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ABSTRACT

The study of the Iranian revolution as a model of Islamic revolution has failed to explain why a revolution has not occurred in other Muslim countries. Egypt, for example, is undergoing many of the same structural and spiritual crises that Pahlavi Iran experienced, as well as witnessing a rise in the power of Islamic revival movements. Although the radical Islamic revival groups in Egypt advocate an Islamic revolution, the political, cultural, and religious differences between Iran and Egypt have kept the current government of Egypt in place.
ISLAMIC REVIVAL MOVEMENTS AND REVOLUTION:
THE CASES OF IRAN AND EGYPT
The revolution in Iran has been studied as a paradigm of Islamic revolution by many political scientists seeking to understand Islamic revivalist movements in the rest of the Muslim world. By studying the Iranian revolution, scholars hope to predict the next revolution. Scholars take two basic theoretical approaches. Structuralists argue that the revolution occurred because the Pahlavi regime did not respond with appropriate political reforms to social and economic changes which rocked the foundation and structure of traditional Iranian life. The cultural or spiritual approach theorizes that the Islamic revolution found fertile ground in Iran because modernization became equated with Westernization, which in turn meant dependency on foreign aid, destruction of traditional culture, and a moral unraveling of society. This cultural breakdown proceeded without providing the benefits of Westernization as widely seen either on television or in the excesses of the wealthy minority. The second model thus focuses on spiritual reasons for a revival. Both approaches to the study of Islamic revival assume that it eventually engenders revolution.

But these theories of Islamic revival and revolution cannot be generalized primarily because they fail to take into
consideration the different types of Islamic revival movements, the historical differences between Iran and the rest of the Muslim world, and the different regime responses toward Islamic revival movements. This failure stems from the mistaken assumptions that Islamic revival movements present a homogeneous opposition to the regime, that the revivalist movements are transnational, and that states have not learned from the example of the Iranian revolution how to respond to an Islamic challenge.

Scholars, among them David Menashri, Johannes Jansen, and Werner Ende, have brought up the possibility of Islamic revolutions following the Iranian model in the rest of the Muslim world.¹ This paper will show that attempts to make the Iranian revolution the model for all Islamic revolutions have failed to explain why a revolution has not occurred in Egypt, for example, which exhibits most of the structural and spiritual problems of Pahlavi Iran, and also like Pahlavi Iran, finds itself in the grip of an Islamic revival.

Current Literature on Islamic Revolution

I. Structuralist Models

Scholars like Bassam Tibi, Philip Khoury, and Ervand Abrahamian, among others, root Islamic protest and revolution in the disruptive effect of modernization on social and economic structures.² The inability of the state to respond
to the disruption is perceived by the people as a crisis of the state. The regime loses legitimacy, prompting attempts at overthrowing it to replace it with an Islamic government.

Bassam Tibi argues that a repoliticization of Islam takes place in countries where the socio-economic structures have been so disrupted, and the political systems so deligitimated, that "Islamists" propose a return to the pure ideology of Islam. Their aim is to achieve order in society following the rules that established the first Muslim city, Medina. Although these movements suffer from a lack of concrete solutions to the structural problems of society other than the return to Islam, Tibi believes that they are attractive because they offer meaning "in a situation lacking meaningful cause."

Philip Khoury proposes a more comprehensive analysis of the causes of Islamic "revivalism" in the Arab world. He delves more deeply into the problem of the crisis of the state than does Tibi, finding that Islamic revivalists react to the state's inability to bring the society as a whole into modernity. Those most likely to react are those who have been left behind by the process of modernization: the classes which have not been assimilated, yet have suffered from being forced to change what they were.

The inability of the state to bring modernity to all its people may stem from regime exhaustion in the face of regional or international pressures to accept its status as a weaker entity in a world order dictated by the West. The state's
crisis may also be due to elites coopted by the West, consolidating their power and opening, rather than closing, the gap in wealth between themselves and the lower classes. The lower classes then react by joining Islamic revivalist groups. Khoury also considers the effect of the economic and political crises of the 1970s, which undermined the legitimacy of many Arab regimes.

Finally, Khoury points out that Islam becomes the vehicle for economic and political demands, rather than the impulse. This is a movement for the correction of the structural breakdown of society in the guise of a puritanical ideology. He specifies,

In sum, rapid urbanization without dynamic industrialization, the increasing inability of the state to distribute goods and services adequately, the retreat from pan-Arabism, successive defeats at the hands of Israel, and mounting external pressures on the state to liberalize the economic system (liberalization, among other things, contributed directly to escalating inflation in the 1970s) combined to increase polarization in Arab society. One important expression of this polarization has been Islamic revivalism.6

In other words, the breakdown of traditional society brought on by incomplete and unequal modernization polarizes a population previously ideologically homogeneous or unconcerned.

The leaders and adherents of Islamic revivalist movements come from the urban classes most affected by the loss of traditional stability. They have suffered, rather than benefited from, the state's attempt at modernizing society.
from above. The leaders are most likely to be members of the urban lower-middle class who live in the old city and maintain ties with the countryside. They are relatively well educated, having attended state schools, but have not found employment to match their level of education or to meet their financial needs. These people would have liked to move out of the old city and the old system and into the new city but have been limited by income, inflation, or lack of foreign language skills in an economy increasingly dependent on international contacts.7

According to Khoury and other scholars, the membership of Islamic revivalist movements tend to be recent immigrants to the city, usually living in inadequate housing in the peripheral districts of the city.8 These people, who make up the pool of casual labor, are unemployed or underemployed. They are cut off from their rural roots, from their socio-cultural traditions, and feel disoriented in the urban culture. They also experience alienation, and attempt to reinforce and preserve their identities by clinging to traditional culture and values.9

Both the leadership and the rank and file of Islamic revivalist movements feel alienated by mobilization without assimilation. Their lack of opportunities in the modernized sectors of society and the economy, the relative insecurity and instability of their daily lives, contrast starkly with the flaunted wealth, decadence, and corruption of the modern elites.
Ervand Abrahamian echoes the themes of lower-middle class alienation, poor government response, and polarization of society. Abrahamian emphasizes the role of the economic crisis of 1975-1977 in bringing down the Pahlavis in Iran. A regime can survive an economic crisis if it claims the loyalty of a large segment of society. But in the case of Iran, society had turned against the Shah during his reign.

Between 1953 and 1977, Iran underwent tremendous industrial growth due to its oil revenues. Revenues were used in part to modernize Iran, through education, economic and social projects. The state's hold on Iranian society grew stronger as its bureaucracy expanded.

The modern classes—which Abrahamian separates into the salaried middle class and the urban proletariat—grew at astonishing rates. The salaried middle class doubled by 1977, while the urban working class went from making up 5 percent of the country's labor force in 1953 to 16 percent in 1977.

But these classes were the first to join the mullahs in their protests against the regime. Abrahamian contends that these classes became progressively disenchanted with the Shah's regime beginning in 1953. In that year the coup which overthrew the popular Prime Minister Muhammad Mossadeq also obliterated the intermediate groups—labor unions, professional associations and independent political parties—which would have normally linked the lower and middle classes with the political sector. This distance between the lower and middle classes and the government stretched into a gulf,
when it became obvious that the government's programs benefited the upper classes far more than the rest of Iranian society.

Damage to the structure of Iranian society came from the very same programs designed to modernize Iran. Here one learns of the failures pointed out by Philip Khoury. Education and health reform during the White Revolution of 1963 increased the number of physicians and the rate of literacy in Iran, while also reducing infant mortality rates. However, after 14 years of White Revolution, Abrahamian writes,

68 percent of adults remained illiterate, the number of illiterates actually rose from 13 million to 15 million, less than 40 percent of children completed primary school, only 60,000 university places were available for as many as 290,000 applicants and the doctor-patient ratio remained of the worst in the whole of Western Asia.\(^1\)\(^2\)

Urban development programs brought the same unequal modernization to city-dwellers as peripheral shanty-towns multiplied and pollution increased. Tehran did not have a modern sewage system or adequate public transportation to cut through the city's terrible traffic jams.

Meanwhile, the countryside suffered from the failure of agricultural reforms. Land ownership remained essentially in the hands of old aristocracy and absentee landlords, with 1 million landholders owning fewer than 3 hectares each, while 700,000 peasants remained landless.\(^1\)\(^3\)

Thus urban and rural problems in Iran depicted by Abrahamian closely parallel the inequities reported by Khoury.
But Abrahamian goes one step further. The population, dissatisfied with the economic situation—and disgusted with the conspicuously wealthy minority—had no political arena in which to air its views. The Shah, while attempting to modernize the economy, had consolidated his political power by eradicating all organs of political participation other than the Rastakhiz party. By doing so, he lost his political base of support and severed ties with the traditional middle class, which had long supported the monarchy.

The traditional middle class, composed mainly of bazaar merchants—who controlled nearly two thirds of the country's retail trade—became alienated from the monarchy when it too lost its guilds and professional organizations in the wake of the formation of the Rastakhiz party. The bazaaris, merchants who were also money-lenders, wielded considerable influence over their employees, associates, brokers, and the countryside where they owned commercial farms and manufacturing plants.

But more importantly, the bazaaris maintained social, financial, and ideological links with the religious establishment. This link proved to be the most dangerous association of all for the government to test by abolishing traditional guilds in favor of state-sponsored and supervised organizations. Not content with destroying the bazaaris' professional organizations, state officials also talked of bulldozing the bazaars entirely to make way for a state-run market.

During the inflationary period between 1975 and 1977, the
Shah blamed the economic crisis on the bazaars, while also waging a war of control against the religious establishment. He attempted to wrest spiritual leadership of the nation from the until-then quiescent religious hierarchy by announcing the advent of a great new civilization, encouraging Parliament to disregard the religious laws, and establishing a Religious Corps to nationalize religion.¹⁷

Protests by the religious establishment elicited a harsh regime crackdown, during which many prominent clerics were imprisoned. Benefiting from the population's animosity toward the regime and its disenchantment with the economic situation, the mullahs also argued that modernization and urbanization had brought moral laxity to Iranian society. They advocated traditional values and religious laws as the antidote to crime, alcoholism, prostitution, delinquency, and other social ills. The tiny anti-regime religious opposition expanded to include the previously accommodating clerics who found that the regime would not hear their grievances.

The combination of the traditional middle classes, the disenchanted modern middle and lower classes, and the religious opposition proved too much for the regime to put down. Thus the Shah lost his monarchy because he did not provide political outlets for his people, who then turned to the religious establishment.

Jerrold Green provides, among the structuralists, the most comprehensive analysis of the Iranian revolution. According to Green, the breakdown of the monarchy stemmed from
its weakening capacity to coerce its opposition, combined with the mobilization of previously non-political sectors of the population under the leadership of the religious elite.\textsuperscript{18}

His model describes the six conditions leading to countermobilization:

1. The declining coercive will or capacity of the state.
2. A simplification of politics.
4. The politicization of traditionally non-political social sectors.
5. Crisis-initiating event(s).
6. Exacerbating responses by the regime.\textsuperscript{19}

The state exhibited its declining coercive will in Iran, according to Green, through its inability to react consistently to pressures from within and without. Specifically, internal political activity in the form of manifestos and open letters from the secular opposition, and religious demonstrations and marches by the mobilized urban classes triggered a cycle of tolerance and violent repression from the Shah. Early in Iran's revolution, the Shah was under international pressure to liberalize his regime. The Carter administration in particular sent frequent messages to the Shah regarding the deplorable human rights situation in Iran. This is why, according to Green, the Shah did not respond violently at first to the nascent protest.

The short experiment with liberalization, called the "Tehran Spring" by some, was followed by numerous instances of military repression of processions and demonstrations in Qum, Tabriz, and Tehran.\textsuperscript{20} But, Green argues, the Shah was responding to the symptoms rather than to the malady itself,
by using intermittent force in a limited and inefficient manner. He alienated the majority of the population without striking at the leaders of the revolution.

When the regime struck at the revolutionary leaders, it did so in an inefficient and even inflammatory way. A Tehran daily newspaper, an organ of the government, published a letter attacking Ayatollah Khomeini, defaming his character, and blaming him for the deaths of demonstrators. This letter provoked spontaneous riots and demonstrations in Tehran and Qum, by people who could not countenance the personal attack on the respected and charismatic religious leader. Far from discrediting the Ayatollah Khomeini, the letter provided him with a ready-made base of support and vaulted him into the leadership of the unfocused opposition.

This attack on Khomeini characterizes the role of the government in polarizing the population and simplifying politics. The population saw two opposite poles, with few political choices in the middle. Given its experience with the government and the ever-clearer message from the religious opposition that the choice lay between the forces of light and those of darkness, the population chose the religious opposition. Secular opponents of the regime threw in their lot with the religious establishment, realizing that the strength of the popular support the clerics could marshal far outweighed their own base of support.

Although the middle classes had been previously politicized through political participation and education, the
majority of the Iranian population did not exhibit much political awareness before the revolution gained momentum. Under the direction of the mullahs, millions of newly urbanized peasants participated in peaceful demonstrations against the Shah's regime.\textsuperscript{23}

Before full countermobilization can be reached, one more condition must be met. Green sees crisis-initiating events and exacerbating regime responses as essential in the transition from reformism to revolution. The Khomeini letter provoked demonstrations, which led to government repression, more gatherings, and martyrs for the cause. A fire at a movie-theater which killed 400 people was blamed on the reform movement by the government. In response, the religious opposition investigated the fire and found evidence of secret police involvement. On September 8, 1978 the military violently put down riots in Tehran, prompting Khomeini to announce that Muslims would not kill Muslims and thus the government must have employed Israeli troops to shoot at the rioters.\textsuperscript{24} This was followed by martial law in many cities.

Many other incidents and regime responses served to intensify the climate of revolution. When violence could not stop the religious opposition, the Shah offered jobs in the bureaucracy, lowered taxes, and dismissed the minister of women's affairs. Yet just as the violence had incensed the followers of the religious opposition, the financial inducements disgusted them, additional proof that the regime had lost all legitimacy and had to resort to bribery.\textsuperscript{25}
Green also lists the reasons why the opposition garnered so much support in such little time. The religious opposition cast itself as an anti-Shah movement, rather than approaching potential adherents with a program or a positive message. The vague message appealed to all Iranians who were embittered by the regime. This led to a glossing over of ethnic, socioeconomic, educational, religious, and regional differences because of the common hatred of the Shah. The countermobilization in Iran included Iranians working for the government, as well as many lower level bureaucrats who simply moved over to the opposition. Finally, because the revolution had no real oppositional center, the regime could not crush it. Its personal attacks against Khomeini simply increased popular support for the cleric.26

After the revolution, according to Green, Iranian society demobilized. Structural differences which had been ignored resurfaced. Ethnic and religious minorities reverted to their traditional rivalry for resources while attempting to maintain their autonomy.27 In essence, the simplification of politics which permitted countermobilization dissipated after the revolution.

II. Models of Spiritual and Cultural Crisis

John Esposito and Alan Taylor put forward the alternative theory that the Iranian revolution and Islamic protest movements in general have their roots in reaction to the moral failure of the secular state.28
John Esposito qualifies his analysis of the resurgence of Islam with the admonition that the causes are many and should be "appreciated within the contexts of individual countries and regions." Nevertheless, he lists some causes that pervade the Muslim experience. Contemporary Muslims suffer from an identity crisis stemming from a sense of failure—in the context of the Arab loss in the Six Day War and of the secular-nationalist experiment—and lack of self-esteem. They are disillusioned with the West and the failure of the western systems of government in Muslim nations. They also find pride in the military success of the Arab-Israeli war of 1973, the oil embargo of the same year which deeply hurt western economies, and the Iranian revolution. Finally, contemporary Muslims are searching for an identity beyond emulation of the West. They yearn for the authenticity and simplicity of their Islamic past.

These feelings transcend socio-economic barriers. The 1967 war is remembered as "the disaster," a defeat which seemed to many to indicate that God was no longer with His community. Religious leaders argued that it was not God who had abandoned Muslims, but rather Muslims who had strayed from the straight path. Revivalism answered the questions also of westernized intellectuals and elites who could not understand the failure of modernization to meet their societies' needs. Both traditional religious leaders and the western elite decried the failure of western models of development. It did not help that governments with pseudo-
democratic facades really maintained authoritarian control over Muslim societies.

While the 1973 war against Israel was no victory, it demonstrated the strength of the Egyptian army. Furthermore, the use of Islamic symbolism in the war led to its remembrance as a religious war. The oil embargo by the petroleum producing states showed that Muslim states were a force to be reckoned with. Saudi Arabia, Libya, and the United Arab Emirates supported Islamic organizations and development projects throughout the Muslim world. Finally, the Iranian revolution in 1978-79 seemed to prove that Muslims could mobilize to restore Islam to the state and live free from dependency on the West. Islamic movements in Sunni and Shii countries alike believed that the Iranian revolution was a harbinger and a model for the Muslim world.31

In another work, Esposito explains how the revivalist movements have progressed toward political activism to bring about their Islamic state. Increasingly alienated from the state, which may use violence to suppress them or religious imagery to coopt them, militants justify their struggle against the secular state with several basic claims:

1. Muslim's [sic] have a God-ordained purpose and vocation, that is, submission to and realization of God's will, which governs both individual and community life.
2. The correct path for society or Shariah is contained in the Quran and Sunnah.
3. Islam is a total way of life that embraces religion and politics, state and society.
4. An Islamic state must be established.
5. It is imperative that the Shariah be implemented, replacing existing Western-inspired legal codes.
6. The westernization of Muslim society and its Western models for modernization are condemned because they have failed and are thus responsible for political corruption, economic decline, social injustice, and spiritual malaise, just like the pre-Islamic period of ignorance.

7. A Western Judeo-Christian conspiracy pits the West against the East.

8. Governments such as Egypt's that do not follow the Shariah are illegitimate. Those guilty of unbelief, "atheist states," are lawful objects of jihad.

9. Muslims are obliged both to overthrow such governments and to fight those Muslims who do not share the "total commitment" of militants.

10. Jihad against unbelievers is a religious duty.

11. Non-Muslims are no longer considered "People of the Book" but rather unbelievers. Thus non-Muslim minorities, such as the Copts, are persecuted.

12. The official ulama are rejected for their tendency to downplay the meaning of jihad as armed struggle. They have succumbed to the West and have been co-opted by the government.

13. The majority of mosques that are state supported and controlled are places of unbelief because God's will and the Prophet's teachings are not upheld there.32

There is very little mention of any structural reason for opposing the state. Rather, the focus is on the moral imperative of returning to true Islam and the spiritual peace ensuing from this return.

While Alan Taylor mentions some structural grievances held by the revolutionaries in Iran, his analysis focuses on the anti-Western aspect of the Islamic opposition. Not only was the Shah pro-West, but he attempted to deemphasize the Islamic culture of Iran in favor of reinforcing national identity and even the pre-Islamic character of the monarchy at his 1971 celebration at Persepolis.33 Thus not only did the traditional masses espouse the cause of the religious opposition, but the westernized elites, in rejecting the Shah,
reidentified with Islam. Ayatollah Khomeini accused the Shah of disliking traditional Iranian culture, of collaborating with the United States at the expense of Iran, of corruption, and of exploiting the Iranian people. These are all moral offenses.

III. Revivalism as a Response to Structural and Spiritual Malaise

A few scholars have sought to reconcile the structural and cultural or spiritual arguments to provide a more comprehensive approach to explaining the rise of Islamic protest movements. Alan Taylor is among them, as is Ami Ayalon.

Alan Taylor emphasizes that the corruption and dissolution of the Pahlavi regime made the structural problems in Iran seem like insults to the people. The traditional balance between the government and the religious institutions had been upset by the Shah. He was attempting to change the basic structure of society, and at the same time altered the political structure of Iran. Moreover, the Shah had promised modernization for all and had not met the expectations of most, while upsetting their traditional way of life. The Iranians were disillusioned and unhappy with westernization, not only because they yearned for Islam and tradition, but because it had altered their lives in a negative manner.

Ami Ayalon puts forward a more convincing combination of structural and spiritual/cultural reasons leading to the rise
of Islamic revivalist movements, specifically in Egypt. He argues that it is precisely because the crisis is two-fold, material and spiritual, that the Islamic challenge may prove dangerous for the Egyptian regime.\textsuperscript{37}

According to Ayalon, Egypt's socioeconomic crisis stems from the paucity of arable land and the rapid expansion of the population. Combined with an inefficient and insufficient economic structure which makes Egypt dependent on foreign aid, notably from the United States, the crisis creates a huge foreign debt and an economy of need, rather than of supply and demand. A general sense of socioeconomic malaise results from periodic shortages of food, scarcity of housing, unemployment, poor public services, and the large gap between the minority of wealthy Egyptians and the majority of the population. The government is entangled in subsidies, which the United States and organizations supplying aid to Egypt have pressured Hosni Mubarak to eliminate.

The hidden economy and regional interest in Egyptian stability contribute to the continuity of the regime, as did the elimination by the United States and many allies of large portions of the Egyptian debt in exchange for support during the Gulf War. Nevertheless, the feeling of dependency remains, as does the spiritual-ideological dilemma, which Ayalon describes as a "crisis of disorientation." Why hasn't Egypt carved a more important niche in the world after several decades of independence? The failure of pan-Arabism and the obvious corruption of the ideals of socioeconomic justice have
led many to question the validity of secular nationalist concepts. One of their options, by far the most popular according to Ayalon, is Islamic revivalism. But Ayalon believes that the Islamic revivalist movement "is not a socioeconomic protest movement which happens to phrase its complaint in Islamic terms... Rather, it is a religious movement which is gaining ground due to socioeconomic and spiritual circumstances." \[^{38}\]

**Pahlavi Iran and Contemporary Egypt:**
**Similar Problems, Different Circumstances**

In many ways, the debate between the structuralists and spiritualists boils down to the question about the chicken and the egg. Which came first, structural dislocation, or yearning for a spiritual renewal? But the point on which they agree is that the presence of Islamic revivalist movements in states suffering from attendant structural problems can be problematic for the stability of the state.

This quickly-drawn conclusion suffers from the attention of scholars to the structural and spiritual causes of Islamic revivalism rather than on the effects of the revivalist movements on politics in the state. By studying the effects of Islamic revival movements, one might be able to trace a pattern of alienation leading to anti-regime violence in a particular state. But because the only contemporary Islamic revolution occurred in Iran, many scholars study the Iranian
revolution in order to predict the next revolution in the Muslim world.

In the euphoria following the revolution in Iran, Ayatollah Khomeini declared that the revolution was an Islamic, not just a Shii, revolution.\(^3\) Despite the initial admiration for the Iranian revolution and its leader in parts of the Muslim world, no other country has followed suit with an Islamic revolution of its own. Most notably, Egypt, with a past so similar to Iran's and a large network of established Islamic protest movements, maintains a secular nationalist government.

I. Iran and Egypt: Patterns of Similarity

The most striking similarities between pre-revolutionary Iran and Egypt lie both in the structure of their society and in the rejection of westernization in favor of the puritanical and nativistic values of Islam. Both Egypt and Iran fit Christopher Clapham's model of the neo-patrimonial state. Clapham has defined a neo-patrimonial state as one in which rational-legal structures inherited from the former colonial power are laid on top of a grid of relationships from the traditional patrimonial system.\(^4\) The pattern of feudal relationships, of which corruption and patronage are two integral components, affects the behavior of bureaucrats in the state towards each other and towards those outside government.\(^5\)

Public positions become platforms for the accumulation of
personal power. The behavior of people in public office takes on the quality of displaying this status rather than performing the duties associated with the position. This results in a government bureaucracy riddled with inefficiency.

Neo-patrimonial states are also characterized by corruption, which emerges as a result of "the weakness of accountability by the governors to the governed." The lack of accountability can be related to the social distance between the western educated elite in government and the masses, and the institutionalized inequalities of power within the hierarchical structure of the state. Often, a corrupt regime is also externally buttressed by its international patrons. So far, one can relate the above-mentioned characteristics of the neo-patrimonial state to both pre-revolutionary Iran and Egypt, following the evidence presented by Abrahamian, Green, Khoury, and Esposito.

Clapham differentiates between two types of corruption, parochial and extractive. Parochial corruption, the less disruptive of the two to society, involves the redistribution of resources and benefits within the community. Extractive corruption exists on a larger scale, "rests on the manipulation of state power, and maintains the lifestyle of a privileged class of state employees." Extractive corruption erodes public trust in authorities, while contributing to a lack of shared sense of values. Thus when the community is no longer receiving adequate resources and benefits from its patron, it becomes distrustful of the state
and alienated from it.

Patron-client relationships are established by those in power to maintain power. The patron provides physical or legal protection, employment, property, economic development, even religious intercession. The client responds with military service, voting, labor, and information. A society characterized by patron-client relations, whether between the state and the people within the hierarchy of state institutions, is a society deeply divided between superiors and inferiors, but also within classes.\(^4\)

Patron-client organization of a society, according to Clapham, most characterizes the Third World states where a competitive party system has emerged since independence. In such a society, the party leadership is obligated as a patron to look out for the interests of its constituent group. It comes to be regarded as the legitimate leadership of that group, regardless of the obvious difference in class and wealth. Thus the patron-client relationship maintains the patron class in power while also minimizing the issue of class in political conflicts.

Although pre-revolutionary Iran did not function along the lines of a pluralistic political system in a formal sense, it had experimented with multi-party politics in the 1950's through the nationalist and communist parties. Moreover, trade organizations provided opportunities for citizens' voices to be heard, as did the state-subsidized Shi'i hierarchy. However, the cooptation of westernized elites by
the Shah, his consolidation of political power, and his crackdown on both the bazaar organizations and the religious establishment denied Iranians any effective means of opposition.

Patron-client relationships are based on inherent inequalities between the partners, and their benefits to the partners are uneven. Furthermore, patron-client relationships exacerbate the problems already present in Third World states, namely corruption, the inefficient allocation of resources, ethnic and religious conflicts, and the unaccountability of the state. A participant in a patron-client relationship looks to the system and the state for the satisfaction of a private benefit rather than a public need. When, in the case of pre-revolutionary Iran or contemporary Egypt, it seems that the state no longer satisfies the private benefits of most citizens, it becomes a public crisis. If someone can organize, politicize, and mobilize the dissatisfied citizens, the crisis becomes generalized to a crisis of the state.

Most importantly, a neo-patrimonial state in which corruption and patron-client relations are the norm cannot claim the legitimacy that a modern rational-legal state can. If the vulnerability of the client decreases, the client may remove himself or herself from the relationship and look for more objectively efficient institutions through which to pursue interests. The more likely scenario in the case of neo-patrimonial countries, argues Clapham, is that despairing clients may follow "some new and revolutionary path, which
will also be based on universalistic values. It seems that in the case of Egypt and pre-revolutionary Iran, the new and revolutionary path is not radical communism but Islam.

Egypt and pre-revolutionary Iran equally fit the description of a neo-patrimonial state. One can argue that in pre-revolutionary Iran, neo-patrimonialism came to be rejected for a number of reasons stemming from the socioeconomic failure of the regime and the malaise brought on by the dislocation of traditions. In its place, Islamic revivalists sought to institute a state which would meet the needs of the people without promoting the inequalities that a patron-client relationship does.

The rational-legal structures which the Pahlavis adopted after their accession to power were discarded in favor of Islamic law, the Sharia. The monarchy and its extensive bureaucracy were replaced by a theocracy, headed by an Imam, whose authority derived legitimacy from the hierarchy of Shi'ite Islam and the myth of the seventh Imam. The secular state, which had failed to meet the employment, educational, health and religious needs of individuals, while attacking those which opposed it, was replaced by the Islamic state which purported to bring the Umma back and the golden age of Islam with it.

Whether or not the Iranian revolution has met these goals does not concern us. However, it seems clear that Iranians revolted against a system which denied them socio-economic security, and political participation, while robbing them of
their traditional religion and culture. Increasingly nepotistic and corrupt, the Shah's regime was no longer able or willing, as a patron, to provide for its client classes. By alienating prosperous clients like the bazaaris, the Shah freed them from their obligations to the state. They then looked to the clerics to fulfill the needs that the state had not.

In Egypt, Hosni Mubarak's presidency, like Anwar Sadat's before him, has been accused of corruption and nepotism. This is ironic considering Mubarak's pledge to clean up Egyptian politics upon his accession to the presidency. Moreover, population growth and the lack of employment available to university-educated Egyptians exacerbates the pressures on Mubarak to meet their socio-economic needs.

While Mubarak has made some efforts toward providing a more pluralistic forum for expression, a generation has grown up having had access to university education in rural areas yet not finding employment in Cairo. The newly urbanized, educated youth provide fertile recruiting pools for the Muslim Brotherhood (Ikhwan al-Muslimin) and other, more militant organizations like the Islamic Liberation Organization (Munazzamat al-Tahrir al-Islami), the Society of Muslims (Jamaat al-Muslimin), and the Holy War Organization (Munazzamat al-Jihad). Mamoun Fandy describes the patronage system in Egypt as a system which favors the Cairene over the rural Egyptian. He writes,

This network begins at the highest level of the Egyptian
government. It is widely known in Egypt that the government is controlled by Mubarak's in-laws. Thus the Islamists [sic] emphasis on brotherhood is a mirror image of the family-centered Egyptian power elite.49

Following Anwar Sadat's assassination in 1981 by members of the Holy War Organization, or al-Jihad, Hosni Mubarak attempted to improve the government's relations with Islamic organizations. He lifted the ban on the Muslim Brotherhood's participation in politics, though they were still not permitted to form their own party. He freed Muslim Brotherhood leaders and other moderate Islamic revivalists.50

In 1984, the Muslim Brotherhood allied with the Wafd, or nationalist, party to contest the parliamentary elections. The alliance won 12 seats in the People's Assembly.51

In the election of 1987, the Muslim Brotherhood allied itself with two secular parties, the Socialist Labor Party and the Liberal Party. Under the banner of an "Islamic alliance," they obtained 20 more seats for the Brotherhood in the People's Assembly.52 Following the declaration by Egypt's High Constitutional Court that the electoral law under which the People's Assembly had been elected was unconstitutional, Mubarak dissolved the People's Assembly.53 The subsequent elections were boycotted by almost all the opposition parties, including the Muslim Brotherhood.

Mubarak's manipulation of the Higher Constitutional Court, his creation of new electoral laws to keep political opposition out of the People's Assembly, his reversal of policy on the Islamist issue, the imprisonment and torture
of several militant Islamicists, and the ruling National Democratic Party's control over the patronage system all hark back to Clapham's neo-patrimonial system.

Similarly, the Shah manipulated politics in Iran throughout his reign. In 1953, he allied with the CIA to overthrow then prime minister Muhammad Mosaddeq, a nationalist who undermined the Shah by advocating the nationalization of the Iranian oil industry. The Shah then set about destroying all opposition to the monarchy with the support of the United States and the CIA trained SAVAK. They began with the Tudeh party, the communist party of Iran, which sustained such a severe blow from repeated arrests, torture, executions, and cooptation that by the mid 1950's, it barely maintained an underground. The National Front, the party of Muhammad Mosaddeq, though not persecuted quite as forcefully, suffered consistent harassment and monitoring, which created a much quieter, more careful opposition. The religious right's leading ayatollahs were also pressured into supporting the regime.

Experimenting with a state-controlled two party system throughout the 1950's, the Shah dissolved parliament in 1961, reinstating it with handpicked appointees soon afterward. His pattern of control over the political participation of Iranians continued into the 1970's, when human rights abuses became so obvious that even prime minister Hoveyda and the Shah had to admit that torture occurred in Iranian prisons. The government's security forces were especially thorough in
their assault on the religious establishment. James Bill writes,

In their crushing attack on Shi'ism, the shah's government closed down the publishing houses that produced books on religion and social problems. SAVAK infiltrated mosque meetings and prayer sessions and disbanded religious student organizations on campuses throughout Iran. The government arrested, interrogated, imprisoned, tortured, and even executed large numbers of clerics.56

The elimination of any avenue of political expression—and opposition—culminated in the formation of the Rastakhiz party in 1977. The Shah ordered all Iranians to join the party, intending to abolish all other intermediary groups like student unions, bazaar trade guilds and religious societies. When it became obvious, in 1978, that the single party was all that the Shah was offering Iranians in the way of participatory mechanisms, Iranians drew their battle lines.

Like pre-revolutionary Iran, Egypt suffers from structural problems in its economy and society. The historical origins of these problems can be found in the first revolution which nominally restored independence to Egypt from Great Britain in 1922. Under Gamal Abdal Nasser, it seemed that Egypt was destined to become one of the most important players in regional politics. Secular nationalist ideology promised the benefits of modernization without dependency on the West.

However, the promises of military greatness and economic independence grew stale when unemployment, urban crowding, uneven income distribution, nepotism, corruption, and defeat
at the hands of Israel came about in the late 1960's. At present, Egypt must import 50 to 70 percent of its food and inflation makes it very difficult for the poor to keep up. But the poor are not the only ones disillusioned with the unfulfilled promises, and the population continues to grow beyond the resources of the state.

Meanwhile, political participation is limited. While far less authoritarian than the Shah, Mubarak maintains control over the political structures in Egypt. Like all the presidents before him, Mubarak, as a former member of the armed forces, can count on their support in quelling unrest. In exchange, the president perpetuates the special position and privileges of the military, mindful of their role in overthrowing previous Egyptian rulers.

The cabinet is firmly under the president's control. Its primary function is to implement policy through the large and unwieldy civil bureaucracy which controls most of the country's daily affairs.

The regime also retains control over the legislature, in both the People's Assembly and the Consultative Council. The People's Assembly is the state's chief legislative body, also designated in the constitution as a forum for discussion between the government and the opposition. Its members, unlike those of the Consultative Council, are all elected. But because the governing National Democratic Party holds a large majority of the seats, the parliament in Egypt often simply sanctions government policy.
The judiciary is perhaps the most independent and respected institution in Egypt. Unlike his predecessors, Mubarak has complied with the court's decisions. His greater fault may be in complying too quickly, as in the instance when the election laws were declared unconstitutional, which permitted Mubarak simply to dissolve parliament and call new elections.

Mubarak has expanded the multi-party system first allowed by Anwar Sadat. Parties are free to organize, compete in parliamentary elections, even publish their own newspapers. The National Democratic Party, the successor of the now defunct Arab Socialist Union, represents the government. Its chairman is Hosni Mubarak. Its other important posts are held by ministers and state officials. State officials also administer elections. In a nation where the state has always been identified with the president in power, it is difficult to vote against the president's party. Thus while Egypt may offer its citizens more official political organs of participation than pre-revolutionary Iran, it does not guarantee that in the final analysis, the opposition will be given as much regard as the government's party.

Moreover, Egypt is experiencing much the same spiritual crisis as did pre-revolutionary Iran. Like the Iranians who decried the moral decay of society due to the westernization of the elite's and the regime's values, Egyptians have lost their shared sense of values with their leadership.59 This particular component of Clapham's model of the neo-patrimonial
state rings true for both Iran and Egypt, through the obvious abandonment of secular nationalism by a large segment of Egypt's educated youth in favor of Islamic revivalist movements.\textsuperscript{60}

Not only have disillusioned and marginalized newly urbanized university students and graduates joined the Islamic movement, but many professionals, bureaucrats, and even members of the military have become members of Islamic revivalist movements. It is in the movements themselves that the greatest differences between the Iranian and the Egyptian Islamic opposition can be seen.

II. Islamic Revival Movements: the Core and the Factions

Puritanical Muslim opposition to a state perceived as overly secular or atheistic finds its roots in the literature documenting the overthrow of the Umayyad caliphate in the mid-eighth century by the Abbasids. Two competing schools of thought emerged on the legality of revolt. The group supporting the ousted Umayyads, sometimes called the Nabita, or young upstarts, claimed that any disobedience to the legal ruler is wrong. The duty of the Muslim is to obey the Caliph in order to avoid \textit{fitna}, or chaos. This has been the orthodox approach to politics in Islam, both Sunni and Shii. The second school of thought, represented by the writer and philosopher al-Jahiz, maintains that it is the duty of the Muslim to resist and depose an impious ruler, when that ruler is "neglecting his duties and abusing his powers as a
The basis for this interpretation of the political duties of the Muslim, used by all of the Islamic revival groups to justify their political opposition to the state, can be found in two of the Prophet Muhammad's sayings, or hadith: "There is no [duty of] obedience in sin," and "Do not obey a creature against his Creator." These two sayings seem to signal the Prophet's permission to disobey the Imam, the head of the Islamic community-state, in the instance where the Imam demands something from his subjects which is contrary to God's law.

Nevertheless, the orthodox interpretation of these two sayings has been that disobedience should happen only in the most extreme cases. In all other cases, in fact in most other cases, obedience and quietism are urged in the name of order and the preservation of the Umma. The message of quietism was accepted far more extensively in the Muslim world than was that of duty of disobedience. The recurring theme has been instead the duty to avoid fitna, the "disruption of religious, social and political order leading to chaos."62

This debate was therefore short-lived and limited for the most part to the Sunni tradition. Nevertheless, in this debate lie the roots and the justification used by both the Shii opposition in Iran and the various Sunni opposition groups in Egypt and other countries. In order to understand the arguments of the Islamic revival groups, it is necessary to explore in more depth the differences between the Sunni and
A. Iran: the Shii Establishment

The greatest schism in Islam's history was based on political differences between the partisans of Ali -- the prophet's cousin and son-in-law -- as a successor to Muhammad, and those who followed the elected caliphs. The partisans of Ali, or Shiat Ali, believed that he was a more legitimate successor to Muhammad than the caliphs on the basis of his blood relationship to the prophet, but also on the basis of his personal piety. The descendants of Ali came to be the political opponents of Muawiya, the founder of the Umayyad Caliphate.63

Also important in popular Shii history is the story of Ali's two sons, Huseyn and Hassan. Muawiya, founder of the Umayyad dynasty, allegedly promised Hassan that he would become the next caliph. Instead, he had him poisoned. Huseyn survived his brother, fighting the caliphate until Yazid, the son of Muawiya, killed him at Karbala. Karbala is now one of the pilgrimage sites of Shii Islam.

Although the popular practice of Shii Islam includes mourning for Huseyn's martyrdom and asking for his intercession during the month of Muharram, he has not traditionally been a figure who incites people to revolution. As a matter of fact, Shii Islam has made a doctrine out of quietism and acceptance of the de facto separation of politics and religion. However, in his rhetoric against the Shah, Ayatollah Khomeini frequently cast himself as Huseyn and the
Shii Islam is divided into several conflicting factions. The form of Shii Islam which most Iranians follow is 'Twelver Shiism', a doctrine which traces the line of Imams from Ali down to his twelfth descendant. The twelfth Imam remains hidden, to return one day as the messiah, or mahdi, to bring the world into the age of true Islam. The hidden nature of the twelfth Imam does not mean that he has abandoned his followers. Rather, he is communicating his spiritual guidance to them through learned men--ulama in Arabic, ayatollah or mujtahid in farsi--who authorize their followers to obey the government even if it is not legitimate. The doctrine of the hidden Imam implies that all will be set right when he returns.

Twelver Shiis believe that they must obey the decrees of particular ayatollahs until the hidden Imam returns. They also believe that one particular mujtahid should claim the allegiance of all other mujtahids. This source of imitation emerges by consensus from other mujtahids by virtue of his great piety and writings. There is supposed to be only one at any given time. Ayatollah Khomeini emerged as the source of imitation during the late 1970's, when the usually quietist Shii establishment and citizenry followed him to revolution.

The mujtahids or ayatollahs are also venerated as charismatic leaders. This veneration derives especially from the popular conception of ayatollahs as "sacred deputies of a supernatural being," the hidden Imam. Ayatollah Khomeini's
charisma, perhaps in contrast to the hatred which the Shah inspired among his subjects, grew to proportions unknown previously even in Shii Islam. 67

Not only do the Shii ayatollahs hold the veneration and admiration of Shiis, but they also benefit from institutionalized means of support, independent from any government. Ayatollahs receive a customary tax on the incomes of their followers. This tax, the khums, usually amounts to 5 percent of each follower's income. 68 Since each Shii is supposedly attached to one particular ayatollah, it follows that the clerics manage financial independence, to a certain extent, from the government. However, the state also finances the religious establishment, in the hopes of keeping it loyal.

Khomeini also had considerable access to the infrastructure of the religious and secular opposition from his exile in Iraq and then France. He used the mosques to reach them and give them political direction. He used the leftist factions and educated youth to spread his teachings in the universities and among the elites. He also used tape recorders and even the BBC to broadcast his intentions to the Iranian people. 69

Ayatollah Khomeini's charisma played a crucial role in bringing together the dissatisfied and polarized segments of Iranian society. His charisma and his inherent legitimacy as a mujtahid, envoy of the hidden Imam, allowed him to mobilize Iranians whose instincts might have led them to wait out the crisis.
Finally, the popular conception of the messianic Imam returning to his people to lead them into an era of pure Islam had galvanized many uneducated Iranians. Among the anti-American and anti-Shah slogans that the crowds chanted on the famous Ashura march (December 11, 1978) were paeans to Ayatollah Khomeini's saintliness. To many, the ayatollah had become the Imam. This exemplifies the extent to which the revolution was understood to be a return to the Islamic umma.

B. Egypt: Factionalized Sunni Militants and Discredited Ulama

The majority of Egyptians are Sunni Muslims, the orthodox branch of Islam to which 85 percent of the world's Muslims belong. The Islamic revivalist movements derive their philosophies, on the whole, from the appeal of puritanical Islam as an answer to the material and spiritual crises of contemporary Egypt. The many movements agree that Egyptian society has fallen into moral decay, that the state no longer provides for Egyptians adequately, and that foreign pressures on the culture and the economy of Egypt must be repelled. In order to restore stability, a Muslim government dispensing Sharia law must replace the secular government of Egypt. It is the duty of all Muslims to strive toward replacing the secular government, which is promoting this fitna, with an Islamic government that will bring back the Umma. On all these points, the diverse Islamic revivalist movements in Egypt manage to agree.

In many ways, the Islamic revivalist movements remain
divided. First, in their approach to the society in which they live, but also in the way they strive to bring about the Umma, their attitudes toward establishment Sunni Islam and the ulama of Egypt, and in their attitudes toward their own leaders—in all these ways the many Islamic movements in Egypt have interpreted the Quran and the Sunna differently.

Scholars have counted 29 different Islamic revivalist groups in Egypt. These include the groups which possess viability and disruptive potential. Egyptian authorities have counted as many as ninety-nine, many of which are discovered and contained or suppressed periodically by the government.71

The most important movements, mentioned earlier, remain the Muslim Brotherhood (Ikhwan al-Muslimin), the Islamic Liberation Organization (Munazzamat al-Tahrir al-Islami), the Society of Muslims (Jamaat al-Muslimin, also known as Takfir wal-Hijra), and the Holy War Organization (Munazzamat al-Jihad, also known as New Jihad).

The Muslim Brotherhood is the oldest, and most moderate, of these organizations. It was founded in 1928 by Hasan al-Banna, a teacher from Ismailiyya, with the twofold goal of liberating the Islamic nation from foreign powers and creating a free Islamic state in its place.72 The ILO, the Society of Muslims, and the HWO derived their philosophies from the original goals of the Muslim Brotherhood. However, their membership and tactics reflect a higher level of militancy drawn from the writings of Sayyid Qutb, a revivalist who joined the Muslim Brotherhood after the death of Hasan al-
Al-Banna wanted to bring Egypt out from under imperialist domination and away from the spell of westernism. He warned against the appeal of secular nationalism, a western concept, arguing that a better conception of one's identity lay within the Islamic Umma.

The Muslim Brotherhood has retained the anti-western bent of al-Banna's original ideology. But from the underground organization of its inception, the Muslim Brotherhood has emerged as the largest, best-known and most established Islamic revival movement in Egypt. The mission of the Muslim Brotherhood, like that of other revival movements in Egypt, is to bring Islam back into the apparatus of the state in order to create the Umma. But unlike most of the other organizations, the Muslim Brotherhood proposes to achieve the transformation of the state through a jihad based on education and political participation rather than on violent action.

The Muslim Brotherhood survived the repression of the movement throughout the Nasser and Sadat years, when the leadership and the members spent many years in prison. Originally militant, it emerged in the late 1970's and early 1980's as a more moderate voice of Islamic revivalism. Moderation of its ideology has resulted in more lenient treatment from the government. The Muslim Brotherhood publishes its own magazines, through which it continues its propaganda against the secular state. It also participates in politics, even, as mentioned earlier, winning seats in parliament.
The particular focus of the Muslim Brotherhood's hostility is the secular nationalist state, which the Brotherhood's ideologues see as a western construct dividing the universal Islamic Umma. Sayyid Qutb, one of the most militant ideologues of the Muslim Brotherhood, identified the secular nationalist state as equivalent to the jahili state, the barbaric pre-Islamic state of Arabia. He noted that jahili states are governed by political systems based on servitude, "one man's lordship over another," echoing the earlier analysis of Egypt as a neo-patrimonial state.76

Sayyid Qutb's writings convey hostility toward the West, and in general a militant attitude toward bringing the secular state back to Islam. His most lasting contribution to the ideology of Islamic revival groups, the Muslim Brotherhood and its more militant offshoots, lies in his interpretation of the concept of jihad. According to Qutb, the Islamic Umma will not come about through mass movement but rather through the hard work of an elite of dedicated Muslims. The ultimate goal of the elite is to establish "al Hakimmiyyah—the reign of Allah's sovereignty on earth to end all sin, suffering, and repression."77

The literal interpretation of jihad as active struggle and the concept of the elite of muslims, or vanguard, are the focal points of disagreement among the various revivalist groups. Qutb did not provide guidelines to differentiate between the elite and those who belonged to jahiliyya society. Some of his writings can be interpreted to advocate the
separation of the true Muslims, those who form the vanguard of Islamic revivalism, from jahiliyya society, following the example of the Prophet Muhammad and his flight to Medina (the hijra).

But Qutb did not make it clear whether he was recommending physical or spiritual removal from society. He also did not explicitly condemn as impious Muslims those who chose not to join revivalist groups, although he maintained the necessity of separation from jahiliyya society. The Muslim Brotherhood has chosen to interpret his call to jihad in light of the Quranic verse (16:125),

Call unto the way of thy Lord with wisdom and fair exhortation, and reason with them in the better way. Lo! thy Lord is best aware of him who strayeth from His way and He is Best Aware of those who go aright.78

The leaders of the Islamic Liberation Organization (ILO), however, read Qutb literally. They command jihad against the regime, in the form of a coup to bring Muslim leadership to the government. Egyptian society, according to the Islamic Liberation Organization, will be reformed from above. The prison experience, rather than cooling their fervor, rendered them more determined than ever to use violent means to overthrow the government.79 They were also galvanized by Sayyid Qutb's example, his execution by the Egyptian state in 1967 providing them with a model of martyrdom.80

ILO members also perceive the Muslim Brotherhood as too complacent and the ulama as coopted by the government. Since it is the religious duty of the Muslim to see that a truly
Islamic social order comes about, Muslims must make sure that Sharia law is implemented as quickly as possible. To do so, one may use any means, including modern ones.\textsuperscript{81} The ILO thus infiltrated the military and other government institutions in order to spring into action whenever an opportunity arose. Its leader, Salih Siriyya, advised caution and patience. Members outvoted him. This resulted in the attempted coup against Anwar Sadat in 1974.\textsuperscript{82}

The activist orientation of the ILO is markedly different from that of the Society of Muslims. The Society of Muslims, though also veterans of a prison experience, and founded by a former member of the Muslim Brotherhood, believe that the whole of society is jahili, or barbaric. The change must not come from the top, but rather from the bottom up. The elite of Muslims, in order to bring about the Muslim state, must emulate the life of the Prophet every step of the way. Therefore, like Muhammad in the face of jahili Mecca, Muslims must follow their leader, Shukri Mustafa, and withdraw from jahili society. In their mini-society, they live according to the laws of Islam, gaining strength until they can return to deal the death knell to jahili society.\textsuperscript{83}

The leader of the Society of Muslims, Shukri Mustafa, believed that everything that came after the Quran and the accounts of the tradition of the Prophet (Sunna) was tainted by interpretation. Therefore the four major schools of law in Sunni Islam are invalid, which makes establishment Islam, and ulama, illegitimate. Mustafa also believed that the jurists
who developed the four schools of law did so to limit the ability of Muslims to interpret the verses of the Quran for themselves. They dared to come between God and his worshippers, which placed them squarely outside the bounds of Islam. Therefore they were jahili.84

Moreover, the ulama did not obfuscate the Quran merely to shore up their own power but also to issue fatwas to fit the views of the sovereign. He offered the example of Sheikh Suad Jalal of the University of al-Azhar, who proclaimed that beer did not fall under the prohibition of alcohol.85 Therefore, not only were the ulama assisting illegitimate rulers, but they were spreading sin. As a result, the Society of Muslims is quite strongly opposed to establishment Islam.

Shukri Mustafa's violent dislike of the ulama was paralleled by his disdain for formal education. Although he had received a Bachelor's degree in Agriculture, Mustafa saw the public education given by the state to Egyptians as useless, in light of the underemployment of educated Egyptians. He said in court,

The teaching of writing for its own sake is illicit... The Prophet did not open kuttab (Koranic schools) and institutions to teach Muslims writing and arithmetic, but permitted them to be taught according to needs and necessities.86

Some members of the Society of Muslims regarded Shukri Mustafa as the mahdi, or messiah. His autocratic leadership controlled every aspect of their lives, including marriage and employment.87 He was feared and respected by members of the Society of Muslims, who considered him an exemplary Muslim.
Like Salih Siriyya, leader of the ILO, Shukri Mustafa was an educated charismatic leader whose organization survived his death.

The Islamic revival group which has had the most dramatic impact on Egypt's politics is the Holy War Organization, also known as al-Jihad. Al-Jihad members assassinated Anwar Sadat on the sixth of October 1981. Their leadership, organization, and tactics are quite different from the ILO's and the Society of Muslims'.

The members of the Holy War Organization do not believe that Egyptian society is jahili. Rather, they see Egyptian society as mostly Muslim, but held hostage by an impious, or jahili, government. Instead of rejecting the interpretations of Islamic law offered by the four schools of Islam, the ideologue of the cell of the HWO that assassinated Sadat founded his arguments on the Traditions.  

This ideologue, Abd al-Salam Faraj, was an electrician who published a pamphlet describing The Hidden Imperative, a reference to jihad, which he believed to be the sixth pillar of Islam. He argues in this pamphlet that ulama have obscured the need for jihad through their calls for stability, in order to maintain the leadership of the impious government in power. In his pamphlet, Faraj also explains that other movements seeking to establish the Umma have failed. Therefore it is time for the removal of the apostate leaders from the head of the state. His pamphlet is focused on the political analysis of power and state rather than on society, which has been the
focus of most of the other revival movements.\textsuperscript{89}

In particular, Faraj focused on the scholar Ibn Taimiyya, a jurist from the 14th century whose writings include a condemnation of the Mongol rulers of Islamic lands for the imposition of non-Islamic codes of law, the \textit{yasa}, on the Muslim population.\textsuperscript{90} Faraj found many similarities between the political situation described by Ibn Taimiyya and contemporary Egypt. He followed Ibn Taimiyya's lead by advocating jihad against the non-Muslim ruler.

The Holy War Organization also differs from the Society of Muslims in its refusal to separate from society. Members of the HWO believe instead that only through mass participation after the coup can the Muslim order come about. They reflect this belief by infiltrating the military, security services, and other organs of government and also by their emphasis on consultative leadership rather than autocratic leadership.\textsuperscript{91}

A ten-man consultative assembly leads the HWO, with a supervisory apparatus overseeing the combat wing, the operational support, and the propaganda of the organization. The organization trains its own soldiers in martial arts and conventional fighting. They also acquire weapons from the black market. Interestingly, the leaders of the HWO also rely on the fatwas of a Sheikh, or learned man of Islam, to justify their actions.\textsuperscript{92}

Thus, while the members of the HWO believe in the imperative of jihad and the uselessness of ulama, they do not
believe in the immorality of Egyptian society. They also do not follow one leader in a messianic manner but belong to different cells of an organization which consults its members before acting. Finally, they do not reject Muslim tradition as a whole, but only the politics of contemporary Egypt.

All four Islamic revival movements described above consider jihad a necessity, although they differ in their interpretation of the means of jihad. They also agree on the uselessness of establishment Islam ulama, although attitudes towards them range from the Muslim Brotherhood's indifference to the Society of Muslims' outright hostility. While the Muslim Brotherhood and the Society of Muslims follow a more autocratic leadership, which could be reflected in their models for an Islamic state, the Holy War Organization and the Islamic Liberation Organization are governed by more democratic consultative councils, which they would like to see in a Muslim state. Finally, the movements also disagree about the extent of the immorality of the society in Egypt, and whether the solution should come from the bottom up or through a coup d'état, or even through withdrawal from contemporary society to a mini-society of utopian Muslims.

III. Regime Responses

In Egypt, throughout the presidencies of Sadat and Mubarak, the government has consistently responded to violence from Islamic revival groups with violently repressive measures, while allowing more moderate groups to express
themselves. It is understood that the Islamic revival movement draws on an Egyptian tradition of faith and mysticism, and that it benefits from the present socio-economic problems in Egypt. Mubarak's government, though repressing violence, has allowed public debate about its decisions in Islamic newspapers and magazines and through participation in politics.

Nevertheless, Mubarak maintains control over both the state and the political participation of the citizens through his hold on the bureaucracy, the cabinet, and the Parliament. The failure of Nasserism and the discrediting of both Nasser and Sadat in the eyes of the Egyptian people have led Mubarak to keep a lower profile than his predecessors. He is not a charismatic leader, but a head of state. As such, he does not refer to the Egyptian people as his children, as Sadat did. He has also avoided the trap that the Shah fell into by identifying his personal power with the power of the state of Iran.

Mubarak has also responded to the pressure of the Islamic revival movements to take a sterner attitude toward Israel and forge better relations with the Arab world. This has earned him grudging acceptance by the moderate revivalists and the secular Left as well. Furthermore, Mubarak benefits from the support of ulama, who feel as threatened by some of the more radical revival movements as the state does.

Thus, although Mubarak's Egypt is experiencing a crisis, the prevalent attitude toward the president is indifference
rather than hostility.\textsuperscript{95} Most Egyptians may be struggling, and the ideology of Islam proves appealing, but the avenues for expression have not been closed. Mubarak has been very careful about denigrating Islam. Only the radical groups whose violent tactics repulse the majority of Egyptians receive harsh treatment in the media. Moreover, the government acknowledges that the economy is in crisis, and has made some effort to remedy the problem. Meanwhile, cautious and limited democracy seems to placate all but the most radical elements of society.\textsuperscript{96}

The Pahlavi response to the growing dissatisfaction in Iran differed from the moderate and careful response of the Mubarak regime. Any and all disagreement with the Iranian regime was illegal and amounted to personal treason against the Shah. Any attempt to participate in politics through any other organ than the Rastakhiz party was also considered treason.\textsuperscript{97} The Shah was the state and Iranians were expected to honor him as such.

When the Shah removed all the traditional anchors of Iranian society through his systematic campaigns against the Shii establishment, the bazaaris, and the nationalist parties, Iranians toppled him in order to topple the state. The polarization and mass politicization of Iranians probably would not have occurred to the same extent if the regime's responses had not emphasized its disregard for the people.\textsuperscript{98}

The only independent way to oppose the regime, after the Shah had tightened his control over the bureaucracy,
institutions, and elites of Iran, was to follow the Shii clerics. They benefited from the wide network of popular support granted them through the khums and the personal allegiance to ayatollahs that most traditional Iranians still practiced. They presented the people of Iran with a simple oppositional message that was vague enough in content to have cross-ethnic and cross-generational appeal. Finally, they provided a charismatic leader whose legitimacy was untainted by involvement in government, and who could use the Shah’s tactics against the opposition to cast him as Yazid, the evil tyrant of Shii history.

Why the Islamic Revolution Was Confined to Iran

The political circumstances articulated above show that Pahlavi Iran and contemporary Egypt, though both neo-patrimonial states undergoing an Islamic revival, differ on other basic points. The Shah's blatant consolidation of power and personal wealth, as demonstrated in his celebration at Persepolis and the creation of the Rastakhiz party, are in marked contrast to Mubarak's low profile leadership and use of limited democracy. But the two states differ in other ways too.

The Shii population of Iran and the Sunni population of Egypt do not hold the same religious beliefs. While Shiism and Sunnism fall under the umbrella of Islam, the Shiis hold particular beliefs in the messianic Imam and in the
infallibility of their ayatollahs which the Sunnis do not hold. This makes it difficult for the various Islamic revival movements to agree on a common leader and a common strategy.

Shiis, through their history, also hold the belief that they are the followers of Ali and his children, who were martyred by the political establishment of Yazid. Sunnis, on the other hand, understand their history as one of political dominance. They feel very little historical affinity for martyrdom or political protest. While they are willing to maintain themselves separate from the secular, western mode of life that they perceive as corrupt, most practicing Sunnis shy away from active struggle in the form of jihad.

The ulama are religious learned men who help interpret the Quran, not sources of challenge to the authorities, unless the authorities are foreign, as in the case of the British colonial occupiers in Egypt. Their income, in the case of Egypt, comes from the Ministry of Waqfs, or religious affairs. This restricts their freedom to disagree too vocally with the government. However, by virtue of being the guardians of the oldest university in the Muslim world (al-Azhar), they hold the respect of most traditional Egyptians.

Finally, the opposition to the Shah was unified by its common goal and its common reaction to the Shah's autocratic rule. In Egypt, the opposition is still very fragmented, whether within or without the Islamic revival movement. The more radical Islamic movements seek to overthrow the
government or withdraw from society completely, while the secular parties and the Muslim Brotherhood seek to challenge the government through electoral politics. There still does not exist in Egypt the consensus about the urgency of the removal of the leader that existed in Iran. Revival movements in Egypt are just as likely to excommunicate each other's members and revile each other's leaders as they are to oppose the government.

Thus, while Mubarak faces a crisis in the continued deterioration of the economy and the growing dissatisfaction of members of the underprivileged segments of society, he is not facing a revolution yet. In order to diffuse the more violent Islamic revival groups, Mubarak may have to implement some changes in the secular constitution of Egypt and in his relations with the West. However, his dependence on U.S. aid may inhibit the reforms necessary to stop the growing popularity of Islamic revival movements. Nevertheless, the Islamic revival movements are not yet the causes of an imminent revolution, but merely the symptoms of a spiritual and socio-economic crisis.
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