6-2013

The Endurance of Arab Authoritarian Regimes: A Study of Jordan and Algeria

Stacey Berger
Union College - Schenectady, NY

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalworks.union.edu/theses

Part of the Comparative Politics Commons, Near and Middle Eastern Studies Commons, and the Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons

The Endurance of Arab Authoritarian Regimes:
A Study of Jordan and Algeria

By

Stacey L. Berger

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for
Honors in the Departments of Political Science

Union College

June 2013

Introduction

The endurance of Arab authoritarian regimes has been quite daunting, especially with the rise of the Arab Spring. Some Arab regimes have ruled with domination and repression since the nineteenth century. These regimes stand out globally with respect to the number of democratic countries. Even with the recent rebellions, the rise of the Arab Spring, starting in 2011, a number of Arab regimes still continue to thrive and remain in tact under authoritarian rule. This includes quite a number of Arab states that have faced uprisings during the Arab Spring, but have not implemented a new democratic system or elected a new leader, such as Syria. With this fascinating reality of Arab authoritarian regimes, I set out to find the reason for the endurance of Arab authoritarian regimes, noting that this was not a simple coincidence. My goal was to find out what exactly allowed Arab authoritarian regimes to remain stable, whether it was political strategies or economic resources, even in the face of the Arab Spring. Overall, I was determined to obtain a grip on one solid and plausible reason as to why Arab authoritarian leaders have endured for so long, or at least a brief number of reasons. Arab authoritarianism has allowed the regimes to endure since the nineteenth century and continue to do so with protests and grievances amongst citizens.

I decided to choose the topic of Arab authoritarian endurance because I understood the importance in exposing the backbone of the regimes. I truly believe that learning about the reasons for Arab authoritarian endurance empowers people of all backgrounds with the knowledge of strategies that dictates the lives of people in Arab states. Not only does this topic allow people to understand the power of Arab regimes in being able to rule with a strong fist, but also enables people to comprehend how most

Arab authoritarian regimes are able to continue to real with a stable regime even with the recent Arab uprisings. The endurance of Arab authoritarianism is most important in being able to analyze and compare Arab regimes that have fallen to the Arab Spring and the ones that continue to maintain durability.

In order to complete this research task, I embarked on extensive research and used various methodologies. My thesis is split into four sections, with two main chapters. My first section is the literature review. I completed this portion by researching a broad range of arguments by a number of different scholars, such as the politicized education system, the condition of the coercive forces, hydrocarbon exports, and so on for the endurance of Arab authoritarian regimes. These arguments included reasons prior to the Arab Spring. The arguments used in my literature review all fall under political, economic, cultural, security, or educational reasons.

My two main chapters consist of Jordan and Algeria. I chose these two regimes as my core chapters to create a balanced argument, as Jordan is a constitutional monarchy and Algeria is a semi-presidential republic. My methodologies for these chapters included conducting extensive research on each country with concern to the recent protests, government responses, and theories amongst scholars as to why these regimes continue to endure even after the Arab Spring. I also learned about the structure of each regime, such as its components, government supporters, government opponents, and security forces. I provided the structure of each regime in the beginning of each core chapter. Each of these countries have unique factors specific to their endurance, which helped me produce a compelling thesis.

The last section of my thesis includes a conclusion. My conclusion wraps up my entire thesis. I provided similarities and differences between Jordan and Algeria for the protests, government responses, and theories for the endurance of each country. In regards to the protests, I explained similarities and differences between Jordan and Algeria for the grievances, general ideals, organization, location, injuries, and the amount of security. As for the government responses, I provided similarities and differences for the economic and political responses. In regards to the theories, I included overlapping political theories for the endurance of each regime. I also focused on overlapping political, security, and economic reasons between the theories in the literature review and the theories for my core cases. I also provided results specific to each country for all of these areas. Finally, I discussed how adequate the literature review theories matched up to Jordan and Algeria, as well as arguments that should be added to the literature review theories. Lastly, I touched upon approaches from the literature review that were not widely argued by theorists for Jordan and Algeria.

My findings did not end up including one solid and plausible reason as to why Arab authoritarian leaders have endured for so long, but rather a number of reasons for the lasting regimes. I argued that the main reasons for the endurance of Arab authoritarian regimes fall under political means, which were overlapping arguments for the core cases of Jordan and Algeria. These arguments include the creation of reforms and promises, the threat of chaos, and societal cleavages. My findings also included theories that fit with the literature. These arguments fall under political, security, and economic reasons. These arguments include legitimacy, multi-party system,

patrimonialism, resource wealth, international support, internal disagreements, and coercive security forces.

The arguments reveal that each Arab authoritarian regime is able to endure due to distinct reasons, as each regime is different. However the theories of legitimacy, multi-party system, patrimonialism, resource wealth, international support, internal disagreements, and coercive security forces stand out as the main arguments, as the reasons are common amongst almost all Arab authoritarian regimes. Overall, I argue that there is not one specific reason for the endurance of Arab authoritarian regimes, but rather different reasons under various categories that fit the majority of the Arab states.

Literature Review

Various theorists have argued about the reasons for this endurance of Arab authoritarian regimes. Some scholars have overlapping arguments, while many reasons clash. Overall most fall under political, economic, cultural, security, or educational reasons.

Among various arguments, political issues seem to be the most popular reasons among theorists for the endurance of Arab regimes. For instance, a number of scholars specifically point to the use of the multi-party system. Posusney claims that the oppositional groups have nowhere to move under this system because they are restricted under almost every area (*Authoritarianism*, 95). This includes the media, campaign activities, simple formation and registration as a political party. Incomplete parliamentarization, liberalized autocracies, the abundance of independent candidates, and financial fragility further restrict opposition groups. With respect to the media, the regime has complete control. The media is extremely restricted, especially for opposition parties. For example, radio stations need their programs approved by the secret police and one newspaper editor claimed "we can barely bring ourselves to express our opinions to our wives in our bedrooms and even then we are afraid" when responding to a question with regards to obeying the secret police about his cartoon section (*The Media Relations* 195). One Jordanian columnist even claimed, "I feel like I am two people…on the one hand I am addressing the readers, but part of me is addressing all the security services watching me" (*The Media Relations* 197). When it comes to the regime, the government controls the media, using it to its own advantage and "creat[ing] the impression of

popular mandate for the leader" (*Authoritarianism* 95). Essentially the media is caged and opposition parties are unable to use it to their benefit.

When it comes to campaign activities and voting, opposition parties face many restraints. During the election, voters are often coerced if they support the challenger (*Authoritarianism* 91). Macfarquhar uses Qudah, a Jordanian poet, as an example. Qudah was jailed by the secret police after simply reciting a poem regarding Jordan's political system (*The Media Relations* 192). Even though opposition parties face major setbacks due to restricted media coverage and campaign activities, creating the actual party itself is the most challenging. Posusney explains how new political parties need to register with the government to receive their permission for creation. Either this takes too long for the group to stay active, or its application is denied (*Authoritarianism* 95). Opposition parties end up working alone, which is completely ineffective (*The Media Relations* 180). Posusney and Macfarquhar mainly argue the restrictions political parties face that inhibit them from effectively seeking change in the government.

Most scholars do not disagree with Posusney and Macfarquhar, as most Arab regimes have instilled restrictions that do in fact limit opposition parties under a multi-party system. Still, some believe that certain aspects of the multi-party system are more significant than others in terms of sustaining the weakness of the opposition parties. Among the various other restrictions that the opposition parties face, Vicki Langhor also lists election fraud, repressive ruling, deficient access to public meeting spaces, and the mass mobilization of government security at protests. Langhor believes that these handicaps certainly slow down any opposition parties, but she argues that incomplete parliamentarization, a lack of voters due to the prevalence of independent candidates, and

financial constraints are the most important, as they limit opposition parties in particularly powerful ways. Insufficient parliamentarization refers to "significant deviations from general parliamentary procedure[s] such as allowing unelected upper houses to censure governments obstruct elected representatives" (Langhor 202). With incomplete parliamentarization, the government is able to diminish the influence of opposition parties, even when they win a large quantity of seats (Langhor 202).

Relatedly, Brumberg illustrates a more broad aspect of some Arab regimes that allow them to continue to thrive: liberalized autocracy. Under this system, "a set of interdependent institutional, economic, ideological, social and geostrategic factors has created an adaptable ecology of repression, control, and partial openness" ("The Trap of Liberalized 57"). The idea is to create a regime with political openness, or perceived political openness. Through this system the state is constantly loosening and then tightening the restrictions on the rival parties, which completely throws them off balance and unable to improve as parties. Also, the periods of openness allow the parties to blow off steam so they do not build up anger towards an uprising ("Democratization Versus Liberalization").

The entire political ecosystem of a liberalized autocracy contributes to the survival of these partial autocracies and the power of the ruler, and as a result, the Arab leader refuses to relinquish any of their control over the regime. In some Arab countries, such as Algeria, Morocco, and Kuwait, the leaders will expand this idea and give some opposition groups representation in parliament. Some regimes even incorporate the process of "Islamization," where Islamists will gain small-scale ideological and

bureaucratic control, but in reality they do not have much influence over the regime

("The Trap of Liberalized 57").

Furthermore, Langhor explains the importance of the abundance of independent

candidates surrounded by other competing candidates. This inhibits the opposition parties

because they take away a large number of seats that would have gone to the opposition

parties (Langhor 205). Also, the abundance of independent candidates hurts the

opposition parties because they weaken the progress of party programs. These party

programs could be established as party alternatives to the authoritarian regime and take

away its support (Langhor 203). Langhor argues "the prevalence of independent

candidacy among non-ruling party candidates weakens the chances for effective

opposition to authoritarian regimes by preventing the formation of well-defined

alternatives that can win popular support" (Langhor 205).

Lastly, Langhor emphasizes the financial fragility of opposition parties. This is

mainly due to the fact that opposition parties do not have the business elites on their side

because their interests or platforms do not overlap with the upper class. Rather, business

elites look more towards sectoral groups because business opportunities are more

controlled by authoritarian regimes. On top of this issue, the opposition parties have to

rely on the government for finances and as a result, they aren't provided with many funds

to act as a functional party and win support (Langhor 205).

Among these various restrictions under the multi-party system, Lust-Okar argues

that the government's censorship of the more radical parties inhibits the more moderate

oppositional parties from succeeding. In this case, Lust-Okar points out that the

government may decide to restrict certain parties in elections, while others are granted the

privilege to compete in elections, which creates moderation among the included groups

("Enduring Arab" 131). The moderates "fear that an alliance with excluded groups could

force the regime to punish the moderates by further constricting their avenues for

participation" ("Enduring Arab" 132). Essentially the moderating opposition parties lose

numbers as a result of fear that they will be completely shut down by the government if

they align with the excluded groups ("Enduring Arab" 132).

Although the multi-party system is significant, the perceived legitimacy of the

Arab regimes is another politics-oriented approach to understanding the conditions that

allow the Arab regimes to endure. Dawisha writes, "Arab leaders constantly endeavor to

win their populations' acceptance of or at least acquiescence to their leadership, usually

by portraying themselves as meritorious and successful" (Dawisha 525). By creating an

image as a popular and successful leader, the population believes that the regime is

legitimate and working for the people. Dawisha also emphasizes how Arab regimes have

formed hierarchical social systems, which appear to be legitimate with the authoritative

figure at the top. As a result, Arab regimes lack insurgent tendencies among their citizens

(Dawisha 525).

This hierarchical structure is further evident in Arab regimes that have had one

tribe or one clique control the government over a long period of time. Macfarquhar

reveals this structure in Saudi Arabia. In Saudi Arabia, the Saud family and Wahabi

clerics formed an alliance early in the 18th century and still reign today. This gives them

complete control over Saudi society and the people. Macfarquhar writes, "the clerical

hierarchy views even the idea of laws emanating from public debate with suspicion, as if

that process might erode G-d's mandate" (255). The majority of princes are the only ones

that can bring about change in Saudi Arabia and it's understood that it won't occur anytime soon (*The Media Relations* 254).

On top of the hierarchal structure with the perceived strong leader, Dawisha believes that the religion of Islam and the relationship between past and present conditions legitimize the regime to the citizens. With respect to the Islamic religion, renowned Muslim jurists ingrained significant imperatives that became a part of the religion's heritage. Muslims feel the need to follow these significant imperatives today. They "prescribed total obedience to the ruler by fostering the belief that rebellion was the most heinous of crimes — a doctrine consecrated in the juristic maxim" (Dawisha 525). In regards to past and present experiences, memories of the past may change their view on the present, but the present conditions override these thoughts, such as modernization. Modernization and other transforming environments have strengthened the Arab people, as changing social conditions have delegitimized authoritarianism and traditional values with advanced education and Westernization. Even so, these present conditions have boosted Arab leaders even more so than the ruled because advanced technology has provided regimes with "access to methods of suppression that made earlier methods pale by comparison" (Dawisha 526). Also, through propaganda acts of creating new economic, social, and foreign policies that appear to be achievements and developments, Arab authoritarian leaders have been able to win the support of their citizens (Dawisha 526). Ultimately, Dawisha argues that citizens under Arab regimes perceive the regime to be legitimate due to factors relating to hierarchal political structures, the imperatives of Islam, and the power of present conditions.

Whitaker presents two different political reasons for the lasting Arab regimes: patrimonialism and Western support. The argument about patrimonialism differs from Dawisha's argument about perceived legitimacy. Whitaker claims that those at the top of the hierarchal structure do not turn against the regime because they are basically "bought off." In this case, the leader will buy off those in the family, tribe, and other dependent groups with jobs, key appointments, and business privileges (Whitaker 97). These favors and resources will be denied to opponents of the regime, but the system guarantees the political support of the influential citizens in society (Whitaker 93). Whitaker explains, "holding the reins of power allows Arab regimes to grant business privileges to themselves or to others in exchange for support, or to restrict the business activities of those who are out of favour" (Whitaker 97). Since the opponents are denied resources, they are unable to develop as a rising power, while those at the top help the regime grow because they are pleased with their patronage (Whitaker 97).

Whitaker also argues that Western support has created lasting Arab regimes. Many Arab regimes have been able to keep a fairly solid relationship with the West, which Whitaker finds to be significant because it helps them stay on the path towards modernity and most importantly, it keeps the West from coming down hard on the regimes (Whitaker 106). The Arab regimes have been able to keep these relationships at a balance, where they still receive support from the West, but they don't run into unfavorable domestic repercussions that can harm the legitimacy of the regime. Western support has come in the form of economic aid and military assistance, which has helped Arab regimes endure with financial help to strengthen the regime and extra security forces to fight off any opponents. To keep the West happy and the citizens from forming

grievances, the regimes will act as if they are emerging democracies without fully reforming. For example, Whitaker explains how Saudi Arabia implemented local government elections in 2005, but women weren't even able to vote and the royal family allocated fifty percent of the seats (Whitaker 107). The Arab regimes essentially set up a system where they are able to keep everyone content, including the West, without fully reforming and revealing their true reliance on the West.

Lastly amongst political reasons, Langhor and Whitaker point to other civil society groups, aside from political parties. Langhor believes that there is too much civil society and not enough politics to build a democracy. Langhor reveals how Arab citizens take a bigger role in nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and other civil society groups rather than in political parties. The Arab citizenry would rather partake in NGOs because they appeal to specific interests and allow citizens to raise funds much more easily, but they are not promising for democratization for the long run (Langhor 193). The main issue with NGOs is their advocacy focus, which is usually for a specific issue or goal. For example, Langhor explains that an NGO can be focused only on human rights issues, which is not productive enough to mobilize a wider range of constituencies around the more significant issue of democratization (Langhor 195).

In opposition to Langhor, Whitaker believes that civil society is too weak, which fuels the endurance of Arab regimes. Just like political parties, civil society groups, such as NGOs, and press publications need to apply for a license. Whitaker explains how Arab citizens don't even apply for licenses because they have witnessed the government decline licenses far too many times. For example, Hisham Kassem, an Egyptian citizen, attempted to create a weekly news magazine, but "recognizing that in the previous ten

years only four political weeklies and one monthly had been granted licenses, and that the founders of all four weeklies had strong connections with the government, Kassem decided not to bother applying for a license" (Whitaker 180). Even worse, the Saudis need the approval of the king just to form a civil society organization based on human rights or corruption (Whitaker 181). The restrictions will vary across each Arab regime, but overall Whitaker argues that civil society is extremely weak under Arab regimes because civic and social organizations do not have the power nor resources to come together as a group and discuss grievances.

In addition to political reasons, a large number of economic reasons for lasting authoritarianism under the Arab regimes have advanced. Under this approach, several theorists, including Whitaker and Macfarquhar, believe that many Arab regimes are able to thrive due to their extensive income from hydrocarbon exports, foreign aid, and rents. Whitaker and Macfarquhar believe these sources of income place the regimes in a good enough economic stance, where they do not need to implement an income tax, keeping the citizens at ease and happy with the government, especially when taxes are compared to ones in the United States. Whitaker explains, "english history might have taken a different course if Charles, like many Arab rulers today, had been able to draw on other financial resources, such as oil. He might well have stayed in power, regardless of his unpopularity, and continued to rule without recourse to parliament" (Whitaker 102). Essentially many Arab regimes are able to rely on resources such as oil to build the state and they do not have to worry about pressure by their citizens for accountability because the levels of taxation are extremely low, especially direct income taxes. Whitaker argues that citizens would move towards a demand for democracy if taxes were high because

they would call for a voice in how the taxes are distributed (Whitaker 102). Brumberg somewhat disagrees with this argument, mainly in regards to oil money, because there are many Arab regimes that rely on oil as their source of income, but are not total autocracies ("The Trap of Liberalized" 57).

Macfarquhar agrees with Whitaker, but focuses on Saudi Arabia. Macfarquhar writes, "indulgence toward reformists tends to rise and fall in tandem with the price of oil—in lean times, the royals are more prone to react to grievances than when they are flush with cash and feel they can buy everyone off" (255). Not only does Macfarquhar argue that Saudi Arabia, like many other Arab states, has low taxation policies, but also the al-Sauds use their oil income in a patrimonial way. Reformists in Saudi Arabia are paid off and therefore choose not to act as dissidents. Out of all the known reserves, Saudi Arabia has total authority over one quarter of them, which allows the al-Sauds to exercise "complete control over the world's richest oil resources" (*The Media Relations* 254). The number of dissidents in Saudi Arabia has declined immensely as many of them have become millionaires, allowing Saudi Arabia to prosper as an authoritarian regime (*The Media Relations* 255).

Whitaker and Macfarquhar may argue that the regime is rich from hydrocarbon exports, foreign aid, and rent, but some scholars emphasize that in many Arab regimes, the people themselves are poor. This economic condition leads to poor education, low literacy rates, and inequality. Bellin writes, "it is not unusual for a fifth of the population in a given country to fall below the poverty line, 32 percent of adults are illiterate, and MENA states rank in the bottom half of the UN's human development index despite the enormous wealth of several MENA countries" (*Authoritarianism* 23). As a result of these

conditions, the elite and masses tend to forget about democratic reform and focus their attention on these issues. The masses don't view democratic reform as essential with these conditions on their hands and the elite are not fearful of the economic issues. Therefore, there are not many groups between the masses and the elite that strive for democratic reform (*Authoritarianism* 23).

Along with political and economic reasons, cultural reasons play a huge role among many theorists. The most popular argument among cultural reasons concerns the Arab culture and Islamic religion. The Islamic religion was previously discussed under political reasons, but only with regard to the fact that aspects of the religion created a perceived legitimacy for the political leader. Luciani claims that Islam, as the main religion among Arabs, tends to shape their cultural attitudes. The Islamic religion is such a dominant part of many Arabs' lives that it is "much more than a system of spiritual guidance; it is accepted as a comprehensive social, political, legal and cultural system, and as such, even after years of 'modernisation' and 'secularisation', Islam remains a powerful and pervasive force in the Arab world" (Luciani 287). Luciani highlights the supremacy of the Islamic religion among Arabs and its power to form cultural views.

Luciani expands the notion of how Islam shapes cultural attitudes and explains how renowned Muslim jurists and various theologians carried on the importance of the Islamic religion after the prophet passed away and turned it into a central authority. Through the worldview of these jurists and theologians, Arabs today believe that, "'rebelling is the most heinous of crimes' and 'sixty years of tyranny are better than one hour of civil strife'" (Luciani 288). They even implemented claims of the Caliph regarding obedience to the leader. Ultimately, these claims became embodied within the

Arab culture and Luciani argues that Arabs' adherence to the Islamic religion shapes the way in which they react towards authority, or rather the inaction they take against the government. Luciani believes that the Islamic religion, or at least the version that renowned jurists and theologians have passed down, explains the endurance of Arab authoritarianism for the most part (288).

Whitaker also points to Islam as the main reason for Arab authoritarian endurance. Whitaker doesn't exactly touch upon the ways in which Islam has been passed down to discourage the formation of opposition groups and uprisings, rather, he explains the importance of Islam's message that fosters complete obedience to the Arab leader. Since Islam is embedded in the Arab culture, Arab citizens strictly follow the Islamic religion. Rather than a separation between church and state, Arab regimes fuse religion and the state, where Arab leaders rule with the power of g-d and build on the negative connotations associated with secularism (Whitaker 137). Therefore Arab citizens are completely compliant to the Arab leader because at the end of the day, the law comes from "g-d" (Whitaker 144). As a result, "g-d's laws", or the regime's laws overrides popular sovereignty.

Along with Luciani and Whitaker, Brumberg mentions the significance of Islam, but in terms of the way in which Arab rulers use it to gain the title as "supporters of the Islamic community and Arab nation" ("The Trap of Liberalized" 58). Since Islam has taken an important role in the lives of many Arabs, they are able to relate to one another and come together as a community. Arab leaders manipulate this commonality and act in a way that makes them look like they are completely devoted to the Islamic community and citizens in general, and not just the regime itself. Brumberg refers to this condition as

"the 'harmonic' foundation of legitimacy: Total autocracies spread the idea that the state's mission is to defend the supposedly unified nature of the Arab nation or the Islamic community" ("The Trap of Liberalized" 58).

Another cultural argument explaining lasting Arab regimes is the significance of family honor. Whitaker labels this phenomenon as the "gilded cage" because Arabs will be able to use family connections to go very far in life. However there are many restrictions involved, especially for women, which keep them in the cage of family honor. This cultural aspect among Arab families has a great impact on the regimes because "regimes are products of the societies they govern" (Whitaker 48-49). Whitaker explains how these household relationships reflect the political regime, where citizens will act obediently to the regime because they were brought up to keep family honor and stay duteous to their clan or tribe. Whitaker writes, "the patriarchal attitudes observed at ground level in the family are replicated throughout society, right up to the top, rulers and political leaders are cast in the image of the father" (Whitaker 52). Macfarquhar agrees with Whitaker with regard to the reason of family honor, but he mainly uses the case study of Saudi Arabia to present this argument. Women are forced to stay in the private sphere for the most part, as they need permission from their husbands to go places, they are not allowed to drive, and they must be fully covered outside the home (*The Media Relations* 262). Ultimately, many Arab households demand obedience to the family honor, which keeps the citizens in line as submissive beings to the regime.

In addition to political, economic, and cultural arguments, many scholars believe that the amount of coercion and security used by Arab regimes is the main factor contributing to the endurance of authoritarianism in the Arab world. Brumberg and

Brownlee touch upon similar examples associated with coercion. Brumberg focuses on Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Syria, explaining that the main concern of the regimes is to build up their security forces and "to absorb or repress rival political voices" ("The Trap of Liberalized" 58). Brumberg points out the risks of these actions, such as the loyalty of the security forces. For example, in Saudi Arabia, a close alliance has been formed between the House of Saud and Wahabi institutions, but the Wahabi religious establishments can revolt against the regime at any time and join Islamist opposition forces ("The Trap of Liberalized" 58). Even so, Brumberg still considers these coercive forces to be one of the main reasons for Arab authoritarian endurance.

Brownlee also argues that the condition of coercive forces as the main reason for Arab authoritarianism. However, unlike Brumberg, Brownlee believes that Arab security forces are completely loyal to the regime. He thinks that rather than looking at the culture of the Arab regions, theorists should analyze the regime's coercive apparatus. Brownlee argues that in the event of an uprising, the security forces would be ready to "deploy violence against the opponents" at any time (Brownlee 44). Many Middle East states reveal this oppressive factor, which is linked to low instances of possible regime changes (Brownlee 44). For example, prior to the Arab Spring, Syria faced an uprising in 1982. "He [Assad] brutally suppressed his most active opponents, the Muslim Brotherhood, when they challenged his forces in the city of Hama. Heavy repression ended the opposition's effort to change the regime. Since then Syria has seen twenty more years of continued authoritarianism" (Brownlee 49). Essentially, Arab security forces are more loyal to the regime than to their nation and citizens.

Similar to Brownlee, Bellin believes that the endurance of Arab authoritarianism "lies not in cultural or socioeconomic factors but rather in the character of the Middle Eastern state and, most importantly, the exceptional strength and will of its coercive institutions to repress all democratic initiatives" (*Authoritarianism* 21). Bellin establishes her argument as a little different from Brownlee's theory by explaining the Arab regime's coercive apparatus and capacity to repress in more depth and adding further factors that justify the authoritarian capacity (*Authoritarianism* 21).

Bellin disagrees with arguments related to the insufficiency of prerequisites to democratize: weak civil society, the state's control of the economy, poverty, low literacy levels, geographical location, and Arab culture. Although Bellin agrees that the many Arab countries lack these various prerequisites, "the MENA [Middle East and North Africa] region is in no way unique for its poor endowment with the prerequisites of democracy. Other regions similarly deprived have nonetheless managed to make the transition" (*Authoritarianism* 23). For example, in sub-Saharan Africa, civil society is extremely weak, but a number of the countries have been able to make some democratic transitions (*Authoritarianism* 23). Therefore, Bellin argues that the prerequisites of democracy argument is not sufficient to explain the lack of democratization in the Arab world, even if a country has combination of all of the factors (*Authoritarianism* 24).

Rather than looking at prerequisites of democracy, Bellin believes theorists should look deeper than the inability to achieve the prerequisites because they are not applicable to just the MENA region. Bellin refers to Theda Skocpol in explaining her argument behind the real reason for Arab endurance. Bellin writes, "the answer, Skocpol argued, lies in the strength of the state and, most important, the state's capacity to maintain a

monopoly on the means of coercion. If the state's coercive apparatus remains coherent and effective, it can face down popular disaffection and survive significant legitimacy" (*Authoritarianism* 25). Even though Skocpol explains this idea in regards to revolution, Bellin argues that it can apply to a democratic transition (*Authoritarianism* 25).

With Bellin's reference to Skocpol, she explains that her argument remains within the threatening capacity and will of Arab states rather than the prerequisites of democracy. The problem belongs to present conditions that sustain robust authoritarianism (*Authoritarianism* 26). "The answer, it argues, lies not in cultural and social economic factors but rather in the character of the Middle Eastern state and, most important, the exceptional strength and will of its coercive institutions to repress all democratic initiatives" (*Authoritarianism* 21). Arab states are extremely robust due to the performance of its armed forces, which comes as a result of the funds and mobilization put into the security forces. "Most [Middle East and North Africa states], moreover, enjoy sufficient revenue to sustain exceedingly robust expenditure on their security apparatuses. In fact these expenditures are among the highest in the world. MENA states are the world leaders in terms of proportion of GNP spent on security" (*Authoritarianism* 31). Middle East countries, along with North African countries, spend the most on arms and have an extremely high number of citizens engaged in the security forces. Arab authoritarian regimes invest exceptional effort into their security apparatuses, strengthening their forces to fight against any opposition groups (*Authoritarianism* 31).

Bellin further explains how the coercive capacity of Arab regimes is explained by four factors. These factors include the states' rent abundance, support from foreign countries, the patrimonial nature of the regime, and low levels of popular mobilization for

change (*Authoritarianism* 21). "First the robustness of the coercive apparatus is directly linked to maintenance of fiscal health. The security establishment is most likely to 'give up the ghost' when its financial foundation is seriously compromised" (*Authoritarianism* 27). Arab authoritarian regimes have even spent more of its GNP on defense than the global average in the past (*Authoritarianism* 31). Through rentier income from various endowments, such as, petroleum or gas resources, Arab authoritarian regimes are able to build up its security forces by spending more on defense rather than on education and welfare (*Authoritarianism* 32).

The second factor, international support, is crucial to the coercive apparatus. "Withdrawal of international backing triggers both an existential and financial crisis for the regime that often devastates both its will and capacity to carry on" (*Authoritarianism* 27). Compared to many other regions, Arab states receive exceptional support from foreign countries. Even after the end of the Cold War, Arab authoritarian regimes were still receiving international patronage, as Western countries wanted to assure its oil sources and the containment of Islamic threat (*Authoritarianism* 32-33). Bellin argues patrimonialism and institutionalization as a third factor that shapes the coercive apparatus. Bellin argues that institutionalization refers to Arab authoritarian states with a coercive apparatus that "is rule governed, predictable and meritocratic" and "promotion is based on performance not politics" (*Authoritarianism* 28). Therefore, institutionalized security forces are more loyal to the country, rather than the regime. Bellin explains how most Arab authoritarian states encompass a patrimonial coercive apparatus. With patrimonialism, "staffing decisions are ruled by cronyism; the distinction between public and private mission is blurred, leading to widespread corruption and abuse of power"

(*Authoritarianism* 28). In a patrimonial society, the security forces are more loyal to the regime, rather than the country itself. Therefore, security forces in Arab authoritarian states with patrimonialism are more dedicated to the regime and willing to repress. Arab states with a patrimonial coercive apparatus are more likely to shoot citizens if they were to rebel against the regime (*Authoritarianism* 34).

Lastly, in concern to the fourth factor, the level of popular mobilization for political reform, Bellin believes "the high costs of massive repression will not deter elites who believe the will be ruined by reform" (*Authoritarianism* 29). The level of popular mobilization remains low and therefore Arab countries do not have to put high costs into repression. "Low levels of popular mobilization for democratic reform are a reality in the MENA region. They lower the costs of repression for the coercive apparatus and increase the likelihood that the security establishment will resort to thwart reform initiatives" (*Authoritarianism* 35). The low levels of popular mobilization strengthen the coercive apparatus, as Arab authoritarian regimes are able to spend less of its funds on repression (*Authoritarianism* 35). These present conditions "shape the robustness of a regime's coercive apparatus" (*Authoritarianism* 27). Ultimately, Bellin argues the endurance of Arab authoritarianism lies in the state's powerful and effective coercive apparatus.

Lastly, Macfarquhar also emphasizes the significance of Arab coercion and security forces as a significant factor to authoritarianism in the Middle East. Here he mainly focuses on just the role of secret police in the Middle East (*The Media Relations* 180). Macfarquhar writes, "secret police agencies, or 'mukhabarat' in Arabic, are a powerful and ubiquitous force in every Middle Eastern country. Any public declaration even hinting at criticism of the regime inevitably attracts their attention" (*The Media*

Relations 181). Arab citizens sometimes explain that the main goal of the secret police is to spy on the citizenry. They are mainly there to listen, arrest, interrogate, and restrict activity (*The Media Relations* 181). For example, the secret police in Jordan, the GID (General Intelligence Department), requires students to receive a good behavior document from them if they would like to apply for a certain government program at a public university (*The Media Relations* 182). Macfarquhar mainly explains the everyday actions and goals of the secret police and its ability to keep opposition forces in line through spying, interrogation, arrests, and restrictions.

Among political, economic, cultural, and security reasons, education plays a role as an argument. Whitaker believes education is significant because it is a politicized area under Arab regimes. Children grow up as passive learners because the students are taught to regurgitate the material and not to question the professor. Whitaker says the result is a form of detachment, where "there is no real thinking about anything" and therefore the students become gullible to manipulation (Whitaker 22). In turn, the students are actually truly manipulated by the government rather than the professor because the authorities monitor the textbooks and the education system (Whitaker 17). The teaching curriculum and teaching methods "'do not permit free dialogue and active, exploratory learning and consequently do not open the doors to freedom of thought and criticism. On the contrary, they weaken the capacity to hold opposing viewpoints and to think outside the box. Their societal role focuses on the reproduction of control in Arab societies'" (Whitaker 19). The government's main goal is to instill loyalty, compliance, and support for the regime in power through education so there are no dissidents, which Whitaker finds to be particularly successful.

The endurance of Arab authoritarianism has been a concerning topic among scholars as many regimes still stand today. Various theorists have argued over the reasons for the lasting Arab regimes. Some theorists argue more than one reason, completely oppose others, or support a similar argument. Overall, the most popular reasons are among political, economic, cultural, security, and educational categories.

The following chapters focus on Jordan and Algeria. These chapters follow fit with the substance of the literature review, as each regime is an Arab authoritarian state. Jordan is a monarchy, while Algeria is a republic. Each regime continues to endure today, and thus supports theories in the literature review. These chapters open up the debate about the reason as to why Arab authoritarian regimes endure after the Arab Spring. Through these core chapters, I hope to expand the knowledge of readers in terms of Arab authoritarianism and the way in which people view the regimes today. Through my extensive research and analysis, I hope to create increased knowledge in the area of Arab authoritarianism.

Chapter 1: Jordan

At the end of 2010, the Arab Spring began in the Middle East. Tunisia was the first country to be affected by the Arab Spring, but then it spread to other Middle Eastern countries. In early 2011, protests began in Jordan's capital and then continued to spread around the country. Even with the large numbers of protests in Jordan, the monarchy still continues to last, as King Abdullah II has dealt with the uprisings through religious, economic, and political strategies.

Jordan's Regime

The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is a constitutional monarchy. King Abdullah II currently presides as the king of Jordan (*Politics and Society* 307). "In Jordanian politics, executive power is invested mainly in the hands of the king, but also in those of his appointed prime minster and cabinet (the Council of Ministers). The political system also includes a bicameral legislature, with a royally appointed fifty-five-member upper house and a popularly elected 110-member lower house" (*Politics and Society* 313). According to Jordan's constitution, the king has the power to appoint the prime minister and the various members of the cabinet. In 1952, Jordan's parliament was given more authority, but the king of Jordan still "retains ultimate authority over the legislative, executive, and judicial branches" and "executive power is primarily invested in the king" (*Politics and Society* 307). The king also has the authority to dismiss the cabinet members, but the parliament has the power to dismiss the prime minister. Currently, the king has full power over the government and all of Jordan when parliament is dissolved. Ryan writes, "the king's considerable powers include the right to sign and promulgate

laws, veto legislation, issue royal decrees (with the consent of the prime minister and our cabinet members), approve amendments to the constitution, command the armed forces, and declare war. In addition, he appoints and dismisses judges" (*Politics and Society* 307). The eldest son of King Abdullah will be the next leader of Jordan, as the eldest son of the royal family assumes the throne (*Politics and Society* 307). Jordan's law is based off of Islamic law, European values, and tradition (*Politics and Society* 308). Overall, Jordan's main power comes from King Abdullah II, but parliament still has considerable authority, such as the ability to dismiss the prime minister, initiate debates, vote on legislation, and most recently, the power to elect the prime minister ("Jordan's Parliament").

The backbone of Jordan's regime is made up of the Hashemite family, the prime minister, Jordan's armed forces, and strong supporters of the monarchy. "The 110 members of the lower house are divided among 45 multimember constituencies, all of which have traditionally been strong supporters of the Hashemite monarchy. These include six seats for the rural Bedouin, nine seats for the Christian community, and three sets for the Circassian and Chechen communities" (*Politics and Society* 313). Lastly, Jordan is highly supported by western countries, including the United States that supplies foreign aid to Jordan's regime (Shaikh)

The main oppositional groups in Jordan are secular, leftists and Islamist activists. Communists, Baathists, and remaining pan-Arab nationalists are among the secular and left-leaning activists. The Islamist activists are much more influential and organized in Jordan compared to the secular leftists. "The Islamist movement in Jordan is mainly in Jordan's Muslim Brotherhood, an Islamist movement as old as the Hashemite regime

itself, and the movement's political party, the Islamic Action Front (IAC)" (*Politics and Society* 315). Ultimately, Jordan's regime faces opposition from two main categories (*Politics and Society* 315). Most importantly, "whether rooted in Islam, in pan-Arab nationalism, or in secular leftist ideas, the political opposition in Jordan has tended to struggle with the regime over policy and the direction of the state (including demands for greater democratization), but has not tended to challenge the nature of the state itself as a Hashemite monarchy" (*Politics and Society* 317). This concept has been fairly reflective in the most recent protests in Jordan, starting in the beginning of 2011, mainly organized by the Muslim Brotherhood (*Politics and Society* 317).

Jordan's security forces are made up of three branches. These branches consists of "the Jordan Arab Army, the Royal Air Force and the Royal Coast Guards" and "Jordan also has a highly efficient police force, border police and desert patrols who form the Public Security Force" ("The Armed Forces"). The army is completely volunteer-based, but eighty-five percent of the army budget is spent on salaries, training, and protection for the soldiers. "Jordan's Public Security Force includes approximately 25,000 persons, who primarily perform police duties. Jordan also has a Civil Defense Brigade, which includes the Kingdom's firefighters and ambulance personnel, and an Intelligence Service" ("The Armed Forced").

Furthermore, Jordan has an intelligence agency, the General Intelligence Agency (GID), which is known to be a very effective and a professional organization. The main purpose of the GID is to "safeguard the security of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan domestically and abroad by means of carrying out necessary intelligence operations" (GID). Even so, the GID is referred to as Jordan's secret police, also known as the

Mukhabarat in Arabic. The secret police use systems of surveillance to monitor opposition groups in Jordan (Aslam). Macfarquhar writes, "those seeking democratic reform say the central role of each country's secret police force, with its stealthy, octopus-like reach, is one of the biggest impediments to democratic change. In the decades since World War II, as military leaders and monarchs smothered democratic life, the security agencies have become a law unto themselves" ("Smothering Democracy").

Protests in Jordan

After the Arab Spring began in Tunisia and Egypt, Jordan experienced its first major protest on January 14, 2011 in front of the Al Omari mosque in Karak. The protest, organized by a small leftist group and Baathist parties, began over the issue of food prices, but the demonstrators were mainly enraged with overall economic conditions and Samir Rifai's government. One of the protesters, Taqfiq al-Batoush, explains, "we are protesting the policies of the government – high prices and repeated taxation that made the Jordanian people revolt" ("Hundreds Protest") A few days before the protest, the Jordanian government announced its commitment to cut food and fuel prices, but this was not sufficient for the citizens, as they did not consider the reforms to be significant enough and suspected they would most likely be temporary ("Hundreds Protests")

Only about 400 people made it to the protest in Karak, but another 200 people showed up to a protest in Dhiban. Another demonstrator, Khaled al-Majali, explained, "we are calling for the departure of Samir Rifai's government and a government of national unity, not a government of Amman corporations" ("Hundreds Protest"). Ultimately, Jordanians were inspired by the Arab Spring and used this time to rebel against high prices, taxes, lack of job creation in a public sector for tribesmen, and the

general economic conditions that they believed were leading to poverty ("Hundreds

Protest").

   A little over a week later, Jordanian citizens gathered for another protest

organized by the dominant Islamist opposition group in Jordan, the Islamic Action Front,

which is also the Muslim Brotherhood's political arm. The protests were similar to the

first one, as the demonstrators called for the same reforms and the resignation of Jordan's

Prime Minister, Samir Rifai, except this time over 3,000 activists showed up in Amman.

They also demanded an end to corruption, inflation, and increasing prices. An extra two

2,500 people also protested in several other cities in Jordan ("Jordanian Protesters

Demand").

   Jordan's king decided to appoint a new Prime Minister, Marouf al-Bakhit, for the

second time. Kadri and Bronner write, "changing cabinets is not new for King Abdullah.

In his 12 years on the throne, he has done so eight times. But this was the first time that

he had done so in reaction to public pressure, seeking to undermine a growing protest

movement across a broad spectrum of society to pre-empt further unrest" ("King of

Jordan"). Jordanians were still unhappy and formed another protest on February 2nd,

2011. This was a much smaller protest, compared to the protests prior to it, and only

mainly involved the Islamic Action Front and leftist groups. This protest called for

political reforms, an end to government corruption, and even the resignation of the new

prime minister (Maktabi). The activists were unhappy with the lack of democracy in

Jordan, as King Abudullah only responded by appointing a past prime minister to

reshuffle the government. Therefore, the activists demanded reforms during their

demonstrations, such as an elected prime minister ("Jordan Islamists").

The protests in Jordan continued on February 18, 2011. The protests were held in Amman at the Al-Husseini mosque, where for the first time activists were injured during a peaceful demonstration. There were only about 300 protesters demanding political reform, but about eight of them were injured after clashing with a pro-government group carrying sticks and metal batons. Muwafak Mahadeen, a newspaper columnist and demonstrator, claims, "'we were not calling for the downfall of the regime but for an elected government, democratic laws, opening the corruption files and against the peace agreement with Israel'" (Greenberg). Mahadeen believes that the government supporters were most likely deployed by the government's forces, as the police did not even attempt to mediate the situation (Greenberg).

The following Friday, Jordan experienced its largest protests thus far. About 8,000 protesters rallied in the streets of Amman for a pro democracy demonstration, calling it the "Day of Anger." All of the protesters, alongside the Islamic Action Front, had different grievances, but ultimately "demonstrators want[ed] greater political say and economic change at home" after learning about the power of the Tunisian and Egyptian uprising ("Middle East Protests"). Most of the Jordanian activists showed up as a backlash to the violence that had occurred in the protest the previous Friday ("Thousands Rally"). The protestors did not want a regime change, but rather reforms and more rights ("Middle East Protests").

On March 24, 2011, a group labeled, the "March 24th" Movement," set up a camp with tents in the heart of Amman. Over 1,000 protesters showed up for the tent camp, modeling themselves after Tahir Square protest in Cairo. The idea was similar to one of a "sit in," as they claimed they would not move from their tents until real reforms were put

into place. A number of the protesters were young students who learned about the protest through Internet sources, such as Facebook. One of the protesters, Abdullah Habiba, a twenty-two-year old student, explained "'this is my first demonstration, and I heard about it on Facebook" and "I study political science in the university. I want the parliament dissolved and new elections. Now this is the only way forward'" ("Jordan Protesters Set Up)". The protesters were looking for tangible reforms, such as economic equality and an end to corruption ("Jordan Protesters Set Up").

A day later the protesters clashed once again with government supporters in Amman. This time one demonstrator died and 130 were injured. Rather than acting as bystanders, the police stepped in this time with the use of water cannons to halt the fighting. Even so, there were reports commenting on misbehavior by the government security forces. One of the protesters claimed "'the [pro-monarchy] thugs were throwing stones from one side and police were attacking protesters with sticks to push them back,'" and a Reuters cameraman explained how he was tackled by government supporters and Jordanian police ("Protests in Jordan Turn"). Many Jordanians are huge supporters of the government and refused to watch protesters attempt to make changes that could lead to a possible regime change ("Protests in Jordan Turn").

A third clash between the protesters and government supporters broke out on April 1st, 2011. Over 1,000 officers were mobilized in Amman to make sure violence did not erupt during the time. The demonstrators were mainly looking for a constitutional change and the dissolution of parliament. In response, the government supporters, also known as government loyalists, were holding pictures of the King and shouting out slogans, such as "long live the king" (Jiang).

The clash continued on April 15th, 2011 when extreme Islamists had an altercation with government supporters in Zarqa. Halaby writes, "a crowd of about 350 extremist Salafi Muslims faced off with a slightly smaller group of pro-king loyalists in the town of Zarqa. Salafis beat the government supporters with clubs and fists, and the two sides hurled stones at each other, leaving people bloodied on the ground" (Wong). Rather than the usual leftists and moderate Islamist groups, the Salafi movement led the protest. The Salafi movement is ultra-conservative, and banned in Jordan. The altercation began after the Salafi group spoke in front of the Omar ibn Khattab mosque, attacking Jordan's alliance with the United States. The Salafi group also called for Islamic Shariah law to rule Jordan, rather than the typical protesters calling for political and economic reforms. Dozens of people ended up injured in the clash, including a couple in critical condition (Wong).

On the same day of the Salafi movement protest, over 1,000 protesters demonstrated in Amman. The Muslim Brotherhood and the Islamic Action Front put the demonstration together. This group of protesters was demanding similar reforms from the past fourteen weeks and the dissolution of the cabinet. The protest escalated between the Islamists and government supporters, thus turning the protest into a violent event. "Jordanian police used tear gas at Islamist protesters Friday after six officers were stabbed and seriously injured" and "forty policemen were injured, including six stabbed, as they tried to disperse a demonstration by Islamist Salafists in Zarqa" (Albawaba) The heightened violence occurred after Salafists had attacked some innocent citizens (Albawaba).

The protests died down until June of 2011. On June 13, 2011, King Abdullah II visited a tribal town in Jordan, Tafileh. The youth protesters had demonstrated against government corruption prior to his visit. The youth activists were denied a request to meet the king, and subsequently responded with an outbreak of violence. As a result, about thirty police officers were injured and the rioters burned several cars (Kadri). In July, the protests subsided and transformed back into a peaceful setting.

On July 29, 2011, around 3,000 people attended a protest in Amman. One of the protesters, a member of the Constitutional Monarchy Movement, explained how the protest revealed how the movement is growing quickly in the northern area, referring to Irbid, Jerash, and Ajlun. Solovieva explains "protesters at the rally said the United States was inconsistent in its policy in the region and was ultimately causing more harm than good – it's an old refrain, but one that has become more apparent since the Arab Spring sprung in January" (Solovieva). A lot of the protesters pointed their anger at the United States, as the United States started out as government supporters and slowly started allying with the rebels in different areas (Solovieva).

The seventh clash in 2011 between the protesters and the government supporters occurred on August 14, 2011. A government reform committee was set to present its constitutional reforms to the king, but the activists were unsatisfied with the proposed changes. There were forty-two proposed changes, which included "limiting the jurisdiction of military courts to only terrorism and espionage cases," leaving out financial and corruption cases ("Proposed Changes"). The proposed changes also consisted of marginally expanding the powers of the elected parliament. The protesters were looking for change to increase the parliament's power, but "the proposed changes to

the nearly 60-year-old constitution would still allow Jordan's monarch to retain most of his absolute powers" ("Proposed Reforms"). The reforms did not even cover the protesters' concerns regarding an election for the prime minister. The clash did not produce as many injuries as the previous ones, but four people were still hurt in the altercation ("Proposed Reforms").

In September of 2011, the protests died down for the most part, except for a few in regards to Israel. As a result of an anti-Israel demonstration, the staff at the Israeli embassy in Jordan was sent home. The group of activists "called for a 'million-man march' against the Israeli mission, part of a rising tide of anti-Israel protests in Jordan and in Egypt, the two Arab countries that have made peace with the Jewish state" ("Israel Evacuates") Jordanian leftists, Islamists, and labor groups mobilized the protests looking for an end to the 1994 peace treaty held with Israel and the removal of the Israeli ambassador ("Israel Evacuates").

At the end of September, over 4,000 Jordanians protested in Amman in response to a bill that was passed in the lower house that made corruption accusations without proof a crime. The protesters explained how they were enraged because "a government that is protecting corruption cannot be trusted, and a parliament of corruption does not represent the people" (Palazzolo). At the same time, the activists were provoked by King Abdullah II's support for constitutional changes that formed an independent commission. The independent commission would be allowed to administer elections and restrain the authority of the military state security court. These constitutional changes were unpopular among Jordanians, as the military state security court would only be allowed to deal with "cases of high treason, espionage and terrorism," leaving out corruption (Palazzolo).

Jordanians viewed these changes as a way to protect government corruption. Most importantly, the Jordanians were upset with the king's failure to amend the constitution in allowing an elected prime minister (Palazzolo).

The protests reemerged on October 7, 2011 in Amman. Over 3,000 people attended the demonstration, which turned out as an anti-corruption march starting from the Al-Hussein mosque and ending at the town hall. Islamists and leftists led this demonstration, labeling themselves as The National Reform Front (NRF), which is the first time they mobilized a group as a partnership. "The demonstrators carried banners reading: 'Political reform is the path to wiping out corruption…Corruption is the cause of poverty and unemployment'" ("Thousands Protest"). Whether in the form of political or financial corruption, the activists were looking to end it altogether ("Thousands Protest").

A few days later, on October 15, 2011, the global "Occupy" movement hit Jordan in the city of Salhub. Outside the conference, "For Reforms and against Corruption," pro government loyalists once again clashed with the peaceful protesters. The altercation became very violent when some of the loyalists threw stones at the protesters and even shot their guns into free space in hopes of breaking up the demonstration. "The event was organized to demand the resignation of Prime Minister Marouf Bakhit's government and the dissolution of parliament for failing to carry out necessary political reform, the organizers of the gathering said" ("Pro-Regime"). Unfortunately, as a result of the clash, thirty-five people were hurt and twenty-seven cars were destroyed ("Pro-Regime").

Throughout November and December a number of riots and protests took place throughout various cities in Jordan, including tribal towns. For example, on December 24, 2011, activists engaged in a demonstration called "Friday to return lands." Luck

writes, "activists claim ongoing corruption, privatization and the failure of the government to follow through on pledges to study various demands of return of wajihat-state-owned lands, that were registered in the names of various tribes during the Ottoman era, are driving this Friday's [December 24, 2011] protests" (Luck). The activists also protested in front of the office of the prime minister in response to the mistreatment of the demonstrators by the police previously in Mafraq. The Jordanian citizens were infuriated with the fact that the Jordanian police used tear gas to end an altercation between the protesters and the government loyalists ("Jordan Opposition").

Until September of 2012, the protests subsided immensely. On September 1, 2012, Jordanian citizens took to the streets again in the city of Amman. Similar to protests in the past, the activists were unhappy with the way King Abdullah II had reshuffled the cabinet and thus demanded that Jordan's Prime Minister, Fayez Tarawneh, step down. Alongside the grievances about the prime minister, the Jordanian citizens were protesting about high fuel prices. The Muslim Brotherhood organized the protest and it was Jordan's first big protest of 2012 ("Jordanian Protesters Stage Rallies").

A week later a clash occurred between the anti-riot forces and the protesters, yet again. The protesters started a demonstration in the city of Tafileh and started rallying against King Abdullah II. One of the present activists, Fadi Abadeen, claimed, "as soon as we started using the words 'royal palace' and 'regime,' the police came at us with force, " and the Jordanian security forces reportedly fired tear gas to break up the riot ("Clashes, Arrests"). The activists had the same goal of the first protest: demand that Prime Minister Fayez Tarawneh resign for his outrageous attempt to increase fuel prices. "Unlike neighboring countries, Jordan's protest movement has long called for 'regime

reform' rather than 'regime change,' urging for a transfer of King Abdullah's constitutional authority to form governments to the people" ("Clashes, Arrests").

Throughout the month of November in 2012, a series of major protests occurred across Jordan as a result of the increase in fuel prices. The first significant riot took place on November 13, 2012. During this riot, the protesters destroyed traffic lights and tires with fire, while the police tried to break up the chaos with tear gas and open fire. Demonstrators even set pictures of King Abdullah II on fire. "In Amman, thousands of demonstrators filled the circle outside the Interior Ministry near midnight, chanting, 'The people want the fall of the regime,'" which is the first time the Jordanian citizens called for a regime change during their protests (Rudoren). Even a member of the Muslim Brotherhood commented how the tension in Jordan was at its peak. Rudoren writes, "the eruption comes as King Abdullah has struggled to contain a growing and increasingly diverse opposition by introducing electoral reforms ahead of balloting scheduled for January and by establishing a constitutional court" (Rudoren). Essentially, the increase in gas prices sparked the November riots and protests, but Jordanian citizens were ultimately upset with the overall political and economic conditions that have remained stagnant (Rudoren).

The "November Gust" protests continued until the 18th. These protests encompassed major riots with chants to take down the monarchy, even when the United States expressed its support for King Abdullah II. First-time protesters and supporters of the government even showed up to some of the demonstrations. For example, "in this affluent northern city [Irbid], usually a bulwark of support for the king, some demonstrators spoke openly of demands for democracy" (Kirkpatrick). One of the

protesters even expressed how the demonstrations have not just been about the rising prices of fuel. The activists were also concerned with democracy, corruption, and freedom (Kirkpatrick). The protests reached its peak on Friday, November 16, 2012 when the activists chanted, "'Qaddafi, Ben Ali and Mubarak all left,' referring to the former leaders of Libya, Tunisia and Egypt. "Abdullah, go, go" (Kirkpatrick). Out of thousands of people, 130 protesters were arrested for calling for an end to the monarchy. The November protests were violent and chaotic, but it sincerely spoke for the people (Jordan Islamists).

Recently, in January of 2013, a number of protests have occurred leading up to parliamentiary elections in Jordan. On January 18, 2013, thousands gathered in Amman to protest the upcoming elections. Most of the protesters were among youth activists and the Muslim Brotherhood. "The Muslim Brotherhood, Jordan's largest opposition group, has renewed calls for King Abdullah to transfer his authority to appoint governments to the 'people', meaning an elected parliament" ("Thousands Call"). The protesters demanded reforms and more power for the people, as they were not fooled by the cosmetic elections with vote buying and election fraud. Protests were also taking place in Karak and Maan, where the activists were also boycotting the elections. "Pro-democracy activists have called for constitutional reform that would transfer the monarch's authority, to appoint and dismiss governments, to parliament" ("Thousands Call"). With the upcoming election, the Jordanian citizens felt the need to protest as a way to facilitate actual reforms in Jordan ("Thousands Call").

Jordan's Response

The analysis of Jordan's protests from 2011 to 2013 point to a regime change, but Jordan's monarchy continues to endure until this day. The government has responded to the protests in various ways over the past few years to ensure a lasting regime under King Abdullah II. The first response occurred on February 1, 2011, when King Abdullah II reshuffled his government. His first step was to fire Prime Minister Samir Rifai and replace him with Marouf al-Bakhit. Al-Bakhit had served in the past under King Abullah II, but the king considered him to be a good choice, as he was seen to be clean of corruption ("King of Jordan")

King Abdullah has reshuffled his government before, but this was the first time he had made this action in response to anti-government protests. Kadri and Bronner write, "the palace statement said Mr. Bakhit would have the task of 'taking practical, swift and tangible steps to launch a real political reform process, in line with the king's version of comprehensive reform, modernization and development.'" King Abdullah II also thought Mr. Bakhit was a good alternative to Rifai because trade unions and the Muslim Brotherhood were upset with the prime minister's focus on technocrats and businesses, rather than focusing on the citizens' concerns. Although many Jordanians were still unhappy with this choice, "some protest leaders were cautiously positive. Nahed Hattar, a leftist activist, said in a telephone interview that he considered the change a good move but that he wanted to see the government program before rendering judgment" ("King of Jordan"). King Abdullah II also promised the inclusion of the Islamic Action Front and Islamists into the new government. He kept this promise and on February 10, 2011, one Islamist and a total of five leftists were sworn into the new Jordanian cabinet ("Middle East Protests")

To follow up with the government change, the government created a 225 million

dollar reduction package in fuel prices and staples, specifically sugar and rice. The prime

minister also increased wages for civil servants and the army ("Thousands Call"). With

these government changes, King Abdullah II called for immediate changes of the laws

regarding politics and civil freedoms (Wong). "Reform initiatives included convening a

national dialogue committee in March, and appointing a royal committee to revise the

constitution in April. The committees proposed modest reforms to the electoral system,

and significant reforms to the constitution, though they left out guarantees for gender

equality" ("World Report 2012").

King Abdullah created the first tangible law reform on February 15, 2011 when

he revised the Public Gatherings Law. The reform allows citizens to mobilize civil

demonstrations or meetings without the permission of the government. The Public

Gatherings Law still requires Jordanian citizens to notify authorities of any demonstration

or meeting two days prior to the event and they must abide by public order. The

government claimed that it would not interfere in any protest or meeting, but security

forces would still need to guarantee public safety. Halaby writes, "about 3,000 tribal

leaders and key figures—including lawmakers, retired security personnel and

academicians – renewed their allegiance to the king in an emotional letter, praising his

reform efforts," which reveals King Abdullah made a step in the right direction in order

to ensure the safety of his monarchy (Schwartz).

In March of 2011, the "National Dialogue Committee" (NDC) was officially

created to reform electoral laws and political parties. Jordanian citizens have long been

upset with the electoral law formed in 1993, which only allows for one vote, therefore

limiting the influence of Islamist and leftist groups in parliament. "The NDC-proposed electoral law provides for a two-tier system, with 115 deputies elected at the district level and 15 seats reserved for national lists. SNTV [1993 electoral law] is scrapped for an open proportional list system, which will give a boost to opposition parties and particularly the IAF" ("How Stable"). The new electoral law still presents an issue for rural and tribal regions because it does not address the problem of gerrymandering. Often times, "rural and tribal areas are given disproportionate weight at the expense of predominantly Palestinian cities like Amman and Zarqa" ("How Stable").

On March 28, 2011, shortly after the first clash between government supporters and protesters, King Abdullah II called for a national unity day. The king stated, "what matters to us in this stage is that our national unity must not be undermined" and "we are proceeding in earnest with the political reform process and we have nothing to fear" (CNN). He expressed optimistic thoughts for a bright future in Jordan with the various economic and developmental programs they were working on, such as projects on health and education that are compatible for the Petra district. For example, "the premier, who reviewed the government's achievements and plans in different fields, said the government is working on electronically linking Queen Rania Hospital in the district with Prince Hamzah Hospital to promote telemedicine" (Ghazal). With the various injuries in the altercation at the protest, King Abdullah II touched upon the need to refrain from violent actions that could harm national unity. The king ended his speech with his promises for economic and political reform (Ghazal).

Later on, in June of 2011, King Abdullah II spoke about his promise to reform the election process, where the cabinets will be created based on the majority of an elected

parliament. The king did not specify when exactly he would give up his appointment powers, but this was "the first time he has made such a concession publicly to his citizens, and follows six months of protests" ("Jordan's King Abdullah"). Most Jordanians claimed that the king did not give a permanent date as to when he would make this reform because he wanted to see a change in the political parties, specifically the merging of thirty-three political parties into three distinct parties. Other than the king's unexpected vow for elected cabinets, he claimed that he would be revising more laws in regard to the election and political parties to quell Jordanians' grievances ("Jordan's King Abdullah").

In August of 2011, King Abdullah II appointed a committee to propose constitutional amendments. These amendments included the creation of a constitutional court, an independent commission for elections, the improvement of civil liberties, the restraint of the State Security Court, the restriction of temporary laws without parliament, and the government limitation to dissolve parliament. All of these proposed amendments had various purposes to develop Jordan. For example, the constitutional court was proposed, "to monitor the constitutionality of laws and regulations. The court replaces a high tribunal for the interpretation of such laws that was headed by the speaker of the Senate and widely considered less than totally independent" and the independent commission was proposed to "oversee elections instead of the Ministry of Interior that has previously been in charge of the electoral process. All electoral contestations will be referred to the judiciary instead of parliament" (Muasher 1). The enhancement of civil liberties was proposed as an amendment to criminalize rights and public freedom violations, as well as torture in all forms. The committee suggested restraining the State

Security Court's "jurisdiction to cases of high treason, espionage, and terrorism, with

citizens being otherwise tried in civilian courts; this includes ministers, who were

previously tried by a parliamentary high tribunal" (Muasher 1). Finally, the committee

proposed to limit the government capability of issuing temporary laws without parliament

and dissolving parliament because Jordan's king frequently abused this power in the past

(Muasher 1).

Jordan's constitution was officially amended in May and October of 2012, but

only the establishment of an independent election commission and a constitutional court

and was passed from the proposed list (Muasher 2). The Independent Election

Commission was created in May of 2012. King Abdullah II announced, "we rely on this

commission to usher in a new era in Jordan's political history, an era characterised with

balance between the branches of government and steady improvement in the performance

of Parliament and political parties" ("Creation of Independent"). He also explained how

the main purpose of the Independent Election Commission was to supervise and run all

parts of elections with regards to international standards ("Creation of Independent").

The constitutional court was amended in October and issued to replace the Higher

Council for the Interpretation of the Constitution (HCIC). The king considered the

establishment of a constitutional court to be a national achievement. "Article 59 of the

Constitution states that "the Constitutional Court shall monitor the constitutionality of

laws and regulations in force and issue its judgments in the name of the King" and "the

Constitutional Court "has the right to interpret the provisions of the Constitution if

requested, either by virtue of a decision of the Council of Ministers or by a resolution

taken by the Senate or the Chamber of Deputies passed by an absolute majority" (JT).

Furthermore, King Abdullah II explained how the Constitutional Court would balance the branches of government (JT).

On October 17, 2011, Jordan's Prime Minister, Marouf Al-Bakhit, officialy resigned after the majority of parliamentarians requested for the end of his reign. Aside from pressure from Jordanian citizens, the parliamentarians believed that Al-Bakhit was unable to stabilize dialogue with the opposition groups, such as the Islamists and the leftist groups. The king replaced Marouf Al-Bakhit with Awn al-Khasawneh, a widely known judge of the Hague-based International Court of Justice. This appointment "reinforces Abdullah's stated intentions of instituting reforms. The measures could include decentralization, fighting corruption, giving more independence to parliament and inviting the opposition into the government" ("Jordan's Marouf").

Abdullah was pleased with his choice for the new prime minister because al-Khasawneh is an older liberal and had a good relationship with opposition groups, specifically the Muslim Brotherhood. In addition, al-Khasawneh had a clean record when Abdullah II appointed him. "Abdullah told al-Khasawneh to launch an 'effective and constructive dialogue with all political groups,' according to a designation letter obtained from the Royal Palace" ("Jordan's Marouf"). The king also demanded that the new prime minster focus on revising the parliamentary election law, where the Islamist opposition group would not be undermined with a disproportionate number of seats. Normally the king does not follow through with legal reforms, but the announcement was a significant response to the citizens. Furthermore, the king called for a resolution to the corruption problem in government, as well as an independent council that could administer the parliamentary elections in 2013. Lastly, Abdullah II replaced Jordan's intelligence chief,

Mohammed Raqqad, with Faisal Shobaki after various complaints were made about

Raqqad's intimidation methods. This was a huge step for Jordan's monarchy in

attempting to reform the government, which has helped keep the regime alive ("Jordan's

Marouf").

Awn al-Khasawneh did not last very long under Jordan's regime. In April of

2012, Al-Khasawneh resigned from office due to failed reforms. Jordanian citizens were

unhappy with the lack of improvements in Jordan, as well as "proposed electoral reforms

in the western-backed kingdom that were seen by critics as an assault on civil liberties"

(Black). The proposed election law was drafted for the purposes of limiting the amount of

seats opposition groups would be able to sustain in parliament, such as the Islamic Action

Front. King Abdullah II was accused of reshuffling his cabinet just to keep the rebellions

under control. Even so, King Abdullah II replaced al-Khasawneh with a former prime

minister from the 1990s, Fayez al-Tarawneh. "The king has shuffled cabinets and then

shuffled them again, using prime ministers as buffers to absorb popular discontent" and

he has charged committees to explore possible reforms, but these remain largely

unimplemented" (Black). Regardless, even with the past uprisings in Jordan since 2011,

King Abdullah II's monarchy seems fairly stable and most of the protests have called for

reforms rather than a regime change (Boghani).

In October of 2012, King Abdullah II dissolved his parliament and announced his

plans for early elections (Boghani). Abdullah Ensour was chosen as the new prime

minister of Jordan to create a new government (Khadder). The king did not provide an

exact date for early elections, but he planned on organizing the polls before 2013. He

made this announcement after he vowed to implement new political laws and revise old

ones, as a way to deal with the anti-government protests. "Abdullah II said recently that the new parliament will elect a prime minister next year, instead of following the country's tradition until now of the king appointing the premier" (Boghani). This sentiment has helped quell the protests and a call for a regime change, even though Jordanians have heard the king make this statement in the past. Many groups still planned on performing peaceful demonstrations after the king had made a call for a new government, but they were still optimistic that the king could help build a brighter future for Jordan. For example, Nimer Assaf, a leader of the Islamic Action Front, explained, "we do not look for names, we look for the deeds, and we hope that this next government will go ahead with reforms which the Jordanians have been asking for a very long time" (Khadder). Overall, the king's attempt at reforms has left Jordanians with an optimistic outlook for the monarchy.

King Abdullah II did not end up holding elections before the end of 2012, but recently, in January of 2013, the king has made attempts to deal with reforms for the parliamentary elections on January 23, 2013. On January 9, 2013, the king called a meeting to deal with election corruption. The meeting was held specifically in concern to vote buying and a number of other election crimes. King Abdullah II met with the Independent Elections Commission to deal with the problems at hand and he explained Jordan's national duty to tackle the issue of political money. The king explained how he wanted the Independent Elections Commission to take full measures in guaranteeing fair and neutral elections with transparency. In order to reach this goal, the king demanded the supervision of local and international groups over elections. "During the meeting, IEC President Abdul Ilah Khatib noted that the monitoring body, which was established under

a Royal Decree and a constitutional provision, has been working to build a reputation as a highly professional and neutral entity that employs the best international practices in election management" ("King Calls"). The monarch and the Independent Elections Commission claimed to have worked hard in the meeting to ensure that Jordan begins 2013 with a new political life era ("King Calls)

To further ensure Jordan's goal of fair elections, "the board has endorsed a number of executive instructions regulating the election stages from registration to ballot sorting to announcing the results" ("King Calls"). The board of commissioners will then provide the king with an elections report on the Independent Elections Commissions' ability to hold elections. The detailed report will also provide the board's improvement suggestions for future elections and laws. The local and international agencies also provided voters with election information in concern to the polls and process, in order to improve the pace and organization of elections. Lastly, the Independent Elections Commission created a training program for the commission's staff. "The IEC has been open to all sectors of society and is keen on building a fruitful partnership with all stakeholders that would enhance people's confidence in the commission and the steps it takes to protect voters' right to free choice" ("King Calls"). The monarchy and the Independent Election Commission may not have been sincere in its reforms, but nonetheless pledged to ensure free and proper elections for Jordanian citizens to keep the regime stable ("King Calls").

King Abdullah II made a following announcement on January 17th regarding the fairness of elections. He explained the outline for a transparent and democratic transition. He claimed, "the new prime minister after next Wednesday's elections will be designated

based on consultations with the majority coalition of parliamentary blocs. If no clear

majority emerges in the next Lower House, the designation will be 'based upon

consultation with all parliamentary blocs'" ("Making Our"). King Abdullah II expressed

his optimism for the upcoming election and his willingness to reform the process for the

next election after observing any mistakes the new system might have. He considered this

to be a huge step towards democracy and a parliamentary government, even though these

were most likely announcements to quell protesters ("Making Our").

Lastly, the king set three conditions to guarantee an effective parliamentary

government. These three conditions included "'true national parties that aggregate

specific and local interests into a national platform for action,'" "the kingdom's civil

service should 'further develop its professional, impartial non-political abilities to support

and advice,'" and "'a change in parliamentary conventions'" ("Making Our"). In concern

to the change in parliamentary conventions, King Abdullah II explained how these

reforms would change how parliament works and support a full parliamentary

government. The formation of Governments will ultimately be guided by parliamentary

bloc consultations, where they will discuss common policy platforms. "Opposition parties

will similarly need to agree on conventions for how they cooperate in holding the

Government to account and offer an alternate vision – their role is just as crucial for

successful Government" (Abdullah II ibn Al Hussein). King Abdullah II claimed that he

believed these conditions would ensure a supportive parliament that communicates well

with him ("Making Our")

On January 18, 2013, the king held another meeting to discuss reforms and

election process. The king met with public figures, such as Islamist leaders, the previous

chief and minister of the Royal Court, and Adnan Bakhit, as well as many other top politicians. "On political reform, he [King Abudullah II] stressed the importance of working with parliamentary blocs after the January 23 elections, adding that the coming stage, which will witness the emergence of parliamentary governments, will be very vital in Jordan's political history" ("Middle East and North Africa"). The meeting also addressed various developments and projects across Jordan, such as ones to improve energy conservation. The king took various concerns among the attendees into consideration, such as social equality and government trust. The meeting was viewed as a step towards Jordan's progress and reforms ("Middle East and North Africa"). Aside from the meeting, the king published a couple of political treatises to facilitate public debate and motivate Jordanian citizens to vote in the elections ("Elections, Parliament").

Prior to parliamentary elections, Jordan's regime passed a new electoral law. The new law established a two-ballot vote. With the two-ballot vote, voters are able to vote twice: "one for representatives from local districts and one for candidates competing under a proportional representation at the national level" (Jordan's Muslim Brotherhood). Opposition groups, such as the Muslim Brotherhood, were not pleased with this reform because "an increase of seats allocated for party candidates in the 140-strong lower house of parliament – from 17 to 27- is not enough" (Jordan's Muslim Brotherhood). Also, the Muslim Brotherhood claimed that the new law would favor tribal candidates in the local district (Jordan's Muslim Brotherhood). Overall, opposition groups were disappointed with the new electoral law and considered it to be an enhancement for the king, rather than the people.

Jordan's parliamentary elections were officially held on January 23, 2013. Once again, government supporters, also known as loyalists, won the majority of seats in Jordan's parliament. The Islamic Action Front boycotted the elections, as it was unsatisfied with the election rules and vote buying. Even so, Islamists and leftists still won seats and "international observers who monitored the elections noted improvements over previous votes" (Fahim). The National Democratic Institute provided fifty members to observe the voting process and ensure safety from election corruption. Many Jordanian citizens were still upset with the outcome of the election and vowed to continue protesting, but Jordan's regime still continues to endure with King Abdullah II (Fahim).

Most recently, on March 9, 2013, Jordan's parliament was given the ability to choose the prime minister for "the first time in the country's history that the legislature rather than the king has decided who will be head of government" (Jordan's Parliament). Abdullah Ensour, previously a liberal lawmaker, was elected as the new prime minister of Jordan by parliament. King Abdullah II claimed that he would allow Ensour to remain in office for the next four years. "King Abdullah II formally confirmed Ensour's appointment. Abdullah has in the past selected prime ministers, but he relinquished that right as part of the reform package announced last year" ("Jordan's Parliament").

Theories

To this day, scholars debate the reasons as to why Jordan's regime still stands even after the Arab Spring. The Arab Spring did not hit Jordan in the same way as countries like Tunisia and Egypt. Jordan has seen a rise in protests over the last few years after the Arab Spring occurred, but the monarchy still continues to endure. Most of these arguments fall under the topic of religious, economical, political, and social reasons.

When looking at religious reasons, some theorists point to the idea of traditional legitimacy. Burger explains how Jordan's monarchy has been extremely stable. He revealed much of its strength over the past three decades. Most of the protesters did not even try to take down Jordan's monarchy. Rather the majority of the protests in Jordan called for reforms instead of a regime change (Burger 7). Burger reveals how Jordan's monarchy still stands after the Arab Spring because the citizens believe in the monarchy's legitimacy, as the regime is rooted in early history. "Tracing back their origins through Islamic lineage to Prophet Mohammad provides the Hashemites with an incontestable source of legitimacy and gives them quasi-religious authority rendering criticism against them equal to blasphemy" (Burger 8). Jordan's monarchy itself uses this role to upgrade the regime and ensure its stability. For example, Jordan's monarchy will highlight its position in the 1916 Great Arab Revolt, where the great-great-grandfather of King Abdullah II, Sharif Al-Hussein bin Ali, organized the revolt against the Ottomans. "This strategy was successful: blogger and activist Naseem Tarawnah states that 'loyalty to the king is seen as loyalty to the country. They are intertwined and people sometimes have difficulty separating the two'" (Burger 8).

Even opposition groups, such as the Islamic Action Front, believe it has a religious duty to maintain the Jordanian monarchy (Burger 8). This strategy was proven extremely successful during the protests when King Abdullah II held various celebrations for Jordan, such as Jordan's 65th anniversary of independence, Army Day, and the Great Arab Revolt anniversary. "According to reports, this mass event 'voiced support for progress in the country and reiterated loyalty to Jordan under the leadership of His Majesty the King" (Burger 15). Also, the king visited tribal areas to secure his support

through royal favors, such as makrama. Makrama has a historical meaning behind it that symbolizes a gift, which is rooted in traditional legitimacy. This was proven to be a success when the king did not meet many protests in Tafileh (Burger 16). Horres agrees with Burger and argues protesters were only looking for reforms within the regime due to the royal family's monopoly on power through the legitimacy of the monarchy (Horres 141). Overall, Jordan's monarchy is deeply rooted in history, preserving its stability through legitimacy (Burger 8).

Aside from religious reasons, economic arguments have been debated among theorists as to why the Jordan monarchy still remains intact. One argument includes the creation of jobs, mainly in the public sector, and the flow of aid to the population (Burger 8). Horres explains how foreign aid in Jordan serves as a "lubricant to ease political tensions" (Horres 155). She also argues that foreign aid has been helpful, but it has only been working with the use of political reforms as well, in order to satisfy the protesters, which makes Jordan's monarchy distinct from Bahrain's monarchy (Horres 155). Jordan relies on the influx of foreign aid to the population in order to keep the regime stable, as the country is unable to rely on its limited resources within the country. This political strategy has become known as a "top down" allocation with the use of foreign aid. Jordan has created economic liberalization programs over the years, but the king has never privatized state entities. Burger explains, "full privatization would have led to the dismissal of workers from previously state-owned enterprises; this would have jeopardized peoples' acceptance of the rulers and was thus avoided." Overall Burger believes Jordanian citizens have been essentially bought off to keep them from overturning the regime (Burger 8).

Similar to this approach, Ritcher explains how Jordan relies on material resources, such as phosphate and potash exports to remain stable. Rather than just buying off the population, Ritcher portrays how the material resources are allocated to a defense and security budget, as well as public wages and pensions. In times of fiscal scarcity, the material distribution has supported the endurance of Jordan's monarchy. Jordan's regime has even been able to reduce external price shocks due to increasing production capacity (Ritcher 17). Overall, Ritcher argues the distribution of material resources as the main source of Jordan's authoritarian durability.

Peters and Moore take the argument of foreign aid one-step further and explain how Jordan's "supply and demand" strategy allows the regime to maintain durability. "The Jordanian rentier state is not exclusively a product of external rents, particularly foreign aid, but also of the demands of the coalition encompassing groups with highly disparate economic policy preferences" (Peters and Moore 256). Through distributive institutions, Jordan makes rent-fueled side payments to coalition members (Peters and Moore 256). The purpose of the distributive institutions is to sustain a heterogeneous coalition, consisting of Transjordanian tribes and a Syrian/pre-1967 Palestinian based merchant elite (Peters and Moore 257). "Assisted by geopolitically motivated donors, the Hashemites have adapted institutions over time to tap a diverse supply of rents that range from economic and military aid to protocol trade, allowing them to retain power through periods of late development, domestic political crisis, and neoliberal conditionality" (Peters and Moore 256). The side payments and distribution of rents have come as a result of delayed development, brutal civil clashes, changing demographics, and

neoliberalism. The modified distribution institutions "explain authoritarian durability in a small state of significant geostrategic value to external patrons" (Peters and Moore 257).

Many scholars argue in favor of political reasons. One of these arguments includes legal reasons, such as the creation of laws and reforms, as to why Jordan's regime continues to endure. This has helped quell the protests in Jordan and satisfy some demands (Burger 9). Cautious reforms have allowed Jordan's monarchy to remain stable (Bauer and Schiller 1). Burger reveals how the recent reforms and laws enacted by the king were similar to the ones in the past in response to protests. For example, "elections and parliamentary activity was reintroduced in 1989. Yet, the election laws of 1989, 1993 and 2001 were designed in a way that allowed the regime to control the parliament's composition while keeping the electoral process legitimate in the eyes of the voters and the international community" (Burger 9). Not to mention the Political Parties Law was enacted in 1992, which still exists today, but the opposition parties barely have power as they are extremely factionalized. The goal of these various laws and reforms were implemented to allow opposition parties to blow off steam through political pluralism (Burger 9). "This fosters the perception that the purpose of these legal-formal actions was again only window dressing to manifest commitment to democratic reform without actually changing the regime structure" (Burger 17). The revision of the recent Public Gathering Law is one that proves this argument. In the end, the activists do not end up calling for a regime change because they are content with reforms (Burger 9).

Symbolism is also an argument under political reasons for the endurance of Jordan's monarchy post Arab Spring. Burger argues that "the use of democratic language or discourses to distract from undemocratic rule, symbolic acts and decisions, and the

framing of the royal family as above the political fray" are symbolic mechanisms that allow Jordan's monarchy to endure (Burger 9). For example, King Abdullah frequently uses democratic language in his speeches, such as the need for democracy as a "national and unwavering choice" (Burger 9). This use of democratic language implies that the king will make reforms, but most of the time he does not follow through with tangible reforms. The king has also been able to push aside political reforms through the focus on economic development. These actions have prevented criticism of the king. Lastly, through these mechanisms, the king presents himself as non-partisan and blames the government for unpopular reforms, rather than the royal family (Burger 9-10). For example, King Abdullah blamed his Prime Minister Mr. Bakhit for the lack of reforms after facing public pressure in concern to the reforms (Burger 18). Burger writes, "it is again a tool to portray the king's responsiveness to public demands by using politicians as scapegoats for political and economic aberrations without having to take responsibility" (Burger 9-10).

In addition to reforms and symbolism, the strategy of inclusion is also seen as a political reason for the endurance of Jordan post Arab Spring. Over time the king has included business elites into the regime. "The King created the Economic Consultative Council (ECC) as an institutionalized stepping-stone for young, Western-oriented business men. Via the ECC, they gradually acquired offices in the government" (Burger 11). This step has included political elites into parliament, where opposition becomes more institutionalized, and thus more controllable. Political elites will still be oppositional, but they are more loyal once they become part of parliament (Burger 11). Conrad points out how past kings have even included the Muslim Brotherhood in the

legislature and gave them concessions when they became an increasing threat to the

regime (Conrad 1). "The Muslim Brotherhood stopped criticizing the regime in public

and rallying people to its cause when it was given some say over policy in the legislature.

King Hussein's decision to bring the group into the political process resulted in their

demands being announced within the confines of the existing institutional regime"

(Conrad 18). The inclusion strategy came in handy when the protests occurred in Jordan.

Many of the oppositional political elites were still in favor of a legitimate constitutional

monarchy, but they stayed loyal to the royal family. Regardless, oppositional forces in

parliament still protested in Jordan, but "inclusionary legitimation ensured the acceptance

of the rulers by economic or political elites and served to either strengthening the support

base by promoting certain figures or to broaden the support base by bringing new elites

into the system" (Burger 11).

A widely used political argument among scholars for Jordan's endurance is the

strategy of divide and rule. This is done through elite rotation, magnifying societal

cleavages, undermining oppositional demands, and creating structural restrictions.

Through elite rotation, King Abdullah II has appointed many different prime ministers to

keep Jordanians content. Elite rotation has been occurring since Jordan's independence in

1946 and most recently in the past few years since the Arab Spring. Burger writes,

"individual ministers or entire cabinets have been dismissed by the king without ever

changing the basic political structure significantly. The pool of recruitment, however,

stays the same" (Burger 12). Most of the time, prime ministers are just reinstated or

reshuffled. Jordan's king uses this strategy to appease Jordanian citizens when they are

unhappy with the corruption or the political situations in the country. The protesters have

recently been calling for elected prime ministers, but to this day, the strategy of elite rotation has worked for the most part (Burger 12). Aside from elite rotation, the Jordanian government exacerbates societal cleavages as a part of their divide and rule strategy. "The Transjordanian-Palestinian issue is the societal cleavage used the most for dividing the population as well as opposition. Basically, Palestinian Jordanians are considered by Transjordanians to be "less Jordanian" and thus less loyal to the royal family and the state" (Burger 13). On top of the Transjordanian-Palestinan cleavage, there is a divide in Jordan among government supporters and government opponents, and ultimately the regime loyalists silence the criticizing voices of the opponents. The societal cleavages "[have] rendered the Jordanian opposition weak and fragmented" (Burger 13).

To further explain the divide and rule strategy, Burger articulates the government's actions to undermine oppositional demands. King Abdullah II will undermine oppositional demands by regarding them as outdated ideas and ideologies. At times, King Abdullah II will also turn oppositional demands into his own by calling for reforms on his own. "Although this does not often translate into legislation, the king can thereby claim to take care of these issues and that further protests by the opposition are only intended to disturb public order since, from his point of view, he is taking care of it" (Burger 13). Lastly, structural restrictions are part of the divide and rule strategy. The Jordanian government applies restrictions in a few different ways. Firstly, the Jordanian regime limits freedoms on the media and association, which weaken the voice of opposition groups (Burger 13). It is also evident that the elections law restrains opposition groups from gaining spots in parliament and prevents "parties from consolidating into broader blocs" (Burger 14).

Furthermore, the government brought forward loyal businessmen as a growing influence to weaken parliament and developed the ECC into a parallel government under King Abdullah II's control. "This allowed him to counterbalance the conventional institutions ensuring their weakness and his ultimate control over political decision making" (Burger 14). In addition, King Abdullah uses his ability to dissolve parliament and postpone elections when opposition groups start to gain more influence (Burger 14). The divide and rule strategy allows King Abdullah II to maintain power, as he reshuffles parliament, exacerbates societal cleavages, undermines opposition demands, and weakens opposition groups through restrictions and marginalization.

Pluralism and the toleration of limited dissent are also viewed as political arguments for the endurance of Jordan's monarchy. This political strategy has allowed Jordan's regime to turn "radical resistance into controlled opposition. As such, pluralist policies function as valuable mechanisms of social control rather than instruments of collective empowerment" (Boukhars 3). When political opposition groups channel their dissent, Jordan's monarchy is better able to assess the magnitude of opposition in regards to their policies and the probability of the opposition turning into militancy (Boukhars 3). Overall, Jordan's political strategy of pluralism has allowed the regime to control opposition groups and prevent radical resistance.

Finally, some scholars have favored of the "threat" argument under political reasons. Burger portrayed how the threat of chaos without the monarchy discourages people from protesting or calling for a regime change. "The Hashemites portray themselves as indispensable for Jordan's well being because of their claimed role as mediators between rivaling groups. It is stipulated that without the royal family, Jordan

would head directly into chaos and the aforementioned rivalries would lead to violent power struggles" (Burger 11). Many Jordanian citizens believe that a violent power struggle would occur in their country between rivalries, such as Northern tribes versus Southern tribes and Palestinians versus Transjordanians, if the royal family were taken down. Jordan's monarchy even highlights how Western powers or its neighboring countries could control their country without the royal family in place. Ultimately, many Jordanian citizens choose not to call for a regime change because they fear life will become chaotic in their country without the monarchy in place (Burger 11).

With regards to social reasons, some scholars argue that the rising status of the middle class in Jordan and "aspiring cosmopolitanism" strengthens the regime. These notions have created a new structure of social organization in Jordan's capital. "This reorients the populace away from failed political reforms and serves as a means to reinforce the status-quo, particularly in the context of deepening internal divisions and a region in turmoil" (Tobin 96). The rising notion of "aspiring cosmopolitanism" in Jordan has come as a result of the creation of neoliberal economic reforms. Over the years there have been a rising number of Jordanians from East Amman traveling to West Amman in hopes of work and leisure activity, which has led to an increase in employment in the service sector and private commercial spaces. "In such spaces, both East and West Ammanis prioritize cosmopolitan constructs of economic, political, and cultural forms of sociality that closely resemble those of the elites. They emphasize inclusiveness and democracy rather than 'internecine conflict, resurgent nationalism, and all sorts of bloody 'othering,'" (Tobin 98-99).

Notions of cosmopolitanism have been shaped through employment in the service sector and leisure activities in commercial areas, such as coffee shops, which allows middle class Jordanians to model themselves after elites as "aspiring cosmopolitans." Overall, "the middle-class orientation has emerged as a king of imagined community displacing overtly political nationalism and replacing ethnic, religious and other forms of elitism, factioning and sectarianism with a class-based cohesion that still carries important political implications" (Tobin 100). King Abdullah II has been able to use the rise of cosmopolitanism and social cohesion as a way to avoid radical protests. For example, King Abdullah II has made various announcements calling for an end to protests that can disrupt the unity of Jordan. Ultimately, the notion of cosmopolitanism has united the Jordanian middle class and elites, allowing the Hashemite regime to use the preservation of unity to its advantage in averting revolution (Tobin 105).

Throughout the Arab Spring, Jordan's monarchy has been able to endure. Various protests have occurred in Jordan over the past few years, but due to religious, economical, political, and social reasons, Jordan's monarchy remains stable. Overall, most Jordanian citizens are just looking for reforms under the regime, rather than a complete regime change in Jordan.

Chapter 2: Algeria

Following the uprisings in Tunisia and Egypt, protests began to occur in Algeria in December of 2010. The major protests took place in the capital, while a number of other minor protests spread across the country. Inspired by the Arab Spring, Algeria has faced many demonstrations over the last few years, however, the regime continues to endure as a result of historical events, presidential tactics, military repression, and economic reasons.

Algeria's Regime

Algeria, formally known as the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, operates as a semi-presidential republic. Abdelaziz Bouteflika is the current president of Algeria and rules the National Liberation Front (FLN) (Migdalovitz 1). "Today, Algeria has a bicameral parliament, encompassing a directly elected 380-member lower house, the National Assembly, and a partly appointed and partly indirectly elected upper chamber, the Council of the Nation" (Zoubir 180). The president has the power to appoint the majority of the Council of the Nation, while local and regional assemblies are given the authority to elect two-thirds of the Council. According to the constitution of 1996, Bouteflika was supposed to serve two terms as president, but Bouteflika himself introduced constitutional amendments that were approved by parliament in November of 2008, allowing him to stay in power for more than two terms (Zoubir 181).

The security forces make up a major part of Algeria's regime. This includes Algeria's security services and military hierarchy. "In 1999, Foreign Minister Abdelaziz Bouteflika, a civilian with vital military backing, won the presidential election after all other candidates withdrew, charging fraud" (Migdalovitz 1). Ultimately, Algeria's

security forces remain completely loyal to the regime and support President Bouteflika

through rigged elections. Bouteflika still has some autonomy from the military and the

ability to remove senior officers if he chooses to do so. "Bouteflika now serves as both

commnder in chief and minister of defense. Following his reelection to a second term in

April 2004, Bouteflika strengthened his control over the armed forces by appointing a

close associate as secretary-general of the Ministry of Defense and appointing other

loyalists as heads of Algeria's six military regions" (Zoubir 188).

Regardless of Bouteflika's power over the security forces the military still has

significant strength over the population, due to the past civil wars, Islamist threat, and

war on terrorism. Through these engagements, the security services, the Department of

Intelligence and Security (DRS), preside over various appointments of ministers and

ambassadors (Zoubir 188). This group manipulates sectors of society, such as the media

and political parties, in order to ensure election results. They also hold significant power

in state affairs (Zoubir 189). Ultimately, "while the role of the armed forces has greatly

diminished, elected officials – including the chief executive—do not have final say over

legislation and policy, given the political weight of the DRS" (Zoubir 189).

The pro-government parties that dominate parliament together make up the

"Presidential Alliance" (Zoubir 189). These parties include the National Liberation Front

(FLN), Democratic National Rally (RND), and the Islamist MSP. The FLN holds the

majority of seats in parliament (Zoubir 189). Even with pro-government parties operating

in parliament, Bouteflika still buys off the groups with major salary increases before the

elections to ensure his stability as leader of Algeria (Zoubir 181). "Political parties—

secular and religious--- exist, but they have no aspiration to accede to power. They are

content with having representatives in the parliament in part because a portion of their salaries goes to the parties' coffers" (Zoubir 182).

The original oppositional figures were among radical Islamists, Louisa Hanoune's Workers' Party, and the General Union of Algerian Workers. "Since the civil war of the 1990s, the regime has successively neutered both of the main Islamist parties, allowing them to participate in elections and including them in governing coalitions, tempting them with the fruits of power, and then watching their support slump as they compromise to stay in Parliament" (J. Brown). Today there are a number of moderate Islamist political parties in Algeria's parliament, such as MSP, Isah, and En-Nahda (Zoubir 189). Hanoune's Workers' Party was a main oppositional force in the 1990s, but has since transformed into a supporter of the Algerian regime. The General Union of Algerian Workers was a main opposition force in the 1988 revolt, but "since the end of the war, the Union has been decisively compromised by the replacement of the leadership with regime-friendly apparatchiks" and did not take any action in the recent protests (J. Brown).

With concern to opposition groups, there are a couple of other secularist parties that are allowed to be included in Algeria's parliament, such as Front of Socialist Forces (FFS) and Rally for Culture and Democracy (RCD). "Given the ongoing role of security services behind the scenes of the political arena and the rigged nature of a party system that contains within it no real, active political opposition, it is not surprising that Algerians are increasingly indifferent to parties and politics in general (Zoubir 190). Thus, most of the recent Arab Spring protests in Algeria were unorganized, except for a couple of protests arranged by specific groups, such as, Rally for Culture and Democracy

(RCD), Algerian League for Defense of Human Rights (LADDH), Coordination for

Change and Democracy (CNCD), Zionist groups, and an umbrella group consisting of

human rights leaders, lawyers, and unionists. The population understands the limited

mobility of political parties to create reforms and bring about real change, especially

oppositional ones (Zoubir 182). Even so, "President Bouteflika recognized the threat such

momentum [from opposition groups] could pose to his regime (S. Brown 15).

Protests in Algeria

Algeria experienced its first protest after the start of the Arab Spring on December

23, 2010, shortly after the Tunisian uprising. As opposed to Jordan, Algeria's first protest

turned violent after a week. The protest occurred in Algeria's capital in the Les Palmiers

neighborhood over insufficient housing. A total of fifty-three people were injured, but

fifty-two of them were a part of the security forces, while only one was a civilian. The

protesters were unhappy with the fact that the government threatened to take away their

housing in parts of Les Palmiers and relocate them to newer houses in a different area

("Scores Hurts").

The Algerian government created the new housing plan in 1984, but the protests

began as the Tunisian uprising inspired demonstrators and the government started to

revive the project. The protesters demanded to be a part of the beneficiaries list. "Chronic

housing shortages are a serious issue in the capital, with many young people forced to

stay with their parents well into adulthood" ("Scores Hurt"). The demonstrations even

extended into surrounding neighborhoods, such as Ennakhil, Laaquiba, Diar el Babor and

Cervantes, where residents were also upset with the inadequate housing. Many protesters

attacked police officers with Molotov cocktails and stones, leading up to the clash ("Scores Hurt")

Protests started up again in Algeria on January 3, 2011 and lasted until January 10, 2011. Rather than inadequate housing, the protests were sparked by the rise in price of food staples. Included are milk and sugar, which are basic essential foods for Algerians. The protesters were reported to be mainly young males, but they created a lot of violence. "They are burning tires, breaking into buildings, breaking everything....We can hear the screams," said journalist Lania Tagzout ("Protests Intensifying"). The rise in price of food staples sparked the weeklong protests, but the civilians were also unhappy with the ongoing issue with housing and the high rate of unemployment. All of these issues have been brewing over time in Algeria, but once again, the uprising in Tunisia triggered the protests. A particular group or leader did not organize the demonstrations, therefore forming chaos, such as many injuries among security forces and the protesters. The police were not liable for many of the injuries, but they did use tear gas to break up the protests. Even with the number of injuries, the dissidents explained, "everyone understands that things will only change through violence" ("Protest Intensifying").

The weeklong protests in the beginning of January 2011 heightened after Friday prayers on January 7th. Algerian security forces armed themselves with tear gas and weapons outside of mosques in the capital, but protesters still attacked the police forces with stones and hard objects. The first death occurred outside the capital in Msila, as a result of the clash. "The official APS news agency said protesters ransacked government buildings, bank branches and post offices in 'several eastern cities' overnight, including Constantine, Jijel, Setif and Bouira" (Chikhi). The protesters made their way over to

schools and gas utility buildings run by the state. Even so, analysts predicted that the uprisings would not turn into similar actions in the 1990s that created a ten-year civil war. The demonstrators continued to complain about high unemployment rates, which were noted to be between ten and twenty-five percent, and food prices that doubled in 2010. Overall, "the riots, more intense than the periodic outbreaks of unrest the country of 35 million has grown accustomed to, put authorities under pressure to deliver economic results that reflect strengthening state revenues from energy exports" (Chikhi). More than just minor grievances, the protesters expressed their need for major change that encompassed values of freedom and development (Chikhi).

The following day, on January 8, 2011, two people were murdered as a result of the riots over food prices and high rates of unemployment. The two deaths occurred in Tipaza province and Msila province. Some reports claimed that the killings were linked to police shootings, but official reports never confirmed the assault. Along with the killings, over 400 people were injured. Even the Algerian Football Federation postponed league matches that could have sparked protests. "The riots are widely seen as drawing on deep frustrations with the ruling elite and a lack of political freedom, as well as more immediate concerns about the cost of living, housing, and jobs" ("Overnight Riots").

The next day, on January 9, 2011, a third person was murdered in the clash, which triggered the Algerian government to reconsider the high food prices ("Reports"). Roberts claims that the private sector traders initiated the price increases, as the government does not have the ability to create these changes ("Reports") Regardless, the private sector traders raised prices on staple goods "in reaction to the government's attempts to impose new regulations on their transactions. The government's decision was,

in principle, part of the necessary and long overdue attempt to curb the rampant informal sector of the economy by subjecting the trade in foodstuffs to basic regulation and to bring it back into the formal sector" (Roberts). Roberts claims that Algeria has faced many protests in the past regarding rising prices and unemployment, but the weeklong protests had completely changed the dynamic of demonstrations in Algeria, as it occurred across the country, simultaneously, and at a great speed from the beginning of January 2011 (Roberts).

Roberts further explains how Algeria's national daily newspaper, *El Watan*, reported the protests as riots that could possibly turn into ones similar to those in October of 1988. In October of 1988, Algeria experienced bloody and traumatic clashes, where Algerian troops opened fire on innocent civilians after the army commanders announced a State of Siege. Even so, the army had not acted at this point in time during the January 2011 weeklong protests and instead practiced restraint. The outcome of the weeklong protests was unclear at the end of the week, but it ended up dying down until late January, with the exception of some self-immolations, as the government made a few announcements in regards to the rising prices to calm the crowds (Roberts).

Throughout mid January, a number of self-immolations took place. This was a way to remake the start of the Tunisian revolution when Mohamed Bouazizi lit himself on fire in front of a government building. On January 17, 2011, Mohsen Bouterfif, an Algerian citizen, set himself on fire and died in front of a government building, the Boukhadra town hall. "The paper reported that it happened after a meeting with the mayor who was unable to provide Bouterfif with a job and a house. About 100 young men protested over Mohsen's death in the town, in Tebessa province, 700 km east of

Algiers" (Algerian Dies). Earlier in the week, three other Algerians attempted to kill

themselves as a form of protest; one did so outside the domestic intelligence agency

headquarters. Bouterfif was the first death as a result of Algerian self-immolations in

2011 ("Algerian Dies").

On January 21, 2011, large protests started up again in the Algerian capital. The

protests occurred as a result of a government ban on protests against the regime. The

protests attempted to make their way to a government building in Algiers. As a result, a

clash occurred between the protesters and the security forces. "Opposition leaders say 42

people were injured and taken to a hospital. The state-run APS news agency says seven

officers were injured, two seriously" ("Police"). The demonstrators waved the Algerian

flag and the Tunisian flag to reveal their support for change, while the security forces

commanded control with their batons ("Police").

On January 29, 2011, a massive protest took place in Bejaja, a northeastern city in

Algeria. This time 10,000 protesters showed up to a rally. "Demonstrators marched

peacefully in the city in Algeria's Berber-speaking Kabylie region, shouting Tunisia-

inspired slogans such as: 'For a radical change of the regime!,' a lawmaker with the

opposition Rally for Culture and Democracy (RCD), Mohamed Ikhervane, told AFP"

(France Presse). This was the first large protest in Algeria that was organized by a group,

Rally for Culture and Democracy (RCD). The protest did not turn out to be violent, but

the police surrounded the city, which led to a calm dispersion of the demonstrators. Aside

from the RCD, the Algerian League for the Defense of Human Rights (LADDH), a pro-

democracy opposition group, also declared its plans for an organized protest in the capital

on February 12, 2011 (France Presse).

On February 8, 2011, university students started an "indefinite strike". Rather than grievances over unemployment and rising prices, the students protested the teaching quality in Algeria. Over 500 students showed up to the protest as they boycotted class in the capital. They demanded better education and a brand new qualification system across the cities of Algiers, Annaba, Tlemcen, and Oran. "Following a presidential decree of December 2010, the formerly used 'master' degree is now replaced by a 'magisterial' degree, which also would mean that an engineer education will now end up with a title equivalent to a 'professional education'" ("Large Student"). This change angered the students because it completely disregarded any previous dedications to a specific degree. In addition to these issues, the students were unhappy with the poor studying conditions and the lack of job availability ("Large Student").

The dynamic of the Algerian protests completely changed on February 12, 2011, the day after Hosni Mubarak resigned as Egypt's autocratic leader. In Algiers, "heavily outnumbered by riot police, thousands of Algerians defied government warnings and dodged barricades to rally in their capital Saturday, demanding democratic reforms" ("400 Arrested"). An umbrella group, mainly joined by human rights leaders, lawyers, unionists, and a number of other groups, arranged the demonstration. The main purpose of the protest was to demand democratic reforms rather than oust Bouteflika. The officials reported that only about 1,500 people made it to the rally, but over 10,000 Algerians showed up to the protest, as they made their way over the barricades. The demonstrators protested against a police state and demanded an Algerian government "for the people" ("400 Arrested").

Clashes occurred between the insurgents and the security forces, but there was no reported violence. The Algerian security forces arrested about 400 protesters for a short time period. Inspired by the successful uprisings in Tunisia and Egypt, the opposition finally spoke out about its anger with the law on public protests and the need for change in Algeria. Ali Rachedi, the prior leader of the Front of Socialist Forces party, explained, "'this demonstration is a success because it's been 10 years that people haven't been able to march in Algiers and there's a sort of psychological barrier,'" as he expressed the new absence of fear in Algeria ("400 Arrested").

Furthermore, the demonstrators were unhappy with President Bouteflika's unwillingness to end the state of emergency. The state of emergency was first declared in the 1990s when Algeria experienced a violent Islamist insurgency. "Opponents say he should have long ago ended a state of emergency declared at the start of that civil strife, and is doing too little to use Algeria's vast oil and gas wealth to help the bulk of its 35 million people" ("400 Arrested"). The opposition groups realized that Bouteflika retained the state of emergency only as a political weapon to restrict all protests. Bouteflika claimed that he would soon lift the state of emergency, but the group of protesters still went through with the rally on February 12, 2011, which ended up being a congregation at the First of May Square in Algiers ("400 Arrested").

Along with the grievances that fueled the state of emergency on February 12, 2011, blocked Facebook and Internet pages angered the protesters. "It was the apparent government attack on the internet which was of particular significance to those calling for an end to President Abdelaziz Boutifleka's repressive regime" (Ramdani). With the prior uprisings in Egypt and Tunisia, organized by the Internet, the Algerian government felt

the need to block pages that could mobilize opponents in Algeria. A number of the

demonstrators were detained for quite some time after operating violent rallies

(Ramdani).

On February 18, 2011, Algeria was placed on high alert for upcoming protests

and rallies for democracy. The Algerian government promised the Algerian citizens that

it would end the state of emergency, but the opposition groups called for protests every

Saturday regardless of the announcement. "Demonstrators said people now felt less

scared of taking to the streets. The protest organizers said the government's offer to lift

the state of emergency was a red herring as it could simply be replaced by an even more

repressive anti-terrorist law" (Chrisafis).

On February 22, 2011, the Algerian government finally lifted the state of

emergency. Protests died down until the beginning of March 2011. On March 2, 2011, a

large group of protesting men marched to Algeria's parliament. Rather than the usual

opposition leaders and unhappy youths, "they were Communal Guards, state-armed

militia on the front line of the country's long battle with Islamist extremists, and their

protest served as an eloquent example of the breadth of social unrest in this gas-rich

North African nation" ("Algeria Keeps Lid"). The grievances among the Algerians

protesting in the first few months of 2011 finally caught up with the Communal Guards,

as they too started to express anger towards the government. The Guards expressed their

unwillingness to clash with the state, but "they feel humiliated by lowly government job

offers put forward now that the service is gradually being disbanded, and emboldened by

the protesters from all quarters of society" ("Algeria Keeps Lid").

The protest among the Communal Guards came as a result of the government's lifting of the state of emergency. This ban led to dispersion of the security forces, as they are no longer needed. They were disgruntled with their lack of income, rights, medical benefits, and housing. The Communal Guards believe that they should not be receiving lower class jobs, such as housekeepers, when they have fought against terrorism before. Ultimately, the force was upset about its loss of power and "the consensus is the same: any hope for democracy in Algeria means dismantling the military pedestal on which the regime sits — not removing a president" ("Algeria Keeps Lid").

A few days later, on March 5, 2011, a protest took place on behalf of the National Coordination for Change and Democracy (CNCD) to demand a regime change. The Algerian security forces and pro-government demonstrators were able to halt the protest and counter the chaos. The CNCD were upset with the restriction on political protests and called the protest in three different cities throughout Algeria. "Counter-demonstrators carrying photos of President Abdelaziz Bouteflika chanted 'Bouteflika Is Not (Hosni) Mubarak' -- the Egyptian president forced out by a popular uprising on February 18. They chased and roughed up the anti-government protestors" (Police, Pro Government). The counter demonstrators were young, violent, and even threatened to lynch one of the members of the CNCD, who also happened to be the leader of the RCD. The CNCD was originally founded during the late January protests, but some of the independent trade unions decided to leave the party, as the CNCD did not match their interests. "The CNCD has said it wants the immediate end of Bouteflika's regime, citing the same problems of high unemployment, housing and soaring costs that inspired the uprisings in Tunisia and Egypt" ("Police, Pro-Government"). The CNCD took on a more radical approach to the

protests and called for the end to Bouteflika's regime, rather than the policy changes most protesters were looking for.

Two days later on March 7, 2011, a second protest took place on behalf of the security forces in Algeria. Over 2,000 members of the forces showed up to the rally. The Algerian Municipal Guards gathered in Martyrs' Square in Algiers. They were unhappy with their low wages, and therefore demanded raises and early retirement. These are the same guards that fought the Islamist militants in the early 1990s. "The government has considered dissolving the municipal police by redeploying its officers to other bodies including the army. But officers have rejected that, demanding a salary rise with retroactive effect as of 2008 or early retirement" (Disgruntled Police). To counter this protest, the Algerian government sent out the Algerian police to stabilize the demonstration ("Disgruntled Police").

The protests died down in Algeria until March 16 and March 23. A slight clash occurred on March 16, 2011. A number of young males decided to throw petrol bombs and stones in the Diar el Mahsoul neighborhood. The police used tear gas to break up the riot. The protesters expressed minor problems that they wanted changed, such as their housing. Other than that, the young males did not have many political demands. About sixty of the males demanded to meet with senior politicians about their housing issues and tried to block a road to get their way. "'We live like dogs. We live in one apartment with the whole family and we have been here since the 1960s,' one young protester told Reuters" ("Update 1"). Eventually about 150 males joined in, while 300 police officers were deployed to cater to the scene.

A week later, on March 23, 2011, a similar riot occurred in Algiers. This time five police officers were hurt in the riots, where the protesters threw stones and petrol bombs. The demonstrators were trying to halt the bulldozing operation that was meant to take down illegally built houses. The insurgents also decided to set a car on fire and throw bricks at the police officers using tear gas to break up the riot. "The clashes, in the Oued Koriche suburb of Algiers, began when local officials ordered the demolition of more than 30 houses built on publicly-owned land without a permit. Police in protective gear formed a shield around bulldozers which moved in to demolish the houses" ("Algerian Police)". The protesters were unable to successfully stop the bulldozers and the buildings were destroyed ("Algerian Police").

After March, the protests died in Algeria, with the exception of a few rallies and a couple of strikes. On June 23, 2011, a terrorist group committing a bomb attack targeted a military patrol. One of the soldiers died and another one was injured. As a result, Algerian soldiers entered the villages in Azazga, part of the Kabylie region, and shot the wrong civilian, who happened to be innocent. "The regional governor of Tizi Ouzou, Abdelkader Bouazghi, reacted angrily, saying, 'there was a man killed, sacking, theft, destruction of property and violation of privacy'" ("Algerian Village"). To stand up for the innocent civilian, opposition groups organized a demonstration after the funeral. The defense ministry announced its mistake and the Maghreb and African affairs minister, Abdelkader Messahel, blamed the attack on terrorist groups, mainly radical Islamists that armed themselves with weapons from Libya ("Algerian Village")

A few months later, on September 16 and 17 of 2011, Algerian citizens called for nationwide protests against the president's regime and the Algerian army. In response,

the Algerian security forces and the interior ministry were placed on high alert. Reports clamed that 'Zionist' groups organized the protest on Facebook and targeted the young Algerian citizens to incite them. Ould Kablia, the Algerian interior minister said, "'had it been people inside [the country], we would have exposed and arrested them, but the clues point us toward foreign parties in relation with the Zionist entity,'" and the "initial investigation showed that there was a lack of popular support for the protest call" ("Algerian Authorities"). The Facebook page only attracted 1,500 members, but had the goal of a revolution on September 17, 2011 for a "'free state with free people'" ("Algerian Authorities"). Kabila explained how the Facebook protest was meant to disturb national order in Algeria, but it failed to successfully mobilize the Algerian citizens ("Algerian Authorities").

A month later, on October 9, 2011, a rally took place in Algiers over the lack of jobs. The CNCD, unemployment rights activist group, organized the protest. "The group had called the rally to demand more jobs, improved unemployment benefits and the right to demonstrate freely," but the Algerian police arrested about twenty-five members ("Algerian Arrest"). The Algerian security forces felt obligated to arrest some of the protesters, as they planned on mimicking the violent protests of 1988 for democracy. Overall, the protest was contained and did not turn into a large movement ("Algerian Arrest").

In 2012, opposition groups failed to organize successful protests for the most part. In February of 2012, the main opposition groups based on Islam announced its decision to run as allies in the May 2012 parliamentary elections. "The alliance of three of the country's fractious Islamist parties increases the likelihood of Algeria following in the

steps of three other North African countries where Islamists have recently triumphed at

the ballot box" (Ouali). The parties had the goal of forming an Arab Spring, similar to the

successful ones in Tunisia and Egypt. With this in mind, the parties also requested the

alliance of other parties with similar interests. The parties expressed their optimism for

success, as elections in Tunisia and Egypt ended with Islamist-dominated parliaments.

Algeria's government did not view this as a threat, as Algerians normally fear religious

parties ever since the 1992 military coup and bloody civil war prompted by the Islamist

militants (Ouali).

Leading up to Algerian elections in May 2012, a number of sporadic attempted

protests occurred in Algiers. Algerian authorities took action through tactics, such as

detainment, to prevent citizens from protesting peacefully against the government.

Algerian security forces even arrested one of the candidates for the Algerian elections.

The security forces also fended off suspected demonstrators from heading to the capital

(Algeria: Crackdown). Aside from the protest attempts, Algeria's population simmered

down, even after the election. "Barely a week after a vote derided by much of the

population as a sham, there are no protests in the streets of this capital city. In a volatile

region, there are no marches, no rallies and no demonstrations" (Nossiter).

Nossiter explains that sixty to eighty percent of the population boycotted the vote,

as they knew the military-backed regime would claim victory over the Islamist opposition

candidates, but they did not even organize a demonstration (Nossiter). With the exception

of a minor protest, where an Internet blogger called for a mass violent protest against the

elections, many Algerians did not voice their opinions against the Algerian elections

(Honda). Ultimately, "the police [were] everywhere, and though criticism flow[ed] freely

in the street, it [was] sometimes delivered anonymously, and with a glance over the shoulder" (Nossiter).

Aside from the anti-government protests, Algerian citizens made a few calls for protests in regards to a small American Youtube film. The film was considered disrespectful to Islam's Prophet Muhammad. The anger was geared towards Americans and even turned into an attack on the American embassy in Libya. "The Algiers embassy said unspecified groups were using online social networks to organize demonstrations 'to protest a range of issues'" (Craggs). The demonstration did not end up moving to Algeria, but the U.S Embassy warned Americans to stay clear of official buildings and crowded places in Algeria, especially after the Gaddafi family fled to Algiers (Craggs).

In 2013, a couple of anti-government protests occurred sporadically in Algiers and provinces close to the capital. Similar to the original protests in 2011, violent demonstrations occurred in Algiers on behalf of the youth population in regards to rising food prices and unemployment. The protesters also condemned declining government services. The protests turned violent when the insurgents started throwing stones at the police forces. In the Bab el-Oued neighborhood, the rioters made their way to police headquarters and stormed the building, which led Algerian authorities to place security forces on high alert. Similar protests occurred in Zeralda, Esharaqa, Tibaza, and Oran. Aijbali reported, "government-owned TV channels completely ignored the protests in their news casts at night on Wednesday and instead reported on the progress of government housing and infrastructure projects across the country" (Aijbaili). Most recently protests have died down due to the focus on the hostage crisis, where a number

of foreigners were taken hostage by Al Qaeda terrorists in an Algeria's gas plant (Ahmed).

Algeria's Response

In response to the protests in Algeria over the past few years, Algeria's government has made a number of minor changes to appease the protesters. The earliest announcements and changes were made in the first week of January of 2011. At first, the government made a few comments concerning the rising prices. Government officials claimed that the price increases would be cancelled. To deal with the surface problem, the Algerian government also looked to religious leaders to calm down the rioters. Lastly, a number of senior regime leaders took it upon themselves to request that the protesters "demonstrate peacefully" (Roberts).

President Bouteflika also stated that the state of emergency was soon to be lifted. He never set a date, but this was a major announcement, as the state of emergency had been in place since the early 1990s. Along with the state of emergency, the government vowed to lower taxes and increase the number of wheat supplies to stores ("Middle East"). Mainly, the Algerian regime promised to reduce taxes and "import duties on some staple goods" (Algeria Vows). Their goal was to ultimately cut down on the price of basic foods, such as sugar and oil, by forty-one percent. Lastly, the government responded with harsh actions by committing to punish any rioters, especially those that became violent. The interior minister, Dahou Ould Kabila, said "around 1,000 protestors had been arrested, many of them minors, during the weekend disturbances, adding that they would appear before judges" ("Algeria Vows").

On February 3, 2011, Bouteflika made another announcement with regards to the state of emergency. He claimed that he would soon lift the rule, but there would still be restrictions on protests in Algiers. Also, Bouteflika announced that Algerians would even have better access to media sources, such as television and radio. The state controls the Algerian television and radio programs and barely broadcasts opposing views, but Bouteflika declared his willingness to allow political parties on the air. Finally, Bouteflika addressed the issue of unemployment and urged the government to adopt new initiatives to create jobs in Algeria (Lowe and Chikhi).

The government always had a fear of Islamist insurgents since the last civil war in Algeria, but it understood that concessions needed to be made in order to ensure a lasting regime without protests. Lowe and Chikhi claimed, "nevertheless, the announcement by Bouteflika reflects the ability -- proven many times before -- of Algeria's ruling elite to adapt to changing circumstances and do what is necessary to stay in power" (Lowe and Chikhi). Bouteflika did not want the Arab Spring to reach Algeria the way it did in Tunisia, and therefore attempted to make some minor compromises for the Algerian citizens.

On February 14, 2011, the Algerian government announced its plans to officially remove the state of emergency rule. This came right after Algeria experienced weeklong protests around Algeria demanding government reform and a change to leadership. The Foreign Minister of Algeria, Mourad Medelci, claimed, "'soon, we will discuss the past, but I say that lifting the state of emergency will occur in the coming days,'" and "it will mean a 'return to Algeria, a rightful state which totally allows, the expression of opinions, but always with reference to the law'" ("Algeria To Lift"). The president did

not release the exact date he would lift the ban, but he promised that he would take these

actions in the upcoming days ("Algeria To Lift").

A few days later, on February 22, 2011, Algeria's cabinet voted to lift the state of

emergency rule. In response to the massive protests across Algeria, the government

feared an uprising, similar to the ones that took down authoritarian leadership in Tunisia

and Egypt. The state of emergency rule was a common grievance among the Algerian

protesters. Alongside lifting the state of emergency, the government created a package of

initiatives to decrease unemployment in Algeria, which was also a major complaint

among demonstrators ("Algeria To End"). Bouteflika also allowed court trials for

"assigned residence" detainees and sent a number of the prisoners to official detention

facilities. These were significant concessions for Algerians because it provided fair trials

and legal facilities for some detainees ("World Report 2012"). Even so, Algerian citizens

were complaining about the government's failure to make sufficient reforms. For

example, Mustafa Bouchachi, Algerian Human Rights League chairman, said, "'we need

a real opening up for political, media and social activities so that the people can

experience democracy for themselves'" ("Algeria To End") Also, even though the

emergency rule was lifted, new laws were adopted to allow the military involvement in

domestic security. Not to mention, the government explained how the protesters were still

banned from holding demonstration marches in Algiers ("Algeria To End").

Along with the lift on the state of emergency, the government approved plans to

combat unemployment in Algeria. The first part of the package included a 100 billion

Algerian dinars specified for public banks for the purpose of long-term business

investments. The second part of the package consisted of measurements to encourage

employment through the reduction of business social security handouts. Lastly, the Algerian government agreed on "promoting the farming sector, one of the country's biggest employers, by offering low-interest loans to farmers and making it easier for domestic companies to lease farmland" ("Algeria To End"). The Algerian government claimed unemployment was at about ten percent, but these measures would reduce the rate ("Algeria To End").

On April 14, 2011, Bouteflika announced he would make a number of changes, such as constitutional amendments and laws concerning elections, the media, and political parties ("Algeria: Crackdown"). This was Bouteflika's initiative to ensure a representative democracy (Chikhi). He claimed that he would do it through a constitutional commission ("Arab Uprising"). Bouteflika also touched upon his promises for free elections, as well as his willingness to halt the detainment of journalists. "In a 30 minute speech, Bouteflika announced he would change the electoral law in Algeria, which is due to hold the next presidential election in 2014" and he said "'all measures will be taken to ensure free and fair elections including supervision by international observers'" (Chikhi). Algeria's president promised he would enact a new information law, as Algerians were upset with the existing law that enables authorities to jail journalists writing about their opposition to Bouteflika and fine them up to 250,000 dinars (Chikhi).

In July of 2011, the Algerian government made a few more concessions. This time, the Algerian parliament agreed to remove prison terms with the revision of two parts in the press code. These prison terms regard those that are sentenced for slandering the president or any state institutions. This did not include prison fines. Later in

September of 2011, a draft press code was approved by the Council of Ministers. This was a big step for the government because prison sentences for verbal offences would be eliminated if the code were adopted ("World Report 2012").

Aside from some of the concessions the Algerian government has made, Algerian authorities have employed many additional tactics to quell the protests. For example, in May of 2012, leading up to the elections, Algerian security forces arrested and detained many of the demonstrators in Algiers. The security forces also deployed during the week of elections to prevent possible demonstrators from entering the capital. "Security forces in the capital have taken pre-emptive measures and used force against groups who have tried to defy the ban on demonstrations in the capital, especially when the purpose of the demonstration was considered politically sensitive" ("Algeria: Crackdown"). The security forces tried blocking anyone from entering the areas of planned protests. Once protesters made their way into the site, the Algerian forces dispersed the demonstrators and arrested them. A number of the protesters were then held in police stations for many hours ("Algeria: Crackdown").

Algeria also made the effort to establish the appearance of free and fair elections during May of 2012. According to news sources, Algeria's parliamentary elections in May of 2012, where the National Liberation Front (FLN) won, were considered its most legitimate elections in years. "A wide range of candidates took part after the president approved the establishment of 23 new political parties" ("Arab Uprising"). Even Hilary Clinton applauded the election as a path towards reform in allowing Algerians to express their opinion. Even though many Algerians boycotted the elections, the announcements helped stabilize the regime and portray the elections as legitimate. The Algerian

government also took substantial steps to establish free and fair elections. For example,

the Algerian government allowed the EU observers to monitor the polls for transparency

(Lowe). The Algerian government has also since made efforts to appease the Algerian

citizens with a public spending program funded by its oil and gas exports. This was an

effort to fix social and economic problems that have led to many protests in Algeria

("Arab Uprising").

Theories

Similar to Jordan, theorists have debated the reasons as to why Algeria's regime

continues to endure, even after the Arab Spring. Algeria has also faced a number of

protests over the post couple of years but the regime still stands to this day. Most of the

debated arguments about Algeria's endurance fall under the topic of historical, military,

economic, political, demographic, and geographic reasons.

In regards to historical reasons, one of the most widely argued theories among

scholars as to why Algeria's regime still exists today is its historical legitimacy that has

created unity among the country. The French first colonized Algeria in 1830. This led to

eight years of war between Algerian citizens and the French, as they were desperate for

independence. The National Liberation Front led the fight against the French and brutal

fighting took place, resulting in a large number of deaths. Algeria finally received

independence in 1962, but "the physical costs of the war were immense with a death toll

in the hundreds of thousands, 3 million Algerians displaced, and villages and

infrastructure destroyed. To make matters worse, with the enemy defeated, a power

struggle then commenced between the disparate leaders of the revolution" (Barr 52). This

led to purgings of French residents and Algerians supportive of the French, upwards of

one million, which resulted in mass bloodshed. Once the Algerians finally received

independence, Ahmed Ben Bella, a revolutionary leader, was elected as president until he

was ousted in a coup. A couple of FLN leaders took power and Houari Boumediene,

former Minister of Defense Colonel, led the Algerian government as a revolutionary

(Barr 52).

Unfortunately, the fighting did not stop once Boumediene transitioned as leader of

the Algerian government. "Boumediene took a pragmatic approach, making Islamic and

Arab identity pillars of a unified Algerian state, but at the same time maintained firm

state control over its practice" (Barr 53). Boumediene died shortly after taking power as

president, but Colonel Chadli Bendjedid replaced Boumediene. Bendjedid was unable to

satisfy the Algerian population, as his policies led to economic deterioration. Brutal riots

started to occur in 1988, which led to inclusive politics. A number of opposition parties

started to emerge, such as the Islamic Salvation Front (FIS). The FIS quickly gained

popularity and became a notable political party to Algerians. "When FIS undisputedly

took the lead in national elections, the army annulled the results and commenced a

crackdown on the Islamists. Driven underground, the Islamists were subject to mass

arrests, torture, disappearances, and deportation to the Sahara" (Barr 53).

These brutal measures led the Islamists to respond with terrorist attacks targeting

innocent civilians and Algerian intellectuals. Many initiatives failed to solve this conflict

and brutal fighting lasted until the 1990s. Over 100,000 people were killed. The

government finally took control and the violence ended once the armed wing of the FIS

was disbanded in January of 2000. Ultimately, through these historical events, the

government has been viewed as the legitimate protector of Algeria against threatening

groups, such as the Islamist groups. The government has been able to instill unity among Algerians and portray itself as a legitimate leader (Barr 54).

Lastly, in relation to historical events, Algerians are still traumatized by the violence and bloodshed during the 1988 riots and past wars. "The ramifications of this violence are still felt today, moreover, as over 7,000 'disappeared' Algerians remain unaccounted for. The fear that another popular revolution could result in similar destruction is a very legitimate aspect of the Algerian psychology" (Barr 56). Therefore, Algerians are unwilling to involve themselves in another uprising that could possibly lead to more violence.

With regards to military reasons, scholars argue that the power of Algeria's security forces allow the regime to endure. Barr explains how the *pouvoir militaire* used their coercive forces to the fullest with the army, security forces, and secret police during the recent protests. "With the overwhelming force on the side of the ruling elites, protesters knew that all that stood between them and the butt of a gun was the internal cost benefit analysis of the ruling elites that determine whether it's worth it" (Barr 62). The Algerian citizens were even nervous about a possible crackdown by the military. Although the military did not take this route, they banned and blocked protests with great strength. A number of protests still occurred, but the security forces were able to outnumber the insurgents many times. They even dispersed and beat protesters that made their way beyond the barricades (Barr 62). Many times citizens are afraid of voicing their concerns because the police are ordered to spread out and hold down every area (Nossiter). When the demonstrators became violent, the police used tear gas (Barr 62).

Ultimately, Barr argues that the Algerian military portrayed its significant strength during the protests that helped the regime to endure.

    To further strengthen Barr's argument, Achy explains that not only is the Algerian military extremely powerful, but it is also loyal to the government. "Officers are both well-paid--they earn 65 percent more than average public civil servant (U.S. $470 compared to U.S. $280 per month)--and enjoy good career prospects, making it unlikely they would turn against the government" (Achy). The number of security forces has even increased immensely over the years. There are about 170 police officers today in Algeria, while there were only about 50,000 officers in the 1990s. Algerian police officers have not open fired on protesters, but they are certainly loyal to the Algerian government. Aside from the military's numbers, strength, and loyalty, it is more integrated into Algeria's politics compared to Egypt and Tunisia. Therefore, protesters would be unable to change the regime, even if they ousted the president. "In addition, many general officers manage the largest public-sector companies, giving them privileged access to strategic sectors in the economy" (Achy). Overall, the Algerian military has exceptional power that will allow the regime to endure.

    Aside from the arguments regarding historical legitimacy and the military, many theorists argue economic reasons for Algeria's endurance. Some scholars point to the idea of resource wealth. Algeria's resource wealth mainly comes from its oil reserves. "With its reserves of natural gas ranked 8th in the world and oil reserves at 16th, Algeria has been able to keep debt to about 1% of GDP, amass large amounts of foreign currency, and maintain a significant hydrocarbon stabilization fund" (Barr 54). Oil and natural gas encompass about thirty percent of Algeria's GDP, which essentially makes up Algeria's

economy. The Algerian government mainly spends this wealth on regime elites and groups that keep the population in line, such as the military pouvoir. The Algerian government even owns SONATRACH, a company dealing with hydrocarbon industries, ranked number nine as the largest company in the world. This company completely drives Algeria's economy and wealth. "SONATRACH is the regime's "most lucrative source of patronage, privilege, and power," making it integral to Algeria's endurance (Barr 54).

Algeria's resource wealth came in especially handy during the protests, as the government bought off some of the demonstrators. Bauer and Schiller explain how Algeria hands out economic benefits, similar to the way Saudi Arabia does, to alleviate all political demands (Bauer and Schiller 1). "Some analysts say that Algeria is different from Egypt and Tunisia because its huge revenues from energy exports allow it to satisfy many of its citizens' economic grievances, especially at a time when oil prices are around $100 a barrel" ("Algeria Promises"). Achy argues that this was the best possible way to handle the protests before they led to violence and brutal fighting. The resource wealth was also allocated for food subsidies, raises for court clerks and municipal civil servants, and interest-free loans for young entrepreneurs to start up their businesses. The young entrepreneurs were also given tax exemptions for three-years, and "[reserved] a quota of local public contracts for them" (Achy).

The government is also fairly generous about its youth-loan employment agency, which has reduced tension among youths looking for money. For example, Souad Gharabi, a young lawyer in Algiers, received a 7,000-dollar loan for her rent. "'People see there is the $200 billion," said Hammouda Naccredine, another economist at the

university, referring to Algeria's cash reserves. 'And they say, 'How do I get it?'''
(Nossiter) Nossiter further reveals that Algeria holds 180 billion dollars in cash reserves
that are oil generated. These reserves and a government money program for oppositional
youth allow them to mitigate reform calls (Nossiter).

Aside from handouts to buy off the opposition, the government made economic
concessions. The government subsidized necessary goods, such as flour or butane gas
(Bauer and Schiller 2). Not to mention Bouteflika responded to some of the protests with
price cuts, mainly on some staple goods. "In addition, in a speech, Bouteflika made vague
promises of future political and economic reforms to tackle unemployment and other
economic disparities and exempted men 30 and older from mandatory military duty if
they have not already served" (Barr 63). Bouteflika also announced his plan to transfer
cash and furniture to impoverished families (Achy). These economic concessions were
able to meet the demands of many oppositional protesters and alleviate grievances that
were driving the unrest (Barr 63).

Scholars also argue political reasons for Algeria's lasting regime. International
support is among these theories. Bouteflika was able to strengthen Algeria's foreign
relations after he was elected in 1999. He opened up relations with the Middle East,
North Africa, and parts of the West (Barr 54). Algeria has exceptional relationships with
regional and international groups, as a contributing member of the Arab League and the
Organization of African Unity (OAU). Algeria also served as a non-permanent member
of the UN Security Council in 2004 and 2005. These supporters allow Algeria to express
itself as an authoritative regional power. The main foreign supporter for Algeria's regime
has been Western alliances focusing on counter-terrorism. The terrorist group, Al-Qaeda

has consistently targeted Algeria with suicide attacks, bombings, and kidnappings. Even the UN headquarters in Algiers was bombed by Al-Qaeda in December of 2007. "Since they mostly target the government and foreigners, it has created a common cause between the West and the Algerian government and has resulted in a robust campaign of joint counterterrorism initiatives" (Barr 55). Algeria has been able to team up with Western alliances and gain international support from them through its common cause of counter-terrorism.

On top of international support, Achy argues how internal disagreements have led to a lack of protests and the endurance of Algeria's regime. This is mainly in concern to demonstrations. Opposition parties and youth groups attempted to create an ad-hoc partnership, the National Coordination for Democratic Change (CNCD), as a way to peacefully protest weekly together for reforms, but they turned out to be unsuccessful as the groups formed many disagreements among their interests. "Internal disagreements within the CNCD have already emerged between human rights organizations and trade unions on the one hand, and political parties on the other. The bone of contention is on maintaining demonstrations every Saturday in Algiers despite their ban by the regime" (Achy).

In addition to international support and internal disagreements, many theorists believe the government restrictions on opposition groups is a valid political argument. Algeria operates as a multi-party system, but Bouteflika's party, the National Liberation Front FLN), commanded control over Algeria. The only other main parties under the multi-party system consist of the "'Presidential Alliance,'" such as the National Rally for Democracy Party, which is run by the prime minister who abides by the president and

oppositional parties. A number of the opposition parties do not even have the ability to campaign, as the government denies them equal opportunities. These opposition parties include the Workers' Party and Party for Justice and Liberty. Aside from this issue, Bouteflika has a complete monopoly on media sources to express himself as the only reasonable candidate. "As a result, while members of the political parties may have been in favor of political change, their ability to institute their demands through formal procedures was quite limited" (Barr 59). The main opposition party did not even hold its first formal protest until after months of demonstrations (Barr 59).

A number of oppositional groups still exist outside the formal sector, such as ones in the business populace and civil society, but some theorists believe that these groups are not unified enough to create a successful uprising. This is partially in regards to the cleavages of Algerians' ethnicities, but mainly because of disagreements amongst parties in concern to the notion of religion in government (Barr 59-60). "In fact, some 60 groups who would support democracy nonetheless prefer to accept restricted political rights in order to prevent an Islamist takeover or chaos" (Barr 60). Once again, this is due to Algerians' fear of another brutal civil war, as the last one resulted in the deaths of between a 100,000 and a hundred and 20,000 Algerians and therefore their desire for change is limited (Achy). Nossiter explains, "tales of mutilated corpses and mass graves remain common currency," and thus they are not looking for another Islamist led bloody repression (Nossiter). Alongside Nossiter, Byrne explains that Algerians are unwilling and unable to stand up for democracy if it means another violent war, as they are still scarred by the past (Byrne).

As a result of disagreements over religion infused in the government, the majority of the Algerian demonstrations have even compartmentalized into minor issues that only represent the party organizing the protest (Barr 60). For example, each group separately demonstrated in concern to a different interest, such as graduate students for university reform and municipal civil servants for their own economic and social values. The lack of common grievance resulted in unsuccessful protests that only mobilized about 2,000 protesters for national calls (Achy). The protests started to lose steam when the divided groups were unable to agree on a common cause and how to go about the demonstrations (Barr 61).

The recent concessions made by Bouteflika also serve as major political reasons among scholars for the endurance of Algeria's regime. Aside from the price cuts of staple goods and promises of reforms, Bouteflika's lifting of the state of emergency rule quelled some of the protests (Barr 63). Achy explains how the state of emergency lift was a major change for the Algerians because it existed for nineteen years (Achy). Also, the lift was a concession made by the government to prevent future protests (Lowe and Chikhi). Furthermore, Bouteflika claimed that he would make changes to the constitution and various electoral laws. He explained how these reforms would strengthen the multi-party system (Barr 63). Lastly, Byrne argues that the recent concession of a new press law has also helped the Algerian regime endure. The new law prohibits journalists from being jailed if they "stray over certain red line sin their commentary on the state of the nation" (Byrne). Many Algerians "believe it's a step in the right direction and are more inclined to wait and see, or put pressure on the regime in other ways" (Barr 63).

Furthermore, the geography and demographics of Algeria explain the endurance of the country's regime. Similar to Achy's argument about internal disagreements, because of its geography, Algeria's citizens are unable to connect as well as those in Tunisia because of two mountain ranges that divide its terrain. With regard to demographics, there is a major cleavage in Algeria's society, as many Algerians define themselves as Arab and fifteen percent of the population identify themselves as Berber. "This tension in recent years has centered on the predominantly Berber region of Kabylie where activists have consistently demanded official recognition of their language, Tamazight, compensation for the deaths of protesters, more economic development, and greater regional autonomy" (Barr 56). Tamazight was acknowledged as the official national language in 2001, but the issue still remains controversial between the two groups. Therefore, Algeria's society is unable to connect with one another successfully to perform an effective uprising through a common cause (Barr 56).

Throughout the Arab Spring, Algeria's regime has been able to survive, even under various protests and rallies. Due to economic and political reasons, as well as being inspired by the Arab Spring, Algeria's citizens have demonstrated against the government since December of 2010. With the use of various government tactics, such as concessions, reforms, announcements, military strength, and historical legitimacy, Algeria's regime continues to endure and fight off the Arab Spring successfully.

Conclusion

Jordan's monarchy and Algeria's republic are two different Arab authoritarian regimes, but they both connect in many ways in regards to the post Arab spring protests, government responses, and theories among scholars as to why each regime has endured. Jordan and Algeria's regimes encompass many factors that allow various other Arab authoritarian regimes to last. Overall, similar to many other Arab authoritarian regimes, Jordan and Algeria have endured for many years and continue to do so.

The Protests

The various protests that occurred over the past few years in Jordan and Algeria pointed to a number of similarities with regards to the causes and demands. Most of these common causes fall under the areas of economic reasons, living standards, corruption, and the lack of general ideals. As for economic causes, rising prices were huge factors in both Jordan and Algeria. These concerns arose multiple times amongst the anti-government protesters, especially in the first protests post Arab Spring. Jordan's protesters were more concerned with the rise in fuel prices, while Algeria's protesters were angered by the rise in food staples. Along with rising prices, citizens under each regime protested the lack of jobs, unemployment, and general economic conditions. These issues had been concerns amongst Jordanians and Algerians for quite some time, but the Arab Spring inspired them to protest about it.

Aside from economic causes, living standards were popular arguments with protesters under each regime. Living standards were concerns amongst tribesmen in Jordan, but the issue pertained more to Algerian citizens. A number of demonstrations

were organized in reference to housing issues in Algeria over the past few years,

including one of the first protests inspired by the Tunisian protest. Algerians were upset

with the government's threat to relocate neighborhoods, bulldoze illegal houses, and

general housing shortages that has consequently forced young adults to live with their

parents. In addition, Jordanians and Algerians have formed demonstrations in response to

government corruption. The problem with government corruption was brought up in

Jordan more so than Algeria, but was a common cause nonetheless.

Jordanians and Algerians have similar concerns with regards to general ideals.

Citizens under each regime strive for freedom, democracy, and development. Protesters

have brought up these concerns many times in demonstrations, even if they were not

organized for those particular reasons. Overall, protesters in Jordan and Algeria called for

reforms, rather than an end to the monarchy. A few radical protests in each country called

for an end to the monarchy and ousting the leaders, but the majority of the

demonstrations were linked to demands for general reforms.

Jordanian protesters had a number of common causes for demonstrations with

Algerians, but there were also a number of concerns did not overlap. The grievances

specific to Jordan include economic and political reasons. One of the economic reasons

falls under the concern of job creation. Similar to Jordanians, Algerians complained about

unemployment rates, but Jordanian citizens also formed a couple of protests calling for

job creation specifically for tribesmen. This is a not a huge difference, however it can still

be noted as distinct concern separate from Algeria. Aside from the demand of jobs for

tribesmen inflation was another reason for protests in Jordan.

Under political reasons, many Jordanians demanded the resignation of the prime minister and the dissolution of parliament altogether. This was a high concern amongst Jordanian protests and came up in the majority of the protests. Demonstrators called for the Prime Minster to resign after a new one was appointed by King Abdullah II. This led to another grievance with the Jordanian protesters, the king's constant willingness to reshuffle the government around. A number of Jordanians caught on to King Abdullah II's political strategy of reshuffling parliament to quell the demonstrations and riots. This is similar to a number of protests that were organized as a result of their discontent with minor political reforms that were cosmetic rather than substantial. Furthermore, the issues of prime ministers and changing parliaments have led protesters to demand an elected government and more political say. Jordanian started calling for the prime minister to be elected by the parliament rather than King Abdullah II.

In addition to government issues, demands for constitutional change and democratic laws have been common among Jordanian protests. These reflect the similar common causes between Jordanian and Algerians, as they both expressed their interests in democracy and freedom. Lastly, a couple of protests occurred with regards to the United States' inconsistent policy and Israel's mission. These protests did not occur many times, but they were distinct to Jordan nonetheless.

Similar to Jordan, Algeria faced a number of protests that did not overlap with causes in Jordan. These protests fall under economic, political, and educational categories. With regards to the economic causes, Algerians organized a couple of demonstrations with concern to specific economic issues. These included the lack of

Algerian unemployment benefits and medical benefits, and low income for Communal

Guards, and the low wages for the Algerian Municipal Guards.

Under political reasons, Algerians protested in a specific manner that mimicked

incidents in Tunisia. A number of Algerians performed self-immolations to get the

attention of the government. A number of these self-immolations occurred in response to

the lack of political reforms in Algeria. In addition, Algerians were angered by the

government ban on protests and the unwillingness of Bouteflika to lift the nineteen-year-

old state of emergency rule. This is similar to a number of demonstrations that expressed

their concern for the restrictions on political protests. Under the educational category,

Algeria faced a protest by university students demanding better teaching quality. The

students protested for better education and an end to the qualification system. The

educational concerns only came up once in the protests, but created a distinction between

the demonstrations in Jordan and Algeria.

Jordan's protests were by far more organized than Algeria's protests. The Muslim

Brotherhood and the Islamic Action Front organized most of Jordan's protests, while a

specific group or party did not organize a number of Algeria's protests at all. Alongside

the Muslim Brotherhood and the Islamic Action Front, leftists groups, Baathist parties,

the "March 24th Movement," tribal youth activists, the Constitutional Monarchy

Movement, and the National Reform Front took charge of organizing protests in Jordan

with similar demands. Aside from these groups, the ultra conservative Salafi Movement

organized one protest calling for Islamic Sharia law to rule Jordan. Also, labor groups

and Islamists arranged protests with concern to Israel's mission and Jordan's peace

agreement with Israel.

Distinct groups or parties did not organize Algeria's protests until a couple months into the Arab Spring. The groups organized protests consisted of the Rally for Culture and Democracy (RCD), Algerian League for Defense of Human Rights (LADDH), Coordination for Change and Democracy (CNCD), Zionist groups, and an umbrella group consisting of human rights leaders, lawyers, and unionists. University students, young males, radical Islamists, terrorist groups, the Algerian Communal Guards, and the Algerian Municipal Guards assembled the rest of the demonstrations.

With regards to location, Algeria's protests were more widespread and occurred in a number of local areas. Regardless, Jordan faced a number of widespread protests, including ones in a number of tribal areas. For Jordan, the majority of protests occurred in Amman. The rest of the protests mainly occurred in Salhub, Karak, Dhiban, Maan, tribal areas, such as Tafileh, and Northern areas, such as Irbid, Jerash, and Ajlun. For Algeria, the majority of the protests occurred in Algiers. The rest of the demonstrations occurred in Ennakhil, Diar el Babor, Cervantes, Msila, Tipaza province, Tebessa province, Anaba, Tlemcen, Oran, Diar el Mahsoul, Qued Koriche, villages in Azazga, Zeralda, Esharaqa, Tibaza, Bab el-Oued, Les Palmiers, Bejaja, and Eastern cities, such as Jiel, Setif, Bouira, and Constantine. Similarly, the majority of protests occurred in the capital cities. The demonstrations in the capital regions were also the largest ones in each country. Protesters in Jordan and Algeria organized demonstrations outside the capital and outside mosques. Also, in both Jordan and Algeria, protesters organized demonstrations after Friday prayers.

Between Algeria and Jordan, quite a number of injuries took place. Algeria's protests were more violent overall, therefore producing more injuries. Even though more

injuries were produced in Algeria's violent protests, more clashes between government supporters and government protesters occurred in Jordan. Overall, there were about eight different occasions where clashes occurred in Jordan. The injuries usually occurred as a result of violent actions, such as government supporters throwing stones at government protesters, and vice versa. Some of the clashes were bloody and Jordanians in critical condition. Police officers were also critically injured in one of the clashes. There was only one death reported in all of the clashes.

From the start Algeria's protests were more violent than those Jordan. For the most part the clashes did not occur between the government supporters and the government protesters. Only a few government supporters participated in the protests. The clashes mainly occurred between the government protesters and the police officers. A number of the injuries and deaths were also produced through self-immolations, which did not occur in Jordan. In most cases, the Algerian police officers were more injured than the Algerian civilians. One of the riots produced over four hundred injuries and on many cases people were in critical condition from the clashes. Most of the time, the violent government protesters threw petrol bombs, Molotov cocktails, hard objects, and stones. A number of deaths also resulted form the clashes between the protesters and the police officers, one as a result of a bomb attack committed by a terrorist group on military patrol. Many times protesters also ransacked buildings and police headquarters, set cars on fire, threw bricks at Algerian forces, and broke into post offices and schools, which also took place in Jordan, but more so in Algeria. Overall, Algeria's protests were much more violent than Jordan's protests, as a number of Algerian's believed that violence was the only way to bring about reform.

With regards to security, police officers in Jordan and Algeria handled the protests and riots similarly. In both cases the government mobilized the police officers in mass numbers for all of the protests. They were sent out to standby, mediate the situation, and practice restraint. In both countries, the police officers ended up using tear gas and weapons to break up the violent riots many times, especially when the government protesters attacked the police officers. Specifically in Jordan, the police open fired at a major riot on November 13, 2012. In both cases, the police officers made many arrests and detained a large number of protesters. In Algeria the police officers blocked off the capital city with barricades to prevent organized demonstrations.

Government Responses

Similar to the protests, there are a number of similarities and differences between the government responses in Jordan and Algeria. With regards to the common government responses under the two regimes, there were many similarities. Under economic responses, both the Jordanian and the Algerian regimes presented packages of initiatives to deal with the protesters issues with unemployment and rising prices. In Jordan, a 225 million dollar package was created in fuel prices and food staples for Jordanian citizens. Similar to this, an economic package was assembled in Algeria to decrease unemployment with benefits such as money for public banks to invest in businesses.

With regards to political responses, both Jordan and Algeria lifted long lasting laws in regards to protests. In Jordan, King Abdullah II revised the Public Gatherings Law, which allowed citizens to demonstrate without the permission of the government. In Algeria, the nineteen-year-old state of emergency law was lifted. Each of these laws still

came with restrictions, but they were still considered huge steps for each country, as they were tangible reforms. Jordan and Algeria also made efforts to establish freer and fairer elections. Jordan's king made a number of initiatives to reform the election process. These initiatives included constitutional changes, such as the creation of an Independent Elections Commission and a new electoral law. Even so, a number of the reforms dealt with surface problems and only appeared to be substantive.

Some of the promises that Jordan's king made consisted of reforming the electoral process, where cabinets would be created based on the majority of the elected parliament, revisions of election laws, and the creation of an independent council that would administer parliamentary elections. Aside from the promises, Jordan's king also made tangible efforts to reform the election process, such as, calling meetings to deal with election corruption, conducting personal meetings with the Independent Election Commission to ensure transparency and fairness in the election, and setting three conditions to guarantee effective and fair elections. The Algerian government did not make as many efforts to ensure transparent elections, but Bouteflika appeared to have established fairer elections and made promises to revise the laws for elections to ensure a representative democracy. Bouteflika never revised any of the election laws, but he did allow EU observers to monitor the polls for transparency. Finally, Jordan and Algeria's political responses overlapped through their promises for constitutional amendments. Jordan's king even went further and announced that he would create a National Dialogue Committee, where proposals to the constitution would be drawn up. Jordan's king successfully followed up on this promised and constitutional laws were created to develop Jordan.

Similarities were also viewed in Jordan and Algeria's efforts to make promises and announcements to quell the protests and deal with surface problems, although these responses were distinct to each country. In regards to Jordan, King Abdullah II first made promises that he would start to include the Islamic Action Front and Islamist groups into the government more. King Abdullah II also made promises for economic and political reforms at National Unity Day. Jordan's king promised that he would look into a resolution to the corruption problem and allow parliament to finally elect the prime minster next year. In regards to Algeria, Bouteflika made announcements and promises that he would decrease food prices and allow Algerians better access to the media.

Specifically in Jordan, a number of tangible reforms were created to deal with the protesters and develop the country. Abdullah II's main political strategy was to reshuffle the government. Since the protests started in 2011, Jordan's king has appointed three new prime ministers. A number of the prime ministers had even served in the past, which reveals his lack of commitment to real change. King Abdullah II also completely dissolved parliament in October of 2012. With regards to replacements, Jordan's king hired a new intelligence chief because citizens were complaining that the current chief was using illegal intimidation methods. To further political initiatives, King Abdullah II called for a National Unity Day, where he expressed his thoughts about Jordan's future and developments the government was working on, such as ways to better education. In concern to economic efforts, aside from the economic package, King Abdullah II increased wages for civil servants and those in the army.

The Algerian government responded to the protests in a number of unique ways. The Algerian government used religious leaders to calm down protesters. Bouteflika also

requested Algerians to demonstrate peacefully, but also threatened them with detainment and punishments if they did not follow the rules. The Algerian government followed up with these threats a number of times and arrested a number of rioters. Aside from the arrests, the Algerian police officers also prevented protesters from entering the capital if they suspected a planned demonstration. With regards to concessions, the Algerian government removed prison terms for those that slander the president or government institutions.

Theories

A number of theories have been drawn up amongst scholars about the reasons as to why Arab authoritarian regimes have remained intact post-Arab Spring. Some of these theories have been specific to Jordan and Algeria, while some of these arguments have overlapped between the two countries. General arguments concerning all of the Arab authoritarian regimes also connect to both Jordan and Algeria, pointing to strong conclusions about Arab authoritarian endurance. With concern to reasons distinct to Jordan, arguments all fall under political initiatives. Symbolism has been a significant belief among scholars. Many times, King Abdullah II uses democratic language in his speeches and engages in symbolic acts to make it seem as if he is developing Jordan and moving towards reforms. It is also evident that King Abdullah II presents himself as a non-partisan leader, but will blame the government consistently for unpopular reforms. Lastly, King Abdullah II constantly reshuffles the Jordanian government and appoints new prime ministers every so often to appease protesters. Since the Arab Spring, Jordan's king has appointed three new prime ministers and dissolved parliament right before elections.

Theorists have made arguments about a number of reforms and initiatives to keep protesters from taking down the Algerian regime. These arguments have fallen under economic, geographical, and demographical reasons. As far as economic reasons go, Algeria's oil and natural gas reserves make up its economy and strengthen the regime. Algeria's government owns SONATRACH, the ninth largest company in the world. Overall, Algeria's resource wealth has allowed it to thrive as a strong economic regime. Aside from economic reasons, the geography of Algeria is distinctive to its endurance. Algeria is made up of mountain ranges that divide terrain, creating major cleavages between groups that are unable to connect. Similarly, demographics have split up Arabs and Berbers. The Arabs and Berbers constantly argue, rather than focusing on common grievances. Ultimately, the Arabs and Berbers are unable to come together to form an opposition group.

Aside from distinct theories for each country, scholars have overlapped in their arguments for both Jordan and Algeria's endurance. These arguments fall under political reasons. One of the overlapping political arguments is the creation of reforms and promises. Both Bouteflika and Abdullah II have made countless reforms and announcements to appease the oppositions groups. For example, Jordan revised the Public Gatherings Law, while Algeria lifted the State of Emergency. Bouteflika and Abdullah II have also called for democratic change and constitutional amendments. They have not always followed through with their initiatives, but the promises have quieted the protesters. It is also evident that the Jordanian and Algerian regimes have placed many restrictions on protests that led to unsuccessful protests.

The governments use the threat of chaos as a political tool to keep citizens in line. Abdullah II and Bouteflika consistently use their own government as the main mediator between rival groups. Both leaders have expressed their "concerns" for the public if the regimes were to fall, as the destruction can lead to violent power struggles between rival groups within the states. Abdullah II and Bouteflika have even noted that powerful Western countries can take advantage of the countries if they were to be ousted. Algeria's government uses the threat of chaos, even more so than Jordan's government. Algerians are constantly reminded about the threat of radical Islamic takeover, as they faced a brutal civil war in the past with extreme Islamists. Bouteflika is viewed as a legitimate ruler compared to Islamic groups, and therefore Algerians do not want to risk chaos with a revolution.

Finally, the issue of societal cleavages is a political argument for both Jordan and Algeria's endurance. Jordan's regime magnifies the societal cleavages as a political tool, while the societal cleavages in Algeria naturally cause a problem for opposition groups. In Jordan, the societal cleaves occur among Transjordanians and Palestinian Jordanians, as well as among government supporters and government opponents. The government exacerbates the notion that Palestinian Jordanians are considered to be "less Jordanian" by Transjordanians, making Palestinian Jordanians less loyal to the monarchy and the state. The Jordanian government also embraces the government supporters, rendering the government opponents as weak political forces.

The theories for Jordan and Algeria's endurance overlap with arguments between scholars about the endurance of all Arab authoritarian regimes prior to the Arab Spring. These theories were revealed in the literature review. These arguments fall under the

categories political, security, and economic reasons. In terms of political reasons, scholars argue that Arab authoritarian regimes are able to endure due to their legitimate appearance. They create the image of success and popularity. This relates to Jordan, as many theorists explain how Jordan's regime lasts due to traditional legitimacy. As a monarchy, Jordan is rooted in early Islamic history and has followed an Islamic lineage. Jordanians are not willing to take down a regime that traces back to the Prophet Mohammad with religious authority. Scholars believe that Algeria prevailed due to legitimacy, but more so due to historical legitimacy. Due to Algeria's past bloody civil wars, Algerians are scarred by violence, destruction, and terrorist attacks. Not only does these wars trigger feelings of nationalism, but also Algerians are not willing to start a revolution as a result of these historical events. Algeria now has an elected leader that is viewed as legitimate because he works to fight off threatening and terrorist radical groups.

Patrimonialism is also a common argument among scholars for Arab authoritarian regimes, including Jordan and Algeria. In regards to Jordan, the citizens are often times bought off in various ways from its influx of foreign aid. The Jordanian government sets up top down approaches where foreign aid is given out to the population to appease the protesters. Jordan's government also created jobs in the public sector to buy off its citizens. With regards to Algeria, the government buys off its opposition groups with money from oil and natural gas reserves. Often times the government spends the money on regime elites and groups, such as the military pouvoir, to keep the population in line. They also buy off the protesters with the oil reserve wealth to satisfy economic

grievances. The Algerian government uses the resource wealth for food subsidies, wages to court clerics and municipal servants, young entrepreneurs, and youth loans.

In addition to patrimonialism, the multi-party system is a popular political argument among theorists for Arab authoritarian regimes that overlaps with Jordan and Algeria. This allows for the inclusion of opposition groups into government, but places various restrictions on them that does not allow them to move anywhere under the system. For example, scholars have pointed out that most Arab authoritarian regimes have a monopoly on the media, which restricts opposition groups from campaigning. In Jordan, opposition groups and business elites are included in parliament. Since their inclusion, they have become loyal to the regime, which guarantees the endurance of Jordan's regime. Algeria's multi-party system provides support for the regime, as Bouteflika's party commands control, the prime minister runs the Presidential Alliance, and the opposition parties are unable to campaign.

In addition to patrimonialism and the multi-party system, Western and international support is a significant political reason for the endurance of Arab authoritarianism that applies to Jordan and Algeria. As explained earlier, Jordan has great relations with many Western countries, such as the United States, and receives support in the form of foreign aid. Algeria has a lot of international support from many different areas. Ever since 1999, Algeria has had great relations with the Middle East, North Africa, and the West. Algeria is also a member of the Arab League, OAU, and was formally a non-permanent member of the United Nations Security Council in 2004 and 2005. Most importantly, Algeria has formed Western alliances to focus on counterterrorism efforts.

Lastly, among political reasons, the lack of ability to coordinate among oppositions groups has helped Arab regimes endure. In Algeria, the CNCD was the most organized opposition party during the post Arab spring protests, but there were too many internal disagreements among the organization. Also, oppositions groups outside the Algerian government disagree on the role of religion in government and how they should organize protests, which does not allow them to come together and form common grievances and effective coalitions. In general, Langhor believes there is too much civil society in Arab regimes, which takes away from the participation in political parties. She argues how citizens under Arab authoritarian regimes take too much of a role in non-governmental organizations and other groups, which appeal to specific interests. Therefore, there is a lack of mobilization because citizens do not come together for common interests. In opposition, Whitaker believes civil society is too weak because groups do not have enough power and resources to form successful protests. Overall, citizens under Arab authoritarian regimes are unable to come together on the basis of common grievances.

On top of the legitimacy and political reasons, scholars argue security reasons for the endurance of Arab authoritarian regimes that overlap with Jordan and Algeria. Under most Arab authoritarian regimes, the security forces are coercive and strong. A number of the Arab regimes have an army, security forces, and secret police that all contribute its strength. The secret police will listen, spy, arrest, interrogate, and restrict activity, leading to unsuccessful protests and fearful citizens. In both Algeria and Jordan, the security forces fight off the protesters with their coercive force and power. In Jordan, the General Intelligence Department and secret police take charge as security forces, while the

pouvoir militare take command as security forces in Algeria. All of these security forces have banned and blocked protests, armed themselves with weapons, beat rioters with batons, used tear gas to break up protests, and detained protesters. Algerians have expressed fear of a military crackdown, which limited their engagement in protests and secret political activity. Jordanians have been fearful of voicing their concerns because of the military and secret police around. Bellin explains how the coercive apparatus of the states remains effective and coherent in the face of protesters.

In addition to security forces' coercive apparatus and strength, the military is completely loyal to the regimes. Most of Arab authoritarian regimes pay their security forces very well, including Jordan and Algeria. In Algeria specifically, they are integrated into the government politics. Therefore, the security forces would take over if the leader were ever ousted, which encourages citizens to call for reforms rather than a full regime change. Overall, with the exception of a couple of Arab authoritarian regimes, the security forces remain loyal to the regimes and fight off opposition groups for the survival of the governments.

Moreover, the literature review theories adequately explain the Jordanian and Algerian post-Arab Spring cases. Although a number of overlapping theories applies to Arab authoritarian regimes that have fallen to the Arab Spring uprisings, such as the multi-party system, patrimonialism, resource wealth, international support, and coercive security forces. For example, all of these arguments apply to Egyptian regime, which fell to the Arab Spring revolution. Thus, post-Arab Spring theories that apply to Jordan and Algerias' endurance can be added to the literature review theories. These arguments include, reforms and announcements, the threat of chaos without the presence of the

regimes, and societal cleavages. There are also a number of literature review theories that are not widely covered by theorists for Jordan and Algeria. These include the religion of Islam, poor regimes that lead to poor education and low literacy rates, family honor, and politicized education. Most of these theories still help us understand the cases of Jordan and Algeria, but scholars did not focus on these areas when focusing on Jordan and Algeria.

Overall, there are many similarities and differences amongst Jordan and Algeria's regimes. The linkages connect to many other Arab authoritarian regimes that continue to endure to this day. The endurance of Arab authoritarian regimes is compelling, as the case studies of Jordan and Algeria reveal many factors that support the stabilization of the regimes and allow them to continue to do so.

Bibliography

"400 Arrested During Anti-Government Protests in Algeria." *CNN*. N.p., 12 Feb. 2011.
        Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

Achy, Lahcen. "Why Did Protests in Algeria Fail to Gain Momentum?" *Foreign Policy
        Magazine*. N.p., 31 Mar. 2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

AFP. "Thousands Protest in Jordan Against Corruption." *Khaleej Times*. N.p., 7 Oct.
        2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

"Afrol News - Large Student Protests in Algeria." *Afrol News - Large Student Protests in
        Algeria*. N.p., n.d. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

Ahmed, Amir. "At Least 37 Hostages Killed in Algeria Gas Plant Standoff, Prime
        Minister Says." *CNN*. Cable News Network, 23 Jan. 2013. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

Ahmed, Amir. "At Least 37 Hostages Killed in Algeria Gas Plant Standoff, Prime
        Minister Says." *CNN*. Cable News Network, 23 Jan. 2013. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

"Algerian Authorities Alarmed by Facebook Protest Call, Blame 'Zionist
        Parties'"*Alarabiya*. N.p., 16 Sept. 2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

"Algeria Arrests 25 over Jobs Rally." *Alarbiya*. N.p., 9 Oct. 2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

"Algeria: Crackdown on Protest as Election Nears: Human Rights Watch." *Human Rights

        Watch*. N.p., 9 May 2012. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

"Algerian Dies from Self-immolation - Africa - Al Jazeera English." *Al Jazeera English*.
        N.p., 17 Jan. 2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

"Algeria Keeps Lid on Social Unrest _ for Now." *Fox News*. FOX News Network, 02
        Mar. 2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

"Algerian Police Clash with Rioters in Housing Row." *Reuters*. N.p., 23 Mar. 2011. Web.
        16 Feb. 2013.

"Algeria to Lift State of Emergency in 'coming Days,' Minister Says." *CNN*. Cable News
        Network, 14 Feb. 2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

"Algeria's Midwinter Uproar: Middle East Research and Information Project." *Algeria's
        Midwinter Uproar: Middle East Research and Information Project*. N.p., n.d.
        Web. 15 Mar. 2013.

"Algerian Village Protests after Shooting Blunder." *Algerian Village Protests after Shooting Blunder*. N.p., 25 June 2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

"Algeria Vows to Punish Protesters - Africa - Al Jazeera English." *Al Jazeera English*. N.p., 9 Jan. 2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

Al-Khalidi, Suleiman. "Hundreds Protest Over High Prices in South Jordan." *Reuters*. Thomson Reuters, 14 Jan. 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

Al-Khalidi, Suleiman. "Jordanian Protesters Demand Political Reforms." *Reuters*. Thomson Reuters, 28 Jan. 2011. Web. 15 Mar. 2013.

Al-Khalidi, Suleiman. "Jordan Islamists Demand Speedy Political Reform." *Reuters*. Thomson Reuters, 04 Feb. 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

Al-Khalidi, Suleiman. "Jordan Protesters Face Charges Over Anti-Monarch Chants."*Reuters*. Thomson Reuters, 18 Nov. 2012. Web. 26 Jan. 2013

"Arab Uprising: Country by Country - Algeria." *BBC News*. BBC, 31 Aug. 2012. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

Aslam. "Jordan's Mukhabarat: Inside the Snakepit:Foreign Policy Journal." *Foreign Policy Journal*. N.p., n.d. Web. 15 Mar. 2013.

Bauer, Michael, and Thomas Schiller. "The Arab Spring in 2012." *C.A.P*. Center for Applied Policy Research, 1 Jan. 2012. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

Barr, Lauren. "REDEFINING A REGION: UNDERSTANDING THE IMPACT OF POPULAR UPRISINGS ON REGIMES IN TUNISIA AND ALGERIA." Honors Capstone for Completion of University Honors in the School of International Service, 2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

Bellin, Eva. *Authoritarianism in the Middle East*. Ed. Angrist, Michele Penner, Marsha P. Posusney. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2005.

Black, Ian. "Jordan's Prime Minister Quits Duddenly." *The Guardian*. Guardian News and Media, 26 Apr. 2012. Web. 26 Jan. 2013

Brown, Simon. "Reform and Revolution: The Arab Spring at One Year." (n.d.): n. pag.

Brownlee, Jason. *Authoritarianism in the Middle East*. Ed. Angrist, Michele Penner, Marsha P. Posusney. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2005.

Boukhars, Anouar. *Politics in Morocco: Executive Monarchy and Enlightened Authoritarianism*. London: Routledge, 2011.

Bronner, Ethan, and Ranya Kadri. "King of Jordan Dismisses His Cabinet." *The New York Times*. N.p., 1 Feb. 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013. <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/02/02/world/middleeast/02jordan.html?_r=0>.

Burger, Gina. "Arab Spring Light -- The Protests in Jordan." Eberhard Karls University Tuebingen Institute of Political Science, n.d. Web. Mar. 2012.

Bronner, Ethan, and Ranya Kadri. "Jordan Protesters Set Up Camp in Amman." *New York Times*. N.p., 24 Mar. 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

Brumberg, Daniel. *Democratization Versus Liberalization in the Arab World: Dilemmas and Challenges for U.S Foreign Policy*. Pennsylvania: Strategic Studies Institute, 2005.

Brumberg, Daniel. "The Trap of Liberalized Autocracy." Journal of Democracy 13.4 (2002): 56-68.

Byrne, Eileen. "Algerians to Go to Polls in Nation Left behind by Arab Spring." *The Guardian*. Guardian News and Media, 09 May 2012. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

Chikhi, Lamine, and Christian Lowe. "Algeria to End 19-year State of Emergency."*Reuters*. Thomson Reuters, 22 Feb. 2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

Chikhi, Lamine. "Algeria Beefs up Security amid Fresh Protests." *Reuters*. Thomson Reuters, 07 Jan. 2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

Chikhi, Lamine. "UPDATE 2-Algerian President Promises Major Political Reforms."*Reuters*. N.p., 15 Apr. 2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

Chrisafis, Angelique. "Algeria Braces for More Protests." *The Guardian*. Guardian News and Media, 18 Feb. 2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

"Clashes, Arrests after Protesters Criticise Jordan King." *The Hindu*. N.p., n.d. Web. 15 Mar. 2013.

Conrad, Courtenay R. "Constrained Concessions: Beneficent Dictatorial Responses to the Domestic Opposition." University of North Carolina at Charlotte, n.d. Web.

Craggs, Ryan. "U.S. Embassy In Algeria Warns Of Protests, Tells Americans To Avoid Travel." *The Huffington Post*. TheHuffingtonPost.com, 12 Sept. 2012. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

"Creation of Independent Elections Commission Key National Achievement - King."*Jordan Times*. N.p., n.d. Web. 15 Mar. 2013.

Dawisha, Adeed. "Power, Participation, and Legitimacy in the Arab World." World
Policy Journal 3.3 (1986): 517-534.

"Disgruntled Police Stage Protest Rally in Algeria." *Reuters*. N.p., 7 Mar. 2011. Web. 16
Feb. 2013.

Fahim, Kareem. "Loyalists to Dominate Jordan's New Parliament." *The New York Times*.
The New York Times, 25 Jan. 2013. Web. 15 Mar. 2013.

Freer, Courtney, and Shadi Hamid. "How Stable Is Jordan?" *Brookings Institute*. N.p.,
Nov. 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.
<http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2011/11/jordan%20ha
mid%20freer/10_jordan_hamid_freer>.

Gavlak, Dale. "Middle East Protests: Jordan Sees Biggest Reform Rally." *BBC News*.
BBC, 25 Feb. 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

Gavlak, Dale. "Jordan's King Swears in New Cabinet After Protests." *BBC News*. BBC,
02 Oct. 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

Gavlak, Dale. "Jordan's King Abdullah Vows to Allow Elected Cabinets." *BBC News*.
BBC, 06 Dec. 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

Ghazal, Mohammad. "National Unity Should Remain in Tact." *Jordan Times*. N.p., 28
Mar. 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

Greenberg, Joel. "Jordan Protesters Attacked by Government Supporters in
Amman."*Washington Post*. The Washington Post, 18 Feb. 2011. Web. 26 Jan.
2013.

Halaby, Jamal. "Ordan's King Fires Cabinet Amid Protests." *My Way News*. N.p., 1 Feb.
2012. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

Hanrahan, Mark. "Middle East Protests: Demonstrations Sweep Iran, Bahrain, Yemen
And Algeria." *The Huffington Post*. TheHuffingtonPost.com, 15 Feb. 2011. Web.
16 Feb. 2013.

Hodna, Massoud. "Algerian Blogger Faces Jail for Inciting Protests." *Algerian Blogger
Faces Jail for Inciting Protests*. N.p., 14 June 2012. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

Horres, Caroline. "How Durable Is "Durable Authoritarianism"? A Comparative Study of
the Kingdoms of Bahrain and Jordan during the Arab Spring." N.p., n.d. Web.

Jerusalem, Associated Press in. "Israel 'Evacuates Jordan Embassy' Amid Protests in
        Amman." *The Guardian*. Guardian News and Media, 15 Sept. 2011. Web. 26 Jan.
        2013.

Jiang, Steven. "In Jordan's Capital, Police Separate Loyalists, Protesters." *CNN*. Cable
        News Network, 01 Apr. 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

"Jordan's Muslim Brotherhood to Boycott Early Elections." *BBC News*. BBC, 13 July
        2012. Web. 15 Mar. 2013.

"Jordan - Government - The Armed Forces." *Jordan - Government - The Armed Forces*.
        N.p., n.d. Web. 15 Mar. 2013.

"Jordanian Opposition Protests in Amman." *Euro News*. N.p., 24 Dec. 2011. Web. 26
        Jan. 2013.

"Jordan's Parliament Chooses Prime Minister for First Time in Kingdom's
        History."*Washington Post*. N.p., 09 Mar. 2013. Web. 15 Mar. 2013.

"Jordanian Protesters Stage Rallies Against Fuel Price Hike." *PressTV*. N.p., 2 Sept.
        2012. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

JT. "Constitutional Court a Milestone in Reform Process, Democratic Renewal –
        King."*Jordan Times*. N.p., n.d. Web. 15 Mar. 2013.

Kadri, Ranya. "Jordan: Protesters Clash With Police During King's Visit to Tribal
        Town." *New York Times*. N.p., 13 June 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

Kadri, Ranya, and Isabel Kershner. "Thousands Rally for Reform in Jordan." *New York
        Times*. N.p., 25 Feb. 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

"King Abdullah II Official Website: Discussion Papers: "Making Our Democratic System
        Work for All Jordanians"" *King Abdullah II Official Website*. N.p., n.d. Web. 15
        Mar. 2013.

"King Calls For Combating Election Crimes." *Jordan Times*. N.p., 9 Jan. 2013. Web. 26
Jan. 2013.

"King Continues Meetings over Reform Path." *Jordan Times*. N.p., n.d. Web. 18 Jan.
        2013.

"King Outlines Roadmap for Democratic Transformation." *King Outlines Roadmap for
        Democratic Transformation*. N.p., n.d. Web. 15 Mar. 2013.

Kirkpatrick, David D. "Protests in Jordan Continue, With Calls for Ending the King's
　　　　Rule." *New York Times*. N.p., 15 Nov. 2012. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

Langhor, Vickie. *Authoritarianism in the Middle East*. Ed. Angrist, Michele Penner,
　　　　Marsha P. Posusney. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2005.

Lowe, Christian, and Lamine Chikhi. "Algeria Promises More Freedoms to Avert
　　　　Protests." *Reuters*. Thomson Reuters, 03 Feb. 2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

Lowe, Christian. "EU Observers: Algeria Vote a Step towards Reform." *Reuters*.
　　　　Thomson Reuters, 12 May 2012. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

Lowe, Christian, and Lamine Chikhi. "Snap Analysis." *Reuters*. Thomson Reuters, 03
　　　　Feb. 2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

Luciani, Giacomo. *The Arab State*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990. Print.

Luck, Taylor. "Friday Protesters to Demand Return of Public Lands." *Jordan Times*.
　　　　N.p., 22 Dec.
　　　　2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

Lust-Okar, Ellen. *Authoritarianism in the Middle East*. Ed. Angrist, Michele Penner,
　　　　Marsha P. Posusney. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2005.

Macfarquhar, Neil. *The Media Relations of Hizbollah Wishes You a Happy Birthday*.
　　　　New York: Public Affairs, 2009.

Macfarquhar, Neil. "Something Democracy in the Middle East." *New York Times*. N.p.,
　　　　n.d. Web. 13 Nov. 2005.

Maktabi, Rima. "Low Key Protests in Jordan Pass Off Without Incident." *CNN*. Cable
　　　　News Network, 04 Feb. 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.
　　　　<http://www.cnn.com/2011/WORLD/meast/02/04/jordan.protests/index.html>.

Migdalovitz, Carol. *Algeria Current Issues*. [Washington, D.C.]: Congressional Research
　　　　Service, Library of Congress, 2008.

"Middle East Rulers Make Concessions." *Al Jazeera English*. N.p., 12 Feb. 2011. Web.
　　　　26 Jan. 2013.

Muasher, Marwan. "In Jordan, There's a Perception of Legitimacy - Carnegie
　　　　Endowment for International Peace." *Carnegie Endowment for International
　　　　Peace*. N.p., n.d. Web. 15 Mar. 2013.

"National Unity Can't Be Undermined, Jordan's King Abdullah Says." *CNN*. N.p., 28
　　　　Mar. 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

"Ordan: Six Policeman Seriously Injured in Riots." *Al Bawaba*. N.p., 15 Apr. 2011. Web.
    26 Jan. 2013.

Ouali, Aomar. "Algerian Islamists Agree on Alliance Ahead of Vote." *Huffington Post*.
    N.p., 26 Feb. 2012. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

"Overnight Riots in Algeria Leave Two Dead." *BBC News*. BBC, 01 Aug. 2011. Web. 16
    Feb. 2013.

Palazzolo, Joe. "Press Bill Fuels Anti-Corruption Protests In Jordan." *Corruption
    Currents RSS*. N.p., 30 Sept. 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

Peters and Moore. "Beyond Boom and Bust: External Rents, Durable Authoritarianism,
    and Institutional Adaptation in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan -
    Springer." *Beyond Boom and Bust: External Rents, Durable Authoritarianism,
    and Institutional Adaptation in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan - Springer*.
    N.p., 01 Sept. 2009. Web. 15 Mar. 2013.

Posusney, Marsha Pripstein. "Enduring Arab Authoritarianism: Middle East Lessons
    for Comparative Theory." Comparative Politics 36.2 (2004): 130-138. Print.

Posusney, Marhsa Pripstein. *Authoritarianism in the Middle East*. Ed. Angrist, Michele
    Penner, Marsha P. Posusney. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2005.

"Police, Demonstrators Clash in Algeria." *VOA*. N.p., 21 Jan. 2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

"Police, Pro-government Activists Block Algerian Protest." *Google News*. N.p., 5 Mar.
    2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

"Proposed Reforms Not Enough for Jordan Protesters." *CBSNews*. CBS Interactive, 14
    Aug. 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

"Protests in Jordan After Spike in Fuel Prices." *Al Jazeera*. N.p., 14 Nov. 2013. Web. 26
    Jan. 2013.
    <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/middleeast/2012/11/2012111464145140480.htm
    l>.

"Protests in Jordan Turn Violent After Police Break up Rallies." *Global Post*. N.p., 25
    Mar. 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

"Pro-Regime Mob Attacks Jordan Demo." *PressTV*. N.p., 15 Oct. 2011. Web. 26 Jan.
    2013.

Ramdani, Nabila. "Algeria Tried to Block Internet and Facebook as Protest
    Mounted."*The Telegraph*. N.p., 12 Feb. 2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

"Reports: Third Person Killed in Algerian Riots; Food Prices Drop." *CNN*. N.p., 09 Jan.
    2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

Roberts, Hugh. "Algeria's National 'Protesta'" *Foreign Policy*. N.p., 10 Jan. 2011. Web.
    16 Feb. 2013.

Ritcher, Thomas. "Contending Aspects of Authoritarian Survival in the Middle East and
    North Africa: The Durability of Material Distributions in Morocco, Tunisia,
    Egypt and Jordan." University of Bremen Graduate School of Social Sciences,
    n.d.

Richardson, Clare. "Jordan's Marouf Al-Bakhit Resigns, King Appoints New Prime
    Minister." *The
    Huffington Post*. TheHuffingtonPost.com, 17 Oct. 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

Rudoren, Jodi. "Riots Erupt Across Jordan Over Gas Prices." *New York Times*. N.p., 13
    Nov. 2012. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

Ryan, Curits. "Elections, Parliament, and a "new" Prime Minister in Jordan." *Foreign
    Policy Magazine*. N.p., n.d. Web. 11 Mar. 2013

Ryan, Curtis. "Hashimite Kingdom of Jordan." Long, Reich, and Gasiovowski, Eds., n.d

Schwartz, Carly. "Jordan Revokes Restrictions On Public Gatherings." *The Huffington
    Post*. TheHuffingtonPost.com, 15 Feb. 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

"Scores Hurt in Algeria Protest." *Al Jazeera English*. N.p., 30 Dec. 2010. Web. 16 Feb.
    2013.

Shaikh. "Now the Pressure's Building on Jordan." *The BrookingsInstitution*. N.p., n.d.
    Web. 15 Mar. 2013.

Solovieva, Daria. "At Jordan Protests, US Role Is Questioned." *GlobalPost*. N.p., 4 Aug.
    2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

Staff, The CNN Wire, and Alanne Orjoux Contributed to This Report. "Protests
    Intensifying across Algeria over Higher Food Prices." *CNN*. Cable News
    Network, 06 Jan. 2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

"Thousands in Algeria Protest March: Organizers | The Raw Story." *Thousands in
    Algeria Protest March: Organizer: The Raw Story*. N.p., 29 Jan. 2011. Web. 16
    Feb. 2013.

"UPDATE 1-Algeria Police Use Tear Gas on Protest in Capital." *Reuters*. N.p., 16 Mar.
    2011. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

Whitaker, Brian. *What's Really Wrong With the Middle East*. London: Saqi, 2009. Print.

Wong, Curtis M. "Jordan Anti-Government Protest Wave Leaves Dozens Injured." *The Huffington Post*. TheHuffingtonPost.com, 15 Apr. 2011. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

"World Report 2012: Jordan | Human Rights Watch." *World Report 2012: Jordan Human Rights Watch*. N.p., n.d. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

"World Report 2012: Algeria: Human Rights Watch." *Human Rights Watch*. N.p., n.d. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

Zoubir, Yahia. *Politics and Society in the Contemporary Middle East*. Ed. Angrist, Michele Penner, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2010.