Muslims in the West after 9/11

Religion, Politics and Law

EDITED BY JOCELYNE CESARI

Muslims in the West after 9/11

This book is the first systematic attempt to study the situation of European and American Muslims after 9/11, and to present a comprehensive analysis of their religious, political, and legal situations.

Since 9/11, and particularly since the Madrid and London bombings of 2004 and 2005 respectively, the Muslim presence in Europe and the United States has become a major political concern. Many have raised questions regarding potential links between Western Muslims, radical Islam, and terrorism. Whatever the justification of such concerns, it is insufficient to address the subject of Muslims in the West from an exclusively counter-terrorist perspective. Based on empirical studies of Muslims in the US and Western Europe, this edited volume posits the situation of Muslim minorities in a broader reflection on the status of liberalism in Western foreign policies. It also explores the changes in immigration policies, multiculturalism, and secularism that have been shaped by the new international context of the war on terror.

This book will be of great interest to students of critical security studies, Islamic studies, sociology, and political science in general.

Jocelyne Cesari is an Associate at Harvard's Center for Middle Eastern Studies and the Center for European Studies, teaching at the Harvard Divinity School and in the Government Department. She is a French political scientist, tenured at the French National Center for Scientific Research in Paris, and specializes in contemporary Islamic societies.

Routledge Studies in Liberty and Security

Series Editors: Didier Bigo, Elspeth Guild and R.B.J. Walker

Terror, Insecurity and Liberty
Illiberal practices of liberal regimes after 9/11
Edited by Didier Bigo and Anastassia Tsoukala

Exceptionalism and the Politics of Counter-terrorism
Liberty, security and the war on terror
Andrew W. Neal

Muslims in the West after 9/11
Religion, politics, and law
Edited by Jocelyne Cesari

Muslims in the West after 9/11

Religion, politics, and law

Edited by Jocelyne Cesari

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2010
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
270 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2009.

To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or Routledge's
collection of thousands of eBooks please go to www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk.

© 2010 Jocelyne Cesari for selection and editorial matter;
individual contributors, their contributions

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Muslims in the West after 9/11: religion, politics and law/edited by Jocelyne Cesari.
p. cm.
1. Muslims–United States–Religion. 2. Muslims–United States–Political activity.
3. Muslims–Legal status, laws, etc.–United States. 4. Muslims–Europe–Religion.
5. Muslims–Europe–Political activity. 6. Muslims–Legal status, laws, etc.–Europe.
7. Islamic fundamentalism–United States. 8. Islamic fundamentalism–Europe.
9. United States–Race relations. 10. Europe–Race relations. I. Cesari, Jocelyne.
E184.M88M868 2009
305.6′97091821–dc22
2009023513

ISBN 0-203-86396-8 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN 10: 0–415–77655–4 (hbk)
ISBN 10: 0–415–77654–6 (pbk)
ISBN 10: 0–203–86396–8 (ebk)

ISBN 13: 978–0–415–77655–4 (hbk)
ISBN 13: 978–0–415–77654–7 (pbk)
ISBN 13: 978–0–203–86396–1 (ebk)

Contents

Notes on contributors *vii*
Acknowledgments *ix*

Introduction 1
JOCELYNE CESARI

PART 1
Overview: Muslims in Europe and the US **7**

1 Securitization of Islam in Europe 9
JOCELYNE CESARI

2 Islam in America 28
JANE I. SMITH

PART 2
Anti-terrorism and international constraints **43**

3 The war on terror and Muslims in the West 45
MAHMOOD MONSHIPOURI

4 Bush's political fundamentalism and the war against militant Islam: the US–European divide 67
DIRK NABERS AND ROBERT G. PATMAN

5 The liberal roots of the American empire 88
MICHAEL C. DESCH

PART 3
Influence of international constraints on politics, law, and religion in the West **117**

6 Welcoming Muslims into the nation: tolerance, politics and integration in Germany 119
FRANK PETER

7 *Shari'a* and the future of secular Europe 145
JOCELYNE CESARI

8 American Muslims at the dawn of the 21st century: hope and pessimism in the drive for civic and political inclusion 176
LOUISE CAINKAR

9 The concept of the Muslim enemy in the public discourse 198
YASEMIN SHOOMAN AND RIEM SPIELHAUS

10 Islamic radicalism in Europe 229
FARHAD KHOSROKHAVAR

Index 245

Contributors

Louise Cainkar is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at Marquette University in Milwaukee. Her areas of expertise include the immigrant experience and Arab and Muslim Americans. She is the author, most recently, of *Homeland Insecurity: The Arab American and Muslim American Experience after 9/11* (Russell Sage Foundation, 2009).

Jocelyne Cesari is an Associate at Harvard's Center for Middle Eastern Studies and the Center for European Studies, teaching at the Harvard Divinity School and in the Government Department. She is a French political scientist, tenured at the French National Center for Scientific Research in Paris, and specializes in contemporary Islamic societies. Her most recent books are *When Islam and Democracy Meet: Muslims in Europe and in the United States* (Palgrave paperback 2006), *European Muslims and the Secular State* (Ashgate 2005), *Encyclopedia of Muslims in the United States* (Greenwood, 2007). She has also received grants to write the reports "Islam and Fundamental Rights" and "The Religious Consequences of September 11, 2001, on Muslims in Europe" for the European Commission (see www.euro-islam.info).

Michael C. Desch is Professor of Political Science and a Fellow of the Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies at the University of Notre Dame. He is the author, most recently, of *Power and Military Effectiveness: The Fallacy of Democratic Triumphalism* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008).

Farhad Khosrokhavar is a Professor at École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales in Paris. He was a Harvard Visiting Scholar in 2009 and a Yale Visiting Professor in 2008. His latest publications include *Inside Jihadism* (Paradigm Publishers, 2009) and *Avoir vingt ans au pays des ayatollahs* (Robert-Laffont, 2008).

Mahmood Monshipouri is an Associate Professor of International Relations at San Francisco State University. He specializes in human rights, globalization, Middle Eastern politics, and the Muslim world more generally. He is the author of *Muslims in Global Politics: Identities, Interests, and Human Rights* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009).

Dirk Nabers is a Senior Research Fellow at the German Institute of Global and Area Studies (GIGA). He has published widely on IR theory, International Relations of the Asia-Pacific, and US Foreign Policy. He is the Coordinator of the Regional Powers Network (RPN) of GIGA, the University of Oxford and Sciences Po Paris.

Robert G. Patman is a Professor of International Relations at the University of Otago, New Zealand. He is the Director of the Master of International Studies Program at Otago, and has authored or edited seven books. His next book will be *Strategic Shortfall: The "Somalia Syndrome" and the March to 9/11* (Praeger, forthcoming).

Frank Peter teaches at the Department of Comparative Cultural and Social Anthropology at the European University Viadrina, Frankfurt-Oder. His research focus is on the governance of religion in Europe, transnational Islamic movements, and modern Middle Eastern history.

Yasemin Shooman is a Magister in Modern History and German Literature and a PhD Candidate at the Center for Research on Anti-Semitism at the Technische Universität in Berlin. Her dissertation project is about hostility towards Muslims in contemporary Germany.

Jane I. Smith is a Senior Lecturer at Harvard Divinity School. She focuses on women in Islam, Muslim communities in America, and historical and theological relations between Christians and Muslims. Her most recent publications include *Islam in America* (rev. edn, Columbia University Press, 2009) and *Educating the Muslims of America* (Oxford University Press, 2009, co-edited with Farid Senzai and Yvonne Haddad).

Riem Spielhaus is a researcher in the field of Islamic studies at the Humboldt-Universität in Berlin. Her expertise is in the religious practice and institutionalization of Muslims in Germany and Europe. Recently, she has been working as Advisor for the Commissioner for Migration, Refugees and Integration of the German Federal Government.

Acknowledgments

This book owes so much to so many people.

Special thanks go to all my colleagues at the CHALLENGE research project, especially Didier Bigo, Elspeth Guild, and Sergio Carrera who provided the intellectual and logistic resources for the research that made this book possible.

I would also like to thank my French institution, GSRL, that has continuously supported the research project on Islam in Europe upon which this book is built.

On the American side, I am grateful to the Center for Middle Eastern Studies and its former director Steve Caton, who has supported the development and growth of the Islam in the West program.

I also would like to thank the research team of the Euro–Islam website: Elizabeth Esebian, Lisa Baughn, Jennifer Selby, David Mottadel, and Maruta Herding who devote so much of their time and enthusiasm to make research and knowledge about Islam available on the Internet.

Finally, I owe many thanks to the wonderful research assistants who dedicated so much of their time and effort to make this book happen: Terra Dunham and Bethany Kibler.

Introduction

Jocelyne Cesari

Since 9/11 the debate on the compatibility between Islam and Western political and cultural values has become increasingly public. It follows a pattern that Mahmood Mamdani refers to as "cultural talk" in his book *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim*.[1] "Cultural talk" is based upon an essentialized approach to Islam as a unified ideology spreading from Europe all the way to Iraq and Afghanistan. In this structure, Muslims are petrified in history and occupy a mold from which they cannot escape, defined by their so-called conformity to the past and their incapacity to address the current challenges of political development and liberal religious thinking. Such an approach justifies the creation of an insurmountable boundary between modern and pre-modern, between secularism and Islam.[2]

For a long time, the antinomy between Islam and modernity was centered on democratization and the perspective that it was impossible for Muslim countries to achieve democracy.[3] This dichotomous way of thinking has now transferred to the domain of international relations for the purpose of addressing the issue of secularizing Muslim societies since 9/11, as well as discovering the root causes of global crises like the Danish cartoons. Furthermore, the role of Islam at the international relations level is now part of the debate on the integration of Muslim immigrants within Western democracies. In other words, the boundary between domestic and international politics is becoming less distinct in terms of assessing the role of Islam in the West.

National and international components of cultural talk

The reason why "cultural talk" is so strong at the international level is because religion has long been absent from most international relations discourse. Through the 1960s and 1970s, international relations discourse had maintained that religion and modernization were incompatible. However, by the 1980s, the Iranian Revolution and the rise of the "religious right" in the US led to a re-assessment of the place of religion in international relations. Now, many scholars of modernization and secularization theory have begun reformulating their approaches with the belief that modernization may be responsible for the rise of religion rather than its decline.[4] In the field of international relations, the interest in culture as a factor in international conflicts is a relatively recent phenomenon, stemming from a growing heterogenization of the world stage and an ending of conflicts fought exclusively on the basis of the nationstate. The post-Cold War era has effectively compelled a re-evaluation of traditional approaches to international relations and forced analysts to attempt to take cultural and religious factors, previously absent from most theories, into account. Barry Buzan, in an article in the July 1991 issue of *International Affairs*, was one of the first to examine the consequences of the disappearance of the communist enemy.[5] In this article Buzan predicted that the new situation would inevitably create a shift in the central relationships of power and precipitate "the collision of cultural identities." The problem is the use of the concepts of "culture" and "civilization," especially when describing Islam.[6]

Cultural talk functions using familiar tropes and images intrinsic to the historical consciousness of Western politicians and intellectuals. These tropes can be easily activated, borrowed and exploited by scholars or political experts lacking basic knowledge of Islam and Muslim societies. In such discourse, the Protestant–Calvinist compromise on religion and politics is considered to be the only legitimate basis for democracy and modernity. In other words, when it comes to Islam, scholars of politics and international relations often operate on the same essentialized assumptions as common public discourse.

The most significant example of cultural talk lies in the emergence of new studies on terrorism. Islam has become the domain and privileged topic of many terrorism experts, such as Marc Sageman,[7] Laurent Murawiec[8] and Jim Lacey.[9] Another, Richard Jackson, in his book *Constructing Enemies: Islamic Terrorism in Political and Academic Discourse, Government and Opposition*, analyzes three hundred written and spoken English texts by political experts and scholars published between 2001 and 2006.[10] He suggests that current Islamic terrorism discourse is the product of three distinct and very influential genealogies. The first is the domain of terrorism studies, namely the work of religious terrorism experts and their links with policy makers. The discourse on Islamic terrorism is part of the "New Terrorism" thesis promoted by the likes of Walter Laqueur,[11] Bruce Hoffman[12] and Charles Kegley[13] whose work is characterized by a preoccupation with religious fanaticism, a perceived intransigence on the part of militants, and an ostensible lack of organization among the militants.[14] The second genealogy consists of the Orientalist scholarship of those such as Bernard Lewis.[15] Finally, Islamic terrorism discourse is influenced by the widespread impact of cultural stereotypes.

The discourse on Islamic terrorism is predicated on binary oppositions: the West versus Islam, democracy versus anti-modernity and secularism versus religion. Islam is portrayed as inherently violent and Muslims are portrayed as desperately incapable of separating religion and politics.

Terrorism is directly linked to fundamentalist forms of Islam,[16] and thus the "bloody borders of Islam" stain much of the discourse on Islam. Accordingly, Al-Qaeda is not a theological outlier;[17] rather, most Islamic terrorism is presented as chiefly motivated by religious or sacred causes as opposed to political ones.[18] Islamic terrorism is continually depicted as anti-modern, anti-secular and anti-democratic, and, as such, the Islamic narrative poses a distinct threat to Western security.

The success of this ahistorical approach to Islam's global role can be explained by the persistence and constant reinvention of the Western political imagination, which, at least since the Age of Enlightenment, has fashioned itself according to the opposition between it and the Muslim world.[19] Mustapha Kamal Pasha accurately describes the West's modernist-liberal imagination based on concepts of progress, nation, the rational individual (*à la* the myth of Robison Crusoe), secularization and the power of the Law.[20] Encounters between the West and the other parts of the world were shaped by this vision and it was brought to bear in international relations as the only legitimate form of political interaction. In this way, the modern liberal order has become normalized throughout the world, forever defining the terms of relation between the West and other societies.

The concept of secularization is a crucial aspect of the international liberal order. Based on the fiction of a clear-cut border between public and private space, secularism develops when ideological discourse based on the suspicion and illegitimacy of any religious expression intrudes on the public sphere. In this context, any manifestation of religion on an international scale is seen as something opposed to modernity and a form of resistance to the secularized liberal order. The regulation of religion outside the public sphere has thus become a touchstone against which to judge other cultures or societies in which such separation is not the same as in the West. Because of this, moreover, non-Western societies that may be secularized in their own terms are often overlooked or ignored by the West in international secularism discourse.[21]

It is of course true that the liberal system has been imposed upon all other cultures, not just that of Islam. Nonetheless, it should be noted that unlike other cultural-religious groups, Islam has played a central role in the construction of the West's very political imagination. The liberal modernist narrative that constitutes Western identity has effectively adopted Islam as its foil in order to establish itself. Such mirroring has a history which reaches much farther back than 9/11, dating instead from the Ottoman Empire's political domination of Mediterranean lands during the eighteenth century. Europe's relationship to the Ottoman Empire has been upheld in the gradual establishment of the East–West binary. This binary, present as early as the writings of Machiavelli, would come to have a decisive impact on the relationship in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. More than simply a product of religious differences, the opposition of East and West was a reflection of political opposition. "The orientalization of the Orient," as Edward

Said put it, was above all the effect of a European cultural crisis linked to the advent of modernity.[22] It was the expression of a particular conception of a political and cultural destiny, defined in opposition to the Ottoman system.

Examples of this identity formation through the relationship to the Muslim "other" appear as early as the sixteenth century, for example in the writings of Guillaume Postel, which are considered to be a prototype of the current dialogue between Islam and Christianity. Postel's attitude was indeed innovative, in that it expressed a desire to understand the "other" through the study of the other's language and literature. Nevertheless, the ultimate goal of this understanding was to incorporate the other into a universally integrated perspective, and in this sense, Postel's theories can also be said to be the precursor of Orientalism. In Postel's era, the examination of foreign cultures led to the development of the idea of relativism, one of the guiding concepts of Enlightenment philosophy. By creating a relationship with the distant and the unfamiliar, the journey, be it real or imagined, allowed for an increased knowledge of one's self. Two stock figures were pressed into service for these transformations: the "Egyptian Sage" and the "Mahometan Arab" (according to a typology described by Maxime Rodinson). The early modern political structure is thus a product of this relationship with the absolute, "oriental," other. It is this image that is evoked in works like Jean Bodin's 1566 *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*: an image of the West in step with the natural progress of the world, and an East already stuck in the past.

Consequences of cultural talk on the post-9/11 situation of Muslims in the West

The post-9/11 situation has blurred the distinction between national and international politics when it comes to Islam. The convergence of European and American political discourse is noteworthy for the automatic correlation between the war on terrorism, internal security measures and immigration policy – always, it seems, with a focus on individuals of a Muslim background. Such a correlation increasingly invalidates the distinction between international and domestic policy and has consequences not only for the status of Muslim minorities, but also for more general issues of secularism and multiculturalism in the democratic nations concerned.

Immigration laws, secularism laws and multicultural policies are all informed by an automatic correlation between war, the West and Islam. Even if the correlation predates 9/11 in the European context, it is still striking to note the current convergence of discourses and political practices in both the US and Europe.

Part 1 of this book gives an overview of Muslims in the US and Europe. Jocelyne Cesari introduces Islam in Europe in terms of the securitization of religion and faith as a direct consequence of the cultural talk about policy making and political discourse. Then, Jane I. Smith presents a comprehensive discussion of Islam in the US post-9/11. Part 2 moves on to discuss foreign policy directed at Islam at the international level. Mahmood Monshipouri discusses the effects of the war on terror on Muslims in the West. Dirk Nabers and Robert G. Patman explore the development and influence of cultural talk on international relations and explain the differences between the US and other Western countries in terms of the association between Islam, the West and terrorism. Michael C. Desch analyzes the liberal roots of the illiberal practices of US foreign policy, which began long before 9/11. Then, Part 3 discusses the influence of these international policies on the law, politics and religion in the West in general, and through the cases of America, Germany, France and the UK, in particular. Frank Peter precisely dissects the changes in policy-making at the national level on the domain of immigration and secular laws. Jocelyne Cesari explores the consequences of the international constraints on the legal status of Islam in Europe and sheds light on the recent dramatization around *Shari'a* Law. Louise Cainkar looks closely at the consequences of religious identities and political engagement of Muslims in the US and notes an increasing identification to Islam and a greater sense of Muslim civic engagement. Yasemin Shooman and Riem Spielhaus deconstruct cultural talk and its effect on Muslims in the German context. Finally, Farhad Khosrokhavar analyzes the causes for Islamic radicalization in Europe, through British and French case studies.

Notes

1 M. Mamdani, *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: America, the Cold War, and the Roots of Terror*, New York: Pantheon, 2004.

2 T. Asad, "Secularism, Nation-State, Religion," in *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003.

3 L. Diamond, *Islam, and Democracy in the Middle East,* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.

4 Scholars Jurgensmeyer and Thomas point to recent backlash in developing countries against secular western ideologies as having helped to encourage the role of religion as identity and necessitate its presence in International relations (see M. Jurgensmeyer, *The New Cold War: Religious Nationalism Confronts the Secular State*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993 and S.M. Thomas, "Taking Religious and Cultural Pluralism Seriously: The Global Resurgence of Religion and the Transformation of International Society," in *Millennium,* 29(3), 2000, 815–841.) Jeff Haynes explains the backlash against modernization by the fact that modernization has undermined traditional, and often religious, lifestyles (see J. Haynes, "Religion and International Relations: What are the Issues?" in *International Politics*, 41(3), 1994, 451–462).

5 B. Buzan, "New Patterns of Global Security in the Twenty-First Century," in *International Affairs*, 67(3), 1991, 431–451.

6 J. Cesari, *Islam and International Relations*, New York: Palgrave, forthcoming.

7 M. Sageman, *Leaderless Jihad*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.

8 L. Murawiec, *The Mind of Jihad,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

9 J. Lacey, *The Canons of Jihad: Terrorists' Strategy for Defeating America,* Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 2008.

10 R. Jackson, "Constructing Enemies: Islamic Terrorism in Political and Academic Discourse, Government and Opposition," in *Government and Opposition*, 42(3), 2007, 394–426.
11 W. Laqueur, *A History of Terrorism,* New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2001.
12 B. Hoffman, *Inside Terrorism*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.
13 C. Kegley, *The New Global Terrorism: Characteristics, Causes, Controls*, Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 2002.
14 Jackson, "Constructing Enemies," p. 398.
15 B. Lewis, *What Went Wrong?: Western Impact and Middle Eastern Response*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
16 Sageman, *Leaderless Jihad.*
17 Q. Wiktorowicz, "A Genealogy of Radical Islam," in *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism,* 28(2), 2005, 75–98.
18 D. Cook, *Understanding Jihad,* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
19 G. Shani, M. Sato, and M. K. Pasha (eds.), *Protecting Human Security in a Post 9/11 World,* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
20 Shari, et al., *Protecting*, p. 114.
21 Shari, et al., *Protecting*, p. 115.
22 E. Said, *Orientalism*, New York: Random House, 1978.

Part 1

Overview

Muslims in Europe and the US

1 Securitization of Islam in Europe

Jocelyne Cesari

Introduction

European discourse on Islam is a microcosm of the debate on Islam's compatibility with the West. Because Western countries generally associate Islam with the Al-Qaeda movement, the Palestinian issue, and Islamic Iran, their discussion of the religion involves an essentialized approach to a multifaceted faith. In his book *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim*, Mahmood Mamdani[1] refers to this slant as "cultural talk," or representing the religion as a unified ideology whether in Europe, Iraq, or Afghanistan. According to this perspective, Islam is steeped in history and absolutely incapable of innovation, and Muslims are defined by an almost compulsive conformity to their past and an inability to address the current challenges of political development and religious liberal thinking. Therefore, cultural talk justifies the artificial divide between modern and pre-modern religions and between secularism and Islam.[2] Cultural talk has become prevalent in modern international relations discourse, in part because it refers to stereotypes that are familiar to the historical consciousness of Western politicians and intellectuals.

The use of these trite depictions of Islam in professional debates has established a paradoxical policy of European governments both fearing and fostering radicalization in a process I call the "securitization" of Islam. The conditions that lead to this development have already occurred: European states view Muslim groups as threats to their survival and take measures to reassure citizens that they will not allow the incubation of terrorism. However, the politicization of religion essentially impoverishes and threatens its survival,[3] leading devout Muslims to feel resentful of the interference of non-religious actors. Thus, the measures intended to prevent radicalization actually engender discontent and prompt a transformation of religious conservatism to fundamentalism. This is the process of securitization. It involves actors who propose that Islam is an existential threat to European political and secular norms and thereby justifies extraordinary measures against it. Ole Wæver best explains repercussions of such actions: "When mobilized as politics, religion represses the transcendence of the divine. Fear and trembling is replaced by absolute certainty."[4] As an existential concept, faith is easily securitized, and it can incite a proclivity for violence in place of pious concepts.

Most acknowledge that the politicization of Islam started in Muslim-majority countries and was intensified and radicalized by Muslim actors before spreading to Europe. In this condition, the situation of Islam in the West cannot be disconnected from the political and religious contexts of Muslims in the Muslim world.[5] The research conducted among Muslims in Paris, London, Berlin, and Amsterdam during the years 2007–2009, analyzes the conditions and outcomes of the securitization of Islam in the European context.[6]

The research is established on a paradox that many nations face: although they seek to facilitate the socioeconomic integration of Muslims, anti-terrorism and security concerns fuel a desire to compromise liberties and restrict Islam from the public space. As domestic and national concerns converge, these factors result in cultural talk that tends to overemphasize the role of religion in the process of integration. Unfortunately, the characterization of Islamin the current debate has encouraged a process of institutionalizing the notion of Islam as a security threat. In both political rhetoric and policy areas, politicians and academics are conflating factors such as immigrant background, ethnicity, socio-economic deprivation, and the war on terror with Islam as a religion. This research shows that the confusion has exacerbated the securitization process.

In order to analyze this phenomenon, we proceeded with the research in two ways. First, we looked at both the political discourses and rhetoric of policy makers that contribute to the securitization of Islam in a top-down manner. Next, we collected data on the attitudes of Muslim populations on issues such as religious identity, political participation, and discrimination. This field research was conducted among Muslims of diverse ethnic, national, cultural, generational, educational, and gendered identities. It took place in four European cities – Paris, London, Amsterdam, and Berlin – in order to provide a representative picture of this multi-faceted issue. We organized 12 focus groups per city, in which more than 500 Muslims participated. We also organized at least two control groups per city to discuss the same topics with non-Muslim immigrants.

Most Muslims are immigrants or have an immigrant background

According to the best estimates, Muslims currently constitute approximately 5 percent of the European Union's 425 million inhabitants. There are about 4.5 million Muslims in France, 3 million in Germany, 1.6 million in the UK, and more than half a million each in Italy and the Netherlands. Although other nations have populations composed of fewer than 500,000 Muslims, these can be substantial minorities in small countries like Austria, Sweden, or Belgium. In general, these populations are younger and more fertile than the domestic populations, prompting many journalists and even academics to hypothesize that these numbers will become even more significant in the future.

The majority of Muslims in Europe come from three regions of the world. The largest ethnic group is Arab, comprising some 45 percent of European Muslims, followed by Turkish and South Asian. The groups are unevenly distributed based on European nations' immigrant history. In France and the UK, for example, Muslim populations began arriving from former colonies in the middle of the twentieth century, leading to a predominately North African ethnic group in France and South Asian immigrants in the UK. On the other hand, the Muslim community in Germany began with an influx of "guest-workers," mainly from Turkey, during the post-war economic boom. Although immigrants arrive in Europe from all over the world, the countries with existing Muslim populations tend to attract those from the same ethnic background. Among current European Union member states, only Greece has a significant indigenous population of Muslims, residing primarily in Thrace.

Therefore, categories of "immigrant" and "Muslim" overlap in Western Europe, unlike in the US where immigration debates center on economic and social concerns such as wages, assimilation, and language.[7] In America, terrorism remains at the margins of such issues: in 2006, the US Congress rarely referred to terrorism when considering new immigration measures. In Europe, by contrast, the association of Islam and immigration has led to a tightening of immigration laws specifically targeting migrants from Muslim countries.

Over the last few years, European governments have greatly restricted immigration. Part of this is certainly due to the difficulties of unemployment and poor economic conditions. For the more economically developed countries, such as Germany, France, and the UK, the prospect of admitting significant numbers of low-skill workers has become economically untenable. Instead, these countries have moved in the direction of policies oriented toward the acquisition of more highly skilled immigrants, who are seen as more economically productive. In France, Nicolas Sarkozy's call for a more selective immigration policy was supported by the legislature in May 2006. The French prime minister has alluded to the implications of the legal changes for France's Muslim population by stating that new immigrants must accept the publication of potentially offensive or satirical cartoons in newspapers and that women must take identity photographs without head covers as well as accept treatment by male doctors. These harsher measures have been supported by representatives from both sides of the political spectrum. On October 23, 2007, the French Parliament went further by passing an immigration bill that sanctioned DNA testing, allowed for government collection of ethnic statistics, and required applicants to pass exams on the French language and French values. Although the French Constitutional Court overturned the provision allowing for ethnic statistic collecting, it upheld the other facets of the law.

Some of the proposals for immigration and naturalization changes openly target Muslim immigrants. The Netherlands and Germany, for example, insist that immigrants must espouse Western liberal values before entering the countries. The Dutch Immigration and Naturalization Department, which is part of the Dutch Ministry of Justice, produced a film intended to help screen "inappropriate" immigrants by showing them the extremes of Dutch gender relations and sexuality: the depiction of naked beachgoers, public displays of homosexual affection, and assertive female characters aim to shock and surprise socially conservative Muslims. In the German state Baden-Wurttemberg, new citizenship tests include questions concerning the willingness of parents to allow children to participate in swimming lessons, in an obvious reference to past tension stemming from Muslim conservatism. Furthermore, such tests were selectively demanded for individuals from Muslim countries.[8] These new measures circumvent the logic of immigration preceding integration by requiring that immigrants show signs of integration *before* even entering the European Union. All these changes in immigration policy demonstrate changing expectations of immigrants, who are now required to show more compatibility than ever with the lifestyles of host countries.

More than just social integration challenges, focus group studies of Muslims living in four large European cities[9] revealed that immigrant participants view their religion in particular as a major reason for discrimination and exclusion caused by new immigration policies. Having a different religious identity than the Christian majority clearly marked the immigrants as "others" or "foreigners." Most of the Muslims interviewed said that the perception of Muslim immigrants as "foreign" greatly affected their capacity to act as legitimate social or religious actors. Thus, with all Muslims being labeled as immigrants or "foreigners," including native-born European Muslims, they are externalized from society before even having the chance to integrate.

On the other hand, Muslims have not been specific targets in the UK, even though the issue of asylum seekers has resulted in vigorous public and political debate. Since 2003, Spain and Italy have tightened immigration policies, though it is too early to determine how these policies will be implemented with respect to Muslims. However, unlike some of the latest measures of restricting immigration, which have caused human rights groups to criticize the reduced rights of asylum seekers,[10] Spain has a history of benevolence toward asylum seekers, and in the past it has even provided applicants with the right to interpreters, legal counsel, and other assistance.

The hardening of national discourse on immigration

In Europe, the pressure caused by increasing immigrant populations and the erosion of national boundaries through the transnational force of the European Union have led to a rising incidence of nationalist rhetoric and an essentializing approach to identity. In its more severe forms, the effects can be classified as xenophobia, the fear and hatred of foreigners. The Italian Forza Nuova states that Italy is essentially Catholic, implying that Muslims cannot be good citizens or Italians. In 1999, after violent riots broke out in Terrassa, Spain between immigrant Maghrebis and local youths, two responses arose: the Socialists proposed more effective methods of immigration control in order to lessen social pressures, but the center-right Popular Party diagnosed the problem as related to the immigrants' presence rather than Spanish society's difficulty in coping with them. As these types of incident increase, the public mood shifts to a perception of Islam – the religion and its values – as the root cause.

Anti-immigrant sentiment is common in many countries facing the difficulties of integrating culturally diverse populations. However in European countries, this degenerates into what is often termed as "Islamophobia." Because immigration introduces such a large proportion of Muslims into Europe, the anti-immigrant rhetoric of extreme right-wing parties has become markedly anti-Muslim. The French National Front has adopted an electoral strategy that associates Islam with terrorism. Its leader, Jean-Marie Le Pen, was implicated for inciting hatred in his description of the potential radicalization of Muslim immigrants.[11] Regardless, his party came in second in the 2002 French election. Germany's Deputy Interior Minister August Hanning only worsened this fear by telling citizens that the government believes there are roughly 700 German citizens involved in Islamic extremist movements.[12] Since then, the term *Leitkultur*, which refers to a European cultural sphere and had been taboo for many years, returned to the vernacular and can now be employed approvingly by members of the center-right. Even in Italy, the Lega Nord has adopted an anti-Muslim rhetoric, deploying slightly modified versions of traditional anti-Semitic devices as weapons against Islam. Former British Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, stated that all Muslims were responsible for terrorism,[13] while Tony Blair's government criminalized condoning terrorism in speeches either at home or abroad.[14] Both Muslims and non-Muslims alike fear that the label "terrorist" is being used to criminalize what they consider resistance or liberation movements. The definition of terrorism is, after all, highly controversial, and results from political decisions more than from objective facts concerning movements or groups. In many European countries, it has become acceptable to associate Muslim immigration and the potential for terrorism.

The changing political stance toward terrorism is far-reaching, but perhaps the most dramatic change has been in the political culture of the Netherlands, where violence and death threats have become increasingly common in an acrimonious debate. Ideas surfacing in the public debate now have called for the deportation of second generation Moroccans, a ban on gender segregated mosques, and even the prohibition of Islam itself. Anti-Islamic discourse has become a staple of political discourse in the Netherlands: Pim Fortuyn had openly criticized Islam in inflammatory terms prior to his assassination in 2002, and his party continued to run on a platform of tougher measures against non-assimilating immigrants after his death. The Dutch filmmaker Theo van Gogh also openly opposed Muslim immigration to the Netherlands, and his assassination in 2004 sparked riots that continued for the entire month of November. These political changes in the Netherlands reflect a general trend across Europe in which making anti-Muslim and anti-immigrant statements in politics is now commonplace.

Two other trends in the political discourse are worth mentioning. First, a distinction between radical, "bad" Islam and law-abiding, "good" Islam has become a common political framing. The fact that Muslims must be named as good or law-abiding means that there is an underlying assumption that Islam is a potential menace to society. The second trend has been the usage of Muslim spokespeople to criticize Islam and Muslims. As members of the minority, these spokespeople can voice criticisms that would seem unduly harsh from the majority population. Probably the most celebrated of these is Ayaan Hirsi Ali, a Dutch legislator born in Somalia and often described as an expert on Islam and thus a plausible critic. Hirsi Ali switched her political allegiance from left to right as her prominence in this debate increased. She has declared even moderate forms of Islam fundamentally incompatible with liberal democracy and named the prophet Muhammad as "a pedophile" and "a perverse tyrant." Despite her rejection of Islam, her Muslim origin lends her opinions a form of legitimacy that is superior to non-Muslim critics of Islam.

The difficulties of integrating Muslims into Western national societies have led many to question the merits of multiculturalism. Prevailing sentiment in European societies favors the rejection of cultural differences. Although an increase in religious diversity is a key issue, the status of cultural diversity is also at stake: as Muslim immigration to Europe increased, a specific integration process was also designed, distinct from the older systems such as regionalism in the UK or "pillars"[15] in the Netherlands. Initially, the concept of multiculturalism "connoted compromise, interdependence, [and] a relativizing universalism" expected to lead to an "intercultural community." Over time, however, it began to seem more that multiculturalism meant an institutionalization of difference, with "autonomous cultural discourses and separated interactional communities."[16]

In the UK, the shock of the July 7 subway attacks by "home-grown bombers" led to increased questioning of the entire possibility of cultural difference. The consensus was that Muslims must become more like some abstractly defined, ideal British citizen. However, this debate began earlier: the Rushdie affair of 1988 in particular created the conditions for a critique of public culture (see Chapter 7). As a counterpoint to its new laws on terrorism and political radicalism, the Blair government pushed for the criminalization of incitement to religious hatred, but the House of Lords restricted the application of the law, limiting it to threatening language rather than the broader rules on insults and abuse desired by the government. Despite the continuing efforts of the Blair government, Parliament maintained the weaker provisions, specifically prohibiting only intentionally threatening words.

In the Netherlands, multiculturalism was the explicit policy of the government since its inception in the mid-1980s.[17] However, since the 1990s, immigrant and minority incorporation policies have placed much greater emphasis on cultural assimilation. "Good citizenship" and "civic integration" became important new policy goals. Minorities were expected to assimilate into the dominant public culture and to maintain any divergent practices in the private sphere. The 1998 Law on the Civic Integration of Newcomers made integration courses compulsory. As part of the continuing debate, there was a parliamentary commission on Dutch integration policies in 2004.[18] Although the report had some optimistic conclusions, multiculturalism is viewed as a failure in the eyes of the general public. The late Pim Fortuyn made this argument best when he claimed that Muslims were undermining the traditional liberalism of Dutch culture.

A fundamental tenet of French political society is the republican ideal that downplays ethnic and cultural differences. However, faced with the difficulties of integrating its sizable minority population, France has moved towards a pluralist conception that advocates positive discrimination. In 2001, the Constitutional Council recognized that sometimes differences must be recognized in the pursuit of true equality. One solution has been to make nominal distinctions on a territorial rather than ethnic basis, so the ideal of individual equality can be maintained; priority zones for education are a manifestation of this policy. The creation of the state organization the Muslim Council in 2003 can also be seen as an attempt to integrate immigrant populations, as can the creation of a Ministry for Equal Opportunities in 2006.

The trend of identifying cultural practices defined or perceived as Islamic has emerged throughout Europe recently. For example, a German judge was ready to deny a case of domestic violence to a Muslim wife since, the judge believed, Islamic marriages condone such actions. Similarly, in France, a judge agreed to grant divorce on the husband's claim that his wife was not a virgin at the time of the wedding. Such cases have raised protests from Muslim organizations, as well as feminist and human rights groups, because they lead to a discrimination of Muslims based on recognition of diversity. Muslims decry these actions for a variety of reasons – some argue that a French judge is not sufficiently educated in Islamic law to rule on issues of personal status, while others condemn the French court for interpreting Islamic law. The latter opinion stems from the belief that France is a secular state and that French Muslims ought to have the same constitutional and legal protections granted to French non-Muslims.

The changes in France, the Netherlands, and the UK are the most pronounced, while developments in the other countries under review have been less clear. In Germany, the 1990s opened up a way to a pluralist society, with the most notable change being that an ethnic conception of citizenship based on *jus sanguinis* was replaced by a new criterion of birthplace, as practiced in France and the US. The result was that many descendants of the guest-workers from the 1960s and 1970s finally obtained citizenship after decades of denial. Spain and Italy have only recently become countries with this level of immigration, and they currently lack developed policies and discourse on cultural pluralism. In the last ten years, the discourse on cultural accommodation has been increasingly linked with religious issues.

The challenge of accommodating Islam

Although there is a tradition of religious freedom across Western Europe, Muslims have encountered difficulties in practicing their faith. Most of the nations in the previously mentioned survey on Muslim religiosity in Europe have tried adjusting to the practices of Islam. However, they have done so largely within legal and social frameworks intended to accommodate Christianity, rather than Islam. In particular, Germany and France have faced difficulty accommodating women's head and face covering, or the *hijab*, which is interpreted as a political rather than a religious practice.[19] Attempts to build mosques often face resistance from local communities. There have also been particular problems with extending the practice of religious instruction in public schools to Muslims. The other significant problem has been the fear of international terrorism, which is associated with conservative and radical imams in domestic contexts.

The construction of mosques is often opposed with pragmatic complaints about traffic and noise, but as the church bells ring across European cities, it seems inevitable that Muslims will see these kinds of complaints as Islamophobic in nature. In Spain, the threat of terrorism has been deployed in campaigns against mosques in a way that it had not been prior to the Islamist international terrorism of recent years. After the attacks of March 2004 in Spain, a new mosque in Sevilla faced significant problems as its site was vandalized and local community members organized a slaughter of pigs on the grounds. Reports of these problems have also been noted in the Netherlands, France, and Germany.

In the countries which provide religious education in public schools, there have been ongoing problems. Part of the debate is due to the lack of an official hierarchical clergy that can speak for Muslims as a whole. Accustomed to the organization of European Christian churches, negotiations stall when Muslims cannot find representatives acceptable both to the community and to the state. This has been a particular problem in Germany in light of controversies over the unwillingness of some Muslim girls to participate in physical education in the public schools. In Spain, the problem was assumed solved in the 1990s when the state came to an agreement for the provision of classes by Muslim teachers in the schools. However, in practice, the program has not been implemented in many places. In the wild rhetorical climate of contemporary Dutch politics, extreme ideas, such as banning Muslim schools, have been proposed.

Across Europe, concerns regarding radical preaching in mosques have led to restrictive measures on the practice of Islam. For example, after the attacks of March 2004, the Spanish Minister of the Interior proposed a law to control the sermons of *imam*. The proposal was greeted with mixed reviews; it was denounced by the president of the Islamic Commission of Spain, Mansur Escudero, but welcomed by the Maghrebi union. Both France and the Netherlands have since deported *imam* for radical speeches. If the *imam* were inciting terrorism, it might have been simple law enforcement, but the punishment has been extended to cases where the primary complaint is about attitudes toward women. In this way, the legal accommodation of Islam is only one aspect of the current tension between Islam and European secularism.

Western European states tend to consider faith as misplaced and illegitimate within the civic context. The idea that religion cannot play a role in the general well-being of societies – a mark of the secularized mind – is, in fact, common throughout all of Europe, despite differences among the national contracts between states and organized religions. It is important to note here the existence of non-Muslim religious groups that question tenets of mainstream secularism. In Germany, for example, Christian values in the public sphere have been debated, while the display of a crucifix in an Italian classroom has sparked controversy in Southern Europe. However, the main strands of public culture in the political, media, and intellectual spheres are highly secularized, and they tend to ignore religious dimensions and references that are still meaningful to some segments of society. The implication of invalidating religious ideas is that the various manifestations of Islam in Europe have become troublesome, or even unacceptable. The *hijab* controversy, the cartoon crisis, and the Rushdie affair shed light on the tension between Islamic claims and European conceptions of secularism. In this ideological struggle, media and intellectuals play a major role, best illustrated by the cartoon crisis.

Paradoxically, the focus groups conducted in Paris, London, Amsterdam, and Berlin in 2008–2009 concluded that the 500 Muslims of diverse ethnic backgrounds have very flexible approaches to Islam and are willing to make accommodations in their practices to fit into Western society. Nearly all of the focus groups showed great adaptability and complexity in defining what it meant to be "Muslim." When answering direct questions about what makes a person a Muslim, or which aspects of Islam are most important for Muslims, respondents tended to immediately answer by referring to the "five pillars." However, when pressed to elaborate, the category "Muslim" was increasingly identified with more general qualities such as "being a good person" or "being tolerant." Islam was often identified as "a way of life." In fact, most, if not all, of the respondents refused to draw a line between being a "practicing Muslim" and just "being Muslim." In other words, someone who does not pray or perform all of the practices and rituals of Islam was still considered Muslim. Here it became evident that there is a strong and widespread notion of Muslim culture that seems to override the more circumscribed definition of "being Muslim."

Supplementing this conclusion, the following exchange was typical:

> — Yes, it's more of a mindset, it's more believing in God, uh . . . it's related to the relationships one can have with other, values too, . . .
>
> — Yes, such as?
>
> — Tolerance, solidarity and that kind of thing, it's more in relationship to other people
>
> — So, for you, religion is more in relationships with others and less in [religious] traditions
>
> — That's it
>
> [Translation]

Respondents tended to answer an open-ended question about "what it means to be Muslim," "defining Muslim," or "what qualities do you consider to be Muslim" in one of two ways. The first was to list certain practices or key beliefs, such as belief in the prophet Muhammad or the performances of daily prayers. However, more often, the response would be to appeal to abstract qualities such as tolerance, respect for others, fairness, and open-mindedness. While this recourse to universals is perhaps less surprising in the French context than it would be elsewhere, it is nevertheless worth noting that such responses almost always overrode all discussion of practice or ritual. In other words, once a discussion of practice (pillars, dietary habits, and mosque attendance) got under way, it almost always resolved itself into a general consensus that none of these practices made a Muslim and that a true Muslim was well intentioned and sincere in his embrace of the more universal positives we mentioned. Thus, even when asked to discuss Islam in terms of specific ritual practice, many respondents tended to be abstract. The French subjects were, by and large, very uneasy with the supposition that strict adherence was the final word on who could and could not be considered a "good Muslim" or even "a Muslim" for that matter. (The references to Muslim culture or traditions were so ubiquitous that we had to create a code for it.)

Another typical statement depicts the struggle between a broad definition of the "Religion of Islam" and being Muslim through some sort of culture:

> to be Muslims, it is the religion of Islam, practicing or not practicing, on the cultural and the civilizational plane, me personally I'm not practicing but I am Muslim . . . I'm having a little trouble explaining myself.

This flexibility extended to almost all rituals or practices. Most respondents were non-committal about the necessity of prayer and prayer times. Many identified non-practicing Muslims as Muslims nonetheless. While almost everyone agreed to the importance of practices such as prayer, this practice was usually voiced in the language of motivations, for example "I will try" or "in the future I will." Women, when talking of the *hijab*, frequently stated that they did "not yet" wear the *hijab*, but hoped to do so one day. For example, echoing sentiment from other groups, one participant said, "If a person says 'I believe in that but I am not ready to follow it just yet,' then that is to a certain extent fine, as long as they are working on it."[20] Again, what is important to note for future survey creation is the fact that these same people, when asked specifically, would list the five pillars as the essential elements of Islam for new Muslims.

Muslims are part of the underclass of Europe

Because European Muslims tend to be socio-economically marginalized, much of the discrimination against them may be due to their class situation rather than their religion. Religion and discrimination may also interact in the formation of "class," especially in the formation of underprivileged classes of British Asian Muslims or French North African Muslims.[21] According to a 2003 EUMC report on employment,[22] Pakistanis and Bangladeshis in the UK had unemployment rates higher than 20 percent, relative to only 6 percent in the broader population. Immigrants in general had a 13 percent unemployment rate. In Germany, the unemployment rate in the Turkish community stood at 21 percent, in contrast to the national rate of only 8 percent. Nationality statistics were unavailable for France, but immigrants had a 22 percent unemployment rate, compared to 13 percent for the country as a whole. Immigrant unemployment rates tend to be at least twice that of native-born workers. In the Netherlands, non-Western immigrants had an unemployment rate of 9 percent, Western immigrants 4 percent, and native-born Dutch 3 percent. In Spain, the numbers were closer, while in Italy migrants had only a 7 percent unemployment rate compared to 11 percent in the broader population.

In France, Spain, Germany, and the Netherlands, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) data[23] show that individuals with ancestry from majority Muslim countries have substantially lower educational success, while they are more equivalent in Italy and the UK. In Germany, about 70 percent of those with ancestry in majority Muslim countries have secondary education or less, while this is true for only about 25 percent of the rest of the population. Only 5 percent have advanced degrees, compared to 19 percent of the broader population. In France, 56 percent of those with ancestry in majority Muslim countries have secondary education or less, compared to 46 percent in the broader population. Higher degrees are more equally distributed in France. In Spain, 76 percent of those with ancestry in majority Muslim countries have less than a secondary education, compared to 63 percent for others, while only 11 percent have advanced degrees, relative to 20 percent nation-wide. The Netherlands' numbers are divergent as well, with 50 percent of those of Muslim ancestry having less than secondary education, with the balance going the other way in advanced degrees – 31 percent to 20 percent. In Italy, the numbers are roughly equal among the wider population. In the UK, the statistics are also relatively equal, although this conceals the difficulties facing those of Pakistani and Bangladeshi heritage.

In 2006 the European Monitoring Center on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) released a report on housing[24] showing that, although there have been some improvements, immigrants routinely have poorer housing facilities and are sometimes subject to exclusionary violence.[25] In Germany, the report states that minorities clearly live in spatially segregated areas with poorer quality housing. The problem has been recognized by the government in Spain, which is taking action to increase public support for housing. France is in a similar situation, although there is a more particular difficulty with declining conditions in the stock of public housing. In Italy, responsibility for housing laws is distributed at various levels, with the resulting patchwork being difficult to analyze, although there is consensus that housing availability is generally more difficult for immigrants. In the Netherlands, although there have been reports of exclusionary violence, the best evidence available suggests that state policy on housing has benefited Muslims fairly well. The UK, in particular, has offered effective support for public housing and more effective anti-discrimination initiatives. Even so, those of Pakistani and Bangladeshi extraction, comprising the majority of British Muslims, live in much poorer conditions than the average Briton, with over two-thirds living in low-income households.[26] Nearly a quarter live in overcrowded houses, compared to just 2 percent of white Britons.[27]

Securitization of Islam

In response to the recent threat of "Islamic" terrorism, European states have restructured and strengthened their security and anti-terrorism laws while placing further restrictions on immigration. Terrorism can no longer be characterized as foreign or domestic; rather, it is transnational. If international terrorists based in foreign countries are recruiting among the disaffected populations of Europe, then European states face a simultaneous internal and external security threat. Europe's relation to terrorism should not be understated: the September 11 plots were partially planned in Hamburg, and there were at least twenty Europeans among the individuals imprisoned by the US in Guantanamo Bay.[28] Since 9/11, EU states have arrested more than twenty times the number of terrorist suspects as the US.[29] Because of this connection, European Muslims are often viewed as "foreign enemies," a classification that implies a much lower level of legal and social rights and privileges.

In all European countries, laws expanded the powers of the state to deal more harshly with potential threats associated with Muslim immigration.

Germany developed wholly new policies in the year after 9/11. In France, the 2001 Law on Everyday Security expanded police powers by permitting officials to stop vehicles, search unoccupied premises, and monitor or record electronic transactions without notice as part of anti-terrorism investigations. A new French immigration law in 2003 made it substantially easier to deport individuals who "committed acts justifying a criminal trial" or whose behavior "threatens public order," along with increased penalties for illegal immigration, more temporary detention centers, and new limits on family reunification. In addition to many of France's expanded police powers, the laws permit the banning of religious groups that threaten democratic order, unrestricted police access to financial records, electronic and postal communications, and most forms of transportation records, and the use of a previously controversial data-mining search method called the "grid-search." In the UK, Parliament passed a new Anti-Terrorism, Crime, and Security Bill that stipulated the indefinite detention of foreign nationals considered unsafe to deport to their country of origin and even permits detention in the anticipation of violence rather than response. It also called for the freezing and confiscation of funds associated with terrorism or proscribed groups, as well as requiring that individuals not associate with suspected terrorists or organizations but report any suspicions to the police. A study by the Institute of Race Relations[30] suggests that the anti-terrorism statutes have been invoked overwhelmingly against Muslim defendants. All of these policies seem to have a disproportionate effect on Muslims.

Other countries' responses were more subtle yet still responded to the perceived threat of terrorism caused by immigration. Spain was one of the few European nations that did not significantly change its security and anti-terrorism laws, but preventive detention of alleged conspirators increased dramatically. Spanish immigration laws have strengthened restrictions on the entrance of "undesirable" foreigners, and the ability of foreign nationals to exercise basic rights such as that of assembly was restricted. Similarly, Italian immigration law, which had been somewhat disorganized prior to the Bossi-Fini law of 2002, now tightly controls the entry and residency of immigrants, mandates harsher penalties for illegal immigration, calls for the creation of more detention centers, and limits family reunification.[31] The Netherlands has plans to legally weaken protections against searches of mosques and to introduce searches outside of databases to profile suspects. After much debate, the Dutch have developed immigration policies emphasizing the assimilation of immigrants into a common set of values. This departs from the Netherlands' previous focus on multiculturalism. In 2001, the Netherlands passed an Aliens Act aimed at reducing the number of accepted asylum seekers. This policy has been successful, and asylum requests have now dropped to a quarter of their previous number.

Policy changes have made the general public suspicious of Muslims, but terrorism does not stem solely from Islamic radicalism. For instance, both Spain and France have arrested far more Basque nationalists than Islamists.

Of the 358 inmates accused of terrorism in France, only 94 are radical Muslims, while the largest contingent of 159 is composed of Basques. Indeed, we can conclude that legal responses to terrorism and immigration have caused three major effects on Muslims in Europe: increased surveillance and police activity, banning of groups, and the deportation of radicals.

These policies effectively restrain the civil liberties of Muslim migrants. As a result of the UK law criminalizing indirect incitement or glorification of terrorism, a number of formerly legal groups have been banned. The EUMC reports that the new surveillance and search laws have disproportionately been used against those of South Asian ancestry and that the special legal authority for terrorism related cases has been used for other crimes such as credit card fraud. In Germany, a number of organizations were also banned, mosques faced searches with little justification, and a new data-mining technique was instituted for formerly private personal records to identify the "quiet" radicals. Although Spain has not gone nearly as far in its suspension of liberties, the government has detained a number of Muslims for periods of time using a policy many believe is oriented towards improving relations with the US in the aftermath of the Spanish military evacuation of Iraq. The disproportionate effect of these laws on Muslims may engender resentment and misunderstandings among the Muslim immigrants.

Role of intellectuals in the securitization of Islam

Falling in line with the changes in politics and media discussed above, intellectuals have also adopted harsh rhetoric in response to terror threats. Most notably, political commentator Oriana Fallaci's book *The Rage and the Pride* attacks Muslims as members of a warlike religion bent on destroying Italy's Christian society. The book sold at least 1.5 million copies and was adopted by various right-wing political movements. In Spain, political science professor Antonio Elorza argues that Islam is a "religion of combat" that defends terrorism as a "legitimate defense,"[32] a position shared by Professor Fernando Reinares, who opposes Muslim migration since it may allow entrance to Islamist terrorists.[33] In the Netherlands, the prominent philosophy professor Herman Philipse[34] has claimed that Islam is a violent tribal culture incompatible with modernity and democracy, and ethics professor Paul Cliteur[35] claims that religion causes violence, and that the only solution is secularization. In a disturbing new trend in Germany, academic backlash has transcended individual opinion and developed into a field of study that focuses on the delegitimation of practices such as wearing the *hijab*. This discipline implies that religious symbols or clothing no longer constitute a protected form of religious expression but rather a representation of anti-state minority nationalism. This trend is not limited to Germany as shown by the creation of a parliamentary commission in France during the Fall 2009 to investigate the visibility of the burqa.

Furthermore, the intellectuals garnering attention are being praised rather than disputed: in France, a pamphlet by Caroline Fourest[36] warning of the fascination of the left with radical Islam won an award from the French Assembly. This kind of speech is presented as courageous truth-telling in the face of moral relativists and dangerous Muslims.[37]

In a similar vein to Muslims in politics, Muslim academics who repudiate aspects of Islam have prominent voices in the discussion on Islam in Europe. In Germany, for example, Bassam Tibi, a professor of international relations at the University of Göttingen and a Muslim of Syrian origin, launched the term "Euro-Islam" in 1998 to express an understanding of Islam in a "European culture of reference" (*Leitkultur*).[38] Although Tibi does not himself promote essentialist visions of Islam, his ideas about the incompatibility of Islam and Europe contribute to an understanding of Islam as foreign and dangerous. Similarly, Turkish-born sociologist Necla Kelek has criticized traditional marriage practices in a way few non-Islamic intellectuals would dare, and the Iranian born Chadortt Djavann wrote two French books critical of his native religion.[39] In the Netherlands, the Iranian refugee and professor of law Afshin Elian has become an important voice as an "expert witness," warning of the dangers of Islamist radicalism. Islamic criticism from these Muslim academics lends legitimacy to cultural talk.

Authors and intellectuals have had substantial impacts on current society through their work on Islam. In the Netherlands, the policies questioning the practicality of multiculturalism are often attributed to an article published in 2000 by a leftist intellectual, Paul Scheffer. He argued that Dutch multiculturalism was simply not working, citing as evidence the poor socioeconomic conditions of immigrants, the growing neighborhood tensions, and the increasing influence of more conservative strains of Islam. Similar impacts can be found in European literature. In France, an anti-Muslim literary genre has become more popular over the last few years. Titles include *Les islamistes sont déjà là: Enquête sur une guerre secrète*,[40] *La France malade de l'islamisme: Menaces terroristes sur l'Hexagone*,[41] *La tentation du Jihad: Islam radical en France*,[42] and *Sentinelle: Contagion islamiste en Europe, le vaccin*.[43] In turn, these books have contributed to the question of contemporary French identity.

This conflict between the European secularism and Muslim religious values highlights a broader challenge, that of rethinking the principles of equality, pluralism, and tolerance. The traditional multicultural policies in European societies do not allow for equality and pluralism to incorporate the minority culture's values. The emergence of a "societal culture," i.e., organized around a shared language to be used in all institutions (both public and private), provides one solution to the problem of minority cultures. Such a culture would not imply that religious beliefs, family customs, or lifestyles would have to be shared (see Chapter 7).

Conclusion: coming to terms with Islam without Islamophobia

Despite the aforementioned political, social, and academic discourse, efforts to combat discrimination against Muslims are underway in European countries. These plans concern not only the economic arena, but also cultural and religious matters. There has been an increase in state initiatives to protect Muslim rights in various domains; these include the new French Ministry of Equal Opportunity and recent legislation against hate speech in the UK. Muslims have been strengthening their own organizations in an effort to keep records of hate-based incidents and to push for helpful policies, as with the establishment of the Islamic Anti-Defamation League of Italy in 2005. There have also been numerous efforts at interfaith dialogue between Muslims and Christians. Much of the debate over these issues has been about the extension of rights and protections already offered to other groups, especially Jews, but not yet applied to the situation of Muslims.

In Germany, state-led initiatives have been minimal, but Muslim organizations and interfaith dialogue have become particularly active. The Christlich-Islamische Gesellschaft, a new national organization that sponsors interfaith dialogues, has opened local chapters in cities across Germany. The Muslim organization Deutsches Islamforum attempts to document and battle anti-Muslim tendencies in society. One of its main focuses has been to mediate between Muslim leaders and authority figures to peaceably defuse conflicts. In addition, the Central Council of German Muslims has declared October 3, the day of German reunification, an annual Open Mosque Day, in which other members of the community are invited to visit mosques in an effort to encourage dialogue.

Spain and the Netherlands have ongoing state-level attempts to battle racism and xenophobia in their respective societies. In 2006, the Spanish state established an advisory council to work on questions of immigrant integration. Later that year, the Spanish Observatory on Racism and Xenophobia was established in order to present document reports and enable communication with like-minded national and international entities working to promote equality. The Netherlands established a Commission on Equal Treatment to help implement the Equal Treatment Law of 1994. There is also a National Bureau against Racial Discrimination established to provide expertise toward the prevention of racial discrimination. In response to the murder of Theo van Gogh in November 2004 and the burning of a mosque in Helden, the Dutch Minister of Aliens Affairs and Integration Rita Verdonk established intervention teams to prevent further violence in Dutch cities.

The Rushdie affair of 1988 brought the issue of Islamophobia to the attention of the British public, and it has remained a constant in the UK ever since. In 1997, the Runnymede Trust, under government sponsorship, produced a report outlining the state of affairs and possible policy direction of the British government in response to widening public awareness and usage of the term Islamophobia. This led to many local initiatives against Islamophobia, including the cooperation between Southwark police and Muslim community members to track and handle the problem of backlash incidents against community members. There have also been joint efforts by community activist organizations, such as campaign called "Islamophobia – Don't Suffer In Silence," which spearheaded a crime-reporting framework established by the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO), National Community Tension Team and the Muslim Safety Forum, and the Islamic Human Rights Commission.[44] In the public sphere, FAIR, or the Forum Against Islamophobia and Racism, has established itself as a prominent public voice urging integrated action. Another notable effort by a Muslim organization is the Islam Awareness Week, which involves discussions, presentations, and social and fundraising events nation-wide. It was established in 1994 but has become more important following the terrorist attacks of 9/11.

Paradoxically, all these efforts do not seem to facilitate an "indigenization" of Islam in all European societies. Islam is still seen as an alien and dangerous religion. Coming to terms with Islam would mean for Europeans to acknowledge their own restrictive conception of religion vis-à-vis civil society and citizenship. This would require a paradigm shift that Europe does not yet seem ready to accept.

Notes

1 M. Mamdani, *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: America, the Cold War, and the Roots of Terror,* New York: Pantheon, 2004.

2 See T. Asad, "Secularism, Nation-State, Religion," in *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam Modernity*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003.

3 Asad, p. 175.

4 C.B. Laustsen and O. Wæver, "In Defense of Religion, Sacred Reverent Objects for Securitization," in Pavlos Hatzopoulos (ed.), *Religion in International Relations, the Return from Exile*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, especially, pp. 147–175.

5 See J. Cesari, *Muslims in Europe: Local and Global Conditions of Integration in Religion and Democracy in Europe,* Jerusalem: Van Leer Institute, 2008.

6 J. Cesari (2008) Muslims in Europe Survey Focus Groups in Amsterdam, London, Paris, and Berlin (unpublished). These focus groups discussed the religiosity of Muslims living in Europe.

7 In the United States, the prototypical immigrant is a low-skilled Mexican or Central American worker rather than a conservative Muslim. Of the 15.5 million legal immigrants who entered the United States from between 1989 and 2004, only 1.2 million were from predominantly Muslim countries. There was a sharp drop from more than 100,000 per year prior to 2002 down to approximately 60,000 in 2003, but this recovered somewhat to 90,000 in 2004. Immigration in the United States is thus a topic in which the issues of Islam and terrorism are at best marginal issues.

8 E. Rothstein, "Putting Citizenship to the Test," *International Herald Tribune,*

September 12, 2006. Available at http://www.iht.com/articles/2006/02/24/news/acitizen.php.

9 Cesari, Muslims in Europe Survey.

10 International Helsinki Federation of Human Rights (IHF) (2005). Online. Available HTTP http://www.ihf-hr.org/welcome.php (accessed September 9, 2009).

11 Euro-Islam, "Country Profile: France." Available at <www.euro-islam.info>.

12 Euro-Islam, "Hundreds of potential terrorists live in Germany, official says." Available at http://www.euro-islam.info/2008/11/01/hundreds-of-potential-terrorists-live-in-germany-official-says/.

13 "Baroness Thatcher criticized British Muslim leaders," *Independent,* October 4, 2001. Available at http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/baroness-thatcher-criticizes-british-muslim-leaders-630240.html.

14 "Fears over 'condoning attacks' law," *Independent,* July 9, 2005. Available at http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/fears-over-condoning-attacks-law-498136.html.

15 "Pillars" refer to the concept of Dutch civil society based on differentiated channels of religion or political choice to express group interest in the public sphere (i.e. Catholic, Protestant, Social Democrat, etc.). Although these pillars are not still in use, they remain a strong force in collective political memory.

16 J.C. Alexander, "Theorizing the Modes of Incorporation: Assimilation, Hyphenation, and Multiculturalism as Varieties of Civil Participation," *Sociological Theory* 19 (3), 2001, pp. 237–249.

17 J. Van Selm, "The Netherlands: Tolerance Under Pressure," Migration Policy Institute, 2003, retrieved June 7, 2005.

18 See Parliamentary Inquiry Committee (Tijdelijke Commissie Onderzoek Integratiebeleid), 5 volumes, 2004.

19 Policies on the *hijab* are often implied in broader laws, such as the French ban on religious symbols in public schools, but they are still widely understood by Muslims as restrictions targeting Islam (see Chapter 7).

20 Cesari, Muslims in Europe Survey, London. Co-ed Bangladeshi Focus Group.

21 J. Cesari, *When Islam and Democracy Meet: Muslims in Europe and in the United States,* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004; and F. Ahmad and T. Modood, "British Muslim Perspective on Multiculturalism," in *Theory, Culture and Society* 24(2), 2007, pp. 187–213.

22 The EUMC is the European Monitoring Center on Racism and Xenophobia. See EUMC (2003) "Migrants, Minorities, and Housing: Exclusion, Discrimination and Anti-Discrimination in 15 Member States of the European Union." Online. Available HTTP http://www.libertysecurity.org/IMG/pdf_EUMC_Migrants_minorities_and_housing.pdf (accessed July 22, 2009).

23 OECD (2006) "Where Immigrant Students Succeed – A Comparative Review of Performance and Engagement in PISA 2003." Online. Available HTTP http://www.oecd.org/document/7/0,3343,en_33873108_33873626_36703111_1_1_1_1,00.html#B#] (accessed July 28, 2007).

24 EUMC (2006) "Annual Report." Online. Available HTTP http://www.ihmisoikeusliitto.fi/EUMC%20AR06%20Media%20Summary%20EN.DOC (accessed July 21, 2009).

25 The situation in Europe sharply contrasts to that in the United States, where Muslims tend to have higher education and income levels than the non-Muslim population. Although exact information on American Muslims is difficult to obtain, Zogby International Polling surveys from 2001 and 2004 show that more than half of American Muslims earn at least US$50,000 per year relative to a nationwide average of US$43,000. Education levels are also higher among American Muslims than the population as a whole.

26 Household Below Average Income Series, Department of Work and Pensions, 2003.

27 M. Harrison and D. Phillips, *Housing and Black and Minority Ethnic Communities: Review of the Evidence Base*, London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2003.

28 T.M. Savage, "Europe and Islam: Crescent Waxing, Cultures Clashing," *Washington Quarterly* 27 (3), 2004, pp. 25–50.

29 J. Cesari, *When Islam and Democracy Meet.*

30 A. Kundnani, "Stop and Search: Police Step up Targeting of Blacks and Asians," *Institute of Race Relations*, March 26, 2003.

31 EIRONLINE (2002) "New Legislation Regulates Immigration." Online. Available HTTP http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/2002/09/feature/it0209103f.htm (accessed July 21, 2009).

32 A. Elorza, "Terrorismo islámico: las raíces doctrinales," in A. Elorza and F. Reinares (eds.), *El nuevo terrorismo islamista*, Madrid: Temas de Hoy, 2004, pp. 156–157. See also "Maniqueos e integristas," *El País,* September 28, 2001 and "El círculo," *El País,* November 23, 2001, among others.

33 F. Reinares, "Al Qaeda, neosalafistas magrebíes y 11-M: sobre el nuevo terrorismo islamista en España," in Elorza and Reinares Nestares, pp. 40–41.

34 H. Philipse, *Atheistisch manifest: Drie wijsgerige opstellen over godsdienst en moraal*, Amstedam: Prometheus, 2004.

35 P. Cliteur, "The Post-Modern Interpretation of Religious Terrorism," Council for Secular Humanism, 2007. Online. Available HTTP http://www.secularhumanism.org/index.php?section=library&page=cliteur_27_2 (accessed July 22, 2009).

36 C. Fourest, *La tentation obscurantiste*, Paris: Grasset, 2005.

37 See A. Caeiro, "French Report," in J. Cesari (ed.), *Securitization and Religious Divides in Europe. Muslims in Western Europe after 9/11: Why the Term Islamophobia is More a Predicament than an Explanation.* Submission to the Changing Landscape of Citizenship and Security, 6th PCRD of European Commission, GSLR Paris and Harvard University, 2006, pp. 195–222.

38 According to Tibi, Euro-Islam incorporates pluralism, tolerance, secularity, civil society, and individual human rights.

39 Djavann published another book in 2006, a novel suggestively entitled *Comment peut-on être français*, Paris: Flammarion, 2006, which has however failed to sustain much media interest.

40 C. Deloire and C. Debois, *Les islamistes sont déjà là: Enquête sur une guerre secrète*, Paris: Albin Michel, 2004.

41 M. Sifaoui, *La France malade de l'islamisme: Menaces terroristes sur l'Hexagone*, Paris: Le Cherche-midi Editeur, 2002.

42 D. Pujadas and A. Salam, *La tentation du Jihad: Islam radical en France*, Paris: J.C. Lattès, 1995.

43 P.A. Pahlavi, *La Sentinelle: Contagion islamiste en Europe, le vaccin*, Paris: Osmondes, 1999.

44 For more information, see Islamic Human Rights Commission, http://www.ihrc.org.

2 Islam in America

Jane I. Smith

Introduction

Although Muslims have been visible on the American scene for well over a century, it is not until fairly recently that most United States citizens have been much aware of their presence. A unique blend of immigrants, African Americans and other American-born populations, the Muslim community is becoming increasingly heterogenous as it both grows and takes its place as a recognized religion in the American cultural milieu. New Muslim institutions are appearing at a rapid rate, issues of leadership are under constant consideration, new initiatives in Islamic education are being designed, young people are playing important roles as models of faith and practice and both men and women are assuming positions as leaders and interpreters of the faith.

The reality of the destruction of 9/11, a defining moment in United States history, has brought major changes both within the Muslim community and in the consciousness and response of the American public. Americans have become aware not only of what they perceive as a growing threat of Islam internationally, but of the reality that Muslims in their own country are their doctors, their scientists, their garage attendants and their children's teachers. Anti-Islamic prejudice continues to rise, despite the wide-ranging efforts of American Muslims to present their religion as the antithesis of the terrorist ideology illustrated on 9/11 and in subsequent attacks abroad. Muslims struggle to model good citizenship at the same time that they are cautious about their own visibility, particularly in light of United States government surveillance. They treasure the freedom of speech guaranteed by the Constitution, but know that criticism of American foreign policy could have serious consequences for themselves and their families.

Assessing the exact number of Muslims currently living in America is impossible. Various survey instruments have come up with wildly different estimates, often depending on the disposition of those attempting the count. Some surveyors have a vested interest in inflating the number, others in presenting it in as minimal way as possible. Since the United States census does not include a question about religious affiliation, researchers are left to their own fairly inadequate resources. Somewhere in the range of 4–7 million Muslims living in America seems a reasonable estimate, with more than 80 countries of origin represented. One of the problems for those trying to find hard numbers is the question of identification. Who has the right to say who is Muslim or not? What about those who identify themselves as Muslim but are members of sectarian movements considered outside the pale of "orthodoxy" by mainstream Muslims? To what extent should religion be a factor in identity since many Americans of Muslim heritage consider themselves secular?

Now that several generations of American Muslims can be identified, earlier descriptions of American Islam as made up of immigrants on the one hand and African Americans on the other no longer hold. Many observers now draw a distinction simply between foreign-born and American-born, the latter including African Americans and other converts as well as third and fourth generation immigrants. Added to the mix are Muslims who are sojourning in America for some specified period of time, such as students, temporary workers, diplomats and other visitors.

Who *are* American Muslims?

America today is home to the most heterogeneous Muslim community at any time or place in the history of the world. Muslims represent many races and ethnic/cultural groups, speak a range of languages, espouse many different understandings of the religion of Islam and often choose to present themselves in very different ways. Many voices are being raised in the discussion of what it means to be an American Muslim today. Members of religious associations, racial-ethnic groups, sectarian movements, political organizations, professional associations and many other types of groupings are now vying for the role of spokesperson for American Islam. At the same time Muslims are struggling to articulate the commonality that might allow them to speak with a united voice. But is it even possible to talk of a truly "American Islam?" If so, what are its boundaries, its definitions, its modes of inclusion or exclusion?

Since the first small group of Muslim immigrants to America came from Greater Syria in the latter part of the nineteenth century, the number of people and Islamic cultures represented in the US has grown conspicuously. The two world wars and the lifting of the immigration ban in 1975 all brought new waves of immigrants. Many of those more lately arrived, such as South and Southeast Asians, have been well educated and economically sufficient. As a result of their professional education and knowledge of English they have provided important lay leadership in American mosque communities. Many others, however, have been poorer and lacking in both education and occupational skills. Political turmoil in various parts of the world has brought refugees to American shores from Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Eastern Europe. South Asians and Arabs are the most sizeable of the immigrant Muslim groups in America, followed by Iranians, Sub-Saharan Africans, East Asians, former members of the Soviet Union and many smaller communities.

Running as a kind of parallel track to immigration in the history of Muslim America has been the growth of African American Islam. Scholars generally agree that Islam first made its way to the American continent during the slave trade of the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries, although forced conversion meant that the Islam practiced by these involuntary African immigrants did not survive.[1] The historical presence of African Muslims in America is of great interest to African Americans today, however, and becomes an important ingredient in the contemporary conversations about identity and belonging.

The most significant socio-cultural and religious movement of the twentieth century claiming to be associated with Islam was the Nation of Islam (NOI). While numerically quite small, the NOI continues today to have very high name recognition. Other African American Muslims often express frustration that non-Muslim Americans seem to see all blacks as "black Muslims" (the term by which the Nation has been identified). The movement has long aroused the ire of orthodox Muslims because of racist and leadership ideologies. Nonetheless, the NOI has achieved respect and recognition for its work assisting the black community to achieve economic independence, self respect and ethical integrity, and is active today in fighting drug-related urban crime and in providing ministry to black prison inmates.

Since the death of NOI leader Elijah Muhammad in 1975, his son the late Warith Deen Mohammed worked to bring the community into the sphere of Sunni Islam. The successive name changes that the group went through represent Warith Deen's continuing efforts to designate his followers as distinct yet still within the orbit of orthodox Sunnism. A number of other African Americans are unaffiliated with either the NOI or the Ministry of Warith Deen Mohammed, considering themselves simply Sunni Muslims, while others are members of sectarian movements claiming some affiliation with Islam.[2] African Americans constitute about a third of the Muslims in America today.

In recent years African American Muslim leaders have become increasingly vocal in calling for recognition of their identity as equal partners in the development of an American Islam that is truly racially inclusive. While demographics and time have made it increasingly difficult, and inappropriate, to distinguish between "immigrant Islam" and "African American Islam," Muslims who are black are speaking out when they feel that their co-religionists of immigrant heritage or identity are ignoring them or treating them as second class citizens. The 2000 Presidential election, for which members of the immigrant community backed a candidate as the Muslim choice without checking with African American Muslims, was a precipitating factor in a now ongoing conversation about inclusiveness and racial equality in American Islam.

Part of the contemporary conversation about the definition of American Islam reflects distinctions between Sunnis and Shi'ites. The latter, who began arriving from Iran after the Revolution of 1979, have seen their numbers swell recently as a result of conflicts like the Lebanese Civil War and American invasions of Iraq. Over 20 percent of American Muslims today are Shi'ite, mainly Ithna 'Asharis who consider religious scholars in Iran, Iraq or Lebanon to be authoritative in their communities. A smaller but articulate majority are Ismai'ilis, who acknowledge the leadership of Prince Karim Aga Khan.

Shi'ite voices are also being raised today in an attempt to claim a share in the current conversations about the definition and direction of American Islam.[3] Until recently the two groups and their subsets existed together in the US with relative ease. Internecine differences have been of less interest than determining what it means to be Muslim in general in the American context. Some significant changes in Sunni–Shi'ite relations have come about, however, as a result of the American invasion of Iraq and its aftermath. As sectarian tensions heightened in Iraq, so interactions between Sunnis and Shi'ites in the US became more tense. A few American Sunnis have even condemned Shi'ites as heretics. Both Sunni and Shi'ite intellectuals, however, have been at the forefront of encouraging better relations not only between religious faiths but between the branches of Islam itself.

Converts to Islam, while not large in number, are coming to play an important role in the public image of Islam in America. Latino/Latinas often claim to see similarities between traditional Muslim cultures and their own heritage and values. A significant body of literature is now available describing the attraction of Islam as a religious alternative as well as with the problems faced by those who choose to adopt Islam. A high proportion of converts to Islam are women. Some have married Muslim men and adopted the faith because of its emphasis on family and communal values. New converts sometimes report that they find Muslim doctrines and duties easier to understand than those of Christianity.[4] The phenomenon of conversion can cause considerable stress both for the new Muslim family and for the family (often Christian) of the convert.[5] While some new Muslims report that they have been warmly welcomed into existing communities, others find it hard to break through the bonds of immigrant cultures and find full acceptance.

Over the years a number of Americans have been attracted to Islam through the vehicle of Sufism, both in its more traditional and in its sometimes trendy forms. By the middle of the twentieth century a number of Sufi groups had become established in America, their popularity fostered by the resurgence of interest among young Americans in religions of the East. Often their legitimacy was not recognized by other Muslims. Today Sufi orders with direct links to centuries old orders have become well established and acknowledged as a legitimate part of the heritage of Islam. Interest in Sufism is increasing among young Muslims who are looking for a moderate version of Islam in light of rising American fears of radicalism. White Sufi converts such as Hamza Yusuf of the Zaytuna Institute in California attract young men and women who want to immerse themselves in an Islamic atmosphere of study and piety.[6]

Ideology and identity

For many American Muslims, whether immigrant, African American or other, the so-called "melting pot" ideology of America has not worked to include them. In the earlier part of the twentieth century many immigrants tried to hide their religious and ethnic identities, often avoiding dress that would associate them with Islam or changing their names so as to fit in. Gradually as the community of Muslims has become bigger, representative of a greater number of cultures, better educated and better able to determine the degree to which they want to assimilate, the conversation about how to live in America as Muslims and as members of distinctive cultures has become much more sophisticated.

Many immigrants coming to America in the middle part of the twentieth century from the greater Middle East brought with them Arab socialist or nationalist ideologies. Events such as the 1967 war between Israel and Arab nations, however, have given rise to a more conservative Islam both in the Middle East and the Islamic world at large. Now in the early twenty-first century a growing Islamic consciousness is even more in evidence, partly in response to American foreign policy in the Middle East. Immigrants to the US today are more likely than earlier in its history to be committed to a clear Islamic identity, although rarely is it linked to extremism. But while they may disagree with certain foreign policies of the government, in almost all cases these new Americans want to live as responsible citizens. They are grateful for the ability to exercise their religious rights and to speak publicly without recrimination in a country founded on the principle of freedom from religious oppression.

Today, however, many Muslims fear that they are unable to exercise that very freedom because of American prejudice and the possibility of government "backlash." How, they wonder, is it possible to speak out when they disagree with certain US policies without being branded as terrorists or asked by fellow citizens why they don't "go home" if they do not like it here? Muslims worry deeply that such realities as the US Patriot Act, "Operation Green Quest" (in which the government invaded homes and businesses of Muslims), profiling in airports and other public places and freezing the assets of Muslim charities represent a loss of Muslim civil liberties.[7]

On the whole the case can be made that since the attacks Muslim Americans are more overt in their practice of Islam, through dress, speech, and public commitment, than before. It is also the case, however, that a significant number choose to define themselves as secular in orientation although Muslim in heritage. One of the problems Muslims have faced since the terrorist attacks is the general assumption on the part of the American public that Muslims must either be moderate (as encouraged by the government) or extremist. As is true for people of all religious faiths in America, Muslims locate themselves everywhere on a continuum of secular, sometimes called "un-mosqued," to very observant. Secular American Muslims have figured prominently in many social, economic, educational and scientific fields although they may never be seen by other Americans as having any connection with Islam.

For many years Muslims who immigrated to the US were very reluctant to involve themselves in American political processes. Often unsure whether Islamic law actually allowed them as minority Muslims in a majority secular culture to engage in political activity, they often chose not to vote and rarely ran for political office. Now the situation has changed significantly. Particularly since the Presidential elections of 2000, Muslims have attempted to form political blocs to gain leverage in promoting causes and candidates that they want to support. Many Muslims are joining the movement to encourage their co-religionists to vote in local and national elections and even to run for public office.[8]

As American Muslims struggle to determine whether or not America really can be a comfortable home for their faith, they increasingly recognize that the answer must be of their own creation. While some continue to insist that isolation and separation are the appropriate responses of Muslims living in a Western context, others argue that integration (though not assimilation) and interaction with other Americans are essential for the Islamic community today.

Leadership and organization

Before 9/11, the question of leadership of Muslim communities (and of American Islam, however that might be defined) was high on the agenda as different Muslim groups reflected on their needs and concerns. It has only heightened in importance since that time. The American public, now increasingly aware of the presence of Islam in America, has questioned who speaks for Islam. Muslims from religious, professional and academic perspectives have all risen to public prominence as they have attempted to distance Islam from terrorism and have participated in the effort to present an honest, realistic and contemporary interpretation of the faith. The media and press have played their own role in identifying certain Muslims as appropriate spokespersons for Islam (often challenged by other Muslims), and the US government has effectively conferred leadership responsibilities by its selection of certain persons to be hosted at the White House and to speak at state occasions.[9]

Leadership issues are at the top of the agenda for African American Muslims today. Warith Deen Mohammed, who became a revered and articulate figure in American Islam and strong advocate of interfaith relations, died in September 2008. It remains to be seen whether his community will choose to identify themselves as followers of another leader, or will simply be absorbed into Sunni Islam in the US. The original Nation has continued under the charismatic leadership of Minister Louis Farrakhan, although he has announced his retirement for reasons of health. The loss of these two old rivals and friends is significant for African Americans, and the potentially contentious question of leadership is yet to be determined.

In some cases, leaders of American Islam become such by virtue of their roles in various Muslim organizations. The proliferation of such religious, political, professional, cultural and political organizations in America has helped structure Muslim life and has contributed to the complex picture of leadership. One of the earliest Muslim organizations to take shape in the US was the Muslim Student Association in the USA and Canada (MSA), founded in 1963 by students hoping to assist the many Muslim students coming from countries around the world to study on American campuses. The organization has grown and now has chapters on most college and university campuses. Until recently these students were served primarily by Protestant campus chaplains, but school administrators are now recognizing the need for Muslim chaplains and are scrambling to find trained leaders. The MSA, which is now international in perspective and advocates an Islam that transcends racial, ethnic and linguistic distinctions, several years ago first chose a woman student to be its president.

Since the founding of the MSA other Muslim organizations have proliferated in the US. Some are religious, the largest of which is the Islamic Society of North America (INSA). ISNA grew out of the MSA and today coordinates a large number of mosque communities, in effect serving as a kind of overseeing body for many other emerging groups. The organization elected its first female president in 2006. The somewhat smaller Islamic Circle of North America (ICNA), known for its adherence to the spirit and law of Islam, is more conservative in orientation. Both groups emphasize righteous living, but while ISNA involves itself in social and political matters, ICNA is more concerned with spiritual regeneration. The two organizations are attempting to find ways in which to work with each other toward mutual goals, such as finding imams who are knowledgeable in English and know American culture, and providing guidelines and activities for Muslim youth. Shi'ite and other sectarian religious groups have designated organizations to serve their interests. Leaders of these organizations are making concerted efforts to work with each other, although attempts to provide an umbrella structure to coordinate the various religious groups have not been very successful.

Some Muslims are more interested in advocating for Muslim civil rights than in dealing specifically with religion. So many groups have proliferated in recent years that it is virtually impossible to keep a fully updated list. The American Muslim Council, for example, is a nonprofit sociopolitical organization working to develop increased political power for Muslims. The Muslim Women Lawyers for Human Rights, known as KARAMAH, has worked for many years specifically for the rights of women in the American context. A number of women's groups have arisen recently looking to provide services from advocacy to education to religious rights to neighborhood care.[10] Many of these organizations are technologically very sophisticated and through internet communication keep in touch with parallel societies in other countries. Many Muslims in America also are affiliated with organizations that are related to ethnic identity or professional interests.

Changing roles of women

Among the dynamic changes in the American Muslim community has been the rise in visibility of Muslim women as active participants in virtually all aspects of social and professional life. The highly educated professionals who began to arrive after 1965 included women of high achievement in such fields as medicine, science and technology, education, engineering, the arts and community organization. The US has provided additional opportunities for such women to complete their education and to enter into the professional mainstream of the country. A major part of the public defense of Islam in American society today is the affirmation that as women played active roles in the community of the Prophet they should do so today, and that women from the earliest times have served as both examples and teachers of the true meaning of Islam.

Particularly since 9/11, Muslim women have assumed leadership roles in articulating an Islam that is peaceful, productive and therefore to be welcomed in America. They are taking the opportunity to become better educated in the religious sciences, traditions and policies of Islam so that they can actively participate in the task of educating an often skeptical American public. Clearly for some Islamic cultures such public participation runs against the grain of traditional expectations of and for women. In general, however, Muslims actively support education for women not only in secular subjects but also in many of the Islamic sciences such as interpreting and reciting the Qur'an, Islamic law and study of the traditions relating to the life of the Prophet.[11]

While some more traditional Muslim men and women feel that employment outside the home is not appropriate, most families are finding ways in which women can contribute both to the family income and to the societies and communities in which they live. Some women do decide that they will interrupt their careers, or put them off, so as to be home while their children are growing up, despite the fact that they may have difficulty later in moving back into their profession. Most Muslim women drive or use other forms of public transport, and those who choose to dress Islamically do so in ways that allow them to feel confident in playing roles in public exchange. Muslim women's organizations are providing for the needs of those who do not have access to adequate health care or other necessities, and women are increasingly encouraged both to vote and to run for public office.

Always active in the life of the mosque in America, Muslim women today are assuming more leadership roles, in rare cases even preaching or performing marriages. Virtually all Muslims feel that being an imam or leader of a worshipping congregation is not a suitable role for a woman, however, and clear efforts are constantly being made to differentiate between the expectations of an American public used to the demands of gender equality and the propriety still expected by Muslims who believe that their own understanding of gender parity is the most appropriate for Muslim societies wherever they are located.

Importance of the family

Few topics evoke more careful attention by American Muslims than the nature and importance of the family. Muslims in America look on the family as the bulwark of their existence in this western (secular) society, the unit through which they filter, accept or reject various elements of American society that they see as compatible or incompatible with their understanding of what it means to be Muslim. In America Muslims rarely have the luxury of an extended family. Usually a husband and wife form the primary and only unit, which may raise such concerns as loneliness (especially for a wife who does not work outside the home), the lack of a larger support group for both parents and children, the difficulty of a young mother working with no family to provide child care, and new forms of stress on the husband–wife relationship in isolation from other family members.[12]

According to Islamic law, to which some Muslims try to adhere and others do not, a Muslim man may marry any woman who is a member of what the Qur'an calls "People of the Book," meaning Muslims, Jews and Christians, while a Muslim woman may only marry another Muslim. In America, where interaction between Muslims and others is virtually unavoidable, the incidence of marriage "outside the faith" is much higher than in predominantly Muslim countries. This can result in extreme hardships for young practicing Muslim women who are left with a dwindling pool of available partners. It is not surprising that increased pressures are being put on observing Muslims today to marry within the faith. Both locally and through national organizations efforts are being made to bring young Muslim boys and girls together to socialize in the context of a highly structured set of activities. "Dating services" are provided by some of the major Islamic organizations, specifically through the matrimonial sections of popular monthly and quarterly journals. Young men and women (or their parents in their stead) can post their own credentials and their hopes for qualities that they would like to see exhibited in their mates, and Islamically appropriate ways can be set up for potential mates to meet.

In some communities in the US and Canada Muslim families still attempt to "arrange" marriages for their children, a practice more popular with newly arrived immigrants than among longer established groups. Islamic tradition has long insisted on the right of the woman to formulate her own marriage contract and to receive *mahr* (a marriage gift) from her husband, which is to remain her property even after a possible divorce. Many women in the Islamic world have been poorly informed about the potential of such a contract in which a bride is legally able to make a number of stipulations. Increasingly, Islamic counselors and advisors in America are talking and writing about the importance of this kind of protection, and more women are taking advantage of it. The contract may contain such details as the amount and nature of the *mahr*, the prohibition on the part of the husband to take a second wife, or specifics about when and what kinds of divorce may be legally acceptable.[13]

Public practice of the faith

Most recent studies of Islam in America indicate that a significant number of Muslims do not actively practice the faith, are not associated with mosques or Islamic centers and do not observe the prescribed duties of ritual prayer, fasting and the like. Those who do, and indications are that the number is rising, face concerns in terms of their presentation and practice of Islam. Even Americans who claim to be tolerant of other faiths often become uneasy when practice takes a public face.

The process of mosque-building, for example, is proceeding apace, but not without some difficulty. There are now purpose-built mosques, or existing buildings used for communal worship, in virtually all of the country's major cities. Still, many Americans are not eager to have a mosque erected in their neighborhood, particularly if it means an "unusual" structure in their midst or problems with parking or too many people coming and going at congregational times and holidays. Muslims who have successfully financed the building of a new structure need to decide how to balance their desire for it to resemble a traditional mosque with the accommodation that might be necessary for the building to blend into the surrounding neighborhood.[14]

Practicing Muslims have to ask for accommodation in the workplace and in schools so as to be able to fulfill religious obligations. A Muslim who wishes to pray at the appropriate time in a public institution such as a school or an office needs to request 10–15 minutes off work or study, a place to do ablutions and a space to perform the prostrations. Even more time is needed to observe religious holidays or to go on pilgrimage to Mecca. Muslims who eat in public cafeterias are increasingly vocal about the need to be assured that food is not associated with any pork product, or even that the meat is *halal* (slaughtered in the Islamically appropriate way). Not all institutions or employers are willing to grant such requests.

Nonetheless, as Muslim presence is increasingly visible in America, and as cases of discrimination against persons who are trying to observe the elements of their faith in accordance with Islamic law become more public, changes are gradually taking place. Organizations such as the Council on

American Islamic Relations (CAIR) are vigilant in identifying violation of Muslim civil rights, and an offending institution may find its employees forced to take a course in understanding the essentials of Islam.

Islamic dress

One of the most controversial issues related to public practice of the faith is the wearing of Islamic dress, or some kind of visible identification that women, and often also men, are members of the Islamic faith. Before 9/11 the majority of Muslim women in America did not wear identifying dress, and many still do not. Since that time, however, the numbers of women adopting some kind of covering, from simple headscarf to full Islamic garb, have risen, and tunics and headwear are becoming more popular for some men who want to show their affiliation with the faith. Islamic stores and catalogues picture a wide range of styles from which to choose, outfits conforming to Islamic rules of modesty at the same time that they project both style and utilitarianism. New lines of modest sportswear, for example, allow Muslim women to be both observant and athletic.

On the whole, the American public has tolerated Islamic dress without too much difficulty, although objections have been raised when full-face covering has not allowed for photographic identification. There have been numerous individual instances in which Muslims have experienced discrimination for dress, including airport surveillance, refusal of employers to allow head-coverings and problems in schools and other public places. Women who dress Islamically face possible discrimination in hiring, promotion and retention in many kinds of businesses.

The Qur'an itself is subject to various interpretations concerning the matter of dress. More specific in delineating the importance of women wearing some kind of veil or cover is the Sunnah, or way of the Prophet, detailed in the traditional literature. While some Muslim women who believe that conservative dress is God's will insist that all women should cover, most grant to their sisters the prerogative of individual choice and leave judgment on the matter in the hands of God.

Education

Religious education is a major issue for many in the Muslim community. Parents struggle with such concerns as how to keep their children from what are perceived to be dangerous western secular values at the same time that they acknowledge their children's citizenship in the West and want them to be able to live their lives comfortably in a western culture. Concerns about education are discussed at virtually all local and national meetings of Muslim groups and organizations.

A few Muslim families are opting for home schooling as an alternative to public education. Others work together to establish Islamic schools, besieged by worries about inadequate financing, teacher training and quality education. Islamic schools, while growing in number (now estimated at somewhere over 200), are not available for most children and when they are, often they cannot claim to compete academically with good public or private secular institutions. Few Islamic schools extend beyond the eighth grade. It is difficult to find teachers who have sufficient training in education, particularly if finances are tight and the pay is insufficient.[15] More community resources are being channeled into the building and maintenance of good Islamic schools, however, and it seems clear that investment in this kind of parochial education is high on the American Muslim agenda. Some Muslim homes are the venue for afternoon or weekend Islamic studies if mosques or Islamic centers are not available for instruction.

Most Muslim children and youth attend public schools, and some of them experience faith-related difficulties. They may find themselves isolated by their classmates, particularly if they wear forms of Islamic dress. Parents worry about allowing girls to participate in physical education if they are forced to wear gym clothing that they consider inappropriate. Some are concerned that sex education in schools appears to condone homosexuality, which Muslims consider wrong, or that by handing out condoms schools may appear to condone sexual activity outside of the classroom. As teachers and administrators in American public schools become better educated about this growing minority of Muslim children, they are learning to accommodate and in many cases to use the presence of Muslims as an opportunity to promote better interfaith understanding in the classroom.

Islamic education is not limited to young people. Opportunities to learn Qur'an, traditions and the Islamic sciences are available on university campuses through MSA chapters, in prisons, women's circles, through adult classes at mosques and in a range of other venues. The Prophet's injunction to seek education even if it be as far away as China is often cited by Muslim leaders to underscore the importance of a community whose members, men and women, are all as Islamically learned as possible.

Relationships with Muslims overseas

Extremely important to American Muslims as they work to feel comfortable in America is the complicated set of relationships they maintain with Muslim cultures, movements and religious entities abroad. The 1970s and 1980s saw serious efforts on the part of Gulf countries such as Saudi Arabia to finance minority Muslim communities in various parts of the world. Some American Muslims benefited greatly from those efforts as the recipients of trained religious leadership and monies to build new mosques and centers. That funding has lessened considerably and, at the same time, American Muslims are struggling to decide whether or not they want it anyway insofar as it may entail expectations of certain ideological commitments. Of particular concern to many Muslims today is the influence of conservative Wahhabi ideology, propagated in a variety of ways through funding by Gulf states such as Saudi Arabia.

A number of international organizations – some overtly political and others oriented toward pietism and practice – continue to operate in the American context. American Shi'ites still look to countries like Iraq, Iran and Lebanon for religious leadership. Some Shi'ites, however, are questioning whether it might not be better to sever such ties and develop forms of Shi'ite Islam that are indigenous to the US.

Islamophobia

American understanding of Islam, and what the religion and way of life mean to Muslims living in the West, is not aided by the brash and insulting commentary of some of the most prominent US Christian evangelical leaders.[16] Since 9/11 public commentary has portrayed Muhammad as a fanatic and a killer, a terrorist and a demon-possessed pedophile. The American public may not recognize that such references are part of a larger picture that includes the rise in global efforts at evangelization of Muslims, and has implications for American foreign policy in the Middle East. Muslims, meanwhile, have to live with the humiliation of such attacks on their faith and its founder who serves as a model for their belief and behavior.

Words of hate have sometimes led to acts of violence, and a number of American Muslim mosques and public buildings have been the targets of crime and destruction. Even before 9/11 many Muslims identified American prejudice against Islam, for which the European term "Islamophobia" has now been adopted, as the major concern they face trying to live in the US. The stakes continue to be raised, and polls consistently show that Americans do not understand the religion of Islam. While they don't believe that most American Muslims condone violence, they do worry that an increase in the number of Muslims allowed to immigrate may lead to the growth of radical cells.

For their part, Muslims are alarmed at the increased vigilance shown by the American government since 9/11 in identifying potential terrorists. They see it leading to invasion of their constitutional privacy with illegal search and seize procedures, deportation of key Islamic leaders, closing of charitable Islamic organizations suspected of affiliation with terrorist groups and other activities that have made them fear for themselves, their families and their communities. Muslims themselves are suffering from the pain of seeing a few of their co-religionists act in extremist ways that they strongly disavow, some even saying that they feel true Islam has been hijacked by those who do violence in the name of the faith.

For law-abiding Muslims in the West who want only to live quiet lives as good citizens and good Muslims, awareness of anti-Muslim feelings is extremely painful. It is also true, however, that since 9/11 increased efforts are being made by many non-Muslims to reach out to their Muslim colleagues, to offer assistance in times of need, and to engage them in the kind of conversation that will help foster and spread a better and more accurate understanding of the faith of Islam.

Conclusion

Clearly many issues face Muslims living in America today. Some are intra-communal and others concern the ways in which Islam and its adherents are viewed by non-Muslim Americans. Members of the Muslim community are energized and sometimes overwhelmed by the possibilities available to them in the US, despite the 9/11 backlash. But some hard realities are also constantly in front of the eyes of American Muslims, whether they are immigrant or indigenous, observant or non-observant. They know that violence has been committed in various parts of the world by Muslims, sometimes even in the name of Islam, and that American Muslims are being pressed to interpret it. They know that just saying "Islam is a religion of peace" is not going to suffice now, and that more is being asked of them.

The fact remains, however, that Muslims in America still enjoy opportunities virtually unparalleled anywhere else in the world. It is also true that many Americans who are not Muslim are engaged in serious efforts to counter anti-Muslim discrimination and foster better interfaith understanding. One can hope that the American public as a whole, or at least a significant part of it, will continue to listen to the voices of those who call attention to an Islam that is moderate and that provides a path of ethical and spiritual values for many millions of people. And we can also hope that as Muslims speak from different perspectives in the attempt to formulate an American Islam, they will continue to make progress in articulating a religion and way of life that ultimately will be welcomed as another valued component of the rapidly changing face of religious America.

Notes

1. For an excellent treatment of Islam and African slaves see A. Austin, *African Muslims in Antebellum America: Transatlantic Stories and Spiritual Struggles,* New York: Routledge, 1997.
2. The much-studied Nation of Islam is presented clearly and concisely by E. Curtis IV, *Black Muslim Religion in the Nation of Islam, 1960–1975,* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
3. See L. Takim, "Multiple Identities in a Pluralistic World: Shi'ism in America," in Y. Haddad, ed., *Muslims in the West: From Sojourners to Citizens*, New York: Oxford, 2002, pp. 218–232.
4. See K. van Nieuwkerk, "Gender and Conversion to Islam in the West," in K. van Nieuwkerk, ed., *Women Embracing Islam,* Austin: University of Texas Press, 2006, pp. 1–16.
5. See, for example, the study of women converts to Islam by C. Anway, *Daughters of Another Path*, Lee's Summit, MO: Yawna Publications, 1996.

6 N. Khan, "Nascent Institutions Take on the Challenge of Educating Muslim Youth in America," in Y. Haddad, F. Senzai and J. Smith, eds., *Educating the Muslims of America,* New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

7 J. Smith, "Caught in the Crunch: Issues Facing Muslims in America." The Michaelsen Endowed Visiting Scholar Lectureship at the University of California, Santa Barbara, November 13, 2002.

8 For a discussion of Muslims in the American public arena see M. Nimer, "Muslims in the American Body Politic," in Z. Bukhari et al, eds., *Muslims' Place in the American Public Square,* Walnut Creek, CA: Altimira, 2004, pp. 145–164.

9 Jocelyne Cesari offers a cogent analysis of Islamic authority figures in the US in J. Cesari, *When Islam and Democracy Meet*, New York: Palgrave, 2004, pp. 123–158.

10 See G. Webb, *Windows of Faith. Muslim Women Scholar-Activists in North America*, Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2000, for an excellent and lengthy listing of most of the national and regional organizations in which Muslim women currently participate.

11 Y. Haddad, J. Smith and K. Moore, *Muslim Women in America. The Challenge of Islamic Identity Today,* New York: Oxford, 2006, pp. 121–142.

12 See a comprehensive (though now somewhat dated) "Typology of Muslim Immigrant Families" in S. Abu-Laban, "Family and Religion Among Muslim Immigrants and Their Descendants," in E.H. Waugh et al, eds., *Muslim Families in North America,* Alberta: University of Alberta Press, 1991, pp. 1–31. See also J. Smith, "Islam and the Family in North America," in D. Browning and D. Clairmont, eds., *American Religions and the Family,* New York: Columbia, 2007, pp. 211–224.

13 Haddad et al, *Muslim Women in America,* pp. 113–118.

14 For an interesting discussion of the mosque in America as public space see A. Kahera, *Deconstructing the American Mosque. Space, Gender and Aesthetics,* Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002, especially ch. 3.

15 K. Keyworth, "Islamic Schools of America," in Haddad et al, *Educating the Muslims in America*, pp. 21–37.

16 It is also some evangelicals, however, who are taking leadership in promoting interfaith dialogue between Christians and Muslims.

Part 2

Anti-terrorism and international constraints

3 The war on terror and Muslims in the West

Mahmood Monshipouri

Introduction

Historically, immigrant groups have been targeted in times of national security crises. The 9/11 attacks, the 2004 Madrid bombings, and the 2005 London transit attacks have further inflamed the view of Islam as the "enemy," an image informed by centuries of Orientalist thinking. The persistence of this perception at the public level has made it virtually impossible to extricate Western Muslims from the external political enemy.[1] The 9/11 attacks have renewed the debate about the tensions between security, immigration law, and civil rights of minorities, especially Arab and Muslim communities in the West. At the same time, a related debate is occurring in Europe over the extent to which homegrown violence reflects the failure to incorporate immigrants into European societies.

Aside from condemning senseless violence, the reactions of the Muslim diaspora to the 9/11 attacks have been mixed. Some Muslims have chosen to retreat from social and cultural life, keeping their distance from the ensuing negative fallout. Others, mostly second- and third-generation Muslims, have resented their host societies' poor treatment of Muslim minorities, turning to their religion as a crucial source of identity and culture. Still others have explored the possibility of reconciling Islam and the West by taking a self-critical approach while arguing that the core messages of Islam, such as equality and egalitarianism, have gained support among other religious groups in Europe and the US. Although it is difficult to foretell which approach will persevere, it is clear that these dynamics – tension and reconciliation – will be influenced by not only the conflict within Muslim communities over whether to create a "trans-cultural space" for a dialogue between different ethnic and religious groups, but also by the various policies of Western governments for the integration and institutionalization of Islam.[2]

The security measures employed by the Bush administration (e.g., extraordinary renditions) have complicated the accommodation of immigrants by the host culture. In Europe, counterterrorism measures have led to discriminatory policies toward Muslim immigrants, especially in the case of nationality or citizenship tests, which tend to undermine the efforts of those Muslims who have sought to bridge their faith with Western values. Such counterterrorism policies are likely to reinforce radical tendencies in diaspora communities, further intensifying identity politics and local unrest.

In this chapter, I explain how counterterrorism measures of the post-9/11 period have exerted a notable impact on the attitudes and policies toward Muslim immigrants in the US and Europe. To better understand the impact that the campaign on terrorism has had on Muslim immigrants, I begin by examining the reasons behind increasing Islamophobia in Europe, followed by a discussion of citizenship tests, and finally Europe's involvement in secret detentions. The chapter's focus will then shift to the issue of how the war on terror has negatively affected Muslim Americans. By applying a comparative analysis, I hope to discern similar and different ways in which Muslim immigrants in the West have embraced integration in some countries and rejected assimilation in others. A recurring theme of this chapter is the need to view integration as a national security matter in an effort to help reshape the debate over the integration issue. In this context, the role of participation and socioeconomic equality of ethnic and cultural minorities is crucial.

Islamophobia in Europe before and after 9/11

In parts of Europe, submissive attitudes toward increasing restrictions on civil liberties have grown in response to rising fear of terrorism. These restrictions have intensified previously existing tensions between Muslim communities and their host countries. If not properly curbed, such tensions have the potential to be highly unsettling for European societies. Some Muslim immigrants lack political confidence in the mainstream institutional processes (police, political parties, and court system) of their host countries. Instead, they have attempted to address their problems via local networks and mechanisms of solidarity. Additionally, ethnic identity persists in large part because of the way in which the Muslim diaspora has been received by the media and the larger Western European society. The media bias against the Muslim diaspora has had a direct impact on the spread of social stigmatization and discrimination against Muslims in European countries.

Throughout Europe Islamic radicalism is partially attributed to the disaffected youth of North African origins or converts. The young French-Moroccan man, who killed the Dutch filmmaker Theo van Gogh, was affiliated with a group of Muslims with no proven direct connection to Al-Qaeda or other transnational Muslim organizations.[3] In general, racism and the de facto inequality in some European countries have expanded the ranks of the discontented. In the post-9/11 era, several factors contributed to the radicalization of a minority within Muslim communities, including a new wave of intolerance toward Muslim immigrants and the widespread economic deprivation as well as social and cultural stigmas associated with these communities. Members of such communities view their segregation in enclaves, or poor suburbs (*banlieues*), as proof of the absence of any prospects for a brighter future. In fact, 2005 French riots had nothing to do with "terror" or "jihad." Rather, as Gilles Kepel notes, the source of the riots lay in France's defective system of integration, which "had failed to offer certain marginalized populations full participation in a vast culture reaching across the Mediterranean to Africa."[4]

It is also important to bear in mind that the French government's concern about social unrest in the *banlieues* related partly to matters of foreign policy. While there is no evidence that the Muslim minority in France has a direct influence on the French foreign policy, the presence of 5 million Muslims does have an indirect impact on diplomacy vis-à-vis the Middle East. This partly explains why President Jacques Chirac disagreed with the US invasion of Iraq in 2003 – a stance reflecting his view that foreign policies and domestic policies were part of a continuum.[5] Regarding the legal restrictions placed on wearing the headscarf or *hijab*, there is no evidence that banning Islamic dress has substantially reduced the risk of Islamic radicalism. To the contrary, such restrictions may well provoke a backlash that could foster extremism. Enforcing the law against wearing the headscarf or *hijab* sends a message to Muslim citizens and immigrants that they are welcome in society only as long as they set their differences – clothing, identity, and beliefs – aside.[6]

Similar challenges to multiculturalism in Europe have sparked debates over the extent to which a common national identity can be constructed to facilitate Muslims' participation in European culture. Equally contentious was the injection of the so-called war on terror into the public discourse, making terrorism integral to understanding international relations and social unrest in Europe. This view reduced Islam to forms of violent extremism and the leading cause of terror and threats to Western hegemony, resulting in increased hostility toward Islamic civilization and Muslim immigrants more generally. It was in this context – one of a growing anti-Muslim atmosphere – that newspapers across Europe reprinted controversial caricatures of the Prophet Mohammad to show support for a Danish newspaper whose cartoons had sparked Muslim outrage throughout the world.[7]

When the Danish newspaper *Jylland-Posten* published 12 cartoons of the Prophet Muhammad in late September 2005, including one in which he is shown wearing a turban shaped as a bomb with a burning fuse, a strong backlash ensued not only in Denmark but also across the globe, including demonstrations in the Indian-controlled part of Kashmir, death threats against the artists, condemnation from 11 Muslim countries, and a rebuke from the United Nations. The publication of these cartoons provoked a fierce national debate over whether Denmark's liberal and secular laws on freedom of speech went too far.[8] When these cartoons were reprinted on February 1, 2006, in France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, and Switzerland, the Muslim world's uproar over insulting the Prophet Muhammad was on display in the streets of Afghanistan, Egypt, Turkey, Pakistan, Iraq, Iran, Indonesia, Malaysia, Lebanon, and the Palestinian territories. Mocking and depicting the Prophet Muhammad wearing a bomb-shaped turban in cartoons, as well as their reprinting by the major European press, were viewed as blasphemous by many Muslims, both in diaspora and homeland. To Muslims, these images were offensive, because they portrayed the Prophet as a bomb-carrying terrorist. To understand the extent of the Muslim outrage, one must note that Islamic law explicitly prohibits the depiction of Prophet Muhammad's image in any shape or form, let alone in an offensive manner.

It is evident that the policies, rules, attitudes, and regulations of a host society in Europe partly determine the course that Islamism adopts within that society. The context of the host society shapes not only the relationship between Islamic movements and the host community but also the form that the Islamist rhetoric takes. Despite the widely held view that Islamic associations are undemocratic, a comparative study of Islamism in Germany and the Netherlands demonstrates that Islamic groups vary greatly in ideology and method. They can become either a counter-hegemonic force that jeopardizes the democratic order of the host country, or a potential force for democratization of the Islamic community. What role Islamic associations in Europe play is largely influenced by the social, economic, and political structure within which Islamists operate. Consider, for example, the case of *Milli Görüş*, one of the most important Islamic movements among the Turkish immigrant community in Europe. *Milli Görüş* in Germany is an Islamist movement that adopts a strong anti-Western posture and is treated as an "Islamist extremist group" by the German Federal Ministry of the Interior. *Milli Görüş* in the Netherlands, by contrast, cooperates with the local Dutch authorities on promoting the integration of Muslims into Dutch society.[9]

While discrimination and exclusion by the host society cause feelings of insecurity, isolation, and thus radicalization within the Muslim community in Germany, inclusive policies in the Netherlands aimed at incorporating immigrants into the host society culminate in a hopeful integrationist Islamist discourse that encompasses democratic ideals. Comparison of the German and Dutch cases reveals that Islamic movements can generate an undemocratic discourse and challenge hegemonic political institutions and practices of the host society in the face of discrimination and exclusion, while they can alternatively be a potent force for the democratization of the Islamic community under the conditions of justice, tolerance, and equality.[10]

Some experts have rejected the argument that religion drives both Islamic culture and politics. Transnational networks and forces have transformed the views of the younger generation of Muslims, especially those who live in diaspora. Such a transformation may be a short-term generational phenomenon. However, if it turns out to be a long-term development, Europeans must search for pragmatic solutions to Islamophobia and discrimination against their Muslim minorities. It may just be the case that second- and third-generation European Muslims seem intent on constructing a new and critical Islam.[11]

On balance, concerns about the place of Islam within the Western public sphere, which is directly linked to the continued influx of immigrants, are certain to result in further backlash against Muslim immigrants – a development that is likely to worsen as fear of an economic recession hovers over the continent. The upshot is that the majority of Muslim immigrants, who are either moderate or identify with moderates, are tainted with the guilt of the minority.[12] A growing number of Europeans have expressed concerns over the welfare system, arguing that the system is overtaxed by non-natives. Approximately 50 percent of immigrants, according to one study, are "caught up in various forms of welfare benefits."[13] In most Western European countries, with the exception of Spain and Portugal, leftist and centrist parties have lost elections, with the majority of electorates supporting governments that are marching to the beat of a nationalist anti-immigrant drum.[14]

In 2006, the then Prime Minister Tony Blair's Communities Secretary Ruth Kelly launched a study commission to examine whether multiculturalism was causing greater social isolation, extremism, and ethnic minority divisions. This investigation was provoked by those critics who argued that multiculturalism had encouraged Britons to elevate Islamic values over British values. Critics noted that local government funding has helped segregate communities and that given the absence of promoting a majoritarian culture, Islamic radicalism has interposed. In its report, the commission struck down the term multiculturalism in favor of "community cohesion," indicating the government's growing anxiety over its earlier approach.[15] Others, such as Sarah Spencer, associate director at the University of Oxford's Center on Migration, Policy, and Society and former deputy chairwoman of the government's Commission for Racial Equality, have noted that rather than multiculturalism causing the separation, the factors that have contributed the most to ethnic segregation have stemmed from mundane socioeconomic conditions such as housing clusters in poor neighborhoods.[16]

The analysis presented above indicates that the struggle for socioeconomic equality and participation does not necessarily imply the promotion of a homogenization of cultures. One can further argue that cultural assimilation in this case is used as a euphemism to allay the larger population's Islamophobic fears. It should be the government's intent to use multiculturalism in the preservation of minority cultures and social institutions in a way that does not force assimilation onto the dominant ethnicity or culture. There is still a great deal of uncertainty concerning the capacity of European governments and communities to embrace multiculturalism, giving rise to the question of whether socioeconomic integration would necessarily bring about cultural integration.

Coercive integration and citizenship tests

Although not completely novel, citizenship or nationality tests and integration courses have triggered debates over the emerging coercive integration policies across Europe, especially after 9/11. The emergence of these obligatory civic integration courses and tests for newcomers, some experts note, make a strong case in favor of policy convergence across Europe. These convergent policies reflect a fundamental shift from an "old" liberalism of nondiscrimination and equal opportunity to a "new" liberalism of power and discipline.[17] This simply means that the pendulum has swung from cultural recognition – that is, respect for migrants' own language and culture – to the enforcement of the core values of liberalism.[18]

In the migration domain, the formal introduction of citizenship tests has caused substantial controversy. Some see such tests as a knee-jerk, populist reaction to fear of the newcomers.[19] Others view these tests as emblematic of a return to the familiar ideal of the cohesive nation and strong nation-building in the wake of the large-scale influx of immigrants into the European Union.[20] The emphasis on language skills as a precondition for acceptance supports this view. The test is indeed "a tool for the state to promote linguistic assimilation and part of renewed attempts to achieve the old ideal of a linguistically cohesive citizenry."[21]

Still others believe that by taking part in the political life or the civil society of their adopted countries, new citizens will be better equipped to avoid the problems implicit in the ghettoization of immigrant communities.[22] Another closely related discourse, albeit from a different perspective, is that immigrants who become naturalized citizens are likely to become far more integrated into their new country than those who remain noncitizen residents – or "denizens."[23] The written test has the advantage of a pass/fail scenario that ends the power of the individual immigration officer to decide whether an applicant is eligible for citizenship.

Civic integration policies for immigrants originated in the Netherlands in the late 1990s. These policies were a response to the obvious failure of multiculturalism to advance the socioeconomic integration of immigrants and their offspring.[24] Increasingly, but especially after the 2002 assassination of the right-wing and populist Dutch politician Pim Fortuyn, who was killed not by a Muslim immigrant but rather by Volker van der Graaf, an animal rights activist, the coercive dimension of civic integration programs was pushed to the country's political forefront. To become a fully fledged citizen via naturalization in the Netherlands, for example, immigrants are generally required to be adequately integrated. This policy has become a general tenet of the European liberal democracy period. Yet at the same time, as one expert notes, "the supposedly difference-friendly, multicultural Netherlands is currently urging migrants to accept 'Dutch norms and values' in the context of a policy of civic integration that is only an inch (but still an inch!) away from the cultural assimilation that had once been attributed to the French."[25]

European nationality tests have arguably replaced the vague concept of integration. The increasing presence of immigrants in society has led to the concern that state identity is at risk and that the protection of historical and national heritage is vital to maintaining stability, patriotism, and even security.[26] In April 2003, a four-hour, partially computerized naturalization test was introduced in the Netherlands. The passing of the test required sufficient oral fluency and written skills, as well as background knowledge of Dutch society. The 2003 Act led to a dramatic drop in applications for naturalization. Compared with 2002, 70 percent fewer applications were filed in 2004.[27]

On April 1, 2007, this naturalization test was abolished. Since that date, both applicants for Dutch nationality and immigrants applying for permanent residence must pass the same "integration examination."[28] Evidence has shown that the test clearly disadvantages weaker groups in society – the elderly, illiterate people, or those with little or no education – as opposed to groups that have few problems integrating into the nation.[29] The decrease in the number of naturalization applications raises the issue of whether this actually was a desired effect of the naturalization policy. What remains unclear is the ultimate purpose of the new policy: was it intended for the further integration of future citizens, or further reduction of the number of foreign naturalizations?[30] It is to the latter that some critics turn by arguing that, as in Germany, the nationality tests in the Netherlands are generally used as a tool to control the level and composition of immigration, rather than to establish qualifications for citizenship.[31]

The new immigrants are tested on their tolerance of the Netherlands' open sexual culture and liberal society. Immigrants should know, for instance, that nude bathing is legal in the Netherlands. The process of naturalization also involves a DVD ("Coming to the Netherlands") meant to make immigrants ready for life in the "tolerant" Netherlands by showing them images of topless female bathers and gay men kissing.[32] In addition, imams of Dutch mosques must also attend a mandatory course on Dutch law, covering among other things, the rights of women and freedom of speech. These new citizenship tests are typically accompanied by new requirements for visas, tougher border control, and greater enforcements of regulation pertaining to work permits. These efforts constitute anti-immigration measures.[33]

Further controversy has arisen regarding the Citizenship Tests Abroad Act (*Wet Inburgeringsexamen Buitenland*) initiated by the then immigration minister Rita Verdonk and ratified in March 2006. This act, also known as "integration from abroad," makes the Dutch integration program one of the most draconian in the European Union. According to this act, foreign nationals wanting to join their families in the Netherlands have to take the nationality tests in their countries of origin. Their knowledge of the Dutch language and culture is evaluated via telephone links at Dutch embassies and consulates. These candidates are required to answer questions set by computer, which they may or may not have knowledge of how to work with. Questions are randomly chosen by a computer from a preexisting database. Human Rights Watch argues that the Turkish and Moroccan communities are disproportionately affected by this law, as they constitute the largest groups of immigrants requesting family reunions.[34]

Those observers who argue that Turkish and Moroccan ethnicities in the Netherlands have a high propensity for in-group marriage offer a counterpoint. Most second- and third-generation Turks and Moroccans select a marriage partner in their parents' country of origin. Studies have shown that 70 percent of the Turkish youth and more than 50 percent of the Moroccan youth marry a partner from their parents' home country. The offspring of such unions are raised in ethnically closed families, thus preserving the ethnic segregation that characterizes the Turkish and Moroccan communities at large in the Netherlands.[35]

Moreover, immigrants from other parts of the world, including Australia, Japan, Canada, New Zealand, South Korea, and the US are not required to take the test. Surinamese citizens who are capable of showing that they have followed basic schooling in Dutch also are exempt. Human Rights Watch considers this act blatantly discriminatory, noting that it clearly sends out the message that certain groups are not welcome. This policy is likely to alienate rather than integrate these communities into Dutch society.[36]

In Germany, integration debate took a coercive turn in the aftermath of the May 2006 events, when "honor killings" in the Turkish immigrant milieu and ethnic violence in a Berlin public school sparked a public outrage over integration policies. Responding to the public outrage, German authorities passed fresh requirements for naturalization, including the attendance of civic integration courses and passing standard language tests.[37] Since 2006, the southern German state of Baden-Württemberg and the state of Hesse have been testing prospective citizens on their views on the country's constitution and Western values. The tests appear to have targeted a single social group: Muslims. Baden-Württemberg requires an education course and a 30-question oral test to determine whether immigrants support issues pertaining to women's rights and religious diversity. Some state officials suggest that the exam may be illegal, stating that one provision allows citizenship to be removed if it is later found that an applicant hid his/her true religious or puritan tendencies. Question 27 is typical: "Some people consider the Jews responsible for all the evil in the world and even claim they were behind the September 11 attacks in New York. What do you think about such suggestions?" The nationality test in the state of Hesse entails about ten queries aimed at Muslims, including whether a woman should be allowed in public unaccompanied by a male relative.[38]

The European Assembly of Turkish Academics has denounced the nationality test as "strongly discriminatory and racist" against the country's population of 3 million Muslims.[39] Kerim Arpad, an assembly spokesperson echoed a similar sentiment: "The test is shaped by stereotypes and damages integration."[40] A cursory look at some questions raised in nationality tests illustrates the prevalence of such stereotypical images of male Muslim immigrants: "Imagine that your adult son comes to you and says he is homosexual and plans to live with another man. How do you react? Your daughter or sister comes home and says she has been sexually molested. What do you do as father/mother/brother/sister? What do you think if a man in Germany is married to two women at the same time? In Germany you can decide whether to visit a male or female doctor. In certain cases, though, this is not possible: emergencies, shift changes at the hospital. In such cases, would you rather be treated or operated on by a female doctor (male applicants) or a male doctor (female applicants)?"[41]

The interview and the nationality test end by requesting applicants to sign a statement that threatens them with the loss of citizenship should they fail to act according to the results of their attitude test.[42] The questions summarized above clearly contradict both the spirit and legal protections granted by the German constitution; among them the protection against the elimination of citizenship if it results in the citizen becoming stateless. Article 3 of the German constitution states that, "No one may be discriminated against or favored due to their ancestry, race, language, place of origin, or their religious or political beliefs."[43]

Since September 1, 2008, prospective Germans are required to take a new citizenship test, which includes 33 questions on politics and democracy, history and responsibility, and man and society – of which they must answer at least 17 correctly. These questions are intended to test the applicant's knowledge and understanding of German society, but not to address matters of conscience, as was the case in the German state of Hesse. In addition to passing the new test, prospective citizens must fulfill several other conditions. An applicant needs to have lived in Germany for eight years, possess a sufficient grasp of the German language, have no previous criminal record, earn a secure living, and commit to upholding Germany's constitution.[44] Many of Germany's immigrants – largely from Turkey, Pakistan, Chechnya, and the former Yugoslavia – say that the citizenship test is another barrier for legal permanent residents hoping to become Germans. Likewise, human rights groups have warned that the new test will simply deter many people from applying for German citizenship in the future.[45] In recent years, the number of applications for German citizenship has fallen. In 2000, for example, 186,688 people obtained German nationality compared to only 126,000 in 2007.[46]

A similar trend toward restrictive immigration policies has emerged in France. President Nicolas Sarkozy has called for selective immigration that entails, among other things, DNA testing, language exams, and proof of financial independence.[47] A law was passed in France on November 15, 2001, known as the "Law of Daily Security," which led to greater harassment of Muslim immigrants, increasing the power of the police in confronting terrorism.[48]

Both Belgium and Germany have adopted a tougher approach toward asylum seekers by setting tighter requirements in terms of income, language skill, and length of stay. In 2006, the UK passed the Immigration, Asylum, and National Act, removing several appeal rights for asylum seekers. Similarly, the 2006 Prevention of Terrorism Act, passed in the aftermath of the July 2005 attacks in London, expanded the discretionary powers granted to both the Home Office and the police.[49] On balance, it can be argued that in the majority of European countries it has become increasingly difficult for asylum seekers to obtain financial support, employment, long-term security, and citizenship.[50]

Even more radical and negative reactions toward multiculturalism have appeared in European countries. The Flemish Interest Party (*Vlaams Belang*) in Belgium has viewed immigration as a threat to the Flemish people and culture, warning of the growing threat of Islamic radicalism, as evidenced by the increase in the number of new mosques and state funding for Muslim organizations. The party now insists on the assimilation of Muslim immigrants to Western values, claiming that Islam runs counter to democratic principles and practices, and that Muslims must choose between religion and democracy.[51]

In the UK, a law was passed on November 13, 2001, known as the British Anti-terrorism, Crime, and Security Bill, which greatly increased the power of the police and military to demand financial records, email, postal communication, and transportation records. The introduction of citizenship requirements ("sufficient" language and knowledge of life in the UK) since April 2007 has blurred the distinction between citizenship as "nationality" and citizenship as "active participation."[52] The proponents of this new policy tend to emphasize more active participation and integration as the basis for permanent residency, rather than the legal status of nationality.[53]

Europe's involvement in secret detentions

The security measures in the aftermath of 9/11 played out in Europe in several ways, but none more overtly than the European governments' involvement in secret detention sites and their severe consequences for constitutional rights of Europeans and the detainees themselves. In response to the rising wave of Islamic terrorism in Europe and the US following the 9/11 attacks, there emerged an acute sense that Europeans and Americans must coordinate their counterterrorism efforts. Achieving that aim, however, carried risks and complexities. The practice of handing over terror suspects to other countries for interrogation – also called extraordinary rendition – has placed the US and its European allies in a precarious position with respect to the rights and protections enunciated in the Geneva Conventions.

The notion that constitutional rights of detainees must be bypassed to help win the war on terror has generated a great deal of controversy around the world. In addition to controversial issues surrounding the legality and morality of detention, the use of torture and illegal interrogation tactics, which often generate and distribute false information, has proved problematic.[54] Some of the CIA "black sites," secret places where the so-called "high value targets" had been disappeared for interrogation, became notorious detention facilities where a variety of harsh interrogation tactics, such as waterboarding, were exercised. These suspects, one expert writes, "were true ghost prisoners, undeclared to the Red Cross, and held, in some cases, for years without any outside communication, even with their families."[55] Some of these sites were located in such Eastern Europe countries as Poland and Rumania.[56] Ironically, the Eastern European countries, persuaded by the CIA to participate in these illegal transfers involving Al- Qaeda captives, were transitional democracies that had embraced the rule of law and individual rights after decades of Soviet domination. The leaders of these countries have been attempting to cleanse their intelligence services of operatives who have either abused their powers in the name of intelligence gathering or have had illicit connections with organized crime.[57]

Some detainees were moved to new "black sites" in the Middle East and North Africa, later revealed to be Syria, Morocco, and Egypt. A plethora of declassified and leaked documents revealed that these practices were sanctioned as policy by American authorities at the highest levels. To avoid the issue of the legality of such practices – since it is illegal for the government to hold prisoners in such isolation in secret prisons in the US – the CIA carried them out overseas. Legal experts and intelligence officials have argued that the CIA's internment practices also would be deemed illegal under the laws of several host countries, where detainees have rights to have a lawyer or to seek defense against allegations of wrongdoing.[58]

Many other European countries have worked closely with United States agencies in their dealings with European nationals, sometimes in cooperation with European national intelligence and other agencies, in the context of the war on terror. Amnesty International has reported that:

> Police in Bosnia and Herzegovina arrested Mustafa Aït Idir and five other men. An Italian officer aided the abduction of Usama Mostafa Hassan Nasr, usually known as Abu Omar, in Milan. Macedonian officials seized Khaled el-Masri. Swedish police picked up Ahmed Agiza and Mohammed El Zari. Information supplied by German security forces may have led to the arrest of Muhammad Zammar in Morocco, and telegrams sent by UK security forces resulted in the detention of Bisher Al-Rawi and Jamil El-Banna in the Gambia.[59]

All of these detainees were transferred to the custody of another state. Some were transferred from US custody to countries where they faced torture or other ill-treatment. Others were transferred to detention centers in Afghanistan or Guantanamo Bay. All were sent to places where due process was not in place. Some were victims of enforced disappearance while in US custody. All claim that they have been tortured or otherwise ill-treated.[60] Yet to this date, there has been no known criminal investigation of US military officers for authorizing or participating in the illegal transfer of these detainees from occupied territories in violation of the Geneva Conventions, as well as the illegal rendition of detainees in violation of the Convention against Torture (CAT). The Bush administration continued the program of enforced disappearances of individuals in violation of several treaties as well as customary international law.[61]

The role of European states in renditions and secret detentions, according to Amnesty International, has ranged from active participation to tacit collusion. European agents have turned detained suspects over to US custody without judicial process. They have directly participated in illegal arrests, in one case helping US agents arrest a suspect in Italy before his rendition to Egypt. Europe's airports have been freely used by CIA-operated planes to transport victims of renditions to interrogation facilities and secret incommunicado detention locations around the world. Between 2003 and 2005, Europe was host to secret prisons run by the CIA, where detainees were frequently subjected to torture or other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment.[62]

Cracking down on terrorism and Muslim Americans

Since 9/11, Arab and Muslim Americans have been singled out for particularly egregious treatment as a result of anti-terror measures and laws. The push for the enforcement of such laws has been widely construed as targeting young, Muslim males. In fact, one expert notes, Muslims have become America's newest race, subjected to the same type of bigoted treatment that has been historically reserved for people of color such as Blacks, Latino, Asians, and Native Americans.[63] In its 2001 annual report on hate crimes, the FBI identified an over 1600 percent increase in reported hate crimes against Arab Americans, Muslims, and even Sikhs, who resemble Muslims.[64]

Many Muslim Americans today feel that their lives have become markedly more difficult. They feel their businesses, homes, and mosques have come under surveillance. Their reactions to 9/11 have been mixed. While many Muslims took refuge in their faith, growing more devout, others retreated into their private lives.[65] US anti-terrorism policy has compelled Muslims – especially Muslim American college youths – to come together and help to forge and preserve a unifying identity among different Muslim communities. Other events, such as the ethnic profiling of Muslims by government and law enforcement officials, have increased cooperation between Muslim Americans of different ethnic backgrounds.[66]

However, the diversity of ethnic, cultural, and theological backgrounds of American Muslims renders it impossible to imagine a single homogenous unit of American Muslims. Second- and third-generation immigrants and native-born Muslims are struggling to bridge their faith with American values and culture. The Muslims' role and participation in American politics and culture remains an unresolved issue. In fact, many scholars argue that, "the problem of how to live as Muslim in America is just as complicated as that of how to reconcile the diversities among Muslims."[67] The diversity of Muslims has made their plight more complicated than simply being that of a product of global immigration, African American nationalism, or one minority group's struggle for social justice. Instead, the dynamic of change may dissolve the old identity or create a new social assimilation scheme.[68] The lasting role of anti-terrorism policies in America may have compelled or accelerated the cohesion of many Muslim communities toward cooperation with their adopted country.

The USA Patriot Act, passed in October 2001 and renewed in 2006, put into place new surveillance guidelines for US law enforcement agencies. The Patriot Act was approved with little debate by lawmakers, many of whom later conceded that they had not seriously examined the bill, which greatly expanded the powers of law enforcement to intrude on the daily lives of American citizens and legal residents. Almost immediately, Muslims in America became targets of law enforcement operations in the name of homeland security. Attorney General John Ashcroft directed the FBI to interview 5,000 legal immigrants from Muslim countries, even though there was little or no evidence that linked these people to terrorist activity, or any knowledge that would aid and abet their investigation.[69] Ashcroft also ordered the special registration and fingerprinting of young males from 25 countries – with the exception of North Korea, all were Muslim or Middle Eastern Arabs.[70]

The federal government, according to the Patriot Act, has adopted a series of new powers that include electronic surveillance of phone conversations, bank accounts, Internet records, and even library lending lists. The "sneak-and-peak" provision of the Patriot Act (Section 213) allows law enforcement agencies to conduct secret searches of a citizen's premises without a valid warrant or even prior notification to the owner. Investigators may enter a citizen's place of residence, take pictures, search and download computer files, and seize items without informing the resident of the search until days, weeks, or even months later.[71] American Muslims, and especially Arab Americans, believe they are unfairly targeted by these new expansions of power. The Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) has observed a steady rise in civil rights abuse cases since 9/11. In 2004 alone, it received 1,522 reports of abuse.[72] Critical of the media and the federal courts, which have been all too complacent in the face of the Bush administration's response to the terrorism threat, some observers have noted that "The Patriot Act . . . [is] a loaded gun lying on the table, aimed at the heart of American democracy, ready for the hand of anyone . . . who would fire it."[73]

In July 2003, the Clear Law Enforcement for Criminal Alien Removal Act (CLEAR) gave local police the power to enforce federal immigration laws. The enforcement of the Patriot Act and CLEAR Act, which led to the creation of a fortress America, came at the expense of civil rights of many

Muslim Americans. According to the seventh annual report of CAIR, "government policies after 9/11 have negatively affected 60,000 American Muslims."[74]

Some 54 percent of Muslims, according to Pew Research Center, indicated that the war on terror singled out Muslims.[75] The social inclusion of US Muslims stands in sharp contrast to what is transpiring in Europe, where Muslims are often economically and socially excluded. Nonetheless, even in a country where Muslims are relatively assimilated, Arab Americans have become the targets of widespread discriminatory acts and hate crimes. The Patriot Act and other counterterrorism measures have infringed upon the civil liberties of Arab and Muslim immigrants who have been detained in various investigations. Despite the fact that many of the accused Muslim detainees have had no connections to terrorists, they have sustained widespread abuse in detention centers. Other efforts by the Department of Justice (DOJ) to combat terrorism, including unleashing a series of high-profile initiatives that explicitly target Arabs and Muslims, have not only resulted in the detention of thousands of people, but also facilitated workplace discrimination and fear in the Arab American community.[76]

In the immediate aftermath of 9/11, the DOJ rounded up at least 1200 immigrants, the vast majority of whom were Arab or Muslim. While refusing to release any information about the detainees, the DOJ alleged that the detentions were linked to the 9/11 investigations. In 2002, the DOJ's Inspector General concluded that the designation of detainees of interest to the 9/11 investigation was "indiscriminate and haphazard," failing to sufficiently distinguish between terrorism suspects and other immigrant detainees.[77] These abuses have harmed the ability of the US government to be a credible advocate for democratic reforms in the Middle East. Another political fallout from such abuses has been the damage done to the US ability to deal more effectively with the fundamental causes of terrorism.[78]

Some Muslims in the US have turned to a self-critical debate about Islam and their faith. These Muslims, caught in the process of redefining what it means to be a Muslim, have become interested in shifting the terms of the debate away from radicals.[79] For their part, American Muslims are likely to foster the spread of new dynamics of Islamic ideas and identity politics. American Muslims, like their European counterparts, have malleable but distinct identities, woven from multiple narratives. Arguing that the culture of hate, martyrdom, and killing is tearing apart the moral fabric of Muslim societies, one Muslim observer notes that, "The biggest victims of hate-filled politics as embodied in the actions of several Muslim militias all over the world are Muslims themselves."[80]

In the case of *Padilla v. Bush*, the tensions between protecting individual liberties and national security came to the surface. On May 8, 2002, Jose Padilla, an American Muslim citizen, was arrested in Chicago and transferred to New York. On June 9, 2002, President Bush signed a secret order, designating Padilla as an illegal "enemy combatant," arguing that he was thereby not entitled to trial in civilian courts. Padilla was moved to a naval brig in Charleston, South Carolina, where he remained in military prison for the next three and half years as an "enemy combatant" held without charge. The Bush administration insisted, in Padilla's case as with other enemy combatants, that these subjects are to be held indefinitely.[81] Padilla's case was eventually moved to a civilian court under pressure from civil liberties groups.

On January 3, 2006, Padilla was transferred to a Miami, Florida jail to face criminal conspiracy charges. On August 16, 2007, Padilla was found guilty by a federal jury. The final charges against him included conspiracy in the killing of victims in an overseas jihad operation and funding overseas terrorism. He was described in the media as suspected of planning to build and detonate a "dirty bomb" in the US, though he was not convicted on that charge. On January 22, 2008, Padilla was sentenced by Judge Marcia G. Cooke of the US District Court for the Southern District of Florida to 17 years and 4 months in prison.

In a highly controversial move, the Bush team resumed the use of military commissions to try "enemy combatants." The executive branch's expanding powers were checked by two notable Supreme Court decisions: *Yaser E. Hamdi v. Rumsfeld* in July 2004 and *Hamdan v. Rumsfeld* in June 2006. These cases show the limits to the prerogative of the president to authorize unlimited detention of American citizens. In both the Guantanamo case (*Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*) and the *Hamdan* case, the court decided to apply similar standards to noncitizens being held at the Guantanamo Bay.[82] The case of *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld* illuminated yet another painful and costly dilemma in which civil liberties of an American Muslim citizen were traded for vague Executive Branch claims involving national security.[83] Yaser E. Hamdi was captured in Afghanistan and later relocated to Guantanamo Bay and then to a naval brig in Norfolk, Virginia, where Mr. Hamdi was labeled as an "enemy combatant."

According to government prosecutors and Bush administration officials, Mr. Hamdi had no right to legal counsel. The US Supreme Court decision reversed the dismissal of a *habeas corpus* petition brought forth on behalf of Hamdi. The Supreme Court recognized the power of the government to detain unlawful combatants, but ruled that detainees who are US citizens must have the ability to challenge their detention before an impartial judge. On June 29, 2006, the Supreme Court issued a 5–3 decision holding that military commissions set up by the Bush administration to try detainees at the Guantanamo Bay lack "the power to proceed," because the structures and procedures of such military commissions violate both the Uniform Code of Military Justice and the four Geneva Conventions of 1949. But more to the point, the court argued that the Bush administration had no authority to set up these particular military commissions without congressional authorization.

Most of the procedural illegalities identified by the Supreme Court in the case of *Hamdan v. Rumsfeld* were related to the Military Commissions Act

(MCA) of 2006. Many constitutional problems surrounded the creation of military commissions outside war zone or war-related occupied territories and absent the context of an actual war. The Act justified discrimination on the basis of national origin, denial of equality of treatment, and denial of justice to aliens. Under the Act, only an "alien unlawful enemy combatant is subject to trial by military commission."[84] The problem with categorizing enemy combatants as "unlawful" and "lawful" is that, under certain conditions, aliens entitled to prisoner of war status under the Geneva Conventions might be mislabeled as "unlawful" enemy combatants. They will thus be subject to trial in a military commission in violation of Article 102 of Geneva Prisoner of War statutes, which requires trial in the same tribunals using the same procedures as the trials of US service members.[85]

The process of "disappearing persons," or turning them into "ghost detainees" went on unabated, as did the policy of "rendering" suspects to coercive interrogations in places like Uzbekistan and Egypt.[86] Once a low-profile counterterrorism tool, the practice of rendition has become integral to US intelligence-gathering efforts since the 9/11 attacks. The case of Maher Arar demonstrates the flaws of such counterterrorist practices. Arar, a Syrian-born Canadian telecommunications engineer who became a Canadian citizen, was detained at New York's John F. Kennedy Airport by the US Immigration and Naturalization officials on September 26, 2002. He was deported to Syria, where he was tortured and detained for nearly a year, only to be released on October 5, 2003, following an effective Canadian "quiet diplomacy."[87] There is ample evidence that planes operated by the CIA flew through and landed at airports in Finland, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Poland, Portugal, and Spain. Many European governments are reluctant to push Washington on the rendition charges, fearing that their own intelligence agencies' cooperation with CIA operations may be revealed.[88]

Similarly, on November 7, 2001, Liban Hussein, a Somalia-born Canadian citizen was placed on a list of 62 people accused by the US government of supporting terrorism. Hussein ran Barakaat North America Inc., a money-transfer business known as *hawalas*. The Bush administration claimed that *hawalas* funneled money from the US to terrorist organizations including al Qaeda. But when the Canadian government could not produce evidence of terrorism, Liban Hussein was cleared of charges.[89] The radicalization of citizenship is bound to pose serious challenges to Muslim diaspora communities seeking integration into Western societies.

The growing disaffection among immigrants, aggravated by increasing resentment toward wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, has led to myriad security anxieties among Arab and Muslim communities in Europe and the US. The question of whether security imperatives have compromised democratic principles of Western states has become a deeply divisive issue among both US allies in the West and Muslim immigrants. Furthermore, a steady diet of images of Israeli oppression of Palestinians and the American collusion in that oppression has created conditions among the masses that assure the terrorists of sympathy and support.[90]

In sum, the above analysis demonstrates that US policies of cracking down on terrorism in the post-9/11 era – largely in the form of arrests, interrogations, detentions, military commissions, the use of torture, rendition, deportation, and special registration requirements – have specifically targeted South Asian and Middle Eastern Arab and Muslim immigrants in the US. The cases reviewed in this section suggest that these groups have become targeted as suspected "terrorists" and that anti-Arab and Muslim policies have particularly tainted enforcement measures. For the most part, the fears and warnings about immigrants as national security threats are exaggerated.[91] The Vera Institute of Justice, a nonprofit policy research center based in New York, reported in 2006 that programs such as Special Registration, in which more than 80,000 immigrant men were fingerprinted, photographed, and questioned by the authorities, provided a way to punish even those with minor immigration violations.[92]

Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to show that a sustained and broad-based integration of immigrants into their host societies is likely to diminish homegrown terrorism in the West. The deep interconnection between security and integration has never been more apparent. As noted above, national security is more contingent upon the way in which Muslim Europeans are integrated into their host societies rather than how restrictive immigration laws and policies are. Yet in perilous times, integration policies tend to come under attack. As concern about violent extremism grows in the West, European governments are rethinking their approaches to integration. Recent strictures intended to heighten European security have exposed immigrants and ethnic minorities, especially Muslims, to mistreatment and discrimination. At the same time, many Muslim Americans have been abducted, detained indefinitely, and denied access to courts or lawyers to contest the legality of their detention. Moreover, the convergence of criminal law enforcement and immigration laws underscores the persistent tension between Muslim immigrants and their host countries.

Whereas the negative reactions to Muslim migrants in Europe reflect a grassroots level discontent with multiculturalism, there is a much higher degree of multicultural tolerance in the US. Second-generation European Muslims feel socially and economically alienated. Their exclusion tends to foster resentment toward the political and cultural structures of the host countries, making them vulnerable to the recruitment campaigns of extremist Islamic organizations. In the US, by contrast, such sentiments of alienation and economic deprivation have been minimized in large part because even though they are only first-generation immigrants 77 percent are citizens. Due to their diverse backgrounds, Muslims in both Europe and the

US do not form a homogenous group.[93] Yet Muslim Americans enjoy much better socioeconomic conditions because they are not concentrated in pockets of poverty and disaffection. Rather, they benefit from an integrative process and a multicultural environment, even as expressions of racism and Islamophobia have intensified in the US following 9/11.[94]

To many observers, citizenship tests and civic integration programs in Europe represent an effort to prevent migration rather than promote the integration of immigrants and ethnic minorities. A more nuanced focus, rather than the prevailing security-oriented perspectives, is needed to alleviate the situation. Despite the fact that the "Dutch model" has quietly launched civic integration programs into the rest of Europe, linking immigration and border control – with the overarching need to combat terrorism – has failed to generate an enhanced ability to respond to terrorist threats. There are several basic reasons for this. First, Europe still depends on immigrants, as its aging population leaves it no other alternative. Second, European leaders continue to regard integration and security as entirely separate issues, with migration policies largely directed at meeting goals of economic growth and welfare. Third, evidence shows that using border control and restrictive asylum policies as a way to improve internal security has proven utterly ineffective.[95] Finally, numerous domestic measures focused on internal surveillance have failed to identify and isolate radical fringes or groups. In short, the failure to integrate Muslim immigrants has become a major source of insecurity in Europe.[96]

There is a need for promoting socioeconomic reform in Europe that brings material well-being and cultural inclusion to Muslim immigrants. Western governments should not treat the tensions associated with the war on terror simply as an immigration and border control issue. Terrorism, as one expert notes, is a multi-causal social phenomenon that has psychological, social, and economic explanations. Rather than blaming ideologies or religions, we should identify the forces within all ideologies and religions, as well as personal motivations, that drive a minority of adherents to violent extremism.[97] To effectively deal with these issues, it is necessary to support efforts to integrate Muslim immigrants into the socioeconomic fabric of their host societies. Failure to do so will fuel Islamic radicalism and spark social unrest of the sort that broke out in October 2005 in the suburbs surrounding Paris, Lyons, and other French cities. There is little doubt that Muslims have become a permanent presence in the West, and even less doubt that they and their host countries together must find a way to negotiate a mutually acceptable future.

Notes

1 J. Cesari, *When Islam and Democracy Meet: Muslims in Europe and the United States*, New York: Palgrave, 2004, p. 175.
2 Cesari, *When Islam and Democracy Meet*, p. 181.

3 F. Khosrokhavar, "Terrorism in Europe," in D.S. Hamilton (ed.) *Terrorism and International Relations*, Washington, D.C.: Center for Transatlantic Relations, 2006, pp. 27–28. (For a more detailed discussion see pp. 23–37.)

4 G. Kepel, *Beyond Terror and Martyrdom: The Future of the Middle East*, Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008, p. 256.

5 J. Laurence and J. Vaisse, *Integrating Islam: Political and Religious Challenges in Contemporary France*, Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 2006, pp. 220–221.

6 B. Saul, "Wearing Thin: Restrictions on Islamic Headscarves and Other Religious Symbols," in J. McAdam (ed.) *Forced Migration, Human Rights and Security*, Portland: Hart Publishing, 2008, pp. 181–212; see esp. p. 212.

7 Kepel, *Beyond Terror,* p. 213.

8 D. Bilefsky, "Denmark Is Unlikely Front in Islam-West Culture War," *The New York Times*, January 8, 2006, p. A3.

9 G. Tol, "What Type of Islamism for Europe? Islamism in Germany and the Netherlands," *Insight Turkey*, 11(1), 2009, 133–149; see esp. pp. 133–134.

10 Tol, "What Type," pp. 145–147.

11 P. Mandaville, *Transnational Muslim Politics: Reimaging the Umma*, New York: Routledge, 2004.

12 J.S. Neilsen, "Islam in Europe: Review Article," in *Middle East Journal*, 62(1), Winter 2008, 144–148; see esp. p. 145.

13 H.T. Satiroglu (January 29, 2009) "The Rise of the Right: Europe's Scary Solution to Immigration." Online. Available HTTP http://www.alternet.org/immigration/122868/the_rise_of_the_right:_europe's_scary_solution_to_immigration (accessed March 12, 2009).

14 Ibid.

15 S. Glazer, "Radical Islam in Europe," in *Global Issues: 2009 Edition*, Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 2009, pp. 81–113; see esp. p. 90.

16 Glazer, "Radical Islam," p. 91.

17 C. Joppke, "Transformation of Immigrant Integration: Civic Integration and Antidiscrimination in the Netherlands, France, and Germany," *World Politics*, 59, 2007, 243–273; see esp. p. 244.

18 C. Joppke, "Beyond National Models: Civic Integration Policies for Immigrants in Western Europe," *West European Politics*, 30(1), 2007, 1–22; see esp. pp. 2–4.

19 S. Wright, "Citizenship Tests in Europe – Editorial Introduction," *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 10(1), 2008, 1–9.

20 Wright, "Citizenship," p. 2.

21 Wright, "Citizenship," p. 3.

22 Ibid.

23 M.M. Howard, "The Politics of Immigration and Citizenship in Europe," in Carol M. Swain (ed.) *Debating Immigration*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp. 237–253; see esp. pp. 242–243.

24 Joppke, "Transformation," p. 249.

25 Joppke, "Beyond National Models," p. 2.

26 R. van Oers, "From Liberal to Restrictive Citizenship Policies: The Case of the Netherlands," *International Journal of Multicultural Societies*, 10(1), 2008, 40–59; see esp. p. 41.

27 van Oers, "From Liberal to Restrictive," pp. 49–50.

28 van Oers, "From Liberal to Restrictive," p. 41.

29 van Oers, "From Liberal to Restrictive," p. 56.

30 van Oers, "From Liberal to Restrictive," p. 58.

31 A. Etzioni, "Citizenship Tests: A Comparative, Communitarian Perspective," *The Political Quarterly*, 78(3), 2007, 353–363; see esp. p. 353.

32 D. Corbett (March 16, 2006) "Testing the Limits of Tolerance." Online.

Available HTTP http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0.2144.1935900.00.html (accessed March 15, 2009).

33 Etzioni, "Citizenship Tests," p. 356.

34 S. Gottlieb and L. Nijzink (May 15, 2008) "Dutch Citizenship Tests Discriminate," Human Rights Watch. Online. Available HTTP http://www.rnw.nl/internationaljustice/specials/HumanRights/080515-dutch-immigration-mc (accessed March 17, 2009).

35 Joppke, "Transformation," p. 251.

36 Gottlieb and Nijzink, "Dutch Citizenship."

37 Joppke, "Beyond National Models," p. 14.

38 J. Fleishman (April 13, 2006) "Some Muslims see German Citizenship Tests as Intrusive," *Los Angeles Times*. Online. Available HTTP http://dailyuw.com/2006/4/13/some-muslims-see-german-citizenship-tests-as/ (accessed March 15, 2009).

39 K. Connolly (December 13, 2005) "Germans to Put Muslims Through Loyalty Test," Telegraph.co.uk. Online. Available HTTP http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/Europe/germany/15067 (accessed March 15, 2009).

40 Ibid.

41 Ibid.

42 L. Sokoll (January 18, 2006) "Germany: Spying and Discrimination Against Muslims." Online. Available HTTP http://www.wsws.org/articles/2006/jan2006/germ-j18.shtml (accessed September 27, 2009).

43 Ibid.

44 (June 11, 2008) "Germany to Introduce Controversial New Citizenship Test," *Spiegel Online International*. Online. Available HTTP http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0,1518,559021,00.html (accessed March 16, 2009).

45 T. Moore (September 4, 2008) "German Citizenship is put to Test," BBC News. Online. Available HTTP http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/7597534.stm (accessed March 16, 2009).

46 "Germany to Introduce."

47 (2007) "Immigration." Online. Available HTTP http://www.euro-islam.info/key-issues/immigration-coming-soon/ (accessed April 28, 2009).

48 Ibid.

49 M. Schain, "Immigration Policy and Reactions to Terrorism after September 11," in A.C. D'Appollonia and S. Reich (eds) *Immigration, Integration, and Security: America and Europe in Comparative Perspective*, Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 2008, pp. 111–129; see esp. pp 115–116.

50 "Immigration."

51 Ibid.

52 D. Kiwan, "A Journey to Citizenship in the United Kingdom," *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 10(1), 2008, 60–75; see esp. p. 73.

53 Kiwan, "A Journey," pp. 73–74.

54 D. Rejali, *Torture and Democracy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007, pp. 504–508.

55 S. Grey, *Ghost Plane: The True Story of the CIA Torture Program*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 2006, p. 224.

56 S. Mulvery (June 8, 2006) "Europe Under 'Rendition' Cloud," BBC News. Online. Available HTTP http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/5057640.stm (accessed March 8, 2009).

57 D. Priest (November 2, 2005) "CIA Holds Terror Suspects in Secret Prisons," *The Washington Post*, p. A01. Online. Available HTTP http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/01/AR2005110101644.html (accessed March 8, 2009).

58 Ibid.

59 Amnesty International (June 24, 2008) "State of Denial: Europe's Role in U.S. Rendition and Secret Detention." Online. Available HTTP http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/EUR01/003/2008/en (accessed March 8, 2009).
60 Ibid.
61 J.J. Paust, *Beyond the Law: The Bush Administration's Unlawful Responses in the "War" on Terror*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp. 32–41.
62 Amnesty International, "State of Denial."
63 J.K. Stubbs, "The Bottom Rung of America's Race Ladder: After the September 11 Catastrophe are American Muslims Becoming America's New N. . . . S?" *Journal of Law and Religion*, 19, 2003–2004, 117. (For more information see pp. 115–151.)
64 Stubbs, "The Bottom Rung," p. 121.
65 A. Elliot, "Muslims in America: Creating a New Beat," *Nietman Reports*, Summer 2007, 55–56.
66 F. Muedini, "Muslim American College Youth: Attitudes and Responses Five Years After 9/11," *The Muslim World*, 99, 2009, 39–59; see esp. p. 40.
67 F. Halim, "Pluralism of American Muslims and the Challenge of Assimilation," *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, 26(2), 2006, 235–244; see esp. p. 235.
68 Halim, "Pluralism," p. 239.
69 G. Abdo, *Mecca and Main Street: Muslim Life in America After 9/11*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006, pp. 83–84.
70 Ibid.
71 A. Iftikhar, "Presumption of Guilt: September 11 and the American Muslim Community," in D.C. Brotherton and P. Kretsedemas (eds.) *Keeping Out the Other: A Critical Introduction to Immigration Enforcement Today*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2008, pp. 108–137; see esp. p. 113.
72 J. Cuffe, "US Muslims Alienated by Patriot Act," BBC News. Online. Available HTTP http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/programmes/file_on_4/5145970.stm (accessed March 7, 2009).
73 M. Stern, "Civil Liberties Have Been Compromised by the Patriot Act," in A. Nakaya (ed.) *America's Battle Against Terrorism*, New York: Thompson Gale, 2005, pp. 98–103; see esp. p. 103.
74 A. Pena, "Protecting Muslim Civil and Human Rights in America: The Role of Islamic, National, and International Organizations," *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, 27(3), 2007, 387–400; see esp. 388.
75 J. Lampman, "In Many Ways, US Muslims are in Mainstream America," *The Christian Science Monitor*, May 24, 2007, pp. 2, 4.
76 J.J. Zogby, "The Civil Rights of Arab American Muslims are Being Violated," in L.K. Egendorf (ed.) *At Issue: Islam in America*, New York: Greenhaven Press, 2006, pp. 46–52; see esp. pp. 48–49.
77 Zogby, "The Civil Rights of Arab American Muslims," p. 49.
78 Zogby, "The Civil Rights of Arab American Muslims," p. 52.
79 J. Piscatori, "The Turmoil Within: The Struggle for the Future of the Islamic World," *Foreign Affairs*, 81(3), 2002, 145–150.
80 M.A.M. Khan, "American Muslims Must Be Less Hypocritical in Their Views Toward the United States and Israel," in L.K. Egendorf (ed.) *At Issue: Islam in America*, New York: Greenhaven Press, 2006, pp. 76–80; see esp. p. 79.
81 G. Greenwald, *How Would a Patriot Act? Defending American Values from a President Run Amok*, Berkeley: Publishers Group West, 2006, p. 47.
82 Schain, "Immigration Policy," p. 123.
83 Stubbs, "The Bottom Rung," p. 147.
84 Paust, *Beyond the Law*, p. 127.
85 Ibid.
86 D.P. Forsythe, "The United States: Protecting Human Dignity in an Era of

Insecurity," in A. Brysk and G. Shafir (eds.) *National Insecurity and Human Rights: Democracies Debate Counterterrorism*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007, pp. 37–55; see esp. pp. 43–47.

87 H. Adelman, "Canada's Balancing Act: Protecting Human Rights and Countering Terrorist Threats," in A. Brysk and G. Shafir (eds.) *National Insecurity and Human Rights: Democracies Debate Counterterrorism*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007, pp. 137–156; see especially p. 150.

88 M. Crane (December 6, 2005) "U.S. Treatment of Terror Suspects and U.S.–EU Relations," *Council on Foreign Relations*. Online. Available HTTP http://www.cfr.org/publication/9350/ (accessed September 27, 2009).

89 Immigration Watch Canada (September 12, 2005). Online. Available HTTP http://www.immigrationwatchcanada.org/index.php?module=pagemaster&PAGE_user_op=view_page&PAGE_id=359&MMN_position=92:90 (accessed April 28, 2009).

90 I.S. Lustick, "The Political Requirements of Victory," *Middle East Policy*, 8(4), 2001, 14–17; see esp. p. 15.

91 J. Tirman, "Immigration and Insecurity: Post-9/11 Fear in the United States," *Audit of the Conventional Wisdom*, MIT Center for International Studies, June 2006, pp. 1–3.

92 A. Elliot (June 12, 2006) "After 9/11, Arab-Americans Fear Police Acts, Study Finds," *The New York Times*. Online. Available HTTP www.nytimes.com/2006/06/12/us/12arabs.html (accessed March 12, 2009).

93 Ibid.

94 J. Vaisse, "Muslims in Europe: A Short Introduction," in *US–Europe Analysis Series*, Washington, D.C.: Center on the United States and Europe at Brookings, September 2008, pp. 1–6.

95 A.C. D'Appollonia, "Immigration, Security, and Integration in the European Union," in A.C. D'Appollonia and S. Reich (eds.) *Immigration, Integration, and Security: America and Europe in Comparative Perspective*, Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 2008, pp. 203–228.

96 A.C. D'Appollonia and S. Reich, "Immigration: Tensions, Dilemmas, and Unresolved Questions," in A.C. D'Appollonia and S. Reich (eds.) *Immigration, Integration, and Security: America and Europe in Comparative Perspective*, Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 2008, p. 340.

97 N. Smelser, *The Faces of Terrorism: Social and Psychological Dimensions*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.

4 Bush's political fundamentalism and the war against militant Islam

The US–European divide

Dirk Nabers and Robert G. Patman

Introduction

In order to understand the US–European divide in international affairs after September 11, 2001, this chapter will examine the question of how domestic religious thinking influenced the political behavior of the Bush administration. After the terrorist attacks of that day, the Bush administration constructed a distinctive form of rhetoric to articulate its policies in the "new" war on terror. The language was grounded in a conservative religious outlook, characterized by absolutism, that imagined a divine hand in history and a sense of American manifest destiny, but it also took on a clear political expression and application. David Domke thus coined the term "political fundamentalism" to describe the new fusion of evangelicalism and foreign policy activism that characterized the Bush administration after 9/11.[1] By using religious language as a horizon, it became possible to create a dominant discourse in the US in the early stages of the war against terror. However, the Bush administration had much less success in framing the war on terror outside the US.

This chapter thus explores the tension between the role of religious language as a domestic legitimizing device for the Bush administration and its adverse impact on Washington's foreign policy image in Europe. To be sure, the political fundamentalism of the Bush administration did provide many Americans with a clear moral compass at a time of great uncertainty in the nation's history. But it also sharply constrained reasoned debate in the US and played a big part in shaping a post-9/11 climate, which, in turn, shaped the invasion and occupation of Iraq – a development that has had a disastrous impact on America's global standing. While the president quoted Psalm 23 on the evening of September 11 ("Even though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I fear no evil, for You are with me"),[2] he also announced a "crusade" against evil on September 16.[3] In projecting American interests in such a manner, the Bush administration emphasized binary conceptions of reality, in starkly black-and-white terms, which drew boundaries between insiders and outsiders.[4]

We will argue that President Bush's political fundamentalism after 9/11 became a major obstacle to effectively addressing the challenge of international terrorism. The chapter proceeds in five stages. The first section examines the interface between religion and the traditional idea of US exceptionalism. The second section considers the political rise of the Christian right in American politics since the 1970s. The third part shows how 9/11 facilitated the emergence of political fundamentalism in the White House. The fourth section explores the impact of the construction of President Bush's war on terror policies on the domestic and international environments. Finally, while the conclusion acknowledges a substantial gulf between the domestic and international responses to President Bush's brand of political fundamentalism, it contends that these differences narrowed over time and could be virtually eliminated during President Barack Obama's first term in office.

American exceptionalism and religious language

The notion of US exceptionalism refers to the idea of American difference grounded in the historical image of the country as one of immigrants and a long tradition of democratic values. It endows Americans with a pervasive sense of faith in the distinctiveness, immutability, and superiority of the country's founding liberal principles, and also the conviction that the US has a special destiny among nations. The founders of America saw the country as a new form of political community, dedicated to the Enlightenment principles of the rule of law, private property, representative government, freedom of speech and religion, and commercial liberty. According to Siobhan McEvoy-Levy, American exceptionalism does not have the coherence of an ideology nor has it been codified as a means toward some definable political end, but it "operates as a sort of filter" through which ideas on domestic and foreign policy are passed.[5]

America's religious tradition has been a key influence on the country's sense of exceptionalism. The country was founded on a basis that was Christian, largely Protestant and with strong Puritan and Calvinist beliefs. It should be stressed that America's religious tradition is one of voluntary association. America was the first country "to found itself without an official cult, without an official protector God."[6] The First Amendment of the US Constitution not only separates church and state; it guarantees the free exercise of religion. According to Garry Wills, "the separation of church and state did two things. It unleashed evangelical feelings and it tempered them. It tempered them with reason and rationality."[7] Today, America is one of the most religious countries in the Christian world. Nearly two centuries after Alexis de Tocqueville declared that, "there is no country in the world where the Christian religion retains a greater influence over the souls of men," the observation still holds.[8] According to a 2007 *Newsweek* poll, 91 percent of American adults say they believe in God.[9] Christians far outnumber members of any other faith in the country, with 82 percent of the poll's respondents identifying themselves as such. All this is in stark contrast to the recent experience of religion in Europe. According to the 1990–1993 World Values Survey, the percentage of Americans who said that "religion is very important" (53 percent) was one of the world's highest and compared with 16 percent in Britain and 14 percent in France.[10]

The historical association between religion, predominantly Protestant sectarianism, and political freedom in America has given US exceptionalism a certain moral imperative. In the view of Seymour Martin Lipset:

> Americans are utopian moralists who press hard to institutionalise virtue, to destroy evil people, and to eliminate wicked institutions and practices. A majority even told pollsters that God is the moral guiding force in American democracy. They tend to view social and political dramas as morality plays.[11]

A pronounced tendency toward moral absolutism has thus underpinned the widely held belief that America is a chosen nation, a sort of Protestant Jerusalem. The notion of manifest destiny is deeply ingrained in American exceptionalism, and reflects the idea that the settlement of the American continent was part of a pre-destined mission, which was guided by providence. Clearly, the notion of American exceptionalism goes well beyond uniqueness – a distinction to which many nations could lay claim. As Daniel Bell has noted, "the idea of exceptionalism . . . assumes not only that the US has been unlike other nations, but that it is exceptional in the sense of being exemplary."[12] That is, the US thinks of itself as a special nation, a "city on a hill," a country blessed by God's will and one with a moral and religious mission in the world. Celebrating the anniversary of the Constitution in 1987, President Ronald Reagan noted in this regard: "The guiding hand of providence did not create this new nation of America for ourselves alone, but for a higher cause: the preservation and extension of the sacred fire of human liberty. This is America's solemn duty."[13]

A consciousness of being exceptional has also had a significant impact on the evolution of US foreign policy. On the one hand, exceptionalism was used, particularly in the period up to 1941, as a justification for avoiding American involvement in the entangling alliances and quarrels of the so called old world.[14] This "go it alone" or isolationist stance assumed that the US remained a political model for emulation, but insisted that the US must limit its global responsibilities to safeguard its internal and external freedoms. For instance, the US Senate declined to support US membership of the League of Nations organization in 1919.

On the other hand, a sense of exceptionalism inspired the US, especially with the attainment of superpower status after 1945, to embark on a quest to improve the world. By sponsoring and leading multilateral institutions, the stated aim of the US was to transform an anarchic, conflict-prone world into an open, international community under the rule of law, in which countries could maximize their common security, economic and political interests.[15] US support was critical to the creation of the United Nations, and without US engagement in post-war Europe through the Marshall Plan and NATO it is difficult to conceive of the OECD or the European Union.[16]

To be sure, American exceptionalism has not been the only factor shaping the course and conduct of US foreign policy. During the Cold War years, hard-headed realism, based on the overwhelming US desire to avoid a disastrous nuclear war with the USSR, regularly kept exceptionalist impulses at bay. Such pragmatism manifested itself during the 1956 Hungarian uprising, the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, the Nixon–Kissinger policy of détente with Moscow in the early 1970s, and President Reagan's willingness to sign the 1987 INF agreement with Gorbachev's Soviet government. Moreover, in the 1960s and 1970s, American exceptionalism was weakened by events like Vietnam, Watergate, civil disturbances, the oil shock, and the Iranian hostage crisis.

The Christian right since the 1960s

If religion has strongly contributed to the national conviction that America has a unique moral status and role to play in world affairs, it should be noted that American religion itself has shifted increasingly toward a socially conservative paradigm. Tumultuous events in the 1960s – mass protests against the Vietnam war, racial de-segregation in the southern states, the sexual revolution, and the rise of feminism – combined to challenge traditional American values founded on Christian principles.[17] Alarmed by the emergence of a liberal counterculture, a number of conservative groups actively mobilized themselves under the umbrella of the Christian right to resist this trend.

The new Christian right was spearheaded by the Southern Baptist Convention, consisting of some 16 million members. In 1972, the Convention endorsed "biblical inerrancy" or the belief that the bible is the word of God and thus should be taken literally.[18] Subsequently, the Southern Baptist Convention confirmed its opposition to abortion and homosexuality, and stated that women should submit to the will of their husbands.[19] At the same time, the congregations of conservative churches grew strongly in the 1970s. The Southern Baptist Convention grew by 16 percent and the Assemblies of God experienced a 70 percent growth rate. In contrast, more liberal churches such as the United Presbyterian Church and the Episcopal Church saw a decline in numbers of 21 percent and 15 percent respectively.[20] By the 1980s, in terms of congregation size, evangelical churches represented the vast majority of the 25 largest churches in America.[21]

The rise of the Christian right had a political impact. In 1964, Republican candidate Barry Goldwater failed to win the White House but began the process of realigning the party's fiscal and social policy to appeal to a growing conservative Christian constituency.[22] In the 1970s, Christian conservatives became active in local politics. Amongst other things, they opposed a gay rights referendum in Florida, campaigned against public school textbooks in Virginia, and succeeded in rebuffing the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) in 1972. In many ways, the defeat of the ERA provided a platform for "conservative countermovement to feminism in particular and liberalism in general" to operate from under a "pro-family" banner.[23]

Nevertheless, America's first evangelical Christian president, Jimmy Carter, who captured 51 percent of the evangelical vote in the 1976 presidential election, proved too liberal for many on the Christian right. But the Republican presidential candidate, Ronald Reagan, took full advantage of this political unease in 1980. He won a landslide election victory by adopting a hard-line anti-Soviet stance, pledging to get "government off the backs of the American people" and shrewdly tapping into the country's sense of manifest destiny. For many on the Christian right, the Reagan presidency seemed almost to epitomize the resurgence of America's traditional values.

The Christian right was less enthusiastic about George H.W. Bush as the Republican nominee in the 1988 presidential contest. But with the help of his "born-again" Christian son, George W. Bush, Bush senior won 81 percent of the evangelical Christian vote and saw off the challenge for the White House from Democrat Mike Dukakis.[24] However, as president, Bush senior did not hide his skepticism of what he called "the vision thing," a factor which alienated many Christian conservatives, and his subsequent defeat at the hands of Democrat Bill Clinton in 1992 set the stage for major changes within the Republican party during the 1990s. Lingering frustration with the centrist orientation of the Bush senior presidency and loathing for the perceived liberal immorality of the Clinton White House facilitated the emergence of a highly influential group known as the Project for the New American Century (PNAC). Many of the key figures in this neo-conservative group went on to become leading figures in the two Bush administrations between 2001 and 2008. They included Vice-President Dick Cheney, former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and former Under-Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz.

The PNAC drew heavily on the ideas contained in a Defense Planning Guidance (DPG) document outlining the US's political and military mission in a post-Cold War world. The document was leaked to the *New York Times* in early March 1992. The DPG stated that the "first objective" of US defense strategy was "to prevent the re-emergence of a new [superpower] rival." Fulfilling this goal required that the US "prevent any hostile power from dominating a region" of strategic significance.[25] Another new theme was the use of pre-emptive military force against possible adversaries. As a result, the PNAC advocated the active pursuit of US global primacy, and condemned President Clinton's policy of containment toward "rogue states" like Iraq.

From the mid-1990s, the PNAC called for the overthrow of Saddam's regime. In January 1998, Wolfowitz and Rumsfeld, along with others associated with the PNAC, wrote President Clinton a letter saying that if Saddam acquired weapons of mass destruction, he would pose a threat to

American troops in the region, her strategic ally, Israel, to the moderate Arab states, and to the supply of oil.[26] What was striking about the PNAC stance was the core assumption that the security interests of the US and Israel in the Middle East were identical, a position that reflected the close ties of virtually all neo-conservatives and prominent Christian evangelicals, including Gary Bauer, Jerry Falwell, Ralph Reed, and Pat Robertson, with the pro-Israel lobby in the US. Many such supporters believe Israel's rebirth is the fulfillment of biblical prophecy and back its policy toward the occupied territories. Failure to do so, they believe, would be contrary to God's will.[27]

The Bush administration and the rise of political fundamentalism

When George W. Bush became president in January 2001, there was a clear strengthening in the direction of policies promoted by the PNAC group and the Christian Right. The new Bush administration rejected the notion of nation-building, embraced the traditional view that security was fundamentally determined by the military means of sovereign states, and sought to promote a distinctly American internationalism in the world. Convinced that President Reagan had successfully used power and ideas to win the Cold War in the late 1980s, Bush's PNAC supporters argued that America had a unique historic responsibility in the post-Cold War era to maintain unrivalled power and spread freedom and democracy. This resulted in an interpretation of US exceptionalism that suggested Washington was somehow an exception to international law and to long established moral rules of conduct in international politics.[28]

American exceptionalism caused a reification of existing security discourses in favor of a military solution. The "new" war on terror was only possible because it did not clash with already established practices, re-inscribing past discourses of national security and exceptionalism into the present. For example, then newly elected president Ronald Reagan's tough words and his threat to "take whatever action is appropriate" led to the release of 52 American hostages held by the jihadists running the Islamic Republic in 1981.[29] On the other hand, Bill Clinton was condemned throughout the George W. Bush campaign for his readiness to commit US troops to missions that were not in the nation's interest, particularly nation-building and humanitarian interventions. Consequently, 9/11 presented the Bush administration with an opportunity, as a number of authors have contended, to accomplish a previously formulated foreign policy agenda with war and coercive regime change in Iraq as its key objective.[30] In retrospect, therefore, the inability of the Clinton administration to come up with a definitive foreign policy vision for the post-Cold War era to counter potential terrorist attacks from non-state actors seemed to be part of a void that the Bush administration tried to fill after 9/11.

Meanwhile, on the domestic front, the new Bush administration seemed to have immediately challenged the traditional line of separation between church and state in American politics. President Bush became the first president to declare that his favorite political philosopher was Jesus Christ.[31] No other president had said that. Moreover, many of the political appointments in the first Bush administration reflected the new emphasis on faith: John Ashcroft, Attorney General during Bush's first term, seemed to have few reservations about mixing his fundamentalist Christian views and running the Justice Department, which, by definition deals with issues such as abortion, the death penalty, civil rights, and the selection of judges;[32] Rod Paige, Secretary of Education in both Bush administrations, openly expressed his preference for children to attend Christian schools over public schools;[33] and other officials with conservative Christian links including Commerce Secretary, Don Evans, who attended bible study lessons with George W. Bush in Midland, Texas, and Karen Hughes, a close and long-time political adviser to the President.[34] Finally, the Bush administration launched a number of policy initiatives to expand the role of religion in government. These included controversial measures such as making federal funding available for certain faith-based welfare groups and spending millions of tax payers' dollars on abstinence-only education in the field of reproductive health policy. It was in this context that the faith-oriented Bush administration was severely shaken by the suicidal terrorist attacks of 9/11. In the space of one deadly day, America experienced what could be called a bonfire of certainties. "All of this was brought upon us in a single day – and night fell on a different world," as President Bush put it.[35]

The most militarily capable nation in the world was powerless to prevent attacks on its own soil – attacks against the very symbols of US power and prestige, the World Trade Centers, by a transnational terrorist group, Al-Qaeda. While the loss of 3,000 civilians was not huge by the brutal standards of the post-Cold War era "new wars," it was a stunning blow for the world's sole superpower. For more than 50 years, American governments had assumed that no enemy would attack the country for fear of an overwhelming retaliatory strike. September 11 abruptly ended that sense of security within American society. Some commentators, like Stephen Walt, have called it "the most rapid and dramatic change in the history of US foreign policy."[36]

For many Americans, the most frightening aspect of 9/11 was its lack of clear definition. It was almost as if " . . . language itself appeared to collapse along with the Twin Towers," as Richard Jackson put it;[37] other observers spoke of a "void of meaning."[38] The amorphous and shadowy nature of the new terrorist threat meant it could potentially strike anywhere without warning. In the aftermath of 9/11, there was a greater sense of vulnerability within the US than at any time since the beginning of the Cold War. A new form of insecurity had interrupted normal life, and from now on, it was not only the US, but the whole "civilized world" that was vulnerable and might be attacked by terrorists. In the words of Colin Powell, terrorism represents "[a] threat to the very essence of what you do,"[39] while the president called it, "[a] threat to our way of life" and a "threat to the peace of the world."[40] A CBS News survey one year after the attacks revealed that 50 percent of those interviewed felt uneasy or threatened by terrorist attacks, 62 percent thought about the attacks every week, and 90 percent agreed that, "Americans will always have to live with the risk of terrorism."[41] The unprecedented level of insecurity and uncertainty immediately after 9/11 had the potential to generate a major crisis of political confidence in the Bush administration.

After all, the Bush administration had presided over what was the greatest failure of US intelligence since Pearl Harbor. The terrorist attacks of 9/11 involved an astonishing level of planning and co-ordination. Yet the Bush administration believed prior to September 11 it had more pressing problems on its foreign policy agenda than international terrorism, despite repeated warnings about the Al-Qaeda threat from officials like Richard A. Clarke who served as Clinton's National Counter-Terrorism Coordinator, and was initially retained in that capacity by the new Bush administration, and John O'Neill, the Director of the Counter Terrorism section of the FBI in Washington DC. These problems included perceived mischief-making from Russia, a great power rivalry with China and the need to counter the perceived threat of ballistic missile attacks from "rogue" states through the establishment of a National Missile Defense (NMD). The economic effects of this high-level political failure were also apparent to most Americans. 9/11 damaged a key part of the US financial structure, and the New York Stock Exchange itself was closed for four days. The effects of the terrorist attacks also spread across the airline and aircraft industries to have an impact of the whole economy.[42] It was only in 2005 that the airline industry returned to pre-9/11 levels.

The initial response of the Bush administration to the events of 9/11 had a dual character. On the one hand, the Bush leadership moved rapidly to intertwine "conservative religious faith, politics and strategic communication,"[43] and thus moved toward a form of political fundamentalism that "offered familiarity, comfort, and a palatable moral vision" to a shell-shocked and troubled public. Declaring an all-out war on what was called global terrorism, President Bush characterized the conflict as a long struggle between "good and evil" and in a speech that was delivered from the pulpit of the National Cathedral, said that the US now had a responsibility "to answer these attacks and rid the world of evil."[44] The juxtaposition of "good" and "evil" symbolized a major theme in Bush's addresses to the nation in the first year after the terrorist attacks. This was evident in his speech to Congress on September 20, 2001 ("Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty have always been at war, and we know that God is not neutral between them"),[45] his State of the Union address in January 2002 ("I know we can overcome evil with a greater good"),[46] and his speech at

West Point in June 2002 ("We are in a conflict between good and evil, and America will call evil by its name").[47] So by declaring war against terrorism, Bush created the political scope for the further erosion of the wall of separation between church and state in America. Fundamentalisms, it has been noted, often appear in times of actual or perceived crisis, and wartime, as Clausewitz acknowledged, provides a definition of a crisis where fanaticism can grow.

In the aftermath of 9/11, the Bush administration sought to expand the image of American exceptionalism. President Bush merged a Christian worldview with American political concepts, creating a new political fundamentalism that emphasized the country's moral superiority over its terrorist adversaries. In a revealing interview given to *The Washington Post* in late 2001, President Bush claimed it was American values of freedom and liberty that came under attack on 9/11, but argued that such values were not purely American: "[T]hese are God-given values. These aren't US-created values."[48] Apparently, Bush was saying that to spread American values in a troubled world was to be on the side of God and to resist them was to oppose God. President Bush promised to "whip" terrorism and confidently predicted the US would "lead the world to victory" in the new war on terror.[49] In this regard, religion can play a unique role in constructing a "good" war on terror. Christian references are thus also ubiquitous in Bush's speeches in the campaign leading to the Iraq war, habitually mingled with the concept of "freedom/liberty" and a missionary attitude:

> Liberty is God's gift to every human being in the world. . . . We're called to extend the promise of this country into the lives of every citizen who lives here. We're called to defend our nation and to lead the world to peace, and we will meet both challenges with courage and with confidence.[50]

By referencing nature and God, Bush tries to render political operations of power invisible.[51] By doing so, the politics of the war on terror gain an impersonal character and its meanings move into the background through allegedly natural and self-evident solutions.

Hence, the rising momentum of political fundamentalism in Washington soon undermined the Bush administration's association with multilateralism. Within days of the 9/11 attacks, Wolfowitz and I. Lewis Libby, the Vice-President's Chief of Staff and National Security Advisor, respectively, had begun calling for unilateral military action against Iraq, on the grounds that Osama bin Laden's transnational Al-Qaeda network could not have pulled off the attacks without the assistance of Saddam Hussein's state apparatus.[52] However, President Bush did not back such calls until a regime change in Afghanistan in late 2001.

In his State of the Union address in January 2002, Bush invoked theological terminology to describe Iraq, Iran, and North Korea as an "axis of evil," and warned that he would "not wait on events" to prevent them from using weapons of mass destruction against the US.[53] But many of America's allies doubted the wisdom of alienating Iran from the West and also questioned the alleged involvement of Saddam Hussein's regime with international terrorism. Moreover, just four months after the Bush administration declared itself keen to build alliances and to collaborate closely with its friends in the war on terror, the speech did not even mention America's allies.

To some extent, the consolidation of political fundamentalism in the US was linked to the revival of the Clash of Civilization theory. For many Christian conservatives, the "Clash" theory provided the new template for US foreign policy. A number of prominent Christian right leaders used the extremist beliefs of the 9/11 terrorists to attack Islam in general. Pat Robertson maintained that Muslims "were worse than Nazis,"[54] while Jerry Falwell's characterization of the prophet Mohammed as a "terrorist" provoked a riot in Sholapurin that killed nine people and injured 100.[55] Meanwhile, Franklin Graham, the man President Bush chose to swear him in at his inauguration in January 2001, denounced Islam as "a very evil and wicked religion."[56] At the same time, Reverend Jerry Vines, a past president of the Southern Baptist Convention, a conservative Christian movement with strong ties to the Bush administration, denounced the prophet Mohammed as "a demon obsessed paedophile."[57] Further, many Christian Zionists believed that 9/11 confirmed the essential correctness of the view that the biggest threat to the US came from the forces of radical Islam.

Such rhetoric could not help but shape the political climate in which White House policy was framed during the war on terror. The likes of Robertson, Falwell and Vines were seen as influential figures in the conservative Christian movement, a key constituency of support for the Bush administration, and especially since President Bush himself had friendly relations with a number of these religious leaders. On occasions, President Bush has publicly used terms favored by Christian conservatives like "Islamofascism" to characterize terrorist threats.[58] His administration has also shown itself to be willing to listen to the policy concerns of the Christian right on key strategic issues. For example, in 2004, Pat Robertson and Jerry Falwell, concerned that the Bush administration's policy towards the Palestinians was too sympathetic, encouraged their supporters to send 500,000 emails to the White House.[59] Within days, there was a change of policy as the White House moved to support Israel's unilateral disengagement plan in Gaza despite the fact it challenged the Road Map for Peace initiative.

A further indication that Bush's strain of political fundamentalism was ascending came during his commencement address at West Point in June 2002. "We face a threat with no precedent," he told assembled graduates. In that context, 9/11 is constructed as a "global tragedy,"[60] not as a local or national disaster. It is represented as a day that bears no comparison, or as James Der Derian appositely put it, "9/11 quickly took on an *exceptional ahistoricity*."[61]

Domestic legitimization or international estrangement

In the aftermath of September 11, 2001, the president and his close aides responded to the crisis by constructing a stark picture of the post-9/11 world that helped to justify the "first war of the twenty-first century." In the short term, President Bush's strategy of political fundamentalism proved very successful. Using familiar religious terminology to "guarantee the continuity of the community,"[62] the Bush administration was able to institutionalize the war on terror with the establishment of the Department of Homeland Security and through massive increases in defense spending. Other examples of far-reaching political changes in the post-9/11 US are the USA Patriot Act,[63] its extension and renewal,[64] the reform of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, the so-called FISA compromise bill, Guantanamo Bay, the electronic surveillance program of the National Security Agency (NSA), and a re-organization of US military forces abroad. All of these policies ensued without any grave opposition, while those who did dissent were easily delegitimized by the power of the dominant discourse of political fundamentalism.[65]

By presenting a world conveniently partitioned into binaries of "good" and "evil," the Bush administration was simultaneously defining itself as good and those who were terrorists or opponents of the Bush government as evil or bad. In using binaries of "good/evil" and "us/them," the Bush administration attempted to entrench in the people what Niebuhr terms "a social myth," a "culturally embedded narrative that distinguishes a nation from others, justifies its existence, and establishes a sense of collectivity."[66] The attempt to promote a particular way of talking about the US after 9/11 served as an important political legitimizing device for the Bush administration.

It enabled President Bush to project "moral clarity" onto a confused and uncertain setting. Psychologically, the declaration of war signaled that the Bush administration had decisively regained its initiative, a development that, in turn, helped to rally an anxious American nation. Whether the Bush administration really believed that its projection of political fundamentalism represented an accurate grasp of the post 9/11 global scene or whether it was a deliberate distortion to maximize domestic support remains a moot point.

In two of his early addresses, one on September 11 and another before a joint session of Congress on September 20, 2001, the president used binary constructions rooted in a Christian fundamentalist worldview to juxtapose the terms "freedom/liberty" and "evil," placing them at opposite ends of the political spectrum. In his speech on September 11, the president declared:

> Today, our fellow citizens, our way of life, our very freedom came under attack in a series of deliberate and deadly terrorist acts. . . . Thousands of lives were suddenly ended by evil, despicable acts of terror.[67]

As a response to 9/11, political fundamentalism performed two important functions for the Bush administration. First, it served as a *diagnostic* tool:

> Americans are asking, "why do they hate us?" They hate what we see right here in this chamber – a democratically elected government. Their leaders are self-appointed. They hate our freedoms – our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other.[68]

According to the Bush administration, it was the "evil" character of the terrorists that led to the attacks of 9/11. Such attacks were portrayed by President Bush as the "*curse* of terrorism that is upon the face of the earth"[69] and the work of "terrorist parasites who threaten their countries and our own."[70] Colin Powell characterized the 9/11 attacks as "the *scourge* of terrorism"[71] and Donald Rumsfeld called them "a *cancer* on the human condition."[72] The use of religious metaphors in this political language enhanced its emotional appeal. As Smith,[73] has shown, the ability of one discursive strategy to succeed against others is first and foremost based on its linkages with institutions that retain some degree of authority throughout a crisis, and its iterations of previously normalized traditions. This is certainly the case with the growing influence of religion in the American society. Since "freedom" and "liberty" were proclaimed as God-decreed values for all nations, President Bush reasoned that 9/11 was not just directed at America, but at the democratic Western world in general. In this view, terrorism was simply the latest version of the murderous ideologies of the twentieth century that had threatened the free and peace-loving Western world.

Second, political fundamentalism had a *prescriptive* role, which suggested that the possibility to wage a war with terrorism was essentially a military problem to be dealt with through state-on-state actions. President Bush observed, "terror unanswered cannot only bring down buildings, it can threaten the stability of legitimate governments – and you know what – we're not going to allow it."[74] Textual analysis accurately unveils this bifurcation of the world into protagonists and antagonists in Bush's speeches, representing the latter as malign and evil. Critical linguists call this mechanism "overlexicalization," meaning that antagonists are lexicalized in various ways. Though sometimes strange to non-American ears, the Bush administration's tough language went down well at home. It signaled that the war on terror was a new type of war where the old rules did not always apply. Bush's description of Osama bin Laden as being "wanted dead or alive," and Rumsfeld's recommendation that certain Al-Qaeda forces in Afghanistan should "either be killed or taken prisoner"[75] were all examples of administrative statements that sat uncomfortably with international humanitarian law, but also signaled the administration's unbending determination to fulfill America's moral mission and defeat what Attorney

General John Ashcroft called "barbarous" forces threatening the civilized world.[76] By confronting and punishing the terrorists, President Bush said, "the United States will use this moment of opportunity to extend the benefits of freedom across the globe."[77]

Political fundamentalism certainly helped to solidify domestic support for the Bush administration. The House of Representatives, following the Senate's lead, gave final congressional approval on September 15, 2001 to a resolution authorizing George W. Bush to use "all necessary and appropriate force" against the perpetrators of the 9/11 terrorist attacks. At the same time, President Bush consistently had popular approval ratings hovering around the 90 percent mark during the early stages of the war on terror. Indeed, seven months after the attacks on Washington and New York, a survey by the Pew Research Center showed that nearly all Americans (83 percent) approved of the US-led military campaign against the Taliban and Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan.[78]

All this provides insight into a major gulf between American attitudes and the rest of the world, particularly Europe, toward the Iraq invasion in 2003. In the US, there was majority support for the use of force in Iraq. Contemporary opinion polls showed that just under two-thirds of Americans supported military action against Iraq. Furthermore, 56 percent said that getting UN support for action against Iraq was "desirable, but not necessary."[79] Apparently, many Americans believed that Saddam's regime was somehow involved in the events of 9/11, and the fact that Saddam publicly applauded the terrorist attacks in Washington DC and New York immediately after them probably reinforced this perception, and they seemed willing to accept the various justifications put forward by the Bush administration for the invasion. These included the claims that Saddam had secretly stockpiled weapons of mass destruction and could make them available to Al-Qaeda, as well as the notion that the US could introduce democracy to Iraq, and thereby reform the Middle East region at large. The latter idea represents President Bush's political fundamentalism in its most simplistic form.

However, in many other countries, including Britain, Washington's most stalwart ally, there were huge public demonstrations building up to the Iraq invasion. In most countries, a majority opposed the intervention in Iraq. In France and Germany, the government's opposition to the US stance garnered huge amounts of domestic political support. The character of the US occupation has only served to confirm its international criticism. At Abu Ghraib, as at Guantanamo Bay, highfalutin US rhetoric about liberation and democratization have collided head on with the reality of sordid – and possibly systematic – abuses against those in American custody. Nevertheless, during the 2004 election campaign, both George W. Bush and John Kerry pledged to continue to aggressively fight the war on terror. Eventually, it was Bush's more fundamentalist vision that held sway. When Kerry suggested that the US should undertake a "global test" of legitimacy before launching foreign interventions he was immediately attacked by the Republican camp, which said that he would effectively give a veto to the international community over US actions.[80]

The susceptibility of the US public to the brand of political fundamentalism put forward by the Bush administration could be explained in several ways. In the first place, religion would appear much more important to Americans than to other Westerners. According to a survey conducted by the Pew Research Center in 2002, some 59 percent of US citizens say religion plays a central role in their lives. This is approximately twice the percentage of self-avowed religious people in Canada (30 percent), and an even higher share when compared with Western Europe, or even Japan.[81] It is evident, then, that religion can play a unique role in constructing a "good" war on terror, since it could override a reluctance to destroy life. Throughout the history of humankind, many wars have been fought in the name of God, lives have been taken, and "just war" theories have also been developed on religious grounds.

The leadership style of President Bush also appealed to many Americans at this time of war. A purported belief in plain speaking, "moral clarity," "gut instincts," and strong faith have all been hallmarks of President Bush's decision-making style. His constantly populist message coincided with America's unprecedented dominance of the international stage. For some, President Bush's apparently boundless faith in America's war on terror represented a source of comfort and strength and a promise of ultimate victory over "the bad guys." At the same time, by depicting the terrorism conflict as a struggle between "good and evil," the Bush administration contributed to a political climate in the US that discouraged any serious debate of why America was the object of the hatred that prompted 9/11. Moreover, groups or individuals who have tried to raise this issue have found themselves stigmatized and often portrayed as unpatriotic or anti-American.[82]

While the US had a pervasive presence in global politics, it remained uneasy about some aspects of globalization.[83] It was ranked fourth in the 2005 A.T. Kearney/Foreign Policy Globalization Index. However, that high ranking had more to do with technological connectivity – the US ranked first in this dimension – than its economic, political, and personal connections with the rest of the world. In terms of economic integration, a category that measures trade and foreign direct investment as a proportion of GDP, the US ranked sixtieth out of 62 countries. With respect to political engagement, which measures participation in international organizations, contributions to UN peacekeeping operations, international treaties ratified, and government transfers, the US ranked just forty-third. Finally, in terms of the personal contact category, which measures international travel and tourism, international telephone traffic, and cross-border transfers like remittances, the US ranked fortieth.[84] Thus, in the context of global integration, US performance was distinctly uneven. It ranked first in the number of Internet hosts and the number of secure servers, but lagged far behind many other countries in categories assessing global economic, political and personal linkages.

However, if political fundamentalism has played a key role in framing President Bush's war on terror, it is clear that it also bore considerable responsibility for the deterioration of America's global standing in Europe and elsewhere. The wave of horror and sympathy for the victims of 9/11 that spread across the world in the immediate aftermath soon evaporated. Differences of perception and understanding became particularly evident across the transatlantic community after the Bush administration shifted its attention towards Saddam Hussein's regime in early 2002. Having declared that Iraq was part of an "axis of evil," President Bush signaled that the offensive against terrorism would be extended to states that allegedly provided support for groups like Al-Qaeda. But key European states like Germany and France publicly rejected the hard-line Bush approach toward Iraq. Amongst other things, Berlin and Paris disputed that there was a Saddam–Al-Qaeda connection and argued that if Saddam had weapons of mass destruction the problem should first be addressed by a UN-supervised weapons inspection team. As German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer said, "The phrase 'axis of evil' leads nowhere." In a similar vein, French Foreign Minister Hubert Vedrine said that Europe was "threatened by a new simplistic approach that reduces all the problems in the world to the struggle against terrorism."[85] By 2007, Gordon Brown, the new Prime Minister of Britain, made it clear that he disapproved of the phrase war on terror as a description of the global campaign against terrorism.

Moreover, a survey published by the Pew Global Attitudes Project in 2005 found sharp drops in America's favorable ratings abroad. In Britain, the US received a 58 percent favorable rating – down from 83 percent in 1999/2000. In France, the drop was more precipitous – just 37 percent gave the US a favorable rating, down from 62 percent. Sentiments were even more pronounced in Muslim countries. In Turkey, Pakistan, and Jordan, Washington scored 30, 21, and 5 percent, respectively. More startlingly, the project found a yawning gap between US self-perception and that of other nations. Seventy percent of Americans said that the US takes the view of others into consideration either "a great deal" or "a fair amount." The equivalent figures in Great Britain, Germany, and France were just 36, 29, and 14 percent respectively.[86] By 2007, the fall in the US's global reputation had reached catastrophic proportions. A BBC World Service survey of more than 26,000 people across 25 countries found that only 29 percent believed that the US is having a positive influence internationally. It found that 68 percent believed the US military presence in the Middle East provokes more conflict than it prevents, 73 percent disapproved of President Bush's handling of the Iraq war and 60 percent opposed Bush's approach to Iran's nuclear program.[87]

How did the political fundamentalism of the Bush administration undermine international support? Among other things, the binary construction of reality has encouraged disproportionate reliance on American military power in this war. As a consequence, the Bush administration was seen by many in the international community to have neglected the political battle to win "hearts and minds" in this struggle. In other words, there is a strong perception outside the US, and increasingly within it, that the Bush administration has tended to focus on the symptoms – disrupting and defeating the Al-Qaeda network – rather than eliminating the political causes of terrorism with a broader range of policies.

In addition, the Bush administration declared war on terrorism after 9/11 without clearly defining who or what the enemy was. The Bush administration has been unable or unwilling to distinguish between what might be called value-driven terrorists like Al-Qaeda and territorially motivated insurgents who oppose perceived foreign occupations in places like Chechnya, the West Bank, and Kashmir. Moreover, the Bush administration's overwhelming preoccupation with defeating "evil" after 9/11 had been widely seen as weakening Washington's adherence to human rights and the rule of law. These principles lie at the heart of the liberal democratic system and play a key role in distinguishing democratic rule from the activities of terrorist groups such as Al-Qaeda, which are dedicated to destroying such norms. Yet the apparently faith-driven Bush administration felt free to disregard these key principles in places like Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib during the war on terror. The danger here is that political fundamentalism replicates the intolerant norms of Islamic terrorism.

Conclusion: the decline of political fundamentalism, the international resurgence of America, and the struggle against Islamic terrorism

After the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington DC on 9/11, the Bush administration embraced a new cognitive framework – political fundamentalism – that presupposed moral superiority. Combining Christian terminology with political strategy to frame a new war on terror, political fundamentalism initially proved effective in solidifying public support for the Bush administration. Domestically, political fundamentalism promoted a shift away from open discussion and humility towards authoritarianism and arrogance. In this context, many politicians felt constrained from making substantial criticisms of the war on terror on the grounds that they might be seen as disloyal or "un-American."

Internationally, political fundamentalism in the White House became a major obstacle to the US coming to terms with the globalized security environment of the post-Cold War era. If 9/11 demonstrated anything, it was that extraordinary power could no longer guarantee invulnerability. But since early 2002, the Bush administration, confronted with the interdependent nature of the new strategic era, remained in denial and persisted with faith-based unilateralism. This, in turn, helped sanction the unlawful use of force, including torture, as well as giving the administration the sanction to cherry-pick intelligence and ultimately mislead the American people and the global public on the rationale for invading Iraq. Such a record culminated in a disastrous loss of international respect for US leadership.

For a while, there was a significant gulf between the domestic and European attitudes toward the Bush administration's political fundamentalism. But that gap began to narrow in the last years of the Bush presidency. After 2005, Bush witnessed a dramatic fall in public support in the US for his conduct of the war on terror, especially in Iraq. By the time he left office in 2008, Bush's poll approval ratings were among the lowest recorded for any departing president.

In many ways, the election of Barack Obama as US President confirmed that political fundamentalism in the US is in decline. Obama had promised on the campaign trail a much more pragmatic approach to foreign policy, and the enthusiastic global reaction to his election revealed that America now has an opportunity to hit militant Islam where it hurts – in the court of international public opinion, especially in the Muslim world. It is likely that Obama will prove a much tougher opponent than Bush for terrorist groups like Al-Qaeda. As well as being more open to multilateral solutions than his predecessor, President Obama seems determined to politically marginalize Al-Qaeda by closing the Guantanamo Bay detention facility, overseeing a planned withdrawal of US forces from Iraq, initiating a possible dialogue with the "rogue" states of Iran and Syria, and re-focusing the anti-terrorist campaign on the Al-Qaeda and Taliban strongholds in Afghanistan and Pakistan. In his first visit to Europe in Spring 2009, President Obama got a rapturous welcome, particularly in Turkey where he declared, "the United States is not, and will never be, at war with Islam."

This, of course, was just a start in the Obama administration's efforts to defeat Al-Qaeda. Nevertheless, the early signs are that the Al-Qaeda leadership has been wrong-footed by Obama's historic election victory, and seems distinctly nervous about the prospect of a new president in the White House whose global appeal parallels that of John F. Kennedy in the early 1960s. Al-Qaeda certainly does not want a new US president who inspires his citizens to live up to the ideals of the American democratic system and promises to fashion a political system worthy of emulation. In a video broadcast in late November 2008, Osama bin Laden's deputy, Ayman al-Zawahiri, accused Obama of being what Malcolm X once called a "house negro." It is striking the video warned its audience, who would presumably include militant Islamic groups in Europe, that "criminal" America remains unchanged despite its "new face," a sentiment which suggests that the bin Laden network fears a return to an America "where the separation of Church and State is absolute"[88] and where there is renewed capability to build and sustain multilateral support in the international arena.

Notes

This chapter partly draws on research published in D. Nabers and R.G. Patman, "September 11 and the Rise of Political Fundamentalism in the Bush Administration: Domestic Legitimization versus International Estrangement," *Global Change, Peace and Security*, 20(2), June 2008, 169–183.

1 D. Domke, *God Willing? Political Fundamentalism in the White House, The "War on Terror", and the Echoing Press*, London: Pluto Press, 2004.
2 The White House (September 11, 2001) *Statement by the President in his Address to the Nation.* Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010911-16.html (accessed December 15, 2003).
3 The White House (September 16, 2001) *Remarks by the President Upon Arrival,* The South Lawn. Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010916-2.html (accessed October 10, 2007).
4 M. Brocker, "Zivilreligion – missionarisches Sendungsbewusstsein – christlicher Fundamentalismus? Religiöse Motivlagen in der (Auβen-) Politik George W. Bushs," *Zeitschrift für Politik*, 50(2), 2003, 119N143; and A. Norris, "'Us' and 'Them': The Politics of American Self-Assertion after 9/11," *Metaphilosophy*, 35(3), 2004, 249–272.
5 S. McEvoy-Levy, *American Exceptionalism and US Foreign Policy: Public Diplomacy at the End of the Cold War,* New York: Palgrave, 2001, pp. 23–25.
6 G. Wills and J.J. Myers (October 11, 2007) "Head and Heart: American Christianities," Carnegie Council. Online. Available HTTP http://www.cceia.org/resources/transcripts/0006.html (accessed November 20, 2007).
7 Ibid.
8 S.M. Lipset, *American Exceptionalism: A Double-Edged Sword*, New York: W.W. Norton, 1996, pp. 63.
9 *Newsweek*, "Newsweek Poll: 90% Believe in God." Online. Available HTTP http://www.yoism.org/?q=node/320 (accessed November 20, 2007).
10 Cited in J. Gibney, "Globalization, American Exceptionalism and Security," in Robert G. Patman (ed.) *Globalization and Conflict: National Security in a "New" Strategic Era*, London and New York: Routledge, 2006, p. 87.
11 Lipset, *American Exceptionalism*, p. 63.
12 D. Bell, "The 'Hegelian Secret': Civil Society and American Exceptionalism," in B.E. Shafer (ed.) *Is America Different? A New Look at American Exceptionalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991, pp. 50–51.
13 President Ronald Reagan, cited in F. Fitzgerald, *Way Out There in the Blue: Reagan, Star Wars and the End of the Cold War*, New York: Simon Schuster, 2000, p. 24.
14 J.C. Hathaway, "America, Defender of Democratic Legitimacy?," *European Journal of International Law*, 11(1), 2000, 121–133.
15 S. Patrick, "Multilateralism and its Discontents: The Causes and Consequences of US Ambivalence," in S. Patrick and S. Forman (eds.) *Multilateralism and US Foreign Policy: Ambivalent Engagement.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2002, p. 7.
16 Gibney, "Globalization," pp. 79–94.
17 R.M. Brown, *For a Christian America: A History of the Religious Right*, Amherst, MA: Prometheus Books, 2002, pp. 20–21.
18 L. Geering, *Fundamentalism, The Challenge to the Secular World*, Wellington: St Andrew's Trust for the Study of Religion and Society, 2003, pp. 23–26.
19 S.P. Huntington, *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004, pp. 345.
20 Ibid.

21 J. Micklethwait and A. Wooldridge, *The Right Nation: Conservative Power in America*, New York: Penguin Press, 2004, pp. 83–84.
22 Micklethwait and Wooldridge, *The Right Nation*, pp. 47–62.
23 Brown, *For a Christian America*, pp. 16–21.
24 Micklethwait and Wooldridge, *The Right Nation,* p. 98.
25 Office of the Secretary of Defense, *Defense Planning Guidance for the 1994–1999 Fiscal Years* (draft), 1992; *The New York Times*, March 8, 1992; and D. Armstrong, "Dick Cheney's Song of America: Drafting a Plan for Global Dominance," *Harper's Magazine*, October 2002, p. 78.
26 F. Fitzgerald, "George Bush & the World," *New York Review of Books*, September 26, 2002, pp. 4–6. Online. Available HTTP http://www.nybooks.com/articles/15698 (accessed September 20, 2004).
27 J. Mearsheimer and S. Walt, "The Israel Lobby," *London Review of Books*, 28(6), 2006, 8.
28 D. Nabers, "The Social Construction of the Alliance against Terror – Japan, Germany and the United States," *Cooperation and Conflict*, 41(3), 2006, 305–326.
29 N. Chomsky, *9/11 Synthetic Terror: Made in USA*. Joshua Tree, CA: Webster Griffin Tarpley, 2005, pp. 40, 51–53, 61, 104.
30 M. Leffler and J.F. Legro (eds.), *To Lead the World: American Strategy after the Bush Doctrine*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
31 S.P. Huntington, *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004, p. 354.
32 Micklethwait and Wooldridge, *The Right Nation*, pp. 261–262.
33 P. Singer, *The President of Good and Evil; the Ethics of George W. Bush*, New York: Dutton, 2004, pp. 110–111.
34 Micklethwait and Wooldridge, *The Right Nation*, p. 146.
35 The White House (September 20, 2001) *Address of the President to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People.* Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html (accessed November 20, 2003).
36 S.M. Walt, "Beyond bin Laden. Reshaping U.S. Foreign Policy," *International Security,* 26(3), 2001/2, 56–78: 56; and D. Nabers, "Culture and Collective Action: Japan, Germany and the United States after 11 September 2001," *Cooperation and Conflict*, 41(3), 2006, 305–326.
37 R. Jackson, *Writing the War on Terrorism: Language, Politics and Counterterrorism*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005, p. 29.
38 D. Campbell, "Time is Broken. The Return of the Past in the Response to September 11," *Theory and Event,* 2002. Online. Available HTTP http://muse.jhu. edu/journals/theory_and_event/v005/5.4campbell.html (accessed January 22, 2005).
39 US Department of State (October 26, 2001) *Remarks to the National Foreign Policy Conference for Leaders of Nongovernmental Organizations, Secretary Colin L. Powell.* Online. Available HTTP http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2001/5762.htm (accessed March 20, 2004).
40 The White House, *Address of the President to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People.*
41 Domke, *God Willing*, p. 13.
42 As President Bush emphasized, "The stakes of this fight for all nations are high – our lives, our way of life, and our economic future. By attacking two great economic symbols, the terrorists tried to shatter confidence in the world economic system. [...] Terrorists want to turn the openness of the global economy against itself. We must not let them." See The White House (October 20, 2001) *President Says Terrorists Tried to Disrupt World Economy.*

Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011021-5.html (accessed April 9, 2004).

43 Ibid.

44 The White House, President George W. Bush (September 13, 2001) National Day of Prayer and Remembrance for the Victims of the Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001. Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010913-7.html (accessed July 14, 2007).

45 The White House, *Address of the President to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People.*

46 The White House (January 29, 2002) *President Delivers State of the Union Address.* Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html (accessed December 20, 2003).

47 The White House (2002) *President Bush Delivers Graduation Speech at West Point.* Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020601-3.html (accessed July 20, 2003).

48 George W. Bush, as cited in C.G. Ryn, *America the Virtuous; the Crisis of Democracy and the Quest for Empire*, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2003.

49 George W. Bush cited (September 14, 2001). Online. Available HTTP http://www.news.telegraph.co.uk, (accessed September 25, 2001).

50 The White House (February 10, 2003) *President Bush Discusses Faith-based Initiative in Tennessee, Opryland Hotel, Nashville, Tennessee.* Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/02/20030210-1.html (accessed August 10, 2004).

51 S. Critchley, "Is There a Normative Deficit in the Theory of Hegemony?," in S. Critchley and O. Marchart (eds.) *Laclau. A Critical Reader*, London/New York: Routledge, 2004, pp. 113–122.

52 Armstrong, "Dick Cheney's Song," p. 81.

53 The White House, *President Delivers State of the Union Address.*

54 P. Robertson (November 14, 2002) *Nov. 11 Statement by Pat Robertson on The 700 Club,* The Official Site of Pat Robertson. Online. Available HTTP http://www.patrobertson.com/PressReleases/bushresponse2.asp (accessed October 10, 2007).

55 E. Kaplan, *With God on Their Side: How Christian Fundamentalists Trampled Science, Policy, and Democracy in George W. Bush's White House,* New York: New Press, 2004, p. 13.

56 F. Graham cited in "Cover Story: Anti-Islam," *PBS*, December 20, 2002.

57 J. Vines cited in "The Fight for God," *Economist.com*, December 19, 2002.

58 BBC News, August 12, 2006. Available HTTP http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/4785065.stm.

59 Geering, *Fundamentalism*, p. 44.

60 U.S. Department of State, Secretary of State Powell (October 26, 2001) "It was an attack against the world, not just against the United States," in *Remarks to the National Foreign Policy Conference for Leaders of Nongovernmental Organizations.* Online. Available HTTP http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2001/5762.htm (accessed March 20, 2004).

61 J. Der Derian, "*In Terrorem*: Before and After 9/11," in K. Booth and T. Dunne (eds.) *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002, p. 102, emphasis in original.

62 E. Laclau and L. Zac, "Minding the Gap: The Subject of Politics," In E. Laclau (ed.) *The Making of Political Identities,* New York: Verso, pp. 11–39: 16.

63 D. Domke, E.S. Graham, K. Coe, S.L. John, and T. Coopman, "Going Public as Political Strategy: The Bush Administration, an Echoing Press, and Passage of the Patriot Act," *Political Communication*, 23, 2006, 291–312.

64 P.A. Ibbetson, *Living Under The Patriot Act: Educating A Society,* Bloomington, IN: Author House, 2007.

65 D. Nabers, "Filling the Void of Meaning: Identity Construction in U.S. Foreign Policy after September 11, 2001," *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 2, 2009, 191–214.

66 R. Niebuhr cited in Domke, *God Willing*, p. 91; see also A. Norris, " 'Us' and 'Them': The Politics of American Self-Assertion after 9/11," *Metaphilosophy* 35(3), 2004, 249–272.

67 The White House (October 17, 2001) *President Outlines War Effort*. Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011017-15.html (accessed March 8, 2004).

68 The White House (September 20, 2001) *Address of the President to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People.*

69 The White House, *Remarks by the President Upon Arrival.*

70 The White House, *President Bush Delivers Graduation Speech at West Point.*

71 U.S. Department of State, Secretary of State Colin Powell (October 26, 2001) *Remarks to the National Foreign Policy Conference for Leaders of Nongovernmental Organizations.* Online. Available HTTP http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2001/5762.htm (accessed March 20, 2004).

72 U.S. Department of Defense (October 7, 2001) *Rumsfeld and Myers Briefing on Enduring Freedom.* Online. Available HTTP http://www.defenselink.mil/transcripts/2001/t10072001_t1007sd.html (accessed March 20, 2004).

73 A.M. Smith, *Laclau and Mouffe. The Radical Democratic Imaginary,* New York: Routledge, 1998, p. 168.

74 The White House (September 12, 2001) *Remarks by the President while touring Damage at the Pentagon.* Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010912-12.html (accessed December 15, 2003).

75 Cited in B. Whitaker, "Raising The Double Standard in Afghan War", *Guardian*, November 26, 2001.

76 U.S. Department of Justice, *Attorney General John Ashcroft Testimony before the House Committee on the Judiciar,* Online. Available HTTP http://www.usdoj.gov/ag/testimony/2001/agcrisisremarks9_24.htm (accessed March 20, 2002).

77 The White House (2002) *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America,* Washington DC.

78 Pew Research Center (2002) *Americans and Europeans Differ Widely on Foreign Policy Issues,* Washington DC: Pew Research Center.

79 Polling Report (August 9–16, 2005) *The Harris Poll Iraq.* Online. Available HTTP http://www.pollingreport.com/iraq9.htm (accessed April 23, 2007).

80 MSNBC, October 3, 2004. Online. Available HTTP http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/6158694/.

81 Pew Research Center, *Pew Global Attitudes Project*, Washington DC: Pew Research Center, 2002.

82 *Guardian,* April 27, 2005.

83 J. Gibney, "Globalization, American Exceptionalism and Security," in Robert G. Patman (ed.) *Globalization and Conflict: National Security in a "New" Strategic Era*, London: Routledge, 2006, pp. 79–94.

84 "Measuring Globalization," *Foreign Policy*, 148, May/June 2005, p. 54.

85 *International Herald Tribune*, February 7, 2002.

86 Pew Research Center (2005) *Global Opinion: The Spread of Anti-Americanism.* Online. Available HTTP http://pewglobal.org/commentary/pdf/104.pdf (accessed April 23, 2007).

87 *Guardian*, January 23, 2007.

88 President John F. Kennedy cited in Lord Longford, *Kennedy*, London: W.H. Allen, 1976, p. 51.

5 The liberal roots of the American empire[1]

Michael C. Desch

Introduction

Why has the US, with its long-standing Liberal tradition, come to embrace the illiberal policies it has in recent years? Abroad, the US has pursued a strategy of hegemony, verging on empire, and almost unilaterally launched a preventive war in Iraq in a fashion inconsistent with its Liberal values. At home, policies such as those flowing from the USA Patriot Act, including even the rendition and torture of terror suspects, have called into question the US commitment to other important tenets of Liberalism, such as respect for individual rights and civil liberties.

The conventional wisdom is that Al-Qaeda's attacks on the US on September 11, 2001, and the subsequent war on terrorism have made the US less Liberal. The logic of this argument is straightforward: interstate war has historically undermined domestic liberties, and the war on terrorism is causing the US to follow this well-worn path.[2] As the American Civil Liberties Union notes, "Throughout this country's history, the phrase 'national security' has often been used as a pretext for massive violations of individual rights . . . Most recently, the terrorist attacks on 9/11 mobilized much of our country in the fight against terrorism. However, this wave of 'anti-terrorist' activity, all in the name of national security, also launched one of the most serious civil liberties crises our nation has ever seen."[3] Ted Galen Carpenter, of the libertarian Cato Institute, echoes this reasoning: "It is a truism that civil liberties have suffered in most of America's wars."[4]

This explanation for recent US policies confronts a puzzle, however: illiberal policies in the US – including the pursuit of global hegemony, launching of a preventive war, imposition of restrictions upon civil liberties in the name of national security, and support for torture under certain circumstances – emerged even before the 9/11 terrorist attacks and were embraced across the political spectrum. Clearly, the 9/11 attacks cannot explain the US' illiberal policies in the war against terror.

I argue that it is precisely American Liberalism that makes the US so illiberal today. Under certain circumstances, Liberalism impels Americans to spread their values around the world and leads them to see the war on terrorism as a particularly deadly type of conflict that can be won only by employing illiberal tactics.[5] What makes the war on terrorism so dangerous, in this view, is not so much the physical threat to the US, but rather the existential threat to the American way of life and the uncivilized means adversaries employ in seeking to destroy it. Were it not for this Liberal tradition, the US would view the threat from global terrorism in a less alarmist light (more akin to a chronic crime problem than to World War III) and would adopt more restrained policies in response (i.e. containment rather than global transformation).

Because the Liberal tradition is a constant feature of politics in the US, it cannot, by itself, explain changes in US policy, particularly why Liberalism has not consistently affected all aspects of US foreign or domestic policies. The two best applications of Louis Hartz's argument that American Liberalism contains the seeds of illiberal behavior – Samuel Huntington's theory of US civil–military relations and Robert Packenham's account of the politics of the US' development strategy in the third world – concede that the effect of the Liberal tradition is mediated by other variables. Huntington employed the Liberal tradition thesis to explain recurrent civil–military tension in the US as the result of efforts by civilian leaders to liberalize the conservative realism of the country's officer corps.[6] For Huntington, a key variable in explaining changing patterns of civil–military relations is threat. In a high threat environment, civilian Liberalism is muted; when threats recede, civilian Liberalism reasserts itself. Similarly, Packenham argued that the Liberal tradition manifested itself during the Cold War not so much in US military policy toward the Soviet Union in Europe, but in US development strategies in the third world, particularly in the Western Hemisphere, where the US had much greater freedom of action because of weaker Soviet power.[7] I argue that with the end of the Cold War and the rise of unprecedented US hegemony, there have been fewer physical constraints on the excesses of US Liberalism, which is why American illiberalism has become a more acute problem both at home and abroad.[8]

To support this admittedly counterintuitive claim, I begin by laying out the paradoxical argument that US illiberalism has deep roots in the Liberal tradition. Next, I show that George W. Bush and the neoconservative activists both inside and outside his administration share the Liberal tradition's core premises. I then trace the links between the Liberal tradition and the rise of US illiberalism abroad and at home during the Bush presidency. I also address likely objections to my argument. I conclude by arguing that the US ought to embrace a non-Liberal foreign policy by adopting realism as a check on Liberalism's excesses.

The United States' liberal illiberalism

Given the many meanings of the term "Liberalism," it is useful to begin with an explanation of what it means in the context of this article. Liberalism, with a small "l," usually refers to those on the left of the US political spectrum, such as members of Americans for Democratic Action and the American Civil Liberties Union, as well as political figures such as former Massachusetts Governor and Democratic presidential candidate Michael Dukakis and Senator Edward Kennedy. Liberalism with a capital "L" refers to "Lockeanism," that is, a political system or set of political values based on some combination of individual freedom, equality of opportunity, free markets, and political representativeness.[9] Historian Arthur Schlesinger referred to this as the "vital center" of US politics.[10]

Historically, the international behavior of the US has been shaped by Liberalism.[11] In Tony Smith's words, "The most consistent tradition in American foreign policy . . . has been the belief that the nation's security is best protected by the expansion of democracy worldwide."[12] In the US, political figures as diverse as John Quincy Adams, Thomas Jefferson, John F. Kennedy, James Madison, Thomas Paine, Ronald Reagan, Franklin Roosevelt, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson all shared the Liberal tradition.[13] Indeed, non-Liberal politicians and thinkers (e.g., Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger) have been the exception. As neoconservative pundit Robert Kagan notes, "Americans have never accepted the principles of Europe's old order, never embraced the Machiavellian perspective. The US is a liberal, progressive society through and through, and to the extent that Americans believe in power, they believe it must be a means of advancing the principles of a liberal civilization and a liberal world order."[14]

What has varied since its founding, is how the US has sought to achieve this objective. Sometimes it has taken active measures to "make the world safe for democracy," in Woodrow Wilson's famous phrase. At other times it has eschewed going abroad "in search of monsters," as John Quincy Adams put it, in favor of inspiring democracy around the world from "the shining city on the hill." What explains which approach the US is likely to choose?

Jonathan Monten argues that US Liberalism has two main strands: exemplarism and vindicationism. Exemplarists are content to spread democracy and other Liberal values by example; vindicationists are committed to doing so through an activist foreign policy. Monten accounts for the choice of which strand to pursue based on the relative power of the US (i.e. the US embraces vindicationism when it is powerful enough to do so) and changes in the ideological content of US Liberalism.[15] The second half of this argument, however, conflates what Monten wants to explain (i.e. the specifics of US foreign policy) with what causes it (e.g., the types of Liberalism).

Moreover, evidence from both the British and US cases strongly suggests that Liberalism manifests consistent expansionist "urges."[16] In both cases, Liberalism was a constant; it was the relative power positions of Britain and the US that changed their foreign policies. Britain was able to build a Liberal empire in the nineteenth century because it was a global hegemon. The US did the same in the twentieth century for similar reasons. If Monten is correct that power is a necessary but not a sufficient condition, it should be possible to identify powerful Liberal states that eschew hegemony. I can think of no such instances. Conversely, there are numerous instances of non-Liberal great powers, from ancient Sparta through Bismarck's newly unified Germany, that frequently resisted the hegemonic impulse.[17] Ironically, as post-Bismarck Germany liberalized, it engaged increasingly in imperialist pursuits.[18]

President Wilson's different approaches to fostering democracy in Europe and in the Western Hemisphere illustrate that the extent of hegemony determines how the US Liberal tradition manifests itself. Wilson chose to act "mainly through international agreements and organizations" in his dealings with Europe where, despite the ravages of World War I, the US was not yet hegemonic.[19] This approach epitomizes for most people the notion of "Wilsonianism." They forget, however, that Wilson took a very different stance in the Western Hemisphere, where he was not averse to acting unilaterally and forcefully to "teach Latin Americans to elect good men." Wilson used the US military on at least seven occasions to intervene in Latin American and Caribbean countries to effect regime change (Cuba, 1917; Dominican Republic, 1916–1924; Haiti, 1914, 1915–1917, 1918–1919, 1920–1924; and Mexico, 1916–1917).[20]

Bush, neoconservatism, and the Liberal tradition

President George W. Bush and the neoconservatives who were so influential in shaping his foreign policy also embraced significant aspects of America's Liberal tradition.[21] Some observers have even noted continuity between Bush and Woodrow Wilson. In 2003 Lawrence Kaplan wrote, "Bush is becoming the most Wilsonian president since Wilson himself."[22] The link between Liberalism and the neoconservative movement is even stronger than Irving Kristol's quip that he and his colleagues were simply "Liberals who got mugged!" As Ronald Steele concludes, "Liberals and neoconservatives may both be correct in considering themselves to be Wilsonians. In truth, they are more alike than they admit in their ideological ambitions and their moral justifications . . . In practice the difference between interventionist Liberals and the interventionist neoconservatives is more a matter of degree than of principle."[23] One difference between them, though, concerns the role of international institutions. Neoconservatives are far more unilateralist than Liberals, who believe that the US ought to conduct its foreign policy in a multilateral framework under the auspices of international institutions.[24] Still, neoconservatives and Liberals have enough in common to place the former squarely within the Liberal tradition.[25]

During its two terms, the Bush administration embraced all four of the Liberal tradition's key premises. Consider first the Liberal tradition's premise that development is a relatively smooth process. The belief that economic development was a benefit that most of the world could enjoy was a staple of the liberal Charles River Development community in the late 1950s and early 1960s.[26] The Bush administration shared this optimism, though it preferred to rely more on markets and economic incentives than on state guidance and foreign aid to foster economic development.[27]

Like past presidents, Bush was also confident that political development – particularly the spread and consolidation of democracy – could take place nearly anywhere.[28] "Do not bet against freedom," he advised Americans when discussing the prospects for peace in the Middle East.[29] On Iraq, Bush argued, "There was a time when many said that the cultures of Japan and Germany were incapable of sustaining democratic values. Well, they were wrong. Some say the same of Iraq today. They are mistaken. The nation of Iraq – with its proud heritage, abundant resources, and skilled and educated people – is fully capable of moving toward democracy and living in freedom."[30] As for Afghanistan, Vice President Dick Cheney boasted to CNN's Wolf Blitzer that, "the fact of the matter is, the town [Washington, D.C.] has got a lot of people in it who are armchair quarterbacks, or who like to comment on the passing scene. But those who have predicted the demise of our efforts since 9/11, as we fought the war on terror, as we've liberated 50 million people in Iraq and Afghanistan, did not know what they were talking about. And I would submit to you today that we'll succeed in Iraq just like we did in Afghanistan. We'll stand up a new government under an Iraqi draft constitution, we'll defeat the insurgency. And in fact, it will be an enormous success story that will have a huge impact, not just in Iraq but throughout the region."[31]

On the second premise that "all good things go together," the Bush administration also seemed squarely in sync with the Liberal tradition. In the late 1950s and 1960s, Liberals were optimistic that as third world countries became more economically developed, they would also become more politically stable.[32] More recently, the Bush administration argued that, "America's vital interests and our deepest beliefs are now one."[33] As the president told Bob Woodward, "I believe the US is *the* beacon for freedom in the world. And I believe we have a responsibility to promote freedom that is as solemn as the responsibility is to protecting the American people, because the two go hand-in-hand."[34] Bush held up his administration's efforts to democratize Iraq as a prime example of how two good things (democracy and US security) go together: "A free, democratic, peaceful Iraq will not threaten America or our friends with illegal weapons. A free Iraq will not be a training ground for terrorists, or a funnel of money to terrorists, or provide weapons to terrorists who would be willing to use them to strike our country or allies. A free Iraq will not destabilize the Middle East. A free Iraq can set a hopeful example to the entire region and lead other nations to choose freedom. And as the pursuits of freedom replace hatred and resentment and terror in the Middle East, the American people will be more secure."[35] "Democracy is a universal idea," Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz maintained, but "letting people rule themselves happens to be something that serves Americans and America's interest" as well.[36]

Both the Clinton and Bush administrations embraced the democratic peace as their rationale for believing that the spread of democracy would both bolster US security as well as advance American ideals. Clinton's 1996 *National Security Strategy* proclaimed, "The more that democracy and political and economic liberalization take hold in the world . . . the safer our nation is likely to be and the more our people are likely to prosper."[37] In his 2004 State of the Union address, President Bush confirmed, "Our aim is a democratic peace."[38] Later that year, National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice asserted, "President Bush's foreign policy is a bold new vision that draws inspiration from the ideas that have guided American foreign policy at its best: That democracies must never lack the will or the means to meet and defeat freedom's enemies, that America's power and purpose must be used to defend freedom, and that the spread of democracy leads to lasting peace."[39]

The third premise – that radicalism and revolution are bad things that the US needs to combat – was the subject of a speech by President Wilson in March 1913 in the midst of the Mexican Revolution. In the speech, he explained his decision not to work with the revolutionary government of Francisco Madero: "Cooperation is possible only when supported at every turn by the orderly processes of just government based upon law, not upon arbitrary or irregular force. We hold . . . that there can be no freedom without order based upon law and upon the public conscience and approval."[40]

More recently, the Bush administration took the view that the "the gravest danger to freedom lies at the perilous crossroads of radicalism and technology."[41] As Bush's 2002 *National Security Strategy* warned, "Traditional concepts of deterrence will not work against a terrorist enemy whose avowed tactics are wanton destruction and the targeting of innocents; whose so-called soldiers seek martyrdom in death and whose most potent protection is statelessness."[42] In Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld's view, the root of the US' problem in the Islamic world was its increasing radicalism. Rather than the US changing its policies in the region or accommodating itself to Islamic fundamentalism, he contended, "the Muslim world needs to take back its religion – it's been hijacked by a small minority."[43]

The fourth premise – that fostering democracy is more important than maintaining stability – led President Jimmy Carter to push US allies to respect human rights and hold elections during the Cold War, even when doing so undermined their continued hold on power.[44] This same thinking was apparent in the Bush administration's handling of events in Iraq following the ousting of Saddam Hussein. Nothing captures the notion that democracy is more important than order better than Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld's dismissal of the widespread looting and disorder in Iraq after the fall of Baghdad to US forces in April 2003: "Freedom's untidy, and free people are free to make mistakes and commit crimes and do bad things. They're also free to live their lives and do wonderful things."[45] Later, in a speech to the Council on Foreign Relations, he compared the anarchy in Baghdad to the disorder in the US shortly after its revolution.[46] Indeed, if the

Bush administration cared only about establishing a pro-US regime in Iraq, it would have been content to replace Saddam Hussein with a friendly dictator rather than pushing for an elected government with all the turmoil that effort has caused. But as Wolfowitz declared before the war, "We're not interested in replacing one dictator with another."[47] One of the most ill advised decisions made by the Coalition Provisional Authority was to disband Iraq's army and undertake a large-scale purge of all former Baath Party members working in the civilian government – a decision that was motivated by the belief that democracy was more important than order.

President Bush applied this same rationale to other areas of the world, maintaining, for example, that democracy was more important than stability in the occupied territories.[48] And in 2005 Secretary of State Rice argued for the application of this approach to the entire Middle East: "For too long the West, and indeed the United States, assumed that it could turn a blind eye to what the Arab intellectuals called the freedom deficit in the Middle East and that that would be all right. We did that for almost 60 years. And we were doing it in the name of stability, but of course we got neither stability nor democratic change; and instead, it is our belief that we instead got a kind of malignancy underneath which produced al-Qaida and the extremist philosophies and that the only way to fight those extremist ideologies is to spread freedom."[49] Bush and Rice were so committed to the notion that spreading democracy is more important than maintaining stability that they were unwilling to heed calls to cancel the Palestinian Authority elections in the spring of 2006, even after many experts warned that the Islamic fundamentalist party Hamas was likely to win them, posing a serious threat to stability both inside and outside the occupied territories.[50] The same sentiments led Rice to dismiss the summer 2006 border war between democratic Israel and democratic Lebanon as merely the "birth pangs of a new Middle East."[51]

In sum, the Bush administration and its neoconservative allies embraced all four of the Liberal tradition's premises. Paradoxically, these premises also helped to produce many of the Bush administration's illiberal policies.

Links between the Liberal tradition and illiberal policies

Looking through the lens of Liberalism, both the Bush administration and American liberals saw the threats facing the US as dire. Liberalism also led them to reject containment and other policies premised upon living with the threat in favor of extirpating it once and for all. It is this latter premise that fostered illiberal policies such as the pursuit of hegemony, preventive war, the restriction of civil liberties, and even the use of torture.

Terrorism through a liberal lens

The Liberal tradition both overstates the threat that non-Liberal currents pose to the nation's security and understates the challenges associated with trying to spread Liberalism beyond its borders. Following the 9/11 attacks, President Bush argued that America's enemies "want to destroy what we stand for and how we live."[52] America's Liberal tradition casts its enemies in the global war on terrorism as outlaws operating beyond the pale of civilization. In his view, "[they] seek to impose Taliban-like rule, country by country."[53] Bush further asserted that Al-Qaeda targeted "our civilian population, in direct violation of one of the principal norms of the law of warfare."[54] In his 2002 *National Security Strategy,* the president reflected, "Enemies in the past needed great armies and great industrial capabilities to endanger America. Now, shadowy networks of individuals can bring great chaos and suffering to our shores for less that it costs to purchase a single tank. Terrorists are organized to penetrate open societies and to turn the power of modern technologies against us."[55] Many liberals agreed. The Princeton Project on National Security, a group of academics and former policymakers, worried that "the world seems a more menacing place than ever."[56]

Another consequence of the US Liberal tradition is the suggestion that the threat from terrorists or rogue states cannot be contained or managed, but instead must be eliminated. The Liberal tradition offers two strategies for eradicating this threat. First, enemies of the US must be annihilated. "Today, we face brutal and determined enemies – men who celebrate murder, incite suicide, and thirst for absolute power," President Bush claimed. "These enemies," he continued, "will not be stopped by negotiation, or concessions, or appeals to reason."[57] Vice President Cheney echoed these sentiments: "Such a group [as Al-Qaeda] cannot be held back by deterrence, nor reasoned with through diplomacy. For this reason, the war against terror will not end in a treaty. There will be no summit meeting, no negotiations with terrorists. This conflict can only end in their complete and utter destruction."[58] Even moderate figures in the Bush administration, such as former Secretary of State Colin Powell, argued, "Any organization that is tainted by terrorist elements in it or a philosophy of terrorism, we can't work with. And that has to be eliminated."[59]

The second strategy, building on long-standing Liberal arguments that democracies do not go to war with each other, is spreading democracy around the world. President Bush thus made it "the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world."[60] He laid out his reasoning in his second inaugural address: "The survival of liberty in our land increasingly depends on the success of liberty in other lands. The best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world."[61] Bush employed this logic in a February 2003 speech to the American Enterprise Institute characterizing the overthrow of Saddam Hussein as the first step in the eventual transformation of the Middle East: "Acting against the danger will also contribute greatly to the long-term safety and stability of our world. The current Iraqi regime has shown the power of tyranny to spread discord and violence in the Middle

East. A liberated Iraq can show the power of freedom to transform that vital region, by bringing hope and progress into the lives of millions. America's interests in security, and America's belief in liberty, both lead in the same direction: to a free and peaceful Iraq."[62]

Given Liberalism's dire view of the threat posed by non-Liberal currents and its radical prescriptions for how to deal with these threats, it is not surprising that illiberal policies would be the result. There are at least two reasons to think that the Liberal tradition played a role in fostering the Bush administration's illiberal policies. First, many liberals supported these policies, suggesting there was broad consensus behind them. Second, the administration's rationales followed the same Liberal reasoning, indicating that this view of the world shaped US policy.

Liberal ideas, illiberal practice

The Bush administration was not the first to pursue US hegemony. President Clinton's 1996 *National Security Strategy* claimed the US had "a special responsibility" for providing global leadership.[63] Clinton's secretary of state, Madeline Albright, subsequently ruffled feathers in Europe and elsewhere when she argued that the US should lead the international community because "we are the indispensable nation. We stand tall. We see further into the future."[64] Liberal pundits such as *New York Times* columnist Thomas Friedman and scholar Michael Mandelbaum also lauded US hegemony.[65] So when in 2002 National Security Advisor Rice characterized the US as the "world's guardian," she was not departing dramatically from the position of the Clinton administration and its liberal supporters.[66] More recently, Democratic presidential hopeful Barack Obama argued that, "America is the last, best hope of Earth." Other liberals, including the principals of the Princeton Project on National Security, continue to sing the praises of US leadership, even though they argue that it ought to be exercised through multilateral institutions in cooperation with other Liberal democracies.[67]

The intellectual foundation for the establishment of US hegemony was laid before Bush came to office. As David Halberstam and others argued, the humanitarian crises of the 1990s provided the impetus, or at least the rationale, for a more assertive US role around the world.[68] But this new liberal activism has a downside. As David Rieff put it, "The human rights movement, whether wittingly or unwittingly, has increasingly become a force for the recolonization of the world, in the name of human rights."[69] Ironically, Liberalism has become yet another potent "myth of empire."

The Bush administration vigorously pushed for preventive war in Iraq. As the president argued at West Point, "If we wait for threats to fully materialize, we will have waited too long."[70] At the Naval Academy, he reiterated, "The best way to protect our citizens is to stay on the offensive."[71] The *National Security Strategy* justified this stance on the grounds that "given the goals of rogue states and terrorists, the United States can no longer solely rely on a reactive posture as we have in the past. The inability to deter a potential attacker, the immediacy of today's threats, and the magnitude of potential harm that could be caused by our adversaries' choice of weapons do not permit that option. We cannot let our enemies strike first."[72]

As historian Marc Trachtenberg documents, preventive war thinking, including the suggestion of launching a preventive war against Iraq, preceded the Bush presidency.[73] In September 1991, for example, Democratic Senator Al Gore urged the George H.W. Bush administration to finish the job after the Persian Gulf War, reasoning that, "we can no more look forward to a constructive long-term relationship with Saddam Hussein than we could hope to housebreak a cobra."[74] Friedman and former Clinton staffer-turned-liberal-pundit George Stephanopoulos (invoking the authority of liberal philosopher Michael Walzer) thought that the threat from Saddam had become so grave by 1997 that he ought to be assassinated.[75] The 1998 Iraq Liberation Act, which declared "that it should be the policy of the United States to seek to remove the Saddam Hussein regime from power in Iraq and to replace it with a democratic government," passed 360 to 38 in the House of Representatives and was adopted by unanimous consent in the Senate.[76] "So can a liberal support this president in this war?" Leon Wieseltier asked rhetorically before the start of the 2003 Iraq War. His answer: "Liberalism is not a philosophy of innocence, and it should make tyrants quake, not smile."[77]

In the lead-up to the invasion of Iraq, support in the US for the war was bipartisan, largely because it was justified within the Liberal tradition. More than 70 percent of respondents in a March 2003 poll, including many liberals, approved of the Bush administration's decision to invade Iraq.[78] Given this level of public support, it is not surprising that the Senate vote to authorize President Bush to use force against Iraq in October 2002 was 77 to 23, and the House vote was 296 to 123. The lopsided votes underscore that liberals in Congress also found this rationale convincing. As Democratic Senator Hillary Clinton admitted, "I was one who supported giving President Bush the authority, if necessary, to use force against Saddam Hussein. I believe that was the right vote. I have had many disputes and disagreements with the administration over how that authority has been used, but I stand by the vote to provide that authority because I think it was a necessary step in order to maximize the outcome that did occur in the Security Council with the unanimous vote to send in inspectors. And I also knew that our forces would be successful."[79]

Support for the Bush administration before the war muted many liberals' subsequent criticisms. Even as it became clear that the war was unnecessary and that the US was increasingly unlikely to succeed in democratizing Iraq, most Democrats focused their criticism on the administration's tactics, not on its larger objectives. Typical was Democratic Senator Joseph Biden's assertion that the problem was that Bush "took us to war essentially alone . . . before it was necessary . . . on the heels of the largest and most lopsided tax cut in history . . . with half the troops we needed to succeed," not that he took us to war in the first place.[80] Likewise, the editorial page of the *New York Times,* as late as October 2006, continued to lament the "needlessly hurried and unilateral" nature of the invasion, while still arguing that, "American should stay and try to clean up the mess it had made."[81] The Princeton Project on National Security criticized the Bush administration's unilateral approach, but still applauded it for at least "strik[ing] a blow for liberty with the toppling of Saddam Hussein."[82]

Indeed, few liberals spoke out against the Iraq War early on. For every Eric Alterman, Todd Gitlin, or Arthur Schlesinger, who opposed the war, greater numbers of liberals – including Madeline Albright, Samuel Berger, Paul Berman, Peter Bienart (along with most of the editorial masthead of the *New Republic),* Bill Clinton, Thomas Friedman, Jeffrey Goldberg, Richard Holbrooke, Michael Ignatieff, George Packer, David Remnick, and Jacob Weisberg – supported it.[83] The handful of liberal voices who opposed the war on principle before March of 2003 were out of government and largely relegated to less influential venues such as the *Nation* or the *New York Review of Books,* rather than leading liberal outlets such as the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post.*

The support for the war among a substantial number of prominent liberal voices caused many others to remain mute. The reason was that many liberals sympathized with the Bush administration's objectives, even if they deplored the means employed to achieve them.[84] As Tony Judt put it, "Today, America's liberal armchair warriors are the 'useful idiots'" of the Bush administration's illiberal foreign policy.[85]

Liberals not only supported the Bush administration's illiberal policies abroad, but also found common cause with them at home. For example, the Bush administration placed significant restrictions on civil liberties, unapologetically justifying such actions as a response to the exigencies of waging the war on terrorism. In replying to questions during testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee in December 2001 regarding the consequences of the war on terrorism on liberty at home, Attorney General John Ashcroft stated, "We need honest, reasoned debate; not fearmongering. To . . . those who scare peace-loving people with phantoms of lost liberty, my message is this: Your tactics only aid terrorists – for they erode our national unity and diminish our resolve. They give ammunition to America's enemies, and pause to America's friends. They encourage people of good will to remain silent in the face of evil."[86] Ashcroft's view was not as far removed from the mainstream as one might think. Harvard University law professor and noted civil libertarian Alan Dershowitz also believed that "the new paradigm – terrorist groups capable of wreaking havoc of the kind that only states could previously inflict, but without the accountability of states – requires civil libertarians to rethink our exclusive focus on state action."[87] Social theorist Jürgen Habermas summarized the paradox of contemporary US Liberalism as it wages the war on terrorism, "No freedom for the enemies of freedom."[88]

Indeed, it was the Liberal tradition's domestic consequences that primarily concerned Hartz when he wrote in the 1950s, which is not surprising given that Soviet military power limited US options abroad. He feared that American Liberalism would try to expunge non-Liberal currents from the society. The "red scare" after World War I and McCarthyism during the early Cold War were the most obvious manifestations of that impulse. For Hartz, the paradox of US Liberalism was its intolerance – verging on hysteria – in the face of non-Liberal ideas and institutions. The wellspring of this Liberal absolutism, in Hartz's view, is the presumption that "its norms are self-evident."[89] There is no legitimate reason not to accept them. So if an individual does dissent from the tenets of Liberalism, it can only be evidence of moral defect or malign intent. Well before the White House "plumbers" scandal during Richard Nixon's administration, John F. Kennedy and members of his administration were so infuriated by leaks to *New York Times* defense correspondent Hanson Baldwin that the president authorized the Central Intelligence Agency to conduct illegal surveillance of him. As the recent release of the "family jewels" – a compilation of documents detailing CIA malfeasance assembled for then-Director of Central Intelligence James Schlesinger – makes clear, this was hardly an isolated event.[90]

The most disturbing manifestation of US illiberalism was the Bush administration's willingness to flout international norms governing the laws of war, particularly the treatment of prisoners captured in the war on terrorism, including condoning or even employing torture in the course of their interrogations. In a February 2002 memorandum, President Bush argued, "The war against terrorism ushers in a new paradigm, one in which groups with broad, international reach commit horrific acts against innocent civilians, sometimes with the direct support of states. Our nation recognizes that this new paradigm – ushered in not by us but by terrorists – requires new thinking in the law of war."[91] The direction of this new thinking was made clear in congressional testimony by Cofer Black, head of the CIA's Counterterrorism Center: "There was before 9/11, and there was after 9/11. After 9/11 the gloves came off."[92]

Many liberals endorsed the use of torture against some Taliban and Al-Qaeda prisoners. For instance, Democratic Senator John Rockefeller admitted that in the case of at least one high-ranking Al-Qaeda prisoner, "I wouldn't rule it out. I wouldn't take anything off the table where he is concerned, because this is the man who has killed hundreds and hundreds of Americans over the past ten years."[93] Similarly, New York Democratic Senator Charles Schumer observed, "There are very few people in this room or in America who would say that torture should never, ever be used, particularly if thousands of lives are at stake."[94]

Well before the September 2001 attacks, some liberals had begun to argue that under certain circumstances torture was acceptable. They justified it using one of two rationales. The first concerned the "ticking bomb" scenario in which the authorities confront the problem of how to extract time-sensitive information from a recalcitrant prisoner with knowledge that could save many lives.[95] In such a case, many accepted the Liberal utilitarian argument that the evil of torture is outweighed by the potential loss of life if the authorities do not obtain information quickly. As Dershowitz rationalized, "The simple cost–benefit analysis for employing such nonlethal torture seems overwhelming: it is surely better to inflict nonlethal pain on one guilty terrorist who is illegally withholding information needed to prevent an act of terrorism than to permit a large number of innocent victims to die."[96] Walzer has long made the point that the responsible politician will of necessity have "dirty hands," because he or she will frequently confront situations such as the "ticking bomb" scenario in which immoral acts such as torture will have to be undertaken for the greater good.[97]

A second argument for condoning torture was offered by both liberals and the Bush administration: terrorists are so evil that they have placed themselves "beyond the pale" of civilization and thereby forfeit the protections due to its law-abiding citizens. It was this line of thinking that animated former Justice Department official John Yoo in his brief to the White House advancing the proposition that the Geneva Conventions did not apply to prisoners taken in Afghanistan. "Why is it so hard for people to understand that there is a category of behavior not covered by the legal system?" he asked. "What were pirates? They weren't fighting on behalf of any nation. What were slave traders? Historically, there were people so bad that they were not given protection of the laws. There were no specific provisions for their trial, or imprisonment. If you were an illegal combatant, you didn't deserve the protection of the laws of war."[98] Employing similar reasoning, Dershowitz wrote, "We must . . . place [terrorists] beyond the pale of dialogue and negotiation . . . We must hunt them down and punish them and incapacitate them, without regard for the possible substantive justice of their cause."[99] University of Chicago divinity professor Jean Bethke Elshtain also accepted this logic, "There are moments when this rule [against torture] may be overridden."[100] Walzer likewise argued, "The only political response to ideological fanatics and suicidal holy warriors is implacable opposition."[101]

Responses to possible objections

Showing that the Bush administration justified its policies using Liberal rationales and highlighting the support for these policies by many liberals are not, by themselves, sufficient to indict Liberalism for the US' illiberal behavior, unless it is possible to discount alternative explanations. In this section I discuss five reasonable, but ultimately unpersuasive, objections to my argument that contemporary US illiberalism is rooted in its Liberal tradition.

First, some scholars argue that Liberalism has not been the dominant intellectual current in the US as Hartz maintained. Political theorist Rogers Smith claimed that US political thought in fact contains "multiple traditions."[102] Although Hartz may have overstated Liberalism's dominance, it has nevertheless been the most consistent and influential ideology in US history.[103] Moreover, Smith's "multiple traditions" thesis overstates the differences between Liberalism and the alternatives he posits.[104] Finally, as Packenham conceded regarding the role of the Liberal tradition in the US intervention in Vietnam, it does not have to be the only factor to still be an important part of the explanation.[105]

A second objection is that a Liberal international order may be possible without having to change the domestic regimes of all the member states. For example, neoliberal institutionalists maintain that international cooperation could emerge under the auspices of international institutions because these reduce the transaction costs of state interaction in an anarchic environment.[106] The logic of this argument should hold irrespective of regime type. Commercial Liberals, in contrast, might assert that because international economic cooperation provides greater wealth to those who engage in it, this sort of Liberal international order could also be self-sustaining irrespective of the nature of the domestic regimes of the states involved. There are two problems with these lines of argument. To begin with, institutions rarely, if ever, cause states to act against their national interests and are therefore unlikely, by themselves, to fundamentally change the nature of international politics.[107] Moreover, states frequently forgo cooperation that might result in absolute gains when such gains might produce unequal relative gains.[108]

Third, some analysts might concede that the Liberal tradition colors the rhetoric of US policy, but still maintain that it does not really shape the country's behavior, which they argue is driven primarily by other considerations such as power or interest.[109] In other words, Liberal-sounding rhetoric is akin to the Leninist boilerplate in speeches by Soviet leaders during the Brezhnev era. If this were the case, realists ought to find little to criticize in US behavior. But over the years, the US engaged in a significant amount of non-realist behavior. In the 1960s, leading realists such as Hans Morgenthau and Kenneth Waltz were outspoken opponents of US policy in Vietnam.[110] More recently, realists such as John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt were leading critics of the Bush administration's Iraq policies.[111]

If Liberalism is merely rhetoric for public consumption, then what US leaders say in private should differ from their public rhetoric. But studies show that the public and private rhetoric of US policymakers does not diverge significantly.[112] And although it is true that the Bush administration's public and private rhetoric has sometimes diverged, it has often been the reverse of the conventional wisdom that Liberal rhetoric conceals realist action. In the case of the Iraq War, the Bush administration offered an interest-based rationale in public (fighting terrorism and eliminating weapons of mass destruction), while embracing an idealist rationale behind the scenes (spreading democracy and promoting human rights).[113] Before the war, President Bush told *Washington Post* reporter Bob Woodward, "As we think through Iraq, we may or may not attack. I have no idea. But it will be for the objective of making the world peaceful."[114] Or as Deputy Secretary of Defense Wolfowitz told *Vanity Fair* in May 2003, well before he needed other rationales for the war, "The truth is that for reasons that have a lot to do with the US government bureaucracy we settled on the one issue that everyone could agree on, which was weapons of mass destruction . . . [But there] have always been three fundamental concerns. One is weapons of mass destruction, the second is support for terrorism, the third is the criminal treatment of the Iraqi people."[115] Nothing could better epitomize Liberal tradition thinking than statements such as these.

One might concede that the Liberal tradition is broadly influential in US society, especially among the intellectual elite (including neoconservatives in and out of the Bush administration) but point out that the architects of the administration's foreign policy – Vice President Cheney and Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld – were hardly Liberals. In fact, some European commentators characterize them as realists.[116] There are two questionable assertions here. First, Bush and other senior members of his administration were vociferous critics of realism, so it seems odd to suggest that Cheney and Rumsfeld were really crypto-realists.[117] Second, this criticism assumes that Bush, Cheney, and Rumsfeld had well-articulated worldviews that they imposed on the rest of the administration. The evidence does not support this assumption. Before the 2000 election, Bush confessed to Saudi Ambassador Prince Bandar, "I don't have the foggiest idea about what I think about foreign policy."[118] Rumsfeld served in the Nixon and Ford administrations during the detente era and implemented US policies, anathema to neoconservatives, and in the Reagan administration he was the US envoy to Saddam Hussein's Iraq. As Secretary of Defense in the George H.W. Bush administration, Cheney reluctantly supported the decision not to intervene in Iraq during the Shiite uprising in 1991, a decision that many neoconservatives deplored.[119] As he later explained, "I felt there was a real danger here that you would get bogged down in a long drawn-out conflict, that this was a dangerous, difficult part of the world."[120] Both Cheney and Rumsfeld eventually signed on to the neoconservative Project for a New American Century's statement of principles.[121] Instead of defining the Bush administration's overarching foreign policy philosophy, both men embraced and implemented the neoconservative agenda established by others.

Fourth, some might object that the US' illiberal policies at home and abroad were simply the logical responses to the 9/11 attacks and the exigencies of waging the war on terrorism. As I have shown, however, the Liberal tradition exercised its illiberal influence on US foreign policy well before those attacks. And illiberal policies such as pursuing hegemony, engaging in preventive war, imposing restrictions on civil liberties, and practicing torture are by no means the best weapons for waging the war against Al-Qaeda.[122] Moreover, if the Bush administration's primary rationale for waging preventive war was to deny weapons of mass destruction to rogue regimes with ties to terrorists, then states such as Iran, North Korea, and even

Pakistan should have been higher priorities than Iraq, given their more advanced capabilities and better-documented ties to terrorists. That they were not higher priorities for the Bush administration suggests that the threat of weapons of mass destruction and ties to international terrorism were less salient concerns than the administration's longer-term desire to implant a pro-US democratic regime in Iraq that would lead to the political transformation of neighboring authoritarian regimes, solving a number of the US' problems in the Middle East all at once. As Michael Gordon and Bernard Trainor put it, "For the Bush Administration, Iraq was an inviting target for preemption not because it was an immediate threat but because it was thought to be a prospective menace that was incapable of successfully defending itself against a US invasion. For an administration that was determined to change the strategic equation in the Middle East and make Saddam an object lesson to other proliferators, Iraq was not a danger to avoid but a strategic opportunity."[123] Such a strategy of regional transformation flows logically from the Liberal tradition's premises that the spread of democracy is a panacea and its absence a threat.

Fifth, some critics might point to deviations from the Liberal tradition's agenda to argue that it does not really influence US foreign policy. During the 1990s, for example, Samantha Power and others held up the US' failure to intervene in Rwanda as evidence of a hollow commitment to human rights.[124] In doing so, however, such critics ignored the plethora of other US-led humanitarian interventions of the period, including Bosnia, Haiti, Kosovo, and Somalia. Others might impugn the Bush administration's commitment to spreading democracy in the Middle East by pointing out that although the US may have toppled a dictatorship in Iraq, it maintains close relations with nondemocratic regimes in Egypt, Jordan, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia. But this would ignore the expectation of many proponents of the invasion of Iraq in the Bush administration, particularly Deputy Secretary of Defense Wolfowitz, that the overthrow of Hussein and the establishment of a democratic regime in Iraq would pressure other regimes in the region to democratize.[125]

In sum, the weakness of alternative explanations for US illiberalism increases confidence in the argument that Liberalism itself is the culprit. Given this, it is necessary to look beyond Liberalism to find sound intellectual underpinnings for US foreign policy.

Conclusion: realism as a check on liberal excess

For Hartz, the US' problem is not Liberalism per se, but rather Liberalism unchecked by an ideological alternative. "It is not to disparage liberalism," he maintained, "to say that a knowledge of it and nothing else can produce an absolute temper of mind that in the end is self-defeating."[126] In Hartz's view, America's Liberal tradition is so deep-seated and all encompassing that there can be little real debate about the objectives of US policies (e.g., spreading democracy), but instead merely quibbles about how to achieve them. Thus, a real challenge to the Liberal tradition can come only from an alternative political ideology. Some scholars recommend one that is based on the philosophy of Edmund Burke.[127] Such a worldview would recognize the limits of the US' ability to engineer the political, social, and economic systems of other countries. It would be sensitive to the unintended consequences of economic and political development. It would reject "one-size-fits-all" arguments such as the universality of democracy. It would appreciate that all good things do not always go together, and that states frequently have to make trade-offs between their interests and their values.[128]

Changing America's Liberal domestic political culture is likely to be extremely difficult. In a Hartzian vein, I suggest instead that the US needs a foreign policy based on realism, a decidedly non-Liberal way of looking at the world, to provide a check on some of its excesses abroad and at home as it wages the war on terrorism.

To begin, realists take seriously the threat from international terrorism, but they also put it in perspective. Fewer people have been killed since the 1993 World Trade Center bombing in the war against Al-Qaeda as a percentage of the population (0.0009), than in the American Civil War (1.78), World War II (0.29), or even Vietnam (0.03). Indeed, terrorism ranks very low as a cause of death among Americans in the period from 1995 to 2005 (3,147), well behind car accidents (254,419), workplace injuries (59,730), influenza (19,415), and even complications from hernias (16,742).[129] Realists are also skeptical of the Bush administration's claim that the US faces a more dangerous adversary in Al-Qaeda than it did from the Soviet Union during the Cold War. After all, the Soviets had a huge nuclear arsenal capable of ending life on the planet as we know it, while the most reasonable worst-case scenarios today are that Al-Qaeda might acquire one or two crude radiological "dirty bombs." The US is fighting World War IV, as some neoconservatives aver, only in the very limited sense that Al-Qaeda is based in a number of different countries.[130] In other words, realism counsels prudent caution – not panic – in the US approach to the global war on terror.[131]

Realists also have a more balanced perspective on Al-Qaeda's motives than do Liberals. Rather than seeing Osama bin Laden and his allies as mindless religious fanatics bent on destroying the American way of life, realists understand that he and his followers are pursuing a limited political agenda to end the US military presence in the Middle East.[132] And realists understand that Al-Qaeda's tactics – particularly suicide terrorism – make strategic sense for a weak non-state actor that has no other choice than to wage asymmetric warfare.[133] To be sure, realists recognize that important US interests are at stake in the war on terrorism that must be defended, but they are less inclined than Liberals to regard Al-Qaeda as implacable and invincible.

Unlike Liberals, realists also understand that radicalism is not always a destabilizing force. Despite hair-raising rhetoric about the possibility of winning a nuclear war during the 1950s, even Mao Zedong's China behaved rationally once it developed nuclear weapons a decade later.[134] Today, realists understand that nationalist movements, though often radical, can help to make the international system more benign. This is because nationalism is the impetus for balancing behavior among states, which helps maintain the balance of power.[135] In other words, realists do not harbor as great a fear of radicalism as do Liberals.

It is also not surprising that it has been the conservative realists in the US military, not liberal civilian politicians, who have been most consistently committed to upholding the Geneva Conventions and maintaining the norm against torture. True, the basis of this commitment has been pragmatic (military professionals support the Geneva Conventions because they understand that they benefit US troops) rather than principled.[136] Regardless of their rationale, realists are less likely than Liberals to place their enemies beyond the pale of civilization.

Realists have also been far less enthusiastic about US efforts to achieve hegemony than either liberals or the Bush administration. While some non-realists have made principled arguments about why the world would be better off under US domination, it has been realists, arguing largely on pragmatic grounds, who have most consistently urged restraint and caution.[137] They fear that as the US grasps for the mantle of world domination, it will generate opposition around the world, resulting in greater international tension and conflict.[138] As Reinhold Niebuhr observed in a somewhat different context, realism "ought to persuade us that political controversies are always conflicts between sinners and not between righteous men and sinners. It ought to mitigate the self-righteousness which is an inevitable concomitant of all human conflict."[139] Realists understand that the rest of the world does not see the US as a benign hegemon despite its good intentions.[140] "One reads about the world's desire for American leadership only in the United States," observed an anonymous British diplomat, but "everywhere else one reads about American arrogance and unilateralism."[141]

Finally, Liberalism vacillates between isolationism when it cannot change the world and messianism when it can. The common impulse linking these two otherwise different foreign policies, according to Hartz, is that Liberalism leads the US "either to withdraw from 'alien' things or transform them: it cannot live in comfort constantly by their side."[142] Realism, in contrast, provides the US with the basis for a consistent and sustained policy of engagement with the rest of the world based on the principle that it can pursue its national interests without having either to remake the rest of the world in its image or retreat from the international system entirely.

The centerpiece of the Bush administration's Liberal foreign policy was the toppling of Saddam Hussein and the construction of a democratic, multi-confessional state in Iraq as the first step in the larger regional transformation of the Middle East. This effort appears to have failed.[143] Not surprisingly, this demonstration of the limits of US hegemony led many observers to call for a change in course. Some advocated a return to a more purely Liberal US foreign policy, thinking that if the US pursued many of the same ends as the Bush administration (regime transformation and preventive war), but employed different means (multilateralism and international institutions), the US would have more success.[144] This approach assumed, however, that the failures of the Bush administration were a function of the means employed, not the unrealistic ends pursued. Others have tried to blend Liberalism with realism to craft a different foreign policy approach for the US.[145] But combining realism and Liberalism in foreign policy was not the solution either. Liberalism's "imprudent vehemence" abroad is too hard to restrain given post-Kantian Liberalism's paradoxical tendency toward illiberal excess in the face of domestic and foreign challenges. Thus, the only way to preserve Liberalism's many virtues as the foundation of the US' domestic regime without suffering from Liberalism's excesses abroad is to adopt a doctrine of "Liberalism in one country." In other words, US policymakers should apply each approach to its own sphere: Lockeanism at home and Machiavellianism in the rest of the world.

Notes

1 Originally published as "America's Liberal Illiberalism: The Ideological Origins of Overreaction in U.S. Foreign Policy," *International Security* 32(3), 2007, 7–43. Portions reprinted here by permission of MIT Press.

2 For two classic articulations of the argument that war restricts domestic liberty, see O. Hintze, "Military Organization in the Organization of the State," in Felix Gilbert (ed.) *The Historical Essays of Otto Hintze*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1975, pp. 178–215; and H.D. Lasswell, "The Garrison State," *American Journal of Sociology,* 46(4), 1941, 455–468. For more recent discussions, see R. Higgs, *Crisis and Leviathan: Critical Episodes in the Growth of American Government*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1987; Bruce D. Porter, *War and the Rise of the State: The Military Foundations of Politics*, New York: Free Press, 1994; and M.C. Desch, "War and Strong States, Peace and Weak States?" *International Organization,* 50(2), 1996, 237–268. A new literature that challenges the conventional wisdom about the inverse relationship between war and liberty is summarized in P. Start, *Freedom's Power: The True Force of Liberalism*, New York: Basic Books, 2007.

3 See American Civil Liberties Union. Online. Available HTTP http://www.acluct.org/issues/nationalsecurity (accessed May 22, 2009).

4 T.G. Carpenter (June 21, 2002) "Protecting Liberty in a Permanent War," Washington, D.C.: Cato Institute. Online. Available HTTP http://www.cato.org/dailys/06-21-02.html (accessed May 22, 2009).

5 This argument builds on, but ultimately goes well beyond, L. Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America*, San Diego, Calif.: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1955. Christopher Layne suggests that Liberalism, as embodied in what some diplomatic historians refer to as the "Open Door," explains U.S. grand strategy since World War II. See C. Layne, *The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to the Present*, Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2006, chap. 7.

6 S.P. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil–Military Relations*, Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap, 1957, p. 155.

7 Huntington, *The Soldier,* p. 32; and R.A. Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World: Political Development Ideas in Foreign Aid and Social Science*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1973, p. 316.

8 Other scholars who suggest that American hegemony makes American domestic political culture more salient are S.D. Krasner, *Defending the National Interest: Raw Materials Investments and U.S. Foreign Policy*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1978, pp. 340–342; C. Dueck, *Reluctant Crusaders: Power, Culture, and Change in American Grand Strategy*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2006.; L. Freedman, "The Age of Liberal Wars," in D. Armstrong, T. Farrell, and B. Maiguashca (eds.) *Force and Legitimacy in World Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006, p. 97; and R. Jervis, "The Compulsive Empire," *Foreign Policy,* 137, 2003, pp. 83–87.

9 S.G. Brown, *Freedom Limited: An Essay on Democracy; the Individual and the New World;* and *The Liberal Tradition in America,* book review, *Ethics,* 65(4), 1955, p. 313; M. Meyers, "Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America:* An Appraisal," *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* 5(3), 1963, p. 263; and M.W. Doyle, *Ways of War and Peace: Realism, Liberalism, and Socialism*, New York: W.W. Norton, 1997, pp. 206–207.

10 A.M. Schlesinger Jr., *The Vital Center: The Politics of Freedom*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1949.

11 G.F. Kennan, *American Diplomacy, 1900–1950*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951, p. 46.

12 T. Smith, *America's Mission: The United States and the Worldwide Struggle for Democracy in the Twentieth Century*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993, p. 9.

13 L. Hartz, "Conflicts within the Idea of the Liberal Tradition: Comment," *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* 5(3), 1963, p. 283.

14 R. Kagan, "Power and Weakness: Why the United States and Europe See the World Differently," *Policy Review,* 113, 2002, pp. 3–28. Online. Available HTTP http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/3460246.html (accessed May 24, 2009). Kagan continues this theme in "Cowboy Nation," *New Republic,* October 23, 2006, pp. 20–23. See also Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World,* p. 7; and Freedman, "The Age of Liberal Wars," p. 94.

15 J. Monten, "The Roots of the Bush Doctrine: Power, Nationalism, and Democracy Promotion in U.S. Strategy," *International Security,* 29(4), 2005, pp. 112–156. This argument is developed historically and at greater length in J. Pitts, *A Turn to Empire: The Rise of Imperial Liberalism in Britain and France*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2006.

16 U.S. Mehta, *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth-Century British Liberal Thought*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999, p. 20. Jennifer Pitts also highlights the Liberal imperialism of early nineteenth-century France, particularly in the work of Alexis de Tocqueville on the Algerian question. Pitts, *A Turn to Empire,* pp. 204–239.

17 See the contrasts drawn between Sparta and Athens by the Corinthians in R.B. Strassler (ed.) *The Landmark Thucydides: A Comprehensive Guide to the Peloponnesian War,* Bk. 1, New York: Free Press, 1996. On the moderation of Bismarck's Germany, see J. Joffe, "'Bismarck' or 'Britain'? Toward an American Grand Strategy after Bipolarity," *International Security,* 19(4), 1995, pp. 105–108.

18 W.J. Mommsen highlights the Liberal roots of late nineteenth-century German *Machtpolitik* in his *Max Weber and German Politics: 1890–1920*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984, pp. 84–90.

19 Smith, *America's Mission,* p. 62.

20 Smith, *America's Mission*, pp. 60–83. For a chronology of U.S. military operations, see *GlobalSecurity.org,* "Early 20th-Century Operations." Online. Available HTTP http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/early20cent-ops.htm (accessed May 28, 2009).

21 For more evidence of the links between neoconservativism and Liberalism, see I. Kristol, "The Neoconservative Persuasion," *Weekly Standard,* August 25, 2003, pp. 23–27; and J. Ehrman, *The Rise of Neoconservativism: Intellectuals and Foreign Affairs, 1945–1994*, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1996. Many "Old Right" conservatives were suspicious of the Liberal tenets of neoconservativism. See M. Friedman, *The Neoconservative Revolution: Jewish Intellectuals and the Shaping of Public Policy*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005, pp. 134–135. For a related discussion of the similarities between Liberalism and neoconservativism, see Monten, "The Roots of the Bush Doctrine," p. 116. Finally, Uday Singh Mehta points to clear parallels in the philosophies of Liberal imperialism and neoconservativism. Mehta, *Liberalism and Empire,* p. 214.

22 L.F. Kaplan, "Regime Change: Bush, Closet Liberal," *New Republic,* March 3, 2003, p. 21. See also D.M. Kennedy, "What 'W' Owes to 'WW,'" *Atlantic Monthly,* 295(2), 2005, pp. 36–40; and Freedman, "The Age of Liberal Wars," p. 99.

23 R. Steel, "The Missionary," *New York Review of Books,* 50(18), 2003. Online. Available HTTP http://www.nybooks.com/articles/16797 (accessed May 24, 2009). For an extended discussion of these similarities, see M.C. Desch, "Liberals, Neocons, and Realcons," *Orbis,* 45(4), 2001, pp. 520–522, 526–531.

24 Many Liberals, however, still think that US hegemony is vital for the establishment of multilateral institutions and to ensure they continue to provide necessary public goods. See R.O. Keohane, *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984; and M. Olson, *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965.

25 Friedman, *The Neoconservative Revolution,* p. 134.

26 Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World,* pp. 62–63.

27 George W. Bush, *National Security Strategy of the United States*, Washington, D.C.: White House, September 2002, p. 17.

28 Samuel P. Huntington treats "development" almost exclusively in terms of government institutions. S. Huntington, *Political Order and Changing Societies*, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1965, pp. 1–9. In contrast, Packenham defines development as also involving democratization. Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World,* pp. 114, 127, 130, 137, 148, 156, 288–294, 317.

29 Office of the Press Secretary (May 9, 2003) "President Bush Presses for Peace in the Middle East," remarks by the president at the University of South Carolina's commencement address, Columbia, South Carolina. Online. Available HTTP http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/05/20030509-11.html (accessed September 25, 2009).

30 Office of the Press Secretary (February 26, 2003) "President Discusses the Future of Iraq," remarks by the president at the Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C. Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/02/print/20030226-11.html (accessed May 24, 2009).

31 Office of the Vice President (June 23, 2005) "Interview of the Vice President by Wolf Blitzer, CNN," Washington, D.C. Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/06/print/20050623-8.html (accessed May 24, 2009).

32 For a critique of this widely embraced assumption, see Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies,* p. 6.

33 Office of the Press Secretary (January 20, 2005) "President Bush Sworn-In to Second Term." Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/inaugural/index.html (accessed May 24, 2009).

34 Quoted in B. Woodward, *Plan of Attack*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 2004, p. 88 (emphasis in original).

35 Office of the Press Secretary (July 23, 2003) "President Discusses Progress in Iraq," Washington, D.C. Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/07/print/20030723-1.html (accessed May 24, 2009).

36 Quoted in T.E. Ricks, *Fiasco: The American Military Adventure in Iraq*, New York: Penguin, 2006, p. 17.

37 William J. Clinton, *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement*, Washington, D.C.: White House, 1996, chap. 2. Online. Available HTTP http://www.fas.org/spp/military/docops/national/1996stra.htm#II (accessed May 24, 2009).

38 George W. Bush (January 20, 2004) "State of the Union Address," Washington, D.C. Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov.news/releases/2004/01/print/20040120-7.html (accessed May 24, 2009).

39 Office of the Press Secretary (March 8, 2004) "National Security Advisor Dr. Condoleezza Rice Discusses War on Terror at McConnell Center for Political Leadership," Louisville: University of Louisville Press. Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/03/print/20040308-15.html (accessed May 24, 2009).

40 Quoted in S.F. Bemis, *The Latin American Policy of the United States: An Historical Interpretation*, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1943, p. 175.

41 Office of the Press Secretary (June 1, 2002) "President Bush Delivers Graduation Speech at West Point," United States Military Academy, West Point, New York. Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020601-3.html (accessed May 24, 2009). This view of radicalism is shared by liberals as well. See G.J. Ikenberry and A.M. Slaughter, *Forging a World of Liberty under Law: U.S. National Security in the 21st Century*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Project on National Security, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, September 2006, pp. 38–39. Online. Available HTTP http://www.wws.princeton.edu/ppns/report/FinalReport.pdf (accessed May 24, 2009).

42 Bush, *National Security Strategy of the United States,* p. 15.

43 D. Rumsfeld (February 14, 2003) "Beyond Nation Building," speech given at the Intrepid Sea-Air-Space Museum, New York. Online. Available HTTP http://www.dod.gov/speeches/2003/sp20030214-secdef0024.html (accessed May 24, 2009).

44 This attitude was roundly and famously criticized in J.J. Kirkpatrick, "Dictatorships and Double Standards," *Commentary,* 68(5), 1979, pp. 34–45. This is but one example of how the earlier generation of neoconservatives was much less optimistic about the prospects for democratization than was the later generation that influenced George W. Bush.

45 Quoted in S. Loughlin (April 12, 2003) "Rumsfeld on Looting in Iraq: 'Stuff Happens,'" *CNN.com.* Online. Available HTTP http://www.cnn.com/2003/US/04/11/sprj.irq.pentagon/ (accessed May 24, 2009).

46 United States Department of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (May 27, 2003) "Council on Foreign Relations (Transcript)," remarks by Donald Rumsfeld, New York. Online. Available HTTP http://www.dod.gov/speeches/2003/sp20030527-secdef0245.html (accessed May 24, 2009).

47 Quoted in Ricks, *Fiasco,* p. 96.

48 Office of the Press Secretary (June 24, 2002) "President Bush Calls for New

Palestinian Leadership," Washington, D.C. Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020624-3.html (accessed May 24, 2009).

49 C. Rice (March 1, 2005) "Interview with Arab Journalists," London. Online. Available HTTP http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2005/42853.htm (accessed May 24, 2009).

50 S.R. Weisman, "Rice Admits U.S. Underestimated Hamas Strength," *New York Times,* January 30, 2006.

51 C. Rice (July 21, 2006) "Special Briefing on Travel to the Middle East and Europe," Washington, D.C. Online. Available HTTP http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2006/69331.htm (accessed May 24, 2009).

52 Office of the Press Secretary (May 27, 2005) "President Discusses War on Terror at Naval Academy Commencement," Annapolis, Maryland. Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/05/20050527.html (accessed May 24, 2009).

53 Office of the Press Secretary (May 24, 2004) "President Outlines Steps to Help Iraq Achieve Democracy and Freedom," remarks by the president of the United States, Army War College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania. Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/05/20040524-10.html (accessed May 24, 2009).

54 Bush, *National Security Strategy of the United States,* p. 15.

55 Ibid.

56 Ikenberry and Slaughter, *Forging a World of Liberty under Law,* p. 11.

57 Office of the Press Secretary, "President Discusses War on Terror at Naval Academy Commencement."

58 White House (February 15, 2002) "Remarks by the Vice President to the Council on Foreign Relations," Washington, D.C. Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/vicepresident/news-speeches/speeches/vp20020215.html (accessed May 24, 2009).

59 Colin Powell (July 30, 2003) "Interview by Hemi Shalev of *Ma'ariv* Newspaper." Online. Available HTTP http://www.state.gov/secretary/former/powell/remarks/2003/22965.htm (accessed May 24, 2009).

60 Office of the Press Secretary, "President Sworn-In to Second Term."

61 Ibid.

62 Office of the Press Secretary, "President Discusses the Future of Iraq."

63 Clinton, *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement.*

64 Jane Perlez, "The World: Command Performance; America Talks and (Some) Others Listen," *New York Times,* September 12, 1999.

65 T.L. Friedman, "Brussels Sprouts," *New York Times,* May 11, 2005; and M. Mandelbaum, *The Case for Goliath: How America Acts as the World's Government in the Twenty-first Century*, New York: Public Affairs, 2005.

66 Office of the Press Secretary (April 8, 2002) "National Security Advisor Speaks at Texas A&M," remarks by Condoleezza Rice at the William Waldo Cameron Forum on Public Affairs, College Station, Texas. Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/04/print/20020408-6.html (accessed May 24, 2009).

67 B. Obama (April 23, 2007) "Remarks of Senator Barack Obama to Chicago Global Affairs Council," Chicago, Illinois. Online. Available HTTP http://my.barackobama.com/page/content/fpccga (accessed May 24, 2009); and Ikenberry and Slaughter, *Forging a World of Liberty under Law,* pp. 7, 16, 18, 22, 29, 30, 59.

68 D. Halberstam, *War in a Time of Peace: Bush, Clinton, and the Generals*, New York: Scribner, 2001, pp. 130–131, 307. For an explicit liberal link between a "duty to intervene" in the face of humanitarian crises and a "duty to prevent" nondemocratic regimes from acquiring weapons of mass destruction, see Lee

Feinstein and Anne-Marie Slaughter, "A Duty to Prevent," *Foreign Affairs,* 83(1), 2004, pp. 136–150.

69 H. Kriesler (March 11, 2003) "Humanitarianism, the Human Rights Movement, and U.S. Foreign Policy: Conversation with David Rieff," Conversations with History series, Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley. Online. Available HTTP http://globetrotter.berkeley.edu/people3/Rieff/rieff-con0.html (accessed May 24, 2009). See also S. Holmes (November 14, 2002) "Looking Away," *London Review of Books,* 24(22). Online. Available HTTP http://www.lrb.co.uk/v24/n22/print/holm01_.html (accessed May 24, 2009); and A. Kreye, "American Liberals Torn," *World Press Review,* 50(3), 2003. Online. Available HTTP http://worldpress.org/article_model.cfm?article_ id?1048&dont?yes (accessed May 24, 2009).

70 Office of the Press Secretary, "President Bush Delivers Graduation Speech at West Point."

71 Office of the Press Secretary, "President Discusses War on Terror at Naval Academy Commencement."

72 Bush, *National Security Strategy of the United States,* p. 15.

73 M. Trachtenberg, "Preventive War and U.S. Foreign Policy," *Security Studies,* 16(1), 2007, pp. 1–31.

74 A. Gore, "Defeating Hussein, Once and for All," *New York Times,* September 26, 1991.

75 T.L. Friedman, "Head Shot," *New York Times,* November 6, 1997; and G. Stephanopoulos, "Why We Should Kill Saddam," *Newsweek,* December 1, 1997, p. 34.

76 See Iraq Liberation Act of 1998, H.R. 4655, 105th Cong., 2d sess., October 31, 1998. Online. Available HTTP http://www.iraqwatch.org/government/US/Legislation/ILA.htm (accessed May 24, 2009).

77 L. Wieseltier, "Against Innocence: A Liberal's War, Too," *New Republic,* March 3, 2003, p. 28. For evidence that this reasoning was more widespread among liberals than it was among realists, see M. Massing, "Hawks at the *Washington Post,*" *Nation,* November 11, 2002, pp. 20–23; M. Massing, "The Moral Quandary: Anti-Imperialism vs. Humanitarianism," *Nation,* January 6, 2003, pp. 17–22; and M. Sandalow, "Stance on War Splits Two Top Democrats," *San Francisco Chronicle,* March 16, 2003.

78 USA Today/Gallup poll, reported at http://www.pollingreport.com.

79 "Remarks by Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton" (December 15, 2003) Council on Foreign Relations, New York. Online. Available HTTP http://www.cfr.org/publication/6600/remarks_by_senator_hillary_rodham_ linton_transcript.html (accessed May 24, 2009). See also J. Gerth and D. Van Natta Jr., "Hillary's War," *New York Times Magazine,* 2007, pp. 38–45, 60, 66–67; M. Crowley, "Hillary's War," *New Republic,* 2007, pp. 19–25; and M. Kinsley, "The Troop Funding Trap," *Washington Post,* June 2, 2007.

80 J.R. Biden Jr. (April 15, 2004) "Getting It Right in Iraq," speech given at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington, D.C. Online. Available HTTP http://biden/senate.gov/newsroom/details.cfm?id?220471 (accessed May 24, 2009).

81 "Trying to Contain the Iraq Disaster," *New York Times,* October 24, 2006.

82 Ikenberry and Slaughter, *Forging a World of Liberty under Law,* pp. 37, 63.

83 M. Tomasky, "Beyond Iraq: Toward a New Liberal Internationalism," in N. Jumonville and K. Mattson (eds.) *Liberalism for a New Century*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007, pp. 209–219.

84 G. Packer, "The Liberal Quandary over Iraq," *New York Times Magazine,* December 8, 2002, pp. 104–107, 156; J. Atlas, "What It Takes to Be a Neoconservative," October 19, 2003; Massing, "Hawks at the *Washington Post*";

S. McConnell, "How They Get Away with It," *American Conservative,* July 4, 2005. Online. Available HTTP http://www.amconmag.com/2005_07_04/article.html (accessed May 24, 2009); and Freedman, "The Age of Liberal Wars," p. 100.

85 T. Judt, "Bush's Useful Idiots," *London Review of Books,* 28(18), 2006. Online. Available HTTP http://www.lrb.co.uk/v28/n18/print/judt01_.html (accessed May 24, 2009).

86 Testimony of Attorney General John Ashcroft before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 107th Cong., 1st sess., December 6, 2001. Online. Available HTTP http://www.usdoj.gov/archive/ag/testimony/2001/1206transcriptsenatejudiciary committee.htm (accessed May 24, 2009).

87 A.M. Dershowitz, *Why Terrorism Works: Understanding the Threat, Responding to the Challenge*, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2003, p. 11.

88 Quoted in G. Borradori, *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogues with Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003, p. 41.

89 Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America,* p. 58.

90 T. Weiner, "J.F.K. Turns to the C.I.A. to Plug a Leak," *New York Times,* July 1, 2007. On the CIA "family jewels," see M. Mazzetti and T. Weiner, "Files on Illegal Spying Show C.I.A. Skeletons from Cold War," *New York Times,* June 27, 2007.

91 Quoted in K.J. Greenberg and J.L. Dratel (eds.) *The Torture Papers: The Road to Abu Ghraib*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005, p. 963.

92 Quoted in D. Priest and B. Gellman, "U.S. Decries Abuse but Defends Interrogations: Stress and Duress Tactics Used on Terrorism Suspects Held in Overseas Facilities," *Washington Post,* December 26, 2002.

93 Quoted in S. Levinson, "Contemplating Torture: An Introduction," in S. Levinson (ed.) *Torture: A Collection*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2004, p. 27.

94 Quoted in S. Kull, "Americans on Detention, Torture, and the War on Terrorism," PIPA/Knowledge Networks poll, July 22, 2004, p. 1.

95 "The United States in the World – Just Wars and Just Societies: An Interview with Michael Walzer," *Imprints: A Journal of Analytical Socialism,* 7(1), 2003. Online. Available HTTP http://eis.bris.ac.uk/?plcdib/imprints/michaelwalzer interview.html (accessed May 24, 2009); and S. Levinson, "The Debate on Torture: War against Virtual States," *Dissent,* 50(3), 2003, p. 83.

96 Dershowitz, *Why Terrorism Works,* p. 144.

97 M. Walzer, "Political Action: The Problem of Dirty Hands," *Philosophy and Public Affairs,* 2(2), 1973, p. 168. Walzer is, of course, merely echoing Niccolo Machiavelli's famous dictum that political leaders need to learn how "not to be good." See N. Machiavelli, *The Prince,* trans. L. Ricci, New York: Mentor, 1952, p. 84.

98 Quoted in J. Mayer, "Outsourcing Torture," *New Yorker,* February 14, 2005, pp. 106–123. Online. Available HTTP http://www.newyorker.com/printables/fact/050214fa_fact6 (accessed May 24, 2009).

99 Dershowitz, *Why Terrorism Works,* pp. 24–26.

100 J.B. Elshtain, "Reflection on the Problem of 'Dirty Hands,'" in Levinson, *Torture: A Collection,* pp. 80–83.

101 M. Walzer, "Excusing Terror: The Politics of Ideology," *American Prospect,* October 22, 2001, p. 16.

102 R.M. Smith, "Beyond Tocqueville, Myrdal, and Hartz: The Multiple Traditions in America," *American Political Science Review,* 87(3), 1993, pp. 549–566; D.T. Rodgers, "Republicanism: The Career of a Concept," *Journal of American History,* 79(1), 1992, pp. 11–38; H. Jaffa, "Conflicts within

the Idea of the Liberal Tradition," *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* 5(3), 1963, pp. 274–278; J.N. Shklar, "Redeeming American Political Theory," *American Political Science Review,* 85(1), 1991, pp. 3–15; and D. Boorstin, "American Liberalism," *Commentary,* 20(7), July 1955, pp. 99–100.

103 For a compelling defense of the Hartz thesis, see P. Abbott, "Still Louis Hartz after All These Years: A Defense of the Liberal Society Thesis," *Perspectives on Politics,* 3(1), 2005, pp. 93–109. For a recent attempt at synthesizing the Liberal and multiple traditions in American political thought, see S. Skowronek, "The Reassociation of Ideas and Purposes: Racism, Liberalism, and the American Political Tradition," *American Political Science Review,* 100(3), 2006, pp. 385–402.

104 I. Katznelson, "Review of *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History*," *Political Theory*, 27(4), August 1999, p. 568.

105 Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World,* pp. 320–321.

106 Illustrative examples include A.A. Stein, "Coordination and Collaboration: Regimes in an Anarchic World," in S.D. Krasner (ed.) *International Regimes*, Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1983, pp. 115–140; and Keohane, *After Hegemony.*

107 For a thorough critique of neoliberal institutionalism, see J. J. Mearsheimer, "The False Promise of International Institutions," *International Security,* 19(3), 1994/95, pp. 5–49.

108 J.M. Grieco, "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism," *International Organization,* 42(3), 1988, pp. 485–508.

109 J. J. Mearsheimer, "Liberal Talk, Realist Thinking," *University of Chicago Magazine,* 94(3), 2002. Online. Available HTTP http://magazine.uchicago.edu/0202/features/index.htm (accessed May 24, 2009).

110 H.J. Morgenthau, "The Failings of Foreign Policy," *New Republic,* October 11, 1975, pp. 16–21. See also M.J. Smith, *Realist Thought from Weber to Kissinger*, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1986, pp. 185–188, 231–232.

111 J. J. Mearsheimer and S.M. Walt, "An Unnecessary War," *Foreign Policy,* 134, 2003, pp. 50–59.

112 Y.F. Khong, *Analogies at War: Korea, Munich, Dien Bien Phu, and the Vietnam Decisions of 1965*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1992, p. 63.

113 For evidence that weapons of mass destruction and links to Al-Qaeda were "being fixed around the policy" of regime change in Iraq apparently decided on other grounds, see the so-called Downing Street memorandum, quoted in Mark Danner, "The Secret Way of War," *New York Review of Books,* 52(10), 2005. Online. Available HTTP http://www.nybooks.com/articles/18034 (accessed May 24, 2009).

114 B. Woodward, *Bush at War*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 2002, p. 340.

115 United States Department of Defense (May 9, 2003) "Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz Interview with Sam Tannenhaus, *Vanity Fair.*" Online. Available HTTP http://www.defenselink.mil/transcripts/2003/tr20030509-depsecdef0223.html (accessed May 24, 2009).

116 In one editorial leader, *The Economist* characterized the intellectual orientation of the Bush administration as "offensive realism." "Unprecedented Power, Colliding Ambitions," *The Economist,* September 28, 2002, p. 27. And in his otherwise penetrating book, *America Right or Wrong: An Anatomy of American Nationalism*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2004, p. 170, A. Lieven identifies both Cheney and Rumsfeld as realists.

117 S. Ackerman and F. Foer, "The Radical: What Cheney Really Believes," *New Republic,* December 1, 2003, pp. 17–23.

118 Quoted in B. Woodward, *State of Denial: Bush at War, Part III*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 2006, p. 3.

119 M.R. Gordon and Gen. B.E. Trainor, *The Generals' War: The Inside Story of the Conflict in the Gulf*, Boston: Little, Brown, 1995, p. 455.

120 Quoted in Ricks, *Fiasco,* p. 6.

121 See Project for a New American Century, "Statement of Principles," June 3, 1997. Online. Available HTTP http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm (accessed May 24, 2009).

122 For a compelling brief against hegemony, see Ian Shapiro, *Containment: Rebuilding a Strategy against Global Terror*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2007. For evidence that torture is counterproductive, see Intelligence Science Board, *Educing Information: Interrogation, Science, and Art, Foundations for the Future,* Phase I Report, Washington, D.C.: National Defense Intelligence College, November 2006. Online. Available HTTP http://www.fas.org/irp/dni/educing.pdf (accessed May 24, 2009).

123 M.R. Gordon and Gen. B.E. Trainor, *Cobra II: The Inside Story of the Invasion and Occupation of Iraq*, New York: Pantheon, 2006, p. 64. For evidence that the Bush administration was searching for a victory in the war on terrorism beyond Afghanistan and Al-Qaeda, see Woodward, *Bush at War,* pp. 137, 217, 227–228. For evidence that Bush, as well as Rice and other administration supporters (e.g., the president's foreign intelligence advisory board member Phillip Zelikow), doubted that Iraq constituted an imminent threat to the United States, see Woodward, *Bush at War,* pp. 49, 350; and J. Mearsheimer and S. Walt, "Letter," *London Review of Books,* 28(10), 2006. Online. Available HTTP http://www.lrb.co.uk/v28/n10/letters.html (accessed May 24, 2009); and Ricks, *Fiasco,* p. 13, which quotes former CENTCOM Chief Gen. A. Zinni as saying, "We didn't see the Iraqis as a formidable force. We saw them as a decaying force."

124 S. Power, *"A Problem from Hell": America and the Age of Genocide*, New York: Basic Books, 2002, p. xxi.

125 P. Reynolds, "The 'Democratic Domino' Theory," BBC News, April 13, 2003. Online. Available HTTP http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/2935969.stm (accessed May 24, 2009).

126 Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America,* pp. 175–176.

127 S.H. Rudolph, "The Imperialism of Categories: Situating Knowledge in a Globalizing World," *Perspectives on Politics,* 3(1), 2005, pp. 7–8; S.P. Huntington, "Conservatism as an Ideology," *American Political Science Review,* 57(2), 1957, pp. 456–461; and Mehta, *Liberalism and Empire,* p. 21.

128 S.P. Huntington, *American Politics: The Promise of Disharmony*, Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap, 1981, p. 258.

129 R. Singel, "One Million Ways to Die," *Wired,* September 11, 2006. Online. Available HTTP http://www.wired.com/print/science/discoveries/news/2006/09/71743 (accessed May 24, 2009).

130 This characterization of the global war on terrorism was first offered in E.A. Cohen, "World War IV: Let's Call This Conflict What It Is," *Wall Street Journal,* November 21, 2001. Online. Available HTTP http://www.opinionjournal.com/editorial/feature.html?id?95001493 (accessed May 24, 2009).

131 J. Mueller, "A False Sense of Insecurity?" *Regulation,* 27(3), 2004, pp. 42–46.

132 R.M. Pape, *Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism*, New York: Random House, 2005.

133 A.M. Mack, "Why Big Nations Lose Small Wars," *World Politics,* 27(2), 1975, pp. 175–200.

134 On this case, see F.J. Gavin, "Blasts from the Past: Proliferation Lessons from the 1960s," *International Security,* 29(3), pp. 100–135.

135 S.M. Walt, *The Origins of Alliances*, Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1987, p. 215.

136 N.A. Lewis, "Military's Opposition to Harsh Interrogation Is Outlined," *New York Times,* July 28, 2005.

137 K.N. Waltz, "America as a Model for the World: A Foreign Policy Perspective," *PS: Political Science and Politics,* 24(4), December 1991, pp. 667–670; and B. Schwarz and C. Layne, "A New Grand Strategy," *Atlantic Monthly,* 289(1), 2002, pp. 36–42.

138 K.N. Waltz, "The Stability of a Bipolar World," *Daedalus,* 93(3), 1964, pp. 881–909. This theme is further developed and applied in C. Layne, "The Unipolar Illusion Revisited: The Coming End of the United States' Unipolar Moment," *International Security,* 31(2), 2006, pp. 7–41; and S.M. Walt, *Taming American Power: The Global Response to U.S. Primacy*, New York: W.W. Norton, 2006.

139 R. Niebuhr, "Why the Christian Church Is Not Pacifist," in R.M. Brown (ed.) *The Essential Reinhold Niebuhr*, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1986, p. 114.

140 Waltz, "America as a Model for the World," pp. 667–670; and Schwarz and Layne, "A New Grand Strategy," p. 38.

141 Quoted in K.N. Waltz, "Globalization and American Power," *National Interest,* 59, 2000, pp. 46–56. See also C. Layne, "What's Built Up Must Come Down," *Washington Post,* November 14, 1999.

142 Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America,* p. 286.

143 This is most clearly articulated in J.A. Baker III and L.H. Hamilton's *The Iraq Study Group Report,* which characterizes the "situation in Iraq as grave and deteriorating." Baker and Hamilton, *The Iraq Study Group Report*, Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, December 2006, p. 6. Senator R.G. Luger, the ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, expressed a similar view in a widely discussed Senate floor speech entitled "Connecting Our Iraq Strategy to Our Vital Interests," June 25, 2007. Online. Available HTTP http://lugar.senate.gov/press/record.cfm?id?277751& &year?2007& (accessed May 24, 2009).

144 Ikenberry and Slaughter, *Forging a World of Liberty under Law,* p. 12; and P. Starr, *Freedom's Power: The True Force of Liberalism*, Cambridge, Mass.: Basic Books, 2007, pp. 205–218.

145 See, for example, Senator Hillary Clinton's remarks to the Council on Foreign Relations, as reported in M. Santora, "Senator Clinton Attacks Bush and Iraqi Government," *New York Times,* November 1, 2006. Two recent books by influential commentators propose a similar agenda. See F. Fukuyama, *America at the Crossroads: Democracy, Power, and the Neoconservative Legacy*, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2006, pp. 9–10, which advocates "realistic Wilsonianism"; and A. Lieven and J. Hulsman, *Ethical Realism: A Vision for American's Role in the World*, New York: Pantheon, 2006, p. xv, which lays out an agenda of "ethical Realism and the Great Capitalist Peace."

Part 3

Influence of international constraints on politics, law, and religion in the West

6 Welcoming Muslims into the nation

Tolerance, politics and integration in Germany

Frank Peter

Introduction

In the past few years, and with the rise of a global terrorist threat, Germany has embarked upon a new policy of "integrating Muslims." The federal ministry's 2006 initiative to convene the "German Islam Conference" (*Deutsche Islam Konferenz*, DIK), an ongoing series of multi-level meetings of state representatives with select German Muslims, is a central element of this policy.[1] Since its inception, the DIK has been controversial due primarily to the fact that the initiative assumes a more favorable position by state authorities with regards to the institutional incorporation of Islam. In this it stands in relative similarity to recent developments in other Western European countries. The DIK policy initiative is further innovative in that it articulates a specific kind of recognition of Islam as part of Germany. However, at the same time, the DIK contributes to the objectification of immigrant populations from Muslim countries as "Muslims."

Drawing on studies of governmentality, this article analyzes the DIK as part of a broader shift in German policies towards persons from Muslim countries who have settled in Germany since the 1950s, as well as their offspring.[2] I will argue that integration policies in Germany, and elsewhere in Europe, primarily arise out of a deep anxiety about how the legal rights and formal equality of immigrants affect the social order and the position of the dominant majority.

In the post-9/11 context, this anxiety has led to a renewed effort by the state to shape the space between legal norms and their implementation and to condition the way in which rights are being exercised by immigrants who are now specifically construed as Muslims. The ensuing policy program, which aims to integrate Muslims and of which the DIK is a central part, is rationalized as tolerance. Following Wendy Brown,[3] tolerance here designates the conditional acceptance of Muslims by the dominant majority. The political rationality of tolerance combines the state's recognition of Islam as part of Germany with its limited support for the incorporation of Islam within the project of normalizing Muslim immigrants. Tolerance asserts the fundamental difference of Muslims and, combined with the variously defined injunction to normalize, results in the natural placement of Muslims at the margins of the national community. The following analysis emphasizes the points of friction between the rationality of tolerance, on the one hand, and the legal order, on the other. Furthermore, it highlights tolerance's continued fragility; in Germany, tolerance emerges from a context where the recognition that immigrants are essentially free and autonomous beings remains unacceptable to a dominant majority. Looking at Muslim responses to tolerance policies, the article examines how tolerance – as paralegal governmentality – is countered by Muslim discourses of equality that reconstruct the national community as one of dissent.[4] In this way, German Muslim activists are outlining a radically different trajectory for national integration. I refer to this complex of state interpellations of Muslims, as objects of tolerance on the one hand and the dissenting and politicizing discourse of Muslims on the other, as tolerance politics. The chapter concludes by considering the DIK as a "translation mechanism"[5] and examining how the DIK establishes material linkages between the state's objectives and the personal or collective activities and aspirations of its Muslim interlocutors.

The *Deutsche Islam Konferenz*

In September 2006, the federal minister of the interior, Wolfgang Schäuble, launched the *Deutsche Islam Konferenz*. In the statements made by the ministry, the overarching objective of the Conference is identified as "integrating" Muslims into Germany, i.e. "to ameliorate the religious and societal integration of the Muslim population and [to achieve] a good living-together of all people, whatever their faith."[6] While the DIK's structure (see below) distinguishes between the issue of integration and that of extremism, the two are regularly connected in government discourse. In numerous statements, the ministry emphasized that the conference should, as it had indeed already done in the past, contribute to disseminating the fact that Islam is part of Germany's present and future. This message is particularly aimed at "Muslims in Germany" who are to be transformed into "German Muslims." The motto of the DIK puts it concisely: Muslims in Germany – German Muslims.

The foundation of the conference consists of yearly plenary meetings. These meetings are hosted by the federal minister and bring together 15 "Muslim representatives" and 15 representatives of the German state, including the federal states and local public authorities. While the ministry regularly points out that it was not in a position to identify Muslim representatives due to Germany's lack of adequate Islamic organizational structures, the convening of the conference and the selection of Muslim members by the ministry itself constituted a major attempt to define both the boundaries of Germany's "Muslim community" and the qualifications of those authorized to speak for it. In the eyes of the ministry, this community included all persons with origins, however distant, in Muslim majority countries, i.e. somewhere between 3–3.5 million persons. While Schäuble declared that "it is clear" that "secular [Muslims]" could not decide on matters such as Islamic religious education in public schools (which is organized in cooperation between the state and recognized religious communities, *Religionsgemeinschaften*), or the creation of faculties for Islamic theology (to be decided between the state and corporations of public law, *Körperschaften des öffentlichen Rechts*), he nevertheless believed that they were entitled to participate in the broader process of debate. This ethnic understanding of Islam on the one hand and, on the other, the notion that Muslim associations can only represent their formal members constituted the implicit rationale of the selection of representatives. Given the relatively small memberships of Muslim associations – estimated at 15–20 percent of Germany's ethnic Muslim community – the ministry chose five representatives of Muslim associations (who demanded a higher number of members in the Conference) and ten independent representatives, some of whom identify publicly as "secular Muslims." Two of the latter – the writer and sociologist Necla Kelek and the lawyer, feminist activist and local social-democratic politician Seyran Ateş – have gained a country-wide notoriety for their strong criticism of Islam. Among the four female members of the plenary group, no covered female Muslim was present. Noting this, writer Feridun Zaimoğlu, who identifies himself as a "believing but not religious person," offered his place to enable one of them to participate.[7] Muslim federations had refrained from nominating women representatives to the DIK. Navid Kermani, a scholar of Islamic studies (*Islamwissenschaftler*) who has published widely on classical and contemporary Islam, was also among the independent members of the DIK.

In addition to the plenary meetings, three working groups (*Arbeitsgruppe*) have been established. The groups meet more often and bring together up to 40 members from each side to debate topics such as: German society and the consensus of values (*Deutsche Gesellschaft und Wertekonsens*); religion in the German conception of the constitution (*Religionsfragen im deutschen Verfassungsverständnis*); and economy and media as bridges [for integration]. The discussion circle "Security and Islamism" – which built on a 2005 dialogue initiative between German security agencies, the German branch of Turkey's Presidency of Religious Affairs, *Diyanet İşleri Türk İslam Birliği* (DITIB), and the Central Council of Muslims in Germany, the *Zentralrat der Muslime in Deutschland* (ZMD)[8] – constitutes the fourth group whose recommendations are discussed in the plenary sessions.

The DIK was and remains a contested initiative. Criticism has been concerned with the fact that Muslim organizations suspected of "extremism" were invited to participate. This critique has been leveled with particular reference to *Milli Görüş*, a German–Turkish organization which has long been under surveillance by the Office for the Protection of the Constitution, a state agency (with branches in the German federal states, the *Länder*) working under the direction of the ministry of the interior. Although there were no members of *Milli Görüş* among the 15 "Muslim" members of the DIK, representatives of the Muslim federation *Islamrat*, of which *Milli Görüş* constitutes an important member, were included. While representatives of Muslim federations – regardless of orientation – are a minority in the DIK, their presence has nevertheless been criticized, not least by "secular Muslims." One member of the DIK, the Afghanistan-born TV producer Walid Nakschbandi, resigned from his position in protest of Muslim federations' dominance in the conference. His critique was shared by other members.[9]

As of summer 2008, the material results of the DIK have been limited to the initiation of a quantitative research project on Muslims in Germany, in addition to the statements and recommendations publicized in its March 2008 interim report. This report aimed not only to define the current situation in Germany and to articulate the various problems demanding the attention of policy-makers and Muslims, but also to make a number of recommendations. The DIK's support – though not unanimous – for the introduction of Islamic religious education in public schools and for the building of mosques and Muslim cemeteries has attracted particular public attention.[10] Moreover, the ministry's initiative – and the new perspectives it has opened up regarding the incorporation of Islam – was a significant contributing factor behind the creation of the Coordination Council of Muslims (*Koordinierungsrat der Muslime,* KRM) in April 2007. This is a major development. The KRM brings together a number of historically antagonistic associations – notably DITIB, *Milli Görüş* and the Süleymanli movement (*Verein der Islamischen Kulturzentren*) – into a federation; their reconciliation and the creation of the KRM marks a crucial shift in the organization of Islam in Germany.

Problematizing immigrants as Muslim after 9/11

The creation of the DIK is regularly presented as a new departure in German policies because it expresses the state's recognition of Islam as being part of Germany. This is essentially correct. However, it is equally true that the DIK falls within a continuous line of state measures that have aimed at regulating German's migrant populations since they first began to settle in large numbers in the 1970s. Like these earlier policies, the DIK is marked by its refusal to consider migrants as a natural part of the population. Further, the very possibility of convening the DIK situates it within a specific type of power differential between immigrants from Muslim countries and the state. Indeed, this power differential has been constructed and maintained through a series of policies, all emerging in the period after the initial economic downturn in 1973.

Sayad has pointed out that, from the point of view of immigrants, "immigration and work are two things which are consubstantially linked to the point that you cannot put into question one without doing the same to the other . . . ."[11] Without doubt the same holds true for the perception of immigrants by the majority society. Guest-workers in Germany were recruited as "temporary mobile labor units."[12] Destined to be at the full disposal of Germany's economy, they were deprived of some of their most basic rights. The guidelines instructing civil servants how to implement the 1965 law regulating the presence of foreigners enumerate these deprivations. They describe the status of foreigners in the following terms: "Foreigners enjoy all basic rights, except the basic rights of freedom of assembly, freedom of association, freedom of movement and free choice of occupation, place of work and place of education, and protection from extradition abroad."[13] The need for such mobile labor units vaporized in the fears of economic recession in 1973. With it, the only legitimacy these guest-workers turned-settlers could claim in the eyes of Germany's dominant majority also vanished. As is well known, the German state subsequently tried, but largely failed in its aim to repatriate guest-workers. During the 1970s, the German public was thus repeatedly confronted with the fact that those who had been brought to Germany exclusively as a function of economic needs had become subjects. As such, they were accorded rights (even if not those of citizenship) and were, to some degree, able to oppose government plans.[14]

It seems to me that we can trace a direct line from that period leading to the current situation. First, now – as then – immigrants in Germany by and large do not have a place in what is seen by the majority as the natural order of society. Second, the fact that immigrants are not mere objects in the hands of the majority remains problematic for this dominant group (and, as we shall see, it inspires the initiative to convene the DIK). Even if the dominant majority recognizes that immigrants can *de facto* make use of certain legal rights and, more generally, have and are able to exert their agency, they nevertheless find this state of affairs ultimately unacceptable. It goes against a fundamental feature of how Germany's dominant majority envisions its relationship to immigrants and how it perceives its privileged place inside the nation. In fact, the way in which the majority understands its relationship to the nation resembles closely what Hage has described in the Australian context as "governmental belonging": "the belief that one has a right over the nation, . . . the right to contribute (even if only by having a *legitimate* opinion with regard to the internal and external politics of the nation) to its management such that it remains 'one's home.'"[15] In contrast, the majority considers that immigrants have been granted at most passive rights, such as to reside in the nation, to benefit from its various resources, etc. Put differently, whereas members of the dominant majority perceive themselves as enactors of the national will, immigrants are fundamentally imagined as mere objects to be managed.[16]

This is indeed an accurate if not sufficient analysis of how majority and minority relate to each other in the German social imaginary. Still today, immigrants are not seen as a self-evident part of the German nation, but rather as objects to be regulated both by state and non-state actors. In order to illustrate and specify this broad statement, we can look at one example which both reflects and contributes to the continual reproduction of this social order, namely the increasing use of surveys on issues related to immigration. If we take the example of the representative poll conducted annually by the research institute GESIS (*Gesellschaft sozialwissenschaftlicher Infrastruktureinrichtungen*), we will notice that many of the questions asked here pertaining to issues of immigration place the respondent precisely in the position of what Hage calls the "imagined national-spatial manager," a person deciding in the name of the nation how many foreigners, what kind of foreigners and which behaviors can be tolerated.[17] The quintessential statement in which this managerial position is expressed is, "The many foreigners living in Germany make me feel increasingly like a stranger in my own country," to which respondents are asked to position themselves in the survey.[18]

In other questions, respondents are asked more specifically about practices and/or groups that they find intolerable. Here, it is important to point out that these questions discursively endow the respondents with a decision-making power over immigrants. This power is to some degree unconditioned by the law and the rights it grants to immigrants whether as residents or citizens. For example, respondents are asked to evaluate as correct or not statements such as "The foreigners living in Germany should adapt their way of life (*Lebensstil*) a bit more to that of Germans," "Foreigners living in Germany should be prohibited from any political activity" and "In times of shortage of labor, foreigners living in Germany should be sent back home."[19] All these questions make sense only if both interviewer and respondent assume that the nation's majority is capable of deciding these issues in a relatively unconstrained manner.

Now, it is obviously impossible for respondents from the majority society to directly determine the way of life of foreigners. As I have indicated above, the history of German policies regarding immigration is marked by numerous attempts at regulation which were ultimately aborted by the law courts or failed for other reasons related to the law.[20] However, these questions socially "make sense," in so far as they both respond to and sustain a sense of entitlement by the dominant majority – an entitlement both distinct from the legal order and based on a combination of ethnic and cultural factors. In the survey mentioned above, we see a sense of entitlement which derives precisely from the fact that it is "normal" for a member of the majority to be asked about necessary disciplinary measures against "foreigners." The point to make here is that this feeling of entitlement is not simply a fantasy; it will not do to point to the legal rights protecting foreigners in this or other cases. Rather, this feeling of entitlement is grounded in the social reality which unfolds between the idiom of universal rights on the one hand and the local effects which produce these rights on the other. Put another way, while the law may have often frustrated majority efforts to regulate the behavior of foreigners, the law alone does not determine the conditions under which immigrants live in Germany and relate to other social groups. Rather, these conditions, in the 1970s as much as in the context of the DIK, are a function of both the "*practical-cultural* national acceptance" of immigrants by the majority and their "*institutional-political* acceptance."[21] One way to understand the DIK is to consider it as an attempt to assert and define the conditions of practical-cultural national acceptance of a group of immigrants now specifically construed as "Muslims."

The variety of policies which have been conducted in order to regulate immigrant groups in Germany's federal states since the 1970s cannot be described here. It is nevertheless important to point out that, in spite of the diversity of these policies, they have, collectively and to a significant degree, prevented immigrants from entering the political process whether directly or indirectly, i.e. by having political parties represent their particular interests. Obviously, Germany's restrictive citizenship legislation is responsible for a good deal of this development. However, the delegation by the state of immigrant matters to charities and the concomitant de-politicization of these issues is perhaps a no less important factor.[22] Any statement about the absence of immigrants in politics needs to be qualified with regard to particular groups of immigrants. It is important for instance to underline that immigrants from Turkey, the primary object of the DIK, participate only weakly in the political process. This absence manifests itself clearly in the fact that the "we" articulated in political speeches and public debates relating to issues of Islam and integration often explicitly excludes Turkish Germans and, more specifically, Germany's Muslims. Arguably, the weak political participation of Turkish Germans is a major factor enabling the creation of the DIK.

However, for all of its continuity, in other respects the creation of the DIK constitutes a rupture with previous German policies. Until the late 1990s, while state authorities were concerned with "radical" Islamic groups, the Islamic religion of immigrants did not itself constitute a major field in which the state deployed efforts to regulate immigrants.[23] Rather, the state's approach was characterized by a reluctance to actively engage the question of Islam in Germany. A major reason for this was that doing so would most likely have necessitated accelerating the incorporation of Islam into German state structures and have considerably extended the legal rights of Muslim religious communities. In fact, the order prescribed by the German "state law concerning churches" (*Staatskirchenrecht*) grants religious groups, under certain conditions, a number of wide-ranging rights. Most importantly, a significant number of religious communities – Lutherans, Roman Catholics, Jews, various smaller Churches and, in addition, some ideological groups (*Weltanschauungsgemeinschaften*) – have been granted the status of corporation of public law (*Körperschaft des Öffentlichen Rechts*) which notably allows for substantial legal and fiscal privileges.

Furthermore, the recognition of Muslims as a "religious community" would allow for the organization of religious education in public schools.

This education would be paid for by the state, which also finances the training of teachers for religious education at public universities. In spite of various attempts to be recognized as corporation of public law which go back, in some cases, to the late 1970s, Muslim associations have so far, with very minor exceptions, been unable to benefit from these privileges. Likewise, the major political parties have until recently been very reluctant, and in some cases hostile, to the introduction of Muslim religious education in public schools.

Given the substantial privileges to which all religions are, in principle, entitled, and given the strong animosity towards Islam in Germany, the standard charge made by German politicians that Muslims do not have an organizational structure adequate for the incorporation into the German legal system has served for many years as a welcome excuse for ignoring Muslim demands and excluding them from the benefits accorded other "churches."[24] Likewise, the regular accusations of extremism leveled at various Muslim federations enables politicians and decision-makers to ignore Muslim demands for recognition.

The government discourse surrounding the DIK marks a clear departure from this position. Indeed, the DIK marks the emergence of the state's will to actively incorporate Islam into Germany. It indicates that the German state is assuming a more active role in the accommodation of Muslim religious practices and that it looks more favorably upon the building of Muslim community structures. One finds, for example, that the long-term perspective of granting Muslim associations the status of corporation of public law is today, in principle, affirmed positively by the minister of the interior, Schäuble.[25] Also, as pointed out above, the DIK largely supports the introduction of Islamic religious education in public schools, a move which will lead to the emergence of an explicitly Muslim group of civil servants and give a major boost to the social respectability of Islam and Muslims. It is indeed difficult to overestimate the long-term effects of this latter policy on the status of German Islam. Finally, the DIK also calls upon public authorities to work with Muslims in order to facilitate the construction of mosques, in this way authorizing what is considered by many an illegitimate invasion of public space by Muslims.[26]

How can we explain this shift in policies concerning German Islam?

It seems to me that this policy shift should be seen in the context of the post-9/11 problematization of the immigration into Germany from Muslim countries. Problematization refers here to a double process: "the transformations of the difficulties and obstacles of a practice into a general problem" and the simultaneous definition of "the conditions in which possible responses can be given" to this problem.[27] While these responses can vary and even contradict each other, they are all made possible by a specific form of problematization. According to Foucault, processes of problematization are triggered by the disruption of a certainty or familiarity underlying social practice. In the context of Germany, the problematization of the immigration from Muslim countries was triggered by the terrorist attacks of 2001 and 2004 in the US and Madrid respectively. No less important was the murder of Theo van Gogh in 2004. These violent incidents disrupted the established ways of governing immigrants in two ways.

First, they provided a new motivation for rethinking the nomenclature of immigrant minorities in Germany. This nomenclature was for a long time structured by criteria of citizenship – "immigrants" (*Zuwanderer*) or "foreign co-citizens" (*ausländische Mitbürger*) – and ethnicity. Religiosity had rarely been a distinct marker. In fact, ethnicity and Islam were often conjoined in the term "Turk" which equals in common day German "Muslim." It is precisely this conflation of ethnicity and religion which began to seem increasingly inappropriate in the aftermath of 9/11. The ongoing consolidation of a world geography structured, on the one hand, around civilizational areas and, on the other, around the perceived emergence of a distinctively global jihad campaign disrupted the historical spatial order which had made it plausible for Germans, from the sixteenth century on, to locate and tie Muslims to Turkey. Henceforward, the unqualified term Muslim was increasingly used and endowed with an autonomous relevance. The question in which sense precisely Muslimness is socially relevant is what this process of problematization has established as a major question for Germany's politicians and pundits to deliberate. Second, the events of 2001 and later raised the double question: on the one hand whether the disavowal by the state of Islam in Germany might have contributed to the possibility of such attacks and, more generally, processes of radicalization and alienation; on the other how the state should engage, to some degree independently of the issue of radicalization, the integration of Islam and Muslims into Germany in the future. These questions started to generate political effects on the federal level after the alliance of Christian and Social Democrats took power in November 2005.

As pointed out above, different and sometimes opposed answers can be given to the questions raised through a problematization. Among the political establishment today, there is a near consensus that the German state has long failed to sufficiently attend to the question of Islam and, in this way, has neglected its duty to protect the security and well-being of the German population. Opinions differ, not surprisingly, on the precise course future policies should take. I will concentrate here on the federal ministry's initiative to convene the DIK and the answer it puts forth.

Tolerating Muslims

At a fundamental level, the DIK is concerned with forms of self-government and the field of possible actions by subjects. As such, it can be said to be part of a policy program that aims to "govern . . . at a distance,"[28] within which the conference itself occupies the position of a "translation mechanism."[29] From a diachronic perspective, the DIK appears to mark the controversial passage from a primarily negative, or coercive, exercise of power to a positive, or productive, one.[30] Its primary aim is to remake Muslim subjectivities – by interpellating them as its objects of tolerance – and to simultaneously guide them in a continual process of normalization. The DIK thus conforms to a productive exercise of power.

In brief, I want to suggest that the policy program informing the DIK, today called integration policy, is rationalized as tolerance. Drawing on Brown, I use tolerance here to designate and describe the conditional acceptance of Muslims by a dominant majority. The political rationality of tolerance combines the state's recognition of Islam as part of Germany, as well as its limited support for the future incorporation of Islam, with the project of normalizing a group of immigrants now construed specifically as Muslims. In other words, with its variously defined injunctions to normalize, tolerance asserts the fundamental difference of Muslims and, as a result, fixes them at the margins of the national community. The integration of Muslims in the context of governmental tolerance is therefore based on their continuous interpellation as different from the majority.[31] By defining their difference as a threat to society, whether to social cohesion, to the consensus of values, etc., the state positions Muslims as insider-outsiders. While Muslims may be legal citizens or residents, they are not perceived to be legitimately so; their inclusion into the nation is necessarily conditional.

Let me specify this point in more detail. Put simply, the government's adoption of a policy program emerges from a double recognition: first, that Muslims, as citizens or residents in a liberal democracy such as Germany, are free and second, that Germany's reluctance to actively relate to Muslims and to incorporate them into society deprives the state of valuable – perhaps even indispensable – means to shape the ways in which Muslims make use of this freedom. Muslims are free in the most basic sense. The state cannot directly control which language they speak, which beliefs they follow, where and how they choose their marriage partners, whether or not they defer to majority cultural practices and sensibilities, etc. The DIK can thus be conceived as a new relay between the German state and the Muslim population. As such, it provides a means to align the state's interests, aspirations and perceptions more closely with those of German Muslims.

In other words, the DIK is an attempt by the state "[to] orchestrat[e] the actions of independent entities."[32] This includes Muslim organizations, various experts, media and civil society groups. The DIK initiative arises then, not out of a concern with respect of the German legal order by Muslims, but rather, out of a government attempt to target and transform emotional dispositions and habits of perception, thought and practice among Muslims. Schäuble, defining the concept of integration, clearly expressed this orientation: "the respect of . . . rules alone does not lead to an accomplished integration." Integration is about the feeling of belonging to a "community" (*Gemeinwesen*) which presupposes in turn something which, according to Schäuble, "connects us together on a more profound human level." Quoting Habermas, Schäuble relates identification with Germany to the "power of emotions."[33] Schäuble recognizes, of course, this cannot be achieved through the law and coercion. Rather, the DIK seeks to create in the course of its long-term deliberations – which are designed to be more "than a non-committal dialogue" – "a collective will" which would facilitate and direct cooperation between state authorities and Muslims in the future decades. The DIK aims to "elaborate agreements on important questions of living together. These cannot be agreements which are legally binding."[34]

At its most basic level then, the goal of the DIK is to change how German Muslims understand themselves as Muslims in the context of Germany, a context whose specificity is itself defined in the process by the government and the DIK. The DIK works to incite Muslims to relate in new ways to themselves – as Muslims – and to guide them in their continual practices of self-constitution and recognition.

We can see now that the government's seemingly more favorable stance towards Muslim religious rights is in fact concerned with, and predicated upon, changing the kind of Muslim subject exercising these rights. The state sets out to enact this change by addressing Muslims as moral subjects and situating them within a specific regime of knowledge about Islam in Germany. Government discourse around the DIK addresses Muslim representatives, and German Muslims more generally, as moral subjects who are (supposed to be) willing to contribute to the integration of Islam into Germany – in conformity with a particular analysis of the process of integration and its demands. That is, the DIK seeks to make Muslims recognize a certain truth about Islam and Muslims in order to morally bind them to what follows from this truth.

From this perspective, the stakes of the controversial debates in the DIK on the correct identification of the obstacles to integration – and the definition of the latter concept itself – become intelligible. What is at stake in this debate is the extent to which the state's objectives regarding the integration of Muslims, insofar as they follow from consensually defined social, political, cultural and historical realities, become self-willed moral obligations for the latter. More generally, what is at stake here is the appropriation by Muslims of a specific status, construed as resulting from their yet-unaccomplished integration into the German national community – the status of a tolerated, i.e. conditionally accepted, minority.

Within this tolerance rationality, Muslims' essential difference is expressed spatially and temporally. Significantly, the identification of difference by the state implicitly imposes a unitary conception of bounded space and homogenous time onto Germany's Muslims. The motto of the DIK, "Muslims in Germany – German Muslims," exemplifies this imposition. On the one hand, by distinguishing between "Muslims in Germany" and "German Muslims," Muslims are described as being in Germany without having fully arrived yet. That is, they are insider-outsiders. The gap separating "Muslims in Germany" from "German Muslims" is identified by politicians with reference to a number of norms which Muslims today do not fulfill sufficiently. In the speech given at the opening of the DIK, Schäuble has referred in this respect to "the German legal order and value consensus, the German language and the social conventions valid in Germany"[35] to which Muslims are asked to commit themselves. While he stated in the same speech that "Muslims are welcome in Germany,"[36] a statement which was widely echoed in the media and overwhelmingly positively assessed, this acceptance was made directly conditional upon their self-willed normalization. Indeed, the act of welcoming Muslims and the regular reference in government discourses to the vocabulary of hospitality when describing the relationship between the state and Germany's Muslim population are part of the attempt to reconfigure the position of Muslims as one which is not simply produced by legal entitlements. Instead, it is construed here as depending upon a power of decision by the dominant majority; this power of decision is constrained by the existing legal order but does not exhaust itself in it.[37] This discourse appeals to the power of topography and the association of culture and locality in order to overrule the law and puts forth a particular spatial configuration of Muslim positionality.

The motto of the DIK also situates Muslims on a temporal trajectory largely imagined by reference to the German and European history of Reformation, wars of religion, enlightenment and secularization processes. Significantly, this trajectory might, or might not, lead to full integration into the nation. Positing empty, homogenous time as time *tout court*, it then serves "as a measure of the cultural distance"[38] separating Muslims from Germany. Schäuble and many other politicians and observers thus regularly underline the need to make Muslims understand the specific historical developments that produced the legal arrangements concerning religion in Germany.[39] In a fundamental sense, integration here is about spelling out "what 'this time' can and must be . . . on the basis of circumscribing the 'where' of its happening."[40]

The policy program embodied in the DIK is thus rationalized in a specific time horizon which structures the way that the program relates to the German legal order. As pointed out previously, the DIK marks a change of position on the part of the government regarding both state recognition and the legal-institutional strengthening of Muslim federations, including those federations such as *Milli Görüş* which have for a long time been ostracized by state authorities because of their alleged extremism. This shift in state policies, which is not consensual among members of the ruling coalition,[41] emerged partially out of a post-9/11 reevaluation of the desirability and necessity of bringing together state policies and the activities of Muslim organizations and institutions. It also relates to the government's adoption of a long-term perspective in its ongoing rationalization of policies on and towards Islam.

Thus, Schäuble defended his decision to include representatives of *Milli Görüş* as being an immediate necessity in order to be able to fully integrate Muslims in the future: "[i]f I excluded from the beginning anyone [among Muslim representatives], who does not stand 100% on the ground of the fundamental law, I could abandon [this initiative] right away. . . . I am not naïve, but confident. And: Which alternative would we have other than doing anything humanly possible so that Muslims feel at home in this order and support it?"[42] In Schäuble's statement, the often made legal argument of *Milli Görüş'* lack of commitment and/or hostility to the German constitutional order is seen to be superseded by arguments of feasibility and a future-oriented analysis of the evolution of the Islamic milieu. The relative dismissal of previously held legal considerations regarding groups such as *Milli Görüş* is conceived as a necessary and temporary step in a process geared toward the generation of a self-willed commitment to the German legal order among German Muslims.

Schäuble makes a similar argument to justify his support for Islamic religious education in public schools: "we compete with hate preachers (*Hassprediger*) by introducing Islamic religious education [in public schools]. Because, if we send children to religious education in public schools, this will lead to a transformation in the religious practice in mosques."[43] Schäuble's position on the creation of a publicly funded faculty of Islamic theology provides another example of this line of thinking. He supported such an institution by pointing out the "civilizing role" that an Islamic theology meeting scientific standards would play: "[i]t is more difficult to deliver a hate sermon from a professorial chair (*vom Katheder*) than from a pulpit."[44] In keeping with the temporal schema outlined above, Schäuble imagines the long-term changes that a faculty of Islamic theology could generate within the Muslim population by reference to the historical precedent of the transformations in nineteenth-century Christian theology. The fact that Christian theology was at that time constituted as just one science among many obliged theologians at public universities to "develop and cultivate a rational discourse." This, in turn, helped facilitate the peaceful coexistence of religious communities inside Germany. Indeed, Schäuble points out, the state's support for the liberalization of Christian theology was fundamentally important. Some famous liberal theologians, such as Adolf von Harnack, were able to continue working only because the state secured them a position in a university. State support for religion thus stood against the Church[45]and in this way, also contributed to a broader transformation inside the Church itself.

Tolerance politics and the DIK as a "translation mechanism"

Thus far, the discussion has pointed to the constitutive distinction between legal rights and the social bearer of these rights present within the discourse of integration. It has also highlighted the equally fundamental conjoining of legal and social norms asserted within that same discourse. By simultaneously asserting the validity of the legal order and the relative unfitness of Muslims for being included in it, the policy program of the DIK can be seen as one example of a typically liberal "strategy of exclusion": "[l]iberal exclusion works by modulating the distance between the interstices of human capacities and the conditions for their political effectivity. It is the content between these interstices that settles boundaries between who is included and who is not."[46] In the case of Germany, the threat which legal equality poses to the dominant majority is countered by making the exercise of legal rights discursively dependent on the acceptance of dominant social norms and allegiance to the social hierarchy they undergird and signify.

The preceding discussion also emphasized that this challenge is being met through a governmental policy. This statement needs to be qualified in two respects. First, and most obviously, it must be emphasized that the shift to a policy that seeks to initiate a gradual and self-directed change among Muslims does not do away with, and cannot be separated from, other policy strategies, notably coercive ones. Indeed, positive and negative technologies of power are inextricably entwined in the case of the DIK and, more generally, in German integration policies targeting Muslims. State agencies continue to conduct surveillance on organizations represented at the DIK, e.g. *Milli Görüş*. Further, as we saw above, one important aim of the conference is to strengthen the cooperation between security forces and Muslim groups. This cooperation has more recently grown at the level of cities and federal states[47] and signals the complex conjoining of self-government with mechanisms of surveillance and discipline which target Muslims and are exercised both by state agencies and Muslims.

The position of Muslim actors inside this configuration is highly complex. Not only do some politicians expect Muslim organizations to transmit certain rules to their clientele,[48] but imams and mosque associations are also asked to participate in various policing efforts. At the same time, in the context of counter-terrorism measures, imams are excluded from basic legal rights. In fact, the protection from wiretapping more generally accorded to ministers, priests and religious specialists from other recognized religious communities, is not granted to them.[49]

Interestingly, this "governmental" turn both results from and is rationalized by the relative lack of coercive means, whether legal or disciplinary, available to the dominant majority. The important point here is that the practitioners of this policy have as yet been unable to fully appropriate this reasoning for themselves. In other words, the initiative to convene the DIK is rationalized and has its raison d'être in the dominant majority's ultimately unacceptable recognition that the standards of social normality have become blurred and that its hegemony has become mere dominance, so to speak. Integration as tolerance, as it is realized in the German context, is hence deeply marked by repeated acts of simultaneous recognition and denial of this reality whose ultimate cause resides in the freedom and autonomy of Muslims. Schäuble expressed a kind of recognition-denial of spatial normality when commenting on Muslim concerns about the 2006 Muhammad cartoons: "They [the foreigners] should not want to live, *as if they were not here* [in Germany]."[50] So, even while German state policies employ governmental technologies in order to shape how Muslims make use of their autonomy, its practitioners continue to harbor a principled unwillingness to recognize Muslims as free and autonomous.

The controversy around co-educational physical education in public schools is just one of many cases illustrating this point. For many years, the German public and political establishment has expressed its profound unease with the fact that some Muslim parents seek dispensations for their children from co-educational sports classes. While German courts have often affirmed the parents' right to do so,[51] recent court decisions have restricted this right. The controversy about co-education was reignited when Ayyub Köhler, ZMD's president, stated that the Muslim Council was ready to support parents seeking such dispensations.

The reactions provoked by Köhler's remarks allow us to measure the establishment's frustration with its inability to directly effect change. Ignoring the complexity of the legal situation, Maria Böhme, federal commissioner for migration, refugees and integration, claimed that "we will not allow that a small minority of backward-oriented [persons] attempts to establish here their grandfathers' rules."[52] However, the DIK's subsequent deliberations on this topic failed to deliver on Böhme's expectations.

Put another way, there is a certain mismatch between the fundamental if often implicit aim of integration policies in Germany – namely, to "restore" the position of hegemony to the majority – and its political rationality, which is governmental and so necessarily implies the recognition of autonomy by Muslims, whose natural play may or may not work in conformity with government wishes.

At this point, we need to further specify the concept of tolerance. Tolerance, according to Brown, seeks to secure or reassert a hegemonic social order in the age of increasing legal equality by intervening "within the range of what is legal."[53] What needs to be emphasized is that the conjunction of governmental tolerance with law and discipline is anything but smooth; the results of this kind of governmental power are not necessarily satisfactory from the point of view of its practitioners. Much of the anxiety and frustration provoked by the issue of "Islam in Germany" resides more in this structural feature than in what Muslims are believed to do or not do.

Indeed, it is important to stress that the DIK is not simply a site of realization of state policies. Rather, the DIK should be considered, at its most basic level, as one institution contributing to the discursive interpellation of Muslims as objects of tolerance. It addresses Muslims as not-yet-perfected Germans and situates them in a specifically German moral landscape. The major points of reference in this landscape are the law, Germany's historical identity and memories, its Christian heritage and its dominant social norms. Situated in relation to these referents, Muslims are expected to act upon themselves in ways which cultivate and sustain their assigned subject positions as conditionally accepted and to-be-normalized Germans. This is not to say that the state can make Muslims simply abide by a given form of moral subjecthood. However, it can to some degree delimit the number of models of subjecthood which are available and to which Muslims must relate – whether adhering to or resisting it, experiencing it as genuine or not, etc. – if their account of themselves is to be socially intelligible.

Functioning inside this broader discursive space, the DIK should be considered a translation mechanism in the sense that it is a site where material linkages are established between the state's objectives and the personal and/or collective activities and aspirations of its Muslim interlocutors.[54] A cursory look at the debates and activities inside the DIK suffices to show that the linkages constructed through it obstruct, relay and divert the state's aims.

First, there is a structural reason why tolerance in Germany does not necessarily succeed in its aim to remake Muslim subjectivities. Tolerance is enacted in a social space where the principles of equality and universal rights are already inscribed.[55] Indeed, discourses of tolerance often cannot but contribute to these inscriptions themselves, if negatively, in their attempt to naturalize a non-egalitarian social order. As already noted, tolerance discourses do not simply deny the validity of the law, but rather construct Muslims as unfit to fully exercise the rights the law grants to them; these discourses do not deny the universality of law, but rather they seek to condition it in various ways.

In order to bring the relationship of tolerance discourses to the law into sharper analytical focus, it is helpful to consider tolerance as part of what Rancière has termed the "police order" or the "policing" of society.[56] Fundamentally, policing is understood here as the activity of structuring a social order so that each part has its place; social space is saturated and stable. The "police" are concerned with constructing an order of the visible and utterable, an order where individuals and groups are allotted specific places, where their ways of being, doing and saying align with each other and where their appearances are rule-governed.[57] It is the continual "policing" of German society which ensures that immigrants from Muslim countries are seen as Muslims – members of a new, foreign and deviant minority religion which can only be conditionally accepted. Likewise, it is the "police" which establish and secure non-relationships between certain things, such as between the principle of the state's neutrality towards religions on the one hand and its unequal treatment of Islam on the other.

Rancière contrasts politics, or the political, to the "police," using the former to designate the intermittent disruption of the order that the latter seeks to naturalize. This disruption occurs when "those who have no part" in this order – marginal, publicly invisible or subordinate groups – identify with the whole by virtue of the ultimate equality of all humans as speaking beings. In this way, they make apparent the contingency of any social order: "Politics exists when the natural order of domination is interrupted by the institution of a part of those who have no part. This institution is the whole of politics as a specific form of connection. It defines the common of the community as a political community, in other words, as divided."[58] Politics thus consists of acts of dissent reacting to "the gap between the egalitarian inscription of the law and the spaces where inequality rules." According to Rancière, these acts are constitutive of politics in the sense that they create "polemical space[s]" where the necessary relation between equality and the places of its absence is demonstrated.[59]

In fact, Rancière asserts a radical difference between politics and police: politics is the never-ending verification of equality, the police order settles conflicts through legal procedures or accords; politics puts into play subjectifications – such as the demos, proletarians, etc. – which ultimately transcend identifiable social groups, the police order is based precisely on the latter. Rancière thus defines politics as strictly exterior to the police order, while simultaneously, he admits the existence of "historical forms of politics,"[60] which developed in relation to the changing forms of the police order. More generally, Rancière recognizes that the two – politics and the police order – cannot be separated.[61]

The following analysis will build on this last recognition to consider how politics in the German context is not simply exterior to the police order which it contests, but is also shaped by it. Such a concept of politics – i.e. intermittent acts of emancipation which are realized through the creation of a community of dispute and conflict against the police order – offers one way to think about the dynamics countering discourses of tolerance in Germany. Since this dynamic of politicization is tightly interwoven with tolerance, that is, the "police," I will speak then of tolerance "politics."

In the case of Germany, this dynamic of politicization is central to the way in which Muslim members of the DIK have responded to the government. A useful example for analyzing such a politicization is found in the speech given by Köhler at the Evangelical Kirchentag in 2007. Churches in Germany occupy a highly important position in state policies on integration. Even Schäuble has advocated a "division of labor" between state and Church in this respect: "[w]ho could transmit to the representatives of Islam as credibly as the Christian Churches [an understanding of] the development of the past centuries and the constitutional context in Germany and how it relates to religion?"[62]

The Lutheran Church in particular has become a major actor in debates on integration. In its numerous interventions into these debates, the Church has stressed – in an often categorical manner – that Islam's fundamental difference in relation to Christianity poses serious obstacles to the integration of Muslims into Germany. The Lutheran Church has been unrelenting in its demands on Muslims concerning the internal reform of Islam while at the same time it has continued emphasizing its interest in "dialoguing" with Muslims.[63] Generally speaking, the dominant discourse inside the Church conforms closely to the government's discourse on integration. Within both, Muslims are situated naturally at the margins of the national community due to Islam's difference and their inclusion into the legal order is anything but self-evident.

Köhler's speech responds to this discourse by asserting Islam as a religion equal to Christianity and asking the simple question of whether Islam's unequal treatment is indeed justified. Responding to the theme of this public discussion – the confessional injunction "And how do you stand towards the [right to] freedom of religion?" – Köhler declares not only that Muslims "firmly defend these fundamental values" of freedom of – and from – religion. All Muslims want, he insists, is for their constitutional rights to be realized: "All we ask for [*erwarten*] is normality. We do not want more, but also not less than what the constitution offers us."[64] Even more importantly, Köhler makes the double claim that "human rights and human dignity are undividable," yet have to be reacquired every time anew, as "Muslims can testify."[65]

Köhler thus reconfigures the national community. Rather than a nation divided by the natural difference of Muslims, the nation is divided by the wrong done to Muslims and the dispute ensuing from it. In this way, Köhler's speech outlines a project of national integration which differs radically from that propounded by the German state's representatives or that of the Lutheran Church. In other words, both the starting and the end point of this integration process, as well as the very reason for undertaking it, differ in Köhler's account.

Köhler's narrative of German and European history and culture starts with the fight of Christianity against "non-Christian religions (or religions deviating from Christianity)" and internal Christian strife and violence. Europe, as he puts it, "has left a thick trace of blood in the world."[66] The end of World War II, the German Basic Law and the process of European unification mark possibilities for a rupture with "Europe's ill-fated (*unseligen*) traditions." In this historical perspective, the contemporary issue of Islam in Germany constitutes for Köhler a "touchstone" from which to evaluate the state of freedom of religion and religious practice in Germany.[67] German Muslims offer a new possibility for realizing equality inside the German nation. According to Köhler, this possibility has not been fully realized because of an "old mentality" which stands against "the acceptance as equal" of non-Christian religious communities. Directly addressing the

Christian audience, Köhler adds that Christians too are in the middle of a "learning process" and are yet unable to accept Muslims as they are.[68]

Köhler's speech revises the situation of "dialogue" between Muslims and the majority society as it is conducted today. Whereas dialogue as practiced by Lutheran leaders is the identification of difference and the injunction to normalize, Köhler speaks as if the presupposition of any dialogue, an interest in exchange, is indeed given. When offering the audience at the Kirchentag his thoughts on the causes of the current anxiety about Islam, Köhler acts as if he were presupposing a common interest and a shared concern for a national community comprised equally of Muslims and other Germans. At the same time, his speech goes to show that this community is in fact deeply divided by the injustice done to Muslims. Put briefly, Köhler's speech is performed "in a community whose nonexistence it at the same time demonstrates."[69]

To the extent that Köhler's speech has a transformative power, it derives it from the "as if" mode in which it functions. Through this mode of speech the law and the legal principle of equality evince its effects. At the most basic level then, the legal referent functions here to "split reality and reconfigure it as double"[70]: a reality where equality and its absence are held together as they are in Köhler's speech. Within this split reality a different type of community emerges – an "aesthetic community" – that "demands the very consent of the person who does not acknowledge it."[71] "Integration" occurs to the extent that this aesthetic community broadens its sphere of materialization and to the extent that the acts of interpellation which constitute this new community – this time directed at Germany's dominant majority – are continued and intensified.

The political impetus of Köhler's speech and its effects cannot, of course, be disconnected from the "police order." If Köhler's speech contributes to universalizing equality, it does so by breaking up, once more, the "natural" order of things and perhaps also by making it more difficult to assert any order as natural. At the same time, Köhler's plea for "normality" is a plea for the incorporation of Islam into a highly detailed legal and administrative framework. This framework will in turn definitely fix Islam's place as one "religion" among others in Germany.

Köhler's speech and the way he responds to the state's discourse of integration thus cannot be disassociated from the social position he occupies as a representative of Muslim federations in Germany. His plea for "normality" can be made only because he accepts this type of "policing" of religion by the state. While Köhler has expressed strong personal doubts as to the benefits of incorporating Islam into German legal structures,[72] in the current context it seems that the law constitutes an increasingly precious means by which he and other Muslim representatives can assure some kind of "normality" for Muslims. Indeed, the persistent efforts to posit the law as the sole foundation of integration politics are a cornerstone of the position of the KRM in the deliberations around the DIK. In the discussions leading up to the publication of the DIK's interim report, the KRM succeeded in altering a passage which had stipulated that Muslims endorse unidentified "German values." The final and publicized version of the document, bearing KRM's changes, referred only to the "value order of the constitutional law."[73]

All of this suggests that the state encounters difficulties in using Muslim federations as relays for that part of its policy which is concerned with the normalization of Muslims.[74] The situation is, to some degree, different in the case of the "secular Muslim" members of the DIK. Seyran Ateş is one such example. For Ateş, participation in the DIK has the potential to further her political agenda. This agenda includes among its priorities the emancipation of women she identifies as Turkish and Kurdish Muslims, the reform of Islam through its "integration" and, more generally, a critical rethinking of the practice of what she labels German multiculturalism (*Multi-Kulti*). In Ateş's eyes, German multiculturalism has not only produced disastrous effects, such the creation of "parallel societies," but it is in fact built on and replicates the fundamental disinterest of the German majority in the lives of "*Deutschländer.*"[75]

Briefly put, her participation in the DIK has made Ateş the kind of public person she is now, namely, a "secular Muslim" whose activist work is linked to the state project of integrating Muslims. Without doubt, this association has enabled her to reach an infinitely larger audience than she would have otherwise. Even if her audience may comprise only a limited number of those who are usually considered non-integrated Muslims, it is clear that Ateş has successfully relayed the state's message about the necessary liberation of Muslim women to a broad group of non-state actors. Her writings and statements are not only seen to legitimize this message from "inside of the Muslim community," but to have also significantly contributed to emerging public narratives about the subordination of Muslim women.

Having said this, it is important to add that female liberation constitutes only part of Ateş's broader message. Ateş is also highly concerned about discriminatory practices directed against *Deutschländer*, even if a comparison of her two published books suggests a decrease in its relative importance within her agenda.[76] Interestingly, this message does not seem to reach its addressees easily.[77] One reason is clear. Ateş's access to the public sphere is predicated upon her specific function as a "critic of Islam" (*Islamkritikerin*),[78] and implies a limit to the topics she can publicly address. Ateş expresses her concern about discriminatory practices in a context where the politics she actively supports function to fix and seal her position as an insider-outsider in Germany. While she can of course criticize any aspect of state policies, her critique will be seen by many as coming from outside the group of those naturally capable of deciding upon German policies.

This fundamental difference is clearly asserted by Schäuble. Citing Amin Malouf, he states: "If I commit myself to my host country, if I consider it to be mine, if I consider that it is henceforth a part of me as I am a part of it and if I conduct myself conformingly, I have the right to criticize any of its aspects [i.e. of that country]. In turn, if this country respects me, if it recognizes my contribution, if it perceives me henceforth in my specificity as a part of it, it has the right to reject specific aspects of my culture which would be incompatible with its way of life or the spirit of its institutions."[79] Schäuble's reference to Malouf underlines the fact that a fundamental difference remains between Muslims and other Germans at the end of the integration process. While Muslims can individually criticize aspects of Germany which they find objectionable, the "host country" can legitimately "reject specific aspects" of the immigrants' culture. Put another way, "integrated" Muslims would still be situated ambiguously at the margins of the nation as a "specific" minority group. Instead of naturally sharing in popular sovereignty, their contribution to the national political life would be limited to critique.

Conclusion

The question of whether or not Muslim religious practices and institutions can be incorporated into European legal orders, and how that might occur, has stirred a great and ongoing debate.[80] This chapter has suggested that this question must be pursued alongside an inquiry into the role of law in the double process of regulating and positioning Islam and Muslims in European societies.

Based on an examination of the DIK, I have argued that German state policies on integration are not simply played out inside the order circumscribed by the law, but rather are concerned with enfolding the legal order into more encompassing mechanisms of power. The case of the DIK suggests that we need to shift our focus away from studying the limitations placed upon the free exercise of religion in order to consider more closely how the state seeks to regulate Muslims' use of their essential freedoms as citizens (or residents) in a liberal democracy. To put it another way, the case of the DIK indicates the importance of more closely considering the configuration within which the law functions to position and regulate Muslims.

My analysis of the DIK has demonstrated that it is designed to remake the Muslim subject into a self-governed individual, prudent in exercising rights and conscious of being situated in a specifically German moral landscape. This policy program is rationalized as an exercise of tolerance. The contested adoption of such a rationality marks a new turn in the German state's approach to the regulation of immigrant populations from Muslim countries. The essential freedom of immigrants – long perceived as a scandal by the dominant majority and thus politically ignored – is now being considered by the state as an opportunity for the deployment of a governmental policy of tolerance. As this article has shown, the rationalization of this policy is in many ways determined by the specificities of the German legal order and the public law regulating religious communities.

Nevertheless, the fundamental dilemma to which it is a response – the essential freedom of Muslims as members of a liberal society – is not specific to Germany and therefore suggests the usefulness of extending this line of inquiry to other European countries.

Notes

An earlier version of this chapter was presented at the Department of Comparative Cultural and Social Anthropology, European University Viadrina, Frankfurt (Oder). I am particularly grateful to Sarah Dornhof and Werner Schiffauer for their comments. My thanks also go to Jocelyne Cesari, Barbara Thériault, Till van Rahden, Elena Arigita, Ahmet Yukleyen and Kerstin Rosenow for their helpful comments.

1 On this initiative, see W. Schiffauer, "Zur Konstruktion von Sicherheitspartnerschaften," in M. Bommes and M. Krüger-Potratz (eds.), *Migrationsreport 2008. Fakten, Analysen, Perspektiven*, Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2008, 1–33 and S. Amir-Moazami, "Islam und Geschlecht unter liberal-säkularer Regierungsführung – Die Deutsche Islam Konferenz," *Tel Aviver Jahrbuch für deutsche Geschichte*, 37, 2009, 185–205. On related changes in German policies see notably L. Tezcan, "Kultur, Gouvernementalität der Religion und der Integrationsdiskurs," *Soziale Welt*, 17, 2007, 51–74 and L. Tezcan, "Governmentality, Pastoral Care and Integration," in A. Al-Harmaneh and J. Thielmann (eds.), *Muslims in Germany*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 119–132.

2 It is difficult to find a term to designate this group. Even more problematic is the simple and inescapable necessity of classifying and naming the object of study when that study itself is dedicated to examining how Germany's unmarked majority has employed precisely such terms to divide and apply a hierarchy to the nation. This chapter hence refrains from offering a new term to designate "persons from Muslim countries who have settled in Germany since the 1950s and their offspring." Rather, it will concentrate on studying some of the processes through which the classifying concept "Muslim" came to occupy its current function and will analyze the dominant yet contested way in which it is today used to structure social order. On the question of social categories see notably S. Sayyid, "BrAsians. Postcolonial People, Ironic Citizens," in S. Sayyid et al. (eds.), *A Postcolonial People. South Asians in Britain*, London: Hurst, 2006, pp. 1–10.

3 W. Brown, *Regulating Aversion. Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire,* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

4 J. Rancière, *Disagreement. Politics and Philosophy*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

5 N. Rose, *Powers of Freedom. Reframing Political Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

6 Bundesministerium des Inneren, *Deutsche Islam Konferenz (DIK). Muslime in Deutschland - deutsche Muslime,* Berlin, 2007.

7 D. Böhmer, "Ja, es gibt einen deutschen Islam (Interview with Feridun Zaimo ğlu)," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, October 1, 2006.

8 The *Zentralrat der Muslime in Deutschland* is an umbrella organization of 19 Muslim associations. In its own words, it represents "the entire diversity of Muslims in Germany," i.e. both Sunni and Shia Muslims and a variety of national ethnic groups (German, Turkish, Albanian, Bosnian, Iranian, etc.) One of the constituent members of the ZMD, *Islamische Gemeinschaft in Deutschland,* is under surveillance of German security agencies because of its alleged links to the Egyptian Muslim Brothers.

9 "Werte des Grundgesetzes anerkannt," *taz*, March 14, 2008.

10 Bundesministerium des Inneren, *Zwischen-Resümee der Arbeitsgruppen und des Gesprächskreises.Vorlage für die 3. Plenarsitzung der DIK (13 März 2008)*, Berlin, 2008. Online. Available at <http://www.bmi.bund.de/Internet/Content/Common/Anlagen/Nachrichten/Pressemitteilungen/2008/03/DIK_Zwischenresuemee,templateId=raw,property=publicationFile.pdf/DIK_Zwischenresuemee.pdf> (accessed May 3, 2008).

11 A. Sayad, *La double absence. Des illusions de l'émigré aux souffrances de l'immigré*, Paris: Seuil, 1999, p. 248. Translation by the author from French: "immigration et travail sont deux états consubstantiellement liés au point qu'on ne peut remettre en cause l'un sans, du même coup, remettre en cause l'autre . . . ."

12 S. Castles, "The Guests Who Stayed – The Debate on 'Foreigners Policy' in the German Federal Republic," *International Migration Review*, 19, 1985, 517–534.

13 Quoted in Castles, "The Guests Who Stayed," pp. 522.

14 P. O'Brien, "Continuity and Change in Germany's Treatment of Non-Germans," *International Migration Review*, 22, 1988, 109–134.

15 G. Hage, *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*, London: Routledge, 1999, p. 46, emphasis in original.

16 Hage, *White Nation*, pp. 42–46.

17 Hage, *White Nation*, p. 42.

18 GESIS, *Allgemeine Bevölkerungsumfrage der Sozialwissenschaften 2006*. Online. Available at <https://social-survey.gesis.org/index.php3> (accessed August 15, 2007).

19 GESIS, *Allgemeine Bevölkerungsumfrage*, pp. 49ff.

20 O'Brien, "Continuity and Change."

21 Hage, *White Nation*, p. 51, emphasis in original.

22 D. Thränhardt, "Patterns of Organization among Different Ethnic Minorities," *New German Critique*, 46, 1989, 10–26.

23 For exceptions see e.g. W. Schiffauer, "Islam as a Civil Religion: Political Culture and the Organisation of Diversity in Germany," in T. Modood and P. Werbner (eds.), *The Politics of Multiculturalism in the New Europe. Racism, Identity and Community*, London: Zed, 1997, pp. 147–166.

24 This is not to say that all those who refer to the so-called organizational deficiencies of Muslim organizations simply reject their right to legal recognition either as "religious community" or corporation of public law. Campenhausen, former director of the *Kirchenrechtliches Institut der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland*, argues that a solution needs to be found in order to grant Muslims the status of corporation of public law in spite of their "organizational deficiencies": "Die Verfassungswirklichkeit und die Verfassungskultur ertragen auf Dauer einen Zustand nicht, in dem wesentliche Teile der Gesellschaft von den rechtlichen Möglichkeiten tatsächlich ausgeschlossen sind." See A. von Campenhausen, "Offene Fragen im Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche am Ende des 20. Jahrhunderts," in H. Marré et al. (eds.), *Das Staat-Kirche-Verhältnis in Deutschland an der Schwelle zum 21. Jahrhundert* (Essener Gespräche zum Thema Staat und Kirche 34), Münster: Aschendorff, pp. 105–145. The contrary position was taken by the former head of the German conference of Bishops, Cardinal Lehmann, who demands that stricter conditions should govern the granting of this status to Muslim federations. See D. Deckers and P. Schilder, "Kardinal Lehmann: Islam rechtlich nicht gleichstellen," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, June 21, 2007.

25 "Schäuble erwartet Körperschaftsstatus für Islam," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, May 10, 2007.

26 Bundesministerium des Inneren, *Zwischen-Resümee*. On conflicts concerning the construction of mosques see J. Hüttermann, *Das Minarett. Zur politischen*

Kultur des Konflikts um islamische Symbole, Weinheim/München: Juventa, 2006.

27 M. Foucault, *The Foucault Reader. An Introduction to Foucault's Thought,* London: Penguin, p. 389. See also P. Rabinow, *Anthropos Today. Reflections on Modern Equipment*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003, pp. 44–49.

28 Rose, *Powers of Freedom*, p. 49.

29 Rose, *Powers of Freedom*, p. 48.

30 See M. Foucault, *Sécurité, territoire, population. Cours au Collège de France (1977–1978)*, Paris: Seuil/Gallimard, 2004, and T. Lemke, *Eine Kritik der politischen Vernunft. Foucaults Analyse der modernen Gouvernementalität,* Hamburg: Argument, 1997.

31 R. Mas, "Compelling the Muslim Subject: Memory as Post-Colonial Violence and the Public Performativity of 'Secular and Cultural Islam,'" *Muslim World,* 96, 2006, 585–616.

32 Rose, *Powers of Freedom*, p. 51.

33 W. Schäuble, "Einwanderung und Integration. Muslime in Deutschland," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, September 27, 2006.

34 Schäuble, "Einwanderung und Integration."

35 W. Schäuble, "Regierungserklärung des Bundesministers des Innern, Dr. Wolfgang Schäuble, zur Deutschen Islamkonferenz vor dem Deutschen Bundestag am 28 September 2006 in Berlin," Online. Available at <http://www.bundesregierung.de/nn_774/Content/DE/Bulletin/2006/09/93-1-bmi-islamkonferenz-bt.html> (accessed October 7, 2007).

36 Schäuble, "Regierungserklärung."

37 See, for example, Sayad, *La double absence*, pp. 316f.

38 D. Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe. Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*, 2nd ed., Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

39 Schäuble, "Einwanderung und Integration."

40 J. Butler, "Sexual Politics, Torture, and Secular Time," *The British Journal of Sociology*, 59, 2008, 2.

41 See, for example, the statement by the Christian-Democratic minister of the interior of Lower Saxony, Schünemann, "Schünemann zur Islamkonferenz." Online. Available at <http://www.islaminhannover.de/2008/04/04/schunemann-zur-islamkonferenz> (accessed July 26, 2008).

42 Online. Available at <http://www.welt.de/politik/article844727/Islam-Konferenz_ist_keine_Schoenwetterveranstaltung.html> (accessed July 26, 2008). For a similar argument by Schäuble see also W. Schäuble, "Ich bin doch kein Sicherheitsfanatiker," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, April 22, 2007.

43 W. Schäuble, "Wir machen den Hasspredigern Konkurrenz," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, March 12, 2008.

44 W. Schäuble, "Vom Sinn universitärer Theologie in einer globalisierten Welt," speech at the inauguration of the new Faculty of Theology at Humboldt University, Berlin, May 9, 2007. Online. Available at <http://www.bmi.bund.de/nn_1043178/Internet/Content/Nachrichten/Reden/2007/05/BM__Sinn__universitaerer__Theologie.html> (accessed July 27, 2007).

45 Schäuble, "Vom Sinn universitärer Theologie."

46 U. Mehta, "Liberal Strategies of Exclusion," *Politics & Society*, 18, 1990, 430.

47 Innenministerium Nordrhein-Westfalen, "Aufruf zu Bündnis gegen Islamismus, Terror und Gewalt – Innenminister Behrens und Moscheevereine in Essen gemeinsam für Toleranz und Integration," September 29, 2004. Online. Available at <http://www.im.nrw.de/pe/pm2001/pm2001/news1260.htm> (accessed July 27, 2008); C. Keller, "Jugendkriminalität: Polizei bittet Imame um Hilfe," *Tagesspiegel*, July 24, 2006; SWR, "Projekt der Polizeiakademie Freiburg, Islam-Unterricht für Polizisten." Online. Available at <http://

www.swr.de/islam/miteinander/-/id=1549992/nid=1549992/did=1573268/aj5uf3/index.html> (accessed July 27, 2008).

48 "Islamkonferenz ohne Beschlüsse," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, May 2, 2007.

49 C. Rath, "Neues BKA-Gesetz – Imame abhören erlaubt," *taz*, March 11, 2008; A. Reimann, "Abhörschutz gilt nicht für Imame," *Spiegel Online*, April 16, 2008. Online. Available at <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/0,1518,547710,00.html> (accessed October 7, 2008).

50 See "Der Islam ist keine Bedrohung für uns," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, March 13, 2006. Emphasis added.

51 M. Rohe, *Der Islam-Alltagskonflikte und Lösungen. Rechtliche Perspektiven*, Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 2001, pp. 152f.

52 See "Muslime kritisieren Innenminister," *Die Welt*, April 30, 2007.

53 Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, p. 12.

54 Rose, *Powers of Freedom*, p. 48.

55 See also M. Koenig, *Staatsbürgerschaft und religiöse Pluralität in post-nationalen Konstellationen*, Ph.D. dissertation, Philipps-Universität Marburg, 2003. Koenig stresses the important effects of global discourses of human rights on the transformation of Muslim demands and activism in Europe and, more generally, on the ongoing changes in the patterns of immigrant incorporation and religious policies concerning Islam.

56 Rancière, *Disagreement*; S. Žižek, "Tolerance as an Ideological Category," *Critical Inquiry*, 34, 2008, 660–682.

57 Rancière, *Disagreement*.

58 Rancière, *Disagreement*, pp. 11f.

59 Rancière, *Disagreement*, p. 89.

60 J. Rancière, *The Politics of Aesthetics. The Distribution of the Sensible*, London: Continuum, 2004, p. 51.

61 Rancière, *Disagreement*, pp. 31ff. On this point see C. Nordmann, *Bourdieu/Rancière. La politique entre sociologie et philosophie*, Paris: Éditions Amsterdam, 2006.

62 Schäuble, "Einwanderung und Integration."

63 In November 2006, the Council of Lutheran Churches published a booklet entitled "Clarity and Good Neighbourliness" (*Klarheit und gute Nachbarschaft*) which was intended as an orientation in matters relating to "Christians and Muslims in Germany" for members of the Church and the broader public. Subsequent to the publication, the KRM withdrew from a planned high-level meeting with Bishop Huber, the president of the Council of Lutheran Churches in Germany. See Koordinierungsrat der Muslime, *Profilierung auf Kosten der Muslime. Stellungnahme des Koordinierungsrates der Muslime (KRM) zur Handreichung "Klarheit und gute Nachbarschaft" der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (EKD)*, May 24, 2007. Online. Available at <http://islam.de/8443.php> (accessed August 18, 2008).

64 A. Köhler "Wie hältst Du's mit der Religionsfreiheit? Rede am evangelischen Kirchentag von Dr. Ayyub Axel Köhler . . . ," June 7, 2007. Online. Available at <http://islam.de/8503.php> (accessed August 18, 2008).

65 Köhler, "Religionsfreiheit." The original German reads: "Davon können Muslime ein Lied singen."

66 Köhler, "Religionsfreiheit."

67 Köhler, "Religionsfreiheit."

68 Köhler, "Religionsfreiheit."

69 Rancière, *Disagreement*, p. 90.

70 Rancière, *Disagreement*, p. 99.

71 Rancière, *Disagreement*, p. 90.

72 A. Köhler, "Die strukturelle Assimilation des Islam in Deutschland. Anmerkungen

zu den Körperschaftsrechten aus islamischer Sicht," no date. Online. Available at <http://islam.de/2579.php> (accessed August 18, 2008).

73 "Werte des Grundgesetzes anerkannt," *taz*, March 14, 2008.

74 While the government has been successful in establishing cooperation in security matters with some Muslim federations, including members of the KRM, the KRM has also clashed with government representatives on the issue of defining sources of current security threats. Thus, representatives of the KRM in the separate Working Group concerned with "Islamism and Security," successfully eliminated a passage in the interim report in which it was claimed that Islamism in Germany posed "a significant danger." See M. Wehner, "Am Tisch mit Islamisten und Orthodoxen," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, March 12, 2008. See also Schiffauer, "Sicherheitspartnerschaften," p. 10.

75 This is Ateş's term to designate Germans descending from immigrants.

76 S. Ateş, *Große Reise ins Feuer. Die Geschichte einer deutschen Türkin*, 2nd ed., Reinbek: Rowohlt, 2007, and *Der Multikulti-Irrtum. Wie wir in Deutschland besser zusammenleben können*, Berlin: Ullstein, 2007.

77 See "Integration – Falsche Freiheit," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, February 3, 2006. In this article written as a defense of Necla Kelek, Hirsi Ali and Seyran Ateş, the author mocks those who consider that language problems among immigrants are due to attitudes and policies of "the receiving society." This is indeed a point Ateş repeatedly makes in her books.

78 Incidentally, Ateş herself is unhappy with the term.

79 Schäuble, "Regierungserklärung."

80 J. Cesari, *When Islam and Democracy Meet: Muslims in Europe and in the United States*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

7 *Shari'a* and the future of secular Europe

Jocelyne Cesari

Introduction

The recognition of Muslim minorities in European and American societies, thrown into the media spotlight after 9/11 and the following attacks in Europe, has introduced debate over the compatibility of Islam with European norms. The controversy has crystallized more recently in the European concern over the imposition of *shari'a* law.

In February 2008, when the Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams voiced the opinion that "there is a place for finding what would be a constructive accommodation with some aspects of Muslim law,"[1] much of the British public was outraged at the suggestion. Williams, however, observed the need to deconstruct the Western perception of Islamic law, and he pointed out that some aspects of *shari'a*, including Islamic banking, have already been incorporated in European culture. Similar debate occurred in Canada in 2005, when protestors rallied in opposition to a movement for Muslim family arbitration councils. Critiques viewed the proposal as the imposition of religious law on all Canadians and the end of their traditional separation of church and state.

Nevertheless, *shari'a* law, perhaps more than any other aspect of Islam, is perceived as a threat to Western culture. It evokes an emotional response because the term *shari'a* generally conjures up images of amputation and stoning. Following 9/11 and the 7/7 bombings, the debate over Islamic law highlights the securitization process of the religion described in the first chapter. Based on research conducted among Muslims in Europe over the last four years,[2] this chapter will differentiate between the reality of Islamic law within the legal systems of European countries and the politicization of post-9/11 debate on *shari'a*.

Malleability of *Shari'a*

Muslims believe that Islamic law originates from divine revelation and serves as a guide to the divine will, from which the term *shari'a* (meaning "path" or "road") is derived. It has developed through the centuries beyond the original revealed text, covering numerous topics for which revelation did not provide any explicit prescriptions. For this reason, there is a distinction in classical Islamic theory between *shari'a* and *fiqh* (positive law). The principal techniques for *fiqh* develop rules in the absence of divine edicts in the Qur'an or *hadīth*; they have been, among others, *qiyās*, or analogical reasoning (applying a rule provided in revelation to a new situation), and *ijmā*, or consensus of the scholars. In other words, the transformation of the divine principles into positive legislation is the consequence of human work, i.e. of lawyers and scholars of Islam. It is significant that *shari'a* is not codified. Instead, it is the result of a process involving knowledge, judgment, techniques of interpretation, and the study of law doctrines and principles. In this way, *shari'a* depends on the efforts of scholars. Traditionally, interpreting *shari'a* has been a continuous process of implementing this positive law controlled by *imams*. Therefore, positive law has taken different forms according to its historical context and the influence of various political communities.

In most contemporary Muslim states, *shari'a* is confined to family law, despite recent controversy about the expansion of *shari'a* to areas of criminal law (*u'dud*). Examples of criminal sentences include stoning to death, as happened in Mauritania, and harsh corporal punishment like those inflicted by the Taliban in Afghanistan. The introduction of Islamic legal principles to constitutional laws that sparks debate from Iran to Iraq and Afghanistan is a recent development. In most cases, the implementation of *shari'a,* is discussed in the framework of human rights (HR) and draws on the incompatibility between *shari'a* and HR.[3] It is worth mentioning the claim that divine law is comprehensive and therefore a source of constitutional law diverges from the traditional perception of political entities in Islamic history, which is based on the distinction of *shari'a* from *siyasah* (politics).[4]

Usually, the debate on Islam is transferred to Europe without taking into account the completely different context in which it operates. In the Western world, where there is democratic constitutionalism, the debate does not stem from constitutional issues. Contrary to the widespread belief that Muslims in the West seek the inclusion of *shari'a* in the constitutions of European countries, most surveys show that Muslims are quite satisfied with the secular nature of European societies. When Muslims agitate for change, they engage in politics and the democratic process, utilizing mainstream parties and institutions.[5] At the same time, it does not mean that they renounce Islamic principles and legal rules to guide or structure their daily life. This conclusion also came through in the focus group discussions we led in Europe and the US from 2007 to 2008: the Muslims interviewed expressed attachment to religious marriage and religious divorce.[6]

The important question raised by the Muslim presence in Europe is how the protection of specific subcultures can favor, rather than stifle, individual emancipation. Sometimes, Islamic groups collectively request rights that limit individual freedom. The Rushdie affair was an illustration of such a dilemma, as British Muslims claimed the right of Islam to be protected by the Blasphemy Law (that traditionally applies only to Anglicanism). As Will Kymlicka states: "If we simplify to an extreme, we can state that minority rights are compatible with cultural liberalism when a) individual freedom is protected within the group, and b) they promote equality, and not domination, between groups within the different European societies."[7]

Within the *shari'a* debate, these two conditions are under intense scrutiny. Individual freedom is perceived as threatened by forced marriage, polygamy, and inequality between husband and wife in the divorce procedure. Indeed tensions may occur between the dominant civil laws and the prescriptions of Islamic religion concerning family. Our research shows that there is a great deal of adaptation when it comes to issues of potential conflict between *shari'a* and civil laws.

The second condition is also problematic, since Islam as a religion and culture is still perceived as alien and external to Europe. Promoting equality between cultures involves redefining public culture and the status of Islam within the public space at the level of both nation-states and the European Union. In the post-9/11 context, some of the Muslim claims champion the European conception of human rights, by arguing, for example, that laws banning religious symbols from French public schools are contradictory to the European notion of fundamental rights. This second part of the debate on Islam and secular principles is more relevant to the US than Europe.

Islamic law and Western civil law: a pragmatic adjustment

There is no clear desire among European Muslims to change the secular nature of their states of residence, but that does not preclude tension from existing between Islamic prescriptions and the provisions of secular law. Islamic traditions of marriage, divorce, and child custody most often cause friction between devout Muslims and European civil law. In legal practice, the question of whether to take Muslim family law into account in the regulation of daily life is bound to the condition that these laws meet the criteria prescribed by human rights and fundamental liberties. That is why personal status appears problematic in the process of integrating Muslims, to the point that some compare the situation to a conflict of civilizations.[8] However, even though the silent majority of European Muslims already accepts Islam's compatibility with human rights, there exist fringes of the Muslim population across Europe that reject this paradigm and act in violent manners that strongly influence Europe's perception of Islam and Muslims.

We looked into the literature and jurisprudence of several key European countries in order to ascertain the arguments used by the courts and by Muslims when conflicts happen. The plethora of national laws in Europe and the diversity among Muslim groups makes comparison difficult, but we found a trend of recognizing foreign law. In countries like France, Belgium, Italy, and Spain, the law distinguishes between national and foreign jurisprudence, with the result that residents act under their national laws. In this case, the country of residence may apply a discriminatory foreign law. For Muslims, Islamic laws on marriage, divorce, and custody may differ according to their school of thought (Hanafi, Shafi'i, Maliki, Hanbali, etc.) or country of origin (Pakistan, Algeria, Morocco, etc.). Furthermore, in some cases like Tunisia, Turkey, and Morocco, family law has been secularized and in theory respects the principle of equality between men and women. However it does not preclude the persistence of customs that can be discriminatory toward women and can be presented as "Islamic."

Because of these complex circumstances, we find different and sometimes contradictory attitudes among Muslims toward European secular laws. As mentioned previously, complete rejection of secular law is rare, except for elements of French secularism that were discussed in Chapter 2. But the complete acceptance of European civil law is also rare. The Dutch legal anthropologist Léon Buskens, an expert on Islamic and Moroccan Law who regularly lectures to Dutch judges on these subjects, when interviewed in March 2004, said that one of the main reasons why Islamic Law is not applied in the Netherlands in family law cases involving Moroccans is that the women often do not want it: they prefer Dutch law, because they see it as more advantageous for themselves.[9] This observation is confirmed by a study of Moroccan women's perceptions of conflicts of laws in Belgium. Marie-Claire Foblets notes that "the application, under Belgian private international law, of Moroccan laws in cases of conflicts of law, is often perceived by these women as an injustice, since they are under the impression that this system seeks to safeguard the interests of the husband above all."[10] Similar conclusions have been made in France in the study *L'étranger face et au regard du droit*: North African women prefer French law, as they consider it more protective and gender-neutral, particularly in cases of divorce and child custody.[11] However, our research does not validate Jean-Paul Charnay's position in *La Charia et l'Occident*,[12] in which he argues that Muslims in Europe are the first believers in Islamic history to call for the non-application of *shari'a*.[13]

We have found that for the majority of Muslims who accept the legal and institutional framework of the country where they live, Islamic requirements are already being adapted to national laws. Surprisingly, this reconciliation has often been conducted in an indirect way through European legal decisions rather than Islamic legal experts or Muslim theologians.[14] Consequently, a slow and "invisible" form of personal Islamic law is being constructed and adapted to Western secular laws. Of course, European judges do not claim Islamic authority, but the fact that Muslim theologians do not contest their decisions, or sometimes even endorse them (see below on divorce) illustrate the law's adaptation.

Pearl and Menski call the hybrid legal system now evolving in the UK "*Angrezi Shari'a*."[15] "While English Law is clearly the official law, Muslim Law in Britain today has become part of the sphere of unofficial law. This analytical paradigm indicates that Muslims continue to feel bound by the framework of the *shari'a*. Thus, rather than adjusting to English law by abandoning certain facets of their *shari'a*, South Asian Muslims in Britain appear to have built the requirements of English Law into their own traditional legal structures."[16] This emergent hybrid product is stamped with the seal of Western individualist culture. In other words, Europeans view it as compatible with the principle of individual freedom. The recognition (even implicitly) of such a principle is currently redefining Islamic regulations on the status of the individual and the family, the two main areas in which discord arises between Western legal norms on the rights of individuals and the legal norms of Muslim countries.

Marriage

Life in the West has profoundly altered Islamic precepts regarding the family and the individual. In matters of family law, most Muslim countries privilege a system of norms that accredits polygamy, gives priority to the husband throughout divorce proceedings (*talaq*), and does not recognize civil or inter-religious marriages. Islamic law does not apply in any Western countries for matters of marriage, divorce, inheritance, etc. except for "foreigners" who are citizens of Muslim countries. Despite being European citizens also, nationals of Islamic countries must abide by the laws of their country of origin. British Muslims constitute the only exception, as UK law recognizes the country of residence rather than origin.

The first difficulty concerns the confusion between culture and religion in the discriminatory practices that can affect Muslim women. One case in point is the frequency of forced marriages in some Muslim groups. One must distinguish, of course, between arranged marriage and forced marriage; it often surprises Westerners that arranged marriages continue to be supported and desired by young people born or educated in Europe, particularly within the Indian and Pakistani populations, where such practices continue to dominate. In all cases of arranged marriage, the choice of spouse is based on the opinions of the families and the interested parties, men and women alike. Nonetheless, it is a sign of Western influence that girls are becoming more and more involved in every step of their marriages. A forced marriage, by contrast, imposes a partner on a girl or a young man, regardless of their wishes. Young women can find themselves threatened by violence or even death if they marry outside the community.

There are many cases of forced marriages reported in the British press, and they emphasize the violence endured by many British citizens. The *Guardian* reported many stories of young British Pakistani girls tricked into marriage in the native countries. Graphic details and shockingly young ages often gain the readers' sympathies and raise public awareness.[17] In the UK, such practices have been the subject of public debate and even a parliamentary report,[18] as well as condemnation by Muslim leaders. In 1998, Rukhsana Naz was murdered by her brother and her mother for having preferred her lover to the man chosen for her by her family. In response to her murder, the British government created a commission, the Community Liaison Unit, to assist victims of forced marriage. Since its creation, this department has handled more than 500 cases. The Home Office is considering introducing a new criminal offence to charge parents who force their daughters to marry against their will. It is conceded that "no major world religion condones forced marriage," but some police and social services were sometimes concerned that taking action was seen as meddling in religious traditions or cultural norms.[19]

The most prominent Muslim leaders and organizations in the UK have strongly condemned such abuses and mobilized against them. The Muslim Women's Helpline, founded in 1989 in Britain, provides counselling service with an Islamic ethos over the telephone. In its 2000 report it notes that forced marriages or women forced to flee their homes due to impending marriage accounted for nearly 3.5 percent of the total calls it received.[20] The coordinator of this phone bank, Najma Ebrahim, wrote in the report that the negligible response of the Muslim community frustrates and angers Muslim women who sympathize with these young girls. She called for justice, even at the expense of bypassing *shari'a*.[21]

In this regard, one of the major Muslim umbrella organizations in the UK, the Muslim Council of Britain (MCB) has held meetings with British authorities to discuss the issue of forced marriages. The MCB has consistently argued that forced marriages are not at all Islamic but only cultural phenomena. In late 1999, the MCB's Newsletter, *The Common Good*, stated the following:

> The MCB has made it clear that the controversy surrounding forced marriages is not a Muslim issue, but concerns the Asian community and its culture. It is a practice which has been condemned by the Prophet Muhammad, peace be on him, which unfortunately exists today among the Asian communities in Britain including some Muslims.

But the issue is a recurrent one. Three years later *The Common Good* notes the discussion of the Home Secretary and representatives from the MCB as including: "The issue of forced marriages was raised and the delegation [from the MCB] responded by stating that this cultural practice was not valid in Islam. However, it was presented and projected as a Muslim-specific problem."[22]

Forced marriages also exist in France. The *Haut Conseil à l'intégration*, in its 2003 report,[23] notes that, according to several grassroots organizations, more than 70,000 teenagers are concerned by the issue of forced marriages in France. Although particularly prevalent among communities from Mali, Mauritania, and Senegal, this practice is developing also among North Africans, Turks, and Asians. According to the authors, forced marriages in France are not decreasing but, if anything, on the rise.[24] This led to the creation of an inter-ministerial research group in June 2004 by Nicole Ameline, the Minister for Parity and Professional Equality. The aims of this project included a more detailed estimation of the real extent of the problem as well as the elaboration of a number of responses appropriate to the situation of the women involved in forced marriages.[25] Generally speaking, French Muslim theologians and leaders have not publicly condemned this practice as strongly as they have in the UK, perhaps because the dominant view in the wider society seems to be that this practice has no Islamic basis. We have not come across in our research a single *imam* who considers forced marriages to be Islamic. Besides this confusion between customs and religion, Muslims express concern about the legal recognition of the religious marriage ceremony. The Islamic marriage ceremony often involves only the consenting bride and groom, at least two witnesses, and a local religious figure or *imam*. In some cultures, reading the *Fatiha*, the first chapter of the Qu'ran, consecrates the marriage. The ceremony generally takes place at the bride's parents' home, with only a few guests in attendance. In countries where Islam is a state religion, a religious authority (i.e. with official status) performs the ceremony. The same is not true for Europe, where any acknowledged believer can conduct the ceremony and thus make the marriage "official."[26]

In countries where religious marriage has the same status as civil unions (as in Spain or Italy), marriage based on an Islamic code is legally binding. In Spain, recording the marriage in the civil registry – a requirement for Jewish and Protestant minorities – is not mandatory for Islamic weddings. According to the 1992 agreement between Spain and Islamic organizations, the regulation of Islamic marriages contains exceptions to civil marriage: the certification of legal marriage is optional before the religious celebration, although it must be registered in order to produce full civil effects. Therefore polygamous marriages subsequent to a registered civil marriage do not have to be recorded. Consequently, polygamy has a kind of hidden approval. Any marriage that occurs after the recording of a first marriage in the civil register will obviously have no legal status, but since marriages do not actually have to be registered, contracting more than one cannot be considered illegal.[27]

In the cases of Belgium, the Netherlands, France, and Germany, religious authorities may not proceed with a religious marriage until a civil marriage ceremony has first been carried out by a government official. It is often the case that this order (civil marriage *then* religious marriage) is not respected by the couple, though such divergent practices remain officially illegal. A judge will sometimes even recognize an existing Islamic marriage on the grounds that official acknowledgment was being sought.[28] It does not imply that religious marriages have civil effect but that according to some circumstances, the judge can recognize the marriage on the ground of the existence of a married lifestyle. Our own research shows that many young people are exchanging religious vows and then allowing a certain amount of time to pass before taking their official vows before a judge. These young couples are not yet married in the eyes of the law, but they can live together as a married couple and take time to get to know each other, as if they were simply cohabiting. Thus if they do decide to split up, there are no legal proceedings to be undertaken. In France, religious ceremonies may also precede the civil marriages, in contravention of the law – but since *imams* have no official status in France, this practice cannot actually be regulated.

Throughout Europe, Muslim activists are wary of the possible negative effects on *women* of such unofficial marriages, in particular since a "divorce" leaves them with no legal rights, and there have been campaigns warning Muslims against this practice. In Britain, the Muslim Women's Helpline has been at the forefront of this struggle, publishing advertisements in the local Muslim press and delivering talks on the subject. Islamonline, a prominent bilingual (English–Arabic) Muslim website, invited a British female activist, Shabana Delawala, to discuss the issue live with Muslims in 2004.[29] Delawala is the founder of the campaign group Knowledge and Justice, launched in July 2002 in order to help Muslim women who find themselves in a situation whereby their marriage contracts are not legally recognized. Herself the victim of an un-registered marriage, she wants to raise the awareness of Muslim women (especially in the UK) to the consequences of not having their Islamic marriage contract followed by a civil ceremony. In France, the *imams* linked to the *Union des organisations islamiques de France* (UOIF) have been advised not to perform religious marriages at all.[30]

Polygamy

First, let us recall that in the Arab world, polygamy is legal and socially acceptable, although not very widely practiced.[31] There are, however, differences between the legal codes of Arab countries according to their interpretations of this rule. One interesting example is the Moroccan family law ("Moudawana") which entered into force in February 2004. Whilst the law does not formally prohibit polygamy, it imposes very strict conditions that render it virtually impossible in practice, including the stipulation that polygamy must be approved by a judge and the first wife must give her approval to the second marriage. In France, there are some statistics on polygamy from INED-INSEE research published by Michèle Tribalat:[32] among the Black African immigrant population of about 212,000 people (where polygamy is supposed to be most prevalent), 3,500 households name polygamy a concern. Generally speaking, polygamy appears to be a declining practice, especially among the generations born and educated in Europe.

However, how is polygamy treated by the European civil laws? A sharp difference appears between countries such as France, Germany, and Belgium that acknowledge the effects of international civil laws on their soil and countries such the UK where domestic law prevails over the foreign law. The key issue here is the difficulty of distinguishing between personal law and the relevant jurisdictional law.[33] According to the judge and legal scholar Mathias Rohe, "German law treats polygamous marriages as legally valid provided that the marriage contracts are valid under the law applicable to the formation of these contracts. The reason is that it would not help the second wife or further wives who may have lived in such a marriage for a considerable time to deprive them of their marital rights such as maintenance etc. Thus §34 sect. 2 , which contains provisions on social security systems, regulates the per capita division of pensions among widows who were living in a polygamous marriage."[34] This effective recognition of polygamy, incorporated even into German state institutions, is fundamentally different from the solutions found by judges in British courts, as exemplified in the decision not to recognize any of the widows in Court of Appeal in *Bibi v. Chief Adjudication Officer* (1998) 1 FLR 375.

In France, polygamous marriages celebrated abroad will be considered valid by the principles of French international private law. However, since the law of August 24, 1993 related to immigration control and conditions for foreigners in France, this marriage will no longer allow the husband to ask for a second wife and their offspring to join him in France under the pretext of family reunion. If he does, he risks losing his "residence permit."[35] A recent survey demonstrates the total respect by North African families for the ban of polygamous marriages under French laws. The practice is also forbidden in Tunisia.[36]

Intra-community debate also plays a role in determining Muslim practices of polygamy. In Belgium, for example, a young woman confronted with the claim that Muslim men should be at least bigamous (sic) turned to a local Muslim website – www.islam-belgique.com – for advice. In his answer, the popular Belgium Muslim scholar, Yacob Mahi, explained that there is a multiplicity of possible interpretations of the Qur'an. However, in the case of polygamy (which, as Mahi notes, is often used to discredit Islam), it is a capital mistake to consider it the basis of the Muslim marriage. The relevant Qur'anic verses, according to Mahi, cannot be dissociated from the socio-historical context of the Revelation: Islam took the existing practice into account, but the Qur'an severely limited polygamy, rendering it close to impossible.[37] This view is widely held by Islamic legal scholars across Europe.

Interestingly, there are some current arguments being presented by female legal experts that the Qu'ranic verses on marriage actually favor monogamy. A conference held at the United Nations in Geneva in 2004 on the topic of Islam, Women and Human Rights, co-organized by the European Islamic Conference and the World Islamic Call Society, provided an instructive forum for this debate. In her keynote speech, the Egyptian-born and Al-Azhar-trained scholar Fawzia Ashmawi, from the University of Geneva, declared categorically: "Although polygamy is allowed in Islam, it is not the rule but the exception. This authorization is strictly limited and linked to specific social contexts."[38] This line of argumentation has been incorporated even by senior European politicians. The French reporter, Ms Yvette Roudy, who wrote the 2002 report submitted to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe entitled "Situation of Maghrebi Women" notes that: "The Koran explicitly states that men may have more than one wife only providing they are able to provide, financially, for all their wives equally, which in fact is practically impossible."[39]

The same line of argument is held by Muslim women lawyers who created Karamah in the United States, a human rights organization of Muslim women lawyers. Founded in 1993, Karamah aims to promote and improve the condition of Muslim women through education about the role of women in the Qu'ran and legal advice on what *shari'a* means for women today.[40] However, like in Europe, invisible practices of polygamy exist even if they remain marginal.

The British situation is very different from continental Europe. UK international private law states that a person's family law is the law of domicile rather than nationality. When a divorce proceeding is brought before an English or Scottish court, it is governed by the English and Scottish laws irrespective of the nationality of the spouses. The principle implying that the law of the forum applies without exception ("lex fori") applies also in Ireland and the Nordic countries. Therefore Muslim immigrants are subject to English or Scottish family laws. But problems arise in the case of marriages and divorces conducted abroad. Thus, the UK is the European country in which polygamy has been the most hotly contested. The ban concerns not only polygamous marriages on British soil but also polygamous marriages conducted abroad and even potentially polygamous marriages, at least until 1972.[41]

In the early 1980s, this strict prohibition appeared increasingly inadequate given the influx of Muslim and Hindu immigrants into Britain. So, in 1973, the Matrimonial Proceedings (Polygamous Marriages) Act made the full range of matrimonial relief available to a marriage whether potentially or actually polygamous. It meant that a potentially (or actually) polygamous marriage contracted abroad by a person residing in the UK but a national of Pakistan is valid in English law. But a Muslim marriage ceremony in general was regarded as establishing a polygamous marriage or potentially polygamous marriage, i.e. performed under a civil law that recognizes polygamy even if the marriage itself is not. Under these conditions, a British national could not validly marry by having a Muslim ceremony in Pakistan even if this marriage was de facto monogamous. In 1979, Mr Husain, a UK national married in Lahore, Pakistan. The wife joined her husband in England, but in May 1981, the wife petitioned for a decree of judicial separation on the ground of her husband's unreasonable behavior. The husband challenged the validity of the marriage on the basis of the existing jurisprudence that voids marriages conducted under polygamous law. But surprisingly, the court declared the marriage legally monogamous and valid in English law. In brief, since this decision only de facto polygamous marriages are forbidden and not potential ones.[42]

However some, such as Prakash Shah, are very critical of this situation: "While clearly attempting to solve the problem of the potential non recognition of a huge number of marriages contracted abroad, the legislation also ends up preserving the fiction that English men and women cannot but enter monogamous marriages. This mirrors the assimilationist position of English domestic law that is justified on Human Rights and discrimination grounds."[43] In this way, restrictions on polygamy have been increasingly founded on human rights and especially on the provisions of the European Convention on Human Rights. The European Convention disclosed in 1998: "The Commission found that excluding surplus wives was a legitimate aim under the second paragraph of article 8 for the preservation of a Christian-based monogamous culture dominant in that society (as pursuing the protection of morals and of rights and freedoms of others). It also recalled its findings in an unpublished Dutch case that a contracting state cannot be required to give full recognition to polygamous marriages in conflict with their own legal order, referring to bigamy laws."[44]

It can be questioned whether the actual ban on polygamy achieves its abolition. There is now considerable evidence of the practice of polygamy in that one marriage is contracted under Islamic law while another marriage may take place both under the secular civil law and the Islamic law. According to Aina Khan, a Muslim solicitor who is a specialist in Islamic family law, "polygamy is becoming more common here (in Britain) than it is even in the parts of the Muslim world. The average man seems to want to exercise his religious right to marry more than once although in my experience they want to do so without the taking on any of the attendant responsibilities."[45] According to Yilmaz, it is no longer surprising to find in Muslim newspapers "an advertisement from a man looking for a second spouse, or a woman advertising to become a second wife of a married man."[46] However, new generations born or educated in the UK show an increasing distrust towards such practices, especially when it comes to divorce.

Divorce: practice of talaq

It is within the domain of repudiation (i.e. divorce) that arbitration or attempts at reconciliation between religious law and civil judgments most often become necessary.[47] Repudiation or *talaq* (unilateral divorce decided by the husband) is prohibited by law in all Western nations. In well-organized minority groups, however, a judge may take into account the recommendations of certain religious decision-makers.

For the UK the recognition of Muslim divorce came in an indirect way through the acknowledgment of polygamous marriages contracted abroad. As described above, the Domicile and Matrimonial Proceedings Act of 1973 expanded the jurisdiction of the English Courts by permitting them to entertain divorce petitions in circumstances where one of the spouses had been a resident within the UK for a period of twelve months prior to the presentation of the petition, and irrespective of the nationality of the parties. The Matrimonial Proceedings (Polygamous Marriages) Act removed the ban on matrimonial relief previously raised by the fact that the foreign marriage was either potentially or actually polygamous.[48] And the 1983 decision of the Court of Appeal in *Hussain v. Hussain*[49] held that the Muslim marriage contracted abroad by a Muslim man in residence in England was not void because it was "potentially polygamous."

However, a very sensitive issue concerns the contradiction that can happen between religious and civil divorce, known as "limping marriages." This term refers to cases where a Muslim woman has been granted a legal divorce by a British court but has not received the Islamic *talaq* from her husband and thus seeks a divorce from a Muslim court. Zaki Badawi gave the example of a young Pakistani woman in the UK who refused to marry her cousin. The young man immigrated to England on the basis of a civil marriage. The woman's father married her to the man, in a religious ceremony, against her will. She decided to run away, so as to escape before the marriage could be consummated. Her father died and her brothers put pressure on her in a variety of ways (including death threats) to make her respect her father's wishes. The husband returned to Pakistan, where he married another young woman, but the first woman was never allowed to have another religious marriage ceremony since her husband continued to refuse to grant her a divorce.[50]

In the UK, there are a number of bodies for reconciliation, but they do not have a standard manner of operation. Two of the most prominent organizations bear similar names and have been established primarily in order to settle disputes between forms of religious and civil marriage: the Muslim Law (Shari'a) Council (MLSC), established by the late Dr. Zaki Badawi, and the Islamic Shari'a Council of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (ISC), whose first chairman was the late Shaykh Syed Darsh. The two councils are based in London and perform similar functions. There even seems to be some overlap between personnel.[51] In both cases, limping marriages have had a catalytic function: if a husband refuses to consent to his wife's demand for a divorce, the wife can take her plea to the Shari'a Councils, which then try to offer a form of arbitration. Both the ISC and the MLSC also issue *fatwa*, voluntary legal advice in matters related to Islamic law.

The Shari'a Councils seek to fulfill the Islamic duty of providing leadership and guidance to a Muslim community, even a minority one, according to Abu Hanifa's injunction. They act as a *qadi*, or Muslim judge, in matters related to marriage and divorce. Located in West London, the MLSC focuses on the British Muslim community, but has dealt with questions from other European countries as well, from Denmark to Spain.[52] The organization has a membership of around twenty individuals, representing not only the four Sunni schools of jurisprudence (in chronological order of appearance: Hanafi, Maliki, Shafi'i and Hanbali) but also the Shi'a/Imamiyya, and has formal links with the Imams and Mosques Council in Britain. Members meet at least every three months in order to make formal decisions about the pending cases. The majority of these cases concern marital disputes: It is typically the wife who approaches the MLSC seeking the dissolution of their Islamic marriage contract when the husband has not granted her a *talaq*. This may take place either before, after, or independently from a civil divorce. The primary objective of the Council is to assist in the reconciliation of the family and it certainly does not want to be seen as a "divorce-issuing office."[53] The MLSC tries first to contact the husband and eventually decides on the case. It may either dissolve the contract or give a *khulla*, a divorce granted to the wife in compensation for the return of the *mahr* (the sum given to the wife by the husband at the time of the marriage contract). The length of time for completion of the whole process depends on the particular case and may take up to three years if the parties choose to enter into negotiations with the mediation of the MLSC.[54] Sonia Shah-Kazemi's study of the workings of the MLSC suggests women from all ages, social categories, and locations in Britain have access to the Council, which is able to provide all of its services by correspondence.

In one typical case where the husband persisted in denying his divorced wife the Islamic *talaq* on grounds that she had committed adultery, the MLSC wrote the following letter:

> Dear Mr X,
>
> *Assalamu alaykum*
>
> The members of the *Shari'a* Council, after having discussed your wife's application for an Islamic divorce and after looking into your submission of (dates) have unanimously agreed to inform you that:
>
> 1 Adultery is one of the most heinous crimes in Islamic law, the punishment for which is death by stoning. But as Britain is not a Muslim state such a punishment may not be carried out here. This punishment can only be administered in a Muslim state after due process.
> 2 The laws of marriage and divorce for their application do not need the authority of a Muslim state hence a Muslim can marry and divorce in Britain according to Islamic law.
> 3 On the basis of your letter which alleges adultery against your wife we can assure you that she will be punished by Allah almighty for her immorality but we regret that you are not entitled to withhold divorce from her as a measure of punishment in this respect. In Islamic law, divorce is the provision for permanent separation of a couple. It must not be used as a penal instrument. Hence the *Shari'a* Council acting according to Islamic law regrets that it must reject your application in this regard.

> 4 The Council does not accept your view that as a Muslim you need not recognize an English civil divorce. Muslims are required by the *shari'a* to observe the laws of the country wherein they reside.
> 5 According to the rules of *shari'a* once you have become separated from your wife you have only two options
>   a) secure a reconciliation.
>   b) if this cannot be achieved or is not desirable then you must divorce your wife according to Islamic law. There is no option of a suspended state between marriage and divorce available to a Muslim couple at all.
> 6 Finally the Council has decided to request you to pronounce an Islamic divorce against your wife within 15 day of this letter's postmark so that you can end a merely paper relationship between you and your wife.
>
> Yours sincerely . . . [55]

Likewise, the Islamic Shari'a Council of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (ISC) started as a group of *imams* who were solving conflicts of law in London and were soon made official in 1982 under their current name. It derives authority from its panel of scholars, which represent the London Central Mosque and Islamic Cultural Centre, the Muslim World League, the Markazi Jammiat Ahl-e-hadith, the UK Islamic Mission, Dawatul Islam, Jami Masjid in Bradford, the Muslim Welfare house in London, and the Islamic Centers in Birmingham, Glasgow, and Manchester. The ISC considers itself a "stabilising facto(r) in the preservation of the community and an aid in stopping the younger members from being swallowed by the non-Islamic environment surrounding them."[56] The Council has also campaigned for the state recognition of Muslim Family Law, which it views as an "essential right enshrined in the universal declaration of human rights."[57] It is less inclusive than the MLSC since it represents only the Sunni strand of Islam. Its twenty members are of different ethnicities (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Somali) and meet every month in the Islamic Cultural Centre in London.[58] The ISC, based in North East London, draws also on its (informal) representatives in Britain's major cities: 95 percent of the letters received by the ISC are related to matrimonial problems faced by Muslims in the UK.[59] From 1982 to 2002, no fewer than 4,500 cases have been dealt with by the Council.[60] In most cases, women initiate the proceedings for an Islamic divorce. The ISC first attempts to reconcile the couple. If this fails, the ISC may divorce the couple on any of the following grounds: the husband suffers certain physical defects, the husband accuses the wife of promiscuity, the husband is missing for a specific period, the husband ill-treats the wife, the husband fails to perform his marital obligations, the husband fails to provide maintenance in spite of having the means to do so, or the husband refuses to comply with the judge's order to divorce his wife for one of the mentioned reasons.

However, there are fears that these *shari'a* councils may sometimes serve male Muslim interests rather than protecting women's rights. The Muslim Women's Helpline Annual Report published in July 2002 calls for greater community involvement in the problem of marriage quality and breakdown. It says that women are growing increasingly frustrated by perceived injustices and great anomalies in the way which the law is administered by *shari'a* bodies in the UK. Women who have civil divorces complain about obstruction in securing a religious divorce where husbands are refusing to cooperate in granting a *talaq*. Some wives find themselves being summarily divorced by husbands with the cooperation of certain *imams* who have not even tried to initiate any attempts to understand and sort out the marital problems being experienced.

In the 2001 report of Muslim Women's Helpline, the author remarks that the application of *shari'a* law and the delays of *shari'a* courts are cumbersome and breed frustration among young Muslim women.[61] This fear of increased discrimination against Muslim women stirred debate about a *shari'a* mediation council in Ontario proposed by former provincial Attorney-General Marion Boyd and ultimately brought about its rejection. The Canadian 1991 Arbitration Act already permitted Canadian courts to endorse decisions made by external religious institutions, such as the rabbinate, prompting Boyd to say that Muslims must be accorded similar rights. However, the Canadian Council of Muslim Women criticized the plan from the perspective of women's rights. The state eventually solved the controversy by abolishing the clause allowing for civil courts to accept the rulings of religious institutions. In the US, by contrast, Dr. Muzammil H. Siddiqi has represented the views of the Islamic Society of North America in saying that a husband's civil divorce automatically entails an Islamic divorce, whereas a woman who legally divorces her husband in a non-Islamic court should contact a local Islamic center to determine the Muslim status of her marriage.[62]

Generally speaking, the judge in most countries will indirectly recognize a *talaq* if its effects are discriminatory on the wife. For example, a Moroccan woman, divorced against her will without having signed any paper or even gone to court, was repudiated in the summer of 1995 while spending a family holiday in Morocco. With her four children, she returned to Val-Fourré where in 1978 she had originally come to join her husband under the policy of family reunion. Back in her native village, the husband quickly remarried a younger woman and moved with her to the villa he built with the savings of the household. The abandoned wife is now taking the husband to court in France in the hope that the separation is declared void and illegal.[63]

This is a typical situation in which the French judge has to deal with *talaq*. As described by Marie-Christine Meyzeaud-Garaud,[64] French jurisprudence went through different phases. Interestingly, between 1983 (arret Rohbi, Cass. Ire civ, 3 Nov 1983) and 1994, the trend was toward an acknowledgment of *talaqs* pronounced overseas. However, since 1994 (Cass. Ire civ, June 1 1994), the trend has been reversed. Today, many judges, especially in France, demonstrate increasing hostility to the effects of a repudiation carried out in a foreign country. The shift is partially caused by the adjustment to the principles of the European Convention of Human Rights: equality of the partners (Article 14) and the right of the woman to a due divorce procedure (Article 6).

To resolve the uncertainties related to this jurisprudence, Belgium chose to answer the divorce question through legislation. It has been attempting to codify its international private law since 1996, when the Minister of Justice asked professors Johan Erauw of Ghent University and Marc Fallon of the Catholic University of Louvain to initiate research towards establishing a code of international private law. After further contributions, the project was submitted to the Conseil d'Etat, and finally deposed in the Senate on July 7, 2003 as a proposed law.[65] In February 2004, the proposal was discussed in the Belgian Senate. The article relating to repudiation (Article 57) proved to be the most controversial. Despite the prudence of the text, which only recognizes the validity of *talaq* under exceptional and rather improbable circumstances, as its opponents readily concede,[66] the article has not been judged sufficient enough in its condemnation of a practice deemed contrary to human rights and the dignity of women. Two senators, Mimount Bousakla (SP.A) and Anne-Marie Lizin (PS), who have also been involved in a campaign to ban the Muslim headscarf from Belgian schools, were at the forefront of this combat, arguing that to render repudiation exceptional is the equivalent of legalizing it.[67] For Senator Bousakla, "it would give a favourable echo to the law of the Islamic shari'a."[68] The law finally adopted on July 16, 2004 states: "Article 57 sets out the principle that a *talaq* is not recognized in Belgium unless the woman and the man have equal right to divorce. A *talaq* is only recognized in Belgium under very strict conditions, inter alia that the wife has unequivocally accepted the dissolution of the marriage."

Custody

Other sources of potential conflict regarding Islamic family life concern the religious education of children and child custody regulations, particularly in cases of interfaith marriage. According to Islamic tradition, it is the father who passes on his name and religion to his children. He is thus legally entitled to custody of the children in the event of divorce from a non-Muslim woman. This means that under Islamic legal orders, the mother usually loses all rights of care. One interesting exception to this is the new Moroccan family law that provides joint custody of the children. In general, however, Western courts do not recognize such a principle, unless it happens to be in the best interests of the child. Jørgen Nielsen has remarked that in Belgium "courts tend to grant custody to a Belgian mother if the father is Turkish or

Arab, although the father feels entitled and, according to his own law, often is entitled. Consequent cases of removal of children from Belgium jurisdiction by the aggrieved party are not common but cause great suffering as well as to attract media attention."[69] Given the number of inter-marriages, the question of custody attained unparalleled proportions in the Franco-Algerian case. Nielsen noted that in France, "as a result of a number of instances, when Algerian fathers have removed their children from their French ex-wives to Algeria (which, inevitably, were widely reported in the media), the respective governments have appointed two experts to study the problem and present proposals."[70] The ensuing bilateral convention of June 21, 1988 related to children from Franco-Algerian couples is an original attempt at solving this problem by instituting the free movement of the children concerned between the two countries.[71]

German law takes the welfare of the minor as the paramount consideration for guardianship and custody. As Rohe remarks, "if the application of such strict Islamic rules would significantly contradict the child's welfare, the German public order will exclude this application."[72] Given the scarcity of Italian case law on *shari'a*-related issues, the judgment of the Corte du Cassazione of March 8, 1999, concerning the effects of Moroccan law in a matter of declaration of paternity and illegitimate children is remarkable: the court refused to apply Moroccan law and to deny the mother or the child the possibility of filing a suit for the declaration of paternity, which is forbidden according to *shari'a*, on the grounds that discrimination between legitimate and illegitimate children is contrary to Italian public order.[73]

Islamic norms in European courts

A new set of Islamic norms is thus being forged in European courts. In most cases having to do with family life, negotiation is still the strategy of choice. The recognition of individual freedoms and the consideration of each party's best interests lead to compromises that change not only the letter but also the spirit of the Islamic laws, stripping them of the official meanings they have in Islamic societies. One example of this transformation, in which Islamic regulations are "acclimatized" to Western legal norms, concerns the acceptable period of time one's widowhood should last. Traditional Islamic law specifying the amount of time that must elapse before one is allowed to remarry cannot be strictly enforced in European societies.[74] Laws governing inheritance offer another example of the flexibility involved in translating old practices into new contexts. Once again, the Islamic laws on inheritance, a holistic system elaborated in a context where men had the exclusive obligation of providing for the women, specify that for every part given to the daughter, two parts must be given to the son. This cannot always be strictly adhered to in practice (especially in legal systems influenced by Roman law which ensures that each descendant be provided for equally).[75]

In 1975, Zaki Badawi established a ready-made Islamic will to solve the contradiction between European and Islamic norms. For years, according to his own admission, no one came to pick it up,[76] perhaps indicating that Muslims in Europe are generally quite comfortable with Western norms of inheritance.

It is in matters of divorce that changes in Islamic law have been the most significant, but also the most difficult to identify. Even though a divorce can still be officially carried out within religious law, unofficially it may have been already initiated by the wife herself in the civil court system. In addition, divorce is increasingly a topic of discussion for both members of the married couple. The fact that husband and wife both abide by traditional Islamic law does not necessarily determine the degree of oppression or inequality within a marriage. The status of polygamous marriages and negotiation in divorce proceedings are the two main categories in which Islamic laws find themselves transformed within the context of Western democratic societies.

Conflict with secularism

With the exception of France, the principle of neutrality that defines the interactions between state and religion is not synonymous with separation. In fact, it is realized within various institutional structures, from state religion or the concordat, to strict separation. It is striking to notice that throughout Europe, the definitive presence of Muslims has re-opened debates concerning the relationship between state and religion. In each European country, there are state initiatives to foster and create umbrella organizations for European Muslims. The multiplicity of Euro-Islam situations sheds more light on the specific political and cultural character of each European country than it does on the so-called singular nature of Islam. The legal arrangements between religion and state in Europe are divided into three modes: cooperation between the state and churches, the existence of a state religion, and the separation between state and religion.[77] In each case, Muslim groups are now part of Islam debates through national institutions representing Islam at the state level.

The institutional agreements between Islamic organizations and the secular state are only one aspect of the status of religions within Europe and the US. Beyond the differentiation of the political and religious spheres and the notion of neutrality lies an ideological meaning of secularization that originated with the philosophy of the Enlightenment. A common denominator of Western European countries is their tendency to consider religion misplaced or even illegitimate in the interactions of citizens.[78] The idea that religion cannot play a role in the general well-being of societies – a mark of the secularized mind – is, in fact, evenly spread throughout Europe, despite the differences in the national contracts between states and organized religion. The consequence of this invalidation of believers in social settings is that the various manifestations of Islam in Europe become troublesome, or even unacceptable. The *hijab* (headscarf) controversy, the status of the apostate as debated during the Rushdie affair, and the protection of free expression as debated during the Danish cartoons crisis shed light on the tension between Islamic claims and the European conception of secularism. Interestingly, such debates on the visibility of Islam in public spaces are specific to Europe and rather rare in the US and Canada.

The headscarf debate

Demands and requests made by Muslims are immediately perceived as suspect and sometimes as backward, and provoke highly emotional reactions. The Islamic headscarf worn by women is interpreted as an indication of this backwardness and a rejection of individual female emancipation, thereby provoking the wrath of those groups spearheading the defence of secular ideology: teachers, intellectuals, feminists, civil servants, etc. The arrival of Islam inside the boundaries of Europe re-launched the dispute over religions in public space in general, as shown by the example of a Norwegian atheist association that sought the right to proclaim for several minutes everyday the non-existence of God in order to offer competition to Oslo's muezzin.[79]

Secularism, the ideological aspect of secularity, reached a peak in France in recent years, when it was institutionalized following the Islamic veil controversy. The influence of positivist philosophy on the founders of the French secular Republic led them to emphasize the collective social being, and allowed them to turn voluntary acceptance of science and humanity's progress into principles of republican action. This was an epistemological reversal which had, as its corollary, the rejection of any form of transcendence. This rejection lies at the core of French *laïcité* and implies more than merely other people's freedom, equality under the law, or neutrality; it reflects an "essential will to place man at the origin and center." Due to historical circumstances specific to the French Republic, this rejection of any kind of notion of transcendence has taken on a radical character. The resultant conception of the private and public spheres tends to limit the presence of religious signs in public spaces. Not only is religious instruction banished from state schools, but displaying signs of one's religion has become cause for controversy. When the headscarf made its entrance into the Republic's state schools, blazing debates regarding secularization, to which French society had paid little attention, at least since the separation of church and state, were reignited and made the order of the day. Above all, it brought into focus the now obvious distortion between, on the one hand, dominant socio-cultural expectations of secularization, and, on the other, its legal definition.

In other words, most French people, and especially the political and intellectual elite, differ from the principles of the 1905 law of *laïcité*. The law sets up the separation of the state and religious organizations, and thus the neutrality of public administration. Furthermore, it guarantees freedom of religious expression for all faiths. At the beginning of the headscarf crisis in 1989, the State Council (the French equivalent of the US Supreme Court) reasserted that the principle of neutrality is mandatory for civil servants, but not for the users of public services. According to this interpretation of the 1905 law, the headscarf is a symbol of an individual's religion, and therefore does *not* contradict in any way the prescription of neutrality. This is why, in a general statement which goes beyond the individual case of the veil, the State Council has sought to remind people that "display of a religious sign does not contradict the law on secular society," with the only restriction being in the case of the disturbance of public order.[80] On the other hand – and this is where the shoe pinches – it does contradict the sociologically predominant conception of the status of religion within public space.

Indeed, many people view *laïcité* as a philosophy designed to ban public affirmation of religion. From 1989 to 2004, the contradictions in interpreting *laïcité* and its consequences on the *hijab* became more complicated. In 2003, the introduction of a bill banning ostentatious religious symbols in public schools raised debate to the next level. The Stasi Commission, a delegation of scholars and experts created in July 2003 at the initiative of the French presidency, came out in favour of the law, and in a televised speech from December 17, 2003, President Chirac himself endorsed the Commission's decision. Such a law intends to bridge, by legislative means, the gap between the 1905 principles and the public perception. It reveals an authoritarian conception of the law, henceforth charged with the protection of individual freedom, even against the individual's will, and above all with imposing a definition of freedom of conscience based on a homogenous vision of society. In other words, to be a modern citizen means to reject all public signs of religion. The headscarf ban seeks to "liberate" young Muslim women from the "oppression" of religious symbols.[81]

Islam today has come to embody a representation of women that some find distasteful or loathsome, and consequently debate all over Europe has begun over the *hijab*. The *hijab*, then, can only be perceived as an attack on female dignity once a reconstruction has taken place based on what one knows (or thinks one knows) about Islamic civilizations. Such an interpretation of a system of religious symbols, that fails to take into account the people who chose to display them, constitutes in itself a limitation of an individual's freedom of conscience. In July 1998, the Minister of Baden-Württemberg upheld the decision made by a Stuttgart school to not recruit a Muslim woman as a teacher because she wore a veil. The Minister declared that in Islam the *hijab* was a political symbol of female submission rather than an actual religious requirement.[82] Since then the polemics have been growing on the legitimacy of school teachers to wear *hijab*. In 2002 the Federal Administrative Court upheld the decision of the State of Baden-Württemberg to ban Muslim teachers. "The court felt encouraged in its ruling by a decision of the European Court of Human Rights. The European court of Human Rights regarded the dismissal of a teacher who had taught for three years without problems with children or parents in a Swiss school to be within the margin of appreciation under article 9 of the ECHR and no violation of HR was found."[83] The Federal Constitution Court had to decide whether the administrative courts had ruled rightly. Surprisingly it held in September 2003, that as German Law stands there is no legal basis for forbidding the wearing of the headscarf in schools. The Länder are the only institution to decide on such issue. "The core of the decision is an allocation of competence to solve the problem, not a material decision on the admissibility of head scarves in German schools itself."[84] In the wake of this ruling, seven German states declared in October 2003 they backed a legislation barring teachers from wearing the Muslim headscarf at a meeting of sixteen regional ministers for culture, education, and religious affairs in the German city of Darmstadt.[85] In late March 2004, the regional government in Berlin agreed to outlaw all religious symbols for civil servants. On April 1, 2004, the southern state of Baden-Württemberg became the first German state to ban teachers from wearing the *hijab*. The state assembly, dominated by a coalition of the opposition Christian Democratic Union and liberal Free Democrats, approved the law almost unanimously.[86] An obstacle to such bans has arisen, in some states. On July 7, 2006, the state court of Baden-Württemberg rejected the state's headscarf ban as discriminatory against Muslims, since veiled Catholic nuns were not forbidden to teach in the state's schools.[87] By February 2009, similar bans were in place in eight of the sixteen German states, prompting Human Rights Watch to criticize the policies that have resulted in the loss of jobs for some teachers.

In the UK and in Ireland, the respective Departments of Education leave the responsibility of setting rules on dress codes and symbols to the governors of each school. There have been several incidents of Muslim schoolgirls being denied access to schools due to their wearing of the headscarf in Ireland. However, these cases have been speedily resolved by the Equality Authority which has consistently advised the relevant schools to reintegrate the schoolgirls. In Britain, the wearing of the *kippa* and turban is protected by the Race Relations Act 1976 under which Jews and Sikhs are considered racial groups, but Muslims (and therefore the *hijab*) are excluded from its provisions. There have been some sporadic cases, such as in Luton and Peterborough, in which schools have attempted to ban headscarves or persuade Muslim girls not to wear them, usually from a belief that they disrupt the school environment. In March 2004, according to the Islamic Human Rights Commission, the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) determined that a headscarf ban imposed by a school in Luton constituted "indirect racism."[88] The school in question subsequently announced that it would be overturning its headscarf ban as of summer 2004. In another controversial case, on June 15, 2004, the High Court deemed the ban against a Muslim schoolgirl wearing the *jilbab* (a full-length gown) by Denbigh High

School was appropriate. The ruling came in the wake of the school's decision to expel the 15-year-old Shabina Begum in September 2002, following consultation with the local Muslim community which felt the *jilbab* could create tensions between the Muslim pupils who chose to wear it, and those who did not.[89]

Face veiling has been problematic in the Netherlands too, where it has stretched the limits of Dutch multiculturalism too far. In the course of 2002–2003, two undergraduate students of Moroccan origin in the Department of Arabic, Persian and Turkish Languages and Cultures at Leiden University arrived in campus wearing a *niqab* (face covering). Their presence was resented by some staff and students as causing discomfort and impeding interactive communication in the classroom.[90] Urged to act on the issue, the Board of the University banned face veiling just before the beginning of the following academic year, a decision upheld by the Dutch Equal Treatment Commission. The legal argumentations in the Netherlands have avoided specifically Islamic references, preferring for example to use the term "face veiling" to the *niqab,* for otherwise this would be considered a case of direct discrimination on the basis of religion.[91] In March 2009, the Dutch government announced a plan to ban the burqa in schools and public offices, a considerable compromise from its original intention of a general veil ban.

The Rushdie affair and the question of blasphemy

At the time of printing of this book, the French Parliament has created a special commission to discuss the ban of the niqab (improperly called burqua) in French public spaces. The rallying of European Muslims who wanted to ban the *Satanic Verses* and have its author killed has been seen by some prominent advocates of minority rights as an important example of a religious and cultural minority attempting to introduce internal restrictions that are unacceptable given that they undermine individual autonomy.[92] For example, Charles Taylor was unable to accept as legitimate the demand that the *Satanic Verses* be banned.[93] Michael Walzer, well known for his relativist approach to values,[94] takes a hard-line liberal position to defend author Salman Rushdie against his detractors by invoking the fact that immigrants, by their very choice of immigrating to Europe, have chosen to adopt Western liberalism and should therefore conform to it.[95]

On the other hand, those who champion multiculturalism, such as Tariq Modood and Bhikku Parekh, have criticized such positions, explaining that it is a mistake to see a fight against apostasy as British Muslims' key motivation.[96] Daniel I. O'Neill's analysis of the literature produced by British Muslims during this period illustrates such an interpretation.[97] Unlike their "brothers in religion" of the Muslim world, the principal goal of Western Muslims was not to punish Salman Rushdie, but to ban the *Satanic Verses*. Their criticism concerned the attack that the book made on their cultural and religious identity, rather than Salman Rushdie's apostasy.[98] Their charges focused on the way Rushdie used images and pejorative descriptions that were purely orientalist in style, and which thus strengthened the stigmas from which Muslims have suffered.[99] Their list of concerns was thus not primarily aimed at Muslims, but at British society as a way of protecting a culture that was facing discrimination. According to Tariq Modood's hypothesis, if a non-Muslim British citizen were to write a similar book about Islam, to which Muslims reacted in the same way as they had to Salman Rushdie's book, these reactions and demands may not have seemed so contestable in the eyes of liberal and multiculturalist thinkers. If we accept, then, that European Muslims were more concerned by the respect they felt their religious identity was owed, than by Salman Rushdie's "transgression," then the *Satanic Verses* are just as open to criticism as Oriana Fallaci's *The Rage and the Pride* (*La Rage et l'Orgueil*).[100]

It is without any doubt that in the UK the "earthquake-like" Rushdie affair created the most stable conditions for a critique of public culture. Like the race riots in 1958 and 1981, or Enoch Powell's speech in 1968, the Rushdie affair was a milestone in the evolution of race relations in the UK. Until that point, the debate about multiculturalism had been mainly led by members of the majority population; the role of minorities was mainly passive. Before the Rushdie affair, integration had been seen as the adjustment of minorities to dominant society; after the Rushdie affair, it was understood to be a mutual process which would also transform the majority population.[101] Muslim leaders notably stressed their desire that the existing legislation on blasphemy, which had only been applicable regarding blasphemy against the Anglican Church, be extended to incorporate the Muslim minority (and all other minorities). The consequences of such a request are very clear: political adhesion is seen as a bilateral relationship in which the host society must enter into negotiations in order to reach a consensus that will respect the fundamental aspects of the minority's way of life. For British Muslims, in other words, associating political adhesion with adhesion to British culture thus constitutes an attack on their moral and cultural integrity.[102] For sure, such an approach is far from being unanimously received within Britain's political and intellectual spheres, but it *is* a subject discussed in the political arena.[103] What is at stake is knowing to what point history and representations of a political community can be transformed in order to make room for minority cultures.

This evolution towards a more pluralistic conception of the dominant culture now appears as a key topic within the debate about British identity launched by the "Multi-Ethnic Britain" report published in 2000 by the Runnymede Commission (better known as the Parekh Report). This group's work has been violently attacked in the press because it denounced British culture as "racist." The thorniest case is connected with the way British history is taught in state schools, and which is still greatly marked by the historiography of the dominant ethnic and cultural group. However, in 1985, the Swann report suggested that a new school culture could emerge which would have been a mixture of all cultures, a kind of British melting pot. The Swann report, however, also stated that ethnic minorities could not be preserved in their current state, and that they should adapt to be in line with the fundamental values of British society. The shock of the subway bombings of July 7, 2005 by "home grown bombers" has led to questioning the entire possibility of cultural harmony and the belief that Muslims must become more like an abstractly defined British citizen.[104]

If the Rushdie affair enabled public debate about the freedom of speech, the cartoons crisis highlighted tensions between freedom of speech and religious freedom, two concepts that do not exactly line up in the Europe public sphere. When the Danish newspaper *Jyllands-Posten* printed twelve editorial cartoons depicting the Prophet Mohammed on September 30, 2005, many Muslims found the images distasteful or even offensive. Before the issue caused global outcry and prompted the reprinting of the cartoons in newspapers around the world, Muslim residents of Europe had a chance to demonstrate their feelings of hurt. Using the tension within religious freedom and freedom of expression, European Muslims called for more respect of minority religious convictions. Once the debate reached an international level, however, many non-European Muslims had other goals, and they desired to frame the debate within the context of international politics. In the West, however, the controversy took place within the framework of social justice and how Muslims accommodate the liberal notion of justice.

The Rawlsian[105] view of justice theorizes that people with conflicting, but reasonable, metaphysical and/or religious views can agree to regulate the basic structure of society. Rawls' account is an attempt to secure the possibility of a liberal consensus regardless of the "deep" religious or metaphysical values that the parties endorse (so long as these remain open to compromise, i.e. "reasonable"). The ideal result is therefore conceived as an "overlapping consensus" because different and often conflicting accounts of morality, nature, etc., are intended to "overlap" with each other on the question of governance. However, Rawls is clear that such political agreement is narrow and focused on justice. This consensus is reached, in part, by avoiding the deepest arguments in religion and philosophy, in favor of sharing core values of human rights and freedoms, as well as democracy and the rule of law. The Muslims' call for censoring the cartoons from newspapers could be seen as a breach in the overlapping consensus concerning the right of freedom of speech.

The Western legacy of open critique also plays into this controversy, and some Muslims are unable to accept any critique of their faith, labeling it an insult instead. However, if in the name of freedom of speech, some opinions insult a specific faith, group, or culture, they also can be considered a breach of the overlapping consensus. This is particularly true in the case of the European legal systems, because most of them maintain legal limits on speech containing offensive content for a specific religious or ethnic group. In this context, the cartoons debate highlights the fact that Islam and Muslims are not protected by such laws. For example, despite the existence of legislation forbidding racism and xenophobia prior to the cartoons crisis, the 2006 Racial and Religious Hatred Act redressed the situation in the UK, where the legal protections did not actually cover the case of Muslims offended in their "faith."[106] Therefore, the cartoons crisis also signifies the arbitrary limits of the universal approach to liberalism and limits of Rawlsian justice.

Conclusion

The major areas of conflict between Islam and secularism in the West are civil law and culture, rather than politics. As demonstrated in debates over the headscarf and sexual orientation, morality and sexuality constitute the greatest divergence between Muslims and non-Muslims. Furthermore, the *hijab* controversy, the Rushdie affair, and the Danish cartoon crisis reveal tensions between the status of religion in European public space, as well as questioning the goals of multiculturalism. In this regard, the contrast with the American debate is striking: the status of religion in American society is quite different from the French case. Indeed, despite a strict separation of church and state, a very different approach to religion and public space characterizes the US.[107]

Pluralism and competition between religions have marked American society since its inception. In contrast to European religious history, where countries were traditionally dominated by the monopoly of a single church, intra-Protestant religious differences were present among some of the very first migrant groups in America. Perpetual schisms and revivals preserved the varied character of American Protestantism. Subsequent waves of migration to the US were even more diverse, bringing Catholics and Jews, and more recently Muslims and Buddhists, into the country.[108] Religion is indeed constitutive of American subcultures, since many migrants came to America specifically to practice their religion without fear of persecution. Mormons, Jehovah's Witnesses, and a burgeoning number of cults and new religions in America have also helped to reinforce religion as an accepted mode of social identity and communal interaction. Religion mobilizes people through a variety of associations and organizations, and freedom of religious expression is paradigmatic of every citizen's right to free association and autonomous identity. In contrast, as described above, religious expression in Europe is often seen as a cause of public and civic perturbations, requiring regulation and control rather than preservation or encouragement.

In general, these cultural differences serve to make Muslim life in America easier than in Europe. The legitimacy of religious activities in American social life makes public expressions of Islamic faith acceptable. In some ways, Islam is no more than one component of the diverse American religious landscape. The social legitimacy of organized religion in American society does not, however, translate into an unequivocal acceptance of Islam. In fact, Muslims in America are caught in a difficult paradox: the simultaneous demonization and acceptance of Islam. Especially after 9/11, American acceptance of Islam is at odds with the persistence of anti-Muslim prejudice and discrimination. Interestingly, the discrimination does not concern the implementation of *shari'a*, as it does in Europe, but it does emphasize the connection of Muslims with transnational Islamic organizations labeled as terrorists.[109]

In this regard, the bad Muslim in Europe is the Muslim who displays public signs of religious observance, whereas the bad Muslim in the US supports, financially or otherwise, groups labeled as terrorists (Hamas, Hezbollah, Al-Qaeda, and others).[110] In the US, by contrast, the Al Arian case illustrates the different approach to "bad Muslims." In 2006, Sami Al-Arian, the son of Palestinian refugees in the US, pleaded guilty to conspiracy to help the terrorist organization the Palestinian Islamic Jihad. It was intended that Al-Arian should spend nineteen months in prison before being deported, but when the US Department of Justice subpoenaed Al-Arian in March 2008, he refused to testify, allowing prosecutors to charge him with criminal contempt. He is still awaiting trial for those charges.

The most heated debates on Islam and secularism reveal that Europe's real challenge is redefining its public culture. Islam makes it necessary to rethink and contextualize the principle of equality between cultures, thus incorporating ideals of tolerance and pluralism in the debate. The multicultural policies that predominate in European societies do not allow flexibility of these Western liberal ideas, thereby disregarding the values of Europe's minority cultures. One solution to this unyielding approach would be the emergence of a "societal culture," i.e. organized around a shared language to be used in many institutions (both public and private). Such a culture would not imply that religious beliefs, family customs, or lifestyles would have to be shared. Since 1965, the US has presented certain elements of this societal culture insofar as the plurality of lifestyles and religious beliefs is no longer considered an obstacle to successful integration. In such conditions, we might wonder whether agreement on shared cultural and social values is still possible. The paradox is that for Muslims, the answers tend to be in the affirmative, whereas non-Muslims tend to answer negatively, especially after the Madrid and London bombings. As we have seen, Western societies do not acknowledge Muslims in Europe as any other minority group endowed with special rights. Instead, debate and partial understanding take place within two main sectors of society: public display of religiosity and family life.

Notes

1 Atkins, R, BBC Interview, February 7, 2008. Transcript available at http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/1573.

2 See Cesari, J. (ed) (2004) *Islam and Fundamental Rights in Europe,* Brussels: European Commission.

3 See Tibi, B. "The Return of the Sacred to Politics as a Constitutional Law: the Case of the Shari'atization of Politics in Islamic Civilization" in *Theoria,* April 2008, pp. 92–119.

4 See Al-Hakeem Carney, A. "The Desecralization of Power in Islam" in *Religion, State, and Society,* 31(2), 2003, pp. 203–219. For this reason, the distinction between the *ulema* and the sultan was quite important: the *ulema* were the guardians of the religious community (*milat*) and the interpreters of *shari'a,* very often against the state.

5 See "Muslims in Europe: Basis for Greater Understanding Already Exists," Gallup Polling, April 30, 2007. Available at http://www.gallup.com/poll/27409/Muslims-Europe-Basis-Greater-Understanding-Already-Exists.aspx.

6 Cesari, J. (2008), Muslims in Europe Survey Focus Groups in Amsterdam, London, Paris, and Berlin (unpublished). These focus groups discussed the religiosity of Muslims living in Europe.

7 Kymlicka, W. (1995), *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights,* Oxford: Clarendon Press, p. 153.

8 See Mercier, P. (1972), *Conflits de civilisation et droit international privé: polygamie et répudiation,* Geneva: Droz; Deprez, J., "Droit international prive et conflit de civilisations. Aspects méthodologiques. Les relations entre systèmes d'Europe Occidentale et systèmes islamiques en matière de statut personnel" in *Recueil des Cours de l"Académie de la Haye*, 211, 1988-IV, pp. 9–372.

9 Buskens, L. (1999), "Marokkaans familierecht in Nederland" in Buskens L., *Islamitisch recht en familienbetrekkingen in Marokko*, Amsterdam: Bulaaq.

10 Foblets, M.-C. (2000), "Le statut personnel musulman devant les tribunaux en Europe: une reconnaissance conditionnelle" in Kahn, P. (ed), *L'étranger et le droit de la famille: pluralité ethnique, pluralisme juridique*. Paris: La Documentation Française, p. 52; see also Foblets, M.-C. (ed) (1988), *Femmes marocaines et conflits familiaux en immigration: quelles solutions juridiques appropriées?* Antwerp/Apeldoorn: Maklu.

11 See, E. Rude-Antoine (2001), "La coexistence des systèmes juridiques différents en France: l'exemple de droit familial" in Kahn, op. cit. p. 159.

12 Charnay, J.-P. (2001), *La Charia et l'Occident*, Paris: L'Herne.

13 Through our own experience, it is common however to find many young Muslims who are not even aware of the traditional constraints on women for example, since their background and culture are thoroughly French, or Belgian.

14 This is not without certain dangers, given that in many cases the judge does not know Islamic law: Halima Boumidienne cites the example of a judge who did not understand that ordinary or definitive repudiation can lead, in Islamic law, to an abrogation of the wife's rights. "African Muslim Women in France," in M. King, (ed) (1995), *God's Law versus State Law*, London: Grey Seal, pp. 49–61.

15 *"Angrezi Sharia"* is an Urdu term that means "British-English Shariah" and refers to the adaptation of the Islamic rules to the British civil Law. Pearl, D. and Menski, W. (1998), *Muslim Family Law*, London: Sweet and Maxwell, p. 74.

16 Pearl and Menski, op. cit. p. 75.

17 Arnot, C., "Stolen Lives," *Guardian*, May 23, 2001.

18 "A Choice by Right," 2000.

19 Travis, A., "Law may counter forced marriages," *Guardian*, June 30, 2000.

20 Muslim Women's Helpline, *Annual Report 2000*, UK.

21 Muslim Women's Helpline, *Annual Report 2001*, UK, p. 3.

22 *The Common Good*, 3(1), Nov 2002, p. 7.

23 *Les droits des femmes issues de l'immigration – Avis à Monsieur le Premier ministre*, p. 18.

24 *Les droits des femmes . . .*, p. 19.

25 *Le Figaro*, "La lutte s'intensifie contre les mariages forcés," June 9, 2004.

26 Conversely, in many Muslim countries, young Muslims unable to afford a normal marriage sometimes seek to circumvent official marriage regulations as well as the social expectations involved in them by performing a "customary marriage" – known as *zawaj urfi*. For this they do not approach *imams*, who

tend to be controlled by the state and tied to the law, but rely precisely on the fact that in Islam any person can serve as witness of the marriage vows.

27 Martinez-Torron, J. (2000), "The Legal Status of Islam in Spain," in Ferrari, S. and Bradney, A. (eds), *Islam and European Legal Systems,* Aldersot, UK: Ashgate, p. 57.

28 Foblets, M.-C. (2001), "Famille, Droit Familial et tribunaux en Europe" in Dassetto, F., Marechal, B., and Nielsen, J. (eds), *Convergences musulmanes, Aspects contemporains de l'islam dans l'Europe élargie,* Louvain la Neuve: Bruylant, pp. 77–96. This principle allows for the recognition of marriage on the grounds of the existence of a married lifestyle.

29 Live Dialogue session at www.islamonline.net on March 3, 2004. See the full discussion at http://www.islamonline.net/livedialogue/english/Browse.asp?hGuestID=llkq00.

30 Personal communication, 2003.

31 H. Barakat's *The Arab World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993) argues that "Official statistics show that in the 1960s it was practiced by fewer than 2 percent of married Muslim men in Lebanon, 4 percent in Syria, 8 percent in Jordan, 8 percent in Egypt (1951), and 2 percent in Algeria (1955). Research conducted in the 1930s showed that 5 percent of married Muslim men in Syria had more than one wife and that this phenomenon was more widespread in rural than urban areas. In the 1970s, a field study conducted by Safouh al-Akhras showed that only 2 percent of married men in Damascus had more than one wife. Similarly, studies of the family in Baghdad showed that of married men, 8 percent had more than one wife in the 1940s. This percentage was reduced to 2 percent in the 1970s."

There are no official statistics available on polygamy in Iran, but it is prevalent in many small cities and rural regions in Iran. In Senegal it reaches 47 percent of marriages according to an Associated Press report (reprinted at www. religionnewsblog.com/7082-Polygamy_still_proves_popular.html).

32 Tribalat, M. (1995), *Faire France, Une enquête sur les immigrés et leurs enfants*, Paris: La Découverte.

33 Foblets, M.-C. (1999), "Conflicts of Law in Cross-cultural Family Disputes in Europe Today: Who will Reorient Conflicts Laws?" in Foblets, M.-C. and Strijbosh, F. (eds), *Relations Familiales Interculturelles,* Ofnat: International Institute for the Sociology of Law, pp. 27–45.

34 Rohe, M., "Islamic Law in German Courts" in *Hawwa*, 1(1), 2003, p. 53.

35 Monéger, F., "Les musulmans devant le juge français" in *Journal des instituteurs* 1994, pp. 365–366.

36 Fulchiron, H., "L'étranger en France, face et au regard du droit," Centre de droit de la famille, Université Jean Moulin Lyon 3, Ministère de la justice, Mission de recherché Droit et Justice, Lyon, April 1999, p. 192.

37 For the full details of the discussion, see www.islam-belgique.com/question ParCat.cfm?cat=1&cat_name=Mariage.

38 The conference entitled "Les droits de l'homme: et la femme musulmane?" was held in Geneva on April 2, 2004.

39 Available at http://assembly.coe.int/Documents/WorkingDocs/doc02/EDOC 9487.htm.

40 See Karamah's website at <http://www.karamah.org/home.htm>.

41 See *Hyde v. Hyde* (1866) when an Englishman went to Utah, converted to Mormon faith, married and came back to England. He apostatised from his Mormon faith. His marriage was dissolved in Utah and his wife remarried. But he petitioned to divorce from his wife on the ground of his wife's adultery with her new husband. The court decided that the matrimonial law of England could not apply to the parties of a marriage celebrated under laws of polygamy. See Carroll, L., "Definition of a 'Potentially Polygamous' Marriage in English Law:

A Dramatic Decision from the Court of Appeal (Hussain v. Hussain)" in *Islamic and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 4(1–2), 1984, pp. 61–71.

42 *Ibid.*

43 Shah, P., "Attitudes Toward Polygamy in English Law" in *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 52, April 2003, pp. 369–400, at p. 379.

44 Reid, K. (1998), *A Practitioner Guide to the European Convention of Human Rights*, London: Sweet and Maxwell, p. 277.

45 *Q-News: The Muslim Magazine*, 270–271, June 1997, p. 8, quoted in Yilmaz, I. (2002), "The Challenge of Post-modern Legality and Muslim Legal Pluralism in England" in *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, (28)2, April 2002, p. 349.

46 Yilmaz, op. cit. p. 349.

47 The issue of dowry does not appear to be incompatible with most existing legal systems. The dowry, another element of Islamic marriage, tends to be viewed by western courts as a form of pre-nuptial agreement. Islamic rules on inheritance can be an issue in countries whose legal system is influenced by Roman law (as in the case of most Romance-language countries), but is less frequently problematic in countries with legal systems based on common law, such as the United States or Great Britain.

48 See Carroll, L., "Recognition of Polygamous Marriages in English Matrimonial Law: The Statutory Reversal of Hyde v. Hyde in 1972" in *Journal Institute of Muslim Minority Affairs*, 5, 1984, pp. 81–98.

49 (1983) Family 26. See Carroll, "Definition of a 'Potentially Polygamous' Marriage in English Law," op. cit.

50 Badawi, Z. (1995), "Muslim Justice in a Secular State," in King (ed), pp. 73–80.

51 See on this point Nielsen, J., *Emerging Claims of Muslim Populations in Matters of Family Law in Europe*, CSIC paper No. 10, Nov 1993, Birmingham, p. 12.

52 Shah-Kazemi, S. (2001), *Untying the Knot: Muslim Women, Divorce and the Shariah*, London: The Nuffield Foundation, p. 21.

53 *Ibid.*, p. 43.

54 *Ibid.*, p. 12.

55 Quoted in Shah-Kazemi, op. cit. p. 44.

56 The Islamic Shari'a Council of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, *An Introduction*, p. 6. Available at http://www.islamic-sharia.org/ (accessed September 27, 2009).

57 The Islamic Shari'a Council, op. cit. p. 6.

58 Secretary of the ISC, personal communication, London, July 2004.

59 The Islamic Shari'a Council, op. cit. p. 9.

60 The Islamic Shari'a Council, op. cit. p. 5.

61 Muslim Women's Helpline, *Report*, 2001, p. 6.

62 "Legal Divorce v. Islamic Divorce," IslamOnline.net, June 10, 2003. Available at http://www.islamonline.net/servlet/Satellite?pagename=IslamOnline-English-Ask_Scholar/FatwaE/FatwaE& cid=1119503547046 (accessed May 7, 2009).

63 *Libération*, May 7, 1996, p. 16.

64 "La femme face à la répudiation musulmane: analyse de la jurisprudence française." Paper delivered at the Adda'wa Mosque, Paris, on March 6, 2004. We thank the author for kindly providing us with a written version of her unpublished paper.

65 See the official transcript of the debates at www.senate.be.

66 See for example the balanced reactions to the proposal in the women's magazine *Vie Feminine*, ample testimony to the scope of the societal debate generated by this question, at http://www.viefeminine.be/fr/default.asp?id=50&mnu=50& ACT=5&content=155.

67 Lamensch, M. "Deux femmes résolues contre la répudiation," *Le soir*, February 5, 2004.

68 *La Dernière Heure*, Lizin: "'Non absolu de la répudiation,'" February 5, 2004.

69 Nielsen, J. (1987), "Islamlic Law and its Significance for the Situation of Muslim Minorities in Europe," Centre for the Study of Islam and Christian–Muslim Relations, Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham, p. 26.

70 *Ibid.*, p. 28.

71 See for an analysis of this convention, Lorcerie, F. (ed) (1999), *Les populations d'origine maghrébine et comorienne de Marseille*. Research report, CNRS/ IREMAN, February 1999, pp. 173–182.

72 Rohe, op. cit. p. 55.

73 Peccoz, R.A.B. (2004), "Islam in the European Union: Italy," in Pots, R. and Weishaider, W. (eds.), *Islam in the European Union,* Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters.

74 In Islam, a divorced or widowed woman may not remarry for three months, or just over four months after her separation or her husband's death, respectively. The goal of such a rule is to avoid any uncertainty regarding the paternity of children born to a new marriage. In traditional Muslim law, several conditions are in place to make sure that this time period is observed, including restricting the freedom of movement of the woman. These conditions are rarely followed to the letter in Europe or the United States.

75 In these situations, the division of inheritance according to Islamic law is either abandoned or somehow circumvented.

76 In Nielsen, *Emerging Claims*, op. cit. p. 3. Nielsen offers a different explanation to the lack of success of Badawi's initiative: according to him, in the 1970s, as the community was generally quite young, Muslims were not concerned with writing wills at all.

77 Cesari, J. (2006), *When Islam and Democracy Meet: Muslims in Europe and in the United States*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan; Ferrari and Bradney, op. cit.; and Laurence, J. and Vaisse, J. (2006), *Integrating Islam: Political and Religious Challenges of Integrating Islam in France*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institute Press.

78 Berger, P., Davie, G., and Fokas, E. (2008), *Religious America, Secular Europe?: A Theme and Variation*, Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.

79 The government authorized their request at the same time they authorized the request made by the Islamic association "World Islamic Mission" to sound a call to prayer. Cf. BBC News, March 30, 2002.

80 The Fauroux report on Islam in the French Republic, submitted to the Ministry on December 14, 2000, aligns its conclusions on those of the State Council, which led to the resignation of several of the commission members who were advocates of stricter definitions of secular society.

81 There have been many scholarly analyses of this debate in the French language. For a recent synthesis in English, see Bowen, J. (2006), *Why the French Don't like Headscarves: Islam, the State, and Public Space,* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

82 US Department of State (1998), *Germany: Country Report on Human Rights Practices*, Washington, DC.

83 Malhmann, M. (2003), "Religious Tolerance, Pluralist Society and the Neutrality of the State: The Federal Constitutional Court's Decision in the Headscarf Case," in *German Law Journal*, 4(11), 2003, pp. 999–1107.

84 *Ibid.*, p. 1104.

85 http://www.islamonline.net/English/News/2003-10/11/article08.shtml.

86 BBC News, April 1, 2004. Available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/3591043.stm.

87 Although the Federal Administrative Court had ruled in 2004 that such legislation did in fact apply to nuns.

88 IHRC, "Briefing: Good Practice on the Headscarf in Europe," March 9, 2004.

89 Another argument put forward by the school was related to safety concerns.

90 Herrera, L. and Moors, A., "Banning Face Veiling – The Boundaries of Liberal Education" in *ISIM Newsletter*, December 13, 2003, pp. 16–17.

91 *Ibid.*, p. 17.

92 Kymlicka, W., "Two Models of Pluralism and Tolerance" in *Analyse and Kritik*, 13, 1992, pp. 33–56.

93 Taylor, C. (1994), "The Politics of Recognition" in Gutman, Amy (ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 25–73.

94 According to Walzer, values such as justice have social meaning and are defined by group consensus at a given time and place. Cf. *Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality*, New York: Basic Books, 1983.

95 Walzer, M., "The Sins of Salman," *The New Republic*, April 10, 1989.

96 Cf. Modood, T., "Kymlicka on British Muslims" in *Analyse and Kritik*, 15, 1993, pp. 87–91.

97 O'Neill, D.I., "Multicultural Liberals and the Rushdie Affair: A Critique of Kymlicka, Taylor and Walzer" in *The Review of Politics*, 61(2), Spring 1999, pp. 219–250.

98 Cf. Ahsan, M.M. and Kidwai, A.R. (eds.) (1993), *Sacrilege versus Civility: Muslim Perspectives on the Satanic Verses*, Leicester: The Islamic Foundation.

99 See Appignannesi, L. and Maitland, S. (eds.) (1990), *The Rushdie Files*, Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

100 *The Rage and the Pride* was a pamphlet against the Muslim presence in Europe; it was sued in several European countries on the grounds of racism because of its insulting and derogatory language. An important distinction that must be added to such an argument is that Rushdie's work is incontestably a work of literature, whereas Oriana Fallaci had no intention of creating anything literary when writing the pamphlet *La Rage et l'Orgueil.*

101 Parekh, B. (2008), "Integrating Minorities" in Blackstone, T., Parekh, B., and Sanders, P. (eds.), *Race Relations in Britain: A Developing Agenda*, London: Routledge, pp. 19–21.

102 Cf. Parekh, B., "The Rushdie Affair: Research Agenda for Political Philosophy" in *Political Studies*, 38(4), 1990, pp. 695–709.

103 Cf. in particular the conference sponsored by the Commission for Racial Equality: *Law, Blasphemy and the Multi-Faith Society*, CRE, London: Elliot House, 1990.

104 See "Islamophobia" online at <www.euro-islam.net>.

105 Rawls, J. (1971), *A Theory of Justice*, Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

106 The 2006 Racial and Religious Hatred Act makes it illegal to write or say things with the intention of inciting religious hatred. In 2007, it was used to deport Sheikh Abdullah al-Faisal, who was accused of influencing one of the London bombers.

107 Warner, R.S., "Work in Progress Toward a New Paradigm for the Sociological Study of Religion in the United States" in *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(5), March, 1993, pp. 1044–1093.

108 However, debate continues among sociologists of religion regarding whether pluralism can in fact be considered a major cause of religiosity. Cf. Warner, op. cit.

109 See Cesari, J. and McLoughlin, S. (2005), *European Muslims and the Secular State*, Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.

110 Mamdani, M. (2005), *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: America, the Cold War, and the Roots of Terror,* New York: Three Leaves Press.

8 American Muslims at the dawn of the 21st century

Hope and pessimism in the drive for civic and political inclusion

Louise Cainkar

> I feel there is no place for us here. When we hear our own president say this is a crusade, and then retracts the statement after pressure. Everyone challenges Islam like this or that. They take portions of the Qur'an and twist them to fit their purpose. It's hard. It's really hard. It has always been a problem but now it's really hard.[1]

> They (Muslims) have a good future. There are some coming out of post-9/11 stronger, more determined – to change this concept and make themselves more visible and open, especially in political elections.[2]

Introduction

A sense of pessimism and a sense of optimism: both sentiments co-existed among Muslim Americans in the first decade of the twenty-first century regarding their prospects for full civic and political inclusion. While the views of many American Muslims undergo transitory shifts in response to particular events,[3] a sociological and ethnographic study I conducted between 2002 and 2005 with Arab Muslims in metropolitan Chicago, one of the most concentrated areas of Muslim settlement in the US, found that the majority of persons interviewed were optimistic about the future of Muslims in the US, with slightly less than 25 percent holding pessimistic views.[4] Data collection for the study, which was funded by the Russell Sage Foundation, included field research and in-depth interviews with Arab Muslims selected through the use of purposive stratified and snowball sampling techniques. I interviewed 102 Arab Muslims – male and female, native born and immigrant, from a range of countries of origin/ethnic backgrounds and social classes – for the study, using an open-ended and lengthy protocol of questions. Table 8.1 provides a summary of the study sample's demographic characteristics.

Persons who held optimistic views were encouraged by a framing of their predicament, which suggested that American Muslims (and Arab Americans) had now "had their turn": they were outsiders who had undergone the high intensity aggression, violence, and abrogation of rights that signified a

Table 8.1 Study sample statistics (sample size 102)

Female	*Socio-economic class*			*Age*			*Education*			*Born in US**
	Poor/ low income	*Middle class*	*Upper middle class & wealthy*	*19–29*	*30–49*	*Over 50*	*High School or less*	*Some college or BS/BA*	*Post graduate*	
45	18	62	20	30	56	14	14	43	42	29

*Includes, for sociological reasons, persons who migrated to the US before age 10.

minority group's right of passage in American society, and now the pendulum would swing the other way and doors would open. In other words, their optimism ensued from an understanding that their post-9/11 experiences were emblematic of the American minority experience. Persons holding pessimistic views framed the American Muslim (and Arab American) predicament quite differently: it had little to do with domestic matters and was instead the outcome of efforts by interested actors to promote certain American foreign policies. These actors, who used anti-Arab racism and Islamophobia to promote their geo-political interests, could not be expected to change, nor could one expect their voices to recede into silence. These perspectives of one segment of the multi-ethnic and multi-racial American Muslim community should be set in the larger Muslim American context as well as that of their immediate post-9/11 experiences.

Muslim America: a brief history

"The religion of Islam is now an American phenomenon," opened the 1987 report, *Islamic Values in the United States,* by scholars Haddad and Lummis.[5] At that time, the authors counted 598 mosques and Islamic centers in the US and estimated that there were some 2–3 million Muslims in the US, the majority of whom were "unmosqued." They predicted that Islam would be the second largest religion in the US by the first decade of the twenty-first century, propelled by natural increase, conversion, and the migration of "some 25–35,000 Muslims a year," and they appear to have been correct. In 2000, Bagby, Perl, and Froehle estimated that there were 1,209 mosques in the US, 30 percent of which were established in the 1990s.[6] By 2005 the number of Muslim Americans had reached an estimated 6–7 million, although this estimate is disputed,[7] the majority of whom lived in medium to large-sized American cities and were born outside the US. By racial and ethnic composition, Yvonne Haddad estimated that 30 percent of American Muslims were African American, 33 percent South Asian, 25 percent Arab, and 4 percent each sub-Saharan African, other Asian, and converts, and 3 percent European.[8] For the purposes of a survey, Zahid Bukhari estimated that only 20 percent of American Muslims were African American, but kept

South Asian and Arab percentages at the same level.[9] Jane Smith, on the other hand, estimated that 40 percent of American Muslims were African American.[10] Geographically, the Association of Religion Data Archives places the largest American Muslim populations in California, Illinois, Michigan, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, and Connecticut.[11] Although it is difficult to measure Muslim American socio-economic status except by extrapolating from US Census country of origin and ancestry data, the American population identified by these particular indicators (having historic ties to Muslim-majority countries) posted rates of educational attainment and median family incomes that exceed those of the US population as a whole in Census 2000. This method of measuring Muslim American socio-economic status is limited by its exclusion of African American Muslims, European origin Muslims, Muslims from countries in which they are a religious minority, and converts, each of which cannot be identified on the Census.[12]

In 1963 Martin Luther King said that in the US the prayer hour was the "most segregated hour of the week." While this fact remains true at the dawn of the twenty-first century, American Muslims appear to be achieving a greater degree of racial integration than any other American religious group.[13] Invoking the immigrant versus indigenous dichotomy used by many scholars of American Muslims,[14] the scholar of American mosques Ihsan Baghby reports that although "the two groups have distinct histories which were largely separate until the 1990s, this is changing rapidly . . . One sign of change is that only 7 percent of all mosques are attended by only one ethnic group" and "(o)ver 90 percent are attended by some African Americans and some Arabs or South Asians."[15]

As African American Muslims and the multi-ethnic second- and third-generation children of Muslim immigrants begin to converge socially, a process of discerning distinctions between cultural practices and religious practices has been ignited,[16] which is generally characteristic of the children of immigrants in the US who seek to shed their parents' cultural twists on religious practice.[17] Beyond cultural variation in religious traditions, further complexity has been added to this process of discernment by an Islamic revival that became evident as a major force of religious renewal in the US in the 1990s (part of a global movement), especially among Muslim immigrants and their children.[18] One outcome of this process is apparent in observations that many US-born children of immigrant Muslims have become more deeply steeped in religious practice than their immigrant parents, and many Muslims who immigrated during more secular times (re)turned to religious practice, including adopting Islamic modes of dress and appearance, praying five times a day, and fasting during Ramadan (although fasting was a practice that seemed to persist even during secularized periods). The institutional outcome of the combination of growing numbers of American Muslims and Islamic religious revival is evident in increases in the numbers of mosques, Islamic schools, and commercial enterprises supporting a Muslim lifestyle, such as *halal* meat markets, Muslim women's clothing stores, and Islamic books and artifacts, as well as increases in the sizes of mosque congregations in the US.

All of these trends have increased the visibility of American Muslims, and because their visibility is growing in a context characterized for at least twenty years by strong Islamophobic discourses, the social distance between Muslims and non-Muslims has been exacerbated, especially in places where people interpret Muslims as posing a serious cultural threat to American liberalism.[19] This social distance created the spaces where Muslims were most likely to be undefended from government profiling and unprotected from popular backlash after 9/11. African American Muslims pose a significant exception to this pattern of social distance and perceived threat in a number of ways. They have lived amicably for decades among African Americans of other religious faiths, often sharing multi-religious extended families. Furthermore, City of Chicago hate crime data from the period between September 11, 2001 and the end of 2001 showed the lowest rates of hate crimes after 9/11 in African American neighborhoods, even though these neighborhoods had the largest proportion of African American Muslims and immigrant Muslim shopkeepers, meaning that they were a zone of safe space for Muslims not of African descent as well.[20] As is true of all religions, religious faith provides Muslims with resources – a sense of dignity, purpose, direction, hope, and strength – that enhance its utility in the social context of vilification, discrimination, and assault, effectively increasing its power and meaning in the lives of individual Muslims when they are under attack.

In the view of some American Muslim scholars, bridging the racial divide between African American Muslims and immigrant Muslims is key to the full social, civic, and political integration of American Muslims, although it requires substantial "practical and attitudinal changes."[21] For example, scholar Aminah McCloud has spoken of African Americans being shunned or being "told how to pray" at immigrant mosques.[22] Sherman Jackson cites the failure of the "fossilized doctrines and practices" brought over by immigrant Muslims to address African American realities as one component leading to a growth in Black Orientalism, an effort by some Black nationalists, scholars, and religious leaders to estrange Islam from the African American experience. This project's ultimate aim, according to Jackson, is to "challenge, if not undermine, the esteem enjoyed by Islam in the Blackamerican community . . . " and "call into question Blackamerican Muslims' status as 'authentic,' loyal Blackamericans."[23] Jackson argues that an estrangement between Islam and African Americans spells disaster for all American Muslims, because it is through "Blackamerican" Muslims that Islam enjoys its status as "a bona fide American religion."[24] The solution, according to Jackson, is for "immigrant Muslims" to focus as least as much energy on American issues as those of Palestine and Kashmir, and to recognize that their greater interest lies in establishing a sense of their "belongingness" in the "collective psyche of Americans as a whole."[25] While the social, civic, and political unification of African American and immigrant Muslims is a long work in progress, there is no doubt that collective American Muslim activism has skyrocketed since 9/11 and that it has been heavily focused on domestic American issues, ignited as it was by the domestic security policies, institutional discrimination, and hate crimes that followed the 9/11 attacks. Furthermore, activism on domestic issues was the type of work that funders were willing to support and that mobilized the coalitions and community organizations who joined with Muslims and Arabs to defend their rights after 9/11.

The immediate post-9/11 domestic climate

Domestic security policies implemented by the American government in the first few years after the 9/11 attacks effectively imposed collective responsibility for the attacks on Muslim (and Arab) Americans while corralling, detaining, and deporting thousands of the most vulnerable Arab and Muslim non-citizens whose immigration papers proved them to be "out of status." Federal policies and practices of mass arrest, detention without charge, special registration, FBI visits, surveillance, institutional closure, and deportation revealed federal policy makers' incapacities (at best) to distinguish among Muslims and their willingness to implement policies that targeted Muslims as a single, undifferentiated group.[26] "If the needle resists discovery, target the haystack," was a policy objective articulated by Robert Leiken of the Nixon Center.[27] Despite President Bush's statement on September 20, that "no one should be singled out for unfair treatment or unkind words because of their ethnic background or religious faith," the US government engaged in precisely such actions, providing moral support for the views of members of the public who eyed Arab and Muslim Americans with suspicion.[28] Attorney General Ashcroft asserted that the rule of law and the Constitution would be respected in the government's domestic security policies, although in fact the constitutionality of many of these policies that directly affected no less than 100,000 Arabs and Muslims living in the US,[29] has been legally challenged.[30]

There was widespread public acquiescence if not approval, according to opinion poll data, toward the government's measures directed at Arab and Muslim American communities, although there was also a context of organized dissent. Public consent was built to a significant degree on fears that another attack might occur, one perpetrated by terrorist sleeper cells hiding within Arab and Muslim American communities. US government officials, who actually knew very little about who and what they were dealing with, publicly articulated this narrative more than once. Popular consent for collective and aggressive policies was also built through the successful leveraging of widely held public beliefs that Arabs and Muslims had an inherent leaning toward violence and terrorism, and that those who did not actively engage in violence were likely to silently support it. Federal officials often described Muslim American communities as "unknown," positioning them as strangers and a potentially suspicious group. The "unknown" social status was itself built to a significant degree on the politically motivated civic and political exclusion of Arab and Muslim Americans prior to 9/11.[31]

Frequently invoking an "us" and "them" narrative, former Attorney General Ashcroft argued that terrorists (them) were hiding inside American communities conducting their lives under false veneers of normalcy just waiting to attack the innocent (us: Americans), implicitly suggesting that a person could not be both Arab or Muslim and American at the same time:

> On September 11, the wheel of history turned and the world will never be the same. . . . The attacks of September 11 were acts of terrorism against America orchestrated and carried out by individuals living within our borders. Today's terrorists enjoy the benefits of our free society even as they commit themselves to our destruction. They live in our communities – plotting, planning, and waiting to kill Americans again. . . .[32]

Such statements provoked fear in the hearts of Americans and cast a sweeping stroke of suspicion on all Arab and Muslim Americans. The government issued a call to action: "The federal government cannot fight this reign of terror alone. Every American must help us defend our nation against this enemy."[33]

The message was clear: Muslims (and Arabs) present in the US should be closely observed and their seemingly normal activities should be treated as suspect. Arabs and Muslims readily understood their position as the subjects of watchdogs in a panoptical world. My study data showed that social relationships between neighbors and among strangers were commonly perceived by Arab Muslims to have changed into a new set of roles, with one party on the lookout for danger, while the other tried to behave in ways that proved he or she was not suspect. Seven days after the 9/11 attacks, Attorney General Ashcroft announced enormous success in American watchfulness. "To date the FBI has received more than 96,000 tips and potential leads: more than 54,000 on the website, nearly 9,000 on the hot line, the toll-free WATTS line, and more than 33,000 leads that were generated in the FBI field offices."[34] These tips and leads identified specific Arab and Muslim Americans as suspicious persons – whether citizen, permanent resident, or visitor – but eventually led nowhere, turning up not a single person with a verifiable plan to attack the US or its people.[35] These actions enhanced Arab and Muslim American fear and mistrust of the federal government, augmented by a series of weak federal government cases alleging terrorist connections that were built on interpretations of conversations and texts rather than on unambiguous evidence, or involving undercover entrapment or the use of information gained from overseas torture.[36]

Some of the persons interviewed in my study reported visits by law enforcement authorities – because a neighbor or co-worker had reported them as acting in a suspicious manner or reported them as suspicious simply because of the way they dressed. They reported that their allegedly suspicious activities pertained to normal behavior interpreted by onlookers as danger signals, such as unpacking their trunk, opening their mail, or making an overseas phone call. These occurrences in the Chicago area matched a national pattern of interpreting innocent acts as laden with guilt. For example, the award-winning documentary *Brothers and Others*[37] reports on a man arrested and detained for months because a World Trade Center postcard was taped to his deli counter *and* he was an Arab Muslim, while Human Rights Watch[38] reported the arrest of a Muslim man because he and his family were taking photos at tourist sites. Others persons interviewed in my post-9/11 study reported being removed from airplanes or denied boarding and being harassed in public places, at banks, and on the job. With the eyes of vigilant citizens perceived to be focused on their every act, many simply said that life in the US was no longer the same; some began thinking about moving elsewhere.

The federal government's management of the post-9/11 domestic security situation, its use of "us and them" narratives, sweeping generalizations, and dragnet actions buttressed the sentiments of hate mongers by giving credibility to the notion that there was an identifiable terrorist phenotype and mode of dress. Aggression motivated by anger or hatred was thus often directed against persons who matched these symbolic cues, and sometimes were directed at those wrongly understood to be Arabs or Muslims, such as Sikhs. The American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee reported "over 700 violent incidents targeting Arab Americans, or those perceived to be Arab Americans, Arabs, and Muslims" including several murders in the first nine weeks after the 9/11 attacks and another 165 violent incidents between January 1, and October 11, 2002.[39] The Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) reported 1,062 incidents of violence, threat, and harassment during the initial onslaught of post-9/11 backlash and 2,242 victims in the full 2001–2002 reporting year, mostly in incidents of bias-motivated harassment and violence.[40] CAIR reported a 121 percent rise in anti-Muslim incidents and a 69 percent rise in reported hate crimes in its 2004 report. Overall, statistics show an initial surge in hate crimes intended for Arab and Muslim Americans in the first months after the 9/11 attacks, followed by a lower but persistent pattern of violence, bigotry, and discrimination across the nation. Whether hate crimes actually increased in 2004 or how much they rose is another matter, because hate crime statistics measure both actual incidents and reporting behaviors. In light of the increased civic activism of Arab and Muslim Americans after 2001, discussed below, we should expect that increases in reported hate crimes reflect to a certain degree "a successful outcome of social movement mobilization."[41] What one can say with certainty is that hate crimes against

Arab and Muslim Americans did not end in 2001 and that they continued well into 2008.

Hate crimes reported for the Chicago metropolitan area mirrored national patterns, with an initial escalation in violence followed by a lower but consistent level of reports. The Illinois Advisory Committee to the US Commission on Civil Rights reported 32 hate crimes perpetrated in Illinois against Arabs, Muslims, and people mistaken for Arabs and Muslims between September 11, and September 17, 2001, most occurring in the Chicago metropolitan area.[42] These included violence against individuals, schools, and mosques, verbal harassment and threats, mob incidents, and anti-Arab protests. Illinois State Police statistics showed 49 reported hate crimes against people of Arab descent in 2001, up from 9 in 2000, while the City of Chicago reported 52, up from four in 2000, 49 of which occurred on or after 9/11. Although the statistical likelihood of being physically harmed or murdered was actually very low, examined from a post facto perspective, an Arab or Muslim's personal assessment of risk at the time was another matter all together, especially knowing the cues of phenotype and dress that seemed to bring it on. In my study, Arab and Muslim Americans reported feeling that there was "something in the air" that made attacks on them permissible.

The federal government was not alone in making criminalizing statements that pointed a finger collectively at Muslims (and Arabs) in the US. Civil rights and advocacy organizations identified mass media radio and television programs, print media, and public statements of prominent personalities that added to this collective assessment of guilt. ADC reported that defamatory statements about Arabs and Muslims increased "in intensity and frequency" during the thirteen months following the 9/11 attacks and cited leaders of the evangelical Christian right, prominent public officials, members of Congress, and the mainstream media, in particular the latter's increasing use of commentators "whose main aim is to promote fear and hatred of Arab Americans."[43] Arab American journalist Ray Hanania testified at the hearings of The Illinois Advisory Committee to the US Commission on Civil Rights that hatred of Arabs and Muslims was a very comfortable emotion during this period:

> I saw how easily people resorted to stereotyping and hatred as a means of dealing with this tragedy. In the weeks after September 11, a man who identified himself by name and said he was one of my neighbors was among hundreds of people who sent e-mails threatening my life. What does it say about a society when someone can feel comfortable in their hatred with no fear of punishment?[44]

In this context of public suspicion and surveillance, sweeping government actions, hate crimes and harassment, my study found that fear of government far outweighed any other post-9/11 fears among Arab Muslim

Americans and cultivated a sense of "homeland insecurity."[45] During the period of research, a majority of Arab and Muslim Americans expressed worry that they might be rounded up and sent to internment camps by agents of the American government (especially should another attack occur, an event over which they had no control), and believed that the American government had the power and mass media influence to auger popular support for such an action. From their perspective, democracy and rule of law had become hollow phrases that government spokespersons used to defend targeting their communities. Muslims perceived that the rule of law did not apply to them, and that the government could do what it wished with them and find widespread popular approval. Their citizenship, it seemed, had been rendered meaningless. This perspective, as well as the distinction between the American government and the American public, is expressed in the following quote from a Muslim American woman:

> I lost trust in American values, to put it very simply. I no longer have the serene sense that I will always be safe here. I feel that being an American citizen is meaningless. That it doesn't really protect you in any way. It's an immense sense of danger and I've never gotten over it. I did not lose faith in Americans. I think my friends are the same. My relationships with my students haven't suffered. It's the same. On that level, I don't think I suffered, but I think the way I approach things made me less sure-footed, less confident even about the future of our family here. Can you believe it? I came home and told my husband, shouldn't we be putting our money in banks overseas? Maybe one of these days we'll end up being in concentration camps.[46]

The government's statements, its pleas for its citizens' help, and its actions thus socially constructed Arab Muslims living in the US as persons who were likely to be connected to the 9/11 attacks and would be responsible for future acts of terrorism if not controlled or removed. Muslims were persons who, if not terrorists themselves, might be hiding terrorists or covering up their knowledge of brewing terrorist plots. So constructed, Arabs and Muslims in the US were symbolically reconstituted as people who were not really part of the American nation, they were the "them," and thus not fully eligible for its package of civil and constitutional rights. The outcomes of these policies for American Muslims' sense of membership in the nation and right to full citizenship were profoundly negative. Arab and Muslim American experiences with ongoing governmental, non-governmental, institutional, and individual discrimination enhanced the negative prognosis. Seemingly relentless work by interested parties to establish, embellish, and sustain Islamophobia among non-Muslim Americans, a theme that has been part of the American discourse since at least the mid-1980s, received a significant boost from the 9/11 attacks.

Seeds of optimism

Despite this overwhelmingly negative context, American Muslims reported varying post-9/11 experiences at the individual and local community levels and the sources of this variation opened the door for optimism. Not every American accepted notions of collective guilt or of the posited Muslim threat to American culture. Some members of the American public were moved by gut and organized efforts to protect Muslim Americans and their institutions and to protest the public and secret targeting they endured. Non-Muslim Americans also showed a rising interest in learning about Islam and Muslims, a positive trend when it stemmed from a questioning of dominant discourses that denigrated Islam.[47] Muslim Americans also sought increased religious knowledge, in order to advance their capacity to answer the queries of others as well as to nourish their own religious faith.[48] While the Muslim American capacity to influence government policies at levels higher than the local remained quite limited (since Muslims were largely shunned by the Bush Administration), a broad multi-racial/ethnic Muslim American assertion of civic responsibilities and demand for civil rights became stronger than ever before.

These trends are the seeds of optimism for American Muslims. Muslims and non-Muslims alike rose up to challenge undemocratic policies, popular political violence, and the social constructions that seemed to justify them. The 9/11 attacks and the official and popular responses to them crystallized a socio-political crisis decades in the making for American Muslims and activated a dialectical counter force. In the view of the majority of Arab Muslim Americans interviewed in the study, the crisis' eventual dénouement would be positive for Muslim Americans because it would mirror the experiences of other historically excluded groups and bring about social and political inclusion.

Processes of Muslim American civic activism and political participation after 9/11

> Regardless of the cause for a more politically conscious Muslim community, there are more politically active Muslims engaging in proactive discourse and professional activism than there were ten years ago.[49]

As sociologist Robert Wuthnow has aptly observed, religion has played a vital role in American democracy and civil society.[50] It has breathed energy into the nation and it has contributed to the nation's moral discourses on issues such as poverty, inequality, racism, and war. At various points in American history, however, religious groups outside the Protestant core, including Catholics, Mormons, and Jews, have faced strong "nativist" challenges to accessing full American citizenship: social, economic, cultural, and political inclusion. "Mere difference is not enough to provoke nativist zeal," argued scholar of nativism, John Higham.[51] Nativism, "a zeal to destroy enemies of a distinctively American way of life," surges when difference intersects with a "hostile and fearful nationalism."[52] Since the mid-1980s American Muslims have faced strong nativist challenges from a range of antagonists, but the campaign to exclude them from full citizenship increased in vigor after the 9/11 attacks.

Persons who viewed Muslims as a threat to American culture and society argued that the 9/11 attacks were "proof" of a theological and cultural Muslim disposition to violence and of the willingness of American Muslim communities to provide cover for terrorists (although these allegations were never proven).[53] The *hijab,* they asserted, was not a symbol of religious faith but a sign of Muslim authoritarianism that needed sequestering or removal. The government's aggressive denial of civil rights to Muslims in American society after 9/11, especially those in its custody, strengthened these efforts to exclude Muslims from American society, but also served to mobilize a counter force. Arguments that posited a relationship between the 9/11 attacks and some 6 million American Muslims were social constructions that American Muslims had to actively fight and could only do so effectively by asserting their American belongingness through civic participation. And so, they waged their discourses in a framework that revolved around fundamental American values. Muslim and non-Muslim opposition to federal government domestic policies after 9/11 – the government profiling, mass arrests, deportations, special registration, wiretapping, charity closures, and security interviews mentioned above – were framed in an American civil liberties discourse. Women's right to wear the *hijab* was similarly argued as an issue of American freedom of religion. Interesting role changing occurred as Muslim Americans, charged by nativists as being inherently authoritarian and undemocratic, accused anti-Muslim personalities of being intolerant and undemocratic. In the case of newly elected Congressman Keith Ellison and his plan to take his oath of office on the Qur'an, it was American Muslims who stood for the Constitutional separation of church and state, whereas their opponents spoke of a national holy book. American Muslims were active and organized prior to 9/11, but the excesses of governmental and popular responses to the attacks turned their pre-existing problems of social discrimination, political exclusion, and media vilification into a crisis of domestic nativism. Anti-Muslim activity became more than a Muslim problem, it became an *American* problem. While government policies encircled them and pushed them to the margins of national belongingness, American Muslims asserted a national belongingness that changed the focus of much of their activism. American Muslims had to fight for more than their civil rights; they had to engage in active battle over who and what was American, how these boundaries were defined, and who had the right to define them. In the process, the focus of American Muslim activism became primarily domestic, exactly what Sherman Jackson had been calling for.

Views of the political future and the road to inclusion

The majority of Arab Muslims interviewed in my post-9/11 study framed their experiences in the context of the historical experiences of other racial and religious minority groups and the struggles of those groups for social and political incorporation. This framing made the methods of Muslim American activism after 9/11 clear: they would need to mirror those of the groups who came before them. Viewed in this light, as a struggle similar to that of other groups in the US who have faced and fought against social exclusion, nativism, hate crimes, and stereotyping, the majority also believed that the future for Muslim (and Arab) Americans would be positive. Sixty-nine percent (70 of 102) of Arab Muslims interviewed said they were positive about the future for Arabs and Muslims in the US, while 23.5 percent (24 of 102) had a negative outlook and 9 percent (9 of 102) were uncertain, seeing both positive and negative signs. Of those with a positive view, many spoke of the current period as emblematic of a larger American history that swings against certain groups and retracts their rights, but eventually swings the other way.

> I like to base things on history. If you go through history you see other groups targeted as the enemy. I like to think as a people, the community will build. 9/11 has opened people's eyes as to who Arabs, Muslims are. We will be more integrated in the society. A lot of people are making the effort. This is Arabs' and Muslims' right of passage. Every group has gone through this. I hope we can move on and be active participants in society at all levels.[54]
>
> I think there is a great future. I think there are swings and now it's swung too far [against] the civil liberties side, but it's going to come back and when it comes back, there'll be much, much more knowledge and appreciation of Islam among the American public than there was before.[55]

Most of these respondents believed that positive change required continuous effort and they placed much of the burden of this effort on themselves, Arab and Muslim Americans, who needed to organize, claim their rights, and reclaim the narrative on Islam:

> The Arabs and Muslims are not going to disappear, and they are going to assert themselves, probably more. I am confident and hopeful that this atmosphere will disappear sooner hopefully than later, because if you look at the American system in general, and government policies in general, you see swings from extreme right to extreme left, and I think this is one of those swings.[56]
>
> Listen, if all Muslims in America don't take a basic one track in their life or stand on a solid cornerstone, they won't have any future and maybe

> America would kick them all out . . . We need more institutions and associations in this country; to be united more and more. We need to let them know what Islam is, and that we are against what happened. We are against those explosions and terrorist acts which do not belong to Islam. . . . There is something in this world called reasoning. We can use it, but not violence.[57]

> We have to be more vocal and involved. I would be more willing to go to a protest or a rally. We need to say what we need to say. We don't have the luxury to be quiet anymore.[58]

Reaching this conclusion about the future for Muslims and the need for increased Muslim activism was often framed in the context of a struggle:

> I struggle. I'm concerned about how my religion is being perceived by others and what affect it will have. I see Muslims voting, more representation, more people standing up for what they believe in, hopefully it's done in a constructive manner on all sides. I have hope.[59]

A few of those with a positive outlook held a more passive view about the Muslim role in contributing to positive change, believing that it was up to the American people to change their attitudes toward Muslims. Although this view was not characteristic of the immigrant generation, only immigrants expressed this notion in this way. For example: "There will be a place for Muslims in this country one day. Why not? It depends on American people and how they will change their thinking about the Muslim people."[60]

Nearly one quarter of respondents, however, had a negative outlook on the future for Arabs and Muslims in American society. Instead of seeing the Arab and Muslim experience as part of the continuing American story of prejudice, racism, xenophobia, and nativism waged against new and different groups of people that gets righted over time, they framed American anti-Arab and anti-Muslim attitudes in the context of larger global activities of the US government, for which they saw little hope for change. The American government's global war on terror was viewed as an inciter of animosity toward Muslims and Arabs and its overall foreign policies as inciters of conflict among peoples. Viewed from this perspective, there is little that can be done to affect positive change on the domestic front without changing US foreign policies. For example: "I see a black picture for the entire US, not just for Muslims. The way that they are looking for these incidents, terror attacks, they are increasing culture clash, and bringing conflicts between races and religions."[61] Or a similar sentiment: "We can't imagine anything good. Are we the next casualty? As many casualties in the news, now new casualties among Arab Americans sacrificed in the name of fighting terrorism."[62]

Arab Muslims who held the view that the Muslim (and Arab) American predicament was not only about social exclusion but also connected to US foreign policies were much less optimistic about the Arab and Muslim American future. While activists of this perspective were not passive and cooperated in a wide range of activities, they believed that supporting political campaigns and voting were not likely to produce the changes needed to halt the defamation, stereotyping, and political exclusion of Arabs and Muslims, which they saw as tied to larger geo-political interests. According to one Arab Muslim activist:

> We were forced to reach out to other organizations and communities for support. This helped us build networks with some entities we did not have relationships with. Despite the hundreds of incidents of discrimination and racism this community has endured, there have been as many if not more of people reaching out in solidarity. People are learning a lot more about world geography and basic history. On some level this is positive. Also, I think on some level that there is a realization in some places, even among those not politically astute, that there is a broader worldview that came out of 9/11. Some do see us as having plans for world hegemony. A large percentage of people especially in the Third World are resentful of us. Not in way the Administration describes it – as jealous of our way of life, but due to the subjugation and oppression of American policies. We need to have education about the community and what it is facing now put in a historical perspective. Provide a geopolitical analysis of Afghanistan, Iraq, Palestine resistance. . . . I still believe that faith-based institutions are important and play an important role, but I believe that the more important institutions are not only those that provide faith-based support or direct social services. I think most important are those providing advocacy, trying to develop organizing campaigns and leadership from amongst affected immigrants to resist anti-immigration legislation and the criminalization of Arabs and Muslims. We need a stronger low cost, free legal service. We need legal clinics around immigration issues, deportations. Some in community feel the need for more concentrated electoral work. I feel the problem in the US is systematic. I don't feel one party is naturally inclined to be more supportive of our issues than the other. I would rather see community resources go into direct action organized campaigns than voter registration and political campaigns.[63]

Terms of engagement

The post-9/11 Muslim (and Arab) American experience was nothing short of paradoxical; they found themselves pushed out of national belonging and embraced by it at the same time, by different sets of actors. While experiencing extensive institutional discrimination, civil rights denials, media bashing, government targeting (mainly focused on men), and public attack (largely focused on women and religious institutions), they also experienced enhanced inclusion in a wide range of American civil society organizations. Muslim (and Arab) Americans of all racial and ethnic origins, their organizations, and institutions became visible players in the American public square to a greater degree than ever before, a position at one time held by African American Muslims alone.[64] This civic inclusion was by no means evenly distributed across the nation nor was it uncontested, but it was nonetheless measurable. This perhaps unexpected positive outcome emerged from the dialectic that was put into motion when state repression, public attacks, and popular vilification rather quickly reached a level that was intolerable to Muslim (and Arab) Americans and to some American institutions and individuals.

To a significant degree, the methods of Muslim American activism after 9/11 were defined by the domestic struggles of groups who came before them – because this was how they framed their struggle and these were the methods used by their supporters and the ones their non-profit funders preferred. Hate crimes and attacks on Muslim institutions spurred the immediate activism of neighborhood, regional, and national coalitions who embraced Muslim American organizations, even if initially for no other reason than legitimacy. When Muslims (and Arabs) mobilized to defend and protect their civil rights, immigrant rights, and religious rights, their community members and institutions, they intersected with other groups in American society in new and deeper ways. At their meeting point, "us" and "them" merged symbolically into a new and different configuration of who "we" are. The work of many groups left a handprint on this post-9/11 mobilization story: human rights organizations investigating abuses of prisoners, private philanthropies supporting community defense work, civil rights attorneys defending the falsely accused, immigrant coalitions marching in protest against government excesses, Japanese American and other ethnic organizations calling for an end to collective profiling, community organizers conducting civil rights teach-ins and special registration monitoring, mosques organizing open houses, neighborhood organizations forming mosque defense committees, inter-faith groups speaking out against hate crimes, school girls exchanging solidarity visits, and local and national Muslim (and Arab) American organizations taking on a broader range of tasks than ever before under emergency conditions. Muslim (and Arab) Americans not only worked in coalition with other groups, they increasingly became part of them, hired as staff and recruited as volunteers. The support of others for Muslim claims to full national belonging and citizenship pulled them in from the margins of social exclusion, accelerating their social integration into American society.

To the degree that Muslim (and Arab) Americans participated in the social mobilizations of mainstream institutions and were defended by these institutions, they became, broadly speaking, less isolated. They also became more permeable, making them "much more subject both to influencing and being influenced by the larger society."[65] These changes were evident in mosque-sponsored events featuring Islamic perspectives on the importance of voting and political participation, environmentalism and global warming. Muslim (and Arab) American civic activism after 9/11 deployed many of the tactics used by other historically excluded groups: voter registration and voting, public protest, institutional capacity building, leadership development, crafting a targeted message, expanding institutional networks, and appropriating the narrative of self-definition. Like "Black is Beautiful" and "Chicanismo," the *hijab* was deployed not as a sign of male domination (as popularly understood) but as a counter symbol of pride, strength, and dignity, further increasing its draw among Muslim American women. Many of these organizational activities reflected what philanthropic organizations were prepared to fund, as well as the agendas of local coalitions in which Muslims had become a part. For example, the embrace of Arab and Muslim American communities by a strong immigrants rights coalition in metropolitan Chicago (Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights) sharply defined many of the terms of engagement, as the coalition's support for Muslim and Arab American legal defense and citizenship rights intersected with its electoral legalization agenda. The Alinsky-esque United Power for Action and Justice Coalition, which stepped up its leadership development and community organizing work in faith-based communities, held the same shaping power.

Other terms of engagement pressed upon the newly permeable organizations included a demand that Arab and Muslim American institutions and leaders persistently repudiate the 9/11 attacks and publicly condemn acts of violence engaged in by Arabs and Muslims wherever in the world they occur. Major Arab and Muslim American organizations have done so, but to little media attention. Yet many Arab Muslims interviewed in the study argued that conforming to these demands amounted to *de facto* acceptance of the validity of the claim that there is an inherent connection between themselves, their culture and religion, and acts of violence. Another term of engagement imposed on, yet accepted by, most major Arab and Muslim American organizations was participation in regular meetings with local representatives of federal law enforcement, justice, and homeland security agencies. Such meetings, sometimes called roundtables, have been occurring across the country in cities with large Arab or Muslim populations and are framed as opportunities "to get to know one another." They reflect the federal government's response to charges that they were alienating Arab and Muslim Americans instead of making them their allies in the fight against terrorism. These meetings nevertheless received tepid support from the top in Washington and their objectives were frustrated by FBI practices of spying and placing agents provocateurs in mosques.[66] In Chicago, the local office of the FBI organized a Youth Academy for the sophomore class of a Muslim school in suburban Bridgeview in which students met with FBI agents for a class period twice weekly to learn about FBI work on terrorism, cyber crime, and civil rights. On the national level, the American Arab Anti-discrimination Committee began actively promoting FBI careers for Arab Americans. The relational gains made from these constructive engagements are nonetheless weakened by other actions of the Justice Department and the FBI.

Counter discourses

While these positive changes in Muslim American civic and political participation were occurring, voices of religious intolerance, anti-Muslim nativism, and anti-Arab dehumanization continued to hold persuasive power in American society. Groups and public personalities who insist that Arab and Muslim Americans should remain as "outsiders" in American society because they are persons "who cannot be trusted to live by the rules" became more active in the years since the 9/11 attacks.[67] Their discourses and narratives create an influential contextual playing field that works to block full Muslim American social and political integration. Anti-Muslim groups base their arguments not on data but on stereotypes and social constructions of their own making.[68]

Barriers to the social and political incorporation of American Muslims continue to be erected by groups identifying what Muslims must do to show that they deserve consideration for membership in American society. So frequently are these "cleansing hoops" through which Muslims must jump tied to condemnations of the Qur'an and derisions of the Prophet Mohammed, that they largely require that Muslims become not Muslim at all to be eligible. An opposite process, however, unfolded for the majority of Arab Muslims interviewed in this study, for whom 9/11 and its aftermath produced a soul searching from which they emerged more deeply Muslim.[69] The persistent influence of anti-Muslim discourses is revealed in public opinion polls. A 2006 Gallup poll found that 39 percent of American respondents favored the requirement that Muslims carry special identity cards, 51 percent believed that Muslims are not loyal to the US, and 25 percent would not want a Muslim neighbor. Another 2006 poll showed that less than half of the American population had a positive view of Islam.[70] Thus, the two-way process of social and political integration, of asserting agency to "change and refashion American institutions" while also being changed by them, continues to face major structural barriers imposed by institutions that are currently out of the reach of Muslim American influence.[71]

Conclusion

Groups acting in both constructive and obstructive ways have helped to shape American Muslim understandings of the actions they need to take to prevent another onslaught like they endured after the 9/11 attacks. The overwhelming majority of Arab Muslims interviewed in this study said they saw the future for Muslims (and Arabs) in American society as positive. They did so because they interpreted their experiences as a typical American story:

a fight for social inclusion successfully waged by other American racial, ethnic, and religious minority groups. Modeled after the tactics of these groups, the paths of agency were defined and clear. The social relationships and mobilizations that have been bridges to Muslim American social inclusion have also shaped the terms of engagement, as they offered solidarity, training, and funding to Muslim (and Arab) American communities. Gerstle has argued that Americanization is shaped by coercion, exclusion, and restriction and that the national community is a "structure of power that circumscribes choice and shapes the identities to which individuals and groups can aspire."[72] As post-9/11 civic engagement, political activism, coalition work, and solidarities help to move a diverse group of Muslim Americans closer to the mainstream with claims anchored in American values, civil rights, and a right to full citizenship, the question remains if these processes can ultimately be successful if, as some Muslim Americans argue, their full social and political integration will be stalled by issues and interests connected to US foreign policies.

The heightened level of civic engagement of Muslim Americans should provide them with better protection should another terrible event occur that provokes notions of collective responsibility. Theoretically, governmental and social relationships are in place to block major assaults on their civil rights and public safety. Yet while full American Muslim incorporation is facilitated by the importance of religious freedom in American society, it is complicated by the fact that Muslim Americans are largely not members of the dominant white social group, with more than 80 percent coming from African American, African, Arab, or Asian heritage. Sociologists recognize that the complete social and political inclusion of subordinated groups requires the removal of structural barriers, as has been argued for African Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, Latinos, Jews, Catholics, women, and other groups who have faced legal and customary barriers to social, economic, and political equality in the US. Many of the structural barriers Arab and Muslim Americans face are tied to American global interests and are rooted in the discourses of interested parties, in which Arabs and Muslims continue to be socially constructed as deviants and outsiders. Despite their recent structural advances emerging from post-9/11 solidarities and institutional incorporations, full Muslim American social and political incorporation may be stalled by those seeking to continue their grip on the power of representation, and who argue that "they" can never be part of "us" because they hate "our" values. As long as arguments that Muslims are somehow different from "us" are socially tolerated, even if referring to Muslims outside the US, and as long as they continue to play a significant role in American culture, it is difficult to pronounce that the road ahead will be smooth for Muslim Americans.

Notes

1 Muslim American Interviewee in L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity: The Arab American and Muslim American Experience after 9/11*, New York: The Russell Sage Foundation, 2009.

2 Muslim American Interviewee in L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity.*

3 These events would include: attempts to smear US presidential candidate Barack Obama by calling him a Muslim; the public issue made over Congressman Keith Ellison's intent to take his oath of office on the Qur'an; the removal by Minneapolis authorities of a group of Imams from an airplane after praying in the airport terminal rendered them suspicious; the withdrawal of a Dunkin Donuts ad because celebrity Rachel Ray was wearing a *kufiyeh*, which some argued symbolized "Muslim terrorism"; wide distribution of the film *Obsession* to the American public, especially in voting districts designated as swing areas for the 2008 presidential elections; and revelations of the FBI's use of hardball tactics and agents provocateur in a southern California mosque whose leadership thought it had developed a strong and positive working relationship with the local FBI.

4 The in-depth, qualitative interview sample of 102 Arab Muslims was stratified according to a range of important demographic variables in metropolitan Chicago's Arab Muslim community, including gender, social class, country of ancestry, location of urban residence, and immigrant generation. More detailed ethodological details are located in L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

5 Y. Haddad and A.T. Lummis, *Islamic Values in the United States: A Comparative Study*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1987, p. 3.

6 I. Bagby, P. M. Perl, and B.T. Froehle, "The Mosque in America: A National Portrait. Report from the Mosque Study Project 2000," Washington, D.C: Council on American–Islamic Relations (CAIR), 2001.

7 These scholars are not usually clear about the scope of the term "Muslim Americans." They do not seem to imply citizenship when invoking "American" but rather permanent residence. With regard to other estimates of the American Muslim population, Haddad (2004) reports that the B'nai Brith estimated 2 million, W. Dean Muhammed (Muslim American Society) estimated 11 million, and the Council on American–Islamic Relations estimated 7 million. Ba-Yunus and Kone (2004) estimated 5.7 million, while in 1999 Smith estimated 6 million. See Y. Haddad, *Not Quite American? The Shaping of Arab and Muslim Identity in the United States*, Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2004; I. Ba-Yunus and K. Kone, "Americans: A Demographic Report," in Z. Bukhari, S. Nyang, M. Ahmad, and J.L. Esposito (eds.) *Muslims' Place in the American Public Square: Hopes, Fears, Aspirations*, Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press, 2004; and J. Smith, *Islam in America,* New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

8 Y. Haddad, *Not Quite American?*

9 Z. Bukhari et al. (eds.) *Muslims' Place in the American Public Square.*

10 J. Smith, *Islam in America.*

11 See http://www.thearda.com/mapsReports/maps/map.asp?state=101&variable=24; and http://www.thearda.com/mapsReports/maps/map.asp?alpha=0&variable=24&state=101&variable2=617&GRP=1&Var2=617 (accessed May 17, 2009).

12 Counting persons by religious affiliation is prohibited in US Census data collection. See http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html (accessed May 17, 2009).

13 In a question and answer session following a 1963 speech at Western Michigan University, Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. stated: "We must face the fact that in America, the church is still the most segregated major institution in

America. At 11:00 on Sunday morning when we stand and sing and Christ has no east or west, we stand at the most segregated hour in this nation. This is tragic." See http://www.wmich.edu/library/archives/mlk/q-a.html (accessed May 26, 2008).

14 The history and growth of Islam in the US is often described by scholars of religion using a dichotomy that distinguishes between "indigenous Muslims" (meaning African American Muslims and some 75,000 US-born converts) and "immigrant Muslims" (including their second- and third-generation descendants), a distinction reflecting complex doctrinal and social realities related to Islam in the American context. The collapsing of immigrant generations into the category of "immigrant Muslims" leaves much to be desired from a sociological perspective as immigrants and their native-born children lead quite different lives. The category "immigrant" Muslims is often used to describe multiple generations by scholars of European Muslims, a means of displaying their outsider status, as well as by politically motivated analysts whose perspectives gain credence by blurring distinctions.

15 I. Bagby, "Imams and Mosque Organization in the United States," in P. Strum (ed.) *Muslims in the United States: Identity, Influence, Innovation*, Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 2005, p. 19. (For more discussion see pp. 19–36.)

16 L. Cainkar, "Islamic Revival Among Second-generation Arab Muslims in Chicago: The American Experience and Globalization Intersect," in *Bulletin of the Royal Institute for Inter-Faith Studies*, 6 (2), 2004 and Y. Haddad, *Not Quite American?*

17 F. Yang and H.R. Ebaugh, "Transformations in New Immigrant Religions and Their Global Implications," in *American Sociological Review*, 66 (2), 2001, 269–288.

18 L. Cainkar, "Islamic Revival."

19 L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

20 L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

21 S. Jackson, "Preliminary Reflections on Islam and Black Religion," in Z. Bukhari et al. (eds.) *Muslims' Place in the American Public Square*; and S. Jackson, "Black Orientalism: Its Genesis, Aims and Significance for American Islam," in P. Strum (ed.) *Muslims in the United States*, p. 48.

22 Lee, Felicia, "An Islamic Scholar with the Dual Role of Activist," *New York Times*, January 17, 2004, Arts. Online. Available HTTP http://www.newyorktimes.com (accessed January 20, 2004); and A. McCloud, *Transnational Muslims in American Society*, Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2006.

23 Other factors contributing to Black Orientalism include the shifting identification of many African American Muslims from Black religion to historical Islam, the demonization of Islam in American culture, and direct African American urban experiences with immigrant Muslims (as shopkeepers). See S. Jackson, "Black Orientalism."

24 S. Jackson, "Preliminary Reflections," p. 47.

25 S. Jackson, "Preliminary Reflections," p. 48.

26 L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

27 R.S. Leiken, *Bearers of Global Jihad? Immigration and National Security after 9/11*, Washington D.C.: The Nixon Center, 2004.

28 President Bush's Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People. See *President Declares "Freedom at War with Fear"* (September 20, 2001). Online. Available HTTP http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html (accessed May 1, 2007).

29 L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

30 D. Cole, "Are We Safer?" in *The New York Review of Books* 53 (4), 2006, 15–18; and N. Chang and A. Kabat, "Summary of Recent Court Rulings on Terrorism-related Matters Having Civil Liberties Implications," New York: Center for Constitutional Rights, 2004.

31 L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

32 Attorney General John Ashcroft, *Prepared Remarks for the US Mayors Conference* (October 25, 2001). Online. Available HTTP http://www.usdoj.gov/archive/ag/speeches/2001/agcrisisremarks10_25.htm (accessed May 17, 2009).

33 Attorney General Ashcroft, *Prepared Remarks*.

34 Attorney General Ashcroft, *September 11, 2001: Attack on America* (September 18, 2001). Online. Available HTTP http://avalon.law.yale.edu/sept11/ashcroft_briefing02.asp (accessed May 17, 2009).

35 D. Cole, "Are we Safer?"

36 S. Shane and L. Bergman, "FBI. Struggling to Reinvent itself to Fight Terror," *New York Times*, October 10, 2006.

37 I highly recommend this incredible documentary, *Brothers and Others*, for persons wanting up close and personal reports of post-9/11 detainees and their experiences. See N. Rossier (Director) *Brothers and Others*, 2002.

38 Human Rights Watch Report for United States (2002). Online. Available HTTP http://www.hrw.org/legacy/wr2k2/us.html (accessed May 17, 2009).

39 H. Ibish (ed.) "Report on Hate Crimes and Discrimination Against Arab Americans: The Post-September 11 Backlash – September 11, 2001 to October 11, 2002," Washington, D.C.: ADC Research Institute, 2003, p. 7.

40 CAIR, "The Status of Muslim Civil Rights in the United States: Stereotypes and Civil Liberties," Washington, D.C.: Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), 2002.

41 R. McVeigh, M.R. Welch and T. Bjarnason, "Hate Crime Reporting as a Successful Social Movement Outcome," In *American Sociological Review* 68(6), 2003, 843–67.

42 See US Commission on Civil Rights (USCCR) (2003) "Arab and Muslim Civil Rights Issues in the Chicago Metropolitan Area Post-9/11." Online. Available HTTP http://www.usccr.gov/pubs/sac/il0503/ch2.htm (accessed May 18, 2009).

43 H. Ibish (ed.) "Report on Hate Crimes and Discrimination against Arab Americans: the Post-September 11 Backlash; September 11, 2001–October 11, 2002," Washington D.C.: ADC, 2003, p. 9.

44 USCCR, "Arab and Muslim Civil Rights Issues."

45 Limited interviews with Arab American Christians produced the same finding, because post-9/11 US government policies targeting Arabs embraced Christians as well as Muslims. See L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

46 Muslim American Interviewee in L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

47 Some increased interest is generated by socially negative impulses, such as to find Quranic quotes that justify the social exclusion of Muslims. These bivalent reasons for learning more about Islam may explain Keeter and Kohut's findings from poll data that "familiarity with Islam has no impact on people's evaluations as to whether Islam is more likely than other religions to encourage violence." See S. Keeter and A. Kohut, "American Public Opinion About Muslims in the United State and Abroad," in P. Strum (ed.), *Muslims in the United States*, p. 61.

48 See L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

49 CAIR Chicago, "The Road to 2008: What is the American Muslim Community's Role?" Online. Available HTTP http://www.cairchicago.org/thescoop.php?file=sc_muslims_in_2008 (accessed December 11, 2006).

50 R. Wuthnow, *American Mythos*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006.

51 J. Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism 1860–1925*, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1953, p. 4.

52 J. Higham, *Strangers*.

53 L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

54 Muslim American Interviewee in L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

55 Muslim American Interviewee in L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

56 Muslim American Interviewee in L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

57 Muslim American Interviewee in L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

58 Muslim American Interviewee in L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

59 Muslim American Interviewee in L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

60 Muslim American Interviewee in L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

61 Muslim American Interviewee in L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

62 Muslim American Interviewee in L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

63 Muslim American Interviewee in L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

64 M. Nimer, "American Muslim Organizations: Before and After 9/11," in P. Strum (ed.) *Muslims in the United States*, pp. 5–17; K.M. Moore, "Open House: Visibility, Knowledge and Integration of Muslims in the United States," in P. Strum and D. Tarantolo (eds.) *Muslims in the United States: Demography, Beliefs, Institutions*, Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 2003, pp. 63–77; and Chicago Council on Global Affairs (2007). Online. Available HTTP http://www.thechicagocouncil.org/dynamic_page.php?id=61 (accessed May 18, 2009).

65 A. Orum, "Circles of Influence and Chains of Command: The Social Processes Whereby Ethnic Communities Influence Host Societies," in *Social Forces*, 84 (2), 2005, 926. (For more discussion see pp. 921–939.)

66 See L. Cainkar, "US Muslim Leaders and Activists Evaluate Post-September 11th Domestic Security Policies," Social Science Research Council, Program on Global Security and Cooperation; Reframing the Challenge of Migration and Security, 2004; and L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

67 H.S. Becker, *Outsiders, Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*, London: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963, p. 1.

68 L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

69 L. Cainkar, *Homeland Insecurity*.

70 For reference to Washington Post-ABC News Poll, see CAIR, "The Status of Muslim Civil Rights in the United States: The Struggle for Equality," Washington D.C.: CAIR, 2006, p. 5. Online. Available HTTP http://www.cair.com/pdf/2006-CAIR-Civil-Rights-Report.pdf (accessed May 18, 2009).

71 Orum, "Circles of Influence," p. 924.

72 G. Gerstle, "Liberty, Coercion, and the Making of Americans," in C. Hirschmann, P. Kasinitz, and J. DeWind (eds.) *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*, New York: The Russell Sage Foundation, 1999, p. 290.

9 The concept of the Muslim enemy in the public discourse[1]

Yasemin Shooman and Riem Spielhaus

Introduction

Although immigrants of Muslim faith have been living in relevant numbers in Western Europe since the 1960s, it took notable events like the 1989 headscarf debate in France, the Rushdie affair of the same year, or the introduction of the new citizenship law in Germany in 2000 to identify Muslims as such in the public discourse. Researchers have described this development with the term New Islamic Presence.[2] Nina Clara Tiesler speaks of an Islamization of debates and individuals, arguing that in a kind of "religious turn," Islam was placed at the center of debates on regional, national, and European identities. Likewise, several researchers have noticed a shift from using the category "foreigners" to instead using the category "Muslims" both in public and academic discourse.[3] Furthermore, in the German context, the relevance of debates on foreigners and immigrants has also been superseded by debates on Islam and Muslims.[4] Religious terminology seems to have (at least partly) replaced ethnic terminology, which for so long served to negotiate, legitimate, and create social boundaries and order. For young Muslims, Islam may be used to disassociate from cultural traditions and ethnic identities in favor of developing a more European or German identity. They may even feel that their ethnicity is a hindrance to their identification as Europeans in a way that being a Muslim is not.[5] However, when this identity is ascribed to them by others, the religious marker has an ostracizing effect on young Muslims, inhibiting their endeavor to integrate and participate in society.

In her research on converts to Christianity in Turkey and converts to Islam in Germany, Esra Özyürek noticed a comparable tendency in both countries in terms of ethnic and immigrant discourse being replaced by a religious one. While ethnicity used to be a leading category in negotiating national identity in both countries, religious affiliation has acquired at least the same distinction in defining a person's national loyalty and acceptance. As she puts it, "the religion is equated with the national majority and keeps the religious minority outside the national imagination, no matter how well integrated or assimilated the members of the minority are."[6]

Arjun Appadurai, in his essay *Fear of Small Numbers,* describes what he calls "majoritanism," a strategy of identity formation using the differentiation of minorities to build up feelings of "we-ness." "The discourse of these mobilized majorities often has within it the idea that it could be itself turned into a minority unless another minority disappears."[7] Appadurai characterizes majorities and minorities as rather new products of a distinctly modern world of statistics, censuses, population maps, and other recent tools of state, which emerged explicitly in the process of developing ideas of number, representation, and electoral enfranchisement in connection with the concept of democracy.[8] As *Fear of Small Numbers* establishes, debates on majorities and minorities circle around the perception of the self and serve to reaffirm (national) belonging. They focus on the majority's fears and premonitions that minority power could disrupt the status quo no matter how small the minority might actually be. Fears of the minority religion corrupting the majority culture "create new categories of threat and mobilize new memories of the past, reconnecting them to the present in novel ways," as Esra Özyürek so strikingly phrases it.[9]

During the 1990s, researchers, anti-discrimination activists, and Muslim advocates faced an array of hostility towards Islam and Muslims including stereotypical images, demeaning pictures, acts of violence, discrimination, and other forms of open or subtle hostility, calling the phenomenon "Islamophobia."[10] However, Marcel Maussen reflects that the major shortcomings of this term and concept is that it conflates various forms of discourses and acts of violence suggesting that they all emanate from an identical ideological core, which is a "fear" or a "phobia" of Islam.[11] Accordingly, the term Islamophobia is contested because it is often imprecisely applied to very diverse phenomena, ranging from xenophobia to anti-terrorism policies.[12] Many studies have taken a closer look at the growing climate of mutual distrust, hostility, and fear between Muslim and non-Muslim populations, such as types of unfair treatment and religious discrimination,[13] and the actual praxis of discrimination.[14] Anti-Muslim and anti-Islamic discourses are significant issues for research not only because they violate norms and values of European states and societies regarding minorities, but also because discrimination and stereotypical depiction impact the ways that Muslims congregate and identify as part of European societies. Thus, it is evident that there are serious repercussions for rejected groups in terms of communalization when confronted with such hostility.[15]

This chapter explores narratives of the "Muslim enemy." After discussing a range of academic approaches to images and concepts of the Muslim enemy in Germany and beyond, it attempts to summarize their functions as well as outline the discursive events and debates in which those narratives occur. It then concentrates on a case study of a popular German anti-Muslim website, Politically Incorrect. This site exemplifies a frequently reoccurring set of stereotypes and images of Muslims as enemies, showing that concepts of the Muslim enemy are shared and exchanged throughout Europe and beyond. One could argue that the Internet provides a sphere for the most extreme opinions affecting only a small number of people and is therefore irrelevant. However, narratives of Islam as a threat that are presented in weblogs are not limited to the fringes of society. Alexander Häusler describes right-wing campaigns against Islam as having majority appeal.[16] The image of Muslims as enemies appears at different levels of public discourse and occupies a new status for various academic disciplines and methodologies.

Classifications of the concept of the Muslim enemy

In German academic literature, different theoretical approaches have been employed to analyze the phenomenon of anti-Muslim and anti-Islamic narratives through concepts of moral panic, anti-Muslim racism, patterns of prejudice, and strategies of right-wing populism. Sociologist Claus Leggewie evaluates debates on Islam and Muslims as "symbolic conflicts" of visibility, which develop out of manifestations of a lasting Islamic presence.[17] Conflicts on Mosque building projects, for example, have been interpreted as a possible motor for integration by urban sociologists like Hartmut Häußermann, since they offer the opportunity to (re)negotiate rules and conditions of living after subtle changes among populations in urban quarters, when carefully monitored.[18]

While looking at governmental policies, Anthropology Professor Werner Schiffauer is able to show that the debate on Islam and Muslims in Germany is based on a perceived dichotomy between "us" and "them" reaching far beyond right-wing or populist circles.[19] He acknowledges a sense of moral panic in debates on citizenship, rights of religious minorities, and the access to public funding. The concept of moral panic describes states of collective hysteria, which periodically appear in civil societies and are characterized by a strong concern over a certain group or category and the consequences that its (alleged) behavior may cause for the rest of society. The moral panic draws its dynamic from increasing hostility, the differentiation of "us," the legitimate and honorable members of society, from "them," the others, and from a noticeable consensus between actors who usually hold widely divergent views. Moral panic is also characterized by an exaggeration of threats to society and a correspondingly disproportionate reaction to them. These panics emerge as waves of collective fear from the loss of control over internal affairs.

In her book *A Suitable Enemy: Racism, Migration and Islamophobia in Europe* Liz Fekete analyses the reactions to the bombings in London and Madrid in Europe in terms of a "new McCarthyism" that replaces the subversive Communist with the Islamic Radical. With examples ranging from EU legislation to the local implementation she is showing that all levels of society, from the legislative, judicative, executive bodies to the media are involved.[20]

Even though levels of fear increased significantly after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, in Germany the fear in these debates stems not only from the threat of Islamic terrorism, Schiffauer argues, but it also reflects a fear that the status of many immigrants and their descendants is rising through the naturalization process caused by the changes in Germany's citizenship law in 2000:

> Immigrants who were hitherto considered different and unequal and who have been, in German politics, taken care of, rather than integrated into the political system, are increasingly becoming citizens who fight for their rights and seek to establish them by democratic means. This leads to fear of losing control of key issues of German society: The reaction to it is moral panic.[21]

The trans-nationalization of the war on terror has doubtlessly affected not only notions of security and danger but also images of "the dangerous other," as Julia Eckert states. The post 9/11 emerging "culture of security" promoted changes in the ideas of the state and of the nation:

> The war on terror operates with categories that are for the most part ascriptive categories; the classification of people as potentially dangerous relates only secondarily to their actual activities. Rather, because of the alleged elusiveness of "the enemy," suspect subjects are classified according to their religious or national background, their ethnicity, their associations or other so-called "characteristics." These form the basis of the current data gathering and surveillance activities.[22]

While Schiffauer is focusing on Islam at the institutional level, the image of Islam in the media has been the object of discussion for several other researches. Quantitative and qualitative analyses have revealed the conflation of foreign affairs and domestic issues in media representations.[23] Thus, in the aftermath of 9/11, the war on terror affected German discourse on and the perception of Muslims in the country. On the one hand, a range of politicians, journalists, and broadcasters advocated a clear distinction between terrorism legitimized with reference to Islam and the religion of Islam. On the other hand, the established news coverage in print media, radio and TV programs reproduces an image of a predominantly violent Islam. Based on a quantitative evaluation of the newscast in two public service broadcastings, Kai Hafez and Carola Richter conclude that Islam is portrayed as a political ideology and a totalitarian codex of moral values affecting the entire society rather than as a religion. Apart from that, the depiction of Islam is further exaggerated by coverage of violent conflicts in foreign countries.[24] In a discourse analysis, Sabine Schiffer not only spots a recurring connection in the media of Islam with violence, threats, regression, and oppression of women, but she also tries to explain the effects of these connections on the media audiences. If certain facts are always presented in connection with each other, she argues, the public tends to suppose causality between them. This constant contextualization of a variety of independent phenomena like religion and violence (from terrorism to domestic violence) nourishes the fear of a threat stemming from alleged members of the Islamic community. According to Schiffer, though, the events of September 11, 2001 do not mark the starting point of the negative view toward Islam but are rather one of several culmination points in a long history of skepticism toward Islam and Muslims.[25]

A number of authors have written about images of the Muslim enemy in German newspapers; however, very often these descriptions are based on a rather eclectic overview of generalized or anti-Islamic articles, media reports, and interviews. Peter Widmann in his analysis of concepts of the Muslim enemy approaches the diverse media landscape more systematically. Using the example of the publisher Hans-Peter Raddatz,[26] Widmann shows how right-wing intellectuals disseminated irrational concepts of an enemy, on the pretext of "Criticism of Islam," and participated in the mainstream discourse as "experts on Islam" in established media after 9/11. He identifies a discourse that he calls a compensational communication, allowing people like Raddatz "to present conventional extreme right-wing views as unsuspicious opinions."[27] According to Widmann, this strategy, in part, succeeded through the use of positive references to Jews and Israel, statements that are not part of the traditional repertoire of right-wing convention. These very references allow for the possibility of rejecting the reproach of racism. Widmann's analysis demonstrates that beside the subtle, possibly unwitting ways in which the media conveys images of Islam and Muslims as dangerous, the established national media time and again offers a platform for narratives that depict Islam and Muslims in general as a threat to European societies. Leading figures of anti-Islamic discourse are heard and repeated in established German newspapers, radio and TV programs.[28]

Not only does the mass media play a role in the construction of reality; in the case of minority issues, coverage in the media is often the only source for the formation of audience opinions, since many media recipients hardly have any direct contact or experience with Muslims.[29] Looking at attitudes in the general population, a team of researchers, in 2002, under the leadership of Wilhelm Heitmeyer, started a long-term survey on "Group-focused Enmity Syndrome" (*Gruppenbezogene Menschenfeindlichkeit,* GMF). The survey approached anti-Islamic attitudes as a pattern of prejudice among other patterns of prejudice, and all patterns were defined by attitudes of enmity with an underlying ideology of inequality.[30] Their empirical results demonstrate that hostile attitudes are not directed at one group in particular but generally at several groups of people. Accordingly, the particular elements of enmity are not developed independently from each other.

The long-term study on GMF is based on the assumption of a correlation between patterns of prejudice among different groups of people, and the study also finds these patterns in hostile attitude toward Islam. Heitmeyer refers to the production of enmity in these studies as a "syndrome." There are ten constitutive elements of misanthropy defined, two of these being Islamophobia and xenophobia. According to Leibold and Kühnel, members of the research group, both attitudes are closely interconnected, such that in Germany, Islamophobia has developed as a specific and independent form of xenophobia.[31] The researchers use the term Islamophobia to describe general hostile attitudes toward Muslim people and all denominations, symbols, and religious practices of Islam. These attitudes can lead to discriminatory behavior or acts of violence.[32] The GMF survey gives evidence of the notable rise of anti-Muslim sentiments since 2004. Furthermore, Leibold and Kühnel have determined a correlation between the general rejection of Muslims and anti-Semitic attitudes.[33]

The conflation of foreigners and Muslims in socio-political discourse under the leitmotif "integration" as well as the German media's contextualization of Muslims in conflict with external and internal adversaries seem to lie at the core of the issue of Muslims being presented both as strangers and enemies. Iman Attia and Kai Hafez discussed how xenophobic and anti-Muslim notions are linked with reference to Etienne Balibar's concept of "cultural racism."[34] The term "cultural racism" specifies the production of pejorative ideas and images about "counter-cultures," as does racism with the construction of races. "Cultural racism" operates with a concept of cultures that supposes them to be homogeneous, static, unchangeable, and clearly defined. Culture, in this understanding, appears to be unchallenged, consistent, and binding for formations of all societies and nations. Thoughts and actions of people are reduced to and determined by a constructed cultural origin. The prevailing topic of "cultural racism" is no longer biological heredity but the irreversibility of cultural differences.[35]

Anti-Islamic agitation – a strategy of right-wing populism

Recently, anti-Islamic agitation has been discussed in studies on right-wing extremism and right-wing populism. Populist discourse has been described as a stylistic device used to modernize the extreme right. In this context, anti-Islamic agitation serves as a connection to the dominant discourse, which is critical of Islamism and, moreover, exhibits anti-Islamic and anti-Muslim tendencies.[36] For instance, political commentators from established German TV and newspapers have recently taken up the concept of an Islamization of Europe.[37] During recent years, right-wing parties and some of their leaders have adopted the strategy of starting citizens' initiatives on local and regional levels in order to draw new supporters. These initiatives argue that political parties do not speak for the local population, so they have to congregate and speak for themselves. In the German context, a whole movement of initiatives developed, all using the preposition *pro-* in connection to local and regional adjuncts, struggling to get access to communal political institutions.

In this context, Oliver Geden speaks of a renaissance of right-wing populism in several Western European countries. According to him, at the center of populist politics stands the attempt to establish a permanent new line of conflict in the political field. The basic storyline of populism is characterized by a principal dichotomy. On one side stands an imagined unity, consisting of "the people" and their alleged political representatives. This idealized "we" is set in conflict with a group of "elites" including "corrupt" politicians and cultural elites (intellectuals), as well as minorities who are then protected by these "elites."[38] While right-wing parties previously had problems uniting on a European level because of competing nationalist ideologies and other issues, Islam has served as a unifying topic, a common enemy, both exterior and interior for the greater European community. Using Islam as a platform, formerly nationalist parties are attempting to Europeanize, by establishing contacts and through cooperation with national populist movements and parties on the European level. This has been the case with the French National Front (*Front national*), the Italian North Leagve (*Lega Nord*), the Belgian Flemish Interest (*Vlaams Belang*), the Danish People's Party (*Dansk Folkeparti*), and the German parties Pro-Cologne (*Pro Köln*) and Pro-North Rhine (*Pro NRW*). Besides their anti-establishment position, these parties look for common topics that go beyond the rejection of European integration.[39] One of the common issues is the rising visibility of Muslims in Western European countries. The cooperation of these parties has already taken concrete forms through the adoption of campaigns and popular initiatives like that of the Swiss Peoples' Party (*Schweizerische Volkspartei*) for a construction ban on minarets in the Swiss federal constitution, a campaign that the respective parties in Belgium, France, Italy, and Germany readily joined.[40] The Freedom Party of Austria (*Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs*, FPÖ) introduced the Swiss bill nearly verbatim into the Austrian National Assembly and Jörg Haider's regional party, Alliance for the Future of Austria (*Bündnis Zukunft Österreich*, BZÖ), succeeded in implementing a ban on minarets in Carinthian (South Austrian) building law.[41]

Like in dominant discourse, the debate on foreigners and migration turned into a debate on Islam and Muslims – a process, which is consequently both ethnicizing Islam and Islamizing ethnic categories. In the field of populist right-wing discourse, hostility against foreigners turned into hostility against Muslims and created a new element of group related enmity. As Häusler puts it, the bogeyman of "silent Islamization" replaced earlier right-wing populist horror scenarios of a "flood of foreigners" and respectively transformed its racist content with a culturalist sentiment.[42]

Functions of anti-Muslim stereotypes in public discourse

Anti-Islamic slogans appear mainly a) after violent events that are being related to Islam, b) in the course of political agendas especially during election campaigns, and c) when Muslims become visible in public space and active in socio-political life. There has been great attention paid to the headscarf debate but this is only one context in which hostile narratives on Islam and Muslims occur. In many European countries, projects for the building of mosques and limitations on the naturalization of immigrants from majority Muslim countries, through measures like citizenship tests, which raise the question of disloyalty, have been central to anti-Islamic discourses. Moreover, every violent act that has been legitimized with reference to Islam or Muslim culture, including terrorist attacks and so-called honor killings, has fuelled a rejection of Muslims in general. Another issue that invites both implicit and explicit statements of incompatibility between Islam and Europe or between Muslim minorities and European states is the debate on Turkey's entry to the European Union. In several Western European countries we can also observe that debates on integration have been linked to, or replaced by, debates on Islam and the Muslim minority in the country.

Debating, problematizing, and addressing Islam-related issues or criticisms should not be equated with hatred or hostility. Nevertheless, positions critical of religious or traditional attitudes and practices or other critiques of Muslim groups and communities often have a stigmatizing effect. This effect can be attributed to the critics' use of double standards, when the demands or measures that are applied to the minority are not also posed to the dominant groups as well, or when the recipient of the criticism is not clearly identified. Abstract criticism often serves to construct otherness while it leaves no possibility to meet the critique. The following three dominant stereotypes are frequently used in the discourse: 1) Muslims are generalized as being part of one coherent and homogeneous group or pictured in a binary and simplistic representation of a good or an evil Islam; 2) Islam as a religion is depicted as a dangerous ideology that encourages violence, terrorism, and the suppression of women; 3) Islam is antagonistic to a European lifestyle and values characterized by enlightenment, humanism, and freedom; and 4) Europe is in great danger of being conquered by Islam through immigration, naturalization, and birth rates of Muslims. Anti-Muslim stereotypes and concepts of Muslims as the enemy are all heavily interwoven with self-assuring debates on national and European identities. In other words, they are connected to the imagination of a new European communal identity. As a case study of an Internet blog in German will show, these constructions and narrations often supersede the national level. The blogs not only encourage the idea of Islam's incompatibility with European norms and values, but they actually direct the imagination of the self as well as construct a Muslim other.

Following Edward Said's concept of Orientalism and other postcolonial theory, Iman Attia positions the dominant images of Islam as a form of cultural racism. She points out that images of the Orient and Islam not only provide information about the other, but rather define and commit to notions of the self. Essentialized images of the other are serving as a foil to outline and fix the image of the self. Exclusion and aggression against "Orient" and "Islam," in the understanding of Iman Attia, "therefore are not only directed against these two, but serve to clarify and enforce norms."[43]

The concept of an Islamization of Europe, as frequently employed in the current discourse, is based on the idea that Islam and Europe could not be harmonized. Instead, one needs to conquer, dominate, or win over the other. The nationalist framework of European states is being abandoned and the image of the supra-national Western European Occident is given importance, while its characterization as Christian is often expanded to include an entire Judeo-Christian tradition. Politicians especially, who use this line of argumentation, stress the phase of enlightenment as constitutive in contrast to Islam, which thereby is characterized as pre-enlightened.

The concept of the Muslim enemy in the World Wide Web: the German website Politically Incorrect – a case study

The Internet has been praised as an especially democratic means of communication. Particularly, weblogs enable every user to publicly express his or her opinion on certain topics. Under the cover of anonymity guaranteed by the use of fictive names, positions are often declaimed more openly and more sharply than in established public discourse, in some cases opposing basic principles of democracy. This is to a high degree also true for the issue of Islam. There are a vast number of websites that turn toward the issue of Islam and Muslims with great zeal in order to warn the Western world of the danger of an alleged impending Islamization. As one can readily observe among German-language Internet activities, a downright Islam-hostile scene has been established, which is well networked and thus enables the fast exchange of information. Websites like The Green Pest[44] (in reference to green as the traditional color of Islam), Stop Islam[45] and File Islam: For, Europe – against Eurabia[46] create a community in the virtual world that uses its own special language and stresses its commitment to the struggle against the purported end of the Western World. They all share a bipolar worldview, according to which Muslims cannot be Europeans. Their rhetoric concentrates on a representation of the other which, if not effectively combated, will spread irretrievably and destroy the self.

The conspiracy fantasy of "silent Islamization"

One of the most vibrant Islam-hostile blogs in the German language is the website Politically Incorrect which, according to its own data, lists over 20,000 (on peak days up to 40,000) visitors daily and more than 17 million in total, as of March 2009.[47] The elementary school teacher Stefan Herre founded PI – the common abridgment for Politically Incorrect – in November 2004. Using the PI example, we can follow the development of the Islam-hostile Internet scene. PI witnessed its breakthrough during the controversies around the publishing of the Danish cartoons portraying the Prophet Muhammad. The website was among the first German-language websites to publish the caricatures. Since then, the number of daily visitors skyrocketed.[48] As the name reveals, the site contains, according to its own self-conception, a platform for politically incorrect news that offers an alternative viewpoint to the mainstream media. PI entitles itself explicitly as pro-American and pro-Israeli and claims to protect the "Basic Law of and human rights" as is displayed on the banner at the top of the website. The actual concern of PI is the fight against the Islamization of Europe. In the "guidelines" section it says:

> The political correctness and the goodness of the people[49] dominate the media everywhere today. Of course there is no censorship, officially. Nonetheless, the "information" we are receiving on many issues are totally insufficient or even falsified, even if they are of highest importance for us and our country.[50]

PI alleges that there is a taboo against reporting freely on certain issues in the media, because a secret unknown power is preventing such coverage. The suggested conspiracy is specified: "Long ago have the principles of Islamic thinking left the ghettos and are influencing not only the thinking and feeling of us citizens, but – even more pronounced – the media and the politics."[51] Stefan Herre and other contributors to the blog are convinced that certain topics like the imminent climate change are publicized to distract from the upcoming Islamization. To document this finding, PI has established the rubric for this "climate hoax." The ruling political class is rejected as remote-controlled, especially politicians from the left who, like the leader of The Greens, Claudia Roth, are marked as covert converts by adding Islamic first names (Claudia *Fatima* Roth).

Based on the assumption that Muslims secretly control the public discourse – whereas the parallel to an anti-Semitic motif is striking – an existential threat is contrived:

> Our civil rights are threatened like never before since the existence of the German Federal Republic. Because of the increasingly pervasive ideology of multiculturalism a creeping undermining of our rights has already taken place.[52]

From the guidelines it follows that, against the background of the concept of the multiculturalism enemy, PI does not reject all immigrants in general, but solely the Muslims, which are accused of aspiring dominance:

> The spread of Islam consequently means that because of the cultural expansion and the demographic development, in two, three decades, our

> descendants – and probably even we ourselves – will live in a largely Islamic coined social system that follows the Sharia and the Quran and not the Basic Law and human rights any more. Hence, we regard it as our civic duty, arisen from historical reasons, to confront the premonitory religious dictatorship in Germany through information and enlightenment according to the motto: "Never again!"[53]

This last phrase tries to locate the aims of PI in the German anti-fascist consensus to prevent totalitarianism, as a responsibility deriving from the Nazi-dictatorship, World War II, and the Holocaust. This argument is premised on the polemical concept Islamofascism, which implies the incompatibility of Islam and democracy and defames the religion of Islam as a totalitarian ideology. Stefan Herre explicates this tacit parallel in an interview with the Austrian Catholic web based News Service (kath.net) in October 2007, in which he responds to the question of the personal risks of his work: "I do not want, like some of our grandparents who were silent during the period of the Third Reich, to be later reproached by my grandchildren: 'You knew it – why didn't you do something against it?'"[54] This argument equates the fight against mosque building with resistance against National Socialism, which subsequently upgrades so-called Critics of Islam to heroes in a moral sense, while at the same time protecting them from being reproached as racists. The same effect is achieved by constantly striking positive reference to Israel and Jews, with whom the users of PI imagine to form a victimized community. They regard themselves as parallel to the ones persecuted by the Nazis, as "new victims" – that is as victims of an impending or even already existing pro-Islamic dictatorship in Germany.[55]

The claim to represent majority opinion

The Internet is not the only place one can find attitudes and arguments similar to those expressed on PI. As mentioned earlier, mosque building projects are serving to both fuel a far-reaching media controversy and to mobilize local residents and other opponents in debates and local initiatives. A result of one mosque building controversy is the citizens' initiative Pro-Cologne (*Pro Köln*), established in 1996, which became popular during the course of negotiations over a purpose-built mosque located at the headquarters of an Islamic umbrella organization in the city of Cologne in 2007. The Islamic organization had been advocating its project among politicians and prominent citizens of the city and had managed to collect a group of renowned supporters. Yet a controversy still developed, especially after the national media took up the issue. At the same time, a mosque controversy broke out on the outskirts of East Berlin in the district of Pankow-Heinersdorf, where representatives of a newly founded citizens' initiative argued in a similar manner that Islamic organizations enjoyed undemocratic support from the municipality, while the purported majority of the people were not heard. The initiative thereby claims to represent the interest of the district's citizens, an aspiration displayed in the name "The community of interest for the citizens of Pankow-Heinersdorf"[56] and the group's leading motto: "We are Pankow!"[57] In this way anti-mosque movements establish themselves as the *real* representatives of the German majority, while politicians are criticized for only representing the Muslim minority.

However, civil society beyond these initiatives both in Berlin and Cologne did not remain silent on this issue. In Pankow, another initiative was founded called "Open Heinersdorf!" which started a discussion on local residents' urgent problems that had not found appropriate resonance among the municipalities during recent years. The mosque opened in autumn 2008, and was welcomed by local residents as well as the district's and Berlin's mayors, though local police still patrol the site frequently to protect it from attacks like the ones carried out on the early construction site.

The debate in Cologne has been a little different. Opponents of the mosque are found in many circles of the city. However, most of them engaged in a critical dialogue with mosque builders. The citizens' initiative Pro-Cologne's claim to represent Cologne's inhabitants has been repudiated and the organization is being investigated by the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution on "suspicion of right-wing extremist ambitions."[58] Pro-Cologne had planned to host an "International Anti-Islamization Congress" on September 20, 2008. The list of special guests announced for the conference illustrates the European network of right-wing populist parties. Those invited included politicians of the French National Front (*Front National*), the Austrian Freedom Party (*FPÖ*), the Italian North League (*Lega Nord, LN*) and the Belgian Flemish Interest (*Vlaams Belang*).[59] Pro-Cologne presented a similar list of speakers for the "International Anti-Islamization Congress" on May 9, 2009. The event in 2008 had to be cancelled because of the strong opposition of civil society in Cologne. At this event, even citizens of Cologne who continued to have different views about the planned mosque, united to prohibit a public demonstration by the radical right in their town. A broad spectrum of civil actors had called for an act of resistance: Christian Democrats, trade unions, Social Democrats, The Left (*Die Linke*) members and students, Christian churches, and Islamic groups. Tens of thousands of Critics of Islam, as well as mosque supporters, participated in the demonstration. As was reported by the media, taxi drivers refused to transport the far-right delegates, hotel owners cancelled their rooms, and bar owners displayed banners stating "No Kölsch for Nazis."[60]

The Islam-hostile Internet scene interpreted the citizens' rejection of this conference as a curtailment of the freedom of opinion. Commentators on PI articulated their commonality and solidarity with the organizers of the Anti-Islamization Congress. An article appeared on PI, which read:

> Those who witnessed the incidents in Cologne yesterday can, to some extent, imagine how the people in the Third Reich felt when they rose

> up against the dictatorship. . . . The people in the Third Reich fought the system from the underground, just as we are doing as well, now, we are in the underground.[61]

This self-perception as new victims, that is as victims of a pro-Islamic dictatorship in Germany, shown in PI's interpretation of the prevention of the Anti-Islamization Congress in Cologne in 2008, is not exceptional but reappears frequently in articles and contributions to the forum of PI. It seems to be the other side of a rhetoric that claims that political parties and democratic structures are not able to represent the needs of the majority. The reference to an alleged majority here is used to legitimize an extreme position. According to the conspiracy theorists, the rejection of this attempt by a relevant number of residents is interpreted as proof to its accuracy.

The anti-Muslim construct of Eurabia

Following this perspective, not just Germany but all European states are depicted as having been infiltrated by Muslims, and the autochthonous people are portrayed as partly helpless victims and partly active collaborators in this development:

> With the oil billions, on which the Muslim (vulg.) states sit, it may well be that "European" mayors . . . and members of the government and members of parliament are simply bought off by the Muslims (vulg.), Baksheesh is nothing special in these states, after all.[62]

Reproaching European politicians with corruption and the "sellout" of their homeland implies a tremendous plenitude of power held by Muslims. The fear-striking scenario of the spread of Islam and respectively of Muslims in Europe, sets up the current discourse about Islam, which is marked by a shift in critique: while Muslims have traditionally been stigmatized as backward and inferior to the majority culture in xenophobic discourse, here they are imagined as a threat and a fifth column which seeks the subversion of Western societies from within.

On Islam-hostile websites like PI, the chimera of Eurabia is spread through the work of contributors like Egyptian-born publicist Gisèle Littman, who reports to have discovered a pro-Islamic conspiracy in the EU. Living in Switzerland, and writing under the pseudonym Bat Yeor (Hebrew: "Daughter of the Nile"), Littman runs her own homepage on which she reveals the supposed secret takeover of Europe and the destruction of the Western society from within by Muslims.[63] Her book *Eurabia: The Euro-Arab Axis* appeared in 2005. Littman wants the term Eurabia to be understood as follows:

> This book is about transformation of Europe into Eurabia, a cultural and political appendage of the Arab/Muslim world. Eurabia is

> fundamentally anti-Christian, anti-Western, anti-American, and anti-Semitic. The institution that has been responsible for this transformation, and that continues to propagate its ideological message, is the Euro-Arab Dialogue, developed by European and Arab politicians and intellectuals over the past thirty years.[64]

Related to the supposed collaboration of European politicians with the Islam she criticizes, Littman verifies, in an interview with the Israeli newspaper *Jerusalem Post* on July 9, 2008, a European attitude that she characterizes as a preemptive submissiveness toward an increasingly mightier group of Muslims. As an explanation for this development, Littman brings in the experience of World War II, which has made Europe war-weary. To prevent further violent conflicts, the continent would be making agreements with its enemies now: “This was their concept of multilateralism – thinking that by joining those who attacked them, they would be protected. This is when a tremendous Muslim immigration into Europe began.”[65] For the purpose of indoctrination, Littman continues, Muslims have infiltrated Western educational institutions:

> European universities – like those in America – are totally controlled by the Arab-Islamic lobby, as are the schools. A teacher who attempts to teach according to the European view of history is thrown out. Indeed, the freedom of expression and thought that has been so crucial for European democracy has disappeared.[66]

Finally, she states the Muslim side has an interest in a geopolitical divide between Western and Eastern Europe because “it is easier to take over the West as a whole when it’s divided.”[67] This infiltration fantasy shows the structural similarities of the Islam-hostile construct Eurabia with other conspiracy scenarios.

Gisèle Littman (alias Bat Yeor) is a prominent figure in Islam-hostile circles. In April 2008 she gave an exclusive interview to the website PI, which devotes an entire category of articles documenting a supposed Western collaboration with Muslims. However, Littman’s influence is not limited to Islam-hostile pages in the Internet. The vision of a weakened self-abandoning West in favor of Muslim dominance has entered the established international media discourse. Littman’s future scenarios can for example be found in a more mild form in the works of German publicist Henryk M. Broder. The blurb of his 2006 book, *Hurray, We Capitulate: About the Desire of Caving In* (*Hurra, wir kapitulieren: Von der Lust am Einknicken*), says:

> Like the appeasement policy toward Hitler only promoted the aggressive stand of the Nazis, the Europeans with their policy of appeasement today are in danger to speedup the transformation of Europe into an Islamic continent.[68]

Remarkably, the Islamization of Europe is presented here as a done deal, in which only the length of the process could be influenced, at best. The book is distributed by the The Federal Agency for Civic Education,[69] a fact which surely increases the spread and justification of such ideas.

The conspiracy fantasy of a silent Islamization of Europe is also propagated by some right-wing populist politicians like the Dutchman Geert Wilders. Wilders, a member of the Dutch parliament and chairman of the Party for Freedom (*Partij voor de Vrijheid*), became famous beyond Dutch borders through his radical Islam-hostile utterances, such as his comparison of the Quran with Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and his move to have the holy book of Muslims banned.[70] In early February 2009, the British government refused Wilders' entry to the country when he wanted to show his anti-Muslim film *Fitna* to the House of Lords at the invitation of a member of parliament. Before the invitation, the movie, which was finished in March 2008, had only been published on the Internet because Dutch television stations refused to broadcast it. The approximately 15 minute long film presents bloodthirsty pictures of beheadings and terrorist attacks linked with out-of-context quotations from the Quran. Thus, Islam is depicted as a religion glorifying violence and demanding its followers to kill non-Muslims. In the film, Wilders follows the logic of terrorists, who try to legitimize their deeds with the Quran. A Muslim German journalist said after the broadcast of the movie: "The video of Geert Wilders could be used by al-Qaeda as an advertisement on their intranet."[71] The viciousness of the film lies in the fact that the crimes shown are associated with Islam in general and thus with *all* Muslims, who allegedly strive toward the destruction of Western societies and, hence, constitute a serious threat as minorities. The end titles of the movie read: "Islam wants to rule, submit, and seeks to destroy our western civilization."[72]

Another issue of *Fitna* is the alleged transformation of the Netherlands into an Islamic country through demographic factors (see below). The speech Wilders wanted to deliver before the House of Lords reads:

> Today, I come before you to warn of another great threat. It is called Islam. . . . Europe is now on the fast track of becoming Eurabia. That is apparently the price we have to pay for the project of mass immigration, and the multicultural project. . . . What will be transmitted forty years from now? Will it still be "This Is London?" Or will it be "This is Londonistan?" Will it bring us hope, or will it signal the values of Mecca and Medina? Will Britain offer submission or perseverance? Freedom or slavery?[73]

To those involved in the Islam-hostile scene, Wilders' denied entry to the UK was interpreted as a proof for the advanced Islamization there. After the failed broadcast of *Fitna* in Great Britain, Wilders traveled to Rome on February 19, 2009, where he showed the movie to an audience including several Italian parliamentarians and again propagated the anti-Muslim construct of Eurabia:

> Ladies and gentlemen, it is five to twelve. In Europe, our freedom is at stake. Islam is Europe's Trojan Horse. . . . The first Islamic invasion of Europe was stopped at Poitiers in 732. The second Islamic invasion was halted at the gates of Vienna in 1683. Now we have to stop the current – stealth – Islamic invasion. Ladies and gentlemen, once Islam conquered Constantinople, now it wants to conquer Rome. We have to stop the Islamization of Europe, because if we don't, Europe will become Eurabia.[74]

Following his visit to Italy, Wilders traveled to the United States of America to propagate his concern in Washington, DC and Boston, on invitation of Senator Jon Kyl. Several conservative activists, who run anti-Muslim websites themselves, such as David Horowitz, editor of the online *FrontPage Magazine* and Robert Spencer, who runs the website Jihad Watch, sponsored Wilders' journey.[75]

Meanwhile, in his home country, investigations against Wilders were conducted by a prosecuting attorney for "inciting hatred and discrimination"[76] – which made him a freedom fighter in the eyes of the Islam-hostile internet community.[77] His fans have initiated an appeal to donate money for his support, which can be linked on international Islam-hostile websites.[78] At the beginning of March 2009, Dutch media reported that according to a recent opinion poll, Wilders' Party for Freedom would become the largest party in the Netherlands, if parliamentary elections were held at this time.[79] This success confirmed Wilders' anti-Muslim agitation and led him to announce his ambition to become the next prime minister of the Netherlands.[80] This shows to what extent the Islam-hostile discourse, such as that taken up by Geert Wilders, is supported by international audiences.

The reproach of deception

In addition to the infiltration fantasy, the reproach of deception is another constant motif in Islam-hostile discourse. On the PI website, a rubric named "Taqiyya" is dedicated to this issue. The Arabic term *taqiyya*, which can be translated as "conceal in danger" denotes disassociating from religious duties in cases of constraints or harm. It allows a believer to conceal his or her belief if his or her life, or a relative's life, is in danger. The concept of *taqiyya* has a special significance for the Shi'a. The members of the second largest branch of Islam were time and again prosecuted as heretics. The practice of *taqiyya* is derived from verse 106 of the 16th Sura of the Quran, which says that God remits the punishment for those who denied him under force. Consequently, *taqiyya* in an Islamic understanding is not a matter of *commandment* of deception, but merely a guarantee of impunity in the special case of denying belief.[81]

Therefore, it is a clear misinterpretation to accuse Muslims of a special inclination for deception within their environment, or even to define it as a religious practice. Interestingly enough, Muslims are not the first religious minority who are being accused of this kind of deception. In pertinent anti-Semitic pamphlets of the nineteenth century this supposed "Jewish attribute" is a reoccurring motif.[82]

A prominent voice often quoted and referred to on PI that reproaches Muslims for their alleged deception is the German publicist and Holocaust survivor Ralph Giordano. In May 2008 he delivered the opening speech at a "Critical Islam Conference" in Cologne and made his address, entitled, "Not the migration, *the Islam* is the problem," available in advance to PI. Giordano says about *taqiyya*:

> It is the permission sanctioned by the Quran in the fight against the "unbelievers" to deceive, to dissimulate and to lie. In clear text, however, a system to think different than to talk and to talk different than to think, a rich ground for lip services. And there are plenty of those.[83]

For followers of PI, this "intellectual input" from a man like Giordano, who because of his fate of persecution during the Nazi era enjoys a kind of moral authority in his public appearances, must not be underestimated. In particular, the reference to Giordano enables hatred toward a minority to be presented as an opinion from the center of society, free from any suspicion of racism or right-wing extremism.

The reproach of deception is so infamous because it is impossible for its victims to rebut the claims. Enemies of Islam can easily interpret any denial as further deception, and every deviation from – according to their perception – typical "Islamic" behavior will be interpreted as cunning for the implementation of secret interests. When the magazine *Der Spiegel* reported on a Christmas message by 138 high-ranking Islamic scholars to the Christians in the world on December 24, 2007, this gesture was labeled on PI as "a Trojan horse" in the article "A Muslim greeting to Christianity." The author of the main article as well as the commentators didn't leave the slightest doubt about the "fraudulent" character of the greeting message of the Muslim scholars. A user by the name of "FreeSpeach" summed it up in the following way: "If it keeps the little door to deception open, it is a deception. That's how it is with Islam." A user with the name "pro-Semite" wrote:

> If it helps to prevail Allah and his big pedophilic prophet[84] than it is permitted to lie, deceit, steal, murder, perjure and even to rape the own mother-in-law. For the sake of Allah EVERYTHING is permitted to the truly believer towards the Kuffar [non-believers].[85]

This quote illustrates the inciting effect that comes out of the comments on PI. It seems that the disputants try to overstep each other in their postings in terms of both radicalism and verbal slander against Muslims.

In a "personal adventure report" entitled "Land Seizure," a PI author describes the observation he made in a Berlin department store during lunchtime where several women with a headscarf lingered:

> Systematic counting reveals the following record: based on ten minutes in a busy place 14 headscarf wearing women are sighted. Out of the prayer time. During the time of afternoon prayer there are ten headscarfed women per ten minutes at the same place. Means what? Means: good 70 per cent of the Berlin female Mohammedans, who can be recognized as such, do not pray. Those pietistic hypocrites! We knew since long ago that Islam is by far the most bigoted religion but that this mob doesn't even stick to its own "laws," that's outrageous! Seen from this angle the continuous screams for more and more and larger and bigger mosques appear in a totally different light. For them it's not about "being devout" or the exercise of their "religion." It's about land seizure, about conquest, about occupation of public space, about more and more special rights and more and more special treatment. Special bathing hours, Burqini, separate kindergartens and schools have little to do with religion, instead all the more with politics, enforcement of special interests and the gain of power.[86]

Such web postings reveal the delusional forms of the perception of Muslims assumed by radical Islam-hostile circles. It is interesting to note that the religion here is interpreted only as a means to an end – an end to obtain an overly secular aim, namely political power.

In direct correlation with the reproach of deception is the vocabulary used on Islam-hostile websites. On these sites, one can find many Arabic terms – like *taqiyya* and *Kuffar* – suggesting an ostensive knowledge about Islam, thus giving the impression that the presented opinions about Muslims are based on a deep study of their religion. Other terms and slogans like "Islam is peace" or the label "cultural enrichment" reveal the opposite "true" character of Islam and Muslims through the ironic way in which they are used. A popular neologism is the term *DiaLüg* (a neologism of "dialogue" and "lie") that tries to show that any effort of dialogue with Muslims is affected by their deceitful behavior.

The self-appointed Critics of Islam do not need to provide evidence for their allegations because deception and deceit are in their eyes core characteristics of Islam and thus by all Muslims and people who are identified as such. It is therefore not surprising that one can also find on PI in the category "Taqiyya" an article about the American President Barack Obama entitled, "The 50 best lies of Obama." He is "unmasked" as a former Muslim who only converted for the sake of appearance and who is just complying with his disposition by lying (this imputation was indeed also to be found in the American as well as German established media).[87]

Anti-Muslim racism

PI is not a xenophobic weblog in the classical sense. The contributors to the website emphasize on every occasion that they do not reject all foreigners and migrants in general, but only a certain group, namely "the Muslims." In the comments to an article by Hans-Ulrich Jörges in the magazine *Stern*, entitled "The buried bomb," which describes a demographic horror scenario of a foreign domination by migrants, one user writes: "The migrants are not the problem. The Muslim migrants are the problem."[88]

The hatred of the Islam-hostile Internet scene is directed against Muslims as a whole. Accordingly, numerous commentators on PI rejected the headline "Islamists want to poison groundwater" in favor of it being called, "Muslims want to poison the groundwater" and added as a comment to the author, "Please pay attention to that next time, even if everybody knows what is meant!"[89]

Beside the perception of Islam as a homogeneous collective, usage of the category Muslim in an ethnic sense can be observed on Islam-hostile websites. This becomes evident when people are identified as Muslims only because of their name or appearance, or when all of the characteristics and actions attributed to them are derived from Islam. Hence one can indeed speak about an anti-Muslim racism cultivated by Islam-hostile websites like PI as the following example – one of many – shows:

> Absolutely no sense of tact, all those Muslims (vulg.) . . . If one notices . . . how unpopular and unwelcome one is here as a Muslim (vulg.), actually one should go to hell voluntarily. But ignorance simply belongs to the many *innate*, unpleasant attributes that the Muslims have.[90]

Muslims are generally credited with acting disloyally toward the German state and society and therefore are not able to be "full-value" Germans. The politician Cem Özdemir, for instance, is referred to as "wolf in sheep's clothing" and a "Muslim hypocrite and liar" in the commentary forums of PI: "All politicians of Turkish origin here in Germany admittedly have the German citizenship, but they represent solely Turkish-Muslim interests. They all only have the Turkization of Germany in mind."[91] As this example shows the attribution as Muslim is often used synonymously with ethnic labels like Turk or Arab. At the same time, it is openly stated that German citizenship does not even remotely turn Cem Özdemir into a German in the eyes of the PI users. Thereby the commentators resort to biological allusions, too: "For me the guy is a Turk with German passport. A cow that is born in a horse barn remains a cow."

The concept of the Muslim enemy mixes with classical right-wing extremist stereotypes on Islam-hostile web pages. One of the most popular issues is, for instance, so-called migrant violence. In common with other classical right-wing extremist explanatory models is the new focus on "criminal Muslims." The explanation for this supposed phenomenon is located within Islamic culture and thereby becomes the very nature of its people.

As soon as someone speaks critically about the content and comments on the Islam-hostile websites, that person is "unmasked" as a Muslim in hiding. An example of this is a report about a school principal in the German town Düsseldorf who wanted to forbid schoolgirls to wear a headscarf at his school. When one panelist on PI uttered doubt about the compatibility of this approach with Basic Law (the German constitution), he received the following response, which shows that for PI users a Muslim identity is tantamount with an alien non-German ethnicity: "Do not always refer to OUR Basic Law. That was made by Germans for Germans. We couldn't know how much our country will please you so that you invade here in hordes to then rub our nose in it!"[92]

The discursive denial of an affiliation of Muslims to the German majority society appears in different ways. For example, the day of the "open house of the mosques," which has been occurring on October 3 for years, was furiously criticized in an editorial piece on PI. Under the title "Day of the open house of the mosques – why it is deception," the choice of the date was attacked as a pretension:

> October 3rd is the GERMAN UNIFICATION DAY on which the reunification of the divided Germany was implemented in 1990. If this day is deliberately and calculated declared to the "day of the open house of the mosques" by Muslims then obtrusively and without any scruples possession is taken of one of the most important German identity forming and testifying dates . . . There is no German Unification with Islam as the "day of the open house of the mosques" fraudulently wants to suggest.[93]

The article extensively discusses why Islam is a philistine religion. Accompanied by rhetorical questions like "where do we meet Islamic students who study Bach or Beethoven at our conservatoires?" or "When could you ever eavesdrop on an Islamic virtuoso pianist as they interpreted Schumann?" it is proposed that there are no Muslims capable of performing such mental efforts. The conclusion reads as follows: "Can it be that the field that we typify as culture quasi isn't existent in Islam?"[94]

Interestingly, both perceptions about Islam and Muslims – the cultural inferiority and the overpowering threat – exist in parallel. The slander of Muslims as "Mohammedan" (*Mohammedaner*), "wog" (*Kanackenpack*), the pejorative, "the ones with raised butts in prayer" (*Hinternhochbeter*), and *Muselpack* (vulg.), arises from contempt for the collective. At the same time, those emotions are superimposed upon a diffused fear that imagines Muslims as an influential and dominant power.

The motifs of Germans and Europeans as victims of their Muslim minorities

In an attempt to prove every day anew the intended destruction of Western societies by Muslims, the website's producers resort to an easy tactic: so-called "good noses" scour the virtual world for occurrences that painstakingly document wrongdoings of Muslims against German society. For this purpose, reports from the regional press or police reports are evaluated. After introducing these events through the editorial postings the comment forums are opened, which constitute the actual heart of the website.

The forums play a significant role in the self-dramatization of PI as a mouthpiece of *vox populi*. Under the cover of anonymity, contributors can unload exuberant aggression. A common motif here is the alleged "anti-Germanism" among Muslims. For instance the article "Make yourselves scarce, this is our town" quotes from a brochure of a police union with the following conclusion:

> [The German town] Duisburg-Marxloh that is presented to us gladly as a shelter of felicity of the cooperation of the cultures is a place of horror for German police officers and German natives. They are being insulted, molested, assaulted and injured, with open season declared on them by ignorant politicians and narrow-minded do-gooders.[95]

In the comment sections, this motif is also reflected by a recurrent motive, as demonstrated in the post of a user with the name The Frank (*der Franke*):

> If one had the financial means, one would have to establish offices in the primary affected regions/towns as contact points for citizens that were "allowed" to experience racism against Germans. As a sort of "White Ring" for German victims of Muslim racism.[96]

This self-dramatization of the majority society as victims of a minority is almost consistently linked to a demographic horror scenario and is inherently part of Islam-hostile discourse.

On the basis of absurd projections, the classical extreme right-wing motif of "immigration as 'Final Solution' of the autochthonous population" is projected on Muslims and labeled, as so-called birth-Jihad (where Jihad in this context is understood as religiously motivated war).

This discourse of birth-Jihad reaches out to the established media. Thus the highest-ranking representative of the Order of Saint Benedict, Abtprimas

Notker Wolf, is quoted in an interview with the national newspaper *Die Welt*: “The question, if church bells are allowed to toll will entirely resolve itself at the latest in 20 years because the Islam will bore its way so much at our place alone through the high birth rate.”[97]

The Italian journalist, Oriana Fallaci, popularized the thesis of a “demographic fight” among others. Her book *The Rage and the Pride*, written shortly after the 9/11 attacks, was promoted far beyond Italy (where it sold a million copies) and became a bestseller. In it she complains about childlessness in Europe and states that Muslims “on the other hand breed too much [“like rats” in the German translation] . . . At least half of the Moslem women you see in our streets are pregnant or surrounded by streams of children.”[98] With her use of the image of Muslims as rats, Fallaci references an image used by the National Socialists as propaganda in the film *The Eternal Jew*. She also transfers other anti-Jewish stereotypes onto Muslims, for instance that of the vindictive God from the Old Testament: The “cursed sons of Allah,” as she disparagingly calls Muslims in the German translation of her book, are “followers of a God who preaches an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.”[99]

After this and her next book *The Force of Reason*, which also agitates against Muslims, Fallaci – who was once on the political left – became a star in Islam-hostile circles. The right-wing populist Geert Wilders said in a speech in Rome on February 19, 2009: “As you perhaps know, Oriana Fallaci is one of my heroes. She definitely was one of the greatest examples of bravery and honesty. Her brilliant books ‘The Rage and the Pride’ and ‘The Force of Reason’ are my guidelines that inspire me day after day.”[100]

In Islam-hostile circles, the thought of an imminent domination by Muslims together with a simultaneous submission of the native population to Muslims transforms the formula “imminent danger” into forceful emotions. Radical measures and violent fantasies toward Muslims are articulated under the pretext of not wanting to submit to this supposed fate. At the same time, racism is projected onto Muslims, justified by their alleged anti-German sentiments. Through this perception of the environment, the defensive attitude toward Muslims appears as a mandatory consequence. It amounts to an entire exclusion of this minority. On PI, at every possible occasion, there are debates about the measures to achieve this exclusion of Muslims. Not infrequently, the expulsion of all Muslims from Europe is played through intellectually as a desirable vision of the future:

> The sheet anchor would be to get Europe clean of Islam and Muslims. This is the only chance for our life. Otherwise everything will be lost soon, everything that we built, will be devoured by Muslims. A smart beginning would be not to pay social benefits to them any more and to cut back the religious liberty for Islam in a way that they won’t want to stay here any more.[101]

Such radical voices are by no means rare opinions: “All Mohammedans back to the desert, it doesn’t matter whether they were born there or not. We can only protect ourselves from them by letting them emigrate.”[102]

Others back a “voluntary migration” of Muslims from Europe: “That the Mohammedans feel unwelcome is a first step. Now they only must draw the conclusions from that and go back to Southland.”[103] To tighten the experience of rejection for Muslims, particular tips are exchanged on PI: “I saw in a bar how a host resolved that in a very simple way. He just didn’t serve them. They could call as much as they wanted, they just wouldn’t be served. After short of an hour they went away and never came back again any more.”[104]

Instructions for the discrimination of Muslims are often accompanied by violent fantasies, threats, and the battle cry that something must be done before it is too late. Thus, ultimately an “offender-victim-reversion” takes place when the majority population first discursively creates a victimhood from which it exercises self-defense against a minority.

Résumé

Islam-hostile websites like the weblog Politically Incorrect should not be downplayed as a marginal phenomenon, both because of their high access numbers and their function as platforms to network and exchange narratives. After various “outings” of readers and guest authors (among them a Zurich local politician of the Swiss People’s Party and a Protestant pastor) it is certain that the users of such Internet offerings are not necessarily social outsiders. They merely radicalize a discourse that has found its place in the center of the society (this is especially true for the concept of a demographic threat). The self-dramatization of the Islam-hostile scene as Critics of Islam represents an attempt to give a rational varnish to the hatred against a whole collective. The conspiracy fantasy of silent Islamization, meaning the secretly conducted subversion of Western societies by Muslims, bears a structural resemblance to anti-Semitic motifs.

There are no indicators whether the articulated hate against Muslims and Islam on PI and similar blogs correlates with hostile or even aggressive behavior in the everyday life of the users. The effects of anti-Muslim weblogs on their readers, whether they incite hate, discrimination, and aggression on the level of acting, remain unknown. Since acts of hate against Muslims are scarcely documented in most European countries, developments in this field seem difficult to monitor at this stage.[105]

Demonstrably, weblogs like PI create a forum to encourage and stimulate users in their mutual animosity. Clear concepts of an enemy are associated with the demonization of any criticism of one’s own position. As soon as an article on the subject of Islam appears in one of the online versions of newspapers, PI contributors arrange to collectively flood the forums of the paper with commentaries and thereby influence the range of readers’ opinions in their favor. In doing so they introduce the concept of the enemy into the discourse about Islam and try to dominate it in the long run – at least in the context of the World Wide Web.

Conclusion

Even some conservative politicians declare that Muslims are a part of Germany and Europe; that they belong and contribute to the country.[106] Nevertheless, with the example of the blog Political Incorrect we have shown that a discourse on the Islamization of Europe has indeed been established. This discourse is most eminent in the World Wide Web but its motifs are also present in "serious" media, sometimes without being questioned. One of the main lines of the narratives of the doom of Christian civilization (*Untergang des Abendlandes*) is that the "majority population," the "real Germans," are threatened to disappear. Right-wing populists use this narrative to claim to represent the "majority" and the people while the governing political parties are merely corrupt and elitist and, in this context, selling out the country to the enemy.

This idea is based on the perception of Muslims as a homogenous group all working together following a long-term conspiracy to conquer Western European countries. This threat of a silent Islamization became an element of the mainstream debate on Islam. The cover of the magazine *Der Spiegel* on March 26, 2007, shows the Brandenburg Gate – a German national symbol – surmounted by the Islamic crescent moon, thus symbolizing a supposed dominance of Islam over Germany. The issue bears the title "Mekka Germany: The silent Islamization." Equating Germany with Mecca refers to the country as an alleged place of pilgrimage and hitherto of immigration of Muslims in a large number. This factor is connected to the motif of foreign domination in the debates about immigration and foreigners in the 1990s. The cover is presented as a night scene thus alluding to the hidden and clandestine character of Islamic infiltration and serves as an invitation for conspiracy theories.

In the main strands of the dominant discourse, even in academic circles, all people with roots in a majority Muslim country are imagined as Muslims. Often, a distinction is being constructed between the "good Muslim" who is integrated and professes the moral values of the constitution, and the "bad Muslim" who is suspected of radicalism. Opposed to this, in anti-Islamic blogs, those politicians, researchers, and journalists who are criticized for supporting Muslim minority rights are marked as collaborators and covert converts, incriminated as parts of the conspiracy, and as agents of Islamization. The notion of a Muslim community behind the conspiracy does not only equate origin, culture, and community, it furthermore imputes a commonality of all Muslims in matters of political and religious opinion and a common political agenda. In this sense, this definition of Muslim is homogenizing because it disregards diversities among Muslims. On PI and in the argumentation of anti-Islamic populist movements, one hardly finds examples of good Muslims. Here, positive references to Muslims are made only in cases where they have publicly dissociated from Islam, because, following this perspective, a good Muslim can only be someone who has renounced the faith.

The arguments of anti-Islamic narratives bear a resemblance to those of Muslim extremists. Both are premised on the same essentialization of *their* concepts of Islam and on the negation and de-legitimization of all other interpretations and forms of religious practice.[107] Heiner Bielefeldt refers to this mechanism as the "Semantics of the actual Islam":

> The fact that many people live in Germany and in other European states who conceive themselves as Muslims and at the same time confess themselves to the principles of the free and democratic constitution and who realize this confession in their daily life with total naturalness, all this is pushed out of the centre of awareness by the dominant concept of the "actual" Islam as anti-liberal. This semantics of the "actual" (*Semantik des Eigentlichen*) in the discourse on Islam is a major drawback for the differentiating perception of Islam and of Muslims.[108]

In contrast to the conception of a backward and pre-modern Islam, the European identity is imagined as essentially enlightened and civilized. As we have shown, this notion of "the West" as a *community of values* opposed to Muslim minorities in the respective European countries and to the "Muslim world" as a whole serves as a connecting factor for different right-wing populist movements on the trans-national level.

The Europeanization of the concept of the Muslim enemy can be observed in personal contacts, joint meetings, and the exchange of leading arguments, images, slogans, and campaigns. In the anti-Islamic narrative, the central role of Europe and "the West" is constructed as a community of values to which Islam is incompatible. Here, the anti-Islamic narrative affects the mainstream discourse.

Notes

All German quotations have been translated from the original by the authors.

1 We want to express our special thanks to Sigrid Luchtenberg and Yasemin Karakasoğlu who contributed to previous versions of the article though it changed its shape considerably. Together with Frank Peter they provided the main basis for this paper in the German section of the report "Securitization and religious divides in Europe."

2 See T. Gerholm and Y.G. Lithman, *The New Islamic Presence in Western Europe*, London: Mansell, 1988; J. Nielsen, *Muslims in Western Europe*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992; G. Nonnemann, T. Nieblock, and B. Szajkowski, *Muslim Communities in the New Europe*, Berkshire: Ithaca Press, 1996; J. Malik, "From the Margin to the Centre: Muslims in Europe," Introduction in J. Malik (ed.) *Muslims in Europe. From the Margin to the*

Centre, Münster: LIT-Verlag, 2004, pp. 1–18; and N.C. Tiesler, *Muslime in Europa. Religion und Identitätspolitiken unter veränderten gesellschaftlichen Verhältnissen,* Münster: LIT-Verlag, 2006.

3 S. Allievi and M. van Bruinessen (2005) Paper presented at the workshop "Public debates about Islam in Europe: how and why 'immigrants' became 'Muslims,'" Seventh Mediterranean Social and Political Research Meeting, Florence and Montecatini Terme, March 22–26, 2006, organized by the Mediterranean Program of the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies at the European University Institute; S. Allievi, "How and Why 'Immigrants' became 'Muslims,'" in *ISIM Review*, 18(6), 2006, 18; R. Spielhaus, "Religion and Identity. How Germany's Foreigners Have Become Muslims," in *Internationale Politik Transatlantic Edition*, 8(2), 2006, 17–23; and G. Yurdakul, *From Guest Workers into Muslims: The Transformation of Turkish Immigrant Associations in Germany*, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2009.

4 W.D. Bukow, "Islam – ein bildungspolitisches Thema," in W.D. Bukow and E. Yildiz (eds.) *Islam und Bildung*, Opladen: Leske & Budrich, 2003, pp. 59–61. (For more discussion on this topic see pp. 57–80.)

5 See O. Roy, *Globalized Islam: The Search for a New Ummah*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2004, pp. 258–267.

6 E. Özyürek, "Convert Alert: German Muslims and Turkish Christians as Threats to Security in the New Europe," in *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* 51(1), 2000, 108. (For more information see pp. 91–116.)

7 A. Appadurai, *Fear of Small Numbers. An Essay on the Geography of Anger*, Durham: Duke University Press, 2006, p. 59.

8 Appadurai, *Fear,* pp. 41–42.

9 Özyürek, "Convert Alert," p. 95.

10 Runnymede Trust, *Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All*, London: Runnymede Trust, 1997; and C. Allen and J. Nielsen, *Summary Report on Islamophobia in the EU after 11 September 2001*, Vienna: European Union Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, 2002.

11 M. Maussen, "The Netherlands: Anti-Muslim Sentiments and Mobilization in the Netherlands. Discourse, Politics and Violence," in J. Cesari (ed.) *Securitization and Religious Divides in Europe*, Paris: Submission to the Changing Landscape of Citizenship and Security 6th PCRD of European Commission, 2006, p. 100. (For additional reading see pp. 100–142.)

12 Cesari, *Securitization.*

13 Malik, "From the Margin," p. 12.

14 P. Weller, A. Feldmann, and K. Purdam, "Muslims and Religious Discrimination in England and Wales," in Malik (ed.) *Muslims in Europe*, pp. 115–144; and C. Allen, "Endemically European or a European Epidemic? Islamophobia in a Post 9/11 'Europe,'" in R. Geaves, T. Gabriel, Y. Haddad, and J.I. Smith (eds.) *Islam and the West Post 9/11*, Burlington: Ashgate, 2004.

15 Jocelyne Cesari dedicated a whole chapter in *When Islam and Democracy Meet* to this issue, which she introduces remarking that the narrative of a conflict between Islam and the West forces "all Muslims from the most secular to the most devout" to examine their beliefs and think about what it means to be Muslim. See J. Cesari, *When Islam and Democracy Meet: Muslims in Europe and the United States*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

16 A. Häusler (ed.) *Rechtspopulismus als "Bürgerbewegung" Kampagnen gegen Islam und Moscheebau und kommunale Gegenstrategien*, Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2008.

17 C. Leggewie, "Auf dem Weg zum Euro-Islam. Moscheen und Muslime in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland," in E.L. Winnacker (ed.) *Gedanken zur Zukunft 6*, Bad Homborg: Herbert Quandt-Stiftung, 2002. See also B.

Beinhauer-Köhler and C. Leggewie, *Moscheen in Deutschland: Religiöse Heimat und gesellschaftliche Herausforderung*, Munich: C.H. Beck, 2009.

18 H. Häußermann, "Umkämpfte Symbole. Moscheen in der christlichen Stadt. Ein Einwurf," in A. Färber and R. Spielhaus, *Islamisches Gemeindeleben*, Berlin: Beauftragter des Berliner Senats für Integration und Migration, 2006, pp. 85–87.

19 W. Schiffauer, "Enemies Within the Gates: The Debate about the Citizenship of Muslims in Germany," in T. Modood, A. Triandafyllidou, and R. Zapata-Barrero (eds.) *Multiculturalism, Muslims and Citizenship: A European Approach*, London: Routledge, 2006, pp. 94–116.

20 L. Fekete, *A Suitable Enemy: Racism, Migration and Islamophobia in Europe*, London/New York: Pluto Press, 2009, pp. 102–131.

21 Schiffauer, "Enemies," p. 94.

22 J. Eckert (ed.) *The Social Life of Anti-terrorism Laws: The War on Terror and the Classifications of the "Dangerous Other,"* Bielefeld: Transcript, 2008, p. 15.

23 S. Schiffer, *Die Darstellung des Islams in der Presse. Sprache, Bilder, Suggestionen. Eine Auswahl von Techniken und Beispielen*, Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, 2005; and K. Hafez and C. Richter, "Das Islambild von ARD und ZDF," in *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte 26–27*, 2007, pp. 40–46.

24 Public service broadcasters in particular have reacted to this criticism on the coverage of Muslims in Germany for instance by including reports on the everyday life of Muslims in the country and a soap opera on a German-Turkish family. Two public television stations complemented the Christian "Word for the Sunday," one of the oldest German TV programs, with Islamic counterparts aired on the Internet: "Forum am Freitag" and "Islamisches Wort." Other initiatives are concentrated on training and recruiting journalists with a Muslim background in order to develop diverse editorial teams. See Hafez and Richter, "Das Islambild."

25 Schiffer, *Die Darstellung*.

26 From 1997 to 2001 Raddatz wrote articles for the German right-wing weekly journal *Junge Freiheit* and published several books through a German publisher who gives a platform to right-wing authors. See P. Widmann, "Der Feind kommt aus dem Morgenland. Rechtspopulistische 'Islamkritiker' um den Publizisten Hans-Peter Raddatz suchen die Opfergemeinschaft mit Juden," in W. Benz (ed.) *Jahrbuch für Antisemitismusforschung*, Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2008, 50. (For an in-depth discussion see pp. 45–68.)

27 Widmann, "Der Feind," p. 64.

28 *Ibid.;* see also A. Königseder, "Feindbild Islam," in Benz (ed.) *Jahrbuch für Antisemitismusforschung*, pp. 17–44.

29 Hafez and Richter, "Das Islambild."

30 W. Heitmeyer and J. Mansel, "Gesellschaftliche Entwicklung und Gruppenbezogene Menschenfeindlichkeit. Unübersichtliche Perspektiven," in W. Heitmeyer (ed.) *Deutsche Zustände. Folge 6*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 2008, pp. 13–35.

31 J. Leibold and S. Kühnel, "Islamophobie in der deutschen Bevölkerung. Ein neues Phänomen oder nur ein neuer Name?" in M. Wohlrab-Sahr and L. Teczan (eds.), *Konfliktfeld Islam in Europa*, Munich: Nomos-Verlag, 2007, pp. 135–154.

32 J. Leibold and S. Kühnel, "Islamophobie. Sensible Aufmerksamkeit für spannungsreiche Anzeichen," in W. Heitmeyer (ed.) *Deutsche Zustände*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 2003, p. 101. (For a further discussion see pp. 100–119).

33 In an additional step Leibold und Kühnel have analyzed the effects of "de-differentiating views" on the degree of Islamophobia among the general popula-

tion, departing from the theory that the "in-group" is perceived as distinctively more heterogeneous than the "out-group," the foreign group, which, by contrast, is perceived as a self contained entity. Leibold and Kühnel have been able to show that respondents who know some nuances about Islam utter significantly less general allegations toward Muslims than persons who state they are un- or insufficiently informed about Islam. See J. Leibold and S. Kühnel, "Islamophobie. Differenzierung tut Not," in Heitmeyer, (ed.) *Deutsche Zustände*, pp. 135–155.

34 I. Attia, "Kulturrassismus und Gesellschaftskritik," in *Orient- und Islambilder. Interdisziplinäre Beiträge zu Orientalismus und antimuslimischem Rassismus*, Münster: UNRAST-Verlag, 2007, pp. 5–28; and K. Hafez, "Öffentlichkeitsbilder des Islam. Kultur- und rassismustheoretische Grundlagen ihrer politikwissenschaftlichen Erforschung," in A. Disselnkötter, S. Jäger, H. Kellershohn, and S. Slobodzian (eds.) *Evidenzen im Fluß. Demokratieverluste in Deutschland*, Duisburg: Diss, 1997, pp. 188–204.

35 E. Balibar, "Gibt es einen 'neuen Rassismus?'" in *Das Argument,* 175, 1989, 373. (For more discussion see pp. 369–380.)

36 See A. Häusler (ed.) *Rechtspopulismus als "Bürgerbewegung." Kampagnen gegen Islam und Moscheebau und kommunale Gegenstrategien*, Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2008; and K. Bozay, "Kulturkampf von rechts – Das Dilemma der Kölner Moscheedebatte," in Häusler (ed.) *Rechtspopulismus*.

37 See Königseder, "Feindbild Islam"; and Widmann, "Der Feind."

38 O. Geden, "Die Renaissance des Rechtspopulismus in Westeuropa," *Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft,* 2, 2009, p. 95. (For a further discussion see pp. 92–107.)

39 Geden, *Die Renaissance*, p. 103.

40 In Germany *Pro NRW* addressed a petition, which is largely based on this bill, to the *Landtag* of North Rhine-Westphalia, the legislative assembly of the German state.

41 Geden, "Die Renaissance," pp. 103–104.

42 Häusler (ed.) *Rechtspopulismus*, p. 11.

43 Attia, "Kulturrassismus," p. 11.

44 See http://gruene-pest.net (German Language) (accessed May 16, 2009).

45 See http://www.stop-islam.de/ (German Language) (accessed May 16, 2009).

46 See http://www.akte-islam.de/ (German Language) (accessed May 16, 2009).

47 See http://pi-news.net/chc_2/stats/index.php (accessed March 18, 2009).

48 See the interview with Stefan Herre: "Der Selbständige" (June 2007). Online. Available HTTP http://www.pi-news.net/wp/uploads/2007/09/ds_magazin_10_07.pdf. (All quotations have been translated from the German original by the authors.)

49 In German the word *Gutmenschentum* is used in an ironical way to discredit political opponents as naïve.

50 See http://www.pi-news.net/leitlinien/ (German Language) (accessed March 18, 2009).

51 *Ibid.*

52 *Ibid.*

53 *Ibid.*

54 See interview at http://www.kath.net/detail.php?id=17898 (accessed March 18, 2009).

55 Iman Attia delineates the entanglement of anti-Muslim and anti-Semitic discourse strands and the strategies of "over identification" and "discourse of reverse concernment" (*Betroffenheitsdiskurs*). As she shows, anti-Muslim discourse is presented as self-defense while it builds on the anti-Semitic discourse both in a contrasting and a confirmative way. I. Attia, *Die "westliche Kultur"*

und ihr Anderes. Zur Dekonstruktion von Orientalismus und antimuslimischem Rassismus, Bielefeld: Transcript, 2009, pp. 87–94.

56 See http://www.ipahb.de (German Language) (accessed April 4, 2009).

57 This motto refers back to the peaceful revolution of 1989 and its motto "We are the people."

58 See the report of the Office for the Protection of the Constitution of the Federal State North Rhine-Westphalia (2007). Online. Available http://www.im.nrw.de/sch/doks/vs/aktuell.pdf. (accessed May 16, 2009).

59 For other examples on European networks of right-wing populist see Geden, "Die Renaissance," pp. 92–107; and Häusler (ed.) *Rechtspopulismus*, pp. 159–164.

60 Kölsch is the local beer in Cologne.

61 See http://www.pi-news.net/2008/09/wann-werden-sie-den-untergrund-verlassen/ (German Language) (accessed March 18, 2009).

62 *Ibid.*

63 See http://www.dhimmi.org/ (accessed March 15, 2009).

64 B. Yeor, *Eurabia. The Euro-Arab Axis*, Madison, NJ: Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007 (9th edition).

65 See http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?apage=1&cid=1215330916349&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull (accessed March 18, 2009).

66 *Ibid.*

67 *Ibid.*

68 H.M. Broder, *Hurra, wir kapitulieren. Von der Lust am Einknicken*, Munich: Pantheon Verlag, 2007.

69 The Federal Agency for Civic Education (*Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, bpb*) centers on promoting awareness for democracy and participation in politics and provides books targeting civic education at schools and other educational institutions at a reduced price.

70 In an interview with *The Boston Globe* on March 8, 2009 Wilders even proceeded: "Q: You've said that under Dutch law, the Koran should be banned. Were you being rhetorical, or did you mean it literally? – A: I meant it. But you have to know the Dutch context for that. In the '70s, *Mein Kampf* was banned, and the left was so pleased. I am now proposing a ban on a book *that is even worse than* Mein Kampf. And I'm not the first one – Winston Churchill compared *Mein Kampf* to the Koran in the 1950s." Online. Available HTTP http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/editorial_opinion/oped/articles/2009/03/0/islam_and_freedom_of_speech/?page=3 (accessed March 17, 2009).

71 See F. Aykut, "Wie 'Fitna' auf Muslime wirkt" [English: What affect does *Fitna* have on Muslims], *Der Spiegel* (March 29, 2008). Online. Available HTTP http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/0,1518,544117,00.html (accessed March 18, 2009).

72 The film can be seen online at http://www.liveleak.com/view?i=216_1207467783 (accessed March 18, 2009).

73 The speech was published on many Islam-hostile websites, for example see http://www.internationalfreepresssociety.org/2009/02/the-house-of-lords-speech-what-wilders%E2%80%99-would-have-said-if-the-uk-allowed-free-speech/ (accessed March 17, 2009).

74 See http://gatesofvienna.blogspot.com/2009/02/geert-wilders-speech-in-rome.html (accessed March 17, 2009). Geert Wilders has linked the speech from his homepage, thus the text is authorized.

75 See Spencer's article "Geert Wilders welcomed in Washington, Shows 'Fitna' at the Capitol." Available at http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?id=30918 (accessed March 23, 2009). According to *Jihad Watch* violence is inherent to Islam. Responding to the objection concerning the aggression of the

Crusades, *Jihad Watch* states: "While religious violence contradicts the fundamentals of Christianity, religious violence is written into Islam's DNA." Since only living creatures have a genetic code, this sentence can be interpreted to the effect that Islam is used in a metonymical way for Muslims who as followers of this religion have an inborn affinity to violence. See http://www.jihadwatch.org/islam101/ (accessed March 23, 2009).

76 After the first run of the movie *Fitna* in March 2008 a lawsuit against Wilders, because of incitement of the people, was first rejected in April by court in The Hague.

77 Bat Yeor published on February 16 an apologia titled "Geert Wilders and the Fight for Europe." See http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=ZGVhOWZl Njk4 N2E0NDk1NDgwYWRhNzlhMTdmNWZlNjI (accessed March 17, 2009).

78 See, for example, the appeal, "Support Geert Wilders!" on the American website *Jihad Watch* at http://www.jihadwatch.org/archives/024517.php (accessed March 17, 2009). Politically Incorrect has also put up the corresponding link to Wilders' homepage.

79 See http://www.radionetherlands.nl/news/zijlijn/6196336-Geert-Wilders-Freedom (English Language) (accessed March 23, 2009).

80 See http://www.dutchnews.nl/news/archives/2009/03/wilders_i_want_to_be_prime_min.php (English Language) (accessed March 23, 2009).

81 R. Strothmann-Moktar Djebli, "Takiyya," in C. Glasse, *New Encyclopedia of Islam*, new edition, Lanham, MD: Alta Mira Press, 2003, p. 134. (For the complete discussion please see pp. 134–136.)

82 See A. Rohling, *Der Talmudjude. Zur Beherzigung für Juden und Christen aller Stände, Münster 1877*, Charleston: BookSurge, 2000. In the chapter "Deception" (*Der Betrug*) it says: "The Talmud says: 'You may betray a Goi [non-Jew] and take usury from him; but if you sell something to your neighbor (that is to say a Jew) or buy from him, so you should not betray your brother,'" (pp. 63–64). Rohling was convicted in several court proceedings of falsification of quotes from the Talmud.

83 See http://www.pi-news.net/2008/05/nicht-die-migration-der-islam-ist-das-problem/ (German Language) (accessed March 18, 2009).

84 The denigration of the Prophet Muhammad as "pedophile" is a popular topic on Islam-hostile websites. It was introduced in a broader discourse through the scandal by the statements of the Austrian *FPÖ* politician Susanne Winter in January 2008, who called Muhammed a "child abuser." See http://diepresse.com/home/politik/innenpolitik/355303/index.do (German Language) (accessed March 18, 2009).

85 See http://www.pi-news.net/2007/12/ein-muslimischer-gruss-an-die-christenheit/ (German Language) (accessed March 18, 2009).

86 See http://www.pi-news.net/2009/03/landnahme/ (German Language) (accessed March 18, 2009).

87 See http://www.pi-news.net/2008/05/die-50-besten-obama-luegen/ (German Language) (accessed September 28, 2008). On May 5, 2008, the article "Barack Obama's Muslim Childhood" by Daniel Pipes, who argued similarly to Politically Incorrect, appeared in the newspaper *Dre Welt.*

88 See http://www.pi-news.net/2008/08/migration-desaster-in-zahlen/ (German Language) (accessed March 18, 2009).

89 See http://www.pi-news.net/2008/08/islamisten-wollen-grundwasser-vergiften/ (German Language) (accessed August 14, 2008).

90 See http://www.pi-news.net/2008/08/hausen-hier-sind-die-buerger/ (German Language) (accessed March 18, 2009).

91 See http://www.pi-news.net/2007/08/braucht-giordano-erziehung/ (German Language) (accessed March 18, 2009).

92 See http://www.pi-news.net/2008/09/duesseldorfer-schule-verbietet-kopftuch/ (German Language) (accessed March 18, 2009).

93 See http://www.pi-news.net/2008/09/tag-der-offenen-moschee-warum-es-betrug-ist/ (German Language) (accessed March 18, 2009).

94 *Ibid*.

95 See http://www.pi-news.net/2008/07/macht-dass-ihr-wegkommt-das-ist-unsere-stadt/ (German Language) (accessed March 18, 2009).

96 See http://www.pi-news.net/2008/08/gerechtigkeit-fuer-fanny-truchelut/ (German Language) (accessed March 19, 2009).

97 See http://www.welt.de/politik/article2462628/Gott-schickt-uns-den-Islam-als-Provokation.html (German Language) (accessed September 18, 2008).

98 O. Fallaci, *The Rage and the Pride*, New York: Rizzoli, 2001, pp. 137–138.

99 Fallaci, *The Rage*, p. 40.

100 See http://www.internationalfreepresssociety.org/2009/02/geert-wilders-speech-in-rome/ (English Language) (accessed March 17, 2009).

101 See http://www.pi-news.net/2008/09/taeter-migranten-opfer-scheissdeutsche/ (German Language) (accessed March 19, 2009).

102 See http://www.pi-news.net/2008/04/friede-freude-eierkuchen/ (German Language) (accessed March 19, 2009).

103 See http://www.pi-news.net/2008/08/hausen-hier-sind-die-buerger/ (German Language) (accessed March 19, 2009).

104 See http://www.pi-news.net/2008/08/gerechtigkeit-fuer-fanny-truchelut/ (German Language) (accessed March 19, 2009).

105 The 2006 EUMC report stresses that the extent and nature of discrimination against European Muslims remain under-documented and under-reported. The report therefore recommends that Member States improve the reporting of incidents and implement measures to counter discrimination and racism more effectively. See http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/products/publications_reports/pub_tr_islamophobia_en.htm/ (English Language) (accessed March 15, 2009).

106 The Federal minister for interior, Dr. Wolfgang Schäuble, started the process of formalized communication with Islamic organizations and other Muslim representatives with a speech to the German parliament (*Bundestag*) on September 28, 2006, stating that Islam is a part of Germany and Europe, a part of present and future. See W. Schäuble, “Erklärung durch die Bundesregierung. Deutsche Islamkonferenz für eine gemeinsame Zukunft,” in *Deutscher Bundestag*, Stenografischer Bericht: Plenarprotokoll, 16(54), September 28, 2006, pp. 5148–5151.

107 Attia, “Kulturrassismus,” p. 11.

108 H. Bielefeldt, *Das Islambild in Deutschland. Zum öffentlichen Umgang mit der Angst vor dem Islam*, Berlin: German Institute for Human Rights, 2007, p. 14.

10 Islamic radicalism in Europe

Farhad Khosrokhavar

Introduction

Islamic radicalism in Europe has had a longer history than in the US. This is particularly true in France, where Islamic radicalism first began to appear in the early 1990s. However, Islamist terrorism does not occur in Europe in a vacuum. European societies have a tradition of terrorism based on the extreme leftist ideology (such as the Red Brigades in Italy, Direct Action (*Action Directe*) in France, and the Red Army Group (*Fraktion Roter Armee*) in Germany) or nationalist-regionalist tenets (such as the Basque movement in Spain, the Corsican movement in France, and the former *Sin Fein* in Northern Ireland). The emergence of Islamist terrorism is a relatively new phenomenon in this part of the world. Still, some converts to this new Islamist ideology believe in a utopian role of Islam in the same fashion that the middle-class leftist youth idealized Marxism and Communism in the 1960s and 1970s. Now, since much of that leftist discourse has been exhausted in the eyes of most Europeans, Islamism appears to be taking its place.[1] In addition to appropriating some concepts from leftist ideology, Islamic radicalism borrows some features from extreme-right Western movements as well, protesting the loss of patriarchal values and the disappearance of stable family through the eclipse of women's traditional role as mothers and wives.

Muslim diasporas in Europe

Islamist terrorism has roots in three Muslim populations within Europe: a very small minority from the first generation of the Muslim diaspora, particularly in Spain and Italy; a small minority of their offspring who have taken up Jihadist ideas (although the majority have become well-adjusted European citizens in France, England, Holland, etc); and a minority of Muslim converts. In the 1960s and 1970s Europe's industrialization attracted many immigrant workers, some from Muslim countries. The descendants of this population, both second and third generations, often encounter many economic and cultural obstacles that block their integration within European countries. In Europe, radical Islam has two main heritages, one from Europe's colonial history such as in France or England, and the other from the more recent immigration of Muslims from the Muslim world such as is more prevalent in Germany or Spain. Each country has a specific history and culture of integration. Radicalization is related to both the local and regional history as well as to the national one.

The French model

In France, radical Islam stems from two places. The internal source is an "Islamist effect" of disaffected youth coming from the *banlieues* within France. The external source is mainly Algerian extremist networks, such as the Armed Islamic Group (*Groupe Islamique Armé*, GIA) directed by the military branch of the Islamic Salvation Front (*Front Islamique de Salut*, FIS). The first signs of Islamist terrorism appeared in the beginning of the 1990s, after the FIS victory in the parliamentary elections in Algeria and the military overthrow of the government.[2]

There was, and still is, an animosity between the GIA and the French government due to the support the latter gave to the Algerian army against the FIS. The GIA relied on a group of disaffected youth in the poor French suburbs for their efforts. Currently, approximately 1.5 million people of Algerian descent, around 700,000 from Morocco and 350,000 from Tunisia, live in France. Only a few of these people have been active in the GIA or other radical Islamic groups. Some terrorist networks were set up in France in the 1990s and enrolled young people from the poor suburbs, such as men like Khaled Kelkal,[3] or Muslim converts. Khaled Kelkal was a young man of Algerian descent who had lived in France since the age of five and took part in the terrorist attack in the Paris Metro in 1995 (and was eventually killed by the rural police the same year). His story is symptomatic of the malaise on the part of second-generation North Africans who feel stigmatized and rejected by French society.[4] This situation is especially dangerous since cells from the GIA were in touch with Al-Qaeda and functioned as its French connection.

There is also an "Islamist effect" in many French *banlieues* that predisposes part of the disaffected male youth towards the violent commitment for a sacred cause embodied in an anti-Western Islamic ideology.[5] Marked by the rancour of the formerly colonized and their children who now live in France and England, religious radicalism in these countries often has a tinge of post-colonial zeal. Recruits to radical Islam are mostly drawn from those young people who feel they belong neither to the country of their parents (North Africa in the French case) nor to the European nation in which they are rejected as just "Arabs." Sometimes this can lead to feelings of being hated and despised by the French and thus those young people consider themselves free to use violence to oppose this indignity.[6]

Islamism provides an opportunity for these disaffected youth to legitimize their feeling of rejection by channeling it into a sacred cause. In this way, these radical Islamists take their revenge on the society and at the same time, achieve salvation for their soul. They realize this two-fold goal by mobilizing under the banner of radical Islam: they fight against a society that has never accepted them and they fight for their religion against those they feel oppose it (the entire West). In their minds, this fight elevates their cause and provides them with a dignity that was denied them in their daily life before adhering to radical Islam. Through their engagement they gain salvation (they become martyrs) if they die, they accede to a new honor and dignity within their communities if they live, and they find meaning and sense for their lives which were previously meaningless.

Another factor that encourages this "Islamist effect" is that this population feels despised by society at large. Racism is strongly felt in general, but is particularly aggravated through the advent of the extreme Right, including Le Pen's group and other dissident parties.[7] These groups have encouraged restrictions imposed through the French institutionalization of *laïcité*, including most prominently the ban of Islamic signs in the public sphere. *Laïcité* holds that religious communities are the moral negation of true and genuine citizenship. There is a hatred (*haine*) or resentment on the part of the second- and third-generation youth of North African origin, which finds expression in two distinct attitudes, both of which can lead to radical attitudes. The first response is the rejection of "Frenchness." In this expression, Islam is used as an identity marker defining the individual as "un-French" or even "anti-French." Being "un-French" can be also achieved by espousing attitudes closer to another version of modernity, namely the so-called "Anglo-Saxon" one. In other words, they embrace a British or American way of life as an alternative to their French one. Many of the young people who travel (and sometimes stay) in the UK do so in order to have a "non-French" way of life, specifically as a reaction to the perceived French denial of their identity. "Americanized" or "Anglicized" attitudes are sometimes displayed in a provocative way in order to show a "non-French" identity. This rejection of French identity is supposed to deny the French public their symbolic supremacy.

When such cultural reactions against French society become radicalized through Islamist extremist networks, an ideology of terrorism can be born. Radical Islamist groups benefit from the predisposition of young people (overwhelmingly male) of North African origin who consider themselves stigmatized and marginalized by society. These young people feel that their greater society is against Islam in general and has reduced them to misery, and on an international scale chooses to defend Israel and support other anti-Islamic forces. If any network succeeds in getting in touch with these youth, they become more open to radicalization. The conjunction of identity problems, racism, and economic exclusion creates a fertile ground for radicalization and violence among a tiny minority of this disaffected youth.

Islamization brings a sense of existence to them and radicalization gives them a new dignity as warriors of a just cause against a corrupt and ruthless society. This generation of inhabitants, mostly of North African origin, living in poor unstructured suburbs, often in single-parent families, with a high rate of joblessness and illiteracy, and an absence of strong ties to family or community, can be easily manipulated.

Paradoxically the media are the major source of inspiration for this cause. The tragic spectacle of Palestinians dying under the attacks of the Israeli army and the indifference of public opinion to the fate of Chechen people and other Muslims in the world easily convinces them that the West in general is against Islam. The antagonistic attitude of some French political groups towards Muslims is easily generalized, and spreads through the images in the media to the entire Western world. A peremptory conclusion is drawn: the West is against Islam and true Muslims should fight against the West in order to recover their dignity and their honor.

The police crackdown and their infiltration of terrorist groups since the 1990s has, for the most part, brought a halt to terrorist action within French borders. Some Islamist terrorist groups relocated to the UK where the presence of a North African diaspora (around some 40,000 Algerians among them) helped for a while to build up their numbers. However, since the attacks of 9/11, the situation has changed as these groups are under much more police scrutiny.

Another factor contributing to radicalization is the feeling of being rejected as Muslims by the secular state and the secular society.[8] Islamization occurs in hyper-secular societies, which, unlike the US, have almost lost the feel of Christianity and all other religions. In such a society, most sorts of religious behavior are seen as suspicious. Therefore, Islam, in particular, is understood as a religion of fanaticism and the return to it by second- and third-generation immigrants is perceived as a threat to the *laïcité*.[9]

In the French case, Islamic radicalism is rooted in the disaffected youth of North African origin or the converts of the *banlieues*, although the networks are often of Algerian (and through a branch of GIA related to Al-Qaeda) and more generally North African origin.[10] This makes the French case a unique one. However, radical Islamic terrorism is more deeply rooted in the poor suburbs than in the cities, in France as it is in Germany. This is due in part to the influx of Muslims from outside who enter the country in order to organize and implement terrorist activities and choose not to live in cities. For example, in Germany, the Islamists who planned and took part in the 9/11 terrorist attacks did so in Hamburg but did not belong to the German Turkish Islamic community.[11] In the Netherlands, one might think some kind of hyper-fundamentalist Islam exists, because of cases like the Moroccan who killed Theo van Gogh. This man was affiliated to a group of Muslims with no proven ties to Al-Qaeda or any other transnational Muslim organisation.[12] This type of group that claims to belong to Al-Qaeda, but in fact has little or no connection with the real organization, has been limited in its real capacity to act directly in its former structure. This new type of Al-Qaeda may be called a "metaphoric Al-Qaeda," and the mere fact that radical Muslims refer to it as such shows the prestige it enjoys within the radicalized youth of Western Europe. The French case, with the highest number of people imprisoned for Islamic terrorist affiliations after the British, preserves its peculiarity concerning radical Islam so far.

The British model

Around 1.6 million Muslims live in Britain, the majority of whom are of Pakistani origin. Their case is not unlike North Africans in France, in so far as they arrived after their nations achieved independence in order to promote industrialization. However, the British model of integration is different from the French model. Recognition of communities and acceptance of a degree of cultural heterogeneity is much higher in the UK than in France, where every citizen must be part of the "legitimate" society (the French nation) without the interference of any other community (such as through religious affiliation).

British Jihadism is becoming one of the most prominent examples in Europe in terms of terrorist activities. It involves members of radical Muslims groups related to or influenced by the association Al-Muhajirun or affiliated with other networks suspected of having ties with Al-Qaeda among Pakistani second- and third-generation British citizens (the so-called "home-grown terrorists"). The UK has the largest number of Jihadists in Europe (more than 1,200 people were suspected of or indicted for Jihadist activities), mainly due to resentment of the UK's involvement in the Afghanistan and Iraq wars on the side of the US and the feeling of estrangement and of "being disaffected" by the new generations of Pakistani-origin Britons.

This theoretical picture of the UK is of course far from being real in daily life. Similar to in France, just because a community is recognized in the UK does not mean that it is respected or tolerated. In practice, racism in both countries feeds on the otherness of the Muslim immigrants and their inability to conform to preconceived notions of citizenship. Frustration in both countries is high on the part of many Muslims who feel stigmatized and rejected, even when they have official British or French citizenship. The colonial memory of their parents as inferior feeds their anger against the new colonialists who despise them and do not treat them on an equal footing, be it for job applications or other social services. Fears of terrorism have caused a new wave of intolerance that has resulted in a renewed estrangement on the part of the Muslims. Four British citizens perpetrated the July 2005 attack on the British subway system: three were of Pakistani origin and the other was a convert from Catholicism of Jamaican descent. All four were raised in the UK and none was an immigrant.[13]

Like the Algerians in France, the Pakistanis are often the target of racism. Although part of their community is successful in business and the public sector, in the same way that part of the North African population, called the *beurgeoisie* in France, is successful,[14] most of Britain's Pakistani population feels segregated and exposed to racism and contempt from other citizens. Their rate of unemployment, again like the North Africans in France, is much higher than the average. However, the culture of tolerance in Britain allowed many radical Muslims from North Africa and other regions to migrate to the UK, forming a mild agreement between these groups and the British authorities. These groups gathered in some famous mosques (such as Finsbury Park mosque, among others) and spread the message of radical Islam. Yet, the gentleman's agreement between the British authorities and the radical community in the UK was broken after 9/11. In the following year, the arrest of several radical Muslims and the promulgation of anti-terrorism laws, saw a situation of antagonism emerge, like the one that prevails in France. The newer generation of radical Muslims had roots in the Muslim middle classes, in organizations such as the Freedom Party (*Hizbu Tahrir*) whose leaders professed an anti-Israel and a pro-Palestine stance. Radicalization was fed through links with Al-Qaeda. Khan, the leader of the group that committed the 7/7 terrorist acts in 2005 in London had ties with Al-Qaeda leaders through his journeys in Pakistan. However, the main breeding ground for this radicalization was the UK itself and the simmering discontent among part of its Muslim youth, due to social conditions, racism, and the involvement of the British troops in Afghanistan and Iraq.

European reactions to home-grown terrorism

France began the fight against Islamist terrorism in 1993. This fight became more urgent after the terrorist attack in the Paris underground by Khaled Kelkal in 1995 that resulted in dozens of fatalities. The law against terrorist association provided the institutional framework. This law facilitated the pursuit and incarceration of suspects with the usual caveats against ordinary crimes. On the institutional level, the secret services and the justice department began to work diligently. The judge for terrorist cases worked within a special framework, informed directly by secret services operating inside the country as well as outside. Arrests were made much easier than they would be under normal circumstances and access to information was much quicker. Many suspects were arrested without sufficient warrants, although some of the arrests were successful in that they stopped terrorist activities.

In the UK, a special terrorist framework did not exist until 2001 and the anti-terrorist laws that appeared in 2004 and 2005 came relatively late. Islamic Radicals termed London "Londonistan"[15] and until 9/11 the UK was considered a safe haven for terrorists escaping arrest in France or elsewhere. This presumption changed after the promulgation of anti-terrorist laws in 2001. However, the British police were not yet in a situation to infiltrate the Islamic radicals in the same fashion as the French. The terrorist attack of July

2005 put an end to the "mutual understanding" between the government and the Islamic radicals. The fight against Islamic radicalism took on an increasingly similar character all over Europe and the judicial framework for it is being promulgated in many countries.

In countries like Germany, however, Islamic radicalization seems to be mainly directed towards the most significant Muslim population's country of origin, Turkey. Turkey seems to be the target of German Muslim terrorist activity more so than Germany, which is an interesting pattern. However, with the emergence of a new generation of Germans from a Turkish heritage, this situation could change in the future. The Jihadist terrorist attacks seem to stem mainly from other Muslim diasporas, for instance the two young Lebanese students, Youssef el Hajdib and Jihad Hamad, who tried to detonate a crafted bomb in 2006 in a railway station in Germany.

Two major problems arise from the increased attention to terrorist activity in Europe. On the one hand, we see the emergence of networks that are flexible enough to be built without the support of rigid hierarchies and therefore able, in many cases, to hide themselves from police scrutiny. On the other hand, the building discontent among segments of Muslim youth makes both the UK and France fertile grounds for recruitment of future terrorists. To prevent a push towards radicalization on the part of the European Muslims, it is necessary for states to pursue short-term regulation and social policies as well as the promotion of a more equal status for Muslims, perhaps through affirmative action.

Islamic radicalism in a globalized world

Apart from the social and economic discontent on the part of the Muslim youth in Europe, another factor pushing radicalization is the real-time reporting of the crises unfolding in Muslim countries on the television. Watching this real life drama promotes the thought of the utopia of a "neo-*umma*" carrying out the actions.[16] Two distinct groups appear on the European scene. The first is a new Muslim middle class, a minority among the immigrants from Muslim countries in Europe. This new middle class has everything to lose from radicalization and the spread of negative images of Islam and Muslims. The other group is the even smaller minority of immigrants that choose to be radical, separating themselves from the mainstream Muslim middle class in Europe.

The main reason for this part of the Muslim community to radicalize is because of their identification with the "neo-*umma*" in the rest of the world and in Europe in particular. Seeing their fellow Muslims downtrodden and stigmatized through racism in Europe and watching the fates of Muslims in the Middle East, Russia, and China and the crises of Muslim societies on their televisions, they come to the firm belief that Islam is being repressed worldwide. The oppressors are the "white" Europeans, the West, or America. In this situation, European radical Muslims give their compassion to this imaginary "neo-*umma*" rather than to their compatriots whose sufferings from infrequent terrorist attacks seem minimal in comparison to the plights of the Muslims all over the world. In a way, the identification with this imaginary "neo-*umma*" (which does not exist in the way the radical Muslims describe it) prevents empathy towards their fellow citizens and gives them justification for terrorist acts in the name of a radicalized representation of Islam.

For the excluded and disaffected youth in Europe, the combination of economic deprivation and cultural stigmas makes it much easier for them to become radicalized in the name of their religion and for them to imagine a greater "neo-*umma*." They come to the conclusion that their sufferings and those of the Muslims in other parts of the world – Palestine, Bosnia, Iraq, Chechnya, or elsewhere – have the same roots, to counter the Western fight against Islam. Their enrollment in terrorist networks is based on a strong feeling of victimization, which in turn is rooted in their dramatic situation in Europe. Their segregation into perceived enclaves or ghettos, such as in the *banlieues* of France or the poorer districts in the UK, and the absence – real and perceived – of any prospect for a brighter future, go hand in hand to make this population a fertile ground for radicalization and in a few cases, terrorism. Even though most European Muslim youth do not get involved in terrorist activities, their outlook on the world is still one of deep victimization and a negative perception of the "white" man.

Both of these groups – the middle classes and the marginalized who choose radicalization – find a common language through extremist networks and their opposition to the West. The military actions in Afghanistan and Iraq and the Palestinian and Chechen problems are reminders of the West's involvement in the fight against Muslim countries, all which inspire them to act. This common ground between radical Muslims of different socioeconomic statuses also encourages the image of a "neo-*umma*." In fact, the predicament of Muslims all over the world is seen through the looking glass of this "neo-*umma*." The governments of countries like Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Turkey are considered to be the "puppets" of the West and therefore necessary targets. In the West itself, they argue that the struggle should go on in order to punish both the Western governments and their "lackeys" in Muslim countries. The globalized "neo-*umma*," unlike real Muslim communities, recognizes neither frontiers nor nations. The ideal is not to topple a specific government in a particular country but to set the entire world ablaze with a new ideology in order to promote a new caliphate through incorporating the "neo-*umma*" into this institution.

In the same way that the leftists of the 1970s were self-proclaimed avant-gardes of the proletariat, the new radicalized Muslims believe themselves to be the vanguard of the Muslim *umma*. However, this creed is not grounded in reality; it is simply an imaginary construction with no support in the real world. Many Muslims, including those attacked as "lackeys" of the West, strongly disagree with the tenets of radical Islam. The majority of those

Muslims who suffer from terrorist acts, such as the Egyptians who were targeted in Sharm el-Shaykh in August 2005, reject these acts to the utmost. In other words, Muslim terrorist groups are only a tiny minority whom the majority of Muslims do not follow.

The paradoxical situation is that Islamic terrorism is an outlet for the sufferings of Muslims in its symbolic dimension (it is an outlet for the Palestinians' plight in their unequal fight against the Israeli army or the Chechens in their fight against a colonial Russian army) but at the same time, the majority of Muslims reject its cruelty and the indiscriminate sufferings it causes. Muslim youth find solace in the fact that "arrogant Westerners" suffer at the hands of Al-Qaeda or those who claim its symbolic paternity yet, at the same time, many of them deplore its ruthlessness and the lack of discerning between enemies and foes through indiscriminate terrorist acts by Jihadist groups.

Still, Europe is the major birthplace of Jihadism in the West because of the social, economic, and cultural predicament of part of its Muslim population. One way to pinpoint the reason for this is by looking at Europe's prisons. In almost all West European countries, the proportion of young male Muslims who are incarcerated is many times higher than for other citizens. This phenomenon is becoming a vicious circle, not confined to a single generation but reproduced through joblessness, stigmatization, a culture of victimization, a feeling of hopelessness, and lack of future among many groups of excluded Muslims.[17] In France, around half of the overcrowded prisons' inmates are Muslim. The case of the Muslims in European prisons underscores the fact that Muslims' problems in Europe are not exclusively religious but also (and even mainly) social and economic. The attraction of Jihadism results from stigmatization and lack of social opportunity. In the long run, the "Muslim problem" has to be tackled socially as much as religiously in order to overcome the enticements of radical Islam.

Types of organization

There are two major types of organizations within the realm of Jihadist terrorism. The first belongs to pre-9/11 Al-Qaeda. The second is comprised of scattered cells that are largely autonomous and whose members are connected either through Internet or through associations, ties of friendship, or geographic proximity (living in the same district makes relations closer and more amicable among the members).

The pre-9/11 Al-Queda type organizations can follow one of three models. The first is based on a charismatic figure who unites diverse followers and gives them a sense of common identity through his knowledge of Islam or his ability to make Jihad the core of the group's religious tenets. This charismatic personality is very important in so far as it gives a new sense of belonging to the group by suffusing them with a common goal which empowers each person within the group. The charismatic figure is the most important case and has played a vital role in many terrorist attacks.

The second model is the "egalitarian group" of friends.[18] Each one shares the radical tenets and this makes the members of the group akin to a sect within which there is no guru (as opposed to the first model) and where everyone partakes in the activities through ties of friendship and sympathy. This model seems to be rather marginal, the first type, a sectarian group gravitating around a charismatic person, being far more widespread.

The third model is that of the male members of the family. Brothers, fathers, uncles, cousins, and even more distant members of the extended family get together and found a Jihadist group. They act within the family, the core members being related to each other by bonds of kinship. This model is also marginal compared to the charismatic model.

The Internet plays a major role and through messages sent to the others, different people with radical tenets might get together, in search of violent action. The communications through the Internet are difficult to detect, more so as the number of exchanges worldwide are too high to be closely scrutinized. The methods of identification of the communications through key words (Jihad, martyrdom, fight against infidels, etc.) are not always very efficient as the senders are more and more conscious of this system of interception of the messages. All in all, these types of organizations show their frightening efficiency through the terrorist attacks successfully achieved.

The Jihadist worldview

Among the different waves of terrorism that swept Europe in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Islamic terrorism is ideologically the most heterogenous, with ideas taken from the extreme-right and extreme-left movements and fundamentalist Islam. Terrorism marked by Marxist or Communist ideologies had a set of tenets that claimed direct bearing on state economics. Right or wrong, followers could express this ideology in a rationalized form, in a way that immediately affected the rest of the nation and even the world. The wave of Anarchist terrorism originating in France and Russia that spread throughout Europe and America also had a corpus of ideological schemes that could be argued and demonstrated in a rational and practical manner. The extreme-left ideologies of the 1970s were also marked by the denunciation of imperialism, the fight for the Proletariat, and sometimes the praise of anarchy as the best model of government on earth. All these ideologies claimed roots in social, political, and economic sciences. The fact that these movements were tendentious and non-rational did not prevent them from having a corpus of ideological "evidences" that claimed the heritage of the Enlightenment or relied upon utopias of Progress as their core justifications.

The Jihadist ideology is, contrary to a long held belief, well developed, and mostly in the Muslim world. There are four major ideas that underline its ideological construction. The first one is the idea of the "neo-*umma*" already mentioned above. This is not a factual entity but a cultural construction based on a mythical global Islamic community. The second ideological tenet is the image of a demonic West.[19] This idea has a dual origin in the leftist ideology of imperialism as well as the concept of polarity between the House of Impiety (*dar ul kufr*) and the House of Islam (*dar ul islam*). According to Jihadist interpretation, Muslims should endeavor to convert non-Muslims and spread Islam all over the world. Those countries which are populated by non-Muslims are in a state of war with Islam and every Muslim should contribute, directly or indirectly to their forced or peaceful conversion to the religion of Allah. This is the root of the third major idea, Jihad. In Islam, Muslims traditionally have two types of duties: if Islam is in danger, every Muslim has to engage in the fight to preserve it (*fardh al ayn*). If the fight is to spread Islam, Muslims should contribute to it through financial means or otherwise, without having to be involved directly (*fardh al kifayah*). For the Jihadists, Islam is the only valid religion and one has to go to the extreme to establish its rule over the world. Similarly, Islamic radicals believe that Islam is in danger from the malevolent action of the West (particularly the US) and therefore, Muslims should accept consequences, even as extreme as martyrdom, in order to fight against a more militarily and economically potent enemy. The fourth major idea is that democracy is a new form of religion, whose intent and purpose is to destroy Islam. Democracy's nature of referring to man-made laws (*waz'i*) and by giving humans the capacity to declare what is socially legitimate and illegitimate, this new religion encroaches upon the exclusive privilege of Allah to promulgate laws, in their view. Democracy is the invention of the West with the purpose to destroy Islam from within through the propagation of secular people and "immodest women" (men and women are equal according to the religion of democracy) who would question Islam's legitimacy.

These four sets of ideas are connected to a utopian world order which is not very cogent. The new Al-Qaeda type ideology does not illicit fighting for national causes, contrary to the Chechen, Palestinian, or Kashmiri movements, which have explicitly nationalist goals, although both the national projects and Al-Qaeda encourage the recourse of martyrdom. For the Al-Qaeda types, the proclaimed goal is a universal caliphate. The necessity of a fight against an impious and arrogant West seems to be the tangible motive which mobilizes sympathizers of Jihadism, for whom the main opposition is the "far enemy" (America and more generally, the West) and not from the Islamic regimes which are simple "puppets" in the service of the West.

The way Islam is instrumentalized denotes the modernity of this type of movement.[20] It is much less the reproduction of tradition than a regressive and oppressive form of modern action based on new technologies and a religious ideology which finds some precedents in the past but which, in its logic of action and its ways of challenging the West, is directly related to the modern world. European youth who get involved in this ideological enterprise are doubly rooted; the enterprise has roots in Europe and the Muslim world, but it considers itself non-national, both non-European and non-Pakistani or non-Algerian. The Muslims who spearhead Jihad are doubly stigmatized in the same way. In Europe they are rejected and considered as non-European. In the country of their parents – mostly North Africa for the French Muslims, Pakistan, India, or Bangladesh for the British Muslims – these youth are often considered, at best, to be foreigners. In both cases this generation is denied a clear identity – doubly marginalized and doubly rejected.

Islam in its radical version allows this generation to take revenge against the host society and against the society of the parents, by becoming part of a global movement. The simultaneous opposition to the West and to the East gives a sense of a new dignity to the proponents of radical Islam. In this way, the disaffected youth of the poor suburbs in France or poor urban districts in Britain feel a new honor in their rejection by European societies. They become heroes of a sacred cause, breaking ties with their past when they were nothing and no one. They inspire fear and take revenge against the indignity and insignificance of their pasts. They thus recover a new identity in which they believe themselves to act as the heroes of a new age. Middle-class Muslims who join the radical Islamic groups become the messengers of the "neo-*umma*." This new identity takes precedence over their membership within the European middle classes. Compassion for their fellow Muslims in Islamic countries and for the plight of the excluded, downtrodden Islamic youth in Europe becomes more potent than their sympathy for the societies in which they live. Being Muslim and fighting for this cause becomes a new sacred identity that overshadows all identities to which they previously belonged – that of immigrant families, that of European citizens, and that of middle-class people.

Another category of people who become Jihadists in Europe is converts to Islam. Most converts adopt a spiritualist Islam (Sufism) or a neo-orthodox version of Islam, neither of which has a pre-existing link with terrorism. Even so, a tiny minority sometimes espouse radical Islam. Imagining themselves as part of the utopian "neo-*umma*," they engage in terrorist activities as part of the war with the perfidious and depraved West. To these people, the West is treacherous and anti-Islamic in essence. Their new identity as Muslims is offended by the plight of many Muslims all over the world as well as encouraged by the biased and antagonistic attitudes of Western countries. They have to prove to themselves and to others the sincerity of their faith. They do so by opposing their former societies and by declaring war on the very same countries where they were born and raised. The chasm between their new faith and the societies into which they were born finds a sacred legitimacy through their identification with the "neo-*umma*." By fighting an impious West they emphasize their rupture with it and reinforce their ties to a new imaginary Islamic community for which they are ready to sacrifice their life and to put to death their fellow countrymen.

The antagonism towards the West in the name of Allah and the promulgation of Jihad as the sole way to achieve the sacred goals of Islam gather a diverse population of Muslims under the same banner. The Al-Qaeda type ideology creates a magic identification process through which hugely different individuals ranging from the excluded and disaffected European youth of immigrant origin, middle-class Muslims, and even converts are drawn to act in unison. They fight against a mythical West to which they marginally belong, but to which their sense of attachment is so weak as to allow for alternative identities to displace and eradicate it. They find solace in a religion which declares war on the "arrogant West" where they feel they have no place, whether as disaffected youth or as stigmatized middle-class people or as converts who have recovered a new sense of identity.

Between radicalization and hyper-fundamentalism

In Europe, the tidal wave of radicalization has not yet dried up. In many cases, through repressive measures, prevention, and public awareness, Islamist violence has been partially controlled. Nevertheless, a major change is perceptible. In lieu of violent radicalism, a new form of fundamentalism is emerging: hyper-fundamentalism. Hyper-fundamentalism rejects the outside society as impure and sinful but does not, generally, indulge in blind violence. Their preference goes to the breakdown of ties with the society and living within closed-knit groups similar to cults or sects.

This type of fundamentalism must be differentiated from three other types. The first one is moderate and open to the society, and is influenced by the Muslim Brotherhood. In France, two major organizations, Union of Islamic Organizations of France (*Union des Organisations Islamiques de France*, UOIF) and the French National Federation of Muslims (*Fédération Nationale des Musulmans de France*, FNMF), claim the heritage of the Muslim Brotherhood. On the whole, both organizations accept the rule of the law, including the dominance of secular laws over religious ones.

The second type of fundamentalism is shaped by the model of the apolitical religious movement called *Tabliqi Jama'at* (*Tabliq*). *Tabliq* is the largest transnational Muslim organization in the World and maintains a European center in Dewsbury, in the UK. *Tabliq* does not usually enter the political arena and is marked by a more hermetic vision of Islam. Its tradition is distinct from that of the Muslim Brotherhood. It is a movement based on pietism, asceticism, and the devotion towards its founder, Maulana Muhammad Ilyas. This movement attracts mainly disaffected youth from poor districts as its rank-and-file adherents.

The third type is the hyper-fundamentalist neo-*Salafi* trend that exists in competition with the other two types of fundamentalist Islam, particularly *Tabliq*. The neo-*Salafi* model is based on a strict following of the Qur'anic precepts and a rejection of all compromise with Western conventions. This version of Islam particularly attracts young people who feel stigmatized and ostracized by society. They renounce violence but choose a form of mental and social rupture with society.[21]

Conclusion

In today's Western environment, a large-scale terrorist activity like that of 9/11 or the Madrid bombings of 2004 is highly improbable, for both technological and government intelligence reasons. Simply put, American and, more generally, Western governments are able to monitor telephone calls and Internet exchanges in order to detect plots before they happen. Many cases of Jihadist plots since 9/11 have thus been successfully thwarted. In the UK in 2007, an attempt at blowing up several airplanes en route to the US was stopped in the same fashion as other Jihadist plots in other European countries. However, the kind of terrorist activity that is still possible in the West is a small-scale attack involving, at most, a few people. These kinds of activities are difficult to detect because of their small number. They are also less spectacular and less likely to draw the large-scale media coverage desired by the Jihadists.

The governments in the West should find out new ways of identifying the small Jihadist groups rather than just focusing on the larger ones. In many cases, small groups have been identified by chance. In other instances, they avoided detection but even so, the plans themselves failed – such was the case in Germany in 2006 when some Lebanese students attempted to blow up a railway station. They failed not because their plot was detected, but because they did not master the technology of the explosives and could not detonate them through a cell phone as they intended. In France in 2005, a network of Jihadists that had sent a dozen people to Iraq to fight against the Americans was detected. The group had gone undetected for some time, until films of demonstrations against the banning of the veil were scrutinized and some of the protesters were identified. Without such careful surveillance, they might have gone undetected. In other words, the major concern for Western intelligence services should not be large-scale groups but small, ad hoc ones. What can help in this process of identifying Jihadist groups is the fact that radicalization, as a general rule, is a lengthy process. In this respect, the contribution of Muslim communities in the West is essential. They have everything to lose through Jihadist attacks, because stigmas and Islamophobia target them and cast them as "dangerous minorities."

Herein is a Jihadist dilemma. Driving many Jihadists in the West is their desire to attempt a spectacular terrorist action like 9/11 again. These actions should be as spectacular in display for media effect as in terms of their mass killing. This opportunity has so far been denied to them. In Europe, attempts involving large groups of people and Jihadist involvement were doomed to failure by the surveillance of the government intelligence and police services. In the Muslim world, such massive attacks are still possible though there has never been as spectacular a terrorist act as 9/11. Thanks to media coverage all over the world, the terrorist actions of 9/11 have become iconic, not only in the West, but also in the Muslim world. The dream of the Jihadists is to reproduce it, ideally in the West. Such an action would show the powerlessness of America and other Western governments.

It is important to emphasize here that there is a huge gap between the effective Jihadist action in Europe and the fear it raises. No successful attacks have been recorded since 2005 and there are around 2,400 Jihadists, suspected or convicted, behind bars in Europe. Although due to either the heightened policing measures of European governments or the decline of the tidal wave of Jihadism, the terrorist threat has not been realized in physical terms, although in social and psychological terms, radicalism is still prevalent in Europe. After Europe gains control over and represses terrorism within its borders, the social and anthropological roots of Jihadism should be studied and re-evaluated in order to fight against the spread of radical Islam among European Muslims. In other words, the rehabilitation of Muslim communities and the struggle against Islamophobia and racism towards Muslims in general should be given a top priority. Muslim citizens should benefit from the same rights and opportunities as other Europeans, which is still not the case in terms of entrenched prejudices against them and the difficulties they encounter in earning a fair share within the economic and political systems in Europe.

Notes

1 However, in Latin America, the leftist Marxist ideology is still of some import in a few countries where trafficking and terrorism go hand in hand under the auspices of communism.

2 In the 1990s Algeria held its first free elections. The FIS won by 953 seats and 32 departments (*wilaya*) of 48. In 1991, in the first legislative elections, the FIS won 188 seats of 231. The army rejected the results and interrupted the electoral process, dissolving the communal and local assemblies and putting their elected members in jail. Their actions pushed segments of the FIS to engage in clandestine behavior and terrorism, notably in France, whose government had supported the Algerian military.

3 See D. Loch, "Moi, Khaled Kelkal," *Le Monde*, October 7, 1995. In this interview, Kelkal spells out the social roots of Islamic radicalism in his own words. In our own interviews, many young boys of the poor Paris suburbs feel that they are treated like "insects" by the French authorities.

4 See F. Khosrokhavar, *L'islam des jeunes*, Paris: Flammarion, 1997.

5 See G. Kepel, *Jihad*, Paris: Gallimard, 2002.

6 For more detailed information see F. Khosrokhavar, *Suicide Bombers: New Martyrs of Allah*, Ann Arbor: Pluto Press (distributed in the US by Michigan Press University), 2005.

7 See M. Wieviorka (ed.) *Violences en France*, Paris: Seuil, 1999.

8 For the problems arising from the *laïcité* and the integration of Muslim migrants and second- or third-generation Muslims in France, see J. Laurence and J. Vaisse, *Integrating Islam*, Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2006 and O. Roy, *La Laïcité face à l'Islam*, Paris: Stock, 2005.

9 See J. Cesari and S. McLoughlin (eds.) *European Muslims and the Secular State,* Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005.

10 See O. Guendouz, *Les soldats perdus de l'islam, les réseaux français de Ben Laden*, Paris: Editions Ramsay, 2002.

11 See N. Tietze, *Islamische Identitäten, Formen Muslimisher Religiosität jünger Männer in Deutschlandund Frankreich*, Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2001;

and F. Khosrokhavar and N. Tietze, "Violence en France, le cas de Neuhof" in M. Wieviorka (ed.) *Violences en France*, Paris: Seuil, 1999. The Movement for Equality (*mouvement pour l'égalité*) of the 1980s aimed at defending the rights of the French citizens of North African origin in a secular and non-religious manner. The slogan 'Don't touch my buddy' ('*touche pas à mon pote*'), defended by a national association like SOS Racisme, did not possess any religious content and was in accordance with the French *laïcité*. The failure of this movement to achieve its goals was one of the causes of the Islamization of the young people from the so-called *banlieues*. These youths no longer believed in equal treatment and opportunity in a society where they felt victimized.

12 On November 2, 2004, Mohammed Bouyeri, a Dutchman of Moroccan origin, killed Theo Van Gogh, first by shooting at him, then, symbolically, by almost cutting his head off with a knife. He was a member of a group later known as Hofstad group, made up of born-again Muslims and a few converts. No direct link has been found between this group and Al-Qaeda, only an ideological influence and sect-like group relations explaining its radicalization.

13 On July 7, 2005, three bombs exploded on three London underground trains. A fourth bomb exploded on a bus in Tavistock Square. The bombings killed 52 commuters and the four suicide bombers, as well as injuring 700 people. The head of the group that perpetrated the attacks was Mohammad Sidique Khan, a 31year-old born in Leeds. His father, Tika Khan, was a foundry worker, born in Pakistan. The other, Shehzad Tanweer, was born in 1982 to a Pakistani middle-class family in the UK. He worked in his father's fish and chip shop at the time of his death. Hasib Mir Hussain was born in Leeds in 1986. His father, Mahmood, worked in a factory, and his mother was an interpreter for South Asian families. The fourth member of the group, Germaine Maurice Lindsay, also known as Abdullah Shaheed Jamal, was born in 1985 in Jamaica. He lived in Dalton, Huddersfield following his arrival from Jamaica at age five. A carpet fitter, he subsequently moved to Aylesbury in Buckinghamshire. Lindsay seems to have been a violent and racist drug dealer in Huddersfield prior to his conversion to Islam.

14 See R. Leveau and W. de Wenden, *La Beurgeoisie,* Paris: Editions du CNRS, 2001.

15 See D.Thomas, *Londonistan, la voix du djihad*, Paris: Michalon, 2003.

16 See O. Roy, *L'islam mondialisé*, Paris: Seuil, 2002; and G. Kepel, *Fitna, Guerre au cœur de l'islam*, Paris: Gallimard, 2004.

17 See J. Beckford, D. Joly, and F. Khosrokhavar, *Muslims in Prison, Challenge and Change in Britain and France*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005; and F. Khosrokhavar, *L'islam dans les prisons*, Paris: Editions Balland, 2004.

18 Marc Sageman insists on this type of informal group. See M. Sageman, *Understanding Terror Networks*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

19 See I. Buruma and A. Margalit, *Occidentalism: A Short History of Anti-Westernism*, London: Atlantic Books, 2004.

20 See D. Gambetta (ed.) *Making Sense of Suicide Missions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

21 See P. Haenni*, L'islam de Marche: L'autre Révolution Conservatrice,* Paris: Seuil*,* 2005.

Index

Abu Ghraib 79, 82
accommodation of Islam, securitization 16–19
Adams, John Quincy 90
Afghanistan 55, 78, 79, 92, 100, 233, 236
African Americans 30, 178, 179–80, 195n
Agiza, Ahmed 55
Al-Arian, Sami 170
Albright, Madeline 96
Algeria 230, 243n
Al-Muhajirun 233
Al-Qaeda 2–3, 9, 73, 74, 75, 78, 79, 82, 83, 88, 94, 95, 104, 230, 232–3, 234, 237, 239
Al-Rawi, Bisher 55
Ameline, Nicole 151
American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee 182
American Civil Liberties Union 88
American Enterprise Institute 95
"American Islam" 29–32; leadership 33–4
Amnesty International 55, 56
Amsterdam 10
anti-Islamic agitation 203–4
anti-terrorism laws and measures 20–2, 45–6, 234–5, 242–3; American 45, 56–61, 98, 180–4; *see also* war on terror
Appadurai, Arjun 199
Arar, Maher 60
Armed Islamic Group (*Groupe Islamique Armé*, GIA) 230, 232
Arpad, Kerim 52–3
Ashcroft, John 57, 73, 79, 98, 180
Ashmawi, Fawzia 153
Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) (UK) 25
asylum seekers 54
Ateş, Seyran 138
Attia, Iman 203, 205–6, 225n
Australia 123
Austria 10

Badawi, Zaki 156, 161–2
Baghby, Ihsan 178
Baldwin, Hanson 99
Balibar, Etienne 203
banking 145
Basque nationalists 21–2
Bauer, Gary 72
Begum, Shabina 166
Belgium 10, 54, 147–8, 148, 151, 152–3, 153, 160–1
Bell, Daniel 69
Berlin 10, 208–9, 215
Biden, Joseph 97–8
Bielefeldt, Heiner 222
bin Laden, Osama 75, 78, 104
binary oppositions 2–3
birth-Jihad 218–19
Black, Cofer 99
Black Orientalism 179, 195n
Blair, Tony 13
blasphemy 166–9
Blitzer, Wolf 92
Bodin, Jean 4
Böhme, Maria 133
Boumidienne, Halima 171n
Bousakla, Mimount 160
Boyd, Marion 159
Broder, Henryk M. 211–12
Brothers and Others 182
Brown, Gordon 81
Brown, Wendy 119, 128, 133
Bukhari, Zahid 177–8
Burke, Edmund 104
Bush, George 71, 97
Bush, George W. 56, 58–9, 95; appointments 73; declaration of war

on terror 75; foreign policy 91–4, 103, 105–6; illiberal practice 96–100; language 67; leadership style 80; Liberal rhetoric 101–2; Liberal tradition 89, 91–4; political fundamentalism 67, 72–6, 77–82, 82–3; response to 9/11 attacks 73–5, 77–8; State of the Union address, 2002 75–6
Buskens, Léon 148
Buzan, Barry 2

Canada 80, 145, 159
Canadian Council of Muslim Women 159
Carpenter, Ted Galen 88
Carter, Jimmy 71, 93
Central Council of German Muslims 24
Charles River Development community 91–2
Charnay, Jean-Paul 148
Chechnya 236
Cheney, Dick 71, 92, 95, 102
Chicago 176, 179, 183, 191
child custody 148, 160–1
China 74
Chirac, Jacques 47, 164
Christian evangelism 40, 70–2, 183
Christianity 4, 12, 16–17, 22, 24, 31, 36, 68, 73, 75, 76, 77, 82, 131, 134–7, 155, 198, 206, 209, 211, 214, 221, 232
CIA 55, 56, 60
citizenship tests 46, 50–4, 62
civil liberties 22, 59, 98–9
civil rights 34–5, 38, 45
Clarke, Richard A. 74
Clash of Civilization theory 76
Clinton, Bill 71–2, 92, 96
Clinton, Hillary 97
Cliteur, Paul 22
Cold War 89
Cologne 208–10, 214
communism, collapse of 2
Constructing Enemies: Islamic Terrorism in Political and Academic Discourse, Government and Opposition (Jackson) 2
Convention against Torture (CAT) 56
converts 31, 198, 240
Cooke, Marcia G. 59
Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) 37–8, 57–8, 182
criminal law 146
criminalization 13
"Critical Islam Conference" 214
cultural practices 15
cultural racism 203
"cultural talk" 1, 1–5, 9

Danish Cartoons Crisis see Muhammad cartoons
Darsh, Shaykh Syed 156
deception 213–16, 227n
Delawala, Shabana 152
democracy and democratization 92–3, 93–4, 95–6, 239
Denmark 47–8
Der Derian, James 76
Dershowitz, Alan 98, 100
Deutsche Islam Konferenz (DIK) 119, 120–2, 125, 126, 128–39, 139–40
Deutsches Islamforum 24
diasporas 229–30
dietary laws 37
difference, identification of 130
divorce 37, 148, 149, 155–60, 162
Djavann, Chadortt 23
Domke, David 67
dress, Islamic 38, 39, 166–7; *see also hijab* controversy
Dukakis, Mike 71
Düsseldorf 217

Ebrahim, Najma 150
Eckert, Julia 201
education 16–17, 35, 38–9, 126, 131, 133
educational success 19–20, 26n
Egypt 55, 60, 236, 237
El Zari, Mohammed 55
El-Banna, Jamil 55
Elian, Afshin 23
Ellison, Keith 186, 194n
el-Masri, Khaled 55
Elorza, Antonio 22
Elshtain, Jean Bethke 100
employment 19; women 35
Erauw, Johan 160
Escudero, Mansur 17
Eurabia 210–13
Eurabia: The Euro-Arab Axis (Littman) 210–11
"Euro-Islam" 23
Europe: accommodation of Islam 16–19; anti-terrorism laws and

measures 45–6, 234–5, 242–3; immigrants and immigration 10–16; involvement in secret detentions 54–6; Islamic radicalism 229–43; Islamophobia 46–9; Muslim diasporas 229–30; Muslim underclass 19–20, 26n; politicization of Islam 10; role of intellectuals 22–3; security policies 9–25, 20–2; terrorism 229; threat perception 9–10
European Assembly of Turkish Academics 52–3
European Convention on Human Rights 155, 160
European Court of Human Rights 165
European Monitoring Center on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) 20
Evans, Don 73
exclusion 132, 188–9, 192, 236
extraordinary rendition 54–6, 60

faith, public practice of 37–8
Fallaci, Oriana 22, 167, 219
Fallon, Marc 160
Falwell, Jerry 72, 76
family 36–7
Farrakhan, Louis 34
FBI 56, 57, 180, 181, 191–2
Fear of Small Numbers (Appadurai) 199
Fekete, Liz 200
Fitna (film) 212–13
Foblets, Marie-Claire 148
Force of Reason, The (Fallaci) 219
forced marriages 149–51
Fortuyn, Pim 13–14, 50
Forum Against Islamophobia and Racism (FAIR) (UK) 25
Foucault, M. 127
Fourest, Caroline 22–3
France: anti-Muslim literature 23; anti-terrorism laws and measures 21, 234, 242; child custody in 161; civil marriage ceremonies 151–2; definition of being Muslim 18; divorce in 159–60; forced marriages 150–1; fundamentalism 241; the *hijab* controversy 26n, 47, 163–4; immigration policy 11; integration 15; and the invasion of Iraq 81; Islamic radicalism 229, 230–3; Islamophobia 13; jurisprudence 147–8; Law of Daily Security 53; Law on Everyday Security 21; Ministry of Equal Opportunity 24; The Movement for Equality (*mouvement pour l'égalité*) 244n; Muslim Council 15; Muslim population 10, 11, 230; Muslim underclass 19–20; polygamy in 152, 153; prison population 237; racism 231; religious tradition 69; riots, 2005 47; terrorist arrests 21–2
Friedman, Thomas 96, 97
fundamentalism 241

Geden, Oliver 204
Geneva Conventions 56, 59, 60, 100, 105
Germany: anti-Islamic agitation 203–4; anti-terrorism laws and measures 21, 22, 242; asylum seekers 54; Basic Law 217; Central Council of Muslims 121; child custody in 161; Christlich-Islamische Gesellschaft 24; citizenship legislation 125, 201; citizenship tests 52–3; civil marriage ceremonies 151; Coordination Council of Muslims (KRM) 122, 137–8, 144n; Deutsches Islamforum 24; the DIK 119, 120–2, 125, 126, 128–39, 139–40; discourse on the Muslim enemy 200–3; The Federal Agency for Civic Education 212, 226n; guest-workers 122–3; the *hijab* controversy 164–5, 215, 217; honor killings 52; identification of difference 130; identity 198; immigrant nomenclature 127; immigrants and immigration 119, 122–7; immigration policy 12; integration 15–16, 119–40; interfaith dialogues 24; Islamic radicalism 232, 235; Islamic religious education 126, 131, 133; Islamophobia 13; majority opinion 208–10; media coverage 224n; *Milli Görüs* 48, 121–2, 130–1, 132; minority power 218–20; multiculturalism 138; the Muslim enemy in 198–222; Muslim population 10, 11, 120–1, 125–6, 129, 136; Muslim underclass 19–20; police order 134–5; polygamy in

152–3; racism 216–18; religious communities 125–6, 135–8; religious education 16; secularization 17; silent Islamization 221; tolerance discourses 134–5; tolerance policies 119–20, 128–39, 139–40; websites 206–10, 213–15, 217, 219–21
Gerstle, G. 193
GESIS (*Gesellschaft sozialwissenschaftlicher Infrastruktureinrichtungen*) 124
Giordano, Ralph 214
globalization, and Islamic radicalism 235–7
Gogh, Theo van 14, 24, 46, 127, 232, 244n
Goldwater, Barry 70
Good Muslim, Bad Muslim (Mamdani) 1, 9
Gordon, Michael 103
Gore, Al 97
governmental belonging 123
Graham, Franklin 76
"Group-Focused Enmity Syndrome" (*Gruppenbezogene Menschenfeindlichkeit*, GMF) 202–3
Guantanamo Bay 55, 77, 82, 83
Gulf War, 1991 97

Habermas, Jürgen 98, 129
Haddad, Yvonne 177
Hafez, Kai 201, 203
Hage, G. 123, 124
Halberstam, David 96
Hamburg 20
Hamdan v. Rumsfeld 59–60
Hamdi, Yaser E. 59
Hanania, Ray 183
Hanning, August 13
Harnack, Adolf von 131
Hartz, Louis 88, 99, 100–1, 103–4, 105
hate crimes 56, 179, 182–3, 190
Häußermann, Hartmut 200
Häusler, Alexander 200, 204
Haynes, Jeff 5n
Heitmeyer, Wilhelm 202–3
Herre, Stefan 206–8
hijab controversy 17, 19, 22, 26n, 47, 160, 163–6, 186, 191, 205, 215, 217
Hirsi Ali, Ayaan 14
Hoffman, Bruce 2
honor killings 52, 149–50, 205
Horowitz, David 213
housing 20
Hughes, Karen 73
human rights 15, 82, 96, 146, 147, 155
Human Rights Watch 52, 165, 182
Huntington, Samuel 89
Hurray, We Capitulate: About the Desire of Caving in (*Hurra, wir kapitulieren: Von der Lust am Einknicken*) (Broder) 211–12
Hussein, Liban 60
hyper-fundamentalism 241

identity 32–3, 58, 198–9, 240
ideology 238–41
Idir, Mustafa Aït 55
immigrants and immigration: backgrounds 11; citizenship tests 50–4; equality 119; Europe 10–16; as foreigners 12; German nomenclature 127; problematizing 122–7; securitization 10–16; terrorism and 11, 45, 61–2; United States of America 25n, 29–30, 32; and welfare benefits 49
inheritance 161–2
Institute of Race Relations 21
integration 10, 14–15, 178, 203; coercive 50–4, 62; Germany 119–40
intellectuals, role of 22–3
International Affairs 2
"International Anti-Islamization Congress" 209–10
international relations discourse 1–2
Internet, the 199–200, 206–10, 212, 213–15, 217, 238
Iran 40, 83, 102
Iraq 40, 92, 93–4; Coalition Provisional Authority 94
Iraq, invasion of, 2003 47, 72, 75, 79–80, 81, 95–6, 97–8, 103, 233, 236
Islamic Anti-Defamation League of Italy 24
Islamic Circle of North America (ICNA) 34
Islamic Council of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (ISC) 156, 158
Islamic Human Rights Commission (UK) 25
Islamic radicalism 46–9, 54, 62, 93, 200, 229–43; charismatic leadership

237; Dutch 232; egalitarian groups 238; English 233–4; French 229, 230–3; and fundamentalism 241; German 232, 235; and globalization 235–7; Jihadist worldview 238–41; kinship groups 238; motivation 235–7; Muslim diasporas 229–30; organization types 237–8; recruitment 230; response to 234–5; *see also* terrorism
Islamic Salvation Front (*Front Islamique de Salut*, FIS) 230
Islamic Society of North America 34
Islamic Values in the United States (Haddad and Lummis) 177
Islamization 198, 206, 232; silent 206–8, 210–13, 221
Islamophobia 13, 16, 24–5, 40–1, 46–9, 179, 192, 199, 203, 224n, 243
Italy 12, 13, 17, 21, 24, 147–8, 151, 161, 212–13, 219

Jackson, Richard 2, 73
Jackson, Sherman 179, 186
Japan 80
Jihad 239
Jihadist worldview 238–41
Jörges, Hans-Ulrich 216
Judt, Tony 98
Jurgensmeyer, M. 5n
jurisprudence 147–8

Kamal Pasha, Mustapha 3
Kaplan, Lawrence 91
KARAMAH (Muslim Women Lawyers for Human Rights) 34–5, 154
Kegley, Charles 2
Kelek, Necla 23, 121
Kelkal, Khaled 230, 234, 243n
Kelly, Ruth 49
Kennedy, John F. 83, 99
Kepel, Gilles 47
Kermani, Navid 121
Kerry, John 79–80
Khan, Aina 155
Khan, Mohammad Sidique 244n
King, Martin Luther 178, 194n
Köhler, Ayyub 133, 135–8
Kühnel, S. 203
Kyl, Jon 213
Kymlicka, Will 147

La Charia et l'Occident (Charnay) 148
Lacey, Jim 2
language: and political fundamentalism 67, 78–9; religious 68–70
Laqueur, Walter 2
Latin America 243n
Le Pen, Jean-Marie 13, 231
League of Nations 69
Lebanon 40
Leggewie, Claus 200
Leibold, J. 203
Leiken, Robert 180
Lewis, Bernard 2
Libby, I. Lewis 75
"Liberalism," American 88–106; Bush and 91–4; definition 89–90; development policies 91–2; dominance 100–1; exemplarism 90; and foreign policy 102–3; and illiberal policies 94–100; illiberal practice 96–100; and international order 101; intolerance 99; and radicalism 93; and realism 103–6; rhetoric 101–2; and the spread of democracy 93–4; and terrorism 94–6; tradition 90–1; vindicationism 90
Lipset, Seymour Martin 69
Littman, Gisèle 210–11
Lizin, Anne-Marie 160
London 10, 234–5, 244n
Lummis, A.T. 177

McCloud, Aminah 179
McEvoy-Levy, Siobhan 68–70
Mahi, Yacob 153
"majoritanism" 199
Malouf, Amin 138–9
Mamdani, Mahmood 1, 9
Mandelbaum, Michael 96
marriage 36–7, 149–52, 171n, 172n, 173n
Maussen, Marcel 199
media, the 46, 201–2, 224n, 232, 235
Menski, Werner 148–9
Method for the Easy Comprehension of History (Bodin) 4
Meyzeaud-Garaud, Marie-Christine 159–60
Middle East, the 94, 95–6, 105–6
Milli Görüs 48, 121–2, 130–1, 132
minority power 199, 218–20

modernity 1, 4
modernization theory 1–2
Modood, Tariq 166, 167
Mohammed, Warith Deen 30, 33–4
Monten, Jonathan 90–1
moral panic 200
Morgenthau, Hans 101
Morocco 55, 148, 152, 159
mosques 16, 37, 177, 208–9, 234
Muhammad, Elijah 30
Muhammad, the Prophet 14, 18, 76, 192, 227n
Muhammad cartoons, the 47–8, 133, 163, 168–9, 207
multiculturalism 14–15, 23, 48, 138, 167–8
Murawiec, Laurent 2
Muslim, definition 17–19
Muslim Brotherhood, the 241
Muslim Council (France) 15
Muslim Council of Britain (MCB) 150
Muslim enemy, the 198–222; anti-Islamic agitation 203–4; anti-Muslim racism 216–18; deception 213–6, 227n; and Eurabia 210–13; good-bad distinction 221–2; and majority opinion 208–10; media coverage and 201–2, 224n; minority power 218–20; patterns of prejudice 202–3; stereotypes 204–6; theoretical approaches 200–3; websites 206–10, 213–15, 217, 219–21
Muslim Safety Forum (UK) 25
Muslim Student Association in the USA and Canada (MSA) 34

Nakschbandi, Walid 122
Nation of Islam (NOI) 30, 33–4
National Community Tension Team (UK) 25
nationalism 12–13, 22
Naz, Rukhsana 149–50
neoconservatives 89, 91–4
"neo-*umma*," the 235–6, 238, 240
Netherlands, the 151; Aliens Act 21; citizenship tests 50–2; Citizenship Tests Abroad Act 51–2; civil society 26n; equal opportunities 24; the *hijab* controversy 166; immigration policy 12; Islamic radicalism 232; Islamization 212–13; Islamophobia 13–14; Law on the Civic Integration of Newcomers 15; multiculturalism 15, 23, 48; Muslim population 10; Muslim underclass 19–20; polygamy in 155; religious education 16; *shari'a* law in 148
New Islamic Presence 198
New York Times 98, 99
Niebuhr, Reinhold 105
Nielsen, Jørgen 160–1
North Korea 102
North League (*Lega Nord*) 13, 204, 209

Obama, Barack 83, 96, 194n, 215–16
Omar, Abu 55
O'Neill, Daniel I. 166
O'Neill, John 74
Orientalism 2, 3–4, 205
othering 180–1, 192
Ottoman Empire 3
Özdemir, Cem 216
Özyürek, Esra 198, 199

Packenham, Robert 89, 101
Padilla v. Bush 58–9
Paige, Rod 73
Pakistan 103
Palestine 76, 236
Parekh, Bhikku 166
paternity 174n
Patriot Act (USA) 32, 57–8, 77, 88
Pearl, David 148–9
Pew Global Attitudes Project 81
Pew Research Center 58, 79, 80
Philipse, Herman 22
Poland 55
"political fundamentalism" 67–83; and American exceptionalism 68–70, 72, 75; and the Christian right 70–2; decline of 82–3; and language 67, 68–70, 78–9; legitimization 77–82; rise of 72–6
political involvement 33, 56–7, 185–6, 191
Politically Incorrect (website) 206–8, 209–10, 213–16, 217, 219–21
politicization 10
polygamy 149, 151, 152–5, 162, 172n
Postel, Guillaume 4
Powell, Colin 74, 78, 95
Powell, Enoch 167

Power, Samantha 103
prejudice, patterns of 202–3
Princeton Project on National Security 95, 98
Project for the New American Century (PNAC) 71–2

Qur'an, the 146, 153, 186, 192, 194n, 213

racism 46, 203, 216–18, 231, 233–4, 243
Raddatz, Hans-Peter 202
radical preaching 17
Rage and the Pride, The (*La Rage et l'Orgueil*) (Fallaci) 22, 167, 219
Rancière, J. 135
Rawls, J. 168
Reagan, Ronald 69, 71, 72
realists 103–6
Reed, Ralph 72
Reinares, Fernando 22
religious education 16–17, 38–9, 126, 131, 133
religious freedom 3, 16
reproach of deception, the 213–16
Rice,Condoleezza 93, 94, 96
Richter, Carola 201
Rieff, David 96
right-wing populism 203–4
Robertson, Pat 72, 76
Rockefeller, John 99
Roth, Claudia 207
Roudy, Yvette 153
Rumania 55
Rumsfeld, Donald 71–2, 78, 93, 102
Rushdie affair, the 14, 17, 24, 146–7, 163, 166–9
Russell Sage Foundation 176–93
Russia 74
Rwanda 103

Saddam Hussein 75, 76, 79, 81, 93, 95, 97, 103
Sageman, Marc 2
Said, Edward 3–4, 205
Sarkozy, Nicolas 11, 53
Satanic Verses (Rushdie) 14, 17, 24, 146–7, 163, 166–9
Saudi Arabia 39–40, 236
Sayad, A. 122–3
Schäuble, Wolfgang 120, 121, 126, 129, 130–1, 133, 138–9, 228n
Scheffer, Paul 23
Schiffauer, Werner 200, 201
Schiffer, Sabine 201–2
Schlesinger, James 99
Schumer, Charles 99
secret detentions 54–6
secularism, conflict with *shari'a* law 162–9
secularization, *shari'a* law 148
secularization theory 1–2
"securitization": accommodation of Islam 16–19; in Europe 9–25; immigrants and immigration 10–16; Muslim underclass 19–20; politicization of Islam 10; role of intellectuals 22–3; security policies 20–2; threat perception 9–10
security policies: Europe 20–2; "securitization" 20–2
Shah, Prakash 155
shari'a law 15, 33, 35, 145–70; and child custody 148, 160–1; conflict with secularism 162–9; and criminal law 146; criminal sentences 146; and divorce 148, 155–60, 162; and human rights 147; and inheritance 161–2; interpretation 146; Islamic norms 161–2; and marriage 149–52, 171n, 173n; origins and development 145–6; and paternity 174n; and polygamy 152–5, 162, 172n; scope 146–7; secularization 148; and Western civil law 147–62
Sharm el-Shaykh 237
Shi'ite Islam 30–1, 40
Siddiqi, Muzammil H. 159
"silent Islamization" 206–8, 210–13
Smith, A.M. 78
Smith, Rogers 100–1
Smith, Tony 90
social context 48
social integration 12
"societal culture" 23
Southern Baptist Convention 70, 76
Soviet Union 89, 104
Spain 12, 13, 15, 16, 19–20, 21, 21–2, 24, 147–8, 151
Spencer, Robert 213
Spencer, Sarah 49
Steele, Ronald 91
Stephanopoulos, George 97
stereotypes 2, 204–6

Sufism 31–2
Sunni Islam 30–1
Sweden 10
Syria 55, 60, 83

Tabliqi Jama'at (*Tabliq*) 241
Taliban, the 79, 83
Taylor, Charles 166
terrorism: 9/11 attacks 45, 73–5, 82–3, 88; American Liberalism and 94–6; arrests 21–2; casualties 104; causes 62; collective responsibility 180–1, 185; communication 238; discourse 2–3; effectiveness 242–3; elimination strategies 95–6; European tradition 229; and immigration 11, 45, 61–2; incitement 17; and Islamophobia 13–4; New 2; July 7 London subway bombings 14, 235, 244n; organization types 237–8; response to 234–5; threat perception 104; worldview 238–41; *see also* Islamic radicalism; war on terror
Thatcher, Margaret 13
theology 131
Third World, American development strategy 89, 92–3
Thomas, S.M. 5n
threat perception 9–10
Tibi, Bassam 22–3
Tiesler, Nina Clara 198
Tocqueville, Alexis de 68
tolerance 119–20, 128–31, 139–40
tolerance discourses 134–5
tolerance politics 132–9
torture 99–100, 105
Trachtenberg, Marc 97
Trainor, Bernard 103
"trans-cultural space" 45
Tribalat, Michèle 152
Tunisia 148, 153
Turkey 148, 205, 236

underclass 19–20, 26n
unemployment 19
United Kingdom: Anti-Terrorism, Crime, and Security Bill 21; anti-terrorism laws and measures 21, 22, 54, 234–5; British Anti-terrorism, Crime, and Security Bill, 2001 54; Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) 165; Community Liaison Unit 150; criminalization of incitement to religious hatred 14–15; divorce in 155–9; Domicile and Matrimonial Proceedings Act 155–6; empire 90–1; forced marriages 149–51; fundamentalism 241; the *hijab* controversy 165–6; Immigration, Asylum, and National Act, 2006 54; Islam Awareness Week 25; Islamic radicalism 233–4; Islamophobia 13, 24–5; July 7London subway bombings 14, 235, 244n; Matrimonial Proceedings (Polygamous Marriages) Act 154, 156; multiculturalism 49, 167–8; Muslim Law (Shari'a) Council 156–8; Muslim population 10, 11, 233; Muslim underclass 19–20; Muslim Women's Helpline 150, 152, 159; and polygamy 153, 154–5, 172n; Prevention of Terrorism Act, 2006 54; Race Relations Act 165; Racial and Religious Hatred Act 169, 175n; racism 233–4; religious tradition 69; Runnymede Commission (the Parekh Report) 167; *shari'a* law in 148–9
United Nations 70
United States of America: and 9/11 28, 73–5, 77–8, 82–3, 88; African American Islam 30; anti-alienation activities 191–2; anti-Muslim discourses 192; anti-terrorism measures 45, 56–61, 98, 180–4; Association of Religion Data Archives 178; the Christian right 70–2; civic activism 185–6, 188, 190; civic engagement 189–92, 193; civil liberties 98–9; civil rights 34–5, 38, 185, 193; civil–military relations 89; Clear Law Enforcement for Criminal Alien Removal Act 57–8; Department of Homeland Security 77; Department of Justice 58; development policies 91–2; distribution of Muslim population 178; domestic security policies 180–4; education 26n, 38–9; endorsement of torture 99–100; Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) 71; ethnicity of Muslim population 177–8; exceptionalism 68–70, 72,

75; exclusion 188–9; external relations 39–40; and extraordinary rendition 55, 60; family life 36–7; fear of internment 184; Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act 77; foreign policy 90, 91–4, 102–3, 104, 105–6, 188–9; harassment 181–2; hate crimes 56, 179, 182–3, 190; hegemony 88, 96, 105; *hijab* controversy 186, 191; identity 32–3; ideology 32–3; illiberal policies 94–100, 102–3; illiberal practice 96–100; immigrants and immigration 25n, 29–30, 32, 45; inclusion 187–9, 189–90, 193; integration 178; invasion of Iraq, 2003 47; Iraq Liberation Act 97; Islam in 28–41; Islamic dress 38; Islamic religious revival 178–9; Islamophobia 40–1, 179, 192; liberal tradition, *see* Liberalism, American; loss of trust in 184; Middle East policy 94, 95–6, 105–6; Military Commissions Act 59–60; mosques 177; Muslim history 177–80, 195n; Muslim leadership 33–4; Muslim optimism 176–7, 185, 187–8; Muslim organization 33–5; Muslim pessimism 176–7, 188–9; Muslim population 28–32, 61–2, 176–93, 194n; National Security Agency (NSA) 77; *National Security Strategy* (1996) 93, 96; *National Security Strategy* (2002) 93, 95, 96–7; Patriot Act 32, 57–8, 77, 88; political participation 33, 56–7, 185–6, 191; polygamy in 154; presence in global politics 80–1; public practice of faith 37–8; ratings abroad 81; religious tradition 68–9, 80, 169–70; socio-economic status 178; terrorism and immigration 11; Third World development strategy 89, 92–3; threat perception 186; United Power for Action and Justice Coalition 191; Wilders visit 213; women in 35–6
Uzbekistan 60

van der Graaf, Volker 50
Vedrine, Hubert 81
Vera Institute of Justice 61
Verdonk, Rita 24
Vietnam War 101
Vines, Jerry 76

Walt, Stephen 73
Waltz, Kenneth 101
Walzer, Michael 100, 166
war on terror 45–62, 72, 79, 80, 81, 95, 188, 201; American anti-terrorism measures 45, 56–61, 98, 180–4; and coercive integration 50–4; declaration of 75; and extraordinary rendition 54–6; and Islamophobia 46–9; lack of definition 82; and the use of torture 99–100; *see also* terrorism
Washington Post, The 75
weapons of mass destruction 102–3
websites 206–10, 213–16, 217, 219
welfare benefits 49
West, the 3–4; Jihadist worldview of 238–41
West Point 76
Widmann, Peter 202
Wieseltier, Leon 97
Wilders, Gert 212–3, 219, 226n
Williams, Rowan, Archbishop of Canterbury 145
Wills, Gary 68
Wilson, Woodrow 90, 91, 93
Winter, Susanne 227n
Wolf, Abtprimas Notker 218–9
Wolfowitz, Paul 71–2, 75, 92, 94, 102, 103
women: and divorce 159; dress 38; education 35; employment 35; leadership roles 36; rights 34–5; role of 35–6; unregistered marriage 152
Woodward, Bob 92, 101–2
World Trade Centers, 9/11 terrorist attacks 45, 73–5, 82–3, 88
World Values Survey 68
Wuthnow, Robert 185

xenophobia 13, 203

Yaser E. Hamdi v. Rumsfeld 59
Yilmaz, I. 155
Yoo, John 100
Yusuf, Hamza 32

Zaimoğlu, Feridun 121
Zammar, Muhammad 55
al-Zawahiri, Ayman 83