# A Recipe for Violence: Conditions in Which the Muslim Brotherhood is Likely to Support Terrorism as a Means to Effect Political Change

Robert Jones
Diplomacy Programs
Norwich University
Northfield, VT 05663
robertjones24601@gmail.com

## Abstract

Much debate persists as to whether or not the effects of the ongoing Arab Spring will actually serve to strengthen global security. Understandably, much of the debate has centered on the events unfolding in Egypt as the ousting of former President Hosni Mubarak has led to the ascendency of the unabashedly Islamist organization the Muslim Brotherhood. Although the Brotherhood has yet to take a provocative foreign policy stance in terms of supporting terrorism as a means to effect political change, this paper seeks to contribute to the debate surrounding the overall impact of the Arab Spring by examining instances in which the Brotherhood has either unquestionably engaged in violence or has directly supported terrorist organizations to the aim of predicting the likelihood as to whether or not the Brotherhood, now being in power in Egypt, will indeed embrace support of terrorism as a part of its foreign policy. The paper also examines Brotherhood activity in Egypt as well as the activities of Brotherhood subsidiary and front organizations operating throughout the greater Middle East and in Western nations in order to determine if the Brotherhood's stated goals of establishing Islamic Sharia law poses any substantial threat to the national security of otherwise secular states. Accordingly, the paper finds that the Muslim Brotherhood is willing to support terrorism violence in such instances as attempts to effect political change through peaceful means become increasingly frustrated and in such instances as the Brotherhood does not view violence as terrorism per se, but rather as a legitimate means to resist a perceived occupying force.

**Key Words:** Arab Spring, Muslim Brotherhood, Sharia Law, Egypt, United States, National Security

## Introduction

A truism of revolutionary change is that it often begins with a single act of courageous defiance against a political system that has long repressed the natural rights of a given state's citizenry. Indeed, even a faint reflection upon the subject of revolution is apt to bring to mind such fateful images as Rosa Park's refusal to give up her seat to a white man on a Montgomery Alabama bus in defiance of the United State's Jim Crow laws, Lech Walesa's climbing of a fence in Poland's Gdansk shipyard to join laborers demanding equal rights for workers, or even the anonymous 'tank man' who stood boldly in the face of oncoming tanks in China's Tiananmen Square. Added to the ranks of such individuals in the context of recent developments certainly remains Tunisian fruit vendor Mohammad Bouazizi, whose act of self immolation in

protest of the long standing dictatorship of incumbent President Zine el-Abidine Ben Ali sparked what has become known as the Arab Spring. Not only did Bouazizi's sacrifice inspire waves of protestors to take to the streets in Tunisia, but also in states all throughout the Arab world leading to the overthrow of several longstanding authoritarian regimes including the regimes of Tunisia's Ben Ali, Yemen's Ali Abdullah Saleh, Libya's Muammar al-Qaddafi, and Egypt's Hosni Mubarak. As the events of the Arab Spring continue to unfold in dramatic fashion across the Middle East, scholars however have remained divided as to whether or not democratic reform throughout the Arab World will actually prove to strengthen global security. Such debate is readily observable in the case of Egypt, wherein the ousting of former President Mubarak has lead to the ascendancy of the unabashedly Islamist organization the Muslim Brotherhood under the leadership of democratically elected President Mohammad Morsi. Although Morsi himself has recently drawn the ire of renewed Egyptian protest vis-à-vis his efforts to establish greater presidential authority through the expansion of the executive office, for now, Morsi and the Muslim Brotherhood remain at the helm of the Egyptian state. Therein, Jonathan Powell, in a detailed analysis of the regional and global ramifications of the Arab Spring, is keen to note the concerns of both right-wing American and Israeli commentators that the Brotherhood's democratic election, in addition to being the shortest route to the implementation of Sharia law in Egypt, was tantamount to the "opening of a Pandora's box, releasing all of the demons that would destroy both the United States and Israel" (Powell, 2012, p. 210) particularly with respect to the argument that the Brotherhood would provide direct support to terrorist organizations such as the Palestinian HAMAS, which, like the Brotherhood in Egypt, was democratically elected to power in the Gaza Strip in January of 2006. Given that HAMAS remains the Palestinian arm of the Brotherhood, such concerns are certainly not without basis. Powell's own analysis however, remains more optimistic as he observes that thus far "the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt is taking a moderate stand and not looking to HAMAS as a role model" (Powell, 2012, p. 211). Although the Muslim Brotherhood has thus far not promoted an overtly provocative Egyptian foreign policy in terms of the support of terrorism, the Brotherhood has certainly demonstrated a capacity for violent tactics in the past in addition to expressing solidarity with organizations that have routinely employed terrorist tactics against the state of Israel. Therein, examination of the circumstances in which the Muslim Brotherhood is likely to support acts of terrorism as a viable means to effect political change remains extremely warranted in the context of ongoing debates surrounding the overall impact of the Arab Spring.

Towards the aim of identifying circumstances in which the Muslim Brotherhood is likely to support terrorism as a viable means to effect political change, it is first necessary to account for the Brotherhood's own presentation of its goals to the international community of states. Alison Pargeter, in a thorough analysis of the Brotherhood's evolution from its founding in 1928 by Muslim school teacher Hassan al-Banna to the eve of the Arab Spring in 2010, succinctly captures the essence of how the Brotherhood desires to be viewed by the international community, noting that the Brotherhood has long asserted "that it is a moderate organization that does not advocate taking up arms to gain power but rather prefers the slower approach of educating society from below in preparation for the eventual establishment of an Islamic order" (Pargeter, 2010, p. 179) in states that do not maintain Islamic Sharia law as the supreme law of the land. Although the Brotherhood has long sought to portray itself as a moderate organization that eschews violence, evidence suggests that the Brotherhood is apt to resort to violent tactics itself as efforts to establish an Islamic order in secular states become increasingly frustrated in addition to supporting acts of terrorism perpetrated by groups such as HAMAS, which the

Brotherhood does not consider to be a terrorist organization, but rather a legitimate resistance movement seeking to end Israeli occupation of Palestinian lands. The fact that the Brotherhood has resorted to violence as efforts to effect peaceful political change have grown increasingly frustrating is particularly alarming given that the organization is not simply confined to Egypt, but rather maintains branches in states throughout the greater Middle East as well in Western nations including the United Kingdom and the United States. Therein, analysis of the Brotherhood's origins in Egypt as well as of the Brotherhood's activities in states throughout the greater Middle East and in the West reveals the extent to which the Brotherhood is likely to support terrorism as a means to effect political change in the aim of establishing an Islamic order in secular states that do not uphold Sharia law as tenet by which to govern.

**Building Angst: The Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood's use and support of Violence as a Means to Effect Political Change**

Although the Muslim Brotherhood was initially founded primarily as a social movement to effect peaceful political change in Egypt, the Brotherhood's tactics took a violent turn as the Egyptian government refused to countenance Brotherhood demands that Cairo adopt a non-secular form of government and purge all vestiges of Western influence that had come to penetrate Egyptian society in the context of British imperial rule. Christine Rinehart, in an extensive analysis of the factors that led to the Brotherhood's adoption of violence, observes that after a decade of political activism on the part of the Brotherhood, "the objectives of the Brotherhood were disregarded because neither the Egyptian government nor the Egyptian people changed their course of action and committed themselves to Islamic reform" (Rinehart, 2009, p. 977). The mounting frustration of Brotherhood founder Hassan al-Banna over Egyptian refusal to adopt Islamic reform is readily evident, Rinehart observes, in al-Banna's own words delivered in 1938 before the Fifth Conference gathering of Brotherhood members that if Egyptian authorities did not adopt the Brotherhood's program of Islamic reform, then the Brotherhood would unequivocally remain "at war with every leader, every party and every organization that does not work for the victory of Islam" (Rinehart, 2009, p. 980). Al-Banna's call for war against the Egyptian government eventually translated into violent action in the formation of the Muslim Brotherhood's so called Secret Apparatus which frequently engaged in acts of terrorism directed against both the Egyptian state and continued British presence in Egypt including the bombings of the King George Hotel which served as a station for British Intelligence in 1946 and the assassinations of Cairo's chief of police Salim Zaka and Egyptian Prime Minister Mahmud Fahmi al-Nuqrashi Pasha in 1948. Interestingly, Rinehart observes that as members of the Secret Apparatus completed militant training, "they were instructed to pretend they had given up membership in the Muslim Brotherhood and were told to join other activist organizations" (Rinehart, 2009, p. 982) so as to obfuscate the Brotherhood's involvement in acts of terrorism. Such observation only underscores the notion that although the Brotherhood may seek to purport itself as purely a social movement that eschews violence as a means to effect political change, the use and support of terrorism by the Brotherhood in order to achieve its goals remains a viable strategy if political change does not occur in a timely fashion. The Brotherhood's support of terrorism as a viable strategy however is further demonstrated in its more contemporary leadership's statements praising the use of terrorism as a legitimate means to resist occupation.

Although the leadership of the Muslim Brotherhood has often condemned acts of terrorism committed by organizations such as Al-Qaeda in order to reinforce the Brotherhood's

insistence that it remains a moderate organization that denounces violence as a means to effect political change, deeper analysis of statements by contemporary Brotherhood leadership gives pause to such claim. Indeed, the statements of Yussuf al- Qaradawi, widely viewed as a leading theologian within the Brotherhood's ranks, are most revealing in regard to Brotherhood support of terrorism violence. Lorenzo Vidnio, in a revealing analysis of the Brotherhood's likelihood to support acts of terrorism, is keen to note al-Qaradawi's 2003 statements in which the influential cleric "laid out five categories of terrorism, including 'terror that is permitted by Islamic law' and 'martyrdom operations' after ruling that Israeli society as a whole can be defined as "invaders" and therefore can be legitimately targeted" (Vidnio, 2010, p. 211) with violence including acts of suicide terrorism that is indiscriminate between persons of military and civilian status. Regarding the use of suicide bombing in Iraq, al-Qaradawi has proven no less candid, as Vidnio observes that in 2004 al-Qaradawi issued an Islamic fatwa "justifying attacks against all American citizens in Iraq, including civilians, pronouncing that there is no difference between United States military personnel and civilians in Iraq since both have come to invade the country" (Vidnio, 2010, p. 211). Moreover, al-Qaradawi has also used the rationale of supporting terrorism as a means to resist occupation in order to defend the actions of the Palestinian HAMAS as Vidnio notes that al-Qaradawi has compared "the actions of HAMAS fighters to those of Nelson Mandela" (Vidnio, 2010, p. 212) in the hope of presenting HAMAS violence against Israeli citizens in a more palatable light to Western audiences. Given that a leading Muslim Brotherhood figure such as al-Qaradawi has routinely defended the use of terrorism violence in both Iraq and Israel as a legitimate means of resistance, it cannot be ruled out that the Brotherhood, now being in power in Egypt, will provide active support to HAMAS as it is clear that the Brotherhood views the actions of HAMAS as permissible under Islamic precept. Conditions in which the Muslim Brotherhood is apt to support terrorism violence as a means to effect political change become more illuminated when considering that the Brotherhood maintains branches in states throughout the greater Middle East and in the West.

**Distinct yet Similar: The Syrian and Jordanian Brotherhood's Support of Violence**

Although branches of the Muslim Brotherhood that exist throughout the greater Middle East remain distinct from the Egyptian Brotherhood and therein uniquely adapted to the political realities with in their own respective states, examination of the histories of varying branches, specifically the Syrian and Jordanian chapters of the Brotherhood, further reveal circumstances in which the Brotherhood is apt to support violence as a means to effect political change. Of the Jordanian branch, Pargeter keenly observes that "among the Jordanian Brotherhood, the cause of Palestine is even more fundamental and the need to be seen to be resisting Israel is most crucial" (Pargeter, 2010, p. 198) due to the large number of Palestinian refugees that reside within the Hashemite Kingdom. Therein, Juan Stemmann, in a detailed analysis of the Jordanian Brotherhood's positions in matters related to foreign policy, notes that the Jordanian Brothers have, in addition to voicing strong opposition to Jordan's 1994 peace agreement with Israel, "openly supported suicide attacks which they consider to be "martyrdom operations" and the only weapons to resist an enemy that is militarily vastly superior" (Rubin, 2010, p. 66-67). Moreover, Stemmann further notes that "support has been expressed openly for resistance and jihad against the American occupation" (Rubin, 2010, p. 67) of Iraq to the extent that the Jordanian Brotherhood's main propaganda tool, the *al-Sabil* newspaper "has regularly published articles praising Osama bin Laden and the Iraqi resistance" (Rubin, 2010, p. 67). While careful to

condemn more extreme forms of violence in the vein of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi's methods of beheading and the indiscriminate targeting of fellow Muslims, it remains of note that the Jordanian Brotherhood still defends the use of terrorism violence as a means of legitimate resistance in the cases of both Iraq and Israel reflecting the stance of leading Brotherhood thinkers such as al-Qaradawi. In spite of openly condemning the methods of al-Zarqawi however, Pargeter observes that it remains of important note that leading members of the Jordanian Brotherhood "attended the funeral of the Jordanian Al-Qaeda commander in Iraq and paid condolences to his family" (Pargeter, 2010, p. 181). While not a direct support of violence, the Jordanian Brotherhood's presence at al-Zarqawi's funeral certainly does nothing to support the position that the Muslim Brotherhood remains a moderate organization that wholly opposes violence as a means to effect political change. When considered along with the Jordanian Brotherhood's open support of suicide bombings in Iraq and Israel, such action further supports the notion that the Muslim Brotherhood is apt to support terrorism in the event that the Brotherhood views such violence as a legitimate means of resistance against a stronger force. Examination of the Syrian Brotherhood however, reinforces the argument that the Brotherhood, in accordance with the example set by its founder Hassan al-Banna, will also be willing to eventually resort to violence as a means to effect political change within a domestic context in order to establish an Islamic regime.

Although the Syrian Muslim Brotherhood has largely remained what might be described as a model of Islamist moderation within a contemporary context, examination of the Syrian Brotherhood's history reveals moments in which the organization has resorted to violence that remain instructive. Whereas the Syrian Brotherhood absolutely pursued a policy of engagement within the political structure of Syria's parliamentary democracy established following the country's independence from France in 1946, the rise of an Alawi-dominated Ba'thist regime prompted the Brotherhood to resort to violent activity in the aim of effecting political change. Robert Rabil, in a detailed history of the Syrian Brotherhood, notes that according to Brotherhood literature, the Brotherhood's opposition to the Ba'th grew from several factors including that the Ba'th regime "represented a minority ruling the country, antireligious secularism, and emergency rule which banned all political activities" (Rubin, 2010, p. 77). No longer permitted to engage in political activity and still bent on establishing an Islamist regime, Yvette Talhamy, in offering a timely analysis of the Syrian Brotherhood's past engagement in violent activity as it might relate to the ongoing Syrian uprising against the regime of Bashar Asaad, notes that "armed elements of the Syrian Brotherhood assassinated government officials and carried out bombings of government buildings, Baath party offices and other targets associated with the regime" (Talhamy, 2012, p. 34). Such escalating violence on the part of the Brotherhood prompted the regime of the elder Hafez Asaad to brutally crackdown against the Brotherhood, culminating in the infamous massacre of tens of thousands in the city of Hama in 1982 which effectively ended any further attempts at armed resistance. Whereas the Asaad regime's brutal crackdown against the Brotherhood effectively caused the Brotherhood to firmly renounce violence and therein to implicitly acknowledge the legitimacy of the Asaad regime's rule, Vidnio is still keen to observe the words of Said Hawwa, a senior leader in the Syrian Brotherhood who wrote that the Brotherhood would still "surely use force, but only at the time when there would be no other course open for it, and when the Brotherhood would be fully satisfied that they have equipped themselves with the strength of faith, belief, unity, and organization" (Vidnio, 2010, p. 213). Importantly, such mindset remains in accordance with the example of al-Banna, who furthers Vidnio, argued that "armed combat for the cause of God is

the highest stage of jihad, a step that Muslims must take in order to achieve the Islamic order if other means have failed" (Vidnio, 2010, p. 213). Thus, examination of the Syrian Brotherhood suggests that should all attempts to establish an Islamic order through political recourse fail, then the Muslim Brotherhood remains fully prepared to engage in acts of violence in order to implement the rule of Sharia law in otherwise secular societies. Such notion becomes all the more prescient however, when considering that the Muslim Brotherhood maintains branches in secular Western societies throughout the United Kingdom and in the United States.

**Precipice to Jihad? : Muslim Brotherhood Activity in the United States and the United Kingdom**

Although the Muslim Brotherhood consistently purports that it remains a strictly moderate Islamist organization that eschews violence as a means to effect political change, examination of varying Brotherhood operations throughout the United States and the United Kingdom further reveals Brotherhood support for organizations such as HAMAS in addition to a determined, if subtle, Brotherhood initiative to Islamize Western societies by any means necessary. While the means of violence does not appear to be the preferred tactic of the Brotherhood to accomplish such aim, the activities of the Brotherhood in the West warrant that the organization remains under intense scrutiny and monitoring from agencies charged with counterterrorism mandates. Regarding Brotherhood activity in the United States, the now infamous prosecution of the Holy Land Foundation (HLF), a Texas based front for the Brotherhood's operations, for direct involvement in terrorism financing produced numerous documents detailing the Brotherhood's designs for America. A document of particular concern, observes authors David Gaubatz and Paul Sperry, remains a 1991 Brotherhood manifesto entitled 'An Explanatory Memorandum on the General Strategic Goal for the Group in North America' which unequivocally states that the goal of the Muslim Brotherhood in America "is a kind of grand Jihad in eliminating and destroying the Western civilization from within, and sabotaging its miserable house by the hands of the believers, so that it is  eliminated and Allah's religion is made victorious over all other religions" (Gaubatz & Sperry, 2009, p. 230). While Gaubatz and Sperry stipulate that the Brotherhood seemingly prefers to accomplish such a goal through the means of activism vis-à-vis the United States' many freedoms and democratic political process, the authors also keenly make note of Pentagon terrorism expert Major Stephen Coughlin's analysis that the manifesto demonstrates "a clear threat statement of hostile intent with stated objectives that overlap with Al-Qaeda's" (Gaubatz & Sperry, 2009, p. 231) in terms of establishing Islamic Sharia law as the sole governing authority throughout the entirety of the world. Upon analysis of the 1991 manifesto and the multitude of additional Brotherhood documents entered into evidence in the HLF trial, the Center for Security Policy in Washington DC issued a report  warning that although the Brotherhood may seemingly prefer to effect the establishment of Sharia law in the West through non-violent means, that the Brotherhood's internal documents make clear that non-violence is preferable "only until such time as Muslims are powerful enough to progress to violent jihad for the final conquest" (Boykin et al., 2010, p. 38). To such end, Birgitte Gabriel is keen to note counterterrorism and radical Islam expert Patrick Poole's analysis of the HLF trial documents noting that both "inflaming violence and keeping Muslims living in the West in a Jihad frame of mind" (Gabriel, 2009, p. 77) as well as "supporting Jihad movements across the Muslim world through preaching, propaganda, personnel, funding, and technical and operational support" (Gabriel, 2009, p. 77) through

varying front organizations remain key tenets of Brotherhood strategy in the United States. Importantly, Brotherhood incitement of violence through varying front organizations has led to cases in which individual Brotherhood members living in the United States have resorted to violence as a means to effect political change. Indeed, Alyssa Lappen, in a detailed analysis of Brotherhood activity throughout North America, makes keen note of the case of Fahad Hashmi, a native of Queens in New York and member of the Muslim Brotherhood front organization the Islamic Circle of North America (ICNA) who, in May 2007, United Kingdom authorities extradited for being "connected to a London bomb plot and for having assisted Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan by transporting military gear, recruiting terrorists, and conducting such operations himself" (Rubin, 2010, p. 163). Moreover, Lappen further observes that the United States Justice Department identified the ICNA itself as an "unindicted coconspirator for allegedly funding terrorism through HAMAS and the HLF" (Rubin, 2010, p. 163-164). In addition to the cases of Fahad Hashmi and the ICNA, key Brotherhood leaders operating in the United States, in spite of issuing public statements condemning the use of terrorism violence as a means to effect political change, have instead been found guilty of directly engaging in the very practices that they have vociferously denounced. For example, Abdurahman Alamoudi, the one time executive director of the Brotherhood front organization the American Muslim Council (AMC) is now, notes Vidnio, "serving a twenty three year sentence for his participation in an Al-Qaeda terrorist plot" (Vidnio, 2010, p. 190) despite issuing previous statements advocating means other than violence to the aim of effecting political change in the United States. Lappen also makes note of the case of Ismail Royer, a former AMC employee and eventual communications director of yet another Brotherhood front organization, the Muslim American Society (MAS), who in 2004 "pleaded guilty to sending recruits to Pakistani terror-training camps managed by Lashkar-e-Taiba, a Brotherhood outgrowth and designated foreign terrorist organization" (Rubin, 2010, p.165). Given that the actions of such individuals seem in accordance with Brotherhood objectives as outlined in the Islamist organization's internal documents, it can hardly be ruled out that the Brotherhood would not resort to violence in the United States should its attempts to effect the rule of Sharia law through political activism continue to be stymied. Indeed, such remains in the example of Brotherhood founder Hassan al-Banna himself. This and the fact that many Brotherhood front organizations operating in the United States have been found guilty of funding terrorism certainly warrants that the activities of the Brotherhood in the United States be kept under intense scrutiny by counterterrorism and law enforcement agencies. While such a pattern is less observable throughout Brotherhood operations in the United Kingdom, examination of the Brotherhood's activities in Great Britain still reveals circumstances in which the Brotherhood is likely to support acts of terrorism.

Although Muslim Brotherhood organizations in Great Britain have seemingly made a determined effort to discourage its members from engaging in violence as a means to effect political change within the United Kingdom as doing so would potentially compromise the Brotherhood's long term aims of establishing Sharia as the supreme law of the land in Western societies, support for terrorism still remains a tenet of Brotherhood subsidiaries operating throughout Great Britain in certain circumstances. David Rich, while contending that United Kingdom Brotherhood leaders remain opposed to terrorist attacks within Great Britain itself, notes that many United Kingdom Brotherhood leaders "all signed a public statement in August 2004 supporting attacks against British and coalition forces in Iraq" (Rubin, 2010, p. 130) in accordance with Yussuff al-Qaradawi's exhortations that terrorism directed against coalition forces constituted a legitimate means by which to resist an occupying force. Accordingly, Rich

furthers that HAMAS "suicide operations in Israel will not be condemned by United Kingdom Brotherhood leaders" (Rubin, 2010, p. 130) as due to the fact that the United Kingdom Brotherhood, in accordance with the positions of al-Qaradawi, does not view HAMAS as a terrorist organization but rather as a legitimate movement resisting Israeli occupation. Such sentiment is further exemplified in the case of Inyat Bunglawla, media director for the United Kingdom Brotherhood organization the Muslim Council of Britain, who, observes author Melanie Phillips in a detailed analysis of Islamist activity in London, describes HAMAS as "an authentically Islamic movement and a source of comfort for Muslims all over the world" (Phillips, 2006, p. 173). Moreover, while United Kingdom Brotherhood leaders have issued stringent condemnations of terrorist attacks within Britain, exposure to Brotherhood ideology has nevertheless inspired violent action amongst British Muslims. With respect to the 2005 London bombings that targeted civilians utilizing the city's subway system, Ian Johnson, in a thorough examination of the Muslim Brotherhood's origins and evolution in Europe, notes that individuals involved in the plot "had begun their careers as radicals through contact with Brotherhood ideology, attracted to its utopian message and learning through it to separate the world into two classes of people; believers and infidels" (Johnson, 2010, p. 216). While not necessarily a direct linkage between the United Kingdom Brotherhood and support of violent action, such observation does little to aid the Brotherhood in seeking to present itself as a moderate organization that eschews violence as a means to effect political change. Much to the contrary, Brotherhood activities throughout the United Kingdom and the United States does much to reinforce the argument that the Brotherhood considers terrorism violence as legitimate recourse to effect political change in cases where violence is deemed necessary to resist a perceived occupier and, with particular regard to Brotherhood activity in the United States, when attempts to establish Sharia as the supreme law of the land through non-violent means have been exhausted.

**Conclusions**

Although it would certainly be inaccurate to cast the Muslim Brotherhood as an entirely monolithic organization that maintains an absolute harmonious agenda between its Egyptian base and numerous subsidiaries operating throughout the greater Middle East and in Western societies including the United Kingdom and the United States, analysis of Brotherhood activity in such varying regions clearly reveals recurring circumstances in which the Brotherhood has deemed violence as a legitimate means by which to effect a desired political change. First, as in accordance with the example set by Muslim Brotherhood founder Hassan al-Banna in Egypt, violence clearly remains a legitimate recourse to effect political change when non-violent means to effect such change have become frustrated and exhausted. Such observation therein remains of special pertinence to officials in the United States, as discovery of Brotherhood internal documents has revealed long term designs to establish Sharia law as the sole governing authority in America, key aspects of which remain inflaming violence and the keeping of American Muslims in a jihadist frame of mind in addition to the support and funding of foreign jihadist movements. Secondly, Brotherhood subsidiaries, in accordance with the positions of leading Egyptian Brotherhood theologian Yussuff al-Qaradawi, have routinely expressed support for terrorism in such cases as violence is purported to be justified when directed against a perceived occupier as in the instances of coalition presence in Iraq and the existence of the state of Israel in greater Palestine. This observation bears particular relevance within the context of the ongoing

Arab Spring as the Brotherhood currently holds power in Egypt under the leadership of Egyptian president Mohammad Morsi. Whereas the Brotherhood may have indeed come to power in Egypt through peaceful democratic means enabled by the revolutionary change ignited by Mohammad Bouzizi's desperate act of self immolation in Tunisia, it is not unreasonable to contend that the Brotherhood, if able to firmly establish its current hold, will likely use the apparatus of the Egyptian state to support organizations such as HAMAS which the Brotherhood has routinely cast as a legitimate resistance movement rather than as a terrorist organization. Given such analysis, it seems a most prescient observation as noted by human rights activist Nonie Darwish, that the ultimate goal of the Muslim Brotherhood might well be summarized in its emblem, "which has two swords, and in its center the words *Wa Aiddou*, which in Arabic means "and prepare" corresponding to the first two words at the beginning of one of the most violent verses in the Koran commanding Muslims to commit terror: Koran 8:60 "Prepare against them whatever arms that you can muster so that you may strike terror in the enemies of Allah" (Darwish, 2012, p. 40). As there remain clear circumstances in which the Muslim Brotherhood has both supported and engaged in acts of terrorism, such symbolism remains accordingly telling in spite of the Brotherhood's best efforts cast itself as a purely moderate organization that wholly rejects violence as a legitimate means to effect political change.

**References**

Boykin, W., Soyster, E., Brim, C., Cooper, H., Couglin, S., et al. (2010). *Shariah: The Threat to America: An Exercise in Competitive Analysis*. Washington DC: Center for Security Policy Press.

Darwish, N. (2012). *The Devil We Don't' Know: The Dark Side of the Revolutions in the Middle East*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Gabriel, B. (2009). *They Must Be Stopped*: *Why we must Defeat Radical Islam and how we can do it*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Gaubatz, D. & Sperry, P. (2009). *Muslim Mafia: Inside the Secret Underworld that's Conspiring to Islamize America*. New York: Midpoint Trade Books.

Johnson, I. (2010). *A Mosque in Munich: Nazis, the CIA, and the Rise of the Muslim Brotherhood in the West*. New York: Hougton Mifflin Publishing Company.

Pargeter, A. (2010). *The Muslim Brotherhood: The Burden of Tradition*. London: Saqi Books.

Phillips, M. (2006). *Londonistan*. New York: Encounter Books.

Powell, J. (2012). A Lasting Glow: Seizing the optimism of the Arab Spring. *Public Policy Research, (December-February)*, p. 207-212.

Rinehart, C. S. (2009). Volatile Breeding Grounds: The Radicalization of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism, (32)*, p. 953-988.

Rubin, B. (2010). *The Muslim Brotherhood: The Organization and Policies of a Global Islamist Movement*. New York: Palgrave McMillan.

Talhamy, Y. (2012). The Muslim Brotherhood Reborn. *Middle East Quarterly, (Spring)*, p. 33-40.

Vidnio, L. (2010). *The New Muslim Brotherhood in the West*. New York: Colombia University Press.