CURRENT TRENDS IN ISLAMIST IDEOLOGY

Edited by
Hillel Fradkin
Husain Haqqani
Eric Brown

Volume 4

Center on Islam, Democracy, and
The Future of the Muslim World

HUDSON
INSTITUTE

CURRENT TRENDS IN ISLAMIST IDEOLOGY

Edited by
Hillel Fradkin
Husain Haqqani
Eric Brown

Volume 4

About the Hudson Institute

Hudson institute is a non-partisan policy research organization dedicated to innovative research and analysis that promotes global security, prosperity, and freedom. We challenge conventional thinking and help manage strategic transitions to the future through interdisciplinary and collaborative studies in defense, international relations, economics, culture, science, technology, and law. Through publications, conferences, and policy recommendations, we seek to guide global leaders in government and business.

Since our founding in 1961 by the brilliant futurist Herman Kahn, Hudson's perspective has been uniquely future-oriented and optimistic. Our research has stood the test of time in a world dramatically transformed by the collapse of the Soviet Union, the rise of China, and the advent of radicalism within Islam. Because Hudson sees the complexities within societies, we focus on the often-overlooked interplay among culture, demography, technology, markets, and political leadership. Our broad-based approach has, for decades, allowed us to present well-timed recommendations to leaders in government and business.

For more information, visit www.hudson.org.

Contents

Introduction

The Islamist world continues to be highly dynamic and was especially so over the last six to twelve months. The contents of this fourth issue of *Current Trends in Islamist Ideology* are an expression of that dynamic.

Two developments of this period stand out most clearly and emphatically: The first is the reemergence of the Muslim Brotherhood in Islamist affairs—or, perhaps, renewed appreciation of its enduring force. The second is the reemergence of radical Shiism, under the auspices of the Islamic Republic of Iran, as a potent, if variant, strand within radical Islam.

Neither the Brotherhood nor radical Shiism was, of course, inactive or entirely unnoticed during the preceding period. But since September 11, 2001, al-Qaeda and its associated organizations have tended to steal the limelight and overshadow them. Their lower profile was abetted, moreover, by al-Qaeda and other *jihadi* terrorist organizations that declared themselves the new, preeminent leaders of the Islamist movement. They claimed to have assumed the mantle of the older *salafi* organizations, such as the Brotherhood, and to have surpassed them in strategic clarity and operational efficiency.

Recent events have tended to weaken that claim. Of course, al-Qaeda remains very important and potent. It appears, indeed, to have reinforced its position recently by establishing a new sanctuary in northwest Pakistan. But both the Muslim Brotherhood and radical Shiism have managed some conspicuous successes over the past year sufficient enough to raise rival claims of leadership.

In the case of the Muslim Brotherhood, three events are particularly significant: the victory of Hamas, the Palestinian branch of the Brotherhood, in the 2006 Palestinian elections; the partial success of the Brotherhood in the Egyptian parliamentary elections; and the Brotherhood's leading role in orchestrating the Danish cartoon crisis—which was instigated by the organization's Danish branch and aggravated by wide-spread violent demonstrations that were supported, at least in part, by its branches in the Middle East. All this testifies to the renewed vitality of the Brotherhood and to the breadth and depth of its resources as the oldest and best organized radical Islamic movement. Two pieces in

this issue are devoted to aspects of the Brotherhood and its recent activities. Israel Elad Altman's article focuses on the current dynamic and debate within the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood, and Lorenzo Vidino's article discusses the Muslim Brotherhood in Europe. The latter provides an account of the history of the organization's establishment in Europe, its relationship with other Islamist groups, and of the steady and now accelerating growth of its influence.

The Brotherhood's achievements—especially its electoral participation and success—and the possibility of alternative Islamist strategies and leadership have necessarily generated considerable discussion within jihadist circles. A third article by Reuven Paz reports on and analyzes this response.

The renewed vigor of radical Shiism dates to the election of the new president of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, and his assumption of office in the summer of 2005. As has become clear in the past six months, Ahmadinejad has managed to revivify the regime. He has restored the revolutionary vision and rhetoric of its founder, Ayatollah Khomeini, and thus the morale of the cadres who are essential to the regime's survival. By confronting Western liberal democracy, Ahmadinejad has advanced Iran's preeminence in the radical Islamic movement, as well as his own personal bid for the leadership of that movement. (See Hillel Fradkin, "Reading Ahmadinejad in Washington," *The Weekly Standard*, May 29, 2006).

This drive has assumed additional momentum because of the Iranian client Hezbollah's claim of success in its war with Israel in the summer of 2006, and because of Iran's ongoing resistance to the demands of the United States and its allies regarding uranium enrichment. Of less certain import is the establishment of a Shi'a-led government in Iraq, which might well fall under Iran's sphere of influence and has thereby given rise to the notion of a general Shi'a revival and/or threat.

The presumed successes of radical Shiism, especially in the court of public opinion in the Middle East, have predictably produced a flood of reactions from *salafi-jihadi* circles, which are traditionally and deeply hostile to Shiism. Their hostility is both of word and deed. The Wahhabi branch of radical Islam has a record of violence directed against the Shi'a that stretches back to the nineteenth century. Its most prominent recent standard-bearer was the late Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, who was until his death the head of al-Qaeda in Iraq. Nibras Kazimi's article explores the sources, both ancient and modern, of *salafi* hostility to Shiism.

Another front in this conflict between salafi-jihadism and Shiism is Pakistan. Although Pakistan is a mostly Sunni country, it has a substantial Shi'a community that has, moreover, played a substantial role in Pakistani politics. The growing impact of radical Sunnism has, however, led to sectarian strife. Hussain Haqqani's article describes the history of that strife and its current manifestations, and analyzes the problems it poses for Pakistan's stability.

Overall, these articles explore the new circumstances affecting the radical movement, namely, its evolution into at least a three-sided competition and rivalry. How long this rivalry will continue and what its outcome will be is difficult to know. But for the moment, it supplies a kind of framework for the global Islamist movement, and future issues of *Current Trends* will continue to track its various factions.

The final article in this issue focuses on an abiding concern of this journal: the attempt to radicalize Islam in Southeast Asia. Zachary Abuza's piece brings much-needed attention to a little-known arena of this struggle—the Muslim minority community of Thailand.

–Hillel Fradkin
Washington, D.C.
November 2006

The Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood After the 2005 Elections

ISRAEL ELAD-ALTMAN

T he success of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood (MB) in the November-December 2005 Egyptian parliamentary elections—followed as it was by the resounding victory of Hamas in the January 2006 Palestinian Legislative Council elections—has bolstered both its domestic and international standing. The MB is now viewed as a possible alternative to the present Egyptian regime just when President Hosni Mubarak's era is coming to a close and Egypt is approaching a delicate succession process. By tracing the main lines of the MB's ideological discourse and political involvement following the elections, this article will explore if and how their results have influenced the movement's thinking and strategies.[1]

An Action Plan

W hile many domestic and foreign observers have expressed concern that the MB may now be contemplating a political takeover in Egypt, MB spokesmen have made a point of allaying such fears, stating that the movement is still far from assuming power.[2] The MB General Guide Muhammad Mahdi 'Akif asserted that the movement's first priority is not to gain the presidency of the state but to advance reform by educating the people.[3] This declaration accurately reflects a strong view within the MB that conditions are not yet ripe for them to be in power.

What, then, is the movement's agenda? Shortly after the elections, 'Issam al-'Aryan, head of the MB's Political Bureau, presented what he described as an action plan for the movement's next phase.[4] In the domestic arena, he enumerated four goals: to crystallize the MB's political project and to explain it to both the public and the country's elites; to achieve a balance among the organizational, educational, political and social activities of the MB; to translate the public's excited emotional support into productive political and social participation; and to consolidate cooperation and form partnerships with other compatible intellectual and political groups.

On the international front, the plan focuses on what it refers to as the threat to Egyptian and Arab national security. That threat emanates from the despotism and self-centeredness of the ruling elites, from the "Zionist entity" Israel and from American intervention in the region's affairs. In response, the MB proposes taking five steps: cooperating with elites and political forces against "the American and Zionist project"; mobilizing Arab and Islamic public opinion against "the project of hegemony and barbaric globalization"; building up a resistance force based on popular solidarity and elite consensus that will thwart this hegemonic project and demand reform of governments and the economy; working to balance relations with the American people and opening a dialogue with the American government to discuss, on an equal footing, a U.S. withdrawal from the region; and opening a dialogue with Europe that will help the United States out of its military quandary and encourage Europe to bear its responsibility for "exporting the Zionist project to our countries." The MB plan also calls for a review of worsening minority problems in the region and for blocking what it terms Zionist and American efforts to capitalize on historical grievances of minorities in order to threaten the region's states and peoples.

Al-'Aryan said that the action plan fits within the context of "the MB's strategic plans." This larger project starts with reforming the self and gradually progresses to the wider stage—to forming the Muslim home; to guiding society; to liberating the homeland from any foreign rule or domination, be it military, political, economic, spiritual or cultural; to reforming government; and finally to the restoration of the international entity of the Muslim Nation (*al-kiyan al-dawli lil-ummah al islamiyyah*).

Clarifying the Message

The first item on the domestic agenda—namely, the crystallization and clarification of the MB's political project—came in response to widespread criticism that the movement's political message is vague and often self-contradictory, and that it purposefully avoids taking clear, detailed positions on matters of national policy. Since the elections, MB leaders have made statements about political and economic reform but have continued to speak in general terms. No comprehensive document outlining the MB's political program has been issued since the publication of the MB's Reform Initiative on 3 March 2004.

In February, for instance, an article entitled "What Will Happen If We Take Charge of the Government" by Deputy General Guide Muhammad Al-Sayyid Habib discussed aspects of the electoral and governmental systems that the MB endorses. But beyond saying that the constitution should state the powers of authorities based on the rules of Islamic law, it did not touch upon the question of what kind of state the movement seeks to set up or what place Islam will have in it.[5] Habib did not even refer in that context to

the formula often used by MB moderates, who describe the MB's objective as the establishment of a civil state with Islam as its source of authority.

One indication of Habib's view on this question did come out in the same article, in the discussion of the status of Egypt's Coptic Christians. Habib wrote that the MB considers the Copts to be citizens who enjoy the full rights of citizenship (*muwatanah*), and that "consequently they have the full right to assume public posts, except the president of the state." That exception obviously reflects the Islamic principle that non-Muslims cannot rule Muslims. It raises the question of what "the full rights of citizenship" actually means, however, and suggests continued adherence to the vision of an Islamic state in which Copts have a secondary status as merely "people of the pact" (*dhimmis*). In the English language version of Habib's article, posted on the MB's official English website, the Copts have the full right to assume public posts "including that of the head of state."[6]

This ambiguity in the MB's public position on the nature of its planned state, and its repercussions for non-Muslims, has been a constant source of concern for the Copts—a concern that has naturally increased since the MB's strong showing in the parliamentary elections. Immediately after the elections, Guidance Council member 'Abd al-Mun'im Abu al-Futuh, 'Issam al-'Aryan and other MB leaders met with Coptic public figures in an effort to assuage their fears and, no less importantly, to limit the negative impact of such fears on the MB's international image.[7]

In those meetings, the MB representatives said that the Brotherhood no longer supported the 1996 fatwa requiring non-Muslims to pay a poll tax (*jizya*), which had been issued by the MB's then-General Guide Mustafa Mashhur.[8] But while Islamic reformers explicitly maintain that the *dhimmah* pact is obsolete and that the Copts are equal citizens as stated in the Constitution, the MB has not yet formally adopted this position. The MB representatives assured the Copts only that the movement was not aiming to set up a religious Islamic state, saying that it sought to establish a civil state (*dawlah madaniyyah*) with an Islamic source of authority (*marja'iyyah*). By "source of authority", they said, they meant Islam as a civilization and a social and political system; it consisted of general principles that would govern the functioning of a state with a Muslim majority. Do not democrats everywhere respect their nation's superior source of authority?, they asked. Does not a democrat in Germany, for example, respect the state's source of authority in rejecting any Nazi party?[9]

The Coptic representatives found the formula of a "civil state with a religious source of authority" much too vague, and urged the MB to issue an official document clarifying its position.[10] Such a document has yet to appear. When asked about the MB's position regarding the Copts, General Guide 'Akif replied: "We in the MB apply Allah's rules in dealing with them."[11]

The MB's attitude toward other minorities reflects a similar approach. When Alexandria's Administrative Court issued a ruling on April 4, 2006 instructing the Interior Ministry to

allow a citizen's identity card to state that the holder was a Baha'i, the Brotherhood reacted with outrage. In the May 3, 2006 parliamentary debate on the ruling, MB deputies said that the Baha'is were apostates who should be killed. Quoting a *hadith* attributed to the Prophet Mohammed to support their position, they declared that they would draft a law making Baha'ism a crime and branding the Baha'is apostates.[12]

'Akif had responded to previous criticism of the MB for linking religion and politics and for seeking to establish a theocracy by saying that the MB is, in fact, proud of linking politics with religion and struggles to do so. Any conception of Islam that limits it to the sphere of worship (*'ibadat*) and morals (*akhlaq*), and that dispossesses it of its role in leading mankind and governing human affairs (*siyasat umuriha*), contradicts both the truth of Islam as presented by the Prophet Mohammed and the will of Allah.[13] In answer to the same criticism, 'Akif's deputy Habib stated on the MB's English-language website: "Islam, as Imam al-Banna said, is a comprehensive program that encompasses all aspects of life: it is a state and a country, a government and people, ethics and power, mercy and justice, resources and wealth, defense and advocacy, an army and an idea, a true belief and correct acts of worship."[14]

Friction Within

Where the election results have enlivened genuine debate within the MB is on the matter of al-'Aryan's second domestic action point—"ensuring a balance between the various dimensions of MB activity"—which goes to the heart of the movement's nature and strategies. The debate is between the two main ideological currents within the movement: the *dawa* trend, which upholds the MB's traditional, pan-Islamic emphasis on missionary, educational and social work, and on constructing a massive, quasi-secretive organization; and the "political" current, which views political action as the most effective way of achieving the movement's objectives. This debate is not new, but the MB's electoral gains have given it a new significance.

The *dawa* approach is based on the doctrine formulated by the Brotherhood's founder, Hassan al-Banna. He envisioned the Islamization of society, the creation of an Islamic state and the eventual restoration of the Caliphate as a gradual, "bottom-up" process. (This is the doctrine to which al-'Aryan referred when he spoke of "the MB's strategic plans.") The first task is to form the Muslim individual by making the individual adopt the MB's vision; next comes the task of forming the Muslim family and, then, the Muslim society. During these stages, the movement's activity should be solely missionary and educational. Only after society as a whole endorses the MB's Islamic message will the movement be in a position to start implementing its vision of an Islamic state in public and political life. And only at that stage should the movement shift its energies from missionary and educational work to political work. Although al-Banna was actively involved in politics, he held that the MB should focus on education (*tarbiyah*). "When the people

have been Islamized," he argued, "a truly Muslim nation will naturally evolve."[15] The MB should exercise power only when the nation had been truly Islamized and is thereby prepared to accept the principles for which the Brotherhood stands.[16]

The *dawa* approach is advocated by both MB leaders from the "old guard" (who, like 'Akif, were formed in the organization's Secret Apparatus and in President Nasser's prisons) and younger members who were formed by the MB educational system and subscribe to its traditional message. The political approach is promoted mostly by MB leaders from "the second generation"—that is, student activists of the 1970s who rose through the ranks as trade union leaders and are more open to politics and negotiation. These leaders, such as Abu al-Futuh and al-'Aryan, have given the movement an increasingly higher profile in the media and in politics. For years Abu al-Futuh has been arguing openly that political change will be achieved not through *dawa* but through the ballot box, and that the MB should transform itself from a *dawa* movement into a political party.[17]

The MB's electoral gains have raised the question of whether the time for the MB to shift focus has arrived. With large segments of society so clearly supporting the Brotherhood's vision, shouldn't the movement now seek power through full-fledged political work?[18] 'Akif referred to this issue when he said that the harbingers of victory of the MB's project, and of society's readiness to accept the Islamic state, are now coming from Palestine and other Muslim countries.[19] 'Akif used the term *tamkin* ("empowerment" of the MB), a key concept in al-Banna's teachings that relates to the stage at which society is ripe for the MB to start implementing Islamic rule.[20]

An entry on the MB website asked if this stage had indeed been reached, and the reply is telling. The electoral gains of the MB and Hamas do indicate that stage has begun, it said, as a large segment of the population now demands the implementation of an Islamic system in public affairs, politics and legislation. Yet this achievement has been the fruit, not of political work, but of the missionary, educational and social work of the MB—work that has spread the movement's thought and assured it a public following. While the election victory might cause some to expect that the movement would now focus on political work, the opposite is true. It will focus on the educational work that provides the basis for further political gains.[21]

A similar argument holds that the MB was set up by al-Banna to reflect Islam's total, comprehensive message. It was formed as a social, missionary, economic and political movement in one, and not just as a political movement. It was the movement's social basis that secured its survival, moreover. Had it been a political movement only, it would not have survived.[22]

Leaders favoring a more political approach, meanwhile, are openly pressing for the MB to move away from what they call its siege mentality, which was fostered by years of persecution, and from its related emphasis on its own organizational activities. They want the MB to engage other political actors in both the opposition and the government, and

to formulate a clear political message that proposes specific solutions to remedy Egypt's many ills.[23] But proponents of the old order contend that the movement's internal organization is not only the foundation of its social base and the machinery that assures its survival, but also—as the parliamentary elections in Egypt and Palestine demonstrated—the key to mobilizing its supporters and to effecting change.[24]

The MB's official website posted a detailed explication of one of al-Banna's missives, "What Are We Calling the People To," with a section asserting that the movement should not seek power at this stage.[25] Quoting al-Banna, it maintained that it would be a mistake to assume power now and make the state responsible for educating the people. Just as the Prophet Mohammed spent thirteen years in Mecca solving no problems and making no laws but, rather, consolidating the belief in God in people's hearts, so the MB is committed to forming a truly Islamic society and nation from which the Islamic government will then emerge.[26] In the same vein, a top MB official argued that the MB should rule only when society is prepared to accept its rule, and at the present time it is not. He said that it would be impossible to deal with such problems as interest banking, tourism and the sale of alcohol before citizens had reached "full belief in the implementation of Allah's Law."[27]

To Be or Not To Be a Political Party

A related internal debate continues over the question of setting up a political party. In principle, the MB could have done so and applied for an authorization from the state. Refusal to grant permission to a political entity that won twenty percent of the seats in Parliament in a democratic election would de-legitimize the state and give the MB a moral victory, but the MB has yet to go down this road. Its formal position is that its legitimacy comes from the masses that support it and not from the state committee in charge of authorizing political parties; it will set up a party only when that committee ceases to exist and real freedom to form political parties prevails.[28]

Those opposed to forming a party can point to the experience of the Hizb al-Wasat al-Jadid ("New Center Party"), which was established in 1996 by MB members who split from the movement, and is still fighting a legal battle for official recognition as a political party. To get around the constitutional prohibition against religious parties, Hizb al-Wasat al-Jadid has defined itself as "a civil party with a religious source of authority [*marja'iyyah islamiyyah*]," [29] "a civil party with an Islamic background [*khalfiyah islamiyyah*]," [30] and "a civil party with an Islamic reference point"[31]—all to no avail.

But the MB's reluctance to form a political party, let alone transform itself into one, reflects the consideration that such a party would then be just one of many, expressing just one more point of view, and would lose the advantage of claiming to represent the one, absolute, divine truth. MB leaders stress, therefore, that if and when they do set up a

political party, it would not replace the movement—which would go on as a general Islamic society—but would be only a much removed extension of the movement.[32]

The absence of a political party has obviously not prevented the MB, under the cover of recognized parties and independents, from taking part in parliamentary elections in the last two decades. This participation was recently attacked by al-Qaeda's ideologue Ayman al-Zawahiri. In response, the MB defended its recognition of the nation as the source of power and its support of free and fair elections by emphasizing that it also holds that all laws issued by Parliament must conform to Islamic *sharia*.[33]

Reaching Out

The absence of a political party has also not prevented the MB from implementing the fourth action point on al-'Aryan's domestic agenda—consolidating cooperation and forming partnerships with other intellectual and political groups that share common interests. The MB's recent rapprochement with the Nasserists and the Arab Democratic Nasserist Party is especially significant. While old guard MB leaders have long viewed Gamal 'Abd al-Nasser as the archenemy responsible for their movement's persecution and their own personal travails during the 1960s and 1970s, the second generation leaders, who did not share that experience, see today's Nasserists as potential allies in the struggle against the Mubarak regime, the United States, globalization and Israel. They calculate that an alliance with them, for example in "The Patriotic Front for Change" (a coalition of opposition groups, which was formed on October 8, 2005 and included the MB, the leftist al-Tajammu' Party, the Nasserist Party, al-Wafd, Kifayah and smaller groups) would increase the MB's legitimacy among elite groups, which remain wary of it, and make it harder for the government to isolate the Brotherhood.

This rapprochement has met considerable opposition within the movement. When the old guard member Shaykh Muhammad Hilal verbally attacked Nasser's personality, other MB leaders—including 'Akif, who spent twenty years in prison following Nasser's 1954 crackdown on the Brotherhood—apologized.[34] These apologies angered many in the movement's ranks, reportedly forcing Muhammad Khairat al-Shatir, Second Deputy to the General Guide, to declare that the apologies were merely tactical and that what Hilal had said was a true expression of MB belief.[35]

Another conciliatory gesture that generated internal dissent was directed toward Egypt's secular and liberal elite. In December, Abu al-Futuh and another second generation leader, Hisham Hamami, paid a symbolic and unprecedented visit to the author Najib Mahfuz, considered by many in the MB to be a heretic because of his book *Awlad Haretna* ("The Children of Our Neighborhood"). The visit, and what was said during it, was strongly condemned by many in the MB ranks, who came close to labeling 'Abu al-Futuh an apostate.[36] The resistance to these overtures came not only from the old guard,

but also from middle-aged and younger members educated in the movement's *dawa* institutions. Al-'Aryan has complained that the curricula in these institutions, developed when the MB was being persecuted, are imbued with *salafi* radicalism and suspicion of others and need to be reformed.[37]

Abu al-Futuh described his visit to Mahfuz as a way of assuring artists, writers, and others with an interest in literature and culture that the MB is not against creative freedom and culture.[38] He was supported to some degree by Habib, who declared that the MB "in principle is not against culture, arts and creativity," and that political reform should include freedom of the press, of criticism and of thought. He emphasized, though, that the people's representatives should "bring to accountability those bodies or institutions that promote pornography, homosexuality or moral perversion under the guise of creativity. It is essential to subject those so-called creative works to examination and review by specialized and expert people."[39]

Proceeding with Caution

It is significant that al-'Aryan's domestic action plan includes only measures designed to increase the MB's cohesion, effectiveness and attractiveness as a political movement, and makes no reference to any specific objectives in the area of political reform. This emphasis may well reflect a realistic assessment that reform is highly unlikely right now. Moreover, by elevating the MB's stature, the parliamentary elections made it a greater threat to the regime. As was reported, the majority of the young voters born in 1983 and added to the voter registry before the elections, cast their ballots for MB candidates.[40] And given the MB's proven electoral power, the government will find it more difficult to justify Gamal Mubarak's inheriting the presidency from his father on the grounds that no widely supported, viable political alternative exists. The MB thus had to take into account that the elections actually reduced the regime's tolerance for its activities.

The government has indeed made this attitude known. It has pressured the MB by harassing members of its parliamentary block, which provoked the government's ire by attacking its record on a variety of issues. According to MB reports, the security services obstructed social activities of the MB deputies in Parliament, warned local officials in provincial administrations to avoid contact with MB deputies, and instructed provincial village notables to discourage their people from seeking out MB deputies to help solve their problems.[41] More specifically, the authorities have sought to minimize the MB's public opposition on two issues—the extension of the emergency laws and, more importantly, Gamal Mubarak's succession.

In force since 1981, the emergency laws allow the government to arrest people and hold them indefinitely without charge or trial, as well as to prosecute civilians in military tribunals. It allowed the Egyptian authorities to arrest about three thousand MB members

during the wave of street demonstrations for change in the Spring of 2005, and apparently those arrests persuaded the Brotherhood to strike a deal with the authorities, in which it dropped its opposition to Mubarak's reelection that September in exchange for the members' release. During the presidential campaign, President Mubarak declared that he wanted to replace these laws with anti-terrorism legislation, but now maintains that the new legislation will require up to two years to complete. As a result, the government argued, the emergency laws, which were to have expired in May, needed to be extended to prevent a legal vacuum.

Another hurdle to the MB's political ascendancy is clause 76 of the Egyptian constitution, which deals with presidential elections and formerly required a single candidate, nominated by Parliament and endorsed by a referendum. Amended in February 2005, the clause now provides for multiple-candidate elections, but it sets conditions for nominating candidates that, in effect, prevent the MB from selecting any. The MB had intended to use the elections to local councils, scheduled for April 2006, to increase the number of its elected public officials—officials needed under clause 76 to endorse presidential candidates. The government frustrated this strategy in February 2006, however, by passing legislation that postponed the local elections for two years. The MB reacted furiously. While stressing that the Brotherhood had no plans to contest the next presidential election,[42] its spokesmen accused the government of postponing the elections simply to deny the MB the ability to field or support a presidential candidate.[43]

The MB then launched a protest campaign against the extension of the emergency laws. It consisted largely of student demonstrations on university campuses. In response, the government arrested dozens of activists, including a member of the Guidance Council who directed the student activities and who had criticized the government and Gamal Mubarak's succession.[44] MB members interpreted the arrests as means of acquiring a bargaining chip: the government would release the detainees in exchange for the MB's softening of its opposition to the emergency laws.[45]

Likewise, the MB interpreted other government actions—an accusation that the MB was training volunteers to fight in conflict zones like Iraq and Palestine in order to acquire fighting skills,[46] and an announcement on April 19 that a new *takfiri* terrorist cell had been uncovered—as a rationale for extending the emergency laws and for continuing to deny legal status to the MB.[47] The editor-in-chief of the MB's official website implied that the government actually orchestrated the Easter attacks on Coptic churches in Alexandria, and the ensuing violent clashes between Copts and Muslims, to serve as yet another justification for the emergency laws.[48] The MB realized that the extension of the emergency laws could not be stopped, however, and settled for merely registering its opposition. The laws were indeed extended on April 29, five days after the terror attack on Dhahab in Sinai, with very little public protest.

The Politics of Succession

Regarding the crucial issue of Gamal's succession, the MB's position is now murky. Before constitutional clause 76 was amended, the MB clearly opposed that succession, but recently it has been less forthright.[49] On the declaratory level, movement spokesmen have stated their opposition to the succession "in principle"[50] (which apparently leaves room for compromise), but also "under any circumstances."[51] The MB's Guidance Bureau was reportedly split on the matter. 'Akif and his allies were said to have argued that the movement must strongly object to the succession or lose credibility with the public and with others in the political opposition. But a second group supposedly held that opposing Gamal's succession would wrongly divert the MB from more important issues that affect the movement's long-term interests. Rather than opposing the succession, the MB should try to exploit the regime's difficulties with getting the succession through in order to end the state of emergency and change clause 76.[52] This position was reportedly advanced by al-Shatir, who is said to be a key figure in the MB's organization despite his low media profile.[53]

There has indeed been public speculation that the MB might strike a deal with the government, reducing the latter's difficulties with passing Gamal's succession. Members of the ruling NDP's Policies Committee, which is headed by Gamal Mubarak, were rumored to have met with MB leaders to secure the MB's neutrality and nonparticipation in opposition activities against the succession. But MB spokesmen denied those rumors; Habib stated that the movement opposed Gamal inheriting the presidency and had had no contact with the ruling party on this issue.[54] Muntasar al-Zayyat, an Egyptian expert on Islamist movements and a former member of Jama'at al-Jihad, has nonetheless suggested that, eventually, the MB will covertly cooperate with the regime to help it pass Gamal's succession.[55]

The possibility of a deal between the MB and the government has generated much internal debate on the MB main website. Entries against any deal have advanced numerous arguments: A deal would have no value because periods of calm in the MB's relations with the regime are inevitably followed by escalation of repressive measures designed to block the movement's political activities; the regime has nothing to offer because it refuses to legalize the MB and rejects its demands for political reform; even if the regime granted a license to a MB political party, it could revoke that license at any time unless it abrogated its political parties legislation; and the MB must oppose Gamal's succession because it contradicts the very reform the MB calls for, because it is rejected by the movement's grassroots members, and because not doing so would undermine the MB's credibility among the Egyptian masses.[56] More circumspect entries, however, warned that the MB should neither lead a civil disobedience movement against the succession nor join other opposition groups in street demonstrations on the issue because that would simply intensify of the government's campaign against the MB.[57]

This campaign has come as no surprise. Within the last year, governmental efforts to weaken the opposition and thus prevent large-scale protests against Gamal's succession led to the collapse of two vocal opposition parties, al-Ghad and al-Wafd, and indicated what lay in store for the MB.[58] A government-orchestrated public scandal directed at the General Guide fits the pattern. Remarks 'Akif made in a press interview were called insulting to Egypt and Egyptians, which created a public uproar and which the MB saw as an attempt to discredit it in advance of the presidential succession.[59]

The MB and the West: Dialogue or Conflict?

The MB's achievement in the parliamentary elections, along with the defeat of the liberal and secular alternative, accentuated the West's quandary about whether or not to engage the MB in a dialogue on the future of Egypt. Simultaneously, it enlivened debate within the movement regarding its attitude toward, and future relations with, the United States. Al-Zawahiri has already accused the Brotherhood of collaborating with the United States in spreading the thesis that al-Qaeda's violent acts are counterproductive.[60]

MB discussions propose two main approaches to the United States—a black-and-white one that accepts inevitable conflict and rejects any form of dialogue, and a more nuanced vision that allows for dialogue but only under seemingly prohibitive conditions. The first approach, reflecting traditional MB attitudes, sees no room for engagement with the United States because the MB's agenda and the American agenda are totally at odds.[61] 'Akif, who holds this position, has dedicated several missives to portraying the United States as the embodiment of evil.

In the new American global order, he maintains, mankind is divided into ten classes: Americans and Zionists are in the first one, Europeans in the second, and lastly the tenth class is comprised of the inhabitants of the Arab, Muslim and Asian worlds.[62] That global order—or global nightmare—is actually run surreptitiously by the Sons of Zion.[63] Since the United States raised the battle cry in its war on terror, the international community, particularly the West, has followed it and apparently accepted its flawed analysis. The American government insists that whoever joins its alliance is a "democrat" and whoever disagrees with its means of fighting terror is a terrorist himself or a supporter of terror.[64] The MB, 'Akif says, has been in the vanguard of those who view the American call for democracy and freedom with suspicion. The United States has, after all, a dark history of imperialism, continues to aid despotic regimes, is in total alignment with the Zionist project, and craves our resources.[65] Speaking in March at the fourth conference of the "International Campaign Against the American and Zionist Occupation"—which was held in Cairo using the slogan "For the Resistance in Palestine and Iraq; Against Globalization, Imperialism and Zionism"—'Akif called for an economic boycott of imperialist states. He said that cultural products should be included in this boycott because they are

designed to transform thoughts, morals and behavioral patterns and to increase susceptibility to imperialism.[66]

Taking a more moderate approach, some members of the second generation faction have declared an interest in opening a dialogue with the United States, but they recognize the multiple risks involved. The Egyptian government might accuse the MB of colluding with foreign powers. *Takfiri* and *jihadi* groups, Iran, Hizbollah, and even radicals within the movement itself might accuse the MB of treason. Finally, the MB might be manipulated by the Americans. Shortly after the parliamentary elections, al-'Aryan nonetheless stated that the MB welcomed dialogue as a cultural and human value, within the context of its revivalist vision of Islam and its commitment to the gradual and flexible implementation of *sharia*. It welcomed open and public discussion with any segment of American society other than the U.S. administration, he said. MB members have participated in meetings with members of Congress and are willing to continue to do so. Even meetings with official representatives of the administration would be possible if they were public, known to the Egyptian Foreign Ministry, and served the interest of Egypt and the Arab homeland.[67]

But al-'Aryan questioned the aims of the American government, saying that its conflicting values and interests account for its lack of clear positions. Does the United States really support democracy, he asked, even if it transfers power to its political rivals? And does it really support multiculturalism, or the continued spread of American culture and the patterns of American civilization under the cover of globalization? Is the American elite still determined to extend U.S. hegemony around the world and construct a global empire?[68] What he called the American project of empire is antithetical to the MB project of Islamic reformist revival. The latter, he said, seeks to liberate Muslim lands from any foreign hegemony—military, economic, cultural and spiritual—and to reform governance in Muslim countries. In this way it will create real Arab unity and an international Islamic entity (*'kiyan dawli islami'*").[69]

In its fight against Western hegemony, the MB played a predictably active role in the protest campaign over the Danish cartoons. It not only called for a boycott of Danish products, and subsequently American ones as well, but also *inter alia* posted on its website the names and logos of businesses to be boycotted.[70]

Palestine

The MB attributes part of its conflict with the West to the Israeli-Palestinian problem. It contends that the West planted Israel in the Arab region in order to control Arab states and to undermine Arab and Islamic identity. Israel is a Western state with a history and culture foreign to the region. Having no right to exist under international law, it should be abolished and its Jewish inhabitants absorbed into a Palestinian Arab state that

would rightly replace it.[71] It is noteworthy that these arguments for de-legitimizing Israel reflect classic Arab nationalist discourse rather than the Islamist discourse that claims Palestine as a *waqf*, or land endowed to Muslims by God.

The MB celebrated the Hamas election victory as its own: "The Muslim Brotherhood has reached power in Palestine," declared Habib in a clear endorsement of the political approach.[72] But the Deputy General Guide also stressed that Hamas's political enterprise would not interfere with its continuing resistance and armed struggle.[73] Al-'Aryan urged the Palestinians, in fact, to develop a new strategy to liberate all the national land and to form a "single democratic state" that could then join a "Greater Syria" (*bilad al-sham al-wasi'ah*) covering Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Palestine.[74] (He did not, however, use the historic term *Suriya al-Kubra* for this entity.) The "single democratic state" is obviously an Islamized version of the "secular democratic state" advanced by the PLO before al-Fatah and other groups accepted the principle of a two states solution. The reference to a Greater Syria apparently reflects the hope that the combined force of the MB branches in the four constituent countries would give the movement's eventual control of the new entity.

Al-'Aryan went on to advise Hamas to learn from the example of the Zionist movement and the Jewish state—that is, to use a lot of talk about peace to disguise its true aims. Hamas should simultaneously work hard to build a strong, united Palestinian society capable of achieving its real goal of replacing Israel with a Palestinian state.[75] Al-'Aryan further counseled Hamas to play hard to get. It should not appear to yearn for negotiations or dialogue, or to knock on the doors of the Jews, Europe, or the United States. Let everyone come knocking on the Palestinians' door, he said.[76] To a large extent, these tips indicate the MB's own tactics in dealing with such matters.

Conclusion

The MB's new, post-election political position has yet to generate any noticeable changes in its strategies, much less its objectives. While continuing to debate whether the movement should remain a missionary, social and religious society or become a political party, the adherents of these two main ideological currents seem to be happy with the fact that it is, in reality, both. The advocates of political engagement provide the organization with a more moderate face and busy themselves with political field work; the devotees of *dawa* use the MB's powerful organization—with which no secular opposition organization can compete—to mobilize massive popular support and secure the movement's continuity. The MB's "new look," systematically cultivated by the media-savvy figures involved in the political arena, at best only camouflages the persistence of the movement's orthodox ideology.

Since the 1980s, many have accused the Egyptian MB of just pretending to be a religious revival movement while actually remaining ideologically and intellectually conservative,

even stagnant. It focused almost exclusively on cultivating its organization and its members' loyalty, they charged, and suffocated innovative, creative thinking. Several of its most prominent thinkers defected, and its stature among the world's other MB organizations declined. Though formally it still holds the leadership of the International Organization of the MB, such figures as Shaykh Yusuf al-Qaradawi (who left the Egyptian MB), or the non-Egyptians Rashid al-Ghannouchi, Hassan al-Turabi and Faisal al-Mawlawi, have become the leading religious and intellectual authorities in the international movement.

But the Egyptian MB views its indisputable success in the 2005 elections as a vindication of its approach. Though external pressure may have forced Mubarak to allow for some degree of free elections, which in turn allowed the MB to assert electoral power for the first time, this electoral power was created by the MB, through its *dawa* and social activities. Its electoral success, therefore, can be expected to strengthen the hands of those in the MB who reject change. If the movement is getting stronger the way it is, they may well argue, why change its methods, let alone objectives? If the slogan "Islam is the solution" resonates with hundreds of thousands of voters, why replace it with another, more neutral slogan that might mollify the Copts but also produce a scantier harvest of votes? And why risk dangerous confrontations with a declining regime fighting for its survival when the MB now has the momentum?

The predominant view within the MB seems to be that the movement should not now actively seek the regime's demise. The time is not yet right for assuming power because society is not yet ready for an Islamic state that will implement *sharia*. The MB has no real interest in fighting Gamal Mubarak's succession, therefore, though the issue gives the movement a valuable card for extracting concessions from the government. As a result of this assessment, the MB is unlikely to deploy its tens of thousands of members and supporters in street demonstrations over the succession, but rather do the minimum necessary to preserve its opposition credentials—much as it did with regard to the extension of the emergency laws.

The MB's anti-American line has an obvious tactical advantage: it helps the leadership retain legitimacy in the face of some harsh criticism. Hard line rank-and-file members object to any dialogue with secularist groups, for example, and also push to tackle the regime head on. In *jihadi* and al-Qaeda circles, the MB is castigated for participating in democratic elections and in a Parliament that issues manmade laws. But because the anti-American line is such a central feature of the MB's Islamic fundamentalist, Arab nationalist worldview, it would seem to preclude any kind of meaningful engagement with Americans. The only MB-U.S. dialogue apparently envisioned by al-'Aryan is a discussion of conditions for the United States' surrender.

Notes

1. For a view of MB ideology and politics prior to the 2005 parliamentary elections, see Israel Elad- Altman, "Democracy, Elections and the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood," *Current Trends in Islamist Ideology*, vol. 3: 24-37.

2. 'Issam al-'Aryan, "Al-Ikhwan wa-Hukm Misr-la Mubarrir lil-Qalaq," www.ikhwanonline.com, 28 January 2006; Muhammad al-Sayyid Habib, "Madha law Wasala al-Ikhwan ila al-Hukm?," www.ikhwanonline, 6 February 2006.

3. "Akif: Al-Istibdad Yaqifu 'A`iqan…," www.ikhwanonline.com, 7 May 2006.

4. *Al-Hayat*, 11 December 2005.

5. Habib, "Madha lau Wasala al-Ikhwan ila al-Hukm?," www.ikhwanonline.com, 6 February 2006.

6. Habib, "What Will Happen If We Take Charge of the Government," www.ikhwanweb.com, 8 February 2006.

7. www.asharqalawsat.com, 11 December 2005.

8. Ahmad al-Qa'ud, "'Issam al-'Aryan Yu`akkidu Taraju' al-Ikhwan," www.alquds.co.uk, 22 December 2005.

9. Interview with 'Abd al-Mun'im Abu al-Futuh, www.al-araby.com, no. 996, 12 February 2006.

10. "Al-Bahith al-Qubti Samir Murqus Yashrahu Hawajis al-Aqbat min Su'ud al-Ikhwan," www.ikhwanonline.com, 19 April 2006.

11. Interviewed by Faraj Isma'il, www.alwifaq.net, 22 February 2006.

12. "Mashru' Qanun li-Nuwwab al-Ikhwan li-Tajrim al-Baha`iyyah wa Takfir Mu'taqidiha," www.ikhwanonline, 3 May 2006.

13. 'Akif, "Hawla al-Mashru' al-Siyasi al-Islahi lil-Ikhwan al-Muslimin," www.ikhwanonline.com, 8 December 2005.

14. "Dr. Mohamed Habib on Economy, Political Reform and Israel," www.ikhwanweb.com, 8 March 2006.

15. Richard P. Mitchell, *The Society of the Muslim Brothers* (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), 308.

16. Ibid., 103.

17. www.al-araby.com, no. 990, 25 December 2005; http://harakamasria.org, 16 January 2006.

18. Rafiq Habib, "Al-Ikhwan wa-Bidaya Jadida," www.ikhwanonline.com, 20 December 2005.

19. www.ikhwanonline.com, 16 February 2006.

20. This term is heavily charged: It was the title of a MB internal document, outlining the movement's plans for penetrating key sectors of society and the state and for reaching power. The document was seized by the authorities and made public in 1994.

21. Rafiq Habib, "Al-Ikhwan wa-Marhalat al-Tamkin," www.ikhwanonline.com, 28 March 2006.

22. Rafiq Habib, "Al-Ikhwan: al-Rajul wal-Risalah wal-Tandhim," www.ikhwanonline.com, 14 March 2006.

23. Muhammad 'Izz al-'Arab, "Al-'Aryan: Mutalabun bil-Tassaluh ma'a al-Nizam," http://harakamasria.org, 9 February 2006.

24. Ibid.

25. "Sharh Risalat ila ayy Shay` Nad'u al-Nas," www.ikhwanonline.com, 18 February 2006.

26. Ibid.

27. Khairat al-Shatir, Second Deputy to the MB General Guide, in *al-Hayat*, 31 October 2005.

28. 'Issam al-'Aryan in *Al-Sharq al-Awsat*, 23 November 2005; Muhammad Mahdi 'Akif in www.ikhwanonline.com, 5 December 2005.

29. "Nubdhah Ta`rikhiyyah 'an Hizb al-Wasat"("A Historical Outline of the Wasat Party"), posted permanently on the party's website, www.alwasatparty.com.

30. "Limadha al-Wasat?" ("Why al-Wasat"), posted permanently on the party's website, www.alwasatparty.com.

31. Abu Ila al-Madi, founding member of al-Wasat, interviewed in *Arab Reform Bulletin*, vol. 3, issue 10 (December 2005), www.CarnegieEndowment.org.

32. 'Issam al-'Aryan in *al-Sharq al-Awsat*, 23 November 2005.

33. Muhammad Habib, "Narfudh Tasrihat al-Zawahiri," www.ikhwanonline.com, 7 January 2006.

34. "Qadat al-Ikhwan Yastankirun Shata`im Hilal," www.al-araby.com, no. 1002, 26 March 2006.

35. Hamdi Rizq, "Habib, al-Shatir Yatanafasun 'ala Khilafat 'Akif," *al-Mussawwar*, 10 April 2006.

36. "Al-Ikhwan al-Muslimun wa-Najib Mahfuz," www.al-araby.com, no. 990, 25 December 2005; "Tafjir al-Ikhwan min al-Dakhil," http://harakamasria.org, 16 January 2006.

37. Muhammad 'Izz al-'Arab, "Al-'Aryan: Mutalabun…," http://harakamasria.org, 9 February 2006.

38. www.al-araby.com, 12 February 2006.

39. Interview in *al-Mujtama'* magazine, quoted on www.ikhwanweb.com, 8 March 2006.

40. Muhammad Jamal 'Arafah, "Fawz al-Ikhwan," www.islamonline.net/Arabic, 28 November 2005.

41. Ibid; "limadha Tadhtahidu al-Hukumah Nuwwab al-Ikhwan?," www.ikhwanonline.com, 19 March 2006.

42. Statement to the press by the MB parliamentary group, in *al-Sharq al-Awsat*, 19 February 2006; Muhammad Habib in www.ikhwanonline.com, 28 February 2006.

43. Ibid; 'Issam al-'Aryan in www.ikhwanonline.com, 15 February 2006.

44. "La Ya Sayyid Jamal," www.ikhwanonline.com, 5 February 2006.

45. "Analysts: Escalation Against MB Is A Warning Message," www.ikhwanweb.com, 8 March 2006.

46. *Al-Hayat*, 7 March 2006.

47. 'Issam al-'Aryan in www.egyptwindow.net, 19 April 2006.

48. 'Abd al-Mu'izz Muhammad, "Ya Marhab bil-Tawari` fi Baladina," www.ikhwanonline.com, 17 April 2006.

49. Muhammad Jamal 'Arafah, "Fawz al-Ikhwan…," www.islamonline.net/Arabic, 28 November 28 2005.

50. Interview with Muhammad Habib, www.ikhwanonline.com, 15 February 2006.

51. Muhammad Mahdi 'Akif in www.ikhwanonline.com, 12 February 2006.

52. "'Akif Yaqudu Tayar al-Rafidhin," www.almesryoon.com, 5 April 2006.

53. Ibid.

54. Ibid.

55. Muntasar al-Zayyat, "'Alaqat al-Ikhwan bil-Nitham al-Misri," *al-Hayat*, 6 April 2006.

56. Rafiq Habib, "Al-Ikhwan wal-Tawrith," www.ikhwanonline.com, 11 April 2006.

57. Ibid.

58. 'Umar al-Qalyubi, "Al-Ikhwan Yujaddiduna Ittihamahum…," www.almesryoon.com, 11 April 2006.

59. Ibid. See also the General Guide defending himself, "Nass Hiwar al-Murshid al-'Aam lil-Radd 'ala al-Iftira`at al-I'lamiyyah," www.ikhwanonline.com, 16 April 2006.

60. www.sabeelnet.com, 7 January 2006.

61. "'Akif: al-Wilayat al-Muttahidah…," www.ikhwanonline.com, 12 February 2006.

62. "Huquq al-Insan fi 'Asr al-Tughyan," www.ikhwanonline.com, 16 March 2006.

63. "Dimuqratiyat al-Iqsa Masiruha al-Fana`," www.ikhwanonline.com, 22 December 2005.

64. Ibid.

65. 'Akif's missive, www.ikhwanonline.com, 13 April 2006.

66. "'Akif Yutalibu bil-Tassaddi lil-Haymana al-Amirikiyyah," www.ikhwanonline.com, 23 March 2006.

67. Al-Ikhwan al-Muslimun wa-Amirika," www.ikhwanonline.com, 21 December 2005.

68. Ibid.

69. Ibid.

70. See 'Akif's call for boycotting Danish and Norwegian products, www.ikhwanonline.com, 30 January 30 2006; list of boycotted companies and products, www.ikhwanonline.com, 24 February 2006.

71. 'Akif in www.ikhwanonline.com, 29 December 2005; Rafiq Habib in www.ikhwanonline.com, 14 February 2006.

72. www.ikhwanonline.com, 16 March 2006. See also Rafiq Habib, "Hamas wal-Ikhwan wa-Istihqaqat al-Fawz," www.ikhwanonline.com, 28 January 28 2006.

73. Interviewed by Munir Adib, www.ikhwanonline.com, 22 March 2006.

74. Al-'Aryan, "Tada'iyyat Fawz Hamas," www.ikhwanonline.com, 2 February 2006.

75. "Al-'Aryan Yaktubu 'an Tada'iyyat Fawz Hamas," www.ikhwanonline.com, 2 February 2006.

76. Ibid.

Aims and Methods of Europe's Muslim Brotherhood

LORENZO VIDINO

In 1990 Yusuf al-Qaradawi, an influential Sunni scholar and the unofficial theological leader of the international Muslim Brotherhood (*al Ikhwan al Muslimoun*), published a book called *Priorities* of *the Islamic Movement in the Coming Phase*.[1] This 186-page treatise can be considered the most recent manifesto of the Islamist revivalist movement. As Qaradawi explains in the introduction, the "Islamic Movement" is meant to be the "organized, collective work, undertaken by the people, to restore Islam to the leadership of society" and to reinstate "the Islamic caliphate system to the leadership anew as required by *sharia*."

Qaradawi's treatise introduces a new agenda and *modus operandi* for the movement, signaling a clear break with many *salafi* groups and even with some past ideological elements of the Muslim Brotherhood. While the book does not rule out the use of violence to defend Muslim lands, it generally advocates the use of *dawa*, dialogue, and other peaceful means to achieve the movement's goals. This doctrine is commonly referred to as "*wassatiyya*," a sort of "middle way" between violent extremism and secularism, and Qaradawi is one of its key proponents.[2]

After examining the situation of the "Islamic Movement" throughout the Muslim world, the dissertation devotes significant attention to the situation of Muslims living in the West. Qaradawi explains how Muslim expatriates living in Europe, Australia and North America "are no longer few in numbers," and that their presence is both permanent and destined to grow with new waves of immigration. While Qaradawi says that their presence is "necessary" for several reasons—such as spreading the word of Allah globally and defending the Muslim Nation "against the antagonism and misinformation of anti-Islamic forces and trends"—it is also problematic. Because the Muslim Nation, and therefore Muslim minorities "scattered throughout the world," do not have a centralized leadership, "melting" poses a serious risk. Qaradawi warns, in other words, that a Muslim minority could lose its Islamic identity and be absorbed by the non-Muslim majority.

Qaradawi sees the lack of Muslim leadership not only as a problem, however. He also

views it as an unprecedented opportunity for the Islamist movement to "play the role of the missing leadership of the Muslim Nation with all its trends and groups." While the revivalist movement can exercise only limited influence in Muslim countries, where hostile regimes keep it in check, Qaradawi realizes that it is able to operate freely in the democratic West. Muslim expatriates disoriented by life in non-Muslim communities and often lacking the most basic knowledge about Islam, moreover, represent an ideally receptive audience for the movement's propaganda. Qaradawi asserts that revivalists need to take on an activist role in the West, claiming that "it is the duty of [the] Islamic Movement not to leave these expatriates to be swept by the whirlpool of the materialistic trend that prevails in the West."

Having affirmed the necessity of the Islamist movement in the West, Qaradawi proceeds to present a plan of operation. The Egyptian-born scholar openly calls for the creation of a separate society for Muslims within the West. While he highlights the importance of keeping open a dialogue with non-Muslims, he advocates the establishment of Muslim communities with "their own religious, educational and recreational establishments." He urges his fellow revivalists to try "to have your small society within the larger society" and "your own 'Muslim ghetto.'"

Qaradawi clearly sees the Islamist movement playing a crucial role in creating these separated Muslim communities and thereby providing it with an unprecedented opportunity to implement its vision, at least partially. Its local affiliates will run the mosques, schools, and civic organizations that shape the daily life of the desired "Muslim ghettoes." And Qaradawi's ambitions go further still. Without saying so openly, he suggests that *sharia* law should govern the relations among inhabitants of these Muslim islands; Muslim minorities "should also have amongst them their own *ulema* and men of religion to answer their questions when they ask them, guide them when they lose the way and reconcile them when they differ among themselves."

What Qaradawi outlines in his treatise might, at first glance, appear to be nothing more than a fantasy. In reality, it corresponds to what the international network of the Muslim Brotherhood has been doing in the West for the past fifty years. Since the end of World War II, in fact, members of *al Ikhwan al Muslimoun* have settled in Europe and worked relentlessly to implement the goals stated by Qaradawi. In almost every European country, they founded student organizations that, having evolved into nationwide umbrella organizations, have become—thanks to their activism and to the financial support from Arab Gulf countries—the most prominent representatives of local Muslim communities. They established a web of mosques, research centers, think tanks, charities and schools that has been successful in spreading their heavily politicized interpretation of Islam. Finally, today, with the creation of a supranational jurisprudential body called the European Council for Fatwa and Research, the *Ikhwan* is taking its first, cautious steps toward Qaradawi's final goal: the introduction of *sharia* law within the Muslim communities of Europe.

Having been the focus of attention of authorities since its early days, the Muslim Brotherhood tends to be extremely secretive, and only if circumstances are favorable do its members reveal their affiliation. While most of the first Islamic activists in Europe were official members of the Brotherhood, moreover, formal links between the group's Middle Eastern base and its European followers have waned over time for various reasons. But the issue of formal affiliation to the *Ikhwan* is moot because the Muslim Brotherhood is more than a group; it is now better defined as a movement whose organization is far from monolithic and whose members are kept together mostly by ideological affinity.

Mohammed Akif, the current General Guide and supreme leader of the Brotherhood and a former head of its Islamic Center of Munich, explained the *Ikhwan's* transcendence of formalities in an interview with Xavier Ternisien, a French expert on religion.[3] He said,

> We do not have an international organization; we have an organization through our perception of things. We are present in every country. Everywhere there are people who believe in the message of the Muslim Brothers. In France, the Union of Islamic Organizations of France (UOIF) does not belong to the organization of the Brothers. They follow their own laws and rules. There are many organizations that do not belong to the Muslim Brothers. For example, Shaykh al-Qaradawi. He is not a Muslim Brother, but he was formed according to the doctrine of the Brothers. The doctrine of the Brothers is a written doctrine that has been translated in all languages.

In a 2005 interview Akif elaborated further. European *Ikhwan* organizations have no direct link to the Egyptian branch, he insisted, but they nevertheless coordinate actions with them. He concluded the interview saying, tellingly, that "we [the *Ikhwan*] have the tendency not to make distinctions among us."[4]

Regardless of their official affiliation, many individuals and organizations that identify themselves with the message of the *Ikhwan* operate in Europe and have been actively working toward the goals outlined by Qaradawi in his above-mentioned dissertation. Driven by their firm belief in the superiority of Islam to any other religion or system of life, the European Brothers fight daily to achieve their goal, using all possible tools, including painful but necessary compromises with European authorities. "Islam will return to Europe as a conqueror and victor, after being expelled from it twice," Qaradawi says. But he adds, "I maintain that the conquest this time will not be by the sword but by preaching and ideology."[5] The European *Ikhwan* network, under the cover of various civil rights groups and Islamic organizations, is the vanguard of this peaceful conquest.

Putting Down Roots in Europe

According to Mohammed Akif, "the Brotherhood established itself in Europe" in the 1950s.[6] At that time Nasser and other pan-Arabist regimes were cracking down on the organization, and many of its members had to flee their homelands. For various reasons most of the Muslim Brothers leaving the persecution of Middle Eastern regimes chose West Germany as their destination. Some had reportedly established links with Germany during World War II when the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin al Husseini, moved to Berlin and aided the Nazi regime in its anti-Jewish propaganda.[7] Others benefited from the fact that the West German government, implementing what came to be known as the Hallstein doctrine, had opened its doors to dissidents persecuted by regimes that had recognized East Germany, which included Egypt and Syria.[8] Many were attracted, moreover, by the prestige of the country's technical faculties and decided to further their studies in Germany's engineering, architecture, and medical schools.

Among this group of pioneers of revivalist Islam in Europe, Said Ramadan stands out. Born in 1926 in a village north of Cairo, Ramadan joined the Muslim Brotherhood at age 14 after attending a lecture by the organization's founder, Hassan al-Banna.[9] In 1946, upon obtaining his law license from the University of Cairo, Ramadan became al-Banna's personal secretary and began the publication of *Al Shihab*, the organization's official magazine. In 1948 he fought in Palestine among Arab volunteers and was briefly appointed the head of Jerusalem's military corps by King Abdallah of Jordan. He then traveled to the newly established state of Pakistan where, despite his young age, he competed for the chair of secretary general of the World Muslim Congress.

By December 1948 the Egyptian government had outlawed the Brotherhood, and the following year Egyptian police assassinated al-Banna. Given these developments, Ramadan decided to remain in Pakistan, where he worked as a "cultural ambassador" of the country to the Arab world. In 1950, as the ban on the Brotherhood was lifted, he returned to Egypt and began to publish *Al Muslimoon*, one of the most important magazines of revivalist thought. Nasser's sudden rise to power in 1953 shook Egyptian political life and—after a short period of peaceful coexistence among the Brothers and Nasser's Free Officers government—another clampdown on the Brotherhood ensued."

Realizing he could not continue his activities in Egypt, Ramadan left the country after his release. Following short sojourns in various Middle Eastern countries, he moved to Europe permanently with his wife Wafa, al-Banna's eldest daughter. They settled in Geneva, Switzerland, and Ramadan enrolled at the University of Cologne, where he obtained a graduate degree in law with a dissertation on Islamic law.

In 1961 Ramadan founded the Islamic Center of Geneva, located first in a villa donated by an Arabian prince and then in an odd white and green building a stone's throw from Lake Leman. Other eminent Islamic scholars sat on the founding board of the center,

including the Indian scholars Mohammed Hamidullah and Maulana Abdul Hassan Ali al Nadwi. It became one of the main headquarters of the Muslim Brotherhood in Europe, and was the first of a score that Ramadan worked to set up throughout Europe with the financial support of Saudi Arabia. The next year Ramadan was also instrumental in the Saudi kingdom's establishment of the Muslim World League, a government-funded transnational organization created to spread the Saudi interpretation of Islam. Ramadan was one of its main founders and even wrote its constitution.

With the ample financial backing of the Saudis, Ramadan began to establish the Brotherhood in other European countries. An early opportunity arose when a group of Arab students in Munich contacted him for help with the construction of a mosque in that city. The Arab students were competing for control of the Mosque Construction Commission, a body that was trying to raise funds for the new Munich mosque.[10] Their adversaries were a group of Muslim ex-soldiers who had fought with the Nazis during World War II and had stayed in Munich after the conflict. Originating from Central Asia and the Caucasus, these ex-soldiers embraced a moderate interpretation of Islam that clashed with the more militant views of the Arabs. By 1960 Ramadan, thanks to his Saudi funding, secured for himself the position of chairman of the commission, and by 1973, when the mosque was completed, the Brotherhood had completely overshadowed other influences over the mosque.

As Geneva was the launching pad for the European operations of the Brotherhood, Munich became its main headquarters in Germany. The Ramadan-dominated Mosque Construction Commission became a permanent organization, which later changed its name to the Islamic Society of Germany (IGD). Ramadan headed the organization for ten years until 1973, when one of the students who had originally contacted him, Syrian-born Ghaleb Himmat, took over at the helm.[11]

Himmat, who kept his position until 2002, is a prominent member of the European *Ikhwan* network and co-founder of Bank al-Taqwa, a financial institution widely believed to have served as the Brotherhood's clearinghouse in the West. According to European and American authorities, Himmat and Youssef Nada, one of the Brotherhood's top financial minds, used al-Taqwa and an extensive network of companies to finance the construction and activities of dozens of Brotherhood-related projects throughout the West. Both men, whom the U.S. Treasury Department also accuses of having financed Hamas and al Qaeda,[12] have been designated terrorism financiers by various Western countries and by the United Nations.

After Himmat's retirement, the chairmanship of the IGD passed to Ibrahim El Zayat, a younger, German-born activist with a phenomenal talent for both public relations and, like his predecessor, murky financial transactions. In 2002 El Zayat, as a director of the Saudi-based NGO World Assembly of Muslim Youth (WAMY) that spreads Wahhabi literature worldwide, came under investigation in Germany for having funneled more

than two million dollars to an al-Qaeda-linked charity and for his involvement in other money-laundering activities.[13] Yet thanks to its activism and good finances, the IGD is now Germany's most important Muslim organization, representing more than sixty Islamic centers nationwide. Together with Milli Görüş, the Turkish revivalist organization linked to the Refah party that has more than 25,000 members and an estimated 100,000 sympathizers in Germany, the IGD is the *de facto* voice of the German Muslim community.[14] The two organizations—whose leaders are linked through marriage[15]— have formally joined forces, creating the umbrella organization Zentralrat, and they monopolize the public debate about Islam in Germany and control the majority of German mosques.[16]

Various German security agencies have repeatedly highlighted the links between these groups and the Brotherhood, and warned about the ambiguity of their rhetoric. An official report from the Office for the Protection of the Constitution in Hessen, for example, stated that

> the threat of Islamism for Germany is posed ... primarily by Milli Görüş and other affiliated groups. They try to spread Islamist views within the boundaries of the law. Then they try to implement ... for all Muslims in Germany a strict interpretation of the Quran and of the *sharia*.... Their public support of toler-ance and religious freedom should be treated with caution.[17]

Yet, despite these warnings, German politicians consider the *Ikhwan* groups their primary partners in the dialogue over issues involving the Muslim community, thus granting them legitimacy and empowering them.

Flowering in France

While Said Ramadan was active in developing organizations in Germany, another founding member of the Islamic Center of Geneva, Mohammed Hamidullah, created the first revivalist organization in France. An Indian-born intellectual, author of almost two hundred works on Islamic history, culture and law, Hamidullah headed the Paris-based Association of Islamic Students in France (AEIF). Even though Hamidullah was a moderate, more intent on his studies than on political activities, the AEIF soon became home base for a small group of radical foreign Muslim students who were attending Parisian universities. Among them was Hasan al Turabi, a young Sudanese law student destined to become one of the most important figures of Islamic revivalism of the last thirty years.[18] The son of a *qadi* (Islamic judge) from the southern part of Sudan, Turabi had joined the Muslim Brotherhood on the campus of the University College of Khartoum in the 1950s and continued his Islamic militancy while studying law at the

Sorbonne.[19] Other well-known figures who orbited around the AEIF were Abolhassan Banisadr, the first President of the Islamic Republic of Iran;[20] Said Ramadan al Boutih, one of Syria's most prestigious legal scholars; and Issam al Attar, a top Muslim Brotherhood leader who fled Syria to escape the regime and finally settled in the German city of Aachen, where he founded the Bilal mosque.[21]

 This select group came to debate the purpose of their sojourn in the West. The Syrian branch of the Brotherhood, headed in Europe by Attar, viewed its exile as instrumental to furthering its struggle in Syria. For them, at least in the beginning, Europe was just a convenient place from which they could operate against the Syrian regime, and the AEIF was little more than a club for foreign Muslim students who were planning to leave France at the end of their studies. It had no serious political mission beyond promoting revivalist ideas among its members. But others in the European Brotherhood, particularly the Egyptians, saw their *hijra* (forced migration, comparing it to the Prophet's time in Medina) as more long-term and Europe as a permanent base from which to expand the *Ikhwan*'s struggle to impose God's word worldwide. The Brothers were in Europe to stay, they concluded, and the continent—with its freedom, wealth and growing Muslim population—was the ideal new front from which the Brotherhood could operate.

In 1979 a small group of AEIF members who embraced the long-term vision of the Egyptian branch of the European Brotherhood, and who wanted to extend the influence of the movement to the Muslim population of France, created a new organization—the Islamic Group in France, which in 1983 became the Union of Islamic Organizations in France (UOIF).[22] While the official founders were two students, Iraqi national Zuhair Mahmood and Tunisian national Abdallah Ben Mansour, the UOIF had two important godfathers. The first was Faysal Mawlawi, a former member of the AEIF during his Parisian days who had returned to his native Lebanon to run the al Jamaa al Islamiya radical political party. The second was Rashid Ghannouchi, secretary of the AEIF between 1968 and 1969 and head of al Nahda, the Islamist movement that battled the Tunisian regime.[23] Ghannouchi and Mawlawi, wise politicians with a tremendous ability to adapt their rhetoric to circumstances, understood that the Brothers needed a well-structured organization to be able to influence the political debate and, simultaneously, to radicalize the Muslim minority in the European country with the largest Muslim population.

Over the last twenty years the UOIF has developed into France's largest and most active Muslim organization, controlling a large number of mosques and attracting tens of thousands of attendees to its annual gathering in Le Bourget. Today the UOIF even boasts its own institution of Islamic knowledge, the European Institute of Human Sciences (IESH).[24] Located in a castle in rural Burgundy, IESH offers various degrees and diplomas in Islamic studies, and states that its goal is to educate imams who, in addition to having an adequate theological and scientific background, will demonstrate "good assimilation in the Western reality." Given the background of the individuals involved in

IESH, however, "assimilation" is unlikely to be its primary goal. The institute was founded by key members of the UOIF, such as Ahmed Jaballah and Zuhair Mahmoud, and regularly hosts the most prominent figures of the international *Ikhwan* network.[25] Its scientific council is headed by Yussuf al-Qaradawi,[26] and Faysal Mawlawi, the spiritual guide of the UOIF, is a frequent visitor and lecturer.[27]

The French government has a schizophrenic attitude toward UOIF. On the one hand, the French Council of State significantly turned down the naturalization request of Ben Mansour, a founding member of UOIF, alleging that he headed "a federation to which are affiliated many extremist movements which reject the essential values of French society."[28] On the other hand, French Minister of Interior Nicolas Sarkozy publicly stated that he believes the UOIF has always held positions that "respected the Republic" and is a reliable partner in the delicate dialogue over the integration of the French Muslim community.[29]

UOIF representatives, most of them recipients of degrees from prestigious French universities, are involved in countless interfaith, anti-racism, and pro-integration partnerships with Christian, private, and government organizations. At the same time, however, they have not abandoned their radical worldview and are occasionally caught making blatantly anti-Semitic remarks or defending the actions of Hamas.[30] Books such as *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* and works of al-Banna and Qutb are regularly sold at UOIF's events. Tellingly, when UOIF was still a small entity and not under much media scrutiny, one of its representatives, Ahmed Djaballah, defined the launch of the organization as having two stages: "The first stage of the launch is democratic; the second will be putting the Islamic society in orbit."[31]

Hoping to Rule Britannia

While Arab members of the Muslim Brotherhood spurred the spread of revivalist Islam in continental Europe, Muslims from South Asia initially played this role in the United Kingdom, where the majority of Muslims were Pakistanis and Indians. In the 1950s and 1960s, followers of Jamaat-e-Islami founder Abul Ala Maududi began to establish the first revivalist organizations in Great Britain. In 1962 a small group of Muslim activists from East London founded the UK Islamic Mission, an organization with the stated goal of "bringing about a new spiritual awakening" and building a society "based on the ideals, values and principles of Islam."[32]

The Mission sees Islam as an all-encompassing system that covers every aspect of life. Defining itself as an "ideological organization," the Mission states that "Islam is a comprehensive way of life which must be translated into action in all spheres of human life. The Mission, therefore, aims at molding the entire human life in accordance with Allah's will."[33] The Mission also openly declares its desire to introduce *sharia* in Great Britain, at least in the areas of private and family law. The UK Islamic Mission advocates, in fact,

a "continuous campaign for the establishment of Muslim family laws," and an "Islamic social order in the United Kingdom in order to seek the pleasure of Allah." While the stated goal of many Muslim organizations created at the time was to safeguard the Muslim identity of the South Asian immigrant population, the scholar Gilles Kepel has correctly noted that the Mission goes beyond such a protectionist aim in openly promoting the Islamization of British society. Following Maududi's teachings, it urges the Muslim community not to be satisfied with simply keeping its own social values; rather, it should proselytize and strive to impose "the Islamic social order" on all, as a "vanguard to spearhead a life-long struggle in the cause of Allah."[34]

In order to carry out its goal of creating an "Islamic social order," the Mission understood the importance of extending its teachings to the largest audience possible. Today the UK Islamic Mission has become a nationwide organization with thirty-nine branches, over thirty-five mosques and Islamic schools in which about five thousand British Muslim children receive Islamic education.[35] It has a youth branch, Young Muslims UK, that attempts to attract the sons and daughters of Muslim immigrants through study groups, summer camps, and Quran competitions. To appeal to the most Westernized among them, Young Muslims UK even sponsors such activities as Go-Karting and Paintball, all conducted in religiously-oriented and sex-segregated environments.[36]

In 1973 the Islamic Mission established a college and research center, the Islamic Foundation. First located in a small two-room office in central Leicester, the Islamic Foundation has grown to be one of Europe's largest institutions of Islamic studies and, by 1990, moved its headquarters to a sprawling mansion in rural Markfield, a few miles from Leicester.[37] The Foundation regularly organizes symposia and conferences and even runs its own institute of higher learning, the Markfield Institute of Higher Education, which issues diplomas in Islamic jurisprudence. It translates and publishes scores of Islamic texts, with a clear focus on revivalist authors in general and Maududi in particular.

The links between the UK Mission and Maududi go well beyond ideology, moreover. The level of coordination between the Mission and Jamaat-e-Islami is very high, though Mission officers in Leicester have publicly denied that the two organizations are formally linked. "We belong to the international Islamic movement," claims Dr. Manazir Ahsan, the director general of the Islamic Foundation, "neither to Jamaat [-e-Islami] nor to *Ikhwan* nor to the Refah Party in Turkey—but all of them are our friends."[38] The evidence contradicts him, however, and indicates that the relationship resembles more a symbiosis than a friendship, at least in regard to Jamaat-e-Islami. The first directors of the Islamic Foundation were officers of Jamaat-e-Islami, including Khurram Murad, who became one of Jamaat's top leaders after leaving Leicester.[39] One of the Foundation's founders and its current chairman is Khurshid Ahmed, a world-renowned Islamic scholar and member of the Pakistani Senate who joined Jamaat-e-Islami in 1956 and currently serves as its vice president.[40]

But it is also true that, as members and sympathizers are increasingly British-born Muslims who feel limited affinity to Pakistani politics, the UK Mission and the Islamic Foundation have developed a life of their own.[41] While issues such as Kashmir remain important, the Mission has increasingly focused its attention on problems affecting the everyday life of British Muslims, with the stated goal of preventing their absorption into mainstream British society.

Radicalizing the Muslim community is the Foundation's first priority, but it also emphasizes the importance of carrying out its *dawa* mission among the non-Muslim British population. The Foundation publishes several introductory books to Islam aimed at British Christians, and its director during the 1980s, the above-mentioned Murad, even published a handbook on how to convert non-Muslims.[42] The Mission's brochures boast of the organization's successes in proselytizing in order to impress, as Kepel notes, "their Arabian benefactors and confirm the latter's conviction that Islam, in its most intransigent version, would subjugate the whole world, with the Mission forming an avant-garde."[43]

Outreach toward non-Muslims goes beyond the religious duty of *dawa*, as the Mission attempts to increase its influence in the social and political life of Great Britain. The Islamic Foundation is involved in partnerships with several secular institutions of higher learning, for example, and has signed memoranda of understanding with various Christian organizations. It often works with city councils on issues involving the Muslim community, and it even conducts Islamic-awareness training for British police officers. Given that politicians from all parties attend its conferences, it is not surprising that even the Prince of Wales, sitting beside Khurshid Ahmad at a 2003 dinner in Markfield, praised the Islamic Foundation as "all that is to be admired about Islamic scholarship in the West" and "a fine example for others to follow."[44]

In 1997 the Arab component of the Muslim Brotherhood founded its own organization in Great Britain, the Muslim Association of Britain (MAB). MAB's leadership includes individuals such as Azzam Tamimi, a former activist in the Islamic Action Front (the Jordanian Brotherhood's political party); Mohammed Sawalha, a self-declared former Hamas member; and Osama al Tikriti, the son of the leader of the Iraqi branch of the Brotherhood.[45] MAB's founding president, Kamal al Helbawy, was formerly the official spokesman for the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood in Europe.[46] Having gained notoriety thanks to its active role in the anti-war campaign during the first months of the U.S. invasion of Iraq, MAB has formed strong alliances with British civil rights and leftist organizations. Its role as a political player became apparent as it endorsed such anti-war politicians and close allies as London mayor Ken Livingstone and Respect Party candidate George Galloway.

Given their large Muslim populations, Great Britain, France, and Germany are naturally the three main centers of activity of the *Ikhwan* in Europe. But virtually every

European country has witnessed some degree of intense activity by the Brothers. As *Ikhwan* members often mention, their vision of Islam as a social religion compels them to create organizations. Tariq Ramadan, the ubiquitous Swiss scholar and son of Said Ramadan—whose affiliation with the Brotherhood is much debated—has stated that the communitarian dimension of Islam is fundamental because "the Islamic faith cannot be reduced to a strictly private affair."[47] But other scholars mention more practical reasons for the *Ikhwan*'s organized activism. Qaradawi asserts that the "organized collective work" characteristic of the Islamic Movement "is ordained by religion and necessitated by reality."[48] Only a well-structured network enables the Brothers to implement their goals, the first of which is preventing the integration or, even worse, the assimilation of Muslim minorities.

Cozying Up to the Elite

"In conversations with journalists and diplomats [Tunisian Islamist Rachid] Ghannouchi gives a moderate, democratic, pluralist image," confessed a follower of this very important player in Europe's *Ikhwan* network. "With us," he added, "he talks about driving out the American invaders and their allies (the regimes in power),… of saving the Holy Kaaba and the Tomb of the Noble Prophet from the plots of the enemies of the Arabs and Islam."[49] The Muslim Brothers have an unparalleled ability to employ different tactics—to adapt their rhetoric and *modus operandi*—according to the circumstances.

In the first years of their existence, Islamist revivalist organizations took very hard and confrontational positions on issues that involved the Muslim community. This stance was apparently dictated both by the leaders' radical views and by the desire to make themselves known and gain primacy within the Islamic community. In 1988, for example, the Islamic Foundation of Leicester fought vigorously to play a predominant role in organizing the protests against the publication of Salman Rushdie's *Satanic Verses*—protests that swept the South Asian Muslim community in Great Britain. While its outrage was unquestionably genuine, the Foundation appeared to be most concerned about making sure that other Islamic groups did not lead the protests.[50]

The following year, having witnessed how the Rushdie affair enhanced the status of the Foundation, the French *Ikhwan* decided to imitate the tactics of their British comrades when an opportunity presented itself in France. As the first nationwide controversy over the use of the *hijab* in public schools erupted in 1989, the then-relatively powerless UOIF became the most active defender of the right to wear the veil. Hoping to attract the sympathies of the Muslim community, the UOIF showed little interest in pursuing a constructive dialogue with the French government while it organized several protests against the ban and declared that "the Muslims of France could not accept such attacks on their dignity."[51]

Today, now that it has achieved a dominant position within France's organized Islamic community, the UOIF has completely changed its tactics and strives to gain the trust of the authorities. Believing it can gain more by working within the system than against it, the UOIF is avoiding head-on confrontations with the government that could set back its agenda. In March 2004, therefore, when the French Parliament passed a controversial new law banning all religious symbols and apparel in public schools, the UOIF kept incredibly quiet. It abstained from participating in the protests that were organized, not only in France, but also throughout the world. Azzam Tamimi, a leader of the Muslim Association of Britain who was harshly critical of this decision, explained that the UOIF is now "against any activity that could cause a confrontation with the public powers."[52]

In its change of behavior, the UOIF provides a quintessential example of the Brotherhood's most effective quality: flexibility. If in 1989 the issue of the *hijab* constituted a perfect opportunity to make the UOIF known to the French Muslim community as a strenuous defender of the honor of Muslims, fifteen years later it constituted a dangerous trap to avoid. Because the law passed with overwhelming and bilateral support, the UOIF saw no practical advantage in challenging the establishment.

Challenging the establishment, in fact, is not the current policy of the European Brotherhood. Realizing they are still a relatively weak force, the Brothers have opted for a different tactic: befriending the establishment. They are taking advantage of the European elite's desperate desire to establish a dialogue with any representatives of the Muslim community, and they are putting themselves forward as the *de facto* voices of European Muslims. Thanks to the Europeans' naïveté and their own activism, the Brothers are now the closest partners that European political elites have in discussing the integration of the local Muslim communities. Nowhere is this more evident than in Brussels, where *Ikhwan* organizations have become the only officially recognized representatives of the European Muslim population, monopolizing the debate with the institutions of the European Union.

In 1989 the European Brothers founded the Federation of Islamic Organizations in Europe (FIOE), with the stated goal of "serving Muslims in European societies."[53] Even though it has gained prominence in Europe as a moderate Muslim organization, however, FIOE is nothing more than the umbrella organization for most *Ikhwan* groups in Europe. Its founders and main members are the French UOIF, the German IGD and the British MAB, and its headquarters are in Markfield, located in spaces leased from the Islamic Foundation. Serving on FIOE's board are such prominent European *Ikhwan* figures as UOIF's Ahmed Djaballah and IGD's Ibrahaim El Zayat. Its president, Ahmed al Rawi, has personally defended suicide bombings in Iraq and Israel, claiming that Muslims "have the right to defend themselves." And yet he is a habitué of the European circles of power, having testified before the European Parliament and attended John Paul II's funeral.[54]

In 1996 FIOE created the European Trust, a financial institution devoted to raising funds for its various activities, such as the sprawling European Institute of Human Sciences, the Association of Muslim Schools in Europe, and its glossy magazine *Al Europiya*. Also in 1996, in cooperation with the Saudi WAMY, FIOE established a youth branch—the Forum of European Muslim Youth and Student Organizations (FEMYSO). Originally headed by the ubiquitous El Zayat and strategically headquartered in Brussels, FEMYSO has managed to become, in its own words, "the *de facto* voice of the Muslim youth of Europe." Today it oversees a network of thirty-seven member organizations, and it enjoys regular relations with the European Parliament, the Council of Europe, and the United Nations.[55]

The Long March Toward *Sharia* in Europe

The success of organizations such as FIOE and FEMYSO is the crowning achievement of the Brothers' thirty years of hard work. The *Ikhwan* groups have managed to become part of the establishment, finding a small niche in the corridors of European power. The Brothers view this triumph as a mere starting point, however. Having gained the trust of large segments of both Europe's elites and its Muslim communities, the Brothers want to use their newly acquired power to create the "Muslim ghetto" envisioned by Qaradawi. An extensive network of mosques and educational facilities already exists; the next step toward the creation of what Reuven Paz refers to as "non-territorial Islamic states in Europe" is the implementation of Islamic law for Europe's Muslim population.[56]

An article in a 2002 issue of *Al Islam*, the official publication of the European Brotherhood's historic Islamic Center of Munich, openly states that "In the long run, Muslims cannot be satisfied with the acceptance of German family, estate, and trial law.… Muslims should aim at an agreement between the Muslims and the German state with the goal of a separate jurisdiction for Muslims."[57] The Brothers fully understand that the implementation of *sharia* in Europe is a very difficult task that currently seems quite far-fetched. But patience and long-term vision are two of the movement's strongest assets, and the Brothers are working to reap their fruits "in the long run." For now, the *Ikhwan* is generally refraining from officially asking for the implementation of *sharia*, despite hints that make its ultimate aim quite apparent. The Brothers have begun, for example, to create an Islamic legal framework that lays the foundation for imposing *sharia* in the West.

In 1989 the UOIF, perhaps the most important of the various European *Ikhwan* groups, made a small but extremely significant change to its name. Previously known as the Union of Islamic Organizations *in* France, it now called itself the Union of Islamic Organizations *of* France—a small semantic difference that had a huge meaning.[58] By changing the name, the Brothers declared that they were in France, and in Europe, to stay. They realized that the presence of Muslims in Europe was a permanent and growing

phenomenon, and that it required a new approach. The following year Ghannouchi, one of the historical spiritual leaders of the UOIF, gave a landmark speech at the organization's annual meeting in which he referred to France as *dar al Islam* (land of Islam), a place where the presence of Muslims is permanent.[59]

A definitive new *Ikhwan* position on the juridical connotation of Europe was formalized two years later, at another seminar organized by the UOIF. There, scholars of the importance of Qaradawi, Mawlawi, and Djaballah agreed that the traditional distinction between *dar al Islam* and *dar al Harb* (land of war) did not currently reflect reality. While Europe could not be considered *dar al Islam* because *sharia* was not enforced there, it could not be considered *dar al Harb* because Muslims were allowed to practice Islam freely and were not persecuted. According to Mawlawi, the distinction was based only on *ijtihad* (interpretation, not coming directly from the text) and limited to a historic context that no longer exists. The *Ikhwan* scholars decided, therefore, that it was possible for them to create a new legal category. They concluded that Europe should be considered *dar al dawa* (land of preaching), a territory where Muslims live as a minority, are respected, and have the duty to spread their religion peacefully. Other definitions have followed: Qaradawi has spoken of *dar al ahd* (land of contact), for example, while Tariq Ramadan has adopted the term *dar al shahada* (land of testimony).[60]

By acknowledging that the presence of Muslims in the West is permanent, and by giving their status a new legal definition, the *Ikhwan* scholars set the stage for creating new rules to regulate this presence. While there is extensive jurisprudence that addresses the situation of non-Muslim minorities living in *dar al Islam,* very few provisions cover the relatively new situation of Muslims living permanently in non-Muslim countries. For most European Muslims, this has not been a major issue, either because religion does not play a large role in their lives or because they have found their own ways to reconcile their faith with their lives in the West. But many do many feel the need for guidance from the *ulema* about such everyday matters as marriage, divorce and relations with non-Muslims. These problems require the development of a new jurisprudence, which has come to be known as *fiqh* (Islamic jurisprudence) for minorities (*fiqh al aqaliyyat*).[61]

Given the lack of intellectual Muslim leadership and structured Islamic clergy in Europe, the Brotherhood sees itself as the entity most able to fill this void and to create this new *fiqh*.[62] Mawlawi, one of the top *Ikhwan* thinkers on minority *fiqh*, has said, "It is obvious that when secular and Islamic laws collide, a Muslim is expected to honor his Islamic law whenever possible."[63] But while affirming the superiority of Islamic law, he refers to the Quranic verse that states "Be observant of Allah to the best of your ability" (*"fa-ittaqu Allaha ma istata`tum"*).[64] According to Mawlawi, this verse allows a Muslim who is in the "legal bind" of having to choose between respecting *sharia* or European law to follow the "less detrimental" option.[65] Other European Brothers hold slightly more ambiguous positions, torn between their beliefs and their political instincts. Thus far,

formal proposals to introduce Islamic law in Europe have been quite timid, in fact, and the reaction from most European politicians has been cold, to say the least.

For the time being, then, officially sanctioned Islamic courts in Europe represent only a dream. The European *Ikhwan* have established an unofficial one, however—the European Council for Fatwa and Research. This body currently limits itself to dispensing advice to Muslims living in Europe who have to juggle obedience to Quranic precepts with respect for the laws of their host countries.

The European Council for Fatwa and Research

In March 1997 FIOE sponsored the first meeting of the European Council for Fatwa and Research, an organization that has become quite a feather in the European Brothers' cap. Held in London, the meeting was attended by more than fifteen well-known Islamic scholars who endorsed the Council's draft constitution. The Council is described as "an Islamic, specialized and independent entity" created to issue "collective *fatwas* which meet the needs of Muslims in Europe, solve their problems and regulate their interaction with the European communities, all within the regulations and objectives of *sharia.*"[66] In practical terms the Council is a jurisprudential body that provides Muslims living in Europe with non-binding legal advice focusing on matters they face in their everyday lives as members of a minority community in non-Muslim countries.

The Council's headquarters are in Dublin, where it operates in conjunction with the local Islamic Cultural Centre. Both institutions have received generous financial backing from the Al-Maktoum Charity Organization, which is headed by Shaykh Hamdan Al Maktoum, the UAE Minister of Finance and Industry and the Deputy Ruler of Dubai.[67] The Council generally meets twice a year in different European venues and currently comprises thirty-two Islamic scholars from throughout the world, the majority of whom reside within the European Union. (The Council's bylaws specifically state that no more than 25 percent of it total membership should live outside Europe.) Its sessions take place behind closed doors, and the clerics deliberate on issues brought forward by either Council members or European Muslims who ask the Council for advice.

In reality the Council is a body created and dominated by the Muslim Brotherhood's global network. Its jurisprudence is aimed at guiding Muslims through a "program of perfect life for the individual, the family, society and the state"—phrasing that echoes al-Banna.[68] Among its members are key figures of the European *Ikhwan*, such as UOIF's Djaballah and Ounis Qourqah, IESH's al Arabi al Bichri, FIOE's al Rawi, and the ever-present Ghannouchi. Several other members are high-profile scholars from Arab Gulf countries, most of whom hold positions very close to those of the *Ikhwan.* The Islamic Cultural Centre of Ireland's Hussein Mohammed Halawa is the Council's secretary general and oversees its day-to-day operations, while the Lebanese cleric Mawlawi is its

vice president—an honor given to him in recognition of his role in promoting the historic doctrinal change of Europe from *dar al Harb* to *dar al dawa*. As Ghannouchi observed, "Some members [of the Council] belong to the Brothers, some others do not. What is important is the ideology, not the movement."[69]

Most tellingly, the president of the Council is Qaradawi, whose position of prominence is widely accepted by the other members. Though the Council is technically a democratic body in which the majority rules, its scholars rarely vote, tending instead to avoid internal dissent and to follow the position of Qaradawi and the Council's most influential figures.[70] Qaradawi is not only the Council's best-known scholar, but also the real driving force behind it. He is a charismatic figure whose prestige is crucially important to the Council's relevance. A gifted speaker with an uncommon ability to deal with the media, Qaradawi disseminates his teachings through his own website and a popular weekly show on *al Jazeera* called "*Al Sharia wal Hayat*" ("*Sharia* and Life"). He should now be considered, according to an internal memo of the British Home Office, "the leading mainstream and influential Islamic authority in the Middle East and increasingly in Europe, with an extremely large popular following."[71]

While Qaradawi is indeed extremely popular and influential well beyond the underworld of the *Ikhwan,* his views, as the same memo acknowledges, are far from moderate. He has repeatedly defended suicide attacks against Israel and American forces in Iraq. He has repeatedly pledged his support to such organizations as Hamas and Palestinian Islamic *jihad*, labeled the Middle East peace process as "a conspiracy to stop the Palestinian Resistance," and decreed that "*jihad* is incumbent upon the entire Muslim nation in order to liberate Palestine, Jerusalem, and the Al Aqsa Mosque."[72] Similarly, in 2004 Qaradawi issued a *fatwa* justifying attacks against all American citizens in Iraq, including civilians, saying "there is no difference between U.S. military personnel and civilians in Iraq since both have come to invade the country" and since "civilians are actually there to serve the U.S. occupying forces."[73]

The European Council for Fatwa and Research reflects the dual personalities of Qaradawi and its leaders. Overall, its jurisprudence gives the impression of being quite moderate and innocuous, offering suggestions to individuals who want to follow the requirements of their religion in their new land. Many *fatwas* simply discuss how to perform certain Islamic rituals in non-Muslim countries, solving mostly logistical problems. Some rulings, for example, address questions about praying in buildings in which facing Mecca poses difficulties.[74] Another *fatwa* deals with the timing of Muslim prayers in Scandinavian countries in relation to sunrise and sunset.[75] As most Muslims living in the West must deal with the banking system, many decrees attempt to reconcile the need to contract loans, use mortgages, and open bank accounts, with the Islamic ban of *riba* (usury), which the Muslim Brothers interpret to include interest.

On these matters the jurisprudence of the Council is quite liberal. Its *fatwas* urge

Muslims to seek all possible "Islamic alternatives" and "Islamic organizations throughout Europe to enter into negotiations with European banks to find formulas that are acceptable," as many of them are already doing.[76] But, if no alternative is possible and the *haram* (forbidden) transaction is vitally important, the Council draws on the principle of accommodation to allow the European Muslim to carry out transactions with *riba.* In general the Court tends to respect Western law as much as possible and espouses a relatively moderate interpretation of Islamic law. No *fatwa* touches issues of criminal law, where any intrusion of Muslim jurisprudence would be perceived very negatively by Europeans. In some cases the Council explicitly decrees that European Muslims should follow the laws of European countries and the rulings of its judges, even if those contradict *sharia.* In cases of divorce, for example, the Council ruled that "it is imperative that a Muslim who conducted his Marriage by virtue of those countries' respective laws, to comply with the rulings of a non-Muslim judge in the event of a divorce."[77]

But not all the jurisprudence of the Council follows this moderate trend. Despite its professed focus on issues affecting everyday life, some of the Council's *fatwas* are extremely political and reveal the radical side of at least some of its clerics. In the July 2003 Council meeting held in Stockholm, for example, Qaradawi described five categories of terrorism, including "terror that is permitted by Islamic law" and "martyrdom operations." Ruling that Israel could be defined as "invaders" and thus legitimately targeted, Qaradawi stated that "those who oppose martyrdom operations and claim that they are suicide are making a great mistake."[78] Mawlawi, the Council's vice president, holds similar views about terrorism. In issuing a *fatwa* that prohibited Arab countries from cooperating with the United States in the "War on Terror," Mawlawi noted that what is dubbed terrorism by Washington is in most cases "Jihad and legitimate right," such as resistance operations in Palestine, Iraq and Afghanistan.[79]

Even more troubling, for its potentially disruptive effects, is the Council's jurisprudence that deals with family matters. While many rulings uphold Islamic principles that are perfectly compatible with European legislation, some *fatwas* express opinions that are at odds with basic Western concepts, particularly with regard to domestic violence and equality between the sexes. And while some *fatwas* instruct Muslims to follow European marriage and divorce laws, other rulings on the same matters refer only to Islamic law, omitting any reference to respecting Western legislation. The relationship between husband and wife is an area where the incompatibility between the Council's jurisprudence and Western law is particularly manifest. Various Council rulings state that men should be good husbands and fair to their wives, but some *fatwas* clearly pay no heed to the concept of equality between men and women. A 1997 Council *fatwa,* for example, states that a wife needs her husband's permission to cut her hair, provided that the cut is significant and "completely change[s] the appearance of the woman."[80] By the same token, the Council authorizes a husband to prevent his wife from visiting another

woman, even a Muslim woman, "if he felt that this relationship has an adverse effect on his wife, children or marital life in general."[81]

These rulings are not surprising, given the positions that Qaradawi holds on marriage and marital relations. In his hallmark treaty on Islamic law, *The Licit and Illicit in Islam*, Qaradawi openly states that "the man is the lord of the house and the head of the family." He asserts, moreover, that when a wife exhibits "signs of pride or insubordination," her husband is entitled to use violence against her, even though this has to be done without hitting hard and avoiding the face.[82] These teachings are clearly at odds with the criminal law and public sentiment of every European country. Significantly, the provisions regarding the treatment of women caused *The Licit and Illicit in Islam* to be banned in France in 1995. Charles Pasqua, France's Minister of Interior at the time, commented that the book deserved the ban because of "its violently anti-Western tones and the theses contrary to the laws and values of the Republic that it contains."[83] Qaradawi has also repeatedly observed that polygamy is a right that all Muslim men should be able to enjoy, provided they respect certain rules.

Polygamy and domestic violence represent two extremes, which would be prosecuted by European criminal laws. But the Council holds other positions that contradict Western laws governing marriage and divorce. It promotes an openly ambiguous situation for Muslims who have contracted marriage under European law, as the Council urges them to respect both the European laws and the conflicting principles of *sharia*. Just as disturbing is the possible application of the Council's jurisprudence to *nikah* marriages. A small, yet significant, number of Muslims living in Europe do not officially register their marriages but simply get married in an Islamic rite (*nikah*). In these cases, where the marriage does not exist under European law, the only rules that could apply are those of *sharia*, and the Council could potentially become the body regulating such marital relationships.

Conclusion

The Council's *fatwas* are not legally binding, as they are simply opinions of respected scholars rather than judgments delivered by *qadis*. Members of the European *Ikhwan* network are quick to point out that its role, comparable to that of the Vatican's, is purely consultative, intended only to advise Muslims about religious issues that arise in their daily lives.[84] Yet the Brothers' ambitions for the Council go beyond a merely advisory role. As stated in its bylaws, the Council is "designed to become an approved religious authority before local governments and private establishments, which will undoubtedly strengthen and reinforce local Islamic communities."[85] The Brothers see today's non-binding Council's jurisprudence as just a step toward their long-term goal of establishing *sharia* for Muslims in Europe.

Most *Ikhwan* groups operating in Europe have the stated goal of establishing Islamic law for local Muslim populations. The Brothers understand that the places where this is most likely to occur are in areas of high Islamic concentration—in other words, in Qaradawi's "Muslim ghettoes." The Brothers believe that, once Muslims reach a majority in certain areas of various European countries, European governments will feel compelled to allow Islamic law to regulate the personal/civil relations among them.

While the *Ikhwan*'s intentions might appear to be nothing more than a dream, a disturbingly large number of European Muslims seem to favor introducing Islamic law into Europe. A 2005 poll revealed that four out of ten British Muslims want *sharia* introduced into parts of Britain.[86] Another poll conducted by a local Muslim institute reports that 21 per cent of Muslims living in Germany believe that the German constitution is incompatible with the teachings of the Quran.[87] But while *salafi* and other extremist organizations are already demanding the introduction of *sharia* in a confrontational and counterproductive way, the more politically savvy Brothers are using a different strategy to achieve the same goal.

The European *Ikhwan* have repeatedly compromised their strict observance of *sharia* in order to advance their cause. Every tactic that might help the movement is justified, even if it entails breaking some Quranic principle, because the higher goal of spreading Islam excuses all deviations. Mawlawi and other *Ikhwan* scholars have asserted, for example, that the creation of Islamic centers in the West is a priority for the Islamic Movement. Muslims should make every effort, therefore, to purchase buildings and turn them into mosques, even if they must resort to financial transactions forbidden by Islamic law to do so.[88] Similarly, asked whether Muslims could vote and participate in the political life of their European host countries, the Council responded that the issue "is to be decided by Islamic organizations and establishment," which should evaluate what position best serves the interests of the Movement.[89] At the moment the Brothers have embraced compromise as the best means of increasing their influence, which will allow them in turn to lobby more effectively for their goals—goals that include the establishment of *sharia* in Europe.

Now relatively weak in the West, the Brotherhood has concluded that engaging in dialogue and showing openness and moderation is their wisest strategy. But if the balance of power were to change over the next few decades, nothing guarantees that the *Ikhwan* would not change its approach and discard dialogue. A German government's analysis of the tactics of Islamist groups operating in Germany reveals a well-founded suspicion that the *Ikhwan*'s desire for dialogue is far from sincere: "While in recent times, the Milli Görüş has increasingly emphasized the readiness of its members to be integrated into German society and asserts its adherence to the basic law, such statements stem from tactical calculation rather than from any inner change of the organization."[90]

To date European Brotherhood organizations have rarely been directly linked to

specific cases of terrorism, but their contribution to the education and radicalization of violent extremists has already been significant. The Brotherhood's renunciation of violence seems more opportunistic than genuine, moreover, when its European members use fiery rhetoric to endorse terrorist operations in the Middle East. While they are quick to condemn violence in the West to avoid becoming political pariahs, they do not refrain from approving of it elsewhere, notably in the Middle East, because they believe they can get away with it. It is not unreasonable to assume, therefore, that should it become convenient for them to do so, the ever-flexible Brotherhood would embrace violent tactics in the West as well.

NOTES

1. Yusuf al-Qaradawi, *Priorities of the Islamic Movement in the Coming Phase* (Swansea, U.K.: Awakening Publications, 2000).

2. Eric Brown, "After the Ramadan Affair: New Trends in Islamism in the West," *Current Trends in Islamist Ideology* (Hudson Institute), vol. 2, September 2005: 8.

3. Xavier Ternisien, *Les Frères Musulmans* (Paris: Fayard, 2005), pp. 110-11.

4. Sylvain Besson, "*La Conquête de l'Occident: Le Projet Secret des Islamistes*" (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 2005), p. 100.

5. "Leading Sunni Sheikh Yousef al-Qaradhawi and Other Sheikhs Herald the Coming Conquest of Rome," Middle East Media and Research Institute (MEMRI), Special Dispatch #447, 6 December 2002.

6. Besson, *La Conquête de l'Occident,* p. 37.

7. See, for example, Kenneth R. Timmerman, "*Preachers of Hate: Islam and the War on America* (New York: Crown Forum, 2003).

8. Khalid Duran, "Jihadism in Europe," *The Journal of Counterterrorism and Security International*, Fall 2000: 12-15.

9. For the life of Said Ramadan, see: M. H. Faruqi, "Les Frères Musulmanes: Politique de 'Rabbaniyya,' les Prières avant le Pouvoir," published on the website of the Islamic Center of Geneva (http://www.cige.org/historique.htm); and Tariq Ramadan, "Une Vie Entière," available at http://membres.lycos.fr/oasislam/personnages/tariq/tariq.html.

10. Ian Johnson, "The Beachhead: How a Mosque for Ex-Nazis Became Center of Radical Islam," *The Wall Street Journal,* 12 July 2005.

11. History of the IGD, available at IGD's website: http://www.i-g-d.com/uber%20unss2.htm.

12. "Recent OFAC Actions," U.S. Department of the Treasury, Office of Foreign Assets Control, 7 November 2001.

13. Report on Ibrahim el-Zayat, Cologne police, 27 August 2003; and Ian Johnson, "How Islamic Group's Ties Reveal Europe's Challenge," *Wall Street Journal*, 29 December 2005.

14. Report on the Islamische Gemeinschaft Milli Görüs (IGMG), Innenministerium, Nordrhein-Westfalen land website: http://www.im.nrw.de/sch/582.htm.

15. Ibrahim El Zayat, chairman of the IGD, is married to Sabiha Erbakan, the sister of Milli Görüş's leader, Mehmet Sabri Erbakan.

16. For the activities of IGD, IGMG, and Zentralrat, see Udo Ulfkotte, *Der Krieg in unseren Staedten* (Frankfurt: Eichborn Publishing, 2003).

17. "Islamismus," report by the Landesamt fur Verfassungsschutz, Hessen, available at http://www.verfassungsschutz-hessen.de/downloads/islam.pdf.

18. Paul Landau, *Le Sabre et le Coran* (Monaco: Editions du Rocher, 2005), pp. 72-3.

19. Ahmed S. Moussalli, "Hasan al-Turabi's Islamist Discourse on Democracy and Shura," *Middle Eastern Studies* 30, issue 1 (January 1994).

20. Jean-Yves Camus, "Islam in France," paper published by the Interdisciplinary Center Herzliya (ICT), 10 May 2004, available at: http://www.ict.org.il/articles/articledet.cfm?articleid=514

21. Khalid Duran, "Jihadism in Europe," *The Journal of Counterterrorism and Security International*, Fall 2000. Pp. 12-5.

22. Ternisien, pp. 254-5.

23. Fiammetta Venner, "OPA sur l'Islam de France: Les Ambitions de l'UOIF," Paris: Calmann-Levy, 2005. Pp. 11-14.

24. Website of the European Institute of Human Sciences: http://www.iesh.fr/Html/C_present.htm.

25. Hugh Schofield, "France's Islamic Heartland," *BBC*, 18 April 2003.

26. Website of the European Institute of Human Sciences: http://www.iesh.fr/Html/C_present.htm.

27. Venner, p. 102.

28. Decision of the French Conseil d'État, 7 June 1999, as quoted in Venner, p. 15.

29. Venner, p. 28.

30. For more information on the UOIF's double-talk, see Venner.

31. Mohamed Sifaoui, *La France Malade de Islamisme* (Paris: Le Cherche Midi, 2002), pp. 49-50.

32. UK Islamic Mission, "Introduction," 2004-2005 Annual Report.

33. UK Islamic Mission, "Introduction," as quoted in Gilles Kepel, "*Allah in the West: Islamic Movements in America and Europe* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997), p. 131.

34. Ibid., p. 132.

35. UK Islamic Mission, "Introduction," 2004-2005 Annual Report.

36. Website of Young Muslims UK: http://www.ymuk.net/.

37. Website of the Islamic Foundation: http://www.islamic-foundation.org.uk/.

38. Kepel, p. 133.

39. Ibid.

40. Biography of Khurshid Ahmed, website of the Jamaat e Islami: http://www.jamaat.org/leadership/pka.html.

41. Joergen S. Nielsen, "Transnational Islam and the Integration of Islam in Europe," in Stefano Allievi and Joergen S. Nielsen, "*Muslim Networks and Transnational Communities in and across Europe*" (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2003), pp. 38-9.

42. Kepel, p. 132.

43. Ibid.

44. Speech by HRH The Prince of Wales during his visit to the Islamic Foundation, 24 January 2003, available at http://www.princeofwales.gov.uk/speeches/multiracial_24012003.html.

45. Michael Whine, "The Advance of the Muslim Brotherhood in the U.K.," in *Current Trends in Islamist Ideology* (Hudson Institute), vol. 2, September 2005: 30-38.

46. Ternisien, p. 124.

47. Tariq Ramadan, *Les Musulmans dans la Laïcité* (Lyon: Tawhid Editions, 1998), pp. 78-81.

48. al-Qaradawi.

49. Antoine Sfeir, *Les Réseaux d'Allah: Les filières Islamistes en France et en Europe* (Paris: Plon, 2001), p. 51.

50. Kepel, pp. 126-35.

51. Ibid., p. 187.

52. Ternisien, p. 127.

53. Website of the FIOE: http://www.eu-islam.com/en/templates/Index_en.asp.

54. Ian Johnson, "How Islamic Group's Ties Reveal Europe's Challenge," *Wall Street Journal*, 29 December 2005.

55. Website of FEMYSO: http://www.femyso.net/about.html.

56. Reuven Paz, "The Non-Territorial Islamic States in Europe," paper published by the Project for the Research of Islamist Movements (PRISM), Herzliya, Israel.

57. *Al Islam*, issue 2, 2002: 14, as quoted in the 2003 report by the Baden Württenberg state Verfassungsschutzbericht, p. 48

58. Ternisien, p. 7.

59. Kepel, p.152.

60. Ternisien, pp. 190-2.

61. See Shammai Fishman, *Fiqh Al-Aqaliyyat: A Legal Theory For Muslim Minorities*. Hudson Institute: Research Monographs on the Muslim World. Series No. 1, paper No. 2. Accessed at: www.futureofmuslimworld.com

62. W. Shadid and P. S. van Koningsveld, "Religious Authorities of Muslims in the West: Their Views on Political Participation," Shadid, W. and P.S. van Koningsveld, eds. *Intellectual Relations and Religious Authorities*: *Muslims in the European Union* (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), pp, 149-70.

63. "Living Islam in the West: An Interview with Shaykh Faisal Mawlawi," *Palestinian Times*, Issue 98, Available at: http://www.palestinetimes.net/issue98/articles.html#7.

64. Quran, Surah at-Taghabun ayah 16

65. "Living Islam in the West: An Interview with Shaykh Faisal Mawlawi," *Palestinian Times,* issue 98, available at: http //www.palestinetimes.net/issue98/articles.html#7.

66. *Fatwas* (First Collection), translated by Anas Osama Altikriti, European Council for Fatwa and Research, date unspecified.

67. Website of the Islamic Cultural Center of Ireland: http://islamireland.ie/enter-the-icci/about-us/.

68. Closing remarks at the Council session in Stockholm, July 2003, as quoted in Besson, p. 124.

69. Ternisien, pp. 197-8.

70. Alexandre Caeiro, "The European Council for Fatwa and Research," presentation at Fourth Mediterranean Social and Political Research Meeting, European University Institute, Montecatini Terme, 19-23 March 2003.

71. Memo on Shaykh Yusuf al-Qaradawi, Home Office, 14 July 2005.

72. "Sheikh Al-Qaradhawi on Hamas Jerusalem Day Online: 'We are a Nation of Jihad and Martyrdom'; 'The Resistance in Palestine, Iraq, and Lebanon Must Go On'; 'We Stand Alongside Our Brothers in Hamas and Islamic Jihad,'" Middle East Media and Research Institute (MEMRI), Special Dispatch #1051, 18 December 2005.

73. Gihan Shahine, "Fatwa Fight," *Al Ahram Weekly,* 16-22 September 2004, issue 708.

74. "Fatwa 3," *Resolutions and Fatwas* (Second Collection), edited by Anas Osama Altikriti and Mohammed Adam Howard, European Council for Fatwa and Research, date unspecified.

75. "Fatwa 4," *Resolutions and Fatwas* (Second Collection), edited by Anas Osama Altikriti and Mohammed Adam

Howard, European Council for Fatwa and Research, date unspecified.

76. "Fatwa 26," *Resolutions and Fatwas* (Second Collection), edited by Anas Osama Altikriti and Mohammed Adam Howard, European Council for Fatwa and Research, date unspecified.

77. "Fatwa 17," *Resolutions and Fatwas* (Second Collection), edited by Anas Osama Altikriti and Mohammed Adam Howard, European Council for Fatwa and Research, date unspecified.

78. "Al-Qaradhawi Speaks in Favor of Suicide Operations at an Islamic Conference in Sweden," Middle East Media and Research Institute (MEMRI), Special Dispatch #542, 24 July 2003.

79. Alaa Abu Elnin, "Tipping U.S. on Baathists Prohibited: Prominent Scholar," *Islam Online*, 30 May 2003, available at http://www.islam-online.net/english/News/2003-05/31/article07.shtml.

80. *Fatwas* (First Collection), translated by Anas Osama Altikriti, European Council for Fatwa and Research, date unspecified.

81. *Fatwas* (First Collection), translated by Anas Osama Altikriti, European Council for Fatwa and Research, date unspecified.

82. Yusuf al-Qaradawi, *Le Licite et l'Illicite en Islam* (Paris: Editions al Qalam, 1992), p. 207.

83. Ternisien, p. 312.

84. Author's interview with Ali Abu Shwaima, editor of *al Europiya* (Milan), January 2006.

85. *Fatwas* (First Collection). translated by Anas Osama Altikriti, European Council for Fatwa and Research, date unspecified.

86. "Poll: Four in 10 Muslims want *Sharia* Law," Channel 4, 19 February 2006.

87. Data released by the Zentralinstituts Islam-Archiv-Deutschlandin; see debate on Deutschlandradio Kultur, 7 January 2006, available at http://www.dradio.de/dkultur/sendungen/tacheles/455731/.

88. Alexandre Caeiro, "The European Council for Fatwa and Research," presentation at Fourth Mediterranean Social and Political Research Meeting, European University Institute, Montecatini Terme, 19-23 March 2003.

89. *Fatwas* (First Collection), translated by Anas Osama Altikriti, European Council for Fatwa and Research, date unspecified.

90. *Annual -Report,* Office for the Protection of the Constitution (Bundesverfassungsschutz), 2000, Cologne, p. 198.

Salafi-Jihadi *Responses to the Hamas' Electoral Victory*

REUVEN PAZ

Hamas' surprising victory in the Palestinian parliamentary elections of January 2006, the first democratic elections to date, has raised a number of questions—questions that are particularly compelling because of the movement's impressive rate of success and its apparently unstoppable rise to power. The questions concern Hamas' future policy, the next developments in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and the Palestinian Authority's very existence and ability to function. Moreover, because Hamas itself was unprepared to handle such an overwhelming victory, it faced significant challenges in composing a Palestinian government without the support of any significant partners.

These challenges still exist nine months after the electoral victory, and the Hamas government still has difficulty fulfilling its daily functions. It is hampered by a financial crisis, the opposition by Fatah elements, an Israeli and partial international boycott, and the wariness of Arab governments who fear the implications of this victory in their own states. One of the most significant signs of Arab reservations about Hamas came in the important field of finance when the influential Palestinian-Jordanian Arab Bank Plc., the largest private bank in the Arab world, closed its branches in the PA. This act clearly resulted from several lawsuits being filed against the bank in the United States—lawsuits claiming that the bank supported terrorism by channeling financial aid to families of Palestinian terrorists, most of whom were Hamas members. The bank's step indicates the effectiveness of global counterterrorism efforts but is also noteworthy because it was taken against a movement that won the only free democratic elections in the Arab world in years.

Hamas' success in winning free elections is, indeed, a landmark event and took place within a political culture quite unique in the Arab region—a Palestinian culture marked by highly developed public opinion, pluralism, and a sense of democracy. The elections can also be regarded as another step in the U.S. campaign to promote democracy in the Middle East, much as it is trying to do in Iraq.

The democratic process in the Arab world began in 1992 with the first free elections

in Algeria, in which the Islamic Salvation Front (*Front Islamique du Salute*—FIS) won the majority. Elections in Jordan followed in 1993; there the Islamic Action Front of the Muslim Brotherhood seized over one-third of the seats in the parliament. The Egyptian elections in December 2005 strengthened the Muslim Brotherhood in that country as well, despite the waves of arrests and other intimidation tactics used by authorities to limit the Brotherhood's potential power. In Iraq, the Iraqi Muslim Brotherhood—the Islamic Party—also supported the elections in the face of considerable opposition from within the Sunni community and many attacks on its members and its platform by various insurgent *jihadi* groups.

In the past fifteen years it has become almost axiomatic to say that, in free democratic elections in the Arab world, Islamic elements trump nationalist ones. A primary reason for this trend is the ideological vacuum in the Arab world, where Islamism, especially that extolled by the mainstream Muslim Brotherhood, is the only ideology left. Social injustices perpetuated by the ruling classes have fomented an almost apocalyptic sense of crisis in large segments of Arab society, which are increasingly receptive to the Brotherhood's slogan "*al-Islam hua al-Hall*" ("Islam is the ultimate solution"). The Palestinian elections seem to close the circle of a process that started in Algeria, in which Islamic movements defeated liberation movements through democratic means—the PLO/Fatah fell to Hamas, just as Algeria's National Liberation Front fell to the FIS.

Al-Qaeda and Hamas

The democratic elections in Iraq and the Palestinian Authority, the semi-democratic elections in Egypt, and especially the policies of the United States and the actions of the Brotherhood have generated considerable discussion and concern over "Western democracy" in *salafi-jihadi* circles. Al-Qaeda and the *salafi-jihadi* movement as a whole pose a threat not only to the West and to Arab governments, but also to mainstream Arab Islamic movements belonging to the school of the Brotherhood. In the case of Iraq, *jihadi*s have reached a consensus against participation in the democratic process regardless of what form it takes. But the electoral success of Hamas—an essentially *jihadi* movement, albeit one focused on local objectives and only against Israel—has presented an Islamist alternative to this rejection of democracy, and thus posed a serious challenge to the *salafi-jihadi* movement. The Lebanese Shi'a Hezbollah group poses a similar problem.

The dogmatic rivalry between Hamas and Al-Qaeda—two of Israel's most obstinate adversaries—underscores the movement's deep hostility both to democracy and to any kind of pluralist society. This tension is not new; it reflects, rather, an ongoing ambivalence toward Hamas over the past three to four years.[1] On one hand, Hamas has conducted most of the terrorist activity against "the Jewish State" while adhering to *jihadi* tenets. It has also served as a model of *jihadi* sacrifice with its martyrs (*shuhada*) carrying

out over two hundred suicide bombings. On the other hand, however, Hamas is viewed as too closely aligned with Palestinian nationalism, conducting a "Jihad for the Homeland" instead of a "Jihad for Allah."

Many *salafi-jihadis* see Hamas as an obstacle to al-Qaeda's infiltration of the Palestinian Authority. It is a movement that cooperates with Shi'a Iran and Hezbollah; that defended, during the second Intifada, Yaser Arafat until his death in November 2004; and that, more recently, has shown signs of weakening in its policy by accepting and keeping its promise of a period of truce with Israel. Hamas is also an integral part of the Muslim Brotherhood, a harsh rival in the eyes of the *salafi-jihadi* movement, with a political and social doctrine that is perhaps best described as "evolution, not revolution." The Brotherhood has a strong tendency to support, at least tactically, democratic processes in the Arab world in which its prospects of winning look promising.

Salafi-Jihadi Movements and Democracy

Islam's interaction with democracy is of key importance for *salafi-jihadi* groups, which hold as sacred doctrine their rejection of both Western democracy and man-made laws in favor of the principle of divine law. Power derived from human beings rather than from Allah is, for them, a form of *kufr* or heresy. In recent years, the subject of elections has become more controversial as Muslims living in the West have increasingly questioned the religious legitimacy of participating in Western elections. Books on this topic, especially those opposing the participation of Muslims in democratic processes, are now translated by *Salafi* scholars and groups into English.[2] In response to American efforts to bring democracy to the Arab world, *salafi-jihadi* groups contend that democracy not only is a heresy, but is also an integral part of the new "Crusader" campaign of colonialism (*al-Hamlah al-Salibiyyah al-Jadidah*) and the historical conspiracy against the Muslim world. Even more moderate Islamic elements in the Arab world, especially mainstream Saudi and Egyptian clerics and scholars, support this view, which contributed to the controversy surrounding the last Iraqi elections.

Democracy is also a threatening prospect for most Arab governments, be they kingdoms or republics. Arab nationalist scholars describe democracy as a form of "Western political-cultural imperialism or colonialism," a description that reflects in part the ideological legacies of the Soviet Union and Arab socialism. Complicating the situation even more is the fact that, in many Arab countries, it is oppressed Islamic movements that are leading the opposition and the demand for civil rights. The Algerian FIS began this trend; the Saudi Islamic reform movement and others continue it.

In recent years, meanwhile, several famous *fatwas* from *salafi-jihadi* scholars have been issued against democracy and against elections. *Salafi* scholars and activists made intensive use of these *fatwas* in order to criticize the Palestinian elections in general and

Hamas' participation in particular. On January 18, 2006, the webmaster of the Al-Maqrizi Center in London, which is headed by the Egyptian Islamist Dr. Hani al-Siba`i, posted on the *jihadi* forum Al-Hesbah the names of 102 Islamic clerics (some now deceased) who strongly opposed any participation in parliamentary elections in the Muslim world.[3] Meant to discourage Hamas from taking part in the elections, the list included 52 Egyptians, 22 Saudis, 5 Jordanians (among them "Shaykh" Abu Mus`ab al-Zarqawi), 5 Syrians, 4 Moroccans, 2 Sudanese, 2 Lebanese, 2 Kuwaitis, an Iraqi, a Nigerian, a Mauritanian, and a Yemeni. The dominance of Egyptians and Saudis on the list reflects the important role they have played in the development of *salafi-jihadi* ideology, which is largely the product of the collaboration among Wahhabi scholars and Egyptian Brotherhood exiles in Saudi Arabia.

There were also four Palestinians on the list who had no links to Hamas or the Brotherhood. Among them, two individuals—Taqi al-Din al-Nabahani and Abd al-Qadim Zaloum, the founders and first two leaders of the Hizb al-Tahrir (Islamic Liberation Party—HT)—are particularly interesting. Another past HT leader, Ahmad al-Da`our, is listed among the Jordanian clerics. The presence of these HT leaders is significant because in the debate over the elections in Iraq, Egypt, and the Palestinian Authority, supporters of *salafi-jihadi* ideology bestowed, for the first time, a sense of legitimacy on HT and its well-known rejection of democracy and elections. In pamphlets it published and distributed in the Palestinian Authority, and on its websites, the HT called for a boycott of the Palestinian elections, as well as those in Iraq. Several prominent members of the party took part in debates in *jihadi* forums on the Internet—the main platform nowadays for *jihadi* indoctrination and discussion—and were welcomed for their stance regarding elections. And several *salafi-jihadis* even relied on and circulated material issued by HT, including *fatwas*.

Though traditionally somewhat ambivalent about elections, HT developed its stronger, more assertive opposition to them in light of events in Iraq and Central Asia. Wide ideological gaps still exist between HT and *salafi-jihadi* groups—gaps made manifest by previous *salafi-jihadi* attacks on HT on a variety of issues. Nonetheless, their agreement on the issue of democracy and elections might provide a basis for closer relations in the future. Even though the HT regards itself as being in a theoretical phase (*nazari*) and not yet a practical one (`amali), the dynamics of the global *jihadi* movement bring HT's younger generation closer to *jihadi* ideas than to those of the Brotherhood.

The most popular rulings used by *salafi-jihadi* opponents of democratic elections are those written by the Palestinian-Jordanian Abu Muhammad al-Maqdisi, the spiritual father of *Al-Tawhid wal-Jihad*; Abu Basir al-Tartousi, the Syrian in exile in London; and the old-time ideologue of the Egyptian Islamic Jihad, Abd al-Qader bin Abd al-Aziz.[4] *jihadi* sympathizers cited their writings quite often to intimidate Hamas prior to the elections.

Illustrative of the *salafi-jihadi* criticism of Hamas are the opinions expressed by Abu

Jandal al-Azdi, a Saudi cleric and one of the first leaders of al-Qaeda in Saudi Arabia, who has been imprisoned there since 2003.[5] In an interview, al-Azdi castigated Hamas for its support of Arafat and the Palestinian national struggle. Arafat, according to al-Azdi, was a *murtadd*—the worst form of apostate—"a greater enemy than the Jews" who should have been killed. Hamas' support of Arafat was unforgivable because it poisoned the entire movement, turning all its members into infidels. Hamas also supported Mahmoud Abbas Abu Mazen, a "known Baha'i" in *jihadi* eyes, and held discussions with the Egyptian intelligence services.

Al-Azdi's main criticism of Hamas, however, centered on the distinction it makes between external and internal enemies, a distinction that Hamas adopted from Muslim Brotherhood doctrine and that al-Azdi and supporters of global *jihadi* firmly reject as being too narrow. In this, al-Azdi cited the Palestinian *jihadi* cleric Abu Qutada, who wrote,

> [T]he *jihad* of the Muslim Brotherhood has only one meaning and narrow-minded understanding—the *jihad* against the foreigners. The Egyptians should fight the British, the Palestinians against the Jews, and the Afghans against the Russians. They have never thought about fighting the Arab enemies, since they lack the legal basis for such a struggle, which understands the *Tawhid* according to the understanding of the *Salaf*—the companions of the Prophet.[6]

Al-Azdi also rejected the idea of any temporary truce (*hudnah*) with the Jews or Israel unless it included the strict conditions of Salafism. He concluded his article, nonetheless, by leaving an interesting opening for Hamas. He wrote that "the benefit of peaceful coexistence—*sulh*—for the interest of the Muslim public might be greater than war. In such a case you are even allowed to prolong the truce for more than ten years." The traditional Islamic principle of community interest apparently carries weight even among the *salafi-jihadis*, and could plausibly serve in the future, provided the proper and compelling conditions, as the basis for a turn toward a more pragmatic, albeit still ideologically-extremist, orientation.

Responses to Hamas' Electoral Victory

Hamas' electoral victory created a vigorous debate in *salafi-jihadi* Internet forums, which subsequently lost some of its initial enthusiasm due to the "virtual Jihad" against Denmark during the cartoon crisis. The stunning victory of Hamas heightened the ambivalence of the responses by Salafists. Early public statements by Hamas leaders, as well as Israeli, American, and European reactions, however, helped generate sharp criticism over Hamas. In particular, members of these forums expressed fear that the movement might change policies in favor of entering the political process with Israel.

The Kuwaiti *salafi-jihadi* cleric Hamed al-Ali, a very popular figure among the younger generation of supporters of global Jihad, exemplified the tone of the critics. In an article entitled "Hamas' Dilemma," which appeared in the *jihadi* internet forum Al-Hesbah on January 27, 2006, al-Ali criticized Hamas, even though he could not refrain from blessing them for their political achievement.[7] According to al-Ali, Palestine remains the focus of the *jihadi* struggle and "a microcosm of the entire *Ummah*." But Palestine is not, he explained, the sole "property of the Palestinians; hence, they cannot decide by themselves what way to choose." Even though Hamas deserves applause for its electoral victory and for gaining the trust of the Palestinian public, "it is badly in need of the advice and guidance of the Islamic nation." Hamas should therefore consult the rest of the Islamists in making its future decisions. It should also choose the only ideologically acceptable strategy of the Islamists, which is armed resistance to Israel.

By winning the elections and becoming a governing authority, al-Ali said, Hamas now has only two unacceptable choices: falling under a strangling siege, or following the path of Fatah—that is, compromising with the Jews. He outlined three challenges that currently confront Hamas. The first results from the contradiction between its Islamist ideology and its political position, which stands in opposition to that ideology. Every Islamic movement that joins the "path of democracy" faces this dilemma and trap. The second problem arises from the contradiction between Hamas' solid, uncompromising positions regarding any concessions in Palestine and its need to soften those positions now that the movement is in charge of the government. Finally, Hamas now must confront the contradiction between its desire to preserve the honor and noble values of its martyrs and its desire to preserve its rule. Hamas is now, al-Ali explains, like a "sheep besieged by wild animals that want to suck her blood."

In short, al-Ali criticizes Hamas for participating in a process that put the movement in an almost impossible situation. At the same time, however, he urges other Islamists to assist Hamas and guide it on the right path rather than condemn it and ignore its dilemma. Al-Ali's "softened" words represent a sort of qualified *salafi-jihadi* patronage of Hamas. They further suggest that Hamas should bear in mind that its victory is not only its own, but one that should be shared with the rest of the Muslim world so as to avoid future mistakes.

Responses to al-Ali's article covered a wide spectrum of opinion. Some stricter Salafists eschewed the "soft" tone, unable to forgive Hamas for disobeying Allah's rules by participating in the elections. More sympathetic commentators, however, applauded Hamas for its social work among the Palestinians and noted the difficulty of fighting simultaneously on so many fronts. Some of these even called for modifying the Islamist project in Palestine by breaking it down into several stages. They asserted that improving the welfare of the Palestinian public is a noble phase in its own right, and one that only Hamas is capable of achieving. Less sympathetic were some supporters of global Jihad who claimed

that the Palestinians should view themselves as part of the entire oppressed Islamic nation, and should not isolate their case as Hamas seems to do.

Conclusion

In general, most *salafi-jihadi* responses to the Hamas victory have been deeply critical. Hamas entered a process that is fundamentally contrary to the *salafi-jihadi* worldview regarding democracy, elections, loyalty to Allah and refutation of Islam's enemies (*Al-Walaa' wal-Baraa'*). The *salafi-jihadi* critics also vehemently disapprove of the pragmatic or, to them, even opportunist nature of the Muslim Brotherhood.

Hamas leaders have thus far ignored such criticism. There is, however, a creeping sense of nihilism among many young Palestinians—a sense connected to the insurgency in Iraq and to the recent Israeli-Hezbollah conflict, to the global Jihad and to nihilism—that may increase in the wake of Hamas' electoral success. The first *salafi-jihadi* Palestinian website and forum, AlOmmh.net, opened recently; its goal is to promote *salafi-jihadi* ideas among the Palestinian public and to encourage communication between Palestinian and other Islamists.[8]

Hamas' historic victory marks a turning point in the Palestinian Authority. The *salafi-jihadi* will certainly try to push Hamas into more hard-line positions by attempting both to color the political-ideological discourse of the Palestinian public and to recruit Palestinians for terrorism against Israel. If Hamas were to change its policy toward Israel or even abandon terrorism for a long temporary period, global *jihadi* groups such as al-Qaeda might well try to take up the "torch of Jihad" and establish affiliated groups within the Palestinian territories. The new situation in the Palestinian Authority is, moreover, markedly unstable. It is likely that Fatah could be dismantled, the Palestinian security forces changed, and new political, military and family alliances formed. Increased unemployment and financial difficulties will also probably contribute to an interim period of chaos. Such conditions may provide the *salafi-jihadi* movement with a golden opportunity to win support among the Palestinians in the Palestinian Authority, as they are slowly but surely now doing in some of the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon. So far, there is evidence of growing support for global *jihadi* groups in Gaza, as well as links between al-Qaeda elements in Sinai and Palestinians in Gaza. However, Hamas remains very cautious about establishing such links with *salafi-jihadi*, and not only because of the dogmatic rivalry between them. Hamas urgently needs the political and financial support of Arab governments such as Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan, not to mention the European Union, and can therefore not afford any overt connections to global *jihadi* terrorist groups.

The issue of democracy and electoral participation will surely remain a controversial element in Islamist discourse as well. Hamas' victory may sharpen the debate, however, and even shake the *salafi-jihadi* persistent opposition. If Hamas succeeds, even partly, in

directing the Palestinian Authority and improving the conditions of its people, it may serve for many Islamists as a model of successful Islamic Sunni rule. The "benefit and interest" of the Muslim public may play a pragmatic role here in justifying a change of policy, if not in the eyes of hard-line *jihadi* groups, at least in the eyes of Arab populations.

The debate over the democratic process in general and the Hamas victory in particular has calmed down in recent months since late spring. It has been superseded by other "hot" issues among *salafi-jihadi*—Sunni-Shiite conflicts, the killing of Zarqawi in Iraq, Hezbollah and its conflict with Israel, the growing *jihadi* insurgency led by the Taliban in Afghanistan, and the fate of the *jihadi* struggle in Saudi Arabia. The comparably more static situation in the Palestinian Authority on the one hand, and the cooperation of the movement with Hezbollah on the other, might have also contributed to the decline of interest in the matter. Yet, from time to time, the issue surfaces, especially when there are successful operations against Israel, such as the attack in late June against an Israeli post on the border with Gaza and the abduction of an Israeli soldier.

In some way, the Hamas victory might prove to be a turning point for larger segments of Arab societies in the region, especially those that are influenced by the Muslim Brotherhood and its "evolutionary," rather than "revolutionary" approach to implementing its agenda. But future elections in Arab countries will undoubtedly reignite controversy, especially when they are held in the shadow of American efforts to counter *salafi-jihadi* terrorism by promoting democratic processes in the Middle East. As such, the *salafi-jihadi* movement will continue to challenge the legitimacy of elections and the groups that participate in them in their struggle to win the support of Arab and Muslim hearts and minds.

Notes

1. On the issue of Hamas and al-Qaeda, see also: Reuven Paz, "Hamas vs. Al-Qaeda: The Condemnation of the Khobar Attack," *PRISM Special Dispatch*, vol. 2, no. 4 (June 2004); see online at http://www.eprism.org/images/PRISM_Special_dispatch_no_3-2.pdf.

2. See, for example, *The Doubts Regarding the Ruling of Democracy in Islam*, 2*nd* ed. (London: Al-Tibyan Publications, 2004). This collection of *Salafi* positions and rulings does not name its author(s).

3. See the list on-line at http://www.alhesbah.org/v/showthread.php?t=48196.

4. For the best list of *Jihadi-Salafi* writings on democracy and elections, see the section on "democracy" at al-Maqdisi's website—*Minbar al-Tawhid wal-Jihad*—http://www.tawhed.ws/c?i=91. Abu Omar Seyf, a Jordanian cleric who was the main cleric of the Arab volunteers in Chechnya and was killed there in November 2005, wrote the most recent book on the issue. See his book—*Al-Nizam al-Dimuqrati nizam Kufr*—regarding Iraq at http://www.tawhed.ws/r?i=3639.

5. See online at http://www.tawhed.ws/r?i=1508&c=1573.

6. Ibid.

7. Hamed al-Ali, *Ma'saq Hamas* (Hamas' Dilemma"), 27 January 2006, online at http://www.alhesbah.org/v/showthread.php?t=49903.

8. Risalat al-Ummah al-Jihadiyyah, at www.alommh.net/forums/.

Zarqawi's Anti-Shi'a Legacy: Original or Borrowed?

NIBRAS KAZIMI

T wo months before his death, Abu Musa'ab al-Zarqawi recorded a four-hour anti-Shi'a tirade under the title "Has Word of the *Rafidha* Reached You?" ("*Hel ataka hadith al-rafidha*"). *Rafidha* (rejecters) and its other plural form, *rawafidh*, are derogatory terms used to describe, as Zarqawi makes clear early on his sermon, the "Twelver Imamist Shi'a who follow the Ja'fari creed."[1] In what came to be his last message to his followers, Zarqawi lays out the reasons he believes that the Shi'a—who follow a "religion other than Islam"—are engaged in a doctrinal and political struggle with Sunni Islam. He also specifies the strategic implications of this notion for global *jihad*:

> The Muslims will have no victory or superiority over the aggressive infidels such as the Jews and the Christians until there is a total annihilation of those under them such as the apostate agents headed by the *rafidha* ….
>
> … Jerusalem was only retrieved at the hands of Salahuddin, even though Noureddin Mahmoud [Zenki] was harsher on the Crusaders than Salahuddin. It was Allah's will that victory and the liberation of Jerusalem would come at Salahuddin's hand only after he fought the 'Ubeidi *rafidha* [the Fatimids of Egypt] for several years, and totally annihilated their state and overthrew it, and from then he could focus on the Crusaders, and victory was awarded to him and he retrieved Jerusalem, which had remained captive for years under their grip because of the treachery of the *rawafidh*. This is a very important lesson that history gives us that should not be overlooked at all: we will not have victory over the original infidels [*alkuffar alasliyeen*] until we fight the apostate infidels [*alkuffar almurtaddeen*] simultaneously along with the original infidels. The Islamic conquests that occurred during the reign of the *rashideen* [the Four Righteous Caliphs] only occurred after the Arabian Peninsula was cleansed of apostates. And that is why the most hated figure among the *rafidha* is Salahuddin, and they would tolerate death rather than tolerate him.[2]

Zarqawi is mapping out the next phase of *jihad* as he sees it: in order to strike at Islam's perceived enemies such as the United States, Europe and Israel, the jihadists must also fight the Shi'a, who are agents of the forces hostile to the faith. Zarqawi asserts that, as a matter of doctrine, the *rawafidh* practice "a religion wholly different from the Islam that was brought forth by the Prophet (PBUH) …and that has no other purpose than to destroy Islam." According to Zarqawi, the Shi'a conspire to cast doubt on the tenets of Islam and to sow sedition against Muslim rulers.

Zarqawi is not breaking new ground here, however. Castigating the Shi'a as political traitors to the Muslim nation is a long-standing tradition. Seven centuries ago Shaykh Al-Islam Ibn Taymiyya, the ideological fount of the Salafist movement, made the same point when he wrote:

> Many of [the *rafidha*] would favor the infidels within his heart more than he would favor the Muslims. That is why when the infidel Turks emerged from the east and fought the Muslims and spilled their blood; in the lands of Khurasan and in Iraq and Sham and in the Peninsula and elsewhere, the *rafidha* were there to aid them in killing Muslims. And the Baghdad vizier known as al-'Alqami; it was he and others like him who greatly aided them against the Muslims, as well as those who were in Al-Sham's Aleppo, and other *rafidha* who were the fiercest collaborators in fighting Muslims. The same goes for the Christians [the Crusaders] in Al-Sham where the *rafidha* were their greatest helpers. And should the Jews get a state in Iraq or elsewhere, the *rafidha* will be their greatest helpers, for they are always supportive of the infidels whether they are idolaters or Jews or Christians, and help them to fight Muslims and show aggression towards them.[3]

Zarqawi turned that thirteenth-century Baghdadi vizier cited above into the poster-boy of Shi'a treachery, and released a sermon in May 2005 titled "The Grandchildren of Ibn al-'Alqami Have Returned" ("*Wa 'aad ahfah ibn al-'alqami*"). In the jihadist version of history, in 1258 the vizier Ibn al-'Alqami—allegedly a Shi'a—conspired with Nassir-eddin al-Tusi, another Shi'a who acted as adviser to the "Tatar" commander Holaku, to attack Baghdad and topple the 'Abbasid Caliphate. The Tatars killed the last caliph, al-Musta'asim, by bundling him up in sackcloth and trampling him to death, and they laid waste to the city, butchering or enslaving hundreds of thousands of its inhabitants. To Zarqawi and the jihadists, the American occupation of Baghdad in April 2003 mirrored those centuries-old events because it also occurred through Shi'a collusion. And that was not the end of Shi'a infamy, for "what was endured by the Sunnis of Iraq at the hands of those *rawafidh*, the grandsons of Ibn al-'Alqami, was harsher and more gruesome than what they have had to endure at the hands of the American enemy." Zarqawi adds, "we are the vanguard of the *umma* and its first line of defense, and its spearhead that stands in the

face of this Crusader encroachment; working to stop this encroachment by these contemporary Tatars at the gates of Baghdad for the good of the whole *umma*."

Zarqawi's Shi'a fixation was first indicated in a letter he allegedly wrote to Osama bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahiri that came to light in February 2004. In this letter, which U.S. soldiers captured on one of his couriers, Zarqawi defends his anti-Shi'a rhetoric and actions. "The *rafidha* have declared a secret war against the people of Islam," he wrote, "and they constitute the near and dangerous enemy to the Sunnis even though the Americans are also a major foe, but the danger of the *rafidha* is greater and their damage more lethal to the *umma* than the Americans." He asserts that instigating Shi'a-Sunni strife would have two benefits: it would both deal with an imminent threat and rouse the Sunnis to action, leading them to flock to *jihad*.

In making his case, Zarqawi is able to refer to a very large body of polemical works that document the Shi'a doctrinal deviations and political betrayals of Islam. In the last century, most of the doctrinal works were commissioned and subsidized by Saudi Arabia's Wahhabis, but recently the jihadists have been turning out tracts of their own to highlight the political danger posed by Shi'ism. A number of sources seem to have influenced Zarqawi's rhetoric, beginning with a tract published in the early 1980s that warned of the challenge posed by Iran's Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini. Several contemporary Wahhabi sermons that focus on political matters also inform Zarqawi's arguments, as do two books published since the start of the Iraq war that address the Shi'a problem from a jihadist perspective. There are some instances where Zarqawi seems to have borrowed directly from these works.

Zarqawi argues in his April 2006 sermon that his tactics, such as indiscriminate attacks on Shi'a civilians, are nothing new—mass eradication of Shi'i populations was a repressive measure previously used by Muslim rulers when faced with sedition.[4] Zarqawi is very careful to ward off any accusations of *bid'a* (innovation), which is taboo to all Salafists. He is unique, however, in his transformation of hate speech into a course for action: he has pushed *jihad* to the extreme by introducing the concept of a final solution to the Shi'a problem through "complete annihilation." He recommends such a course as a prelude to defeating the other enemies of Islam and resurrecting the Caliphate. The security and moral implications of such a strategy should greatly worry those battling terrorism, as well as the Shi'a themselves, who are the majority in some key Middle East countries and sizable minorities in such strategic locales as the Persian Gulf's oil-rich rim and the areas adjacent to Israel's northern borders.

Pioneering Anti-Shi'ism

In many ways a book by Abdullah Muhammad al-Gharib entitled *Then Came the Turn of the Majus* [*Wa ja'a dawr al-majus*] set the tone for successive works that describe the

Shi'a political threat.[5] And several instances in Zarqawi's sermon indicate that he borrowed directly from al-Gharib's book, including a verbatim—yet not cited—paragraph about a historical character called al-Hurmuzan who was involved in Caliph 'Umar's murder.[6] Zarqawi does directly acknowledge al-Gharib in making the case that Khomeini was in reality an American agent.[7]

According to al-Gharib, he wrote this book in the late 1970s to warn of the imminent danger posed by Khomeini's movement even before the overthrow of the Shah. The word *majus* is the generic, early-Islamic term for all the "fire-worshiping" Persians—whether Zorastrians, Mazdakites or Manicheans—who were encountered in the conquest of Iraq and Persia. The first edition was published in 1981 in Cairo (among other places), and an expanded second edition appeared in 1986, also in multiple printings. The author claims to have followed the activities of the "*rafidhah*" for two decades before compiling his treatise, and felt compelled to publish his case at a time when Middle Eastern Islamists were looking favorably on the Iranian Revolution. They believed, as he did, that this seismic event would help overturn Communism and other secular ideologies.

The gist of the book is cautionary, however, warning of Shi'a expansion originating from Iran and spreading into the rest of the Middle East. Though the author never definitively casts off the Shi'a as infidels, he comes close when writing in the introduction that "Their doctrines are rotten … and these contemporary Shi'a are worse than yesterday's Shi'a…. And I have demonstrated that the Shi'a have their own origins and we have our own too, and there is no room for convergence…. Shi'ism reverts to majusist roots and not Islamic ones, and the home of majusism is the land of Iran and Persia." Later on, al-Gharib gives more specific reasons for labeling Shi'a as heretics:

> The Twelver Imami Ja'afaris who slander the companions of the Prophet (PBUH) and deny the *sunnah*, and believe that the scribes have deleted nary a verse from the Quran, and who believe in the infallibility of their Imams and claim that they are better than Allah's prophets and know the unknown, then we have no doubt about their heresy, and that their distance from Islam is such as the distance between the sky and the earth, especially if they believe in their known books: *Al-kafi, Fasl al-khitab, Fiqh men la yahdhuruhu al-faqih* …[8]

Fueled by Arab ethnic chauvinism, the first part of al-Gharib's book is replete with indictments of the Persian race, whom the author holds responsible for a string of conspiracies against Islam. These began with a plot, allegedly hatched in alliance with Christians, to murder 'Umar. According to al-Gharib, "the esoteric *rafidha* look upon Arab Muslims with malice and hate simply because they destroyed the glory of Persia and vanquished the rule of Cyrus."[9] Al-Gharib asserts that the Persians turned to Shi'ism only because Imam Hussein married into royal Sassanian blood.[10] The Persians also aided the

'Abbasids in dethroning the 'Umayyad dynasty, and then secretly sought to control them. Al-Gharib proceeds to describe the disruptive uprisings of the Qaramitah (Carmathians), the Buwayhids and the Fatimids—all of which contributed to weakening Islam. He adds that "they divided up the Islamic lands among them and spread unbelief wherever their feet tread … then Salahuddin al-Ayyubi came and cleansed Bilad al-Sham and Egypt from majusism, and returned the Prophet's *sunnah* to the Muslims." But the Shi'a went underground and

> the batinis prepared themselves to emerge with their old beliefs with only the names changed: the Safavids, the Baha'is, the Qadianis, the Druze, the Nusayris ['Alawites], the Assassins, the Isma'ilis…. The [batinis] returned to support the enemies of Allah and to cooperate with them against Muslims. They cooperated with Britain, Portugal, France, and Czarist Russia…. They returned to shred Islamic unity all over again.[11]

Al-Gharib then elaborates about all the groups cited above, claiming that even the founders of the Druze and Nusayris sects were Persians. He makes some glaring historical mistakes, however, such as wrongly characterizing the Afghan Afsharids as Shi'a, when they were, in fact, trying to foment a Sunni revival in Iran after defeating the Safavids.[12] Al-Gharib even denounces the Sufis by arguing that some of their luminaries, such as al-Hallaj, were majusis.[13] He also mentions in passing the "treachery" carried out by Ibn al-'Alqami and Nassir-eddin al-Tusi.[14] But he is particularly vitriolic about

Syria's Nusayri sect, who had aided the Crusaders, the Tatars and the French. Al-Gharib insists that their ethnic ancestors were Persian slaves who had fled Iraq's Samara ahead of the Carmathian raids,[15] and adds:

> Today they control an important part of Bilad al-Sham—Syria—and plan to destroy Islam and Muslims when the coast is clear for them, and they cooperate with Israel, Iran and the United States, and Muslim scholars in the past and the present have unanimously declared this sect to be infidels.[16]

On doctrinal issues al-Gharib instructs the reader to review the work produced by an earlier generation of Sunni scholars—thinkers such as Muhammad Shukri al-Alusi, Muhib-eddin al-Khateeb, Muhammad Behjet al-Bitar, Rashid Ridha, Taqi-eddin al-Hilali and Mustafa Siba'i. He also recommends "contemporary" scholars such as Muhammad Nassir al-Albani; al-Bashir al-Ibrahimi; Ahmad Amin, who's book *The Dawn of Islam* [*Fajr alislam*] "ties Shi'ism to Judaism"; Muhammad Is'aaf al-Nashashibi; Ibrahim al-Jabhan, whom al-Gharib credits with revealing Shi'ism's *majusi* roots; Muhammad Rashad Salim; and Ahmad Hassan al-Zayyat.

Almost half the book is devoted to highlighting the danger posed by a resurgent Khomeini and alleged Iranian designs on the Persian Gulf. In al-Gharib's eyes Khomeini only makes a show of hostility toward the United States in order to hide the fact that he is an American agent. Khomeini's bellicosity gave the Americans an excuse to send their troops to such places like Oman, Somalia and Kenya, thus encircling the region. The author points out, however, that because treachery is second nature to the Iranians, they may eventually betray the Americans as well.[17]

Al-Gharib writes that Israel's long-term safety will be assured if Khomeini poses as its enemy and that "the day will comes when people will know that the Jews were behind [the Iranian Revolution] just like Ibn Saba' was behind their emergence in the first place."[18] Here al-Gharib regurgitates a long-standing accusation, employed by Sunni propagandists for centuries, that Shi'ism was founded by a Jewish convert to Islam, Abdullah Ibn Saba', who plotted to sow dissent among the early Muslims by championing the 'Alid cause.[19] The author goes on to argue that the Shi'a of the Gulf States are essentially "fifth columnists" for Iran "who live with their bodies in the Gulf but their hearts and minds are in Tehran."[20] He gives details of how those Shi'a monopolize certain trades and create closed-off communities, and how they are proceeding to infiltrate government and society. He gives very specific examples from Kuwait, including long lists of Shi'a-controlled mosques and cultural institutions.

Al-Gharib's only intent is to bring attention to this emerging threat. He laments that many Sunnis are so enthralled by Khomeini's sloganeering that they fail to notice the impending Shi'a encroachment. The author offers no remedies to counter this threat, and proposes no grand strategies for defending Sunnism.

Contemporary Anti-Shi'a Wahhabism

Sharing al-Gharib's perspective is the 40-year-old Saudi preacher Mamdouh bin Ali al-Harbi. He analyzes the Shi'a "menace" in a two-and-half-hour sermon entitled "The Shi'a Octopus in the World" ("*Al-ikhtaboot al-shi'i fil 'alem*"), which is available in four audio files on a number of anti-Shi'a websites (such as www.albainah.net).[21] The series begins with several audio segments, apparently recorded from chat rooms, of individual Shi'a cursing and mocking the Caliphs Abu Bakr and 'Umar, as well as the Saudi royal family. Rehashing the Ibn 'Alqami story, al-Harbi warns that "the Shi'a naturally constitute a supportive column for Iran's political and religious plans and ideas." He first highlights the danger posed by Saudi Arabia's Shi'a, who are "actively breeding" through community-funded mass nuptials and who seek to control such strategic businesses as bakeries and fish markets. "The Saudi Shi'a are similar to the Shi'a all over the world with regards to their heretical doctrine, paganism and grave-worship," al-Harbi declares. He also warns that some Shi'a are attempting to go undercover and to pass themselves off as Sunnis by

assuming common Saudi tribal surnames. He gives several examples, including some Kaysani (Nakhawileh) Shi'a in Medina who distort their family name of "al-Hirbi" to sound like that of the numerous al-Harbi tribe.

In the second audio file, al-Harbi uses Persian Gulf shipping and oil production statistics from al-Gharib's *Wa ja'a dawr al-majoos*, as well as his examples of Shi'a proliferation in countries like Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates, but does not cite the source. Al-Harbi proceeds to describe Iranian proselytizing efforts among Yemeni tribes along the Saudi border because the Saudi state "is considered by Iran to be its first and greatest enemy to itself and to Shi'as in general."[22] According to him, the American ambassador in Yemen has disbursed a hundred-million-dollars worth of weaponry, such as anti-aircraft and anti-armor missiles, among these tribes in order to foment unrest. Al-Harbi also describes what he believes are Iranian efforts to spread Shi'ism in Egypt.

This undated sermon was undoubtedly recorded after the start of the Iraq war because al-Harbi laments and lists all the illicit Shi'a designs on Iraq, including their "deceitful" efforts to inflate their numbers that "do not exceed 40 percent of the population." Some of al-Harbi's assertions about their sinister designs verge on the bizarre:

> The Shi'a of Iraq control most of the important departments in the Iraqi government and they [lure others] through money and women just like their brothers the Jews, and one of the recent trends is the increase in the number of private sports halls in the capital Baghdad, where its patrons train on all sorts of martial arts such as Karate or Kung-Fu or Judo, and most of these halls belong to the Shi'a whether they be trainers or trainees, and when asked about the reason for this large number of [sports] halls and the large number of Shi'a among its patrons, more than one responded unanimously that they want their hearts to get accustomed to fighting Sunnis with their [bare] hands rather than with weapons, since weapons provide a quick death and that is not to their heart's content, as one of them said.[23]

Al-Harbi claims that Khomeini's revolution assumed the mantle of leading the world's Shi'a, and spreads the Shi'a creed through Iran's worldwide network of embassies and cultural centers. He gives detailed examples of such activities in Kenya and the Sudan, and continues in the third audio file along the same lines to describe more Iranian proselytizing campaigns in Senegal, Nigeria, the Philippines, and Indonesia. In the fourth and last audio segment, he cites similar activities in Afghanistan, Turkey, Bosnia and North America, going so far as to give a detailed breakdown of Shi'a mosques and cultural centers in the state of Georgia, among many others.

In another one-hour sermon in two parts entitled "The Secret Plans of the Shi'a" ("*Mukhattetat al-shi'a al-sirriyyeh*"), which is similarly available on several anti-Shi'a

websites, al-Harbi dwells at length on a purportedly secret document called "The Secret Plan of the Clerics and Ayatollahs of the Shi'a" ("*Alkhuta al-sirriyyeh li 'ulema' wa ayaat al-shi'a*"). The Society of the Sunnis of Iran (*Rabitat ahl al-sunnah fi iran*), a London-based organization, "exposed" this document, and it was published in *Al-Bayyan* Magazine in March 1998. The text also appears in many versions on the internet and under different titles; one is the "Protocols of the Elders of Qum," which echoes the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" to reinforce the impression among radical Sunnis that the Shi'a conspiracy is akin to the Jewish one.[24] Similarly, Zarqawi argues that

> the roots of the *rafidha* and the roots of the Jews are one and thus much of the teachings of the *rafidha* are highly similar to the teachings of the Jews, and their secret meetings and conferences and their use of *taqiyya* [dissembling] to show something other than what they really harbor towards Muslims, is the same as with the Jews.... And he who is aware of what came in the protocols of the Jews and the teachings of the Talmud toward nations other than the Jews will find a complete overlap with the *fatwas* of the Ayatollahs and Seyyids of the *rafidha* towards the Muslims in particular.[25]

In this second sermon, al-Harbi describes an alleged fifty-year plan that the Shi'a are employing to turn Sunnis to Shi'ism and to take over the Persian Gulf, as well as Pakistan, Turkey, Iraq and Afghanistan. The secret plan was put in place to confront the threat of the Wahhabis who "oppose the *Vilayet-el-Faqih*," and it seeks to create dissention among Sunni clerics and Sunni rulers. The plan encourages Iranians to immigrate to the target countries and then spread fake pamphlets in which Wahhabi and Sunni clerics denounce the depravity of their societies—pamphlets that will cause the ruling regimes to seek retribution against such clerics. Meanwhile, Shi'a clerics will profess fealty to the rulers and push for representative government. Al-Harbi accuses the Shi'a using financial bribes to sway the rulers and of making gifts of "Persian female agents fluent in Arabic and with force of character and intelligence, in addition to being beautiful." This charge seems to have been provoked by Saudi Shi'a attempts, in April 2003, to petition then-Crown Prince Abdullah for full citizenship rights—to the chagrin of leading neo-Wahhabi clerics.[26] Al-Harbi points out that such a strategy has worked in the past: the Safavids turned Iran from a majority Sunni nation into a bastion for Shi'ism and, in a more recent example, the Shi'a now constitute 50 percent of the population of Baghdad, up from only 10 percent in the 1950s.

Al-Harbi's main argument is that there can be no reconciliation or co-existence with the Shi'a after the revelation of this secret plan. The primary motivation for such an anti-Shi'a line seems to stem from fears harbored by establishment Wahhabis that the ruling House of Saud would seriously entertain the idea of extending full rights to the kingdom's Shi'a

minority. Like al-Gharib, al-Harbi proposes no counter-measures to respond to this per-ceived threat, and finds it sufficient to counsel Saudi Arabia's rulers not to trust the Shi'a.

Early Jihadist Anti-Shi'ism

Zarqawi seems to have relied most heavily in his sermon on a book by 'Imad 'Ali 'Abdul-Sami' Hussein entitled *The Treachery of the Shi'a and Its Impact on the Defeats of the Islamic Nation* (*Khiyanat al-shi'a wa athereha fi haza'im al-ummah al-islamiyyeh*).[27] There are at least three instances where he borrows directly from this publication, although without citation.[28] According to it author, the book, which is widely available in electronic form over the internet, was completed on 16 November 2003.[29] It is unique in linking the fall of Baghdad in April 2003 to al-Gharib's theme of the Shi'a menace and to many historical examples of alleged Shi'a aid to the enemies of Islam.

In a sense, the Shi'a role in the American invasion of Iraq was a wake-up call to the jihadists, prompting them to search for similar precedents in Islamic history. Hussein dwells on Ibn al-'Alqami's treachery and even includes a fictional one-act play called *Upon the Walls of Baghdad* in which al-'Alqami, the 'Abbasid Caliph, and the phantom of History are characters.[30] According to Hussein, al-'Alqami "downsized" the 'Abbasid mili-tary for two reasons: to save funds to further indulge the caliph's decadence, and to leave Baghdad defenseless in the face of the Tatars. Hussein dispels the notion that al-'Alqami was motivated to perform this betrayal because his relatives had been the victims of anti-Shi'a riots in Baghdad the year before; rather, Hussein claims, his treachery can be traced to "the beliefs he carries."[31]

Hussein asserts that "treachery, betrayal and deceit is what passes for religion among the Shi'a"[32] and—just as Zarqawi does—makes clear that he means, not only the main-stream Twelver Imamis, but also the Isma'ilis and Alawites when he speaks of the "treach-erous Shi'a." Their impulse for treachery stems, he claims, from Shi'a doctrine that holds Sunnis to be infidels and that refers to them derogatively as the *nawasib*, or "those who are obstinate in hating Aal al-Bayt" (the "People of the House," including Mohammed, Ali, Fatima, Hasan ibn Ali, Hussein ibn Ali.) Hussein says there is no need to dwell on all the doctrinal differences that set the Shi'a apart from Islam because this has been amply done by many scholars before him. He is more interested in sounding an alarm by pointing out why the Islamic nation has been constantly thwarted politically and militarily. Hussein contends that the Shi'a are at the root of most of the calamities that have befallen Islam. He suggests that treachery has contaminated Shi'a blood, moreover, and they cannot be trusted to show benevolence even to those closest to them, such as the Aal al-Bayt them-selves[33]: "How can we enumerate their treachery when betrayal is in their blood and veins, and it is to them like water and air?"[34] He relies heavily on Ibn Kathir's book, *The Beginning and the End* (*Al-bidaya wel nihaya*), in delineating the many Shi'a betrayals.[35]

Hussein draws parallels between the Fatimids' relationship with the Crusaders and the "alliance" between the Americans and the Shi'a today in Iraq.[36] He also highlights the allegation that the Fatimid caliphs were not descended from Aal al-Bayt, but rather from a Jewish blacksmith. Furthermore, he draws a correlation between the Carmathian raids on Mecca (including the "theft" of the holy Black Stone) and Iranian-inspired disturbances and riots during the Hajj season.[37]

Hussein lists the many "distractions" the Shi'a had put in place against the Seljukes and the Ayyubids at a time when the latter two Muslim dynasties were determined to address the Crusader threat. He echoes the sentiment that "Jerusalem was lost because of the treachery of the Shi'a."[38] Like al-Gharib, he devotes plenty of space as well to denouncing the Nusayris of Syria, going so far as to assert that the "Tatar" conqueror Tamerlane—who, according to Hussein, massacred hundreds of thousands of Sunnis in Syria and Iraq—was a Nusayri himself.[39] By referring to the first and second editions of al-Gharib's *Wa ja'a dawr al-majus*, Hussein also makes the case that Lebanon's Shi'a acted to further Israel's interests. Hussein then emphasizes the suspected allegiance of the world's Shi'a to Iran: "Iran is considered the nurturing mother for all the Shi'a and especially the Twelvers in every place," he writes, "and the Shi'a wherever they happen to be located are more loyal to Iran than to the land which they inhabit."[40]

Hussein calls Iraq the "deep wound in the depths of the Islamic nation" and writes that the Shi'a betrayal there came about despite Saddam Hussein's "policy of appeasement." He contends that Saddam spent

> large sums of money to build mosques and religious centers for the Shi'a in Iraq, and [gave] incentives to Shi'a leaders and individuals, to the extent that the president of the regime Saddam Hussein declared that he was descended from Hussein bin 'Ali and made 'Ali bin Abi Taleb's birthday a national holiday …despite all of that the leading Shi'a clerics refused to cooperate with the Ba'ath.[41]

And now, Hussein continues, they have the gall to demand compensation for the former regime's political persecution of the Shi'a, "which was not persecution but rather a response to their never-ending treachery and mischief."[42]

In conclusion, Hussein declares that the Shi'a "are the reason for most of the past and present setbacks endured by the Islamic nation…. So how can there be a rapprochement with those who allied themselves to the human and *jinn* devils in the past and the present to humiliate the Sunnis?"[43] His book reorients al-Gharib's argument, moving it beyond subtle suggestions of Shi'a treachery to highlighting their outright treacherous support for the American war Iraq. As far as jihadists are concerned, the support the American invasion received from Shi'i opposition leaders who agitated for it was the

epitome of betrayal in their times. And the precedent of al-'Alqami further justifies their anti-Shi'a hostility. It provides powerful imagery to underscore their view of the cyclical pattern to history and to support their claim that the Shi'a today are simply enacting the same role they played in the past. Like al-Gharib and al-Harbi, however, Hussein has no suggestions for action to counter this threat.

The Development of Jihadist Anti-Shi'a Ideology

In a book entitled *The Rafidhi-Crusader Alliance in Iraq* (*Al-tahaluf al-rafidhi al-salibi fil Iraq*), Abdel-Muhsin al-Rafi'i brings many of Hussein's themes into sharper focus—though he never cites Hussein.[44] Al-Rafi'i says that he completed the book on 12 January 2005, and explains in the introduction that he was motivated to write it after seeing how much Hezbollah had distorted the reality of the Shi'a menace in many Muslims' eyes. He wanted to reveal the "extent of the *rafidhi* collaboration with the enemies of Allah and their role in the declared war on Islam … towards the goal of destroying true Islam." Continuing his denunciation of the Shi'a, al-Rafi'i writes: "Over the ages there did not pass a period of time when the *rafidhi* did not have a role in striking Muslims and conspiring against them with all the means available by way of betrayal, deceit and cunning, for the *rafidhi* are an esoteric group with many branches but one root, and they operate in the shadows to execute their goals."[45] In essence, however, al-Rafi'i highlights the same historical timeline of betrayal as al-Gharib and Hussein, expanding on it only slightly when discussing the Ottoman-Safavid rivalry. He claims that "the Ottomans had a certain desire to retrieve al-Andalus [Spain] but the Shi'a played an important role in distracting the Ottomans in cahoots with the Crusaders to deny the Muslims this long-awaited dream."[46]

Where Al-Rafi'i does differ from the previous authors is in his focus on, and greater concern with, the current goals of this long-standing Shi'a-"Crusader" alliance. He contends that one goal is to use Iraq as means of achieving direct "Crusader" control over the Islamic world and its resources. Another of the alliance's goals is to create a "State of Greater Israel" from the banks of the Nile to the Euphrates River, and to prepare the ground for the False Messiah.[47] The author discerns the first vestiges of this plan in Saudi Arabia, where that country's Shi'a are "demanding their rights in order to spearhead the execution of the aforementioned plan in dismembering Saudi Arabia and bringing the Shi'a to power, and giving the Crusaders control of the Holy Sites as they did in Iraq," thus fulfilling "the dream of the Jews."[48] In analyzing Iran's foreign policy, Al-Rafi'i determines that there is also a "*Rafidhi*-Russian Alliance" directed against the Muslims of the Caucuses and Central Asia and a "*Rafidhi*-Hindu Alliance" directed against the Muslims of the Indian Subcontinent. The "Crusader" master plan calls for the lands of Islam to be handed over to the Shi'a, he argues, and where they are too few in number, other minorities—such as the Copts of Egypt or secularists ("the spawn of Communists")—will take over.

Al-Rafi'i focuses on symbolism as well. Because the crescent is an Islamic symbol, for instance, he proposes changing the term "Shi'a Crescent" to the term "Shi'a Crucifix." He also suggests devising a symbol to represent a "Triangle of Evil" that would have the words "*rafidha*, Crusaders and Hindus" at its three corners and a Star of David at its center.[49]

Yet despite the rampant Shi'a perfidy he has detected, al-Rafi'i writes that he is heartened by the apparent success of the jihadists in Iraq, who are confronting and foiling this "evil scheme" in the "land of the caliphate." His only lament is that "the governments of the region and even though they are in the majority associated with the Sunnis are unconcerned with the conspiracies being hatched to destroy Islam, even though these came in the form of a manifest military invasion that aims to occupy the lands of the Muslims, because the only concern of these governments is to stay in power."[50] He also chides "those clerics who have sold their religion cheaply" and have come out with *fatwas* against *jihad*.[51]

Al-Rafi'i contributes to the discussion by highlighting the jihadist role in putting a stop to the Shi'a conspiracy, but he, too, fails to offer any specific guidance about how the jihadists should act. Nevertheless, his thesis is an important stepping stone toward Zarqawi's assertion that jihadists such as himself must become the Islamic nation's vanguard in halting the designs of the Shi'a.

The Problem Posed by Hezbollah and the Mahdi Army

The anti-American and anti-Israel rhetoric and actions of the Iranian regime, and of such Shi'a radical groups as Hezbollah, seriously challenge the Wahhabi and jihadist myth of Shi'a treachery and collaboration with the enemies of Islam. But the jihadists have arrived at several explanations for this puzzling contradiction.[52] Al-Rafi'i has his own theory about Hezbollah—an "Iranian creation" in his eyes—and it holds that the radical Shi'a organization is merely *posing* as an enemy of Israel to ward off accusations of treachery, which are leveled against the Shi'a generally. Hezbollah, moreover, entices Sunnis toward Shi'ism by playing on the popular Middle Eastern sentiment that supports the Palestinians cause. Its ultimate goal is, in fact, to stamp out the Sunni identity of Lebanon and to deny the latter any role in leading its society. Al-Rafi'i even uses the words of the former head of Hezbollah, Shaykh Subhi al-Tufaili, to suggest that Hezbollah actually serves to protect Israel's northern border.[53]

Zarqawi's take on the issue is more expansive. He asserts that the Iranians—after seeing that the Lebanese Amel organization had been "burnt" and disgraced by its fighting against Palestinians—set about to "invent" a new organization called Hezbollah. This new group's guiding principle is that "every enemy of Iran is an enemy of Hezbollah …which stands as a security cordon to prevent the Sunnis from crossing the border to confront Israelis."[54] Zarqawi then wonders why is it that Israel cannot stomach, and proceeds to

assassinate, a "harmless cripple" like Shaykh Ahmad Yassin while Hezbollah's General Chairman Hassan Nasrallah holds regular rallies in downtown Beirut calling for Israel's destruction and goes unharmed.[55] In a similar vein, Zarqawi derides Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's "screaming" to destroy Israel as mere oratory.[56]

According to Zarqawi, Iran is more afraid of having "a strong Sunni neighbor because their main war is not with the Jews and not with the Christians but their first and last war is with Sunnis."[57] The Iranian policy in Iraq, therefore, seeks to change that country's demographics by facilitating massive Shi'a immigration and by furthering a policy of massacring the Sunnis.[58] They are aided in doing so by "the Iranian Sistani, the occupier's preacher and the imam of heresy and unbelief who issues *fatwas* that are catastrophic to the Sunnis, in addition to those who serve the occupiers like al-Hakim and Ja'afari and their followers who are wolves in sheepskin ... to expand and consolidate the geographic domain of Iranian Persian *rafidhi* rule."[59]

Zarqawi also appears to declare war on Muqatada al-Sadr's Mahdi Army that twice (in April and November 2004) clashed with U.S. troops in Iraq. He regards them as another Shi'a ruse, akin to Hezbollah. Their real role "is to protect their *rafidhi* creed and to fight the Sunnis and they are being prepared as an alternative card to be gambled with in case the balance in assuming power tips in favor of the resistance rather than the politicians."[60] Directing his words to al-Sadr in the wake of the reprisal killings that occurred after the Samarra-shrine bombing, Zarqawi says, "We tell you that you have crossed your boundaries.... You have falsely claimed to be protecting the mosques of the Sunnis.... And we have agreed to join the battle against you and your flock of sheep but on two conditions." Those conditions are that the Mahdi Armies retrieve their weapons from the "Crusaders" —weapons that were voluntarily handed over to American forces as part of a brokered cease-fire in November 2004—and that only Mahdi Army fighters who know the identity of their fathers emerge to fight Zarqawi's men.[61] Here Zarqawi is deriding the Sadrists for caving in to the Americans after the two confrontations in Najaf, and is alluding to what he sees as Shi'a sexual deviancy, which results in illegitimate offspring.

More of Zarqawi's Tirade Against the Shi'a

The book that Zarqawi quotes most often in his diatribe against the Shi'a is *For Allah and Then for History* (*Lillahi wa thuma lil-tareekh*) by a pseudonymous author who goes under the name Hussein al-Musawi.[62] This author is an alleged convert from Shi'ism to Sunnism who, as a former insider, reveals the secret machinations of the Shi'a clerical establishment. Such secrets include lewd allegations about Ayatollah Khomeini's penchant for pedophilia,[63] as well as charges that Khomeini intended to destroy Mecca and Medina because they were "Wahhabi strongholds" and to make Karbala "into the *qibleh* towards which Muslims direct their prayers."[64]

Zarqawi castigates the Shi'a for many more sexual deviations as a result of the *muta'a* (temporary marriage) sanctioned by their clerics. He claims that it leads to even more depravity among them than what is tolerated in Europe and America, particularly in regard to such matters as incest, wife-swapping and anal sex.[65] But what roils Zarqawi the most—if the break in his voice is any indication—are the slanderous contentions leveled by the Shi'a on the chastity of Ayesha, the Prophet Muhammad's wife[66]; he vows that "a hair from Ayesha's head is more beloved to us than ourselves or our families or all of mankind."[67]

In addition to dwelling on this large volume of Shi'a treachery and deviancy, Zarqawi further justifies his excessive tactics against them by claiming that previous Muslim rulers and commanders handled the Shi'a problem in a similar way. He proclaims, "What we do regarding all these crimes, and that is only to put into effect Allah's religious instruction upon them through killing and repressing them, we are in this case—by Allah—not bringing anything improvised to the *mujahidin* but only implementing the rule of Allah against [the Shi'a] as it was implemented by our predecessors."[68] Zarqawi then proceeds to list historical instances when entire Shi'a populations were put to the sword or, alternatively, hurled into burning trenches.

Implications for Counter-terrorism

On July 29, 2005, the *New York Times* featured the story of Zaid Horani, a Jordanian jihadist who had been arrested four months earlier by local authorities when he returned to Jordan after fighting with Zarqawi's outfit in Iraq. Part of what compelled him to go, his mother volunteered, was that "he hated the Shiites." The next day *Asharq al-Awsat*, a leading Saudi-owned Arabic-language daily that translates and runs stories from the *Times*, printed the article without the reference to hating the Shi'a. Why would the 27-year-old Horani develop such hatred toward the Shi'a while growing up in a country that hardly has any Shi'a? And why would a Saudi-owned paper excise his mother's quote?

The Saudi government may be rightly worried about the fruits that it has allowed to grow. Several decades of sustained anti-Shi'a propaganda issued by the Wahhabis—and recently augmented by jihadists chiming in on the topic—seem to have psychologically primed many young Sunni jihadist sympathizers in the Middle East to comprehend Zarqawi's sermon and observe his instructions. Zarqawi did not need to do too much anti-Shi'a brainwashing; much of the heavy lifting, such as casting the Shi'a as beyond the confines of Islam and highlighting their alleged treachery, had already been done. Zarqawi simply built on these perceptions when he asserted that "traitors" lurking within the Muslim camp were responsible for the success of Christians and Jews in thwarting the Muslim nation at every turn. To end this cycle of defeat, he argues, the jihadists need to do what heroic Muslim redeemers such as Salahuddin had done before them: address

the Shi'a problem. Past attempts to fix the problem have failed, Zarqawi adds, as evidenced by the current pitiful state of Muslim lands. The only permanent solution, therefore, is to excise the Shi'a and put an end to their very presence. Zarqawi uses the words "mass annihilation" and recommends it as jihadist policy.

Whether such jihadist anti-Shi'ism will survive the death of Zarqawi, its leading proponent, is now the question. Abu Hamza al-Muhajir, Zarqawi's purported successor as head of al-Qaeda in Mesopotamia, indicates that it will indeed continue. He made this point very clear in his first message to the world (posted on several jihadist websites 13 June 2006):

> We say to the grandchildren of Ibn al-'Alqami: you who have taken gods in addition to Allah, and slandered the honor of the Prophet, and cursed his blessed companions, and were ardent in the service of the Crusaders …. We shall do unto you as Abu Baker al-Siddiq saw fit to do against the apostates, and we will continue what Abu Musa'ab—God bless his soul—started with you, and we will fight you until the word of monotheism is supreme and the word of your tyrants is brought low.

Even jihadist groups other than Zarqawi's al-Qaeda are playing "catch-up" and reconfiguring their propaganda to address the Shi'a menace. The Ansar al-Sunnah terrorist organization posted a video on the internet on June 7 entitled "The Throbbing Vein that Confronts the Malice of the *Rawafidh*" ("*Al-'irq al-nabidh fi ssad hiqd al-rawafidh*") This video, which runs for over an hour, highlights acts of aggression attributed to Shi'a militias over the last two years in Iraq, and ends with the fighters of Ansar al-Sunnah vowing vengeance.[69] Other jihadist groups active in Iraq, which are redirecting their resources from targeting American to fueling sectarian war, have also clearly decided to adopt some form of Zarqawi's anti-Shi'ism. The fact that they need to do so to remain relevant to *jihad* testifies to the popularity of Zarqawi's policy.

Zarqawi's most enduring legacy, therefore, may be the transformation of anti-Shi'ism into a central tenet of the jihadist worldview. He argued that Islam's victory is tied to the physical eradication of the Shi'a, and there is evidence that adherence to this policy is expanding among jihadists. The dissemination of anti-Shi'a propaganda should be considered an act of ideological terrorism, and raises the issue of how counterterrorist efforts should address the plethora of Saudi-funded Wahhabi propaganda directed against the Shi'a. At last count, there were at least twelve actively maintained websites dedicated to disseminating anti-Shi'a material.[70] Shutting down these websites and monitoring the flow of orchestrated hate speech directed against Shi'a should become a priority for those concerned with the spread of jihadist ideology.

NOTES

1. Although the audio recording was posted on several jihadist websites a few days before Zarqawi was killed on 8 June 2006, the accompanying text stated that this sermon had been prepared two months in advance but that accentuating circumstances had prevented an earlier release. The recording appeared as three separate files (two approximately 1.5 hours in length, and the third ran for one hour) and were identified as three separate "tapes" by a moderator who spoke before Zarqawi. The recordings were released by the Shura Council of the Mujaheddin (*Majlis shura al-mujaheddin*). The title of the sermon is a play of words on the similarly phrased opening verse in the al-Ghashia *sura* (88:1): "Has not there come to you the news of the overwhelming calamity?" (M.H. Shakir translation).

2. Zarqawi, "*Hel ataka hadith al-rafidha*," minute 29 of tape 3.

3. Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyya, *The Syllabus of the Sunnah* ([Minhaj al-sunnah), 1*st* ed. (1406 A.H.), vol. 3, pp. 377-78, available from http://arabic.islamicweb.com/books/taimiya.asp?book=365. Ibn Taymiyya (1263-1328 A.D.) was born in Harran (northern Syria) and died in Damascus. As part of his biographical lore, it has been recorded that he himself went on several Seljuk campaigns to quell Shi'a (specifically Nusayri and Druze) rebellions in Kisrawan, Wadi al-Taym and the Jurd Mountains of the Syrian coast.

4. There is a split opinion among jihadists over targeting the Shi'a ruling elite versus the Shi'a laity. Ibn Taymiyya sanctioned the targeting of the Shi'a ruling elite only and marking them for death. Zarqawi, in a response to an admonishment from his former mentor Abu Muhammad Al-Maqdisi, argued that there is no longer a distinction between the elite and the laity since, under a democracy, the lay people of the Shi'a elect their rulers. See Nibras Kazimi, "A Virulent Ideology in Mutation: Zarqawi Upstages Maqdisi," *Current Trends in Islamist Ideology*, vol. 2 (Washington: Hudson Institute, September 2005): 68.

5. There are three other books written under the name "Dr. Abdullah Muhammad al-Gharib": *Notes on the Iranian Revolution and the Stance of Islamists Regarding It* (*Lamahat 'an al-thawra al-iraniyya wa mawqif al-islamiyeen minha*), undated but written after *Wa ja'a dawr al-majus* since it cites the earlier book; *Amal and the Palestinian Camps* (*Amel wel mukhayemmat al-filisteeniyya*), undated but also written after *Wa ja'a dawr al-majus* since he defends his earlier thesis in the introduction; and *The Conditions of the Sunnis in Iran* (*Ahwal ahl al-sunnah fi iran*), 1990.

   "Dr. al-Gharib" is assumed to be a professor of Islamic Studies in Egypt. In email correspondence dated 6 May 2006, however, Dr. Ahmad Rasim Elnafis, a leading Shi'a Egyptian scholar, disputed the existence of any scholar by the name of "Dr. Abdullah Muhammad al-Gharib" in Egypt. Furthermore, it has been insinuated (see Mishari al-Dhayedi in *Asharq Alawsat*, "Muhammad suroor ghadera...", 28 October 2004) that the real author was a Syrian cleric called Shaykh Muhammad Suroor Zein al-'Abidin, who was a member of the Muslim Brotherhood but left Syria in the 1960s to teach Islamic jurisprudence in Saudi Arabia (where one of his students was the neo-Salafist ideologue Salman al-Audeh). Suroor then moved on to Kuwait before settling in Great Britain in 1984. His followers are known as "Surooriyoon" and are derided by jihadists as "procrastinators of *jihad*." Suroor began publishing a magazine called *Al-Sunnah* from Birmingham and supervised the website www.alsunnah.org, which was shut down on 20 May 2006.

   According to Al-Dhayedi, Suroor left Britain indefinitely for Jordan in October 2004, and that his contribution to jihadist ideology was to combine the strict anti-schismatic views of Ibn Taymiyyah against sects like the Shi'a with the *hakimiya* theories of Seyyid Qutub. 'Ali Al-Ahmad of the Institute of Gulf Studies in Washington, D.C., claimed in a conversation with this author to have spoken to a confidante of Suroor's who had heard the aforementioned shaykh take credit for writing under the pseudonym "Dr. Abdullah Muhammad al-Gharib." This assertion seems to be corroborated by the book's many detailed references to Kuwaiti Shi'a that may have reflected Suroor's long sojourn in Kuwait at the time of writing the book. In a curious coincidence, Zarqawi's *nom de guerre* while in Afghanistan was "Abu Abdullah al-Gharib."

6. Al-Gharib, Wa ja'a dawr al-majus, p. 54 (see note referenced to Ibn Kathir), from the internet edition available at www.d-sunnah.org, and Zarqawi, "*H el ataka hadith al-rafidha*," minute 37 of tape 1.

7. Zarqawi, *"Hel ataka hadith al-rafidha,"* minute 27 of tape 2.

8. Al-Gharib, *Wa ja'a dawr al-majus*, p. 153.

9. Ibid., p. 222.

10. Ibid. pp. 53-56. He attributes the "royal blood" theory to the Pakistani anti-Shi'a writer Ihsan Ilahi Dhahir (or Zahir), who is the author of several similar, and equally influential, books against the Shi'a. Dhahir sustained fatal wounds in a bomb blast in Lahore, Pakistan, in 1987 that was attributed to Shi'a militants, and died while being treated in Saudi Arabia.

11. Ibid., p. 78.

12. Ibid., p. 81.

13. Ibid., p. 97.

14. Ibid., p. 142.

15. Ibid., p. 219. This visceral attack on the Nusayris may be an added clue hinting that the author was Syrian in origin (see note no. 4). For more on the Nusayris, see pages 393-419.

16. Ibid., p. 85.

17. Ibid., pp. 280-84.

18. Ibid., p. 296.

19. Yitzhak Nakash, Reaching for Power: The Shi'a in the Modern Arab World (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), p. 45. Nakash traces the Ibn Saba' myth to medieval times, but highlights that it was revived by Wahhabi propaganda in the 1920s during Ibn Saud's early overtures for taking on the mantle of Islamic leadership. The next two phases of Wahhabi writings on the topic came in 1959, when the Al-Azhar University in Cairo recognized Shi'ism as a legitimate school of Islamic law, and then following the Iranian Revolution of 1978-79.

20. Al-Gharib, Wa ja'a dawr al-majus, p. 317.

21. Al-Harbi is denounced by jihadists as an "apologist" for the Saudi regime. He has several sermons arguing against the feasibility of *jihad* at this time, saying that it would only engender the hostility of the rest of the world when Islam is at its weakest.

22. Al-Harbi, *"Al-ikhtaboot al-shi'i fil 'alem,"* minute 10 of audio file 2.

23. Ibid., minute 29 of audio file 2.

24. Al-Harbi has another 2.5-hour sermon (in four audio files) entitled "The Doctrinal and Military Relationship Between the Shi'a and the Jews" ("*Al-'ilaqa bayn al-shi'a wel yahood 'aqadiyyen wa 'askariyyen*") on www.albainah.net in which he makes the case that shared beliefs, such as waiting for the advent of the Mahdi or Messiah and seeing themselves as divinely chosen, binds the Jews to the Shi'a. He adds that "Ibn Saba' was the first to invent the *rafdh* and the *rafdh* reverts to Judaism."

25. Zarqawi, *"Hel ataka hadith al-rafidha"*, minute 39 of tape 3.

26. The 30 April 2003 petition was signed by 450 leading Saudi Shi'a and entitled "Partners in the Homeland." It advocated a platform for reform and turning back decades of Shi'i disenfranchisement. At the time, it was a measure of how emboldened the Arab Shi'a of the Middle East were by the rise of Shi'a fortunes in post-Saddam Iraq. The task of articulating the neo-Wahhabi response fell to Shaykh Safar bin Abdel-Rahman al-Hawali who wrote "A Response to the Demands Delivered by the Shi'a Sect to the Crown Prince" on 7 July 2003. For another, more extremist Wahhabi approach to the issue of Saudi Shi'a, see Nassir al-'Umar, "The Situation of the *Rafidha* in the Land of Monotheism" ("*Waqi' al-rafidha fi bilad al-tawheed*"), undated (available at www.albainah.com).

In *"Hel ataka hadith al-rafidha"* (minute 30 of tape 1), Zarqawi refers in detail to a *fatwa* issued by Saudi Arabia's Permanent Committee for Studies and *Ifta'* that declares the Shi'a as idolaters who are beyond the confines of Islam. He laments the fact that this clear *fatwa* has not deterred the Saudi government from "bringing [the *rafidha*] close to them

and sitting with them and talking to them in official dialogue councils."

27. The author is identified as bearing a "PhD in Islamic Culture and Proselytizing," but there is no indication of his citizenship, age or current residence. There are also no other books under this name.

28. In "*Hel ataka hadith al-rafidha*" (minute 44 of tape 3), when Zarqawi discusses a tradition attributed to Imam Hussein about employing surreptitious methods to kill Sunnis, such as pushing a wall on top of them, see Hussein, *Khiyanat al-shi'a*, p. 11. The example of Imam Musa al-Kazim and Ibn Yaqtin in "*Hel ataka hadith al-rafidha*" (minute 40 of tape 3) is taken from Hussein, *Khiyanat al-shi'a*, p. 19. And Zarqawi (minute 30 of tape 3) also uses two quotes from the preface to Hussein's book made by Mustafa Al-Siba'i and 'Ali Ahmad Al-Saloos to advise against reconciliation between Shi'a and Sunnis.

29.Hussein, *Khiyanat al-shi'a*, p. 109. The copy used for this article was downloaded from www.tawhed.ws before it was shut down in late March 2006.

30. Ibid., pp. 100-106. The play is attributed to Muhammad 'Ali Badawi, who first published it in *Al-Bayyan* Magazine, no. 189, in July 2003.

31. Ibid., p. 45.

32. Ibid., p. 2.

33. Ibid., p. 14.

34. Ibid., p. 107.

35. Ibn Kathir (1301-1373) was born in Syria's Horan plain and allegedly studied under Ibn Taymiyya and continued his studies under the latter's successor Ibn al-Qayyim al-Joziyyeh. Ibn Kathir wrote multi-volume tracts on Islamic history tinged with virulent anti-Shi'ism.

36. Hussein, *Khiyanat al-shi'a*, p. 26.

37. Ibid., p. 32.

38. Ibid., p. 59.

39. Ibid., p. 68.

40. Ibid., p. 89. This is a widely held belief, even among some of the region's rulers such as President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt and King Abdullah II of Jordan, both of whom have recently made public remarks to this effect.

41. Ibid., p. 93.

42. Ibid., note 188, p. 97.

43. Ibid., pp. 107-108.

44. There are at least two instances in which Zarqawi borrowed from this book in "*Hel ataka hadith al-rafidha*" (again without citation): for the quote made by Subhi Al-Tufaili (minute 43 of tape 2), see Al-Rafi'i, *Al-tahaluf al-rafidhi al-salibi fil iraq*, p. 45; and when Zarqawi discusses Qajar benevolence toward Christians (minute 20 of tape 2), see al-Rafi'i, *Al-tahaluf al-rafidhi al-salibi fil iraq*, p. 16. Al-Rafi'i is another mysterious author like Hussein and al-Gharib, and there are no other books under his name. This book was downloaded from www.tawhed.ws.

45. Al-Rafi'i, *Al-tahaluf al-rafidhi al-salibi fil iraq*, p. 5.

46. Ibid., p. 18. Zarqawi (see "*Hel ataka hadith al-rafidha*," minute 17 of tape 2) likewise has kind words for the Ottomans whom he calls "rejuvenators" of the faith; while "[the Ottomans] were busy advancing *jihad* into the heart of Europe," the seditionist Shi'a were being supported by Western powers to undermine them.

47. Ibid., p. 21.

48. Ibid., p. 22. The flimsy foundations on which Al-Rafi'i makes most of his assertions are highlighted by his reliance of relying on blatantly forged memos, attributed to the Badr Corps, detailing plans to harm Iraq's Sunnis and to take over

Baghdad (see p. 24).

49. Ibid., p. 32.

50. Ibid., p. 39.

51. Ibid., p. 41.

52. There is a significant quantity of jihadist literature that is specifically anti-Hezbollah: see Abu Basseer al-Tartousi, "Lebanese Hezbollah and the Export of the Shi'a *Rafidhi* Creed" ("*Hezbollah al-lubnani wa tassdeer al-madhhab al-shi'i al-rafidh*"), 2004, from www.tawhed.ws; Abdel-Mun'im Shafiq, "Hezbollah: A Different View" ("*Hezbollah: ro'ya mughayira*"), undated but written after the Israeli withdrawal from southern Lebanon in 2000 and available from www.albainah.net; and a two-part essay by Muhammad Suroor Zein al-'Abidin, "Hezbollah's Victory" ("*Intissar Hezbollah*"), undated from www.alsunnah.org. It is interesting to note that the hyperlink on Abu Muhammad al-Maqdisi's website *Tawhid wel Jihad* to Hezbollah-related topics was deliberately misspelled as *Hezb-Al-Lat* (Party of Lat), Al-Lat being a pre-Islamic pagan deity—a not-so-subtle accusation of pagan worship leveled against Hezbollah.

This jihadist antipathy toward what should be a fellow terrorist entity deserves further study. There is a revealing interview, for instance, conducted by 'Usama bin Abdel-Fatah of the *Al-Ansar Bulletin* with Ayman Al-Zawahiri dated 1415 A.H. (1994 A.D.) and republished on www.tawhed.ws under the title "Our Stance Regarding Iran: Countering the Allegation of Cooperation between the Salafist Jihadist Movement and Rafidhist Iran" ("*Mawqifuna min iran: al-red a'la tuhmet al-ta'awun bayn al-haraka al-jihadiyya al-salafiyya ma'a iran al-rafidhiyyeh*"). In it, Zawahiri makes an ardent case denying associations between himself and the Iranian regime, thus reflecting a general sense of embarrassment at such a relationship among jihadists. Recently, Palestinian discussion forums such as www.palestinianforum.com, where self-described jihadist sympathizers regularly post, have featured attacks on the Palestinian Islamic Jihad organization for being associated with Iran.

53. Al-Rafi'i, *Al-tahaluf al-rafidhi al-salibi fil iraq*, pp. 42-45.

54. Zarqawi, "*Hel ataka hadith al-rafidha*," minute 43 of tape 2.

55. Ibid., minute 50 of tape 2.

56. Ibid., minute 36 of tape 3.

57. Ibid., minute 55 of tape 2.

58. Ibid., minute 57 of tape 2.

59. Ibid., minute 53 of tape 3.

60. Ibid., minute 54 of tape 3.

61. Ibid., minute 56 of tape 3.

62. Zarqawi cites this book numerous times in his sermon, but no copy could be found on any of the various anti-Shi'a websites. There is a detailed refutation of the book, however, that quotes from it at length at www.shiweb.org/books/llah_llhaq_1/index.html under the title "For Allah and For Truth" ("*Lillahi wa lil-haqeeqa*"). This piece is dated 24 August 2002, and its author, 'Ali Aal Muhsin, writes that Musawi's book had been "published recently." Muhsin reports that Musawi claims to write under a pseudonym for fear of Shi'a retribution. But Muhsin argues that the biographical details he reveals—such as hailing from Karbala and having interacted closely with many Shi'a luminaries whom he names—create a profile of someone who could not, and does not, exist. Muhsin concludes that Musawi must be a Sunni by birth.

63. Zarqawi, "*Hel ataka hadith al-rafidha*," minute 60 of tape 2.

64. Ibid., minute 46 of tape 3.

65. Ibid., minute 75 of tape 2.

66. Ibid., minute 84 of tape 2.

67. Ibid., minute 36 of tape 3.

68. Ibid., minute 3 of tape 3.

69. The *nom de guerre* of the masked presenter of the video is given as "Abu 'Uthman al-'Ubeidi." This choice for a name is interesting since, at the time of the Kadhimiya Bridge tragedy last year, a Sunni youth named 'Uthman al-'Ubeidi died while rescuing several Shi'a from drowning in the Tigris River, and was hailed by Iraqi politicians as a hero of Shi'a-Sunni brotherhood in Iraq. The choice by the presenter seems to be a direct stab at notions of reconciliation among Iraq's mutually hostile sects.

70. These include: www.albainah.net, www.d-sunnah.net, www.alburhan.com, www.ansar.org, www.alrased.net, www.islammemo.cc, www.shiaa.org, www.almjos.com, www.montadaalquran.com, www.alminbar.net, www.chi-had.net, www.alsunnah.org.

"Weeding Out the Heretics": Sectarianism in Pakistan

HUSAIN HAQQANI

T he ongoing war in Iraq has drawn the world's attention to sectarian violence between Islam's Sunni and Shi'a sects. Terrorists operating under orders from Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, the now-dead leader of al-Qaeda in Iraq who proclaimed himself the "Slaughterer of Infidels," have bombed Shi'a mosques and killed hundreds of Shi'a in attacks on civilian targets.

The American military presence in Iraq has made the Sunni-Shi'a sectarian rivalry relevant to the Western world and resulted in stories of intra-Muslim sectarian violence finding play in the Western media. But Shi'a-Sunni violence did not start in Iraq, nor was Zarqawi its initiator. Pakistan has been a sectarian battleground for almost twenty years. The International Crisis Group pointed out in a report released in 2005 that "Religious sectarianism is, in fact, the principal source of terrorist activity in Pakistan."[1]

The Sunni-Shi'a rivalry goes back to Islam's earliest times. The sects were born as political factions, soon after the death of Islam's founder, Prophet Mohammed. The Sunnis believed in choosing Mohammed's successor through the consensus of the majority of believers. The Shi'a considered Mohammed's cousin and son-in-law, Ali, to be the Prophet's rightful heir.

The Sunnis founded the *Khilafa* (or Caliphate), which changed hands many times and ended only in 1924 with the fall of the Turkish Ottoman empire. The Shi'a adhere to the notion of the Imamate, which passed on to Ali's sons and direct descendants. Mainstream Shi'a are known as "twelvers" because they believe that the twelfth and final imam, Mahdi, is still living but in hiding; he will appear before the Day of Judgment to establish justice on earth. Other Shi'a sub-sects, such as the Ismailis led by the Paris-based Aga Khan, have a different line of imams from among Ali's descendants and believe in a contemporary living Imam.

Throughout history Shi'a and Sunnis have clashed as often as they have cooperated. But until now the sectarian conflict in Islam had been far less brutal than, say, the sectarian wars in Christian history. One reason for that might be that Sunnis overwhelmed the

Shi'a in numbers during the period of Islam's expansion. Even today, less than 15 percent of the world's estimated 1.4 billion Muslims are Shi'a. They are a majority in Iran, Iraq and Bahrain and a plurality in Lebanon and Azerbaijan.

In contemporary times the Sunni majority in the Muslim world largely ignored the Shi'a until the 1979 Islamic revolution brought Shi'a clerics to power in Iran. Authoritarian governments in several Muslim countries started worrying about the prospect of Ayatollah Khomeini's Islamic revolution spreading through their lands. Countries with mixed Sunni and Shi'a populations started looking upon their Shi'a compatriots as potential revolutionaries and troublemakers. The Iranians' rhetoric of exporting the Islamic revolution did not help, nor did the war between Sunni-led Iraq and Shi'a Iran. The conservative Arab Gulf states, led by Saudi Arabia, funded fellow Sunni Saddam Hussein in an effort to contain the Iranian revolution, notwithstanding Hussein's previously proclaimed aversion to religion.

Pakistan, then under the Islamizing military regime of General Ziaul Haq, was also affected by the sectarianism brewing in the Middle East. Fifteen percent of Pakistan's population is Shi'a. The country borders Iran and has a rich Persian heritage. But Pakistan's ruling elite is close to Saudi Arabia. Under Ziaul Haq, Pakistan even provided troops for the protection of the Saudi royal family in return for generous Saudi economic assistance.

Soon after the Iranian revolution Pakistan became the staging ground for the anti-Soviet *jihad* in Afghanistan. Pakistan's intelligence service channeled around two billion dollars in covert American aid to anti-Communist guerilla fighters in Afghanistan. Saudi Arabia and other Arab Gulf states also provided billions of dollars for the Afghan war, which was fought under the banner of Islamist ideology. Radical Islamists from all over the world poured into Pakistan to join the Afghan *jihad*. Some of these radicals morphed into al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups currently confronting the West.

Pakistan's founder, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, was a secular Shi'a lawyer who demanded a separate homeland for India's Muslims that he said would not be a theocracy. And Pakistan started out on a non-sectarian track. Its first law minister was a Hindu; its foreign minister belonged to the Ahmadiyya sect, which opposes violent *jihad*. Over the years, however, Pakistan has become a major center of Islamist extremism. A 1974 amendment to Pakistan's constitution declared the Ahmadis (followers of the Ahmadiyya sect) non-Muslims. Subsequent legislation forbade them from describing themselves as Muslim or from publicly using Muslim terminology or religious symbols even when their religion required them to do so. Religious minorities, such as Hindus and Christians, complain of discrimination and have periodically been subjected to violent attacks by extremists. The disproportionate influence wielded by fundamentalist groups in Pakistan is the result of the state sponsorship of such groups.

Jinnah embraced religious symbolism just before Pakistan's independence in an effort to rally India's Muslims to his cause. His successors relied even more on Islam as a

national unifier, and the process of casting Pakistan as an Islamic ideological state intensified further under the military rule that began in 1958. Through its complex post-independence history, Pakistanis have debated vehemently whether Pakistan was created to be an Islamic state or a secular state with a Muslim majority. General Ziaul Haq hoped to end this debate once and for all. He proceeded to Islamize Pakistan's laws, involved clerics in legislation and appointed Quranic scholars as judges.

Ziaul Haq's Islamization empowered the Sunni clergy and antagonized the country's Shi'a minority. When the Shi'a demanded protection of their religious rights, Ziaul Haq and his intelligence services saw their protests as a sign of potential Iranian subversion. The Iranians were, most likely, assisting Pakistan's Shi'a with money, and Ziaul Haq invited the Saudis to help Sunni sectarian groups.

The Afghan *jihad* had already resulted in the free flow of arms and military training for Sunni Islamists. Soon, some of these Sunni militants were attacking the Shi'a in an effort to purify Pakistan of their "heterodoxy." Shi'a militias emerged to fight the Sunni extremists with similar tactics. During the last twenty five years, nearly two thousand people have been killed, and thousands more maimed, in attacks by zealots of the rival sects in Pakistan. Official Figures are not available for the period 1980-1989 but deaths by sectarian violence during that phase are estimated at several hundred . Between 1989 and 2004, 688 people were killed in 1,837 reported incidents of sectarian conflict. In 2005 sixty-two incidents resulted in 160 deaths, and in the first three months of 2006, six incidents occurred in which 136 people reportedly died. [2]

Sectarian Identities

In Pakistan's formative years the sectarian affiliation of the country's leaders did not seem to matter. The Pakistani nation accepted in stride the nominal Shiism of Jinnah and several of his leading colleagues. In many cases no one was sure whether a particular official was Shi'a or Sunni as there was no official need to state one's sectarian affiliation. But in 2004, in a sign that times had changed, Pakistan's Prime Minister Shaukat Aziz found himself compelled to declare publicly "I am a Sunni Muslim" to counter rumors that he was an Ahmadi.[3]

According to Syed Vali Nasr, sectarianism in Pakistan is "organized and militant religious-political activism whose specific aim is to safeguard and promote the sociopolitical interests of the particular Muslim sectarian community, Shiite or Sunni, with which it is associated." Pakistani sectarianism has its own "discourse of power," which "promises empowerment" of a particular sect "in tandem with greater adherence to Islamic norms in public life." Sectarian Islamist organizations hope to achieve greater power and greater piety "through mobilization of the sectarian identity in question and the marginalization of the rival sectarian community, largely through prolific use of violence."[4]

Ninety-six percent of Pakistan's 150 million people are Muslims. Sunnis are estimated to account for 75 to 85 percent of the country's Muslim population, and Shiites are believed to number between 15 and 25 percent.[5] One must remember, however, that like the term 'Muslim', the terms 'Sunni' and 'Shi'a', 'Shi'i' or 'Shiite' encompass groups with widely differing views. There are many Shi'a sects, such as the Ismailis, the Bohras and the Ithna Asharis (twelvers). Sunnis in South Asia include such groups as the Sufi-inspired Barelvis, the puritanical Deobandis, and the Wahhabi-like Ahl-e Hadith.

The Barelvis are traditionalist Sunni Muslims who describe themselves as Ahl-e Sunnat wa-al Jamaat ('followers of the Prophet's way and that of the majority of the believing community'). They trace their origin to Ahmed Raza Khan of Bareilly (1855-1921) who opposed Wahhabi ideas as they gained ground in the India-Pakistan subcontinent. For the Barelvis, custom-laden religious practices and the intercession of Sufi saints are an integral part of Islam, not the innovation the Wahhabis denounce in describing the syncretism of South and Central Asian Islam.[6]

Included in the Sunni groups is Jamaat-e-Islami, a revivalist organization similar to the Arab world's Muslim Brotherhood. Founded in 1941 by Maulana Abu Ala Maududi, Jamaat-e-Islami considers itself the vanguard of the Islamic Revolution and is focused primarily on the creation of an Islamic state. The Jamaat-e-Islami initially shied away from being identified as Sunni because, for them, the central issue was the political struggle between "Islam and un-Islam." Maududi reinterpreted Shi'a doctrines in an attempt to bring the Shi'a within the broader discourse of Islamist politics, and Jamaat-e-Islami welcomed Iran's Islamic revolution despite its Shi'a foundations. In 1995 Jamaat-e-Islami played a leading role in unifying Pakistan's Islamist political parties under the umbrella of the Milli Yikjahati Council (Council of National Unity)—the MYC—in an effort to end Shi'a-Sunni sectarian violence. It is interesting to note that all the groups in the MYC are unified in their antagonism toward Ahmadis.

The Deobandis grew out of a reform movement that originated at the Dar ul Uloom, a traditional *madrasa* set up in Deoband, India, in 1867. The Deoband *madrasa* emphasized the purification of Islam from cultural accretions, and a return to the teachings of the Quran and the practices of the Prophet. The Deobandis opposed westernization and were suspicious of all modernity. They were also inclined to issue *fatwas* against other Muslim sects as part of their quest for religious purity.

The Deobandis' hardline religious and political discourse inspired the Taliban in Afghanistan, and the movement's extreme vision can be understood by examining the practices of the Taliban. Pakistan's Deobandis have been most ardent in igniting sectarian warfare, including campaigns against Ahmadis and Shi'a. As early as the 1940s, the Dar ul Uloom in Deoband had issued a *fatwa* that declared the Shi'a were infidels, and Pakistani Deobandis have published anti-Ahmadi pronouncements since the 1950s and anti-Shi'a tracts throughout the 1970s.

The Jamaat Ahl-e Hadith (party of the Tradition of the Prophet) was founded by Sayyid Nazir Husain Muhaddith Dehlavi. The Ahl-e Hadith differ from the Deobandis in holding that the Quran and the Hadith (recorded traditions of Prophet Mohammed) are the sole sources of law, while the Deobandis accept the vast corpus of Islamic jurisprudence (*fiqh*) and follow the Hanafi school of *fiqh.* Often called Wahhabis in South Asia, the Ahl-e Hadith have maintained close ties with the Wahhabi religious establishment of Saudi Arabia since the 1960s. They are vehemently opposed to Barelvi custom-based Sunni Islam; they are both anti-Sufi and anti-Shi'a.

Another South Asian Sunni group is the Ahmadis or Ahmadiyya, who regard their founder, Mirza Ghulam Ahmed, as a messiah and prophet of God and thereby sanction the possibility of revising Prophet Mohammed's message. Most Muslims consider Mohammed to have been the last of the prophets, and consider his the final word from God to humanity. Although Ahmadi religious rituals and almost all their practices are derived from Sunni Islam, their aversion to violence and *jihad* and their refusal to recognize the absolute finality of Mohammed's prophethood account for the conflict between them and other Muslim groups.

Targeting the Ahmadis: The First Sectarian Agitation

Religious political parties have been a part of Pakistan's political scene since its inception. As the Pakistani state increasingly adopted an Islamic identity, sectarian differences and theological arguments led to the formation of sectarian political movements. The slogan "Islam in Danger" was widely used during the campaign for Pakistan's creation, and it remained a powerful rallying cry for religion-based politics. Even secular civilian and military leaders found it expedient to argue, from time to time, that the nation must mobilize to fend off threats to Islam or to Pakistan's Islamic ideology.

As Pakistan's character as an Islamic state became more established, sectarian groups resorted to a variation on the "Islam in danger" theme. New groups emerged, focusing on supposed threats to their interests or to Islam as interpreted by them. Just as Benedict Anderson described nationalism as an "imagined" constructed identity,[7] Muhammad Qasim Zaman has justifiably argued that sectarian identities in Pakistan were also "constructed and redefined" through a process of political imagining."[8] Although differences between Shi'a and Sunnis have existed for centuries, the form of sectarian identity that has emerged in Pakistan over the last several decades is relatively modern and new.

The first violent outbreak of sectarianism in Pakistani history targeted the Ahmadis. The Objectives Resolution adopted by Pakistan's Constituent Assembly in 1949 declared that Pakistanis would "order their lives in accordance with the teachings and requirements of Islam." This wording created more problems than it solved because the resolution defining the basic principles of Pakistan's future constitution did not specify

if *sharia* would be the law nor—if it were—who would define *sharia* for the purpose of state law and how. The question of the status of minorities was also left unresolved.

Soon after the adoption of the Objectives Resolution, the first challenge to a consolidated Muslim identity in Pakistan surfaced with the rise of the "Ahmadiyya question." Most leaders of Sunni radical movements were initiated into the world of militant sectarianism through the Ahmadiyya controversy. During the early 1950s, the Anjuman-e Ahrar-e Islam (Society of Free Muslims) demanded that the Ahmadiyya be defined as a non-Islamic sect and converts to it be treated as heretics and apostates. The Ahrar argued that the Ahmadis' wealth and prominence were responsible for the misery of the poor[9] and that, in addition to being declared non-Muslims, they should be removed from positions of power in the Pakistan government. The fact that Pakistan's foreign minister at the time, Sir Chaudhry Zafrullah Khan, was an Ahmadi led the anti-Ahmadi protests to become part of a campaign against the fragile government of conservative Prime Minister Khawaja Nazimuddin. The prime minister's rivals covertly helped the violent agitators, and martial law was imposed in parts of Pakistan in 1953.

Vali Nasr attributes the rise of the Ahmadi issue so soon after Pakistan's independence to the internal dynamics of the two major Islamist groups, the Jamaat-e-Islami and the Deobandis. Neither Maududi's Jamaat-e-Islami nor most Deobandi leaders had supported the creation of Pakistan, though they eventually accepted the new country and even migrated to Pakistan. Secular elements within the Muslim League, the dominant Pakistani political party of the era, stigmatized the Islamists as anti-Pakistan for opposing the campaign for a state separate from India. The Deobandis, in particular, needed to deal with the stigma of their pre-independence position, and a sectarian campaign against the Ahmadis helped them carve out a positive political role—that of the protectors of true Islam—in the new State of Pakistan.

The Ahmadiyya issue continued to plague Pakistani politics through the 1960s and was resolved to some extent only in 1974 when the secular social-democratic government of Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, capitulating to the Islamist parties' long-standing demand, declared the Ahmadis a non-Muslim minority. After coming to power in a 1977 coup, General Ziaul Haq expanded the restrictions on Ahmadis by decrees that forbade them from identifying themselves as Muslims. Criminal penalties were introduced for violating this law, leading to the imprisonment of many Ahmadis and giving the Islamists a powerful weapon against critics and opponents. Any mullah or Islamist activist could now punish anyone he disliked by accusing him of being an Ahmadi masquerading as a Muslim.

In the case of the Ahmadis, the state used a constitutional amendment to define a sect as an un-Islamic minority. This paved the way for Sunni sectarian groups to insist that the Shi'a be similarly defined, even though the Shi'a had supported the Deobandi and other Sunnis in their demands regarding the Ahmadis. Now that the "Islamic State" in Pakistan had established the right to determine who was and was not a true Muslim,

religious identity and religious correctness became larger issues in Pakistan's political discourse. The policies of Ziaul Haq's military regime, aimed at Islamizing the country further, aggravated Pakistan's slide into sectarian conflict and confrontation.

The Shi'a Awakening

General Ziaul Haq, who ruled Pakistan with an iron hand from 5 July 1977 to 17 August 1988, believed that "a state that is construed as a legitimate Islamic actor can both ride the tiger of Islamism and harness its energies in the service of the state."[10] Islamization under General Ziaul Haq affected four areas—judicial reform, the penal code, economic activity and educational policy. Two decisions that had a particularly significant, long-term impact on the rise of sectarianism were the imposition of *zakah* or *zakat* (a 2.5 percent annual contribution Muslims must make toward charity based on their net asset value) and the expansion and radicalization of traditional religious schools called *madrasa.*

The state funded the *madrasas* through *zakat.* In 1984, 9.4 percent of *zakat* funds went to *madrasas,* and in 1996, long after Ziaul Haq was gone, the government was giving various *madrasas* 3.5 million dollars a year.[11] In 1982 the government had announced that *madrasa* diplomas would be considered equivalent to formal school certificates as long as the *madrasas* reformed their curricula according to state demands. As the state and the Islamists collaborated during the Ziaul Haq years, many *madrasas* changed their focus from traditional religious education to training an Islamic bureaucracy that could assume positions in the lower and middle echelons of the government, thus creating a social base for a future Islamic state.

Islamist groups set up numerous *madrasas* with government *zakat* funding. The Jamaat-e-Islami, which had set up its first *madrasa*—the Ulema Academy at Lahore—in 1976, ran seventy-five *madrasas* by 1990. The Barelvis set up a new network of *madrasas* called Ziaul-Quran (the Light of the Quran) in response to the government initiative, which was primarily benefiting politicized groups such as the Deobandi, Ahl-e Hadith and Jamaat-e-Islami.

The Shi'a were not too keen on Ziaul Haq's Islamization from the top, particularly when it strengthened Sunni Islamist groups. The Shi'a and Sunnis differ in their understanding of *zakat.* Unlike the Hanafi school of Sunnis, which accepts the government's right to collect and distribute *zakat,* the Shi'a consider *zakat* to be an individual obligation. They may voluntarily entrust the collection and spending of *zakat* to the Shi'a clergy, but Shi'a jurisprudence gives the state no role in the matter. This communitarian and voluntary approach to *zakat* among the Shi'a is probably a reaction to centuries of domination by Sunni rulers over most of the Muslim world. When Ziaul Haq decreed that 2.5 percent of all bank savings would be forcibly deducted every year and deposited in the government's *zakat* account, therefore, the Shi'a protested.

An important Shi'a cleric, Mufti Jaafar Husain (1916-1983), had argued for a long time that if Pakistan was to have Islamic law, the Shi'a should be allowed to follow their own jurisprudence—known as Jaafari *fiqh* after the sixth Shi'a imam, Jaafar al-Sadiq. Husain formed the Tehrik-e-Nifaz-Fiqh-e-Jaafariya (TNFJ), the Movement for the Enforcement of Jaafariya Law, which was later shortened to Tehrik-e-Jaafariya. Soon after Ziaul Haq's decree authorizing the forcible deduction of *zakat*, the TNFJ started agitating against the decision. From Ziaul Haq's point of view, and that of other Sunni Islamists, the Shi'a demand was unjustified. Iran had just had an Islamic revolution the year before (in 1979) and had implemented the Shi'a interpretation of Islamic law. If the majority's jurisprudence prevailed in Iran, Pakistan's Sunni Islamists believed the majority should prevail in Pakistan as well, and they saw no reason to make special provisions for the Shi'a minority. The state had become not only more Islamized, but it was also now adopting a sectarian preference within the Islamic context.

Ziaul Haq's preference for an across-the-board enforcement of Sunni law in relation to *zakat* was challenged by large Shi'a demonstrations. On 5 July1980 the TNFK brought tens of thousands of Shi'a from all over the country and laid siege to the government headquarters in Islamabad. The government backed down and exempted the Shi'a from the compulsory deduction of *zakat*. Although this measure appeased the Shi'a, it did not please the Sunni Islamists. They saw it as a dilution of Ziaul Haq's commitment to Islamizing the Pakistani state with their support. For his part, in an effort to limit any damage to his reputation among the Sunni Islamists, Ziaul Haq made a point of venerating Prophet Mohammed's earliest successors, the first three caliphs whom the Shi'a consider usurpers of political power from their first imam, Ali.

In articulating its ideology and position, the TNFJ avoided expressly sectarian arguments. It insisted that, like every other Muslim group in Pakistan, it considered the Quran and the Sunnah to be the fundamental sources of law. It sought only for the right of "all recognized schools of Islamic thought" to be governed by their own interpretation of the Quran and the Sunnah. The TNFJ also talked about the creation of a popular Islamic army. Both these ideas—the concept of a popular army, as opposed to the professional one that dominated Pakistan, and the support for multiple interpretations of Islamic law—were viewed as dangerous by the army-run Pakistani state and its Sunni Islamist allies.

Outside Influences

Two international and regional events also had a profound effect on the rise and growth of sectarian conflict in Pakistan—the Iranian revolution and the anti-Soviet Afghan *jihad.* The Iranian revolution had a multifold impact. The first seizure of power by an avowedly Islamist group in an Islamic revolution brought Iran's Shi'a clergy to power and energized Shi'a all over the Middle East, particularly those in the Gulf states.

Saudi Arabia's monarchy was wedded to Wahhabism, and the Sunni rulers of all the Gulf states had suppressed their Shi'a minorities since the emergence of the modern Middle East.

The Iranian government threatened the Saudis and their allies with its rhetoric of exporting the Iranian revolution. Polemical tracts attacking the Gulf monarchies as un-Islamic were distributed throughout the region and beyond. The Iranians also provided overt and covert assistance to Shi'a organizations and movements. The Gulf states retaliated by emphasizing the heresy of Shiism in an effort to mobilize their Sunni and Wahhabi base. When Iraq's dictator Saddam Hussein invaded Iran, Saudi Arabia and other Gulf monarchies supported him as a defender of Sunni Arab interests in the face of Shi'a Persian threats. Sunni Islamist groups in the Gulf forgave Hussein's past attacks on Islamic observances and his repression of such groups as the Muslim Brotherhood.

The Shi'a clergy of Iran and Pakistan were linked historically, but these links became politicized only after the Iranian revolution. The changing role of the Shi'a Imamia Students Organization (ISO) provides an example of the new reality. Before 1979 the ISO took care of the material needs of Shi'a students in Pakistani educational institutions and facilitated Shi'a prayers and other religious observances. After 1979 the group began offering scholarships to Shi'a students to study in Iran. The increased contact between Pakistani Shi'a students and clergy and their Iranian counterparts created a cadre of politicized Shi'a leaders. TNFJ founder, Jaafar Husain, was succeeded as the leader of the Pakistani Shi'a by Allama Arif Husain al-Husaini (1946-88), who had studied at Shi'a academies in Najaf, Iraq and Qom, Iran. Husaini had come into close contact with Ayatollah Khomeini in both places. When Sunni sectarian terrorism began during the 1980s, Iranian diplomats in Pakistan were among its targets. In the minds of Sunni sectarian militants, Pakistan's Shi'a groups and Iran were closely linked.

Ziaul Haq's military regime, meanwhile, was closely tied to Saudi Arabia and its Gulf allies. Pakistan was also organizing and training Sunni mujahidin to fight the Soviets in Afghanistan—a project that was backed by Saudi Arabia and the United States. Islamists from all over the world converged on Pakistan to receive state-of-the-art training in guerilla warfare, and the Afghan *jihad* became a training ground for an entire generation of Islamist militants and terrorists. Pakistan's Islamists not only served as facilitators for the Afghan and international *mujahidin*, but also built a *jihadi* infrastructure and acquired a modern weapons arsenal in the process.

Although Pakistan officially maintained correct relations with Iran even after the 1979 revolution, Ziaul Haq saw its regime as a threat. And for their part, the Iranian mullahs did not like Ziaul Haq for his close ties to the Saudis and the United States. Given this state of affairs, the rise in Shi'a political activism in Pakistan was seen as a challenge by the Pakistani military and intelligence services, though large numbers of Shi'a served in both. Ziaul Haq's initial reaction to such activism was to use diplomatic means to

dissuade Iran from supporting local Shi'a political groups. Pakistani Foreign Minister Agha Shahi, himself a Shiite, traveled to Tehran in 1980-81 to convince Khomeini's regime not to try to export its revolutionary fervor to Pakistan. He argued that Pakistan's Shi'a were a protected and respected minority and that Iran would harm its relations with Pakistan, as well as the Pakistani Shi'a, by dabbling in Pakistan's internal politics.

The Iranians did not heed Shahi's advice, however, and Pakistan's permanent state structure and its Intelligence services soon turned to other means in an effort to contain rising Shi'a fervor and political activism. From 1981 onward Sunni sectarian groups began to emerge, and they often found a willing sponsor in the Pakistani state.

The Emergence of Sunni Militancy

Ziaul Haq's policies of Islamization had strengthened Sunni Islamist institutions, especially the *madrasas,* and given influence to Islamist political parties disproportionate to their electoral strength. Even before their Iranian-inspired political awakening, Pakistan's Shi'a had been wary of the Islamist political formations and had tended to support secular political parties, notably the Pakistan People's Party (PPP) founded by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto.

Ziaul Haq had deposed Bhutto and executed him. The PPP and the pro-democracy movement it led were seen by Ziaul Haq as major challenges to his authority. It suited Ziaul Haq, therefore, to advertise himself as the defender of Sunni Islam and to identify the pro-democracy movement with Shiism for the purpose of mobilizing Sunni Islamists on his behalf. And it was not difficult to spread fear among Sunni Islamists about the Shi'a minority's possible rise to power. The Shi'a were an influential minority, prominent in the arts and literature. Several leading Pakistani politicians were Shi'a, and Shi'a support for the pro-democracy movement meant that Sunni Islamists would never have as much influence under a democratic government as they wielded under Ziaul Haq's Islamizing regime. More significantly, the number of Shi'a in Pakistan was rising.

In addition to making gains through effective proselytizing and natural growth, Shi'a ranks were swelling through conversions of convenience. Well-to-do secular Sunnis did not think much of declaring themselves Shi'a to enable their daughters to benefit from a larger share of their inheritance. While Islam's laws of inheritance are defined in the Quran, the Shi'a interpret them more favorably for women. The compulsory deduction of *zakat* from bank accounts, so essential to generating funds for Sunni Islamist *madrasas*, also became a reason for defections from Sunni ranks. Many non-practicing Muslims decided to become Shi'a, not necessarily to observe the sect's faith or practices, but to avoid having *zakat* deducted from their savings each year.

These circumstances, which appeared to threaten Sunni dominance and identity, provided an environment conducive to Islamist political activism and militancy. A

Deobandi cleric, Maulana Saleemullah Khan, founded Sawad-e Azam Ahl-e Sunnat (Greater Unity of the Sunnis) in 1980, demanding that Pakistan be declared a Sunni state and that the Shi'a be declared non-Muslims.[12] Soon after, sectarian riots erupted in the port city of Karachi, and Sawad-e Azam followers attacked Shi'a neighborhoods and religious gatherings. The Sawad-e-Azam was later instrumental in creating the strongest Sunni sectarian militia—the Anjuman-e Sipah-e Sahaba (ASS), or Society of the Army of the Prophet's Companions. Both organizations were run by Deobandi clerics who had little or no knowledge of English, and once the militant leaders learned the connotation of their English language abbreviation, they changed the name of their organization to Sipah-e Sahaba Pakistan (SSP), the Pakistan Army of the Prophet's Companions.

The Sipah-e Sahaba was formally established by Haq Nawaz Jhangvi (1952-90) in 1985 in Pakistan's central Punjab province. According to the organization's literature, it is part of the global struggle between Western materialism and the true faith:

> The greatest evil of our age is atheism, irreligion and the revolt against the true faith. Although those (in the west) who revolted against religion at the beginning of the twentieth century are now returning to religion themselves, the poison of their ideologies has seeped into our society's thinking. We need to generate the antidote…. Just as the Muslim Ummah got rid of the yoke of British and French colonialism, we need a major effort to protect ourselves from the demon of irreligion and secularity and immerse ourselves into the beauty of Islam and Quranic injunctions.[13]

Sipah-e Sahaba opposed the notion of freedom of religious observance if it meant that the Shi'a would be free to criticize the early caliphs and companions of the Prophet. "True faith is only that following the way of the Prophet's companions; anything else is heresy," declared Ziaur Rehman Faruqui, who took over as SSP chief after Jhangvi's assassination in 1990. The emphasis on following the Prophet's early companions is simply a subtle way of condemning the Shi'a as heretics.

The SSP's goals are to combat the Shi'a at every level of society, to have them declared a non-Muslim minority like the Ahmadis, and to proscribe their processions of self-flagellation during the month of Muharram. Sipah-e Sahaba also wants to impose its own version of Sunni Islam on the state and society. Its ideal polity is the *Khilafat-i- Rashida,* the rightly guided Caliphate that succeeded Prophet Mohammed and lasted for only thirty-one years. SSP justifies its virulent anti-Shiism as crucial to protecting Islam from Persian influence and saving the Muslim world from Khomeini's pernicious, heretical ideology.

The SSP gained influence in the rural parts of Pakistan's central Punjab province, partly

by criticizing the influence of Shi'a landowners. They accused the Shi'a of having maintained their large land holdings through close ties with the British, which made them representative of secular culture. It did not occur to SSP's militant Sunni followers that focusing on the large Shi'a estates might inadvertently endorse Shi'a inheritance laws, which prevented the kind of fragmentation of property that inevitably resulted from Sunni laws of inheritance.

SSP also attacked traditional, custom-based, mystical Sufi Islam that often allowed Sunnis and Shi'a in rural Pakistan to merge in their common reverence for particular saints and shrines. Seeking to impose a standardized, ritual-free, text-based Islam, SSP took pride in articulating the anti-Shi'a puritanism that other Islamist organizations shared but were unable to voice for the sake of political correctness. SSP maintained close ties with the leading Deobandi organization, Jamiat-e Ulema-e Islam (JUI), and all its leaders were graduates of Deobandi *madrasas.*

Almost all Sunni Islamist organizations quietly supported SSP's anti-Shi'a rhetoric and campaigns. The Ziaul Haq regime saw the SSP as a check on the rise of Shi'a influence and gave it a free hand. Soon covert links had been established between SSP and Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI), which managed official Pakistani support of *jihadi* operations in Afghanistan and Indian-controlled Kashmir. SSP cadres attended Afghan *mujahidin* training camps and returned to kill Shi'a leaders within Pakistan. The rise of the Taliban in the 1990s further deepened the ties among Pakistan's various *jihadi* groups (see *Current Trends,* vol. 1), Deobandi *madrasas* and Sunni sectarian organizations like Sipah-e Sahaba.

SSP's lethal attacks on Shi'a *ulema* and professionals generated a violent Shi'a backlash, however. The Shi'a Sipah-e Mohammed Pakistan (SMP)—Army of Mohammed in Pakistan—surfaced in 1991, almost a year after the assassination of SSP founder Haq Nawaz Jhangvi. Sipah-e Mohammed claimed to have more global aims than just protecting Pakistan's Shi'a. Its founder, Ghulam Raza Naqvi, declared that he wanted to set up a Quds-force of both Sunnis and Shi'a to liberate Palestine.[14] But in practice SMP did little more than retaliate for SSP's assaults on Shi'a by killing SSP leaders and cadres, and occasionally by mounting attacks on Deobandi mosques in reprisal for attacks on Shi'a mosques.

The violence between Shi'a and Sunni extremist groups escalated further once Ziaul Haq's military regime came to an end and civilian rule was restored in Pakistan. Worried about the sectarian violence, the civilian political leaders attempted to co-opt the SSP into the political system. The group's candidates won some seats in the Punjab Assembly, and they were offered positions in the government in exchange for renouncing violence. One segment of the SSP found this bargain unacceptable, however, and responded by creating the secretive and uncompromisingly violent Lashkar-e Jhangvi (JI)—Jhangvi's Army. This group, founded by Riaz Basra in 1994, consisted mainly of Afghan *jihad*

veterans and worked closely with the Taliban and al-Qaeda. It is important to note that since the collapse of Taliban rule in Afghanistan, Pakistan's Baluchistan province has become a major center of anti-Shi'a militants. Their main targets have been the anti-Taliban Shi'a Hazara community.[15]

Sectarian conflict in Pakistan has not remained confined to the sphere of Sunni-Shi'a rivalry. Violence has erupted among competing Sunni organizations as well. Once the floodgates of discussion over who is or is not a Muslim are opened, any number of claims for excluding heretics from the mainstream can emerge. Although sectarian violence in Pakistan began with demands to declare Ahmadis and Shi'a non-Muslims, the rising tide of Sunni extremism has led the various Sunni organizations to vie with one another for the right to decide who can legitimately be considered a true Sunni Muslim.

As Deobandi and Wahhabi groups expanded through state patronage and organized militias, the traditionalist Barelvis found themselves marginalized. By the middle of the 1990s, a militant organization called the Sunni Tehreek (Sunni Movement) was founded in Karachi by Saleem Qadri. This movement sought to roll back the rising tide of Wahhabi and Deobandi influences and to restore the South Asian tradition of devotional and festive observance of Islam. This effort did not sit well with the Deobandi and Wahhabi groups, of course, who saw the revival of traditionalism as a setback to their successful imposition of fundamentalism in the preceding two and a half decades. On 11 April 2006 a massive bomb blast in Karachi on the occasion of *Eid Milad-un Nabi* (celebration of Prophet Muhammad's birthday), which the Deobandis and Wahhabis view as sinful, killed about fifty people and injured many more. Most of the casualties belonged to the Barelvi sub-sect of Sunni Islam, and many were affiliated with the Sunni Tehreek.

The Role of the State

The complexities of Pakistan's centralized militarist state have encouraged the rise of both Islamism and its sectarian manifestations. According to Vali Nasr, two distinct factors account for this development. The first involves the state's attempt to increase its own power by manipulating the rifts in society. The post-colonial state, though large and interventionist, has only limited capabilities. By manipulating social and cultural divisions and using a divide-and-rule strategy, however, the government is able to create a sphere in which it becomes the arbiter in any conflict. The state and its wings thus acts as an agent of identity mobilization and intensifies sectarian conflict.[16]

The second factor involves the Pakistani state's use of Islam or religious nationalism to bind the country together—which, in turn, gives impetus to fundamentalism and sectarianism. Since the days of Pakistan's first military ruler, Field Marshal Ayub Khan, the country's military-technocratic elite or "establishment" has believed that Pakistan is

difficult to govern. They consider the masses not to be ready or fit for democracy, and they are in constant fear that ethnic and regional centrifugal tendencies will pull the country apart. The Pakistani state has, therefore, consistently felt the need for an ideology to bind Pakistan—and Pakistanis—together. Islam is seen as fulfilling that role.

The ties connecting the state, the military and the Islamists have strengthened over the years to combat the growing power of secular and ethnic-based political parties that often do not share the Pakistani establishment's hostility toward India. Throughout the 1980s the Pakistani military and the Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) supported militant Sunni Islamist groups in the northwest frontier bordering Afghanistan, as well as in Punjab and Baluchistan. And the government has funded Sunni *madrasas*, which in addition to preparing cadres for *jihad* in Afghanistan and India, have also become bastions of sectarianism.

The Iranian revolution and the reaction it caused in the Gulf states, especially in Saudi Arabia, also contributed to sectarian violence in Pakistan. The Gulf states with Shi'a minorities were worried about domestic rebellion and civil war. Iran challenged Saudi Arabia's pre-eminent position and status in the Muslim world—a replay of the Ottoman-Safavid power struggle of long ago. This led to large-scale pan-Islamization attempts by Saudi Arabia and other Gulf countries, as well as by Libya and Iraq, to export Sunni-Wahhabi Islamism to other parts of the Muslim world. Pakistan was one of the key battlegrounds in this Iran-Saudi battle.

In 1984 the Deobandi scholar Muhammad Manzur Numani wrote a tract asserting that the excesses of the Iranian revolution proved that Shiism was un-Islamic. The preface to this work was written by Sayyid Abul Hasan Ali Nadvi, rector of the Nadwatul Ulema and recipient of Saudi Arabia's King Faisal Prize for Service to Islam. The fact that Nadvi was associated with the Saudi Rabita al-Alam al-Islami (Muslim World League) raised the suspicion that Gulf politics had a lot to do with the timing and virulence of the tract. Another pro-Saudi religious leader in Pakistan, Asrar Ahmed, went so far as to argue that Shiism, which originated soon after the demise of Prophet Mohammed, was part of an early Jewish conspiracy against Islam.

The assumption that Islamist forces and sectarian militias could be used and controlled has backfired against Pakistan's government and—especially—its military, which now face the serious challenge of rolling back extremist beliefs. So far the state is not doing well. The government is finding it difficult to shut down or control the numerous radical and militant *madrasas* that were set up during the Afghan *jihad*. As the Islamists have increased their ability to raise funds globally, their *madrasas* have become less dependent on *zakat* assistance and hence less amenable to state influence. In the case of militant groups, the state's periodic resort to force seems merely to substitute one combatant for another. The *jihadis* eliminated through the use of force are quickly replaced by more virulent cadres, who are constantly being produced.

The Islamists know their strengths and the government's weaknesses. They also know that until Pakistan's government decides, once and for all, not to rely on Islam for nation-building and state consolidation, it will continue to court Islamist partners. For the foreseeable future, then, sectarian Islamist militancy will remain a serious threat to Pakistan's stability. In 1954 the Pakistan government appointed a court of inquiry into the anti-Ahmadi violence. The Munir Commission, named after the Supreme Court chief justice who headed it, published a report that contained a very prescient assessment of future Islamist politics in Pakistan. It concluded that the government should keep out of the business of defining who is, or is not, a Muslim and of how Islam is to be enforced as the state religion:

> Keeping in view the several definitions given by the *ulema* (of who is a Muslim) need we make any comment except that no two learned divines are agreed on this fundamental? If we attempt our own definition as each learned divine has done and that definition differs from that given by all others, we unanimously go out of the fold of Islam. And if we adopt the definition given by any one of the *ulema*, we remain Muslims according to the view of that *alim* but *kafirs* according to the definition of everyone else…. What is happening now seems almost the writing on the wall, and God help us if we do not stop these…people from cutting each other's throat."[17]

Notes

1. International Crisis Group, *State of Sectarianism in Pakistan* (Brussels: International Crisis Group, 2005).

2. "Sectarian Violence in Pakistan," South Asian Terrorism Portal at http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/pakistan/database/sect-killing.htm.

3. "I am a Sunni Muslim, says Shaukat," *Dawn,* 1 July 2004.

4. Syed Vali Nasr, "International Politics, Domestic Imperatives and Identity Mobilization: Sectarianism in Pakistan, 1979-1998," *Comparative Politics,* vol. 32,2 (January 2000): 171.

5. Muhammad Qasim Zaman, "Sectarianism in Pakistan: The Radicalization of Shi'i and Sunni Identities," *Modern Asian Studies,* vol. 32,3 (July 1988): 689.

6. Usha Sanyal, *Devotional Islam and Politics in British India: Ahmad Riza Khan Barelwi and His Movement, 1870-1920* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 11-13, 89-90.

7. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New York: Verso Books, 1991).

8. Zaman: 690.

9. Syed Vali Nasr, *Vanguard of the Islamic Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), pp. 131-37.

10. Syed Vali Reza Nasr, *Islamic Leviathan—The Making of State Power* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 136.

11. *The Economist,* 28 January 1996: 37.

12. Mehtab Ali Shah, "Sectarianism—A Threat to Human Security: A Case Study of Pakistan," *The Round Table,* vol. 94,382 (October 2005): 617.

13. Ziaur Rehman Faruqui, *Sipah-e-Sahaba Mein Har Musalman ki Shamooliat Kyun Zaroori Hai? (Why Must Every Muslim Join Sipah-e-Sahaba),* Sipah-e-Sahaba pamphlet in Urdu with no publication details, circa 2000.

14. Mariam Abou Zahab, "The Regional dimension of sectarian conflicts in Pakistan," October 2000, p. 5, at http://www.ceri-sciencespo.com/archive/octo00/artmaz.pdf.

15. International Crisis Group, "The State of Sectarianism in Pakistan,'" *Asia Report,* no. 95 (18 April 2005): 21.

16. Vali Nasr, "International Politics, Domestic Imperatives and Identity Mobilization": 174.

17. *Report of the Court of Inquiry into the Punjab Disturbances: Munir Commission Report* (Karachi: Government of Pakistan, 1954), p. 35.

The Islamist Insurgency in Thailand

ZACHARY ABUZA

On January 4, 2004 Islamic militants in southern Thailand launched a daring and well-coordinated raid on an army post and got away with a large cache of weapons that included some 300 M-16s. Since then Thai militants have killed over 1,300 people and wounded thousands more. Their attacks have become more brazen and are meant to terrify; to wit, they are now responsible for over twenty-four beheadings. This insurgency has grown in both size and technical sophistication. Though the government repeatedly asserts that the situation is under control and that it has made more than 700 arrests, Thai security forces have detained very few of the leading militants and have acquired very little actionable intelligence.

The social fabric of the south is coming apart. Over sixty teachers have been killed, which has led to a mass exodus of educators. And because almost a thousand teaching positions are vacant, schools are closed for months at a time. At least ten percent of the Buddhist population has fled, creating a de facto ethnic cleansing, despite the presence of some 80,000 soldiers, police and government personnel. The situation is getting out of control and might soon attract greater interest from the broader international jihadist community.

A Volatile Region

Insurgency is not new to southern Thailand. A devoutly Therevada Buddhist country, Thailand has a Malay Muslim community of roughly five to six million people. Though only five percent of the country's total population, Thai Muslims comprise roughly eighty percent of the population in three provinces—Yala, Narathiwat and Pattani[1]—along the border with Malaysia. In this region Muslims have rebelled since the nineteenth century against Thailand's rule and its attempts to inculcate Siamese language, customs and values.

The twentieth century was plagued by insurgent movements, though none posed a

major challenge to the Thai state for several reasons. The insurgent organizations were sharply divided along ideological lines. They included fairly secular ethno-nationalist groups, such as the Pattani United Liberation Organization (PULO); the Barisan Revolusi Nasional (BRN), which was closely aligned with the Malaysian Communist Party (MCP) and received support from Syria and Libya; a hardcore Salafist organization that targeted the beloved Thai monarchy; and the Barisan Nasional Pembebasan Pattani (BNPP), to name but a few. Personal rivalries and internal divisions weakened these groups as well. The BRN split into three distinct factions, for example, with each differing in its degree of Islamic identity. The organizations' ultimate goals and political platforms were also at odds. Some advocated union with Malaysia; others wanted to remain in Thailand, though with greater political and cultural autonomy; others wanted independence; others espoused the establishment of an independent Islamic state.

Unable to cooperate and find a common platform, the rebel groups were slowly picked apart by the Thai government.[2] By the mid-1990s the insurgency had petered out, and in 2001 newly elected Prime Minister Thaksin Shinawatra declared that the insurgency had ended. He then proceeded to dismantle many of the mechanisms that had been credited with defeating the insurgency.

This history raises four interrelated questions: Why has the insurgency resumed? Who is behind it? Why has the Thai government mishandled this new insurgency to the degree that it has? And what is the ideological basis of the movement? The answer to all these questions is Islam. Islamic schools—*madrasas*—incubated the insurgency for almost a decade, and distinctly new Islamist organizations, unknown to Thai security forces, are behind the unrest. The Thai government's refusal to acknowledge the perpetrators' Islamist goals and agenda, in fact, accounts in large measure for its failure to counter the insurgency effectively. The implications of these developments are serious for both Thailand and the other states in the region. Thailand is becoming a magnet to *jihadis*, as well as an important propaganda front for the transnational jihadist community.

Insurgent Islamists

Dating the start of the insurgency to the January 2004 raid is a politically motivated and journalistically convenient mistake. The violence began years before that with attacks as early as 2001. But having just declared the insurgency at an end, the government refused to see it for what it was. It saw instead battles between smugglers and underworld criminal gangs. Though violence was being perpetrated by the Islamist groups active today, it was at such a low level that it blended into the overall criminality so endemic in the region.

This more accurate timeline raises the question of whether the insurgency broke out as a result of 9/11. Was it inspired by al-Qaeda's 9/11 attacks, or did the insurgents

assume that it was their religious obligation to join the jihad against the United States and its allies? There is no evidence to support this hypothesis. The best information to date indicates that the surrender and capitulation of the insurgent groups in the 1990s frustrated many of their leaders, who spent the next decade acquiring and indoctrinating new recruits in a large number of *madrassas*, which are known in Thailand as *pondoks*. By 2001 they had sufficient manpower to move beyond indoctrination and begin operations.

One of the many reasons Thai officials have mishandled the insurgency is that they did not anticipate the emergence of the new and distinctly Islamist organizations. When the insurgency broke out, they simply went after the usual suspects, rounding up old PULO members. Making things more confusing is the fact that no group has taken responsibility for any of the 2004-2006 attacks, nor has any new organization publicly stated its goals or platform. The Thai government missed the emergence and slow transformation of a number hardcore Islamist organizations that include the Gerakan Mujahidin Islamiya Pattani (GMIP); the BRN-Coordinate (BRN-C), an outgrowth of the old Barisan Revolusi Nasional organization; and two smaller fringe groups—Jemaah *Salafi* and the New PULO, which was split from PULO in the early 1990s. The GMIP was founded in 1986 but quickly degenerated into a criminal gang until 1995 when two Afghan veterans consolidated power. Since then the rural-based GMIP has led attacks on police and army outposts. The group had close relations with a Malaysian militant organization, the Jemaah Islamiyah-linked Kampulan Mujahidin Malaysia (KMM), which was also founded by veteran Afghan *mujahidin* in1995.

The Thai National Security Council has acknowledged the existence of "a new Islamic grouping" that, "through increasing contacts with extremists and fundamentalists in Middle Eastern countries, Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines," has "metamorphosed into a political entity of significance."[3] Thai intelligence also now speaks of the insurgency as being a "*pondok*-based" movement.[4] As the former commander of Thai forces in the south said, "There is no doubt that the basis for this new insurgency is the *ustadz* [Islamic teachers]. This is something that has been in the making for a long time."[5] Beginning in December 2004, the Ministry of Justice's Special Investigations Department has launched a number of raids on five different *madrassas* and arrested or issued warrants for Islamic teachers from the Thammawittaya Foundation School and the Samphan Wittaya School.[6] The evidence suggests that these schools, *ustadz* and radical students hail from the old BRN organization and networks established in the 1970s.

The Islamic identification has led to one significant development: an historically unprecedented degree of cooperation—and shared goals—among the insurgent groups. The GMIP, BRN-C, as well as the smaller Jemaah *Salafi* and New PULO, are not at ideological war with one another; indeed, they share an Islamist vision. No group has

credibly claimed responsibility for the attacks or outlined a political platform that could serve as a basis for negotiations: their demands are absolutist. To date, this insurgency has not been about physical space but mental space.

Muslim v. Muslim

This is a religious conflict, but one primarily within the Muslim community itself. Since March 2005, militants have killed more of their co-religionists than they have Buddhists. According to *The Nation*, "Ninth Police Region records show that more than half of the non-security personnel assassinated over the two years are Muslims. In Pattani, Muslim casualties number 330 against 141 Buddhists; in Yala, it is 222 to 99; and in Narathiwat, the figures are 1,406 to 237."[7] The ideologically and religiously motivated militants are waging war on their own community, which they find rife with government collaborators and other enemies. Thirteen percent of their victims have been village headmen and 61 percent mostly Muslim civilians. In May 2006 a Muslim police official was gunned down while he was praying in a mosque. Insurgents have targeted fellow Muslims who receive a government salary, Muslim clerics who support the government or who perform funeral rites for *murtad* (apostates), and teachers who work in schools that have mixed curriculums. Countenancing no opposition, they are trying to impose a very austere and intolerant form of Islam on their society.

The conflict in the deep south is more religious in nature than it ever has been. As one former BRN-C member told *Slate* correspondent Eliza Griswold, "The new generation of leaders uses religion as motivation. They turn to events around the world to show how America is treating Muslims, and they use this to motivate people."[8] The insurgents firmly ascribe, moreover, to the radical Islamist belief that Islam cannot triumph until it has been purged of corrupting impurities and incorrect interpretations, which include the acceptance of secular rule. At the heart of Salafism is a commitment to remove all innovations or "impurities" that have entered the religion since the death of the Prophet Mohammed. Its goal is to Islamicize society by inculcating it with *Salafi* values and norms that will strengthen the movement, regardless of whether or not these values and norms are popular.

The militants are intimidating their community with a variety of threats: They warn people not to work on Friday, and to observe it as a day of prayer, or to risk death or the amputation of ears; they warn imams not to conduct funeral rites for Muslim security forces, guards at state schools, government employees, or "anyone who receives a salary from the state"; they warn people not to send their children to state-run schools; and they warn everyone not to destroy the leaflets that carry the warnings. The insurgents seem to perceive themselves as operating from a position of strength and seem undeterred by their lack of popularity among the Muslim population. They have introduced

the Wahhabi culture of *takfiri*—condemning fellow Muslims for their lax interpretation of Islam. Rather than trying to create a mass-based movement, they are trying to impose a strict interpretation of Islam on society, which they believe will strengthen the Muslim community (*ummah*). There is some evidence that their efforts may be weakening, but it is also clear that the insurgency has never been so Islamicly-oriented.

Differing Views

Not everyone agrees with this assessment. Joseph Liow still sees the conflict as more criminal than religious in nature.[9] Francesca Lawe-Davies, of the respected International Crisis Group (ICG), sees far more religious identification than ever before, but she sees it wrapped up in terms of national identification.[10] S. P. Harish of IDSS thinks that the conflict is not religious in nature but that the militants use religion to "deepen the Thai-Malay divide." Harish argues that the "frequent portrayal of the conflict as religious nourishes the Buddhist-Muslim cleavage. Minority elites, who include separatist leaders, play a significant role in sustaining these subaltern identities."[11]

Such veteran journalists as Don Pathan of *The Nation* do see the influence of Wahhabism on the new generation of militants, however. As the old insurgency was dying out, the current militants were being instructed for the better part of a decade in Thailand's roughly 500 private *pondoks.* Their ranks were increased, moreover, by some 2,500 graduates of Middle Eastern institutions—a critical mass—who have returned to the south.[12] While Wahhabis are still a distinct minority in the region, their influence and numbers are growing steadily. At the same time the region's traditional Sha'afi community is becoming more theologically and ideologically conservative and pious.

The south still remains, nonetheless, a very diverse region theologically. Moderate Sha'afis and Sufis have rejected Wahhabi approaches and, because of the conditions attached, Wahhabi financial support. As one Sha'afi told a reporter, "They came here to offer money to complete the school on the condition that we permit Wahhabi teachers."[13] But there is no doubt that Wahhabism is gaining strength. Thailand's leading Wahhabi cleric, Ismail Lutfi, is on the board of directors of the Muslim World League, and millions of dollars have poured into his new Islamic College of Yala. Other Saudi and Gulf funds have poured into southern Thailand via the Pusaka Foundation and a branch of the Kuwaiti Om al Qura charity.

A Revealing Document

Attempts to evaluate the religious nature of the insurgency have been further complicated by a captured document, *Ber Jihad Di Pattani* ("Waging Jihad in Pattani").[14] This booklet has two distinct parts and, in the English translation, is twenty-two

pages long. The main section is structured in the form of a seven-day series of sermons. The remaining text includes an introduction, commentary, and an epilogue by a Malaysian cleric, Assuluk Ismuljaminah, of Kelantan. Though August 10, 2002 is affixed to the preface, the booklet is undated.

This document has generated considerable debate. Some see it as proof that the jihadists in southern Thailand are not salafis. They point to Sufi references, noting that salafis constantly try to purge their religion of Sufi heresy. They also emphasize two other facts: (1) The book seems to support the Sha'afi school of jurisprudence, the most common school in Southeast Asia, that the salafis tend to reject, and (2) it calls for the restoration of the Pattani sultanate rather than a pan-Islamic caliphate. But others point out that the booklet advocates martyrdom and implores the reader to become a *shaheed*—a martyr. It echoes the language of many other *salafi-jihadi* tracts—focusing on the idea that Islam is under attack, that there is a global conspiracy against Islam and that it must be defended at all costs.

From the first sermon, the author refers to the congregation as "*shaheed* warriors." And each successive sermon is longer and more incensed, calling on the *shaheed* warriors to make greater sacrifices. The author chastises them for their complacency and goads them into action:

> We should be ashamed of ourselves for sitting idly by and doing nothing while our brothers and sisters are trampled on by our conquerors. Our wealth that belongs to us and the wealth of our country are stolen. Our properties have been confiscated and our assets stolen from us. Our rights and freedoms have been curbed and our religion and culture have been sullied.

He reminds them that they are under the strictest religious obligation: "It is clarified that fighting to protect various rights is a responsibility that every one must fulfill."

While the document does make many references to the Prophet Mohammed, who is usually downplayed in the writings and oratory of Salafism, it reflects the core of the *salafi* approach, which is to attack *munafiks* (Muslims who do not live in accordance with *sharia*) and *murtad* (apostasy). The booklet gives theological justification and instructions for killing both non-Muslims and Muslims who, even if they do not collaborate with the Thai government, are not cooperating with the jihadists. The author is unequivocal in his assertion that the greatest threat to "our honorable Islam" (i.e., Salafism) comes from fellow Muslims:

> It is certain among the group of infidels [*munafiks* is the term used in the text] that they are the most dangerous enemies of God and ours for they are together within the Muslim circle. Sometimes you may see them fulfilling responsibility

before God, such as praying, fasting, giving alms, etc. In reality, all their actions or practices are a disguise, for their hearts are filled with hatred and anger against Islam. And they have fear against the laws and orders of Islam [i.e., they do not live in accordance with *sharia*].

These *munafiks* undermine their faith in two ways: by not living in accordance with *sharia* and, thereby collaborating with the Thai state.

One last point should be made about this document: its significance might well be overrated. It is a single document and, being one of the few found, received a great deal of media attention when it was leaked to the press by Thai security forces. We have little or no knowledge, however, about the teachings in the *dawa* sessions where most of the indoctrination takes place.

It is clear, though, that the insurgents are more religiously motivated than they have been in the past, and that previously secular groups are now dominated by religious leaders who are trying to impose an Islamic state. Whether the militants have a shared ideology with Jemaah Islamiyah (JI) or al-Qaeda is hard to tell at this point. To date the role of JI or foreigners in southern Thailand has been minimal, and the insurgents have not expanded their activities beyond the Muslim south, with the exception of two attacks in Songkhla's Hat Yai city. They have not bombed soft targets in Bangkok or Phuket, for example. While executing over 400 indiscriminant bombings that have killed some one hundred people and wounded hundreds more, they have thus far stayed focused on the "near," rather than the "far," enemy. Yet attacks have been decidedly sectarian and brutal.

Domestic Rebellion or International Front?

The Thai government has gone to great lengths to state that this is a domestic insurgency with no foreign roots. As a Thai Foreign Ministry spokesman said, "The causes of the situation (are) domestic. It's not part of any international terrorist network, but of course we are concerned about the introduction of extremist ideologies among the youths. We are concerned about the possibility of extremist groups in the region connecting together, and this could become a serious problem."

Though evidence pointing to JI links is limited, there are still several reasons to be suspicious. First and foremost, JI approached both the GMIP and Jemaah *Salafi* in 1999-2000 and invited them to a series of three meetings known as the *Rabitatul Mujahidin*—though it is unknown how deep or strong a relationship was forged. Thai intelligence officials have estimated that 120 to 150 Thais passed through Afghanistan over the two decades beginning in 1982, increasingly in 1988-89 when the *mujahidin* structure there became better organized. [15]

The arrests of prominent Islamists in Thailand also suggest that Thai insurgents may have ties to some international terrorist groups. Hambali, JI's operational chief and a senior member of al-Qaeda, was captured in Thailand, along with his two lieutenants, Zubair Mohamad and Bashir bin Lap (Lillie), who were charged with perpetrating a major terrorist attack in Bangkok. Lillie was arrested along with a local Thai *mujahid*, Awang Ibrahim. A Singaporean JI member, Arifin bin Ali, was captured in Thailand, where he was allegedly plotting to hijack an Aeroflot jetliner to crash it into Singapore. Several southern Thai militants were arrested in conjunction with a JI cell in Cambodia that was implicated in laundering money for al-Qaeda through the Om Al Qura Foundation.

The fact that one of JI's leaders and a key planner of the October 2002 Bali bombing, Ali Ghufron (Mukhlas), was given refuge by Thailand's leading Wahhabi cleric, Ismail Lutfi, also testifies to the existence of, at the very least, social links. Other JI members have sought refuge in southern Thailand as well. Thai security officials are aware of such links, but they have been unable to detect anything more than passive support for JI. In the April 2004 siege at the Krue Se mosque in Pattani, two Indonesians were killed and a third—an employee of the Medical Emergency Relief Charity (MERC), an organization related to JI, that supports JI-linked paramilitaries in the Malukus and Poso, Indonesia—was arrested and deported. Recent reports about the Indonesian leader Mudeh's influence in Thailand are sketchy, but it is clear that more Thai militants have been training in Indonesia than was previously thought. Thai authorities now regularly speak of an Indonesian network of the BRN-C known as the Runda Kumpulan Kecil.

JI nonetheless remains, as it always has been, focused first and foremost on Indonesia. It is currently regrouping and has little reason to increase activity in Thailand. Like al-Qaeda JI is less a monolithic organization than an organizational network based on a shared ideology, and it has limited means for strengthening the Thai insurgency other than offering a bit more training and support. From its point of view, moreover, everything in southern Thailand is going along swimmingly. The militants there share similar goals and values, and the technological proficiency of their bomb-makers make JI somewhat superfluous. In short, JI does not have to be involved.

Conclusion

It can be said with certainty that the insurgency in southern Thailand has never been as Islamist as it is today. *Salafi* principles and values, such as *takfiri*, are being injected into the conflict, making it more of a cultural war than a traditional insurgency. Though the groups involved have said almost nothing about their goals and ideology, their actions have been absolutist. Their current objective appears to be three-fold: to weed out moderates who support the government and oppose the Islamist agenda of the militants; to

make the region ungovernable so that they can establish parallel political institutions (known as *hijrah*); and to alienate the local population from the government by provoking Thai security forces to make heavy-handed crackdowns—as they did at Krue Se in April 2004 and Tak Bai October 2004—or to establish hit squads.[16] Yet, as no group as stated its goals or platforms, there is very little in the way of an ideological paper trail.

There is palpable concern among many observers that, as bleed-out occurs in Iraq, the situation in southern Thailand will attract foreign *jihadis* who will want to escalate the conflict. Right now, the only silver lining of the war in Iraq may be that it is attracting most of the itinerant *jihadis* and most of the attention of the world's angry Muslims. Thus far, Thailand has remained low on their list of grievances toward the West and apostate regimes, well behind Iraq, Palestine, Pakistan, Afghanistan, North Africa, Kashmir, Chechnya, Mindanao and Indonesia. But there are already some signs that this is changing. The veteran Middle East journalist Amir Taheri wrote in a March article in the pan-Arab *Asharq Al-Awsat* newspaper that "international jihadist circles" on the internet and across the Muslim world were discussing the possibility of waging a broader *jihad* in southern Thailand. "The buzz in Islamist circles is that well-funded Jihadist organizations may be preparing a takeover bid for the southern Thailand insurgency."[17]

Notes

1. There is also a majority Muslim population in the neighboring province of Satun and in certain districts of Songkhla.

2. The government was assisted by other factors as well. First, in return for the right to pursue MCP rebels into Thailand, the Malaysian government gave substantial assistance to their Thai counterparts and never let the ethnic-Malay rebels develop an infrastructure in Malaysia that would allow them to wage a larger guerilla war. Second, starting in the late 1980s, the Thai economy took off and was the fastest growing economy in the world by the mid-1990s. While the ethnic-Malay-dominated provinces are poorer and lag behind the national average in most measures of development, they are still not the poorest region in the country. Finally, the Thai government had very good counterinsurgency tactics and operations. Officials understood that this was primarily a political, rather than a military, struggle. For that reason the military never operated alone. The Thai government put in place a joint command of civilian, police and military officials. This unified command coordinated operations and intelligence, and also served as an important community liaison and dispute-resolution mechanism. The government employed amnesties to great effect and directed development funds into the region.

3. Cited in Shawn Crispin, "Strife Down South," *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 27 January 2004.

4. The Thai Ministry of Education has registered 214 Islamic schools but acknowledges that there are hundreds of small, unregistered, privately-owned *pondoks*. "Muslim Teachers Extend Cautious Welcome to Aree," *The Nation*, September 2004.

5. Simon Elegant, "Southern Front," *Time-Asia*, 11 October 2004.

6. The school, which is one of the largest Islamic schools in Thailand, was founded in 1951 by Haji Muhamad Tohe Sulong and has some 6,000 students, spread across four separate campuses. It has 196 *ustadz*, or Islamic teachers. The curriculum is mixed, however, and only 400 students solely study Islam.

7. Supalak Ganjanakhundee and Don Pathan, "From Guerrillas to Terrorists: New Face of Violence," *The Nation*, 9 January 2006.

8. Eliza Griswold, "Dispatches from Southern Thailand," Slate, 27 September 2005.

9. See, for example, Joseph Liow, "Over-reading the Islamist Factor in Thailand's Southern Troubles," *Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies* (*IDSS*) *Commentaries*, 10 March 2005, at www.idss.edu.sg/publications/Perspectives/IDSS112005.pdf.

10. Francesca Lawe-Davies, talk at the Foreign Correspondents' Club of Thailand, Bangkok, 11 January 2006.

11. S. P. Harish, "Insurgency in Southern Thailand: Ethnic or Religious Conflict?" *IDSS Commentaries*, 14 April 2005, at www.idss.edu.sg/publications/Perspectives/IDSS172005.pdf.

12. Don Pathan, "Planning for a Peaceful Future in the South," *The Nation*, 28 August 2005.

13, Kavi Chongkittavorn, "Thailand: International Terrorism and the Muslim South," in *Southeast Asian Affairs 2004* (Singapore: Institute of South East Asian Studies [ISEAS], 2004).

14 Found in Rohan Gunaratna, Arabinda Acharya, Sabrina Chua, eds., *Conflict and Terrorism in Southern Thailand*, (Marshall Cavendish Academic). 2006.

15. Author interview, Kuala Lumpur, 19 April 2005

16. "Army Chief Admits Agencies Are Using 'Blacklists' in South," *The Nation*, 26 April 2006; "Govt Must Probe Blacklist Fiasco," *The Nation*, 28 April 200

17. Quoted in Ismail Wolff, "Jihadist Threat to South Insurgency," *Thai Day*, 13 March 2006.

Contributors and Editors

Hillel Fradkin is director of the Center on Islam, Democracy, and the Future of the Muslim World and senior fellow, Hudson Institute.

Husain Haqqani is an associate professor at Boston University, and co-chair of the Islam and Democracy Project, Hudson Institute.

Eric Brown is a research fellow of the Center on Islam, Democracy, and the Future of the Muslim World and the Center for Future Security Strategies, Hudson Institute.

Zachary Abuza is associate professor at Simmons College and the author, most recently, of *Political Islam and Violence in Indonesia.*

Israel Elad-Altman is director of studies at the Institute for Policy and Strategy at the Interdisciplinary Center, Herzliya, Israel.

Nibras Kazimi writes a weekly column on the Middle East for the *New York Sun,* and is a visiting fellow, Hudson Institute.

Reuven Paz is director of the Project for the Research of Islamist Movements (PRISM), Herzliya, Israel.

Lorenzo Vidino is an analyst at the Investigative Project and the Jebsen Center at Tufts University's Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, and the author of *Al-Qaeda in Europe.*