



THEORY AND PROBLEMS OF DEMOCRACY DEVELOPMENT IN EGYPT AND THE MIDDLE EAST

G. Sh. Kadyrova

Lecturer, PhD

Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

Tashkent, Uzbekistan

E-mail: guzal.kadirova.1986@mail.ru

ABOUT ARTICLE

Key words: one-party systems, democracy, the Arab world, “Arab spring”, the Middle East, “Western democracy”, civil society, Muslim cultural traditions.

Received: 11.05.23

Accepted: 13.05.23

Published: 15.05.23

Abstract: The article is devoted to Egypt and the Middle East, where the author comments on democratic processes.

Over the past 30 years, one-party systems in Arab countries have been replaced by multi-party systems. This process began in Egypt in 1976 when the Arab Socialist Union split into three groups.

Later, in the late 1990s, Egypt established an electoral system that favored the candidate of the ruling party under the provisions of the Electoral Law. This was related to the constant inclusion of changes in the powers of the head of state in the constitution.

Although Egypt is officially considered a republic, we consider it a modern appearance of a parliamentary monarchy. Because the infinite government of the political leader unites the functions of the party leader and the head of state in the form of a person.

We can see the threats to western reconstruction in Egypt from the events of 2011-2013. As a result of this “Western democracy” we have witnessed that Islamic radical forces and the crisis have entered into the crisis. In general, the article is widely covered in Egypt that the developments of democratic and civil society development and sharply different from Western understanding.

**MISR VA YAQIN SHARQDA DEMOKRATIYANI RIVOJLANTIRISH NAZARIYASI
VA MUAMMOLARI****G. Sh. Kadirova***o'qituvchi, PhD**Toshkent davlat sharqshunoslik universiteti**Toshkent, O'zbekiston**E-mail: guzal.kadirova.1986@mail.ru*

MAQOLA HAQIDA

Kalit so'zlar: bir partiyali tuzumlar, demokratiya, Arab dunesi, "Arab bahori", Yaqin Sharq, "G'arbona demokratiya", fuqarolik jamiyati, musulmon madaniyati an'analari.

Annotatsiya: Maqola Misr va Yaqin Sharqga bag'ishlangan bo'lib, muallif tomonidan demokratik jarayonlar to'g'risida fikr yuritilgan.

Oxirgi 30 yil ichida arab mamlakatlardagi bir partiyalik tuzumlar o'rnini ko'p partiyaviy tuzumlar egallagan. Bu jarayon Misrda 1976 yili Arab sotsialistik ittifoqi uch guruhga bo'linishi bilan boshlangan.

Keyinroq, Misrda 1990-yillar oxirlarida saylov to'g'risidagi qonunning qoidalariga asosan hukmron partiya nomzodi foydasiga xizmat qiladigan saylov tartibi o'rnatilgan bo'lgan. Bu esa davlat boshlig'i vakolatlarining konstitutsiyaga o'zgarishlarini doimiy ravishda kiritishi bilan bog'liq bo'lgan.

Misr rasman respublika hisoblansa-da, aslida parlamentli monarxiyaning zamonaviy ko'rinishi deb hisoblasak bo'ladi. Chunki siyosiy yo'l boshchining cheksiz hokimiyati bir shaxs siyosida partiyaviy rahbar va davlat rahbarining funksiyalarini birlashtiradi.

G'arbona rekonstruksiyaning xavfliligi isbotini Misrda 2011-2013 yillar voqealaridan ko'rishimiz mumkin. Mazkur "G'arbona demokratiyasi" natijasida hokimiyatga islomiy radikal kuchlar kelib davlatni inqirozga uchratganiga xammamiz guvohmiz. Umuman olganda, maqolada Misrda demokratik va fuqarolik jamiyatini rivojlantirish jarayonlari o'ziga xosligi va bu muammolarni g'arbcha tushunishdan keskin farq qilishi haqida keng yoritib berilgan.

**ТЕОРИЯ И ПРОБЛЕМЫ РАЗВИТИЯ ДЕМОКРАТИИ В ЕГИПТЕ И НА БЛИЖНЕМ
ВОСТОКЕ****Г. Ш. Кадырова***преподаватель, PhD**Ташкентский государственный университет востоковедения**Ташкент, Узбекистан**E-mail: guzal.kadirova.1986@mail.ru*

О СТАТЬЕ

Ключевые слова: однопартийные системы, демократия, арабский мир, «арабская весна», Ближний Восток, «западная демократия», гражданское общество, традиции мусульманской культуры.

Аннотация: Статья посвящена Египту и Ближнему Востоку, автор комментирует демократические процессы.

За последние 30 лет однопартийные системы в арабских странах сменились многопартийными системами. Этот процесс начался в Египте в 1976 году, когда Арабский социалистический союз раскололся на три группы.

Позднее, в конце 1990-х гг., в Египте была установлена избирательная система, отдающая предпочтение кандидату от правящей партии на основе положений Закона о выборах. Это было связано с постоянным внесением изменений в полномочия главы государства в конституцию.

Хотя официально Египет считается республикой, на самом деле его можно считать современной формой парламентской монархии. Потому что неограниченная власть политического лидера сочетает в себе функции лидера партии и главы государства в одном лице.

Подтверждение опасности старой реконструкции мы можем видеть из событий 2011-2013 годов в Египте. В результате этой «гарбонской демократии» к власти пришли радикальные исламские силы, которые привели государство к кризису. В целом в статье дается широкий обзор специфики процессов развития демократического и гражданского общества в Египте и их резких отличий от западного понимания этих проблем.

INTRODUCTION

It is known that since Egypt is located in the Middle East region, all the processes and events happening here are directly related to this country.

In the 1960s and 1970s, such regimes established in countries such as Algeria, Sudan, Libya, Yemen, Syria, and Iraq were dominated by highly empowered officers, but even though the army is the guarantee of the stability of these countries, the military aspects in them are gradually becoming secondary. Authoritarian regimes are gradually declining. In 2003, Saddam Hussein's regime was overthrown in Iraq, and this process was observed in Egypt, Syria, Algeria, Sudan, and Yemen.

THE MAIN RESULTS AND FINDINGS

In countries, one-party regimes are replaced by multiple joint regimes. This process began in 1976 when the Arab Socialist Union was divided into three groups, in Egypt. The same conclusion about Algeria can be said. This happened from 1977-1985 in Libya and Sudan. Chou Party regimes are also different in age and direction. In Egypt, for example, it is possible to see their clear “asymmetry”. As the average and transparent election, it is explained by the ruling parties that the rules cannot receive a majority vote. Because from the making of the electoral legislation, from the making of the countless manipulation - the purchase of voters and votes is also normal.

“Democracy” of the “Middle Eastern model” is visible in the case of ARE. Here, since the late 1990s, an electoral system has been established based on the provisions of the Electoral Act, which favors the candidate of the ruling party. This is because the powers of the head of state are constantly changing (increasing) in the constitution (H. Mubarak’s - from 1981 to 2012). At the same time, the issue of legal succession is an extremely sensitive political factor.

These aspects lead to the conclusion that although Egypt is officially considered a republic, it is a modern form of monarchy. That is, the unlimited power of the political leader combines the functions of the party leader and the head of state in one person.

Arab countries, regardless of the name of their political system, have clearly expressed authoritarian aspects. Everything in the region is shaped by the idea of authoritarianism, which in itself calls into question the realization of the idea of pluralism.

The democratization of political systems in the Arab world is very problematic.

On the one hand, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the NucoCracy of Iran, the United States, and Europe in the region, these “painful points of the United States and other institutions of the European Democratic Institute and other institutions of Europe Mixing to” is a direct aggression to the national sovereignty of the countries of the region.

A clear example of this is the “Arab Spring” “protest” process that began in 2011. French expert L. Martinez states that the leadership of Arab countries comes from the opinion that “honor is not law or politics”, that is, for them, the observance of clan brotherhood is more important than anything else [1].

In addition to Egypt, hardline regimes in the Middle East include Jordan and Saudi Arabia [2]. In most cases, the opposition uses religion as a means of protest because the government does not have the power to ban religion. Although the political activity of the population of the Arab countries is weak, even though the activity of the opposition against the regime has begun to be felt, the government is suppressing them in Egypt, as well as in Tunisia, Syria, and Saudi Arabia.

Famous Egyptian human rights defender A. Hamza believes that it will take another 20-40 years for democracy to settle in Egypt [3].

Of course, it takes time to build an open civil society. In our opinion, democratic reforms here can be realized only after secularization, basically, the liberation of social and individual consciousness from the influence of religion.

In opposition to the US initiative to democratize the Middle East, Egypt, along with Saudi Arabia and Syria, promoted their Arab model. At the same time, if the Arab regimes cannot solve their social problems in the fields of politics, economy, and culture, the Arab model will not work.

Western experts believe that the regimes of the Middle East are incapable of carrying out real democratic reforms because this threatens the existence of these regimes. Consequently, the initiative of the Arabs to “democratize themselves” is an attempt to make a kind of “cosmetic repair” without touching the fundamentals of the current situation in the Arab world. But this attempt has been stopped by the Arab Spring processes that started in the region and are being completely forgotten.

The main points of the Arab initiative are:

reforms should be carried out “from within” by the Arab societies themselves and not imposed from the outside, reforms should be implemented step by step in order not to disrupt security and stability, and the reform process should serve the interests of the region and not the enemies (interested external actors), resolve the Palestinian-Israeli conflict making is an inevitable condition for the success of political reforms, the characteristics of each Arab country should be taken into account in the process of reforms, reforms cannot be carried out in one form, extremist groups should not be allowed to use the reforms and “open door” policy.

In these countries, the absence of true democracy is explained by the ruling of the country for more than 20-30 years. The opposite is a “religious extremist group” in this region, which allows the ruling systems to hope for “single capability” support.

Another problem is that in the Middle East, including Arab countries, special services are replacing the law and not allowing the development of civil society. There are also opinions that most of the representatives of the government and bureaucratic apparatus use their official position only to gain wealth.

A common problem for most Arab countries is the lack of a democratic way of success in practice. This creates the basis for growing opposition to the ruling elites and the struggle for power through rebellions and coups.

Former Egyptian Foreign Minister A. Maher believes that the G-8 group “considered many of Egypt's proposals, including the internal nature of these reforms based on the characteristics of each country”, regarding Middle East reforms.

In the issues of modernization and reform of the Middle East, ICT emphasizes that the countries of the region are capable of solving their problems independently without foreign interference. ICT doubts the acceptability of the Western model of democracy for Muslim societies but believes that the US initiative to "reconstruct" the Middle East will be a certain catalyst for this process. A clear proof of this is the events of 2011-2013 in Egypt. As a result of this "Western democracy", radical forces came to power and brought the state into crisis.

The issues of reforming the countries of the Middle East are being discussed a lot. However, some Egyptian experts are urging the US to allow the Arabs to carry out their reforms without outside interference. They argue that the Americans should do more to resolve the Palestinian-Israeli conflict if they want to facilitate effective reforms.

To this day, all US attempts to "democratize" the Middle East region lead to the opposite consequences, that is, the growth of instability, fundamentalism, and terrorism.

Democracy in the Middle East must take the form of open, equal, and impartial dialogue. At the same time, transferring "Western values" to the "civilized land" of the Middle East will not bring any good. Interaction between civilizations can be successful only if they enrich and understand each other.

At present, Muslim legal doctrines are actively used to prove that it is possible to widely refer to the Western experience on the main issues such as parliamentarianism, elections, political pluralism, separation of powers, and human rights. Of course, Middle Eastern countries' adoption of world democratic principles along these lines is usually quite limited and often consists of copying Western models. However, the absence of a clear and strict requirement that the establishment of power in Islamic legal thinking should be derived from the Sharia itself opens the way for the use of world experience in political democracy.

Maintaining political stability in the Middle East serves international security interests. Experience has shown that the policy of ignoring Islam leads to the rise of Islamic radicalism.

At the same time, focusing on the perception of liberal values, which implies artificial democratization and the removal of traditional Muslim society from Islamic political and legal culture, leads to the risk of instability and, consequently, to a decrease in the level of security at the global level. Therefore, the democratization strategy should be aimed at bringing the Arab East into the process of globalization with Islamic (including political-legal) values that are compatible with their universal democratic principles and rethought in the spirit of current reality.

CONCLUSION

It is important to note that the appeal to Islamic evidence is not a step that is dictated by circumstances and is not baseless propaganda. The researches of Arab jurists and political

scientists who interpret Sharia as moderate and restrained indicate that such harmony is theoretically important.

The ratio of Islamic and European approaches to the national-legal systems of Arab countries is manifested differently. In particular, the acceptance or, on the contrary, the rejection of the Western experience depends on whether the European legal models collide with the provisions of the Sharia in the minds of Muslims, which are directly related to their religious status and strengthen the religio-moral rules of Islam.

There will be not only possible conflicts between religious and western approaches to the right are not only possible but in several cases. It is important to see the boundaries of their mutual adaptation (adaptation) and mergers conceptually. But to eliminate the differences between them remains. This conclusion is an assessment of prospects for globalization prospects and forms in the Middle East, and it is important to predict its democratization. Currently, it has not commented on the maintenance of democratic reforms in the region, uniting political stability in the region, and the accession to globalization processes. We believe that as democratization processes take place, tensions between moderate and radical forces and movements in the Arab world are likely to increase.

First of all, the proof of this was shown during the “Arab Spring” process. The embers that started in 2011 are still smoldering. Tunisia, Algeria, Libya, Egypt, Bahrain, Yemen, and Syria - all these are the results of this “spreading Western democracy” policy.

In general, the processes of democratization and development of civil society in the Middle East (Arab world), including in Egypt, are unique and differ sharply from the Western understanding of these problems.

Practice shows that exporting democracy instead of Islam cannot ensure that the threat of extremism and terrorism will decrease. Therefore, democratization can be achieved in this region only if there is a balance between the traditions of Muslim culture, on the one hand, and the desire to form democratic institutions, on the other hand.

REFERENCES

1. Al-Masry al-Youm. - 2008. - July, 7.
2. Die Welt. - 2009. - October, 23.
3. Washington Profile. - 2007. - March, 22.