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Introduction

Multi-party elections are often thought to be a democrat’s tool. But dictators find them useful legitimation tools; and Egypt is no exception. As far back as the 1970s, Egypt’s multiparty electoral system has been a democratic façade by design. As President Anwar Sadat shifted Egypt’s external alliance from the Soviet Union to the United States and marginalized Abdel Nasser’s socialist base, he proclaimed his commitment to political liberalization. In holding Egypt’s first multiparty elections—albeit tightly controlled through an electoral scheme that guaranteed his party’s victory—Sadat transitioned Egypt from one party to multiparty electoral authoritarianism.

This electoral design allowed the business class to dominate Egypt’s political elite over forty years, with the military holding sway behind the scenes. In exchange for loyalty to the authoritarian state, this crony capitalist class siphoned off state resources. Elections, therefore, became the elite’s mechanism for rent seeking. Parliamentarians had privileged access to government ministries to obtain licenses, permits, and public contracts for themselves and their constituents. They engaged in corruption while immune from criminal prosecution secured by their elected official status.

President Hosni Mubarak continued Sadat’s legacy with a few key differences. The most important being waning influence of the military in political affairs as domestic security forces became the coercive arm of the authoritarian state. Additionally, Mubarak groomed his son Gamal for the presidency, and toward that end, elevated Gamal’s business cronies to key executive and legislative positions. Over time, the military, while still a political stakeholder, was marginalized from the center of power.

After three decades of Mubarak’s authoritarian rule, millions of Egyptians took to the streets on January 11, 2011 to protest rigged elections, corruption, police abuse, poverty, and political repression. After one of the most fraudulent parliamentary elections in Egypt’s history in 2010, Egyptians rebuked electoral authoritarianism. Merely holding elections was no longer good enough to satisfy their desire for democracy. Egyptians sought systemic reforms granting them meaningful self-governance. Their demands were ultimately defeated when another former general, Abdel Fattah Al Sisi, was elected as...
president of Egypt after a military coup in July 2013. The military returned to the helm of governance under Sisi, reverting Egypt back to military electoral authoritarianism.

In the heady days after the 2011 uprisings, the military exploited Egypt’s populist anger to replace Mubarak’s business and domestic security elite with a military ruling elite. Although multiparty elections remained a component of the authoritarian system, the military opted not to create a new dominant political party to manage intra-elite conflict and safeguard the military’s supremacy. Instead, Sisi has adopted a strategy of dividing Egypt’s parliament into hundreds of individual, self-interested candidates who could be easily co-opted, bribed, or coerced into supporting his regime. It remains to be seen, however, whether this strategy will work in the long run as the economy deteriorates and populist discontent grows. Without a political party to do its bidding, the military is likely to depend more on brute force against emerging opposition groupings.

This Article argues that the current regime under President Abdel Fatah Sisi has established a military electoral authoritarian state with a non-dominant party electoral system. Coupled with Egypt’s long tradition of nepotism, cronyism, and patronage networks, the new election laws perpetuate a fragmented, depoliticized parliament wherein no mobilized opposition can take shape to challenge the military state. The cause of Egypt’s current depoliticization, however, is not a weak central party beholden to the presidency – as was the case under Sadat and Mubarak – but rather hundreds of rent-seeking parliamentarians with no party affiliation. Sisi intentionally structured the parliament to consist of over four hundred individual, self-interested actors vulnerable to bribery or coercion to keep them depoliticized and compliant. This strategy facilitates purging any parliamentary figures who emerge to challenge executive power.

Unlike his three predecessors, President Sisi has opted not to create a central party to manage elites and channel social opinion. Instead, he is relying on the military as the foundation of his elite coalition to manage intra-elite conflict, co-opt new elites, and suppress populist opposition. This shift has transformed Egypt’s political landscape in three ways. First, the military now overtly dominates in political and economic affairs. Second, fractured and weak political alliances are composed of small

---


parties with divergent ideologies and self-interested individuals. Third, a coopted and conservative judiciary legitimizes the regime’s structure.12

This Article begins by providing a theoretical framework for examining the specific ways in which Egypt under Sadat and Mubarak experienced electoral authoritarianism. It then analyzes how election laws and the electoral system were changed after the mass uprisings of January 2011 to liberalize Egypt’s political system. Finally, it focuses on the Sisi era to demonstrate the specific ways election laws have been manipulated to produce a military electoral authoritarian state. Despite the elimination of the dominant National Democratic Party (NDP) from political life, the executive in Egypt continues to control the political system. But now, the military is overtly at the helm of the ruling elite.

II. Electoral Authoritarianism

An examination of contemporary politics in Egypt prompts the question: why would a dictator bother to hold multiparty elections? A robust political science literature discusses multiple typologies of authoritarian regimes that hold elections.13 Electoral authoritarians systematically use elections as instruments in furtherance of their authoritarian rule, not to transition toward democracy.14 While a full exposition of the literature is beyond our scope here, a brief discussion of hybrid regimes, including electoral authoritarianism, provides a theoretical lens for analyzing Egypt’s electoral system today.15

Elections in authoritarian regimes do not change who rules the nation. Rather, they determine membership in the dictator’s elite coalition.16 As Lisa Blaydes’s work highlights, competitive parliamentary elections are the regime’s mechanism for distributing rents and promotions in exchange for political loyalty and obedience.17 Elections preempt the inevitable conflicts that arise between individuals and groups competing for coveted access to state resources.18 As a result, candidates spend millions of Egyptian pounds from personal funds for a seat in parliament in anticipation of reaping hundreds of millions in return.19

Asli Bali insightfully highlights three means by which the Mubarak regime shaped electoral laws to further authoritarianism: 1) the rules governing the formation and activities of political parties; 2) the impact of electoral rules on the ability of political parties to compete in contested elections; and 3) the

---

14 Id.; Seeberg, Authoritarianism and Elections during the Third Wave, 15 Statsvetenskaplig tidskrift 313, 322 (2013) (noting the two sub-types of electoral authoritarianism: non-competitive and hegemonic).
15 Diamond, supra note 10, at 23, 33 (defining hybrid regimes as possessing a mix of democratic and undemocratic features).
16 Bunce & Wolchik, supra note 9.
17 Blaydes, supra note 2, at 1.
18 Id. at 10.
19 Thabet, supra note 3, at 16; Ghandi and Lust-Okar, supra note 5, at 410.
The constitutional balance between the executive and legislative power.”20 The Sadat and Mubarak regimes deployed these strategies for over forty years to maintain the status quo. Today, Sisi is using similar tactics to establish a military electoral authoritarian regime in Egypt.

Military electoral authoritarianism constitutes a type of hybrid regime where the military upholds the façade of elections, but places current and former military officials at the helm of the elite selectorate.21 Civilians are disposable surrogates who implement policies created by the military elite and take the blame when policies fail. As a result, the military effectively controls the executive branch, which in turn manipulates the legislative and judicial branches through fringe benefits and coercive measures.

In contrast to the predictable rules and unpredictable political outcomes found in democracies, an authoritarian system produces reliable outcomes in a political process based on uncertain rules and procedures.22 The more authoritarian a regime, the more power is centralized and personalized.23 Presidents surround themselves by trusted men who manage the bureaucracy, intelligence services, and a single government party that manipulates popular sentiment in favor of the president. A loyal police force coerces the population into submission.24 A centralized political system dominates institutions such that agents rely on the presidency for their political survival, and do so at the expense of their institutional mission.25 Thus, institutions are weak by design and incapable of incorporating social demands.26

Coopting elites through a dominant party becomes a crucial mechanism for maintaining the authoritarian regime. The dictator methodically mobilizes and incorporates individuals into the state apparatus to develop a patron-client relationship.27 The ruling elite divide and dominate society by selecting new agents who then become vested in the political system.28 Individuals accept cooptation for the material and status benefits as well as the security protections in a system where rule of law is arbitrary. The result is a ruling coalition composed of an elite and middle elite class that suppresses populist demands for democratic governance.29

A combination of exogenous and endogenous factors incentivizes dictators to hold elections. Internal pressures arising from the elite’s competition for special access to state resources necessitates elections to manage such conflicts. The regime allows weak opposition parties to operate on the margins to

---

21 See generally Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, PRINCIPLES OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS 79-87 (5th ed., 2014) (describing the selectorate theory of international politics wherein leaders build a coalition of supporters among the selectorate).
25 Stacher, supra note 23, at 38.
26 Id. at 35.
27 Id. at 40–41.
28 Id. at 40–41.
29 Id. at 79.
appease international pressures to liberalize.\textsuperscript{30} Dictators leverage elections to determine which elites are insiders and which are outsiders based on loyalty to the regime and their willingness to diffuse populist grievances.\textsuperscript{31} In turn, elites seek personal enrichment through elected office or political appointments.\textsuperscript{32} As the insider elites become more dependent on the regime for (unjust) self-enrichment, they depoliticize governance away from policy priorities that serve the public interest. Elections are also a source of information for the centralized regime. In collaboration with governorate-level security, presidentially appointed governors purge individuals who are underperforming or whose loyalty falls into question.\textsuperscript{33} Thus, elections are turned into intra-elite competitive clientelism divorced from democratization.\textsuperscript{34}

Although liberal and established democracies are not immune from uneven playing fields, the authoritarian regime’s party has far more access to media, state resources for campaigning, and coercive means for obtaining votes than its opposition.\textsuperscript{35} The public is demobilized by design as citizens lack freedom of speech, assembly and association; and civil society is circumscribed to non-political activities.\textsuperscript{36} Any meaningful opposition to the regime is met with state violence.\textsuperscript{37} Ultimately, the underlying distribution of power in favor of the president is unaffected by elections.\textsuperscript{38}

III. Elections Under Sadat and Mubarak


\textsuperscript{31} Gandhi & Lust-Okar, supra note 5, at 495, 507.

\textsuperscript{32} Blaydes, supra note 2, at 3–4.

\textsuperscript{33} Id. at 17.

\textsuperscript{34} Gandhi & Lust-Okar, supra note 5, at 507; Bunce & Wolchik, supra note 9, at 48. Meanwhile, Western patrons and international banks require dictators to hold elections in exchange for economic and military aid. See Jason Brownlee, Democracy Prevention: The Politics of the U.S.-Egyptian Alliance 68, 92 (2012) (discussing the use of “limited multipartyism” to appease foreign creditors).

\textsuperscript{35} See Lucan A. Way, Authoritarian Failure: How Does State Weakness Strengthen Electoral Competition?, in Electoral Authoritarianism: The Dynamics of Unfree Competition 169–70 (Adreas Schedler ed., 2006) (noting that “authoritarian states are defined by the conflation of state and regime” resulting in the state apparatus at the service of safeguarding the regime rather than serving the public). Democracy by the People: Reforming Campaign Finance in America (eds. Timothy K. Kuhner & Eugene D. Mazo, forthcoming 2018) (arguing that American elections create an uneven playing field, especially when it comes to the system of campaign funding that incumbents and insiders enjoy).

\textsuperscript{36} Bunce & Wolchik, supra note 9, at 74; Javed Maswood and Usha Natarajan, Democratization and Constitutional Reform in Egypt and Indonesia, Democratization and Constitutional Reform in Egypt and Indonesia: Evaluating the Role of the Military, in Arab Spring in Egypt: Revolution and Beyond 227 (Bahgat Korany & Rabab El-Mahdi eds., 2012) [hereinafter Arab Spring in Egypt].

\textsuperscript{37} Diamond, supra note 10, at 29; Bellin, The Robustness of Authoritarianism, supra note 7, at 143; Brownlee, supra note 34, at 92–94 (discussing Mubarak’s use of hired thugs to beat up opposition voters); Mona El-Ghobashy, The Dynamics of Elections Under Mubarak, in The Journey to Tahrir: Revolution, Protest, and Social Change in Egypt 143 (Jeannie Sowers & Chris Toensing, eds., 2012) (noting the crackdown on the Muslim Brotherhood after their electoral success in the 2005 elections where they obtained twenty percent of the seats).

\textsuperscript{38} Bâli, supra note 20, 41–42 (2009); Gandhi & Lust-Okar, supra note 5, at 495.
Despite a history of elections dating back to the 1920s, Egypt has yet to experience democratic governance.\textsuperscript{39} Under the monarchy, tightly controlled elections were the means by which the dominant Wafd Party served as the intermediary between the monarchy and citizens in a patron-client relationship. Liberal proponents of the 1952 revolution that overthrew the monarchy were disappointed when General Gamal Abdel Nasser imposed one-party elections to effectively establish a military dictatorship. The Arab Socialist Union was the only political party allowed to operate, and all Egyptians were expected to join it.\textsuperscript{40} A coercive police state harshly punished individuals and entities that challenged Nasser’s rule, and by extension the military. When Nasser died in 1971, Sadat found himself surrounded by a mistrusting leftist elite seeking to continue Nasser’s socialist agenda.\textsuperscript{41} Sadat strategically used political liberalization as a pretext to marginalize Nasser’s inner circle and form his own elite coalition.

A. Sadat Introduces Multiparty Elections

Sadat, also a military general, changed the face of the regime but not the underlying authoritarian means by which it operated.\textsuperscript{42} To appease his new American patrons and attract foreign investment, Sadat initiated political liberalization with multiparty elections as his regime’s cornerstone. But like other authoritarians, Sadat proved masterful at using political liberalization as an adaptation strategy to prevent rather than produce democratization.\textsuperscript{43} Most notably, Sadat tolerated the Muslim Brotherhood and allowed it to field individual candidates in parliament. As Jason Brownlee points out, Sadat created the National Democratic Party (NDP) to mobilize grassroots support, quash local opposition, and enhance the coercive capacity of the regime.\textsuperscript{44}

The NDP managed conflict within the regime and blocked the emergence of autonomous societal agents that could challenge Sadat’s rule.\textsuperscript{45} No institutions had the autonomy to compete with the president’s centralized power.\textsuperscript{46} The Egyptian parliament was merely a décor devoid of meaningful power to shape policy. As such, the president’s prerogatives were consistently rendered into formal legislation by a docile parliament controlled by the NDP.\textsuperscript{47} The NDP operated without any pretense of independence from the presidency. Political elites joined the NDP not for ideological reasons, but rather to gain access

\textsuperscript{40} Tavana, \textit{supra} note 2, at 556–57.
\textsuperscript{41} Bruce Rutherford, \textit{Egypt After Mubarak: Liberalism, Islam, and Democracy in the Arab World} 141-42 (2008).
\textsuperscript{42} Stacher, \textit{supra} note 23, at 159–60.
\textsuperscript{45} Albrecht, \textit{supra} note 43; Stacher, \textit{supra} note 23, at 112.
\textsuperscript{46} Stacher, \textit{supra} note 23, at 39.
\textsuperscript{47} Ninette S. Fahmy, \textit{The Politics of Egypt: State-Society Relationship} 52 (2002); Blaydes, \textit{supra} note 2, at 25; Levitsky & Way, \textit{supra} note 44, at 63–64.
to scarce government resources as well as protect their business monopolies.\textsuperscript{48} Thus, parliamentarians had little to gain and much to lose by challenging the centralized executive-driven political system.\textsuperscript{49}

To ensure NDP victory, elections were consistently riddled with irregularities and fraud.\textsuperscript{50} Candidates campaigned on promises to deliver favors to voters as intermediaries between the citizens and the state. And in return, the few Egyptians that bothered to vote (or were bribed to do so) did so for services and jobs, not for ideology or policy changes.\textsuperscript{51}

**B. Mubarak Promotes Civilian Electoral Authoritarianism**

Mubarak, the fourth military officer to rule Egypt, expanded on Sadat’s multiparty electoral authoritarian system through extensive co-optation of civilian crony capitalists.\textsuperscript{52} Presiding over the dominant NDP party still in control of parliament, Mubarak established a hegemonic electoral authoritarian regime.\textsuperscript{53} Presidential elections were more national referendums than competitive elections; parliamentary elections were merely political theater to appease the regime’s Western benefactors.\textsuperscript{54}

Mubarak’s multiparty electoral regime was inherited in large part from Sadat.\textsuperscript{55} Law 140 of 1977, also known as the Political Parties Law, created the Political Parties Affairs Committee (PPAC) charged with overseeing the registration of new parties. Chaired by the presidentially appointed head of the Shura Council (now defunct) and composed primarily of NDP partisans, the PPAC served as a gatekeeper to safeguard the NDP’s hegemony.\textsuperscript{56} New parties with the potential of mobilizing the public to compete

\textsuperscript{48} Stacher, supra note 23, at 99.
\textsuperscript{49} Id. at 142.
\textsuperscript{51} Shehata, supra note 50, at 124–25; David M. Faris, *Constituting Institutions: The Electoral System in Egypt, 19 MIDDLE EAST POL’Y* 142 (2012); Thabet, supra note 3, at 16 (noting voters were given chickens and promises of government jobs in exchange for votes).
\textsuperscript{52} Bhuiyan, supra note 39, at 500; NADIA RAMSIS FARAH, EGYPT’S POLITICAL ECONOMY: POWER RELATIONS IN DEVELOPMENT 1–2 (2009). Former presidents Mohamed Naguid, Gamal Abdel Nasser, and Anwar Sadat were all military leaders prior to becoming president.
\textsuperscript{53} Diamond, supra note 10.
\textsuperscript{56} Tavana, supra note 2, at 556–57.
with the NDP were denied registration based on pretextual procedural technicalities.\textsuperscript{57} New political parties, for example, had to prove their platform was not similar to an existing party, affirm their principles did not contradict the 1952 revolution, support the Camp David Agreement, and show how they contributed toward national unity.\textsuperscript{58} Moreover, political parties based on religion were categorically rejected—a rule intended to keep the Muslim Brotherhood out of party politics.\textsuperscript{59} These restrictions gave ample grounds for PPAC to delay and reject most new party registrations.\textsuperscript{60} As a result, most opposition candidates ran as independents.\textsuperscript{61}

Parliamentary election laws were amended multiple times over Mubarak’s thirty year tenure. While a full explication of the legislative history is beyond the scope of this Article,\textsuperscript{62} a summary of the key components of Egypt’s electoral system post-2011 informs the political implications of the current parliament under Sisi. Egyptians elect parliamentarians in a mixed-system from 1) closed list party seats and 2) first-past-the-post independent candidate seats. Egypt’s 27 governorates are divided into two-seat districts for electing independent candidates and a legislatively specified number of party list districts. The 2014 constitution changed Egypt’s bicameral parliamentary system to a unicameral system by abolishing the Shura Council, making the People’s Assembly the sole parliamentary body.\textsuperscript{63}

Law No. 38 of 1972 established a 454-member People’s Assembly. Ten candidates were appointed by the president and 444 were elected in 222 two seat electoral districts.\textsuperscript{64} Because rural areas tended to be NDP strongholds, they were purposely granted more voting power than urban areas where social mobilization is higher.\textsuperscript{65} Electoral districts were strategically shaped to allow for rural areas with small populations to receive the same representatives as larger urban areas with multiple times more citizens.\textsuperscript{66} When opposition parties challenged such gerrymandering, the government responded with the pretext that they were preserving the integrity of historical communities.\textsuperscript{67}

In 2000, the Supreme Constitutional Court (SCC) mandated judicial supervision of elections thereby restricting NDP-aligned security forces from engaging in electoral fraud inside voting polls.\textsuperscript{68} As a result,
the NDP won only 177 out of 444 parliamentary seats in the 2000 election. To retain its majority in parliament, the NDP persuaded (primarily through corruption) over 200 independent candidates to join the NDP after their election victories.

Election laws also ensured that fielding a presidential candidate was impracticable. Prior to 2005, a presidential candidate had to obtain no less than 250 written endorsements from elected members of the People’s Assembly, the (now defunct) Shura Council, and local councils in multiple governorates. Additionally, a candidate’s political party must have been “founded at least five years before the starting date of candidature and have been operating uninterruptedly for this period,” and its members must “have obtained at least 5% of the elected members of both the People’s Assembly and the Shura Council.”

Both criteria were purposely prohibitive, causing Mubarak to run unchallenged. Due in large part to international pressure from the United States as part of its democracy promotion policies, these insurmountable obstacles were changed in 2005. Law 174 of 2005 allowed a candidate to run if: 1) his party had at least five percent of the seats in both houses; 2) he obtained endorsement from 90 parliamentarians and 140 members of local councils; or 3) he was a senior board member of a political party with at least one seat in parliament. The third option resulted in an unprecedented eight candidates entering the 2005 presidential elections. Even though the regime legalized running for president against Hosni Mubarak, it did not make it politically cost free. Soon after coming in second in the presidential elections, Ayman Noor was prosecuted on trumped up fraud charges, and sentenced to five years in prison. This sent a chilling message to prospective candidates that they could run, but they could not compete.

The impact of independent judges monitoring ballot boxes coupled with decades of social service work in rural areas across Egypt contributed to the Muslim Brotherhood winning over twenty percent of the parliament by running independent candidates in the 2005 elections. Thus unprecedented outcome caused Mubarak to take the extraordinary step of amending the constitution.

---

69 Bhuiyan, supra note 39, at 500.
71 Law No. 174 of 2005 (Regulating the Presidential Elections), al-Jarida al-Rasmiyya, 2 July 2005, art. 2 (Egypt).
73 Law No. 174 of 2005 (Regulating the Presidential Elections), al-Jarida al-Rasmiyya, 2 July 2005, art. 2 (Egypt).
74 Brownlee, supra note 44, at 124.
75 Issandr El Amrani, Controlled Reform in Egypt: Neither Reformist nor Controlled, in THE JOURNEY TO Tahrir: REVOLUTION, PROTEST, AND SOCIAL CHANGE IN EGYPT 157 (Jeannie Sowers & Chris Toensing, eds., 2012).
76 Bhuiyan, supra note 39, at 502 (noting the regime’s systematic repression of the Muslim Brotherhood through closing their businesses, revoking licenses, and arresting members as a means of debilitating their organizational capacity).
Article 88 of the 1971 Constitution was amended to eliminate the one judge for every ballot box rule for judicial supervision of elections. Instead, a purportedly independent electoral commission composed of sitting and retired judges would supervise judicial elections. An expansive definition of judicial authority allowed prosecutors and administrative judges who are technically members of the judiciary but beholden to the executive branch to supervise elections. Article 62 was also amended to decrease the number of independent candidate seats, with the purpose of reducing the Muslim Brotherhood’s ability to participate in elections. Amendments to Article 136 allowed the president to dissolve the parliament based on necessity, which critics interpreted as a mechanism to eliminate prospective parliaments without an NDP majority. Article 179 was amended to grant the state expansive anti-terrorism authorities, including reference of any terrorism case to military court. And Article 5 imposed a constitutional prohibition of parties based on religion – a direct affront on the Muslim Brotherhood’s desire to start a party.

Combined with the coercive security practices of the December 2010 elections, these legal changes resulted in the NDP controlling ninety-seven percent of the parliament. The level of election fraud and gerrymandering in 2010 was unprecedented. The government systematically cracked down on opposition media by shutting down television channels and blocking websites. Security forces pressured private businessmen to silence critical editors, opinion writers, and talk show hosts. Opposition activities at universities and professional syndicates were systematically quelled.

This time, however, Mubarak’s regime had gone too far in engineering its monopoly. The aftermath of the 2010 parliamentary elections pushed the political elite to the breaking point, setting the nation on the path toward the mass uprisings of January 2011.

IV. From Revolution to Military Coup: General Sisi Becomes President

During the three years between Egypt’s mass uprisings in January 2011 and the 2014 election of General Abdel Fatah Al Sisi, Egypt’s electoral landscape was in flux. Egyptians went to the polls seven times to vote on an interim constitution in 2011, two constitutions in 2013 and 2014, two parliaments in 2012

---

78 OWEN, *supra* note 24, at 71.
82 OWEN, *supra* note 24, at 5; Schedler, *supra* note 13, at 9 (noting “[t]he logic of distrust that prevails under authoritarian rule would make us uphold the suspicion that the worst may be hidden from our eyes”).
83 OWEN, *supra* note 24, at 175 (noting that Arab authoritarian regimes failed to provide basic services to their burgeoning youth populations while having limited capacity to respond to domestic political crisis).
84 Mona El-Ghobashy, *supra* note 37, at 133.
and 2015, and two presidents in 2012 and 2014.\footnote{Nicolas Heliotis, \textit{A Textual Analysis of Presidential Power under the 2014 Egyptian Constitution}, 48 INT'L LAW. 127 (2014).} Initially, the euphoria from the populist removal of Mubarak motivated Egyptians to vote in the tens of millions. For the first time in their lives, Egyptians believed democratic governance was attainable and authoritarianism could be a relic of the past. But with each new election, it became clearer that democratic election results were reversible through undemocratic means.

Whether as a result of the Supreme Constitutional Court’s June 2012 ruling that dissolved Egypt’s first democratically elected parliament or the July 2013 military coup deposing Mohamed Morsi and nullifying the 2012 constitution, many Egyptians regressed back to their pre-2011 disillusionment with elections.\footnote{Dina Shehata, \textit{Youth Movements and the 25 January Revolution}, in \textit{ARAB SPRING IN EGYPT}, supra note 36, at 108 (noting only 16% of eligible young Egyptians participated in elections in 2005 and 85% had never participated in a parliamentary election).} Put in perspective, over 50% of Egyptian voters turned out to vote in 2011 and 2012 elections compared to only 27% in the 2014 presidential elections and 28% in the 2015 parliamentary elections—the same low voter turnout rate as under Mubarak.\footnote{Hassan Nafaa, \textit{Parliamentary elections and the future of the political system in Egypt}, 9 CONTEMP. ARAB AFFS. 163, 177 (2016); \textit{Election Guide: Democracy Assistance and Election News, Arab Republic of Egypt}, USAID (last visited May 10, 2016), \url{http://www.electionguide.org/countries/id/65/}; ALAA AL ASWANY, ON THE STATE OF EGYPT: WHAT MADE THE REVOLUTION INEVITABLE 62 (2011) (noting 38% showed up for the 2014 constitutional referendum).} Egyptians’ disillusionment with politics arose from their realization that the military had effectively kept in place the same authoritarian system, but now the generals were at the helm instead of behind the curtain.\footnote{Jan Völkel, \textit{Why almost nobody participated in the Egyptian parliamentary elections}, OPENDEMOCRACY (Oct. 23, 2015), \url{https://www.opendemocracy.net/arab-waking/jan-v-iklel/why-almost-nobody-participated-in-egyptian-parliamentary-elections}.}

In the year following the 2011 uprising, reform efforts were underway. Pent up populist demands for democratization caused the administrative court to dissolve the NDP and issue a lustrations decree banning NDP members from running for elected office.\footnote{Ahram Online, \textit{Military Council Issues Long Promised Lustration Law, Days Before Elections}, JADALIYYA (Nov. 21, 2011), \url{http://www.jadaliyya.com/pages/index/3226/military-council-issues-long-promised-lustration-l}. The issue of lustrations has been hotly contested in Egyptian courts. Ultimately, the courts lifted any bans on NDP leaders from running for office paving the way for their participation in the 2015 parliamentary elections as individual candidates. \textit{Court lifts ban on NDP members running in elections}, \textit{MADA MASR} (July 14, 2014, 3:54 PM), \url{http://www.madamasr.com/news/court-lifts-ban-ndp-members-running-elections}.} Meanwhile, dozens of new political parties were registered.\footnote{Evan Hill, \textit{Explainer: Egypt’s crowded political arena}, \textit{AL JAZEERA ENGLISH} (Nov. 17, 2011), \url{http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/spotlight/egypt/2011/11/2011111510295463645.html}.} Law 40 of 1977 was amended to change the composition of the PPAC from regime loyalists to judges from various judicial institutions.\footnote{Law No. 40 of 1977 as amended by Law No. 177 of 2005 (Law on the Political Parties System), \textit{al-Jaridah al-Rasmiyah}, 6 July 2005, art. 8 (Egypt): Bhuiyan, supra note 39, at 504.} No longer did new parties have to wait months or years for the PPAC to affirmatively approve or reject their applications. Instead, a party provided notice of its registration which was presumed valid unless PPAC filed a case in the Supreme Administrative Court within ninety days of the application.\footnote{For example, parties no longer had to distinguish themselves from existing parties. Tavana, supra note 2, at 558.} Moreover, the parliamentary election law was amended...
to shift seat allocation from 50% party list seats and 50% independent candidate seats to 2/3 party list seats and 1/3 independent candidate seats. Many Egyptians viewed this change as a means of limiting the ability of former NDP loyalists from obtaining parliamentary seats as independent candidates at the expense of new parties.

Over forty new political parties were registered in 2011 and 2012. Among them were the Muslim Brotherhood’s Freedom and Justice Party (FJP), which for the first time in decades was permitted by law to engage in party politics. New secular parties maneuvered to fill the political void created by the dissolution of the NDP. However, liberal political leaders proved collectively inept at developing cohesive policy plans or managing interpersonal conflicts, leading to multiple defections and party spinoffs. Meanwhile, the Muslim Brotherhood’s strong organizational skills, internal discipline, established record of providing social services, and deep roots in rural areas contributed toward their electoral success in the 2012 parliamentary elections.

That two-thirds of the new parliament would be comprised of party list candidates further facilitated the Muslim Brotherhood’s and FJP’s victory. No longer limited to independent candidate slots, the Muslim Brotherhood leveraged the party list system to field thousands of candidates. In the 2011-2012 parliamentary elections, the People’s Assembly was composed of 508 seats, of which 332 were filled by a proportional representation vote for closed party lists; 166 seats were elected by first past the post independent candidate elections; and 10 seats were presidentially appointed. Reformers actively lobbied for the two-thirds party list allocation to impede former NDP members from obtaining parliamentary seats as individual candidates. Nor could a candidate appear on a party list and run as an independent candidate at the same time. Reformers found that more party list seats would incentivize voting based on national policy platforms rather than individual charisma. In contrast, the 2015 People’s Assembly under Sisi was comprised of one-third proportional representation party list seats and two-thirds individual candidate seats, allowing more military officers and former NDP members to win a seat.

The Freedom and Justice Party, like other parties, ran its members for the 166 seats in the individual candidate elections. Independent candidates competed for two seats in each of the 83 districts. A candidate receiving over 50% of the total vote won a seat and the other two highest vote recipients

94 Tavana, supra note 2, at 558; Brown, Dunne, & Hamzawy, supra note 76, at 6–7.
95 Tavana, supra note 2, at 556.
98 Tavana, supra note 2, at 560; Faris, supra note 51, at 143.
100 Id.
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would then face a run off for the second seat. The FJP won 235 parliamentary seats, resulting in their control of 47% of parliament in total. Coupled with the far right Salafi Nour party’s 121 seats, over 70% of the 2012 parliament was controlled by political Islamist parties.

The sudden rise of the Muslim Brotherhood from repressed opposition to the dominant party in parliament rang alarm bells among Egypt’s liberal elites, business elites, security elites, and most notably the military. Rumors spread that the Muslim Brotherhood would turn Egypt into a theocracy along the lines of Iran. Security personnel, who just a few years back had detained and tortured the same Muslim Brotherhood leaders now in political office, fretted at the prospect of political retaliation. State officials, including judges, worried they soon would be replaced with Muslim Brotherhood loyalists in Egypt’s patronage system. The military viewed the Muslim Brotherhood as suspect outsiders who may not acquiesce to military political supremacy behind the scenes. Meanwhile, Egypt’s allies in the region and in the West were concerned with how the Muslim Brotherhood would change Egypt’s foreign policy moving forward.

When FJP candidate Mohamed Morsi eked out a victory against former Mubarak loyalist Ahmed Shafiq in the 2012 presidential elections, the so-called “deep state” began mobilizing Egyptians to oust the Muslim Brotherhood from power. The first step came when the SCC issued a ruling in June 2012 dissolving the Muslim Brotherhood-dominated parliament. Without a parliament, Morsi was unable to legislate his party’s policy agenda. Instead, he relied on presidential decrees with dubious political legitimacy.

For the next year, Morsi’s regime struggled to govern as multiple state institutions, ranging from the judiciary and police to state regulatory bodies, actively undermined his presidency. Even the Republican Guard refused to protect Morsi when protesters broke into the presidential palace, causing him to call in Muslim Brotherhood members to help him escape. Nevertheless, like his predecessors, President Morsi used elections to push through a controversial constitution. Putting the document
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before a rushed national referendum in December 2012 after he issued a presidential decree placing him above judicial scrutiny granted Morsi a short-lived political victory; but proved to be a fatal political error.\footnote{M. Patrick Yingling & Mohamed A. ‘Arafa, After the Revolution: Egypt’s Changing Forms of Corruption, 2 UNIV. BALTIMORE J. INT’L L. 23, 43–44 (2013).}

The Egyptian public came to view Morsi and the FJP as the Islamist version of Mubarak’s authoritarian regime—a regime they had sacrificed much to overthrow in 2011.\footnote{Mirette F. Mabrouk, The View From a Distance: Egypt’s Contentious New Constitution, in MIDDLE EAST MEMO 2013 at 1, 1–2 (Saban Ctr. Brookings No. 28, 2013), http://www.brookings.edu/~media/research/files/papers/2013/1/31-egypt-mabrouk/0131_Egypt_Mabrouk.pdf?la=en.} Adding to the public’s grievances were a worsening economy and stagnating tourism revenue.\footnote{Gwyn Topham & Terry Macalister, Egypt crisis hits tourism and economy, GUARDIAN (Aug. 16, 2013 1:49 PM), http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/aug/16/egypt-crisis-hits-tourism-economy.}

During the first half of 2013, the multiple stakeholders, including the military that benefited from Mubarak’s patronage system, exploited populist anger to create the Tamarrod movement.\footnote{Shana Marshall, CARNEGIE MIDDLE E. CTR., THE EGYPTIAN ARMED FORCES AND THE REMAKING OF AN ECONOMIC EMPIRE 19 (2015), http://carnegieendowment.org/files/egyptian_armed_forces.pdf.} The movement demanded early elections to remove Morsi, calling for nationwide protests on June 30, 2013. Three days later, Field Marshall Abdel Fattah Al Sisi announced on national television, with the Supreme Constitutional Court Justices standing behind him, that Morsi had been removed from office, arrested, and detained in an undisclosed location.\footnote{Profile: Egypt’s Tamarod Movement, BBC NEWS (July 1, 2013), http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-23131953.}

Egypt’s short-lived experiment with democracy was officially over. On July 3, 2013, the military had successfully ensured no civilian president would rule Egypt in the near future.

V. Egypt’s Shift to Military Electoral Authoritarianism

In the heady days after the January 2011 uprisings, few Egyptians appreciated the long term consequences of the military’s move to become the highest authority in the country.\footnote{Egypt crisis: Army ousts President Mohammed Morsi, BBC MIDDLE E. (July 4, 2013), http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-23173794.} Feigning a reluctance to rule, Egypt’s generals in the Supreme Council of Armed Forces (SCAF) agreed to shepherd the nation through their demands to transition toward democracy. As events unfolded, however, the revolutionary activists realized the military had no intention of returning to their barracks. Mubarak had structured civil-military relations to facilitate military influence in politics and granted the military economic autonomy over its shadow economy. This made it easier for the generals to quickly take on

\footnote{Hazem Kandil, Back on Horse? The Military Between Two Revolutions, in ARAB SPRING IN EGYPT, supra note 36, at 176. But see Aziz, Bringing Down an Uprising, supra note 8, at 19–27.}
the mantle of governance – first through the Supreme Council for the Armed Forces (SCAF) and later through General-turned-President Sisi.\footnote{Holger Albrecht & Dina Bishara, \textit{Back on Horseback: The Military and Political Transformation in Egypt}, 3 \textit{Middle East L. \\& Governance} 13, 18 (2011). I disagree with Albrecht and Bishara that the Egyptian military was reluctant to govern. The SCAF’s tenacious fight to stay in power couple with the military coup against Sisi evince the generals’ desire to rule Egypt.} Replacing Mubarak’s crony business elite with a crony military elite, Egypt’s generals transformed Egypt from a civilian electoral authoritarian system to a military electoral authoritarian system.\footnote{Yezid Sayigh, \textit{Inducing a Failed State in Palestine}, 49 \textit{Survival} 7, 10 (2007).}

Four decades after Egypt’s first multiparty elections, President Abdel Fattah Al Sisi is the latest in a line of elected authoritarians arising from the military. In contrast to his predecessors, however, Sisi does not have a political party to manage the status quo. Nor is he limiting the military’s role to operating its shadow economy. Although Sisi’s presidency appears to be a continuation of Egypt’s sixty-year tradition of former generals becoming president, three key differences distinguish Sisi’s reign. First, civilians under Sisi have much less control over governance or the national economy than under Mubarak. Second, the military elite control a parliament composed primarily of individual rent-seeking individuals and weak small parties with divergent ideologies that can easily be purged should they mobilize the citizenry against the regime. Third, a coopted judiciary with a defunct judicial independence movement is willing to legally sanction the regime’s authoritarian laws and practices.\footnote{Aziz, \textit{Independence Without Accountability}, supra note 8; Sahar F. Aziz, \textit{Theater or Transitional Justice: Reforming the Judiciary in Egypt}, in \textit{TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE IN THE MIDDLE EAST} (Chandra Lekha Sriram ed., forthcoming Aug. 2016) \url{http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2543313}; Sahar F. Aziz, \textit{(De)Liberalizing Judicial Independence in Egypt}, in \textit{EGYPT AND THE CONTRADICTIONS OF LIBERALISM: ILLIBERALISM, INTELLIGENTSIA, AND THE FUTURE OF EGYPTIAN DEMOCRACY} (Dalia Fahmy \\& Daanish Faruqi eds., forthcoming 2016), \url{http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2659554}.}

The military is so entrenched in the Egyptian economy such that it has multiple incentives to be spoilers in Egyptians’ quest for democracy.\footnote{Svolik, supra note 59, at 786.} And like his predecessors, Sisi’s regime uses elections as a tool to create the appearance of legitimacy.

A. The Military as Spoilers of Democracy

Scholars Holger Albrecht and Dina Bishara argue the Egyptian military intervened in February 2011, not out of disposition but out of opportunity. They proffer the military’s motivation was primarily to preserve their economic interests and privileged status.\footnote{Albrecht \\& Bishara, supra note 120; Holger Albrecht, \textit{Authoritarian Transformation or Transition from Authoritarianism? Insights on Regime Change in Egypt}, in \textit{Arab Spring in Egypt}, supra note 36, at 270.} This conclusion, however, is not supported by the military’s behavior. Since leading the movement to overthrow Morsi in July 2013, the military has leveraged its ubiquity in the economy, state and local government, and the upper echelons of the civil
service to take de facto control of the executive branch. Civilians have become mere technocrats and subcontractors subordinate to the military’s agenda.\textsuperscript{120}

To be sure, the military’s expedient ascension to power was facilitated by its massive business enterprise comprised of hundreds of factories, hundreds of thousands of hectares of land, and a growing service industry.\textsuperscript{121} Military personnel and their families purchase discounted consumer goods from the supermarkets, cooperatives, and gas stations operated by the armed forces.\textsuperscript{122} The military economy grew so large and diverse under Mubarak that it operated like a commercial sector, partnering with local and foreign private firms and conducting business abroad.\textsuperscript{123} With cheap labor from conscripts, tax exemptions, and ownership of vast swaths of public land, the military’s enterprise in 2012 reportedly generated $200 million dollars in revenues - all of which remained within the military’s budget and undisclosed to the public.\textsuperscript{124}

As a longtime member of Egypt’s feeble political opposition under Sadat and Mubarak, the Muslim Brotherhood was fully cognizant of the military’s ability to sabotage its ambitions to govern Egypt. For this reason, the FJP courted the SCAF to reassure the generals that their benefits and privileges would be preserved by a prospective FJP government.\textsuperscript{125} Upon his election, and in opposition to the revolutionary youth’s demands, Morsi kept the military’s enterprise in place, acquiesced to the generals’ demands to keep the military budget a state secret, and did not change the military courts’ jurisdiction over cases that otherwise belonged in civilian criminal court.\textsuperscript{126}

Despite these concessions, the military did not trust the Muslim Brotherhood would keep this commitment over the long run, particularly after he allied with Qatar to build the Suez Canal corridor and relegated the military to sub-contractors.\textsuperscript{127} Coupled with Morsi’s attempts to normalize relations with Hamas as part of a new strategy to decrease violence in the Sinai, the military’s patience with the

\textsuperscript{120} See Marshall, \textit{supra} note 111. “In every government authority now, there is a military officer. You deal with him,” said Abdel Wahab Mustafa, who imports satellite receivers through the country’s ports, where he said military control — and corruption — have come to permeate every aspect of the bureaucracy.” Abigail Hauslohner, \textit{Egypt’s military expands its control of the country’s economy}, WASH. POST (Mar. 16, 2014), https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle_east/egyptian-military-expands-its-economic-control/2014/03/16/39508b52-a554-11e3-b865-38b254d92063_story.html.
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nascent democratically elected government quickly ran out.\textsuperscript{128} Morsi was decisively removed from office on July 3, 2013 and whisked to an unknown location, only to reemerge as a defendant charged with espionage and other felonies.\textsuperscript{129}

Despite having just orchestrated a coup, Sisi still had to pay homage to democracy to satisfy the youth and secularists who had not yet discovered they were pawns in the military’s grand strategy.\textsuperscript{130} Sisi also had to appease Egypt’s Western backers who needed to save face as they supported yet another military general in Egypt.\textsuperscript{131} Holding formal elections after he amended election laws to produce his desired outcome met both goals.

\textbf{B. Using Elections to Maintain Military Authoritarianism}

Upon taking power, informally through Justice Adly Mansour as interim president, Sisi was in no rush to hold elections.\textsuperscript{132} The regime’s repressive campaign focused on the Muslim Brotherhood and the secular youth opposition was still actively engaged in advocating for a new constitution that restrained presidential powers.\textsuperscript{133} The youth did not realize the military had tricked them into installing a military regime until Sisi announced his run for president in March 2014.\textsuperscript{134} Meanwhile, the Adly regime aggressively prosecuted the FJP, quashed anti-coup protests, and issued presidential decrees that legalized an anti-democracy agenda.\textsuperscript{135}

\textsuperscript{128} Acemoglu, Ticchi, & Vindigni, \textit{supra} note 125 (noting the risk of a military coup against a nascent democratic reform); Sahar Aziz, \textit{Sinai’s Role in Morsi’s Ouster}, CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT INT’L PEACE (Aug. 20, 2013), \url{http://carnegieendowment.org/sada/?fa=52715}.
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\textsuperscript{131} Sahar Aziz, \textit{Bringing Down an Uprising}, \textit{supra} note 8. See also Patrick Kingsley, \textit{Egypt’s parliamentary elections set to be delayed by new legal battle}, \textit{THE GUARDIAN} (March 1, 2015)

\textsuperscript{132} After deposing Morsi, Sisi appointed Mansour under circumstances that evince a premeditated plan to comply with Sisi’s political agenda. See generally, Aziz, \textit{Bringing Down an Uprising}, \textit{supra} note 8. See also Patrick Kingsley, \textit{Egypt’s parliamentary elections set to be delayed by new legal battle}, \textit{THE GUARDIAN} (March 1, 2015)

\textsuperscript{133} Nafaa, \textit{supra} note 87, at 166.


\textsuperscript{135} Khaled Mansour, \textit{The new parliament’s heavy legislative inheritance}, MADA MASR (Dec. 6, 2015, 1:38 PM), \url{http://www.madamasr.com/opinion/politics/new-parliaments-heavy-legislative-inheritance}; President Mansour leaves office with a legislative bang, AHRAJM ONLINE (June 5, 2014),
On January 18, 2014, Interim President Mansour held a referendum for a new constitution after the constitution was suspended on July 3, 2013. Due in large part to the youth activists’ advocacy, checks on presidential powers exist in the current constitution that did not exist under Mubarak. For instance, Article 159 was added to allow for impeachment of the president, to avoid having to resort to a military coup or other extra-legal mechanisms to oust a president suspected of treason or a felony. Similarly, Article 161 allows a parliamentary vote of no confidence in the president, which triggers new presidential elections. Both mechanisms require a motion signed by a majority of parliament and approved by two-thirds of its members. The 2014 constitution retained the provisions from the 2012 version that restricted the president to two four year terms and did not include a provision for appointing a vice president. While the parliament must approve any new cabinet, the president can reshuffle the cabinet without cause. Notably, the new constitution mandated that all decrees issued by the president, which totaled over 340 under Mansour and Sisi, had to be approved by the parliament within fifteen days of their first session. Otherwise, the presidential decrees are void. True to form, the parliament in the fall of 2016 approved all 342 presidential decrees without revision or meaningful discussion.

Nearly a full year after Morsi was deposed, presidential elections were held on May 26, 2014. The 2014 constitution regressed to making it more difficult to run for president. The total number of signatures needed to be on the presidential ballot increased from 20,000 to 25,000. The number of governorates from which at least 1000 signatures had to be obtained was increased from ten to fifteen out of Egypt’s 27 governorates. Obtaining twenty endorsements from members of parliament remained an alternative to getting on the presidential ballot. In stark contrast to the presidential elections of 2012 when nine candidates vigorously competed for the presidency, only one opposition candidate, leftist
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Hamdeen Sabahi, ran against Sisi. The populace understood that Sabahi was a not a serious candidate, but rather a pawn to create the appearance of a competition.

Most Egyptians also recognized the replication of the Mubarak era, but for a different former general guaranteed to win the presidency. That the Muslim Brotherhood had been criminalized as a terrorist organization and over 16,000 people, both Islamists and secularists, were imprisoned, further evinced the fate of Egypt’s democracy. Moreover, the administration of elections was controlled by the Presidential Elections Commission, a body comprised of presidents and senior members of the judiciary who aligned with Sisi in overthrowing Morsi. Sisi had secured the presidency, but with the newly expanded powers of parliament, he would also need a compliant parliament.

It is likely no coincidence that the new election law—passed just before Adly Mansour stepped down—increased individual candidate seats to two-thirds of parliament while shrinking seats selected through party lists to one-third of parliament. The 2015 parliamentary elections filled 596 seats of which 448 are individual candidates; 120 seats are elected by party list, and 28 seats are appointed by the president. Egypt’s 27 governorates were divided into two sets of districts. One set is comprised of 224 districts for the individual candidates, most of which elected two representatives to parliament (though in some districts the number was three of four); and the second set of four districts from which political party list candidates are chosen. In the independent candidate districts, each voter could vote for two candidates. The candidate with more than 50% of the votes in the district obtained a seat. The remaining seat(s) was filled by a run off between the top two vote getters to fill the second seat. The party list seats were contests in four districts in total. Two of these districts were allocated 45 seats and two districts had 15 seats. In the proportional representation districts, voters voted for a particular party. If a party received over 50% of the votes, it obtained all of the seats in that district and distributed the seats to the members listed on its party list.
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Candidates elected to the independent seats could easily be coopted and depoliticized to ensure the regime’s continuity.\textsuperscript{152} If any defected for altruistic reasons or on principle, they would be expelled as exemplified in the case of Tawfik Okasha in May 2015.\textsuperscript{153} Only 120 seats were allocated to party list seats, and these were selected from four districts throughout the country. These seats were not limited to political parties, but also available to independents should they choose to form their own lists. Ultimately, this structure facilitated the return of powerful local figures and rent seekers who used to be the backbone of the NDP.\textsuperscript{154} Instead of Mubarak as their patron, it was now Sisi.

To rally the divided candidates, Sisi sent his colleague, Major General Samih Seif El-Yazal, to create an unnatural alliance between divergent political parties from the left, right, and youth movements under an alliance called “For the Love of Egypt.”\textsuperscript{155} Seventy-two independent candidates and forty-eight party candidates received official support from the state and security apparatus.\textsuperscript{156} Likewise, former Mubarak loyalists running under the Wafd Party and the Free Egyptians Party became vocal Sisi loyalists.\textsuperscript{157} Egypt’s most pressing economic and policy issues were notably absent from the campaign discourse as independent candidates relied instead on their personal charisma to solicit votes.\textsuperscript{158}

Further weakening political parties are diversity quotas imposed exclusively on the party lists. The 120 list seats have to be filled by fifty-six women, twenty-four Copts, sixteen workers and farmers, sixteen youth, eight Egyptians abroad, and eight Egyptians with disabilities.\textsuperscript{159} While this increases representation of these historically under-represented groups, it comes at the expense of smaller political parties who cannot compete in the party list because they do not have sufficient numbers of members with these characteristics willing and able to run for parliament.\textsuperscript{160} That said, the upside to the quotas is the historic number of seats that have gone to women (88), youth (45), and Copts (36) in 2015, of which a portion were obtained through individual candidate elections.\textsuperscript{161} But these are not the only constituencies that increased their parliamentary representation. A historic number of former army officers, police, businessmen and bankers also obtained seats. Seventy-five parliamentarians are
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former army or police officers and approximately one hundred and forty are from the private commercial sector.\footnote{Nafaa, supra note 87, at 180 (noting that most of the businessmen parliamentarians are members of the Free Egyptians party, the Future of Nation party, and the New Delegation party).}

Predictably, no political party obtained enough seats to create a majority. The Free Egyptians Party obtained the most seats at sixty five, the Nation’s Future obtained 50 seats, and the Wafd Party secured 46 seats.\footnote{Mounir, supra note 141.}

Combined, political parties obtained approximately forty percent of the total seats.\footnote{Nafaa, supra note 87, at 179.}

For the Love of Egypt obtained only one hundred and twenty seats. Thus, the likelihood that rent seeking individual candidates are able to form a united parliamentary bloc able to shape policy is slim. This leaves Sisi and his military elite with the weak and fragmented parliament the election laws were designed to produce.\footnote{Marsha Pripstein Posusney, Multiparty Elections in the Arab World: Election Rules and Opposition Responses, in AUTHORITARIANISM IN THE MIDDLE EAST: REGIMES AND RESISTANCE 94 (Marsha Pripstein Posusney & Michele Penner Angrist eds., 2005).}

VI. Conclusion

From a comparative perspective, Egypt’s experience is not exceptional. Similar to other electoral authoritarian regimes, its dictators set up an institutional landscape where constitutions, elections, parliaments, courts, state agencies, and local governments create a fictitious representative democracy.\footnote{Schedler, supra note 13, at 12.}

Elections are the centerpiece on which this fiction is built. At the same time that authoritarians and their cronies manipulate election laws and procedures to retain their grip on power, they point to elections and calls for democratization when faced with international criticism or internal dissent. Thus, elections are both the sword and the shield that preserve authoritarian rule.

Neither is electoral authoritarianism a new development in Egypt. Both Sadat and Mubarak manipulated multiparty elections to sustain the status quo. Elections allowed the regime to manage intra-elite conflict, reward loyalists, and appease Western benefactors’ expectations of political liberalization. What is new, however, is the sudden move of the military from influencing events behind the scenes to governing out in the open. Harking back to the Nasser era, military generals are now openly controlling the economy and state apparatus. More former military officers are taking on high level civil service positions; major state infrastructure projects are managed by the military with civilian businesses as the subcontractors; and the number of generals appointed to governorships has increased.\footnote{David D. Kirkpatrick, Appointment of 19 Generals as Provincial Governors Raises Fears in Egypt, N.Y. TIMES (Aug. 13, 2013), (“Of the 25 provincial governors named, 19 are generals: 17 from the military and 2 from the police.”);} These former officers are trusted to maintain the status quo by working with the intelligence services to eliminate any political threats to the regime.
This new normal makes the military’s survival intrinsically linked to the survival of the regime. Domestic intelligence services under the jurisdiction of President Sisi work with his former subordinates at the military intelligence agencies to monitor and quash civilian dissent and prevent the formation of politicized groups that act based on policy or principle rather than self-interested rent seeking. Indeed, the crackdown on civil society, prosecution of revolutionary youth, and criminalization of the Muslim Brotherhood is consistent with this agenda.

Another new development is Sisi’s decision not to form a dominant party to do his regime’s bidding in parliament. Instead of creating his own version of the NDP, Sisi structured parliament to be comprised of over four hundred individual, self-interested actors who are vulnerable to bribery or coercion to keep them depoliticized and compliant. The remaining 120 party members are weak by virtue of the fragmented political party landscape, while a host of restrictions impede opposition parties from competing effectively. Because Sisi is relying on current and former military officers to comprise his elite coalition, he does not need a dominant party to enforce his agenda and discipline political actors who challenge his hegemony. Hence, so long as he can rely on the loyalty of senior officers, Sisi’s military (as opposed to civilian) electoral authoritarian regime is sustainable.

The result is a highly fractured political landscape comprised of over one hundred political parties. The criminalized Muslim Brotherhood leadership is in jail or on the run. Egypt’s liberal parties are weak, disorganized, and under-funded. And Mubarak’s old guard is eager to re-enter parliament to collect rents in exchange for policy acquiescence. The same political rivalries and personal conflicts that facilitated the FJP’s electoral victory also prevent a dominant party from taking shape.

At the same time, the underlying populist grievances—rampant corruption, increasing poverty, and harsh coercive security abuses—that triggered the January 2011 mass uprisings persist. Thus, Sisi’s military electoral authoritarian state is far from stable. Should populist anger reach a tipping point, the elite may decide their survival depends on mobilizing against his regime. While the security and
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military apparatus will not hesitate to use force to suppress opposition, they may find themselves overwhelmed by the millions of Egyptians fed up with another corrupt dictatorship. And this time, Egyptians will not be cajoled to go back to the ballot box. They learned the hard way that it takes far more than new elections to produce a democratic transition.
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