One could only imagine the feelings of Hosni Mubarak watching his huge portrait, which watching over the great hall where his ministers of government would meet, was brought down and solemnly moved out of the hall, ending a legacy of oppression, corruption and a life of apostasy.

It was the 6th of October 1981 when the world was shocked with the greatest and most spectacular event of its time: the assassination of Anwar Sadat. Thirty years later the people of Egypt surprise the world again with their toppling of the next in line, Hosni Mubarak.

Not ruling in accordance to the law of Allah was a sufficient enough reason for the removal of Sadat but his signing of the peace accord with Israel added urgency to the mandate of his removal. His assassination marks the first large-scale operation by the modern jihad movement.

Hosni Mubarak proved to be no better. In fact he proved to be an eviler version of his predecessor. He went further with the persecution of the Muslim activists and mujahidin, and he furthered the process of turning Egypt into a client state of the West and Israel. Corruption increased under his rule and the gap between the rich and poor widened even more. This time he was removed, however, not by a selected few but by the entire population of the largest Arab state. Eighty million spoke with one voice and said “leave” to the ally of America and Israel.

For a long time the Muslim world has not suffered from such stagnancy in its forms of government. Mubarak, Gadhaf, Ben Ali, Saleh, Assad and the kings of Morocco, Jordan and the Gulf have been a scourge on the ummah and many were seeing no end in sight. It was becoming an accepted, albeit an unwanted, reality that Mubarak would be followed by his son just like Bashar followed his father and just like every other system of government in the Middle East, whether it was a monarchy or a republic, was there to stay, was there forever. This spirit of defeatism was widespread but was not universal. There were those who wanted change and believed that it was not only possible but soon. Muslims who understood Islam never accepted the rotten systems of
government that were wrapping the area in a cloak of tyranny. They wanted change and they worked for it. They paid the price for their struggle and defiance by losing their lives, living in exile and being imprisoned.

Even though many aspired for change and believed that it was near, no one saw it coming from Tunisia. But then when it came from Tunisia, no one saw it happening in Egypt. So leaving the expectations of what might or might not happen in the future, let’s take a look at how this Tsunami of change has already benefited the ummah.

The first and probably most important change that this monumental event brought is a mental one. It brought a change to the collective mind of the ummah. The revolution broke the barriers of fear in the hearts and minds that the tyrants couldn’t be removed. After the Algerian crises of the past decade when the elections brought victory to the Islamists, a civil war ensued that resulted in large scale bloodshed and caused many to think that any attempt for change would bring with it more tyranny than what they want to remove. This led to a widespread belief that changing the client regimes in the Muslim world which have the entire Western world backing them politically, militarily and economically is unrealistic in this period of our struggle. The events of Algeria which came after unsuccessful attempts by the Islamic movements in Egypt and Syria spread a spirit of defeatism amongst the ummah. The long lives of the tyrants along with their amazingly long rule led to the belief that there was no hope in change. Twenty three days in Tunisia and eighteen days in Egypt were enough to shatter that deep and long held belief. The Tunisian and Egyptian people proved to us that it can be done.

It appears that the West was taken by surprise by the current events. This left them scrambling in their reactions and gave an impression of a Western leadership that is confused, worried, and unhappy for the departure of some of its closest and most reliable friends, but yet willing to betray them and ride on the wave of change that is sweeping the area.

The Western leaders realize that it would be unwise to reveal their true feelings of what is happening. The West knows that it would be unwise to stand by their friends when the masses have spoken out and asked for freedom, a principle the West claims that it stands for. But it seems that the West either does not know what is awaiting them or does know but wants to put on an optimistic face. Let’s take a look at some of what the Western leaders and experts have been saying:

Hillary Clinton claims that: “The success of peaceful protests discredited the extremists and exposed their bankrupt arguments.” Robert Gates thinks that the Arab protests represent a major setback to al Qaeda. Fareed Zakaria asserts: “there is an interesting debate on whether the events in the Middle East are good for the United States, the West, good for peace and stability, but I think there can be little dispute about whom they are bad for: al Qaeda. In fact the Arab revolts of 2011 represent a total repudiation of al Qaeda's founding ideology.” Peter Bergen who sees that al Qaeda would be watching the events with a mixture of glee and despair only sees the glee in the fact that al Qaeda would be happy to see the current regimes gone but would mostly view the events with despair because: “whatever outcome there is in these different revolutions and uprisings, I think it is very unlikely that a Taliban style theocracy is going to replace the regimes that are fallen.”
The statements of the U.S. State and Defense Secretaries prove that either the intelligence reports these guys are reading are misleading or that they are just trying to justify the stance that they are forced to take in support of the Arab masses, by claiming that they are bad for al Qaeda when they know very well that the opposite is the case. In the case of Fareed Zakaria, well, he is wrong this time just like he, and his cabal of neo-conservatives, are wrong every time they speak about an issue pertaining to the Muslim world.

But for a so-called ‘terrorism expert’ such as Peter Bergen, it is interesting to see how even he doesn’t get it right this time. For him to think that because a Taliban style regime is not going to take over following the revolutions, is a too short-term way of viewing the unfolding events.

We do not know yet what the outcome would be, and we do not have to. The outcome doesn’t have to be an Islamic government for us to consider what is occurring to be a step in the right direction. Regardless of the outcome, whether it is an Islamic government or the likes of al-Baradi, Amr Mousa or another military figure; whatever the outcome is, our mujahidin brothers in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya and the rest of the Muslim world will get a chance to breathe again after three decades of suffocation. The crackdown that the Islamic movement in Egypt witnessed at the out-start of the Mubarak regime and that continued for the following thirty years would not be possible again in a post-revolution Egyptian government. The anti-Islam secular government of Tunisia that was the only Arab state to go as far as banning the niqâb would be impossible to repeat in a post-revolution Tunisia. In Libya, no matter how bad the situation gets and no matter how pro-Western or oppressive the next government proves to be, we do not see it possible for the world to produce another lunatic of the same caliber of the Colonel. By the will of Allah those days are gone. Even if the upcoming governments wanted to continue with a policy of appeasing the West and Israel, they would not have the strength and depth of power that the previous governments had developed over the past three decades. In addition to that, it would be difficult for a government that came into power, in order to fulfill the aspirations of the people for freedom, to restrict their freedoms even if it wanted to and was pushed by the West to do so. If the West is counting on an Animal Farm scenario to follow the revolution, they are definitely mistaken.

If one would trace back the roots of today’s jihad movement, one would see clearly the strong influence of the Egyptian Islamic movement. It was Sayyid Qutb and then the Egyptian Jihad that represented the ideological basis for today’s jihad work. For the scholars and activists of Egypt to be able to speak again freely, it would represent a great leap forward for the mujahidin.

One should not consider the rule of Mubarak as being successful in crushing the jihad movement. What he has done was to spread the movement all over the world. The pressure on our mujahidin brothers in Egypt was the cause behind them moving into Afghanistan, Pakistan, Sudan, Yemen, Europe, and the United States. This exodus brought with it the proliferation of the jihadi ideology. Therefore, so to speak, Hosni did not solve the problem; he just spread it all over the place.

Another important lesson is the American response. Hosni Mubarak has been a staunch ally of America, as America wishes to call him or an American stooge as we view him. He has stood firmly
in the face of popular opposition from the entire Muslim world when he continued with the peace process with Israel. His support for the American invasion of Iraq in the first Gulf War was indispensable for America. He persecuted the Islamists in his country, filed the prisons, tortured, and killed, all for the sake of America. He did the dirty job for the Americans. In spite of that, how did the Americans treat him at his moment of need? They trashed him. He was conned by America. He was tricked, swindled, cheated, or as Malcolm would have liked to say: He’s been bamboozled. America duped him and then dumped him.

Now the important question is: Are the rest of America’s servants, littering the scene from Morocco to Pakistan, paying any attention?

The fruits of what happened in Egypt are not exclusive to Egypt. In fact we might probably witness the greatest effect of what is happening in Egypt outside of Egypt. One such place might turn out to be Yemen. Yemen already has a fragile government and the events of Egypt are only going to add pressure on it. And any weakness in the central government would undoubtedly bring with it more strength for the mujahidin in this blessed land. Yemen would also represent another great opportunity for the West to show their hypocrisy of calling for freedoms while supporting a dictator just because they do not want Muslims to be ruled by Islam.

Another place might be Libya. Omar al-Mukhtar had left the Libyans with a legacy of jihad against the West and as such Libyans have featured prominently in jihad work ever since. Al-Gadhaf has filed the Libyan prisons with thousands of our mujahidin brothers. With turmoil in Libya, these brothers will have a chance to regroup again and connect with their brothers in the Maghreb. With the events in Tunisia, Libya and Algeria, the jihad in the Islamic Maghreb is witnessing a new dawn.

Then there are the great expectations of what will come out of the Arabian Peninsula when the revolts reach the shores of the Gulf. Does the West not realize that there are thousands and thousands of mujahidin in Saudi prisons and elsewhere in the Arabian Peninsula? Doesn’t the West realize how the jihadi work would just take off as soon as the regimes of the Gulf start crumbling?

Peter Bergen believes that al Qaeda is viewing the events with glee and despair. Glee yes, but not despair. The mujahidin around the world are going through a moment of elation and I wonder whether the West is aware of the upsurge of mujahidin activity in Egypt, Tunisia, Libya, Yemen, Arabia, Algeria, and Morocco? Is the West aware of what is happening or are they asleep with drapes covering their eyes? Or is what is happening too much for the West to handle at the moment and they are just bidding for time while attempting to prop up some new stooges who would return the area to the pre-revolution era?

America, since 9-11, has been focused on the fight with the mujahidin in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq and now Yemen. It has devoted its resources and intelligence for the “fight on terror”. But with what is happening now in the Arab world, America would no doubt have to divert some of its
attention to the unexpected avalanche that is bury- ing its dear friends. America has depended on these men for the dirty work of protecting the Ameri- can imperial interests. They acted as point men that saved America the effort of doing it themselves but now with their fall, America would have to divert huge amounts of effort and money to cultivate a new breed of collaborators. This would force Amer- ica, which is already an exhausted empire, to spread itself thin, which in turn would be a great benefit for the mujahidin. Even without this wave of change in the Muslim world, the jihad movement was on the rise. With the new developments in the area, one can only expect that the great doors of opportunity would open up for the mujahidin all over the world.