

MASTER THESIS

Titel der Master Thesis / Title of the Master's Thesis

„The Egyptian-American Relations in terms of Human Rights and the Role of
The CSOs in Egypt from 2011 to 2021“

Verfasst von / Submitted by

Nada Osman

angestrebter akademischer Grad / In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Advanced International Studies (M.A.I.S.)

Wien/ Vienna 2022

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt

A 992 940

Postgraduate program code as it appears on the student
record sheet:

Universitätslehrgang lt. Studienblatt

Internationale Studien / International Studies

Postgraduate program as it appears on the
student record sheet:

Betreut von / Supervisor:

Professor Markus Kornprobst, M.A., Ph.D.

On my honor as a student of the Diplomatische Akademie Wien, I submit this work in good faith and pledge that I have neither given nor received unauthorized assistance on it.

Nada Osman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract

Introduction **1**

Chapter 1:

- Literature Review **5**
- The Theoretical Approach: Theory **11**
- Methodology **18**

Chapter 2: The U.S. Foreign Policy **22**

- The U.S. foreign policy towards the Middle East **23**
- The U.S.-Egyptian relations **27**
- U.S. hypocrisy about human rights **30**

Chapter 3: Civil Society Organisations **34**

- The role of Civil Society Organisations **34**
- Outcomes and challenges of CSOs' Activity **35**
- Western CSOs **36**
- Amnesty international in Egypt **37**

Conclusion **39**

Bibliography

Acknowledgment

I would like to express my sincere thanks and gratitude to Professor Markus Kornprobst for guiding this work and for his invaluable help. I also thank all professors who have taught me besides my colleagues at the Diplomatic Academy of Vienna. and I am also grateful for my family, as their love and support have been a major motivation for me.

Abstract

This master thesis is working on scrutinizing and analyzing the main interest behind the foreign policy of the United States towards the Middle East. It hypothesized the question of what shapes this foreign policy regardless of what is already proclaimed by the American or Egyptian officials. Plus, the extent of the credibility or positive impact of promoting the principles of human rights and democracy from the American side to halt the abuses that take place in Egypt will be contemplated. In addition. Civil society organizations have proven to be positively influential in many countries worldwide. Accordingly, they ought to be considered an important player in Egypt that could mediate between the population and the government. Thus, the Egyptian government should allow them to adopt this role so as to properly introduce the demands of the people as well as share with the government some institutional tasks to elevate its performance and development. These efforts are of utmost importance because with democracy, transparency, and accountability, the pace of development increases.

.....

In dieser Masterarbeit wird das Hauptinteresse an der Außenpolitik der Vereinigten Staaten gegenüber dem Nahen Osten untersucht und analysiert. Sie geht der Frage nach, was diese Außenpolitik prägt, unabhängig davon, was bereits von den amerikanischen oder ägyptischen Beamten verkündet wurde. Außerdem wird untersucht, inwieweit die Förderung der Grundsätze der Menschenrechte und der Demokratie von amerikanischer Seite glaubwürdig ist oder positive Auswirkungen hat, um die Missstände in Ägypten zu stoppen. Hinzu kommt. Organisationen der Zivilgesellschaft haben sich in vielen Ländern weltweit als einflussreich erwiesen. Dementsprechend sollten sie auch in Ägypten als wichtiger Akteur angesehen werden, der zwischen der Bevölkerung und der Regierung vermitteln kann. Die ägyptische Regierung sollte ihnen daher gestatten, diese Rolle zu übernehmen, um die Forderungen der Bevölkerung angemessen einzubringen und gemeinsam mit der Regierung einige institutionelle Aufgaben zu übernehmen, um deren Leistung und Entwicklung zu verbessern. Diese Bemühungen sind von größter Bedeutung, denn mit Demokratie, Transparenz und Rechenschaftspflicht erhöht sich das Tempo der Entwicklung.

Introduction

Furthering Human rights is a key and essential concept in foreign policy. As a general principle, they are agreed and universal principles. This thesis will analyze the role of human rights and democracy in American foreign policy toward the middle east. Additionally, the main research questions in this dissertation are: What is the reason for the duality in the united states' foreign policy towards Egypt with regard to human rights and democracy? And to what extent have the CEOs in Egypt been influential in making revolutionary political changes so far since 2011?

As a superpower, the administration of the United States, in general, perceives that it is its duty to get involved in many events in the world. This American engagement worldwide is intended to resolve conflicts, establish official political and economic relations, and contribute to spreading values of peace and democracy. Based on the policies of the American administrations for decades, one can deduce that the factor of utmost importance in American foreign policy is the existence of trust when collaborating with other nations. The United States is always keen to establish stable and long-term relations in order to achieve a common interest between it and the governments of Arab countries. This means that when it comes to establishing these relations with the Arab states, there must be trust between the United States and the Arab nations' presidents. The attention of the United States to the Middle East began during the Cold War. And increased after the flow of oil and the fear of the imposition of control of the Soviet Union and the spread of communist ideology.

The United States has always viewed itself as a nation that is exceptional in moral terms; this perception of American exceptionalism relates to the patriotic and national pride of the United States (Nye 2020). Also, in the event of errors and offenses committed, it shall be declared that they were necessary in order to achieve the highest integrity and maintain peace and stability. Yet, there has not been any real accountability for American crimes and violent interference in other nations. From this American political principle, United States policy has tended to alternate and vary. There has been a double standard, while other times, there has been a policy of containment. Hence, plenty of analysts believe that this policy is an embodiment of American duality and inconsistency. All these concepts assure that the fundamental constant principle of American foreign policy is the one that seeks interests and rejects malevolence policies from its perspective. In this case, interest competition never acknowledges friends or morals; they accept the level of mutual or unilateral gain, whichever is necessary.

The United States' diplomacy encountered its most harrowing challenging situation in Egypt. At that time, President Nasser established the influential "Voice of the Arabs", a major international radio station that broadcasted his speech and political statements throughout the region. This radio station was the most successful media station throughout the Middle East (Alahmed 2011). The situation became even more complicated when Nasser announced in July 1956 that the Suez Canal had been nationalized by Egypt. According to this, Britain, France, and Israel started a military campaign against Egypt.

On the other hand, President Eisenhower vehemently denied the attack and demanded a truce and a complete withdrawal (Rugh 2006). It was during the 1960s when U.S.-Egyptian relations were on edge. Almost a decade later, when Sadat became Egypt's president, his measures actually started to alter the Egyptian's hostility toward the United States. He demonstrated not only good standing toward the American policy but also Sadat followed through by drawing up a peace agreement with Israel, with the support of President Carter. Since then, the two countries, Egypt and the United States have been seeking to enhance their relations on the political and economic levels. And to cooperate in terms of security issues. During this time, Egypt has been totally transformed from a socialist country to a liberal one that promotes economic openness and the prevention of restrictions on imports. This bilateral relationship between the two countries on the economic level has been easing and facilitating trade between both of them.

There has been an elevated awareness of human rights in global politics and foreign policy in the new millennium; postmillennial U.S. presidents have proclaimed that human rights and good governance are the most important drivers of U.S. policy and practice (Choi and James 2017). Besides, direct expressions of concern about human rights feature prominently on the U.S. State Department's official website; the U.S. ensures accountability regarding past violations and efforts to avoid future cases of abuse (The U.S. Department of State, n.d.). The notion of human rights has assumed the status of one of the most important vehicles of U. American foreign policy (Hancock 2007). However, it is agreed and argued by a myriad of analysts and policymakers that United States officials have not applied human rights principles in an even-handed manner.

In this research, an explanation of how the United States has used western and Egyptian NGOs and civil society to promote its general propaganda of maintaining democracy and human rights will be provided. Generally, the term civil society is used to describe a "third system" of actors, i.e., corporately organized individuals unlike state or for-profit actors; These are groups of self-organized people interested in taking collective steps on a voluntary basis within and over the

boundaries of their respective states to achieve what they believe to be in the general national and international public interest (Price 2003).

Through this research question, we will impugn the Egyptian-American relations in terms of human rights and freedom of expression through and analyze the politics of Civil Society organizations during the last decade since the revolutions of the Arab Spring and their results so far. In this regard, the thesis will not only focus on political, economic, and military aspects but also on social and cultural dimensions.

Global civil society is a relatively novel concept, one that has entered the academic, political, and public debates in the last decades of the 20th century (Anheier 2010). Accordingly, there do not appear to be many available references and sources leading to a more conclusive, accurate definition of CSO. Added to this is the effect of this uncertainty or unclearness on the domestic politics of governments towards them. Therefore, in this paper, a conceptualization of civil society will be more focused on. An explanation will be introduced to the tension that occurs between the two subjects and why it is getting more complicated in spite of the existence and criticism of some NGOs that work on a global level such as Amnesty International and Human right watch.

Civil society, as a term used in the late 20th century, was distinct from the state. For example, it was used to illustrate those social dynamics that developed throughout Western and Eastern Europe as well as Latin America (Marlies Glasius, Lewis, and Hakan Seckinelgin 2004). So, this may be seen simply as an example of " participatory democracy " (Aragonès and Sánchez-Pagés 2009). Having such organizations would give more young people a medium through which they will be able to contribute to changes taking place in political and social life.

Nevertheless, this term carries very ambiguous and, in some cases, contradicted connotations. The concept of civil society emerged in the 1990s and 2000s as an inseparable part of the liberalization efforts and democratization process of the political regimes and societies of the Middle East. In parallel, however, one can find a deepening gap between the support for democracy that has been provided by investments in civil society and emerging literature that is more critical of how the two relate to each other (Altan-Olcay and Icduygu 2012).

In this proposal, the first chapter will begin with the literature review, in which various opinions on the foreign policy of the United States in general and its policy towards the Middle East (especially Egypt) in particular. The main issue that will be discussed here is democracy. Plus, I will mention how previous studies have identified Civil society and clarified its role in advocating

Human Rights. After that, the literature review will be followed by the theoretical approaches. I will explain how previous kinds of literature have tried to analyze the American foreign policy, its relationship with Egypt (particularly with respect to human rights and democracy), and how the CSOs have been theorized so an explanation for their role could be introduced. Afterward, through the methodology, Egypt will be focused on as an empirical model, and the bilateral relationship between the two countries will be analyzed through different levels of analysis. In the second chapter, some significant historical facts, as well as the evolution of this mutual relation, will be demonstrated—besides the circumstances of human rights in Egypt. The third and final chapter then focuses on civil society organizations in Egypt, Western civil society, and Amnesty International reports. Finally, a conclusion will summarize the whole paper.

Chapter 1

Literature review:

This subject is critical and controversial as it defines the situation and identity of Arab countries. This issue includes the duality and paradox of the intentions of the US towards the region. And how these changes that middle eastern countries adopt affect their domestic policies regarding breaching human rights and avoiding democracy.

In this section, I will introduce previous thoughts on the influence of the Egyptian-American relations on the situation and circumstances of human rights and democracy in Egypt and will discuss it. The time range will be focused on is the ten years starting from 2011 till 2021 notwithstanding; mentioning a background about this mutual relationship between the two countries and how it has started is essential to understand the current situation. In addition, civil society organizations play an important role in upholding human rights, defending the freedom of expression and protesting, monitoring government policies, criticizing their violations, and fighting for genuine democracy.

It has been claimed that the United States has been a critical active superpower in promoting democracy worldwide, and in particular, in the Middle East and third world countries. It is asserted by political scientists like Charles Lipson (Lipson 2005) that democracy brings about peace as democratic states rarely fight each other. This assertion means that wars are the last option for them since democracy always seeks peace. Moreover, Charles Lipson has stated that democratic states are more likely to win their wars. This is because democracy makes countries more able to mitigate and resolve issues and quarrels, in particular issues related to commitment (Lipson 2005). These are among the most essential features of democratic countries. Nevertheless, it should be understood that every nation should create a democratic model that fits its condition, not just the western democratic model. Plus, exterior or foreign help might be possible in some cases. However, it must be unconditional help without grave interference that negatively affects suffering states regarding their Sovereignty or independence of the decision-making process.

Democratic regimes are also able to build more rewarding and fruitful cooperation and relationships with each other, with little likelihood of becoming embroiled in conflict. This is due to the trust between them and the transparency which makes their pledges trustworthy.

According to George P. Shultz, Secretary of State 1982, stated that *"Support for democracy is not simply a policy of the American government. It is basic to our history and world view"* in a conference about the democratization of communist states (Department of State 1985, 378). By this, he explained how important and indispensable democratic values are to U.S. foreign policy. For Elliot Abrahams, in his memo, which dates back to 1981- the Kennedy-Clark Memorandum. This memo was directed to the president of the United States then, under the request of William Clark (who was the Deputy Secretary of State and adviser for the president). In this memo, he wrote about human rights in the U.S. foreign policy, and how it should be, he demonstrated that: *"Human rights is at the core of our foreign policy, because it is central to America's conception of itself. This nation did not "develop." It was created, with specific political purposes in mind. It is true that as much as America invented "human rights," conceptions of liberty invented America. It follows that "human rights" isn't something we add on to our foreign policy but is its very purpose: the defense and promotion of liberty in the world. This is not merely a rhetorical point: We will never maintain wide public support for our foreign policy unless we can relate it to American ideals and to the defense of freedom"* (Abrams 2017, 40). This is what Elliot Abrahams claimed about how the American administration should act with regard to human rights. However, it is easy to find the assurance of sustaining democracy and human rights in the official documents and rhetoric of the United States. But this kind of political slogan is not necessarily implemented in reality. By contrast, the United States has already failed to abide by international law and has invaded countries like Iraq. It has committed war crimes there without any accountability or responsibility for the sufferance that the Iraqi people have and still going through.

Almost ten years after the Berlin Wall came down and the dissolution of the Soviet Union, American military intervention took place in many regions, including (Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Iraq). However, Kagan and Kristol (Kagan and Kristol 2000) have justified these military actions as interventions and protection against tyrant rulers and for undoing coups. In other words, these were not for fulfilling American interests but for the sack of these countries in trouble and to implement the tasks of a superpower that bears the responsibility of stabilizing the international system and supporting human rights everywhere. Yet, in my opinion, this point of view contradicts the realistic logic the United States adopts. The American decision-making process relies on a rational concept that prioritizes national interest. Consequently, no military action would be adopted without a benefit in return. In addition, based on this rational thinking, morals and human values come after achieving one's interest. Another opinion considering the aftermaths of American or western interventions is explained by Dan Schueftan. For him

(Schueftan 2016) in most cases, the outcomes proved that these interventions have mainly incurred problems for the western powers. However, even when they claim to modify and augment their policies to boost the situation of the aggrieved people and ameliorate their living conditions, they fail to do so.

U.S. foreign policy with respect to international human rights is controversial. It has been argued by some scholars like J. D. van der Vyver that the human rights conception of the foreign policy of the United States is more or less considered a “cultural relativism”. That is to say, and there are relative values that rule the application and defending of human rights, these include culture, ethnicity, and religion. Accordingly, the international human rights concept is subject to this American relativism in defending human rights. Besides, in some cases, it impedes some international bodies, such as the UN and some NGOs, from being fair in uncovering violations, in particular, in the Middle East (Van der Vyver 1998). And this sort of crystal-clear double standard of human rights perception for the United States is called “the paradox of American exceptionalism,” according to Michael Ignatieff (Ignatieff 2005). From my point of view, this idea of relativism abolishes the concept of utter and absolute moral values that is also accounted as a definitive reference for laws. Human rights, equity, freedom, demanding justice, and transparency are the basic and fundamental rights of all people worldwide. To put it another way, not all things are subject to relativity because otherwise, injustice, aggression, and exploitation would be accepted and even legal.

Now we will focus on works of literature that expound on the United States’ foreign policy towards the Middle East and the importance of this region to the United States. According to some politicians including Tony Blair, the former British Prime Minister, the Middle East is yet to be one of the most important regions for the United States and Europe, mainly, due to the enormous amounts of oil production. Moreover, many powers around the world will still maintain stable relationships with the states of the Middle East, especially gulf countries to guarantee the flow of oil exports, despite the lower dependency of the United States on oil for other alternatives (Prifti and Springer 2018).

Dictatorships in some countries in the middle east have engendered ostensible stability like a Time bomb. This situation is due to the accumulation of some issues such as persecution, violation, and corruption that are mostly coupled with authoritarian states. For Paul Brooker (Brooker 1997) a deep, inclusive explanation for this stability is still not reached. Notwithstanding, this case could be attributed to a religious reason, as for some, Islam prohibits

democracy, so this could be a logical explanation that people got easily subdued to totalitarian governments due to religion. Even an article in the Economist, “The law of man or the law of God?” (The Economist 2003) claims that Islam does not include democracy and its approach is against it, as the rules of God are indisputable and there is no discussion about it. Nevertheless, this opinion totally lacks accuracy and basic knowledge about Islam which emphasizes the importance of democracy and justice. Besides, politicians and scholars are aware of the genuine approach of Islam and the misconceptions provoked on purpose to involve religion in politics which would, in turn, give rise to chaotic circumstances and distortion of thinking and culture.

In fact, according to Adam B.Seligman, our modern notion of civil society is “*the result of a crisis in social order and a breakdown of existing paradigms of the idea of order*” (Seligman 2002: 14). The socio-economic transformations taking place from the 17th century onwards accompanied by several discoveries have fundamentally altered what had been the dominant paradigms of both social order and public authority. In addition, these changes have been coupled with the British, North American, and Continental Revolutions. As a consequence, this has resulted in new opportunities for increasingly empowered and autonomous groups of individuals seeking to defend their interests more effectively within the broader social sphere (Seligman 2002). Moreover, to further elaborate on the origin of the phrase civil society with its diverse range of conceptualizations, an old view could help track the origin of this idea; The first to conceive of civil society (bürgerliche Gesellschaft) as a distinct social category intermediate between the political state (politischer Staat) and the family (bürgerliche Familie), was in no doubt Hegel (Hegel and Reichelt 1972).

When it comes to identifying the concept of civil society organizations, a myriad of studies has been undertaken to conceptualize the nature, structure, and role of CSOs. In this research, the various views related to the conceptualization of the CSOs. For instance, as stated in Eur-lex, the Civil society are envisaged as a type of organized entity that carries out various types of actions by individuals or groups.; Such groups are not instructed by or work for governments. But they act as mediators that not only aim to fulfill the general interests and express public concern through democratic practices but also create more connections between citizens and their governments ("Glossary of Summaries - EUR-Lex" 2020).

According to some scholars like Jacques Maritain, CSOs have been through long evolution during the first half of the 20th century. Jacques Maritain was influenced by Thomas Aquinas, one of the late medieval theorists; Civil society became a partnership based on the interdependence of values between the church and the secular civil state (Maritain 1970). While

by the 1920s through the 1960s, the term "civil society" was entirely overlooked in English textbooks in both social and political studies (Laski 1967). Later on, there has been a rediscovery and repurposing of this old yet long-ignored concept among policymakers and analysts throughout the world since the 1980s. During such circumstances, the promotion of the principles of "civil society" in Europe, both East and West, all across America, Africa, and Asia has emerged. Moreover, at that time, civil society was seen as an important strategic tool to address some of the observed deficiencies in the governance, political culture, and social structures of many modern states (Rhodes, Binder, and Rockman 2006).

A number of political and social analysts have expounded on this topic. (Qandil 2008) Among these authors is Amany Qandil, who focused on the importance of civil society organizations' studies. She explained that the existence of the CSOs does not necessarily work for the sake of the intended goals based on social and political values related to the Arabian cultural, political and social context. Such values include Democratic Reform, maintaining human rights, fighting corruption, transparency, and contributing to solving social issues. Furthermore, she criticizes the Arabian role in accepting western literature on that matter with all its values; neither we use critically thinking so as to apply it to our model, nor do we develop it to be more suitable to our social and cultural model (Qandil 2008).

According to some scholars, there is a perception that civil society had sufficient strength which could restrain states; This notion of civil society as an adversary of the state corresponds to that of a neoliberal understanding of the concept of CSOs (Ibrahim Natil, Chiara Pierobon, and Tauber 2019).

With regard to Egypt, today, the independent civil society organizations (CSOs) operating in Egypt continue to deal with some of the most suppressive conditions they have seen for decades; these policies are carried out under the pretext of maintaining national security (Saskia Brechenmacher and Carnegie 2017) as well as a reaction to acts of violence by armed groups; Through its research, nonetheless, Amnesty International reveals how they are being used as repressive measures abusing and misusing the lately introduced anti-terror laws to imprison people who should not be punishable for actions such as a peaceful expression of viewpoints critical of the authorities ("Permanent State of Exception: Abuses by the Supreme State Security Prosecution in Egypt" 2019).

The term effectiveness of civil society organizations is understood as the capability of the organizations to efficiently accomplish their expressed and adopted goals, i.e., without wasting their human and material resources (Qandil 2010).

Some authors have focused on the specific positive role CSOs played in Egypt in 2011. Claiming that even though determining precisely how influential civil society organizations were in the Middle East can be difficult, such organizations were distinctly a key initiator within the Arab Revolts; And despite the fact that they formed no more than a small group, they fueled and created an atmosphere confronting the regime which quickly led to a whole country uprising under the right circumstances (VERICAT 2017).

On the one hand, most of the existing literature has expounded on the interpretation and the explanation of the CSOs as a third sector, which is independent of the government and the private sector as well. Further, it has been Assured that organizations of civil society should be consistent with their own social environment and should be also a model of transparency. on the other hand, previous works have lacked presenting solutions to the contradictions that take place between CSOs and governments, and how their role could be developed and sustained by International Organizations and NGOs in a way that good maintain their position and protect human rights.

Moreover, only limited evidence exists on the degree to which civil society organizations address this equilibrium act. Indeed, one of the fundamental causes of this lack in the existing literature has been the fact that most academic research has typically highlighted only one of the defining features of the transmission belt; Such studies have placed emphasis on either the participation and involvement aspects (Binderkrantz 2009), or organizational capabilities of CSOs while failing to address either how civil society organizations are able to handle and combine both dimensions (Albareda 2018).

The Theoretical Approach:

The last 70 years have witnessed a new trend in the foreign politics of the United States towards the Middle East; the United States has started to focus more on the geostrategic importance of the region, especially in the course of the cold war. In this regard, the Middle East was exploited as a tool to curb the expansion and influence of the Soviet Union and its interest in the region (Prifti and Springer 2018). Whereas, for almost four decades (especially after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the cold), the United States has embarked on fulfilling more strategic interests in the middle east; among these interests is to maintain beneficial trade deals with the countries of the regions and guarantee a constant flow of energy. Besides, containing the expansion of the terrorist groups and extremisms in the Arab world and forbid nuclear and mass destruction weapons. Another primary goal is to protect and maintain the security of its main ally "Israel" and create cooperative regimes in the region. Lastly, the United States has been proclaiming that its policies towards the Arab world tend to achieve developed and flourished nations, promote democracy, and secure human rights (Ewers 2019).

Needless to say, the existence of dangerous circumstances in the Middle East is not only dangerous on the local level of the Arabian states, but also to the European states. this is due to the geographic proximity. A dramatic rise in the immigration level to the European Union has taken place after the deterioration in the situation in Syria and Iraq (Prifti and Springer 2018). Moreover, Political scientists have claimed that more instability on the political and economic levels would take place as a result of badly affected oil exports or higher oil prices (Chomsky 2005, 8; Cohen 2009).

Since the end of the cold war and by the beginning of the unipolar order, the United States has constantly been keen on preserving and expanding its domination all over the world so as to maintain its status as the major power. Hence, that used to take place through creating mutual and beneficial relations with states of strategic importance. Accordingly, Given the strategic, geopolitical, and, above all, economic importance of the Middle East, there has been a big focus on this region in the United States (K. Lehr et al. 2019). Hence the theoretical approach that has explained the foreign policies of the United States since almost the beginning of the Cold War so far is their realistic approach. Realism's focus is a paradigm that involves the domination of power and seeking national interests in the first place. According to both Hans Morgenthau and Kenneth Waltz, who are regarded as the foremost scholars of realism, the concepts of survival, power and interest are at the heart of these scholars' depictions of the scholarship of international relations;

regardless of the sub differences in their views in this theory, for both of them, these principles shape the main trend, which is based on rational thinking and analysis, of the theory of realism (Cozette 2004).

During that time and on the international level, international relations were based on this power and realistic view, which included anarchy as well. Therefore, there was no room for applying ethics and morals in international politics (Glenn Peter Hastedt 2004). That was seen clearly, especially during the Cold War and the fight against international domination between the two primary poles i was the United States and the Soviet Union, with their two opposed ideologies. Because of this, so many wars have been fought all over the world without taking into consideration the responsibility for the casualties of wars and the morals. In fact, realism in foreign policy outperformed idealism. Later on, liberalism has come into existence as a competing paradigm to realism as in a more peaceful approach that focused more on international cooperation zone enforcing power (Glenn Peter Hastedt 2004).

It is well understood by being a realist politician or scholar that there are always immoral tools and measures adopted to achieve worthy goals and fulfill national interests (J. Stupak and M. Leitner 2001). Theories and policies are inseparable and work in a parallel fashion. That is to say, politicians and decision-makers apply political theories they see as the best for implementing their policies and serving their goals (Rosato and Schuessler 2011). Indeed, with Walt's emphasis, strategy and policy should be based on theoretical thinking. This will help them organize their actions and plans so as to reach the desired outcomes, assess their effects, and predict future policies and events (Walt 2005).

Maintaining and expanding a global order that is consistent with our material interests and our principles has always been the ultimate goal of United States foreign policy. That order must be molded in American terms. To do otherwise, there will be efforts by others to structure it by means that mirror and fulfill their goals (Kagan and Kristol 2000). In the event that great power is facing a minor power of strategic importance, the significant power involved here has to build robust ties with the relatively minor power. Furthermore, such ties could even be dominated by the major power itself.

Meanwhile, if a great power is opposed by a smaller power in a region that has no strategic significance, a more diplomatic and untroubled attitude should be fostered toward the more minor power (Rosato and Schuessler 2011). powerful connections or coalitions are made by the realist regime solely when they serve to advance the particular self-interest of the given country. This

means that, it is not out of principle or goodwill that alliances are made (J. Stupak and M. Leitner 2001).

When it comes to theorizing American foreign politics at the beginning of the 21st century, neocons' ideas dominated during the presidential term of George W. Bush (Dagger 2019). It has always been and remains an elitist school of thought (Vaïsse 2010). This ideology had an apparent effect on American foreign policy, especially in the Middle East. As we have mentioned before, as claimed, among the main goals of neoconservatism is maintaining democratic regimes around the world, as it has been influenced by the idealism of Woodrow Wilson (Dagger 2019). Moreover, this same conviction results in their more likelihood to noticeably focus on the concept of power and approve of foreign intervention to a greater extent than realists. Such realists would apply more rigorous criteria to the deployment of American troops by which they would be in a position to have little tendency to maintain America's values, trust, and integrity (Vaïsse 2010). In the view of the George W. Bush administration, unused power of all its sorts is considered, in effect, more or less a waste. Accordingly, The United States had an interest in furthering the rise of peaceful democratic regimes in other countries, given the stability and peace democratic governments guarantee. Therefore, the United States military could be deployed worldwide to advance United States interests and its vision of peace and democracy. This policy is because democracies generally tend to opt for peaceful diplomatic policies and solutions for any issues, in the words of a hypothesis of "democratic peace" that has been advocated by various political theorists (Dagger 2019).

In short, superpowers like the United States are supposed to achieve a proper counterbalance against other superpowers as well as against hostile more minor powers that are in strategic regions around the world in order to enhance both their security and their dominance (Rosato and Schuessler 2011). This is what the United States has done with Egypt after the death of the former president Gamal Abd El Nasser and the end of the social nationalism in Egypt and the beginning of the liberal ideology on the economic level during the reign of the Sadat and the adoption of the American liberal principles. That took place by convincing El Sadat of Economic openness and American dependence. Furthermore, that is where the implementation of soft power becomes apparent. It is defined fundamentally by the capacity to recruit other people in order to get them to agree to what one desires. In addition, it is the power to influence the decision-making patterns of others (Nye 2005). It is explained by Joseph Nye as: "... the ability to get what you want through attraction rather than coercion or payments. It arises from the attractiveness of a country's culture, political ideals, and policies. When our policies are seen as legitimate in the eyes of

others, our soft power is Enhanced." (Nye 2005, p.x). As soft power, economic resources enjoy a strong reputation as a form of power and influence through international relations. Players may allocate economic resources in the form of aid in order to change the gain from the desired partner (Rothman 2011).

In foreign policy, Hans J. Morgenthau stated that the concept of realism is simply a rational theoretical model of international relations. His premise is based on the rational standpoint that the imperfect nature of the world is a product of intrinsic aspects of human nature. As a consequence, clashes over power and conflicting opinions are unavoidable due to the fact that the world always suffers from competing interests (Morgenthau and Thompson 1982). In international relations, realistic thinking also assumes that there is no such thing as high moral values or matter of ethics. Therefore, ethical principles can only be expressed through rhetoric, and that is only political rhetoric based on ethical principles. Besides, the absence of genuine respect from the side of nation-states for the global public opinion of the international community or even the principles of international law. That being said, there could be no tangible effect to deter unacceptable policies. As a result, it is common to see non-compliance with the rule of law in enforcing some policies or sanctions when opposing desired interests. Nevertheless, some circumstances could be when the rule of law and interest strongly correlate. But, overall, till that day neither moral nor law have been capable of outweighing the concepts of power and interests (J. Stupak and M. Leitner 2001).

Finally, it seemed that the end of the Cold War began to undermine not only the neorealists' but also neoliberals', whose interpretations and explanations lacked "foresight about the end or post-cold war era (Reus-Smit 2007). Thus, that study of power politics, rationally seeking interests, and marginalizing morals was no longer in the first place at that time. As the fundamental political shifts that took place were not a close outcome expected by these two theories (Chandler 2005). That is, the end of the Cold War was to be viewed as an event that was closer to the approach of constructivism. This is because the factors that brought about the dissolution of the Soviet Union were presented more in identity and policymaking, which are fundamental ideas in the constructive theory, than in politics of power. According to this, the United States started altering its foreign policy toward Russia and curbing the antagonism (Chandler 2005).

Alexander Wendt who was one of the pioneering international relations theorists to advocate a constructivist perspective. He states that: *"States do not have conceptions of self and other, and thus security interests, apart from or prior to interaction... [Rationalist] claims presuppose a history of interaction in which actors have acquired 'selfish' identities and interests; before interaction...they would have no experience upon which to base such definition of self and other. To assume otherwise is to attribute to states in the state of nature qualities that they can only possess in society (Wendt 1992, 401-402)."*

In fact, states had their identities and interests shaped by their mutual cooperation and interaction rather than notions of power. As the formation of interest is the identities of actors and both of which are important subjective perceptions (Wendt 1992).

The theoretical approach used in explaining the CSOs and their situation is the constructive perspective. According to which actors are seen as deeply social entities. That is to say, they are formed by values and norms derived from the same society in which they have emerged. Besides, their goals and endeavors are intrinsic, and they are a reflection of their own identities (Burchill, Linklater, and Devetak 2005). The term civil society refers to a particular type of institutional regime in which the economic and political structures, as well as the social-cultural provisions, that are inherent to the society, are included. Besides, this is where human rights are institutionally established, and individual freedoms become protected interdependently. As a result, civil society organizations constitute a solid foundation for all political practice, laying the foundation for politics based on an ethical theory (Gary Brent Madison and Firm 2003).

The term civil society refers to a particular type of institutional regime in which the economic and political structures, as well as the social-cultural provisions that are inherent to the society, are included. Besides, this is where human rights are institutionally established, and individual freedoms become protected interdependently. As a result, civil society organizations constitute a solid foundation for all political practice, laying the foundation for politics based on an ethical theory (Gary Brent Madison and Firm 2003).

Furthermore, Pursuant to a functionalist approach, CSO's organizational structure is designed to tackle community engagement problems while maximizing its ability to obtain the most effective and efficient results for its member base. In effect, civil society gets illustrated as coterminous with government, within the rule of law whereby all lawful power and authority are determined through the state, as well as with the set of institutions responsible for the administration of state affairs.

In order to maintain their power status in the face of any tyrannical authority, civil society organizations have been identified as intermediaries that defend people from government authoritarianism (Alexander and International Sociological Association 1998). Besides, they are able to promulgate global ideals of democracy, establish just procedures under the rule of law, as well as guarantee that human rights are respected (Rhodes, Binder, and Rockman 2006). Evidently, Civil society organizations have succeeded in proving their power through fulfilling egalitarian appeals; that is due to their coherent and broad structure of national political economies, along with their associations with other economic solid agents like trade unions (Huber and Stephens 2001) (Gøsta Esping-Andersen 1998).

In point of fact, the constructive approach is the most adequate to analyze civil society organizations as it focuses on their empirical studies. To be specific, the activities of agencies, social movements and NGOs are shaped and made by ideas and knowledge, which are the basic elements of constructivism, instead of only being relying on governments' policies (Chandler 2005). As a social theory, constructivism is concerned with the changes that happens in societies and social life overall (Finnemore and Sikkink 2001). a changing dynamic in the understanding of civil society and its role in society is clarified through an interaction among professionalization, institutionalization, and involvement in societies (Mann et al. 2022). the dynamic among these three pillars implies continuous change, one that is best analyzed in terms of institutional performance and achievements (Rabab El-Mahdi 2011). However, there is always unsettled tensions between them that complicate their relations. It is important that the agents and groups that make up civil society not be considered utterly apart from or totally opposed to the existing government. They should be a balance between sustaining CSOs as complementary entities to their authorities through both engagement and solidarity and keeping their genuine role as a sort of opposition or supervision of the governmental achievements or measures in particular in the field of human rights(Mann et al. 2022).

Even though civil society and the state are two separate and distinct entities, civil society organizations can only emerge through states. Both of which are shaping a merging of the integration process and conflict. This means that the existence of one of those entities correlates to the existence of the other one. And this integration means that both are true mediums in modern societies (Qandil 2008). Constructivist scholars have emphasized the role of (intersubjective or collective ideas) in the study of international relations and social life. They have done so by exploring the study of such non-material elements, which include (culture, norms, ideas, and knowledge). In addition, the intersubjective or collective ideas do not include material factors

that determine the interaction of people. Instead, they are mainly driven by ideational factors and identities. Finally, interests are mostly shaped by such intersubjective and collective understandings) (Finnemore and Sikkink 2001).

Lastly, according to Alexander Wendt, while the nation-state is still the critical figure of analysis, attention has turned away from rational self-interest and shifted toward the interaction that takes place within it.

How did it answer RQ? To conclude, the duality and contradiction in the United States' foreign policy towards Egypt with regard to human rights and democracy could be given an explanation by understanding the fundamental ideas of the realistic theory which prioritize achieving objectives even if that might contradict morals. Thus, the relation between The United States and Egypt is based on the material gains that are being unevenly divided between the United States as a major power and only the heads of the states in the Middle East. This will definitely implicate the interest of the populations in the Arab world. Besides, only thinking rationally by focusing only on the economic gains and original domination, the United States will consequently, overlook and neglect the abuses of human rights in the Middle East. In addition, this realistic policy, which rely on the power and interest, of both the United States and the authoritarian regimes in the Middle East, especially Egypt, is narrowing the area of operation for civil society organizations and severely restricting their activities. And this is already planned and intended to ensure that the goals and gains for the Middle Eastern dictators and the United States are achieved.

Methodology:

In this section, an account of the methodological context used to answer the above research questions will be provided. This methodology is the procedure by which we gather the relevant data to gain knowledge and use it in order to explain the given facts (Lamont 2015). These facts include the intentions and policies of the United States, Egypt, and civil society organizations. These data and sources will demonstrate and analyze their bilateral relations and the importance of the regional dimension. A further point is, that it will grant a persuasive answer to the research question.

Applying Theory

The methodological approach will propose a framework to connect the theoretical debates with the object of research. First, I will explain why the theoretical approach I used is suitable for explaining the research question. The realism theory has been used to explain the logic of the United States' foreign policy when it comes to dealing with the Middle East.

In fact, rational choice and argumentation contributed to defining and understanding current theoretical discourses regarding international politics; Generally, it is considered a kind of methodological assessment. In this approach, both individual and collective or social relations are clarified on the basis of specific individual objectives that are subject to different limitations and restraints (Carlsnaes, Risse, and Simmons 2013).

Levels of Analysis

In this part, I will explain these policies in the framework of three levels of analysis which are (the international, regional, and the domestic level of analysis). Moreover, the relation between the three levels will be explained. The international level of analysis will explain the relation between the United States and the middle east in general and Egypt in particular. The United States as a superpower is in a position of control and it rules this relation in a way that serves its interests. for a foreign policy to be on the right track, it must make decisions that are rational on the basis of the nature and circumstances of the international system from its perspective (Carlsnaes, Risse, and Simmons 2013). The relationship between the United States and the countries in the Arab region is a relation of interest, material benefit, and domination. Hence, the United States could be able to take advantage of the gulf oil, gain immense profit from arms sales

so these Arab states would be capable of defending themselves and involve in proxy wars, and what is of utmost importance, is assuring the security of Israel through sponsor peace treaties between Israel and the Arab countries.

Whilst regarding the Regional level of analysis, during the last decade, we have seen accelerated changes that have taken place in the MENA region. These changes Incorporate wars, normalization with Israel, compromises, relinquishment of land, and increasing the siege on Yemen and Palestine. All these issues are coupled with an iron fist opposing this submission and obedience. Many politicians are even expecting more changing dynamics in the region such as Henry Kissinger (Kissinger 2011), according to these dynamics one can assume that the role of the public, opposition, and NGOs should be diminished.

Furthermore, concerning the State-level of analysis, the formalization of foreign policy does not occur through any single decision-making procedure. Rather, there are a number of variables that determine how exactly this progress is made, among them the nature of the political system (Otieno, n.d.). States' foreign policy and domestic conditions are correlated. That is why the Egyptian regime is always seeking to consolidate fasten relations with the United States and work on implementing its agenda in the Arab world at the expense of suppressing freedom, opposition, and any other adequate alternative for it.

The case that will be explained

The key model that will be analyzed in the Middle East is “Egypt” and its foreign relation with the United States. Among the reason for choosing Egypt, is that Egypt has played a leading and influential role in the Arab world since the fifties during the last century. Moreover, its strategic location, as it borders Palestine, has made it a focus country for the United States, as the latter is always concerned with the security of Israel. In addition, it has contributed to and supported the liberation of Palestine against the Israeli occupation.

Nevertheless, the regional role of Egypt has recently declined (Ottaway 2012), especially in issues such as the war in Yemen, Syria, and the waning influence of supporting the Palestinian case. Meanwhile, other Arab states have increased their role in the region and cooperation with the United States, these countries include Saudi Arabia and The United Arab Emirates. Added to this, some of the privileges that Egypt has introduced to the United States, for instance allowing the usage of the airspace of Egypt or even providing facilities for the United States for crossing

the Suez Canal, are no longer special or unique (Al-Minshawi 2018). For some scholars, the concept of financial aid has become an old perception of the mutual relations between Egypt and the United States. In other words, this relationship became more comprehensive and related more to regional matters (Al-Minshawi 2018).

however, keeping Egypt as a close ally is of paramount importance to broaden the domination throughout the Arab world. Therefore, the real promotion and expansion of democracy through the region, including Egypt, arguably, have the potential to substitute allies with regimes that could be substantially antagonistic toward the United States (Lesch and Haas 2018).

Civil Society organization analysis

In this case, A basis for comparison between democracy and freedom before and after the revolution of 2011 will be provided here to give an evaluation of the performance of the CSOs and clarify the changing position and capabilities of the CSOs in Egypt regarding their role in and endeavors in seeking these objectives. In addition, this comparison will be used to illustrate and analyze the dire situation we have reached, after ten years from the revolution in 2011, due to the suppressive politics of the government. This comparison is based on the reports of Amnesty International during the whole decade demonstrating how authoritarian rule and repression have been exacerbated in Egypt. Based on the analysis of the activities of the CSOs and the severe politics the government practices towards the activists and even normal people an explanation could be elicited. Nonetheless, this kind of approach should not be generalized, as such kind of methods, in this case of CSOs, deal with various sorts of agencies. In other words, they are not homogeneous entities, neither on the regional nor domestic level. However, outcomes of analysis could be taken advantage of by paving the way for scholars to expound on this modern topic of study by introducing empirical knowledge for different models of CSOs (Qandil 2010).

In Egypt, several kinds of civil society organizations with various specifications have been active. Concerning Human rights organizations, (Khallaf n.d.) In 2007, Egypt had about 61 human rights organizations in total; Among the well-known human rights groups are the Egyptian Organization for Human Rights, the Egyptian Center for Housing Rights, and the Egyptian Association for Personal Rights. During the last decades, the Egyptian authority has been confining their activities and suppressing their practices. That is, from the government's perspective, due to the vague definition and understanding of the CSOs as entities, that have

different interests ranging from political, economic, social, cultural to environmental; plus, their intentions as a dubious form of opposition, especially since many of the CSOs receive donations from foreign countries. Thus, they might be implementing foreign agendas. Thus, in this research, we will focus mainly on CSOs specializing in and advocating human rights and democracy.

A further point is that the growing power and number of such organizations, in the period before the beginning of the revolutions, has managed to compete with the ruling regime and the deep state for mastery of state institutions and demand accountability and transparency in some internal and external policies and handling state property.

That is why, in 2014, when Abdel Fattah al-Sisi became president, it was not surprising that the sense of optimism with which the Egyptian uprisings were once characterized has been undone by such resilient authoritarianism. As a result, such totalitarian policies are hampering the capacity to not only support these organizations and social movements that are tirelessly striving to traverse this terrain of contention-through finding and implementing alternative avenues of opposition to authoritarianism, but also to hold accountable civil society's agents and activists and arbitrarily arrest them

Hence, the ruling regime always seeks to maintain strong foreign policies in order to sustain and guarantee its position and so that the international community turns a blind eye to the violations taking place on the domestic level against the CSOs.

In 2019, the reports of Amnesty International stated that the Egyptian prosecution must ensure that individuals under investigation by the SSSP shall receive guarantees of a fair trial and be able to appeal the legality of their detention prior to a verdict. In addition, the Egyptian government should establish an independent national monitoring system for all detention centers and ascertain that precise numbers of detainees in Egypt are published. However, the role of such an international NGO is yet to be effective or have tangible solutions regarding human rights matters in Egypt. This is still a pending issue that could be resolved by exposing these violations to the international community, so sanctions could be imposed on the ruling regime to mitigate the horrendous state human rights have reached in Egypt.

Chapter 2

The U.S. Foreign Policy

After Barak Obama came to power in 2009, he promised a different policy, especially towards the middle East, than the previous American republican president George W. Bush. He pursued a distinct speech in Cairo in which he promoted a new phase and policy (Nye 2020). For some who are not really involved in politics, the speech sounds inspirational. However, it has been proven through decades that the American policies do not depend on different visions of successive presidents, it is all about particular ideas and concepts like what has been mentioned before in the previous chapter. These concepts include power and direct and indirect intervention that could be mainly fruitful for the American side and not necessarily the other one.

For Obama, the main goal was to improve America's image internationally, especially in Islamic countries. He wanted to end America's involvement in wars and bring peace to the Middle East. This includes reaching out to opponents, reshaping relations with Russia so as to help free the world of nuclear weapons danger, and establishing greater significant collaboration with China over regional and global issues. In addition, he proclaimed that he is seeking to establish regional peaceful relations with the Middle East (Nye 2020).

The U.S. foreign policy towards the Middle East:

The United States progressively took over from the two western powers (Great Britain and France) in the region, following the Cold War's advancement into the Middle East. Meanwhile, on the other hand, starting from 1955, the Soviet Union had aided most of the Arab nations by providing arms to Egypt and supplying arms as well to some other Arab states. Later on, the United States began supporting Israel from the 1960s onward up to the end of the Cold War in 1991 (Lesch and Haas 2018). By the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s, The United States has tried to undermine the Arab dependence on the aid and support of the Soviet Union; Washington has tried to mediate between Egypt and Israel during the years after the war of 1967 so as to reach a compromise between the two parties and maintain peace in the Arab world. What is more, in 1970, President Nixon made it clear to the Soviet Union that the United States will not allow any kind of domination of the MENA region. Furthermore, Nixon has related the importance and American interest in the Middle East to the security of Europe and the Mediterranean Sea (Abd El Raheem Mustafa 1978).

In the meantime, during the post-Cold war period, the MENA region has witnessed more political integration and involvement in international politics (Korany 2016). The strategic and petrol-political importance of the region continued to expand during the Cold War. This significance reemerged during the post-Cold War, reflected in successive and significant United States undertakings within the region. Among these were the 1991 Gulf War, the Madrid-Oslo Middle East Peace Process from 1991 to 1993, the sanctions regime against Iraq from 1991 to 2003, and the 2003 invasion and consequent occupation of that country. Hence, such initiatives in the Middle East have been recognized as examples of the most drastic actions committed by the United States on the world stage in the years since the end of the Cold War (Lesch and Haas 2018).

The main events that have been shaping the Politics in the whole MENA region are the Arab-Israeli conflict as well as the Iranian politics inside the gulf region and its nuclear developments. A further point is the considerable wave of revolutions in several Arab nations that have been the Arab Spring. These revolutions that have taken place in the Middle East in 2011 have been a manifestation of the dissatisfaction of the Arab populations with their totalitarian governments (Korany and El-Mahdi 2012). All these incidents and developments have shed more light on the Middle East and emphasized the dangerous outcomes that could take place especially due to the increase of conflicts, wars and insecurity (Korany 2016). Persistent difficulties are being

encountered by many Arab countries in coping with these new challenges of the 21st century. And even Tunisia, which had better chances of coping with the post-revolution dilemmas, is still struggling in establishing a democratic system and enhancing its economic circumstances (Schueftan 2016).

In a speech delivered by Secretary of State Mike Pompeo in Cairo in January 2019, human rights records in opposing countries such as Syria and Iran were Condemned. whereas, at the same time, the administration of the United States is backing the rulers and overlooking human rights status in all other allies and loyal states in the same region. For Pompeo, the idea of a state, in the Middle East, was only concerning the ruling governments without bearing in mind the populations and the circumstances of these countries (K. Lehr et al. 2019). in the meantime, these authoritarian administrations of the partner states would serve another goal for the United States by supporting and benefiting the latter in containing Iran (K. Lehr et al. 2019).

In the Middle East, we have seen major upheavals and transformations that have taken place within this region in the form and exercise of power; In fact, the United States has spurred some of these changes, most notably the invasion of Iraq in 2003 as well as others, such as the series of insurgencies with which the region was engulfed in 2011. Such events have resulted in, in some instances, conflicts and civil wars a civil war (Ewers 2019). My analysis: Since American military intervention has taken place in Iraq, Syria, Yemen, and Libya, this supports the idea that states with internal divisions, tribal social nature, or Religious and sectarian differences and divisions are more prone to fall apart in front of American intervention and due to devastating policies of corrupted ruling regimes loyal to the United States.

During the reign of George W Bush (2001 - 2009), the main prevalent concept in his political rhetoric what was the promotion of human rights as a separate domain in foreign politics (Hancock 2007). Thus, in March 2001, while leading the U.S. delegation for the 57th meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, the leader of the American delegation made an assertion about the commitment to human rights concerns (Tahir-Kheli 2001).

And for more assurance about human rights, the secretary of state proclaimed that The United States' endeavors to come to sustain human rights in the world during the presidential term of Bush will certainly remain intact (Hancock 2007). As per the former president George W Bush:

"We shall continue to be the world's leading advocate for democracy and human rights. We shall continue to meet foreign government officials and insist that our views on human rights be known. We shall speak up for the dissidents, the victims of persecution, the tortured, and the dispossessed. We shall continue to tell the truth when we submit our Country Reports on Human Rights Practices to Congress and to the millions who now access them via the Internet. (Dobriansky 2001)"

Nonetheless, it was only a sort of propaganda for Bush and his team that was proven to be hypocrisy after the invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq and the crime wars that took place then. What was necessary then for the United States its power domination under the pretext of the war on terrorism. Thereafter, when Barack Obama became the president (2009 - 2017), some analysts expected a totally diverse foreign policy concerning the Middle East as he had stated that his Obama Doctrine was not going to be doctrinaire' as was the Bush Doctrine (Prifti and Springer 2018). He promoted a foreign policy program aimed at fostering collective security and pursuing " mutual welfare" in cooperation with other states. In addition, there has been assurance from his administration to follow more peaceful policies and altar the image of American foreign policy that has been affected badly, during the term of George W Bush, as a result waging wars and being involved in a tremendous number of casualties (Ackerman 2008).

"It's time to reject the counsel that says the American people would rather have someone who is strong and wrong than someone who is weak and right", Barak Obama (Ackerman 2008).

"It's time to say that we are the party that is going to be strong and right" Barak Obama (Ackerman 2008).

At the beginning of Obama's presidential term, he focused on different political rhetoric, toward the Arab world, that involved religious references from the Quran. He chose this kind of rhetoric to create allies and spheres of influence in order to maintain the continuity of status and power on the international level.

Among the ways insert good ease and increase the influence and termination of a country over another his arm exports and aids. The United States is it clear example and the biggest arms exporter for the Middle East. In effect, one of the principal world players and customers of the weapons industry and trade, for some time, has been the Middle East, at relatively large levels in

relation to its population; In this region, there are two sorts of states, some create buyers and specify large portion from their budget for buying arms from the United States, whereas, other Arabic states depends on military aid and grants by which The United states enforce its influence on their politics (Congressional Research Service 2020).

Top 10 customers of U.S. weapons, 2002–2016

Country	Total sales
1. Saudi Arabia	\$25.8 billion
2. Egypt	\$17.1 billion
3. Israel	\$15.2 billion
4. Taiwan	\$15.0 billion
5. Australia	\$10.5 billion
6. Japan	\$9.4 billion
7. South Korea	\$9.3 billion
8. Iraq	\$8.9 billion
9. United Kingdom	\$6.6 billion
10. United Arab Emirates	\$6.3 billion

(Thrall and Dorminey 2018)

The U.S.-Egyptian relations:

It was during the Cold War when this ongoing Egyptian-American relation has started, in particular, In the wake of the war of 1973, after which Egypt has halted its cooperation with the Soviet Union and embarked on building strong relations with the United States (Hanna 2015). In my opinion, this American policy has been clear since the Camp David peaceful treaty took place between Egypt and Israel – the American ally and the western implanted entity in the heart of the middle east – which has initiated a different kind of policy after many wars including the war of 1957, 1967, the attrition war and October 1973 Yom Kippur war. That is to say, peaceful relations and cooperation are more rewarding and fruitful from the American perspective. By enacting this treaty and after the visit of the former president Sadat to Jerusalem a new phase has started in Egypt which was the end of the National socialism, independence of the decision-making process, and political and economic policies – that have been followed by former President Jamal Abd El Naser, and the beginning of the capitalism and giving up the independence of our political and economic decision-making process. During this new phase and till the present time, Egypt has not been able to oppose the American policy towards it and it became a total follower creates policy and this is simply, according to some scholars, a result of a form of occupation that does not involve military or direct force. This means that this indirect force is being undertaken by national Egyptian figures employed by the administration of the United States; Their job is to make sure that their policies are being applied and that their interests are being served. In turn, The United States promise and guarantee support and protection for these Egyptian actors (Amin 2011).

By the time the relationship between Egypt and the United States became closer, and Egypt became a strong strategic ally in the Arab world. In this regard, some sort of activities has been seen during the last decade, including the American support to Egypt in terms of strengthening the latter's security and stability. A collaboration has been witnessed between the two countries in order to fight against the terrorist attacks that started to rise after the revolution of 2011. This has rationalized the strong relations between Egypt and the United States and the increase in the American arms imports to Egypt. Moreover, it is easy for the United States to pass their naval ships through the Suez Canal and their military aircraft to enter our borders in order to achieve their missions. Hence, by these privileges, we also provide The United States easy access to and deployment of its military in other Arab countries (Hanna 2015).

With respect to the American funding to the Egyptian government, in fact, for the past several years, in the time range between 1975 and 2009, Egypt has been considered America's top receiver of the USAID aid (USAID 2019). And with regard to financial matters, the main factor to be mentioned is an annual amount of US\$1.3 billion in military aid allocated to Egypt by the United States under the terms of the Camp David Agreements since 1987. Meanwhile, the grants of the United States to Egypt, during the two decades prior to the revolution, through USAID have been more or less stable (it has even mainly remained intact after the January 25 revolution); These grants amount to roughly \$250 million per year for the purposes of bolstering the economic development of Egypt and improving its infrastructure (Sharp 2012). Such assistance is not about showing generosity; rather, it is about the national interests of the United States. To put it another way, all aid bears an intention of intervention, irrespective of how disguised it is. As a consequence, such aid infringes on the recipient governments' national interest, national sovereignty, and independence of decision-making. Additionally, charity-based aid is generally prone to be halted by the giver at will (J. Stupak and M. Leitner 2001). Egypt is ranked as the second-largest beneficiary of the American military, financial assistance in the world after Israel, which still remains the number one receiver of U.S. military aid (Bremmer 2018).

And with regard to the mutual economic relation between the two parties, in spite of the powerful allegiance between Egypt and the United States, the economic ties between the countries sometimes faces ups and downs; It is time to modify the financial aspect of the allegiance, namely the pro-U.S trade insufficiency, the unstable economic aid, and the minimal U.S foreign direct investment (FDI). A further point is, based on the status and the system of the trade, aid, and investment between Egypt and the U.S, it can be determined that the economic and political ties are not fair to Egypt. When the benefits gained by the United States are compared to the benefits of Egypt, we can conclude that the most significant benefits accrue to the United States ("U.S. Relations with Egypt - United States Department of State" 2018).

U.S-exports to Egypt have been on the rise for the last decade, whereas the exports to the U.S have been quite unmoving. As a result, this status has caused a trade deficit in favor of the United States, amounting to approximately US\$ 2.5 billion per year. While this amount is relatively minor to the United States, it represents around 3% of the Egyptian GDP. Thus, it is crucial to boost and expand the U.S market access for Egyptian exports and to enhance their competitiveness through industrial reforms ("U.S. Relations with Egypt - United States Department of State" 2018). Furthermore, compared to U.S FDI in Brazil (US\$ 38.0 billion) and Mexico (US\$ 26.0 billion), the U.S FDI in Egypt in 1999 was about US\$ 2.2 billion, where 68%

goes to the petroleum industry. So, in order for Egypt to be able to receive more FDI from the United States, more reforms must be realized. In the meantime, the United States could be an essential actor in backing these reform initiatives. Whereas, Concerning the aid, after Israel, Egypt has been the second-largest receiver since 1978, reaching US\$ 80 billion, where US\$ 50 is for the military sector and US\$ 30 for economic assistance ("U.S. Relations with Egypt - United States Department of State" 2018).

Foreign aid and funding have taken other shapes as well. These include the funding of civil society organizations that work in many fields, among which are human rights CSOs. The vast majority of Egypt's civil society organizations are either charitable or public benefit organizations. However, there is a small number of CSOs specializing in the political and human rights fields. Nevertheless, the number of these kinds of CSOs does not exceed 25 % of the overall number, which was 29,000 in 2010 (Amānī Qindīl and Civicus (Association 1995). The former president Mubarak has always been seeking to not only impede the activities of CSOs and NGOs, which he does not approve of their political direction but also to praise and shed light on other organizations that are loyal to the regime; A number of human rights organizations, CSOs and syndicates have played a significant role with respect to creating broader political awareness among the public before the revolution of January 2011.

Later on, after the revolution and ousting of President Mubarak, the nature of the funding with such an organization was widely debated among different political currents in Egypt (Elagati 2013). Such controversy happened especially after Egyptian government authorities in February 2012 charged 43 human rights actors under the pretext of establishing NGOs without the required authorizations, besides, of course, the source of funding for such organizations (Elagati 2013). And what added to this kind of doubt was the fact that The Economist disclosed in October 2012 that some Gulf states had donated money to Salafist groups and parties in an effort to compete with the rival Muslim Brotherhood. This financial support has been used to fund Salafist speeches, websites, and television channels (The Economist 2012).

In 2022, the U.S blocked an aid of US\$ 130 million in annual security assistance amid human rights abuses, despite Biden's ongoing military assistance aid.; Several examples of governmental abuse include extrajudicial executions, abductions, torture, suppression of free and political speech through restricting media, and violating homosexuals, bisexuals, and transgender individuals (Jakes and El-Naggar 2022).

Human rights and hypocrisy in the American foreign policy:

In this part, I am going to explain more about the concept and the politics related to human rights in the United States foreign policy. We will focus mainly on the presidential term of Bush, Obama, and Trump (2001-2021). In fact, over decades, both Republican and Democratic American administrations have disregarded and overlooked human rights breaches in Egypt; this was done in order to continue providing financial and economic assistance and, of course, to maintain Egypt's position on America's side in return (Toosi 2018).

“Freedom and democracy are critical to defeating terror because free nations that respect human rights will help overcome hatred, resentment and the ideologies of murder”

George W. Bush

(“President Bush, Indonesian President Megawati Hold Joint Press Conference” 2003)

“The hundreds of millions of people in the Middle East are not condemned by history to live in despotism or that Islam, the faith of one-fifth of humanity, “is ” consistent with democracy”

George W. Bush

(“President Bush Discusses Freedom in Iraq and the Middle East” 2003)

With regard to the consideration of human rights during the presidential term of President Bush, it has been an expression of hypocrisy and false slogans. This real consideration was evident in the wars he conducted in Afghanistan and Iraq. The leaks from Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq are among the evidence of his political crimes. In 2004, the disclosures and leaks about the cruelty and torture of Iraqi war prisoners at Abu Ghraib as well as subsequent reports of ill-treatment of detainees at Guantanamo, have strengthened the negative reputation of the American endeavors and behavior. However, once congressional committees came down hard on Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and other high-level officials about such abuses and war crimes in May 2004, there was extensive coverage by Arab media about both internal debate and self-criticism occurring in the United States (Rugh 2006). Now that the United States had found no weapons of mass destruction (WMD) in Iraq. The situation became more complicated than before the war. The American authorities tried to save their face by pointing out that the United States had done a favor to Iraq and the world through the ouster of Saddam. Moreover, at the same time, they emphasized and praised their success in spreading democracy across the Middle East (Rugh 2006). During the period, there has been a big awareness among the Arabs of the real motive behind the invasion of Iraq.

Both the Middle East and North Africa have been regarded extensively as a region with the lowest level of political liberty than anywhere else in the world (Lesch and Haas 2018). Therefore, it was unlikely that Obama's aspirations for the advancement of democracy would be materialized in the foreseeable future (Lesch and Haas 2018). In the Speech of Obama in Cairo in 2009, he promised a new distinct policy toward the Arab Muslim world. He gave a speech that inspired optimism, as he was an eloquent and tactful speaker. Barack Obama concisely made his views clear during his speech in Cairo, where he affirmed that democracy does have its advantages. He stated that: *"no system of government can or should be imposed upon one nation by any other"* (THE WHITE HOUSE 2009).

Despite Obama's assertion of the importance of implementing democracy in his speech, he clarified how different his policy would compare to Bush's, as Bush has claimed that promoting democracy in the MENA region was a priority for his administration. Nevertheless, his government's foreign policy had nothing to do with these values related to democracy and human rights. Obama urged the propagation of democratic rule in the Middle East and North Africa in his 2009 Cairo speech. He thought that the "freedom agenda" of the George W. Bush government involved threatening or applying force to sustain the rise of peaceful democratic Middle-Eastern governments. However, of course, that had been a mistake from his perspective. Therefore, to recover the image of the United States, they needed to take a different approach, one that was less aggressive and more conciliatory (Lesch and Haas 2018).

Later on, after a couple of years, the revolution of 2011 broke out in Egypt. This revolution has been fomented due to the increasing dynamics of civic uprisings, civil disobedience, vigorous political mobilization, as well as the paramount role of social networks. Furthermore, these revolutionary movements have been not only demanding and seeking advancing democracy, employment, freedom, and social justice but also halting Arbitrary and unlawful arrests, torture and death in custody, enforced disappearances, and intensified constraints imposed on the freedom of expression and association (Toosi 2018). After ousting Mubarak, the people began to believe that the political demands would be met, and the smuggled money and wealth recovered. Nonetheless, after the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces temporarily took over the administration of the state until a fair presidential election could be held, the violence and arrests continued. What is more, the delay in holding parliamentary and presidential elections and amending the constitution continued in light of the policy of violence and violation of people's rights. The result in the following couple of years was a political struggle in which people were

victims. Meanwhile, it was not surprising not to see a really effective political help from the American side regarding defending human rights in Egypt; on the contrary, the United States government has been backing the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces. In effect, this is a typical way of conducting American politics. To put it more simply, the United States finds that the best way to pursue and maintain its goal is to consolidate strong relations with the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces. At the same time, the Council of the Armed Forces has had the same intention. Then, Obama's attitude was expected by many analysts; among the reasons for this prediction is his attitude toward the nuclear deal with Iran. That deal made him simply belittle Iranian human rights abuses and stay silent as grassroots protests erupted in Iran against election fraud in June 2009. In addition, he chose to place U.S. human rights considerations in the region second to this nuclear deal. Another example in Syria, he witnessed the transformation of Syria and the brutality of war, and the displacement of the people without any real initiation (Abrams 2017). Even Secretary Clinton stated that: *“Development must become ” an equal pillar of our foreign policy, alongside defense and diplomacy”*, but the concept of democracy was just not there (*“Remarks on Development in the 21st Century”* 2010). According to David Sanger, of the New York Times: *“In his first two years in office, Mr. Obama said little about democratic transformations as a core goal. . . . Now [in 2011] he has begun speaking of them as a central part of the ‘alternative narrative’ to [that of ideological enemies, e.g.] Al Qaeda’s theology, or Iran’s.”* (Sanger 2011).

Delivering his 2017 inaugural address, Donald J. Trump stated that: *“From this day forward, it’s going to be America first. America first . . . We will seek friendship and good will with the nations of the world, but we do so with the understanding that it is the right of all nations to put their own interests first.”* (Nye 2020,1)

During the presidential term of Donald Trump, the American side criticized the conditions of human rights in Egypt. Rex Tillerson, Donald Trump's first secretary of state, has reportedly been upset because El-Sisi passed a law that imposed harsh restrictions on civil society groups. A further cause for his attitude is that Egypt, apparently, is more or less following the North Korean model in the dictatorship. Furthermore, Tillerson as well pointed out that he was disappointed with the judicial prosecution of plenty of people who work for many NGOs that advocate democracy and human rights. Notwithstanding, it turned out set the main reason why he criticized this law of the NGOs and detaining activists is that among the defendants were 17 Americans, and most of them were tried in absentia. Accordingly, the American aid was suspended (Toosi 2018). Indeed, at one point, Tillerson has before diminished and undermined the emphasis on

furthering American principles of human rights and democracy worldwide. Nonetheless, suspending the funds have had repercussions. As a result, a new procedure has been arranged for the NGO employees (Toosi 2018).

Sustaining democratic reform is a primary normative objective emanating from American values. Yet that objective will be embraced by U.S. political figures as long as such advocacy does not jeopardize the material interests of the United States. Failing that premise, American leaders will probably make little effort to support the protesters over the brutal government repression like what has happened in Bahrain (Lesch and Haas 2018).

Chapter 3

Civil Society Organizations

The role of Civil Society Organisations:

In fact, in the 1990s, it became common for the term "civil society" to appear in Arab thinking and research. But, Prior to that, one was used to considering the state and society broadly in the absence of the addition of the concept of "civil." Notwithstanding, after the expansion of neoliberalism and the accelerated tempo of changes, the impact of civil society organizations has increased. These profound modifications drove many researchers to refer to them as the globalization of democracy (Hassan 2009).

There have been widespread concerns in a number of developing countries about the unfair distribution of wealth and the skyrocketing rate of corruption since the 1990s. this corrupted policy has created a deep state that has resulted from the international neoliberal policy. as a consequence, this policy has had a catastrophic impact on the majority of the Egyptian people by impeding the deprived people from participating in the development (Rabab El-Mahdi 2011). Rising rates of poverty, wealth inequality and deprivation are among the major worries voiced by scholars, human rights activists, and development practitioners (Harvey 2005). From here comes the importance of the role of civil society organizations in Egypt, given that their national objectives embody the demands of the grassroots. The goals revolve around the demand for a fair distribution of the state's national income, political and economic reforms, supervision and accountability for fraud and corruption, enacting laws that guarantee citizens' rights and defending detainees in cases of protest and freedom of opinion. these are all features that share the concept of civil society of being the connection and medium between the individuals, the community, and their state (Howell and Pearce 2002).

In parallel with the repressive policies of the state and the monopoly of political thought and decision-making, the international community remains conversant and acutely aware of the dimensions of domestic and foreign policy and the relations between them (Talani 2017). In 2007, after holding the General Conference of the Arab Network for NGOs in Kuwait, the idea of measuring and assessing the effectiveness and influence of civil society was raised (Qandil 2010). The evaluation of civil society effectiveness is carried out in a cumulative cognitive framework. Besides, it includes an integrated Egyptian and Arab team of experts and professionals in

sociology, political science, and information technology, and takes into account Arab and foreign experiences and references (Qandil 2010).

The state remained relatively robust for a time to subjugate society by means of its arbitrary apparatus which includes the military, and state security institutions (Kassem 2004). It was noticed during the last decade that the West, including Europe and the United State, has been inclined to regard civil society as a promoter of the process of democracy-building, most notably in the Middle East and the Arab world (Abdalla 2008).

Outcomes and challenges of their Activity:

Indeed, a functional civil society exists by enabling diverse groups who may have opposing views, to work collectively in a productive manner. Besides, it facilitates a consensual process of accommodating and bringing together diverse interests that limit the capacity of a single group or ideology to prevail over others. Meanwhile, it enhances the development yields and increases the number of intellectuals and academics. Nevertheless, this type of engagement, reconciliation, and rewarding social outcomes that emerge from such a process has remained absent in both developing countries that are experiencing authoritarian regimes and recently democratized nations (Rabab El-Mahdi 2011). However, the adoption of laws and the decision-making process strongly rested on some theoretical principles, such as bureaucratic authoritarianism and Oriental despotism (Fahmy 2002). In Egypt, tensions and ambiguity still exist in the relationship between government and civil society organizations. Furthermore, the authority in Egypt has become even more bureaucratic over the last decades. This means that the government is the only entity that has the capability to take decisions think, create or suggest ideas in order to organize social, political, and economic life—added to this, the government's monopoly over opinion and decision in the production and distribution of services and essential goods. Moreover, the government also managed cultural life (Qandil 2008). Further, reflecting the national public opinion and the real needs of the people is no longer among the government's main goals. On the contrary, the authority is now focusing on twisting the public opinion and suppressing specific views so as to create a fake and more harmonized public opinion. The government considers itself above all kinds of Categories and groups of the public controlling it through the centralization of power (Qandil 2008).

Western CSOs:

In effect, it is impossible for NGOs to be established or operate if they do not have external funding, in particular, if they work for the interests of citizens or if they are political in nature. On the contrary, the Egyptian authority forbids them from obtaining funding unless they are authorized to do so, which is seldom provided (Abdalla 2008). Thus, it is essential for civil society organizations to have sufficient financial resources to ensure their independence. Nevertheless, most such organizations in Egypt do not have these resources. As a result, this opens these organizations up to exploitation by their governments or by foreign donors. (Hassan 2009). The United States has allocated a great deal of its economic aid to finance its NGOs in Egypt after the revolution of 2011 and ousting of Mubarak. However, this happened after the Egyptian government had halted and illegalized the activities of the American NGOs (Ottaway 2012). In addition, this problem of foreign support, especially for those Egyptians who work to advocate for human rights, can be a source of great conflict with their respective local governments. (Hassan 2009)

Indeed, Egypt is in need of this bilateral relationship with the United States, given the strong influence the United States can practice on the decision of the IMF. Thus, stable relations between the two countries would ease the decisions of the IMF to provide loans to Egypt in the post-revolution period in which a fragile economy has been witnessed. (Ottaway 2012)

While not officially licensed and receiving funds from the United States, American NGOs promoting and supporting democracy were bolder in their activities in Egypt. These NGOs include (Freedom House, NDI, the International Center for Journalists, and IRI) (Ottaway 2012). Furthermore, Egyptian civil society must maintain a certain level of autonomy with respect to any foreign intervention and influence and their oppressive regime. This autonomy is substantial since funding and implanting foreign ideas and agendas in some organizations might bring about the penetration of ambiguous ideas among human rights advocates and opposing figures, divisions among the opposition, and weak trust in national figures and personalities.

Amnesty international in Egypt:

Further, with respect to global NGOs, I will also use Amnesty International's evidence of human rights violations. First, the AI is a neutral international NGO. The AI researches and uncovers the facts about human rights abuses. In doing so, it aids people in claiming their rights. Moreover, it conducts extensive efforts to lobby governments and other potent entities. Thereby, it helps

ensure that governments fulfill their obligations and abide by the law (Amnesty International 2014).

Amnesty International in Egypt has been active for years. It introduces reports on human rights there per year. According to its reports in 2020/2021), It is stated that the Egyptian prosecution should make sure that individuals under investigation by the Supreme State Security Prosecution (SSSP) receive guarantees of a fair trial. Besides, arrested individuals should be able to appeal the legality of their detention before a proper judge at any time. In addition, The Egyptian government should establish an independent national monitoring system for all detention centers; and ascertain that precise numbers of detainees in Egypt are published.

According to the "Amnesty International Egypt," The government authorities have repeatedly targeted human rights activists, members of the opposition, and politicians by fabricating false accusations. In addition, they have conducted harsh interrogation, wrongfully prosecuted them, and placed them on a "terrorist list." (Amnesty International Egypt, n.d.). There are thousands of arbitrarily detained people. These arrested individuals are journalists, university students, businessmen, and non-violent protesters. These arbitrary arrests are simply because of the nature of their jobs or their political opinions. So, they may face torture and enforced disappearances (Amnesty International 2021).

In addition, numerous workers have been subjected to arrests and prosecutions as a result of using the legal right to strike. Plus, the inhabitants of illegal urban neighborhoods have suffered violent evictions. Furthermore, the Egyptian government launched a crackdown on offline and online freedom of expression.

The government launched a crackdown on offline and online freedom of expression. Moreover, the Police raided the office of the independent news site al-Manassa in Cairo on the 24th of June 2020 to arrest its editor-in-chief, Noura Younes, for a short time. What is more, several hundred websites for news, human rights, and other purposes continued to be suspended (Amnesty International 2021).

Only during last year, a minimum of nine health care employees have been arbitrarily arrested. That was due to expressing their opinions on their social media regarding safety concerns or expressing criticism of their government's management of the pandemic; they have been kept in custody on charges of terrorism and spreading false news. Moreover, detention environments continued to be gruesome and inhumane, with detainees deprived of reasonable medical care. This situation stayed the same even during COVID-19 (Amnesty International 2021).

Officials kept heavily curtailing the freedom of association of human rights organizations, political parties as well as financing of human rights bodies. There has been a case referred to as Case 173 where at least 31 employees of civil society organizations are on the list o be banned from leaving the country for any reason (Amnesty International 2021).

However, the role of such an international NGO is yet to be effective or have tangible solutions regarding human rights matters in Egypt. This is still a pending issue that could be resolved by exposing these violations to the international community, so sanctions could be imposed on the ruling regime so as to mitigate the horrendous state human rights have reached in Egypt.

Conclusion

In conclusion, and after all has been said and done, the creation of rights in political thought is regarded as not only a modern development but also hard to conclude a basic framework for Human rights. That is to say, creating one human rights model or form is not reached so far. However, a broad perception and minimum level of acknowledging them are still taken into account. In spite of the vast awareness of the international community by this minimum consideration of human rights, many countries all over the world still neglect or intentionally overlook violations and infringements. Until that day, when hideous abuses take place in any developing country, many activists and agencies seek to criticize and fight this kind of violation. Added to this, they also try to uncover these crimes to the whole international community. However, the thing is that the whole international community was its major influencing powers cannot be relied on; this is because there is no real effective action that could be taken against the abusing governments.

On the contrary, such key powers keep supporting and backing these kinds of totalitarian regimes and overlook the high morals and values they try to spread worldwide. What drives them to do so is the factor of interest. To put it more simply, the concept of interest is a significant factor that shapes policies in the whole world. Thus, what drives any country to take any kind of action is preserving and maintaining its own interest. That is why the United States is enforcing its domination on the whole Middle East to benefit from this relation and fulfill its political and economic interests, as we mentioned before. Even though the United States has for decades claimed an outstanding position in the promotion of international human rights, it has been proved that all its morals and democratic slogans have been nothing but hypocrisy. That was clear in how the United States has acted in the war on Iraq, Syria, and its proxy war in Yemen. Besides supporting the Egyptian administrations from the 70s till that day. This kind of support is represented in military assistance, loans from the International Monetary Fund to pressure the government and offering guarantees for maintaining the ruling regime. That being so, we should never entirely rely on foreign governments. This changing power should come from within our nation; for example, by making people more aware of their rights, showing solidarity with deprived and abused people, and finding all legitimized ways to support our national CSOs by intellectuals from different specifications and fields and authorized financial means. Civil society organizations ought to take a more critical role in political, economic, social, and cultural life. It

should maintain its role as a platform for people to express themselves and their needs and participate in public affairs. Both entities, government, and CSOs, should be accountable, transparent, and cooperative. However, obstacles faced by CSOs, in countries like Egypt, due to the suppression policies of authoritarian regimes could also be solved with the unconditional support of some international actors. What is of great importance is to make sure that all kinds of policies against the government should be peaceful and reasonable. Criticizing abuses and advocating legal rights will always be a priority for the Egyptian society as this is the only way to create better living conditions for the majority of the Egyptian people and to impede any possibility of infringements in the future.

Bibliography

- Abd El Raheem Mustafa, Ahmed. 1978. *The United States and the Arab East*. Kuwait: عالم المعرفة, knowledge world Kuwait.
- Abdalla, Nadine H. 2008. "Civil Society in Egypt: A Catalyst for Democratization?" ICNL. August 4, 2008. <https://www.icnl.org/resources/research/ijnl/civil-society-in-egypt-a-catalyst-for-democratization>.
- Abrams, Elliott. 2017. *Realism and Democracy : American Foreign Policy after the Arab Spring*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ackerman, Spencer. 2008. "The Obama Doctrine." The American Prospect. March 19, 2008. <https://prospect.org/features/obama-doctrine/>.
- Ahmadi, Jila, and Afshin Zargar. 2019. "(PDF) Human Rights in US Foreign Policy." ResearchGate. January 2019. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/353719982_Human_Rights_in_US_Foreign_Policy.
- Ainsworth, Scott, and Itai Sened. 1993. "The Role of Lobbyists: Entrepreneurs with Two Audiences." *American Journal of Political Science* 37 (3): 834. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2111576>.
- Al-Minshawi, Mohammed. 2018. "أهمية القاهرة للولايات المتحدة - محمد المنشاوي - بوابة الشروق", the Importance of Cairo to the United States." [Www.shorouknews.com](http://www.shorouknews.com). July 26, 2018. <https://www.shorouknews.com/mobile/columns/view.aspx?cdate=26072018&id=9f173883-46c2-4dd7-b09f-416d53371abe>.
- Alahmed, Anas. 2011. "Voice of the Arabs Radio: Its Effects and Political Power during the Nasser Era (1953-1967)." *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://www.academia.edu/3308119/Voice_of_the_Arabs_Radio_Its_Effects_and_Political_Power_During_the_Nasser_Era_1953_1967_.
- Albareda, Adrià. 2018. "Connecting Society and Policymakers? Conceptualizing and Measuring the Capacity of Civil Society Organizations to Act as Transmission Belts." *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 29 (6): 1216–32. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-018-00051-x>.
- Alexander, Jeffrey C, and International Sociological Association. 1998. *Real Civil Societies : Dilemmas of Institutionalization*. London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Altan-Olcay, Ozlem, and Ahmet Icduygu. 2012. "Mapping Civil Society in the Middle East: The Cases of Egypt, Lebanon and Turkey." *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 39 (2): 157–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13530194.2012.709699>.
- Amānī Qindīl, and Civicus (Association. 1995. *Civil Society in the Arab World : Private Voluntary Organizations*. Washington, D.C.: Civicus.

- Amin, Galal. 2011. *مصر والمصريون في عهد مبارك : ١٩٨١-٢٠١١* / *Egypt and the Egyptians in the Mubarak Era*. دار الشروق Dar Alshorouq.
- Amnesty International. 2014. "Who We Are." Amnesty.org. 2014. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/who-we-are/>.
- . 2021. "Document." Wwww.amnesty.org. Amnesty International Ltd. 2021. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/pol10/3202/2021/en/>.
- Amnesty International Egypt. n.d. "Egypt Archives." Amnesty International. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/location/middle-east-and-north-africa/egypt/>.
- Anheier, Helmut K. 2010. *International Encyclopedia of Civil Society*. New York: Springer.
- Aragonès, Enriqueta, and Santiago Sánchez-Pagés. 2009. "A Theory of Participatory Democracy Based on the Real Case of Porto Alegre." *European Economic Review* 53 (1): 56–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2008.09.006>.
- Armstrong, David, Valeria Bello, Julie Gilson, and Debora Spini, eds. 2011. *Civil Society and International Governance : The Role of Non-State Actors in Global and Regional Regulatory Frameworks*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon England ; New York: Routledge.
- Babajanian, Babken, Sabine Freizer, and Daniel Stevens. 2005. "Introduction: Civil Society in Central Asia and the Caucasus." *Central Asian Survey* 24 (3): 209–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02634930500310287>.
- Barakat, Zahraa, and Ali Fakih. 2021. "Determinants of the Arab Spring Protests in Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya: What Have We Learned?" *Social Sciences* 10 (8): 282. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci10080282>.
- Barkin, J.Samuel. 2003. "Realist Constructivism." *International Studies Review* 5 (3): 325–42. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1079-1760.2003.00503002.x>.
- Baylis, John, Steve Smith, and Patricia Owens. 2014. *The Globalization of World Politics : An Introduction to International Relations*. New York, Ny: Oxford University Press.
- Binderkrantz, Anne Skorkjær. 2009. "Membership Recruitment and Internal Democracy in Interest Groups: Do Group–Membership Relations Vary between Group Types?" *West European Politics* 32 (3): 657–78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402380902779162>.
- Bremmer, Ian. 2018. "The Winners of Trump's Foreign Policy - Year One." CIRSD. 2018. <https://www.cirsd.org/en/horizons/horizons-winter-2018-issue-no-10/the-winners-of-trumps-foreign-policy>.
- Brooker, Paul. 1997. *Defiant Dictatorships : Communist and Middle-Eastern Dictatorships in a Democratic Age*. Basingstoke ; London: Macmillan.
- Burchill, Scott, Andrew Linklater, and Richard Devetak. 2005. *Theories of International Relations*. Basingstoke Palgrave Macmillan.
- Carlsnaes, Walter, Thomas Risse, and Beth A Simmons. 2013. *Handbook of International Relations*. London: Sage.

- Chandler, Alfred D. 1969. *Strategy and Structure : Chapters in the History of the Industrial Enterprise*. Cambridge, Mass: M.I.T. Press.
- Chandler, David. 2005. *Constructing Global Civil Society : Morality and Power in International Relations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Choi, Seung-Whan, and Patrick James. 2017. "Are US Foreign Policy Tools Effective in Improving Human Rights Conditions?" *The Chinese Journal of International Politics* 10 (3): 331–56. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cjip/pox010>.
- Collier, Paul, and Anke Hoeffler. 2004. "Greed and Grievance in Civil War." *Oxford Economic Papers* 56 (4): 563–95. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3488799>.
- Congressional Research Service. 2020. "Arms Sales in the Middle East: Trends and Analytical Perspectives for U.S. Policy." <https://sgp.fas.org/crs/mideast/R44984.pdf>.
- Cozette, Murielle. 2004. "Realistic Realism? American Political Realism, Clausewitz and Raymond Aron on the Problem of Means and Ends in International Politics." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 27 (3): 428–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1362369042000282976>.
- Crawford, Robert M A. 2000. *Idealism and Realism in International Relations : Beyond the Discipline*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Dagger, Richard. 2019. "Neoconservatism | Political Philosophy | Britannica." In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/neoconservatism>.
- Department of State. 1985. *American Foreign Policy Current Documents, 1982*. Washington: Dept. Of State.
- Dobriansky, Paula. 2001. "Dobriansky, Testimony on Human Rights, 24 May 2001." [Www.mtholyoke.edu](http://www.mtholyoke.edu). March 24, 2001. <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/bush/dobriansky2.htm>.
- El-Mahdi, Rabab. 2011. *Empowered Participation or Political Manipulation? : State, Civil Society and Social Funds in Egypt and Bolivia*. Leiden ; Boston: Brill.
- Elagati, Mohamed. 2013. "Foreign Funding in Egypt after the Revolution." https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/162759/WP_EGYPT.pdf.
- Ewers, Elisa Catalano. 2019. "Hearing on Assessing U.S. Policy Priorities in the Middle East." JSTOR. 2019. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep28741>.
- Fahmy, Ninette S. 2002. *The Politics of Egypt : State-Society Relationship*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Fateh Media - فلسطين. 2020. "المطامع الأمريكية الشرق الأوسط - فتح ميديا , American Ambitions in the Middle East." Fateh Media. January 11, 2020. <https://www.fatehgaza.com/p/7213>.
- Fearon, James, and Alexander Wendt. 2002. "Rationalism v. Constructivism: A Skeptical View." In *Handbook of International Relations*, edited by Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth A Simmons. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

- Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. 2001. "TAKING STOCK: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 4 (1): 391–416. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.4.1.391>.
- Foust, Joshua. 2011. "Revisiting the Obama Doctrine." *The American Prospect*. May 6, 2011. <https://prospect.org/article/revisiting-obama-doctrine/>.
- Glenn Peter Hastedt. 2004. *Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy*. New York: Facts On File, Cop.
- "Glossary of Summaries - EUR-Lex." 2020. Europa.eu. 2020. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/summary/glossary/civil_society_organisation.html.
- Gøsta Esping-Andersen. 1998. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- GREENWOOD, JUSTIN. 2007. "Organized Civil Society and Democratic Legitimacy in the European Union." *British Journal of Political Science* 37 (2): 333–57. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0007123407000166>.
- Greenwood, Royston, and Danny Miller. 2010. "Tackling Design Anew: Getting back to the Heart of Organizational Theory." *Academy of Management Perspectives* 24 (4): 78–88. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2010.55206386>.
- Grugel, Jean. 2003. "Democratisation Studies Globalisation: The Coming of Age of a Paradigm." *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 5 (2): 258–83. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-856x.00106>.
- Hamid, Shadi. 2011. "Egypt: The Prize." In *The Arab Awakening: America and the Transformation of the Middle East*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Hancock, Jan. 2007. *Human Rights and US Foreign Policy*. London ; New York, Ny: Routledge.
- Hanna, Michael Wahid. 2015. "Getting over Egypt: Time to Rethink Relations." *Foreign Affairs* 94 (6): 67–73. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43946542>.
- Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford Oxford University Press.
- Hassan, Hamdy A. 2009. "The State and Civil Society in Africa: A North African Perspective." *Papers.ssrn.com*. Rochester, NY. February 1, 2009. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1698308.
- Hegel, Friedrich, and Helmut Reichelt. 1972. *Grundlinien Der Philosophie Des Rechts Oder Naturrecht Und Staatswissenschaft Im Grundrisse : Mit Hegels Eigenhändigen Notizen in Seinem Handexemplar Und Den Mündlichen Zusätzen*. Frankfurt Am Main: Ullstein.
- Hendawi, Hamza. 2018. "Egypt's Leader Says Arab Spring Uprising Was Ill-Advised." *Fox News*. Fox News, Associated Press. November 5, 2018. <https://www.foxnews.com/world/egypts-leader-says-arab-spring-uprising-was-ill-advised>.
- Hopf, Ted. 1998. "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory." *International Security* 23 (1): 171–200. <https://doi.org/10.1162/isec.23.1.171>.

- Howell, Jude, and Jenny Pearce. 2002. *Civil Society & Development : A Critical Exploration*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner.
- Huber, Evelyne, and John D Stephens. 2001. *Development and Crisis of the Welfare State : Parties and Policies in Global Markets*. Chicago: The University Of Chicago Press.
- Ignatieff, Michael. 2005. *American Exceptionalism and Human Rights*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- J. Stupak, Ronald, and Peter M. Leitner. 2001. "Realism Revisited: Philosophical Assumptions, Power Patterns, and American Foreign Policy [PDF] [7sv9atdim860]." Vdoc.pub. Southern Public Administration Education Foundation, Inc. January 2001. <https://vdoc.pub/documents/realism-revisited-philosophical-assumptions-power-patterns-and-american-foreign-policy-7sv9atdim860>.
- Jakes, Lara, and Mona El-Naggar. 2022. "U.S. Blocks \$130 Million in Aid for Egypt over Rights Abuses." *The New York Times*, January 28, 2022, sec. U.S. <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/01/28/us/politics/egypt-us-human-rights.html>.
- Jung, Hoyoon. 2019. "The Evolution of Social Constructivism in Political Science: Past to Present." *SAGE Open* 9 (1): 215824401983270. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019832703>.
- K. Lehr, Amy, Michael J. Green, Victor Cha, Jon B. Alterman, Judd Devermont, Sara M. Allinder, Melissa Dalton, Mark L. Schneider, and Erol Yayboke. 2019. "Human Rights in a Shifting Landscape, Recommendations for Congress." Washington: Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). https://csis-website-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/publication/190906_Lehr%20et%20al_HRICompendium_WEB.pdf.
- Kagan, Robert. 2014. "Superpowers Don't Get to Retire." *The New Republic*. May 26, 2014. <https://newrepublic.com/article/117859/superpowers-dont-get-retire>.
- Kagan, Robert, and William Kristol. 2000. *Present Dangers : Crisis and Opportunity in American Foreign and Defense Policy*. San Francisco, Ca: Encounter Books.
- Kaldor, Mary. 2003. "The Idea of Global Civil Society." *International Affairs* 79 (3): 583–93. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.00324>.
- . 2011. *Global Civil Society an Answer to War*. Cambridge Polity-Press.
- Kassem, Maye. 2004. *Egyptian Politics : The Dynamics of Authoritarian Rule*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Khallaf, Mahi. n.d. "1 Civil Society in Egypt: A Literature Review." CiteSeer. Accessed March 4, 2022. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.476.7708>.
- Kissinger, Henry. 2011. "Henry Kissinger at 99: How to Avoid Another World War." Edited by Interview by Niall Ferguson. *Www.thetimes.co.uk*, June 2011, sec. the sunday times magazine. <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/henry-kissinger-at-99-how-to-avoid-another-world-war-lwt6q5vbq>.

- Korany, Bahgat. 2016. "The Middle East since the Cold War: The Multi-Layered (In)Security Dilemma." In *International Relations of Middle East*, edited by Louise Fawcett. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Korany, Bahgat, and Rabab El-Mahdi. 2012. *Arab Spring in Egypt : Revolution and Beyond*. Cairo: The American University In Cairo Press.
- Lamont, Christopher K. 2015. *Research Methods in International Relations*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Laski, Harold J. 1967. *A Grammar of Politics*. London: G. Allen & Unwin.
- Legro, Jeffrey W., and Andrew Moravcsik. 1999. "Is Anybody Still a Realist?" *International Security* 24 (2): 5–55. <https://doi.org/10.1162/016228899560130>.
- Lesch, David W, and Mark L Haas. 2018. *The Middle East and the United States : History, Politics, and Ideologies*. New York, Ny: Routledge.
- Lipson, Charles. 2005. *Reliable Partners How Democracies Have Made a Separate Peace*. Princeton, Nj Princeton Univ. Press.
- Madison, Gary Brent, and Proquest Firm. 2003. *The Political Economy of Civil Society and Human Rights*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Mann, James. 2014. *The Obamians : The Struggle inside the White House to Redefine American Power*. New York: Viking.
- Mann, Robin, David Dallimore, Howard Davis, Graham Day, and Marta Eichsteller. 2022. *Local Civil Society : Place, Time and Boundaries*. Bristol: Policy Press, An Imprint Of Bristol University Press.
- Maritain, Jacques. 1970. *True Humanism*. Freeport, N.Y.
- Marlies Glasius, David Lewis, and Hakan Seckinelgin. 2004. *Exploring Civil Society : Political and Cultural Contexts*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- McKay, Alasdair, ed. 2011. "Edited Collection - the Arab Spring of Discontent." E-International Relations. June 30, 2011. <https://www.e-ir.info/2011/06/30/the-arab-spring-of-discontent-an-exclusive-publication-by-e-ir/>.
- Mirshak, Nadim. 2019. "Rethinking Resistance under Authoritarianism: Civil Society and Non-Contentious Forms of Contestation in Post-Uprisings Egypt." *Social Movement Studies* 18 (6): 702–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2019.1627865>.
- Monshipouri, Mahmood, and Ali Assareh. 2011. "The New Middle East and the United States: What to Expect after the Uprisings?" *Www.proquest.com. Insight Turkey*. 2011. <https://www.proquest.com/docview/884550204/3C30EE8842084298PQ/9?accountid=146310>.
- Morgenthau, Hans, and Kenneth W Thompson. 1982. *In Defense of the National Interest*. Washington, D.C. University Press Of America.
- Mueller, John. 2005. "The Iraq Syndrome." *Foreign Affairs* 84 (6): 44. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20031775>.

- Natan Sharansky, and Ron Dermer. 2009. *The Case for Democracy : The Power of Freedom to Overcome Tyranny and Terror*. Publicaffairs.
- Natil, Ibrahim, Chiara Pierobon, and Lilian Tauber. 2019. *The Power of Civil Society in the Middle East and North Africa : Peace-Building, Change, and Development*. Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, Ny: Routledge.
- Nye, Joseph S. 2005. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs.
- . 2020. *Do Morals Matter? : Presidents and Foreign Policy from FDR to Trump*. New York, Ny: Oxford University Press.
- Obama, Barack. 2009. “Remarks by the President at the Acceptance of the Nobel Peace Prize.” Whitehouse.gov. December 10, 2009. <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-acceptance-nobel-peace-prize>.
- Otieno, Alvin AKOKO. n.d. “Levels of Analysis and Foreign Policy.” *Www.academia.edu*. https://www.academia.edu/6623315/Levels_of_Analysis_and_Foreign_Policy.
- Ottaway, Marina. 2012. “Getting Priorities Right: American NGOs and U.S.-Egypt Relations.” Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. February 13, 2012. <https://carnegieendowment.org/2012/02/13/getting-priorities-right-american-ngos-and-u.s.-egypt-relations-pub-47164>.
- Pagoulatos, George, and Panayiota Kastritis. 2013. “Theorizing and Assessing Civil Society: A Review of Approaches.” Jean Monnet Chairs. March 2013. https://jmonneteuldc.files.wordpress.com/2013/11/pagoulatos_kastritis.pdf.
- Pérez-Díaz, Víctor. 2014. “Civil Society: A Multi-Layered Concept.” *Current Sociology* 62 (6): 812–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392114533115>.
- “Permanent State of Exception: Abuses by the Supreme State Security Prosecution in Egypt.” 2019. Amnesty International. November 27, 2019. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/campaigns/2019/11/egypt-permanent-state-of-exception-abuses-by-the-supreme-state-security-prosecution/>.
- Pijl, Kees van der, and Harry Sminia. 2004. “Strategic Management of Public Interest Organizations.” *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 15 (2): 137–55. <https://doi.org/10.1023/b:volu.0000033178.54004.e9>.
- “President Bush Discusses Freedom in Iraq and Middle East.” 2003. Georgewbush-Whitehouse.archives.gov. November 6, 2003. <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/11/20031106-2.html>.
- “President Bush, Indonesian President Megawati Hold Joint Press Conference.” 2003. Georgewbush-Whitehouse.archives.gov. October 22, 2003. <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/10/20031022-2.html>.
- Price, Richard. 1998. “Reversing the Gun Sights: Transnational Civil Society Targets Land Mines.” *International Organization* 52 (3): 613–44. <https://doi.org/10.1162/002081898550671>.

- . 2003. "Transnational Civil Society and Advocacy in World Politics." *World Politics* 55 (4): 579–606. <https://doi.org/10.1353/wp.2003.0024>.
- Prifti, Bledar, and Springer. 2018. *US Foreign Policy in the Middle East the Case for Continuity*. Cham: Springer International Publishing Palgrave Macmillan.
- Qandil, Amany. 2008. *The Arab Encyclopedia of Civil Society*. Cairo: Egyptian General Book Authority, الهيئة المصرية العامة للكتاب.
- . 2010. مؤشرات فاعلية منظمات المجتمع المدني العربي, *Indicators of the Effectiveness of Arab Civil Society Organizations*. Vol. 33. الشبكة العربية للمنظمات الاهلية, The Arab Network for NGOs.
- "Remarks on Development in the 21st Century." 2010. U.S. Department of State. January 6, 2010. <https://2009-2017.state.gov/secretary/20092013clinton/rm/2010/01/134838.htm>.
- Reus-Smit, Christian. 2007. "Constructivism." In *Theories of International Relations (Third Edition)*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rhodes, R A W, Sarah A Binder, and Bert A Rockman. 2006. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rosato, Sebastian, and John Schuessler. 2011. "A Realist Foreign Policy for the United States." *Perspectives on Politics* 9 (4): 803, 803–19. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41623695>.
- Rosenthal, Joel. 1995. "Rethinking the Moral Dimensions of Foreign Policy." In *Controversies in International Relations Theory : Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Rothman, Steven B. 2011. "Revising the Soft Power Concept: What Are the Means and Mechanisms of Soft Power?" *Journal of Political Power* 4 (1): 49–64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2158379x.2011.556346>.
- Rothstein, Bo. 2000. "Trust, Social Dilemmas and Collective Memories." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 12 (4): 477–501. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0951692800012004007>.
- Ruggie, John Gerard. 1998. "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-Utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge." *International Organization* 52 (4): 855–85. <https://doi.org/10.1162/002081898550770>.
- Rugh, William A. 2006. *American Encounters with Arabs : The "Soft Power" of U.S. Public Diplomacy in the Middle East*. Westport, Connecticut ; London: Praeger Security International.
- Sanger, David E. 2011. "Half a Doctrine Will Have to Do." *The New York Times*, May 21, 2011, sec. Week in Review. <https://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/22/weekinreview/22sanger.html>.
- Saskia Brechenmacher, and Carnegie. 2017. *Civil Society under Assault : Repression and Responses in Russia, Egypt, and Ethiopia*. Washington, Dc: Carnegie Endowment For International Peace.
- Schmitter, Philippe C., and Wolfgang Streeck. 1999. "The Organization of Business Interests: Studying the Associative Action of Business in Advanced Industrial Societies." *Www.econstor.eu*. 1999. <http://hdl.handle.net/10419/43739>.

- Schueftan, Dan. 2016. "The West in the Middle East: A Realistic Analysis and Policy Priorities for a Region with Structurally Irresolvable Problems." JSTOR. 2016.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep22200>.
- Seligman, Adam B. 2002. "Civil Society as Idea and Ideal." In *Alternative Conceptions of Civil Society*, edited by Simone Chambers and Will Kymlicka. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sharp, Jeremy. 2012. "CRS Report for Congress Egypt: Background and U.S. Relations."
<http://hrlibrary.umn.edu/research/Egypt/Egypt%20Background.pdf>.
- Singer, J David. 1961. "The Level of Analysis Problem in International Relations." *World Politics* 14 (1): 77–92. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2009557>.
- Sterling-Folker, Jennifer. 2000. "Competing Paradigms or Birds of a Feather? Constructivism and Neoliberal Institutionalism Compared." *International Studies Quarterly* 44 (1): 97–119.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/0020-8833.00150>.
- Stork, Joe. 2019. "Transitional Injustice: Egypt's Human Rights Reversals after the Uprising." *Social Research: An International Quarterly* 86 (1): 337–64. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sor.2019.0014>.
- Tahir-Kheli, Shirin. 2001. "Item 4: Report of the High Commissioner for Human Rights." 2001–2009.State.gov. Bureau of Public Affairs, Department Of State. The Office of Electronic Information. March 21, 2001. <https://2001-2009.state.gov/g/drl/rls/rm/2001/1655.htm>.
- Talani, Leila Simona. 2017. "Women, Globalization and Civil Society in the MENA Area: Between Marginalization and Radicalization." *Journal of Balkan and near Eastern Studies* 19 (5): 499–523. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19448953.2017.1296258>.
- Tezcan, Neslihan. 2014. "Democratic Uprisings in the New Middle East: Youth, Technology. Reviewed by Neslihan Tezcan, İstanbul Şehir University Human Rights and Foreign Policy."
 Www.proquest.com. 2014.
<https://www.proquest.com/docview/2026327553/fulltextPDF/E5BB34477BA14B13PQ/1?accountid=146310>.
- The Economist. 2003. "The Law of Man or the Law of God?" The Economist. September 18, 2003.
<https://www.economist.com/special-report/2003/09/13/the-law-of-man-or-the-law-of-god>.
- . 2012. "Dogma and Purity v Worldly Politics." The Economist. October 20, 2012.
<https://www.economist.com/middle-east-and-africa/2012/10/20/dogma-and-purity-v-worldly-politics>.
- The U.S. Department of State. n.d. "Security and Human Rights." United States Department of State.
<https://www.state.gov/key-topics-bureau-of-democracy-human-rights-and-labor/human-rights/>.
- THE WHITE HOUSE. 2009. "Remarks by the President at Cairo University, 6-04-09."
 Whitehouse.gov. June 4, 2009. <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-cairo-university-6-04-09>.
- Thompson, Jack. 2018. "Trump's Middle East Policy." *Research Collection*.
<https://doi.org/10.3929/ethz-b-000292962>.

- Thrall, A. Trevor, and Caroline Dorminey. 2018. "Risky Business: The Role of Arms Sales in U.S. Foreign Policy." JSTOR. 2018. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep23043>.
- Toosi, Nahal. 2018. "Pompeo Justifies Sending Egypt Money in Memo Detailing Human Rights Abuses." POLITICO. September 25, 2018. <https://www.politico.com/story/2018/09/25/pompeo-justifies-sending-egypt-money-840214>.
- "U.S. Relations with Egypt - United States Department of State." 2018. United States Department of State. 2018. <https://www.state.gov/u-s-relations-with-egypt/>.
- United States Department of State, Office of the Historian, Foreign Service Institute. n.d. "Foreign Relations of the United States, 1952–1954, the near and Middle East, Volume IX, Part 2 - Office of the Historian." History.state.gov. Accessed June 5, 2022. <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1952-54v09p2/subch2>.
- . n.d. "Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1955, Volume XIV - Office of the Historian." History.state.gov. Accessed June 5, 2022. <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1955-57v14/ch1?start=91>.
- USAID. 2019. "مصر | Egypt | U.S. Agency for International Development." Usaid.gov. October 30, 2019. <https://www.usaid.gov/egypt>.
- Vaïsse, Justin. 2010. "Why Neoconservatism Still Matters." Archive.lowyinstitute.org. 2010. <https://archive.lowyinstitute.org/publications/why-neoconservatism-still-matters>.
- Van der Vyver, Johan. 1998. "Universality and Relativity of Human Rights: American Relativism." Papers.ssrn.com. Rochester, NY. January 20, 1998. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1952622.
- VERICAT, JOSÉ S. 2017. "Civil Society in Egypt and Tunisia." JSTOR. 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep17508.7>.
- Wagner, Peter. 2006. *The Languages in Civil Society*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Walker, Thomas C., and Jeffrey S. Morton. 2005. "Re-Assessing the 'Power of Power Politics' Thesis: Is Realism Still Dominant?1." *International Studies Review* 7 (2): 341–56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2005.00504.x>.
- Walt, Stephen M. 2005. "THE RELATIONSHIP between THEORY and POLICY in INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS." *Annual Review of Political Science* 8 (1): 23–48. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.7.012003.104904>.
- Wendt, Alexander. 1992. "Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics." *International Organization* 46 (2): 391–425. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2706858>.
- Williams, Michael C. 2005. *The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Williamson, Oliver E. 1981. "The Economics of Organization: The Transaction Cost Approach." *American Journal of Sociology* 87 (3): 548–77. <https://doi.org/10.1086/227496>.

Wouters, Jan. 2014. "DIRECTORATE-GENERAL for EXTERNAL POLICIES of the UNION
DIRECTORATE B POLICY DEPARTMENT STUDY a COMPARATIVE STUDY of EU and
US APPROACHES to HUMAN RIGHTS in EXTERNAL RELATIONS."
[https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2014/534981/EXPO_STU\(2014\)534981_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2014/534981/EXPO_STU(2014)534981_EN.pdf).