for a phased de-escalation of the violence in the country. He then proceeded to Tehran, stating that Iran’s involvement was essential to peace in the region. From there, he went on to Iraq.

Annan’s haste is in part dictated by the fact that his UN mandate is scheduled to run out on July 30, and that his monitoring team, which has been essentially confined to barracks over the past month, is scheduled to report back to the UN Security Council on July 11. It is no secret that those nations, like Obama’s U.S., Britain, and France, that have wanted to kill the mission, will be utilizing the ongoing violence, fed by their support for arming the terrorist part of the opposition, to try to remove its mandate.

A Shift in the West?

While the shift of a British oligarchical faction toward Glass-Steagall may well lessen the drive for war confrontation, it is a good sign that initiatives in the direction of preventing a “new Libya” are emerging.

Most significant was a carefully crafted interview with Syrian President Assad broadcast June 8 on the first national TV channel ARD in Germany, conducted by renowned Afghanistan and Syria expert, former CDU member of the Bundestag Jürgen Todenhöfer. Todenhöfer visited Assad in Damascus for the interview, and the full text in English was posted on the ARD website, from which it was picked up in hundreds of Middle Eastern and international publications, including the New York Times.

While all this international coverage is peppered with the usual denunciations of Assad, the story has nonetheless gotten out that Assad says he is willing to negotiate with opposition members who are not carrying out violence. It is also significant that a major German TV station interviewed the Syrian President.

In the interview, Assad stressed the importance of the Annan plan, attacking Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and the United States for sabotaging it. He identified al-Qaeda and other terrorist bands from Tunisia and Libya, and also mentioned the role of drug running in supporting the terrorist opposition. Assad also insisted that the main victims of the fighting were security and army personnel, and pro-government people in the population, with the terrorists appearing in army uniforms, to put the responsibility on the government.

Assad underlined that he still enjoys the support of the population, and that he is ready to work with all non-violent opposition forces.

Egypt

Pan-Islamism Is the Death of the Nation!

by Hussein Askary

July 10—With the declaration on June 25 of the Muslim Brotherhood candidate Mohamed Morsi as winner of Egyptian Presidential elections, Egypt and the broader Arab world entered a new phase of the British-created Pan-Islamism, which threatens not only the integrity of the oldest nation-state in Africa, but the entire region.

The potential for chaos and civil conflict then escalated on July 8, when Morsi issued a Presidential decree reversing the Constitutional Court’s and the SCAF’s (Supreme Council of the Armed Forces) decision to dissolve the Parliament, calling on its members to return to their seats. He also decreed that new elections will be held, but only six months after the drafting and ratification of a new constitution by the Islamist-controlled parliament. This is potentially the start of a new round of rioting and violence in the country.

To understand how the promising revolutionary fervor of early 2011, which brought millions of Egyptians into the process of debating and fighting for a future with human dignity, turned into this threat of chaos, we have to step back from the standard “military vs. the people,” or “secular vs. religious” view, and look at the forces who have served as puppetmasters for the region for more than a century, the British Empire.

Britain’s ‘Pan-Islam’ Card

The British Empire is still alive, if not well, and it has a clear strategy for the Islamic world, which is based on replacing Arab, Asian, and African anti-imperial republican nationalism with the vague pan-Islamism, controlled, as it has been in recent decades, by Anglo-Saudism. This idea was used in the 1880s by the British imperialist banker Evelyn Baring (Lord Cromer), who was the debt-collector for the British
Empire in Egypt, and later, colonial administrator and proconsul for almost 30 years.

This was prompted by the Urabi revolt of 1879-82, led by Egyptian Col. Ahmed Urabi, against the combined rule of the Turkish-Ottoman oligarchy of the Khedives and their European controllers. The Khedive Ismail had enslaved Egypt with huge debts, after being manipulated to borrow massively from British and French banks, after the building of the Suez Canal. Later, he was forced to mortgage Egypt’s farmlands and farmers to pay the debt which kept growing larger and larger, and the Egyptian peasants had to pay greater and greater taxes.1

The Urabi revolt created a national government and reduced the power of both the British collectors and the Khedive Tawfik, their new puppet. This prompted the British Empire to invade Egypt and occupy it. A little-known, but historically significant feature of the Urabi revolt, is the fact that, from the early 1870s up until the total British takeover, a group of American Army officers, all Civil War veterans from both the Union and Confederate sides, had been in Egypt, creating the equivalent of a West Point system of military education and organization. Urabi himself had been an active participant in this American effort, and his children had been trained by schools set up by the American officers.

Urabi was tried and sent into exile in Ceylon (Sri Lanka)—and all the Americans were promptly expelled. The banker Evelyn Baring, Earl of Cromer became the governor of Egypt. But in order to devise a new method of controlling the people of Egypt, Cromer and the British intelligence resorted to a new method of controlling the anti-imperialist national sentiment. Religion was chosen as a antidote to nationalism.

Mohammed Abduh, an Islamic scholar who was sent into exile after the Urabi revolt, but joined a British-controlled Free Masonic Lodge in Paris, together with his master and British intelligence asset Jamaedidin Al-Afghani, was dusted off, brought back to Egypt, befriended by Lord Cromer, and appointed as the Grand Mufti of Egypt, from 1899 until his death 1905. Abduh, who renounced the Urabi revolt, preached dialogue with the British colonialists, and approved many of the new slavery laws imposed on the Egyptian peasants by Cromer.

Abduh, who was befriended by another British intelligence agent and orientalist, Wilfrid Scawne Blunt, became the philosopher of pan-Islamism, a reform movement based on Islamic spiritual enlightenment, to unite all Muslim peoples from Asia to Africa, never mind that they lived under the British flag. This ideology became the strategy of the British Empire to crush nationalist movements all over the Muslim world, but especially in Egypt, continuing to this day.

Just so that this author’s point is not misunderstood—I am Muslim by faith, and grew up in a religious family; I have deep respect for the teachings, philosophy, and morals of Islam; however, the Muslim Brotherhood (MB) and similar pan-Islamist movements are not religious phenomena, but political move-

ments that use the cloak of religion to disguise power ambitions.

Unfortunately, these movements, which have allied themselves, on and off, with colonial and imperialist powers, especially the British, whom, ironically, they claim to despise, do not realize that under such alliances, as in the 1980s Afghan war or current regime-change wars in the region, they are the ass and the British are the rider.²

Egypt: The Anchor Is Loose!

Egypt, which had, until recently, been the political anchor of the Arab world, has become a hotspot of instability for itself and the region. It has been replaced by Saudi Arabia as the main player for American-British bloody geopolitical games and religious wars now engulfing Southwest Asia and North Africa.

The January 2011 events in that country can only be described as an “uprising,” because a revolution demands leadership and ideas for an alternative, which did not exist in Egypt in January 2011, or later, in spite of some independent individual efforts. It was an uprising against the economic-social and political injustice that had been implemented by the regime of Hosni Mubarak as a tool of the American-EU policies, promoted through such institutions as the IMF and the World Bank. The social-economic conditions, against which the Egyptian people had risen, are worse now, and political power is up for grabs by different factions with different agendas.

The events of the week leading to the Presidential elections of June 16-17, are witness to this reality. The results of the second round of the tight Presidential elections between former Mubarak-regime Prime Minister Ahmed Shafiq and the Muslim Brotherhood’s Mohamed Morsi were deliberately delayed on orders of the ruling Supreme Council of the Armed Forces after the MB prematurely declared its candidate the winner. The SCAF is determined to either block or reduce the MB’s power grab in the country.

The MB and its more extreme partners, the Salafist Al-Nour party, won a majority in the parliament in the elections earlier this year. Just as the Presidential vote was being tallied, the Constitutional Court declared half of the parliamentary elections’ result to be null and void, because the MB and Islamist candidate were filing more than one candidate in each electoral district as independents. Furthermore, the Court declared the exclusion of members of the former ruling party, the National Democratic Party, from the elections as unconstitutional, forcing a new round of elections for the Constituent Assembly.

It is this process that Morsi challenged on July 8, by convening the parliament, which approved a legal appeal of the SCAF’s decree. So far, there has been no violent confrontation resulting from the political standoff.

The Constituents Assembly is key to the drafting of a new constitution or amending the current one. Making the power struggle even more complicated, the SCAF announced on June 22 a new constitutional declaration, making itself independent of the President’s and the government’s power. The Armed Forces, which are traditionally the defender of the national interests and the Constitution, intervened during the January 2011 revolt, and forced the President Mubarak to resign, forming a new government under its emergency powers.

Now the Army is trying to make these emergency powers permanent, meaning that the next President would either share power with the SCAF, or work under it as a figurehead. Such an arrangement could also lead to conflicts and coups and counter-coups, similar to what happened in Turkey over the past three decades, where the military and the President were taking turns on who runs the nation’s policies, until the Muslim Brotherhood’s AKP and its leader Recep Tayib Erdogan cleansed the army of his opponents in a not-so-peaceful manner.

Needless to say, conditions in Egypt and the region have been brought to a level where not only Egypt, but the whole region, could descend to chaos. Under an Islamic government working with the Saudis and Turkish Muslim Brotherhood government, Egypt would find itself in civil war conditions inside the country, where the youth behind the revolt, the Christian minority, and the secular middle-class forces reject the Islamist march to power, or the SCAF military dictatorship, or both. Externally, Egypt would soon find itself at war, not only with Israel, but also other countries, such as Syria, that refuse the Anglo-Saudi 100-year sectarian war scenario for the region.

The conditions that triggered the Egyptian people to

revolt against their government were created by the global economic-financial powers in the City of London and Wall Street. While Mubarak and his regime are gone or behind bars, the authors of the global policy are still at large. Unless those forces are stopped, Egypt and the region would remain a simmering cockpit of war and destabilization.

There Is an Alternative

On the other hand, ideas for rebuilding Egypt and the economies of the nation-states of Africa and Asia are readily available, as provided by Helga-Zepp LaRouche and EIR recently. In the EIR package, the project which is specifically related to Egypt, but covers a significant part of Africa with water and transport development projects, is Africa Pass. Egyptian engineer Aiman Rsheed, the designer of the project, has issued a public call to the new President Morsi, to appoint him as the Transport and Communications Minister to implement this project as the first priority of the nation and its government. With 470,000 engineers in Egypt, and an army of young, well-educated people, this challenge would be a good test for the new President to prove that he is not a typical MB, pan-Islamist demagogue, but a patriotic leader.

Morsi’s First 100 Days program, which he announced after the elections, is nothing but a low-calorie diet for the Egyptian people. He effectively proposes to maintain the status quo of poverty, by focusing on keeping the bakeries open with subsidies (a policy which adds nothing new, as it was even followed by former President Mubarak) as the first point in the program, and keeping the streets clean and traffic rolling as second, and making sure the old subway system is running (and so forth). Such a program shows that this President is not serious about alleviating the poverty and social injustice in the country. If Morsi does not break with the IMF and World Bank policies, and immediately call for an emergency mobilization to issue national credit to launch such crucial projects as Africa Pass, this President will only prove the points raised by this author about the origin and purpose of the Muslim Brotherhood.


New from EIR

The British Empire’s Global Showdown, And How To Overcome It

In the face of a potential thermonuclear World War III, a confrontation being engineered from London by a desperate British-centered financial oligarchy operating through the vast—yet often underestimated—powers of the British monarchy, EIR has produced a 104-page Special Report, documenting both the drive for war, and the war-avoidance efforts of patriotic military/intelligence circles in the U.S., and the Russian and Chinese leaderships. The British hand behind the warmongers, and the concrete economic and strategic programs which can defuse the threat, are elaborated in depth. These include the Russian proposal for collaboration on the Strategic Defense of Earth (SDE), based on Lyndon LaRouche’s original Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI).

The Global Showdown report is available in hard copy for $250, and in pdf form for $150, from the EIR store. Call 1-800-278-3135 for more information.