate and expand legal revenue streams so as to improve pay radically, enhance service conditions, and bolster pensions. This poses a truly daunting challenge, which may prove insurmountable for some.

### **Conclusion**

Whether armies support peaceful transition, revert to repression, or fragment will be key to their ability to maintain or develop their professional and corporate identities in the aftermath. This is moreover highly contingent on their readiness to accept readjustment of their institutionalization into state systems; specifically the manner in which this is pursued by other actors, its pace, and the nature of any compromises that are negotiated.

It is most likely that the decisive pressures, whether in support of transition and renegotiation of civil-military relations or in opposition to them, will come from the ground forces which are not only the largest component of national armed forces, but also, due to their dependence on conscripts or recruitment among lower-income and lower-skilled social sectors, the most affected by pressures on living standards and pensions and consequently the most vulnerable to the same socio-economic factors that drive the popular uprisings.

Senior commanders are very sensitive to these calculations, but this is not, in itself, any assurance that the military as a whole will ultimately throw its lot in with democracy movements. A new status quo is just as likely to emerge, combining elements of *ancien regimes* with the more conservative wings of opposition movements, in which ‘stability’ is prioritized, something most external powers are also likely to favour. Bringing about genuine democratic governance of armed forces, not to mention genuine reform within the military itself, still requires a protracted political struggle on multiple levels. Until then, the military have been reconfirmed as a key asset – and

sometimes a key actor – in national politics in all newly-democratizing Arab states.

—注—

- <sup>1</sup> Alfred Stepan, *Rethinking Military Politics: Brazil and the Southern Cone*, Princeton University Press, 1988.
- <sup>2</sup> Samer Soliman argues that the durability of authoritarian regimes despite financial crises may be explained by their allocation of a greater share of state resources to domestic security agencies. *The Autumn of Dictatorship: Fiscal Crisis and Political Change in Egypt under Mubarak*, Stanford University Press, 2011.
- <sup>3</sup> Anouar Abdel-Malek, 'Nasserism and Socialism', *The Socialist Register 1964* London, 1964, p. 45.
- <sup>4</sup> Discussed in Yezid Sayigh, *The future of civil-military relations in Egypt* (working title), Carnegie Middle East Center, forthcoming (2012).
- <sup>5</sup> Steffen Hertog, 'Rentier Militaries in the Gulf States: The Price of Coup-Proofing', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 43, No. 3, August 2011, p. 400.
- <sup>6</sup> For an excellent fuller discussion, see Clement Henry and Robert Springborg, *Globalization and the Politics of Development in the Middle East*, Cambridge University Press, 2010 (2<sup>nd</sup> edition).
- <sup>7</sup> The most recent and perceptive summary of the Egyptian military economy is Mohamed Al-Khalsan, 'The Army and the Economy in Egypt', *jadaliyya*, 23 December 2011. URL: <http://www.jadaliyya.com/pages/index/3732/the-army-and-the>
- <sup>8</sup> A succinct recent assessment of the challenge facing the interim government is Amanda Kadlec, 'Disarming Libya's Militias', *Analysis on Arab Reform-Sada*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 16 February 2012. <http://carnegieendowment.org/sada/2012/02/16/disarming-libya-s-militias/9of0>