

# The Muslim Brotherhood and Islamic “democracy” in Egypt as part of the New World Order\*

TAKIS FOTOPOULOS

## **Abstract**

*The aim of this article is to show that the Muslim Brotherhood’s rise to power in Egypt (as well as in Tunisia before it) has been engineered by the transnational elite, with the help of the local elites and the US-dependent local armies, since the previous client autocratic regimes were politically bankrupt and clearly incapable of imposing the “economic restructuring” required by neoliberal globalization without the occurrence of serious social turbulence. The Muslim Brotherhood’s rise to power will secure the integration of the countries concerned into the New World Order of neoliberal globalization and representative “democracy” in a new form of more sophisticated client regime based on Islamic “democratization,” whereby all the rituals and paraphernalia of “democracy” are present. The first part of this article deals with the Muslim Brotherhood’s rise to power and attempts to explain why it was chosen as the main instrument of the New World Order in the Middle East. The second part puts forward the case that the Muslim Brotherhood’s rise to power represents a new form of “democratic” client regime in the Middle East, in place of the autocratic client regimes which had been dominant in the area since the end of the Second World War.*

## **PART I: THE MUSLIM BROTHERHOOD’S RISE TO POWER**

### ***The “democratic” rise to power of the Islamists***

The Muslim Brotherhood (MB), the oldest Islamic organization, won a major victory in the 2011-12 Egyptian parliamentary elections, with 47.2% of the vote and 235 seats out of 498, whereas another, even more conservative Islamic organization, the Salafists, took around 30% of the vote and 123 seats.<sup>1</sup> Thus, if we add Salafists in the Islamist group of power, as we should, given the high degree of ideological and political affinity between the two organizations, conservative Islamists seemed to control between them about three quarters of

---

\* This article is an extract from the forthcoming book *Redesigning the Middle East: The Arab “Revolutions,” Counter-Revolution in Iran and Regime Change* (Clarity Press, 2013).

<sup>1</sup> Alaa al-Din Arafat, “Egypt’s Muslim Brotherhood divides,” *Le Monde Diplomatique* (May 2012).

the electorate. However, although nobody could doubt the power of the MB, there is a striking discrepancy as regards the voting patterns of the countryside, where most of the peasantry (characterized by very high rates of illiteracy and the associated with it high degree of religious irrationality), live, versus those of the main urban centers, Cairo and Alexandria, where almost a fifth of the country's population and many, if not most, of the workers, self-employed, and employed in the services, as well as of the country's unemployed and underemployed, are concentrated. As regards illiteracy in particular, Egypt has a very high illiteracy rate, as shown by the very low literacy rate among adults (15 and older), which amounts to 75% of the male population (vs. a world average of 87%) and 58% of the female population (vs. 76% world average).<sup>2</sup>

Concerning the voting patterns, the Brotherhood, following its victory in the parliamentary elections it went on to win also the June 2012 presidential elections, with its candidate, Mohamad Morsi, elected as the first "democratic" President of Egypt (who studied and taught in the California university system before returning to Egypt to enter politics, winning election as an MP in 2000), but by only 51% of the vote. The victory of the MB in both the parliamentary and the presidential elections was hardly surprising, given that it is Egypt's best-organized opposition group, which has an estimated 600,000 members.<sup>3</sup> Yet, there were reports and witnesses who testified that MB candidates were blackmailing and bribing poor Egyptians with food and, as an RT correspondent reported, people in the Nile Delta were being offered bribes of a few dollars and a meal to vote for MB candidates.<sup>4</sup> Similar reports emerged about the very recent constitutional referendum.<sup>5</sup> However, even more significant than the reports about irregularities are the voting patterns, both as regards the very high and growing with every election abstention rates but also with regards to the long term trend in the MB vote itself.

Thus, there were four main electoral contests following the January 25 "Revolution" in 2011. First, the March 19 constitutional referendum (which put a constitution temporarily into effect until a new one was drafted), which had a turnout of 41%, then the parliamentary elections with an overall turnout (for all phases) of 59%, followed by the June presidential elections with a turnout of 52% and finally the December 2012 referendum on the new constitution drafted by the MB, where the turnout was the lowest ever: 33%,<sup>6</sup> forcing even the establishment *Economist* to comment sarcastically "not much of an endorsement

---

<sup>2</sup> World Bank, *World Development Indicators 2010*, Table 2.14.

<sup>3</sup> Ian Black, "A force the world can no longer afford to ignore," *The Guardian* (7/2/2011).

<sup>4</sup> Paula Slier, "Muslim Brotherhood bribing voters as Egypt chooses new leader," *Russia Today* (24/5/2012). <http://rt.com/news/egypt-president-elections-fraud-026/>

<sup>5</sup> Mahmoud Khaled, "Fraud allegations as Egypt Islamists claim constitution poll win," *The Times* (17/12/2012).

<sup>6</sup> Ekram Ibrahim and Nada El-Kouny, "Analysis: Voting pattern sees little change in Egypt since revolution," *Al Ahram*. <http://english.ahram.org.eg/News/60653.aspx>

for a constitution promoted as the Brothers' crowning achievement and as a blueprint for the country's future"<sup>7</sup>! A definite growing trend of indifference for representative "democracy" could clearly be established from these figures. Furthermore, the results show a clear trend of a diminishing MB appeal to the electorate. As Hani Shukrallah stressed recently, "in the space of a few months, between the parliamentary elections (28 November 2011 - 11 January 2012) and the first round of the presidential elections (23 - 24 May 2012), the Brotherhood had managed to lose over half its electoral base – nearly seven million votes."<sup>8</sup> For the author this is far from surprising since, as he aptly pointed out,

A Brotherhood in power that is happy to collaborate with the US and Israel in fighting terrorism in Sinai; speaks of strategic ties with Washington; signs a typically stringent loan deal with the IMF; shows astonishing ineptitude and lack of vision; fails to deliver on any of its own promises, let alone the promises of the revolution; and is hailed by the US and Europe for its role in "containing" Hamas and safeguarding Israel's security is a Brotherhood that has lost whatever mystique it once had.<sup>9</sup>

However, what is the most important conclusion that could be drawn from the above election results is that the working classes and the urban poor in general have not favored the MB. This is confirmed both by the presidential elections and the referendum results. Thus, in Cairo, Morsi received only 42.3% of the votes in the presidential elections in June, whereas in the referendum vote, in December 2012, the "yes" vote (for the MB constitution) was again only 43.1%. As regards Alexandria, in the first round of the presidential election, the city surprised many by voting for Nasserist candidate Hamdeen Sabbahi instead of Shafiq or Morsi, despite the fact that the city is considered the Salafists' hometown and Islamists' stronghold. In the referendum, where all Islamists in the city joined in voting "yes" for the constitution, they managed to get a 55.6% "yes" vote. Finally, in the Gharbiya governorate, home to the industrial cities of Mahalla Al-Kubra and Tanta, which as we have seen in previous chapters have a long history of workers' struggles, particularly against the Mubarak regime, the "yes" vote at 47.87 per cent was beaten by the "no" vote.<sup>10</sup>

As one could expect, the "natural" favorites of the transnational elite, i.e. the liberals, the Facebook Youth candidates and the likes, were all but obliterated in the above contests. The liberal New Wafd and the Egyptian Bloc coalition came third and fourth respectively in the parliamentary elections, whereas "The

---

<sup>7</sup> "A dubious yes," *The Economist* (22/12/2012). <http://www.economist.com/news/middle-east-and-africa/21568756-flawed-constitution-will-be-endorsed-argument-far-over>

<sup>8</sup> Hani Shukrallah, "The decline and fall of the Muslim Brotherhood," *Al Ahrām* (6/12/2012). <http://connect.freedomworks.org/news/view/333952?destination=gac%2Fhome>

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Ekram Ibrahim and Nada El-Kouny, "Analysis: Voting pattern sees little change in Egypt since revolution."

Revolution Continues” coalition, dominated by youth groups at the forefront of the protests that toppled Mubarak (i.e. the Facebook Youth), attracted less than a million votes and took just seven of the 498 seats up for grabs in the lower house.<sup>11</sup> As a result, the liberals, the middle classes, and the Facebook youth did not manage to promote as a presidential candidate any of their favorite candidates. Thus, neither Moussa nor ElBaradei managed to make it to the final round, although the former (who worked as foreign minister under Hosni Mubarak), as secretary general of the Arab League played a crucial role in inviting NATO to massacre the people of Libya, while the latter (who pulled out early of the presidential race, presumably assessing as nil his chances of success, particularly after his outing by his own movement as a western stooge!<sup>12</sup>), was considered “a top choice for a lot of liberals.”<sup>13</sup> No wonder that, the first round of presidential elections left Egyptians with a choice between an Islamist candidate and an ex-prime minister from the Mubarak era, prompting the London *Times* to write in an editorial that “these are not the candidates, and that is not the choice, that Western governments would have preferred.”<sup>14</sup>

The events following the election of the Muslim Brotherhood candidate as president showed clearly the character of the new regime as one based on Islamic “democratization,” whereas the liberal forces of the “revolution” were simply passed by. Indicatively, when the main organ of the international “liberal Left,” the *Guardian*, raised the question “Who will the new president choose as a prime minister?” the obvious for it answer was “A non-Brotherhood figure – Mohamed ElBaradei is being mooted – could signal pluralism and help deflect heat on the economy.”<sup>15</sup> But, ElBaradei was not going to be the new PM. Instead, Hisham Qandil was appointed as PM, a US-educated engineer who was water resources minister in the last military-appointed cabinet and not a member of Muslim Brotherhood’s Freedom and Justice party (FJP), although, as his BBC profile states, “is believed to be religious and once said he had grown his beard as a sign of piety “in line with the Sunnah” – the Prophet Muhammad’s words and actions”<sup>16</sup>. Qandil, in turn, appointed a cabinet of mainly technocrats (only a handful from the FJP).

### ***Political Islamism and the Left***

However, before we proceed to examine the politics of Egyptian Islamists, a brief

---

<sup>11</sup> Reuters, “Islamists secure top spot in new Egypt parliament” (21/1/2012).

<sup>12</sup> El Baradei was outed by Mamdouh Hamza, a prominent member of ElBaradei’s own National Front for Change, as “having strong ties to Zionist institutions” and sitting directly on the board of trustees of George Soros’ International Crisis Group; see Tony Cartalucci, “ElBaradei Outed by Own Movement as Western Stooge,” *Land Destroyer* (1/12/2011).

<sup>13</sup> “No choice for Egyptians? ElBaradei pulls out of presidential race,” RT (14/1/2012).

<sup>14</sup> “After the Arab Spring,” Leader in *The Times* (26/5/2012).

<sup>15</sup> Ian Black, “Morsi wins – but military’s power remains,” *The Guardian* (25/6/2012).

<sup>16</sup> “Profile: Egypt Prime Minister Hisham Qandil,” *BBC News* (3/8/2012).

digression is needed to avoid any misunderstandings or distortions about my stand on Islamism, as a political, as well as a religious, ideology. Clearly, my stand against Egyptian Islamism does not arise out of the modern brand of political correctness promoted by the dictates of the transnational elite, which implies a selective rejection of religious irrationalism, according to the basic criterion of whether it is friendly or not towards the New World Order (NWO) based on neoliberal globalization and representative “democracy” that the transnational elite has been imposing by economic or military force all over the world since the emergence of globalization and the parallel collapse of the Soviet bloc. Thus, religious irrationalism based on Judaism or Christianity is today praised by the media, as is also Saudi Arabian Islamism, or even Al Qaida Islamism – as long as it fights for the “right” causes, i.e. against communism in Afghanistan in the past, or against the anti-NWO movements in Libya or Syria at present. Although the term “Islamism” itself, as well as its nature as a political ideology, is controversial, my stand on Islamism is clearly based on my general stand against any kind of irrational ideology – which includes of course religion that expresses irrationality *par excellence*. Politics, in the classical sense of collective self-determination, can only be based on democratic rationalism, as expressed through genuine direct democracy (or I what I call Inclusive Democracy, as opposed to the travesty of democracy called representative “democracy”), and not on any kind of irrational beliefs, as I tried to show elsewhere.<sup>17</sup> In fact, whenever the decisions of even a traditionally anti-NWO Islamic movement like the Iranian movement were based on irrational belief, they were criminally wrong. An indication of this is what Ayatollah Khatami told a Friday prayer gathering in Tehran during the Egyptian uprising, in view of the foreseeable at the time taking over by the Muslim Brotherhood: “An Islamic Middle East is being formed. A new Middle East is being shaped around Islam, religion and religious democracy.”<sup>18</sup> In other words what matters, according to this view, is Islamism itself and not its stand towards the NWO of neoliberal globalization! Not surprisingly, the Iranians were soon to have a nasty surprise by Morsi and the MB in the Tehran conference of the non-aligned movement, as we shall see below.

In my view, Islamist movements must be supported by the Left, as it has always been the case in the past, as long as they are part of national liberation movements, or anti-New World Order movements. National liberation, which nowadays mainly takes the form of breaking with the NWO, is a precondition for any social liberation and the struggle for this goal should unite everybody wishing to fight for it, irrespective of sex, race, ethnic or cultural differences, including religious ones. However, neither national liberation nor, even more so, social liberation, can ever be achieved with the help of the very elites against whom both types of struggle are fought. Therefore, any Islamic movements

---

<sup>17</sup> Takis Fotopoulos, “The Rise of New Irrationalism and its Incompatibility with Inclusive Democracy,” *Democracy & Nature*, Vol. 4, Nos. 2/3, pp.1-49.

[http://www.democracynature.org/vol4/fotopoulos\\_irrationalism.htm](http://www.democracynature.org/vol4/fotopoulos_irrationalism.htm)

<sup>18</sup> James Reynolds, “Are uprisings a ripple of Iran in 1979?,” *BBC News* (3/2/2011).

cooperating with the transnational elite and its client regimes, in order to overthrow a non-client regime – even if it is an authoritarian one – are enemies of the peoples, as they put their religion above the struggle for national liberation and against the NWO, and, as such, should be treated accordingly by the struggling peoples and by the antisystemic Left. Of course, the degenerate “Left,” which in fact does not fight for systemic change but only for human rights and “freedoms,” does not also have anything to do with this struggle. This is why this “Left,” indirectly, backed the criminal campaigns of the transnational elite against the Libyan and Syrian peoples when it supported the so-called “rebels” who were armed and financed by the transnational elite and its client regimes. The criminal role of this degenerate “Left” (which sometimes even claims to be “Marxist” or “anarchist”!) should therefore be revealed, as it clearly plays, either objectively, or sometimes even deliberately, the role of justifying ideologically the NWO and the transnational elite, as well as its wars against any resisting peoples.

### ***Why the Muslim Brotherhood was chosen as the main instrument of the New World Order in the Middle East?***

Going back to the Egyptian Islamists, the first issue with respect to their movement refers to what is exactly the nature of their movement and, related to it, why did the transnational elite trust them so much, so that they did not have any qualms about triggering the replacement of an autocratic client regime with a new form of client regime expressing Islamic “democratization” and based, mainly, on the Muslim Brotherhood. This issue is raised because the emergence of Islamic “democratization” in Egypt, clearly, did not happen by some sort of historic accident. It is obvious that the transnational elite (and particularly the US based part of it), had known very well, at least since 2004, who would take over in Egypt in case free elections of any sort were going to be allowed there. We should not forget that this was the year when Mubarak was forced by the US elite to allow a degree of freedom in the parliamentary elections and, consequently, the Muslim Brotherhood had elected more than half of its candidates in the areas it contested! But in fact, it was since 2005, as we saw in the last chapter, that the US campaign for “democracy” in Egypt began, a campaign which culminated with the election of Obama in the Presidency, who, even before his official inauguration, was busy organizing meetings with Egyptian activists of the Facebook youth at the end of 2008, with the explicit aim of “regime change.”

However, to understand the nature of the Muslim Brotherhood movement we have to go back to its historical development, particularly in the post-1948 period. Historically, the movement, which was founded by Hassan al-Banna in 1928, in the aftermath of the 1919-20 revolution and the continuing struggle against the reactionary bloc (comprising the monarchy, the great landlords, and the rich peasants), was formed with the active support of the British embassy and the royal Palace (controlled by the British) and was inspired “by ‘Islamist’ thought in

its most backward 'Salafist' version of Wahhabism, as formulated by Rachid Reda – i.e. the most reactionary, antidemocratic and against social progress version of the newborn 'political Islam'.<sup>19</sup> The movement initially aimed simply to spread Islamic morals and good works, but soon became involved in politics, particularly in the fight to rid Egypt of British colonial control and cleanse it of all Western influence – although what they meant by this was cultural influence and not economic one as well! Their main aim has always been the Islamization of Egypt's political and cultural institutions and the promotion of sharia as the basis for legislation. This is summed up by its main slogan used worldwide: "Islam is the solution." After its launching in 1928, branches were set up throughout the country – each running a mosque, a school and a sporting club. As a result, also, of this social activity its membership grew rapidly so that, by the late 1940s, the movement is believed to have had as many as two million followers in Egypt, while its ideas had spread across the Arab world.

The Brotherhood has always made pragmatic alliances with regimes – those of King Farouk from 1936; the Free Officers under Nasser (who ousted Farouk in 1952); and Sadat from 1970 (who used the Brothers against the Nasserites and the left).<sup>20</sup> The tactical alliance with the Free Officers however was inevitably short lived as they had divergent political goals: the Muslim Brotherhood believed in the establishment of a Koranic state, whereas the Nasserite officers in a nationalist, secularist one. No wonder that a failed attempted assassination of Nasser in 1954 led to the brutal suppression of the Muslim Brotherhood and the imprisonment and sentencing to death of Sayyid Qutb, one of its leading ideologues, which led to the jihadist movement. A year after Qutb's death in 1966, Ayman al-Zawahiri, aged 16 at the time, set up a jihadist cell at his school and invited a few friends to join. In May 2011, Zawahiri became the leader of Al-Qaida, following the murder of Osama bin Laden by US Special Forces. In fact, according to Fawaz A Gerges,<sup>21</sup> "the birth of the jihadist movement cannot be understood without reference to this great clash between the Muslim Brotherhood and Nasser's forces."

The Brotherhood's relation with Western powers had started early on and even during the Second World War, the British viewed the Brotherhood as a possible counterweight against the secular nationalist party, the Wafd, and the communists.<sup>22</sup> But it was in the post-Second World War period, and particularly since 1946-1948, when two crucial events took place, almost at the same time, which marked the post-war period in the Middle East and the entire world:

---

<sup>19</sup> Samir Amin, "2011: An Arab Springtime? Reflections from Egypt," *Europe solidaire sans frontières* (15/5/2011). <http://www.europe-solidaire.org/spip.php?article21911#top>

<sup>20</sup> See Alaa al-Din Arafat, "Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood divides."

<sup>21</sup> Fawaz A Gerges, "This Brotherhood has a real sense of purpose," *The Independent* (7/2/2011).

<sup>22</sup> Jack Shenker & Brian Whitaker, "A rare glimpse into the world of the Muslim Brotherhood," *The Guardian* (9/2/2011).

- the beginning of the Cold War in 1946 and
- the establishment of the Zionist Israeli state in 1948 on occupied Palestinian land.

Both events and, particularly, the latter functioned as catalysts, in the aftermath of the humiliating defeat of Arab regimes at the hands of Zionists, for the emergence, on the one hand, of the secularist Arab nationalist movement (spearheaded, in Egypt, by the Free Officers movement under Nasser and, in Libya, by Colonel Gaddafi), and, on the other, the strengthening of the Islamist movement headed by the Muslim Brotherhood, which proclaimed that “the only way to restore the former glory of the Islamic world was to return to fundamentalist Islam.”<sup>23</sup> At the same time, the needs of the Cold War first (and of the NWO at present) have led to the creation of an unholy alliance between Islamists and the West, through the client Gulf regimes. Here is how Lizzie Phelan describes the process:<sup>24</sup>

Money from Saudi Arabia helped sustain the movement when other Arab governments, especially Egypt’s, moved against them. And thanks to the Cold War, the Muslim Brotherhood would draw energy from the global crusade against communism. Its combination of elite insider politics and underground violent militancy marked the true start of what we now call “political Islam.” The Islamist regimes in Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iran, and Sudan that came to power beginning in the late 1970s were the direct result of the groundbreaking work done by Banna, Ramadan and their allies. (...) The strategists who build the NATO, Baghdad Pact, and CENTO alliances, the Rapid Deployment Force, and the U.S. Central Command attached extraordinary importance to securing the Gulf. (...) To defeat the nationalists, and to build a tier of nations aligned in opposition to the Soviet Union, the United States would reach out to the Islamic Right.

A large part of the Brotherhood’s support rests on the welfare services, health clinics and computer training for young people that it provides. Yet, the economic policies themselves of the Muslim Brotherhood, at least since the mid 2000s, have been the usual mix of neoliberal globalization policies (i.e. support for privatization and gradually opening Egypt to global free trade), which were complemented by the ideology of globalization, namely, human rights and representative “democracy.” In this sense, the Muslim Brotherhood was the perfect Egyptian candidate for the transnational elite, so that it could implement Egypt’s “democratization” and its full integration into the NWO.

---

<sup>23</sup> Lizzie Phelan, “History of the Muslim Brotherhood's collusion in Palestine” in Robert Dreyfuss’s book *Devils Game: How the United States Helped Unleash Fundamentalist Islam* (Metropolitan Books, 2006/2008), pp. 58 – 64.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*



As Samir Amin also stressed about the historical role of the Brotherhood:

The Muslim Brotherhood is committed to a market-based economic system of complete external dependence. They are in reality a component of the comprador bourgeoisie. They have taken their stand against large strikes by the working class and against the struggles of poor peasants to hold on to their lands. So the Muslim Brotherhood are “moderate” only in the double sense that they refuse to present any sort of economic and social program, thus in fact accepting without question reactionary neoliberal policies, and that they are submissive de facto to the enforcement of U.S. control over the region and the world. They thus are useful allies for Washington (and does the US have a better ally than their patron, the Saudis?), which now vouches for their “democratic credentials.”<sup>25</sup>

Finally, in view of the above about the history of the MB and its stand with respect to neoliberal globalization and the present huge campaign of the transnational and Zionist elites to redesign the Middle East political map, one could understand why there is an obvious (unholy) alliance between the Islamist winners on the one hand and the losers in the liberal camp who have been eliminated through the electoral process on the other. This, despite the fact that the direct flag carriers of ideological globalization are those who, through the Facebook Youth, the NGOs and so on, tried hard to control the uprising according to the principles of ideological globalization (see chapter 3). Here is how El Baradei accurately described this alliance:<sup>26</sup>

I predict the Islamists will embrace other political factions, support free markets and be pragmatic. It is time to set aside our differences. We need the strength of a unified Egypt: ensuring judicial independence, protecting media freedom and civil society, and tapping Egypt’s potential as an emerging market. With the lack of a democratic framework, I recently bowed out of the presidential race. I believe I can contribute more if I am not wading through the political muck and hope to help groom the youth that triggered the revolution so they can take over the leadership of the country in the next election. (...) Despite the ups and downs of the past year I believe with all my heart that our revolution will succeed.

In fact, ElBaradei knew very well that Egypt, left to MB and Salafists, was very much in safe hands (from the transnational and local elites’ point of view). As we saw above, both the MB and Salafists belong to the sort of Islamists who, historically, have never had anything to do with the anti-New World Order kind of political Islamism (as expressed e.g. by the Iranian regime), and have no

---

<sup>25</sup> Samir Amin, “2011: An Arab Springtime? Reflections from Egypt,” *Europe solidaire sans frontières* (15/5/2011). <http://www.europe-solidaire.org/spip.php?article21911#top>

<sup>26</sup> Mohamed ElBaradei, “My year of hard-pounding in Egypt’s political muck,” *Financial Times* (7/2/2012).

objection at all to the full integration of Egypt into the NWO of neoliberal globalization and representative “democracy” – as long as they are left free to preach and practice their irrational beliefs, as all religious organizations all over the world do. Naturally, the elites are happy to let them do so, as long as they do not bother them in perpetuating a system securing the concentration of economic and political power in their hands! And this is exactly the case of the MB, which is not only an enthusiastic supporter of neoliberal globalization but has already showed that it can function as a client regime of the transnational and Zionist elites, with respect to their present systematic attempt to effect “regime change” in Syria – as it did also with respect to the massacre of the Libyan people by the same elites which it directly or indirectly supported. In fact, one of the main aims of the establishment of a new kind of client regimes based on Islamic “democratization” in both Tunisia and Egypt was exactly the facilitation of regime change in both Libya and Syria, which, unlike in the cases of Tunisia and Egypt, required external intervention to be effected. In this light, the present conflict between the secular front under Baradei and the Islamic front under Morsi is just an “internal affair,” as far as the transnational elite is concerned, given that both the MB and many within the secular front (liberals, the middle classes, the Facebook Youth etc.) will serve its strategic and economic aims in the Middle East perfectly well. Thus, although a liberal regime would of course be preferable, the transnational elite accepts that, for the short and medium term, Egypt, like the rest of the client regimes in the area (the Tunisian as well as the newly added Libyan one, to be followed by the one planned for Syria) need to go through a transitional process of “Islamic democratization,” so that they may become fully integrated into the New World Order of neoliberal globalization and representative “democracy”.

As regards Salafists in particular, they seem to be even worse than the Muslim Brotherhood. As Benjamin Schett wrote in a significant recent article on Salafism/Wahhabism:

Wahhabi ideology serves U.S. interests for several reasons. Its followers’ archaic perception of society makes them reject any kind of progressive social change. Therefore they are well equipped to push back socialist, secular or nationalist movements, whose independence-oriented policies are a threat to America’s geopolitical agenda. Although Wahhabism certainly is not representative of the majority of Sunni Muslims, Wahhabi Muslims are Sunni extremists, which causes them to maintain an extremely hostile stance towards Shi’te Islam.<sup>27</sup>

One could even go further and assume that one reason (though not the only one)

---

<sup>27</sup> Benjamin Schett, “US Sponsored “Islamic Fundamentalism”: The Roots of the US-Wahhabi Alliance,” Global Research (7/9/2012). <http://www.globalresearch.ca/us-sponsored-islamic-fundamentalism-the-roots-of-the-us-wahhabi-alliance/>

for which the MB, through its affiliates in Syria and Libya, has directly or indirectly supported the criminal campaigns of the transnational elite against the peoples of these two countries, was exactly that it was well aware that its support for the crucial campaigns of the transnational and Zionist elites in Libya and Syria was a condition that it had to meet in order to be allowed by them to take power in Egypt. In other words, this was the only way in which an Islamist Egypt could avoid, for instance, the fate of Islamist Algeria, where Islamists were massacred by the transnational elite, through its proxy in the local army, exactly because their victory in the 1991 elections was not approved by them. In fact, in Algeria, the army intervened as soon as the Islamist victory became obvious when the Islamic Salvation Front won the first round of the country's first multi-party elections. In contrast, in Egypt, the army not only did not intervene to stop the Islamic victory but its leadership was also ousted immediately after it, in effect, by the US elite on which it was dependent. It will be hard to believe that it was just a coincidence that, a few weeks before Morsi's soft coup against the generals, Hilary Clinton was in Cairo, in her first visit to Egypt after the Morsi victory, and declared that the army should return to the barracks, "to a purely national security role!"<sup>28</sup>

Of course, the image promoted by the media of the transnational elite at the time was one of a strong new president who purged the army from pro-Mubarak elements but it is very surprising indeed that even experienced anti-Zionist Middle East analysts like James Petras, to whom I frequently referred in this book as one of the honourable exceptions in the Left today, would have fallen into the same trap not only crediting Morsi for purging the army from pro-Mubarak elements but even going as far as supporting the new client regime in Egypt for the sake of supporting the newly established "democratic" institutions, as a better alternative to the previous Mubarak regime. However, as regards the sort of "democracy" being established in Egypt at the moment, I hope that the present chapter will help in forming a more perceptive view on the matter, whereas as regards the risk of return of the previous regime, as I showed in the previous chapters, it is almost non-existent. Furthermore, considering the MB regime as a kind of involuntary hostage of the transnational elite (as if the MB in general and Morsi in particular have ever shown any significant divergence of views – or willingness to adopt alternative policies, as we shall see next – from those promoted by the transnational elite!) could well lead, as it did in this case, to what I consider a fundamental error, i.e. to call for the Left to support Morsi from an imaginary risk of an army takeover:

In the case of Egypt, secular liberals and leftists should have joined with the Morsi regime to oust the remnants of the brutal Mubarak regime. They should have supported the elected legislature, even while challenging Morsi's pacts with the IMF, the US, EU and Israel. Instead, secular liberals appear to agree with the regime in its reactionary socio-economic

---

<sup>28</sup> Heba Saleh, "Clinton backs 'full transition' in Egypt," *The Financial Times* (15/7/2012).

policies.<sup>29</sup>

Naturally, the possibility of an army takeover cannot be ruled out – but for the opposite reasons than those mentioned by Petras. Given that, as I showed in the previous chapters, Mubarak would never have fallen had he been supported by the US-controlled Egyptian generals and that since his fall the army had plenty of opportunities to intervene (the last one being just a few months ago when the “strong” man Morsi carried out, supposedly single handed, a heroic soft coup against the army!), but it never did so, there are obviously other reasons that have to be examined in order to interpret the present situation in Egypt. In this framework, an army takeover could indeed take place in the future but only if the Islamic “democratization” model fails to contain popular anger against the policies of neoliberal globalization to be imposed by the transnational elite through the IMF and the EU, and not because the pro-Mubarak forces would attempt a return. The Mubarak model of client regime has been dead and buried since the “revolution” of January 2011 – apart perhaps from some remnants in the judiciary – when the transnational elite decided to oust Mubarak who was already politically bankrupt and replace this obsolete model of clientelism with a synchronised one based on Islamic “democratization” in the redesigned Middle East. Furthermore, the millions of poor, the unemployed and the marginalized would be hardly concerned about the risk of losing the supposed freedom that liberal “democracy” (particularly of the Islamic kind!) offers to them, as they are well aware that, as soon their struggle creates a real danger to the local and foreign elites, even this freedom will be effectively (and “legally”) undermined, through the various laws they have in their arsenal, on top of the most effective ever technology of state violence available to them, to protect public order. This is, for instance what the peoples in the peripheral European countries discovered in the last two years or so when every time they began revolting against the savage economic war launched against them by the local and foreign elites, then, in case they were protesting peacefully, their massive protests were simply ignored, whereas every time they had to resort to defensive collective violence against the samurai of the security forces they were violently suppressed. Needless to add that in the latter case nobody in the West (governments, mass media etc.) was the least concerned about these blatant cases of “regimes turning against their own peoples” – this being presumably a practice forbidden only to rogue regimes.

Of course there also many other indications about the real role of the MB, which clearly show that this role, far from being enforced by the transnational elite on the organization, it was in fact a voluntary decision by it. Thus, one of the first things Morsi did as soon as he took over was to reassure the transnational elite of his intentions, telling the *Wall Street Journal* that his foreign policy priority was a “strategic partnership” with the US, with the aim of gaining access to international

---

<sup>29</sup> James Petras, “Egypt and Argentina: The Right-Left Alliance,” *Global Research* (10/12/2012).  
<http://www.globalresearch.ca/egypt-and-argentina-the-right-left-alliance/5314891>

credit markets and global legitimacy!<sup>30</sup> Similarly, he rushed to reassure the Gulf client states by dismissing as “delusional, slanderous and baseless” the suggestion that the Brotherhood had direct relations with Iran or Hezbollah, its Lebanese ally. Thus, as Morsi pledged immediately after he was elected: “We will never stand with the forces which threaten friendly countries in the Arabian Gulf”<sup>31</sup> (by which of course he meant the most reactionary regimes around, i.e. Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Kuwait and the likes!). In fact, Morsi in his inauguration speech not only formally committed the Muslim Brotherhood to the Camp David Accords but also to the transnational elite’s campaign for regime change in Syria: “We emphasize the state of Egypt’s commitment to international treaties and agreements (...) Spilling the Syrian people’s blood has to stop. We will exert efforts to achieve that in the near future.”<sup>32</sup>

No wonder also that the Egyptian elite celebrated Morsi’s victory with a significant rise in the stock exchange index. After all, Morsi’s five-point plan for his first 100 days in office was clear: to deal with the problems of traffic, security, street cleanliness, bread and fuel!<sup>33</sup> This, in a country in which, as Seumas Milne, a liberal Left analyst, pointed out, about 40% of the population lives on less than two dollars a day, and the IMF is hovering in the wings with the kind of structural adjustment reforms that can only make things worse for those at the sharp end. Those include privatizations the Brotherhood has pledged to continue and expand. No wonder the MB won plaudits from US officials for saying “all the right things on the economic side,” despite its social programs.<sup>34</sup>

What is less self-explanatory is that the first formal congratulations to Morsi from abroad came from Hamas. Although this is not surprising given that Hamas is an offshoot of the Egyptian MB, it is still difficult to explain how Hamas, as a result presumably of its close links with the Egyptian MB, ended up supporting the Muslim Brotherhood in Syria that makes up a significant part of the anti-Assad armed insurrection, despite the huge (financial and military) help that Hamas and Palestinian resistance in general received from the Ba’athist regime all these years! In other words, Hamas, indirectly, supports now also the transnational and Zionist elites’ plans in the Middle East, which, in case they are successful in changing the non-client regimes in Syria and Iran with client ones, they will inevitably lead to a Zionist solution on the Palestinian issue! The present massive expansion of Israeli settlements which precludes any idea of a two-state solution should have given Hamas an idea of what this solution will be about, at the time

---

<sup>30</sup> Abdel-Rahman Hussein & Julian Borger, “Tahrir cheers as Morsi named Egypt’s president,” *The Guardian* (25/6/2012).

<sup>31</sup> Ian Black, “Formal welcome, private fears,” *The Guardian* (26/6/2012).

<sup>32</sup> “President Morsi hails ‘new Egypt’ but faces challenges to authority,” *Russia Today* (30/6/2012). <http://www.rt.com/news/morsi-egypt-inauguration-army-constitution-121/>

<sup>33</sup> Abdel-rahman Hussein, “Morsi win calms stock market – now real battle begins,” *The Guardian* (26/6/2012).

<sup>34</sup> Seumas Milne, “Egypt’s revolution will only be secured by spreading it,” *The Guardian* (27/6/2012).

that the “fearless” Morsi and the MB gang do not even dare to break completely any diplomatic relations and demand from the UNSC to take real action against the racist Zionists, instead of the present verbal criticisms of Israel which are of course completely ignored by them. Furthermore, the Gaza incidents in August, which played a significant role with respect to the Islamist “coup” against the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces (SCAF), confirmed in an undisputed way the client nature of the Muslim Brotherhood regime and do not allow any scope for continuing Hamas misunderstandings on it. As Abayomi Azikiwe, director of Pan-African News Wire from Detroit rightly stated recently, “we’re seeing that the siege on Gaza has become tighter than ever before”<sup>35</sup> i.e. what used to be considered by most peoples in the world as “the largest open-air prison in the world,” which was created by Zionists and maintained with the support of the Mubarak regime, has become an even worse prison, thanks to the Muslim Brotherhood and Morsi!

Needless to add that Hamas’s supposed military “victory,” following the latest Zionist massacre in Gaza, and Morsi’s related diplomatic “victory” (for which he was explicitly congratulated by the entire transnational elite and its media – although only implicitly by the Zionist elite, for obvious reasons) were just fiascos yet again, if not clear acts of treachery against the Palestinian people. Thus, Hamas’s military victory consisted in the fact that it was shown to be capable of launching a few long-range missiles (which would best be described as more developed fireworks!) into the suburbs of Tel Aviv and Jerusalem, giving Israel the chance to test its anti-missile system successfully. In the process, not only did Hamas had to pay a very high price in terms of the amount of Palestinian casualties it suffered vs. the minimal number of Israeli casualties suffered, but also the Zionists had the chance to destroy most of Hamas’s infrastructure, rendering it incapable of launching any major offensive (even if it wanted to!) once the imminent “big battle” against Syria and Iran begins. At the same time, Morsi’s diplomatic “victory” consisted in the fact that he negotiated a truce between the two sides, his big “achievement” being to get the Israelis to stop their offensive against Gaza, while at the same time forcing Hamas to abandon its right to resistance against the Zionist occupiers! At the same time, Morsi did not even dare to open the Gaza-Egypt border fully, so as to break the criminal imprisonment of the Gazan people from his side, let alone break diplomatic relations with Israel for its massacre in Gaza.

[http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/journal/vol8/vol8\\_no1-2\\_takis\\_muslim\\_brotrherhood\\_part1.html](http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/journal/vol8/vol8_no1-2_takis_muslim_brotrherhood_part1.html)

---

<sup>35</sup> “Egypt new govt. risks losing support among working class: Analyst,” Press TV (9/9/2012).  
<http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2012/09/09/260633/egypt-hit-gaza-financial-move/>