

The Movement in Egypt

Thursday 3 February 2011, by [AMIN Samir](#) (Date first published: 1 February 2011).

Egypt is a corner stone in the US plan of control of the Planet. Washington will not tolerate any attempt of Egypt to move out of its total submission, also required by Israel in order to pursue its colonization of what remains from Palestine. This is the exclusive target of Washington in its "involvement" in the organization of a "soft transition". In that respect the US may consider that Mubarak should resign. The newly appointed Vice President, Omar Soliman, head of the Army Intelligence, would be in charge. The Army was careful not to associate with the repression, thus preventing its image.

Baradei comes in at that point. He is still more known outside than in Egypt, but could correct that quickly. He is a "liberal", having no concept of the management of the economy other than the on going, and cannot understand that this is precisely at the origin of the social devastation. He is a democrat in the sense that he wants "true elections" and the respect of law (stop arresting and torturing etc), but nothing more.

It is not impossible that he would be a partner in the transition. Yet the Army and the Intelligence will not abandon their dominant position in the ruling of the society. Will Baradei accept it ?

In case of "success" and "elections", the Moslem Brotherhood will become the major parliamentary force. The US welcome this and have qualified the MB of being "moderate", that is docile, accepting the submission to the US strategy, leaving Israel free to continue its occupation of Palestine. The MB is also fully in favour of the ongoing "market" system, totally externally dependent. They are also, in fact, partners in the "compradore" ruling class. They took a position against the working class strikes and the peasants struggles to keep their ownership of land.

The US plan for Egypt is very similar to the Pakistani model : a combination of "political Islam" and Army intelligence. The MB could compensate their alignment on such a policy by precisely being "not moderate" in their behavior towards the Copts. Can such a system be delivered a certificate of "democracy"?

The movement is that of urban young, particularly holders of diplomas with no job, supported by segments of the educated middle classes, democrats. The new regime could perhaps make some concessions - enlarge the recruitment in the State apparatus - hardly more.

Of course things could change if the working class and peasant's movement moves in. But this does not seem to be on the agenda. Of course as long as the economic system is managed in accordance with the rules of the "globalization game", none of the problems which resulted in the protest movement can be really solved.

Samir Amin
