

The impact of globalization of democracy on the revolutionary movement of Egyptian nation

Faramarz Mirzazadeh

Department of Political Sciences, Islamic Azad University, Ilam Branch, Ilam, Iran.

Accepted 3 August, 2016

ABSTRACT

Revolutionary uprising of Egyptian in 2011 drew the question of what is the entity of this uprising. Some theorists call it, on Philip Schmitter's spring of freedom view, Arab spring and had known it entity Arab identity and secular nationalist. Others, with Islamic perspective and in the direction of Iran 1979 Islamic revolutionary political Islam interpret it as Islamic awakening. But inefficiency of these theories had appeared in continuity of Egypt transformation. We believe that the aforementioned theories are placed under the meta-theory of democracy globalization. Even, USA role and position on development of democracy and implementation of some policy in Egypt can be explained with this meta-theory. Thus, this article in the frame of globalization of democracy investigates recent changes and its future in Egypt and takes its entity ground-based democracy.

Keywords: Democracy, globalization, democracy, mass media, Egypt.

E-mail: f.mirzazade@gmail.com.

INTRODUCTION

A question that has not been replied is what is the nature of revolutionary movement by Arab countries' people, especially Egyptians? This movement was analyzed from various perspectives which inefficiencies have been today more explicit through conflicting and heterogeneous shifts. American authorities called it "guided democracy" being presented in terms of America's security and national interests. Most western analysts and secular nationalists of the Orient have seen it as "Arab Spring" indicating implicitly releasing of the Arab people from authority confinements, corruption and tyranny of local rulers. As a result, others considered it "Islamic awakening" being worthy to be discussed in line with the 1979 Islamic revolution of Iran.

Although the role and efforts of America cannot be ignored in the development of democracy, it should be noted that external privileges and incentives could not be moved forward without Egyptian people's intent. The theory of Arab Spring has based its analysis on Arabic identity and civilization because of its loyalty to post-ideological view, as a result of ignoring Islamic fundamentals of the given movement as well as in line with weakening Islamic-advocating view; therefore it

confiscated its process, nature and results. In contrast, theory of Islamic awakening is to state this change with the same goal, namely expropriating the process, nature and results of the aforementioned movement; but with different approach. Interestingly, the three views based on democratic principles claim and attempt to assume these as principles emanating from their intellectual and ideological principles.

Both theories, Arab Spring and Islamic Awakening, have been considered under the meta-theory of "Globalization of democracy" in the present paper, and each has own perspective to its principles and messages. From this perspective, democracy globalization has risen in line with various economic, cultural and political dimensions and is compatible with "humanity" and any changes of human nature. Thus, this paper presents the following hypothesis: "the nature of revolutionary movement of Egyptian people influenced by globalization of democracy is through the mass media such as the Internet". Regarding the very hypothesis, we first illustrate concepts like democracy, globalization and globalization of democracy in literature review, followed by the effect of globalization of democracy on Egyptian revolutionary

movement.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Here, the concepts that illustrate the aim of this article: democracy, globalization, mass media, democracy globalization of and global waves of democracy, are explained.

Democracy

Democracy is among those concepts with a simple but sophisticated definition. On one hand, it is not absolute and self-contained per se. On the other hand, it is content-based (Kinnvall and Johnson, 2002:7). It is not such a concept coined by an individual or a group, but every nation has had a certain role on its development, whether positive or negative. Historically, democracy and related entities emerged in the Middle East, not in ancient Greece (Goodin and Pettit, 1997:80; Al-Sulami, 2003:19), but it has been formed fundamentally not theoretically (Yeager, 1997:409). However, needless to say the ancient Greeks were the first nation who analytically delved into politics, especially democracy.

Democracy is originally a Greek term which has entered into English as a French notion of Democracy in the sixteenth century. Indeed, it has been taken from the notion *Democracia* that its roots were *demo* (people) and *cratus* (government). With regards to the given derived compound, democracy refers to a type of government in which people rule, unlike monarchical and aristocratic regimes (Held, 1999:14).

Although some believe that "ruling by people" or "ruling people over people" considered as the initial concept of democracy seem clear and free from ambiguity, but it is an ideal unrealizable because the society is based on some rulers and ruled, so it is not expected that people rule over themselves (Al-Jabri, 2009:120). Thus, as Philip Green well pointed out, not only is democracy a controversial concept, it but also is extremely vague (Green, 1993:2). To Cohen, it is a type of mass government; however, he refers to mass, society, community and its targets in the definition. Similarly, Cohen defined democracy as:

Mass governing in which individuals, directly or indirectly, take in many decision-making affairs related to them or can take in (Cohen, 1994:27).

We also believe that democracy is a form of government or state in which people play a main role in the power; it will come to force directly by people themselves or by their elected representatives. Today, democracy has been turned into a universal value. Democracy, in this sense, is non-historical and intercultural, so it needs to be

executed all over the world. Thus, democracy will begin to grow in the Arab world, especially Egypt, but it -as been from Canada to Japan- has various forms and is exerted through separate institutions (Toscano, 2012:5). However, democracy has further become a sort of hegemonic "sticker", so we can expect that any trend to expand and learn it, especially in the Arab and Muslim world, will go on.

Globalization

Although the term "globalization" has become a common cliché, it is not a new concept. Its origin can be found in works of many intellectuals of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, from Karl Marx and sociologists like Saint-Simon to political geographical researchers like Mc Kinder exploring how to integrate the world through modernity. Yet, the notion "globalization" did not come to broad academic use till 1960s and early 1970s (Held and Mc Grow, 2003:18). Indeed, when referring to globalization, it implies that the function of supra-national elements in social, political, economic, and cultural practice of all countries has increased. This advancement has changed the relationship between man and his surroundings. Globalization attributes to an individual leaving the introspective behavior and reliant to a particular area toward an extra-territorial and extrospective identity.

A variety of approaches and strategies attempting to make the phenomenon of "Globalization" understandable in the form of a universal and comprehensive theoretical pattern have not been successful in presenting a reasonable and realistic analysis or even an interpretation. In fact, what now called globalization has been placed in a changing situation, so it seems difficult to present a comprehensive definition for that. The notion "becoming" implies the nature of the term and results of refusing a final judgment about it. Generally, following features can be considered when having a short look to the phenomenon of "Globalization":

1. Globalization is not a one-dimensional and limited process in any economic, cultural and political aspects, but it is an integrated one penetrated in all social contexts.
2. Globalization is a challenging phenomenon in its initial meaning; so that its aspects go beyond the scope of many classical concepts such as government, authority, culture, identity, security ... and it has provided a ground for openly interpreting and redefining them.
3. Globalization is a process not an infinite state. We deal with "becoming" process in the Globalization, a process that goes beyond national borders through main forces including global communication system, multinational corporations, international organizations, etc, and has made lots of phenomena changed, transformed, and affected.

4. Globalization is neither good nor evil, despite all pros and cons, so it can be both good and evil. In other words, it is both a savior and destroyer.
5. Globalization is a conflicting phenomenon with the dual concepts such as local-global, regionalism, globalism, convergence-divergence, etc.

Recently explaining global changes, Alvin Toffler claimed that the world is moving toward a new civilization in which national states will no longer be the only decision makers on global policies (Tafler and Tafler, 2004). Manuel Castles, with emphasis on the element of information and communication, also believed that a new world is getting formed at the end of second millennium. This world has emerged as a result of the symmetry of the three independent processes in the late 1960s and mid-1970s: the revolution of information and technology, economic crises of capitalism and statism, and prosperity of cultural-social movements. To him, these changes have led to emerging the "networking society" (Castles, 2001:417). Anthony Giddens interpreted globalization symbolically in line with the continued modernity and as the "modernity globalization" (Giddens, 1999:31). Martin Albero, other expert, believed the beginning of a new era in the world history in which the modernism ends and a new era starts. He found globalization as a prelude to a different time in human life; hence, not only has it changed science and knowledge, but also the institution of human society and it has created completely different social phenomena. In this new period, "humanity" is more highlighted rather than national state and its citizens; a concept coming to a new life in the world context, and this will not understandable in the modernity (Albrow, 1996:3). According to Albrow, learning rationality along with extending communications causes beginning a new era in which: first, the life is turned into a globalized style through which globalism and globalization are at the core of people's social life. Second, given high importance of the theory in this new world, views should be trans-historical and enjoy intercultural talents (Ibid).

Globalization and mass media

Any of the different dimensions of globalization has had its needed tools at the disposal to evolution; technological revolution has helped different globalizations in any way. As the first facilitating factor for communication and information, the invention of printing provided a ground for other communication and information facilities. Information revolution, and consequently the globalization of media such as Internet, E-mail, social networks, weblogs, mobile, fax, etc has been become a return point in expanding cultural, economic and political cooperation among communities of which we can refer to increasing the speed of communications, universally accessing to information, creating a new source of power, and

developing common global culture.

Internet, as a post-modern media, reminds of the end of distances and mental geography resulted from the railways. Through constructing railways, human overcame distances. Developing Internet infrastructure represents the same event. Man has dominated space and time now. It can be said that extreme centralization on dominated traditional media has been challenged with more severe decentralization in digital and post-modern media. Small online media have deployed against dominated media, and the value is depended on the power at the elite level (Golshan Pezhu, 1997, p. 26); therefore, politically speaking this thing provides the foundations of democracy in developing countries.

Today, we have to admit that the media is the most powerful thing on the earth: "more powerful than bombs, more powerful than any missile", because information is power, but the greatest one (Boller, 2008:200). Mass media are the main instructive and informative tool in the modern world. The tool, at its earliest form since the invention of printing, has accelerated education and knowledge, and experienced a huge revolution through inventing telecommunications. Today, radio and television have replaced with functions and uses of Internet and online networks. In one side, Internet and social networks in cyberspace are a tool for advertising and promoting cultural, political and social institutions; in the other side, they are an important source for presenting political-social information in the world being the factor of political activists' communication with the public, and finally motivating the main protesting behaviors and mobilizing protests all over the world. Thus, it can be said that Internet and social networks are the most important sign of symbolic power, infusion of identity, and advertisement in the new era, and political developments depend considerably on such extent media (Sardar Nia, 2009:152).

Virtual social networks enjoy a series of features and functions. These are: a) changing the way of communication; today, digital and virtual relationships have been expanded using virtual networks of communications, rather than face to face ones. b) Lack of control and censorship; governments and political rulers cannot completely control these networks, and not able to censor news or widespread information. c) Exchanging information and creating links; the extent and availability of virtual networks provide people with this opportunity to exchange and communicate with great deal of individuals. d) Being transnational and having no borders; thus, the origin of news and recipients are not known, so this causes a sort of psychological security for users. e) Informing; being its main function can bear both negative and positive aspects. This means it can serve government's or groups' demands, or can lead to damaging all. And f) organizing protests (Aghaee et al., 2012:13); it plays an important role in changes of the Middle East and Egypt. One of the Internet services is the

use of weblogs being increasingly learned and developing.

Today, democracy is supported in developing communities through alternative media. Unlike media which depends on governments, these media are not controlled by governments and hence are managed through non-governmental groups or even by the opposed. To John Downing, alternative media play a significant role in shaping political awareness of opposition groups in the society. He discriminated these groups from political parties: the groups act collectively not in a hierarchical way; they are not official. They are, in most cases, free networks of individuals and small organizations coming together extensively for common purposes; in other words, they turn to social movements (Boller, 2008:200). Klemencia Rodriguez, like Downing, argues that alternative media enable the public to get politically powerful. In his opinion, when people create their media they can the best show themselves and the society. Such media, unlike official media applying elite groups as a source, challenge a wide range of voices including members of local communities, protesters and activists (Ibid).

In general, information technology has been able to assist more democratized process. This claim is based on the argument that changes such as Internet and global television have caused power. These technologies provide directly users with information needed without any processing through media, governments, and hierarchical organizations (Soltani Far, 2006:52). Thus, modern and post-modern media influence globalization of politics, economy, culture and democracy, and accelerate its process.

Globalization of democracy

Values and principles being valid and reliable among individuals are quickly getting universal and comprehensive. Democracy is of categories that cause man transplantation around values such as freedom, equality, prosperity and participation in community management, etc, through human orientation. Democracy, or governing by people, is the fundamental legitimacy of current systems of the world. Although countries have differently presented the definition of democracy over time, there is a sort of mass agreement on good and democratic government almost in the form of globalization. According to Tohid Pham, early 21th century, international subcultures emerging with electronic media lead the world to Mac Lohan's global village and democracy globalization era (Tohidfam, 2003:48). Democracy has penetrated all communities in the current situation.

Some believe that democratic policy has been based on a certain democratic culture. Yet, available information indicates that such a view is not true. Of course, authoritarian cultures grow in the shadow of authoritarian

policies, but democracy comes to exist within a culture (Kinnvall and Jonsson, 2002:51). No democratic country has been democratic inherently in its first place. This implies that democratic values can be established in any country or region. It also should be noted that once the capacity for democracy is universal, its application will be unique; any democracy is unique. There will be no advancement unless the democracy is proportionate to cultural, historical and social features (Ibid). The point is that universality and globalization of democracy has been gradually and time-consuming, so some scientists specified it in the frame of "waves of democracy".

Global waves of democracy

After ancient democracies waned, no region in the world, from the fall of the Roman Empire two years after the Middle Ages, experienced democracy. Since the late 18th century, political system of democracy has been established gradually in some European countries. In 1970 there were only three democratic countries in the world (France, USA, and Switzerland), but in the second half of the twentieth century, the ideas and practice of democracy was so pervasive that many countries with undemocratic systems stepped into democratic ones at different periods of time. Based on estimates from "freedom house" in 1974, there were only 41 democratic countries out of 150 and the remaining were dominated under types of military dictatorship or one-party, and traditional oligarch systems, but in 2004, 121 countries out of 193 enjoyed a system of electoral democracy (Bashirieh, 2009:10).

Huntington, in his well-known book entitled "third wave of democracy in the late twentieth century", has separated three waves of democracy since the establishment of democratic systems in Europe till now:

First wave: It has been active during the years 1820 until after World War I rooted in American and French revolutions. The emergence of nations democratic institutions, the election with majority votes, and voting rights 50% of men were among achievements at this stage of democratization. Return to first wave of democracy was initiated after Hitler seized power in Germany, the rule of totalitarianism in European countries, and the emergence of ideologies such as Communism, Fascism, and Militarism.

Second wave: Some countries joined democracy after World War II till 1960. After ending the wars, western Germany, Italy, Austria, Japan and South Korea began to move toward democracy and countries like Turkey and Greece also experienced it in the late 1940s. Some countries in Latin America also had a transition to democracy.

A number of developments were to stop the second wave of democracy in the late 1960s such as getting power by authoritarian military in Latin America, Asia, and the era of military coups.

Third wave: since 1974 along with gradual falling of undemocratic systems of southern Europe, it begun to exist first in Portugal and then in Spain and Greece; as a result, 30 countries with democratic regimes were replaced during approximately past 15 years. Democratic wave moved toward Latin America in the late 1970s, and it involved 80 communist countries in 1980s. Some of Asian countries were influenced by such wave. Generally, European undemocratic countries, communist regimes of East Blocks, and most of Latin America and Asian countries were in transition to democracy in the third wave which was much wider than the early two waves. Even most of countries were placed on the second wave and experienced the return wave; they were exposed again to being democratized. This wave encompassed southern Europe, Latin America and Asia merely in 15 years (Huntington, 1994:25-30).

Many believe that the only region of the world that did not experience comprehensively the third wave (except Iran, Turkey and Lebanon) is the Middle East. This is true about the second wave through which the Middle East has merely experienced the practice of democracy on the second wave in Iran and Turkey (Fazeli, 2010:8). What notably is that although many countries have moved toward a democratic political system on the third wave, these practices had falling and rising, so they have not enjoyed complete achievement as the concept "waves of democracy" indicates. Huntington estimated that the number of democratic countries of the world has been more and less from years 1922 to 1990. Therefore, that a country experienced the transition to democracy does not imply that its democratization will be conclusive. Records indicated that returning to authoritarianism is feasible, and sometimes is the dominated aspect of political changes for countries of the world. All countries known as carriers of the second and third waves have not experienced democratization to an extent. Some, despite the massive social struggles, failed to make the transition successful. The other countries, after falling authoritarian regimes, stopped on the process of establishing a democratic government. Some other, despite falling authoritarian regimes and establishing an alternative government, have not stabilized democracy in their communities. There are only a few countries considered to have stabilized democracies. Among these, it is better to point out some cases having replaced the former dictatorship regimes with governments indicating different levels of authoritarianism (Huntington, 1994:48-53). To him, the third wave of democracy will go on, and most of countries having not already been influenced by the practice of democratization will gradually join.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology of this article is descriptive – analytical. For descriptive the condition in pro, through and post revolution, concepts of democracy, globalization, mass

media and waves of globalization, we exploit data from related books and articles. Then, the effect of mass media on globalization of democracy was explained, particularly in Egypt. After reviewing the Egypt's condition in revolutionary era, the uprising result was analyzed.

MANNER OF GROWING USE OF THE INTERNET IN EGYPT

It should be acknowledged that the Internet is an important part of social movements at the information age whether in democratic communities or limited ones. While government obstacles mobilized ways, the Internet can be used to approach individuals with common ideas, and assist them to find supporting for their actions (Movassaghi and Attarzadeh, 2012:160). Today, among 7 billion people live on the earth, two billion and three hundred million use the Internet (Pingdom, 2014). The speed of using the Internet and virtual space can be seen in Egyptian evolutions. Table 1 shows the quality of growing use of the Internet in Egypt.

Although increasing spread of Internet users in Egypt seemed regular, it entails negative consequences for the government. The entering of the Internet into Egypt was met with wide censorship from the government. However, as the government delegated ISPs to the competitive and private section in 2002, Egypt turned into the greatest Internet market in Africa with about 300 companies providing Internet services (having been members of the five great companies), and many people had opportunity to access the Internet. Access to public media such as the Internet helped to spread principles and approaches of democracy in Egypt. This led to increasing dissatisfaction with the political conditions in which Hosni Mubarak governed as a dictator president.

Literature of democratic trends in Egypt

Democratic trends do not have long records. The reason dates back to special conditions of Islamic civilization in the region. Islamic civilization has frequently faced stress and disembodiment due to lack of internal concentration confronting world evolutions; as a result, it has been uncertain about the present, past and future. Given conditions in the Arab World resulted from the same stress. This got more objective when facing the West colonialism through which novel technology and science entered into the Muslim World strangely with unknown military equipment. As a result, there remained occupation of Muslim lands by non-Muslim whenever there are failures against western powers.

Thus, Muslims were considered more lagged behind than the westerns. It was thought that the cause of such backwardness was Islam. Islamists such as Seyd Jamal-al-Deen and Mohammad Abdoh objected to such misunderstanding. From their view points, the

Table 1. Estimates of Internet users in Egypt.

Date	Number of users	Total population	Value (in percent)
2000	450000	66303000	7.0
2006	5100000	71236631	7.0
2008	10532400	81713517	9.12
2009	16636000	81866635	1.21
2011	20136000	82079636	5.24

Source: Internet World States, "Egypt: Internet Usage and Telecommunications".

backwardness of Muslims was not related to Islam by itself, but it associated with contemporary Muslim's wrong thought on Islam (Abu Zayd, 2006:23). Jamal-al-Deen called for reforms in the Muslim World. Afterwards, the reform movement conducted by Aebdeh was developed. It mirrored a messy view on Europe and modernity; Europe was an enemy that not only must it be fought, but also must be studied especially its advancements. Such a view was kept safe all over Egypt in the twentieth century until Aebdeh death in 1905 (Ibid).

Following the interface of Islam and the West, a cosmopolitan view was introduced in a contrastive nature with the West power. Only emphasizing on the revival of Islamic caliphate and returning to Islamic supremacy could decline the stress of Muslims. One of the complications of such a story was a collective look to Arab communities represented in the form of the revival of Islamic caliphate or pan Arabism. People, in this frame, were unfamiliar with democracy since independence and the establishment of government-nation (Larry, 2010:96). Thus, Arabism was dominated in the Arab World, especially Egypt, rooted in cultural activities of Christians in Ottoman Empire since the mid-nineteenth century.

After World War II, not only could scattered endeavors not integrate Arab nationalists, it also led to localizing partially the nationalism. Since the seizure of power by Jamal Abd-ol-Nasser in Egypt in 1952 and his actions, he was known as the spokesman and the symbol of conservative Arabism, coinciding with the defeat of Liberal and conservative Arabism, and indeed, he achieved a key stance on the Arab World while nationalizing Suez Chanel in 1956; as a result, Naserism was seen the same with Arab nationalism linking the Arab solidarity to socialism (Gholami and Abdollah Pour, 2013:17). Nationalism linked to socialism and Marxism was exerted in a particular interpretation on Islam, and this impeded democratization in Egypt.

Generally, Arab authoritarian rulers were successful in neutralizing their people's political will through bogus tricks between the two polarized extremes including "totalitarianism versus Islamism", or "stability versus anarchy". The problem of Arab's political thought was frequently that it interfaced freedom, development and progress to democracy (Al-Zubaidi, 2011:38). These factors came together to form a quasi-authoritarian system in Egypt.

In the early 1970s, a quasi-authoritarian system emerged gradually in Egypt. At the same time, Anvar Sadat did dismantle cautiously the one-party state inherited from his predecessor, Jamal Abd-al- Nasser, and re-established a limited rate of political pluralism. He opened doors of the dominated part to domestic competition, then allowed establishing the two opposed parties. Seemingly, he paved the way for holding parliamentary election that seemed superficially a democratic and competitive aspect. It was when Sadat would never have exposed his stance and authority to the election (Ottaway, 2007:41). However, the practice of democratization was halted at the end of this decade. Yet, as Sadat died, there remained this possibility that Egypt would be considered a country with the transition from authoritarian to democracy. Sadat had taken a few important steps in this field. Although he, during the last year of his presidency, withdrew considerably democratic perspective, Sadat left the country much more politically and economically open than what he had received upon Nasser's death in 1970.

The view that Egypt is in the transition to democracy has been validated in the early reign of Hosni Mubarak. Being vice president of Sadat, he seized power with the consent of the army and in a legal and regular manner. Mubarak began his presidency with a conciliatory apparent being remarkable at that time. But two decades later, there remained an extremely distinct reality. At the same time, there was no longer possibility to regard Egypt as a country approaching democracy (ibid). Mubarak had monopolized his authority and wealth to create a personal state or absolute rule. As Karl Gunnar Myrdal points out, Egypt in Mubarak era was a "soft state": a state that pass laws but do not enforce them (Zahed, 2016:3). Therefore, Mubarak restored to co-opting and controlling all institutions starting from the parliament, media, military, police and judiciary to civil society. Despite constraints exerted by Mubarak in the democratic practice in order to limit political atmosphere as well as any participation from opposed parties and groups in the body of government to enjoy the mass and political authority, trends to the democracy turned into a public discourse (Dunne, 2003:129).

Following the practice of developing democracy, based on estimations from Gallup institution in 2007, 59% of Egyptians found democracy the best form of government,

12% asked for undemocratic one, and 19% was indifferent (Esposito and Mojahed, 2007:6). The rate of asking for democracy was 71% in 2011, so it implied a satisfactory growth. The very rate was 67% in 2012 indicating 4% decrease. Other survey indicated that 76% of Egyptians, during the 2011 revolution, believed that their movement would lead to democracy, 22% were opposed to democratizing the political system after the revolution, and 2% were abstentions (Kohut, 2012:15). The estimate showed that democracy advocating has been widespread in recent developments of Egypt.

GLOBALIZATION OF DEMOCRACY AND RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN EGYPT

The impact of globalization of democracy on the Arab World, particularly Egypt, can be analyzed in two theoretic and objective perspectives. Theoretically, the emphasis is on the positive approach from scholars of Islam on democracy and Islam. On objective perspective, protesters' demands and slogans are investigated in the recent developments in Egypt.

Theoretical impact

Waves of democracy trends were represented in the form of revolutionary movements along with the support of vast social networks as a rebellion against the regime, rather than, as socialist, liberal or Islamic revolutions (Rosiny, 2012:5). However, the analysis of recent developments in Egypt from the perspective of democracy globalization requires surveying the impact of democratic trends in the form of speculations configured by Muslim scholars' perspective.

Before disseminating democracy teachings through mass media, some scholars had sought to establish a link between Islam and democracy. Althtavi, a pioneer of the political Islam in Egypt, devoted his scientific affords to systematic arguments of relationships within divine and wisdom regulations. The core of his affords was country and commitments through which an individual would cope with for the pride of his motherland. To Athtavi, citizens should enjoy freedom in carrying out such an important duty. To do so, citizens are ensured to reach their legal rights while they have multilateral political support. According to his opinion, civil freedom and wisdom regulations feeding it have no conflict with divine laws (Fedal, 2011:85). Tofigh-al-Shawi is also among scholars seeking to provide an Islamic alternative for democracy through disseminating "General theory of the council". Based on his perspective, The council is any participation from individuals and their free cooperation in the consultation and negotiation prior to making decisions; therefore, the council for all individuals, including groups and minorities, guarantees the right of freely negotiating and challenging over any arguments, because

negotiation is based on the given value in any idea and argument rather than on the majority demands in democracy (Feirahy, 2009:199). Shawi kept on forward so far as he considered councilcracy superior to western democracy (Mir Ahmadi, 2005:395). Also, Rashed-al-Qhanoshi advocated the compatibility of Islam and democracy. Some scholars believed in the effectiveness of consultation on implementing democratically Islamic commandments such as Mohammad Amareh, Mohammad Badie and Yosef Qardavi.

The impact of democratic interpretation on Faith in the frame of general systems of the council is worthy to be investigated on orientations and Islamist actions in Egypt. For an instance, although Muslim Brotherhood was established in 1928 based on such a slogan "God is our final target, the prophet is our leader, Qur'an is our law, jihad is our way, and death in the way of God is our supreme goal", and with regards to the unity of Islam World and the release of Muslims from imperialism, it protects democracy elements today. This is when there was a belief that neither were Muslim Brotherhood "moderate" nor "democratic" (Amin, 2011:9). Thus, some parties and groups have emerged in Egypt advocating "Islam and democracy". These suggested that there would no incompatibility between faith teachings of Islam and modern democratic doctrines. They supported any participation in the political process aimed to achieve authority and exert political reforms in lights of Islamic principles (Maghraoui, 2006:23). Similarly, intellectual and mental grounds on democracy advocating were provided in Egypt. Confirming and developing views on Islam and democracy having conducted by Muslim and Egyptian scholars removed such a picture that there would be any contradictions or conflicts within Islam and democracy.

Objective and referent impacts

As mentioned above, Egyptian protesters were familiar with principles and teachings of democracy under the influence of mass media, so they called for it within their demands and slogans. Even when Islamists joined the process of developments, not only did they not deny democracy principles, but also they emphasized on its practices and procedures. Theoretical and practical trends of Egyptians, particularly top scientific scholars, to democracy provided a ground in which every group would claim democracy advocating.

Therefore, on 25 January 2011, 80,000 people took to the street. They saw themselves as victims of poverty, misrepresentation and corrupt government. This contributed them to an overall feeling of humiliation (Cook, 2015:1). The people and the leaders of the parties were very keen to have a peaceful uprising. The revolutionary parties did not use any violence or military means. This was considered as a triumph without heavy bloodshed, destruction or military confrontation, and it led to quick

desired results (Atawna and Othman, 2015:541). In the other word, the process was democratic.

Understanding these conditions and in lines with the policy of combining idealism (developing principles of liberal democracy) and realism (lack of consistency in principles of Muslim Brotherhood with liberal democracy ones), even the USA connected with such a group of Islamist in 1990s since it believed that the group played a main role in the Middle East and northern Africa (Gerges, 2003:278), and it could act as a link between the Muslim World and West (Emerson, 2008:10). The practice of changing attitudes and adopting democratic vision from Islamists is feasible in the framework of emerging democracy globalization that bears the characteristic of localization-globalization with particular representation and features in the Middle East.

Meanwhile, the Egyptian revolutionary movement linked three active trends together: the "re-politicized" youth through their wills in modern forms developed by themselves; radical leftist parties, and groups from the middle democratic classes. Each had conflicting goals and demands.

The youth and radical parties sought to follow three goals in common: restoring democracy (terminating the police-army system), coping with a new social-economic policy in accordance with the popular (separating from the submission to demands of globalized liberalism), and an independent foreign policy (disobeying orders from the U.S, and developing the U.S military control over the world). The middle classes have also gathered around democratic goals as a whole, and affluent young people having been highly "Americanized" opposed the present dictatorship (Amin, 2011:5). This indicated that Egyptians' main demands were terminating religious authoritarian governments, emphasizing on democracy as an appropriate solution to establish an alternative political system, terminating corruption, discriminations and top dominated officials' economic and political privileges, enjoying equal rights, sign off the sectarianism and religious conflicts, and focusing on those rights everyone should have inherently, such as freedom, equality, justice, prosperity, etc (Farazmand, 2011:12).

According to estimates conducted by "strategic political Agency of Al-Ahram" on August, September and October 2011, although Egyptians were concerned about the future of their country more than ever, they found democracy as the only solution to rectify given problems (Agha Ali, 2011:50). Inevitably, revolutionary movement of Egyptians has been pinned to democracy advocating; but, this is required considering its local conditions and culture. Also, views on political development shows that: 34% believe to completed democratic state, 50% semi-democratic state, and 15% situation will remain constant (Erle et al., 2013:40).

To coordinate with globalized democratic principles, no doubt there must be appropriate economic, cultural and social conditions; hence, this will occur fruitfully within the communities rather than outside (Koolae, 2007:94).

Therefore, domestic and ground conditions of Egypt should be considered while analyzing its developments. However, it could not help ignoring Islamic teachings (Kohut, 2012:2) (culturally), religious and ethnic plurality (Khan, 2014:78) (from social-political perspective), and psychological dependence of the popular on army forces (Azzam, 2012:10) (from security and psychological viewpoints) in investigating Egyptian's revolutionary developments and their relationship with pro-democracy. In other words, such a movement will not be fruitful unless these considered conditions and grounds as well as their agents are kept satisfied; this seems unlikely for the too long records of authoritarianism, and lack of proper democratic experience.

However, the constitution was drafted based on a democratic strategy after the fall of Mubarak (Kaeby et al., 2012:74). The strategy can be seen in the constitution which resulted from Egyptian developments. The right of sovereignty has been granted on people in lights of democratic principles. To establish the government, the main conditions are to realize councils and observe citizens' rights, and some principles of such a regulation are: respecting human rights and citizenship as well as personal, political and social freedoms (article 6). After the fall of Mubarak, principles have been included in the constitution such as pertaining human dignity and self-esteem (article 31), the right to self-determination (article 55), personal freedom (article 35), freedom of association and political parties (articles 51 and 52), freedom of speech, ideas, thoughts, etc (Articles 48 and 49), social justice (articles 8, 11, 35, 36, and 38), ...

Indices of democratic government have also been included in this regulation: there would be a particular emphasis on the separation of stipulated powers (articles 114, 159, and 168) and the equality of all before the law (article 33).

It is concerned in detail with the practices of assemblies and councils, duties and specialized authority of the council of ministers, practices of their democratic election (article 159), the procedure of choosing judges and the court of constitutions (article 169), and According to article 2 in the new Egyptian constitution, the official religion is Islam considered the main source of legislation. The same principle was a source of contradictions surrounding the future of Egyptian developments.

After dethroning Mubarak, the greatest impact of codified constitutions was moving developments toward the return of authoritarian; this would lead to monopolizing and removing each other from the political contexts as the two main political rivals of Egypt, that is, secular and Islamist nationalists, suggested.

CONCLUSION

Democracy always is pinned to time and place terms. We applied public media, particularly the Internet, as a connecting variable in the current paper and indicated

how it had influenced on distributing and disseminating democratic teachings in Egypt considered from Huntington's viewpoints following third wave of democracy. From this view, in June 2012, Muhammad Mursi became the first democratic and freely elected president in Egypt history. Another victory for democracy, but things were not as rosy as they seemed, and Egypt's problems do not end there. Because, on 3 July 2013, a coalition led by the Egyptian army chief General Abdel Fattah el-Sisi removed president from power by coup d'état.

In this manner, principle of democracy that penetrated Egypt via mass media and through globalization fell. Since July 2013, el-Sisi banned Muslim Brotherhood, round up its leaders along with the revolutionary youth, undermined the political parties, and allowed the media to create an atmosphere of personality cult around him. Today, Egypt really is not where its people want to be, and its political history significantly widens this expectation of democratizing process versus where the democratizing process actually stands.

REFERENCES

- Abu Zayd, N. (2006).** Reformation of Islamic Thought: A Critical Historical Analysis. Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press.
- Agha Ali, K. S. (2011).** Egypt a year after the revolution, events and investigations, 264 (4).
- Aghaee, D., Sadeghi, S., and Hadi, D. (2012).** Investigating the role of Internet in new social media on developments of the Middle East and northern Africa- rapidly informing, organizing and spreading developments. *Periodical of Foreign Relations*, 14 (2).
- Albrow, M. (1996).** *The Global Age (State and Society beyond Modernity)*. Stanford University Press.
- Al-Jabri, M. A. (2009).** *Democracy, Human Rights and Law in Islamic Thought*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Al-Sulami, M. F. (2003).** *The West and Islam: Liberal Democracy versus the System of Shura*. London: Routledge.
- Al-Zubaidi, L. (2011).** *People's Power: The Arab World in Revolt*. Heinrich Boll Foundation, Middle East.
- Amin, S. (2011).** On the Egyptian Revolution. Trans. By Shone Henrymage. *Pambazuka Monthly Review*.
- Atawna, A. A. M., and Othman, M. R. (2015).** Obstacle faced the democratic transition in Egypt in Muhammad Mursi era. *Social and Behavioral Science*, 172:540-547.
- Azzam, M. (2012).** Egypt's Military Council and the Transition to Democracy. Chatham House, Middle East and North Africa. Available at: www.Chathamhouse.org/Egypt.
- Bashirieh, H. (2009).** Iran and the crisis of transition. *Aftab Emrooz*, 4.
- Boller, M. (2008).** *Digital Media and Democracy (Tactics in Hard Time)*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Castles, M. (2001).** *Information Age (three volumes)*. [Translated by Aligholian, Khakbaz, and Chavoshian]. Tehran: publication of Tarh-e-now.
- Cohen, K. (1994).** *Democracy*. [Translated by Majidi, F.], Tehran: publication of Kharazmi.
- Cook, B. J. (2015).** A dramatic look at motive and Egypt's 2011 revolution. A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Liberty University In the School of Communication Studies.
- Dunne, M. D. (2003).** *Democracy in Contemporary Egyptian Political Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Emerson, E. (2008).** Report on the Roots of Violent Islamist Extremism and Efforts to Counter It: The Muslim Brotherhood. Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs, (July 10).
- Erle, J., Wichmann, J. M., and Kjærum, A. (2013).** The future of Egypt's democracy: The voice of the Egyptian voter. The Danish Egyptian dialogue institute.
- Esposito, J., and Mogahed, D. (2007).** *Who Speaks for Islam: What A Billion Muslim Really Think*. NY: Gallup Press.
- Fazeli, M. (2010).** *Structural foundation of consolidation of democracy*, Tehran: Kand o Kav.
- Farzmand, M. (2011).** The nature of 2011 Arab uprising: A comparative analysis. *Iranian Review of Foreign Affairs*, 2(2):7-30.
- Fedal, M. (2011).** A modern political thought and the 2011 revolutions in Egypt and Tunisia. [Translated by Mirzaee, M.], *Cultural Relations*, 3 (3).
- Feirahy, D. (2009).** Tofiq Mohammad-al-Shawi and the general theory of counseling in Islam. *Periodical of Politics*, 1 (3).
- Gerges, F. (2003).** *America and Political Islam* [Translated by Sarvarian, M. K.]. Tehran: The center of strategic studies.
- Gholami, A., and Abdollah Pour, A. (2013).** Pan-Arabism and Arab spring: The ontological dissimilarities. *Economic-Political Information*, 291 (1).
- Giddens, A. (1999).** *Consequences of Modernity*. [Translated by Salasi, M.]. Tehran: Publication of Markaz.
- Golshan Pezhu, M. R. (1997).** *The study of opportunities and challenges from digital media*. Tehran: Publication of Shadan.
- Goodin, R. E., and Pettit, P. (1997).** *Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Anthology*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Green, P. (1993).** *Democracy (Key Concepts in Critical Theory)*. New Jersey: Humanities Press.
- Held, D. (1999).** *Models of democracy*, translated By Abbas Mokhber, Tehran: Roshangaran.
- Held, D., and Mac Grow, A. (2003).** *Globalization and its opponents*. [Translated by Sabeti, E.], Tehran: Ghoghnoos.
- Huntington, S. (1994).** The third wave in the late twentieth century. [translated by Shahsa, A.], Tehran: Rowzaneh.
- Internet World Stats, "Facebook Users in the World", (2011) <http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats.htm>. Last accessed at: 11/15/2014.
- Kaebly, A., Alamolhoda, H. A., and Fattahi, A. (2012).** The analysis of Egyptian constitution (2013). *Knowledge of General Laws*, 1 (3).
- Khan, M. (2014).** Islam, democracy and Islamism after the counterrevolution in Egypt. *Middle East Policy*, 21(1):75-86.
- Kinnvall, C., and Jonsson, K. (Ed) (2002).** *Globalization and Democratization in Asia: The construction of Identity*, London, Routledge.
- Kohut, A. (2012).** Most Muslims Want Democracy: Personal Freedom and Islam in Political Life. *Global Attitudes Project*, July 10. www.pewglobal.org.
- Koolae, E. (2007).** *Globalization, America and the Middle East*. Aeen, 7 (1).
- Larry, D. (2010).** Why are there no Arab democracies? *Journal of Democracy*, 1(1): 93-104.
- Maghraoui, A. M. (2006).** *American Foreign Policy and Islamic Renewal*. United States Institute for Peace, Special Report.
- Mir Ahmadi, M. (2005).** *Islam and consultative democracy*. Tehran: Publication of Ney.
- Movassaghi A., and Attarzadeh, B. (2014).** Role and effect of virtual space on social movement: Case study of Egypt. *Political Sciences Research*, 3(27): 147-191.
- Ottaway, M. (2007).** A transition to democracy or quasi-authoritarianism. [Translated by S. Mirtorabi]. Tehran: Quoms Publications.
- Pingdom (2014).** Internet in numbers 2014. Dec, 28, available at: <http://www.royal.pingdom.com>.
- Rosiny, S. (2012).** The Arab Spring: Triggers, Dynamics and Prospects. *Giga Focus*, No. 1.
- Sardar Nia, H. (2009).** Internet, new social movements, and mobilizing the discontent, *Communicative Research quarterly*. Vol, 4.
- Soltani Far, M. (2006).** Sociology of democracy in informative communities (studying the crises of democracy sociology at the information age from Castles viewpoints). *Periodical of Sociology*, 6 (3).
- Tafler, A., and Tafler, H. (2004).** *Toward new civilization*, translated by Mohammad Reza Jafari, Simorg Publication, Tehran.
- Tohidfam, M. (2003).** The end of history at the age of globalization democracy. *Journal of Law and Political Science*, 61(3).
- Toscano, R. (2012).** Which Democracy after the "Arab Spring"? Notes

Internationals, June.
Yeager, W. (1997). Paideia. [Translated by Lotfi, M. H.], First volume, Tehran: publication of Kharazmi.
Zahed, H. (2016). The making of the Egyptian revolution. International Journal of Research in Business Management, 4(1):1-36.

Citation: Mirzazadeh, F. (2016). The impact of globalization of democracy on the revolutionary movement of Egyptian nation. Net Journal of Social Sciences, 4(3): 49-58.
