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Abstract: Much analysis and research on Islamist parties and political Islam in general has been produced, with the recent occurrences in the Middle East termed by many as the ‘Arab spring’ providing further impetus for the production of even more. However in many instances these analyses have been written from a Eurocentric perspective, omitting the context wherein these parties operate, and refusing to allow for the evolution of them. Islamist parties are often portrayed by these as, anti-modern, war-promoting, women-oppressors that need to be opposed at all costs. Thus, this paper seeks to provide a more substantive and nuanced perspective of Islamist parties by comparing the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood and Hezbollah. These two parties are compared on their positions toward democracy, women’s rights and the rights of religious minorities; the social services they provide; and whether or not they are involved in terrorist activities. This enables the paper to illustrate the differences between Islamist parties, and elucidate the role context plays in their evolution. Moreover, it enables it to tease out criteria which the international community should use when deciding to recognize and enter into negotiations with Islamist parties. In addition the impact of the Arab spring on the future of Islamist parties is also examined, the argument being that Islamist parties have been and will be one of the biggest beneficiaries of it. Running through this paper is the argument that many Islamist parties have evolved tremendously, and by allowing them to operate, the citizens of these states will derive benefit, and we will further ‘de-radicalize’ them as their oppositional rhetoric, which is aimed at appealing to the masses, will have to be toned down and pragmatism will prevail.
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Proposal-Introductory Chapter

1. Aims, objectives, and rationale

1.1. Aims

This paper aims to provide a substantive and nuanced perspective of Islamist parties by comparing the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood and Hezbollah. It aims to illustrate the many differences prevalent in the practises and policies adopted by these two parties and hypothesises that context and history play a tremendous role in informing the vastly different policies and stances adopted by them, and de-facto most Islamist parties, and that merely asserting that Islamist parties are anti-modern, war-promoting, women-oppressors as is the case with most analyses on this issue, is naive and factually incorrect. Moreover it is of the view that Islamist parties are not static as many argue, but evolve when faced with different contexts. Thus its objectives include:

- An analysis of the many factors that have contributed to the increasing popularity and operability of Islamist parties in contemporary times;
- The illustration that Islamist parties, contrary to mainstream belief, do exude many positive behaviours in addition to the widely publicised negative positions they sometimes adopt;
- An analysis of whether these positives can lead to an improvement in the qualities of life for the citizens of the states wherein Islamist parties operate;
- To highlight that Islamist parties are not just one homogenous entity seeking the end of the Western enlightenment project; and
- most importantly, by illustrating these nuances, assisting to debunk the myth of the apocalyptic clash of civilizations which many have predicted.
1.2. Rationale

The international system has witnessed many changes in the past decade, September 11 2001 has resulted in the perceptive threat of Muslim terrorism (amongst Western leaders and policy makers) being heightened; the ill effects of globalization and neoliberalism have left many people disillusioned and seeking alternatives; and there has been a renewed desire for democracy from various constituencies (Musamba, 2010; Schönleitner, 2003). The main consequence of this is that Islamist parties, or parties with Islamist roots have been gaining in influence over the past decade, and will most probably consolidate and increase these gains in the coming decade. Hamas (the Palestinian Islamist faction) won the 2006 legislative elections; Hezbollah has increased its influence in Lebanon’s politics, winning every constituency in which it fielded candidates during Lebanon’s 2009 elections; and the Turkish AKP has successfully won the past three Turkish elections (CFR [A], 2009; CFR [B], 2009; Tristam, date unknown). This increased willingness by Islamist parties to use the democratic route to gain influence has left many commentators baffled, with some on the right utilizing this to argue and assert that Huntington’s ‘clash of civilizations’ thesis is indeed correct (cited in Esposito, Kramer, Fuller, & Pipes, 1999; Singh, 2011; Shephard, 2011). Amos Gilad (head of Israel’s Defence Ministry’s diplomatic-security bureau) is but one of many high ranking Western officials subscribing to the foregoing thesis (Shephard, 2011). When commenting on the consequences of a possible toppling of Syria’s Bashir Assad, he asserted that this would be devastating to Israel as it would lead to the formation of an Islamic empire in the middle east led by the Muslim Brotherhoods of Egypt, Syria, and Jordan which would be bent on Israel’s destruction, a statement that, though methodologically flawed, would make Huntington smile in his grave (Cited in Shephard, 2011). Hence this paper’s focus is on Islamist parties and the nuances between them, so as to debunk this thesis and promote tolerance and mutual respect. Another one of the key rationales for one undertaking this task, is as most writings on this topic do not carry out a cost/benefit analysis of Islamist parties, but as mentioned above and will be mentioned many times more, merely have a static, Eurocentric view of these parties (Esposito et al, 1999; Bayat, 2005). Lastly one’s reasoning behind this paper is to illustrate that many Islamist parties have evolved tremendously, and by allowing them to operate, the citizens of these states will derive benefit, and we will further deradicalize them as their oppositional rhetoric, which is aimed at appealing to the masses, will have to be toned down and pragmatism will prevail (Esposito et al, 1999; Cassel, 2009). Before proceeding it needs to be noted that this paper distinguishes between Islamist parties
such as Hamas and Hezbollah, and terrorist organizations such as Al Qaida and the Egyptian Islamic Jihad (Esposito et al, 1999; Rubin, 2007).

2. Methodology

This paper aims to utilize a qualitative, case study approach to realize the above objectives. Two cases will only be utilized (Hezbollah and the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood), and compared on various dimensions which will be elaborated upon in the framework section. The use of this method better equips one to elucidate the various differences between the parties analyzed (George & Bennett, 2005; Shively, 2005). Moreover this method better enables one to illustrate the role context plays in informing the evolution of these parties (George & Bennett, 2005). This approach does have some disadvantages in that the reliability of one’s findings might be inhibited as, firstly, less cases are being analyzed (Shively, 2005). Secondly, one may be accused of sampling bias as a multitude of cases will be omitted due to space and time constraints (George & Bennett, 2005). However this method will increase the validity of one’s conclusions as the analysis will be deeper (Shively, 2005). Moreover one’s distinction between terrorist Islamist organizations and Islamist parties will serve to inhibit the charge of selection bias (Rubin, 2007). In addition the reasons one will provide in defence of one’s selected cases will further redeem/protect one from this charge (George & Bennett, 2005).

2.1. Cases selected

2.1.1. The Muslim Brotherhood

The Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood was the first modern Islamist party to be formed (Spears, 2002; Rubin, 2007). Founded in 1928 by an elementary school teacher, Hassan Al Banna, it is still today seen as one of the leaders of Islamist parties worldwide (Robbins, 2009; Rubin, 2007; Spears, 2002). The Muslim Brotherhood is a vast organization whose membership is diverse in nature, with factory workers, medical professionals, and clergyman all claiming allegiance to the party (Bajoria, 2011; Fleishman, 2011). In the words of Shadi Hamid (an
expert at the Brookings Institute), it is the “mother of all Islamist movements (cited in Bajoria, 2011).” It has been selected as, firstly the policies adopted by it influence most Islamist parties worldwide (Rubin, 2007; Robbins, 2009). It was one of the first Islamist parties to renounce violence, the first to promote democracy, and through its appointment of a Coptic Christian (DR Rafik Habib) as a vice president of the newly formed Freedom and Justice party, is the first to have a non Muslim in a senior leadership position within the party. Thus contemporary Islamist parties’ acceptance of democracy and their willingness to participate in the democratic process can be attributed to the Brotherhood’s advocacy of it (Bajoria, 2011; Sabry, 2011). Secondly it has spawned over 70 different Islamist parties including many sister parties, key amongst them are the Islamic Action Front (IAF) in Jordan and Hamas in Palestine, and these organizations (the IAF in particular) though viewing the Egyptian branch as being the leader, operate vastly different from it owing to context, thus assisting debunk the ‘clash of civilizations’ notion mentioned above (Robbins, 2009). Lastly the recent uprising in Egypt, which deposed former president Hosni Mubarak, and the party’s strong showing in the first round of Egypt’s 2011/12 staggered parliamentary elections means that it will play an important role in informing the policies and actions of the most populous Arab state (Hamid [A], 2011; Al-Masry Al-Youm, 2011; Tadros, 2011). Before proceeding, it needs to be noted that events occurring post the aforementioned first round of elections (run-offs held on the fifth and sixth December 2011) will not be examined in this paper. This is as the current situation is extremely fluid, and incorporating these would inhibit the coherency and reliability of this paper.

2.1.2. Hezbollah

Formed in 1982 as a result of Israel’s occupation of southern Lebanon, Hezbollah’s influence has grown drastically over the past 29 years, and in January last year (2011) it was even able to force the resignation of Lebanon’s now former prime minister Saa’ad Hariri (Cassel, 2009; Dharapak, 2011). Hezbollah’s increasing appeal is mainly a result of its ability to provide various social services to the Lebanese Shiite community (which comprise over 40 percent of Lebanon’s population), and the protection it affords to them through its powerful military wing (Cambanis, 2010; CFR [B], 2009). It should be noted that Hezbollah has managed to achieve its main objective which was to end Israeli occupation of Lebanon, even managing to repulse the Israeli Defence Force’s 2006 incursion in retaliation for Hezbollah’s rocket fire at
Israeli military targets, an outcome which has served to further entrench it into Lebanese society (CFR [B], 2009; Cassel, 2009). Hezbollah has been chosen as it is one of a minority of Shiite Islamist parties which are in existence, thus increasing the validity of this paper’s conclusions (CFR [B], 2009). Secondly it has been selected as it best elucidates the various interpretations of Islam, thus assisting debunk the notion that a clash of civilizations is ensuing by illustrating that Islam is not one single, undifferentiated doctrine. Many would argue that one should have rather chosen Iran as it is a more all-encompassing and apt case in light of the Shiite and Islamic nature of its political system post the 1979 Iranian revolution. However one has decided against this as, by virtue of being an Islamic Republic, Iranian conditions are an exception to the environment wherein the Majority of Islamist parties operate (Barzegar, 2008). Moreover the approval that is required by the council of guardians for candidates to run, severely limits parties options, and many are forced to adopt Islamist values so as to be allowed to run, thus the validity of one’s findings will be inhibited were Iranian parties to be utilized (Barzegar, 2008). Lastly before proceeding, it needs to be noted that just as in the foregoing case, events occurring after the tenth December 2011 will not be examined.

3. Literature review

Islamist parties are defined by their reinterpretation and re-appropriation of Islam for political and social purposes (Esposito et al, 1999; Bayat, 2005; Burgat & Dowell, 1993; Roy, 1994). Fuller echoes this when he asserts that Islamism and Islamist parties seek “to draw meaning out of Islam applicable to problems of contemporary governance, society, and politics (Esposito et al, 1999). Most theorists argue that they are anti modern and adopt reactionary policies (Burgat & Dowell, 1993; Esposito et al, 1999; Roy, 1994). They are mainly viewed as being undemocratic, anti-democratic, violent parties who seek the overthrow of the current system and the replacement of it with a discriminatory Islamic one (Pipes, 2002; Burgat & Dowell, 1993; Roy, 1994). Many also argue that Islamist parties seek to re-entrench women’s inequality as a result of their narrow reading of religious texts, and use this as a justification to withhold support from them (cited in Coleman, 2008). Pipes aptly sums this up when he argues that Islamist parties are power hungry reactionaries, who are utilizing modern
processes for their own undemocratic goals, and thus need to be totally opposed at all costs (Esposito et al, 1999). Before proceeding it needs to be noted that the above was a brief discussion of how most mainstream theorists define and view Islamist parties.

This is problematic, and has been critiqued on many fronts (Bayat, 2005; Esposito et al, 1999). Bayat asserts that most theorists are often too busy analyzing the speeches rendered by the leaders of Islamist parties and the symbols they (Islamist parties appropriate), and thus their analyses on Islamist parties and the factors that inform their increasing appeal are unreliable and incorrect (Bayat, 2005) Esposito’s anecdote that many in the Jama’at-I Islami complain that they are often judged by a statement Moulana Mawdudi made 30 years before clearly illustrates the above (Esposito et al, 1999). Moreover Esposito’s argument illustrates another point about mainstream views on Islamist parties, the notion that they are all homogenous and static entities (Bayat, 2005). This is problematic, and is one of the main reasons this paper is being written. Bayat’s conclusion that the weakness of the Islamic movement was one of the key reasons for the success of the Iranian revolution, whilst the strength of the Islamist movement in Egypt is one of the key reasons why this revolution has not occurred in Egypt is insightful in this regard as it clearly illustrates the role context plays in shaping Islamist parties, and more importantly in illustrating the role of people’s agency within these parties (Bayat, 2005). Thus he brilliantly asserts that in order for us to study the impact of Islamic education in schools as fostering adherence to Islamist goals, not only do we need to analyze the text books in use, but the class room environment, and how these books are thought of and interpreted by students need to also be analyzed (Bayat, 2005).

Before proceeding it needs to be noted that most members in leadership positions within Islamist Parties are professionals (Burgat & Dowell, 1993; Roy, 1994; Ayubi, 1991). Abdesalam Yassine, Rached Ghanouchi, Khaled Mishal, and Mahmoud Zahar all hold professional degrees (Burgat & Dowell, 1993; Roy, 1994). Pipes echoes this when he argues that a disproportionate number of Islamists have university degrees (Pipes, 2002). Issam Al-Erian (spokesman for the Muslim Brotherhood) best illustrates this, not only is he a representative for the Brotherhood, he is also an Imaam at his local Musjid, and a dedicated physician (Black, 2011). As he puts it, whilst still remaining a spokesman for the Muslim Brotherhood “I go to the lab every night to look through microscopes (cited in Black, 2011).
Lastly it needs to be noted that Islamist parties are usually opposed to the clerical establishment (Burgat & Dowell, 1993; Roy, 1994). This opposition is mainly a result of the clerical establishment’s perceived co-optation by the states wherein these parties operate, the example being Al-Azhar’s close relationship with the now defunct Egyptian regime of Hosni Mubarak (Burgat & Dowell, 1993; Roy, 1994). Thus it is not surprising to note that whilst Islamist parties have youth and women’s wings, none have clerical wings (Roy, 1994).

4. Theoretical framework

Thus in order to better analyze and understand Islamist parties, and the merits of conversing with them this paper will utilize a social democratic/Rawlsian framework as a yardstick. One has contemplated utilizing a human rights framework embodied in the two UN sponsored covenants on civil and political rights, and on economic, social and cultural rights. However because there still remains conflicting views on which covenant more emphasis should be placed upon, it was decided that the use of a more widely accepted framework would better suit this paper’s objectives(Berman, 2005). Moreover the widely accepted and acknowledged fact that social democracy embodies both covenants (as will be observed), has further contributed to one’s decision (Berman, 2005; Callaghan & Favretto, 2006; Broadbent, 1999).

Social democracy has two key tenets which are best articulated by the political philosopher John Rawls (Rawls, 1971; Roberts & Sutch, 2004). The first one reads as follows: “each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty compatible with a similar liberty for others”; and the second is that: “Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) reasonably expected to be to everyone's advantage, and (b) attached to positions and offices open to all (Rawls, 1971:275). In other words social democrats believe in the primacy of politics and the necessity to use it to realize a more equitable distribution of resources (Berman, 2005; Broadbent, 1999). Hence to elucidate and operationalize the above framework, the two cases will be judged on their

- Promotion of and tolerance for democracy;
- Promotion of women’s rights;
• The activities which concern social welfare and redistribution carried out by them;
• The religious tolerance encouraged and allowed by them; and
• Whether or not and to what extent they are complicit in terrorist acts.

It needs to be noted that this paper aims to assess the rhetoric as well as the actions of these parties, and the extent the above actions are promoted or discouraged by them. Moreover this paper seeks to illustrate the evolutionary nature of these parties and is of the view that integration as opposed to isolation of them by the international system is the most optimal method of reforming them further.
Chapter one will provide a backdrop, by analyzing the various factors that have resulted in Islamist parties’ appeal and ability to operate increasing in contemporary times. The role of Islamic ideology; the advances in technology; funding by outside powers; the lack or absence of democracy in most states which are constituted by a Muslim majority; and the influence of poverty will be touched upon in this chapter. Concerning poverty it needs to be noted that conflicting views exist regarding its influence on people’s support for Islamist parties (Pipes, 2002; Esposito et al, 1999). Many argue that it provides one of the main reasons as to why people support Islamist Parties, with some even going as far as arguing that the coalition forces, rather than dropping bombs over Afghanistan, should have dropped food packages (cited in Pipes, 2002). Pipes on the other hand differs, and argues that in fact wealth is the main reason people support Islamist parties, the classic Marxian notion that men are not able to make history on an empty stomach (Pipes, 2002; Esposito et al, 1999). Funding by outside powers; Islamic ideology; the lack of democracy; and the advances in technology are unanimously agreed as being reasons as to why Islamist parties are so popular in contemporary times (Barsky, 1996; Black, 1993; Bayat, 2005). Democracy or the lack thereof acts as a draw card to increase Islamist parties’ support base; technology enables Islamist parties to circumvent state control; Islamic ideology provides a justification and method of action; and outside powers provide the funding to allow Islamist parties to operate (Freedom House 2009; Barsky, 1996; Gasper, 2001). The above social democratic/ Rawlsian framework will also be discussed and further elaborated upon in this chapter.

Chapters two and three will assess the aforementioned cases using the above discussed theoretical framework. Chapter two aspires to discuss and analyze the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood. The factors that will be analyzed include:

- Its renunciation of violence and the consequent criticisms levelled against it by Al Qaida.
- Its promotion of democracy, and the internal democracy practised by it.
- The newly formed Freedom and Justice party, which is currently participating in Egyptian politics, and is comprised of many of the Brotherhood’s senior members.
- Its contradictory stands toward women’s equality.
- Whether or not the political order it seeks is discriminatory toward Egypt’s 10 million Coptic Christians.

Chapter three will endeavour to examine the Shiite Hezbollah party. Aspects to be touched upon include:

- The complex nature of Lebanon’s political system wherein no one group can totally dominate.
- Hezbollah’s liberal stance toward women’s rights.
- The 2008 retaliation by Hezbollah in response to the proposed shut down of its communications network.
- The assassination of former Lebanese Prime minister (Rafeq Hariri) allegedly by the party, and their (Hezbollah’s) continued attempts to disrupt the tribunal investigating his death.
- The Party’s surprising stance that Lebanon be governed by secular laws.
- The various social services that it provides. It needs to be noted the Hezbollah even goes as far as helping raise the children of its slain fighters, and finding partners for their widows (Cambanis, 2010).

Chapter four will then compare and contrast these parties and the policies they promote, so as to ascertain whether or not they should be allowed into international negotiations, and which of them are more suitable to this environment. This chapter, by making salient the differences in approaches by the two parties, also seeks to illustrate the role context plays in informing the positions adopted by Islamist parties.

The final chapter (chapter five) is a conclusion which will tie up the various threads of this paper, and elaborate on the future of Islamist parties. The challenges they may encounter will also be examined.
Chapter 1: Background & Framework Elaboration

1. Introduction

“MEQ: What causes Islamism to flourish?

Fuller: Many things, but especially bad social and economic conditions, incompetence and corruption of regimes, authoritarianism, close affiliation with Western power (Esposito et al, 1999).”

As can be observed from above, many factors have contributed to the rise and increasing popularity of Islamist parties, hence this background chapter aims to examine these whilst also elaborating on the framework which will be used to compare the Muslim Brotherhood and Hezbollah. The first part aims to tease out some of the differences between Islamist parties and terrorist organizations such as Al Qaida. It achieves this by firstly defining Islamism, and illustrating how this notion/concept informs the structure of Islamist parties. Secondly it touches on the varying nature of Islamist parties, and utilizes the example of the application of hudud (the amputation of limbs as punishment for crimes which include stealing) to illustrate that these parties are continuously evolving, and are shaped by their respective environments (Rubin, 2007). This then leads it to tease out the main differences between Islamist parties and terrorist organizations. Statements by Qaradawi (Muslim Brotherhood ideologue) and Zarqawi (former Al Qaida deputy) concerning the utility and necessity of elections are examined in this section so as to make salient some of these differences.

The second part aspires to tease out some of the main factors that have contributed to the rise of Islamist parties. It accomplishes this by firstly analyzing the role that poverty plays and historically has played in accounting for the rise of these parties. Conflicting views exist regarding this, with some arguing that poverty plays a critical role in influencing people’s views on Islamist parties, and others arguing that the opposite is true (Pipes, 2002; Esposito et al, 1999). Secondly, it discusses the role that Islam, being an all encompassing system,
plays in enabling the growth of Islamist parties. This leads to a discussion around the role outside powers have played in encouraging and enabling the growth of Islamist parties. As political conflict theorists argue, without resources, nothing is possible (Skocpol, 1979). Lastly this part discusses the role that technology has played in enabling the formation of Islamist parties, and allowing them to operate. The lack of democracy and rampant corruption prevalent in the states wherein most Islamist parties operate is also analyzed in this section.

The last part then endeavours to elaborate on the framework that this paper is utilizing. It achieves this by firstly defining the concept of social democracy, and illustrating how it differs from Marxism and Liberalism. Secondly the two principles conceptualized by the political philosopher John Rawls are expanded upon. It needs to be noted that in order for social democracy to be realized, these principles need to be emulated (Roberts & Sutch, 2004). Lastly it discusses the criteria being used by this paper to assess the Muslim Brotherhood and Hezbollah, illustrating how these tie into social democracy.

Running through this chapter is the argument that Islamist parties are vastly different from terrorist organizations; and that a combination of factors are responsible for their rapid rise and increased operability in contemporary times.

2. Islamist Parties vs. Al Qaida

Before analyzing the factors which have contributed to the increasing popularity of Islamist parties in contemporary times, and enabled them (Islamist parties) to operate, the differences between them and terrorist organizations such as Al Qaida need to be teased out so as to remove the existing ambiguities prevalent in the literature (Esposito et al, 1999; Rubin, 2007). Islamist parties, as mentioned above (proposal chapter), reinterpret and re-appropriate Islam for political and social purposes (Esposito et al, 1999; Bayat, 2005; Burgat & Dowell, 1993; Roy, 1994). Hence many argue that Islamist parties are parties which instrumentalize Islam (Rubin, 2007).

They (Islamist parties) come in many different forms and adopt vastly different postures, some are attempting to extend the Shari’a (Islamic law), whilst others argue that Islam should
not merely be reduced to the Shari’a, and are hence attempting to ascertain the scope and relevance of it (Rubin, 2007; Esposito et al, 1999). Fuller echoes this when he touches upon the fact that the application of hudud is being widely debated amongst Islamists, and in most cases is not applied even in Islamist countries such as modern day Iran (Esposito et al, 1999). The Turkish Justice and Development party (AKP) is insightful in this regard (Tristam, Date Unknown; AlJazeera Centre for Studies, 2010). It styles itself as a conservative party akin to Europe’s Christian democrats, and makes no mention about Shari’a, or about it being an Islamist party, but is rather more interested in increasing people’s liberty in the ultra secular Turkish republic (Tristam, Date Unknown; AlJazeera Centre for Studies, 2010). Islamist parties also differ in the extent of their legalization/ability to operate in countries, i.e. the Islamic Action Front in Jordan (this party is an offshoot of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood) has been legalized and thus has freedom to campaign, whilst its sister or should one say brother party in Syria is strictly outlawed and mere membership in it is punishable by death (Rubin, 2007).

Before proceeding, it needs to be noted that Islamist parties differ from Al Qaida in many respects. Firstly unlike Al Qaida, Islamist parties are nationalist organizations (Rubin, 2007). In other words, Whilst Al Qaida seeks international domination; Islamist parties merely seek control of their home countries (Rubin, 2007). Secondly as opposed to Al Qaida, Islamist parties are tactical in that they usually are willing to enter into partnerships with non-Islamist parties were these to assist them in achieving their goals (Rubin, 2007). The Jordanian Islamic Action Front’s partnership with Christian parties, and Hezbollah’s current partnership with Michel Aoun’s Free Patriotic Movement are just but a few examples of this (cited in Robbins, 2009; Cole, 2011). Thirdly Islamist parties are increasingly promoting and participating in the democratic process, which al Qaida condemns as elevating man’s will above God’s (Rubin, 2007). A comparison of Qaradawi (Muslim Brotherhood ideologue) and Zarqawi’s (former Al Qaida deputy) 2005 statements concerning the 2005 Iraqi and Egyptian elections best illustrate this. Zarqawi vowed to kill any person participating in the election, whilst Qaradawi encouraged people to participate in it saying that had the election been free and fair, the Brotherhood would have won (cited in Rubin, 2007). Lastly it is important to note that Islamist parties see Al Qaida as more of a competitor as its existence is a drain on their resources (Rubin, 2007).
3. Factors behind the rise of Islamist parties

3.1. Poverty

Now that one is familiar with what Islamist parties are, and how they differ from terrorist organizations such as Al Qaida, can one proceed to examine the reasons behind their increasing popularity and operability despite the various obstacles they face. Most commentators argue that poverty holds one of the keys in explaining this (Esposito et al, 1999; Robbins, 2009). This is echoed by Hooshang Amirahmadi when she asserts that, “the roots of Islamic radicalism must be looked for outside the religion, in the real world of cultural despair, economic decline, political oppression, and spiritual turmoil in which most Muslims find themselves today (cited in pipes, 2002)”. Others who subscribe to this view include former US president Bill Clinton who has argued that prosperity is the most effective way of rooting out Islamism, and Shimon Peres, who asserted that “fundamentalism’s bases is poverty (Pipes, 2002).” The foregoing has led some to go as far as arguing that the coalition forces should have, rather than bombs, dropped food packages over Afghanistan (cited in Pipes, 2002). Statistically this reason does seem very plausible. Egypt, the country wherein the Muslim Brotherhood operates has a per capita GDP of around 6000 dollars and a ranking of 133 in terms of countries with the highest GDP per capita; Jordan has a GDP per capita of 5300 dollars, with a ranking of 137; and Afghanistan a meagre 800 dollars and is ranked 219th (The CIA World Fact Book, 2009).

Pipes, on the other hand, sees it differently (Pipes, 2002; Esposito et al, 1999). He argues that in reality states experiencing growth are more likely to witness a strengthening of Islamist parties, and cites the oil boom of the 1970s and the subsequent increase in the popularity of Islamist parties to back up his argument (Pipes, 2002). In addition he utilizes the example of 1990s Iraq under Saddam (who’s GDP had shrunk to less than 10% of 1980 levels), and Bangladesh to illustrate that poorer countries, contrary to mainstream belief, have not become hotbeds for Islamists (Pipes, 2002). Moreover he cites the statistic that a disproportionate number of suicide bombers and Islamist party leaders are university graduates from middle
class backgrounds, to argue that Islamism mainly appeals to the well off, what Cramer calls counter-elitists (Pipes, 2002).

However Fuller counters this by arguing that the increased popularity of Islamist parties did not necessarily begin in the 1970s for the very same reason that Pipes gives, namely, economic growth; and by arguing that the only reason Iraq has not been a hotbed of Islamists was as Saddam’s repression forced them out (Esposito et al, 1999). This can clearly be observed when one surveys the growth of Islamist parties in post-Saddam Iraq (Rubin, 2007). In addition one would argue that one of the foremost reasons that Islamist parties’ leaders and many suicide bombers are university graduates, are as a result of what Lupsha calls moral/righteous indignation (Lupsha, 1971). These people, Lupsha would argue, act out of a sense of resentment of the current status of the poor, and as nothing is being done to alleviate their (the poor’s) suffering (Lupsha, 1971). To sum up, the leaders of Islamist parties are more well-off, economically, and educationally; however, the main reason for their tremendous appeal and rise has more to do with the sad economic conditions that many people find themselves in.

3.2. Islam as a political ideology

Many commentators justifiably argue that we should not omit the nature of Islam in explaining part of the reason behind the rise of Islamist parties (Black, 1993; Rubin, 2007; Esposito et al, 1999). As Black correctly asserts, Islam is fundamentally different from Christendom in its understanding of the religious community, and religious law (Black, 1993). Whilst Christendom was mainly aimed as an ecclesia (gathering) of believers who sought salvation, Islam was a political system which sought to direct the Ummah’s (initial Islamic community) life in totality (Black, 1993). Moreover, whilst Christendom preaches a loosely defined law, Islamic law embodied in the Shari’a is all encompassing, and governs many aspects from how a person takes a bath to how he washes his clothes (Black, 1993). It is argued that the above had clear differences as to how the two communities evolved, whilst Christendom very easily adapted to the separation of power between the state and church (it was relatively easy for this to occur as the bible did not spawn any political laws), Islam could not adapt to this separation, as Islam is political as well as religious (Black, 1993).
This feeds into the rise of Islamist parties in the following way: after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire (which practised a form of caliphate rule, which though not endorsed by many, was nevertheless Islamic, with no separation between church and state), a vacuum was created as Islam was no longer used as a criteria in making political decisions (Isseroff, 2008). This space was subsequently filled by Islamist parties who intended to reassert Islamic law as a method of rule (Isseroff, 2008). This is clearly discernible when one notes that the first modern Islamist party (the Muslim brotherhood) was only formed in 1928; post the collapse of the Ottoman Empire (Spears, 2002). Moreover it is argued that the 1979 Iranian revolution and the resultant establishment of an Islamic state has reinvigorated Islamist ideology, in that it has illustrated that the creation of a state based on Islamic principles is still possible (Isseroff, 2008). It needs to be noted that this is one of the reasons which accounts for the rapid growth of Islamist parties during the 1980s and 1990s post the aforementioned revolution (Isseroff, 2008).

3.3. Role of Outside Powers

We should not under estimate the role that foreign actors play and have played in the creation and establishment of Islamist parties (Gasper, 2001; Levitt & Jacobson, 2008). As political conflict theorists argue, no matter the level of discontent, without resources, parties opposed to the current order will not arise (Skocpol, 1979). Concerning Islamist parties, this factor is extremely salient when explaining their rise. It is widely known that in step with its ambition to act as the protector of Islam, Iran has sponsored many an Islamist party (Levitt & Jacobson, 2008). In contemporary times it funds Hezbollah and Hamas (to the tune of over 200 million dollars per annum according to some estimates); provides them with weapons and training; and even went as far as sending over 1500 members of its revolutionary guard core to the Bekker Valley in Lebanon to train and assist Hezbollah fighters during the 1980s when it (Hezbollah) was heavily involved in the Lebanese civil war (Takeyh, 2007; Levitt & Jacobson, 2008). Moreover even the US (a state which in contemporary times vehemently opposes any organization with Islamic leanings) assisted Islamists as proxy fighters during the cold war (Gasper, 2001). During the so called Afghan jihad, the US sponsored the Mujahidin with over 6 billion dollars in military equipment, which included anti-aircraft
missiles, tanks, and even satellite assistance (Gasper, 2001). It even went as far as establishing Madressa’s (Islamic learning institutions) to train these mujahidin, called ‘freedom fighters’ by the Reagan administration (Gasper, 2001). We can all attest as to how these weapons and training have been used post the Soviet withdrawal in 1989 (Gasper, 2001). The above clearly illustrates that without outside funding, the ability for Islamist parties to form, operate, and reproduce themselves would have been seriously inhibited.

3.4. Technology & the lack of Democracy

Most commentators argue that the advance in technology played a key role in promoting and enabling the rise of Islamist parties (Barsky, 1996; Al-Rasheed, 2002). as is glaringly apparent, the countries in the world with a majority Muslim population are not the most democratic, and are usually governed by dictators, who deny their citizens most civil and political rights, including the right to assemble and the right to vote amongst others (Esposito et al, 1999). This is clearly observable in the Freedom House democracy index which scores countries with a predominantly Muslim population quite low i.e. in their 2009 index Egypt has a score of 6, Sudan 7, Yemen 5, and Syria 7 (it should be noted that these scores range from 1 to 7 with 1 being democratic, and 7 being totally undemocratic) (Freedom House democracy index, 2009). Moreover these states’ governments have used all means to repress opposition groups, the most brutal of these incidents occurred when the Syrian government gassed over 20 thousand Brotherhood members in the city of Hama in 1982 (Barsky, 1996).

The foregoing meant that opposition parties (including Islamist parties) were not able to mobilize at all, however the advent of the fax machine, internet, and cell phones have altered this drastically and the governments of these countries are no longer able to control communication between and amongst opposition groups (Barsky, 1996). Islamist parties have very quickly latched onto these, during the first Intifada, communiqués were jointly drawn up by Hamas members in Gaza, and were then faxed to Ahmed bin Yusuf (a Hamas ideologue then living in Virginia) for approval, who then faxed them back to Gaza for release and distribution (Barsky, 1996). Another example is that of the Saudi dissident Muhammad Al-Masari, after being jailed for opposing the monarch, he settled in London, and by utilizing the internet, was able to publish a monthly news letter called Huquq, which sort to expose
government scandals (Al-Rasheed, 2002). The above are just some of the many examples of how technology has been used by Islamist parties, and how it is enabled them to circumvent government controls.

Lastly before proceeding, it needs to be noted that coupled with the lack of democracy in most of the states wherein Islamist parties operate, is an abundance of corruption (Esposito et al, 1999; Robbins, 2009). Thus it is argued that Islamist Parties’ vehement opposition to corruption, combined with their promotion of democracy, are two of the main factors accounting for their rise (Esposito et al, 1999; Robbins, 2009). Concerning this it is enlightening to note that this has been empirically proven (Robbins, 2009). Using public opinion data, Lahloh has established that behind its opposition to the peace process, Hamas’s strong stance against corruption was the most important factor accounting for the party’s 2006 Palestinian legislative election victory (cited in Robbins, 2009).

4. Framework (Social Democratic-Rawlsian)

Now that one is acquainted with what Islamist parties are, how they differ from terrorist organizations such as Al Qaida, and what assisted in their rise, can one elaborate on the theoretical framework being used in this essay. As mentioned above (proposal chapter), this essay is utilizing a social democratic-Rawlsian framework to analyze and assess Hezbollah and the Muslim Brotherhood. One has contemplated utilizing a human rights framework embodied in the two UN sponsored covenants on civil and political rights, and on economic, social and cultural rights. However because there still remains conflicting views on which covenant more emphasis should be placed upon, one decided to rather use a more widely accepted framework (Berman, 2005). Moreover the widely accepted and acknowledged fact that social democracy embodies both covenants (as will be observed below), has further contributed to one’s decision (Berman, 2005; van der Linden, 2006; Broadbent, 1999).

Some scholars do seek to argue that social democracy is merely a halfway house between Marxism, and Liberalism (socialists who choose balance instead of bullets), and thus is not
very useful a concept (cited in Berman, 2005). However Berman argues that social democracy is an alternative political system that is not compatible with Marxism, or Liberalism (Berman, 2005). Social democracy, she argues, is a system which believes in the “primacy of politics and communitarianism (Berman, 2005: 4).” Broadbent echoes these claims, and extends it by asserting that the promotion and realization of a more substantive equality embodied in what he calls social rights, is what sets social democracies apart from the rest (Broadbent, 1999). Whereas Marxism and Liberalism are rooted in the belief in economic forces; in the case of Marxists, that the mode of production shapes life; and that the market is the most efficient system of distribution according to liberals; social democracy’s main tenet is that politics can be used to control economics and thus a greater level of equality can be realized (Berman, 2005). In other words that by controlling the market, its potential to accelerate growth can be maximized, whilst at the same time the dislocation and disproportional distribution caused by it minimized.

However for the above to be fully achieved and a more substantive form of social justice realized, the two principles of ‘justice as fairness’ conceptualized by John Rawls needs to be emulated (Rawls, 1971: 270; Roberts & Sutch, 2004). According to Rawls, substantive equality, what he calls social justice, is arrived at when “no arbitrary distinctions are made between persons by important political, social and economic institutions (cited in Roberts & Sutch, 2004: 186).” Rawls has conceptualized two principles which according to him, if applied, will allow for a just distribution of societies’ resources (Rawls, 1971). The first principle reads like this: “each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty compatible with a similar liberty for others”; and the second is that “Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) reasonably expected to be to everyone’s advantage, and (b) attached to positions and offices open to all (Rawls, 1971:275).” These principles will be elaborated upon below, as one first needs to understand how they were conceptualized.

Rawls argues that if all people were placed on an equal footing, then they would agree on certain principles to govern society which would seek the realization of equality, unless of course, inequalities would benefit the worst off (Rawls, 1971). Hence he conceived of the “veil of ignorance” (Rawls, 1971). This, he argues, is a hypothetical situation whereby people
enter as equals not knowing where in society they will fall (Rawls, 1971). This veil of ignorance should ensure that no principles are agreed on as a result of threat, or of what one could call tailoring (Rawls, 1971). For Rawls, people should not have a certain conception of the good, and not even take their natural talents into account (Rawls, 1971). He argues that if these conditions are fulfilled, people will arrive at the two principles mentioned above (Rawls, 1971).

Concerning the first principle, ‘liberty’, Rawls argues, that it refers to liberties such as the rights to vote and stand for public office, to hold private property, liberty of conscience, and freedom from arbitrary arrest etc (Rawls, 1971). Rawls further argues that trade-offs between principle one (liberty) and principle two (social equality) should not be made (Rawls, 1971). In other words he argues that this is not a utilitarian theory (Rawls, 1971).

Concerning principle two, what some call the difference principle (as it justifies inequalities), Rawls argues that there are primary goods such as liberties and income, etc. which people would want equal distribution of (Rawls, 1971). However if an unequal distribution would benefit the worst-off, then no person would object to this (Rawls, 1971). Rawls further argues that this principle is egalitarian in that it promotes equality (Rawls, 1971). He illustrates this by arguing that the difference principle has room for redress and that although people under this principle may not realize total equality of opportunity, natural and social inequalities would only be utilized justifiably if they would benefit the worst-off in society (Rawls, 1971). In addition this would engender a sense of fraternity in that the whole of society will reciprocally benefit from each other; whilst at the same time people would be rewarded for extra effort thus making the system acceptable to the best and the worst-off in society (Rawls, 1971).

As one can observe from the above, social democracy as embodied in the two principles conceptualized by Rawls, presents one of the most acceptable standards to judge the effectiveness and progressiveness of Islamist parties, and thus is the reason for one’s utilization of it. The Promotion of democracy and women’s rights; the provision of social services; non violence; and religious tolerance are all criteria subscribed to by social
democrats, and thus will be utilized to assess the efficacy and progressiveness of the Muslim Brotherhood and Hezbollah. However in order to further elaborate on how these fit into the social democratic lens and illustrate that they do conform to the views of social democrats, the next part of this paper will examine each separately. Before proceeding, it needs to be noted that by ‘views of social democrats’ this paper is referring to both: members of social democratic parties, and theorists such as Broadbent, Berman, and Rawls himself who write from a social democratic perspective.

4.1. Promotion of, and tolerance for, democracy

Social democrats believe in the primacy of politics, of which democracy constitutes an integral part (Berman, 2005). In fact some even go as far as arguing that, democracy is the main reason social democrats arose (Berman, 2005). It is argued that Eduard Bernstein’s (the father of social democracy) desire and belief that socialism need not be achieved by passive waiting, nor by violent revolution, but by democracy and political participation, sowed the seeds for social democracy to prosper (Berman, 2005).

Rawls affirms the importance of democracy, when he argues that trade-offs between liberty, which as mentioned above includes political participation, and welfare, should not be made, and that liberty can only be restricted for liberty, unless a less extensive liberty strengthens the total of shared liberty, or a less than equal liberty must be acceptable for those with the lesser liberty (Rawls, 1971).

4.2. Promotion of women’s rights

Social democrats espouse the promotion and realization of gender rights and equity (Pontusson, 2008; Stokes, 2006). They usually favour the use of quota systems in parliament; childcare subsidies so that women are able to seek employment; and solidaristic wage policies as a means to realize gender equity (Pontusson, 2008; Stokes, 2006). The statistic that women enjoy the most rights, and political representation in Nordic/Scandinavian states (women make up over 45 percent of Sweden’s parliament), clearly illustrates the emphasis
placed on gender issues by social democrats (Stokes, 2006). It needs to be noted that Nordic states were the first to elect social democratic parties (as early as 1932 Sweden’s social democratic SAP party won a Swedish election in coalition with a peasant party); and that these parties are credited with developing and refining the social democratic model (Berman, 2005; van der Linden, 2006).

4.3. The activities which concern social welfare and redistribution carried out by them

It is argued that this fits into the emphasis placed by social democrats on a more substantive form of equality and cross-class cooperation (Berman, 2005; Broadbent, 1999; Iversen, 2005). By substantive equality, one is mainly referring to the promotion and realization of “equality of opportunity” as opposed to the mere promotion of ‘formal equality’ which libertarians promote (Heywood, 2004). It should be noted that social democrats conceptualized the welfare state, which sought to redress inequalities through the provision of services such as free education, health insurance, and unemployment pensions etc (Iversen, 2005; Broadbent, 1999).

Rawls affirms his support for this by arguing that the difference principle provides room for redress, and that measures such as spending more on education for children from poor backgrounds should be undertaken, so as to reduce the “bias of contingencies in the direction of equality (Rawls, 1971:280).”

4.4. Religious tolerance encouraged and allowed by them

Historically social democrats were totally opposed to religion, as it was viewed as a cause of enmity between and amongst people (Knudson, 2010). However in contemporary times social democrats are altering their views on religion and culture per se (Knudson, 2010). As Knudson puts it, people need religion so as to find meaning in life (Knudson, 2010). However social democrats believe that religion should operate in the civil realm, and that all religions need to be respected, admired, and tolerated (Knudson, 2010). In the aforementioned words
of Rawls, social justice can only be achieved when, “no arbitrary distinctions are made between persons by important political, social and economic institutions (cited in Roberts & Sutch, 2004: 186).”

4.5. Whether or not and to what extent they are complicit in terrorist acts

Social democrats abhor all forms of violence (Berman, 2005). As was observed in the foregoing discussion, one of the main reasons informing their inception was the realization of socialism democratically and non-violently (Berman, 2005). Their dislike of violence, Berman argues, resulted in the left (communists and the Soviet Union) mainly viewing them as enemies, as it was argued that social democracy appeased the working class and minimized the chances for revolution (Berman, 2005). The above illustrates that let alone terrorism, social democrats are very unlikely to sanction violence even if it is used for redressive purposes.

Before proceeding, it needs to be noted that this paper aims to utilize the concept of terrorism in a very careful manner. This is in keeping with Lockman’s brilliant argument, that the terrorism label has in many cases been used as a smoke-screen to protect the establishments’ interests, and to enable them to repress and delegitimize struggles whose goals and grievances are reasonable (Lockman, 2004). Thus in his words, anti colonial organizations were characterized as terrorists by the British and French; Soviet sponsored groups were characterized as terrorists by the US; and Palestinian movements were labelled terrorists by the Israeli government, despite these groups legitimate and in some cases admirable goals (Lockman, 2004). Hence this paper will distinguish between armed resistance (resistance [pre-emptive and retaliatory] carried out against military targets), and terrorism (“the use or threat of violence directed primarily against civilians in order to achieve some political aim) (Lockman, 2004: 225).”
5. Conclusion

In conclusion this chapter has discussed and examined the framework which will be used in the proceeding chapters, to compare Hezbollah and the Muslim Brotherhood. The first part provided a brief definition of Islamist parties, distinguishing them from terrorist organizations such as Al-Qaida. This was realized by elaborating on how Islamist parties reinterpret and reappropriate Islam for political purposes, and how their goals and tactics are vastly different from those subscribed to by terrorist organizations. The second part then critically analyzed the factors that have contributed to the increased popularity and operability of Islamist parties. This was achieved by touching on the roles poverty, Islamic ideology, outside powers, technology, and the lack of democracy have played in increasing the popularity of these parties and enabling them to operate. The last part then elaborated upon the framework that the Muslim Brotherhood and Hezbollah are to be assessed on. This was accomplished by defining social democracy as espoused by John Rawls, and illustrating how the five questions to be used fit into the theory. The above discussion has led this chapter to conclude:

- Islamist parties are parties which instrumentalize Islam (Rubin, 2007). They come in different forms and adopt vastly different postures (Esposito et al, 1999; Rubin, 2007). They differ from terrorist organizations such as Al Qaida in that they are nationalistic, tactical, and willingly participate in the democratic process (Rubin, 2007).

- Poverty, Islamic ideology, technology, the lack of democracy, and sponsorship from outside powers, are some of the main factors which have contributed to their rise (Barsky, 1996; Esposito et al, 1999; Pipes, 2002; Black, 1993). Poverty and lack of democracy have contributed to their appeal, whilst sponsorship from outside powers, the advance in technology, and Islamic ideology have enabled them to operate in spite of the many obstacles they face (Esposito et al, 1999; Pipes, 2002; Black, 1993).

- Lastly, the promotion of democracy, religious freedom, and women’s rights; and the provision of social services and non violence (condemnation of terrorism in this instance) tie in to the main principles and practices of social democracy, and thus are being utilized by this paper as criteria to assess the efficacy and progressiveness of the Muslim Brotherhood and Hezbollah (Berman, 2005; Broadbent, 1999; Rawls, 1971).
Chapter 2: The Muslim Brotherhood

1. Introduction

“The downstairs entrance is littered with rubbish, and the stairwell is dark and cramped. Only the opulence of the second-floor door – a broad, ornate colossus of a door – offers any clue as to what lies inside this unprepossessing apartment block in an unfashionable corner of Cairo's Roda Island. Behind the door is the headquarters of the Muslim Brotherhood, the movement that – depending on who you believe – is about to either give Egypt the Taliban treatment or help steer the country through transition to a pluralist democracy (Shenker & Whitaker, 2011).”

As can be inferred from the above quote, the Muslim Brotherhood will play an important role in shaping the policies of the most populous Arab state, Hence this chapter aims to assess and critically analyze it. The first part aims to briefly elaborate on the history of the party. This is accomplished by firstly touching on the two main objectives which informed its creation. It needs to be noted that Britain still controlled Egypt during the period when it was formed (Aly & Wenner, 1982). Secondly the party’s use of violent methods to oppose the creation of Israel and to lobby for the implementation of Shari’a Law is discussed. Even in contemporary times it still prefers a one state solution to the Palestine/Israel conflict (Cobban, 2011). Lastly the party’s participation in the democratic process post the 1980s and its increasing popularity in contemporary times is discussed.

The second part aspires to analyze the party’s position on democracy. It achieves this by firstly discussing its pro democratic rhetoric. Some in the organization have even gone as far as implying that voting in an election is analogous to testifying in a court of law (Rutherford, 2006). Secondly its impeccable democratic credentials are examined. Thirdly an assessment of the internal structures of the party is undertaken, so as to shed light on the democratic and transparent nature of these. Fourthly this section discusses the party’s actions during, and post
the 2011 overthrow of Mubarak, and how they illustrate that democracy, not power, is its main objective. It needs to be noted that the Brotherhood mandated the secular liberal, Mohammed ElBaradei, to negotiate on its behalf during the protests that ousted Mubarak, and has stated that it will not field a presidential candidate during Egypt’s 2012 presidential election (Lynch.M, 2011; Shenker & Whitaker, 2011). Lastly this part discusses the type of democracy it envisages. Aspects such as the party’s call for an independent judiciary and its position that the state conform to the principles of Shari’a are elaborated upon.

The third part then endeavours to examine its position on women’s rights. This is realized by firstly touching on the party’s ambiguous rhetoric toward women’s rights. Secondly its internal promotion of and adherence to women’s rights are discussed. It should be noted that the party nominated two candidates for Egypt’s 2005 elections, a number which it argues would have been a lot more were the Egyptian security apparatus not so brutal toward opponents (Rutherford, 2006). Thirdly it elaborates on the internal rebellion within the party which is mainly concerned with women’s rights. Lastly it touches upon the rights afforded to women in contemporary Egypt as a juxtaposition to the Brotherhood’s position on women. It needs to be noted that Egyptian women under Mubarak’s rule weren’t able to form their own independent organizations, and were seen as “permanent wards of the state” (Hatem, 1994:666).

The forth part then aims to elaborate on the various social services that the Brotherhood is involved in the provision of. This is achieved by firstly touching on the drastic conditions faced by ordinary Egyptians. It should be noted that in 2009, 20 percent of Egyptians were characterized as suffering from poverty, a number that has increased as a result of the 2011 Egyptian revolution’s impact on tourism and investments amongst others (Kandeel, 2011; Awad, 2011; El-Din, 2011). Secondly the Brotherhood’s position on economic redistribution is examined. This leads it to elaborate on the various services that the Brotherhood, and Brotherhood controlled syndicates provide to ease the suffering of ordinary Egyptians.

The fifth part then endeavours to analyze the Brotherhood’s position toward ‘non Muslims’ (Coptic Christians in the Egyptian context). It accomplishes this by firstly elaborating on the historically cordial relations between the Brotherhood and Coptic Christians. Secondly it examines the contradictory rhetoric emanating from the Brotherhood. This leads it to discuss the main criticisms of the Brotherhood’s position toward Coptic Christians. The party’s call for the implementation of Shari’a law, and its stance that a Coptic Christian cannot run for
presidency are examined in this section. Lastly it discusses the actions that the Brotherhood has taken to counter the above criticisms.

The last part then aspires to analyze the brotherhood’s stance on terrorism. This is realized by firstly elaborating on the party’s rhetoric which exudes a clear disinclination toward violence and terrorism. Secondly it analyzes the various actions that the Brotherhood has taken which illustrate its hatred toward violent acts. The 1997 Luxor temple attack is used as an example to illustrate that the Brotherhood is committed to non-violence in most instances. Lastly the argument that the Brotherhood assists in inhibiting the influence of al-Qaida is examined. It needs to be noted that al-Qaida have implicitly agreed with this perspective (Leikin & Brooks, 2007).

2. Brief History

Before analyzing the Muslim Brotherhood’s positions on democracy, violence, women and ‘non Muslim’ rights, and social services, one first needs to be familiar with some of the salient events in the history of this colossal organization, as a contextualization, and as a reference point for the proceeding discussions. Known in Arabic as the Jam’iyyat al-Ikhwan al-Muslimin or Ikhwan al-Muslimin, the Muslim Brotherhood was founded in 1928 by a 22 year old elementary school teacher Hasan al-Banna (Aly & Wenner, 1982; Shenker & Whitaker, 2011). It was founded for two main purposes, namely to oppose and fight the British presence in Egypt, and to Islamise Egyptian society (Shenker & Whitaker, 2011). For this to be realized, al-Banna begun holding evening classes, social clubs were formed, hospitals and industries were created, and a military wing was even developed (Bajoria, 2011; Aly & Wenner, 1982). The Brotherhood’s popularity grew tremendously, and by 1938 it had over 300 branches in Egypt (Shenker & Whitaker, 2011). This lead to Al-Banna being arrested in the early 1940s and the above mentioned military wing being formed (Shenker & Whitaker, 2011). The year 1948 saw the creation of Israel, a move which until contemporary times is opposed by the Brotherhood (Bajoria, 2011; Leikin & Brooks, 2007; Saleh, 2011). The Brotherhood sought to mobilize people to fight during the 1948 Israeli war, and carried out bombings within Egypt, which led to many being arrested by Egyptian authorities and the organization being banned (Shenker & Whitaker, 2011). In late 1948 the military wing of the
Brotherhood assassinated the then Egyptian Prime Minister Mahmoud al-Nuqrashi, and the subsequent retaliatory assassination of al-Banna by Egyptian agents in February 1949 (Leikin & Brooks, 2007; Isseroff, 2008). It needs to be noted that al-Banna condemned the assassination of al-Nuqrashi (Leikin & Brooks, 2007). The organization then elected Hasan al-Hudaybi as its new guide, and sought to establish ties with the Egyptian military (Wickham, 2011). The result was that the Brotherhood was an integral part of the Free Officer Movement (led by Gamal Abdul Nasser) which deposed the Egyptian government through a military coup in 1952 (Isseroff, 2008; Aly & Wenner, 1982). Initially relations between the Brotherhood and Nasser were very intimate resulting in them being allowed to freely operate as a religious organization, however their (the Brotherhood’s) demand that Shari’a law be instituted, and their attempted assassination of Nasser led to them being banned once again, and many of the brothers being arrested and killed, the most famous being Sayyid Qutb (Aly & Wenner, 1982; Shenker, 2011). By the 1970s things had changed, their then new general guide Umar Al-Tilmisani renounced violence, and the Brotherhood begun actively, but in many cases covertly, participating in Egyptian politics (Abed-Kotob, 1995; Wickham, 2011).

The 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s saw them running candidates in elections, first as junior partners to other parties, and then as independents (Hill, 2010; Bajoria, 2011). It needs to be noted that religion-based parties are formally banned in Egypt, hence the Brotherhoods running as independents (Blac, 2011). 2011 has witnessed drastic changes in Egyptian society, the most important being the forced retirement of former president Hosni Mubarak (who dictatorially ruled Egypt for 29 years) and control being relinquished to the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces (SCAF) with elections being slated to occur in a staggered process between November 2011, and June 2012 (subject to continuous revision) (Kandeel, 2011). This has resulted in the opening of the Egyptian political system, with it being hypothesised that this opening, combined with the subsequent strong performance of its political arm (the newly formed Freedom and Justice Party) in the first round of Egypt’s staggered parliamentary elections, means that the Brotherhood will play a major role in shaping Egyptian politics in the near term (Hamid [A], 2011; Al- Masry Al-Youm, 2011; Bajoria, 2011; Brown, 2011). It needs to be noted that the Freedom And Justice Party’s strong performance in these elections (together with its alliance partners, the FJP gained over 48 percent of the vote in the aforementioned election) means that it will play an influential
role in shaping Egypt’s new constitution; thus the need for an analysis of the party’s positions on democracy and women’s rights is all the more important (Lynch.S, 2011; Tadros, 2011). To sum up, the Brotherhood’s history, organizational abilities (it has over 300 thousand members), and opposition to previous regimes means that Egypt’s domestic and foreign policies will most definitely be influenced by it(Hill, 2010; Blac, 2011). In the words of Ed Husain (senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations), “Without the Muslim Brotherhood, there’s no legitimacy in whatever happens in Egypt anymore (cited in Bajoria, 2011).”

3. The Muslim Brotherhood and Democracy

Now that we are acquainted with some of the main events that have shaped the evolution of the Muslim Brotherhood, this essay can proceed. The next part will discuss and analyze a variety of aspects concerning the Brotherhood and democracy. Aspects to be discussed include the rhetoric of the organization; the democratic experience of it; the internal democracy practised within the brotherhood; the type of democracy the organization envisages; and its role in the 2011 protests. These aspects do overlap in some instances, however for analytical purposes, and so that the paper remains coherent, they will be examined separately.

3.1. Democratic rhetoric of the Muslim Brotherhood

Over the past 25 years, and increasingly in contemporary times, the Brotherhood has sought to promote democracy at every opportunity (Bajoria, 2011; Abed-Kotob, 1995). Even opponents of its ideology, have been forced to concede that in terms of rhetoric, the Brotherhood is committed to the democratic process (Bajoria, 2011; Blac, 2011). Statements such as, "The Brothers consider constitutional rule to be closest to Islamic rule. . . . We are the first to call for and apply democracy. We are devoted to it until death," and, "There can be no question that genuine democracy must prevail," clearly illustrate the party’s active promotion of democracy (cited in Abed-Kotob, 1995:326 and Shenker & Whitaker, 2011). Yusuf Qaradawi (Brotherhood ideologue) best exudes the Brotherhood’s pro democratic
rhetoric, when he asserts that voting is like testifying in a court of law as one is expressing one’s view on the person based on the information one has, and uses the Qur’aanic verse that commands one testify in the case if one has information on it, to illustrate Islam’s and the Brotherhood’s de-facto view on democracy (Rutherford, 2006).

3.2. Democratic Experience and Participation

However many are sceptical as to the real intentions of the Brotherhood, arguing that once it attains power it will abolish the democratic system, and impose its ideology on the populace (Saleh, 2011; Bajoria, 2011; Wickham, 2004). People such as the current US secretary of state Hilary Clinton, the current Middle East envoy Tony Blair, and the famous Middle East commentator Daniel Pipes all subscribe to this perspective (Shenker & Whitaker, 2011; Wickham, 2004). In Mrs Clinton’s words “We obviously want to see people who are truly committed to democracy, not imposing any ideology on Egyptians (Shenker & Whitaker, 2011).” This statement is clearly aimed at the Brotherhood’s stance on the superior position of Shari’a, and its slogan that ‘Islam is the Solution’ (Traud, 2011; Eldin, 2011).”

What these people fail to understand is that from its inception, the Brotherhood adhered to democracy (Aly & Wenner, 1982). Al-Banna believed in democracy, though not a multi party democracy, but in democratically electing the leader (Aly & Wenner, 1982). This view was altered when it was realized that the only method of protecting the organization was protecting and promoting a multi party system (Aly & Wenner, 1982). Thus in keeping with this stance, as early as 1942 the Brotherhood sought to participate in Egyptian elections, however, under British pressure, the then Egyptian government forced the party to withdraw (McCants, 2011).

In addition to the above ideological misconceptions, many commentators are unaware that the Brotherhood has been participating in the democratic process for the past 28 years (Abed-Kotob, 1995; Wickham, 2004). Brotherhood participation in elections, as mentioned above, began in 1984 when it partnered with the Wafd party and 8 members were elected into parliament (Abed-Kotob, 1995). In 1987 it partnered with the liberal and labour parties, a
result which saw 36 of its members being elected (Abed-Kotob, 1995; Hatem, 1994). These two experiences of democratic participation are important as they illustrate that the Brotherhood is able to work in coalitions, an aspect which is necessary in a democracy (Robbins, 2009). In addition it illustrates that it believes in substantive and not merely formal democracy (Rutherford, 2006). In the years 2000, 2005 and 2010 it ran as independents, gaining over 20 percent of the vote in 2005 (Hill, 2010; Cobban, 2011). These elections are important as various obstacles were constructed so as to maintain Mubarak and his National Democratic Party’s (NDP) dominance of the system, mass arrests of Brotherhood members were carried out, the party wasn’t able to run in its proper name; elections were highly rigged; and in the 2010 elections, its slogan ‘Islam is the solution’ was even banned (Blac, 2011; Hill, 2010). Yet despite this, the party still participated in the democratic process, and in the 2010 elections refused to heed the call to boycott the elections made by most opposition parties (Hill, 2010). The statement by alAriyan (now VP of the Freedom and Justice Party), in response to the 2010 election boycott call, best sums up the Brotherhood’s experience of democracy and its impact on the organization,” It is clear to all observers that we are going on [with] our strategy to participate politically… Some people want us to be out of the seats, but ... we struggle [against] any attempt to exclude us (cited in Hill, 2010).”

3.3. Internal democracy practised

Aside from the Brotherhood’s progressive pronouncements and actions concerning the democratic process and its participation in it, internally the party exudes democracy and transparency (Hill, 2010; Lynch.M, 2009; Saleh, 2011). It has more than 300 thousand members who are well organized (Hill, 2010; Lynch.M, 2009). They are grouped into ten to twenty member groups which are called Osras (families), 50 of these come together to form a branch, and 10 of these branches form a district (Hill, 2010). It is argued that since 2004 elections have been held at each of these spheres, making the Brotherhood more democratic than the state itself (Hill, 2010). The 2009 leadership elections for the guide’s office (the de-facto executive of the movement) are insightful in this respect (Lynch.M, 2009). Firstly the then supreme guide Mohammed Mehdi Akef stated that he would voluntarily step down when his term expired in 2010 (the current supreme Guide is Dr Mohammad Badie); and secondly the elections were carried out despite fear of arrest by Egyptian security (Lynch.M, 2009). Thus leading Professor Marc Lynch to assert that, “Virtually no other Arab political
movement, party, or government holds such free or fair internal elections to positions of real power (Lynch.M, 2009).”

3.4. Egypt 2011

Because of the importance of the overthrow of Mubarak, and the Brotherhoods part, or lack thereof, in enabling this to be realized, one has decided to discuss these incidents in a separate subsection. As mentioned above in February 2011, Hosni Mubarak was forced to relinquish power as a result of 18 days of non-violent protests which left Egypt at a standstill (Blac, 2011; Kandeel, 2011). The reasons for these protests will be elaborated upon in later sections, however of importance is the Brotherhood’s role in these, and its actions post Mubarak’s overthrow. During the initial stages of the protests on January 25th, the Brotherhood did not play much of a part, however on January 28 it decided to back the protests, a move which Cobban argues, resulted in the numbers of the protesters drastically increasing and the eventual overthrow of Mubarak (when Cobban was writing her piece, the protests were still ongoing (Cobban, 2011). During the protests it preferred to be in the background, and even mandated Mohammed ElBaradei to negotiate on its behalf, a clear sign that attaining power is not its objective (Shenker, 2011). Moreover post Mubarak’s overthrow, it has formed the Freedom and Justice Party (FJP) to run in elections, but has stated that it (the FJP) will not field a presidential candidate and instead will only run in the parliamentary leg, thus further illustrating that democracy rather than power is its main ambition (Lynch.M, 2011). It needs to be noted that this move (not fielding a presidential candidate) has resulted in many individuals becoming disillusioned with the party and leaving to start their own parties and to run for the presidency, yet the Brotherhood has not yielded thus illustrating that they aren’t just strategically instrumentalizing democracy (Hedeya, 2011).

3.5. Type of democracy the Brotherhood envisages

Before proceeding it is important for us to be familiar with the type of democracy the Brotherhood envisages as a reference point for the analysis to follow. Its 2004 reform initiative states that the Brotherhood seeks a “republican system of government that is democratic, constitutional, and parliamentary and that conforms with Islamic principles (cited
It asserts that state power should conform to the Shari’a, and that the state cannot make permissible what the Shari’a prohibits (Rutherford, 2006). In addition the Brotherhood promotes the creation of an independent judiciary, and thus has supported the 1990 law proposed by the Judges Club which proposed that the judiciary be allowed to hire and train its own officials, and that it be independent (cited in Rutherford, 2006). It needs to be noted that it envisages a different role for the judiciary, than what Western judiciaries are tasked with performing (Rutherford, 2006). Instead of interpreting the constitution, it argues that the judiciary should be tasked with analyzing whether the action (committed by the individual; carried out by the head of state; or even legislated by the parliament) conforms to Shari’a (Rutherford, 2006). Lastly concerning women’s rights, and the rights of ‘non-believers’, it asserts that they are equal to Muslims, and in the case of ‘non-Muslims’ that they should be permitted to make their own religious decisions and perform rituals/actions that are prohibited in Islam; however the caveat being that they are not allowed to run for the position of state president (Sabry, 2011; Rutherford, 2006). A more detailed analysis of the Brotherhood’s stance on women and ‘non Muslims’ will be undertaken in later sections of this paper.

4. The Muslim Brotherhood and Women’s rights

4.1. Rhetoric

Many commentators argue that the Brotherhood’s stance toward women is both ambiguous and contradictory (Coleman, 2008; Lindsey, 2009). In most public forums and Brotherhood publications, it emphasises women’s equality to men, both morally and spiritually (Coleman, 2008; Rutherford, 2006). The party often cites passages from the Qur’aan and sayings from the Prophet Mohammed (PBUH) to illustrate that its view is informed by Islamic tenets (Muslim Brotherhood Report, 2005; Rutherford, 2006). This leads the party to advocate for Women’s equality in financial, legal, and civil matters (Muslim Brotherhood Report, 2005; Rutherford, 2006). In its words Women can “possess all types of wealth whether it be in the form of assets, real estate or cash… she can buy, sell, trade, barter, provide grants and loans, incur loans, exchange assets (without needing) consent of any male (Muslim Brotherhood Report, 2005).” Moreover it is of the view that she can participate in elections, be elected to
public bodies, and even head the judiciary (Rutherford, 2006). Qaradawi best sums this up when he asserts that attempting to exclude women "is like trying to breathe with one lung or fly with one wing (cited in Rutherford, 2006: 717)."

However there are some serious stipulations that the party attaches to the above (Muslim Brotherhood Report, 2005; Rutherford, 2006). It is argued that women need to give priority to their domestic life before embarking on projects that take them outside their homes; that they should only run for public office if they have no children or if their children are already grown up; and that they are not permitted to be head of the Egyptian state (Rutherford, 2006). These stipulations drastically inhibit the rights afforded to women, and has led to what many call the rebellion of the sisters which will be touched upon below.

4.2. Internal promotion of, and adherence to women’s rights

Nevertheless women have been encouraged to play a role in the evolution of the organization (Abdel-Latif, 2009; Rutherford, 2006). For this to be realized, the Muslim Sisters Group was founded in 1932, and it continues to play an important role in lobbying for women’s rights within the organization (Abdel-Latif, 2009; Coleman, 2008). This has paid off and many women now occupy mid level positions in the organization, with two of them (Jihan al-Halafawi, and Makarem al-Deeri) even being put forward as candidates during Egypt’s 2005 elections (Abdel-Latif, 2009).

However the slow speed of transformation and the Brotherhood’s 2007 platform which renewed its position on women not being allowed to run for the presidency of Egypt has led to an internal schism between the leadership and many of its women members (Abdel-Latif, 2009; Adnkronos, 2007). This resulted in a letter being addressed to the then supreme guide Mehdi Akef, by the women, expressing their grievances at continuously being undermined, and seeking permission to run for office (Adnkronos, 2007). Risha Ahmad (faculty of medicine lecturer), put it very satirically, when in the letter she asserted, perhaps Allah has not spoken to women in the same way he has spoken to men? Then inside our organisation why are there some things for men and some things for women (cited in Adnkronos, 2007).”
It needs to be noted that many men in the Brotherhood support the above call for women to be allowed to run, and that this may lead to a split within the organization (Lindsey, 2009).

4.3. Current situation faced by women in Egypt

Before proceeding it is important for us to be familiar with the rights women in Egypt currently enjoy, as a juxtaposition to the Brotherhood’s attitude toward them (women). Special emphasis will be given to their political rights, mainly as the main criticism of the Brotherhood’s position is its assertion that women should not run for the presidency. Under the rule of former presidents Sadat, and Mubarak, women had little to no political power (Hatem, 1994). Women’s organizations were defined as "auxiliary mass" organizations, and thus were controlled by the regime, who defined their agendas and referred to these as "permanent wards of the state” (cited in Hatem, 1994: 665-666). Moreover law two of 1972 prohibited the formation of political parties based on gender, religion, class, or region amongst others, thus inhibiting women’s ability to fight their discrimination in parliament (Hatem, 1994). Discrimination against women was so pervasive, that Mubarak’s decrees that women be earmarked 30 seats in the people’s assembly,; that they be allowed to file for divorce were their husbands to take a second wife; and that they be given the house after divorce, were soon struck down by his NDP controlled supreme court as they were deemed biased against men (Hatem, 1994). Thus it comes as no surprise that only three women feature in the current 29 member Egyptian cabinet headed by the military appointed Kamal El-Ganzouri; and that out of the 212 women candidates running on the party list system for the aforementioned election, only three ended up being elected, a meagre 1.4 percent (El Gundy, 2011; Ammar, 2011).

From the foregoing we can clearly observe that the Brotherhood’s position toward women in the Egyptian context, whilst not progressive, is not regressive toward women’s rights. Lastly before proceeding, it needs to be noted that their (the Brotherhood’s) position toward women has evolved tremendously from the days when former supreme guide Umar Tilmisani stated, “I do not like to talk about women. Modern people may find this shameful, or cowardly, but I want nothing to do with modern theories and the equality of men and women. I still believe that a man is a man and a woman is a woman and that’s why God created her. A woman who
believes that she is equal to a man is a woman who has lost her femininity, virtue and dignity,” to the position held by the party in contemporary times that women are equal to men, and that they can undertake any financial, civil or legal activity, except running for head of state (cited in ElGhobashy: 382).

5. The Muslim Brotherhood’s stance on, and provision of Social Services

5.1. Current economic conditions facing ordinary Egyptians

In order for one to discuss and analyze the Brotherhood’s provision of social services, we first need to be aware about the conditions faced by ordinary Egyptians, so as to contextualize the stance adopted by the Brotherhood. As mentioned above (chapter one) Egypt’s per capita GDP (in 2009) was a low 6 thousand dollars and this despite the fact that GDP as a measure masks the deep income inequalities within the state, thus painting a rosier picture (Kandeel, 2011; The CIA World Fact Book, 2009). In 2009 18 million Egyptians (20 percent) were characterized as suffering from poverty according to world standards, with many more just above the mark; official unemployment stood at between 8 and 11 percent (an under exaggerated statistic according to Candeel); and inflation stood at 12 percent, coming off 18 percent in 2008 (Kandeel, 2011). The fact that the military had been involved in the baking and distribution of bread for the previous two years (2009 and 2010) clearly illustrates the drastic conditions faced by ordinary Egyptians (cited in Brumberg, Hamid, Brown, Brooks & Carpenter, 2011).

These economic conditions, coupled with the lack of democracy mentioned above, argue many, led to the overthrow of Hosni Mubarak (Brumberg et al, 2011; Kandeel, 2011). Before proceeding, it needs to be noted that the 2011 uprising, and the uncertainty spawned by it have further worsened the aforementioned dire economic conditions (Awad, 2011; El-Din, 2011; Bank Audi sal, 2011). Tourism, a sector which employs between 10 and 12 percent of mainly poor Egyptians and accounts for around 11 percent of the country’s GDP (13 billion dollars in 2010), was severely affected by the uprising, losing, according to state estimates, as much as 825 million dollars in February of 2011 alone; whilst foreign direct investment,
which is necessary for economic growth to be fuelled, is forecasted to drop from the pre uprising estimate of 8 billion dollars for fiscal year 2011, to 4 billion dollars for this same period, mainly as a result of the uncertainty engendered by the uprising and the military’s reluctance to relinquish power (Bank Audi, 2011; El-Din, 2011; Awad, 2011). The consequences have been devastating. At the time of writing, the Egyptian Pound is at a seven year low against the dollar, with central bank dollar reserves decreasing from 36 billion pre the uprising to 20 billion at the end of October 2011; the country’s budget deficit is estimated to increase from 98 billion dollars in 2010 to 166 billion in 2011/12; and economic growth is forecasted at 2.6 percent for 2011, down from 5.8 percent in 2010 (El-Din, 2011; Awad, 2011). The above means that ordinary Egyptians will find it even harder to survive, and the minimal redistributive state activities that the Egyptian state performed pre the 2011 uprising will have to be curtailed even further (Bank Audi, 2011; Awad, 2011).

5.2. The Economic position adopted by the Muslim Brotherhood

Now that we are acquainted with the severity of the conditions faced by the average Egyptian, can we proceed to analyze the Brotherhood’s stance on the economy, and how it has sought to realize this. According to Husaini, behind the principles of interpreting and defending the Qur’aan, and uniting Muslim states around it, the third main principle of the Brotherhood is the promotion and realization of social justice through the provision of social services, the redistribution of income, and the guaranteeing of equal opportunities for all (cited in Aly & Wenner, 1982: 339). Thus in its 1987 economic platform drawn up in partnership with the liberal and labour parties it affirmed the need for the state to own certain industries; the need for usury to be abolished so as to enable the growth of the individual; and the need for the Zakaah (alms giving which is an integral part of Islamic belief) to be used to provide services to the poor, and thus realize social justice (Abed-Kotob, 1995; Aly & Wenner, 1982). In the words of many, it seeks a more socialist redistribution of resources (Kandeel, 2011; Aly & Wenner, 1982).
5.3. Redistributive activities undertaken by the Muslim Brotherhood

In order for the aforementioned economic objectives to be realized, the Brotherhood has undertaken many redistributive activities. It has built schools and hospitals; created small industries and shops, and runs many organizations and foundations (Bajoria, 2011; Blac, 2011). A case in point is the Muslim Brothers spinning and weaving company formed in 1946 in Shubra al-Khaima (Ayubi, 1991). This company provided generous benefits for its employees such as unemployment insurance, and workers were even encouraged to buy shares in it so as to eliminate class conflict, the classic stake holder capitalism argument (Ayubi, 1991). The Brotherhood even provides a voluntary after school tutoring service for parents, and in 2011 it was reported to be considering the feasibility of starting a soccer club (Blac, 2011). Post the 1992 Egyptian earthquake, it is argued, that it, not the state was the main provider of food and clothes to survivors (Davis & Robinson, 2006).

In addition to the services it provides under the Brotherhood name, syndicates controlled by Brotherhood members have assisted in providing training, health and unemployment insurance; and low interest loans to their members (Wickham, 2004). These Amirs (leaders) even facilitated the purchase of furniture for their members, who started up businesses or who got married, on instalment plans that were long term in nature (Wickham, 2004). Black sums this up well when he argues that these services (provided by the Brotherhood and brotherhood affiliated syndicates) serve to “fill gaps left by a state that has seen illiteracy rise and (state) services fail as liberal economic reforms (only) enriched businesses close to the regime (Blac, 2011).”
6. The Muslim Brotherhood and Religious Tolerance

6.1. History

Historically relations between the Brotherhood, and ‘non-Muslims’ (Coptic Christians in the Egyptian context had been very cordial (Sabry, 2011; Ikhwanweb, 2010) it is argued that when any sectarian issue occurred, al-Banna, and the Coptic Pope would exchange conciliatory messages (Sabry, 2011). Lower level contacts existed through meetings held between the two groupings, the Brotherhood would invite Coptic Christians to its Iftaar (the meal that is eaten on the breaking of the fast) occasions, and this was reciprocated by the Christian community (Sabry, 2011). However toward the late 1990s this changed and enmity began to grow between the two groups (Sabry, 2011). This enmity it is argued was mainly fuelled by Mubarak’s co-optation of the Christian community in his fight against the Brotherhood; in turn for them supporting him. Christians were allowed to forcibly hold Christian converts to Islam in their churches (Sabry, 2011). The events of 2011 have dealt a severe blow to the Christian leadership, and the Church is now beginning to reassess its position toward the brotherhood (Sabry, 2011). Before proceeding it needs to be noted that Coptic Christians comprise over 10 percent of the Egyptian population (Khalifa, 2005).

6.2. Rhetoric

In terms of rhetoric the Brotherhood never misses an opportunity to tout its tolerance of ‘non-Muslims’ (Rutherford, 2006; Sabry, 2011). It cites the Qur’aanic verse which asserts that there is "no compulsion in religion [2:256],” to argue that ‘non-Muslims’ should be free to believe as they will and do as they wish (cited in Rutherford, 2006). This position is best summed up by Mohammed Badie, when during his 2010 Christmas goodwill message, he asserted that, “as they (Coptic Christians) have the same rights that we have, and carry the same obligations, we, the members of the Muslim Brotherhood, recognize that we do not call for ethnic discrimination, or sectarian fanaticism (cited in Ikhwanweb, 2010)).” In keeping with this Brotherhood personnel have stressed that Christians should be allowed to run for public office, and even head the Egyptian army if they possess the requisite qualifications (ElGhobashy, 2005; Rutherford, 2006). However the party’s call for Shari’a law to be
applied, and its stance that a Coptic Christian cannot run for the presidency of Egypt, has led many to be sceptical about the party’s commitment to religious freedoms (Lindsey, 2009; Wickham, 2004).

6.3. Criticisms

As mentioned above the two main criticisms of the Brotherhood’s ‘religiously tolerant’ credentials is its emphasis on Shari’a as forming the law, and its pronouncement that a Coptic Christian cannot run for president of Egypt. Concerning Shari’a, it is argued that this disadvantages Christians, as they are being subjected to an Islamic legal system which as the name denotes is inherently discriminatory toward them (Wickham, 2004; Bajoria, 2011). These commentators are of the view that were the Brotherhood to attain power in Egypt, it would be on its way to becoming another Iran (cited in Bajoria, 2011& Wickham, 2011). Mohammed Badie’s assertion that in religious terms, "democracy cannot make permitted what is forbidden, or forbid what is permitted, even if the entire nation agrees to it,” only serves to increase and give credence to these fears (cited in Brown, 2011).

Concerning the party’s stance that a Christian cannot run for the Egyptian presidency, opponents to this exist even within the organization (Lindsey, 2009). It can be argued that this clearly illustrates how the Brotherhood views Coptic Christians, as second class citizens.

6.4. Actions and responses by the Brotherhood which seek to allay the above fears

Many actions and activities that the Brotherhood has previously undertaken do allay the above fears, and would inhibit the above charges. these include its 2006 assistance to Coptic Christians who were suffering the after effects of a spell of bad weather in Alexandria which destroyed many of their homes; its non-combative, and non-confrontational stance in the 2011 Egyptian protests wherein it refrained from holding up religious texts or uttering religious slogans; and its appointment of a Christian intellectual (Dr Rafik Habib) as the VP of the FJP mentioned above (Ikhwanweb, 2006; Wickham, 2011; Sabry, 2011).
It has sought to allay the fear that its call for Shari’a law would discriminate against Christians by arguing that Christians are not subject to Islamically impermissible acts such as the drinking of alcohol and the consuming of pork, and thus are free to do as they seek fit (Rutherford, 2006). Moreover, it has altered its stance on Christians running for office by arguing that should the people elect a Christian leader, it would not oppose him/her (Sabry, 2011). As mentioned above, it needs to be noted that for the proceeding elections slated for June 2012, it will not field a presidential candidate (Sabry, 2011; Lynch.M, 2011).

7. The Muslim Brotherhood and Terrorism

7.1. Rhetoric

Most commentators unanimously agree that the Brotherhood is an organization that has renounced violence (Leikin & Brooks, 2007; Wickham, 2011; Bajoria, 2011; Saleh, 2011). Statements such as “The Muslim Brothers are a special case because we are not seeking power through violent or military means like other Islamic organisations that might be violent…. we work according to the constitution and the law,” and “The Brethren do not consider revolution, nor do they depend upon it, nor do they believe in its utility or its outcome,” clearly illustrate the party’s disinclination toward violence (cited in Shenker & Whitaker, 2011 and Abed-Kotob, 1995:324). Thus many commentators argue that it is a ‘moderate’ Islamist party, and that dialogue should be sought with it (Leikin & Brooks, 2007).

7.2. Actions renouncing violence

In keeping with its stance against violence the Brotherhood has sought to distance itself from the carrying out of violent activities (Abed-Kotob, 1995; Leikin & Brooks, 2007). The denunciation of the 1974 coup attempt by the Hizb al-Tahrir al-Islami group; the condemnation of the assassination attempts on the former interior minister Hasan Abu Basha, former minister of information Safwat al-Sharif, and former interior minister Hasan al-Alfi; and the censuring of the 1997 Luxor Temple attack, are just some of the many actions that the
Brotherhood has undertaken to illustrate the party’s abhorrence of violence (Abed-Kotob, 1995; Gerges, 2000). The Luxor Temple attack and the Brotherhood’s condemnation of it are of importance, and will be briefly elaborated upon. In 1997 an al-Jama'a al-Islamiyya cell attacked the Luxor temple killing 68 people including many foreigners (Gerges, 2000). The brotherhood condemned this attack in totality, and went as far as asserting that the attackers had no “conscience or religion,” and imploring the state to act against terrorism (Gerges, 2000:595). The condemnation of violence in this instance is very important for two reasons. Firstly the attack was carried out on a temple, and secondly because many of the people who passed away were ‘non-Muslims’ and foreigners, Thus illustrating that the Brotherhood does not have double standards in its opposition and abhorrence toward violence.

In addition, as observed above, the party has willingly and actively participated in elections, despite the various state placed obstacles that it has had to outmanoeuvre (Hill, 2010; Abed-Kotob, 1995). These obstacles which included random arrests (between October, and November 2010 alone, 600 of its members were randomly arrested), torture and intimidation, would most definitely have made resorting to violence in retaliation seem very attractive, yet the Brotherhood stood firm to its principle of non violence (Cobban, 2011; Hill, 2010).

7.3. The Muslim Brotherhood VS Al-Qaida

The Brotherhood’s principled position on violence, and its impeccable Islamist credentials, has led many commentators to argue that it actually acts as a deterrent to the influence of al-Qaida (Lynch.M, 2008; Cobban, 2011; Leikin & Brooks, 2007). It does this through two ways, firstly through its ideology which shuns the concepts of Jahiliya (state of ignorance) and Takfir (excommunication), which Al-Qaida affiliated organizations utilize to justify their attacks on civilians (Lynch.M, 2008). Secondly it is argued that its organizational structure (musjids, clubs, and charity organizations) is able to easily monitor and lock out al-Qaida sympathizers (Lynch.M, 2008). The result being that in states where Brotherhood affiliates are strong (Egypt, Jordan, and Palestine), al-Qaida is weak; and where brotherhood affiliates are weak (Iraq and Saudi Arabia) Al-Qaida is strong (Lynch.M, 2008). Al-Qaida has even conceded this, and argued that the Brotherhood’s pro democratic non-violent stance is in fact
serving the US’s interest by “[luring] thousands of young Muslim men into lines for elections ... instead of into the lines of jihad (cited in Leikin & Brooks, 2007: 107; Aki, 2006).”

8. Conclusion

In conclusion this chapter has assessed and analyzed the Muslim Brotherhood. The first part briefly touched on the history of the party. It accomplished this by elaborating on the objectives for its formation; its opposition to the creation of Israel; and its willingness to participate in the democratic process. The second part then examined its position toward democracy. Its pro democratic rhetoric, its participation in many Egyptian elections; and the internal democracy practised by it were some of the many aspects discussed in this section. The third part then discussed the party’s position toward women’s rights. This was realized by touching on its ambiguous rhetoric, and the ‘rebellion of the sisters’. The fourth part then elaborated on the social services it provides. The fifth part analyzed its stance toward ‘non-Muslims’. This was achieved by touching on its pronouncements on Christian rights, and the response it offered to critics. The last part then analyzed whether or not the party is complicit in terrorist activities. It accomplished this by touching on its non-violent rhetoric, and its participation in elections, amongst others. The above has led it to conclude:

- The Muslim Brotherhood is the oldest modern Islamist party (Hill, 2010; Bajoria, 2011). Aside from being an Islamic revivalist movement, it was also created as an anti imperialist organization (Leikin & Brooks, 2007; Aly & Wenner, 1982).
- It believes in the democratic process, and has continuously shown a willingness to participate in it despite the various obstacles it has had to overcome (Hill, 2010; Abed-Kotob, 1995).
- It provides various social services which are of imperative importance to Egyptian society, and has enabled them (ordinary Egyptians) to survive in spite of the drastic consequences of the Egyptian government’s neoliberal policies and its susceptibility to corruption (Blac, 2011; Abed-Kotob, 1995; Kandeel, 2011).
- It has continuously denounced acts of terror, and through its ideology and structure, even acts as a deterrent to it (Lynch.M, 2008; Leikin & Brooks, 2007).
• However it has adopted a contradictory stance toward women and ‘non Muslims’ arguing that they are allowed to pursue anything, as long as it does not affect their mothering role (in the case of women), and that they should not run for the Egyptian presidency (in the case of both women and Coptic Christians) (Rutherford, 2006; Coleman, 2008).

• Lastly it needs to be noted that it is an evolving party, and that many of the positions discussed above have evolved tremendously (ElGhobashy, 2005). One was really surprised to observe that on its website http://www.ikhwanweb.com/, articles written by critics such as Mona ElTahawy are posted and easily accessible. This clearly illustrates that the party does not aim to monopolize the truth or create the impression that there is a single universal narrative.
Chapter 3: Hezbollah

1. Introduction

“Hezbollah's actions (concerning its 2011 collapsing of Lebanon’s government) illustrate the dangers of not excluding from democratic participation extremist groups which act as proxies for foreign powers, reject democratic values as a matter of principle, or fail to renounce violence. Hezbollah is a creature of Iran…. Many of its cabinet allies are themselves clients of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad's regime, with which Hezbollah coordinates (Singh, 2011).”

As can be observed from the above quote, many are ignorant and unaware as to what Hezbollah actually is, what its principles are, and how it operates, hence this chapter aims to analyze and assess it so as to shed some light on its machinations and in doing so provide a more nuanced and objective picture of it. The first part aims to briefly touch upon the history of Lebanon, and how it spawned the conditions in which Hezbollah was conceived. It also aims to discuss some of the major events that have shaped the evolution of the ‘Party of God’ (Hezbollah). It accomplishes this by firstly discussing Lebanon’s demographics and how this has shaped its system of rule. It needs to be noted that since 1932 Lebanon has not had a population census (Krayem, 1997). Secondly it touches upon the 1975 to 1990 Lebanese civil war and its consequences. Lastly this part touches on the history of Hezbollah, and how it has evolved since its formation.

The second part aspires to analyze Hezbollah’s stance on democracy. It achieves this by firstly assessing its pro-democratic rhetoric. Secondly the party’s participation in the democratic process and its support of the Arab spring are discussed. Thirdly the various criticisms of its pro-democratic stance are examined. Of importance in this regard are its 2008 rebellion, and its continued efforts to undermine the tribunal investigating the death of slain Lebanese Prime Minister Rafik Hariri, as these show that Hezbollah only abides by democracy when it serves the party’s interests (Ibrahim, 2009; Singh, 2011). Lastly this part
analyzes the type of democracy it envisages. Its call for the abolishing of Lebanon’s consociational system is examined in this section.

The third part then endeavours to analyze Hezbollah’s stance toward women’s rights. This is realized by firstly analyzing the Shiite framework on women’s rights, as Hezbollah’s position is informed by this framework. Secondly the party’s internal adherence to women’s equality or the lack thereof is discussed. Of importance in this regard is its failure to nominate a single woman candidate to represent it in parliament (Duncan, 2009). Lastly the positions toward women adopted by the other parties operating in Lebanese politics are elaborated upon, and compared to Hezbollah’s.

The fourth part aims to tease out, and analyze some of the various social services that Hezbollah provides. This is achieved by firstly elaborating on the conditions faced by ordinary Lebanese. It needs to be noted that the various wars (internal and external) that Lebanon and Lebanese factions have been involved in have resulted in the destruction of large parts of its housing infrastructure and thus exacerbating the already bad conditions faced by ordinary Lebanese (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009; Zunes, 2010; The CIA World Fact Book, 2011). Secondly this part analyzes the type of economy that Hezbollah envisages. This leads it to elaborate on the various services that Hezbollah provides. Lastly this part analyzes some of the criticisms met out toward Hezbollah’s economic stance and its service provision activities.

The fifth part then endeavours to analyze Hezbollah’s stance toward Lebanon’s other sects. It accomplishes this by firstly elaborating on its historically tenuous relations with Lebanon’s other sects. Secondly the various activities carried out by the party so as to mend religious and sectarian ties are analyzed. Of importance in this regard is its omission of any reference to the creation of an Islamic state in its 2009 political manifesto (Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009; Kabbara, 2009; Kfoury, 2010). Lastly the various criticisms of its claim to non sectarianism are discussed.

The last part aspires to analyze Hezbollah’s attitude toward terrorism. It achieves this by firstly elaborating on Hezbollah’s ambiguous rhetoric concerning it. Secondly it touches upon the various terrorist activities that the party has been involved in. Of importance in this regard is its assassination of Rafik Hariri, as this inhibits its self categorization as a resistance organization (El-Masri, 2008). Lastly this part discusses and provides reasons as to why one,
though fully asserting that Hezbollah’s 2006 border raid which sparked off the 2006 Hezbollah/Israel war was illegal under international law, does not classify it as a terrorist act.

2. Brief history of Lebanon and Hezbollah

2.1. Population and system of governance

In order for us to assess Hezbollah’s positions on democracy, terrorism, women’s rights, the rights of other religious communities, and the provision of social services, we need to be familiar with some of the events that have occurred in Lebanese history, and that have shaped the evolution of the party. Lebanon is a relatively small state with a population of around 4 million (Zunes, 2010). It is comprised of many different sects (18 according to its constitution), with the Shiites, Druze, Sunnis, and Maranite Christians being the most influential of these (Morrison, 2007; Cole, 2011; Krayem, 1997). Thus in order to maintain the integrity of the state, and ensure the representation of all the sects, Lebanon is governed by a consociational system of power sharing wherein a Maranite Christian is allocated the position of president, a Sunni the position of prime minister, and the speaker of parliament is always a Shiite (Morrison, 2007; Krayem, 1997). Moreover its parliament which has 128 seats is divided into different blocks with 64 seats allocated to Muslims (Sunnis, Shiites, and Druze comprising this block), and 64 for Christians (Maranite and Greek Orthodox Christians comprising this block) (Morrison, 2007; Krayem, 1997).

This system was an outcome of the national pact of 1943, and was implicitly ratified in the 1989 Taif accord which ended a 15 year civil war to be elaborated upon below (Krayem, 1997).
2.2. Lebanese civil war

As is normally the case with states comprised of different groups with differing allegiances, order and stability is difficult to maintain and often short lived (Krayem, 1997). Lebanon is no different, during the 1950s and 1960s it was viewed as being one of the most stable democracies, an outcome which was attributed to the 1943 pact (Krayem, 1997). However the changing population demographics (Shiites now comprise over 40% of the citizenry) and unequal distribution of wealth led to antagonisms between the different sects being formed, resulting in the 1975 to 1990 civil war (Krayem, 1997). The war was ignited when four Phalangists were killed in an attempted assassination of the then Phalange party leader Pierre Gemayel, and retaliatory attacks against Palestinian refugee positions were carried out (Krayem, 1997; Pike, 2011). It needs to be noted that Lebanon is home to over 400 thousand Palestinian refugees (Pike, 2011). This small incident led to the formation of two broad fronts, the Lebanese National Movement (a party aligned to the Palestinians, and in favour of dissolving the consociational system) and the Lebanese Front (led by the Phalangist party and in favour of maintaining the status quo), and a war between the two parties ensuing (Krayem, 1997; Pike, 2011). The crisis became further inflamed when outside powers such as Syria, Israel, and the US entered the arena and at different times backed different groups (Krayem, 1997). The conflict ended with the signing of the Taif accord, which promoted the maintenance of the status quo as per the aforementioned 1943 pact with minor adjustments, and a call for the disarmament of the various militia groups which each party (during the civil war) formed to ensure the realization of their interests (Pike, 2011). The main consequence of this civil war was the severe destruction of Lebanon’s infrastructure; the death of over 100 thousand Lebanese and another 100 thousand of them becoming disabled; and the displacement of over 700 thousand citizens mainly from its south (Pike, 2011).

2.3. Hezbollah

It was during this period and in this confrontational atmosphere that Hezbollah (Party of God in English) was born (Kahil, 2006; CFR [B], 2009). Formed in 1982, Hezbollah’s main purpose was to fight the Israeli occupation of Southern Lebanon, and thus protect the Shiite community which mainly reside therein (Krayem, 1997; CFR [B], 2009). For this to be achieved, it carried out various attacks on Israeli forces; was involved in suicide operations
(the most famous being the twin truck bombings which killed over 200 American Marines in 1983); and the abduction of Westerners as hostages (CFR [B], 2009). Before proceeding, it needs to be noted that Iran played a direct role in the establishment of Hezbollah, funding the party, and even dispatching personnel to the Bekka valley to train it (Kahil, 2006; Levitt & Jacobson, 2008).

The late 1980s saw the party being involved in an intra Shiite conflict with another Shiite faction the Afwaj al-Muquwama al-Lubnaniyya (AMAL) over representation of the Lebanese Shiite community, and as AMAL sided with the Druze sect over the Palestinians (Kahil, 2006; Conway, 2008). This conflict dragged on beyond the Taif accord, and ended in Hezbollah’s favour with AMAL being integrated into the Lebanese army (Conway, 2008; Krayem, 1997). It needs to be noted that in contemporary times relations between Hezbollah and AMAL are very cordial and they often form partnerships in parliament (Cole, 2011; Zunes, 2010). During the 1990s Hezbollah begun participating in politics, and its pinnacle performance was in January 2011, when together with the party’s allies, it was able to collapse the Lebanese government, and replace it with a more Hezbollah sympathetic one (Levitt, 2011; Cole, 2011; Heydemann, 2011). The year 2000 is an important marker in the history of the organization, as Israeli troupes withdrew from the south, thus meaning that its main goal had been achieved (Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009; Zunes, 2010). Post this it has participated in another skirmish with the Israeli’s and in 2008 even turned its arms on Lebanese citizens, causing irreparable damage to its image (Teslik, 2008; Abdul-Hussain, 2009). The above experiences have served to entrench it into Lebanese society and as its aforementioned ability to collapse the Lebanese government illustrates, its influence is only increasing. Many of the aforementioned events will be further elaborated upon in later sections of this chapter.
3. Hezbollah and Democracy

3.1. Rhetoric

Many commentators argue that rhetorically Hezbollah is committed to democracy (Kabbara, 2009; Berti, 2010; Kfoury, 2010). This stance is best inferred from its condemnation of Lebanon’s consociational system, which runs counter to the notion that the party who gains the most votes should assume power (Berti, 2010; Suttner, 2004). In the words of the manifesto,” The fact that the Lebanese political system was founded on a sectarian basis represents in itself a strong restriction to the achievement of true democracy where an elected majority can rule and an elected minority can oppose, opening the door for a proper exchange of power (Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009).” However it does need to be noted that Hezbollah’s Shiite constituency stands to gain the most from a majoritarian democratic system, as they comprise over 40 percent of Lebanon’s citizenry, yet are only allocated 21 percent of parliament seats (27 out of 128) (Morrison, 2007; Berti, 2010). Moreover had a majoritarian system (winner of the elections governs) been in place, it would have won the 2009 Lebanese elections as its coalition gained around 55% of the popular vote (Cole, 2011; Berti, 2010).

3.2. Democratic Experience and Participation

As observed above, Hezbollah began participating in Lebanese elections from 1992 when it won 8 seats in parliament (Westcott, 2002; Berti, 2010). Moreover post the Israeli withdrawal in 2000 it has been more active in its promotion of, and participation in, the democratic process (Abdul-Hussain, 2009; Berti, 2010). Thus when it issued its 2009 manifesto which did not make mention of an Islamic state, and promoted the idea of a democratic Lebanon which respected all of its citizens, many analysts weren’t surprised, and viewed it as merely formalizing its evolution as a political party (Berti, 2010; Abdul-Hussain, 2009). Of importance in this regard is Lebanon’s consociational political system which fosters the creation of partnerships (Cole, 2011). This is as no single party can rule, leave alone dominate the political scene, and thus coalitions need to be formed (Cole, 2011; Morrison, 2007). Hence during its 2009 campaign, Hezbollah partnered with Michel Aoun’s Free Patriotic movement and AMAL, a coalition which now also contains the Druze faction led by
Walid Jumblatt (Cole, 2011). The foregoing is important as it illustrates that the party is able to make compromises and form coalitions, a feature that is necessary for democracies to run optimally (Robbins, 2009).

In addition to this the party has supported many of the democratic uprisings engulfing the Arab world (Anzalone, 2011; Nashashibi, 2011). Statements such as “Hezbollah cannot but express respect for the popular will [of the Tunisian people] that astonished the world, its unity, solidarity, and quick reaction”, and “What’s taking place in Libya is war imposed by the regime on a people that was peacefully demanding change… Such serious crimes should be condemned and the revolutionary people of Libya should be helped so as to persevere,” clearly illustrate its regard for democracy (cited in Anzalone, 2011; Nashashibi, 2011). However it needs to be noted that Hezbollah hasn’t made such statements concerning its backers Iran and Syria, calling their uprisings ‘internal issues’ and in the Syrian case asserting that the party will “stand by a regime that has stood by the resistance for a long time,” imploring Syrians to “preserve their country as well as the ruling regime” (cited in The Daily Star, 2011 & Nashashibi, 2011). Moreover the party has allegedly been dispatching personnel to assist the Syrian regime quell the aforementioned uprising, and has gone as far as capturing and returning Syrian dissidents taking refuge in Lebanon (Butcher, 2011; Prothero, 2011; Maher, 2011). The reasons for Hezbollah’s support of the current Assad led Syrian regime will be elaborated upon below in the terrorism section, and in chapter five.

3.3. Criticisms and the Special Tribunal for Lebanon (STL)

However many have questioned Hezbollah’s commitment to democracy (Singh, 2011; Ibrahim, 2009) these commentators argue that Hezbollah is merely instrumentalizing democracy, and will not refrain from curbing it if it no longer serves its interests (Singh, 2011). Hezbollah’s May 2008 rebellion (which will be elaborated upon in the terrorism section), and its continuous attempts to undermined the STL, are cited as examples to illustrate that Hezbollah only seeks democracy if it furthers its interests (Singh, 2011; Khatib, 2010). The party’s attempts at delegitimizing the STL is of importance and will briefly be touched upon.
On February 14th 2005, a car bomb exploded in a Beirut Suburb killing a prominent Sunni leader Rafik Hariri (El-Masri, 2008). Hariri’s stance against the then Syrian troupe presence in Lebanon made this a very volatile situation, with the finger being pointed at Syria (Cole, 2011; El-Masri, 2008). Various pro, and anti Syrian Rallies were held in March of that year, a consequence was the withdrawal of the aforementioned Syrian troupes (El-Masri, 2008; Zunes, 2010). The Lebanese government reacted to the assassination by authorizing the United Nations to assist in bringing the killers to justice (Khashan, 2011; El-Masri, 2008). After two years of initial investigations by the UN, a special Tribunal for Lebanon was instituted in 2007, and tasked with investigating the assassination (El-Masri, 2008; Khashan, 2011). Hezbollah immediately sought to undermine this investigation by arguing that it was an Israeli conspiracy, and arguing that it inhibited Lebanon’s sovereignty and thus needed to be opposed (El-Masri, 2008; Young, 2011). When it emerged that the Tribunal might indict Hezbollah members, the criticism became more vocal with Hezbollah threatening that “any cooperation with the investigators is a contribution to assault on the resistance,” and mobilising its members to impede the investigation (cited in Khatib, 2010). Moreover it attempted to pressure the then Lebanese government headed by Saad Hariri (Rafik’s son) to withdraw its participation and funding from the tribunal, and when this was not forthcoming, together with its allies walked out of the Lebanese government on January 12th 2011, thus collapsing it, and replacing Hariri with a more pro Hezbollah candidate Najib Makati (Bazzi, 2011; Young, 2011; Heydemann, 2011). The tribunal has since issued its indictments, and four senior Hezbollah members, Assad Sabra, Assan Issa, Salim Ayachhe and Moustaf Badredine, were fingered as being involved in the murder (Chulov, 2011). Hezbollah responded by arguing that the tribunal was politically motivated, and justifiably questioning the many media leaks, and vowing to never give any of its members up (Rida, 2011). In the words of Hezbollah’s secretary General (Hassan Nasrallah) the Lebanese cabinet will not be able to “arrest them (the indicted) not [in] one, two or even in 600 years (cited in Rida, 2011).” The above gives credence to critics’ assertions concerning Hezbollah’s commitment to democracy.
3.4. Type of democracy Hezbollah envisages

Before proceeding it is important for us to be familiar with the type of democracy Hezbollah envisages as a reference point for the analysis to follow. Its 2009 manifesto calls for a majoritarian democracy wherein sectarianism is abolished (Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009). It disavows any process of federalism, and argues that the judiciary needs to be independent and non politicised (Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009). Of importance to this paper is the processes of non discrimination by the state and women’s incorporation into it (the state) mentioned in the manifesto (Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009). These will be further elaborated upon in the sections below.

4. Hezbollah and Women’s rights

4.1. Rhetoric

According to sociologist Mona Fayyad, women’s roles in the party are defined within the ‘Shiite Framework’, (cited in Lynch.S, 2010). Two influential theologians, Muhammad Husayn Fadlallah (many argue that he was Hezbollah’s spiritual guide) and Muhammad Mahdi Shams al-Din (was chairman of the Lebanese Supreme Shiite Council from 1994 to 2001), have contributed tremendously in creating and forging this framework, and thus their rhetoric around women’s issues will be examined (El-Husseini, 2008; Kahil, 2006). Fadlallah uses the example of Fatima (the daughter of the Prophet Muhammad [PBUH]), her dealings and how she reared her children, to argue that women are allowed to obtain an education (he encourages this), seek employment, and even become the head of state (cited in El-Husseini, 2008). He argues that the role played by Zainab, just like her mother (Fatima) legitimizes, “women's participation in political and jihadi work in an Islamic manner (cited in El-Husseini, 2008). Shams al-Din echoes Fadlallah’s views, and takes them further by arguing that a woman can seek employment or pursue a political career even if her husband objects to it (cited in El-Husseini, 2008). From the above one can deduce that the Lebanese Shiite framework is very progressive toward women’s rights, and many have even gone as far as terming it ‘reformist (cited in El-Husseini, 2008). Its influence on Hezbollah has been felt,
and the party’s 2009 manifesto calls for a state that “works to fuse the role of women at all levels” (Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009).

However it needs to be noted that the Shiite framework maintains that a woman’s first duty is caring for her children (El-Husseini, 2008). Moreover Fadlallah and Shams al-Din assert that working women need to wear the Hijab, and in the case of Shams al-Din are not permitted to wear makeup, perfume, or involve themselves in conversations with sexual undertones (cited in El-Husseini, 2008).

4.2. Internal promotion of and adherence to women’s rights

Internally Hezbollah has to a great extent promoted women’s rights (Kahil, 2006; Lynch.S, 2010). Women run many of its service provision projects; are encouraged and fully accommodated at the schools that it operates; and have even been allowed to fight alongside men in the many conflicts the party has been engaged in (Kahil, 2006; Lynch.S, 2010; Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). The Lebanese journalist Walid Charara sums this role up brilliantly when he asserts that, “women are playing a key role in the Hezbollah since the beginning. The goal of Hezbollah was not only to create a movement of resistance but also a society of resistance. It implied to run schools, dispensaries, hospitals, [and] institutes dedicated to the surviving families of martyrs, etc. (cited in De Cleves, 2009).”

However despite the above, women are conspicuously absent from the party’s political activities (Duncan, 2009; Abu-Zayd, 2002). For instance it only employs one woman (Rima Fakhry) in a senior political position, and in parliament the party has no women representatives (Duncan, 2009). Fakhry has tried to defend this by arguing that the party has been considering a women’s quota, but unforeseen circumstances have necessitated against it (Middle East Times, 2005). However this argument is useless considering the fact that Hezbollah women are some of the most educated, and would easily be able to assist the party overcome political problems (Lynch.S, 2010; Duncan, 2009).
4.3. Current situation faced by women in Lebanon

Before proceeding it is important for us to be familiar with the rights women in Lebanon currently enjoy, as a juxtaposition to Hezbollah’s attitude toward them (women). Women in Lebanon enjoy many rights, they are free to don whatever attire they desire; they head many institutions and are rarely discriminated within these; and are encouraged to seek education (The CIA World Fact Book, 2011). However when it comes to political representation, they are severely underrepresented with only four women sitting in the Lebanese parliament, with these women only being appointed as a result of their affiliation to a senior male party politician and not on the basis of merit (Duncan, 2009). Lina Abu-Habib (director of the Centre for Research and Training for Development) echoes this and argues that when Lebanon’s internal system is suffering from internal, mostly sectarian conflict (as is normally the case), women’s rights and their representation in parliament takes a back seat, a point that seems to fit in with Fakhry’s aforementioned assertion (cited in Duncan, 2009). From the above it can be observed that it’s not just Hezbollah, but all the parties operating in Lebanon’s political system that aren’t representative of women in terms of their employment demographics.

5. Hezbollah’s stance on, and provision of Social Services

5.1. Current economic conditions facing ordinary Lebanese

In order for one to discuss and analyze Hezbollah’s provision of social services, we first need to be aware about the conditions faced by ordinary Lebanese, so as to contextualize the stance adopted by Hezbollah. Lebanon’s GDP per capita in 2010 was 14 400 dollars, which puts her 81 on the list of the world’s richest states (The CIA World Fact Book, 2011). Her GDP per capita does not seem really drastic, until we take note that as of 1999 28% of her population was categorized as suffering from poverty, a number that would most definitely have increased during Israel’s 34 day war with Hezbollah in 2006 (The CIA World Fact Book, 2011; Zunes, 2010; Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). Moreover the rampant corruption within the Lebanese civil service further exacerbates the above (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). Flanigan and Abdel-Samad brilliantly detail this when they illustrate that for a
Lebanese citizen to obtain a hospital bed, he needs to ask a favour from his legislator, and promise to repay them during elections, or else he wouldn’t be served (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009).

5.2. The Economic position adopted by Hezbollah

Now that we are acquainted with the severity of the conditions faced by the average Lebanese, can we proceed to analyze Hezbollah’s stance on the economy, and how it has sought to realize it Hezbollah defines itself as “the champion of the ‘peasants and farmers, the labourers and the poor, the oppressed and the deprived, and the workers and the homeless.” (Cited in Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009:126). Hence in its 2009 manifesto, it sought to stake its leftist position by stating that it was opposed to neoliberalism as promoted by the US, and praising the leftist states of Latin America, arguing that they have similar interests in opposing the current American controlled international order (Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009). Thus it advocates a state wherein certain services are provided freely; education is developed and promoted; each citizen lives with dignity; and the wellbeing of the citizenry is ensured (Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009). This progressive stance has led some commentators to argue that it is an anti globalization movement (Berti, 2010).

5.3. Redistributive activities undertaken by Hezbollah

For the above to be achieved it has carried out many activities. Its social services wing is divided into three categories, the social unit, the health unit, and the education unit (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). The social unit contains the Jihad Construction Foundation, known in Arabic as Jihad al-Binaa, the martyrs foundation; the foundation for the wounded; and the Khomeini support committee (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). Of importance for this paper is the Jihad Construction Foundation. This foundation is tasked with building and repairing infrastructure damaged during wars, and it has achieved this optimally (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). By September of 2006 (less than a month after the Israeli Hezbollah war) it had already paid over 280 million dollars compensation to people affected by the war, and in some cases it paid despite the fact that they did not have documentation (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009).
Its education unit provides cheap and quality education to over 14 thousand Lebanese who are not able to attend private schools owing to their economic situation (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). Students attending Hezbollah run schools are even provided with scholarships to attend universities, and facilities to obtain used books have even been created (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). This unit is also tasked with running the Mahdi Scouts, an institution which provides an array of extra activities to Lebanese children (Cambanis, 2010).

Its Health unit (known in Arabic as al-Imdad) runs 3 hospitals, 10 defence departments, 20 dental clinics, and 12 health centres amongst others, and these services are provided at little to no cost (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). This unit works so efficiently that it has been mandated to run many Lebanese hospitals in the South (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009).

In addition to the above, it provides water and refuse collection to many areas in Southern Lebanon, and even runs its own Micro Credit Institution (al-Qard al-Hassan) which provides loans at no interest to over 40 thousand Lebanese (Roy, 2009). These loans are then used for the creation of income generating ventures and to purchase agricultural material (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). It needs to be noted that this is the largest micro lending system currently in operation in the whole of the Middle East (Roy, 2009).

5.4. Criticisms of Hezbollah’s economic position and a Response

Hezbollah’s economic stance has been criticised for being too centrist (Kfoury, 2010). Kfoury’s criticism best illustrates this. He argues that, “Hezbollah is not a revolutionary party of the labour movement in Lebanon…. Nor should there be any expectation that it will change in the future into a socialist or social-democratic party, let alone a proletarian, Marxist, or other more radical left formation (Kfoury, 2010).” He further argues that the aforementioned services are merely part of its patronage network being provided to Shiites only, and thus are not really progressive (Kfoury, 2010). Moreover he slates Hezbollah for not opposing the Lebanese governments IMF programs in its platform (Kfoury, 2010).
Kfoury’s implicit argument that Hezbollah provides social services for votes, and that it provides it mainly to Shiites is factually incorrect (Roy, 2009; Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). Firstly it needs to be noted that Hezbollah’s social services are provided without discrimination and available to all who preside in the areas wherein it operates (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). Secondly it is argued that Hezbollah specifically presents itself as an organization which provides services on the bases of “need rather than sect”, and that it is careful not to antagonize the other Lebanese sects (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009: 128). Lastly it is argued that in places where Hezbollah doesn’t provide services to people from other sects, it does that not because it is a sectarian organization, but because it does not want to infringe upon the operations of Lebanon’s other sects (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009).

Needless to say that in a survey, 72% of Lebanon’s poor stated that their preferences are with Hezbollah (cited in Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). The words of Ananya Roy best sum this section up, “Hezbollah is as much an apparatus of development as it is an apparatus of war (Roy, 2009:163).

6. Hezbollah and Religious Tolerance

6.1. History and rhetoric

Historically relations between Hezbollah and most other Lebanese factions were tenuous to say the least (Krayem, 1997; Pike, 2011). As observed above, the party was conceptualized during the 1975 to 1990 Lebanese civil war to resist Israeli occupation of Southern Lebanon and protect Shiites from attacks against them by other, mainly Christian militia (Krayem, 1997; Kahil, 2006; Zunes, 2010). Thus it attacked other sects with impunity, even turning on its own Shiite constituency when it involved itself in a conflict with AMAL (Pike, 2011; Conway, 2008). Post the civil war relations have been more amicable, with the party now arguing that it envisages, a “Lebanon that is united through its land, its people, its state and institutions (Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009).” This move was reciprocated by Sheikh al-Gharib
(influential Druze religious leader) who in a conversation with Hezbollah Shoura Council member Muhammad Yazbek asserted that, “Much unites us and that which creates distance between us is non-existent. The first thing that unites us is this homeland, Lebanon, the dear homeland where we all shelter Christians and Muslims, under the shades of its eternal cedars (Hezbollah website, 2009).”

6.2. Experience and policies adopted

Hezbollah has sought to mend ties with Lebanon’s other sects and religions through many channels (Roy, 2009; Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009; Berti, 2010). Firstly it has attempted to achieve this through its provision of social services, which as observed above, is provided on a non-discriminatory basis (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009; Roy, 2009). Secondly its partnership with Michel Aoun’s Free Patriotic Movement (Aoun’s party represents around half of Lebanon’s Christians) illustrates that it has been undertaking joint activities with Lebanon’s other religious sects (Berti, 2010; Kfoury, 2010; Cole, 2011). Thirdly it has sought to promote integration of Lebanon’s sects by vehemently opposing Lebanon’s consociational political system, yet being sensitive enough to acknowledge that it has enabled all of Lebanon to participate in the political process (Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009; Kabbara, 2009; Kfoury, 2010). Lastly and most importantly, in its 2009 manifesto it dropped its call for Lebanon to be an Islamic state governed by Sharia law (as was envisaged in its 1985 call), instead arguing that the state it seeks should not discriminate between sects in its application of laws (Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009; Kfoury, 2010). Before proceeding It needs to be noted that this retreat is not a radical ideological break, but rather is the culmination of a process which begun in the early 1990s when the party vacated some of the areas it occupied during the civil war and commenced participating in elections (Berti [A], 2010; Kfoury, 2010; Abdul-Hussain, 2009).
6.3. Criticisms

However many have justifiably argued that when the chips are down, it will not hesitate to revert back to its original position (Singh, 2011; Abdul-Hussain, 2009). Of importance in this regard is Hezbollah’s 2008 uprising against the Lebanese state, which will be briefly elaborated upon (Singh, 2011; Zunes, 2010). In May 2008, Hezbollah fighters seized large parts of Beirut, in retaliation for the Siniora government’s attempts to shut down its independent phone line, and replace a then Hezbollah sympathetic general in charge of security at the Lebanese airport (Abdul-Hussain, 2009; Young, 2011; Simon & Stevenson, 2010). Pro regime news outlets were destroyed, and prominent politicians Saad Hariri (Sunni) and Walid Jumblatt (Druze) were blockaded in their houses mainly as they supported the Siniora government’s activities (Teslik, 2008; Abdul-Hussain, 2009). The crisis eventually ended when the Siniora government resolved to refrain from shutting down the line, and the Hezbollah block was given a veto vote over Lebanese policies (Abdul-Hussain, 2009; Zunes, 2010). A consequence of this is a growing scepticism amongst Lebanese Sunnis (West Beirut is a predominantly Sunni area) about Hezbollah’s commitment to democracy and nonsectarianism (Abdul-Hussain, 2009; Zunes, 2010). Before proceeding it needs to be noted that though Hezbollah was largely the culprit, the Syrian Socialist Nationalist Party (a Lebanese party comprised of Greek orthodox Christians) was also involved in the burning down of buildings (Zunes, 2010). Lastly it needs to be noted that Hezbollah still believes in the concept of the Wali al-Faqih (the notion that Iran’s supreme leader Ali Khamenei is the supreme leader and jurist of the Islamic world), and that this in the future may complicate sectarian relations if he (Khamenei) issues an interdict which runs contrary to the sectarian tolerance rhetorically promoted by Hezbollah (Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009).
7. Hezbollah and Terrorism

7.1. Rhetoric

Most commentators argue that Hezbollah’s stance toward terrorism is ambiguous at best (Zunes, 2010; Foster, 2003; Byman, 2003). Statements such as those made by Amar Massawi to David Lewis that, ...“no one should attack civilians, it's terrible, and it’s awful. If you've got a problem with a government, you shouldn't take it out on innocent civilians,” referring to the September 11 terrorist attacks are quickly balanced out by statements by Naim Qassem (Hezbollah’s deputy general secretary) that “We will buy weapons, and we will tell the world that we are buying weapons, and we will liberate our land with these weapons... Let the (U.N.) Security Council take a rest and sleep... Let them shout but their shouts will go unheard (cited in Foster, 2003& Badran, 2009). The party attempts to reconcile the above statements by arguing that it is a resistance organization aimed at liberating lands still occupied by Israel, and distinguishing this from terrorism carried out against civilians (Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009). to accomplish this ‘resistance’ task, it has a stockpile of over 40 thousand rockets, anti tank equipment, and it even possesses unmanned Aerial aircraft, most procured from Iran and Syria, its two main backers (Bruno, 2008; Bazzi, 2009). The party maintains that its weapons are to protect Lebanon from Israel’s thirst for land and water, and will remain as long “as (these) threats and aspirations persist (Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009).” the above differentiation is valid, terrorism and armed resistance are different, and Israel had occupied Southern Lebanon for over 22 years and still continues to violate its air space on a regular basis; however various activities which the party has participated in falls outside the armed resistance boundary (Zunes, 2010; El-Masri, 2008). Before proceeding it needs to be noted that the possession of weapons by Hezbollah contravenes UN Security Council resolutions 1559 (passed in 2004) and 1701 (passed in 2006), which are specifically aimed at effecting its (Hezbollah) disarmament (El-Masri, 2008; Badran, 2009).
7.2. Terrorist activities that Hezbollah has carried out

Over its short history (29 years), Hezbollah has carried out its fare share of terrorist activities (CFR [B], 2009; Byman, 2003; Zunes, 2010). In 1983 it truck bombed a US marine barracks in Lebanon killing over 200 US marines; it was involved in the high jacking of TWA flight 847, the picture of the pilot’s head out of the cockpit with a gun next to it still resounds; and during the 1990s it was involved in the bombing of the Israeli embassy in and a Jewish centre in Argentina (CFR [B], 2009; Byman, 2003; Zunes, 2010). In recent times, as mentioned above, it has been fingered in the assassination of former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafik Hariri, and was the main culprit behind Lebanon’s 2008 skirmishes (Zunes, 2010; El-Masri, 2008; Chulov, 2011). The assassination of Hariri is important in this regard, as he not only was a civilian, but as he was anti-occupationist in that he advocated the withdrawal of Syrian Troupes from Lebanon, thus illustrating that Hezbollah’s anti-occupationist rhetoric is laden with double standards (El-Masri, 2008; Khashan, 2011).

7.3. The 2006 Israeli/Hezbollah war, and why one is not categorizing it as Terrorism

On July 12th 2006 Hezbollah raided an Israeli border post capturing 2 soldiers, an action which sparked off the Israeli /Hezbollah war (CFR [B], 2009; Zunes, 2010). This war lasted 34 days, and resulted in the deaths of over 800 non combatants at a rate of 25 Lebanese to 1 Israeli; and the large scale destruction of South Lebanon’s infrastructure (Zunes, 2010; Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). Many have argued that this act is a form of terrorism carried out by Hezbollah, however though illegal, there are various caveats to labelling this act a form of terrorism (Zunes, 2010). Firstly it is argued that the US and Israel were waiting for an excuse to attack Hezbollah, and in May that year (2006) convened a summit to plan for this (Zunes, 2010). Secondly post the 2000 Israeli withdrawal from south Lebanon, Israeli Defence Force Jets continually violated Lebanese airspace, a move which the then UN secretary General Kofi Annan labelled as "provocative" (cited in Zunes, 2010: 54). Thirdly the border raid was in response to the Israeli’s seizure of three Lebanese citizens, so as a prisoner swap could be arranged (Zunes, 2010). Lastly the attack was carried out against a military target, and not a civilian one thus further inhibiting it from being labelled terrorism (CFR [B], 2009; Khashan, 2011; Abdul-Hussain, 2009). It needs to be noted that one in no
way is condoning this action, or attempting to argue that it was justified under international law, but merely asserting that the border raid cannot be categorized as a terrorist act.

Lastly before proceeding it needs to be noted that Hezbollah’s weapons have had some positives for Lebanon and its sovereignty. It was as a result of Hezbollah’s military wing which carried out attacks against Israeli targets, that in the year 2000, Israel withdrew its forces from Southern Lebanon (Byman, 2003). Byman puts it well when he asserts that Hezbollah is the only party that was able to militarily defeat Israel, a feat that the Arab world combined (in 1948 and 1967) were not able to accomplish (Byman, 2003).

8. Conclusion

In conclusion this chapter has analyzed and assessed Hezbollah. The first part discussed some of the major events that have shaped, and are shaping its evolution. It accomplished this by touching on Lebanon’s demographics, its 1975 to 1990 civil war, and how the above have contributed to Hezbollah’s formation and evolution amongst others. The second part analyzed Hezbollah’s attitude toward democracy. It achieved this by touching on its pro democratic rhetoric; its participation in the democratic process; and the various criticisms regarding its stance on democracy. The third part examined the party’s attitude toward women’s rights. This was realized by touching on the Shiite framework which informs its ideology; its adherence to women’s equality; and the discrimination meted out to women by the other parties operating in Lebanese politics. The fourth part elaborated on its provision of social services. The conditions faced by Lebanese citizens; the party’s progressive economic stance; and the various services it provides were some of the aspects covered in this part. The fifth part then discussed and analyzed the party’s stance toward Lebanon’s other religious sects. This was realized by elaborating on its call for the altering of Lebanon’s consociational system; and its omission of any reference to the formation of a Lebanese state governed by Islamic laws in its 2009 manifesto; and the criticisms of its position. The last part analyzed its contradictory stance on terrorism. The indictment of party members for the assassination of Rafik Hariri was also examined in this part. The above has led this chapter to conclude:
Lebanon is a highly fragmented society with many underlying sectarian issues (Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009; Krayem, 1997; Pike, 2011). These have in the recent past led to conflicts and a devastating 15 year long civil war wherein many outside powers also participated (Krayem, 1997). It was in this context that Hezbollah was formed, to resist Israeli occupation of South Lebanon, and to protect the Shiites who mostly reside therein (Kahil, 2006; Zunes, 2010). It should be noted that this has been achieved, Israel now only occupies a small area called the Shebaa farms (which the UN deems Syrian property), and the Shiites are now a dominant force in Lebanon (Zunes, 2010; Byman, 2003).

Hezbollah began participating in the democratic process from 1992, and in contemporary times is part of the ruling coalition thus illustrating that it is experienced in participating in the democratic process (Heydemann, 2011; Young, 2011; Berti, 2010). However the party’s alleged assassination of Rafik Hariri, and its 2008 rebellion have made some commentators sceptical about its democratic credentials, with some arguing that it merely instrumentalizes democracy (Singh, 2011; Khashan, 2011).

It has attempted to promote religious tolerance by dropping its call for the establishment of an Islamic state in Lebanon, and by providing social services to all with no regards to religion or political affiliation (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009; Roy, 2009; Kabbara, 2009). However its 2008 rebellion have made some sceptical about its toleration toward sects that oppose its interests (Khashan, 2011; Singh, 2011; Abdul-Hussain, 2009).

The Shiite framework that it ideologically subscribes to perceives women as being equal to men, and thus many of its institutions are headed by women (El-Husseini, 2008; Lynch.S, 2010). However women are conspicuously absent from leadership positions within its political structure, with no women occupying any of its 13 parliamentary seats (Berti, 2010; Duncan, 2009).

The party provides a range of services to Lebanon’s population, and is even involved in running some Lebanese state institutions (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009; Roy, 2009; CFR [B], 2009).

However it has not been afraid to use its weapons against this same population when its interests are being threatened such as what occurred in May 2008 (Zunes, 2010; Teslik, 2008). Hence many argue that its distinction between resistance and acts of
terrorism is tenuous and rather contradictory (Byman, 2003; Foster, 2003; Zunes, 2010).

- Lastly its ability to collapse the former Hariri led government illustrates that it is entrenched into Lebanese politics and society (Berti, 2010; Young, 2011; Bazzi, 2011) Daniel Byman sums it up brilliantly when he asserts that it (Hezbollah) is “the most powerful single political movement in Lebanon (cited in Bruno, 2008).”
Chapter 4: Analysis & negotiation criteria

1. Introduction

Are Hezbollah and the Brotherhood actually different; should they be recognized and negotiated with; if so which party should be allowed in; and what criteria should be utilized to make this judgement? These are the questions being asked in light of their increasing popularity, and thus an attempt will be made to answer them in this chapter. The first part aspires to make salient the similarities and differences between Hezbollah and the Brotherhood as examined in chapters two and three. This is realized by firstly elaborating on the different positions taken by them concerning democracy. The quality of democracy practised in their internal structures is also touched upon in this section. Secondly their stance on women’s rights is compared. It should be noted that both argue that women have civil, legal, and financial rights and that they are independent of men (Rutherford, 2006; El-Husseini, 2008). Thirdly this part analyzes their posture toward the provision of social services, and attempts to provide reasons for the similarities between the two parties in this realm. This then leads it to tease out the similarities and differences on their views and practises regarding other religious groups. Of importance in this regard is Hezbollah’s omission of the term ‘Islamic state’ and ‘state based on Sharia’ in its 2009 election manifesto (Berti [A], 2010; Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009). Lastly this part elaborates on the differences in the two parties’ positions on the use of violence and terrorism.

The second part then endeavours to critically assess which of the parties should be recognized and allowed into negotiations. It achieves this by firstly assessing the parties based on the criteria for cooperation advocated by neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism. However because these are too rigid and confining, it proceeds to use a more nuanced set of criteria to assess the chances and benefits of recognizing, negotiating, and cooperating with Hezbollah and the Brotherhood. Before proceeding, it needs to be noted that by cooperation one does not mean complying with the dictates of these parties (what legal scholars imply when they refer to cooperation), but rather the formation of partnerships based on mutual interests.
Running through this chapter is the argument that lumping the Brotherhood and Hezbollah together is methodologically flawed; and that recognizing, negotiating, and cooperating with these two parties would be beneficial and assist in moderating them provided certain conditions are enacted in the case of Hezbollah.

2. The Muslim Brotherhood vs. Hezbollah

Before progressing it needs to be noted that many of the aspects to be discussed in the proceeding section have been elaborated upon in chapters two and three. This may seem repetitive; however it is necessary so as to clearly highlight the differences between the two parties. Moreover this has the secondary benefit of enabling the nuances to be understood easier, whilst at the same time improving the paper’s coherency. It needs to be noted that the foregoing aspects will only be briefly touched upon, as reference to chapters two and three can be made for a more detailed discussion of these.

2.1. The Muslim Brotherhood vs. Hezbollah on democracy

2.1.1. Similarities

As observed in the above chapters (two and three specifically), rhetorically both parties vehemently promote democracy. Statements such as those made by the Brotherhood that, “The Brothers consider constitutional rule to be closest to Islamic rule. . . . We are the first to call for and apply democracy. We are devoted to it until death,” are equally matched by those made by Hezbollah, who’s manifesto asserts that, the fact that the Lebanese political system was founded on a sectarian basis represents in itself a strong restriction to the achievement of true democracy where an elected majority can rule and an elected minority can oppose, opening the door for a proper exchange of power (cited in Abed-Kotob, 1995: 326 & Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009). Moreover both have participated in the democratic process for an extended period of time, Hezbollah since 1992 and the Brotherhood since 1984 (Westcott, 2002; Bajoria, 2011; Abed-Kotob, 1995) Of real importance in this regard is the partnerships that these parties have entered into, Hezbollah currently partners with the Free
Patriotic Movement and AMAL, whilst the Brotherhood partnered with the Wafd and Labour parties during the 1980s (Cole, 2011; Abed-Kotob, 1995). The foregoing illustrates that both are informed about, and have participated in coalition building, which is of critical importance in ensuring the protection and smooth running of the democratic process (Robbins, 2009).

2.1.2. Differences

2.1.2.1. Internal democracy practised

Most internal structures of the brotherhood operate transparently and democratically (Lynch.M, 2009; hill, 2010). As elaborated on in chapter two, the Osrahs, branches, and districts regularly have elections which are well attended (Hill, 2010; Lynch.M, 2009). Thus leading Marc Lynch to assert that internally the Brotherhood is more democratic than most Arab political parties and Arab states (Lynch.M, 2009). Hezbollah on the other hand is severely lacking in this department (Kaplan, 2010). Its Secretary General has been in charge for the past 19 years, with no real election or process for contestation being organized (Kaplan, 2010). Moreover there are no plans for this to change, thus leading one to believe that Nasrallah will only be replaced were he to be assassinated by the Israeli government, like his predecessor, or were he to publicly disagree with Ayatollah Ali Khamenei (Kaplan, 2010).

2.1.2.2. Type of democracy envisaged

As observed in chapter two, the Brotherhood seeks a "republican system of government that is democratic, constitutional, and parliamentary and that conforms with Islamic principles (cited in Rutherford, 2006: 721).” In other words the Brotherhood seeks a system wherein the president and parliament are democratically elected, with the judiciary being independent of them (Rutherford, 2006). However, the parliament and executive are not allowed to formulate laws which are unislamic (does not conform to the Sharia), the judiciary being tasked with ensuring that this does not occur (Rutherford, 2006). The type of democracy envisaged by the Brotherhood does discriminate against women and Christians, as it is argued that they are not eligible to run for the highest public office (the presidency), and in the case of Christians as
they have to abide by Sharia law in criminal matters (Rutherford, 2006; Sabry, 2011). Hezbollah on the other hand envisages a more secular democracy wherein no discrimination on the bases of sex or sect is allowed (Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009). For this to be achieved it has called for Lebanon’s consociational system to be done away with, and even gone as far as dropping its call for the establishment of an Islamic state in its 2009 manifesto (Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009).

2.1.2.3. Instrumental vs. substantive belief in democracy

Lastly, and most importantly for this paper, is the different values attached to democracy by Hezbollah and the Brotherhood. It is argued that Hezbollah has an instrumentalist view of democracy, and will not hesitate to circumvent it when it is not in the party’s interest (Singh, 2011; Khatib, 2010). Empirically this is the case, with the party allegedly being involved in the assassination of former Lebanese prime minister Rafik Hariri (who was anti Syrian in ideology); and its 2008 rebellion in response to the shutting down of its underground phone network and the replacement of a Hezbollah sympathetic general in charge of security at the Lebanese airport (Abdul-Hussain, 2009; Young, 2011; Khatib, 2010; Bazzi, 2008). The foregoing clearly illustrates that Hezbollah only acts democratically when it is in the party’s interest. The Brotherhood, in contrast, views democracy in more substantive terms (Bajoria, 2011; Lynch.M, 2011; Wickham, 2011). This can best be inferred from its continuous participation in the Egyptian democratic process in spite of the various obstacles (mass arrests; and the banning of the party and its slogans etc) it has had to endure (Hill, 2010; Lynch.M, 2011; Black, 2011). The party’s statement that it will not put forward a candidate for Egypt’s upcoming presidential elections, and that it will only run for 50 percent of parliamentary seats clearly illustrates that democracy, not power is its goal (Lynch.M, 2011).
2.1.3. Reasons/Analysis

Many have attempted to understand and explain the Brotherhood’s progressive stance on democracy and the reasons therefor (Abed-Kotob, 1995; Rutherford, 2006). Wickham has brought forward two main arguments which explain this (Wickham, 2004). It needs to be noted that Wickham’s arguments were conceptualized to explain the stillborn Hizb al-Wasat party which was founded as a rival to the Brotherhood, however the Brotherhood’s evolution concerning democracy, and women’s rights amongst others means that they are applicable to it as well (Lynch.M, 2011; Rutherford, 2006). Firstly it is argued that the Brotherhood’s conversion to democracy was a move aimed at inhibiting the repression meted out toward the party by the then Mubarak Regime, and increasing its support amongst international activists (Wickham, 2004). Secondly and more importantly it is argued that the party’s participation in the various professional organizations during the Sadaat and Mubarak eras engendered a normative shift in the leadership of the party from instrumentalism to democracy and compromise, a process many refer to as ‘political learning’ (Wickham, 2004). Concerning Hezbollah, it is argued, that Lebanon’s sectarian nature (which is conducive to conflict, and block voting in the case of elections), and the party’s strong armed wing (which many argue is more powerful than many states’ armies), means that it is less prone to long term compromise which is necessary for democracy to become ideologically entrenched into the party (Sadiki, 2011; Singh, 2011).

2.2. The Muslim Brotherhood vs. Hezbollah on women’s rights

2.2.1. Similarities

In terms of rhetoric both parties tout their promotion of, and adherence to women’s rights (Lindsey, 2009; Coleman, 2008; Lynch.S, 2010; El-Husseini, 2008). Both assert that women are equal in legal, financial, and civil matters, and thus should be allowed to obtain an education, and be employed outside of the house and in the case of Hezbollah, that this employment is not contingent on her husband’s consent (Muslim Brotherhood Report, 2005; El-Husseini, 2008). Moreover internally women play an increasingly active role in these parties, from running service provision organizations to organizing political events, and in the case of the Brotherhood, it is argued that its women’s wing is larger than many Egyptian
parties (Sadiki, 2011; Rutherford, 2006; Abdel-Latif, 2009; Kahil, 2006; Flanigan, and Abdel-Samad, 2009).

However, worryingly, from a social democratic perspective, both assert that women’s first duty should be the raising of her children, and that she should minimize intermingling with men in the instance that she is employed (Rutherford, 2006; El-Husaini, 2008). Moreover both parties implore women to wear clothes which cover her body, with some ideologues even going as far as asserting that she shouldn’t apply makeup (Rutherford, 2006; El-Husaini, 2008). It needs to be noted that both parties cite religious texts to call for these rights to be awarded to women (Rutherford, 2006; El-Husseini, 2008).

2.2.2. Differences

The main difference between the two parties, is of minor consequence, and is ideological in nature. Whilst Hezbollah is of the view that women can run for any political office including president, the Brotherhood asserts that the position of president needs to be held by a man (El-Husseini, 2008; Muslim Brotherhood Report, 2005; Adnkronos, 2007). The repercussions of the brotherhood’s stance were discussed in chapter two, and thus will not be duplicated. Needless to say that this is of minor consequence as the Brotherhood has resolved not to put forward a candidate for the upcoming Egyptian presidential election, and as it is a rapidly evolving party, thus making it likely that prior to the next election this stance will be altered (Sabry, 2011; Abdel-Latif, 2009). Moreover the fact that women are minimally represented in Hezbollah’s political structures (only one woman occupies a senior political position in the party, with no women representing the party in parliament) means that this is more a theoretical as opposed to a practical difference (Duncan, 2009).
2.2.3. Reasons/analysis

It is argued that the above is mainly a consequence of Islamist Parties’ views that women should have special, not equal rights when compared to men, as they are different in nature (Hatem, 1994). Thus women can work, but their best contribution to the state would result from their child-rearing and domestic tasks (Hatem, 1994). This, Hatem argues, mirrors the equality vs. difference debate currently occurring in feminist circles wherein proponents of equality argue that universalism and equality of rights between males and females, which is dominant in the public realm needs to be applied to the private realm as well, whilst opponents argue that this universalism is andocentric, and thus women need to celebrate their gendered roles such as motherhood and attempt to obtain state recognition of it (Hatem, 1994; Squires, 2000). Islamist parties subscribe to the latter view, arguing that women have different roles in society, but asserting that these are of equal importance in ensuring the survival and progression of society (Hatem, 1994; El-Husseini, 2008; Rutherford, 2006). In addition it is argued that these parties’ stance on women (specifically political participation) is shaped by the context wherein they operate (Esposito et al, 1999; Fuller, 2002). As observed in chapters two and three, women’s participation in politics is severely limited, with only four seats (out of 128) being occupied by women in Lebanon, whilst in Egypt the decree allocating 30 seats to women was overturned on the basis that it was discriminatory toward men (Duncan, 2009; Hatem, 1994). This means that the Brotherhood and Hezbollah’s stance on women, whilst not being progressive, is not regressive toward them (women) and their rights.

2.3. The Muslim Brotherhood vs. Hezbollah in the provision of social services

2.3.1. Similarities

Both the Brotherhood and Hezbollah have similar beliefs and policies on economics and how the state should act (Davis & Robinson, 2006; Aly & Wenner, 1982; Kandeel, 2011; Roy, 2009; Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). Hezbollah views itself as the champion of the poor, and thus its 2009 manifesto asserted that it was opposed to neoliberalism; whilst the Brotherhood has a similar perception of itself and has called for the state to own certain enterprises and for the Zakaah to be used to provide social services to the poor (Davis & Robinson, 2006; Aly & Wenner, 1982; Berti [A], 2010; Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009;
Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009). Of importance in this regard is the fact that both parties are not of the view that the market should be dissolved, but merely assert that it should be controlled and regulated, a core tenet of social democracy (Berman, 2005).

In addition both have attempted to realize the foregoing through the provision of social services at little to no cost for their constituents (Roy, 2009; Bajoria, 2011; Black, 2011). Hezbollah’s social service wing is more developed in this regard, with specific subdivisions such as its health and education wing being created so as to improve the efficiency of the party’s activities (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). Of importance in this regard is Hezbollah’s non-discrimination in the provision of these services, something that will be further elaborated upon in the next section (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). So efficient is its service provision wing, that the Lebanese government has mandated it to run many hospitals in Southern Lebanon (Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). It needs to be noted that many citizens in Egypt and Lebanon are suffering the ill effects of the current neoliberalist order, and that these services are of the utmost importance in enabling them to survive (The CIA World Fact Book, 2011; Kandeel, 2011; El-Din, 2011). Lastly before proceeding it needs to be noted that there is no real difference in the provision of services between these parties, the only aspect that may be of importance is the fact that whilst the Brotherhood is funded by member contributions (each member contributes around 7 percent of his/her annual income to the party), Hezbollah is partly funded by Iran, who reportedly provides the party with funds totalling over 200 million dollars each year (Lynch.S, 2011; Levitt, 2008; Levitt & Jacobson, 2008).
2.3.2. Reasons/Analysis

Three main reasons have been provided which purportedly explain the economic stance and provision of services by the two parties. Before proceeding it needs to be noted that all three partly explain why the Brotherhood and Hezbollah have adopted such a left-leaning economic stance. Firstly as examined and elaborated upon in chapter one, most of the constituents which support Islamist parties (Hezbollah and the Muslim Brotherhood in this instance) are poor and working class (Zunes, 2010; Robbins, 2009). Thus it is argued that this is a strategic move by these parties so as to maintain and increase their support (Robbins, 2009). Hezbollah’s activities best illustrate this. Its main constituents are Shiites from Lebanon’s southern and Eastern regions (Zunes, 2010). These Shiites, it is argued, are poorer than most Lebanese as a result of Lebanon’s political system wherein bribery and corruption reign supreme, and as a result of Israel’s occupation of the south (Zunes, 2010; Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). Thus Hezbollah, by championing their cause has become an extremely powerful actor in Lebanon, altering this would result in the party losing a great amount of support to the more secular Shiite AMAL party, a party which as elaborated upon in chapter three, had been in conflict with Hezbollah during the 1980s (Zunes, 2010; Krayem, 1997; Pike, 2011; Conway, 2008). Secondly it is argued that Islamic ideology provides a reason as to why Islamist parties adopt such a leftist posture on economics, and the provision of services (Black, 1993; Davis & Robinson, 2006). This is as the Qur’aan calls for the poor to be looked after, the result being the Zakaah which basically refers to the donating of 2.5 percent of one’s assets annually (this mostly takes the form of a monetary contribution) (Aly & Wenner, 1982). This can be observed in the Brotherhood’s 1987 demand that the Zakaah be used to provide services to the poor (Aly & Wenner, 1982; Abed-Kotob, 1995). Lastly Davis and Robinson have conceptualized modern cosmology theory which asserts that the more religious a person is, the more likely he/she will have a favourable view on economic redistribution, as he/she believes that he/she is part of a community of believers that are subject to God’s timeless laws (Davis & Robinson, 2006). This theory would explain these parties championing of social redistribution as resulting out of the religiousness of its members- the provision of services by Brotherhood managed syndicates discussed above, clearly illustrating this (Wickham, 2004; Davis & Robinson, 2006). Before proceeding it needs to be noted that modern cosmology theory posits that this (championing the cause of the poor, and calling for redistribution etc) is not specifically an Islamic tenet, but is common
with people from all the Abrahamic faiths as they believe that they are part of a religious community subject to the timeless laws of God (Davis & Robinson, 2006).

2.4. The Muslim Brotherhood Vs Hezbollah on religious tolerance

2.4.1. Similarities

Both the Brotherhood and Hezbollah have had tenuous relations with other religious groups (Coptic Christians in the Brotherhood’s case, and Christians and Shiites in the case of Hezbollah) (Sabry, 2011; Kahil, 2006; Pike, 2011). This is as Egypt’s Former President Hosni Mubarak co-opted the Coptic Christians in his battle to repress the Islamists in the Brotherhood’s case; whilst Hezbollah was conceptualized during the Lebanese 1975 to 1990 civil war, and thus acted with impunity toward people from Lebanon’s other sects (Pike, 2011; Conway, 2008; Sabry, 2011; Fleishman, 2011).

However in recent years both parties have attempted to redress this. The Brotherhood has asserted that Coptic Christians are free to run for any political office barring the presidency, and provided assistance to Coptic Christians; whilst Hezbollah has dropped its call for the establishment of an Islamic state (elaborated upon below), and provides its social services on the basis of need as opposed to sect (Ikhwanweb, 2006; Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009).

2.4.2. Differences

2.4.2.1. Differences in the type of state envisaged

There are two main differences between the parties when it comes to religious tolerance. The main difference is Hezbollah’s 2009 renunciation of its 1985 call for the establishment of an Islamic State in Lebanon (Berti [A], 2010; Kfoury, 2010). The foregoing means that it has resolved to operate within Lebanon’s secular system, and thus attaining power will not inhibit Lebanon’s diverse nature. It should be noted that this retreat does not necessarily mean that the party will halt attempting to proselytise and Islamize ordinary Lebanese, but merely that
this will be a bottom-up voluntary process as opposed to a top-down forced process (Esposito et al, 1999).

The Brotherhood in contrast calls for an Egyptian state, headed by a Muslim, which as touched upon above, is based upon Sharia, and thus this will have an effect on religious tolerance were it to attain power (Lindsey, 2009; Bajoria, 2011; Wickham, 2004). Before proceeding it should be noted that the Brotherhood has altered its policies, now arguing that if the Egyptian population elects a Coptic Christian as head of state, it will not oppose it (in the impending presidential elections scheduled for June 2012, it is not putting forward a candidate), and asserting that laws such as the banning of alcohol as a result of the state’s attempt to conform to the Sharia will not apply to Christians (Sabry, 2011).

2.4.2.2. Use of violence and intimidation tactics

Unlike the Brotherhood, Hezbollah has not hesitated to use violence and intimidation tactics against other religious groups when things were not in the party’s favour (Hill, 2010; Abdul-Hussain, 2009; El-Masri, 2008). Hezbollah’s alleged role in the assassination of Rafik Hariri, and its 2008 rebellion clearly illustrate that violence against other religious sects will always remain an option (Chulov, 2011; Abdul-Hussain, 2009). This has justifiably led to many ordinary Lebanese becoming very sceptical as to whether Hezbollah is as tolerant as it states (cited in Abdul-Hussain, 2009).

2.4.3. Reasons /analysis

Islamic ideology, as examined in chapter one, best accounts for the similarities between the two parties regarding religious tolerance (Rutherford, 2006; Conway, 2008). As touched upon in Chapter two, the Qur’aan clearly states that there is “no compulsion in religion (2:256),” and thus both parties, in attempting to prove their religious credentials, tout this injunction (Rutherford, 2006; Conway, 2008).
The differences in their policies regarding religion are best explained by taking into consideration the context wherein the parties operate, and the resultant political calculations this engenders (Hamid [B], 2011; Berti [B], 2010). Lebanon’s population is diverse, comprising many sects with none holding a large majority, thus for political power to be attained, the party needs to appeal to as many of these as it can (Morrison, 2007). Hence Hezbollah dropped its call for the establishment of an Islamic state, so as to appeal to voters, and so as to allow it to participate in a broader coalition, and thus have a greater chance of obtaining real power (Berti [A], 2010; Kfoury, 2010). Moreover it is argued that the party’s successes, both military and electoral, have resulted in it becoming entrenched into Lebanese society and thus it no longer sees the utility of turning Lebanon into an Islamic state (Berti [A], 2010; Kfoury, 2010; Berti [B], 2010). Berti puts it brilliantly when she asserts that the party has evolved “from being an extra-institutional armed group that opposed collaborating with the State, to becoming a highly-entrenched, popular, and mainstream political party,” a process many term ‘lebanonization’ (Berti [B], 2010; Badran, 2009). Thus it is argued that the party’s 2008 rebellion and alleged assassination of Rafik Hariri had very little to do with its religious leanings, but was a political move aimed at protecting the party’s position and strengthening its influence (Berti [B], 2010; Badran, 2009). In other words the party’s reaction would have been much the same even were Shiite AMAL the party threatening to shut down its communications network or calling for a Syrian withdrawal.

The Brotherhood in contrast operates in a totally different environment (Hamid [B], 2011). Egypt’s population is mainly Muslim, with over 94 percent of them in an April 2011 poll asserting that the state should in some way conform to Islamic principles (Cited in Hamid [B], 2011). This means that were the Brotherhood to moderate its stance and drop its call for a state based on Sharia it would lose many votes, particularly as the more stricter Salafis strand is taking hold in the state (82 percent of Egyptians polled in 2010 asserted that adulterers should be stoned, with 77 percent asserting that the Hudud be applied for repeated stealing), and as Salafis parties are combining and have performed astoundingly well in the first round of Egypt’s 2011/12 parliamentary elections with the Salafis Al-Nour alliance gaining over 20 percent of the votes alone (Al-Masry Al-Youm, 2011; Hamid [B], 2011; Tadros, 2011).
Lastly before proceeding it needs to be noted that secularism in its current form is discriminatory toward certain religions (non-Christians in the Western context) (Kymlicka, 1995; Taylor, 1992). Kymlicka argues that the language, symbols, and boundaries used by secular states favour certain groups, ethnicities, and religious groupings over others (Kymlicka, 1995). He has conceptualized measures which will inhibit the above; however a discussion of these does not fall into the scope of this paper. One has touched on this, not to assert that the discrimination and religious intolerance faced under states subscribing to an Islamic ideology is less than that faced under secular states, or to lobby for either system, but merely to assert that both (secular and Islamic states) need to be interrogated, and that we should not be hypocritical in condemning Sharia law whilst turning a blind eye to the religious intolerance which results from secular states’ privileging of certain groupings.

2.5. The Muslim Brotherhood vs. Hezbollah on terrorism

2.5.1. Differences

In contrast to the two parties’ similar positions on the provision of social services, there is not much in common when considering their positions on terrorism and the use of violence (Leikin & Brooks, 2007; El-Masri, 2008; Khashan, 2011). The Brotherhood has long since renounced violence and terrorism, even refusing to participate it when the Egyptian government under Mubarak severely repressed the party through mass arrests, and torture, etc (Hill, 2010; Lynch.M, 2008; Wickham, 2011). Moreover it has distanced itself from terrorist activities carried out by other Egyptian groups, the Luxor Temple massacre (examined in Chapter two) clearly illustrating its abhorrence toward terrorism (Gerges, 2000). Its stance against terrorism has been so firm that Al-Qaida has sought to reprimand it, arguing that the Brotherhood’s position on democracy is luring thousands of men into election lines instead of Jihad lines (cited in Leikin & Brooks, 2007).

Conversely Hezbollah’s stance is rather more ambiguous (Foster, 2003; Zunes, 2010; Byman, 2003). It possesses a large armed wing wielding over 40 thousand rockets, and regularly uses violence and commits acts of terror against its opponents, asserting that it is a resistance organization and attempting to distinguish itself from terrorist organizations (Al-Masri, 2008;
This paper does agree that armed resistance is different from terrorism, however the party’s alleged assassination of Rafik Hariri, and its 2008 uprising illustrates that in many instances it has crossed the boundary and committed terrorist acts (Chulov, 2011; Khashan, 2011).

2.5.2. Reasons/Analysis

Political learning, discussed above, provides the best explanation for the Brotherhood’s abhorrence of terrorism and violence (Wickham, 2004; Hill 2010). This process started in the 1970s when the Brotherhood began participating in student and syndicate elections (Bajoria, 2011; Wickham, 2011). The aforementioned participation engendered a normative shift in the party from democracy and non-violence as being an instrument to attain power, to democracy and nonviolence as being the only option even though it may have negative consequences (Wickham, 2004). This can best be inferred from former supreme guide Umar Tilimsani’s statement that “The Brethren do not consider revolution, nor do they depend upon it, nor do they believe in its utility or its outcome (Cited in Abed-Kotob, 1995:324).” It needs to be noted that during the 1940s the brotherhood did maintain an armed wing (Bajoria, 2011; Aly & Wenner, 1982). Concerning Hezbollah, as elaborated upon above, the sectarian nature of Lebanon (which is conducive to block voting), and its maintenance of a formidable armed wing, make it likely that violence and terrorism will always remain an option (Bazzi, 2009; Sadiki, 2011). The concept of smart power would best explain this, were Hezbollah a state actor, but then again, Hezbollah is termed by many as a state within a state (Nye, 2011; Abdul-Hussein, 2009; Byman, 2003).
3. Recognition and negotiations

3.1. Neorealism vs. neoliberal institutionalism

Now that one is familiar with the differences between the Brotherhood and Hezbollah can one assess which party is more suited to being recognized, negotiated and cooperated with; and the stipulations that should be applied. Concerning this, theorists such as Martin Kramer, Daniel Pipes and Judith Miller amongst others, argue that Islamist parties are anti-democratic, anti-pluralist, anti-Western/American, and that these traits are inherent in them, thus recognizing, negotiating or cooperating with them is futile (Pipes, 2002; Miller, 1993). Miller even goes as far as arguing that the US, and implicitly, the international community, should refrain from promoting democracy, and rather back the many Middle Eastern dictatorships so as to block Islamist parties from gaining power (Miller, 1993). However as this paper clearly illustrated, many of these assumptions are flawed, and thus entering into relations with them may have surprising and progressive results (Leakin & Brooks, 2007).

Two main schools of thought (neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism) exist in the International Relations literature which deals with this, and specifically with the criterion for negotiations and cooperation (Mingst, 2004). Neorealism assumes that the international order is characterized by anarchy; that states are the most important actors in the international system; and that fear and the quest for survival make war between states inevitable (Morgenthau, 1948; Mearsheimer, 2001; Mearsheimer, 1994/95). Neorealists do concede that cooperation can occur, provided it represents the distribution of power in the system, or is entered into in an attempt to balance this power (Mingst, 2004; Mearsheimer, 1994/95; Mearsheimer, 2001). Neo liberal institutionalists in contrast assume that individuals and groups also play an important role in the international system; and that though the international system is characterized by anarchy, institutions and shared morals make negotiations and the resultant cooperation possible (Mingst, 2004; Doyle, 1986). Of importance for neoliberal institutionalists is the promotion of democracy and capitalism (shared morals) amongst actors, as these engender a sense of interdependence which inhibits conflict, the surprising statistic that liberal democracies have not entered into war with each other being the most salient example (Doyle, 1986; Mingst, 2004).
From a neorealist perspective, Hezbollah is the party that the international community needs to cooperate/partner with and allow into negotiations. This is as the party maintains a relatively powerful military wing, thus cooperation based on power distribution or power balancing will work (Mearsheimer, 1994/95; Bazzi, 2009; CFR [B], 2009). The party’s selective use of democracy, and its espousal of violence are not criteria used by neorealists as they believe that power is the only aspect of importance in the international system (Mearsheimer, 1994/95; Mearsheimer, 2001). Mingst puts it aptly when she asserts that “Morality, for realists, is to be judged by the political consequences of a policy (Mingst, 2004: 67).” By virtue of not possessing power (military) in a neorealist sense, the Brotherhood, neorealists would argue, does not need to be negotiated and cooperated with (Mearsheimer, 2001). Before proceeding it needs to be noted that neorealists assert that states are the only important actors in international relations. However Hezbollah’s armed wing, which is more powerful than many states’ militaries, would put it in this category (Mearsheimer, 1994/95; Singh, 2011). Conversely from the neoliberal institutionalist perspective, the Brotherhood would be the party to be negotiated and cooperated with. This is as the party believes in democracy, the free market, and significantly has renounced violence (Hill, 2010; Wickham, 2011; Doyle, 1986). Of importance in this regard is the above discussion (chapter 2) on how its centrism acts as a deterrent to al-Qaida (Lynch.M, 2009). Hezbollah’s selective participation in the substantive democratic process, and its nonhesitance to use violence puts the party in a contrary position toward the ideals and criteria espoused by neoliberal institutionalists (Doyle, 1986).

3.2. A more nuanced perspective

However, many have argued that these perspectives are too rigid and confining, thus a more nuanced set of criteria which incorporates elements from both needs to be adopted (Neumann, 2007; Fuller, 2002). Hence drawing on Robert Neumann, Bruce Hoffman, and William Zartman, three criteria can be selected which would allow for a more pragmatic approach to negotiating and cooperating with Islamist parties (Hezbollah and the Brotherhood in this instance) (Neumann, 2007). These include their (the party’s) goals; their position on the utility of violence; and the level of cohesion exuded by them (Neumann,
Concerning the party’s goals, it is argued that they need to be rationalist and able to conform to the current interstate order, thus organizations like al-Qaida which have globalist ambitions shouldn’t be negotiated with, whilst parties which have nationalist or secessionist goals can be negotiated with (cited in Neumann, 2007). Secondly negotiations and cooperation should only occur with parties that are rational when it comes to the utility of violence (Neumann, 2007). In other words only parties that believe that violence is not always the solution to problems are able to be negotiated with. Lastly the party needs to be cohesive in that the leadership needs to be able to relatively control its rank and file, failing this it would be useless to negotiate and cooperate with the organization/party as the leadership’s pronouncements will be of little utility (Neumann, 2007).

Under this framework both the Brotherhood and Hezbollah are to be negotiated with, Hezbollah having to fulfil certain conditions though. The Brotherhood’s nationalist ideology (it seeks to attain influence within Egypt), and its non-violent nature, means that it is the ideal candidate; whilst Hezbollah’s cohesion, and its pragmatic use of violence combined with its anti-occupationist goals results in it also making the cut (Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009; Hill, 2010; Wickham, 2011; Neumann, 2007). However in the case of Hezbollah it is argued that this needs to be an incremental process, with the renunciation of violence, and disarmament being required before the party is fully recognized (Neumann, 2007). This may seem impossible, but as Britain’s negotiations with the Irish Republican Army illustrates, peace and respect for human rights can be achieved provided the will from both sides exists (Neumann, 2007).

4. Conclusion

In conclusion this chapter has compared and contrasted the Muslim Brotherhood and Hezbollah, and assessed which of the two should be negotiated and cooperated with. The first part made salient the similarities and differences between the two parties, providing reasons that account for these. It accomplished this by comparing the parties’ attitudes toward democracy, social services, terrorism, women’s rights, and the rights of other religious
groupings; and by using political and Islamic theory to explain these. Part two then assessed which party should be recognized, negotiated and cooperated with. This was realized by examining what neorealists and neoliberal institutionalists assume, and the criteria thereof; and then proceeding to spell out a different set of more nuanced criteria. The above has led this essay to conclude:

- The Muslim Brotherhood and Hezbollah, whilst both being Islamist parties, adopt independent and different stances on important issues. Some of these may be similar such as their positions on the provision of social services, whilst some are vastly different such as their stances’ on the sanctioning of violence and acts of terrorism (El-Masri, 2008; Bajoria, 2011; Hill, 2010; Khatib, 2010). Political learning, the context wherein these parties operate, and Islamic ideology are just some of the reasons accounting for these differences (Wickham, 2004; Fuller, 2002; Black, 1993; Esposito et al, 1999).

- Many have asserted that they should not be recognized and entered into negotiations with, however this ‘one size fits all’ notion is methodologically flawed, and may serve to further radicalise them (Fuller, 2002). In addition using criteria based on the assumptions of neorealism and neoliberalism to assess the prospects for cooperation are much too rigid, thus more nuanced criteria need to be applied when contemplating negotiating with these parties (Neumann, 2007). Three criteria have been elaborated upon in this chapter (the goals of the party/organization; their position on the utility of violence; and the level of cohesion the party exudes), which if utilized would provide a more nuanced and pragmatic approach to dealing with Islamist parties (Neumann, 2007). Of importance in this regard is the use of stipulations with tangible benefits to further deradicalize/moderate these parties (Neumann, 2007).

- Lastly under this framework both the Muslim Brotherhood and Hezbollah are to be recognized and negotiated with, however the caveat being that in Hezbollah’s case this needs to be an incremental process with disarmament being a criterion for full recognition (Neumann, 2007).
Chapter 5: Conclusion and Further Research

1. Introduction

“The Arab Spring has catapulted Islamists onto centre-stage - in Egypt, Libya and Tunisia. Sooner or later, Syria will follow. This dynamic is not going to go away (Sadiki, 2011).”

“Popular revolutions have swept U.S.-backed authoritarian regimes from power in Tunisia and Egypt and put Libya's on notice. If truly democratic governments form in their wake, they are likely to include significant representation of mainstream Islamist groups (Hamid [A], 2011).”

“Should countries that have experienced more violent revolutions also hold elections, such as Libya, Syria, and Yemen, Islamist parliamentarians are well positioned to compete in those nations as well (McCants, 2011).

As can be observed from above, Islamist parties are predicted to gain tremendous influence as a result of the Arab Spring, hence this concluding chapter aims to elaborate on this, and tease out some of the challenges they may face. The first part aims to sum up the analyses undertaken in the previous chapters. It accomplishes this by providing a chapter synopsis, and by illustrating how the various chapters built on, and relate to each other.

The second part then aspires to illustrate how the objectives of the paper were achieved. This is realized by examining how the various discussions within the paper tie in to the objectives stated in the introduction (proposal chapter).

Part three endeavours to speculate on the future of Islamist parties. Included in this section is a discussion on the various challenges that they may face. It needs to be noted that a consequence of the ‘Arab Spring’ is the increasing accession to power of Islamist parties - Ennahdha in Tunisia, and the Justice and Development party in Morocco are just but a few salient cases (France24, 2011; Schemm, 2011).
The last part then aims to tease out some areas concerning Islamist parties and political Islam wherein much will be gained from further research. Relations between Islamist parties and analyses of different parties are some of the aspects elaborated upon in this part.

Running through this chapter is the notion that the growth of Islamist parties is still in its infancy; and that were the international community to refuse cooperation and negotiation with them as a result of misinformation or narrow mindedness, terrorism and the disappearance of the more moderate of these will be a consequence.

2. Chapter synopsis

Many threads interspersed this paper, thus in order to tie these together and enable us to make sense of the various arguments discussed, a brief chapter synopsis will be presented. Chapter one elaborated on the framework which this paper utilized. It began by teasing out the differences between Islamist Parties such as the Brotherhood, and terrorist organizations such as Al-Qaida. It established that the goals (nationalist as opposed to internationalist); and the tactics (democracy and partnerships as opposed to all out violence are the main distinguishing factors between Islamist Parties and terrorist organizations (Rubin, 2007; Robbins, 2009). Of importance in this regard was its finding that Islamist parties exude a form of animosity toward organizations such as Al-Qaida (Rubin, 2007) This fact brilliantly tied into the discussion surrounding the relationship or lack thereof, between the Brotherhood and Al-Qaida in chapter 2 (Leikin & Brooks, 2008). It then proceeded to critically analyze some of the factors accounting for the increased popularity and operability of Islamist parties in contemporary times. Poverty, Islamic ideology, the role of outside powers, and technology combined with the autocratic and corrupt nature of most Middle Eastern regimes were the main factors which, it concluded, accounts for the increasing popularity of these parties (Black, 1993; Gasper, 2001; Barsky, 1996; Robbins, 2009). Poverty and lack of democracy, it established, contributes to their increasing appeal, whilst sponsorship from outside powers, the advance in technology, and Islamic ideology have enabled them to operate in spite of the many obstacles they face(Esposito et al, 1999; Pipes, 2002; Black, 1993). These factors were further touched upon, and proven correct, in chapters two and three, when it was observed that the Brotherhood and Hezbollah have similar ‘pro-poor’ economic stances; that
corruption is rife within both Egyptian and Lebanese societies, an aspect that they are highly averse to; that rhetorically, both tout their democratic credentials; and that in the case of Hezbollah, the party’s ability to operate is partly contingent on the assistance (financial and military) it receives from Iran (Levitt, 2011; Hezbollah Manifesto, 2009; Abed-Kotob, 1995; Bajoria, 2011; Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2009). The last part defined social democracy and provided reasons as to why it was being used as a framework. Moreover it illustrated how the promotion of democracy, religious tolerance and women’s rights; the provision of social services; and non-violence are all factors that social democracy espouses, thus linking the questions to the theory, and subsequently forming the framework/criteria through which the parties were to be assessed.

Chapters Two and Three examined the Muslim Brotherhood and Hezbollah based on the aforementioned criteria. It commenced by contextualizing the emergence and rise of the parties, and elaborating on some of the salient events that have shaped them. In the Brotherhood’s case, British Imperialism; the creation of the state of Israel; the party’s role in the 1952 Egyptian coup; and Nasser’s violent response to their demand for the institution of Sharia law were some of the events touched upon, and their subsequent impact discussed (Bajoria, 2011; Abed-Kotob, 1995; Leikin & Brooks, 2007). Whilst in the case of Hezbollah, Lebanon’s 1943 consociational pact; and its 1975 to 1990 civil war were examined (Morrison, 2007; Pike, 2011). The parties’ positions on democracy; non-violence and terrorism; women’s rights; religious tolerance; and the provision of social services were then critically analyzed. Moreover these categories were further subdivided so as a clearer, more nuanced and accurate picture could emerge, i.e. the women’s rights criterion was divided into the parties’ rhetorical positions on them; their internal promotion and adherence to them; and the current situation faced by women in the state wherein they operate. The picture which emerged was that of nuance between the two parties’ stances on these criteria. Whilst the Muslim Brotherhood was found to be substantively committed to democracy, and vehemently despises terrorism; it was established that Hezbollah views democracy and violence more as tools to achieve its interests (Leakin & Brooks, 2007; Singh, 2011; Khashan, 2011; Hill, 2010). Their stance’s toward people from other religious groups and on women’s rights were found to be comparatively ambiguous, in that theoretically Hezbollah is very progressive, asserting that it seeks a secular state, and arguing that women are free to occupy any position in this state; whilst the Brotherhood seeks an Islamic state, and is of the view that women are
not allowed to hold the position of president (Berti [A], 2010; Sabry, 2011; Wickham, 2004; Rutherford, 2006; El-Hussaini, 2008). However in practice the Brotherhood fares better with women having been represented on its election nomination lists, and the party asserting that it will not put forward a candidate for Egypt’s upcoming 2012 presidential elections and not oppose a Christian or woman candidate were they to be chosen by the Egyptian population; whilst female representation in Hezbollah’s political structures is severely lacking (no women represents Hezbollah in the Lebanese parliament), and as Hezbollah has not hesitated to use violence against Lebanon’s other sects when it was in the party’s interest (Sabry, 2011; Abdel-Latif, 2009; Duncan, 2009; Bazzi, 2008; El-Masri, 2008). Lastly it was not surprising to note that both parties have a similar position on the provision of social services, with both of them running extensive social services wings (Roy, 2009; Black, 2011; Bajoria, 2011).

Chapter Four built on the above chapters, by firstly juxtaposing the two parties’ positions on the aforementioned criteria, and thus making salient these continuities and discontinuities, and then by providing reasons which explain and account for these. It was argued that political learning and the context wherein these parties operate are two of the main reasons accounting for their differing views on democracy, religious tolerance, and violence amongst others (Wickham, 2004; Esposito et al, 1999; Fuller, 2002). Whilst Islamic ideology and modern cosmology theory were utilized to explain their similar economic stances (Davis & Robinson, 2006; Black 1993); the equality/difference debate was also elaborated upon so as to explain the parties’ position that women’s first duty should be the maintenance of their households (Hattem, 1994; El-Husaini, 2008). The chapter then proceeded to assess whether the parties should be recognized and cooperated with. The argument brought forward in this part was that the criteria conceptualized by mainstream theories (neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism in this instance) are much too inflexible and confining in nature and thus a more nuanced criteria taking into consideration the goals and cohesion of the parties would prove more fruitful (Neumann, 2007). Using this criteria it was argued that both parties should be negotiated and cooperated with, however negotiating and cooperating with Hezbollah should be incremental and subject to certain stipulations, disarmament being a key condition. however this disarmament needs to be requested with tangible benefits being promised to the party such as a written declaration by the international community asserting that it (the international community) commits to protecting Lebanon’s Shiite population and ensuring that Israeli aircraft would not violate Lebanese airspace were it to disarm, and that
subsequent to this the party would be fully recognized and donations to it allowed (Neumann, 2007).

3. Objectives Achieved

Before ending, an attempt will be made to illustrate how the objectives of this paper were achieved, so as to enable us to understand how comparing Hezbollah and the brotherhood tied in to the more general and abstract nature of these (objectives).

Chapter One’s analysis around the impact poverty, Islamic ideology, assistance from outside powers, and technology have played in increasing the popularity and operational ability of Islamist parties directly contributed to achieving the first objective of this paper which sought to tease out the main factors accounting for their rise. In addition the various discussions in chapters two, three, and four illustrated that this is no different when it comes to the Muslim Brotherhood and Hezbollah. It was observed that Hezbollah receives much assistance from Iran, whilst both Hezbollah and the Brotherhood appeal to the poor (Egypt’s GDP is less than six thousand dollars, whilst Lebanon’s is less than fifteen thousand) (The CIA World Fact Book, 2011; Kahil, 2006; Levitt, 2011).

Objectives two and three, namely the illustration that not all aspects of Islamist parties are bad and that their rise can have benefits for the citizens of the states wherein they operate, were realized by analyzing Hezbollah and the Muslim Brotherhoods’ increased willingness to participate in the democratic process, and by examining their progressive economic stance. Of importance in this regard was the observation that the social services these two parties provide are extensive, non-discriminatory, and of imperative importance in enabling the citizens of the states wherein they operate to survive, particularly as IMF and World Bank loan stipulations have resulted in a huge contraction in state activities (Roy, 2009; Bajoria, 2011; Black, 2011; Flanigan & Abdel-Samad, 2011). In addition the analysis of the negatives of these parties illustrated that in many instances these stances (e.g. women’s rights in the Brotherhood’s case) though not being progressive, are not by any means regressive in terms of the conditions already faced by the citizens of these states (Hatem, 1994).
The various apparent differences between the two parties and the explanations accounting for these have contributed to the achievement of objective four, which was to illustrate that Islamist parties are not one single homogenous entity seeking the end of the Western enlightenment project. Of importance in this regard was the comparison on the type of state Hezbollah and the Brotherhood sought. Hezbollah’s omission of its call for the establishment of an Islamic state in Lebanon was attributed to the Lebanese context wherein no sect dominates, and partnerships between sects in order to govern are institutionalized; whilst the Brotherhood’s fervent call that the state conform with Sharia was attributed to the conservative nature of Egyptian society, and the fact that Christians make up only around 10 to 15% of the Egyptian citizenry (Hamid [B], 2011; Cole, 2011; Morrison, 2007; Berti [A], 2010).

Lastly the fifth objective (assisting to debunk the myth of the clash of civilizations) was attained through two ways. Firstly it was observed that unlike Huntington’s assertion that civilizations (‘Islamic’ and ‘western’ in this instance) have different conceptions of the good, and thus have different views around democracy, constitutionalism, and human rights amongst others; the Muslim Brotherhood and Hezbollah both are increasingly participating in the democratic process, and calling for human rights to be abided by (Huntington, 1993; Hill, 2010; Birti, 2010). Moreover it was observed that these differences if and when they do occur, aren’t immutable, and compromise is always possible. Hezbollah’s omission of its call for the establishment of an Islamic state, so as to appeal to Lebanese Christians, and so as to partner with Michel Aoun’s Free Patriotic Movement, provides the best example of this (Birti, 2010; Cole, 2011). Secondly it was illustrated that Islamist parties have many fundamental differences. The apparent differences on the utility of violence best illustrated this. This, as mentioned above, means that Islamist parties and de-facto the Islamic civilization is not a homogenous entity as Huntington, and believers in the clash of civilizations myth assume (Cox, 2002; Lockman, 2004).
4. Future of Islamist parties

4.1. The Muslim Brotherhood

In ending, this paper will briefly speculate about the future of Islamist parties, and attempt to tease out some of the challenges they may face. Concerning the Muslim Brotherhood, it is argued that its short term future is extremely rosy (Hamid [A], 2011; Hamid [B], 2011; Lynch.M, 2011; Sadiki, 2011). As mentioned above (chapter two), the FJP led alliance has just won the first round of Egypt’s parliamentary vote, garnering over 48 percent of the vote, and thus will play an influential role in formulating Egypt’s next constitution, and in the short term, will remain the most powerful institution in Egyptian society (Tadros, 2011; Lynch.S, 2011; Al-Masry Al-Youm, 2011).

However it faces two main challenges (Hamid [B], 2011; Fleishman, 2011) Firstly it is argued that the downfall of Mubarak has resulted in the unity and solidarity between its members shattering, as there is no longer a single unifying goal for the party to subscribe to (Fleishman, 2011; Bayat, 2011). As touched upon in chapter two, the consequences of this are already being felt within the party, with many of its members being expelled for diverging from the official party position regarding its presidential aspirations or lack thereof; and many subsequently leaving the party as a result of disagreements around its stance on the separation of church and state, amongst others (Fleishman, 2011; Hedeya, 2011; Charai & Braude, 2011). In addition the parties silence around the November 2011 protests, which witnessed throngs of people flocking back to Tahrir square, has left many disillusioned and arguing that the party and the Egyptian military have signed a backroom deal (Fleishman, 2011).

Secondly the increasing popularity of parties referencing themselves to Islam has resulted in a variety of different Islamist parties within Egypt being founded (Hamid [B], 2011; Ashour, 2011). Some of these parties such as the Egyptian Islamic Group (IG) and Al Nour are more conservative, whilst some such as the Hizb al-Wasat are more liberalist, thus the Brotherhood’s dominant position is taking a huge dent as there are a variety of alternatives.
(Fleishman, 2011; Hamid [B], 2011). The strong performance of the newly formed conservative Salafis Al Nour party in the aforementioned parliamentary elections, wherein the party-led alliance received the second highest number of votes, best illustrates this (Tadros, 2011; Lynch.S, 2011; Al-Masry Al-Youm, 2011). Moreover, Al-Nour’s strong performance illustrates that in contemporary Egypt, party history is playing a minimal role in influencing voters, thus giving the Brotherhood reason to be apprehensive (Lynch.S, 2011).

4.2. Hezbollah

Currently the March 8 Hezbollah coalition is in power in Lebanon, and it is argued that the increasing Shiite demographic, and the popularity of Hezbollah’s social service wing means that its influence within Lebanese politics will continue growing (Zunes, 2010; Singh, 2011; Levitt, 2011). The main challenge for Hezbollah is external in nature and concerns the occurrences in Syria wherein President Bashar Assad is, at the time of writing, attempting to brutally suppress a nine month rebellion which has so far led to the deaths of 4000 Syrian citizens, and the injury of thousands more (Fahmy, 2011; Slim, 2011). The current Syrian regime is one of Hezbollah’s main backers, and thus its overthrow, which is seeming more eminent by the day with the raft of sanctions it is under, will result in Hezbollah’s ability to conduct resistance operations and replenish its weapons being seriously inhibited (Slim, 2011; Yacoubian, 2011). It needs to be noted that the Syrian regime provides numerous amounts of weapons to Hezbollah; has agreed to the stationing and use of military equipment on Syrian soil (even scud missiles according to some officials) by the party; and that the country forms an important transit point for the transfer of weapons from Iran (Slim, 2011; Bazzi, 2009; Yacoubian, 2011). Moreover the party’s assertion that Syrian’s should maintain the ruling regime, have not gone down well with ordinary Syrians (the majority of whom are Sunni) thus inhibiting the chances of a new regime being sympathetic to the party were Assad to be removed (Nashashibi, 2011; Yacoubian, 2011). Lastly before proceeding it should be noted that contestation within the party over its position regarding the Syrian uprising does exist, with many in its middle and lower ranks arguing that the party needs to stay true to its principles and rather back the Syrian people (Slim, 2011). However the party’s continued support for the Assad regime, combined with Saad Hariri’s assertion that the March 14 coalition “openly and proudly” supports the Syrian uprising may serve to entice these
4.3. Islamist parties in general

In April 1991, an extraordinary meeting of Islamist leaders took place in the Sudanese capital of Khartoum (Miller 1993). Present, were members of Egypt’s Muslim Brotherhood, Algeria’s Islamic salvation Front, Tunisia’s Annahdha; and even Georges Habash, the then head of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (Miller, 1993). The manifesto that emerged out of this meeting stated that democracy was compatible with Islam’s belief in Shoura (consultation); that political pluralism was allowed provided national unity was not impeded; and that Muslim states can and should have relations with non-Muslim states, provided these were more equitable in nature (Miller, 1993). This event, though not being covered by most media outlets, had a tremendous impact on the understanding, evolution and practice of political Islam (Miller, 1993). Doctrinally parties such as Palestine’s Hamas, Turkey’s AKP, and Jordan’s IAF could now participate in the democratic process knowing that they were not contravening Islamic tenants (CFR [A], 2009; Esposito et al, 1999; Tristam, date unknown). This subsequently has occurred and the results have been astounding, the AKP has won Turkey’s past three presidential elections (2003, 2007, and 2011); Hamas has won the 2006 Palestinian legislative election; and Hezbollah won every constituency it fielded candidates in during Lebanon’s 2009 election (Cassel, 2009; CFR [A], 2009; Tristam, date unknown).

The recent Arab uprisings termed the ‘Arab Spring’ and the resultant democratization they promise, means that this trend will continue (Moosa & Johnson, 2011; Hamid [A], 2011). In the past year alone, states that have experienced uprisings such as Egypt and Tunisia have witnessed Islamist parties doing particularly well in elections with the Islamist Ennahdha gaining 90 out of 217 seats in the 2011 Tunisian elections, and the Brotherhood and the Salafis Al Nour party gaining tremendously in the aforementioned first round of Egypt’s 2011/12 parliamentary elections (around 124 of the 166 seats in which preliminary results were released) (France24, 2011; Tadros, 2011). Moreover it is argued that were the uprisings
in Syria and Yemen to end successfully, Islamist parties would stand to gain the most (McCants, 2011; Hamid [A], 2011).

However this increasing popularity does have its challenges. As touched upon above in the discussion on the challenges facing the Muslim Brotherhood, most states wherein Islamist parties operate may witness the formation of more than one Islamist party, thus the pressure to ‘out Islamicise’ each other might become unbearable, forcing Islamist parties to become more conservative (Hamid [B], 2011; Hamid [A], 2011). Moreover the failure of the international community to recognize, negotiate, and cooperate with these parties may further amplify this, thus in some instances leading to violence and terrorism (Zartman & Ahmad, 1996; Hamid [A], 2011). Lastly, before proceeding, it needs to be noted that the increasing popularity of Islamist parties will contribute to the reduction in terrorism, as many of the rank and file of these organizations (al Qaida etc) would be able to channel their frustrations through the electoral process rather than through violence (McCants, 2011; Leikin & Brooks, 2007). Al Qaida’s assertion that the Muslim Brotherhood is luring men into election lines instead of Jihad lines, best illustrates this (cited in Leikin & Brooks, 2007).
5. Further research

This paper has assessed the Muslim Brotherhood and Hezbollah, and with qualifications, in many instances generalized its findings to Islamist parties as a whole, thus assessments of other Islamist parties according to similar criteria would need to be undertaken so as to test the validity of this paper’s conclusions, and so as a more holistic picture can emerge. Parties that should be assessed include the Turkish AKP; Morocco’s Justice and Development Party; and Tunisia’s Ennahdha. Of importance in this regard is the AKP, as many contemporary Islamist parties (the Muslim Brotherhood and Ennahdha amongst others) claim to be influenced by its ability to remain Islamic whilst operating in a secular system (Hamid [A], 2011; Charai & Braude, 2011; Moosa & Johnson, 2011). In addition research needs to be undertaken so as to assess how Islamist parties develop and conduct foreign policy. This paper, aside from briefly touching on the role of outside powers in enabling their development, and touching on their positions regarding Israel, has not really analyzed their foreign policy dimensions. Lastly, much will be gained from assessing and critically analyzing how the many Islamist parties interact with each other. This paper was more concerned with how the various Islamist parties contributed to the development of the doctrine regarding Islam and democracy, and thus not much attention was paid to the levels of interaction and cooperation between them.
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