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Introduction

The Muslim Brotherhood is an organization that was founded in Egypt 1928 with the goal of establishing a global Islamic caliphate. The ideological influences of Wahhabism and Salafism and the socio-political atmosphere of the early 20th century that saw the strengthening of Western colonial expansion and the weakening of Islamic influence in the Middle East set the stage for the organization’s establishment. Ideologically, Wahhabism and Salafism, two purist movements constructed respectively in the late 18th and 19th centuries, called for the removal of what Wahhabists and Salafists perceived as corrupt influences that contaminated a “pure” and “true” Islam. The basic concepts of Islamic purity in Wahhabism, which provided a foundation for Salafism to build upon, asserted the need for an Islamic caliphate to expand in opposition to the Western-influenced governments that embraced religious pluralism. Wahhabism and Salafism thus created an enveloping ideological framework that spawned many 20th century jihadist organizations. The Muslim Brotherhood became one of these jihadist organizations—arguably the most significant one. Since its establishment in 1928, it has expanded its influence into multiple political, non-governmental, and non-state organizations with far-reaching global influence, including but not limited to the Iranian regime after the Islamic Revolution of 1979, Hezbollah,
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Sudan under Omar al-Bashir, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, Hamas, al-Qaeda, and Islamic State (ISIS), as well as several NGOs in present-day North America and Europe.

Hand in hand with the drive to construct an Islamic caliphate that would ensure the practice of what the Muslim Brotherhood perceived as a pure and true Islam free from foreign influences, as well as the view that Western expansion posed a threat to Islam’s influence in the world, key Brotherhood members also advocated the evilness of the Jewish people and the need for their eradication. A recurring perception among Muslim Brotherhood members is that Jews conspired behind the West’s ideological and colonialist expansion in order to weaken Islam. Likewise, the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 significantly exacerbated the genocidal antisemitic rhetoric and practices of the Muslim Brotherhood, and to this day the Brotherhood has been active in slandering and taking hostile actions against Jewish people and the State of Israel in particular.

In his book, *Islamic Fundamentalism in the West Bank and Gaza: Muslim Brotherhood and Islamic Jihad*, Ziad Abu-Amr identifies three key periods in the Muslim Brotherhood’s development: (1) the period of “insurrection” (1928-1949), which were the years of its establishment by and rule under its founder, Hasan al-Banna; (2) the period of “ordeal” (1949-1967), which followed the assassination of al-Banna and the Muslim Brotherhood’s persecution in Egypt by President Gamal Abdel Nasser, during which it underwent an intellectual resurgence mostly through Sayyid Qutb’s writings, until his execution in 1967; and (3) the period of “differentiation” (1967-present), which is characterized by the renewed vigor of Qutb’s ideas and jihadism in general due to his execution, the exit of the Muslim Brotherhood from its persecution in Egypt, and the further establishment and strengthening of its numerous international political, non-governmental, and non-state guises (Abu-Amr 1994, 90-91). Until the present day, the Muslim Brotherhood maintains its focus on realizing a global Islamic caliphate and eliminating the secular, pluralistic, and democratic values of the West, including the State of Israel and the Jewish people, which it perceives as forces of corruption and contamination.
This paper presents an examination of the Muslim Brotherhood and its connected organizations. It aims to show the stages of the Muslim Brotherhood’s development, how the Brotherhood connects to its offshoot organizations, the injustice and violence that occur when any of these organizations manage to gain enough power in order to carry out jihad and enact sharia law, and the rhetoric and practice of Jew hatred in each of the organizations and their key members. In addition, it aims to show how genocidal antisemitism is a core ideology of the Muslim Brotherhood that can be traced throughout its history and the history of its offshoots.

The Period of Insurrection under Hasan al-Banna (1928-1949)

Establishment of the Muslim Brotherhood in Reaction to Western Colonialism and Secularism

The Muslim Brotherhood was officially founded one night in March 1928 by Egyptian schoolteacher and jihadist Hasan al-Banna, in the presence of six other men, with a creed that remains unchanged until today: “Allah is our goal, the Prophet our model, the Qur’an our constitution, jihad our path, and death for the sake of Allah the loftiest of our wishes.” According to al-Banna’s reflection upon the occasion, “We determined in solemn oath that we shall live as brethren, work for the glory of Islam, and launch jihad for it” (al-Banna [n.d.] in Patterson 2011, 65). The goal of the Muslim Brotherhood was and remains the establishment of a global caliphate ruled by sharia law, with one people under the rule of a single leader (Patterson 2011, 129). Such Islamization of human society became expressed in the Muslim Brotherhood’s emblem: a Qur’an between two swords, which represents Islam through the sword for believers, and Islam or the sword for nonbelievers (Patterson 2011, 65).

The founding of the Muslim Brotherhood emerged in the middle of tense relations between the modern Western world and the traditional Islamic world in Egypt, which can be traced back to 1882, the year that the British occupied the region to control the Suez Canal. The 1920s came at a time of vast changes to the Middle Eastern landscape, with Western colonial-
ization rigorously marking itself in the region. In resistance to the Western powers in Egypt, al-Banna participated in the Egyptian Revolution of 1919-1921, which led to the declaration of the Kingdom of Egypt in 1921 (Patterson 2011, 128). Against the backdrop of the social, cultural, and political tension between the West and Islam, al-Banna was ideologically influenced by the founder of Wahhabism, Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhab al-Tamimi, and Salafists Jamal al-Din al-Afghani and Rashid Rida, all of whom advocated jihadism as the path to Islam’s purification (Patterson 2011, 66). Also common to these thinkers were the perception of the West as contaminating the Islamic world’s purity and the search for a “true” and “pure” Islam that necessitated the implementation of sharia law (Patterson 2011, 66-67).

Figure 1: Emblem of the Muslim Brotherhood

Adding to the tension between the Western and Islamic worlds, in al-Banna’s view, was the end of the Islamic caliphate in 1924, as Turkey’s President Kemal Atatürk declared Turkey a secular state. Despite the caliphate lacking any significant power and existing mostly symbolically, al-Banna considered this development a “calamity” and “a declaration of war against all shapes of Islam” (al-Banna [n.d.] in Farmer 2008, 83). For al-Banna, the caliphate represented the idea of global Islamic power whose eventual goal would be the appointment of a caliph under whom humanity would be subordinate in a world governed by Islam. The end of
the caliphate thus symbolized the weakening of Islam. Al-Banna experienced further frustration with colonialism and secularization after he moved to the Egyptian city of Ismailia in 1927. As a city that hosted the headquarters of the Suez Canal Company, Ismailia experienced much greater European influence than other parts of Egypt. Al-Banna witnessed many of his fellow Egyptians become second-tier citizens in a city favoring European secularization, liberalism, humanism, and modernity, which led them to turn their backs on their Egyptian heritage in order to fit in (Caspian Report 2020). He noted his experience of the city as a “humiliation and restriction” of Arabs and Muslims, giving rise to their loss of “status (manzila) and dignity (karama)” (Mitchell 1993, 8).

The Muslim Brotherhood’s Support for Palestinian Arabs and Denunciation of Jews and Zionism (1934-1937)

After a beginning involving the development of the organization’s structure, the setup of its administrative institutions, the refinement, teaching, and dissemination of its doctrine, and the expansion of its recruitment through educational, charity, and sporting activities, in the mid-1930s, the Muslim Brotherhood started implementing a vocal, and later violent, approach to the question of a Jewish state in Palestine (Gershoni 1986, 369). In April-August 1934, al-Banna published the first call to action for mobilization against threats to the “territory of Islam” in his message (risala), “To What Do We Summon the People” (Lla ayy Shay’ Nad’u al-Nas), where he wrote about “the ineluctable obligation to protect the territory of Islam from the attack of the aggressor, to deliver it from the usurpation of the usurper, and to fortify it against the ambitions of the hostile” (al-Banna, 1934, in Gershoni 1986, 368-369). In mid-August 1935, the Muslim Brotherhood established official relations with the President of the Supreme Muslim Council and Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin al-Husseini, which became the foundation for a long-term relationship between the Muslim Brotherhood and the leadership of the Palestinian Arab national movement (Gershoni 1986, 369-370). Also, in August and September, at the recommendation of al-Husseini, the Muslim Brotherhood was received favorably among Islamic activists in
Lebanon and Syria (Gershoni 1986, 370). By November 1935, the Muslim Brotherhood made an emotional appeal that Egypt, in the words of Abd al-Rahman al-Sa’āti (with al-Banna’s encouragement), “do its duty to rescue Palestine—the holy Islamic homeland,” and fulfill its obligation “to aid the victimized [Palestinian] Arab people” (Gershoni 1986, 370). In the first stage of the Arab Revolt in 1936, the Muslim Brotherhood expressed outright support for the Palestinian cause by calling on all Egyptians to support “fighting Palestine,” and in May 1936 the Muslim Brotherhood expressed its plan of support for Arabs in Palestine, a declaration written by al-Banna, entitled “For the Sake of Brave Fighting Palestine” (*Min Ajli Filastin al-Mujahida al-Basila’*), which aimed to mobilize Muslim and Christian public opinion in Egypt to support Palestinian Arabs, as well as to promote the Muslim Brotherhood’s image in supporting the cause (Gershoni 1986, 370-371). In the declaration, al-Banna wrote about “the heroic struggle” of their Palestinian brothers in “playing their part in the struggle of the entire Islamic Arab umma [community] against ‘the Jewish injustice,’ ‘British oppression,’ and ‘the violent, murderous hand of imperialism’” (al-Banna, 1936, in Gershoni 1986, 371). By May 1936, the Muslim Brotherhood had established two councils, the General Guidance Council (GGC; *Maktab al-Irshad al-’Amm*), formed in August 1935, and the General Central Committee for Palestine’s Aid (GCCP; *al-Lajna al-Markaziyya al-’Amma li-Musa’adat Filastin*), formed in May 1936. The former had representatives establish ties with al-Husseini and Palestinian activists in Lebanon and Syria, expanding the Muslim Brotherhood’s influence across the region. The latter focused on mobilizing Egyptians toward the aid of Palestinian Arabs. They were nearly identical in membership and roles, and showed the vast importance that the Muslim Brotherhood ascribed to organizing in support of Palestinian Arabs (Gershoni 1986, 370-371).

After failed lobbying attempts to gain support from leading Egyptian officials for Palestinian Arabs, the Muslim Brotherhood turned to a completely internal focus, promoting their cause to the people, fundraising, and gaining recruits. In 1936, their recruitment expanded significantly in Egypt due to their “Palestinian Campaign,” and they significantly
strengthened two of their institutions: the “excursion troops” (*firaq al-rihalat*) and the “rovers” or “roving troops” (*firaq al-jawwala*). The latter received military training and acted as the organization’s policing force that maintained order at Muslim Brotherhood-led rallies and demonstrations. In 1937-1938, they were entrusted with organizing the first Muslim Brotherhood pro-Palestinian demonstrations in Egypt. Messages disseminated at these demonstrations included the denunciation of Zionism as “irredentist, expansionist, and covetous” by nature and the claim that it was a substantial threat to Egypt and the entire Arab world, as it aspired beyond a mere “Jewish national home” and set its sights on “establishing a great Jewish kingdom,” the borders of which would extend “from the Nile to the Tigris and Euphrates” (Gershoni 1986, 376). The Muslim Brotherhood thus called upon Egyptians to view Palestine as “the northern branch” of their homeland, stating that its defense was essential to safeguarding Egypt’s integrity and independence.

**The Muslim Brotherhood’s Non-Negotiable Rejection of a Jewish State in Palestine and Outright Push for a Single Palestinian Arab State (1937-1949)**

In July 1937, the Muslim Brotherhood rejected the Peel Commission’s plan to partition Palestine into a Jewish state and a Palestinian state, aligning itself with the stance of al-Husseini’s Higher Arab Committee. In October 1937, the Brotherhood responded to the strong measures taken by the British authorities in response to a resurgence of the Arab revolt—including al-Husseini’s dismissal from all positions and his exile, the disbanding of the Higher Arab Committee that he represented, and the subsequent exile of its members—by sponsoring demonstrations that rallied around 5,000 people and included violent clashes with the police.

On November 2, 1937, al-Banna presented a petition to the British ambassador in Cairo, Sir Miles Lampson, on behalf of the GGC. The petition demanded that the British government renounce the Balfour Declaration, abandon the idea of partition, since this implied “the annihilation of all the rights of the Arabs,” heed the Palestinian Arabs’ “just and
legitimate claims” to put an immediate end to Jewish immigration, and grant “complete independence” to “Arab Palestine.” In addition, it demanded that the British unconditionally free all prisoners in Palestine, allow exiled Palestinian leaders to return, and enable them to resume their leadership of the Arab community in Palestine (Gershoni 1986, 379).

During 1937 and 1938, the Muslim Brotherhood, in collaboration with the Young Muslim Men’s Association (YMMA), carried out a long series of activities on behalf of the Palestinian Arabs in cooperation with a new committee known as the Supreme Committee for Relieving Palestinian Victims (SCRP; al-Lajna al-‘Ulya li-Ighathat Mankubi Filastin or al-Lajna al-‘Ulya li-I’anat Mankubi Filas). These activities included the organization of “Palestine Days” (demonstrations and rallies expressing solidarity with the Arab Revolt); protest petitions and letters of denunciation sent to the British authorities in Cairo, Jerusalem, and London; the “utter denunciation” of Zionism and boycotting of Egyptian Jews who cooperated with Jews in Palestine; fundraising and offering of material aid to the Palestinian Arabs; support for “the violent struggle” of the Palestinians and the Higher Arab Committee’s positions; and ceaseless activity in the Arab and Islamic world in order to exert pressure on Muslim and Arab rulers to increase their involvement in the Palestine question (Gershoni 1986, 379-380).

In May 1938, bolstered by the recent boost in its membership, the great unrest caused by terrorist activities at the height of the Arab Revolt in Palestine, and its successful efforts to establish ties with politicians who were more open to Islamic and Palestinian issues, the Muslim Brotherhood expressed its political ambitions in the inaugural issue of its new weekly political publication, al-Nadhir. In the lead article, “The Second Step,” al-Banna announced a shift in the Muslim Brotherhood’s focus from religious, cultural, and educational activities to political activities, and from a “mission of mere talk” to a “mission of talk plus struggle and practical acts.”

From now on, we must direct our mission at the responsible heads of state, its leaders, ministers, rulers, senators, deputies, organizations, and parties; we must call them to our way, present them with our program, and demand that they lead
The article defined the politicization of Islam that became the cornerstone of the Muslim Brotherhood’s approach from 1938 until today. Al-Banna professed that “politics (siyasa) is an integral part of the Islamic religion” and that “the Islamic mission” requires political power and activism (al-Banna, 1938, in Gershoni 1986, 383).

At this time, Muslim Brotherhood propaganda became much more hostile and militant in its tone, demonizing “the British conqueror” who “cruelly oppressed” and “robbed Palestine from its legal owners” to “hand it over to the Jews” (al-Nadhir, 1938, in Gershoni 1986, 384). British soldiers were labeled “shedders of rivers of blood” and perpetrators of “a modern Jewish-British crusade against the Arab nation and the Islamic umma.” They also condemned Egypt’s political establishment for doing nothing practical in aid of the Palestinian Arabs, being content with “a policy of barren words” (al-Nadhir, 1938, in Gershoni 1986, 385). Again and again, the GCCP called upon the Egyptian political establishment to become directly involved in attempts to solve the Arab-Jewish conflict, and “to rally unhesitatingly” in support of the Palestinian Arabs in their struggle against the British and the Zionists. In June through September 1938, the struggle against the Egyptian political establishment under Muhammad Mahmud turned into violent demonstrations in an attempt to force it to support the Palestinian Arabs “unequivocally.” Thousands of people participated in these pro-Palestinian demonstrations, led by the GCCP with the aid of the jawwala (the Muslim Brotherhood’s policing branch), against the British, the Zionists, and the Egyptian government.

In addition to the Muslim Brotherhood’s firm rejection of a Jewish state, it displayed its first public affinity for Nazi ideology in October 1938 by distributing Arabic translations of Mein Kampf and The Protocols of the Elders of Zion\(^1\) at the Parliamentary Conference for Arab and Muslim

\(^1\) Although not originally a Nazi document, The Protocols of the Elders of Zion was frequently referenced in Nazi propaganda between 1933 and 1945 in support of Nazi ideology (Bytwerk 2015).
Countries in Cairo, which it organized (Patterson 2018). In November 1938, al-Banna publicly detached himself from upcoming negotiations on the Palestine question between the British government, representatives of Arab countries, and Jewish representatives, claiming that Jews had no place in the negotiations. “The Palestine question,” maintained al-Banna, “is a question involving the true Arab inhabitants and the English who conquered it [Palestine] thanks to the circumstances of an unforeseen world war.” The Jews “are strangers and usurpers who came [to Palestine] under the protection of the bayonets and cheating patronage [of the British] to a land which is not theirs” (al-Banna, 1938, in Gershoni 1986, 386). Al-Banna warned the representatives of the Arab countries who had been invited to the conference to make no concessions to the British and called upon them to be alert to “the wiles of British policy, which would lead the Arabs into a dangerous trap at the expense of Palestinian rights.” He demanded that the Arab conference participants strenuously guard the Palestinian interest. After the publication of the MacDonald White Paper in May 1939, al-Banna quickly responded with a personal letter to Egyptian Prime Minister Muhammad Mahmud, calling the White Paper “ill-omened” and urging him to completely reject all of its resolutions and recommendations (Gershoni 1986, 386). Furthermore, in 1939, the Muslim Brotherhood planted bombs in a Cairo synagogue and in Jewish homes (Patterson 2018).

---

2 The MacDonald White Paper was a policy paper issued by the British government in response to the 1936-1939 Arab Revolt in Palestine. It served as the basis for the governing policy of the British Mandate in Palestine from May 23, 1939, until the British departure in 1948 (Cohen 1973, 571). Notably, the White Paper was rejected by Jewish Zionists, as it constituted a major blow to the growth of the Jewish community in Palestine, limiting Jewish immigrants to 75,000 over five years and allowing no further Jewish immigration without Arab approval, as well as banning Jewish land purchases (Cohen 1973, 587-592). Al-Banna’s rejection of the White Paper shows that these limitations on the Jewish-Zionist enterprise in Palestine, to which various representatives from Arab states agreed, were insufficient in relation to the Muslim Brotherhood’s demands for more extreme measures.
While the Muslim Brotherhood established and strengthened its ties with al-Husseini, al-Husseini did the same with the Nazis. After an initial meeting in March 1933 between al-Husseini and Nazi General Consul Heinrich Wolff al-Husseini met with Adolf Eichmann and Herbert Hagen on October 2, 1937, which led to Eichmann reporting that “Nazi flags fly in Palestine, and they adorn their houses with Swastikas and portraits of Hitler” (Morse 2003, 46). By January 1942, al-Husseini was recruiting Muslims to serve in SS killing units, the most infamous of which was the Handschar Division (Dalin and Rothmann 2008, 55). On November 2, 1943, al-Husseini expressed how hatred of Jews was a key unifying point with the Nazis. He publicly demonized and dehumanized Jews while identifying them as a common enemy and commending the Nazi solution to commit genocide against them:

The immoderate egoism inherent in the Jews’ nature ... make[s] them incapable of keeping faith with anyone or of mixing with any other nation: they live, rather, as parasites among peoples, suck their blood, steal their property, pervert their morals. Germany is also struggling against the common foe who oppressed Arabs and Muhammadans in their different countries. It has clearly recognized the Jews for what they are and resolved to find a definitive solution for the Jewish danger that will eliminate the scourge that the Jews represent in the world. (Al-Husseini, 1943, in Achcar 2011, 131)

In addition, on March 1, 1944, in one of his radio broadcasts to the Arab world, al-Husseini demanded that Muslims “kill the Jews wherever you find them” since “this pleases God” (al-Husseini, 1944, in Morse 2010, 82). In May 1946, after the end of the Second World War, the Muslim Brotherhood established its first Palestinian branch in Jerusalem and named al-Husseini its director (Bartal 2016, 2). On June 20, 1946, al-Husseini, now a wanted Nazi war criminal, received a hero’s welcome in Egypt and was publicly praised by the Muslim Brotherhood more than by any other organization. The sheer reverence for al-Husseini is clearly visible in the following quote from the article “You Arab Hero and Symbol of Jihad: We Are Proud to Have You Here” in the Muslim Brotherhood publication, Al-Ikhwan Al-Muslimin:
Thank you, our Lord, for your mercy and generous disposition. Thank you for putting our mind at ease. Our hearts were pounding but may now rest. We can now breathe freely. The Arab hero and symbol of Al Jihad and patience and struggle is here in Egypt. The Mufti is among his friends. He is protected by our great King Farouk. So who can now harm him? We shall protect him with our very lives. He shall be our leader in struggle and jihad. They wanted to harm him but the Lord saved him. They were cunning but the Lord was more cunning than they. The Lord always protects those who struggle for they will inherit the earth. The Mufti is here, oh Palestine! Do not worry. The lion is safe among his brethren and he will draw the plans of Al Jihad and struggle for you. We, here, shall be his soldiers and we shall not stop fighting for you until you rid yourself of Zionism.

(Herf 2011, 242)

By 1948 the Muslim Brotherhood had expanded to 25 branches in Palestine, with 12,000 to 20,000 members spread across the country, as well as over two dozen branches in Jordan, and by 1952 it had over fifty branches in Sudan (Bartal 2016, 2; Patterson 2018). In Egypt, the political establishment started recognizing the Muslim Brotherhood as a significant threat due to its rising political power. The peak occurred in 1948, when agents of the Muslim Brotherhood assassinated Prime Minister Mahmud Fahmi Nokrashi and King Farouk’s secret agents assassinated al-Banna in retaliation on February 12, 1949, leading to the Brotherhood’s sudden downfall and marking the end of its first period of insurrection (Patterson 2018). In 1950, Muslim Brotherhood members were prosecuted for a series of bombings between June and November 1948 in Cairo that targeted Jewish areas, killing 70 Jews and wounding nearly 200. This set the scene for a period in which the Brotherhood would endure political exile—the period of “ordeal” (Calvert 2018, 120-121).

The Period of Ordeal: Sayyid Qutb (1949-1967)

The Muslim Brotherhood’s initial rise to political power mostly signified its period of insurrection, starting with its founding mission, its religious, cultural, and educational work, and later its networking, political lobbying, propaganda, demonstrations, riots, and terror acts that focused
primarily on the Jews. The Brotherhood’s second period, which Abu-Amr described as the period of “ordeal,” was characterized by its expansion and solidification and the strengthening of jihadist ideology, mostly through the writings of Sayyid Qutb. At this time, the organization was politically exiled under the regime of Egyptian Prime Minister Gamal Abdul Nasser, who had risen to power in a coup d’état in July 1952 (Abu-Amr 1994, 90).

Qutb officially joined the Muslim Brotherhood in 1951. It was a short time after he had returned from two years of study in America. He had become disgusted with American society, perceiving it as steeped in immorality and depravity, a modern embodiment of the Qur’anic concept of jahiliyya³ (Loboda 2004, 4). In 1954, after a failed assassination attempt on Nasser by a Muslim Brotherhood member, Nasser retaliated by imprisoning and deporting numerous Brotherhood members. Qutb became one of the prisoners. While imprisoned from 1954 until his release in 1955, he wrote his most influential jihadist work, Milestones (Ma’alim fi al-Tariq). Qutb was arrested again in 1965 and was executed by hanging on August 29, 1966. He is widely regarded as one of the most—if not the most—influential jihadist authors, who laid an ideological foundation that has served to educate and inspire jihadists and jihadist organizations ever since (Patterson 2011, 147).⁴

Whereas al-Banna had devoted most of his attention to combating threats to Islam that came from outside Islam—European imperialism, Zionism, and the Western cultural invasion—Qutb shifted the focus. While also continuing al-Banna’s line of condemning Western hegemony over

³ *Jahiliyya* is a concept that means “ignorance” of Divine guidance. In the *Qur’an*, it represents a pre-civilizational barbaric time before Islam entered the world, a time of dispersed tribes when paganism thrived (Calvert 2018, 2, 14, 67, 70, 217; Aaron 2008, 59; Shepard 2003, 521-525).

⁴ To further emphasize Qutb’s impact on jihadists, in the words of Bassam Tibi, “militant fundamentalists are far more familiar with Sayyid Qutb’s main writings than with the text of the *Qur’an*” (Tibi [n.d.] in Patterson 2011, 147).
Muslim lands, Qutb urged Muslims to confront what he regarded as the corrupt cultural and political foundations of their own countries. In Qutb’s view, Muslims should strive to replace secular governance with Allah’s judgment as manifested in the sharia, and he accordingly urged Muslims in Egypt and around the world to unite around this goal (Calvert 2018, 1). Moreover, in opposition to Western hegemony, he upheld Islam not just in terms of religion but as a comprehensive ideological system (nizam) covering politics, society, and the economy, which finds its ideal form in an Islamic state. According to Qutb, once Qur’anic principles are implemented in their entirety, Muslim societies will realize the potential that Allah grants them and overcome their weakened status in the world with a renewed global strength. As such, Muslims will then crush their enemies and lead humanity to a pure and holy future in Allah’s grace of prosperity, peace, and deep spiritual satisfaction (Calvert 2018, 4).

Qutb professed that Islam was a force for good, purity, and truth and that Islam’s enemies fell under an umbrella definition of “Satan” or more specifically “Satanic forces and Satanic systems of life” (Qutb [1962] 2006, 81):

The reasons for jihad ... are ... to establish Allah’s authority in the earth; to arrange human affairs according to the true guidance provided by Allah Almighty; to abolish all the Satanic forces and Satanic systems of life and to end the lordship of one man over others since all men are creatures of Allah and no one has the authority to make them his servants or to make arbitrary laws for them. ... The jihad of Islam is to secure complete freedom for every man throughout the world by releasing him from servitude to other human beings so that he may serve his Lord, who is One and who has no associates.

Qutb defined Satan as “every obstacle which comes into the way of worshiping Allah Almighty and the implementation of the Divine authority on earth,” including a person’s “own desires and ambitions, his

---

5 For instance, Calvert (2018, 100-101, 117) describes Qutb’s stance on the Palestine question throughout the late 1930s as being in complete agreement with al-Banna and the Muslim Brotherhood’s position on the topic.
personal interests and inclinations, the interests of his family and of his
nation against all that which is not from Islam” (Qutb [1962] 2006, 82). In
the same vein as his definition of Satan, Qutb also mentions how “Jews
and Christians ‘disobeyed’ Allah,” and thus “they became like those who
‘associate others with Allah’” (Qutb [1962] 2006, 69), and also that “all
Jewish and Christian societies today are also jahili societies [that is,
societies ignorant of Divine guidance]. They have distorted the original
beliefs and ascribe certain attributes of Allah to other beings” (Qutb
Satanic, the evil enemies of a holy and pure Islamic path to Allah.

Emphasizing Jewish evil in particular as superseding that of Christians,
Qutb asserts that Jews are “the blackest devil and source of the worst anti-
Islamic machinations” (Qutb [n.d.] in Nettler 1987, 28). Qutb’s essay Our
Struggle with the Jews (Marakatuna ma’a al-Yahud) singled out an overtly
“destructively egoistic” evil character in Jews that supersedes that of
Christians, as “they just wait for humanity to meet with disaster. … All of
this evil arises only from their destructive egoism” (Qutb [n.d.] in
Webman 2019, 172).

With their spite and deceit, the Jews are still misleading this nation, and dis-
tracting her away from her Qur’an in order that she may not draw her sharp
weapons and her abundant ammunitions from it. … [The Jews’] aim is clearly
shown by the Protocols of the Elders of Zion. The Jews are behind materialism,
animal sexuality, the destruction of the family, and the dissolution of society.
(Qutb [n.d.] in Aaron 2008, 159)

Qutb’s reference to The Protocols of the Elders of Zion to illustrate the aim
of the Jewish people is more elaborately described in Milestones, where he
writes that “the purpose of world Jewry is to “perpetuate their evil designs”

---

6 Further showing Qutb’s infatuation with The Protocols of the Elders of Zion,
in his essay Our Struggle with the Jews, he even provides interpretations of
certain Qur’an passages by footnoting them with excerpts from the Protocols
(Qutb [n.d.] in Nettler 1987, 76-78, 80).
into “the body politic of the whole world,” or in simpler terms global domination (Qutb [1962] 2006, 123). In other words, he uses the Protocols’ pernicious antisemitic perception of Jews as conspiring to rule the world in order to portray the evil of Jewish intentions. In addition to these perceived evils, Qutb claims that Jews are “the eternal enemy of Islam” (Qutb [n.d.] in Nettler 1987, 81), based on his view of a hidden Jewish global power agenda competing directly with the establishment of a global Islamic caliphate. He also argues that the Jews’ strategy for global domination primarily involves concentrating humanity’s wealth in Jewish financial institutions:

[The] purpose [of] world Jewry ... is to eliminate all limitations, especially the limitations imposed by faith and religion, so that the Jews may penetrate into the body politic of the whole world and then may be free to perpetuate their evil designs. At the top of the list of these activities is usury, the aim of which is that all the wealth of mankind ends up in the hands of Jewish financial institutions which run on interest. (Qutb [1962] 2006, 123)

Proof of the Jews’ “evil-doing,” Qutb maintains, is their repeated punishment by Allah throughout history, which they can expect once again due to their sinful formation of the State of Israel: “Allah punished them and brought upon them humiliation and expulsion more than once. ... Hitler was his last servant, but they returned to evil-doing in the form of Israel, and they will be meeting their punishment again” (Qutb [n.d.] in Webman 2019, 172).

Likewise, Qutb’s solution to the threat of the “Satanic forces and Satanic systems of life,” in which the Jews are viewed as the principal threat, is in jihad:

Jihad linguistically means to exert one’s utmost effort in word and action; in the sharia it is the fighting of the unbelievers, and involves all possible efforts that are necessary to dismantle the power of the enemies of Islam including beating them, plundering their wealth, destroying their places of worship, and smashing their idols. This means that jihad is to strive to the utmost to ensure the strength of Islam by such means as fighting those who fight you. (Sharh Multaqal Abha [n.d.] in Qutb 2006, 232)
In 1966, Qutb was convicted of plotting to assassinate Nasser and was executed by public hanging. His death martyred him and imbued his writings with a clear jihadist narrative, as he died what Islamists came to perceive as a heroic death for the cause of upholding the purity of Islam and Allah (Tibi, 2010, p. 11). The years following Qutb’s death would see his ideas—including his genocidal antisemitism—become a mobilizing ideology among jihad-sympathetic Muslims worldwide. This set the stage for a further period of ideological and geographical expansion of the Muslim Brotherhood—the period of “differentiation.”

The Period of Differentiation: Global Expansion of the Muslim Brotherhood (1967-present)

The Muslim Brotherhood’s period of differentiation is characterized mostly by the global expansion of its ideology throughout the Muslim world, its political rise and fall in Egypt, and its branching out into numerous organizations, most notably in the United States and Europe. Significant to the Muslim Brotherhood’s expansion is that its creed and ideology remain unchanged while acquiring different disguises, enabling it to become more socially, culturally, and politically acceptable in various societies. However, regions where the Muslim Brotherhood acquired outright power, as it did in Sudan, exemplified the relentlessness by which its ideology can unfold into mass murder, rape, and genocide, while other regions where it obtained political power, as it did in Egypt in 2013 and Gaza since 2006, show the difficulties that the organization—which essentially remains a resistance movement—has in relation to the day-to-day governance of its populations.

During the aforementioned “period of insurrection,” the Muslim Brotherhood established a blueprint that it would later follow in various guises: a blend of religious education (da’wa, i.e. “missionary work”), the development of a sociocultural infrastructure, and—when a large enough quantity of people join its ranks—the implementation of violent jihad in order to gain political power (Azani 2013, 900-901). During the “period of differentiation,” depending on the political climate and nature of the
societies into which it has expanded, the Muslim Brotherhood has been able to pick and choose between the da’wa and sociocultural expansionist approach and the violent resistance approach, depending on what contributes most effectively to the realization of its vision. During this period, moreover, the genocidal antisemitic ideology expressed in Sayyid Qutb’s writings has found its way into the speech and texts of key Muslim Brotherhood members, in addition to several outbreaks of violence against Jews that the Brotherhood has stood behind.

The First State Mobilization of Muslim Brotherhood Ideology: The Islamic Revolution in Iran (1979)

The first state mobilization of Muslim Brotherhood ideology can be found in Iran’s Islamic Revolution of 1979. The sociopolitical atmosphere in Iran leading up to the 1979 revolution bore a fundamental similarity to the sociopolitical atmosphere in the lead-up to the Muslim Brotherhood’s establishment in Egypt in 1928 in that it was characterized by Western secularism and materialism, which led purists, such as the clerics who engineered the Islamic Revolution, to deeply fear and criticize the strengthening of Western influences and the weakening of Islamic ones (Mackay 1996, 215, 264-265). As a near-parallel to the Muslim Brotherhood’s creed,7 Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini regarded the Islamic Revolution and the foundation of the Islamic Republic of Iran as a means to launch a new order and reinstate the system of the Islamic caliphate, which would consist of a single Muslim community (umma), governed by sharia law and the tradition of the Prophet (sunna) by means of jihad (Shahvar 2009, 85-86). Moreover, the clerics involved in the revolution were known to be highly influenced by Qutb’s writings.

Starting in the 1950s, and increasingly in the 1960s and 1970s, Qutb’s works were translated into Persian and thus played a key role in shaping

---

7 The Muslim Brotherhood’s creed, developed in 1928 by Hasan al-Banna and six other founding members, reads as follows: “Allah is our goal, the Prophet our model, the Qur’an our constitution, jihad our path, and death for the sake of Allah the loftiest of our wishes.”
the political and ideological Islamist discourse in pre-revolutionary Iran (Ünal 2016, 36, 42). Works of other Islamists were also translated into Persian during this period, including those of al-Banna, but Qutb’s works attracted the most attention and interest among Iranian Islamists both before and after the 1979 revolution (Ünal 2016, 42). Ünal (2016, 37) points out that the translation of Qutb’s works into Persian was not merely a technical-linguistic process of translating words and text from one language to another but rather an “ethical, political, and ideological activity” that involved “prominent cultural figures, highly visible, and publicly engaged in the assertion and creation of resistance to oppression.” Among these prominent Iranian cultural figures were Iran’s current supreme leader Ayatollah ‘Ali Khamenei, his brother Muhammad Khamenei, and Ayatollah Hadi Khosroshahi (the Islamic Republic’s first ambassador to the Vatican). These translators were particularly drawn to Qutb’s descriptions of Islam as a complete social, political, and economic system and not simply a religion limited to daily prayers and certain rituals, such as funerals, marriage ceremonies, and other commemorations (Ünal 2016, 44-46).

In addition, the Muslim Brotherhood’s influence over the Islamic regime that took over in 1979 can be traced back to the Iranian revolutionary organization *Fida’iyan-i Islam* (Self-Sacrificers of Islam) and its leader, Navvab Safavi, who was deeply inspired by al-Banna and Qutb, and who was a teacher of and inspiration to Khomeini (Taheri 2014). Safavi played a key role in carrying the ideology of the Muslim Brotherhood to Iran and in promoting the idea of an Islamic state among Iranian revolutionary Islamists (Ünal 2016, 39). His contribution laid the foundation for the translation of Qutb’s writings into Persian in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. In addition, Safavi’s connection to the Muslim Brotherhood was the initial breeding ground for Iran’s pro-Palestinian Arab and anti-Jewish involvement in Palestine and the idea of strengthening Muslim unity, notably between the rival Shiite and Sunni Muslims, against the Western powers supporting Israel (Ünal 2016, 40). Safavi has been recorded as expressing his high appreciation for the Brotherhood: “Whoever wants to be a real *Ja’fari* [Shiite] should follow the Muslim Brotherhood” (Safavi
In 1950, well before Khomeini, he proposed a detailed program for an Islamic government, which bears the hallmarks of al-Banna’s influence, and also laid the philosophical groundwork for the 1979 revolution (Ünal 2016, 41).

The Islamic Republic of Iran under Khomeini espoused an official policy of anti-Zionism but often “leaked” evidence of its outright antisemitic stance by expressing beliefs falling into a similar ideological framework to that of Qutb—Jews as Satan and thus as enemies of Islam; Jews as the prime threat to Islam since they aspire to world domination; the Jews’ accumulation of the world’s wealth as the main strategy for achieving global domination; Jews as misleading and distracting Muslims away from Islam—and advancing these beliefs as justification for the elimination of the State of Israel.

(1) Parallels in the thought of Qutb and Iran’s post-1979 leadership:

Jews as Satan and enemies of Islam

Much like Qutb’s equation of Satan and the Jews, Khomeini waged *jihad* against “the Satan,” which he referred to as the State of Israel. “It is our common mission, to topple the Satan, which is none other than this illegitimate political regime which currently dominates the Islamic homeland” (Khomeini [1980] in Shahvar 2009, 86). Khomeini, whose ideology serves as the foundation of the clerical regime in Iran and the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran, considered the Jews to be the enemies of Islam from their inception until the present time: “The Jews have been a nuisance to the Islamic movement from its beginning. They were the first to spread anti-Islamic propaganda and devise ideological plots; and … this situation prevails until the present time” (Khomeini [1989] in

---

8 The partially hidden antisemitic beliefs of the clerical regime, and its sometimes careful Jewish-related statements, conform to one of the main principles of Shiite belief: *taqiyah* (concealment). Originally, this was intended to protect minority Shiite believers from being prosecuted by majority Sunnis. However, *taqiyah* is also used in order to practice deceit against the unbelievers (Shahvar 2009, 104).
Regarding the Jews as Islam’s common enemy, Khomeini also saw Jew hatred as key to uniting Muslims above “their petty differences” in order to defeat the Jews (Khomeini, 1981, p. 47).

(2) Parallels in the thought of Qutb and Iran’s post-1979 leadership:

Jews as the prime threat to Islam due to their pursuit of world domination

Khomeini also professed the same view as Qutb in his description of the Jews as the prime threat to Islam’s goal of realizing a global caliphate: “Their anti-Islamic conspiracies,” he claimed, “are aimed at damaging Islam and shaking its most important pillar—the eternal and total legal system that directs the affairs of the state and society.” He further stated that in order to destroy Islam the Jews joined forces with groups that “are more Satanic than themselves” in order to pave the way for the penetration of imperialism into Islamic lands (Shahvar 2009, 87). *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, which were frequently referenced by Qutb, were first published in Persian in Iran in 1978, one year before the Islamic Revolution, with new editions published in 1985 and 1994 (Shahvar 2009, 91-94). The *Protocols* became an Iranian bestseller, and various regime-endorsed newspapers, books, and media published excerpts, showing the post-1979 Iranian regime’s support for the ideas contained therein (Hirshfeld 2012). Much like the *Protocols*’ portrayal of a Jewish elite conspiring to dominate the world, Khomeini also pointed out that “a handful of wretched Jews” were “the agents of America, Britain, and other foreign powers.” Like Qutb, he asserted that Muslim disunity enabled them “to accomplish what they have” (Khomeini 1981, 47).

(3) Parallels in the thought of Qutb and Iran’s post-1979 leadership:

The Jews’ main strategy for achieving global domination is to accumulate the world’s wealth

---

9 The United States, as Israel’s superpower ally, is referred to as the “Great Satan” in this context (Bagheri [1999] in Shahvar 2009, 93).

10 A dominant theme in Qutb’s ideology was the need for Muslim unity, a shared brotherhood bonded by a common Islamic belief, and the belief that that the main cause of Islam’s dwindling strength in the 20th century was due to Muslim disunity (al-Mehri [2006] in Qutb [1962] 2006, 7-12).
Qutb’s promotion of the Protocols’ theory that the Jews’ main strategy for achieving global domination is to accumulate the world’s wealth is reflected in a statement by Ayatollah Hossein Noori-Hamedani, one of Iran’s religious authorities:

From the beginning, and because of their greed, the Jews have been after the accumulation of the world’s wealth, always hold important posts, have accumulated all the wealth of the world in one place, and all the world, and especially the USA and Europe, [are] their servants. (Hamadani [2005] in Shahvar 2009, 102)

(4) Parallels in the thought of Qutb and Iran’s post-1979 leadership: Jews as misleading and distracting Muslims away from Islam

Furthering the accusation that Jews posed a global power threat to Islam was the theory that circulated in post-1979 Iran that Jews tampered with the Qur’an in order to undermine Islam. Khomeini believed that the Jewish desire for global domination, which simultaneously required the overthrow of the Islamic world, drove Jews to distort the Qur’an’s content by disseminating false translations with the goal of manipulating its intended meanings (Khomeini 1981, 127; Shahvar 2009, 99-100). As Khomeini wrote in his book Islam and Revolution (1981, 127):

We see today that the Jews (may God curse them) have meddled with the text of the Qur’an and have made certain changes in the Qur’ans they have had printed in the occupied territories. It is our duty to prevent this treacherous interference with the text of the Qur’an. We must protest and make the people aware that the Jews and their foreign backers are opposed to the very foundations of Islam and wish to establish Jewish domination throughout the world. Since they are a cunning and resourceful group of people, I fear that—God forbid!—they may one day achieve their goal, and that the apathy shown by some of us may allow a Jew to rule over us one day. May God never let us see such a day!

The following excerpt from an article in a leading Iranian regime-endorsed newspaper, Tehran Times, explains the way the political leadership of post-1979 Iran viewed the Jews’ objectives and attitude regarding the Islamic world:
Islam is the religion with the strongest propagation worldwide. The Jews cannot control it. By studying the Qur’an, and the life of the prophet Muhammad, the average Muslim acquires all there is to know about the Jewish infidels. For this reason [the Jews believe that] the Muslims must be exterminated and their belief in their religion must be undermined ... Islam must be uncovered as a threat to the world. The real significance and teachings [of Islam] may not be exposed. We [the Jews] shall re-interpret and exhibit them to the world. We shall display our “sources” in suitable places, in which we can misrepresent them and trick anyone who dares to investigate our claims. (Tehran Times [2002] in Shahvar 2009, 100)

In a more general context, Khomeini also referred to the Jews as being the first to establish “anti-Islamic propaganda” and “various strategies” that “the historical movement of Islam has had to contend with” all the way “down to the present” (Khomeini 1981, 27).

(5) Parallels in the thought of Qutb and Iran’s post-1979 leadership:

Justification for the elimination of the State of Israel and acceptance of the inferior status of Jews scattered around the world

Since the 1979 revolution, the Islamist leadership of Iran has believed that, while the Jews are a threat to Islam, the State of Israel, as the materialization of Jewish political power, represents a much more significant threat. In other words, the Jews could be tolerated if they were scattered among the nations of the world, but the existence of a Jewish state is a complete travesty and a statement that they are on their way to realizing their global domination (Shahvar 2009, 100). ‘Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, the former president of Iran (1989-1997) and one of the country’s most influential people, reflected such thinking in a Friday sermon on December 14, 2001, in which he defended the “Islamic bomb” capable of annihilating Israel.

The Jews should in truth be expecting the day on which this superfluous limb [Israel] will be torn away from the body of the Muslim region and Muslim world, and all the people assembled in Israel [that is, the Jews] will once again be scattered all over the world and become refugees. (Rafsanjani [2001] in Shahvar 2009, 101)
Imbued with Muslim Brotherhood ideology and matching the Brotherhood’s extremely pernicious antisemitic rhetoric, the post-1979 Iranian regime has made significant strides toward realizing the words of the Brotherhood’s creed. Since 1979, it has implemented aspects of *sharia* law, including the amputation of hands and fingers for theft, flogging for various crimes, including adultery, drinking or possession of alcohol, and public displays of affection, as well as death sentences for same-sex relations, to name but a few (Tamadonfar 2001, 210-211). Not surprisingly, the Jewish population in Iran shrank from 80,000-100,000 in 1979 to approximately 8,300 in 2019 due to emigration, encouraged by the imposition of restrictions and limitations that effectively reduced the status of Jews in Iran to that of second-class citizens (Shahvar 2009, 86, 89-90; Jewish Virtual Library, n.d.). In addition to the similarity of its ideology to that of the Muslim Brotherhood and the restrictions it has imposed within the country since the Islamic Revolution of 1979, the Iranian leadership has also been very active in its struggle against the State of Israel through its support and funding of terrorist organizations including Hezbollah, Hamas, and Islamic Jihad.

**Hezbollah: Leaders in the Fight against Israel**

Hezbollah was established as an umbrella framework for pro-Iranian Islamic organizations in Lebanon that shared a belief in obedience to the supreme leader Khomeini and a desire to ultimately establish an Islamic republic in Lebanon based on the Iranian model (Azani 2013, 903). Hezbollah self-identifies as being part of the *umma* established by the Iranian Islamic regime:

> We are often asked: Who are we, Hezbollah, and what is our identity? We are the sons of the *umma*—the party of Allah (lit. *hezb Allah*)—the vanguard of which was made victorious by God in Iran. There the vanguard succeeded in laying the foundation of a Muslim state which plays a central role in the world.\(^\text{11}\)

\(^{11}\) From “An Open Letter: The Hezbollah Program,” Hezbollah’s manifesto, which was published by the Lebanese daily *Al-Safir* on February 16, 1985, 2 (hereinafter, Open Letter).
Hassan Nasrallah, Hezbollah’s secretary-general since 1992, has also clearly identified the organization’s position as a branch of Iran’s Islamic Republic:

Our plan, to which we, as faithful believers, have no alternative, is to establish an Islamic state under the rule of Islam. Lebanon should not be an Islamic republic on its own, but rather, part of the Greater Islamic Republic, governed by the Mahdi (Master of Time), and his rightful deputy, the Jurispudent Ruler, Imam Khomeini.12

Hezbollah’s organizational infrastructure is similar to that of the Muslim Brotherhood: ulama (religious scholars), who themselves are former members of militia groups, swell its military ranks, and groups devoted to da’wa and education form its social infrastructure (Azani 2013, 903). During the initial phase of Hezbollah’s crystallization as an organization in the 1980s, it had no political wing. This was due partly to the chaotic conditions that characterized Lebanon at least until the Taif Accord of 1989 and partly to the “revolutionary vanguard” component of Hezbollah’s approach, which was dominant at that time. This approach, which was much “rawer” than the one Hezbollah would come to adopt, favored jihad as a means of evicting foreigners, eliminating the existing regime, and implementing sharia law (Azani 2013, 903). In addition to Hezbollah seeing itself as a front for the Iranian Islamic Republic, Nasrallah confirmed Hezbollah’s close affiliation with Hamas, Islamic Jihad, and the National Islamic Front in Sudan, which are all extensions of the Muslim Brotherhood, in an interview on March 29, 1998 (Noe 2007, 188).

Hezbollah’s Use of Jihad to Thwart Foreign Forces

Hezbollah’s terror attacks were surprising in their innovativeness, their determination, and the willingness to sacrifice that they reflected. In April 1983, Hezbollah carried out a suicide bombing against the US embassy in

Beirut, and in October 1983 it infamously attacked the US and French barracks of the Beirut-based Multinational Force in Lebanon (MNF) (Azani 2013, 906). The latter, in particular, led to the withdrawal of the MNF from Lebanon in early 1984. Although Hezbollah made no public statement assuming responsibility for these attacks, it was widely known as being responsible. Among the Lebanese public, the attacks lent further validity to Hezbollah’s claims that jihad, resolve, and a willingness to sacrifice were key to evicting foreigners from Lebanon.

Hezbollah’s Antisemitic Views and Activities

On February 16, 1985, Hezbollah spokesman Ibrahim al-Amin publicly announced the organization’s manifesto, which included three goals: to remove all Western colonialist entities from Lebanon, to turn Lebanon into an Islamic state in accordance with sharia law, and to destroy the State of Israel (Open Letter). Notably, the section titled “The Necessity for the Destruction of Israel” outlined Hezbollah’s position as recognizing “no treaty, no ceasefire, and no peace agreements” with Israel and stated that Hezbollah’s “struggle will end only when [Israel] is obliterated” (Open Letter, 7-8). Hezbollah assumed leadership in the fight against Israel, which led many Sunni organizations, including the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt and Jordan, to rally to its side. The Saudi cleric Salman al-Awda even defied his government’s anti-Hezbollah position, writing on his website that “this is not the time to express our differences with the Shiites because we are all confronted by our greater enemy, the criminal Jews and Zionists” (Haykel 2006). Nasrallah also made it clear that the jihadist enemy is not Israel but the Jew: “If we search the entire globe for a more cowardly, lowly, weak, and frail individual in his spirit, mind, ideology, and religion, we will never find anyone like the Jew—and I am not saying the Israeli” (Nasrallah [2007] in Patterson 2018). In a speech on May 7, 1998, Nasrallah sought to dehumanize Jews by referencing passages from the Qur’an (7:163-166), echoing Hamas in declaring the “Zionist Jews” to be the descendants of “apes and pigs” and condemning them as the “murderers of prophets” (Nasrallah [1998] in Patterson 2011, 206).
Hezbollah is a front for Iran’s Islamic Republic that implements Muslim Brotherhood ideology and shares close ties with other branches of the Muslim Brotherhood in Palestine, such as Hamas and Islamic Jihad, as well as the National Islamic Front in Sudan. Hezbollah sees itself as a leader in the fight against Israel and justifies jihad in order to reach its ultimate goal of eliminating the State of Israel. Moreover, a deeper look into the attitudes behind Hezbollah’s hostile stance toward Israel reveals that its leadership shares a view of the Jews—as inhuman, criminal, and lowly beings—that is similar to the views of Qutb and Khomeini. It accordingly argues that the jihadist enemy is ultimately not Israel, but the Jews.

**Sudan: Example of a Muslim Brotherhood Regime Taken to the Extreme**

Sudan was the first Islamic state to arise as a direct branch of the Muslim Brotherhood and provides an example of how a long-term aim to consolidate political power leads a Brotherhood party to gradually and carefully break down moderate systems, implement sharia law, and reach extremes of bloodshed in order to realize Islamist supremacy. After establishing over fifty enclaves throughout Sudan by 1952, the Muslim Brotherhood officially launched its Sudan branch under Rashid al-Tahir’s leadership on August 21, 1954 (Patterson 2011, 148-149). Al-Tahir made unsuccessful attempts to stand as a candidate for the Umma Party in 1957 and to overthrow the Abboud regime on November 9, 1959, which led the Sudanese Brotherhood into political exile. In 1964, Hasan al-Turabi, a Muslim Brotherhood member since 1954, returned to Sudan from Europe after completing a doctorate in constitutional law, and a year later he entered politics and led a new branch of the Brotherhood in Sudan: the Islamic Charter Front (ICF) (Patterson 2011, 149; Sidahmed 2011, 164-165; Zahid and Medley 2006, 696). In particular, al-Turabi started stressing that the movement should aim for political power in its own right rather than being satisfied with educational and lobbying activities (Zahid and Medley 2006, 696). The ICF worked with other political parties that promoted Sudan’s Islamization, and together they outlawed the Communist Party of Sudan (Patterson 2011, 150; Sidahmed 2011, 165).
May 1969 saw a significant development for the Muslim Brotherhood in Sudan, when Colonel Jafar Numeiri led a coup to overthrow the Abboud government (Patterson 2011, 151; Sidahmed 2011, 165-166). Initially, Numeiri viewed the Sudanese Brotherhood as a threat to his power and placed its members under house arrest, while others went into exile. After the outlawed Communists failed in an attempt to overthrow Numeiri in 1971, he met with al-Turabi and accepted him as an ally against communism. The ICF regained its ability to act, and in 1972 also acquired control over the Khartoum University Student Union. In 1973, Numeiri implemented some facets of *sharia* law in Sudan, and throughout the mid-to-late 1970s enacted a policy of reconciliation, which opened the door for the Brotherhood to enter various positions within Numeiri’s government. These included the teaching of Islamic ideology for senior army officers, including future Sudanese president Omar al-Bashir. In 1978, the Sudanese Brotherhood took control of major sectors of Sudan’s banking system, and in 1979 al-Turabi was appointed Minister of Justice. In 1983, al-Turabi and the Sudanese Brotherhood influenced the enactment of another category of *sharia* law in Sudan’s legal system, namely that of *hudud*, which prescribed forms of punishment for various transgressions, including the consumption of alcohol, illicit sexual relations, and blasphemy. The punishments for these and other offenses included flogging, amputation, stoning, beheading, and crucifixion. For women, committing adultery and the “crime” of being raped were punishable by death. On April 6, 1985, Numeiri was ousted from power in a bloodless coup by his chief of staff Lieutenant General Suwar al-Dhahab, a member of the Muslim Brotherhood. In May 1985, al-Turabi changed the name of the ICF to the National Islamic Front (NIF). In January 1987, the NIF drafted a National Charter that affirmed its program to Islamize South Sudan through genocidal *jihad* and bring the country under the rule of *sharia*.

> Once we put political power within our sight, we discovered the wider borders of the Sudan and realized how far behind we had been. Thus, we embarked on a more serious program of action. ... You have the right to take the initiative, and confront your enemy economically, politically, and territorially by all means until God grants you victory. (Al-Turabi [1987] in Patterson 2011, 152; emphasis added)
In 1989, the NIF overthrew the Sudanese government in a coup d’état, which led to Omar al-Bashir declaring himself president of Sudan on October 16, 1993 and to the declaration of Sudan as an Islamist regime (Ahmed 2014, 11-13). Jihadists filled positions of power in Sudan under the direction of al-Turabi and al-Bashir. Jalal Ali Lutfi, who also believed that Sudan’s legal system must become aligned with *sharia* law, became head of the Sudanese Bar Association (Patterson 2011, 153). NIF member Dr. Ibrahim Ahmad Umar became Minister of Higher Education and embarked on Islamizing Sudan’s higher education system. Another NIF member, Abd al-Rahim Hamid, became Minister of Finance and Economy, which enabled the NIF to control the state’s leading financial institutions. On December 31, 1990, al-Bashir’s Revolutionary Command Council (RCC) announced tighter *sharia* laws than Numeiri had done, imposing a much more inferior status on Sudanese non-Muslims. For example, the new laws mandated the death penalty for anyone who left Islam. In December 1991, the Popular Police Force Act was passed, enacting strict requirements on women’s dress and behavior in public, with flogging as the preferred form of punishment. In the early 1990s, Sudan thus already exemplified the extreme measures that a Muslim Brotherhood-run regime takes in order to realize its goal of an Islamic state.

In keeping with the Muslim Brotherhood’s goals of creating a pan-Islamist movement of states unbounded by national borders or internal theological splits, al-Turabi expressed his enthusiasm for “The Project.” Discovered on paper in 1983 during a raid on a Muslim Brotherhood member, it outlines the organization’s strategy for unifying Muslims worldwide for the sake of the Islamization of the Western world (Farah 2007). The Project calls on its members to work with “Islamic groups and organizations on different pivotal issues, agreeing on some common points, cooperate on what we have agreed upon and excuse each other on what we have disagreed upon.” It also states that its members should “accept the idea of a type of transitory/temporary cooperation between Islamic and other national movements, on general issues and on some of the points that do not involve disagreement, such as fighting colonization, missionary work, and the Jewish state.” By 1989, al-Turabi’s enthusiasm
for this form of Muslim unity took concrete shape when he turned Sudan into a training center for al-Qaeda, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, Hamas, and the Palestinian Liberation Organization (Warburg 2008).

On April 25-28, 1991, al-Turabi organized the first meeting of the Popular Arab and Islamic Congress (PAIC) in Khartoum, whose purpose was to coordinate jihadists’ efforts to bring about a global Islamic revolution. As al-Turabi stated in an essay entitled “Priorities for Islamic Movements until 2020”:

> Under Islam as a religion of tawheed, Muslim activists must strike a balance between short-termism and the eternity of their mission; between the local and the universal; and between the absolute and the relative in terms of time and place. (Al-Turabi [1991] in Patterson 2011, 155)

This statement describes the gradualist approach of al-Turabi and the Muslim Brotherhood in Sudan, where they took what they could get at any given time over a period of decades, with the long-term goal of creating an Islamic state in the name of Allah run by sharia law by means of jihad. Al-Turabi’s dream of uniting Muslims around common points of agreement, with the destruction of the Jewish state being the major one, came to fruition at an Islamic conference on Palestine in December 1990. It was the first time that Shiite Iran reached out to Sunni Palestinians involved in the intifada (Arab rebellion) against Israel, and Iran would go on to provide military assistance to Hamas, signing a secret agreement for cooperation between the Sudanese and Iranian intelligence services. These conferences continued, with the NIF, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and Hamas all attending another one in October 1991 (Patterson 2011, 156).

After al-Bashir declared himself president of Sudan, al-Turabi took the speaker role of the National Assembly and worked closely with al-Bashir to promote NIF’s agenda to Islamize Sudan. This agenda would ultimately result in the murder and displacement of over two million people, including many Christians and many followers of native African religions. To highlight his closeness to al-Bashir, al-Turabi once even asserted “Omar al-Bashir is me” (al-Turabi [1994] in Patterson 2011, 157). The
Implementation of the Islamist plan would become a program of mass murder in Southern Sudan, which continued until the signing of the fragile Nairobi Comprehensive Peace Agreement on January 9, 2005, under which Southern Sudan would enjoy a certain amount of autonomy for the next six years. As the conflict in the South decreased, however, the devastation in the West, around Darfur, increased; mass murder perpetrated by the Janjaweed Muslim militias in the region began around October 2002 (Human Rights Watch 2004; Patterson 2011, 157-159).

In keeping with his support for Palestinian organizations and his alignment with Muslim Brotherhood principles, al-Turabi stated that if Sudan were to acknowledge the Jewish state, “it would be betraying its Islamic conviction and would be appeasing the West while incurring the wrath of Allah” (al-Turabi [1998] in Patterson 2011, 154). In 1996, al-Turabi added his signature to a “Statement of Solidarity and Support” for Hamas in its efforts to destroy Israel at a time when Sudan was hosting 500 Hamas members (Patterson 2011, 158).

Sudan thus offers a clear example of a direct Muslim Brotherhood branch seizing and retaining power in a region for a considerable amount of time. It shows the immense violence and bloodshed that results from a regime that aims to politically Islamize its population by imposing sharia law by means of jihad. As regards the Muslim Brotherhood’s genocidal antisemitic ideology, moreover, its Sudanese leaders showed full solidarity with and outright support for terror organizations that aim to eliminate the State of Israel. These organizations are examined in the following sections.

**Palestinian Islamic Jihad: Same Muslim Brotherhood Goals, Different Violent Jihad-Prioritized Approach**

Islamic Jihad, both in Egypt and in Palestine, provides a prime example of a tendency to act much faster and with reliance on violent militant force in order to realize Muslim Brotherhood goals. The organization emerged out of a disagreement with the strategy of other Muslim Brotherhood factions that act much more gradually, patiently, with a more drawn-out focus on entering the educational and political infrastructures of certain
societies, and with more room for negotiations at the political level (Shaqaqi [n.d.] in Bartal 2016, 90-91). Bartal (2016, 84) describes the disagreement between Islamic Jihad and the Muslim Brotherhood as follows: “Do not say a day will come—bring the day,” which means, “Do not be satisfied with just the preparation of the hearts … but also act in the jihad way. Jihad now and not for the future.” Islamic Jihad has shown much more readiness to carry out violent acts of jihad in order to reach the same goals that the Muslim Brotherhood has laid out in its creed. Likewise, Islamic Jihad’s attitude toward the Jews is similar to that of the Muslim Brotherhood. It reveres Hasan al-Banna, Sayyid Qutb, ‘Izz ad-Din al-Qassam,13 and Ruhollah Khomeini, agrees with their ideas about the Jews and the Jewish state, displays belief in the words of The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, and views the struggle between Judaism and Islam as an eternal battle between two religions (Abu-Amr 2002, 97; Bartal 2016, 85).

Between 1971 and 1974, Egyptian President Anwar Sadat, known for being more sympathetic to Muslim Brotherhood members than his predecessor Nasser, let Brotherhood members out of prison. While many were cautious with regard to pursuing militant activity, a group of them formed and pushed a military agenda, ignited by Sadat’s signing of a peace treaty with Israel on March 26, 1979. They became known as Islamic Jihad (Patterson 2011, 159). Inspired by the model of the 1979 Islamic revolution in Iran, the Egyptian Islamic Jihad branched off from the Muslim Brotherhood with the short-term goal of overthrowing the

---

13 Al-Qassam worked for al-Husseini. He was the first person who waged jihad in Palestine in the 1930s and was martyred in 1935 (Bartal 2016, 1-2). He is probably the most identifiable individual in relation to Palestinian Islamic Jihad. The organization still uses al-Qassam’s rigorous member selection process that targets the poorer segments of society to find suitable jihadists (although it disagrees with the idea that al-Qassam focused almost exclusively on the poor). It also parallels his rapid pursuit of jihad, which was seen as an embarrassment to the traditional leaders of his time, just as Palestinian Islamic Jihad’s rapid pursuit of jihad before the first Palestinian intifada was seen as an embarrassment to the Muslim Brotherhood (Abu-Amr 2002, 99-100; Patterson 2011, 110-111).
Egyptian government and establishing an Islamic state run by Islamic law, but as quickly as they arose they also fell (Patterson 2011, 160). Fearing Islamic Jihad, the Egyptian political establishment rounded up several jihadists and executed a key Egyptian Islamic Jihad leader, Muhammad Abd al-Salam Faraj, one year after Sadat’s assassination in 1981, even though the organization was not deemed directly responsible for the assassination.

Palestinian Islamic Jihad emerged from Egyptian Islamic Jihad in 1979 in Gaza. Just as the Egyptian faction believed that the Muslim Brotherhood was not moving rapidly or violently enough, Palestinian Islamic Jihad’s founders—Fathi Shaqaqi, Abd al-Aziz Odeh, and Bashir Musa—viewed the Brotherhood’s actions as insufficient to destroy the Jewish state, and Shaqaqi soon assumed the leadership of Palestinian Islamic Jihad (Abu-Amr 2002, 93). In short, the Muslim Brotherhood asserted that Islam needed to spread throughout Palestinian society before mobilizing jihad for Palestine, while Palestinian Islamic Jihad prioritized the destruction of Israeli control in the region and thus forbade the delay of jihad (Abu-Amr 2002, 106). In support of their stance against the Muslim Brotherhood’s gradual approach to Islamization, Palestinian Islamic Jihad also maintained that the Brotherhood failed to understand the implications of the 1979 revolution in Iran. In particular, Shaqaqi, who revered Qutb’s Milestones as “one of the most important works in modern Islamic literature,” viewed the revolution in Iran as an important connecting point between Sunni and Shiite Muslims, one of Qutb’s major recurring themes (Shaqaqi [1981] in Hatina 2001, 23). Shaqaqi expanded on his position regarding the Islamic Revolution in Iran, as well as Palestinian Islamic Jihad’s ties to Iran and Hezbollah:

The Iranian Revolution has already presented itself as a good example of an Islam that opposes and rebels, emphasizing Islam’s strengths on the plane of political activity and its influence while leading the public. [The meaning] as bestowed by the Imam [Ruhollah] al-Khomeini to the Iranians has left the Muslims with a new meaning in a world that is ruled by materialistic and corrupt fulfillment. ... We must follow in these footsteps ... for [two] reasons: [the Islamic] spiritual eleva-
tion over [considerations of] nationalism, religious systems or ethnicity, [and] their stance in regard to the Palestinian problem. It is the Iranian position in regard to these two questions that defines our stance and our ties to Iran or to Hezbollah. [Hezbollah’s] military activities against the Zionist enemy stamped its positive signature inside occupied Palestine until the activities of Hezbollah [became a good example] of a martyr’s death and the dream of every young Palestinian. We will strengthen our friendship with Hezbollah and we will support the jihad activities of that organization just as we will support any Islamic movement that fights with jihad. (Shaqaqi [n.d.] in Bartal 2016, 93-94)

Shaqaqi’s stance on the Jews was as uncompromising as Qutb’s, and it served to build Palestinian Islamic Jihad’s rigidly negative attitude toward the Jewish state: the “cancer” that plagues humanity is “embodied in the Zionist presence in Palestine” (Hatina 2001, 75, 118; Patterson 2011, 162). The dehumanized depiction of the Jewish presence in Palestine as a cancer alludes to the need for its eradication in order to establish a healthy society, and this Jewish genocidal hint is strengthened by one of the core themes listed in the Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ) Charter: “Islamization of the struggle against the Zionist enemy, alongside rejecting national and patriotic perceptions, which seek to marginalize the struggle” (PIJ Charter [n.d.] in Hatina 2001, 161). In other words, Palestinian Islamic Jihad does not treat the war on the Zionist enemy as merely a national or patriotic struggle but as a holy war of Islam versus the Jews.14 Continuing the murderous antisemitic rhetoric, Shaqaqi stated as follows on Iranian television on November 3, 1994: “We shall raise arms against the criminal Israelis wherever they may be in the autonomous territory and outside it” (Patterson 2011, 165; emphasis added).

One of the “features of the movement” listed in the Palestinian Islamic Jihad Charter is that “it aims to restore the dignity of the Muslim, which has been crushed by the West and by Zionism” (PIJ Charter [n.d.] in

14 Supporting this point in his book, *Khomeini, the Islamic Solution and the Alternative*, Shaqaqi cites a fatwa issued by Khomeini indicating that the endeavor to eliminate the “Zionist entity” is a religious duty (Abu-Amr 2002, 102).
Hatina 2001, 161). In addition, the Charter outright dismisses any peace negotiations with Jews regarding land in Palestine, as this is considered as going against the Qur’an: “A solution of peace based on the recognition of the Jews’ right in Palestine, or part of it, contradicts the Qur’an, since this means relinquishing Islamic holy land” (PIJ Charter [n.d.] in Hatina 2001, 162). For example, in 1993, Shaqaqi criticized the Oslo Accords as a tool devised for boosting the Palestinian Liberation Organization’s financial resources and Arafat’s power aspirations (Hatina 2001, 87). Instead, Palestinian Islamic Jihad described the fateful gathering of the Jews on Palestinian land as a stage on the path to their inevitable extermination, which goes hand-in-hand with Islam’s victory:

The struggle between Islam and the West ... embodied in the Zionist presence in Palestine ... must be viewed from the Qur’anic perspective, which points to the inevitability of the Jews gathering in Palestine and to Zionist corruption, but also assures the final victory of Islam. (PIJ Charter [n.d.] in Hatina 2001, 165)

This means that the movement self-identifies as being at the frontier of the holy war for Islam in its geographic positioning to exterminate the Jewish people. Shaqaqi also described his perception of why Muslim (Shiite and Sunni) unity, through its common engagement in jihad, is of the utmost importance, namely because the success of the revolution (intifada) against the Jewish state depends on it:

The revolution (intifada) cannot free al-Aqsa, not in the evening of the day and not in the morning of the next day as long as it is alone and orphaned, limited, and isolated. ... The intifada is racist in its righteousness [because it is aimed against the Jew]. It has not stopped since the First World War and the Balfour Declaration [in 1917] in various forms. The intifada changes the balance of powers as a result of the jihad of the nation—all the [Islamic] nation—and this is the way. (Shaqaqi [n.d.] in Bartal 2016, 95)

In terms of its practical mobilization against the “Zionist entity,” Palestinian Islamic Jihad launched its first attacks on the Jewish state in 1984 (Patterson 2011, 164). On October 15, 1986, it assumed responsibility for
the Gate of Moors operation, in which three hand grenades were thrown at Israeli troops during a graduation ceremony near the Wailing Wall, wounding about seventy soldiers and killing the father of one Israeli soldier (Abu-Amr 2002, 96). It also conducted an operation to free six of its members from the Gaza Central Prison. On August 2, 1987, members of Palestinian Islamic Jihad killed an Israeli military police commander in the Gaza Strip, and on October 6, 1987 they violently clashed with the Israeli security forces in Gaza City, which led to the death of an Israeli security officer and four Palestinian Islamic Jihad members. In 1988, Shaqaqi published guidelines on how to conduct suicide bombings in which he described such bombings as “exceptional” acts of martyrdom (Abu-Amr 2002, 102; Brooks 2002), and in December of that year he made the first of many trips to Tehran that resulted in Iran donating 20 million dollars to Palestinian Islamic Jihad (Patterson 2011, 164). On August 4, 1989, Palestinian Islamic Jihad took responsibility for a hand grenade attack against an Israeli patrol in Khan Yunis in the Gaza Strip, which wounded four Israeli soldiers (Abu-Amr 2002, 108). On August 14, 1989, it firebombed an Israeli Civil Administration vehicle in Ramallah, injuring four Israeli tax collectors. On May 3, 1989, one of its members carried out a knife attack on several Israelis in West Jerusalem, killing two and injuring three others. One of Islamic Jihad’s factions also claimed responsibility for an Israeli tourist bus attack on the Ismailia-Cairo road in January 1990, killing eight Israelis and injuring many others. On July 7, 1989, a member of Palestinian Islamic Jihad conducted the first suicide attack (at least in terms of intent, because the attacker survived) on an Israeli bus on the Tel Aviv-Jerusalem highway, taking over the wheel and steering the bus into a ravine, killing sixteen people, mostly Israelis, as well as two Canadians and one American, and injuring twenty-seven others (Abu-Amr 2002, 108; Brinkley 1989). Since these attacks, Palestinian Islamic Jihad has taken responsibility for hundreds more attacks on Israeli targets, causing deaths, injuries, and inciting fear by means of stabbings, shootings, bombings, and rockets, with a focus on bombings throughout the 1990s and 2000s and rockets after 2012.15

For an updated list of attacks, see Wikipedia, s.v. “Islamic Jihad Movement in Palestine,” subsection “List of Attacks.”
While differentiated in approach from the Muslim Brotherhood, Palestinian Islamic Jihad still sees itself as pursuing the same goals. The first twelve points in its Charter (“The Features of the Movement”) read like an extended version of the Muslim Brotherhood creed that al-Banna and his brethren established in 1928. Palestinian Islamic Jihad thus shows strong ties to Muslim Brotherhood ideology, especially as regards the elimination not only of the Jewish state but of Jewish people in general. While highly critical of other Islamic movements, Palestinian Islamic Jihad is ready to unite with them for the sake of their common Islamic goal of defeating the Jews, and it has collaborated with Hamas in attacks on Israel (Patterson 2011, 166). Moreover, Palestinian Islamic Jihad has proven its eagerness to utilize violence in its severest forms—including pioneering the use of suicide attacks against Israelis—in order to realize its long-term goal of pleasing Allah by reviving Islam in the world, while simultaneously achieving its short-term goal of eliminating the Jewish enemy in its proximity (PIJ Charter [n.d.] in Hatina 2001, 163).

16 “The Features of the Movement: 1. Religious: Its aims, principles and activities derive from the glorious Islamic heritage. 2. Combatant: It upholds the sacred jihad as the only solution for the liberation of Palestine and the destruction of the heretical regimes. 3. Comprehensive: It perceives Islam as a comprehensive framework not subject to division or annulment. 4. Unifying: It believes in Islamic unity, based on justice, equality and fraternity. 5. Vanguard: It leads the Arab and Muslim peoples and mobilizes them to defend their identity. 6. Worldwide: It perceives the universe as Islamic territory which must be liberated from heresy. 7. Benevolent: It aims to restore the dignity of the Muslim, which has been crushed by the West and by Zionism. 8. Ethical: It oversees private and public morality, as commanded by Islam. 9. Military: It enhances military activity and reveals its true meaning. 10. Consultant: It regards the shura as the authentic and firm source for decision-making. 11. Independent: It is not subordinate to any internal or external force. 12. Uniqueness: It is a unique phenomenon among the Islamic movements with a specific platform.” (Palestinian Islamic Jihad Charter [n.d.] in Hatina 2001, 161)
Hamas: The Official Muslim Brotherhood Branch in Palestine

Hamas is the acronym for the Islamic Resistance Movement (*Harakat al-Muqawama al-Islamiya*), which officially materialized as the Muslim Brotherhood’s militant Palestinian branch on December 9, 1987 following the onset of the First Palestinian Intifada (Scham and Abu-Irshaid 2009). Hamas’s background can be traced back to the Muslim Brotherhood’s resistance to British and Zionist occupation in Palestine in the 1930s (Bartal 2016, 44). Abdullah Azzam argues that Hamas—not the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)—is the real movement continuing the jihadist activity for Palestine that the Muslim Brotherhood, al-Husseini, and al-Qassam started in the 1930s (Bartal 2016, 34). Moreover, in its Charter, Hamas self-identifies as “one of the wings of the Muslim Brotherhood in Palestine,” and its slogan is identical to the Muslim Brotherhood’s creed.17

As a branch of the Muslim Brotherhood in Palestine, Hamas has mostly focused its rhetoric on the elimination of the State of Israel in Palestine and has been careful with outright expressions of Jew hatred as it seeks diplomatic relations with other countries and entities in its rise to power. However, when investigating Hamas, researchers do not need to look very deep in order to pinpoint the same genocidal Jew-hating ideology that developed throughout the Muslim Brotherhood’s periods of “insurrection” and “ordeal.”

Hamas was founded by Sheikh Ahmed Yassin, together with Dr. Abdel Aziz al-Rantisi and Mahmoud al-Zahar, who has been quoted as stating: “If the Qur’an attacks the Jews in some of its verses, the people must read it” (al-Zahar [2005] in Aaron 2008, 78). Yassin had revered al-Husseini since his youth and joined the Muslim Brotherhood in 1957 while studying at

---

17 Hamas’s slogan reads: “Allah is its goal, the Prophet its model, the Qur’an its Constitution, jihad its path, and death for the case of Allah its most sublime belief.” See “The Charter of Allah: The Platform of the Islamic Resistance Movement (Hamas),” translated and annotated by Raphael Israeli, Harry Truman Research Institute, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel, 2008 (hereinafter, Hamas Charter).
Al-Azhar University in Cairo (Patterson 2011, 166-167). In 1973, Yassin founded the Islamic Congress (*Mujama al-Islami*) in Gaza as part of his efforts to expand the Muslim Brotherhood’s influence, and in 1978 his organization established the Islamic University of Gaza, whose Rector, Dr. Ahmad Abu Halabiya, is known for “publicly calling for the massacre of Jews everywhere” (Patterson 2011, 167). For example, he is recorded as stating as follows in a Palestinian television broadcast from 2000:

None of the Jews refrain from committing any possible evil. ... They are all liars. They all want to distort truth, but we are in possession of the truth. ... They are the ones who must be butchered and killed, as Allah the Almighty said: “Fight them: Allah will torture them at your hands, and will humiliate them and will help you to overcome them, and will relieve the minds of the believers.” (Halabiya [n.d.] in Patterson 2011, 167)

Continuing the genocidal antisemitic line of thought among Hamas leaders, Sheikh Ibrahim Mudeiras of Hamas once declared: “The Jews will not live in peace and comfort under our rule. Treachery will keep being their nature throughout history. The day will come when the whole world will rid itself of the Jews” (Mudeiras [2005] in Aaron 2008, 113). Thus, key Hamas members show themselves as sharing the Muslim Brotherhood’s stance that the Jews are “the dirtiest and meanest of all races, defiling the most sanctified and honored spot on earth” (Abu Musab [n.d.] in Abu-Amr 2002, 26), making “no distinctions between Jews, Zionists, and Israelis” (Abu-Amr 2002, 26).

It is also worth noting the parallel between Hamas attaching Western influences to their Jew-hating ideology and the Muslim Brotherhood’s habit of referencing the claim that the Jews are global power conspirators as articulated in *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. In this regard, Article 32 of the Hamas Charter states:

World Zionism and Imperialist forces have been attempting, with smart moves and considered planning, to push the Arab countries, one after another, out of the circle of conflict with Zionism, in order, ultimately, to isolate the Palestinian
People. ... For Zionist scheming has no end, and after Palestine they will covet expansion from the Nile to the Euphrates. Only when they have completed digesting the area on which they will have laid their hand, they will look forward to more expansion, etc. Their scheme has been laid out in The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, and their present [conduct] is the best proof of what is said there.

Tibi (2010, 18) compares Hamas’s identification of “world Zionism” as the enemy with Qutb’s condemnation of “world Jewry,” as both the Hamas Charter and Qutb mention this phrase together with a reference to The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, thereby suggesting that the purpose of world Zionism/Jewry is global domination. Likewise, former Hamas leader Khaled Mashal acknowledged the threat to humanity posed by the Zionist entity: “Do not take the Zionist danger lightly because it does not menace only Palestine, Lebanon or the Ring States [surrounding Israel]. It is threatening all of you” (Mashal [2005] in Aaron 2008, 118).

In addition, like Qutb, Hamas has attached dehumanizing stereotypes to Jews by claiming that they once transformed into “apes, pigs, mice, and lizards,” which “left its mark in the souls of the Jews who came after them,”18 a concept borrowed from the Qur’anic verse that mentions “those whom Allah has cursed and with whom He became angry and made of them apes and pigs and slaves of taghut [false deities]” (Qur’an 5:60). Likewise, Hamas used the following dehumanizing and demonizing words about Jews in their first proclamation during the First Intifada:

Here are the Jews, the brothers of apes, the murderers of the prophets, the blood suckers, the war agitators—murdering you, depriving you of your life after they have stolen the Motherland and your home. Only Islam can break the Jews and destroy their dream. ... Take into account that when you are fighting with them to ask one of two favors: The martyr’s death or victory over them and their rout. (Hamas [n.d.] in Bartal 2016, 46)

---

18 Taken from an article published in September 1996 in the Hamas monthly magazine Falastin Al-Muslima by Ibrahim al-Ali (Patterson 2011, 169). In the broadcasts of Hamas’s Al-Aqsa television station, Jews are commonly referred to as “the brothers of apes and pigs” (Patterson 2011, 172).
Perceived as enemies of Islam and Allah, the fate of the Jews is seen as being a “great punishment” or in the elaborate words of Hamas legislator Sheikh Yunis al-Astal in the Hamas weekly publication *Al-Risalah*:

Suffering by fire is the Jews’ destiny in this world and the next. ... But the urgent question is, is it possible that they will have the punishment of burning in this world, before the great punishment? ... We are sure that the holocaust is still to come upon the Jews. (Al-Astal [2008] in Patterson 2011, 173)

The opening section of the Hamas Charter includes a quote from al-Banna that mentions the rise of Israel and its subsequent elimination by Islam, which is significant in the context of the Muslim Brotherhood’s genocidal antisemitic ideology because the statement was made before the existence of the State of Israel: “Israel will rise and will remain erect until Islam eliminates it as it had eliminated its predecessors.” In addition, Article 7 of the Hamas Charter quotes a famous *hadith*¹⁹ to reflect that Hamas is looking forward to implementing Allah’s promise by fighting and killing “the Jews”:

Hamas has been looking forward to implement Allah’s promise whatever time it might take. ... The time will not come until Muslims will fight the Jews (and kill them); until the Jews hide behind rocks and trees, which will cry: O Muslim! There is a Jew hiding behind me, come on and kill him!

There are arguments among scholars as to whether Hamas is using the *hadith* in support of a religious or a nationalistic war stance (Scham and Abu-Irshaid 2009, 5-6). However, Hamas has made it clear that it views nationalism as an integral part of the Islamic religion and uses this reasoning to declare that there can be no peaceful resolution with any non-Islamic entity on Palestinian land but only *jihad*, as stated in Article 13 of its Charter:

¹⁹ The *hadith* reads: “The Day of Judgment will not come about until Muslims fight the Jews (killing the Jews), when the Jew will hide behind stones and trees. The stones and trees will say ‘O Muslims, O Abdulla, there is a Jew behind me, come and kill him!’” (Scham and Abu-Irshaid 2009, 5).
[Peace] initiatives, the so-called peaceful solutions, and the international conferences to resolve the Palestinian problem, are all contrary to the beliefs of the Islamic Resistance Movement. For renouncing any part of Palestine means renouncing part of the religion; the nationalism of the Islamic Resistance Movement is part of its faith. ... There is no solution to the Palestinian problem except by *jihad*. ... When our enemies usurp some Islamic lands, *jihad* becomes a duty binding on all Muslims. In order to face the usurpation of Palestine by the Jews, we have no escape from raising the banner of *jihad*.

This idea that the Islamic religion encompasses nationalism is consistent with the Muslim Brotherhood’s view of Islam as a complete social, cultural, economic, and political system, as described above.

Driven by a genocidal hatred of the “Zionist enemy,” Hamas has carried out a wide range of violent attacks on military and civilian targets since 1987: kidnappings, stabbings, shootings, suicide bombings, and mortar and rocket attacks (Bartal 2016, 55-56; Gupta and Mundra 2005; Levitt 2007, 12). In 1989, Yassin arranged the kidnapping and murder of Israeli soldiers, burying them in a way that allowed Hamas to negotiate a trade of the soldiers’ dead bodies for jailed Hamas operatives, a tactic that Hamas would use on repeated occasions (Patterson 2011, 169). On April 16, 1993, Hamas conducted the first of many suicide bombings against Israelis, killing only the attacker and one Arab civilian. However, the second suicide bombing, which took place a year later on April 6, 1994, already killed eight people, mostly teenagers, and injured over forty others (Levitt 2007, 11-12). Between February 1989 and March 2000, Hamas carried out at least twenty-seven attacks, including twelve suicide bombings and three failed bombings, causing around 185 deaths and over 1,200 injuries (Levitt 2007, 12). The Second Intifada, which started in September 2000, saw a significant increase in the amount and frequency of Hamas attacks. Between September 29, 2000 and March 24, 2004, Hamas carried out fifty-two suicide bombings—killing 288 people and injuring 1,646 others—and a total of 425 attacks—killing 377 people and injuring 2,076 others (Levitt 2007, 12). On March 27, 2002, on the first night of Passover, Hamas sent a suicide bomber to a hotel in Netanya to murder
Jews during the traditional Passover Seder. Following this attack and in response to numerous other attacks, Human Rights Watch urged that Hamas leaders, including Yassin, “be held accountable for war crimes and crimes against humanity” (Human Rights Watch [2002] in Patterson 2011, 169-170).

On June 10-15, 2007, Hamas fighters took control of the Gaza Strip. They killed at least 100 PLO members, injured at least 200 more, and captured and punished at least 300 others for cooperating with the Jews—taking some naked through the streets of Gaza and then out to the desert to be killed, while others either fell or were thrown to their deaths from a fifteen-story building (Bartal 2016, 48). On June 30, 2007, Human Rights Watch condemned Hamas for firing over 8,000 rockets and mortars into Israel from 2001 (Patterson 2011, 169-170). By the end of 2015, 12,338 rockets and 6,500 mortars had been fired into Israel from Palestinian territory, with Hamas taking responsibility for the majority of the attacks.20

As an official branch of the Muslim Brotherhood in Palestine, Hamas has clearly adopted the Brotherhood’s genocidal antisemitic ideology—calling for the death of all Jews because they are enemies of Islam who pursue global domination and have an inhuman nature—in its own ideological positioning, propaganda, and violent activities.

Al-Qaeda, ISIS, and the Muslim Brotherhood: Same Core Ideology, Same Jewish Enemy, Different Tactics

While the Muslim Brotherhood shares no formal ties with al-Qaeda and ISIS,21 they share the same fundamental ideology and goals—to establish a

---


21 ISIS is the acronym for the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, which was the name that it acquired in the region in 2013-2014. It subsequently became known as Islamic State (al-Dawla al-Islamiyya) (Khawaja and Khan 2016, 105). However, the acronym ISIS continues to be used in the media to refer to the organization as a whole, and the present paper accordingly uses it as well.
global Islamic caliphate run according to *sharia* law by means of *jihad* in the name of Allah—and this connection is apparent from the fact that several key founding members of al-Qaeda and ISIS have been members of Brotherhood. They branched off from the Muslim Brotherhood due to differences over the Brotherhood’s gradualist approach to reaching Islamist goals, with al-Qaeda and ISIS favoring a much more immediate and violent *jihad*. Their ideological and goal-oriented connection is worth discussing, since they have shown a willingness to cooperate on various occasions, usually in the presence of a greater enemy.

Al-Qaeda’s co-founder, Palestinian-born Abdullah Azzam, became a member of the Muslim Brotherhood in the 1950s, during which time he became well acquainted with the writings of Hasan al-Banna and other Brotherhood members (Hegghammer in Kepel and Milelli 2009, 82-83). Sometime between the late 1960s and 1970, Azzam participated in the Palestinian *jihad* against Israel, although the extent of his participation is unclear and disputed among historians. While completing his doctorate at Al-Azhar University in Cairo in 1971-1973, he became a close friend of the Qutb family (Hegghammer in Kepel and Milelli 2009, 86-87). Qutb’s heavy influence on Azzam is evident from the fact that while teaching in Amman, Jordan, after his return from Cairo during the 1970s he became known as “the Jordanian Sayyid Qutb” (Hegghammer in Kepel and Milelli 2009, 88).

After the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan on December 25, 1979, Azzam issued a *fatwa* that tied the struggle against the Soviets to the struggle against the Jews and declared *jihad* on both of them (Patterson 2018). In a pilgrimage trip to Mecca in 1980, Azzam met Sheikh Kamal al-Sananiri, an Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood member who impressed on Azzam the idea of *jihad* in Afghanistan. Soon after, he took up a teaching post at an Afghan university, making connections between Islamists and militants (Hegghammer in Kepel and Milelli 2009, 90-91). In 1984, Azzam published a book, *The Defense of Muslim Territories*, in which he argued that the Afghan *jihad* was an obligation for Muslims worldwide. That same year, his insistence on sending jihadist fighters from Jordan to Afghani-
stan led to the suspension of his membership in the Jordanian Muslim Brotherhood (Hegghammer in Kepel and Milelli 2009, 92). In addition, 1984 was the year in which Azzam met Osama bin Laden and established an organization in Peshawar that would form the basis for al-Qaeda. Called the Service Bureau (Maktab al-Khadamat), it acted as a jihadist hub in Afghanistan, facilitating the arrival of jihadist volunteers and distributing recruits to various battlefields, training camps, and other activities for the purpose of jihad in Afghanistan (Hegghammer in Kepel and Milelli 2009, 92-93). In 1989, bin Laden officially announced the establishment of the al-Qaeda organization, which was based on Azzam’s concept of “the solid base” (al-Qaidah al-Sulbah), that is, a vanguard to pave the way for an Islamic society (Maliach 2010, 80).

While focused on establishing jihad in Afghanistan, which he perceived as a necessary first step toward global jihad, Azzam maintained his emotional connection to Palestine and believed that the jihad would reach Jerusalem in the end, as he often said: “If my body is in Kabul like a specter, my heart, soul, and spirit are in Jerusalem” (Hegghammer in Kepel and Milelli 2009, 100).

We will force the world to recognize us, if they recognize us—good, if they don’t, that is their problem. We will fight, we will beat our enemies; we will establish an Islamic state on the slice of land, like in Afghanistan. Afghanistan will expand; the jihad will spread. Islam will fight in other places. Islam will fight against the Jews in Palestine and will establish an Islamic state in Palestine and an Islamic state in Afghanistan and in other places. Afterwards, all of these states will merge into one Islamic state. (Azzam [n.d.] in Bartal 2016, 16)

Moreover, Azzam felt a closeness to Hamas from its establishment in 1987, viewing it as “the spearhead in the religious confrontation against the Jews in Palestine and as followers of the Islamic Movement (a branch of the Muslim Brotherhood)” and believing that “only Hamas is capable of restoring Palestine into Muslim hands in this era” (Maliach 2010, 85, 87-88). Azzam raised funds for Hamas during his travels through Arab nations and through his organization’s branches in the United States, and
he supported the organization politically, financially, and logistically during the First Intifada (Hegghammer 2013, 21; Maliach 2010, 88). In return, Hamas expressed great reverence for Azzam, treating him as one of its most important martyrs and naming its West Bank military wing—the Abdullah Azzam Martyrs Brigades (later the Izz ad-Din al-Qassam Martyrs Brigades)—and its military academy in the Gaza Strip—The Dr. Abdullah Azzam Academy—after him (Maliach 2010, 89).

Maliach (2010, 85-86) also postulates that, while Azzam’s approach and the Hamas Charter share several similarities, his stance was far more extreme than that of Hamas and that he would have disagreed with Hamas’s ceasefires with the Jewish state. Azzam’s firm stance on violence was strengthened by his statements in support of *jihad*: “Those who believe that Islam can flourish [and] be victorious without *jihad*, fighting, and blood indeed are delusional and do not understand the nature of this religion” (Azzam [n.d.] in Aaron 2008, 68) and “[t]he word *jihad*, when mentioned on its own, only means combat with weapons” (Azzam [1987] in Aaron 2008, 68). In keeping with the genocidal antisemitic underpinnings of his approach, moreover, it is not surprising that Azzam saw the ultimate aim of the final battle for Palestine as the elimination of the Jews from the region: “If only the Muslims would apply their Lord’s command and implement the laws of their *sharia* … for just one week in Palestine, Palestine would be completely purified of Jews” (Azzam [1987] in Patterson 2011, 214).

In addition to Azzam, al-Qaeda’s other co-founders, Osama bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahiri, were also members of the Muslim Brotherhood. Bin Laden had been a member before the 1980s and had studied with Sayyid Qutb’s brother, Mohammad, at King Abdulaziz University in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia (Musallam 2020, 7-8). However, bin Laden was evicted from the Brotherhood due to his insistence on fighting with the *mujahideen* in Afghanistan, while the Muslim Brotherhood permitted him to do no more than bring aid to Pakistan (Musallam 2020, 10-11). Likewise, bin Laden criticized the Muslim Brotherhood as only calling for “half solutions” and claimed that they would end up aligning with a more violent jihadism if it would lead the way: “the return of the Brotherhood
and those like them to the true Islam is a matter of time.” After bin Laden’s death, the Muslim Brotherhood awarded him the honorific title of “Sheikh” and praised his resistance in Afghanistan and Iraq (Trager 2011). Al-Zawahiri became a Muslim Brotherhood member at the age of fourteen, one year before Sayyid Qutb’s execution (Lacroix in Kepel and Milelli 2009, 148-153). After Qutb’s execution in 1973, al-Zawahiri created the Brotherhood offshoot known as Egyptian Islamic Jihad and became its leader. In 1981, he was arrested with other Egyptian Islamic Jihad members for the assassination of President Anwar al-Sadat (Ramana 2011, 5-6). In 2001, Egyptian Islamic Jihad merged with al-Qaeda (Howell Jr. 2015, 1).

The genocidal antisemitism attitudes of bin Laden and al-Zawahiri were closely aligned with those of Qutb and the Muslim Brotherhood. Bin Laden describes an umbrella hatred that exists in the heart of every Muslim, as part of the Muslim religion, which includes the hatred of Jews, Christians, and Americans: “Every Muslim, from the moment they realize the distinction in their hearts, hates Americans, hates Jews, and hates Christians. This is a part of our belief and our religion” (bin Laden [1998] in Lawrence 2005, 87). More specifically, bin Laden identifies Jews as the enemies of humanity by stating:

The Jews are those who slandered the Creator, so how do you think they deal with God’s creation? They killed the Prophets and broke their promises. Of them God has said: “How is it that whenever they made a covenant or a pledge, some of them throw it away? In fact, most of them do not believe.” These Jews are masters of usury and leaders in treachery. They will leave you nothing, either in this world or the next. Of them God said: “Do they have any share of what He possesses? If they did they would not give away so much as the groove of a date stone.” These Jews believe as part of their religion that people are their slaves, and whoever denies their religion deserves to be killed. Of them God said: “[That is] because they say ‘We are under no obligation toward the gentiles’—they tell a lie against God and they know it.” (Bin Laden [2003] in Lawrence 2005, 189-190)

If Jews are the enemies of humanity, then “peace with the Jews … is a disaster for Muslims” (bin Laden [1994] in Lawrence 2005, 8). Likewise, bin Laden sees a fateful battle between Muslims and Jews as an epic future religious event that it is destined to happen, that Muslims are destined to win, and that will be the Day of Judgment: “The enmity between us goes back far in time and is deeply rooted. There is no question that war between us is inevitable. … The Hour of Resurrection shall not come before the Muslims fight the Jews” (bin Laden [1998] in Küntzel 2009, xxiii).

The [Islamic] nation has also been promised victory over the Jews, as the Prophet Muhammad has told us: “The Day of Judgment will not arrive until the Muslims fight the Jews and kill them…” This hadith also teaches [us] that the conflict with the enemy will be settled by killing and warfare, and not by disabling the potential of the [Muslim] nation for decades by a variety of means such as the deception of democracy. (Bin Laden [2003] in Aaron 2008, 159)

Likewise, al-Zawahiri continues the line of genocidal antisemitic rhetoric by focusing on jihad and the absolute rejection of any peace with Israel: “Peace with Israel and acceptance of its usurpation of Palestine is a rejection of jihad…” and “[t]he one slogan that has been well understood by the nation … is the call for the jihad against Israel” (al-Zawahiri [2007] in Patterson 2011, 215-216). Moreover, al-Zawahiri reveres Qutb as “greatly [helping] the Islamic movement … know and define its enemies” and for playing “a key role in directing the Muslim youth to this road” (al-Zawahiri [2007] in Patterson 2011, 216).

Additionally, al-Zawahiri sees the Jews as the leading influence on the United States, which is incapable of establishing ethical, moral, and legitimate relations and only knows a “language of interests backed by brute military force”:

We must acknowledge that the West, led by the United States, which is under the influence of the Jews, does not know the language of ethics, morality, and legitimate rights. They only know the language of interests backed by brute
military force. Therefore, if we wish to have a dialogue with them and make them aware of our rights, we must talk to them in the language that they understand. (Al-Zawahiri [2001] in Aaron 2008, 163)

Moreover, within this “language of interests backed by brute military force” against the Jewish-backed West, “the rules against the slaughter of innocents must be relaxed” (Wright 2006, 218). In the words of al-Zawahiri’s fellow jihadist bin Laden: “Yes, we kill their innocents, and this is legal religiously and logically. There are two types of terror, good and bad. What we are practicing is good terror. We will not stop killing them” (bin Laden [2001] in Patterson 2011, 218).

In other words, the genocidal antisemitism of bin Laden and al-Zawahiri translates into what they regard as “religiously and logically” legitimate terror attacks. Al-Qaeda has been prolific in this area since the 1990s, racking up over fifty attacks including suicide bombings, hijackings, hostage situations, and shootings, as well as the infamous attacks of September 11, 2001. In terms of specifically Jewish targets, three suicide bombers blew up a hotel popular with Israelis in the Kenyan resort of Mombasa on November 28, 2002, killing fifteen people. On the same day, two missiles narrowly missed an Israeli Arkia Boeing 757 carrying 261 passengers as it took off from Mombasa airport. Al-Qaeda claimed responsibility for the attacks. On May 16, 2003, fifteen suicide bombers attacked five targets in Casablanca, Morocco—a Spanish restaurant, a Jewish community center, a Jewish cemetery, a hotel, and the Belgian consulate—killing forty-three people and wounding 100 (Karmon 2020). The Arab Spring of the early 2010s also spawned other organizations connected to al-Qaeda, including the al-Nusra Front in Syria, the Houthis in Yemen, Algerian al-Qaeda, Boko Haram, and al-Shabaab. Throughout the 2010s, reports of jihadist acts of murder poured in almost daily, with nearly all such tragedies traceable to the Muslim Brotherhood (Patterson 2018).

ISIS: The Rush to Carry out Jihadist Violence and Build the Islamic Caliphate

Former ISIS leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi was a member of the Iraqi branch of the Muslim Brotherhood until his criticism of its gradualist approach to building an Islamic caliphate led him to seek a much more immediate and violent approach (Howell 2015, 160). Moreover, al-Baghdadi’s criticism of the Muslim Brotherhood extended to accusing the Brotherhood and Hamas of entering into “alliances with the apostate regimes,” including Egypt, Syria, and Iran, displaying “rampant hostility toward the Salafi jihadists,” such as ISIS and al-Qaeda, and delaying jihad (al-Baghdadi [2007] in Lynch 2010, 471). The Muslim Brotherhood, in turn, criticized al-Baghdadi and ISIS in many respects, while maintaining that the time was unripe for establishing a caliphate and that al-Baghdadi’s self-declaration as a caliph and ISIS’s self-declaration as establishing the Islamic caliphate without having brought the matter before a sharia court went against the Qur’an (sura 3:159) and thus invalidated ISIS’s caliphate according to Islamic law (Winter 2016, 32). However, while the Muslim Brotherhood and ISIS traded accusations amid disagreements over tactics and strategy, they found common ground on other issues and readily cooperated logistically and in other ways.

One example of Muslim Brotherhood and ISIS collaboration can be found in ISIS’s Sinai branch, Wilayat Sinai, which cooperated directly with Hamas against the Egyptian government after the 2013 ousting of the Mohamed Morsi-led Brotherhood government (Counter Extremism Project 2019). Examples of this cooperation include Hamas contributing its drone program to spy on Egyptian military positions for Wilayat Sinai, Hamas giving Wilayat Sinai access to its underground tunnel network to smuggle weapons between Sinai and Gaza, and Wilayat Sinai fighters receiving medical treatment in Gaza. However, these ties dissolved in 2017 after Hamas reached an agreement with the Egyptian government, which led to an ISIS suicide bombing that killed a Hamas border guard in August 2017, a Wilayat Sinai video showing one of its members being executed for smuggling weapons to Hamas in January 2018, and an ISIS cleric in Sinai calling on ISIS’s followers to attack Hamas for its failure to
prevent the United States’ recognition of Jerusalem as Israel’s capital. Also, at least since 2016, Muslim Brotherhood youth members in Libya had participated in ISIS and al-Qaeda training camps, which reportedly received significant payments from the Brotherhood for this purpose.

Under the ideological umbrella of jihadism, al-Baghdadi remained consistent in his genocidal antisemitic rhetoric. In addition to dehumanizing Jews as “grandchildren of monkeys and pigs,” he threatened those living in Israel by stating that the gathering of Jews in Palestine was Allah’s wish in order for it to be the place of their slaughter:

To all the Jews, grandchildren of monkeys and pigs, we are coming for you from all over the world to slaughter you. ... Jews, you will not enjoy in Palestine. Allah has gathered you in Palestine so that the mujahideen can reach you soon and you will hide by the rock and the tree. Palestine will be your graveyard. (Al-Baghdadi [2015] in Rickenbacher 2019, 5)

The July 2014 issue of ISIS’s official English-language magazine, Dabiq, also mentions its long-term goal of killing Jews in Palestine: “Actions speak louder than its words and it is only a matter of time and patience before [ISIS] reaches Palestine to fight the barbaric jews [sic] and kill those of them hiding behind the gharqad trees—the trees of the jews [sic]” (Anti-Defamation League 2015, 5). While ISIS was militarily focused on establishing its self-proclaimed caliphate on Iraqi and Syrian land, its terror activities abroad often targeted Jews. In 2015, a jihadist who had pledged allegiance to ISIS attacked the Hypercacher kosher supermarket in Paris, killing four Jewish hostages. Also, in 2015, a few weeks after the Hypercacher supermarket attack, another gunman who was also reported to have pledged allegiance to al-Baghdadi went on a shooting spree at three separate locations in Denmark, one of which included the Great
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Synagogue in Copenhagen, where he killed a young Jewish man on security duty and wounded two police officers (Yan 2015). After al-Baghdadi’s assassination, the new ISIS leader, Abu Ibrahim al-Hashimi al-Qurashi, issued a statement in February 2020 declaring war on Israel, urging ISIS factions in the Sinai and Syria to attack Israel, and calling on Muslims to thwart the Trump-led Israel-Palestine peace plan also known as the “Deal of the Century” (Karmon 2020).

With elusive formal ties, while the Muslim Brotherhood, al-Qaeda, and ISIS can at times be competitors due to operational disagreements, they are linked through their core ideologies and the fact that their leaders and founding members started out as members of the Brotherhood. Moreover, they are open to engaging in coordinated efforts when circumstances require, such as when confronting their ultimate enemy—the Jews in Palestine.

The Muslim Brotherhood in North America

To achieve the same goals that Hasan al-Banna and his comrades developed in 1928, the present-day Muslim Brotherhood strategy in North America takes advantage of a progressive worldview, espoused by most mainstream Western media outlets and academic institutions, that regards Western colonialism and its economic capitalism as the enemy, argues that antisemitism is a colonialist tool for justifying the existence of the State of Israel, and refers to opponents of the Muslim Brotherhood’s goals as “bigots,” “white supremacists,” and “Islamophobes” (Investigative Project on Terrorism 2013). Such ideological foundations enable leading and respected scholars such as Judith Butler to argue that Hamas and Hezbollah should be viewed as part as the progressive global left and encourage some observers, including scholars of antisemitism, to blame Israel for antisemitism throughout the world (Small 2013, 9).

Focusing on the common enemy of Western colonialism, the Muslim Brotherhood has established itself through a network of disguised organizations that are not connected to it by name, although it remains their
ideological, financial, and organizational parent. In August 2004, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) uncovered a Muslim Brotherhood archive in the home of a suspect wanted for Hamas fundraising in Chicago. This archive contained a document outlining the Brotherhood’s current strategy in North America. The document, which is entitled “An Explanatory Memorandum: On the General Strategic Goal for the Group in North America,” was written in 1991 by Mohamed Akram, a member of the Board of Directors of the Muslim Brotherhood in North America and a senior Hamas leader. It provides insights into the Brotherhood’s goals, modus operandi, and infrastructure in the United States, clarifying how and through what organizational disguises it plans to achieve its goals in North America. The following key statement appears under the heading “Understanding the role of the Muslim Brotherhood in North America”:

The process of settlement is a ‘Civilization-Jihadist Process’ with all the word means. The Ikhwan [Muslim Brotherhood] must understand that their work in America is a kind of grand Jihad in eliminating and destroying the Western civilization from within and “sabotaging” its miserable house by their hands and the hands of the believers so that it is eliminated and God’s religion is made victorious over all other religions. Without this level of understanding, we are not up to this challenge and have not prepared ourselves for Jihad yet. It is a Muslim’s destiny to perform Jihad and work wherever he is and wherever he lands until the final hour comes, and there is no escape from that destiny except for those who chose to slack. (Explanatory Memorandum, 21)

The elimination and destruction of Western civilization from within exemplifies the Muslim Brotherhood’s gradualist approach, namely to establish itself by initially non-violent means through myriad organizations, which are described in the memorandum as “our organizations and
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the organizations of our friends.” The list of these organizations is accompanied by the enthusiastic statement: “Imagine if they all march according to one plan!!!” (Explanatory Memorandum, 32). The memorandum identifies twenty-nine organizations by name, including the Islamic Society of North America (ISNA), the Muslim Students’ Association (MSA), and the Muslim Communities Association (MCA).

The MSA currently has a partnership with National Students for Justice in Palestine (SJP) and organizes events such as “Israel Apartheid Week,” an annual series of lectures and rallies aimed at delegitimizing Israel as an apartheid state (Small, Patterson, and Feder 2019, 10). These activities, which generally take place on university and college campuses, have spread to at least fifty-five cities worldwide. While MSA advocates an Islamist agenda in keeping with that of the Muslim Brotherhood, SJP appeals to a larger network of so-called “leftist” individuals and organizations that push its political agenda under the guise of progressivism and human rights. Both organizations use classic Muslim Brotherhood methods to build coalitions and temporary alliances from within. SJP shares a common goal—the destruction of the State of Israel—with the Muslim Brotherhood and Hamas and collaborates with them toward the realization of this goal.

SJP echoes Hamas in its use of antisemitism and anti-Zionism while specifically targeting university campuses throughout North America (Small, Patterson, and Feder 2019, 11). Its members engage in propaganda campaigns calculated to incite hatred against Jewish people in general and Jewish students in particular. This antisemitism can be found in all SJP materials, including its social media output, such as YouTube videos from SJP college chapters. SJP activities on college campuses focus on students and faculty in order to achieve the greatest possible impact. SJP is one of several manifestations of the objective outlined in Article 15 of the Hamas Charter: “It is necessary that ulama [learned people], educators and teachers, information and media men, as well as the educated masses, especially the youth and elders of the Islamic movements, must participate in this raising of consciousness.”
SJP’s antisemitic activism, which is advanced by highly educated individuals, threatens Jewish university life. In 2016, for example, a Brandeis University study described aggravated antisemitism in US academia, reporting hostilities, intimidation techniques, and antisemitic rhetoric used by SJP activists against Jewish students on US campuses (Diker 2018). Many Jewish students report being accused by SJP activists of bearing personal responsibility for the actions of the Israeli government simply because they are Jewish. Intimidation tactics employed by SJP have included the placement of mock eviction notices under the doors of Jewish students; graffiti stating that Israel engages in ethnic cleansing; social media posts including caricatures and links to content drawing comparisons between Israel, Nazism, and white supremacy; a rally in front of the Israeli consulate in Miami, where SJP protesters chanted “Khaybar, Khaybar, oh Jew, Muhammad’s army will return,” referencing a massacre of Jews by Muslims in 628 CE; and an SJP-hosted event entitled “International Solidarity with Palestine: Towards a Global Intifada,” where the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) movement’s founder, Omar Barghouti, claimed that Israeli soldiers shoot Palestinian children “for sport” (Diker 2018).

The Muslim Brotherhood in Europe

One year before the Explanatory Memorandum was written, in 1990, Yusuf al-Qaradawi, an unofficial leader of the present-day Muslim Brotherhood, published a book, entitled Priorities of the Islamic Movement in the Coming Phase, that also follows the approach of using organizations in order to blend into the West. The book outlines the gradualist approach that the Muslim Brotherhood should assume in the West—Europe, North America, and Australia. It does not specifically condemn or exclude violence but emphasizes da’wa, dialogue, and other peaceful means to achieve the Muslim Brotherhood’s goals. In the words of al-Qaradawi, “Islam will return to Europe as a conqueror and victor, after being expelled from it twice. … I maintain that the conquest this time will not be by the sword but by preaching and ideology” (al-Qaradawi [2002] in Bukay 2017, 296).
Al-Qaradawi specifies the pros and cons of Muslim population expansion in Western countries: the pros being that Muslims can disseminate Allah’s word globally, and the cons being that Muslims become vulnerable to the distortions of Western influences (al-Qaradawi 1992, 20-28). Likewise, with no central leadership for the global Muslim community, Muslims are at risk of dissolving into the non-Muslim majority. Al-Qaradawi’s strategy seeks to turn this perceived weakness into an opportunity. He argues that the Muslim Brotherhood, in its myriad organizational disguises, can fill the vacuum at local level and, moreover, that it is the Brotherhood’s duty to uphold the identity of Muslims scattered throughout the West.

Operationally, al-Qaradawi envisions that Muslim Brotherhood-backed organizations will run Muslim religious, educational, and recreational establishments, such as mosques, schools, and civic organizations, and suggests that sharia law should govern relations between the inhabitants of these Muslim islands. In other words, Muslim minorities “should also have among them their own ulema and men of religion to answer their questions when they ask them, guide them when they lose the way, and reconcile them when they differ among themselves” (al-Qaradawi 1992, 87). The strategies laid out in al-Qaradawi’s treatise are in keeping with the infrastructure that the Muslim Brotherhood has been establishing in Europe since the beginning of the above-mentioned “period of ordeal” (1949-1967), when its members began to settle in Europe and work devotedly to realize the Brotherhood’s goals. In nearly all European countries, Muslim Brotherhood members established student organizations that developed into nationwide umbrella organizations and became leading representatives of local Muslim communities (Vidino 2006). With financial backing from Arab Gulf countries, they created a network of mosques, research centers, think tanks, charities, and schools that have advocated and taught the Brotherhood’s politicized version of Islam.

In the West, membership of the Muslim Brotherhood has been kept secret wherever possible and has only been revealed if the circumstances called for it. The Muslim Brotherhood in the West has thus become a kind of
ideological umbrella movement that hovers over many organizations rather than a single, clearly identifiable organization. In the words of former Muslim Brotherhood general guide and supreme leader Mohamed Akif:

We do not have an international organization; we have an organization through our perception of things. We are present in every country. Everywhere there are people who believe in the message of the Muslim Brothers. In France, the Union of Islamic Organizations of France (UOIF) does not belong to the organization of the Brothers. They follow their own laws and rules. There are many organizations that do not belong to the Muslim Brothers. For example, Sheikh al-Qaradawi. He is not a Muslim Brother, but he was formed according to the doctrine of the Brothers. (Akif [2005] in Vidino 2006)

In Germany, the Islamic Society of Germany (IGD) is a leading organization for Muslims that was originally founded as the Mosque Construction Commission by Said Ramadan, a Muslim Brotherhood member who worked directly with Hasan al-Banna in the 1930s (Vidino 2006). Muslim Brotherhood members Ghaleb Himmat and Youssef Nada established the Bank al-Taqwa, which acted as a financial hub for the Brotherhood in the West and worked together with a wide network of companies to finance dozens of Brotherhood-related projects and activities throughout the West. Both men, whom the US Treasury Department has accused of funding Hamas and al-Qaeda, have been designated as terrorism financiers by various Western countries and the United Nations. Himmat also held the chairmanship of the IGD until it was passed to Ibrahim El-Zayat, who came under investigation in Germany for having funneled more than two million dollars to an al-Qaeda-linked charity and for his involvement in other money-laundering activities. IGD and Millî Görüş, a Turkish organization linked to the Refah party, developed an umbrella organization, the Zentralrat, which would hold a monopoly over German mosques. Various German security agencies have repeatedly highlighted the links between these groups and the Brotherhood and warned about the ambiguity of their rhetoric. For example, an official report from the Office for the Protection of the Constitution in Hessen states that
The threat of Islamism for Germany is posed primarily by Millî Görüş and other affiliated groups. They try to spread Islamist views within the boundaries of the law. Then they try to implement ... for all Muslims in Germany a strict interpretation of the Qur’an and of the sharia. ... Their public support of tolerance and religious freedom should be treated with caution. (Vidino 2006)

The Islamic Group of France—which became the Union of Islamic Organizations in France (UOIF) in 1983—was established in 1997 by a small group of members of a moderate organization, the Association of Islamic Students in France (AEIF), that wanted to extend the influence of the Muslim Brotherhood to Muslims in France (Vidino 2006). Though a moderate group, the AEIF served as the hub where Muslim Brotherhood members and other Islamists gathered when in Paris. Its members included al-Turabi, Abolhassan Banisadr, the first President of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Said Ramadan al-Bouti, one of Syria’s most prestigious legal scholars, and Issam al-Attar, a Muslim Brotherhood leader who fled Syria to escape the regime and finally settled in the German city of Aachen, where he founded the Bilal mosque. The UOIF had two important precursors: Faysal Mawlawi, a former AEIF member who had returned to his native Lebanon to run the al-Jama’a al-Islamiya radical political party, and Rached Ghannouchi, AEIF secretary between 1968 and 1969 and head of al-Nahda, the Islamist movement that battled the Tunisian regime. Under Ghannouchi and Mawlawi, the UOIF became France’s largest and most active Muslim organization, controlling a large number of mosques and attracting tens of thousands of attendees to its annual gathering in Le Bourget. Today, the UOIF has its own institution of Islamic knowledge, the European Institute of Human Sciences (IESH), which offers various degrees and diplomas in Islamic studies, states that its goal is to educate imams, and regularly hosts prominent figures from the international Muslim Brotherhood network. Its scientific council is headed by al-Qaradawi, and Mawlawi, the spiritual guide of the UOIF, is a frequent visitor and lecturer. As proof of the effectivity of the Muslim Brotherhood’s gradualist approach in the West, the UOIF has been described by former French president Nicolas Sarkozy as “respecting the Republic” and as a “reliable partner in the delicate dialogue over the
integration of the French Muslim community,” on the one hand, while making blatantly antisemitic remarks, defending the actions of Hamas, and selling books by al-Banna and Qutb and The Protocols of the Elders of Zion at its events, on the other (Vidino 2006).

The Muslim Brotherhood established the Muslim Association of Britain (MAB) in 1997 (Vidino 2006). Its leadership includes such individuals as Azzam Tamimi, a former activist in the Islamic Action Front (the Jordanian Brotherhood’s political party), Mohammed Sawalha, a self-declared former Hamas member, and Osama al-Tikriti, the son of the leader of the Iraqi branch of the Brotherhood. MAB’s founding president, Kamal al-Helbawy, was formerly the official spokesman of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood in Europe. Having gained notoriety thanks to its active role in the anti-war campaign during the first months of the US invasion of Iraq, MAB formed strong alliances with British civil rights and leftist organizations. Its role as a political player became apparent as it endorsed anti-war politicians and close allies such as London mayor Ken Livingstone and Respect Party candidate George Galloway. In a lecture to students at Queen Mary University in 2007, Tamimi referred to Zionism as “the most inhumane project in the modern history of humanity.” In addition, before an audience of students at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) in 2010, he praised Hamas and called for Israel to “come to an end” (Klaff 2010, 305). In July 2002, Azzam Tamimi spoke at a conference on Palestine in South Africa, where he said: “Do not call them suicide bombers, call them shuhada (martyrs),” and continued “[t]hey, the Israelis, have guns. We have the human bombs. We love death, they love life,” adding “for us Muslims, martyrdom is not the end of the things but the beginning of the most wonderful of things.” He also told a conference in Vienna that, after Israel is destroyed and replaced with an Islamic state, the Jews should “sail on the sea in ships back to where they came or drown in it.”

Moreover, MAB has posted stories about modern Jewish blood libel conspiracies (Community Security Trust 2009).
Given their large Muslim populations, Germany, France, and Britain are obviously the three main centers of Muslim Brotherhood activity in Europe, but virtually all European countries have witnessed some degree of activity. Muslim Brotherhood activity in Europe and North America is characterized by a careful, long-term approach that focuses on political and cultural integration into Western society. However, the same Brotherhood creed—“Allah is our goal, the Prophet our model, the Qur’an our constitution, jihad our path, and death for the sake of Allah, the loftiest of our wishes”—still looms in the background, waiting for the opportune time to emerge. Likewise, the same extremist genocidal antisemitic attitude that has been prevalent in the Brotherhood since the 1930s continues to spread through Brotherhood members and affiliates in Europe and North America.

Conclusion

The Muslim Brotherhood is a reactionary social movement that politicizes Islam, legitimizes violence, terror, and death in the name of jihad, and aims to establish a global Islamic caliphate that controls all aspects of life—education, politics, the media, the economy, science, culture, society, security, and law—on the basis of sharia law. Since the 1930s, key figures in the Muslim Brotherhood have consistently expressed a genocidal antisemitic ideology that combines Islamic texts such as the Qur’an and the hadiths with the non-Islamic, fictional, and perniciously antisemitic Protocols of the Elders of Zion to paint Jews as enemies of Islam and Allah, as the manifestation of the worst kind of evil in the world, as Islam’s main competitors for world domination, and as inhuman and demonic beings, while teaching Muslims that it is a part of Islam to hate the Jews and seek to destroy them.

The State of Israel provides a political platform where the Muslim Brotherhood and its members can express their hatred of Jews in a practical fashion, beginning in the 1930s with overt support for Palestinian Arabs and the unequivocal denunciation of Jews and Zionists, which paved the way for Brotherhood-led and/or inspired organizations, such as
Hezbollah, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and Hamas, to use *jihad* to justify violence against Jews and Israel. Sudan under al-Bashir and al-Turabi exemplified the violent extremes that a Muslim Brotherhood-led regime could reach when left in control of a region for a prolonged period, while other *jihad* offshoot organizations, such as the Islamic Jihad, al-Qaeda, and ISIS, have similarly departed from the Brotherhood operationally in an attempt to wage a more immediate and violent *jihad* while maintaining a certain connection to Brotherhood ideology. The present-day gradualist approach of the Muslim Brotherhood in North America and Europe, which aims to “eliminate and destroy Western civilization from within,” conceals the Brotherhood’s ultimate goals within a network of organizations while promoting an Islamist agenda as part and parcel of Western Muslim infrastructure. Likewise, the Muslim Brotherhood’s genocidal antisemitic ideological core, which is hidden under a veneer of political correctness, “leaks” out in myriad ways in the West and finds an unsuspecting partner on the Left as it takes aim at the common Western colonialist enemy: the State of Israel. However, the Muslim Brotherhood’s current gradualist approach is merely a stepping stone imposed by the prevailing sociopolitical and socioeconomic circumstances. As it strengthens its own version of Islam among the growing Muslim communities in the West and continues to spread its genocidal antisemitic ideology, it serves as an increasingly dangerous breeding ground for violent extremists, the delegitimization of the State of Israel, and the dissemination of virulent antisemitic propaganda among Muslims worldwide.
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Founded in 2004, the Institute for the Study of Global Antisemitism and Policy (ISGAP) is the first interdisciplinary research center dedicated to the study of antisemitism to be established in North America. Its mission is to explore antisemitism from a wide range of approaches and perspectives within an academic framework, including the study of such topics as the changing historical phases of antisemitism, how antisemitism relates to other forms of hatred, to what extent it is unique, how some societies are able to resist antisemitism, and how policies can be developed and implemented to combat it.

ISGAP’s Occasional Paper Series covers topics that have profound implications for our understanding of contemporary antisemitism, its impact on Jews and non-Jews, and our efforts to combat this irrational yet enduring prejudice. With the publication of this series, as well as its other academic efforts, ISGAP continues to fight antisemitism on the battlefield of ideas.