École Pratique des
Hautes Etudes

GROUPE DE SOCIOLOGIE DES RELIGIONS ET DE LA LAÏCITE

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DG RESEARCH

Program "Improving the Human Research Potential
and the Socio-Economic Knowledge Base"

5TH FRAMEWORK RESEARCH PROGRAM ACCOMPANYING MEASURE
Contract No HPSE-CT-2001-60027 :
Islam, Citizenship and the Dynamics of European Integration

"EUROPEAN MUSLIMS AND THE SECULAR STATE IN A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE"

JUNE 30 & JULY 1, 2003

BY THE NETWORK OF COMPARATIVE RESEARCH ON ISLAM AND MUSLIMS IN EUROPE

Final Symposium Report
Editor and Coordinator Jocelyne Cesari

TABLE OF CONTENT

SESSION I:
MODES OF INTERACTION IN NON MUSLIM SOCIETIES

SILENCE AND SPEECH IN THE MUSLIM GROUPS IN SWEDEN,

JONAS OTTERBECK, MALMÖ UNIVERSITY

One striking feature when observing Islam in Sweden is the number of Muslim women participating in public discourse on Islam. Women are active in debates or are interviewed on television and radio. They compose and translate texts on Islam. Women are spokespersons for Islamic organisations giving lectures and making statements. How do we understand this? Has traditional gender roles changed among Muslims in Sweden paving the way for a public participation of women? Can we find structures explaining the situation?

This article deals with Muslim leadership in Sweden. I will develop an argument on leadership and gender based on a theory on speech and silence. When discussing gender (or any other similarly broad categorisation of humans) one has to be aware of differences within (for a discussion, see Brah 1996). In this article/paper, gender will have to be understood as conflated with at least ethnicity, social and cultural capital. My main argument is that Muslim women can be leaders in spite of their sex rather than due to or regardless of it. One of the reasons to conclude this is that they are not (with few exceptions) leaders or representatives within the groups. Generally they have a function representing the group and the faith outside the group. Another reason is that the women who represent a group are of different Nordic ethnicities; they have not immigrated to Sweden from Muslim societies nor have their parents immigrated before them. These women have converted to Islam and have Swedish (or another Scandinavian

language) as their native tongue. Another important factor is the understanding of Muslim genders among the non-Muslim majority of Sweden. Gender specific prejudices about Muslim men and women and a fascination with the converted women make politicians, journalists, researchers and seminar organisers seek out the converts.

Leadership, Gender, Speech and Silence

In organisations and groups that market the Truth with capital ”T”, speech and silence is likely to be disciplined. It is important who is speaking and who is silent in public. But silence and speech are complicated issues. Are the acts of speech or silence voluntary or imposed, i.e. can you chose your speech (and its content) or your silence, or are you forced to speak (and to do it in a disciplined way) or are you silenced? Could there be elements of silence in speech and vice versa? Jeremy R. Carrette (2000:25ff) has reworked some of Michel Foucault's central concepts and ideas on religion to be able to formulate a position admittedly never reached by Foucault himself. Carrette starts with Foucault's interest in silence and confession especially focused on Christianity (i.e. Catholicism) and tries to develop a Foucaldian theory on religion, silence and speech. Through an extended discussion on leadership, gender, speech, and silence, I hope to be able to apply these thoughts in the analyses.

Leadership

Leadership is intimately connected to legitimacy, authority and power. Max Weber suggested three ideal types of authority that are at the core of classical sociology of religion: traditional, legal-rational and charismatic authority (Weber 1920/1996:58ff.). Meredith McGuire (1983:6f) claims that Weber thought charisma to be an inherent personal quality. Due to an increased theorising on socialisation and social psychology, it seems more accurate to understand charisma as a result of the interaction of a leader, or a potential leader, and his or her followers in which the successful leader develops a competence of getting legitimised as an authority. The crucial thing is that charismatic authority relates to the individual not the office or the position of the person. Traditional authority, on the other hand, is based on a specific cultural understanding of who is invested with authority. Which class, sex/gender, age group, ethnicity, family, education,

or profession do you have to be part of to be a potential candidate? Legal-rational authority is according to Weber the typical type of authority in modern societies. It is based on rational arguments and a belief in the fairness of the legislative bureaucracy and the meritocratic system. In this article I will consider anyone who has a position in a group, or who can represent a group in public, a leader. By this broad scope I hope to be able to position male and female leadership more clearly.

Being in Control of Speech and Silence

One important skill when seeking authority is the managing of speech and silence. A person invested with authority is likely to be in control of his or her speech and silence. By choosing the media and when and where to speak, an authority can avoid uncomfortable critique, questions or just discussions or, for that matter, create a forum in which discussion, critique or questions are so arranged that the authority will have the final word. But the act of speech also involves silence. When choosing one topic he or she can be silent on another. By controlling the moment of appearance, he or she also controls the moments when not appearing. A person in control can, with the help of for example a religious ritual in a ritual building or on consecrated ground, create a situation in which speech is extremely disciplined and silence is imposed. Rituals are often combined with an extensive use of signs in the form of concrete symbols, clothing, holy scriptures, liturgical languages, etc.

An almost perfect example of this is the ways in which Usama bin Laden has tried to be perceived as an authority and leader among Muslims. His sparse speeches on video, in which he tries to convey an aura of Islamic morale and modern Jihad aesthetics, are totally controlled by him (or at least by his organisation). No one can pose uncomfortable questions or disturb him. He directs his speech – others are silenced; then he himself becomes silent and in fact unreachable leaving the crowd to spread legends about him and his organisation. In this it becomes clear that speech and silence are not to be seen as binary oppositions, instead speech and silence are inscribed in each other.

The initial anecdote of Michael Gilsenan in his book *Recognizing Islam* (1982/1992:9ff.), stress the importance of role taking, leadership and speech/silence. When in Yemen, Gilsenan observed a ritual homage paid by a student to two young sharifs (descendants of the Prophet Muhammad) and the sharifs' appropriate response. Gilsenan followed the sharifs to their home in which they immediately threw off turbans, put a cassette on with Western pop music, opened a bottle of whiskey and discussed how boring Yemen was. Later when meeting the student alone, Gilsenan learned that he was a Nasserist just waiting for the revolution to come. What can be said (or done) in private or in public – indeed the borders of what is private – varies greatly.

Disciplined Speech and Silence

Not everyone is allowed to speak in public in the name of an organisation or parish, and those who are might not be or feel at liberty to speak their minds. Foucault (1970/1972) wrote on how discipline works in organisations. He made a difference between outer and inner systems of exclusion, the former being used to purge or keep out those considered erroneous, mad, unwanted or dangerous. The latter, of particular interest in this paper/article, relates to systems of discipline within an organisation. Simply put, when you are admitted in to an organisation you are taught (gently or violently) your insignificance through rituals, meetings, punishments, rewards, hierarchies, official discourses, etc. For those who are low in rank, the possibilities to speak in public will be limited to moments when they are needed as representatives and expected to speak in line with the organisation rather than against it. If they depart from the official truth there is always the threat of sanctions, for example exclusion. Thus, speech can be disciplined in the sense that you may speak but you cannot say what you would like. When speaking you are in fact also silenced. To be silent might also include the situation where someone can speak but cannot be heard or when someone is forced to be silent. Another aspect can be addressed with the help of Foucault's conceptual pair *énonciation* (enunciation) and *énoncé* (statement) differentiating between the act of making statements and statements as such (Foucault). The former might be unique and is tied to a historical context and thus to discourse, while the later signals the elements that discourses are made of. One might use the speaking of some sentences, the sentences themselves and the language as such to make clear the differences between the act, the statement

and the discourse.[1] Depending on your role, your function in an organisation, you are expected to tie your act of utterance to different statements supporting (or in some cases confronting) discourses.

Of cause this can be made more complicated by for example pointing out that even the most charismatic leaders are caught in discourses and are in need of being consistent in their use of symbols and their uttered ideas, thus being both disciplined and silenced. As stressed above, charismatic leaders are in need of recognition. Further, according to Carrette (2000:33f), silence can be a strategy of the deprived. By being silent you may avoid control, something that Foucault (1976/1990:39) identifies as a strategy of the ones risking to be discredited. Foucault (1980/1999) claims that elements from Christian governmentality, especially the confession, became an important feature in the discourse of the modern individual and made silence an illegitimate strategy. The modern individual was supposed to speak the truth about herself in public. For example homosexuals were caught in a discursive explosion when sexuality was to be made public, understood and controlled.

Still, it is difficult, if not impossible, to judge why a believer utters conventional and, from the believers' point of view, discursively correct statements. Does the believer just adopt statements and comply with a discourse to please or does he or she truly believe in (and understand) the uttered statements? What we do know is the importance of confessing to the right values; this is a powerful social force. It is an act of belonging and acceptance of power structures. However, it can become a source of resistance when a believer starts living and applying the religious discourse. Actual practice often confronts the pragmatic power practices of leaders seldom in tune with a radical understanding of statements stressing for example ascetism or anti-hierarchical equality.

Gender and Leadership

Can women be Islamic leaders? Regardless of if this questioned is answered in the affirmative or

[1] I would like to thank Torsten Janson who drew my attention to these concepts through his Ph.D. thesis to be published during the autumn 2003. The terminology is not originally Foucault's but he conflates them in a special way with his discourse theory.

not, most present day Islamic theologians will engage in apologetic, intricate and esoteric arguments to explain what is quite easily described from a gender theoretical position (see Roald 2001: Chapter 8 for theological arguments). Historically women have been constructed through a process of othering as the odd one out in a gender game and theologians, jurists, philosophers, Sufis and other leaders in the Islamic world have engaged considerably in creating separate rules and regulations ritually, legally, socially and ontologically for men and women. It is not surprising that the general change towards an emancipation of women during the 20th century have caused considerable discussions among Islamic leaders, but no accepted revolutionary solutions (see for example Afshar 1998; El Guindi 1999; Fawzi el-Solh & Mabro 1994).

Historians can only name a few Muslim female authorities on or scholars of Islam while they know the names and works of thousands of men. Throughout history (and of cause not just Islamic history) women of all classes and cultural belongings have been silenced. Evidently, men of most classes have also been silenced. But while male gender has been constructed as hierarchically supreme and potentially powerful, female gender has generally been constructed as inferior and without mobility. Women have been deprived of the possibility of being public figures in religious contexts. A complex weave of dos and don'ts relegates female activities to places outside of public space. For example, women are separated from the ritual centre when praying with men. They cannot lead the prayer when praying with men. Women's bodies are ritually problematic because when menstruating they are classically considered to be impure. Women are also burdened with guilt because of the lust for them felt by men and female sexuality is othered. Further, women are in some cases inferior to men in the religious jurisprudence. This was just to mention some religious situations where gender is a crucial category. Of cause, women have historically exercised power; they have for example had informal and historically undocumented influence and power via male relatives and in all-women settings.

But things change. During the 20th century we have seen both a domestic and a foreign influenced feminist consciousness spread in Muslim societies and an increase in public female voices, also in the religious field, but still almost all the religious institutions in Muslims societies are run by men. The differences between the sexes and genders are further important points of

departure in much State supported education and in the system of laws, especially in the family law (Naciri & Nusair 2003; Yamani 1996).

Some Comments on Migration in Sweden

Sex and gender are important aspects in a study of leadership, speech and silence among Islamic groups. Questions (keeping gender in mind) need to be asked: Who is allowed to speak? Under which conditions can a person speak? What happens when someone has transgressed the limits of what can be said? How are group members disciplined? How is silence used? Who is silenced? Who has the power of silencing others? In which ways do institutions, rituals etc. discipline speech and silence?

Muslim Leadership in Sweden: What Kinds of Leadership Exist?

I will divide the different kinds of leadership into different spheres of activity. First I will concentrate on Islamic organisations in Sweden, after that I will look into the ritual situation. After that the ones engaged in *da'wa* will be discussed. Finally I will discuss those who can be considered to have a charismatic authority by being acknowledged as persons having exceptional personal qualities (like knowledge or supernatural powers). All through I will concentrate on sex/gender and the matter of speech and silence.

Islamic Organizations

Roughly we could talk about three types of Islamic organisations in Sweden. The *first* kind is the local organisation engaged in arranging ritual prayers, gatherings at religious (and sometimes national, ethnic or cultural) feasts, education for the children and study circles for grown ups. These Islamic organisations will often arrange other activities as well, for example sports clubs. They will further keep a library with books, magazines, pamphlets, video- and audiocassettes containing Islamic teachings and maybe issue an information sheet for the members. The organisations often have members from one ethnic, national and/or language group sharing the same religious tradition, but it is surprisingly common that the members of an organisation have

different backgrounds, even when it comes to religious traditions. The simplest explanation for this is the lack of plurality among the organisations. Many smaller towns do not have more than one Islamic organisation. There is no register of all groups, but there are probably some 200 local groups (Otterbeck, forthcoming). No one has made a detailed overview of all these organisations and therefore it is difficult to know about how gender is enacted with them. But when looking at previous research done and also drawing from a rather extensive personal experience, I think it is fair to say that women generally do not have leading positions in these organisations. If they are in a position to speak in public it is generally as teachers of female adults or children or as spokespersons for the organisation. It should be stressed that due to the fact that you can obtain grants from the State for certain prioritised activities, among them workshops, education or other activities for women, a lot of the local organisations arrange activities for women. These activities are often lead by women. Within the local organisations authority is often of the traditional kind. Sex, gender, ethnicity, kinship, social and cultural capital will be decisive if you are a potential leader or not. Even so they are forced to organise in accordance with the Swedish bureaucratic tradition of associations. Otherwise they will not obtain any grants from the State.

Generally, in these organisations women do not speak as leaders or spokespersons outside or inside the group. The act of making statements might be free, but when they speak, their speech is disciplined and under the surveillance of others. An interesting situation developed in Malmö at the Islamic Center (*sic*!) running the only purpose built mosque in Malmö (see http://www.algonet.se/~icmalmo/). Sofia Becirov, the daughter of the long time director Bejzat Becirov ran an information campaign for the mosque. She did this together with another young woman, Arjumand Carlstein, who did not wear a veil and was at times criticised for this. Moreover, she was living with a man without being married who was not even Muslim! She was also very outspoken and personal, and did not work in any of the traditional roles of a *da'i*. But after finishing a major project resulting in a book (*Insikt*, 2002) Arjumand Carlstein stopped working for the Islamic Center but the daughter of the director is still employed. This far in the history of Islam in Sweden, this is an unusual situation.

If a woman holds a position she is very likely married to or the daughter of one of the men who have a power position in the organisation. I am not by this implying that these women are

powerless or incompetent, but the possibility of a female Muslim to be perceived as an authority seem to be linked to this kind of relation to a man who have or have had authority. Such is the case with the small Tatar group that came from the Baltic countries in the 1940's. Didar Samaletdin, the daughter of one of the founders of the Tatar religious organisation, has had a leading role and also frequently acts as spokesperson of the group (Otterbeck 1998). She grew up in Sweden, is unveiled and is educated as a social worker. Since 2000 she is director of Noah's Ark (a branch of the Swedish Red Cross Foundation), a center for HIV/AIDS prevention and care development. In the 1980's she became a favourite interviewee of journalists as a counterbalance to more traditional images of Muslims. According to herself she is the only woman active in the community. However, being the chairman of the Tatar organisation (which she was for a short period of time) did not work because, as she concludes: "This is the men's world" (Westman 1983:8). Didar Samaletdin has instead turned to local politics in Stockholm where she is active in *Folkpartiet* (a Swedish liberal party). Samaletdin position as a spokesperson of the group is built upon three things: Her own engagement and skills, her genealogy, and the interest she attracts from journalists. I will return to this in the analyses.

There are independent local organisations in the major cities formed around female key persons. The organisations might formally be part of either local groups or of the umbrella organisations discussed below. One example is *Islamiska kvinnoföreningen i Göteborg* (IKF, Islamic Women's Association in Gothenburg) which formally is a part of FIFS (se below). IKF was established in 1984. One of the leading women is Fatima Idris, a convert to Islam and a long time activist among Muslims. She has translated texts, written in the Islamic journal *Salaam*, been active in spreading Islam, co-ordinates *Muslimska kvinnors idrottsförening* in Gothenburg (Muslim Women's Sports Club), etc. In IKF there is an on-going discussion about Islam, gender and sharia in study circles, at seminars, etc. Fatima Idris is writing a dissertation at the department African Languages at Gothenburg University.

The *second* kind of organisation is the national umbrella organisation co-ordinating the activities of the local organisations and representing them before the State. These organisations are more easily studied since they are few and since they are organised in accordance with general Swedish rules of associations having a formalised board, a secretary, a chairman, etc. At present there are

three organisations acknowledged by the State and one called associated that is likely to be acknowledged during the year (SST 2003; Andersson 2003-06-02). This means that they are entitled to receive grants from the government through the organisation *Samarbetsnämnden för statsbidrag till trossamfund*, SST (The Commission for State Grants to Religious Communities). There are also a couple of umbrella organisations that for a variety of reasons do not get grants (Otterbeck 2002). When looking through the SST archives, that among other things document the composition of the boards, it is obvious that most members of the boards of these organisations are men. One notable exception is Helena Hummasten (formerly Benaouda) who has a leading role in FIFS (United Islamic Communities in Sweden) the oldest of the umbrella organisations, established in 1974. She is also editor of the Islamic journal *Salaam* and head of the Sunni Islamic *Islamiska Informationsföreningen* (IIF, the Islamic Information Association). But also in this case her admittance to power goes via a man. Her former, now sadly deceased husband, Mohamed Benaouda, was one of the leading figures in FIFS. The umbrella organisations tend to be interested in public relations and either have or sponsor groups engaged in this and *da'wa*. When looking at leadership and authority from a Weberian model it is difficult to settle for one of the three models. In one way the organisations are definitely legal-rational with a bureaucratic structure with written statutes and everything. But leadership tends to be connected to a few persons that hold power year after year, persons who often were among those who took the initiative to form the organisation.

According to Anne Sofie Roald (1999) there is much criticism against the leaders of the umbrella organisations. First of all they are too focused on activities in Stockholm. Secondly women's organisations have problems finding a space. Roald claims some women's organisations do not enter into collaboration with the umbrella organisations, not wanting to be controlled and limited by them. A technique developed by active female leaders and organisations are to seek out the few (according to Fatima Idris in Roald 1999:131) more progressive men and create bounds with them. By choosing authority the women decide who can speak about Islam.

The third kind is transnational or global organisations that have representatives in Sweden. The Turkish *Diyanet* is an example of the first type and the Islamic Movement of the second. The latter consists of organisations and sympathisers built up around The Muslim Brotherhood,

Jamaat-i Islami and Saudi groups like Rabitat al-'alam al-islami (The Muslim World League) or WAMY (World Assembly of Muslim Youth) (Otterbeck 2000). There are many connections between the Islamic Movement and the umbrella organisations but also with some of the larger local organisations. Apart from when collaborating in the production of *da'wa* texts, the transnational and global organisations have contacts with male Muslims. There is one global organisation, registered as a UN NGO, which breaks the pattern. The International Muslim Women Union (IMWU) formed in Sudan in 1996 where it still has its main office, has a national organisation in Sweden. This was initiated by Anne Sofie Roald a member of IMWU. IMWU works for the liberation and empowerment of Muslim women through Islam. The organisation in Sweden supports local activities for example a shelter for Muslim women called *Soumaya* established in 1998 (www.soumaya.nu). It has arranged seminars and discussions about for example sharia and women (Roald 1999:128).

The mentioned *Diyanet* is a semi-official Turkish authority that among other things sends imams to parishes outside of Turkey. For example, *Muslimska församlingen i Malmö* (The Muslim Parish in Malmö) founded in 1970, has since long an imam paid by *Diyanet* who stay in Sweden for about two years each. None of the *Diyanet* imams in Sweden are women. To send out a woman as imam would be seen as ritually and religiously impossible even though women do study at sharia faculties in Turkey. But the umbrella organisation *Islamiska Kulturcenterunionen* (IKUS, Union of Islamic Centres of Culture) actually invited in the beginning of the 1990's a female imam from Turkey, Hacer Gökcekli who has done ten years of Quranic Studies, to lead women's groups in the Stockholm area (Gustafsson 1993:67ff). She is still working with these groups according to Celal Ayata at IKUS (Ayata, 2003-06-26). IKUS has no contact with *Diyanet*. Instead the organisation is at least partly inspired by the Süleymanli tradition, an ideological competitor to *Diyanet* among the Turkish Muslims of Europe.

Rituals

One of the most important rituals of Islam is *as-salât* (the daily prayer) especially the *jum'a* prayer at Friday. The separation of the sexes in the daily prayer is almost always motivated by gender differences and especially by the sexualisation of the female body. The argument is that

men run the risk of loosing their concentration if women are praying in front of them. Women can pray behind men shows how differently bodies are valued and genders constructed. This division presupposes the male gaze and often ignores the female gaze. In classical theology going back to a hadith, women are recommended not to raise their heads when prostrating until the men have straightened their backs to avoid that the women might see what they should not. Even so there is a distinct difference implied. Men cannot be expected not to peak at the women but you can expect this of women.

This separation is also extended to the person(s) leading the prayer. A man calls to prayer both from the minaret (this is not done in Swedish mosques) and inside the mosque. In conservative theology a woman's voice is considered erotic and is thus not suitable to hear especially in ritual contexts. A man leads the prayer and holds the *khutba* of the *jum'a* prayer if the congregation is mixed. Thus, in the mosque women can see and hear men, but men cannot see or hear women. I have not heard of any mosque or congregation in Sweden breaking the gender patterns mentioned above. The ritual leaders are men who often have a seat in the board of the organisation running the mosque.

Who Performs Da'wa?

A caller is used here as a translation of the Arabic Islamic term *da'i*, i.e. someone who calls or invites others (to Islam). A *da'i* makes *da'wa*, the act of inviting to Islam. A possibility would be to translate it as "missionary" and "mission", but there are some slight disadvantages connected to that. Firstly, Muslims engaged in *da'wa* tend to get infuriated due to their association of mission with Christian mission, and secondly because of the historical belittling of Islam in Western Europe and North America describing it from a Christian discourse rather than from its own, denying Islam originality and authenticity. From a less politicised understanding I think *da'i* and *da'wa* translate fine into missionary and mission.

According to classical texts Islamic *da'wa* can be made by tongue and by pen. Today it is more relevant to distinct between face to face or mediated *da'wa*. The first kind can be made in the mosques during the *khutba* (sermon) on Fridays, or in a *dars* (lecture) between prayers or in

smaller *halaqas* (study groups). It can be done through public meetings or lectures or by knocking on the door of peoples' apartments or houses.

In Sweden it is relevant to make a distinction between *da'wa* directed towards Muslims and that to non-Muslims (compare Poston 1992). Non-Muslims are invited both by active and passive *da'wa*, the later being the act of being visibly Muslim showing non-Muslims what being Muslim is all about. The example is supposed to counter stereotypes and show Muslims as good, friendly and special. But what is especially of interest here is the active *da'wa* made in public.

In Sweden, internal *da'wa* is the most common form. The internal face to face *da'wa* is done by men as long as it is not all women's groups. In the later case both women and men act as *da'is*. There are several all women study groups led by women sometimes educated at a theological faculty as Hacer Gökcekli mentioned above. Some of the female converts to Islam have engaged in the education of women and children, like Fatima Idris mentioned above. Ali Ibrahim, imam in Lund and sometimes in Malmö, is an example of a man who leads women's groups. Ibrahim, who also works at a school as a teacher, is one of five imams in Malmö who have a State issued licence to wed couples. The women groups he has organised tries to give a helping hand to Muslim women by discussing marriage, teachings of the rights of women, Swedish society, etc.

The situation is different if we look at mediated *da'wa* in Swedish. In my dissertation I made an inventorying of all published, printed (or copied) texts available in Swedish. Most of the texts are translations of articles, booklets or books by famous male Muslim authors considered to be authorities within their respective interpretation of Islam. Women, especially female converts, are responsible for most translations but also of new texts written (Otterbeck 2000:109ff). However, most da'wa texts circulating in Sweden are not written or recorded in Sweden. They are in other languages than Swedish most commonly either in one of the languages of the immigrated groups or in English. Many texts are oral and are communicated through what Sreberny-Mohammadi & Mohammadi call small media (video- and audiocassettes, etc.) rather than through big media like State controlled television or radio (Sreberny-Mohammadi & Mohammadi in Halldén 2001:271). Furthermore, the authors or speakers are generally men.

The mediated *da'wa* in Swedish is evidently also directed to none Muslims. This is a conscious strategy clearly stated in several texts. For example, the editors of the Islamic journal *Salaam* stress that they direct themselves to the newly converted and those about to convert. They further mention that Swedish schools and libraries are target groups, the goal being to inform about the faith rather than to convert (Otterbeck 2000:15f). The association IIF was formed by female converts to do external *da'wa*, to communicate with the majority society and they had some success in this. Journalists found their way to them and several of the activists were interviewed in several different forums such as monthly magazines, radio, television, newspapers, etc. they also attracted the attention of schools and public authorities eager to know more about Islam. The activists of IIF became skilled in arranging public lectures at schools, hospitals and social authorities, etc. This took the male Sunni leadership by surprise and caused some discussions. Mariam Kanjah, one of the active converts, comments on this:

Maybe we have treaded on the men's toes by taking our own initiatives. A reason for this [that we take initiatives] is that we know Swedish well. […] Maybe the fact that we are women contributes. Swedish society is more interested in us more than in Arab men who can be found anywhere. (M. Kanjah, interview 1990).

At the time when Kanjah uttered the above she was editor of *Salaam*. Kanjah was well known among Sunni Muslim activists for being outspoken when it came to gender questions and she was perceived by many as a feminist even though she never used (or even refused to use) the word at the time (Otterbeck 2000:194ff). The point that Kanjah wants to make above is quite obvious: There was frustration among the Muslim male activists because they were superseded by a group of converted women when it came to public recognition or getting a public platform. Kanjah stopped being an Islamic activist in the early 1990's, tired of conflicts caused by the fact that she was quite outspoken on among other things gender matters.

Summary

All through the article I have tried to give evidence for the strong relation between how different leadership, speech and silence is managed because of gender among the Muslims of Sweden. First of all, women will not be leaders or spokes persons due to or regardless their sex, they will be it in spite of their sex because of other talents. If sex/gender did not play any importance surely there would be more Muslim female leaders with non-Nordic ethnicities, and the balance between converted men and men born Muslims with non-Nordic ethnicities would be different. Now, men born as Muslim dominate both within the groups and as representatives of the groups. Another important issue is the kind of leadership offered to leaders. Men can be leaders both within and outside the group, but female gender narrows the options. Women can be allowed to represent the group and also be leaders of parts of the groups for example as teachers for female grown-ups and children.

Still, one has to ask the question about what happens when someone gets the possibility to speak and formulate thoughts on Islam in public. As I have tried to show there are some examples of this already. Also the women who are talking may well function as role models for other women who would like to speak in public.

References

Afshar, Haleh (1998), *Islam and Feminisms: An Iranian Case-Study*, Houndmills: Macmillan.

Beronius, Mats (1986), *Den disciplinära maktens organisering. Om makt och arbetsorganisation,* Lund: Arkiv.

Brah, Avtar (1996), *Cartographies of Diaspora*, London: Routledge.

Carrette, Jeremy (2000), *Foucault and Religion: Spiritual Corporality and Political Spirituality*, London: Routledge.

El Guindi, Fadwa (1999), *Veil: Modesty, Privacy and Resistance*, Oxford: Berg.

Fawzi el-Solh, Camilla & Mabro, Judy (eds.) 1994, *Muslim Women's Choices: Religious Belief and Social Reality*, Cross-cultural perspectives on women, vol. 12, Oxford: Berg.

Foucault, Michel (1970/1972), "The Discourse on Language" (inaugural lecture at the Collège de France) appendix in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, New York: Pantheon, 1972.

Foucault, Michel (1976/1990), *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*, London: Penguin.

Foucault, Michel (1980/1999), "About the Beginning of the Hermeneutics of the Self", in J. R. Carrette (ed.), *Religion and Culture by Michel Foucault*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Gilsenan, Michael (1982/1992), *Recognizing Islam: Religion and Society in the Modern Middle East*, London: I. B. Tauris.

Gustafsson, Kerstin, 1993, *Profetens döttrar. Muslimska kvinnor i Sverige*, Stockholm: Brevskolan.

Halldén, Philip (2001), *Islamisk predikan på ljudkassett. En studie i retorik och fonogramologi*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Insikt (2002), in A. Carlstein & S. Becirov (eds.), Malmö: Gondolin.

McGuire, Meredith (1983), "Discovering Religious Power" in *Sociological Analysis*, vol. 44, no. 1.

Naciri, Rabéa & Isis Nusair, 2003, *The Integration of Women's Rights from the Middle East and North Africa into the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership*, Copenhagen: Euro-Mediterranean Human Rights Network.

Otterbeck, Jonas (1998), "The Baltic Tatars: The First Muslim Group in Modern Sweden", in K. Junefelt, M. Peterson & L.-L. Wallenius (eds.), *Cultural Encounters in East Central Europe*, Stockholm: FRN.

Otterbeck, Jonas (2000), *Islam på svenska: Tidskriften Salaam och Islams globalisering* [*Islam in Swedish: The Journal Salaam and the Globalization of Islam*], Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Otterbeck, Jonas (2002), "Sweden" in B. Maréchal (ed.) *A Guidebook on Islam and Muslims in the Wide Contemporary Europe*, Louvain-la-Neuve: Bruylant Academia.

Otterbeck, Jonas, forthcoming, "The legal Status of Islamic Minorities in the EU and in the USA: The Case of Sweden", Conference paper, Turin, June 19-21, 2003.

Poston, Larry (1992), *Islamic Da'wa in the West: Muslim Missionary Activity and the Dynamics of Conversion to Islam,* New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roald, Anne Sofie (1999), "Evas andra ansikte – muslimska kvinnoaktivister" in I. Svanberg & D. Westerlund (eds.) *Blågul islam? Muslimer i Sverige*, Nora: Nya Doxa.

Roald, Anne Sofie (2001), *Women in Islam: The Western Experience*, London: Routledge.

SST, 2003 (Samarbetsnämnden för statsbidrag till trossamfund, The Commission for State Grants to Religious Communities), *Årsbok 2003*.

Svanberg, Ingvar & Westerlund, David (eds.) (1999), *Blågul islam? Muslimer i Sverige*, Nora: Nya Doxa.

Weber, Max (1920/1996), *Religionen, rationaliteten och världen*, Lund: Argos.

Westman, Lars, 1983, "Didar fortsätter där hennes far slutade – fast hon inte blev en son", in *Vi*, n°46.

Interviews

Andersson, Sven-Eric, telephone, 2003-06-02.

Ayata, Celal, telephone, 2003-06-26.

Kanjah, Mariam, 1990. [*Ykköskanava: Merja–Mariam: Allahs tjänare*. Sveriges Television, Channel 1, broadcasted 11 September 1990.

Internet source

Malmö mosque: http://www.algonet.se/~icmalmo/ (2003-06-17)

Soumaya shelter: www.soumaya.nu (2003-06-17)

Communication in Conflict:
Germany and the Muslim Other in the Aftermath of 9/11

Gerdien Jonker / University of Muenster – Germany

Communication between German majority institutions and Germany's Muslims can look back on forty years of history. During this time, three forms especially dominated public space. Whereas dialogue tried to explore common ground, discussion concentrated on the exposure of differences. Both were an answer to the problem of German society, how to get to know a group of immigrants that seemed to differ in cultural and religious respects. The third form of communication was the spreading of rumour. Its very existence indicates that the joint effort of dialogue and discussion did not succeed in covering the original problem. Notwithstanding the amount of information solicited and the multifarious clarification of differences, the settling down of communities and individuals representing "Islam" left ample space for scepticism and doubt. [i] In this contribution I will discuss these three forms as a unity.

Because of its less public and altogether different character, I will not discuss here forms of communication that take the court as their focus. But mention must be made of these because of their direct interaction with the former. The main court communication concerns all Muslim attempts to establish an Islamic infrastructure through the obtaining of equal rights for Islamic cemeteries, *halal*-slaughter or the wearing of headscarves in public service. These cases influence the range of topics debated in public space. A second form of court communication came into practice after the 9/11 especially and may be considered a direct answer to the practice of spreading rumours: Islamic organisations and individuals warding off suspicion with the help of a court appeal.

Spreading rumour - like gossiping - is a form of communication that speculates about past events. But contrary to gossip, which presupposes a more or less intimate relationship between the gossip and the gossiped, rumour discloses information about persons or groups with whom a relationship has not been - or not sufficiently been – settled, and it goes about this job in anonymous, public ways. Spreading rumour answers to the problem of distrust. This may arise when, due to language problems or national borders, one is not able to look into a persons or organisations' past. Rumour fills in a gap that is left by lack of knowledge or by fear. The act of rumouring also creates a new situation. It ascribes something from the outside to the person being rumoured about and functions as a stigma. Once publicly ascribed, rumour is difficult to get rid off.[ii]

Back in the Seventies, the Churches answered to the influx of Muslim workers with the setting up of dialogue forums. These were accompanied by public discussions in which the more serious differences were isolated and queried. It is worthwhile to note that dialogue and discussion were not performed by the

same actors, rather did these take different sides: The one pleading for understanding while the other inclined towards an inquisitive, sometimes accusing attitude. Behind the discussion actor, sometimes fusing with him, stood those who mouthed public doubts and fed these with rumours that served to disprove the honesty of the Muslim dialogue partner, a role predominantly played by the press. Nevertheless, dialogue forums for a long time constituted the main place for meeting with Sunni and Schi'i representatives.
The events of September 11 radically changed this equilibrium. Controversial discussion took the lead and, as religiously minded Muslim individuals and organisations were increasingly accused of being not sufficiently transparent, the spreading of rumour accelerated. In its wake, the usefulness of dialogue was openly questioned and its initiators were scolded as persons who had opened doors that better stayed shut.

In the following, I will discuss this development and its implications in four steps. First, I will recount the history of Christian-Muslim dialogue - how it came about, what people spoke about together and how both parties used to observe 'the other'. Second, I will describe the changes that shook this institution after 9/11. Suspicion spread like oil and made both the initiators of dialogue and Muslim organisations look back with distrust. Circulating rumours and feeding these with tit-bits of circumstantial evidence became an accepted vehicle to fill in the void that surrounds the Muslim other. In the third step the reader will be introduced to its functioning. In finishing, I will recapitulate the spiral that has been set into motion and widens the gap between the Muslim minority and the non-Muslim majority. Present-day German society has created a new problem to which it still fails a communicative answer.

1. Early dialogue

Discussing religious matters in public, debating its political implications, confirming common religious interests for the good of the Nation – all that has a long and well-accepted standing in Germany. Going back as far as the peace treaty of Westphalia, there exists a high tradition of religious dialogue between German Catholics and Protestants. It bases on the widely spread conviction that "as long as one speaks with one another one is protected from violence"[iii]. After the Second World War, Christian-Jewish reconciliation circles came to tread the old dialogue path in a new manner. Reconciliation circles now slowly built public awareness of what had happened, worked towards the acknowledgement of guilt at different levels of society and all the while groped for a common language "after Auschwitz". In both cases, religious dialogue started only after interaction between the different parties had been irreversibly wrecked. In the former the wreckage came about through 30 years of religiously inspired civil war, in the latter through the annihilation of the Jewish population by the German State. But for both, rebuilding trust after the wreckage presented the very first step towards the reconstruction of society. It

was performed through the work of numerous dialogue circles that were drawn out over the country and lasted several generations.

Contrary to these huge endeavours, Christian-Muslim interaction started in 1976 in a socially secure setting. Foreign guest workers from Turkey and the Balkans had been hauled into the country for a decade and while family reunion was still underway and the workers only just started to organise common places for prayer, the Churches recognised their responsibility to build communication structures before anything could go wrong.
The Protestant Church took the initiative and offered the newly emerging Muslim organisations an official "Christian-Muslim Working Group", in which both parties could have a chance to get to know each other and discuss what was coined "common interests".[iv] As a matter of course, the Catholic and Orthodox Churches were also invited to join in. The idea was not to let lay people or other individuals act on their own, but to build a communication structure between religious representatives right away, so as to guarantee deep-rooted representation at different levels. It was also felt that the findings of the Working Group should not have any official, binding character. Instead, internal recommendations and occasional press releases were to be the instruments with which members would communicate both to their own communities and to the outside. In its wake local church and mosque communities were expected to start up local dialogue circles all over the country. The recommendations of the Working Group were also meant to guide these.[v]

Almost inevitably, expectations differed hugely on both sides. Christians generally used the Working Group to pursue information about an as yet unknown religion and a foreign Muslim population, whom they tried to seize up on a political level as a matter of course. Contrary to this, Muslim participants expected down-to-earth aid from their Christian partners in their foreign surroundings, aid that the Churches could not or would not provide: Muslim parents needed sustenance in their struggle with school directors over co-education in sports and biology. Muslim organisations needed help while buying plots for mosque building or gaining permission for *halal* slaughtering. Inevitably, many dialogue encounters ended in disillusion on the Muslim part, a reaction that the Christian side did not always understand.[vi]

There is a lot of literature covering these years that reflect the topics discussed. It also involuntarily betrays the focal point this particular dialogue took. A Christian-Muslim Documentation Centre was soon installed and issued a steady stream of information about Islam as well as the situation of Muslims in Germany, featuring Muslim organisations and institutions, Muslim law and Muslim customs, the situation of Muslim women or that of mixed marriages.[vii] Christian theological journals singled out what they considered common religious properties - such as the possession of Holy Scriptures, the belief in a monotheistic deity, or the need for mission - and published scholarly discussions on these.[viii] Moreover, Church Academies – which in Germany function as educational centres for politicians, the media and the common

church people – organised workshops and summer schools on Islam. They functioned as go-betweens among Muslims and society at large and gave support to the local dialogue circles in progress.
However, over the years, only a few Muslims participated in the proceedings – an occasional theologian and a handful of dialogue partners. Representatives of Muslim communities, who could have expressed what was being thought or felt at grass root level, were simply hard to get by. In fact, although the dialogue partners learned to appreciate each other over the years and sometimes also concluded friendships, their efforts to build trust between Muslims and Christians never touched base. As somebody described it much later: "We all loved each other. It was like a head without a body, floating somewhere in the air".[ix]

As a matter of fact, the dialogue initiative, well meant and thoroughly organised as it was, realised only a fraction of its original plan. For one thing, throughout 25 years of dialogue, Muslim participants were not rooted in their organisations in a manner equal to their Christian partners. In the beginning, they were mostly young and little educated, did not know much about theology, were even less experienced in dialogue and still lacked the contextual knowledge necessary to become an actor in German society. Christian participants, as a rule, consisted of elder, highly educated theologians experienced in dialogue, well seated within their organisations and equipped with intimate knowledge of the workings of German society. This pattern of structural inequality repeated itself whenever a new dialogue circle was set up. In other words, the Churches' wish to communicate with Muslims confronted long-standing religious institutions with just-appearing communities without any experience in these matters. Consequently, their meeting was not at eye-level.

The Working Groups' non-binding character presented another obstacle. Internal recommendations can also be neglected and indeed were largely put aside by the churches.[x] On the Muslim part, inexperience with handling a flow of information from "the outside" came to complicate matters. Muslim communities were struggling for survival and sometimes there remained very little energy for "outside" matters at all.[xi] Consequentially, those Muslims who had endeavoured into dialogue with Christians were largely left to themselves. In a way, it served them to compensate for the initial inequality, as their being cut off from mainstream community life allowed for more flexibility and enabled them to adapt quicker to the dialogue context.

A last obstacle may be detected in the fact that all these knowledge productions and communicative experiences – useful as they sometimes were - were hardly taken notice of by the public. Already in the 1970s, Germany constituted a largely secularised society, in which the publication of inter-religious encounters or learned theological discussions was considered out of place. To many intellectuals this presented an unwanted category of knowledge. A general distrust of "religion", religious language and inter-religious dialogue thus

came to join the already widely spread scepticism of Muslim communities. It turned every discussion about, for instance, the opaque structures of Muslim organisation, or the inflexibility of its leaders concerning power structures, gender issues and the intergenerational gap, into a source for further speculations. The spreading of rumours substituted missing information and answered to diffuse fears. Underneath, many public actors in secular society such as politicians and the media suspected that what they could see with their own eyes – the phenomenology of the Muslim counterpart -served as a cover-up.

Summer 2000 Germany harboured three Muslim umbrella organisations, several regional religious mergers and as many as 2.400 local communities.[xii] Only a fraction of these were linked to Christian-Muslim interaction. But in some places, local churches did succeed in establishing lasting contacts and wherever that happened controversies were avoided as a matter of course. Rather, dialogue served as an instrument for getting to know each other. However, once dialogue was in progress participating Muslims were soon cut off from their communities. Narrowed in by two different expectation patterns, these men and women were also prone to make faults. In my book on the *Süleymanci*, a Sufi lay community of Turkish origin, I have described how a local *Süleymanci* dialogue representative, in his wish to oblige his Catholic partner, overlooked the internal communication rules of his community and involuntarily insulted the community's female hocas. To protect them, the community thereupon withdrew from all outside interaction. Its Catholic dialogue partner, not knowing what was going on, interpreted the withdrawal as a sign of disinterest. [xiii]

As time went by, the majority of Germany's Muslim communities felt not understood, isolated, left alone with their many problems and as a consequence very frustrated.[xiv] The dialogue, they felt, was predominantly Christian oriented, whereas even their most pressing needs had never even been taken into account. As one Imam in Berlin, looking back on those early years, summed up to me: "We had not come here to do theology. All we wanted was work and a little help".[xv] After doing a survey in 70 Berlin mosques I concluded in 1999: "Many speak about Muslims - but only a few speak with them".[xvi] Offensive as this was for the dialogue endeavour, on the Muslim part the phrase met with a wave of recognition.

1999 was also the year in which communication patterns started to change. In the last days of 1998, a local federation of mosques in Berlin had finally obtained the right to teach Islam in State schools.[xvii] For the German government it was reason enough to establish direct contact with Muslim organisations. Church Academies once more played their role as go-betweens,[xviii] but the governing Green and Socialist Parties also started to organise their own meeting grounds.[xix] The political Academy of the Socialist Party established a political dialogue circle, in which standards for Islamic education were being discussed with Muslim, Christian and Jewish educational

experts.[xx] The Green Academy organised a series of workshops, in which the young Muslim elite was invited to express their thoughts on all sorts of subjects.[xxi] In all these meetings, the mood alternated between pragmatism and cautious friendliness. And although voices could still be heard that rumoured about oil money and the fundamentalist threat, there was something in the air - the sense that communication in the form of interaction was about to break through.

2. After the attack

In the past, before September the 11, we spoke about private religiousness only. We visited. We explained the functioning of a church or a mosque. We sniffed at one another so to say. We preferred to avoid unsettling questions. After the attack we have become more challenging. There is this realisation: What we discuss here is a matter of public interest. But misgivings now sprout at its root. My people nowadays read the Koran and state in public that it contains nonsense. They also say that Islam, as a religion, is mischief. This is the newest latency. In the past, nobody dared to say things like that, but now this is becoming socially acceptable".[xxii]

In the days after the devastating attack on the twin towers in New York, Germany wakes up to the terrible realisation that it had harboured terrorists all along. It appears that the leader of the group, Muhamed Atta, and a diligent student at the Hamburg Technical University, called Muhamed Al Amir, had been one and the same person. The student had been the pride of his professor and managed an excellent paper on urban planning in Aleppo, in which he argued against the distortion of the human quality of life through anonymous global forces. His shaken teacher describes him as a "friendly, very intelligent, intellectual, clear-headed person who was always ready to help out and smiled a lot". [xxiii] Within a week the police traces down two more group members in Hamburg. Their trail leads to the cities of Bochum, Wiesbaden and Frankfurt. By that time, all students from Muslim countries are already being screened, their fingerprints and photographs of their irises taken, their exam papers scrutinised and their websites closed down. It is estimated that approximately a hundred "sleepers" possibly live on German soil. "Sleepers": the newly introduced term for an invisible network waiting to become active at some point in the future arouses public imagination and activates fresh torrent of rumours.[xxiv]

The very first rumour after 9/11 pronounces that the terrorists had been backed up by the mosque organisations. The press publishes lists of Muslim organisations in Germany and in the light of the recent catastrophe they all seem to be tinged somehow with Islamist views.[xxv] Of course, there are the notorious splitter groups such as *Hamaz*, *Hizbollah*, *Hizb-ut-Tahrir*, *Muhajedin* and *Hilavet Devleti*. These groups have been known to harbour fundamentalist ideas and to support extremist action for a long time already, hence their observation by the State organisation safeguarding the Constitution *(Verfassungsschutz)*. To these extremist action groups the Islamic Community

of *Milli Görüsh* - a big Turkish grass-roots movement with some 500 well frequented mosque communities in Germany alone - now finds itself added. The energetic protest of its president Mehmed Erbakan receives some echo in the press but his honesty is openly doubted. Rather, it is an accepted view that "Milli Görüsh presents itself as a religious community but *under this cloak in reality* unfolds economic and political activities that raise a doubt about her harmlessness (cursive G.J.)".[xxvi] Tabloids also add the more orthodox and pietistic communities to their list of suspects.
Not before long, doubt is poured on all three million Muslims who live in Germany and scepticism is voiced in public that Islam after all is the same as Islamism. And, suddenly, politicians and the media unanimously discover that 'we do not know anything about these people'. In the face of the threat that "Islam" now seems carry, the knowledge on Muslims and Muslim organisations that had been conveyed by the Churches looses its validity. Press people and politicians start to generate their own information instead.

How do the Churches react? The Catholic Bishop Conference, meeting some weeks after the event, officially confirms the Churches' responsibility "to search for ways to enable true encounter". The Church should "not just develop conflict avoiding strategies" but also "competence for true dialogue". However, its spokesman, Cardinal Lehmann, summarises the relationship between the two religions as "speechless co-existence".[xxvii] Many Christians today still faced the world of Islam "as if it were a bulwark", he states, thereby implicitly acknowledging the ruin of the dialogue enterprise.[xxviii]
Leaders of the Protestant Church employ a harder language. "Our Islam representatives who keep up dialogue with Muslims cannot maintain their blue-eyed innocence anymore. They should make better use of the Protection of the Constitution *(Verfassungsschutz)".*[xxix] In an internal recommendation, these same Islam representatives, most of whom have been partners in dialogue for 25 long years, are strongly advised to first single out "terrorist elements" before continuing. In public discourse the Christian-Muslim dialogue is coined "romantic": a "cuddle encounter" whose supporters have been hopelessly "naive". When they meet in January in order to take up stock, the Protestant initiators are thoroughly shaken.[xxx]

The Muslim community is shaken too. Press declarations appear in which Muslim organisations unanimously state that "this is abuse of our religion", "whoever does a thing like that, cannot claim to be a Muslim", and "in no way founded on religious principles".[xxxi] Muslims publicly declare to vote for Germany, for democracy, for the constitution and against any form of violence. Their leaders warn against accusing all Muslims of nurturing secret sympathies. But their voices are thin and their intention publicly doubted. In the aftermath, the Central Council for Muslims in Germany (ZMD) draws up an Islamic Charter that tries to re-establish trust where doubt has taken over. This Charter covers the statutes of Islamic faith and draws out its implications for Muslim men and women who live in Germany. Islam, it says, means peace. Therefore, Muslims follow a set of beliefs that do not stand in the way of democracy and

human rights. The 21 articles of the Charter function as a general declaration of faith to Germany and the German constitution and the year following the attack its signatories defend the contents at some thousand discussions throughout Germany. [xxxii] By then, the harm is already done. Local communities continuously receive anonymous hate mail and the Islamic Community of *Milli Görüsh* remains publicly coined as "an Islamic terror group". Muslim youths that over the past years have actively worked towards integration feel offended and some young Muslim social workers warn against a mounting aggressiveness amongst youngsters: "They feel sick of being abused. They don't feel responsible for what happened just because they're Muslims!"
However, there is also another side to this reaction, one that appears difficult to hide. It becomes visible in barely laughing eyes, in sudden gut-reactions, an overwhelming feeling that 'we got them good and proper'. The 11/9 attack has hit a raw nerve among Germany's Muslims. Schoolchildren act it out in the classroom. Grown-ups develop a semantics that offers it a logical frame, stating that "we have to be able to defend ourselves".[xxxiii]

There is a new latency growing, one that is differently experienced on both sides and it accelerates both the Christian-Muslim dialogue and the political discussion culture. Whereas Christians declare in public that the Koran contains nonsense and that Islam is mischief, Muslims now applaud whenever somebody defends human bombs in Palestine.[xxxiv] And while politicians publicly contemplate the secrets that may be hidden under the cloak of Islam, Muslims become aware of the fact that every word they utter in public might be used against them.
The events of September 11 have thrown out into the open what used to be a closed - almost intimate - encounter. In Berlin for instance, the Catholic Academy turns to organising public discussions on sensitive subjects in which it invites Christian and Muslim speakers to declare their particular viewpoints. The subject matter includes topics like "Christian and Muslim Martyrs", "Loyalty to Faith or Loyalty to one's Community?" or "Justified Resistance". The proposition finds a wide echo and succeeds in attracting a highly diversified crowd. For instance, politicians suddenly frequent Muslim-Christian encounters and sit among the public. It is a change that opens a window of opportunities for 'young' Muslim organisations. To these, political presence turns Christian-Muslim encounters into important occasions in which they have a chance to present themselves. Consequentily, a string of Muslim organisations that previously did not participate in dialogue appears on the scene. The Catholic organiser states that if he wanted he could easily organise two, three discussions a month with changing Muslim partners.[xxxv]
Many 'Young' Muslim organisations gained attractiveness after the 9/11, taking this date as a starting point to organise Muslim presence in Germany in a different way than their parent generation. Some now actively try to overcome the old forms of communication – dialogue and discussion - and query interaction with majority society instead. These attract young people from different mosques and different nationalities, who state to be fed-up with the homeland-oriented views of their parents. Other ones sense a space in which to

articulate bottled up feelings. But whatever the thrust, a new Muslim generation now seems to install itself in Christian-Muslim dialogue declaring for everyone to hear that they want to be taken serious and supplement to the social structure just as any normal citizen. It seems that the Christian-Muslim dialogue endeavour, once begun on a high note, finally touches base.[xxxvi]

However, in the political sphere the discussion culture on Islam has hardened considerably. Since the events of September 11 it is increasingly conducted against the horizon of that initial rumour, mosque communities would back up terrorists or at least offer a good breeding ground for any form of extremism. This conviction forces politicians to clear situations that in their minds present doubts, to urge their Muslim discussion partners time and again lest these deny to have anything to do with extremism, and finally to uncover 'secrets' that they suspect their Muslim partners to hide from them.

3. *Shifting grounds*

Religion and politics highlight different sections of social life. What they consider as information and worthy communication differs accordingly. As a matter of course, these different considerations also set the scene for a religious or a political approach to the social problem that was introduced with the mass arrival of Muslim migrants. Churches for instance are on the lookout for signs that signal religious transformation. Whenever the Muslim partner speaks about taking responsibility, the experience of the divine or the acting out of compassion, these words will be understood as to belong to his or her religious code. For religiously minded people this constitutes the essential information that is needed to be able to communicate.[xxxvii] Communication might take the form of a discussion, but discovering common ground in dialogue comes more natural.

As it is their function to produce politics, politicians look for a different type of information altogether. Whether or not something qualifies as information depends on its value for the political agenda and its compatibility with the constitution. The code that politicians operate is power/powerless but not everything that is offered by the religious sphere qualifies for it. Thus, "taking responsibility" could still be interpreted against the political horizon ("power"), whereas "the experience of the divine" – or, for that matter, the search for light, inspiration, power, integrity or liberation – can not. To fill in this informational gap, politicians judge the democratic value of religious properties and measure its compatibility with the constitution. Discussion is a politician's natural habitat but vis-à-vis the Muslim partner it has led to serious forms of speechlessness in the past. There are many reasons why politicians listen more to rumour than Churchmen. Not only have they more gaps to fill in, they have also more to loose. Therefore, they must seize up even the slightest information. Is the communication with this or that Muslim person going to empower one, or does it decrease one's power? Whether or not their Muslim discussion partner covers something up in his past, whether or not a Muslim organisation secretly nurtures anti-democratic thinking has direct implications

for any politician who ventures into direct communication. Under these circumstances, rumour may become a valid source of information.

Rumour functions in a circular way and runs through several sections. It begins with a suspect who is ascribed a property. This property is by definition a secret, but not a sweet one. It is a suspicion that signals deception and infiltration, which in turn point to a scenario of menace. Between the suspicious party and their suspect there exists little or no contact and the latter usually is the last one to receive the information that he or she is being suspected, and of what. Next, suspicion is voiced through well-aimed indiscretions or moral outrage. Once these have surfaced in public space they set into motion a mechanism of exposure.
At this stage, a class of experts moves in, journalists as a rule, but also scholars, police or politicians who collect circumstantial evidence to back up the original suspicion. Circumstantial evidence may almost look like proof – almost but never completely. What is inevitably needed is the confirmation of the suspect himself. In this last phase, the initial suspicion is turned into a public accusation. And once it has reached the accused, the circle of rumour is closed. Usually this is achieved in public. In the face of a television camera or in front of a public, the accused may now hear for the first time what he or she is charged with. In reaction, he or she may turn red, deny, become speechless, laugh, or start crying, but whatever the reaction, it will serve as evidence that something has been in the bush all along. Rumour functions according to the 'no fire without smoke' principle. In the end, proof is never reached. However, the procedure can start all over again at any given time.

In the past, the insufficient transparency of Muslim organisations has time and again functioned as a set-off for rumour. During the last twenty years, key terms centred on 'oil money', 'Islamism', 'right-wing sympathies', 'anti-Zionism' and 'Nazi-collaboration'.[xxxviii] But after the terrorist attack on the twin towers, the seemingly inaccessibility of the Koran and the Muslim religious tradition for Non-Muslims serve as key indicators that Muslims after all are not able to participate in dialogue and in fact cannot be trusted.[xxxix] Suspicions are that between what people say and what they think there is a huge difference. But how can the difference be grasped? The chain that connects suspicion to proof is a hazardous enterprise, but usually the media do not bother to investigate all that thoroughly. In these quarters, 'good news' must have a tinge of the sensational or the scandalous, otherwise it won't be recognised by the public, or so press people fear.
To politicians, this sort of news-making has validity. After all, it is a politician's first and foremost task to defend and propagate democratic values, and, as their own party is supposed to propagate the best bid, it is also their task to stay in power. Rumours point to potentialities that are not fact but might become one. For that reason alone they deserve to be taken serious. Within the field of terrorist threat, a field full of "things we don't know that we don't know them", as Donald Rumsfields famous dictum runs, rumours about the Muslim community almost border upon fact.

How has this communication in conflict affected internal Muslim communication? The aftermath of September 11 has thrust European Muslims into a crisis. Over the last years, little pockets of Muslim terrorists were discovered to operate from European territory. In reaction, European policy makers and large parts of the media put pressure on the Islamic organisations. These were accused of covering up for revolutionary and dangerous elements and average Muslims saw themselves faced with the demand to name perpetrators and their sympathisers and hand them over to the police. Moreover, the Islamic tradition was once again publicly charged of not being contingent upon Western values such as democracy and human rights. Suspicion took root that, when all was said and done, "Islam" fostered elements, which, under certain conditions, were able to yield terrorist threat.
The mounting strain caused a twofold reaction. Many local Muslim communities withdrew from whatever intercourse with majority society they had been entertaining. Wherever spokesmen were put too harshly on the defensive they ceased to participate in public events that addressed Islam or the Muslim minorities in Europe. In this way, numerous intermediaries, dialogue-circles, public discussions, round tables, boards, advisory committees and hearings among these, lost their Muslim participants.
At the same time, the continuing stress caused new Muslim actors to make an entry on the European stages, bearing in common that they are born or socialised in Europe. These, generally young, newcomers wish to formulate a European Islam of their own, one that differs from the traditional, defensive ideas of the old generation. The formulations they put forward also differ very much from each other. Some request a proper representation for the 'cultural' and 'laic' Muslims. Others claim that Muslims should become 'walking Qurans' – living examples of the Islamic ethics. In their midst one may find Muslim democrats as well as Muslims who question democratic structures. Missionaries side with believers who defend private religiousness, activists face intermediaries who develop compromises in order to offer a re-entry to the communities of their parent-generation.The date of 9/11 has taken care of shifting contexts. A new page has been turned that tells the story of internal Muslim differentiation. On the one hand, new structures emerge on the national level. On the other hand, young local Muslim platforms trying to establish a voice of their own evolve. Its history reflects the difficulties of creating a common Muslim representation. Launching into negotiations with hospitals, prisons, welfare institutions and local administrations, the platform tripped over its own internal distinctions. And, before the interaction with the Berlin institutions had seriously begun, it broke into different fractions and once again demonstrated the deadly internal clutch in which spiritual and political Muslims persist.

However, new constellations seem to be underway. Looking back, 1999 was the year in which German society made a fresh effort to communicate with its Muslim communities. Started off by the court decision in Berlin that allowed one Muslim partner to enter public schools without having the required legal

status, everywhere in the Federal Republic new round tables, discussion platforms and working groups were installed and once more worked the well-known communicative perimeter. They resulted in new internal communication structures that, after the shock of 9/11 and the setting into motion of security frames, today try hard to offer an alternative to the old opposition of spiritual versus political communities, or to non-existence in the public sphere versus mass-gatherings.

By way of Conclusion

I.
The sum of a society's communications is a frozen answer to the questions and problems this society has and the form these communications take point to the nature of the original problem it copes with. Luckmann's enlightening thought helped to sort out my initial question why German society answered to the influx of migrants from Muslim countries with religious dialogue and critical discussion. The Muslim newcomers seemed to be very different and both forms of communication produced the information deemed necessary to adjust to the new situation. Meanwhile, rumour, this most human form of communication in situations of uncertainty, filled in the communicational gaps with entertaining speculations or wild guesses about the Muslim 'other'.

II.
Dialogue and discussion were by no means haphazard choices. They proved to be very much part of the German societal frame. It was pointed out in this article that religious dialogue constitutes one of the most lasting of Germany's institutions to create social life. But critical discussion too is a highly esteemed German institution. It helped the after-war generation to overcome the silence of their parents and to this day it belongs to the democratic self-understanding of this country to be sceptical and take nothing for granted. To the Muslim newcomers however both communicational forms presented a novelty that neither the religious tradition nor the community reasoning proved to be familiar with.

III.
Communication never moved beyond dialogue and discussion. This created another problem. While the religious actor looked for religiousness on the part of the dialogue partner and by necessity defined 'Muslims' as religious beings, the discussion actor summed these up as political beings – more often than not with a hidden political agenda. The sum of these official views led to the general impression that 'a Muslim' is a person with highly developed political and religious sentiments. Stereotypes might have a function but they are never true. German polls among German-Turkish households tell us that the religious stereotype is maybe accurate for 7 % of the so-called Muslim population, the political for even less.[xl]

IV.
The events of 9/11 favoured the spreading of rumour and this again radicalised the old dialogue and discussion equilibrium. The circle of rumour now proved

to be an accurate instrument to perform "public executions" – a term that has become sad popularity to describe the confrontations in public that serve to turn a suspicion into proof. On the part of the Muslim communities two reactions crystallised from this. The overwhelming majority opted for withdrawal, arguing that whatever they would say was liable to be used against Muslims. A small minority consisting of mainly youngsters came forward and urged to start interaction - interaction on all societal levels being the only way to escape the stigma of essentialisation.

V.

After thirty years of soliciting information from the Muslim 'other', of sometimes useful, sometimes painful try-and-error in religious dialogue, of sharp questionings and sceptical summing-ups of Muslim religious communities, of ruling out religious identities, of experimenting with inflated rumours and menacing scenarios: It is time for German society that a new generation installs a new mode of communication. It should answer to the present problem of distrust on both sides, and, in its wake, of deepening fissures between believing Muslims and secular society.

---

[i] Luckmann, Thomas (1986), "Grundformen der gesellschaftlichen Vermittlung des Wissens: Kommunikative Gattungen". In: F. Neidhardt et al. (eds.) Kultur und Gesellschaft. Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Gesellschaft Nr. 27, Opladen pp. 191-21; Luckmann speaks of communicative "households" or "budgets" with which a society has to balance its problems, each form of communication indicating a special problem.

[ii] Bergman, Jörg R. (1987): Klatsch. Zur Sozialform der diskreten Indiskretion. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter. Shibutani, T. (1966): Improvised news: A Sociological Study of Rumor, Indiapolis. Neubauer, Hans-Joachim (1998): Fama. Eine Geschichte des Gerüchts, Berlin: Berlin Verlag.

[iii] Rita Süßmuth, former Chair of the German Bundestag.

[iv] Die Christlich-Islamische Arbeitsgruppe (ICA).

[v] Christoph Elsas, member of the ICA since 1979 on behalf of the Protestant Church (interview 7.01.2003).

[vi] Elsas, op.cit. note iv.

[vii] Christlich-Islamische Begegnungs- und Dokumentationsstelle (CIBEDO), Frankfurt am Main 1978 –2000(?)

[viii] Among these: Berliner Theologische Zeitschrift (Berlin); Theologische Rundschau (Tübingen); Theologische Beiträge (Wuppertal); Herder-Korrespondenz (Freiburg); Una Sancta (Meiningen); Consilium (Mainz).

[ix] "How will dialogue continue?" - Workshop after 9/11 in the Protestant Academy of Loccum, (January 7-9, 2002).

[x] Elsas, op.cit. note iv.

[xi] Jonker, Gerdien / Kapphan, Andreas (1999) (eds.), Moscheen und islamisches Leben in Berlin. Berlin: Die Ausländerbeauftragte.

[xii] Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, Ulrich von (2001) (ed.): Türken in Deutschland. St. Augustin: Conrad-Adenauer Stiftung.

[xiii] Jonker, Gerdien (2002): Eine Wellenlänge zu Gott. Der Verband der Islamischen Kulturzentren in Europa. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, pp. 165-170.

[xiv] Jonker / Kapphan op.cit. note x: "++"; Jonker, Gerdien (2002): "Vom Dialog zur Kooperation. Probleme der Kommunikation zwischen Muslimen und der Mehrheitsgesellschaft – Analyse und praktische Beispiele". In: Marie-Luise Beck (ed.): Vom Dialog zum Kooperation. Fachgespräch am 5.12.2001 im Bundesministerium für Arbeit. Berlin: Die Bundesausländerbeauftragte.

[xv] Nail Dural, head imam of the Berlin Islamic Federation and in charge of his community since 1981 (interview 13.05.2003).

[xvi] Jonker / Kapphan, op.cit. note xii, Introduction.

[xvii] Jonker, Gerdien (2001): "Muslim Emancipation? Germany's Struggle over Religious Pluralism". In: W.A.R. Shadid and P.S. van Koningsveld (Eds.), Religious Freedom and the Neutrality of the State: The Position of Islam in the European Union. Leuven: Peeters, 36-51.

[xviii] Fritsch-Oppermann, Sybille (1999) Islam in Deutschland – Eine Religion sucht ihre Einbürgerung. Loccum: Evangelische Akademie 19/99.

[xix] Beck, Marie-Louise (2001) (ed.): Der islamische Unterricht in Deutschland - Praxis, Konzepte – Perspektiven. Kolloquium am 16.11.99 im Bundesministerium für Arbeit. Berlin: Die Bundesausländerbeauftragte.

[xx] Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (Berlin). The Muslim Dialogue Circle took up its work in spring 2000. All Muslim organisations in Berlin received a standing invitation but only a few actually participated. Its majority consisted of politicians, churchmen, the occasional scholar and Jewish representatives.

[xxi] Hartmann, Thomas/Krannich, Margret (eds.), Muslime im säkularen Rechtsstaat. Berlin: Das Arabische Buch (2001).

[xxii] Ernst Pulsfort, Spiritual Rector of the Catholic Academy in Berlin (Interview 26.01.2003).

[xxiii] "In einer kleinen Stadt", Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (18.09.2001), Feuilleton.

[xxiv] "Das Netz der Terroristen", Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (29.09.2001), pp. 2.

[xxv] "Islamistische Organisationen in Deutschland", Spiegel (20.09.2001), pp. 41; "Im Namen einer göttlicher Ordnung", Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (21.09.2001), pp. 17.

[xxvi] "Allah hat einen anderen Plan", Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (13.10.2001), pp.7.

[xxvii] "Den Islam besser kennenlernen". Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (27.09.2001).

[xxviii] op.cit. note xxviii.

[xxix] "Evangelische Kirche erwägt kritischere Haltung zum Islam". Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (27.09.2001), pp. 4.

[xxx] "How will dialogue continue?" - Workshop after 9/11 in the Protestant Academy of Loccum, (Jan. 7-9,2002), op.cit. note viii.

[xxxi] Jonker, Gerdien (2002): "Der elfte September in Berlin". In: Ästhetik & Kommunikation 33, Heft 118, pp. 49-54. (www.gerdien-jonker.de).

[xxxii] The Islamic Charter was first published in January 2002 on the website of the ZMD (www.islam.de). Printed in: Oebbecke, Janbernd (ed.) (2003), Muslimische Gemeinschaften im deutschen Recht, Frankfurt: Peter Lang, pp.78-83.

[xxxiii] Jonker op.cit. "Der elfte September in Berlin": pp. 54.

[xxxiv] Discussion evening on "Muslim and Christian Martyrs", Catholic Academy, Berlin 19.01.2003.

[xxxv] Pulsfort op.cit. note ---(interview 26.01.2003).

[xxxvi] Examples of 'young' organisations representing the new generations that have moved into dialogue are *Al-Inssan - for Cultural Interaction* (Berlin) and *The Forgotten Youth* (Berlin). At a lower level, well before crossing the threshold to public discourse, many of these youngsters are still in a process of re-structuring. Since the event of 9/11, a mixed crowd of young people contemplates their chances and resources to take things in their own hands. Young women build professional aid structures for isolated families or war-stricken newcomers. Young men devise ways to ameliorate internal communications across mosque communities. They wish to turn the power-ridden community organisation into a transparent organisation of experts. But seeking access to its power base appears difficult if not impossible, and, meanwhile, competition blooms. In Berlin alone I count six new Muslim initiatives (*IBMUS*, *Schura*-Berlin, *Maram*, *Fadak*, *Sebrenica* and *Muslim Youth*) as well as several new Christian-Muslim networks.

[xxxvii] Luhmann, Niklas (2000): Die Religion der Gesellschaft, esp. pp.115-147 "Die Funktion von Religion". Frankfurt: Suhrkamp; Beyer, Peter (2003): "Forming Religion in Global Society: From Organization to Invisibility". In: Jonker, Gerdien/Daiber, Karl-Fritz (Eds.): Local Forms of Religious Organisation as Structural Modernisation: Effects on Religious Community-building and Globalisation, Marburg: Philipps-University Internet Publication http://archiv.ub.uni-marburg.de/uni/2003/0001.

[xxxviii] Jonker, Gerdien (2002), Eine Wellenlänge zu Gott. Der Verband der islamischen Kulturzentren in Europa. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag: pp. 81-110.

[xxxix] Kandel, Johannes (2003) " 'Lieber Blauäugig als blind?' Anmerkungen zum 'Dialog' mit dem Islam". In: Materialdienst der EZW 3/2003, pp 177-183.

[xl] Skotnik, Manuela (2002): "Gemeinsamer Turn-Unterricht stört den meisten Muslims nicht. Studie über türkischstämmige Bundesbürger zeigt: Von einem zunehmenden Fundamentalismus kann keine Rede sein", Frankfurter Rundschau 28.11.2002.

JEWISH LIFE IN SWEDEN,

LARS DENCIK, ROSKILDE UNIVERSITY

Introduction

The conditions of human existence change continuously. A process of *post*modernisation today follows the modernisation of the Western societies – a notion aiming at capturing the continuous process of social transformations in the highly developed Western societies – among them the Scandinavian welfare States. The assumption is that as the conditions of social life change, so the conditions for the individual's identity formation also change. How does the European Jewry today cope with the challenges of these ongoing transformations? How do the identities of Jews, regarded both as a minority group and as individuals living in these societies, transform? How do they live as Jews in contemporary Modernity? In other words: how – if at all – does their "Jewishness" appear? These are the questions addressed in this paper.

The main empirical basis for this paper is a study conducted between 1999 and 2001 entitled *Jewish Life in Contemporary Modernity.* The data are based on a questionnaire sent to members of the Jewish communities in Sweden. The questionnaire comprises about a hundred questions that focus on Jewish life and attitudes towards Jewish issues.[50]

In this paper on the Jewish life in Sweden, I will present an element of possible comparison, as I am not an Islamologist but a professor of social psychology at Roskilde University and also involved in minority studies at the Copenhaguen University. We should start by noting that the Jews in Sweden are now, that is since two years, officially recognised as a national minority. A feature, more manifest in Sweden than in the other Scandinavian States, is a rapid ethnic "pluralisation" of its population. Thus during the last three decades the social fabric of Sweden

[50] An English version of the questionnaire called "*Questions about Jewish life*" can be ordered from me.
Together with my colleague and co-worker the sociologist Karl Marosi in Denmark we have applied the same questionnaire in studies of the members of the Jewish Communities in Finland and Norway.
Parallel studies have recently also been carried out in other countries such as Great Britain, Hungary, the Netherlands and South Africa. The Jewish Policy Research Institute in London is coordinating some of these studies.

has changed from an extraordinary ethnic homogeneity – that served as the social basis for quite effective collectivistic measures – towards heterogeneity comprising a majority of ethnic Swedes and a considerable number of newly arrived immigrants and refugees from many different countries and several different ethnic groups. Today, approximately 15% of the Swedish population are of non-Swedish heritage. Sweden has recently officially proclaimed itself as being a multi-cultural and multi-ethnic society. In connection with ratifying the *European Council's Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* in 1999, the Swedish Parliament also passed a law granting the rights of five officially acknowledged *national minorities*, among them the Swedish Jews.[51] In connection with the simultaneous ratification of the European Charter for Regional and Minority languages, *Yiddish* was also acknowledged as a minority language in Sweden.[52] In this context it is noteworthy that Sweden, according to a law dating back to 1937[53], is the only country within the European Community (EU) that prohibits *shehita* (the slaughtering of animals according to the religious prescriptions stated in the Bible).[54] In 2001 the Swedish parliament also passed a law to restrict – and in the long run to prohibit – the practice of having boys circumcised.

On the one hand, the Jews in Sweden, since they arrived in the country about 225 years ago, have organized themselves as a particular ethnic-religious-cultural group in Sweden. As such they enjoy a certain degree of cultural autonomy. On the other hand, the group of Jews in Sweden are also fully integrated citizens at all levels of the Swedish society. How did it come to that? How did it come that they could keep a certain cultural autonomy and at the same time be fully integrated and accepted members of society? To give a very short but very abstract answer, we could say that it is through a two-sided process of cultural transformation and social integration. This implies that there has been continuous changes in the relationship to the dominant first Christian and then secular society or State and also a continuous transformation of how, that is according to what criteria, the Jews in Sweden identify themselves as Jews.

---

[51] The other groups are the Same people, the Roma people, the Finnish Swedes and the Tornedalians – a group living in the valley of the river Torne along the border of Sweden and Finland at the bottom of the Baltic sea. They speak the language of *meänkieli*, a special variation of Finnish. Cf. *Statens Offentliga Utredningar*, 1997a & 1997b.
[52] Of the other European States only the Netherlands has also done so.
[53] Clearly influenced by the anti-Jewish sentiments prevailing emanating from Nazi-Germany at that time.

I will present some historic and sociological facts to elucidate this: first, a very brief history of how the Jews became integrated into the Swedish society and then some data from a sociological survey that I recently conducted on Jewish life in Sweden and in other countries in Europe as well. Then, thirdly, I will present a model of what I would label "living with a bivalent identity", – please note, not ambivalent but *bivalent* identity.

Sweden: The History of the Swedish Jews

Adopting liberal criteria for who might be included in the group of "Jews", according to recent estimates approximately 30 thousand Jews live in Scandinavia (including Finland)[55]. Of these, approximately two thirds may be counted as a "core" group of Jews, meaning that they are born Jewish or have converted to Judaism and – even if not religious – to some extent observe Jewish practices.[56]

The history of the Jewish population differs considerably between the Scandinavian countries. In particular, the situation for the Jews in these countries during and after the Second World War has turned out very differently. The Jewry in the Scandinavian counties experienced *Shoah* in dramatically different ways. The Swedish Jewry, due to Sweden's neutrality during the war, escaped *Shoah*. The Norwegian Jewry, on the other hand, lost close to half of their members in the Nazi death camps. The Danish Jewry, in contrast, experienced the miracle of having been saved by rescue operations carried out by the gentile Danish civilian population. In Finland, on the other hand, Jews enrolled in military units of the Finnish army that fought against the Soviet Union – in fact, on the same side as the Germans. Indeed, four very different historic fortunes can be seen here. Based on their experiences, the Jewish communities in these countries have taken on very different post-*Shoah* paths.

---

[54] Among the European countries Norway and Switzerland also prohibits *shehita* (the slaughtering of animals according to the religious prescriptions in the Bible). These two countries, however, are not members of the EU.

[55] Denmark, Norway and Sweden comprise the Scandinavian countries. The group of so-called "Nordic" countries also include Finland and Iceland. For practical purposes in this context I use the better-known notion "Scandinavian" to denote the group of countries I refer to here.

[56] Estimated by the demographer Prof. Sergio Della Pergola at the Dept. of Contemporary Jewry of the Hebrew University Jerusalem.

But not only do differences in experience play a role in shaping Jewish life. Also, the sheer differences in the number of Jews in the different countries contribute to divergences with respect to how the Jews there lead their lives. The population of Jews living in the Scandinavian countries is as follows:

Number of Jews living in the Scandinavian countries today.[57]

Denmark	6400-8000;	≈	1,2 per thousand of the population
Finland	1100-1500;	≈	0,2 - " -
Norway	1200-1500;	≈	0,3 - " -
Sweden	15000-19000;	≈	1,7 - " -

In contrast to the other countries, Sweden was kept out of the war and was never under German or Nazi rule. When the Nazis seized power in Germany in 1933, 7044 Jews were living in Sweden[58]. At the outbreak of the war in 1939, the number had increased by approximately 3000, mainly due to political asylum given to refugees of Jewish descent from Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia. The case of Sweden is outstanding in that the Jewry there has doubled in size as compared with the pre-war period. This, on the other hand, can most likely be attributed to the effects of *Shoah*. Many of the Jews living in Sweden today are, as we shall learn soon, survivors of *Shoah* and/or their children. They, or their parents, came to Sweden shortly after the Second World War from other parts of Europe – a considerable number of them directly from the death camps.

The Swedish Jewry today is approximately *twice as large* in numbers as the Jewry in all the other three Scandinavian (Nordic) countries *taken together*. This fact in itself needs to be taken into account when attempting to understand the differences in Jewish life between the countries. Judaism in many respects is a social, not to say a collective, practice. Numbers as such matter

[57] By the year 2000. The lower figure refers to the ”core” group and the larger figure to an estimate of an ”enlarged” group of Jews in each of the countries.
[58] According to a Swedish law not abolished until 1951 every person living in Sweden had to belong to an acknowledged religious community. That is how we now the exact number of Jews living there at the time. Jews who had formally converted to Christianity are not included in these figures – hence according to the race criteria of the Nazi Nuremberg laws the figure would be somewhat higher.

when it comes to social life: a “critical mass” is often necessary to make things possible.[59] The larger the number of Jews in one location, the more intra-group social interaction is possible (including the possibilities of meeting potential mating partners), the more variation in life-style, in religious orientation and cultural customs can be manifested and tolerated.

Now let me give a brief history of how the Jews became integrated in the Swedish society. Schematically, it went from marginalisation to segregation to assimilation to integration. *Marginalisation* prevailed when the Jews first came to Sweden, in 1770-1775: they were a very small group, protected by the King; they were what was called then in European languages *Schutzjuden*. They were protected because otherwise they would be outsiders of society and harassed as such. Later there was a *regulation* of the Jews stating where they could live, what kind of trade they could engage in, how they were permitted to carry out their religious practices and so forth? Their segregation in Swedish society was organized by a law passed in 1782 (*Judereglementet*: “Regulations on Jews”). In the midst of 1870 the Jews were given more or less full civil rights in society and this opened up for a process of assimilation. They formed the “Communities of Believers in the Mosaic Faith”. And through this strange way of describing, one has to understand that this was a kind of “a clerical assimilation”, because in the dominant Christian society, the Christians who believed in Christ had a "Christian" religion, whereas the Jews had Moses as their main figure and thus had a "Mosaïc" religion. And that is how they adapted to the pattern of how to be religious. Something that you have on a personal level. There were not so many Jews then in Sweden; at that time in 1870ties there were 3000 Jews. Today there are about 18000 Jews in Sweden. There are 20 times as many Muslims in Sweden as there are Jews. The Jews constitute a rather small group of society: only 1,7 out of 1000 Swedes are Jews.

This process of assimilation went up until about the 1980s or so. Until then they were perceived mainly as a religious group. There were people who were Christians and others who were "Mosaïc believers" and the difference between them rested in their different religions. But the Jews never perceived themselves only as a religious group. The “ethnic revival tendency” in the 1980ies, caused by increasing ethnic plurality in the Western societies, coincided with vivid

[59] The ideas of *minyan*, as well as the voluntary establishments of *ghettos* are in different ways expressions of this.

debates within the Jewish group whether one should describe oneself as a "Mosaïc believer", because nobody would know what that is; or simply as "Jews". The discussions ended in the Jews in Sweden deciding to change name and to define themselves as “The Jewish community”. This meant that they identified not only as a religious community, but also as a cultural community and as an ethnic community. The Jews in Sweden today perceive themselves mainly as belonging to the Jewish people, not only as believers in a certain religion. As a matter of fact, religion plays a minor role and ethnicity plays a major role in their definition of what it means to be Jewish. A further step from assimilation towards integration was taken two or three years ago, when Sweden discussed the European Commission’s proposal to protect national minorities. When investigating which are the national minorities in Sweden, they found that there are five national minorities according to the criteria they put up – among these, a long standing presence in the Swedish society and having certain cultural characteristics of your own. According to these criteria, the Jews in Sweden constitute a national minority. That is, they are part of the Swedish fabric of nationalities. The Jews are now integrated in the Swedish society as an officially acknowledged minority, respected in their particularity, and equal in rights and position with any other group in Sweden.

Within the study of minorities, we discussed what “social integration” means. It has to be seen as a two-sided process: on the one hand, on the system level or the reception level, it is a social process by which a person is made part of a coherent social unit or entity as an equal part with all other members of that unit. This is the *integrative process*. But it also presupposes that the person at the same time can keep his or her own personal cultural *integrity*, that is, not to have to give up any significant features of being what they are. These two elements, to be part of the whole, of the nation's *demos*, and at the same time not to be forced to give up your subjective way of perceiving yourself as a particular *ethnos* or cultural/religious group, i.e. to be able to keep your integrity, these are the two elements, or if you wish communicating vessels of integration.

This, on the whole, has become realized in the Swedish case. The Jews there have become fully accepted, they are not regarded any more as "alien" in the Swedish society, they are part of the Swedish “fabric” – and at the same time they have not given up their integrity, nor do they have any strong reasons to feel that their integrity as Jews is offended.

The Jews in Sweden now have a certain autonomy, as a group they organize what I would call their own civil society within the Swedish society. They have lots of different associations, take care of marriages, childbirths, deaths and so forth but they do that in a good dialogue with the State. There is no conflict or tension on that level, or just very few.

Another element that are used in the comparative studies should be elucidated: how to define an ethnic or national minority? According to what criteria is a minority an *ethnic* or *national* minority? There are usually four elements that are needed, not always are all of them fulfilled. The first element is: self categorization. The group should perceive itself as particular in the sense that they understand themselves as belonging to a certain category of people. The second is: heredity in some sense – not necessarily biological heredity, it could be cultural, social, but whatever constitutes their particularity it has to be transmitted over the generations. Thirdly: the presence of cultural characteristics – it could be language, religion, customs and/or symbols. The fourth element, and not the least: a social organization that regulates the group inwardly and outwardly. Many groups do not qualify to be regarded as ethnic or national minorities but the Jewish group is a national minority according to all of these four elements.

On this background I now want to present a few data on how the Jews in Sweden today perceive their situation and themselves.

Presentation of Some Figures of the Survey

The questionnaire was made in collaboration with the sociologist Karl Marosi, of Copenhagen, Denmark and the professor of social psychology Sigvard Rubenowitz, of Gothenburg, Sweden. Our shared interest was lying in discovering more about Jewish life and identities in today's world guided our work. In the course of planning the investigation we contacted the Jewish Policy Research Institute in London (JPR) and coordinated our questions with them, since they, at that time had already carried out and published some results of a survey of social attitudes of British Jews (Goldberg & Kosmin, 1997; Miller et al. 1997).

The respondents: this study is an investigation of *the registered members* of the Jewish communities in Sweden.[60] Membership in these communities is voluntary. But not anyone can become a member. Membership requires one is *halachically* Jewish, i.e. have been born by a Jewish mother or to have converted to Judaism with an acknowledged rabbi. Recently the entry criteria to the Stockholm Jewish community (but not to the Gothenburg and Malmoe Jewish communities) has been changed so that a person who has a Jewish father, but not a Jewish mother, may also become a member. Registered members are required to pay tax to the community – amounting on the average to about 2% of the person's yearly net income.

The Importance of Being Jewish

The first question is: "How important is it to be Jewish? Is it important or is it a minor thing or is it a major thing in your own self-perception?" In our survey we asked them: "How important is it for you to be Jewish, what does it mean to you?" The 55% of them would say: "it is very important, it is defining my identity." The 1/3 of the respondents would say: "it is of great importance but other aspects of my life are also very important to me." A conclusion from that would be that those who are members of the Jewish community in Sweden do perceive Jewishness as a very important feature of their own personal identity. It is not a minor thing for them to be Jewish.

Then we asked them: "What are the constituents, what makes you Jewish?" (according to their own perception). The major thing in their own perception is the feeling of having a Jewish personality, to be Jewish inside, or Jewish in essence, in the way of thinking.

[60] Parallel studies have been carried out with the members of the Jewish Communities in Finland and Norway.

Factors Constituting a Personal Sense of "Jewishness"

"How important is each of the following aspects for your personal feeling of 'being Jewish'?" (In percent)

	Very important	Of certain importance	Not at all important
A feeling of being Jewish in essence (e.g. as a personality, way of thinking, etc.)	80,8	16,8	2,4
Loyalty to my Jewish inheritance	78,3	19,7	1,9
A feeling of belonging with other Jews	76,1	22,5	1,4
A feeling of solidarity with Israel	61,0	31,7	7,4
Jewish culture (music, literature, arts, etc.)	57,1	37,8	5,1
The Jewish atmosphere at home (food, customs, etc.)	52,2	39,1	8,7
Religious activities, going to the Synagogue, religious customs, etc.	23,8	56,4	19,7

It is clear from this that an individual element – e.g. a feeling of having a 'Jewish personality' – is the strongest factor contributing to the feeling of 'being Jewish' to Jews in contemporary Modernity. But this is closely connected to a certain collective orientation – viz. loyalty to one's Jewish inheritance and a feeling of belonging with other Jews. Religious activities is of considerably lower importance to their personal sense of 'being Jewish'. Whereas less than one out of four members of the Jewish communities in Sweden attribute high importance to such activities, and close to one out of five members declare that religious activities are of no importance to them 'being Jewish', approximately eight out of ten state that a feeling of being Jewish in essence, loyalty to the Jewish inheritance and a sense of belonging to the Jewish people is very important to their personal feeling of "Jewishness". A conclusion may be that modern Swedish Jews primarily have an *ethno-cultural* conception of what it means to 'be Jewish'.

Relation to Swedish Society: *the Jewish Group as a "National Minority*"

Since it so, that most of the Jews in Sweden feel to a great extent that Jewishness primarily is a kind of peoplehood, - it is also religion, it is also culture but it is mainly peoplehood – how then do they relate to being part of the Swedish society, because they live in Sweden? Do they feel more "Jewish" than "Swedish" or vice versa?

When directly asked how they consider the Jewish group in the country the members of the Jewish communities in Sweden answer as follows:

Conceptions of the Jewish Group in Sweden

a) "How would you describe the Jewish community in Sweden? Mainly as a religious group or as part of the Jewish people?"

Alternative options	In percent
Mainly as a religious group	4,5
Mainly as part of the Jewish people	65,3
Both equally	24,5
Don't know	5,7

Very few of them say that they feel more Swedish than Jewish, most of them say that they feel more Jewish than Swedish, but very many also say that they feel equally both: they are Swedish and they are Jewish at the same time. And they combine the two, there seem to be no conflict in being Jewish on one hand and being Swedish on the other hand; they accept to belong to two different kinds of people-hoods. Again we may conclude that the Jews in Sweden identify strongly with their "Jewishness" and regard this mainly as an ethnic thing. While the Jewish communities in the First phase of Emancipation, i.e. from the mid-19th to the mid-20th century, strived to become regarded as nationals (e.g. Swedes, French, etc.) just having another religious faith – and in society in general, at least officially and in particular after the Second World War also was regarded the as such – the Jews themselves in contemporary Modernity tend to down-

play the religious aspect and to enhance the ethno-cultural aspect of what it means to be "Jewish".

Marriage

We were interested in how they as a minority relate to the majority, the State and the society around them. For instance with respect to marriage: 1/3 of those who have chosen to become members of the Jewish community and who are married – remember, to be a member of the Jewish community is a voluntary thing – are married to a non-Jewish partner. One is justified to suppose that among those Jews who are not members of the Jewish community, many more are married to a non-Jewish partner. In the case of this 1/3 of the actual members of the Jewish communities, it seem not to constitute a intimidating conflict that they live with a non-Jewish spouse: they are married to a non-Jewish partner and at the same time they are active as Jews in the Jewish communities.

We asked the members of the Jewish communities how they relate to mixed marriages. We know that this is also a burning issue in many newly established Muslim communities in Europe. As a comparison it might be elucidating to know how a more longstanding religious Diaspora cope with this challenge. Thus, do they think that a Jew as a matter of principle should marry a Jew? How important is this in the modern Jewish world of today?

Attitudes to "mixed marriages"

a) "A Jew should marry a Jew" (In percent)

Agree completely	20,6
Agree by and large	30,0
Neither – nor	19,2
Disagree in part	12,4
Disagree completely	17,8

Only half of the members agree to the principle idea that mixed marriages should be avoided. But how would they handle this in their own personal life? We asked all members, including those presently married to a Jewish partner, the following:

Attitudes to "mixed marriages" (In percent)

	Yes	No	Don't know
"Could you, as a matter of principle, consider marriage to a non-Jew?"	51,6	35,3	13,1

Half of the *members* of the Jewish communities in Sweden evidently don't mind to engage in a "mixed marriage". A closer analysis shows that a dividing factor here is degree of religiosity. More than two thirds of the secular members could consider marriage to a non-Jew, whereas "only" one fourth of the religious members could do so. However, the fact that even 25% of the religious members could consider doing so is perhaps the most remarkable in this context.

So far what we have asked concerns themselves – how prepared would they be to intervene in the choices of their children?

"If I had a son/daughter[61] who wanted to marry a non-Jew I would do all in my power to prevent it" (In percent)

Agree completely	12,3
Agree by and large	13,2
Neither – nor	16,9
Disagree in part	15,4
Disagree completely	42,3

[61] We asked separately about sons and daughters. Only very slight differences were found in the way the members look at possible mixed marriages of sons as compared to daughters.

Again only one out of four members say they would intervene in the choice of their child to prevent him or her from marrying a non-Jewish partner. The modern idea that individual choices and preferences should be respected – even within the family and even when they are in opposition to traditional values – has evidently become widely accepted in Swedish Jewry.

Not only is *individualism* a prominent value in postmodernity. An aspect of this that seems to be accompanying the postmodernisation of society is the increasing respect paid to the *subjectivity* of individuals as a legitimate base for action. While formerly what people "objectively" *are* – e.g. noblemen, unmarried or "Jewish" – decided how they were handled in society, today increasingly how they "construct" themselves, that is *what the individual subjectively think of or make of him- or herself*, should be what counts.

We may trace this for instance in the attitudes of the members towards who should be entitled membership in the Jewish communities. Traditionally this is open only for those that are "objectively", meaning *halachically*, Jewish, i.e. have been born by a Jewish mother or to have converted to Judaism with an acknowledged rabbi. But nowadays the members of the Swedish Jewish communities also regard alternative options, for instance that those who identify "Jewish", that is "feel Jewish" subjectively, even if they are not *halachic* Jews, but have some other relationship in terms of kinship or marriage, should also be entitled to membership in the Jewish community.

The Position of Women

One way of assessing the influence of larger society on Jews in the Diaspora is to look at how the members cope with the quite strong tendencies towards gender equality prevailing in contemporary Swedish society. Traditional and Orthodox Judaism prescribes a different role to women than men have in religious life. According to *Halachah* – acknowledged Jewish law and traditions – women cannot sit together with men in the Synagogue, they do not count in *Minyan* – the group of ten Jews that are required for a religious service to be held, they can't be called to the *Torah*, i.e. as part of the service read out to the congregation from the Biblical scriptures. A

woman is also not entitled to become a rabbi.[62] On the basis of this we asked the members about their attitudes to the position of women in Judaism. The answers are as follows:

Attitudes to the position of woman within Judaism

a) "The position of women is not satisfactory within Judaism"

(In percent)

Agree completely	21,3
Agree by and large	31,1
Neither – nor	23,6
Disagree in part	10,0
Disagree completely	13,9

A majority of the members of the Jewish communities in contemporary Sweden find the position of women in Judaism not satisfactory. Interestingly there are only slight differences between younger and older members, and between male and female members with respect to this. The largest proportion of dissatisfied members (59%) is found among middle-aged women (the smallest proportion is found among the young male members, (47%). The largest proportion of members who do not disagree with the present position of women in Judaism is found among the young male members (24%) – and the smallest proportion, 18%, is found among the middle-aged women. It is also remarkable that even within the subgroup of "religious Jews" there are more (42%) who find that the position of women is *not* satisfactory than there are religious members find the position of women in Judaism completely or by and large satisfactory (32%).

With respect to particular functions the picture looks like this:

[62] Some so-called Reform communities accept women as rabbis and "mixed seating", i.e. women and men are not assigned separate places in the Synagogue. The Swedish communities are not "reform", they do not acknowledge female rabbis and only since a few years ago "mixed seating" is permitted in the major Synagogue in Stockholm – but not in any other of the synagogues in Sweden.

Attitudes to the position of woman within Judaism (In percent)

"*Do you think that Jewish women should*"	Yes	No	Don't know
Be able to sit among the men in the Synagogue	68,7	24,8	6,5
Count in a *Minyan*	42,4	41,1	16,5
Be called to the *Torah*	49,1	35,1	15,8
Be a rabbi	50,7	33,1	16,2

There are clearly more members of the Swedish Jewish communities who want to change the synagogal life in an egalitarian direction than there are members who want to stick to the traditional rules of sex differences. It seems the strong tendencies towards egalitarianism in modern Sweden has strong repercussions also within the Jewish community. It is noteworthy that the chairman of the Jewish community of Stockholm is currently a woman. And contrary to the situation in, for example, the Mosques in Paris, in Stockholm, in the main Synagogue, it is now accepted that men and women may sit together. This is very often also the situation in the American Jewish communities.

Acceptance of egalitarianism in religious matters is not a singular phenomenon. As we have seen the Jews in Sweden by having accepted the status of a national minority have positively approved of their ethno-cultural particularity. This, in this perspective, can also be understood as another acceptance of equality: in a truly multi-cultural setting all minority groups ideally have equal rights. While in a *pre*-multicultural setting *assimilation* (personal or clerical[63]) as it showed in the First phase of Emancipation[64] in Europe in fact often was the only road towards emancipation, in a postmodern multicultural setting *ethnification* – that is promoting the ethno-cultural particularity of the group and simultaneously being granted non-discriminatory and equal rights with other groups, including the majority group – becomes a new, viable option towards emancipation. (At the same time assimilation tends to become obsolete as a way towards

[63] By this I mean such things as synagogue ceremonies taking on more and more traits of the religious practices that are dominant in the country, e.g. the use of organ music, dressing the rabbis in garments reminding of that used by the priests in the Churches, etc.
[64] Cf. my remarks in connection with the notion of 'national minority' in a previous section of this article.

emancipation: one just looses one's affiliation to one's culture without "gaining" anything socially from it).

Participation in Swedish Customs

But there are also other elements: do the members of the Jewish communities in Sweden participate in non-Jewish festivals and holidays, and to what degree? I will give you a personal testimony: that in Sweden from where we just came, there is a kind of a peak of the year: it is called "Midsummer". The nights are bright, there is hardly any darkness and people stay outside late since the sun is shining even at night, people drink and have parties, there is a kind of carnival atmosphere. This celebration of the Midsummer always happen on a Friday in Sweden, so that people can rest over the weekend after having drunk a lot. So, this feast coincides with the Jewish Shabbat. With my friends and among them some Rabbis, we celebrate a kind of "Midsummer Shabbat". The point here is that you can do both at the same time; and this is in a way typical of how things are solved, of how the Jews as a minority live in a majority culture: if the customs can be combined, then combine them!

In general the Jews in Sweden live according to that. We asked them about other things: Like in most Christian societies to have a Christmas' tree and to give Christmas gifts – customs alien to the Jewish tradition – are important popular traditions. We asked our Jewish respondents: "Do you give Christmas gifts?" More than 1/3 said: "Well, we keep some significant Jewish traditions at home but we also give Christmas gifts."

We also asked whether our Jewish respondents use to have a Christmas tree at home (which is not anything you should have as seen from a Jewish perspective). About 1/5 of the respondents would say "we keep Jewish traditions but we also have a Christmas tree at home." This is illustrative how they as Jews of interact with and adapt to the society they happen to live in.

Enjoying the Ethno-cultural Smorgasbord

There is today a very active Jewish life in Sweden, a very active cultural life, theatre, music, all kinds of activities. People are very involved. There was recently a French magazine which wrote about this; the headline was: "Vive le Judaïsme ouvert!" referring to Stockholm. There is a kind of continuous cultural transformation in order to retain the Jewish identity. The Jews do not give up the Jewish identity but it is constantly transformed; today it has developed towards what I would call "post-modern Swedish smorgasbord" Judaism": you pick what you like and you mix as you like. On your plate is what is relevant to you in that particular society and the particular situation in which you live.

The Jews of Sweden today constitute a formal and officially acknowledged national minority. As such they are a distinguishable as an ethno-cultural group in society, and at the same time quite integrated in it. This is accompanied by the members of the Jewish communities in Sweden today manifesting:
A strong Jewish self-awareness;
A clear-cut ethno-cultural identification as "Jews";
A high level of activity, especially within the field of "Jewish Culture";
A free choice and combination of Jewish practices;
A tendency to attribute new meanings to those traditional Jewish practices that are observed.

This attitude to choose freely among the religiously prescribed practices which to observe, and which to refrain from observing, is accompanied by a wish that all kinds of members should have equal value within the congregations and that tolerance for differences between them should be increased. An interesting and challenging aspect of their way of "being Jewish" is that the Jews in Sweden today tend to combine the traditions they choose to observe in a personally relevant way: for instance keeping a kosher or partly kosher household at home (38%), but enjoying shrimps[65] in restaurants (67%), or within the family sometimes lightning *Shabbat* candles (73%) but also giving Christmas gifts (35%), or having a *mezuzah* at the entry door to one's house (80%), but having a Christmas tree inside it (15%), and so forth. In this way, by selectively to choose among

the customs and to combine what is observed, one often attach new subjective meanings to these practices, meanings that are socially relevant to the individual in contemporary society. With all societal changes traditions become transformed – not just now, and not just in Europe (cf. Goldscheider & Zuckerman, 1984). Cultural transformation, and even cultural "creolisation"[66], in a way is the opposite of assimilation. It is to live in the modern world and to make traditional cultural patterns and customs relevant to one's contemporary social situation. To do so is certainly nothing new in Jewish history – in this respect the Jews have always been modern.

"The David Star of the Diaspora"

In order to understand these processes I will present a diagram I have constructed, which is a kind of Jewish Trinity based upon three constituting elements for modern Jewry: religion, Jewish history and Zionism.

In order to be a Jew –*mutatis mutandis* this may also be true for other minority groups – there are certain elements that you cannot avoid relating to:

– If you are a Jew you have to relate to Judaism as a system of thought and a *religion*. You can be an atheist as a Jew, still you have to relate to Judaism as a system of learning, of ideas.

– There is another element which is also decisive: it is, what I would call, *Jewishness* as a filter of experience. This filter is grounded on significant *historic elements*: the Holocaust (*Shoah*), the long history of victimization, the Pogroms, anti-Semitism and all kind of things that became part of one's inner life, that make you react the way you do; it gives you a certain sensitivity, a certain sensibility to certain things that others would not have, because you have this historic memories and references that make you perceive the world through the "eyes of Jewishness".

– Nowadays you have also another entity, the State of Israel as a cornerstone in modern Judaism: you can be a Zionist or an anti-Zionist or an a-Zionist whatever – anyway as a Jew you cannot avoid to have to relate to the fact that the Jewish State of Israel is there.

---

[65] Shrimps and other shellfish are not *kosher*.
[66] Cf. Hannerz (1996).

Any Jew in the modern world, e.g. in Sweden, is inscribed in this triangle. Within it you can have different positions: you can relate one way or the other to the Jewish religion, to Zionism and to the Jewish history, but you cannot *not* relate to these cornerstones of modern Jewish existence.

The Jews we have interviewed, however, are also Swedes. Based on that fact you can construct a similar triangle: if you are a Swede, or a Frenchman or whatever you are, you have a *homeland*, you are a *citizen* of a State, where you have the right to vote, to do your military service, pay your taxes and so forth. For Swedes, Sweden is their homeland, whether they like it or not. They live in an environment that is characterized by a certain discourse in which one is intellectually and culturally embedded: in the Swedish case I would call it "Secularized Lutheranism". It is a Lutheran society, not in the sense of being a religious society, but a society impregnated with the virtues of Lutheranism: to be industrious, to work hard, to be energetic and all that – these are significant elements the Swedish society. We may, for instance, consider the way religion is understood in this secular, Swedish, Lutheran cosmology: it is regarded as something "inner", something that you have a belief in rather than something that you practice publicly. But within Judaism religion is understood as something that you observe or practice. But living in a society, you are defined by that society and if you live in Sweden it is the Swedish way of understanding religion that becomes hegemonic – implying that it permeates even the way many Jews understand what, in this case, "religion" is.

But as a Swede not only Jewishness, also Swedishness is part of you: – you will come to like the Midsummer, salted herrings, small red houses, the nature and landscape of Sweden, the melancholy of the Swedish folk music and songs; all that is also part of you. So you will also perceive the world through a kind of "filter of Swedishness". Thus you will be inscribed also in a "Swedish triangle".

You can combine the two triangles. Together they will form what I call "the Star of David of the Diaspora". You are simultaneously within both of these filters. But not like 50-50 - on the contrary, you are 100% Jew and you are 100% Swede at the same time. This is the way one can understand a modern diasporic identity. That is what I call a *bivalen*t identity, both aspects are valid, still you are not "half" of anything.

Some of my colleagues mentioned here that we now live in a world of globalization permeated by new technologies and so forth... So, you may ask, how can you lead a life as a minority, if you are a very small minority?

In this the new communication technologies help. What now emerges are a kind of "digital diasporas": you can live in Sweden or in Denmark or in any country, and through these modern technologies you can now relate to any particular group of people to whom you want to belong. It is not anymore so much **geo**graphy, i.e. where you live, that defines who you are but rather your **bio**graphy, that is with whom you share history and values. The *bio*graphy of people has come to replace their *geo*graphy as the "social glue" that shape belongingness.

Not only do you now have a kind of "digital diasporas", you also have what I would call a kind of "globalized ghettos". You can lock in, in a certain ideological or cultural ghetto, or virtual group with whom you may engage in social, emotional and intellectual exchange. In this way your significant partners, those with whom you relate may well live somewhere else.

Conclusion

Since we are not here to discuss the Jewish groups but to learn about Muslims in Europe, my conclusions are – if you for the sake of comparison look at the Swedish Jews as an – you may focus on that what has emerged through the years is that the Jewish group today live with some minor frictions, but on the whole prevail very good relations to the secular States in Europe. There are open communication and a good attitude between the groups. For instance, anti-Semitism is actively battled by the Swedish government. The 27th of January, the day of the liberation of Auschwitz, is made a national memorial day. Based on the Holocaust experience there is a State has launched a campaign against genocide and ethnic discrimination.

The Jewish group in Sweden today has no serious problems with the dominant secular society. We could even say that Jewish group in Sweden is a respected part of that society while still retaining its religious, cultural and ethnic particularities.

What has emerged with the Jewish minority is based on a long experience. The Jewish case is interesting here because it is a case endowed with a long experience of the Diaspora. That has shaped certain social attitudes and certain traditions within the group. Through the years a longstanding tendency among the Jews has developed to seek *relationship* rather than *rivalry* with the State, or any other ruling part for that matter. The ambition of the Jewish Diaspora in Europe has never been to dominate, never to control anything but their own lives. Today there is neither suppression on one hand, nor submission on the other hand.

My question to you is: whether this, *mutatis mutandis* somehow, can become a path also for the future of the now growing Muslim groups in Europe? If the answer is "no", one has to analyze it. Why not? What would then be a possible future development of the Muslim groups in Europe?

References

Arvidsson, H., Berntson, L., Dencik, L. (1994), *Modernisering och välfärd – om stat, individ och civilt samhälle i Sverige*, ('Modernisation and Welfare – on State, Individuals and Civil Society in Sweden'), Stockholm: City University Press.

Bauman, Z. (1991), *Modernity and Ambivalence*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Bauman, Z. (1998), "Allosemitism: Premodern, Modern, Postmodern" in B. Cheyette and L. Marcus (eds.), *Modernity, Culture and 'the Jew'*, Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 143-156.

Beck,U., Giddens, A., Lash, S. (1994), *Reflexive Modernization. Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Blum, J. (1973), *Dansk og/eller Jøde*, ('Dane and/or Jew'), København: Gyldendal.

Castells, M. (1997), *The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture*, *Volume II. The Power of Identity,* London: Blackwell.

Crook, S., Pakulski, J., Waters, M. (1992), *Postmodernization. Change in Advanced Society*, London: Sage Publications.

Dencik, L. (2001), "Transformation of Identities in Rapidly Changing Societies" in M. Carleheden & M. Hviid Jacobsen (eds.), *The Transformation of Modernity*, *Aspects of the Past, Present and Future of an Era*, Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 183-221.

Dencik, L. (1993), "Hemma i hemlösheten" ('To be at home in Homelessness') in Jakubowski, J. *Judisk Identitet* ('Jewish Identity'), Stockholm: Natur och Kultur.

Ellemers, R., Spears, B., Doosje, B. (eds.) (1999), *Social Identity*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Giddens, A. (1990), *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1991), *Modernity and Self-Identity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Goldberg, J. & Kosmin, B. (1997), *The Social Attitudes of Unmarried Young Jews in Contemporary Britain*, London: Institute for Jewish Policy Research.

Goldscheider, C. & Zuckerman, A. (1984), *The Transformation of the Jews*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Gordon, H. & Grosin, L. (1973) *Den dubbla identiteten. Judars anpassning i historisk och psykologisk belysning* ('The dual identity. The adaptation of Jews in Historic and Psychological light'), Stockholm: Dept. of Education, Stockholm University.

Gruber, R. E. (2002), *Virtually Jewish. Reinventing Jewish Culture in Europe*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hannerz, U. (1996), *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places,* London: Routledge.

Jakubowski, J. (ed.) (1993) *Judisk identitet* ('Jewish Identity'), Stockholm: Natur och Kultur.

Mendes-Flohr, P. & Reinharz, J. (eds.) (1980), *The Jew in the Modern World. A Documentary History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Miller, S., Schmool, M. & Lerman, A. (1997), *Social and Political Attitudes of British Jews: Some key findings of the JPR Survey*, London: Institute for Jewish Policy Research.

Paideia Perspectives (2001), No. 1, Stockholm: Paideia – The European Institute for Jewish Studies.

Schnapper, D. (1980), *Juifs et israélites,* Paris: Gallimard.

Schnapper, D. (1994), "*Israelite* and *Juifs*: New Jewish Identities in France" in J. Webber (ed.), *Jewish Identities in the New Europe*, London: Littman Library of Jewish Civilisation, pp. 171-178.

Statens offentliga utredningar (1997a), *Steg mot en minoritetspolitik. Europarådets konvention om historiska minoritetsspråk* ('Steps towards a minority policy. The European Council's Frame Convention on historic minority languages.'), Stockholm: SOU 1997: 192.

Statens offentliga utredningar (1997b), *Steg mot en minoritetspolitik. Europarådets konvention för skydd av nationella minoriteter* ('Steps towards a minority policy. The European Council's Frame Convention for the protection of national minorities.'), Stockholm: SOU 1997: 193.

The American Jewish Committee (2000), *Attitudes Toward Jews and the Holocaust in Argentina – a Public-Opinion Survey*, New York: The American Jewish Committee.

Toulmin, S. (1962), *The Philosophy of Science*, London: Arrow Books.

Wasserstein, B. (1996), *Vanishing Diaspora. The Jews in Europe since 1945*, London: Hamish Hamilton.

Webber, J. (1994), "Modern Jewish Identities" in Webber, J. (ed.), *Jewish Identities in the New Europe*, London: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, pp.74-85.

Ziehe, T. & Stubenrauch, H. (1982), *Plädoyer für ungewöhnliches Lernen,* Hamburg: Rohwohlt.

Ziehe, T. (1989), *Kulturanalyser: ungdom, utbildning, modernitet*. ('Cultural analysis: youth, education, modernity'), Stockholm: Symposion.

BEYOND VICTIMHOOD – FROM THE GLOBAL TO THE LOCAL: *A BRITISH CASE-STUDY*

PHILIP LEWIS, BRADFORD UNIVERSITY

Firstly, I will try to explain why I chose this title "Beyond victimhood", then I will look at a range of novelists in Britain who are unintentionally de-exoticing (in French: *banaliser*) the Muslim communities: that is they are trying to render familiar and accessible the Muslim communities. This very important, because it represents an alternative narrative to those Muslim groups, maybe national groups, who are locked into the rhetoric of Muslim as victim: victim of Islamophobia, of racism, of social and political exclusion.

I want to take some examples in all the religious traditions of the Muslim communities in Britain, of individuals connecting with wider society, to pick up a comment to Professor Jonker: if in Germany there is communication, discussion but no interaction, in Britain we see real attempts within the Muslim communities to encourage social, political interaction with wider society; and to legitimize that islamically and that is new, certainly for some of the groups of which I will speak today. So, I want to look at that given the example of a Suffi and look at his discourse. There are interesting debates within Islamic seminaries in Britain; unlike France, we have in Britain 20 Islamic seminaries and I want to talk about an important debate amongst and within British educated Imams from within the most traditional of seminary groupings. Again the debate turns on isolation… So, a critical debate is going on within the most traditional group of Islamic seminaries. And finally I will just mention in passing the contributions of what we've got in the literature Islamists' groups.

Let me start by giving an example of victim hood: there are a number of national Muslim organizations in Britain: that what is best organized is called the Muslim Council of Britain which was created in 1997. It recently published a book of essays of which the title was *The Quest for Sanity: Reflections on the 11th September and the Aftermath*. It is very evident, if you look at this book of essays, that the key organizing theme is Muslim as victim, a victim of 9/11 with an increased incidence of Islamophobic attacks locally and nationally. The threat for civil

liberties posed by legislation aiming at addressing terrorism. And the practice of US hegemony under the guise of a war on terrorism. However there also are cause for mutual understanding between the world of Islam and the West.

Let me give you a quotation, which is very typical, from the book of essays:

"*... as part of the war on terror, we hear calls and measures to close down Coranic schools or… Often the only providers of literacy in some of the poorest parts of the Muslim world*." There is of course no doubt that the content of curricula and educational methods in Muslim institutions need urgent and wide-ranging improvement. This seems very typical of the content of this book. Here a crucial issue is touched upon, a crisis in religious formation and education, but apart from a few well-intended generalities, nothing more is said about addressing this local issue.

If we return to the novelists, I want to just draw your attention to 3 or 4 novels: Yunus Alam – is one of a number of young writers recently [July 17th 2003] awarded £7,000 by the Arts Council for demonstrating 'exceptional promise' He won the award for his second published work, a crime novel set in his home town, Bradford, entitled "Kilo". In an interview given to the local press, he expressed the hope that:

Kilo is relevant to people who don't normally pick up a novel. My nephew read it, he's 15, and he watches films. He read it in three days and thought it was great. He was engaged by the reality of it…I think that [it]…has things in it relevant to younger people in Bradford…[while] I hate the idea of being a role model…how many Bradford-born Pakistani writers are there? When I was growing up there was no-one I could relate to. (Telegraph & Argus, 29-06-03).

However one judges its literary merit, Kilo is no Harry Potter. The main character is Khalil, the son of a small shop-keeper who leaves home after his father disowns him on his refusal of a transcontinental arranged marriage. His metamorphosis from a polite young man into the street-wise drug dealing Kilo who wields a knife and a gun begins. However, he has a bad conscience and the intervention of a good cop and a religious epiphany returns him to the straight and narrow. Along the way there are sharp comments about transcontinental arranged marriages,

outwardly pious fathers who know how their sons earn a living pushing drugs but prefer to enjoy its fruits rather than challenge it; as well as bitter comments about rote learning at the mosque which necessarily has no practical impact on the behavior of young men[67]. The novel is no apologia for drugs – indeed, its unvarnished depiction of the moral and social disintegration of many involved in the drug trade has led more than one youth worker to use it for anti-drug training among young men at risk.

I mention this recent novel as but one example of a number of such – often by better known writers – which are beginning to provide a richly textured insight into aspects of many Muslim communities in Britain. Hanif Kureishi's novel in 1995 – *The Black Album* – offered an insightful study of a young British Pakistani student pulled between the blandishments of western culture and radical Islam. The celebrated first novel by Zadie Smith – *White Teeth* – involves, *inter alia*, Bangladeshi characters in London: while Monica Ali's *Brick Lane* has just been published to critical literary acclaim. Ali is a young writer born in Bangladesh but educated and brought up in London. *Brick Lane* is set amongst the Bangladeshi community in Tower Hamlets, East London and this finely crafted novel illuminates many aspects of life, whether religion, gender, generational tensions and the impact and dynamics of transnationalism on family life. This is a wonderful example of a novel which de-exceptionalizes, de-exoticizes the Muslim communities. And I think it is very welcome, in offering this alternative narrative of an ordinary Muslim community. And therefore locates some positions, those issues in the Muslim community which are of interest. Radical Islam is put into context beautifully.

---

[67] "*Thing is, that girl from Pakistan probably didn't want to know me at all. Two people, her and me both, were being squeezed here. In all likelihood, she hated the idea of marrying a stranger possessing some strange culture as much as I did. That's what it came down to, this cross fertilisation of people, this bridging of the culture gap by force. I could imagine her parents trying to force me on her, and while I had the liberty to bitch about it, she'd be sitting there, head bowed, ready to accept it, silently praying for a husband who treated her okay*" [43] "*….these days, I see fathers, five times-a-day people with beards, the prayer beads and the ticket to Paradise, knowing damned well what their sons are up to and not doing a thing about it. Matter of fact, as long as the sons bring in a few hundred notes every week to go towards the mansions in Pakistan, or the upkeep of the family four wheel drive, there's no problem. When money comes into it, conflicts between religious beliefs and criminal activities are suddenly and quite miraculously overcome*" [150-51] "*…I never understood any of it [the Qur'an] as a kid. I'd go to mosque, read a few pages and then I'd go home like all the other kids. Like them, I knew how to read, how to pronounce, where to pause and where not to, but I never understood like I should have understood. Just a load of words in Arabic, could have been Russian, for all the difference it made…I could have been a monkey, mimicking and learning by rote, being conditioned into reading for the sake of it but not for the sake of it…*"[204] It is interesting that Kilo's reconversion is mediated through a Qur'an with an English translation. (Alam, M.Y. (2002), *Kilo*, Route, West Yorkshire, ISBN 1 901927 09 1 www.route-online.com)

I mention Yusuf Alam's novel because as a British educated Pakistani, he chooses to acknowledge and address real social abuses which Muslims share with wider society, but about which many elders are in denial. Such novels are not works of social science – although Yusuf Alam happens to teach such in Bradford University! – but nonetheless, indicate that British born writers are contributing to an understanding of 'Muslim' communities which neither sentimentalises nor demonises those communities.

Such novels can communicate the complex lived reality of Muslim communities and can offer an alternative narrative to Muslim as victim, whether of racism, Islamophobia or social and economic exclusion which so often features in Islamic publications. An example of this genre of Muslim as victim is a book of essays entitled *The Quest for Sanity: Reflections on September 11 and the Aftermath* produced by The Muslim Council of Britain (MCB). The MCB, created in 1997, aspires to articulate and champion the concerns of Britain's diverse Muslim communities. The book comprises forty contributions which range in length from a couple of pages to substantial chapters drawn from previously published works and are organised around various themes: the main one is Muslim as victim of 9/11 with the increased incidence of Islamophobia worldwide; the threat to civil liberties posed by legislation aimed at addressing terrorism and the practice of USA hegemony under the guise of a war on terrorism. There is also a call for mutual understanding between the West and the world of Islam; notes on the historic presence of Muslims in Britain and a final section on Islamic values includes perspectives on war and peace, tolerance, hope, and Human Rights.

What is clear is that it is not an easy to be a Muslim today. This, in part, explains the defensive and apologetic tone of some of these pieces. What is more surprising is the denial that there is compelling evidence to indicate Al-Quaeda involvement in 9/11. There is hardly a word of criticism of the Taliban regime. There is even a defence of leaflets produced by the radical Muslim group - *Al-Muhajiroun*. Nothing feeds Islamophobia more than their inflammatory diatribes against the West, Jews, and Christians.

While there is much of interest here - not least an interesting draft social contract calling on British Muslims to be 'faithful to the Islamic values of truth, justice, care and compassion' – and

generalised self-criticism, there is little evidence of engagement with pressing intellectual and social issues exercising Muslims in Britain. Typical is the following remark taken from the introductory essay:

…as part of the war on terror, we…hear calls and measures to close down Qur'anic schools or madrasahs, often the only providers of literacy in some of the poorest parts of the world…There is of course no doubt that the content of curricula and educational methods in Muslim institutions need urgent and wide-ranging improvement…

Here, then, a crucial issue is broached – the crisis in religious formation and education across the Muslim world – but apart from a few well intended generalities, nothing more is said. Occasionally, echoes of anguished debates exercising reflective Muslims, can be heard, for example, should Islam be depicted as 'ideology' or is this a betrayal of Sufism, the historic custodian the Islam's humanist and spiritual values? Among those who best articulate this concern are the few Muslim women whose voices can be heard in this collection. However, such debates are muted, drowned out by the insistence on Muslims as victims.

A Development Cycle for Muslim Communities in the West

We can locate the proliferation of positive Muslim interventions in public and civic life within the final phase of a familiar four phases development cycle for migrant Muslim communities. First, the pioneers; then 'chain migration' of generally unskilled male workers from a number of villages; followed by the migration of wives and children; finally, the emergence of a generation of Muslims born and educated in the West. Each phase, serves to enlarge the range of contacts and familiarity with British society. During the second stage, the intention was for men to work for a few years and return to their country of origin, to be replaced by a relative who could continue sending remittances back. The men often lived in multiple occupancy flats and houses; most saw no need to develop a good knowledge of the language and culture of their neighbours, sustained as they were by the myth of return.

The third phase is from sojourners to settlers. During this third phase wives join their husbands or a bride was sought from the homeland. With family consolidation, a network of institutions was developed to meet the religious and cultural needs of their families. This typically involved establishing places to worship – initially, a Church might extend to them a use of a building, or a couple of houses or redundant commercial buildings would be acquired and converted into a mosque; then an imam would be sought, usually from the homeland, to teach the children the basics of Islam. During this third phase, Muslims had to develop the linguistic and social skills to interface with the municipal authority and key local institutions to make sure service provision was sensitive to their needs, whether in hospital, school or cemetery.

The third and fourth phase are, of course, overlapping. However, with the emergence of a generation of Muslims born, educated and socialized in Britain, embedded in communities whose future is in Britain, we notice more and more Muslims being incorporated into public and civic society. There is an increase of Muslim local councilors, some 219 in the UK [of which are 161 are Labor] in 2002[68]; the emergence of an Islamic civil society, with associations of Muslim lawyers, teachers and doctors; in centers of high Muslim settlement there is the consolidation of Muslim quarters with a whole range of goods and services provided by Muslim businessmen and professionals.

Further, British Muslims have become aware that wider society is not inhospitable to many of their concerns. Britain allows more space for Muslim self-expression than most other European countries: a State which comprises four nations, which has gradually made institutional space for denominational diversity since the Reformation, and which enjoys the relatively plastic category 'British' allowing some measure of multiple identities – British Jews – has gradually extended to Muslims the same rights enjoyed by other faiths.

Because public and civic life is permeated with Christian influence - with the existence of an established Church – British society is proving increasingly responsive to the religious concerns of Muslims. Theology departments have been extended to include religious studies. All new religious education syllabi used in State schools have to reflect the social fact of religious

diversity. Because the State funds religious schools which provide education for over 20 per cent of all children, this category has been extended since 1998 to include a handful of Muslim schools. Any religious group can found a private school. There are now more than 80 Islamic private schools. In September 1999 the Prison Service appointed the first Muslim Adviser and there are now a growing number of Muslim chaplains in prisons and hospitals. Public service broadcasting has always included explicit religious slots, which now include Muslim voices.

This is the context within which we can now detect a willingness by some Muslims to acknowledge and tackle pressing social problems, as well as professionalisation or clericalisation of religious leaders, who are exploring the institutional spaces for religious personnel in British society. This, then, is the focus of this short paper.

Beyond Polemic: a Sufi Call for Engagement with British Society

Often, in the past, the sort of international speakers invited to Bradford to speak to British educated Muslims have been anti-Christian and anti-western polemicists such as the South African, Ahmed Deedat[69] However, in February 2003 an American Sufi, Shaikh Hamza Yusuf, spoke to some four to five thousand young people in a large Bradford mosque in English. This was a very different sort of meeting.

It was organised by an informal network of some twenty young Muslim professionals in the city, male and female, with the females taking the initiative in inviting the Shaikh to Bradford – a local teacher introduced the speaker; a young doctor spoke before the shaikh about a rising drug and substance abuse problem in the local Muslim community. The elders of the Bradford Council for Mosques and sections of the business community played a supportive role. Local political and religious dignitaries were invited to a smaller gathering for a meal and a conversation with Hamza Yusuf after the main event, to which many had also been invited.

---

[68] Ansari, Humayun (2002), *Muslims in Britain*, Minority Rights Group International, p 19.
[69] See Lewis, Philip (2001), 'Depictions of "Christianity" within British Islamic Institutions, in L. Ridgeon, (ed.), *Islamic Interpretations of Christianity*, London: Curzon Press, pp 211-15.

It was clear from Hamza Yusuf's presentation that he was a scholar of Arabic and the traditional Islamic sciences. He also was able to draw on a wide set of references outside Islam, including Chinese wisdom and Thomas Hobbes, the 17th century English political philosopher. The shaikh began by commending the sign language facility for the deaf as a welcome development within a community which often neglected this group. He sought to put the present crisis facing the Muslim world in a historical context. This conforms to his reading of the Qur'an which supports an understanding of history. Reference to earlier history was made to remind contemporary Muslims that their forbears had faced and weathered far worse tribulations. The Qur'anic answer to such adversity was patience/*sabr*. He reminded his audience that the religious life moves through well defined [sufi] stages [*maqamat*]. The first is *taubah* [repentance]; then *sabr*. He argued that the Qur'anic verses which pointed to the need for forbearance, patience and humility in the face of tribulation had not been abrogated.

He went on to remind Muslims of the historic presence in Britain. In the 16th and 17th centuries some Britons converted since the Ottoman culture was a much more a meritocracy than England at the time, and also characterised by greater tolerance than Europe. Islam's historic vocation had been a civilising one – indeed, he argued that the same word in Arabic was used for colonization and civilization. He then pointedly noted that 'We [Muslims] can only be a civilising presence if we ourselves are not barbarians!'

In all, Hamza Yusuf was seeking to remind Muslims that they had within their tradition two essential notions which undergird human rights: human dignity and equality. The Jewish historian Bernard Lewis was cited as acknowledging that traditionally Jews in the Muslim world had greater security than those in the pre-modern West. In the light of such comments he could address those angry voices in the Muslim world who press for the massacre/expulsion of Jews for Israel/Palestine as anti-Islamic. He insisted that the Muslim case against them is the illegitimate authority they exercise over occupied lands. An occupation enabled and supported by the USA.

He sought to emphasize Islamic concern with human dignity by citing a famous illustration when an action by the Caliph Ali was challenged by a Jew and his case was upheld. He went on

pointedly to remark that such an attitude is the opposite to the 'contempt and disdain' we show for those we dismiss as *kuffar* [non-believers].

Turning to the rising drug problem in the Muslim community, he counselled the need for compassion for users. 'Why the flight to oblivion?' What had gone wrong in families, communities and society? He provocatively asked: 'Why do we internalise in our family life the very political despotism from which we have fled in our homelands?' The mark of any society's health is its ethics. 'We have failed to inculcate sound ethics in our children'. In Islam rights off property and life are sacred. Hence his dismay at the riots in Bradford. He also made some criticisms of corporate capitalism which exploits child labour in South Asia to provide cheap products. He had a clever aside about USA policy: it was said Britain used 'to rule the waves'; the USA 'waives the rules'!

His remarks on religious diversity were particularly pertinent. He argued the Qur'an acknowledges religious diversity as a given. The implication was that it was not God's will for all to be Muslims. The more open schools of Islamic law had embodied this understanding in extending the traditional protection afforded to The People of the Book – Christians and Jews – to other religious traditions. However, it was not clear whether he considers diversity a positive good or something to be tolerated. What was clear was his willingness to learn from others. He cited the importance the Catholic Church gave to pre-marriage guidance. This would be useful for Muslims to emulate as an antidote to the increase in dysfunctional families. With regard to ethics he cited A. Toynbee's affirmation that historically Islam had been more successful than the West in addressing racism and alcoholism.

The shaikh worried about the sectarianism within the community, especially ignorance that masqueraded as learning. Those who were serious scholars knew that Islamic jurisprudence *[fiqh*] acknowledged a place for valid disagreements on a range of issues. Further, he was dismayed at how Qur'anic verses were often being taken out of context e.g. 'Kill the polytheists wherever you come across them' – cited from an Afghan video – or 'Do not take Jews and Christians as friends' [*Hizb at Tahrir*]. The Arabic mistranslated friends – *'aulia* – he stressed actually meant

protectors. In all, He was concerned by the proliferation of 'fools' issuing *fatw*a – legal opinions – without adequate training.

He cautioned against forever looking for external causes for troubles within the Muslim community. 'We are weak and divided'. Sections of the community frequently locked into 'arrogant argumentation' with each other. In all, we do not 'embody tranquillity and piety', but are led by 'passions and whims'.

He made some very sharp comments about women's rights. In conditions of social corruption *'ulama* from South Asia had preferred women not to come to the mosque. However, in changed conditions in the West, Muslim leaders should embody the Prophet's teaching and practice which ran counter to this prohibition. Education, religious and secular, was of vital importance for women, if a new generation of Muslims were to be appropriately schooled.

A question and answer session followed his presentation. To the many questions from women he responded affirming their rights. He noted that Muslim women about to be married were given such manuals on right behaviour – such as *Bihisht Zewar* [Heavenly Ornaments] - but what of a manual for men?![70] Islamic law, he reiterated, was against forced marriage. Verbal abuse, he insisted – not simply physical abuse by a husband – was a legitimate ground for divorce. He was scathing of such people who sought asylum in Britain from oppressive Muslim regimes and then vilified the host community. Further, he asked rhetorically, whether the companions of the prophet who fled oppression in Mecca to the Christian Kingdom of Abyssinia abused their protectors as *kuffar* who were bound for hell fire? In all, he urged British Muslims to be alert to their many allies in all aspects of life, media, police, civil service etc. He was concerned that Muslims were alienating the majority society: such alienation was 'foolish, dangerous and giving Islam a bad name'. As to whether Muslims should flee – *hijrah* – from corrupt [non-Muslim?] society, he pointed out that there is always a case to leave a corrupt part of a city to a better part. However, today, such a [medieval] notion as the House of Islam [*Dar al-Islam*] was little more than a theoretical concept. Indeed, some Muslim scholars could speak of Britain/the West as *Dar*

[70] See Metcalf, Barbara Daly (1990), *Perfecting Women, Maulana Ashraf 'Ali Thanawis' Bihishti Zewar,* Oxford: University of California Press.

al Islam – although a majority still reserve this term for situations with Muslim rulers. Earlier Hamza Yusuf had asked rhetorcially: with regard to judicial process in courts where would most people prepare to be tried: in Muslim or Western countries?

To those who spoke of only obeying God's law – *shariah* – and by implication feeling free to ignore or override British law, he argued such a position was based on ignorance of Islamic law. The Muslim world from time immemorial had made commercial [etc] contracts with the non-Muslim world. This presupposed shared understandings of justice within humanity as *fitra* or [approximating] to natural law – which clearly did not depend only on *shariah*.

With regard to the status of cultural norms which communities carried with them to the UK. he stated that Islamic law recognised a variety of local customs: a Scottish Muslim could still enjoy haggis, albeit made from *halal* ingredients! Islam came to purify not obliterate local custom. Of course, many British Muslims might be ethnically Punjabi but their parents needed to recognise that they were culturally British. They needed to 'take the best and leave the rest'. It was important that parents allowed this process of discernment to take place, otherwise their children would become schizophrenic culturally or be locked into an identity crisis.

In all, this was a balanced and irenic presentation. He briefly commented on the situation in the wider Muslim world – especially Israel/Palestine – but resisted the temptation to engage in a sustained indictment of the non-Muslim world, the stock-in-trade of so many Muslim preachers, which can generate a debilitating sense of victimhood. This is consistent with his earlier well publicised remarks about 9/11 when he famously commented that:

We Muslims have lost [a] theologically sound understanding of our teaching. Islam has been hijacked by a discourse of anger and a rhetoric of rage. We have allowed our mimbars *to become bully pulpits in which [imams]…use anger…to rile Muslims up, only to leave them feeling bitter and spiteful towards people who in the most part are completely unaware of the conditions in the Muslim world, or the oppressive assaults of some Western countries on Muslim people*. [*Q-News*, October 2001].

The focus of his talk remained a critical and constructive engagement with many of the difficult issues which British Muslims face. What was heartening was that such a large crowd had come to hear him; while the radical Muslim group, so beloved of the national media, who distributed their literature outside the mosque – *Hizb at-Tahrir* – comprised less than a dozen people![71] Hamza Yusuf was insisting that a confident Islamic identity was part of the solution rather than part of the problem. Importantly, there is an emerging constituency of British educated professionals for the sheikh's eirenic and engaged presentation of the social relevance of Islam. This represents an important generational shift from the agenda of a defensive South Asian Muslim community which earlier would invite such polemicists as Ahmed Deedat.

Between Isolation and Integration – a New Debate amongst British Educated Imams

One of the most striking developments in the 1990s has been the emergence of Islamic 'seminaries' – *madaris*/*dar al 'uloom* in Britain. There are now at least 22 seminaries. The first was established in the 1970s, three in the 1980s, seventeen in the 1990s and one in the new century. All are Sunni: sixteen Deobandi seminaries, three Barelwi, one Azhari, one Nadwi and one Ikhwani [Muslim Brotherhood]. I shall focus my comments on the Deobandis, a tradition rooted in South Asia, but by now a transnational movement with a website in English with links to materials in French, German, Italian, Portuguese and Spanish.

The movement takes its name from Deoband, a small town a hundred miles north of Delhi, where the first *madrasa* was founded in 1867. With the failure of the 'mutiny' this tradition emphasized the importance of popularising Islamic law and legal decisions [*fatwa*-s] as a bulwark against non-Islamic influences. Its curriculum deliberately excluded English and western subjects. In all, it sought to maintain social, cultural and intellectual distance from non-Muslims. It has also generated a revivalist tradition - *Tablighi Jama'at* [the Preaching Party] - which adopts an a-political strategic stance and seeks to win back lapsed Muslims[72].

---

[71] See Taji-Farouki, S. (1996), *A Fundamental Quest: Hizb al-Tahrir and the Search for the Islamic Caliphate*, London: Grey Seal.

[72] See Masud, Muhammad Khalid (ed.) (2000), *Travellers in Faith, Studies of the Tablighi Jama'at as a Transnational Islamic Movement for Faith Renewal,* Leiden: Brill.

The first seminary in the Deobandi tradition in Britain was established in 1975 in Holcombe a sleepy village near Bury in the North of England: its founder a Gujarati Indian scholar, Maulana Yusuf Motala, was referred to affectionately by one of my informants as 'the Pope' of the Deobandis in Britain. Until very recently, students who attended these seminaries were socialised in a relatively self-contained world. Locations are often remote from centres of population - or on the edge of such; there was no structured interaction with wider society and informal meeting discouraged; TV and radio were not allowed. The language of instruction up to the present remains Urdu and Islamic study dominates the morning – a minimal English curriculum was taught in the afternoon for pupils from 12-16 to conform to the dictates of English law. Students who complete the entire programme of study often lack good English and inter-personal skills to relate to wider society. The structure of study indicates that students live in two unconnected intellectual, linguistic and cultural worlds[73].

The syllabus in the British seminaries offers an attenuated form of an eighteenth syllabus - *dars i nizami* - taught through the medium of Urdu[74.] The first few years include the study of Arabic literature and language - the precondition for any serious study of the key Islamic texts. There is some minimal study of the life of the Prophet, his companions and an elementary review of the history of early Islam. Apart from the canonical *hadith* collections forming the apex of study, a selection of medieval texts drawn from the historic *dars i nizami* syllabus are included: a short Qur'anic commentary by Suyuti (d. 1505) *Tafsir al-Jalalayn*; a short text on the articles of belief by Nasafi (d. 1143) and Hanafi *fiqh* text - *Hidaya* - written by Marghinani (d. 1196). The teaching methods are also traditional: the aim is to initiate student into the accumulated wisdom of a religious tradition, personalised in the life and teaching of a respected teacher. Teaching is one way - with opportunity for questions to clarify rather than challenge the contents of these revered texts. The aim is to master key books rather than systematically and critically explore subjects. Mastery of these key texts entitles one to teach them to others.

---

[73] See Lewis, P. (2002), *Islamic Britain, Religion, Politics and Identity among British Muslims*, 2002, London: I.B. Tauris.
[74] See Robinson, F. (2001), *The 'ulama of Farangi Mahall and Islamic Culture in South Asia,* Orient Longman, for the earlier and more expansive curriculum serving the Mughal elites, which included logic, philosophy and even an emerging historical contextualisation of classical texts.

It would be wrong to consider the Deobandi tradition is impervious to change. Indeed, in the last few years there have been some significant shifts in emphasis. Radio is now allowed – but not music! – also some newspapers and weeklies, excluding the tabloids. Many students continue with their studies of Arabic and Islamics at Al-Azhar in Cairo, Madina University or Karachi. Also early in the 1990s some of the more able students were being encouraged to get further qualifications from British Universities. Initially in Islamic disciplines, Arabic and law – three alumni now have PhDs from Manchester University, SOAS and Birmingham University respectively. 1998 saw the first cohort of five Bury students accepted to study on the BA course in applied theological studies offered by Westhill College of Higher Education in Birmingham. This course gives them a qualification to teach religious education in schools. This innovative scheme majors on Islam and is largely taught by Muslim scholars, two of whom were themselves Bury alumni. This prepared the way for a new development in 2000 whereby some thirty graduates from Bury went on to study a range of degrees at a local university where another of its alumni now lectures.

Bury has also begun to open up a little to the outside world. The Muslim Adviser to Prisons was encouraged to visit and talk about prison chaplaincy. Some school children studying religious education are allowed to visit. There has also been a realisation since September 11 that Muslims are under close scrutiny. To address fears and misconceptions the Principal invited a local Bishop, MP and a few others to visit and talk to students on the anniversary of 9/11. This reflects both a growing confidence in the institution and an awareness that many students will not go on to become imams in mosques, and so will need other qualifications to earn a living. The minimal attention given to the English curriculum is also changing. A local college is providing science and IT facilities on site and some personnel to teach examination subjects: mainly GCSE level but some at AS or 'A' level in Arabic, Urdu and Islamic History. Such people could also begin to teach in the proliferating private Muslim school sector (circa 80). It is clear that the principal of Bury, Sheikh Yusuf Motala, has given active support and blessings to such developments which should enable many of his alumni to engage with wider society with more confidence.

The cream of the English speaking scholars participate in the annual Youth Tarbiyyah [Islamic education] Conference - held in the summer under canvas in the spacious grounds of a Deobandi

seminary near Kidderminster, an attractive rural location in the Midlands. This represents the major public interface between the Deobandi imams and British Muslim youth, a couple of thousand of whom attend. The conference is also testimony to the imagination and influence of Bury's principal, Sheikh Yusuf Motala, the driving force behind it. For the 2002 camp two alumni had travelled from the USA and Zimbabwe.

Table 1 indicates the full list of topics and scholars who delivered by seventeen addresses over the three days conference in 2002. These include Maulana Riyadhul Haq - the imam of the prestigious Central Mosque in Birmingham - and other Bury alumni who, having completed their Islamic formation at Bury, have gone on to further education in secular establishments: two talks on education were given by an *'alim* who also teaches in a State school in Birmingham; another on 'globalisation and Islam' was delivered by an *'alim* with an MA from Manchester University; the talk on 'the terrorist act 2000 (UK)' was given by Ibrahim Mogra who has an MA from SOAS; the lecture entitled 'the Prophet's image in the West' was delivered by an *'alim* with a PhD from SOAS; the talk on Muslims and Education was given by another PhD from Manchester.

What is most striking is an evident tension in many of the talks between those who are urging wide ranging engagement with non-Muslim society and those who seem content to keep their spatial, social and intellectual distance from a *kuf*r society, often painted in lurid colours. Not surprisingly, those who are most open are often – if not always – those who have gone on to study in secular academies and work outside the mosque as teachers or chaplains. Here they have developed new social and intellectual skills.

The difference is seen most clearly if we compare two talks, one by Dr Mahmood Chandia, who now lectures in Islamics at the University of Central Lancashire, UCLAN, and that delivered by Maulana Riyadhul Haq, imam of the central mosque in Birmingham. Mahmood's presentation points to the necessity for British Muslims – 70 per cent of whom are under 25 years old – to consider the importance of education. He insists that if they are to have influence in society they must raise their aspirations in education. Only thus will they be able to recapture that time in

medieval Spain where they co-existed creatively with Christians and Jews and made significant additions to the store of knowledge in a whole range of disciplines.

Table 1 Youth Tarbiyyah Conference 2002

Amaal (Actions) of the Inner and outer self Maulana Bahauddin Sayyid	Safeguarding the tongue Maulana Rafiq Sufi	The Prophet's Image in the West Maulana Ashraf Patel
Status of Women Maulana Anas Uddin	Education Maulana Imran Mogra	How to practice Islam in this day and age Maulana Ibrahim Madani
Advice from a great scholar on education Maulana Imran Mogra	Zikrullah – remembrance of Allah Maualana Ahmad Patas	Iman (faith) Maulana Ahmad Ali
Globalisation & Islam Maulana Rashid Musa	Obedience to the Prophet Maulana Saeed Peerbhai	Muslims and Education Maulana Mahmood Chandia
The Terrorism Act 2000 (UK Legislation) & our responsibilities as Muslims Maulana Ibrahim Mogra	The Nur [Light] of Allah and the dark deeds of Kufr Maulana Abdur Rahman Mangera	Elements of Quranic medicine Maulana Shabbir Menk
Seerah of the Prophet Maulana Khalil Kazi	Important role of youth in the mosques Maulana Shoayb Desai	Steadfastness in the days of fitna [sedition] Maulana Riyadhhu Haq

Time and again he repeats that the Muslims integrated but did not assimilate. The respect in which they were held turned on the pen not the sword. He regrets that as with other ethnic minorities in Britain so few Muslims go into education and teaching – 4 per cent compared to 25 per cent in IT and 10-12 per cent in medicine for all ethnic minorities.

A good education is presented as a passport to influence in the key professions which shape the nature of society: academia, law – especially judges – politics, civil service and the media. Muslims are urged to engage in all these areas not simply out of narrow sectional Muslim interests – 'because it serves our needs' - but in 'the interests of wider society'.

He then worries about the attitudes in the Muslim communities. Drawing on his own experience as a lecturer, he notices that many students do not complete their examinations in science, medicine, law or journalism and use the 'excuse' that we must give priority instead to revivalist tours of forty days, four months or one year duration – a central component of the activities of *Tablighi Jama'at*. Mahmood is scathing about such attitudes. The Spanish experience is presented as teaching the important lesson that Muslims adopted a balanced attitude with regard to secular and religious learning and sought to contribute to the common good. He notices that because Muslim students '*do not know how to handle that freedom they enjoy on the university campus, [their] rate of drop outs…is highest [amongst all communities] and still rising'*.

Mahmood remarks that the most popular disciplines in university are politics, philosophy, economics and law and the number one students are from the Jewish community. He then asks rhetorically: '*What of Muslims? Not interested in politics…philosophy?…[we] do not know what the word means…economics?… [where is the need?] I have my corner shop and petrol station…law? I make up my own rules…*' In all, Mahmood attacks the complacency and low educational aspirations within the Muslim communities. He points out that there is an open door in British society to influence its future shape…but that they must engage at every level, whether as school governors, judges, academics or journalists.

The title of Maulana Riadhul Haq's talk – "Steadfastness in the days of *fitna* [sedition]" – already suggests another set of attitudes. He has no truck with the 'propaganda' that all has changed since 9/11.

Nothing has really changed. The persecution of the Muslims…enmity, hostility, hatred of the ummah*…ridicule and vilification of Islam [is] part of a constant battle between* haq *and* batil*, truth and falsehood, which did not start on 9/11 but [was] present from the beginning [of Islam].*

The Maulana insists that all this was promised by Allah as a test to his people. A number of supporting hadith are cited to the effect that a time would come when men would prefer to be in the grave than living; that to be steadfast to their faith would be like holding fast '*to a burning cinders*'. Muslims stand '*in awe of USA fire power and economic might…their technology…[enabling] them to spy on the whole globe and [seemingly[bomb anywhere at will…[as well as] their culture of Macdonald – Big Mac – their fashions, music…their apparent liberty and democracy'*. They have even begun to '*doubt the Word of Allah and the supremacy of Islam over all other faiths, cultures and ways of life'*. Faced with the Western world's 'blind passion for retaliation' post 9/11 some Muslims have begun to change their names and avoid dressing according to the *sunnah* and want to dissolve into wider society. '*Not just out of fear but doubt about the truth of Allah's promises' when they see non-Muslims straddling the globe*'.

This jeremiad continues with stirring stories of exemplary Muslims standing up to the super powers of their day. The Prophet himself was not spared such hardships in the Battle of the Trench but prevailed. When he prophesied that the wealth and glory of Abyssinia, Rome and Persia would fall to Islam he was mocked by the doubters. He did not see it come to pass but it did.

Riyadhul Haq seeks then to reassure Muslims that Allah has not abandoned his *ummah*. He has promised that they will know glory, liberty and liberation. However, '*demoralised and divided and doubting*' Muslims are, Allah will reward their steadfastness and patience. In all, Muslims must not despair:

'*Allah's light will not be extinguished…Allah's truth and guidance are such that 'His religion will prevail over all other religions…[even though] the mushrikin [those who associate a creature with the Creator] detest it*'.

This lachrymose reading of contemporary history is almost manichean. Reality is presented in terns of binary opposites, the undifferentiated *kuffar* – no mention here of the People of the Book – intent on humiliating Muslims. Such an essentialist vision does not provide space for Muslims

to engage critically with wider society. It is significant that in his diatribe he conflates integration with assimilation. A distinction Mahmood Chandia was careful to draw.

Yet, Chandia's voice seems the one in the ascendancy: along with the other PhDs he is trying to gain university accreditation for a Joint Honours Islamic Studies Degree offered in an Islamic Centre in Leicester. If the movement succeeds in developing a University course then this will represent an important step towards healing of a basic intellectual fracture in Islam between the products of Islamic seminaries and tertiary education[75].

Islamist Contributions to Civil Society

I want to conclude this contribution by referring very briefly to a couple of initiatives, national and local, generated by Muslims who loosely belong to Islamist networks, since this will be the focus of my friend Dr Sean McLoughlin's contribution to this consultation. The Islamic Foundation at Markfield near Leicester has recently initiated an Institute of Higher Education (September 2000) offering postgraduate certificates and degrees in Islamic Studies accredited by a British University. Its MA programme offers the following modules: the core modules comprise Islamic Thought and Sources, Major Trends in Muslim Thought, Islamic Law, Muslim Political Thought and Activism, Islamic History, Islamic Economics; and a selection from the optional subjects, Islamic Banking and Finance, Islam in Europe, Islam, Women and Feminism, Islam and Pluralism, Life of the Prophet Muhammad, Management of Mosques and Islamic Centres. Amongst its student body there is a trickle of *'ulama*. This initiative, embedded in critical historical thinking is, in part, a response to two concerns identified by Dr Ataullah Siddiqui, the head of their inter-faith unit.

In the Islamic tradition an alim *or a* mufti *is required to have some basic knowledge and…an awareness of the custom (*'urf*) and 'practice' (*adat*) of the people where he lives and work[s]…[Yet], in Europe, I am not aware of any* madrasa *which is in the business of training* ulama *even the basic concepts and ideas about the Judaeo-Christian traditions…Furthermore,*

[75] See Rahman, Fazlur (1982), *Islam & Modernity, Transformation of an Intellectual Tradition*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, and Safi, Omid (ed.) (2003), *Progressive Muslims, On Justice, Gender and Pluralism*, Oxford: Oneworld.

there is an urgent need to introduce the intellectual and cultural trends of Western society into Muslim seminaries' syllabi.

Muslims in a pluralist society, particularly, in today's context, need to re-examine their perceptions about the people around them. The tendency to perceive all non-Muslims as inherently 'antagonistic' to Islam and to Muslims and 'perpetually' conspiring against them needs rethinking[76].

The Foundation has recently developed a one year course for Muslim chaplains in collaboration with Christians. The advisory committee includes three Christian chaplains from hospital, prison and University sectors, three members of the Islamic Foundation, and members of the wider Muslim community, including Dr Fatima Amer, an educationalist from the Regent Park Mosque in London. The hope is that the course, once established will enjoy external university accreditation.

It is clear that here we are a world away from the tired anti-Christian polemics of Ahmed Deedat. Such developments indicate a new confidence and rootedness in British life, with Muslims exploring those many institutional spaces in British life for religious actors.

The second example is a conference undertaken by the Bradford branch of the Islamic Society of Britain, part of the cluster of organisations within the Islamist orientation[77]. In May 2002 they organised a day conference on Muslim Education with education policy makers, Muslim parents, students and educationalists to reflect on how to raise standards within the Muslim communities in the city. This event is significant in that it is another undramatic example of an Islamic organisation seeking to address real issues.

Across the country there are disturbing figures on educational underachievement within sections of the Pakistani community. National statistics for examinations aken when 15 or 16 years old, indicate that while Indian children were out-achieving white pupils – 54 per cent getting the

[76] Siddiqui A. (2000), "Fifty years of Christian-Muslim relations, *IslamoChristiana*, 26: 51-77.
[77] See Lewis, P., *Islamic Britain, op. cit*.

benchmark five or more GCSEs at Grade A-C as against 47 per cent for white youngsters in 1998 – the figures for Pakistani pupils was 29 per cent. This, of course, then translates into high levels of unemployment. These bald figures obscure another worrying reality which can best be illustrated by Bradford educational results.

In 1999 Pakistani heritage students reached only 21.8 per cent targets while the national figure for all was 46 per cent. However, once these figures were disaggregated into male and females, the results become even more disturbing with the figures for boys 16.7 per cent and 27.8 per cent for girls. Across the country girls are doing better than boys in all communities but the gap is widest within the Pakistani community.

This was the context for the ISB conference. The point here is not to spend time reviewing its provisional findings. The reasons for underachievement are complex and contested[78]. However, what is significant is that ISB, a vehicle for Muslim professionals, had the confidence and the desire to enter a highly difficult public policy issue, seeking to map a way forward for the Muslim communities in the city. Ten years earlier, if such issues were addressed at all, it would have been by the elders of the Bradford Council for Mosques or Muslim politicians.

In a recent article Professor Jocelyne Cesari suggests that Islamists in Europe are developing Islam as a new form of citizenship.[79] She is doubtless right. But the few examples I have offered indicate that such public and civic engagement, nationally and locally, is not confined to Islamists. The examples I gave – which could easily be multiplied across the country - indicate a whole range of Muslim groups, whether Sufi, traditionalist Deobandi or Islamists are involved. They draw on a wide and growing constituency of Muslim professionals and businessmen educated and socialised in Britain, with a stake in the country, and willing to spend time embodying Islamic perspectives to improve the situation for Muslims in Britain. Moreover, they are prepared and willing to work with non-Muslims in the process. This growing shift from isolationism - reinforced by a rhetoric of victimhood – to what our Home Secretary refers to as

[78] See Lewis, P. (2002), "Between Lord Ahmed and Ali G: which future for British Muslims?" in W.A.R. Shadid and P.S. van Koningsveld (eds.), *Religious Freedom and the Neutrality of the State: the Position of Islam in the European Union*, Leuven: Peeters.

'active citizenship' among a growing section of British Muslims is a welcome development. It also offers an antidote to the media preoccupation with pockets of extremism within the communities.

[79] See Cesari, J. (2003), "Muslim Minorities in Europe, the Silent Revolution", in John L. Esposito and Francois Burgat (eds.), *Modernizing Islam, Religion and the Public Sphere in Europe and the Middle East*, London: Hurst.

DISCUSSION LED BY TUULA SAKARANAHO, UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI, FINLAND

First, I would like to make a short comment on each paper separately and afterwards proceed to a summary, a global commentary and conclusion relatively to all the papers which, on one hand, had a very different problematic but, on the other hand, were connected one to the other.

Jonas Otterbeck dealt with women's leadership in Muslim communities in Sweden. According to his paper, speech and silence are inscribed on each other. From a research point of view, the studying of speech is not problematic: researchers can use tapes and transcripts and then be able to proceed to an analysis of speech. On the contrary, the following question can be raised: how is it possible to conduct research on the topic of silence? How can the researcher verify something which is *not* said? It is, in fact, relatively to this point that the hardship of studying communication becomes evident. Another question which is of the utmost importance is the following: *who* is allowed to speak? Who is *not* allowed? What I consider to be very interesting in Jonas Otterbeck's paper is the question raised pertaining to the identity of the listeners: *who* are the people that are listening to? This question can be raised especially in the context of the media. According to Jonas' paper, women's audience is usually composed by women or children. This can be explained by the fact that women are allowed to teach women and children. Nevertheless, there are some moments of surprise, which he describes very efficiently in his paper, which concern the media. The media are actually interested in women as Swedish Muslim converts. Naturally, these women have a very good command of the Swedish language and have a thorough knowledge of the Swedish society as well. They possess a "social and cultural capital", to quote here Jonas, and therefore are capable to explain things in a way which can be understood by the Swedish people. Consequently, there is a strong demand for these women in the media. As regards the leadership, perhaps they are not leaders in the communities themselves, but they can become some sort of opinion leaders, since there is a strong request for opinions on behalf of the media and the wider society. An interesting question to develop is the following: *who* are the opinion leaders and *how* are they made into operating as such? What is important to note, is that the wider society has a strong effect on the Muslim community. And the same remark goes as regards the dynamism interacting between men and women and the roles that they

both play in the community. There is no isolation, on the opposite, there is a constant interaction. Therefore one can clearly observe the way in which the interest in the media affects the community.

Concerning Gerdien Jonker's paper on Germany and the communication between Muslim communities and the wider society: I consider that it was an excellent description of the way that the events of the 11th of September affected this country and led to a series of changes. What I found particularly interesting in this paper, is the fact that in Germany the events of the 11th of September took a very powerful meaning and provoked particularly strong reactions. When we compare with the reaction of Finland to the events of the 11th of September, we realize that it did not touch the Finnish people so much. People considered it as merely something that happened somewhere out there in the world. On the contrary, Germany was very much affected by these events. This can be justified by the fact that the terrorists had been educated in Germany. I suppose, in that sense, this was somehow the reason why this country reacted so strongly. One can say that events like the one of the 11th of September make certain undercurrents visible in a society, for instance, in this case the undercurrents concerning the relationships between Muslims and the wider society. In the same way, the existing problems perhaps become more visible. One could point out some negative repercussions towards Muslims. But this is not the case exclusively in Germany. We know that in any country in the so called West there is suspicion about Muslims. Perhaps this attitude differentiates and gets different emphasis in the different countries. What I found very important in Gerdien Jonker's paper, was her observation that in Germany there is a general distrust of religion. And that, somehow, generates a certain kind of skepticism concerning Muslim communities in this country. Naturally, if there is this kind of distrust and this skepticism, it is very hard for Muslims to gain credibility in the media. Whatever they say is misinterpreted, nobody cares to ask what they actually mean. Their uttering is somehow filtered through this distrust.

Regarding Philip Lewis' paper, one realizes the existence of a completely different atmosphere. And Lars Dencik's paper on the Jewish people is very different as well, it has very particular dynamics. But this is actually the reason of being of comparative studies: to perceive the different ways in which religion, on one hand, and minorities on the other hand are conceived, as well as

the link between them. Lars Dencik's paper constitutes a very interesting description of one minority. He has recourse to a method of triangles: there is *religion*, *ethnicity* and the *wider society*. There are different identifications, which interact and are also emphasized differently, in different time and place. In the paper in question, effort was made to position these different identifications, which was particularly stimulating. There was one theoretical question that interested me in particular: how to theorize all this Jewishness in the post-modern age? Lars Dencik refers to symbolic ethnicity. I was reading recently a paper written by Jocelyne Cesari, in which she speaks about symbolic religiosity. It was Herbert Gantts who launched the concept of symbolic ethnicity, in 1979. In 1994, he launched the concept of symbolic religiosity. He was studying third generation of Jews, Armenians and Catholics in the United States, however it would be interesting to see how his theories fit to Europe and the different groups of this continent. I believe that these two concepts would be very interesting to work upon from a comparative perspective. Another point that was important about Lars Dencik's paper is integration and the way this concept is apprehended. And it is not only important to look how wider society understands integration but how the minorities themselves perceive it. And this is a question that also arises in Philip Lewis' paper. Consequently, the following question can be raised: does one consider integration as being assimilation, or as an emergence of new kinds of citizenship?

Philip Lewis' paper deals with Muslims in the discourse of victimhood in Britain. It was very stimulating to read his paper, where he describes the development towards a tolerant and collaborative form of interaction between Muslims and the wider society. And of course, like he describes it, it is linked to the way that integration is understood among Muslims. If they perceive it as assimilation, there is no interest in interaction. On the contrary, if they perceive it as a form of an emerging, new form of citizenship, there is interest in interaction. Like he describes it in his paper, one can see the emergence of an Islamic civil society in Britain. This is a question interesting to study in each European country, namely how the emergence in question takes place in each country and what is its meaning. Philip Lewis notes that there are certain social problems that are dealt with in this respect. But the main point is how religion is perceived within a certain society. In this respect, there is a change on both sides: the British society is more tolerant towards religion, but there is a move among Muslims from the view of victimhood. In the British

society, Muslims are perceived as full citizens. Consequently, there are two processes going on and it would be very challenging to study the way interaction takes place between them. What is also thought provoking, is the shift within the problem discourse. In Gerdien Jonker's paper, the emphasis is put on Muslims being perceived as a problem, whereas in Philip Lewis' paper it is more question about the problems that Muslims face and the modes of resolution of these problems. The question raised in particular, concerns the kind of actual social problems that Muslims face in their every day life and how can they be dealt with. This is a completely different kind of problem discourse: more practical, more pragmatic and therefore more limited. In the end, the main question is: how can the members of religious minorities, such as Muslims, become full citizens of the host society? In this respect, Lars Dencik's paper is very compelling. We can see a very concrete example of one group minority and how this process of its transformation into full citizens actually operates in practice.

As a short concluding remark, all four papers stimulate the following reflection: we have to look at interaction. We should not consider every community in itself, but how the wider society and the Muslim communities interact. The following question should be raised: which are the signs and modes of this interaction? How does it take place? Different answers are given to these questions by the different papers. Undoubtedly, the importance of the media is crucial and this is an aspect on which all papers have put emphasis. The question of communication is also of the utmost importance, as well as the question of integration and the way this reality is apprehended. Last but not least, the question dealt with in Philip Lewis' paper: the emergence of a Muslim civil society. I believe that all these are the main aspects we should examine thoroughly.

Finally, a last question can be raised here: a connection cannot be made between the way religion is perceived within a society, and the way the religious minorities are treated within this society? Namely, if there is suspicion, or tolerance, or even if there is interest in these groups, all these attitudes are closely linked to the way religion is conceived. We can see different examples illustrating this remark, presented in the different papers.

Debate

Question (Person non identified): The description of the cycle of rumors was very interesting: the way it operates and ends up with the public assassination of a person trying to speak in the name of, or as part of a Muslim community. While describing, you said that there is a very big role that the journalists play and that when they come and make the rumor more or less public, a public assassination ensues afterwards. You said that this is more Muslimophobia than Islamophobia. My question is: what exactly is the difference, or what do you mean by these two terms, how do you define them? Secondly, if we take a step back and try not to focus on the fact that we are talking about Muslims, is it then really something that has to do with Muslimophobia or Islamophobia, or with the general working of our press in Europe these last years which is more and more geared towards sensationalism and just the logic of the market: "sell, sell, sell". So, they have to have sensational stories and the public assassinations are happening not only with Muslims, but with a lot of other people from other different groups who try to speak. Or is there a certain specificity concerning Muslims?

Gerdien Jonker: Niklas Luhman has written a tiny little book on the function of media and I found this very enlightening. Media have to produce news that can be connected; one has to recognize at news in one's personal life and an easy way to do this is produce sensation. So, it is more or less a function of the press, to do that. It has very ugly side effects. We had a public assassination the last weeks in Germany, that did not concern a Muslim but a Jew, Mr. Friedman. I don't know whether you followed that. Well, he is suspected of something, but before any hard facts on the table, he is already assassinated. He is just nowhere anymore. That's how the press functions. And, of course, Tuula just made a very good remark about the undercurrent. He is just an undercurrent, people are waiting to do just that. It is not a specific form of communication, reserved *for* Muslims, but it typifies in the moment communication *with* Muslims. And it does that since the 11th of September, it dominates. There is no reason why we shouldn't move away from this, there are other forms of communication. But at the moment it typifies.

Jocelyne Cesari: We understood very well that apparently there is a sort of niche for Muslim women with a convert background to dialogue with segments of Swedish societies. But I would

like to know more about what are these women in terms of religiosity. Are they religious women, do they appear with a certain way of dressing and all these kind of nuances that can be used in discussing of relating with the Swedish society. We had a vision of what this body of persons was, but is it an homogeneous body or within this group of women can we also make differences, in terms of religiosity, as this would be the key question?

Garbi Schmidt: You wanted to tell us a little bit more about the charismatic leadership, the charismatic spoke people in your paper. I think that now is the time to return to that description. Also, one thing you were talking about is the aspect of discipline: that people are speaking because they are allowed to, they are given the authority to do so, or are part of a structure that allows them to speak. But, those who speak differently, either for one reason or another are also aware that they are speaking differently, or in another way and that they are going to be disciplined. So, the question is: why are they still doing it?

Jonas Otterbeck: Thank you both for posing really extremely complicated questions, so I sort of wrote a new speech. About the differentiation of the women: there is a problem of generalization because there are only a few cases; so, I have to divide them into two categories: the converts and the second generation basically. The converts mark their identity by the dress, so they use the new Islamic dress code; that's for sure. Some of them also mark this identity by names but lately some of them have dropped them. For example, Soumaya Ouis is now Pernilla Ouis or Fatima Idris is now Helena Fatima Idris and so forth. So their old identities are sort of coming back in some certain ways. Most of these women have been converts for approximately 20 years, something like that. And they were attracted by the discourse that – let's say – *Sunni, Salafi, Wahabi* (or whatever we would like to call it), inspired by Muslim Brotherhood, Pakistani authors like Mawdoodi[80], roughly put together in what we can call the Islamic Movement, which is a label that was introduced by Mawdoodi himself. They have two sorts of founding texts nowadays: they have the Koran and the *Sunna,* of course, but they also have these Islamic movements' texts as founding texts. But then they have a reaction of that, when they comment again upon it, from a very specific US-European discourse. And it is very clear how the

[80] Author and activist who influenced the creation of the Pakistani State and is considered as one of the leading figure of Political Islam movements.

conditions of modernity in different societies are part of that discourse today; how, for example, such a prominent feature of European modernity as individualism, is a part of the way of presenting Islam. This could be seen for example in the way that they present Islam as such: as an individualist revivalist process that you have to go through, that you have individually to think about, not as a collective, not as a family nor as a group. You have individual responsibility in front of God.

This is something that is highly specific of the group and it says a lot about gender equality and all that we can call global flows of ideas and questions that set the agenda. For example, in culture equality, human rights, ecology, individualism, equality between the sexes: this kind of things are inscribed in the discourse and they find it in the founding texts. So they comment upon the founding texts and find this agenda of modernity in it. These are typical traits of their agenda and of the converts. And this is also one of the things that connects the converts to the second generation who has been brought up in this atmosphere of the Swedish school and the Swedish legislation system. We can use Lars' triangles and sort of fit in the Swedishness of these persons. In this way, they have something in common but they have something dissimilar too: the women of the second generation - and also that goes for the men of the second generation who have come to a certain power through kinship - , when it comes to the dress codes for example they are not strict. And I have an example in the full paper of a situation that emerged in the Malmö Mosque, where two women, one who was the daughter of the founder of the Mosque, and another one who is sort of taken from the outside, just a talented informer; and this woman, whose name is Arjumand, didn't wear a veil, she lived together with a non-Muslim man without being married to him and this was of course gossiped about, spread rumors about. And eventually, when they finalized the project that they were together involved in, one of them was employed by the Mosque to continue working and the other one was not; and you can guess who. Of course the daughter of the founder of the Mosque was employed and the one who caused some problems by this very free speaking, very free way of being and unveiled, she did not get any further employment. There is a new generation that are doing it that way and in that way, they are provoking the other generation.

I want now to mention one thing regarding the development of *da'wa*[81]. I have a friend who is about to finish his PhD, it will be published in the autumn, about the Islamic foundations' children literature. One can see similar development in Sweden, a development from a *da'wa* which is very authoritarian – "this is the way that Islam is practiced"- to a *da'wa* that has more nuances, where one is much more open, prepared to discuss, to put doubt into the picture, to be individualized. And this is a really interesting development that my friend Torsten Jansson is really mapping down in this study of Islamic foundations' children literature. But this is something that I can see in my material also.

Coming now to charismatic and disciplined persons, this is a huge question. First of all, Michel Foucault suggested in his inauguration lecture in College de France, that one has to separate between different systems of exclusion. You can have outer exclusion and then inner exclusion. These are key-issues to deal with one studies Islamic organizations. The outer exclusion is of course about shutting people out, saying that "you are mad, you are on the wrong track, you are dangerous, we don't want anything to do with you." So, you shut people out. Then , the process of inner exclusion is almost more interesting, because it is very much about discipline." Yes, you are admitted into this part of the education, this part of speaking, but if you do not behave in a certain way, there are systems of punishment. Mild punishment sometimes, verbal or physical punishment in other cases. It is a very sectarian milieu in that way. That you are allowed to speak, if you speak in the right way. This act of speaking is one of the discipline systems that is connected with this inner system of exclusion. You are always risking exclusion, if you are free minded. Then again, these charismatic figures which are found problematic but are called charismatic because they do not really fit in the weberian picture, not even updated versions of weberian Churches; they are rather characterized by a more profound intellectual training, whether in Islamic matters or not. It should be noted that these new leaders invest in new areas for reasons of opportunity and strategy. But it is that the Mosques are not possible places to compete in and new strategies are chosen because of a different competence. They move, for example, towards the media, the majority-society, youth groups, trying to create new alliances, outside of this first generation organizations which are occupied already. So, they have personal qualities but I am doubting to call them charismatic; How are they disciplined? Often, they start

[81] Proselytism geared toward Muslims first.

off in the organizations and while breaking certain rules they gain a platform of speaking, which is one of the final things that I said in my speech. This new platform is the basis for operation, to break certain kind of discourses. And if they are really skilled, as my colleague Anne Sophie Roald who spoke as a platform of the academic community and the Muslim community, she can use knowledge from the academic community to provoke discussion in the Muslim community and vice versa. She will bring in questions from the Islamic community into the academic discourse. It is often mild provocation, but she is very skilled for this nowadays.

Jocelyne Cesari: We saw very well the evolution of breakdown, as you called it, before and after the 11th of September in German institutions relating to Muslim groups. But we did not know a lot about who are these Muslims? You said that they are defined as religious actors or authorities but can you tell us a little more about the Muslim side of this dialogue, discussion or rumor?

Gerdien Jonker: Let me first answer the main question: what is a Muslim? According to the Churches who did their part in defining the "Muslim other", a Muslim was a religious being. They picked their partners for dialogue among professed religious partners: moderate or very traditional ones. But for those who were specific outspoken religious peoples, Muslims were religious in their eyes.

Secular intellectuals had a different approach. For them, a Muslim was a political being. So, they looked in a different direction: they want to have people who could speak for the community about political prospects, ideas, or Islamism; the subject changed through the time. In public space, a Muslim is somebody with strong religious and strong political sentiments. Of course this does not describe how Muslims see themselves. I would say, for 95 per cent of people it does not apply. But this is the difference in communication and the ones who have a power of definition, which is the German side, German media and public space: they define a Muslim like that. Who came, who talked actually? Those have been well-known Muslim persons who came to talk with Churches, most of the time independent, or they lost connection to Muslim communities, because there was no way of communicating what was happening into this inter-religious dialogue back to Muslim communities. I think these were people who started as amateurs, who became professionals in the long run and they sticked to it for 25-30 years. And every local Church had

his or her own Muslim, one or two. It is true, that after the 9th of September the politicians, especially the office of the Chancellor, decided to generate their own information on Muslims. And a working group was installed, which is an inter-ministerial working group, that first wanted to work among themselves and connect information they had. This was new. They had two sights: one was in order to protect the Constitution, so this was enforcing the *Verfassungsschutz*, those who protect the Constitution, lots of money went into that, and there was a positive sight: they called it two-construction sights. So, the positive sight was new money to develop inter-religious dialogue. Yes! That's what the money is for! And they also said: "we want to speak to different people, we have seen the same faces, and we do not know any Muslim actors from Muslim communities; we want to speak with the normal, secular Muslim, including the Alevis." This idea was taken over by Friedrich Eibetschtiftung, which is the political academy of the socialists on national level. And a working group was installed there, it is called "Islam and democracy" and it is a political discussion group about Muslims and with Muslims. It is beautifully set together and many politicians come there, people from Churches come there, the Jewish community is always present; the only ones who do not come there are any of these Muslims - neither Alevites - who are invited; the communities who refuse to go anywhere, unless it is used against them; and the normal secular Muslim in the street: how is this person going to be reached? The 65-70% of the population of Muslim descent is from Turkey, as you rightly pointed out. They brought their own discussion and problems from Turkey to Germany. A laicist is not going to speak with a religious person. A laicist is not going to represent religion. It is a void, here there is an information gap. It would be a possibility to get out into the present problems, if this group of 70% Turks, who are professed secular Muslims with a Muslim identity, would come to the fore and speak and get a totally different discourse into going; but they don't. And there has been critics becoming loud last month about this, people from Churches say: "why are the laicists not taking a new position? Why aren't they telling us what is happening in Turkey at the moment?" Because the new government has set into movement laws for the betterment of religious positions in Turkey, not only for Muslims but also for Christians. This would be a perfect chance for laicists to come to the fore, but they refuse. So, we are stuck there. And I don't think that a working group with all their best intentions could do anything yet, because they come from very high above and before they are on the floor, it will take a couple of years.

Question (Person non identified): I have a question on silence but it is not directed to Jonas Otterbeck. In the diagram that Lars Dencik showed us, I think something very significant is missing: there are no Muslims in the diagram. And I think they have the presence of a large Muslim community in Sweden, as in other European countries, which has completely changed the social matrix in which Jewish define themselves and their relationship to the non-Jewish community. I would like you to elaborate a little bit on that.

Lars Dencik: Muslim communities are not part of my analysis but I think it is a very relevant question to point that the changes that are taking place, not only in Sweden but in many countries, between the minorities; as I mentioned there are about 18000 Jews in Sweden and there are 20 times as many Muslims in Sweden. And of course it has changed the situation. But it is not entirely new. We have a very sad story which became famous in Sweden, about a radio station called "Radio Islam". It was a vitriolic anti-Semitic station and it communicated lots of aggressive anti-Semitic messages. And when it was brought to Court, it was not run by any Muslim community, but it was called "Radio Islam" and was run by a certain person and his backing group in conjunction with some old-fashioned, old-style anti-Semites in Sweden. Actually, it was partly supported by parts of the Academic community, some of the departments of Theology in Uppsala were involved in supporting this group. It created a scandal, but it also created a certain sensitivity towards what could come from this corner. In recent dates, there have been no animosity, on the contrary, between the Muslims and the Jewish. Many of the Jewish activists in the public scene have been defenders of the Muslim cause and the right of a minority to become a minority and to be integrated in the society. Many public figures were supporting this Muslim cause. Recently, it has changed. For obvious reasons, I would say, there have been certain threats, palpable threats; there was a demonstration in Stockholm, mostly arranged by liberal groups and Jewish in defense of peace and the Middle East. This demonstration was attacked by a Muslim group, which in the streets of Stockholm yelled "death to the Jews", which was not heard of before; it was the first time that you could hear that. In Abro, in Denmark, there have been cases where the His Putatiris is quite strong and they published pamphlets saying "Death to the Jewish" or "Kill the Jewish", which have not only been published on the Website but also, since it was not enough (because Websites are under protective laws) and as they wanted to be even more provocative, they printed it on paper and that's how it came to the street.

It came to a situation where among the Jews one felt threatened. So, it has changed in a way, but not very much. I can't say that there are anti-Muslim sentiments and it has not reached the level where you can say that it has anything particularly to do with Islam as a religion; there are certain Islamic groups. On the contrary, there is now an active trialogue going on between Shifra of Sweden or Denmark and the Muslim representatives and Christians to try to build on communication. And I think it is less so in Sweden than in many other countries, certainly less so than in Germany, or in Denmark. Garbi raised the question about how you relate to citizenship and I think that one dimension that should be brought into the picture in this debate is how different countries in Europe relate to citizenship. To make it short, Sweden basically is a country where you are a citizen if you live in the country and you have lived there for a certain time; then you become a citizen by being part of the people, the "demos". In Denmark, for instance, it is not so; you can be used to the notion of a true Dane, or a true Swede etc. which is of course in the case where you have the definition of nationality by "ethnos"; but if you are a true Dane, then you are much more marginalized. And you have in Denmark a situation where you have groups like the Muslims who are extremely put out in the margin and they can never become members of the "demos" because they belong to an other "ethnos". I think that is very important. It is different in different countries. The developments are very different for instance in Sweden and in Denmark.

This relates to Tuula's question also: about symbolic ethnicity because I think it is important to understand that Judaism certainly is a religion but most of them who define themselves as Jews, do not do that by religious criteria. They do it by what I call "symbolic ethnicity" They think that they belong to a certain people. And they mark that in their daily life more or less; it means that they attach new meanings to old symbols; they do not mean the same anymore. For instance, you could come across remarks of people saying: "I am not religious at all, but I have a religion", or for example "I am not religious but I lit the candles on Friday night, because that's how I belong to my people and relate to my history, my memory, my culture…" So, it is not anymore about having a strong religious feeling. And these symbols are very important to them, the possibility to manifest this certain belonging. And it is in a way actually a kind of an approval of otherness: that "we are other but we are at the same time equals". And this is I think how it may develop,

that if you can approve of your otherness by being at the same time equal, then it has less to do with religion as such, and more to do with the society, whether society accepts plurality or not.

Question (Person non identified): Gerdien told us about the people involved in dialog: they have only tried to establish a dialogue with a 30 per cent of the Muslims, the actively practicing Muslims and have forgotten about the 70 per cent of what you call "secular Muslims". I think that your whole paper is also about the 30 per cent and I would like you to tell me a little bit more about the 70 per cent. After 9/11 I noticed that the office of the Chancellor, the Bundeskanzeloramt, had plans to establish a dialogue no longer with fundamentalist Muslims, but they wanted to make the Alevis spoke-persons for the Muslims. I don't know what the Alevis think about that themselves; but what would have been the responses of this 70 per cent who includes Alevis and who includes Sunnis somewhat practicing but not all the time practicing Muslims. What has their response been? Were they pushed towards the 30 per cent, by this anti-Muslim discourse in Germany, or did they make great efforts to disengage themselves , to disassociate themselves from the Muslim side of the spectrum?

Gerdien Jonker: It is just a continuation of the question: I understand that you presented the question of communication from the perspective of German society, but the Muslims are perceived as an undifferentiated whole. And we know that the majority of Muslims in Germany are Turks; and Turks themselves are differentiating Alevis, Sunnis Muslims, secular Muslims, Kurds, Kurds that are maybe Alevis. I mean, Alevis can be either Turks or Kurds. It is very complex. The Muslim community that appears from the point of view of German society is just one undifferentiated whole. And to which extent, even this discourse. The question of communication that you presented is, itself, solidifying these stereotypes, unless we begin really to differentiate much more the internal complexity of the community.

Garbi Schmidt: I want to return to a remark that Tuula made: what is needed in order to make Muslims full citizens of these countries? I think, a part of it is this whole aspect of the construction of a national identity that, as something that you either consider or take into account: what is a true Dane, or a true Frenchman, or a true Norwegian or Swede? Often Muslims play a role within this discourse, this formation of a national identity, whatever that means. I think, a

distinction that can be made here and should be made, if this process, or experiment, or whatever we should call it, of making Muslims true citizens of our countries, is to make the distinction between State and nation. The whole aspect of citizenship within a State, but how does this relate to having a national identity?

Tuula Sakaranaho: It is very important what she said, that we have to look at the national identity. And of course one of the key questions is: if you look at the minorities, in any society, how does one call it by, as a Dane, or as a Swede or as a Finn or as a German? That is the key question that we are looking at the moment. In each country it gets a different answer. It was very interesting what Lars said, that some of the Jewish people say that "I have a religion but I am not religious." This is how we should actually perceive religion today. It is not so much about believing or practicing but it is about belonging. And if we would define religion in that sense, we would look at things in a very different way. And especially when Muslims are concerned, religion is imposed on them. And they are seeing through the religious lens too often. But if we would accept that perhaps being a Muslim is about belonging to a certain group, being recognized and having certain rights, then we would not read too much into this religious identity. And perhaps this is something you could call symbolic religiosity, as Jocelyn refers to in her article.

Question (person non identified): Just a few words to Lars, talking about the anti-Semitism in the Muslim groups in Sweden and in Denmark. I think that a lot of the researchers doing research in these groups have encountered this in different ways. I know for example that the Milli Görush Community studied by a Danish researcher provoked him to write in his dissertation a chapter on anti-Semitism. And I myself have encountered it several times and actually bought my copy of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* in a bookstore in Malmö that is selling Muslim literature, operated by Muslims. And it is printed in a series sponsored by Saudi money in English. And if we can go for example to Turkey we can notice that in the *Diyanet* the official religious communities are selling Turkish translations of the same book, which is read, not as the fabrication as it is, but as truth, which is highly disturbing. And this is something that I encountered a lot.

Lars Dencik: What is truth is that we are not talking about religion, we are talking about the ethnification of religion. Different information of religion into some symbolic, cultural identity, which is something completely different than the actual content of religion. And I think saw that in all of the papers, I think it got to be clear because it means that a very different kind of analysis has to be used to understand what is really happening. So, the problem is not a particular religion, the problem is the ethnification of religion and what means. The question is whether you can find anything particular in a particular religion, that has a particular ethnic outcome in actual practice. And I am not so sure that that is the case. Ireland is a very good example.

SESSION II: MUSLIM LEADERSHIP AND INSTITUTIONAL CONSTRAINTS IN EUROPE

ISLAM, CITIZENSHIP AND CIVIL SOCIETY: 'NEW' MUSLIM LEADERSHIPS IN THE UK

SEÁN MCLOUGHLIN, LEEDS UNIVERSITY

Introduction

The title of the NOCRIME project is 'Islam Citizenship and European Integration'. From the outset it has sought to move beyond an essentialist account of the Muslim presence in the West, which suggests an inevitable clash of civilisations, to a study of Islam as a potential resource for active citizenship and political participation. A key concern has been to differentiate what sorts of orientations to Islam and what sorts of Muslim leaderships are most supportive of such a project. In this paper I am starting to process and reflect upon the body of material I have gathered in the UK during the last eighteen months or so.

I begin here with some general remarks about how my approach to our topic has evolved and been refined as the research process has unfolded. Ultimately my argument is that, perhaps not surprisingly, there seems to be an important articulation between the human, social or cultural capital of a 'new' Muslim leadership acquired through educational, business and professional experiences in pluralistic contexts and their desire and ability to access the different sorts of Islamic resources, which in turn can affirm the importance of citizenship and civil society in the West.

However, for me, actually uncovering the ethnographic evidence to support the understanding that culture and social structure are mutually constitutive in this way, was something of a journey of discovery. While initially it was tempting to suppose that Islamic orientation would be the major determinant of whether Muslims would be engaged or not, I was eventually to discover examples of reformist Islamists, traditionalist Deobandis and Sufi Barelwis – the three main orientations to Islam in Britain – who affirmed the importance of debates about citizenship and civil society.

My initial response to this research agenda had been to focus on what appeared to me to be a discrepancy between the national and the local. Unprecedented levels of public recognition and political participation of Muslims in Britain were being attained on a national level with the election of a New Labour Government in 1997. However, on the local level in Bradford (the Muslim community I am most familiar with) the situation was one of ethnic and religious polarisation, most especially after riots involving Pakistani heritage youth in 1995 and 2001. On the national level an educated and professional Muslim 'elite' associated with a new umbrella organisation, the Muslim Council of Britain (formed 1997), had emerged and seemed just the sort of 'moderate' Muslims that the State and wider society could do business with. However, reflections on what I already knew about the Muslim leadership in Bradford, most especially in terms of the majority of mosques, suggested that opportunities for engagement would be more difficult to identify there. In general mosques are ethnically orientated institutions which sustain the life-worlds, and maintain the localised hegemony, of often uneducated and unemployed first generation male migrants encapsulated in the inner city. Even members of the Council for Mosques in Bradford admitted they had little authority or control over what their member institutions did. I knew of an interesting Barelwi mosque where there was 'cooperation' with the local State over the funding of *ad hoc* welfare projects and occasional multicultural photo-calls. However, this sort of cooperation is very limited in terms of citizenship or participation in that it tends to be no more than a transaction at the ethnic boundary.

Given this perception of the local situation in Bradford, I decided to concentrate my attention on the national level and on the MCB in particular. However, no research had, or indeed has yet, been published on this new umbrella organisation. How was it to be fitted into existing paradigms

of analysis? In terms of attitudes to the State, what now seems like a simplistic literature on Muslims in Britain, has tended to compare and contrast the relative 'isolationism' and 'introversion' of the traditionalist Deobandis and Barelwis with the accommodationist and highly adaptive reformist (as opposed to radical and rejectionist) Islamism of Jama'at-i Islami related organisations.[82] So was the MCB in some way an extension of reformist Islamist activity in Britain? Certainly it was organisations such as the Islamic Foundation (IF), UK Islamic Mission, the Islamic Society of Britain, Young Muslims UK and so on that seemed to have thought through the most coherent strategies for living as active Muslim citizens in Britain. Moreover, around one-third to one half of individuals on the MCB's Central Working Committee (CWC) seemed to share a reformist Islamist heritage.

What I was to discover about this relationship will become clear in the two case studies of the MCB and IF that I present here in this paper. Suffice to say that the links are far more nuanced and complex than I at first had imagined and that what I have learned perhaps serves as a warning against unintended forms of essentialism. My account of the MCB documents the nature and extent of its concern to seek political recognition and rights for Muslims in the public space. I will endeavour to say a little about each of the following: the background and structure of the MCB; the nature of its leadership; its networks with other Islamic organisations (both domestic and international); and, finally, its engagement with the British State, media and civil society (eg interfaith activity). Whereas the MCB's leadership is political, the IF can increasingly be seen as facilitating the growth of a more 'intellectual activist' leadership amongst Muslims in Britain. Therefore I take the opportunity here explore what it might mean for a 'movement' and its 'ideology' to be transformed not only from one generation to another but also from one context to another. The Islamic Foundation has a long history of publishing the works of Mawdudi and encouraging *da'wa* (invitation to Islam) but more recently it has taken on 'warts and all' cultural awareness training for non-Muslims. Through its connections with the Citizen Organising Foundation it has also been proactive in encouraging Muslims to move beyond the 'Pakistani' or even 'Muslim' good to some sort of 'common good'. Much of this reflexivity regarding Muslim identity would seem to have been driven by the particular lived experiences and hermeneutic

[82] I use the term 'Islamist' somewhat tentatively here to signal the idea of a politicised Islam. I am especially interested to discover the extent to which Muslim colleagues are happy with this label.

reflections of its increasingly diverse and cosmopolitan staff. This includes young British-Muslims of different ethnic heritages, converts to Islam, Muslim women, and those who would not necessarily position themselves as Reformist 'Islamists' at all.

Before I say any more about the MCB or IF, I want to flag up here some recent research that I have yet to write up. It reflects a shift from the national back to the local, from Reformism to Traditionalism, and so from a minority of Muslims to something which may have the potential to engage more of the majority. In Bradford, the Council For Mosques (BCM) remains unaffiliated to the MCB and only one of over 40 mosques is associated with a Jama'at-i Islami related organisation. The city's 75,000 Muslim population is dominated by Pakistanis from 'Azad' Kashmir whose Islamic orientation is usually described as Barelwi. Apparently, it is the preponderance of Barelwis in Bradford which keeps the BCM out of the MCB and, increasingly, it is also the low levels of cultural capital amongst Barelwi Kashmiri families that is being identified as a factor in the ethnic and religious polarisation in the city. In debates about citizenship and civil society in Bradford, Islam is usually seen as part of the problem rather than part of the solution. However, based on recent fieldwork, I think it is important to note that even amongst Barelwi Muslims a new body of young educated professionals is beginning to think about citizenship and civil society in Islamic terms. Moreover, in the past it may have been that in order to access Islamic resources such constituencies would have gravitated towards Reformism and away from the Sufi heritage of their parents. Now, though, it seems clear that Traditionalists are becoming just as adept at presenting their ideas in a meaningful way. However, it is not the mosque elders that have suddenly awoken to this need; rather, with the help of a global network of Islamic scholars - including converts such as Hamza Yusuf, Nuh Ha Mim Keller and Abdal Hakim Murad - young British-Muslims are increasingly able to connect to a classical Sunni heritage which has much to say about Islamic 'manners' and 'etiquette' and is positive about the possibility of peaceful coexistence with non-Muslims. In future work, then, I will report on a collective of young professional Muslims of Barelwi Sufi background, the curiously named Community Safety Education Group (CSEG), who have begun to organise a number of projects reflecting this 'Traditionalist' ethos. However, for the time being, I must retain my focus on MCB and IF. In the next section I want to preface my case studies with some general remarks about the context of Muslim leaderships in Britain.

'Soft' Secularism: The National Context

It is well documented that compared to many other European nations, the British State has responded to religious and ethnic diversity by embracing multicultural recognition. However, while colonial and commonwealth connections have ensured that a majority of Muslims in Britain have been citizens since they entered the country, their accommodation has historically been based on communal rather than civil rights. This has meant that the State, initially at the local level and more recently on the national level, has required the presence of a leadership to represent Muslim concerns. While the State has stopped short of actively creating such leaderships it has certainly been able to lend them legitimacy either by actively channelling funding in their direction (eg the BCM) or simply inviting them to consultations.

Until very recently multiculturalism in the UK has tended to reinforce difference rather than encourage notions of integration. But 'race' riots in a number of towns in the north of England including Bradford, together with the experience of September 11 2001, have produced a new concern for citizenship and community cohesion within the nation-State in a globalising world. Some consider this a new moral panic but in any case the old multicultural taboo of speaking out against aspects of minority cultures which inhibits integration has been broken. For example, transcontinental marriages and the importation of imams have both been openly criticised by high profile public figures. In short there is a concern to balance the 'rights' of citizenship, which has supported the emergence of an Islamic identity politics, with a new concern for 'responsibilities'.

At the same time as this reassessment of multiculturalism there is a new openness to religion in the public space of Britain. Certainly there are still many elements of 'hard' secularism in the public square but Prime Minister Tony Blair and many of his cabinet share a faith position or at least the recognition that religions have a role to play in regeneration, social uplift and building up civil society. Of course, in Britain Muslims have the benefit of an established Church which is prepared to share the public space with other faiths. For the Muslims this provides the opportunity for alliances and the possibility of learning how to best conduct themselves in negotiations with the State. For the Anglicans, the Muslim presence has revitalised arguments about the significance of faith perspectives in a secular society.

'Old' and 'New' Muslim Leaderships: A Brief Overview

At least two general types of leadership are observable within Britain's South Asian Muslim communities. First of all, there is what might properly be called traditional 'religious' leadership – leadership which offers theological / legal and mystical / spiritual guidance on 'how to be a good Muslim'. The authority of such leadership is enshrined a) in the scholarly expertise of *'ulama* and b) the inspired charisma of Sufi *shaykhs*. Both forms of religious leadership tend to be associated with transnational Islamic movements. For example, in the city of Bradford, Deobandi trained *muftis* give *fatwas* in response to written and telephone enquiries about Muslim family law, while Qadiri *shaykhs* such as Pir Maruf Hussain Shah take *baiyah* from *murids* (Lewis, 1994).[83]

In the past most traditional *'ulama* and *shaykhs* have not become directly involved in the second form of leadership, that is 'community' leadership.[84] 'Community' leadership is routinely concerned with both internal and external political affairs, including representing Muslim claims on their rights as citizens of Britain. It is this form of leadership which concerns me most here. In some ways Muslim communal leadership in Britain recalls the popular movements that opposed colonial regimes and fought for independence in the twentieth century (Werbner and Anwar, 1991). For example, Muhammad Ali Jinnah of the Muslim League and Father of the Nation of Pakistan was no religious specialist. Similarly, the expertise of Muslim 'community' leaders in Britain has traditionally drawn upon quite different types of 'cultural capital' than the *'ulama* and *shaykhs* they may turn to on purely 'religious' matters (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977). However, this is beginning to change.[85] For example, a number of young Muslim scholars in the Deobandi tradition such as Mahmood Chandia (Bolton) and Ibrahim Mogra (Leicester) combine the classical training of al-Azhar with higher degrees from British universities; both now speak on community affairs in their localities and work with the MCB on a national level.

---

[83] Notably, Sayeda Khatoon of Salford (Greater Manchester), a *khalifa* (deputy) of a Karachi-based Qadiri *shaykh*, is one of the few female Muslim 'religious leaders' in Britain. She ministers to both men and women.

[84] There are, of course, important exceptions. As in South Asia, Sufi *shaykhs* in Britain will often exert a subtle influence over (trans)local politics by encouraging some of their followers to participate.

[85] The Egyptian graduate of al-Azhar, Dr. Zaki Badawi, who is principal of the Muslim College in London and chairman of the Imams and Mosques Council of Great Britain. Badawi, now in his late 70s, is married to an English convert, has a high public profile and is often to be heard on BBC Radio 4. He is well connected with Prince Charles who has a longstanding interest in

The cultural capital of Muslim community leaders therefore varies between the generations as well as on local and national levels. For example, amongst the first generation of economic migrants, the men who emerged as leaders – say, of mosques - have not usually been democratically elected. Rather they were often those who shared certain characteristics, characteristics which, when combined, at once reflected their background in South Asian society and yet set them apart from other migrants. These characteristics routinely included: membership of a powerful and well-established regional and or kinship group (*biradari*); a reputation as an effective political operator – a 'strong man'; some limited education, including basic competence in English; and, finally, some experience of engagement with members of the white majority, perhaps through a public service occupation (e.g. transport) or a small business (e.g. a shop).

This sort of cultural capital allowed first generation leaders, to both build up strong ethnic institutions and become authoritative interlocutors with local government, the police, media, schools etc. However, as noted in the introduction, part of the problem is that this sort of 'public relations' is routinely confined to transactions at the ethnic boundary rather than encouraging ordinary people to interact and create a civic citizenship. Instead, mosques and their leaders have focused on securing community rights and access to scarce resources for institutions with the occasional 'multicultural photo-opportunity'.

A 'second generation' of local community leaders were often born in South Asia to first generation migrant families but partially, or fully, educated in Britain after they had been reunited with their fathers. Crucially, the second generation has had a deeper level of interaction with wider society and is often more politicised than its parents. Second generation leaders routinely began their leadership careers as young anti-racist or religious activists in the late 1970s and early 1980s. When the race relations industry and multicultural provision expanded in this period, their activities ultimately qualified them to take up new publicly-funded positions with local councils etc. In this context, representation and advocacy in respect of anti-racism and community rights became an implicit part of their job description. For example, Ishtiaq Ahmed, currently secretary

---

Islam. As Chair of the Muslim Law Council UK he issued a *fatwa* advising that Muslims in the armed forces had a duty to obey orders whilst fighting in Afghanistan.

of Bradford Council for Mosques (BCM), had a background in UK based Islamic youth movements during the 1970s but has worked in race relations for more than 20 years. Nevertheless, like the first generation of community leaders, this segment of the second generation, which is now into well its 40s, remains reliant on its ethnic and regional networks and constituencies. Indeed, a combination of their community leadership and *biradari* connections has sometimes provided a platform for entry into formal politics.[86] For example, the second Muslim MP to enter Parliament, Khalid Mahmood (Birmingham, Perry Barr, 2001), is a Kashmiri community worker by occupation. However, as we shall see, it is fair to say that not all successful community leaders on a local level have what it takes to become significant players on a national level.

This short outline begins to provide an important context for the development and significance of leaderships on a national level in the UK. More than any event, the Rushdie Affair of 1989 illuminated the limits of localised Muslim leaderships and strategies grounded in grassroots ethnic networks. National umbrella organisations such as the Union of Muslim Organisations (UMO) had been set up during the 1970s, but as Nielsen remarks they were 'essentially irrelevant because all the major aspects of government which affected Muslims were based at local level until well into the 1980s' (1999: 40). However, on the other hand, while there may have been several Pakistani and Kashmiri councillors in Bradford come the time of the Rushdie Affair - many of whom were beginning to position themselves more explicitly as 'Muslims' - there was not a single Muslim MP to make their case in Parliament. Indeed, when it came to national issues, Muslim organisations had hitherto relied upon alliances with stronger and better organised constituencies such as the Jewish lobby on ritual slaughter or the Christian Churches on religious education.

Effective representation of Muslim concerns therefore needed to take place on the national level where more and more political decisions were being made. However, the cultural capital of first,

[86] Notably, the race relations industry and 'community' related work has also created a 'secular' space, away from the ethnicised male spaces of mosques and politics, where second-generation women's leadership roles might be developed. The same is true of politics and the professions. However, the authority of such women is usually based on their occupational expertise alone and they tend to remain rather marginal figures in community terms. Inter-faith activity is another space that has opened up for women's representation. For example, during the Bradford riots of both 1995 and 2001 – almost exclusively male affairs – a group of

and some second, generation leaders, was such that they did not have the necessary sophistication to deal with government ministers and senior civil servants. Indeed, BCM's violent burning of a copy of *The Satanic Verses* only reinforced Islamophobic stereotypes in wider society. Thus it became clear that Muslims would have to explore other political strategies if they were to secure recognition from central government.

As the case of the MCB attests, such strategies have tended to be advanced by a middle class elite of well-educated Muslim businessmen, professionals and intellectuals. They have the competencies and specialised skills that are required to do business with the State and wider society, especially the media. Back in October 1988, one of the antecedents of the MCB, the UK Action Committee on Islamic Affairs (UKACIA), had led the campaign against Salman Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses* (*TSV*). However, despite the letter-writing of their professional elite, UKACIA's peaceful lobbying failed to make much impact on the Conservative government of the day. Indeed, although UKAICIA doggedly persisted with the engaged and gradualist representational strategies first adopted during the Rushdie Affair, for much of the early to mid 1990s it made relatively slow progress on issues such as religious discrimination and State-funding for Muslim schools. However, in the period since 1997, when a New Labour government came to power and the MCB was founded, there have been a number of firsts in respect of recognising 'Muslims' on a national level. The MCB, in particular, has evolved a mode of Muslim representation that has now entered the mainstream and stands as one of the best examples of Muslim engagement in debates about citizenship and civil society. It is to a case study of this organisation we must turn now.

Engaging the State and Civil Society: Mapping the Muslim Council of Britain

The MCB emerged in the post-Rushdie context, building on the new levels of cooperation amongst diverse Muslim organisations witnessed during the affair. In April 1994 a meeting of Muslim organisations in Birmingham established the National Interim Committee on Muslim Affairs to 'consult' Muslims country wide on the need for a new umbrella organisation (*The*

---

women from different faiths staged a peace march in the midst of the troubles. The women involved were sometimes those who knew each other already on a professional basis, e.g. through schools.

Muslim News, 31 May 2002). A survey of 1200 organisations and activists is said to have given them their 'mandate' for this. After the constitutions of a variety of Muslim and non-Muslim institutions had been examined, at a final meeting in Bradford during May 1996, the MCB was founded. 'Information roadshows' in Manchester and London were followed, on November 23 1997, with representatives of more than 250 Muslim organisations meeting to inaugurate the MCB at Brent Town Hall in London.

Today 350 or so institutions representing a wide range of Muslim ethnicities are affiliated to the MCB at the national, regional and local levels. They include mosques, education and charitable institutions, women's and youth organisations, and professional bodies. There are also a number of key committees including some to deal exclusively with the media, research, finance, membership and legal affairs. Other committees and task groups include social policy, health, community, education and employment, mosques, business, family, public affairs and London. Every two years the General Assembly meets to elect members of a Central Working Committee (CWC) which is made up of 25 national representatives plus 12 designated zonal representatives from around the country. The CWC in turn elects a number of office bearers for a two-year term of office.

The MCB insists that it is funded entirely by affiliation fees, which for local organisations such as mosques are as low as £25. Sponsors of *The Common Good* (an occasional newsletter) seem to have been London and Leicester based manufacturing, IT and property management businesses, as well as Muslim Aid, Iqra Trust and the Islamic Cultural Centre. However, overall the lack of funds has frustrated the ability of the organisation to develop its work. Indeed, the MCB is run by a skeleton staff who, for the most part, work on a voluntary basis. For example, both general secretaries of the MCB to date, Iqbal Sacranie (1998-2000, 2002-04) and Yousef Bhailok (2000-02), have done just that. In the short term funding is likely to remain a key issue and the willingness of affiliates to increase levels of financial support an important test of the true extent of grassroots support.

A brief look at the biography of Bhailok begins to reveal something of the cultural capital of the MCB's leadership.[87] Yousef Bhailok is a Gujerati Indian who came to Britain in 1962 as young child and as such is essentially second generation. Gujerati Indian Muslims are also generally regarded as much more upwardly mobile than the majority Pakistani or Kashmiri Muslims. It should be no surprise to hear then that, now in his mid 40s, Bhailok is a successful company director with an investment company. Based in Preston in Lancashire, he has had an interest in community affairs at the local level for 25 years. Like many community leaders Bhailok's leadership skills were honed on the local level. In Preston he was: chair of a local mosque, a managing trustee of the Deobandi Lancashire Darool Ulum Higher Islamic College, and also vice chair of Preston and West Lancashire Racial Equality Council.[88]

As mentioned earlier, one of the things that becomes clear to a careful observer of the backgrounds of many but by no means all MCB activists is that they appear to be associated with what I have tentatively called 'reformist Islamists'. In particular they seem to come from a variety of Jama'at related organisations such as the Islamic Foundation, as well as UK Islamic Mission, Young Muslims UK and the Islamic Society of Britain. Other organisations associated with the Islamic movement include the Federation of Student Islamic Societies (FOSIS), Islamic Forum of Europe (IFE), Iqra Trust, and the Islamic Cultural Centre (London).

Certainly the recent critique of the MCB as 'lassi Islamists' by glossy Muslim magazine, *Q News* (March-April 2002: 22-3) supports the impression of a significant Jama'at related influence. Moreover, a study of *The Common Good* often reveals that it is the activities of such organisations that have the highest profile. For example, Islam Awareness Week in 2002 was rightly given great prominence in the MCB's organ. Launched from the House of Commons by Munir Ahmed, President of ISB, it was also ISB that had organised a monthly 'Question Time Forum' at the House of Lords made up of MPs and broadcasters in order to encourage Muslims to 'participate more fully in local and national elections' (2001). Perhaps more revealingly, a

---

[87] Sacranie is also a businessman with an African Asian background in Malawi. Joint Convenor of UKACIA and General Secretary of MCB, Iqbal Sacranie was once reckoned to be the 246th most powerful person in Britain (*The Observer*, 24 October 1999).

[88] Notably, one hears little mention now of another well known, but first generation, Deobandi Muslim, Sher Azam. Former President of Bradford Council of Mosques (BCM), he was actually the convenor of the preparatory committee for the MCB which met back in Bradford May 1996. However, as noted above, BCM is not affiliated to MCB.

residential 'brainstorming session' was held at 'Markfield' (ie the Islamic Foundation – although this is not mentioned explicitly) on Saturday 22-23 May 2002. The weekend was to discuss the future of the MCB and was attended by former and current office bearers and committee chairs.

The purpose of such observations is simply to suggest that it is the Jama'at related organisations that have both the energy and aptitude for such work. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that the MCB has been careful to underline the fact that 'no member body and its branches could have more than five of its members elected to the Central Working Committee (CWC)' (CG,1,2:2). Indeed, as noted above, Bhailok, and indeed Sacranie, just happen to come from Deobandi and not Jama'at related backgrounds. Moreover, in 2002 Iqbal Sacranie was reported as attending an *Eid Milad al-Nabi* celebration in Merton, London, a festival usually associated with popular Sufi oriented Barelwis and distained by both the Deobandis and Jama'at.[89]

Overall, this suggests that, not unlike the Bradford Council of Mosques in its heyday, the MCB is providing a space for Muslim representation 'beyond sectarianism' (Lewis, 1994).[90] Indeed, given their exposure to a wide variety of Islamic orientations growing up in Britain, many younger activists are more impatient of narrow sectarianism than some of their older co-religionists. The MCB contains its fair share of 'Rushdie's children' – young, relatively 'free-thinking', Muslim professionals who became politicised whilst at university during the late 1980s and early 1990s. Moreover, the MCB is also careful to associate itself with various non-affiliated but still prominent Muslims such as the writer, Akbar Ahmed, the Islamic scholar, Zaki Badawi, and the Labour Peer, Lord Ahmed. *The Common Good* reports MCB members attending the same events as these established personalities which of course lends them legitimacy and creates the impression of moving in the right circles. Finally, MCB 'academic' advisors such as Professors Tariq Modood, MBE, and Muhammad Anwar, also do much the same job.

I have said something then of the MCB's domestic Islamic networks, the sorts of organisations and individuals that make the organisation tick. I also want to make just a few observations about

[89] There are Barelwis mentioned amongst the MCB elected representatives. One is from Birmingham, a contemporary and rival of Pir Maroof Hussain Shah in Bradford but there is never any mention of his activities in *The Common Good* newsletter.
[90] Perhaps the Deobandi / Jama'at related relationship is no surprise given the current alliance of these religious parties in Pakistan.

the MCB's more international Islamic connections. To a large extent the MCB simply endeavours to play the role of 'statesman', something I will comment on presently. Again, this has the effect of raising its profile both within Britain and overseas. For example, in *The Common Good* we hear of the following being hosted and entertained: a World Muslim League delegation (Lord Ahmed); OIC; Ameer of Qatar; parliamentary delegation from Morocco; Afghani delegation Muslim Media; Bangladeshi High Commissioner; Pakistan High Commissioner; Arab League; Bosnian Ambassador; Egyptian Ambassador; Saudi Ambassador; Iranian Ambassador; Malaysian Prime Minister; Mufti of Uganda; Macedonian Muslim organisation; President Islamic Society of Malaysia. Similarly, MCB representatives attend overseas conferences and meetings in the Muslim world; for example: the Summit of World Muslim Leaders (Jordan); Milli Gorus Conference (the Netherlands); and the International Intifada Conference (Iran, 2001).[91]

However, in the same way that the MCB has stood against what is perceived as Western aggression in the Muslim world (see below), it is also fair to say that there is evidence of the MCB adopting a critical and engaged approach to Muslim affairs on an international level. In the same way that the MCB distinguished itself in its condemnation of the atrocities of September the 11, so too it deplored the grenade attack on a Protestant Church in Islamabad (18 March 2002). In perhaps an even braver intervention, the MCB wrote to the President of Sudan, Umar Hasan Ahmad Bashir, expressing its concern at the arrest of a distinguished pathologist and Islamic charity worker, Dr El-Amin on 10 June 2002. The text of the letter read: 'The Sudanese government has acted in an unconscionable manner out of keeping with the civil traditions of its peoples…there has been a breach of human rights' (Tuesday 2 July 2002). Clearly then the rights based discourse at the heart of the MCB's concern for Muslims in Britain, also extends to Muslims in the Muslim world at large.

[91] Senior MCB officials including Bhailok were criticised for attending this conference and sharing a platform with organisations like Hamas in a recent investigative television programme about the MCB (*Who Speaks For Muslims*, Channel 4, April 2002). The suggestion was that although presenting themselves as 'Muslim moderates', the MCB actually has within its ranks many with radical sympathies. However, such critiques tend to rely on the assumption of an homogenous, integrated political outlook in Britain rather than an engaged, critical citizenship. Similarly, younger MCB activists, Mahmud al Rashid and Inayat Bunglawallah, who have come up through the ranks of YMUK and ISB, were challenged for their association with the popular Muslim youth magazine *Trends*. It was alleged that during the 1990s the publication published 'anti-Semitic', or at least 'anti-Zionist', material.

At the beginning of this paper I suggested that in the period since 1997, when a New Labour government came to power and the MCB was founded, there have been a number of firsts in respect of recognising 'Muslims' on a national level. The MCB's assessment of itself is that it has made a 'significant impact in public circles'; it claims that it is responsible for the 'respect…[that the] Muslim community has begun to win'. It is certainly a distinctive 'Muslim voice' speaking to central and local government but the extent of its actual influence over government is questionable.

Since New Labour has come to power Muslims in Britain have experienced unprecedented levels of engagement with the British State. For example, Foreign Secretary, Jack Straw, was reported as 'calling in' to report on his visit to India and Pakistan. The reality is that much of the MCB's activity is at the invitation of New Labour. Indeed, some have argued that the MCB is a creation of Tony Blair and his cronies.[92] However, perhaps it is preferable to suggest that New Labour gave the MCB its opportunity for, as we have seen, the plans for such an organisation can be traced back to the early 1990s.

New Labour was certainly keen to have a group of 'moderate Muslims' it could engage in dialogue. Therefore visits to the Home Office, Whitehall breakfast meetings, luncheons and receptions, all became the norm. While key issues have often focused on religious discrimination and Islamophobia, as well as 2001 Census faith schools, other more mundane matters have been up for discussion too. For example, everything from prison and hospital chaplaincy, to health matters such as circumcision, diabetes, heart disease and mental illness,[93] to changes in the marriage laws.[94]

---

[92] When in the wake of September 11, the MCB referred to some radical Islamists in Britain as 'a lunatic fringe…totally unrepresentative…[with] a few hundred supporters', one of the organisations concerned, al-Muhajiroun, issued its own press release (22 September 2001) in which it referred to the 'sect set up by the British government known as MCB'. Though from an entirely different perspective, similar suggestions were made by the Channel 4 programme of April 2002 referred to above.

[93] Another interesting example is that Hajjis were given a meningococcal infection warning. Also, foot and mouth disease had been identified in a number of animals for Qurbani and so the sacrifice had been much reduced (*TCG*, 1.4.9).

[94] Muslim marriages can now be conducted in a mosque by an imam without the need for a civil registrar to be present.

All such matters are suggestive of the variety of government departments now considering religious and ethnic pluralism as a matter of policy and good practice.[95] However, it seems very far from the truth that the MCB has become a powerful lobby as perhaps it would like to think. It has certainly been consulted by government but, as the wars on Afghanistan and Iraq revealed, a fairly narrowly conceived 'loyalty' is also part of the Blair agenda. But before turning to conflict over such matters let us consider further examples of MCB cooperation, this time, in British civil society.

The mapping of the MCB's engagement with the British State and civil society demonstrates the incredibly dense network of activity and opportunity for alliance making that exists in the UK. Given that this is something relatively new to the Muslim community, at least at the national level, begins to explain why Muslims have lacked influence for so long. As I have cited the MCB's range of engagement with the State above, so too it will be worth mapping their interaction with the bodies of British civil society in full: the Commission for Racial Equality; Greater London Authority; London Civic Forum; Islamophobia Commission; The Prince's Trust; National Association Against Racism; National Association of Standing Conference on RE; NHS Tobacco Campaign; Three Faiths Forum; University of Bristol; Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies; Local Government Association; European Parliament. It is these connections that allows the MCB to do its sort of politics in a British context.

What is also very clear from *The Common Good* is that Muslims associated with the MCB are increasing gaining recognition for their participation in British civil society. Muslims are being held up as 'model citizens', which is just what the MCB want. For example, the following were honoured by Her Majesty the Queen, independently of their association with MCB: Manazir Ahsan of the Islamic Foundation, MBE; Bashir Maan, Lord Provost of Glasgow, CBE; Nawazish Bokhari, OBE. MCB representatives were presented to the Queen at Buckingham Palace during her Jubilee Reception for Faith Communities.[96] In a different way, MCB members' recognition in their professional associations is also celebrated. Khurshid Drabu of the MCB CWC was made

[95] A list of the government departments that the MCB has been consulted by includes the Department of Culture, Media and Sport, the Department of Trade and Industry; the Department of Health and the office of the Deputy Medical Officer; Her Majesty's Treasury; the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food; the Department for International Development; the Civil Service; and the Department of Social Services.

Vice President of the Immigration Appeal Tribunal, and Dr Jafer Qureishi, also of the MCB CWC, was elected to the Expert Advisory Group of the Royal College of Psychiatrists (2001). Of course, all such achievements enhance the cultural capital of the Muslim leadership.

Two further examples of MCB activity will exemplify their collaborative but also their critical perspectives on civil society. First, the arena of interfaith is incredibly significant for all Muslims wishing to engage wider British society. It provides a relatively safe space in which to learn from the experiences of the Church of England and others at representing religion in the secular public space. Together with Christians and Jews, the MCB have lobbied on 'moral issues' such as proposals to lower the age of consent for homosexuals from 18 to 16. They issued a joint statement on the need for 'moral leadership' after the racist murder of Stephen Lawrence, a black teenager from London. At a different level the MCB has again played the statesman, taking part in The World Congress of Faiths and the dialogue between the Anglican Church and Islam's greatest university, Al-Azhar in Cairo. Furthermore, Iqbal Sacranie was careful in this respect to publicly 'condole the demise [death]' of the former Chief Rabbi and Cardinal Hume in 1999.

A second important arena for MCB participation in British civil society is the media. However, while there is collaboration and cooperation in this field too, there is also a sense in which the MCB, and most especially its media committee, operates to 'police Islamophobia'. The media is a priority for the MCB mainly because it has a strong perception that media relations have not been well managed in the past. As Tariq Khan, Convenor of the Media Committee suggests,
The response needs to be based on sound reasoning and good research. Its style has to be measured or forceful, as the situation requires. And it should be free from emotional outbursts that often lead our point of view to be ignored or misrepresented (*TCG*, Vol. 1, Issue 2).

Thus the MCB aims for a more active and organised role in the media projecting a strong voice and a positive image of Islam. There is also a sense in which not responding to negative constructions of Islam implies that Muslims are not bothered. To this end, a campaign of regular monitoring and vigorous letter writing in response to what are perceived to be Islamophobic pieces has been embarked upon. Press releases and meetings with political and news editors and

[96] The Prince of Wales held an Eid Reception for Muslim youth on 19 December 2001.

broadcasters, as well as the Broadcasting Standards Commission and Press Complaints Commission, to discuss complaints have become commonplace. They express disappointment, seek apologies or, sometimes, offer thanks.[97] Indeed, there have been attempts to build bridges, especially with liberal titles such as *The Guardian*.[98] Moreover, in order to educate themselves about the media, MCB staff have organised in-house training as well as attending courses run by the Religious Programming unit of the BBC.[99] Finally, showing that Muslims did not have a narrow agenda on the media, MCB members attended *The Mirror* newspaper's 'Pride of Britain Awards'.

Of course the media was a key player in shaping how Muslims, and especially the MCB managed the fallout of the events of September 11 2001. A statement of condemnation was issued within hours and was acknowledged by Blair as being very strongly worded. Even the tabloid press announced 'Islam is not an evil religion' (*The Sun*, ** September 2001). Could it be that the MCB had won the war on Islamophobia? Attacks on Muslims and the BNP's Campaign Against Islamic Extremism soon put paid to that idea and the MCB were once again on the defensive. The issue of 'loyalty' and 'treason' became paramount as stories of grassroots support for Osama Bin Laden and even small numbers of young Muslims joining the Taliban for jihad grew. The MCB's claim to represent the moderation of Britain's Muslims was put in jeopardy and its legitimacy in government eyes was certainly underminded.

The MCB responded by asserting that 50% of Muslims were born in Britain and that that was their only home. They spoke or 'our government', maintained that the rule of law was indeed inviolable and made a statement to MPs on the occasion of special debate in the Commons (14 September 2001) expressing their appreciation to the Prime Minister for his support in the face of hate crimes. They sought to highlight examples of good practice such as the hand delivered letters to neighbours in South London by a local Muslim GP and held meetings with faith groups, also attending an event at the US Embassy. Finally, they also sought actively to distance

[97] For example, the MCB media committee wrote to thank Conservative MP Oliver Letwin who challenged Margaret Thatcher's assertion that there had not been enough condemnation of the events of September 11 from 'Muslim priests'.
[98] They commended *The Guardian* on its excellent series of articles on Muslims in Britain during June 2002. *The Guardian* was also the first major British newspaper to print the times of prayer and the opening and closing of the fast during Ramadan.
[99] Another example of cooperation was the BBC Islam UK (2001) season in which MCB members participated as part of the advisory committee.

themselves from – and generally delegitimate - those movements that saw an inevitable clash between Islam and the West, between belief and *kufr*:

In an important issue of policy the MCB has also taken a public stand to confront groups within the community that only misrepresent the values of Islam but will cause ill-will through foolish statements and quixotic behaviour. The MCB urged TV producers and newspaper editors not to offer a high profile to such people, who not only do not represent how the mainstream community thinks and feel, but who indirectly inflame passions and spread hatred. (*The Common Good*, Vol. 1, Issue, 4: 3)

If MCB members speak of the 'backlash' after September 11 as alienating for many Muslims, there is also a sense now that the widespread protests against the wars on Afghanistan and Iraq bound many Muslims into society through an active citizenship they shared with many non-Muslims. As Sarah Joseph of the MCB related at a day workshop on *Islam and Social Justice* organised jointly by the Islamic Foundation, the Citizen Organising Foundation and the British Council (June 2003), some Muslims were thrust together with the sort of people they had just never met before – from CND and Socialist Workers to Jews and Sikhs - breaking down assumptions and translating shared values on both sides.

The emergence of the MCB is undoubtedly a significant development in the story of the evolution of a mature Muslim leadership in the UK. Even during episodes of conflict with the State over international affairs it has retained its emphasis on public reason and participation in civil society. However, the organisation does have to face a number of challenges. Based on developments in 2003, I want to suggest that 'relevance' is an issue that the MCB is going to have to confront increasingly. The General Secretary himself admits that the main body of the MCB's work - networking and consultation – has rather 'intangible outcomes' (Annual General Meeting, April 2003). However, in general the organisation seems to be demonstrating signs of an inability to prioritise and also a worrying lack of self-awareness and judgement. Given its limited funding one might reasonably question whether the MCB should be content to spread itself so widely and thinly in every corner of civil society. Every issue had become 'a Muslim issue' so much so that there is a danger of smothering civil society with Islam. Perhaps there are

some issues where Islamic agendas are more important than others? Recent developments also suggest that the MCB leadership are in need of something of a reality check. In June 2003 it was announced that a Muslim 'Cabinet' had been established. This represents a crass over inflation and mis-recognition of the significance of the MCB by its leaders and risks derision or suspicion akin to that excited by the defunct Muslim Parliament. Perhaps operating in the rather rarefied world of politicians and civil servants has given some at the MCB delusions of grandeur?

The Islamic Foundation: Intellectual Activists and Reformist Islamism

Esposito (1996) argues that movements of Islamic revival can promote as well as militate against political participation by drawing on the 'democratic resources' of the Islamic tradition. This has been most evident since the Islamic resurgence became institutionalised in the mainstream of Muslim societies in the 1980s. As well as the increased visibility of Islamic dress and media, an Islamised civil society has emerged led by a new generation of activist intellectuals who are a synthesis of traditional *'ulama* and Western intellectuals (Esposito, 2001). They are deeply involved in politics but also draw upon associations with professional and other bodies to deliver welfare and charity services. For example, 'reforming' - as opposed to 'revolutionary' – elements within the Ikhwan in Egypt have begun to suggest that they might be, amongst other things, effective agents of development and social change.

In Britain, the settlement of Muslims has provoked both conservative and dynamic responses in communities. In general terms the former is associated with an emphasis on ethnicity whereas the latter is more suggestive of hybridity. While Islamist movements perhaps have the reputation of defending religious boundaries in a way that is reminiscent of ethnicity (Eriksen, 1993), it is also clear that the relative freedom of the diasporic context has proved fertile ground for new constructions of Islam. Not only does diaspora expose Muslims to western society, it brings them into contact with Muslims from other ethnic and sectarian traditions (Mandaville, 2001). Indeed, it is a new generation of Islamists that seems to have embraced this interstitial experience of living in Britain most confidently. It is they that are busy exploring what it means to live 'in' the West. While the authenticity of their position has not gone unquestioned by others, they refuse the simplistic oppositions of *dar al-Islam* and *dar al-Harb* that many revolutionaries and radicals

perpetuate (Mandaville, 2001).[100] Rather than separation, then, the reforming Islamists of Britain stress active participation in the wider (non-Muslim) society while maintaining that Islam has something distinctive to contribute to understandings of justice, morality, etc.

The home of reforming Islamist intellectual activism in Britain is the Islamic Foundation (IF) in Leicestershire.[101] The IF was founded in 1973 by Khurshid Ahmad (1932 -) with a brief to promote worldwide *da'wa* or mission. A deputy '*amir* of Jama'at-i Islami (JI) in Pakistan, Professor Ahmad began his life in the party as a highly politicised student activist before going on to make his name in developing the field of Islamic economics. He also became an (ultimately short-lived and critical) member of the military government of General Zia (1977-88) (Nasr, 1994). As Esposito (2001) argues, the fact that Ahmad was a generation younger than JI's founder, Sayyid Mawdudi, made him more aware of the interdependence of a globalised social and economic order. Indeed, Ahmad emphasised the need for relations and dialogue with the West rather than rejecting it outright. For example, while remaining critical of the Western dichotomy of the secular and the sacred, as well as neo-colonialism, Ahmad's intellectual leadership at the IF pioneered Muslim Interfaith work in 1970s. He was a member of the advisory council of CSIC at the Selly Oak Colleges, University of Birmingham.

Khurshid Ahmad believes that Allah revealed only broad principles to human beings and endowed them with the freedom and capabilities to apply their intellect (*ijtihad*) in every age. Thus while the IF is clearly inspired by the tradition of Mawdudi and JI – first generation Islamism - it is not formally affiliated and increasingly reflects the values and experiences not

---

[100] Since the Muslim Parliament is now effectively defunct, the mantle of rejectionism has passed to movements such as Hizb al-Tahrir (founded 1953, Jerusalem) and Al-Muhajiroun (founded 1983, Jeddah). Both aim to revive the *ummah* (Islamic community) and liberate Muslims who live under *kufr* (systems of unbelief in Muslim or non-Muslim countries) by (re)establishing the *khilafah* (Caliphate) and an Islamic State ruled by *shari'ah*. They reject, for example, any form of participation in the mainstream political process such as voting. However, both have small, if vocal, constituencies that the mainstream media all too frequently latches onto.

[101] During their campaign against Rushdie's novel, *The Satanic Verses*, BCM co-opted Shabbir Akhtar, a locally born Cambridge graduate of philosophy, to help them make their case to the media. Akhtar's first book asked defiantly 'what's wrong with fundamentalism?' but in his second he became more critical of the 'intellectual stagnation' he saw in contemporary Islam and outlined the need for Islam to engage with the Western intellectual tradition on the basis of the religious freedom they enjoyed (Lewis, 1994). Not really an Islamist, Akhtar did not find Britain an hospitable place to develop his ideas and after a fruitless sojourn in 'Islamic' Malaysia, where he found almost no intellectual freedom at all, he moved to North America. Unfortunately then, Britain has no intellectual figure of Tariq Ramadan's status at present. There are other Muslim intellectuals associated with Britain, such as Akbar Ahmed (now in the US), Ziauddin Sardar and now Bobby Sayyid, but none seems to have as engaged or creative a vision as a Ramadan. Indeed when one talks to ISB activists in Bradford it is Ramadan's name that they know. Ramadan's books are published by the IF although some within the organisation are critical of his work.

only of a second – i.e. Khurshid Ahmad - but a third generation of Islamists (Esposito, 2001). Given the specifics of its diasporic context, the IF has brought together a staff with a variety of backgrounds, which together with its European and international connections, seems to be evolving a uniquely cosmopolitan and self-critical vision of Islam (Mandaville, 2001). In a context that could not be more different to the ethnicised encapsulation of Bradford, British-born, university-educated professionals with a South Asian ethnic heritage are joined by white European converts to Islam such as Batool al-Toma, Muhammad Seddon and Yahya Birt. All in their 20s, 30s and 40s, they are religiously serious but with a very different outlook than the products of traditional *dar al 'ulums*. Some are well-networked in terms of a range of organisations not all of them within the Islamist tradition, others are not. In this respect the third generation follow in the footsteps of the second generation. Dr. Manazir Ahsan MBE, Director General of the IF, sits, or has sat, on the managing committees of the UK Action Committee on Islamic Affairs (UKAICIA), Muslim Aid and the Muslim Council of Britain. In the tradition of Khurshid Ahmad, Ahsan was also, until recently, co-chair of the Inter-Faith Network of the UK (IFNUK).[102]

Today, the main work of the IF focuses on research and publication, education and training. Both Muslims and non-Muslims are part of their target audience. For example, the IF has long been recognised as a purveyor of quality Islamic publications in English (Lewis, 1994), especially for young Muslims and converts to Islam. However, it also articulates its mission in terms of creating better understanding of Islam in the West. A particular concern, also reflected in the work of MCB, ISB and YMUK, is to challenge and defuse misconceptions and misunderstandings about Islam and Muslims in the face of Islamophobia in wider society. Amongst other things, this is a barrier to successful *da'wa*. However, non-Muslim professionals, who provide services to Muslims, have also been targeted for Cultural Awareness Courses which give what has been described as 'a warts and all' overview of 'the Muslim way of life'. Therefore while YMUK and ISB remain *da'wa* based organisations the IF, like MCB, is becoming less so.

[102] The IFNUK works to promote good relations between the world faiths in Britain and actively promotes the role of religion in public space. The IF's scholarship and alliance-making in this crucial area of civil society is also continued by Ataullah Siddiqui.

Some scholars are critical of the way in which the idea of a Muslim 'way of life' could present an 'overbearingly normative' construction of Islam. For example, Baumann (1999) considers that such representations of Islam - as presented in McDermott and Ahsan's, *The Muslim Guide* (1979) - reinforce the dominant discourse of 'difference multiculturalism' and are insufficiently attentive to diversity and difference within Muslim communities. Nevertheless, the IF finds many satisfied clients in a context where religious literacy is becoming a more important component of ethno-sensitive service delivery.[103] Moreover, tackling the issue of Islamophobia successfully in a non-confrontational manner requires a particular self-consciousness amongst Muslim staff about how 'Muslims' might be perceived in wider society. It also requires an understanding of what makes one's non-Muslim clients tick. These are skills that IF staff have acquired through interaction with a wide range of clients in their own professional work. Finally, the success of the IF in this respect was even leant government legitimacy in a recent Home Office report, *Community Cohesion in Britain* (Denham, 2001). Appendix B identifies their courses as an example of good practice in the context of promoting inter-cultural exchange: 'The IF brings together different traditions to explain what Islam stands for. It runs short courses for a range of professionals such as the police…it believes that extremism on all sides is the result of the absence of dialogue' (Denham, 2001: 62).

Interestingly, 6 of the 11 authors of the *Community Cohesion* report were from minority groups, including 4 of Muslim origin. Their inclusion is a sign of the extent to which some Muslim leaders are beginning to acquire more public profiles in Britain. Moreover, the backgrounds of these individuals exemplify the different ways in which emerging Muslim leaderships can and do participate in public life. The four were as follows:

- Baroness Uddin[104] - formerly a senior social services officer and now a Labour peer in the House of Lords and Deputy Leader of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets where there is a high concentration of Bengali Muslims.
- Mohammed Taj - a full time lay negotiator for bus workers and member of the General Executive Council of the Transport and General Workers Union and the Trade Union Congress;

[103] So far IF clients have included social services, education departments, the police, the probation service, and the home office.
[104] Baroness Uddin exemplifies the fact that spaces associated with the secular State and its provision often seem more open for Muslim women to emerge as 'leaders'. Notably she is quite critical of the MCB for its apparent lack of representativeness.

also a (dissenting) part of the team that produced the Bradford Commission Report (1996) into riots in the city in 1995.

- Humera Khan[105] – freelance researcher and consultant as well as one of the founders of An Nisa Society (Muslim women's welfare and education organisation) in London.
- Ahtesham Ali – former chief editor of Trends, President of YMUK and co-ordinator of Himmat Project which promotes an Islamic approach to probation and rehabilitation in Halifax, Bradford and Keighley.

An-Nisa and Himmat would be useful case studies of the emergence of an Islamic civil society in Britain, not to mention the growing recognition of religion – as well as race and ethnicity - in the public space.[106] The IF and its engagement with the Citizen Organising Foundation (COF) was discussed at a recent IF conference, *British Muslims: Loyalty and Belonging* (8 May 2002). The COF is an independent body which teaches 'the art of politics in action' to potential grassroots leaders. However what makes the COF distinctive is that it promotes the cooperation of different faith and other organisations. The basic rule is working across community boundaries on common issues and struggles. However, the COF and IF both recognise that the dominant model of politics in Britain does not support building broad-based agendas. Participants noted that as in Bradford, amongst Birmingham's Muslims, there is very little notion of 'the common good'. Councillors, mosques etc have all 'abdicated their responsibilities' to wider society by 'playing the race or religious card'. 'Pakistanis or Muslims always come first'. Therefore, it seems that people from all sorts of different backgrounds have yet to be convinced that it can be in their interest to - as Baumann (1999) puts it - 'multi-relate'.[107] This would seem to be at the heart of a more civic – as opposed to the hitherto predominant 'rights based' – citizenship.

---

[105] Islamist religious spaces are generally more hospitable to women's leadership in the public space. Apart from parallel 'sisters' sections', Muslim women with avowedly Islamic identities – often signalled by the wearing of headscarves – are becoming prominent in arenas such as welfare and the media. One example is Humera Khan, another is the editor of the glossy Muslim magazine, Q-News, is a woman, Shagufta Yaqub. Perhaps this reflects the institutionalisation of the Islamic revival in Britain?

[106] Other arenas of interest could include State-funded Muslim schools, the Muslim media, Muslim charities etc.

[107] I am not unaware of the fact that, far from reinforcing the bounded nature of 'difference multiculturalism' – see Baumann's critique of McDermott and Ahsan above – this COF / IF partnership may well involve Islamist participants in the political process negotiating their Muslim (and other) identities so as to accommodate diversity and difference. It also strikes me that this could be an example of what Nasr, writing about Jama'at-i Islami in Pakistan, calls the 'dangers of democracy' to [Islamic] revivalism (1994: 230). He argues that involvement in the political process inevitably leads to a compromise in ideology.

It is significant that the IF is interested in pursuing a more civic approach to citizenship. Nadeem Malik, practising solicitor and COF trainer at the IF, sees an essential link between Islam and participation in civil society.[108] In a dynamic interpretation of the Islamic tradition, Malik (2001) argues that the Qur'an teaches Muslims to uphold justice and equity for all people in a society regardless of their faith, race or gender. All, he maintains, are the 'children of Adam' and Muslims might follow the example of the prophet Joseph who worked in a 'non-Muslim (!)' government to 'promote good and forbid evil'. Moreover, Malik insists that the Quranic concepts of good and evil are not defined in terms of 'a high moral ground', Muslims v non-Muslims. Rather they refer to what is 'common to people', to 'common sense'. This puts an overwhelming emphasis on 'common values' as opposed to uniquely 'Islamic values'. As noted above however, many Muslims and their local mosques are more concerned with 'tribal ancestry' and 'self-interest'. Nevertheless, Malik suggests that it is only through participation in civil society that Muslims will 'come to know and understand others and, in turn, allow others to understand them'. To be a good Muslim, then, is to be 'an effective citizen and an example to others'. This, it would seem, is how the IF, ISB and other reforming Islamist organisations intend to give *da'wa* in the context of modern Britain. Moreover, the emphasis in COF work is on understanding the political system which does not suggest that Muslims blindly adopt or assimilate dominant values. Rather, it promises the possibility to learn the skills to engage in critical and productive dialogue about the recognition of legitimate differences – including religious differences – and the meaning of 'citizenship', 'integration' etc in a pluralist society.

Conclusion

I have sought to provide a sketch of Muslim leaderships in the UK which highlights the differences in orientation and cultural capital of a) locally-based, grassroots, ethnic leaderships and b) nationally-based, more elite, leaderships. One feature of the discrepancies between the two is the willingness of the latter to 'reach out' beyond the limits of the Muslim community and engage in highly topical debates about 'the common good'. Typically, the former have been restricted to a citizenship of rights and recognition, 'the Muslim good', or even the 'Pakistani' or

[108] Mandaville (2001) also mentions the work of Dilwar Hussain on '*maslaha*' which he takes to mean a public good including all of (non-Muslim) society.

'Kashmiri good'. Such an orientation has come in for much criticism from a New Labour government that has (not uncontroversially) rehabilitated the notion of citizens' 'responsibilities' – as well as 'rights' - in British multiculturalism. Moreover, although raising serious issues about the ability of the State to relate to the grassroots, localised ethnic leaderships have struggled to demonstrate the cultural capital necessary to engage with the State on a national level. This was painfully evident during the Rushdie Affair of 1989.

Since then, it has often fallen to organisations such as UKACIA and the MCB to represent Muslims as the centralisation of the State increased in the 1990s. While there are now two Muslim origin MPs and three Muslim origin peers in the House of Lords, much of the creativity needed to adapt to this evolving diasporic context has been driven by a third generation of reforming intellectual-activists associated with the IF, YMUK, ISB etc and their counterparts in the Deobandi and Barelwi traditions. Their personal experiences, professional activities and Islamic agendas are helping to create a Muslim civil society in Britain. This represents not only a rethinking of Islamic politics by Muslims in the diaspora but also suggests the need for scholars to rethink what is meant by political Islam.

BUILDING RELIGIOUS AUTHORITIES AMONG MUSLIMS IN EUROPE: SOME EXAMPLES FROM FRANCE

VALERIE AMIRAUX, CURAPP-CNRS, AMIENS

I will necessarily be brief first because I have few minutes for the presentation and second because the fieldwork that is at the core of this paper is still a work in progress.[109] It is focusing on what I call the parallel building of Muslim authorities both at national and local levels. In this presentation, I'll present examples from the French context and I will take on some issues that have been raised by Jean-Paul Willaime in his introduction.

The central idea of this talk is based on the two processes of elaboration of authority going on among Muslims in Europe. On the one hand, national States have urgently asked Muslim communities during the past decades to organize themselves and to create institutions (boards, councils, committees…) to represent their interests and to act as mediators between public powers and Muslim believers. On the other hand, working on associations and Muslim groups in their local environment gives another view of this "authority building process". In the 19th district of Paris, I have in particular been following over the last year the activities organized by Larbi Kechat in his social-cultural center that is also including a mosque. Independence and autonomy from the "big national project" seems to be the key idea.[110] Two processes are therefore emerging simultaneously: local groups oriented towards locally centered authority and national institutionalized Muslim communities.

Who are thus the "legitimate" representatives? When dealing with religious and Muslims authorities in France, different types of figures come to mind[111]: imams, charismatic leaders (the most charismatic becoming popular outside of the Muslim audience through TV channels and media), conveners, president and general secretary of associations, speakers of NGOs, Muslims

[109] This study includes four countries: France, Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom.
[110] First results have been presented at a workshop organized jointly by Stefano Allievi and Martin van Bruinessen. It will be published in a forthcoming volume edited by both of them.
[111] For a good review of these types of figures, see the forthcoming piece by Franck Fregosi, to be published in the last 2003 issue of *Archives des Sciences sociales des religions*.

engaged in politics as Muslims and, recently elected, the fresh and new French Council of Muslim Worship*, Conseil français du culte musulman* (hereafter CFCM). The State has obviously a central role in the production of specific types of authorities and more specifically in the process of designating who should be in charge of assuming the task of representing Muslims at a national level. The French government helped –not to say forced – Muslim organizations to set up what today is recognized publicly and politically as the representatives of the Muslims for the public authorities. It remains however extremely complex to map this Muslim authorities in France. It covers sociological key issues such as representativeness, legitimacy, audience. Who are the central actors that can contribute to build this authority: imams, political leaders, associative representatives? What type of topics are they supposed to cover? There is obviously a strong gap between what may seem to be a priority at the local and the national level.

Coming back to the issue of religious authorities in the French context, you nowadays hardly avoid talking about the CFCM. You hardly avoid talking about it mainly because it has been raising more and more attention during the last years and particularly during 2003. But also because it now occupying a central position and is actively contributing to help the government to decide if, for instance, wearing a veil at school could eventually be prohibited or not, if reforming the Education Code in that sense is a necessity. In the process of deciding about this concern, some expert and imams are actually been asked to give their views on this as inside the CFCM, none of the personalities is competent for answering this question. The elected CFCM is thus in charge of managing issues it is not competent as such for.

What type of topics is the French State delegating to the CFCM as newly institutionalized authority? Answering this means identifying the religious aspects with which the French State does not want to interfere and in the same time questioning the ability of the State to act as protector of public freedoms and individual freedom of conscience. The veil at school is not a consensual issue and the reaction of the CFCM to the request by the Ministry of Interior to work out the issue confirms it. As a group, the members of the CFCM refused to pronounce an opinion that could be considered as their statement on the issue. They rather suggested that some relevant religious figures living in France should be consulted if the government wishes to really have a religious expertise on it. In parallel to this process, it seems that several MPs have tempted to

promote new reform proposal in the sense of an interdiction of the veil and other religious signs at school. The question of the competence of the CFCM to decide in that matter is thus not anymore that central as the issue is being tackled by politicians and opinion makers independently from any "religious" discourse. The legitimacy of the prohibition of the veil at school does not seem to be a strict religious argument but rather a political one. Therefore, the issue of competence as far as Muslim religious authorities are concerned seems to me one of the crucial elements to be studied in the next years. If we look at the training of imams all over Europe for instance, the same notion of "competence" seems to refer to very different types of meaning: is an imam defined as competent because he does speak the local language? Is he defined as competent because he has an access to the community he is speaking to and/or for? Does an imam have a competence because he followed a specific curriculum? On this specific point of imam training, I think there would be, at least in the French context, very much to be learned from a comparison with the Jewish institutions and in particular with the system of "institutional rabbis". In the case of Muslims in France, it could be the case in few years if a proper system of training is set up that "institutional imams" coexist with "unofficial" ones, locally significant. Who will be the most legitimate?

In my view, what the Muslim community is experiencing in France can be considered to follow two paths. On the one hand, it seems to me there is a stronger personification of religious authorities throughout an accumulation of identification mechanisms that is in particular based on shared experience. This is more strongly the case in places where associative work has been done for over ten years. On the other hand, the process of institutionalization (I don't think the label "churchification" is 100% relevant to describe this process) is based on a State regulation of the religious Muslim sphere, from above, which is hardly corresponding to what locally has been produced and constitutes the basis of associative authorities. Coming back to the 19th district Muslim center I mentioned earlier, there is a huge diversity of the type of activities that are considered as legitimate in such a space. The whole spectrum cannot be defined as strictly religious but however contributes to define or create a community order. The place is structured around spaces that coexist without systematically meeting (education, prayer, intercultural dialogue, conferences….). Beyond the activities that are directed to the strict community of believers, you'll find a set of initiatives that go beyond the immediate audience of the Muslim

believers. The same person (the imam who is rarely the association's president) is then conducting several types of activities that are not strictly linked with his position but are more and more considered as a natural extension of his power, mainly due to his position as a mediator and a speaker to the local authorities.

Coming back to the CFCM, its implementation has a lot to do with the general French framework of *laïcité* and its denominational definition of religion (religion exists through the religious institutions). The personification dimension is also present if you look at the selection of the personalities and leaders that are sitting around the tables of discussion since the end of the 90s. The structure that is now at work as CFCM is an hybrid one. It is a systematic construction that is on the one hand based on a legitimacy made for a part of recognition by a part of the community, for another one of validation by the State (i.e. institutionalization). This legitimacy given by public agencies exist in other ways at the local levels, in the role of mediators ascribed to certain religious and associative leaders for example.

The difficult task that seems to me to be the real challenge at least in the case of the CFCM is a double regulation process of the Muslim worship on the one hand beyond the Muslim audience and inside it on the other hand. Indeed the CFCM has been elected also to cope with what could be defined as misperception, misunderstanding about Islam as a culture and as a religion. Since June 2002, the persons in charge of the file at the Ministry of Interior have always clearly expressed the connection between the post 11.09 atmosphere, and the acceleration of the implementation of the CFCM. The government expects from the CFCM that it can communicate with the Muslim citizens when facing some difficulties like in the suburbs, but also that it can take on the responsibility of deciding upon identity issues such as the wear of the veil at school. We are in this case facing a project of regulation that goes beyond the strict denominational management of the worship and that is mainly articulated on the basis of internal capacity of the CFCM members to act for a part as Muslims that can talk to non Muslim French citizens, and for another part as Muslims that can talk to Muslims. In the case of the CFCM, I think there is a clear disconnection of the issue of representation and "representativeness". In the case of the CFCM, the political project that lies behind its implementation is rather clear: the CFCM as an institution is requested to assume only the first dimension, i.e. dealing with representation in the framework

of the public freedoms (Islam as a worship), while it does not have the legitimacy to pretend to be representative.

TEACHING DUTCH WAYS TO FOREIGN IMAMS. BETWEEN GOVERNMENT POLICY AND MUSLIM INITIATIVE

WELMOET BOENDER[112], ISIM, LEIDEN

(Work in progress. Please do not quote without the permission of the author).

Introduction

Since 1998, new immigrants who will stay in the Netherlands permanently are obligated to follow a course on Dutch language acquisition, adaptation to Dutch society and orientation to the labour market. This is called *inburgering* and is regulated in the law Wet Inburgering Nieuwkomers (WIN). The course they must follow is called *inburgeringscursus*. It is difficult to translate this word. It is not a course which precedes naturalisation. It is a course focused on adopting Dutch customs and a course, which prepares an immigrant "*to realise his or her rights as Dutch citizen and to fulfil his or her societal rights and duties*," (Tijssen 2001: preface). Sufficient language ability and knowledge of laws, rights and duties is seen as an instrument for citizenship. Since January 2002, this law on *inburgering* applies to foreign imams as well. For them, the course not only involves the regular program for every newcomer, but includes teachings on religion and society as well. Under large national and international media attention, the first course started in September 2002. Topics in this program are, amongst others, position of faith in society, history of religious pluralism, political, legal and socio-economic aspects of ethnic minorities. In the language program a vocabulary is taught with useful words in the (inter)religious dialogue. The Ministry of Internal Affairs finances the courses. Per imam, an amount of approximately 5500 Euro is reserved (twice as much as for a regular newcomer). The program should be completed within one year.

[112] Welmoet Boender is a Ph.D.-student at the International Institute for the Study of Islam in the Modern World (ISIM) at Leiden, the Netherlands. Her research topic concerns the role of imams in Turkish and Moroccan mosque communities in the Netherlands and Flanders.

Already since the early 1980s a large public debate is held in the Netherlands on the position of foreign imams who work in mosques in the Netherlands. This public debate assumes an inherent tension between the traditional tasks of an imam on the one hand, and his tasks in secularised Dutch society on the other. A considerable number of the imams working in Dutch mosques are recruited in the countries of origin of the first generation of migrants (especially Turkey and Morocco). They move to the Netherlands on a temporary basis and have little or no proficiency in Dutch. Much is made of the question whether these men can adequately assume a counselling role, particularly in relation to the young generation born and bred in the Netherlands. The debate focuses on the possibility of training imams within the Dutch education system and tradition instead of recruiting imams from the Muslim countries of origin. The government's point of departure is her conviction that clergymen of religious institutions of ethnic minorities can play an important role in the integration process of ethnic minorities of whom a large part is Muslim.[113] From the 1970s onwards we see that imams are regarded as having comparable tasks and positions as ministers and priests in their religious community.[114]

Until now, such an imam training financed by the government has not been realised. However, the government succeeded to make a compulsory training program for imams: the *inburgeringscursus*. In this paper, we will look at some motivations of the government to apply this course to imams who work in the Netherlands on a temporary basis. However, it is not only the government who has ideas on the question how to prepare imams to their tasks in Dutch mosques. Initiative of Muslim organisations must be considered as well. I will look at examples of the Association Imams in The Netherlands (Vereniging Imams Nederland, with mostly Moroccan members), of imams from the province of Brabant, and the Turkish imams of Milli Görüsh Nederland.

All actors deal with the question of how a foreign imam can best be prepared to perform his coming up tasks in a secular society with a dominant Christian tradition. However, the question

[113] The following quote from the Minority Policy illustrates clearly the attitude of the government on imams*: The government considers it of high importance that the leaders of the philosophical associations and organisations, including those which attract especially ethnic minorities, can communicate fluently with their Dutch surroundings and are also very well acquainted with the social structures and cultural characteristics of Dutch society. Here the government pays special attention to the social skills of imams since they belong to the largest philosophical stream among ethnic minorities. The present practice of recruiting imams from Turkey and Morocco should come to an end.* (*Minderhedenbeleid* 1998:17).

comes up who defines the knowledge an imam functioning in the Netherlands (on a temporary basis) should have? And what knowledge should that be?

Contents of the Course

After a regular program, which must be followed by every newcomer, imams follow a specific part for imams, which is given at one location.[115] The program has two phases, because the course is not only aimed at the personal *inburgering* (adaptation) of a foreign imam, but also at the adaptation of a group of people, namely the Muslim community he is guiding.

In January 2003 the first Turkish and Moroccan participants obtained their certificate (under large attention of national and international press). A new course is due for September 2003, but the application process goes slowly, because many authorities are involved before an imam can be subscribed for the course. The government's expectation is that yearly about 35 – 50 imams will participate.[116] The course is compulsory for new foreign imams. Imams who are already here are also free to follow this course on a voluntary basis. Sanction of not following the course or not passing is an administrative fine (which is seldomly actually fined).[117]

The course consists of ten meetings on the following topics. These topics are all focused on the position of ethnic minorities in the Netherlands: general aspects of the (multicultural) society; political and legal aspects; socio-economic aspects; education and upbringing; housing; health care; ethnic, cultural and religious aspects; culture and language; and media focused on ethnic minorities.

The Dutch language course is specified on the task of the imam. Mentioned are:

---

[114] See Shadid and Van Koningsveld (1999); Boender and Kanmaz (2002).
[115] The regular program is organised under the responsibility of the municipality; the specific part by Kontakt der Kontinenten in Soesterberg and CINOP.
[116] See www.inburgernet.nl
[117] Different expectations and different tracks formulated for Turkish and other imams. Final attainment level must be the same, though. The experiment in May 2002 (?) was on purpose with Turkish Diyanet imams, who have followed universitary education in Turkey.

(*sic*): "*the task of interpretation and explanation of the Islamic teachings and morals"; "Mediating with the police, the local government, etcetera"; and "spiritual care taking in prisons and health care institutions*" (Tijssen 2001:11).

The attainment goals are not very specified. Knowledge presented in the course is not so much "operational" but more "conceptual". It has to do with "principals" (Tijssen 2001:11). The aim of the course is to arrive at "a kind of awareness".

"*Spiritual servants must become aware that their function here can be different from the function in the country of origin, because it is a fact that the community for whom they work ... live in the Netherlands in a Western, secularised society who are influenced by it, whether they want that or not*" (Tijssen 2001:12).

The coordinator of the course told me that during the evaluation by the imams, it became clear that the participants were positive about the course. They got easier access to societal organisations. They had experienced the extensive media attention as a hindrance and annoyance, but the fact that the course was widely known also offered openings in the dialogue. She referred to the results as "not big steps, but they are small steps indeed".

Government Policy

Foreign imams who come to the Netherlands must follow the laws and regulations as laid down in the paragraph on imams of the Alien Act (Vreemdelingencirculaire B11/5.6). In short this Act states that mosque committees invite a certain imam, after which the government investigates whether there is no objection against the coming of this man concerning the public peace, public order and national security. Furthermore it must be proved that there is no imam available within the European Union.[118] However, demands on language proficiency and orientation to Dutch society are not posed in these laws.

[118] For explanations see Boender (2000).

As explained in the introduction, many questions have come up regarding the position and influence of an imam when he does not know the language nor the culture: how can he be a good counsellor and how can he guide his community? In these discussions, both governmental and in the media, often a solution was seen in the establishment of a Dutch imam training, so that mosques were no longer dependant on imams coming from the countries of origin. The fundamental underlying question regards the commitment and loyalty of foreign imams. By training Dutch imams, the language problem would be solved and the government would gain inside in the internal affairs and developments within mosques. However, an imam training as financed by the Dutch government has so far not been established.

When in 2001 and 2002 several 'orthodox' or radical utterings of imams reached the media, the societal unrest about the role of imams in mosques increased. The moral commotion was high when in May 2001 the Moroccan imam El-Moumni expressed his vision on homosexuality. He called this a contagious disease and a danger for Dutch society. This television interview was broadcasted in the same month that the legal emancipation of homosexuals was completed through the access of the civil marriage to people of the same sex. His words were seen (among others) as a confirmation of the suspicion that imams are orthodox. El-Moumni became the catalyst of the debate on imams. Firstly, his words created a large debate on the relation between the constitutional rights of freedom of religion, freedom of expression and the non-discrimination principle. Secondly, he has become the pars pro toto of the imams working in the Netherlands: he stands for a bigger group of imams (and Muslims) who are considered unwilling towards integration and adaptation to "the Dutch norms and values".

The discussion on the implementation of the WIN for foreign imams gained momentum because of the el-Moumni affair. For, it is not evident that imams should be obligated to follow a course on citizenship. Firstly, because they are here on a temporary basis and why should the government invest so much money on people who will leave after a couple of years? And secondly, because it concerns religious functionaries. The Netherlands knows a separation between church and state. This separation is not absolute, as in the French system of laicité. The government regards it her duty to provide for necessary prerequisites for religious groups, such as spiritual care taking in hospitals, prisons, the army and other public institutions. This rests on a

long history of religious pluralism, which took the shape of a 'pillarization model' in the 20th C. 'Pillars' formed along lines of religious and secular denominations became power blocks for socio-religious groups and contributed greatly to the emancipation of their members in Dutch society as a whole.[119] A relevant remnant is that education has always been an important instrument in the attempts of the government to integrate different religious groups (Jonker and Scholten 2002:51).[120] The problems which have hindered the establishment of an imam training (like the separation between Church and State, the cultural and confessional heterogeneity of the Muslim communities, and the reluctant attitudes of both government and Muslim groups) did not impede the implementation of the WIN for imams. The government could act more or less unilateral. The social climate in 2001 (El-Moumni affair and 9/11) accelerated the approval of the law on *inburgering* for foreign imams. The wish for an imam training still exists, but the course on Dutch citizenship for imams is seen as a step in the right direction of improvement of the facilities an imam has in realising his special responsibility as religious leader of a community. One of the explanations behind this wish is the fear that foreign imams might act as messengers of a radical political Islamist ideology.

Another factor, which must be stressed here, is that in 1996, the minister of Internal Affairs, Hans Dijkstal, shifted the focus of the discussion on integration to 'citizenship' or 'burgerschap'. "Citizenship' had to become the focus of the integration policy. Thus, in the 1990s a shift occurred from an idea of collective integration (allowing individuals to preserving their cultural identity) to individual integration. The former attitude puts responsibility for integration with the host society, while the new attitude puts the responsibility for the lack of integration into mainstream Dutch society with the minorities. In this climate the stress on 'citizenship' appeared. Citizenship means that everyone has equal rights and duties and thus it is a helpful concept to neutralise, avoid or neglect the inherent tensions on plurality of commitments of citizens in a

[119] The course includes teachings on this history of Dutch religious pluralism and system of pillarization, and the separation of Church and State.

[120] Another very important remnant of this pillarization – despite a strong secularisation since the 1970s – is the financing by the State of the academic education for clergymen, both at public and private confessional universities and seminaries. It was put forward that an Islamic seminary could be established in the same manner. However, the Dutch government is unable and also unwilling to organise an imam training by herself, among others due to the separation between church and state. She needs the cooperation and the initiative of Muslim organisations as well. It is not only hampered by the cultural and confessional heterogeneity of the Muslim communities in the Netherlands, but also by a reluctant attitude of the government. Despite several attempts of universities and Muslim groups, many practical, emotional and moral arguments have hindered this founding until now. (See Boender and Kanmaz 2002:171).

multicultural society. At the same time however, the appearance of the WIN showed the compulsory character of the policy of the government. Jonker and Scholten call the fact that the Law on *inburgering* for imams concerns not only their personal integration, but the integration of an entire group, a shift in the political meaning of the concept of citizenship: "*Their inburgering takes the shape of a moral appeal in which loyalty and servitude to the Dutch government and society are central*" (Jonker en Scholten 2002:48).[121]

Other Initiatives

Imams and mosque boards are still very often confronted with the "El-Moumni-affair", when talking to representatives of the municipality, journalists, ministers and priests. The issue of homosexuality and Islam is one of the most debated topics in the dialogue. As an imam said:

"*The Dutch government tries just as the Turkish government to influence: how will you explain things? As the state expects us to do? If you explain it the way Islam tells it, then you get the situation of El-Moumni*".

The question of "what is expected of me as an imam here in the Netherlands?" is of central importance in this and other debates initiated by imams. One tries to get clear what is expected – without denying their position as prestigious representative of Islam. For, time and again they are told that as long as they do not speak the language properly they will never be able to function adequately. But they also have a high self-esteem: they are the ones who possess scarce knowledge, they are the spiritual guides of a community, they often know *fiqh* and can explain what is *halâl* and what is *harâm*. It is an important matter how to interpret *fiqh* in Dutch Muslim daily life.

The necessity of learning Dutch is widely felt. Many are aware of the problems, the confusions, the lack of information, and the misunderstandings for example when interpreters are unable to

[121] It is interesting and relevant that Jonker and Scholten analyse the development of the WIN for imams in combination with the WIN applied to foreign nurses. They explain it in terms of political strategy: "*When* inburgering *would have been obligatory for imams only, this would have raised a debate on dropping the separation between Church and State. The fact that nurses are*

translate the technical Islamic theological details. It is seen as a severe problem when a lack of language proficiency means that imams cannot direct themselves to society without intermediates.

Weekend of the Association Imams Netherlands (AIN)

The difficulties of how imams should deal with this matter was one of the reasons why the Association Imams Netherlands or AIN,[122] asked Forum, the institute for multicultural society, to organise a two days course on current social topics. In a weekend in September 2002, 38 imams, mostly Moroccan, came together in Soesterberg. This introductory course was not only given at the same centre as the governmental course on citizenship for imams, but also in the weekend before the start of the first course, opened by the Minister of Immigration and Integration. The weekend course was organised on the initiative of the AIN by two Muslim organisations. Discussion topics were: relation between freedom of religion, freedom of expression and the non-discrimination principle; separation between church and state; position of women and of homosexuals in Dutch law and principle; public opinion and the fear for Islam and Muslims; *'ulama* and modern interpretation; the messages of Islam in the West; future plans. Language of communication was Arabic.

The course was only open to participants, but Friday evening a press conference was held, which I attended. The media almost exclusively wanted to know whether imam el-Moumni was invited and why he was not here: "Weren't these kind of courses valuable particularly for him?". He did not participate; according to the organisation he had been invited, but was too busy in the weekend.

After the weekend the communication between imams and broader society remained difficult. An imam who had been invited by a journal on multicultural society (Contrast) did not publish his report on the course, because his mosque committee did not allow him.

---

included as a group who is temporary in the Netherlands, but has to adapt themselves through a course as well, seems to be meant to avoid this fundamental debate." (Jonker and Scholten 2002:51).

[122] Vereniging Imams Nederland (V.I.N.). About 120 imams, mostly of Moroccan origin, are member of this association. It is not a very strong body in the range of national Muslim organisations.

Imam-day in Brabant

On 2 November 2002, I followed a one-day discussion of a group of about 30 Moroccan and Turkish imams working in the province of Brabant.[123] There are approximately 60 imams in Brabant. An imam in the Brabant province became discredited because of the broadcasting of parts of his sermon, in which he pled for segregated recreational parks for veiled women (Nova television 14 June 2002).[124]). He was present that day. Languages used where Arabic, Turkish and Dutch.

The main question here was too: what are the central questions of society towards us and how can we live up to them without denying our Islamic principles? A Moroccan imam questioned the obligationary character of the governmental initiatives. He says:

"*An imam is a teacher. An imam should give answers. But must we accept everything? What is the meaning of integration in this country? We must be able to practice our religion. We must think deep and understand the situation in this country well, and then answer*".

"Inburgeringscursus Milli Görüsh[125]

This year, eleven out of the 22 imams of Milli Görüsh North Netherlands voluntarily followed an extensive *inburgeringcursus* at their initiative.[126] They used the budget for so-called "old comers". Thus, the Amsterdam municipality financed the course. Besides language courses, they visited – at their request as well – institutions like the Commission for Equal Treatment,[127] a youth prison, a relief centre for abused women, and an office for drug addiction care. The opinion of the imams is very positive. Not only do they improve their Dutch in an important way, they

---

[123] This was an initiative of some (Muslim) welfare organisations (Brabantse Islamitische Raad, Prisma Brabant and Phalet.
[124] Besides that, in Brabant is the el-Fourqaan mosque (Eindhoven) attracts much attention of the Secret Service, since it is thought that young men are recruited here for *jihâd*.
[125] This branch of Milli Görüsh wants to establish their own imam training themselves in cooperation with the University of Amsterdam. They do no longer want to wait for the others. However, they also find obstacles on their way.
[126] An interesting detail is that the Egyptian imam El-Shershaby is also an active participant of the Milli Görüsh course. He is one of the other imams like the imam in Brabant, whose sermons where secretly taped and then broadcasted by Nova television.
[127] Here they discussed the "hot issue" of the prohibition of wearing the *niqaab* in high schools.

also come at places where they have never been before. One of the imams explained to me that he as imam deals on a daily basis with the entire spectrum of issues which are divided by the different institutions they visited. “When something is happening or something is wrong, people come to me first.” The contacts established now make it easier for people working in those institutions to contact the imams as well when they have questions.

Milli Görüsh North Netherlands is a very open organisation which calls itself a socio-religious movement. Its director is an active participant in the Dutch debate on multicultural society.

Some Concluding Remarks

The developments around the *inburgeringscursus* perfectly illustrate two main problems, namely firstly the lack of knowledge of the government on what imams actually preach inside the mosque, the image built on the presumption that imams are similar to ministers and pastors, and the solutions they try to develop within the boundaries of the legal state. And secondly the difficult and confused position of imams who feel they do not only have to meet the expectations of their mosque community, but of the broader society as well, while the expectations of the broader society often remain unclear to them because of a lack of language proficiency in Dutch.

What can we say then about the question who defines the knowledge an imam functioning in the Netherlands (on a temporary basis) should have? And what knowledge should that be? The reaction of Muslim organisations, sometimes organised almost simultaneously with the governmental course, shows that there is indeed a felt need to discuss the question what is expected from an imam. It is also considered very important by the parties that imams speak Dutch. However, that does not mean that he agrees with the Dutch ways of dealing with society. Thus, it is an illusion to expect that a system of values and norms is “transferred” to the minds of the imams.

Of course, with a language course the negative image for an imam and the problems on the meaning of integration are not solved. The advocates see it as an important step; while critics think that the government should not interfere in the internal affairs of religious organisations.

They all agree on the importance of learning the language and acquaint to society – but they come from different directions and look at the courses form different angles.

References

Boender, Welmoet and Meryem Kanmaz (2002), Ïmams in the Netherlands and Imam Teachers in Flanders", in W.A.R Shadid and P.S. van Koningsveld, *Intercultural Relations and Religious Authorities: Muslims in the European Union*, Leuven, Paris, Dudley MA: Peeters, pp. 169-180.

Boender, Welmoet (2000), "Freedom of Religion in the Netherlands: The Immigration Policy Regarding Imams", in: Welmoet Boender and Matthijs de Jong (eds.), *Exploring Religious Identities. Studies concerning the Relations between Jews, Christians, and Muslims in Modern Western Europe by the Student-participants of the Honours Class Theology 1999*, Leiden, pp. 155-169.

Jonker, Ellis and Monika Scholten (2002), "Noodgreep. Over de *inburgering* van bijzondere categorieën vreemdelingen in Nederland". *Migrantenstudies,* 2002, n°1, pp. 37-55.

Tijssen, Marli (2001), *Inburgering van geestelijke bedienaren. Een handleiding voor gemeenten*. Den Haag, Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijkrelaties.

Shadid, W.A. and van Koningsveld, P.S. (1999), "Beeldvorming over de imam in Nederland", in Shadid, W.A. and P.S. van Koningsveld (eds.) *Religie, cultuur en minderheden: historische en maatschappelijke aspecten van beeldvorming*, Tilburg: Tilburg University Press, pp. 55-77.

Vreemdelingencirculaire (June 1997), B11/5.6

Discussion Led by Martin Van Bruinessen, ISIM, Utrecht University

All three papers presented showed very efficiently the way in which three different Nation-State contexts have shaped the process of emergence of Muslim spokespersons, considered whether as counterparts by the State, or independent from the latter. In the United Kingdom, the Church of England has facilitated the presence of the various Muslim groups within the public sphere. The importance of this presence is dependent on the degree of presence of religion in the public sphere in this country. In France, where the State is all powerful, it is the State that creates a representation for the Muslims, in the form of a council. In Holland, where there are Church ministers, a special programme has been developed, aimed at creating Muslim Church ministers, as well as transforming Imams into Dutchmen.

All three papers mentioned that a series of shifts happened. For instance, a shift from a local leadership - based on a local Muslim community seeking accommodation as local authority within the host community - towards a national level leadership articulating Muslim interests, with a stronger emphasis on citizenship, instead of accommodation and within which integration seems to become the dominant discourse. In the case of Great Britain in particular, the "Rushdie affair" constituted a watershed that contributed in speeding up the process of transition. Apparently, the "Rushdie affair" has had this paradoxical effect of empowering Muslims, leading them to a new type of leadership. And the new type of discourse, which is much more creative, makes it much more easy for them to maintain the presence in the European public sphere. Naturally, it is question about a generational shift, namely a shift from first generation to second generation immigrants, who were educated in the host countries, with a deep knowledge of the host countries' cultures, a good command of the languages and therefore able to interact quite easily with institutions in the host country, since they possess an educational, cultural and economic capital. Their orientation has gradually shifted from their countries of origin and the religious authorities established in these countries, into the countries of residence. Attempts have been made in order to create patterns of religious authority within the countries of residence. Naturally, this process has been accompanied by a series of conflicts.

All speakers without exception put emphasis on the questions of legitimacy and legitimisation, but it has to be stressed at this point that there has also been a process of "de-legitimisation". We can mention, for instance, the shift that took place within the Islamic Foundation. How did the "old guards", who were hard-line *Jamaat-Islamiyya*[128], allow the take-over of control of the organization by persons no longer easily identifiable as real *Jamatis*? To what extent has there been an impact of the State environment in which they are active? This brings us to the difficult question of representation, representativeness and authority attributed by the host society or the government, or even by the community. The two-dimension nature of authority has been stressed by several persons: one can be *in* authority, *be an* authority, *in a position* of authority, or *have* authority. There is definitively an important distinction, as well as a challenging dialectic between these nuances.

The States and Churches have showed interest in people who *have* authority but they have been rather trying to create links with, or have as interlocutors people who *are in* recognizable positions of authority. By speaking to those people and by recognizing them as authorities – for instance, by giving them authority within a council - they may to some extent have contributed to de-legitimise them. An example that illustrates this is the case of Turkey, where the Diyanet Organization has strong State recognition, but it is not really legitimate in the eyes of a large proportion of Turkish Muslims. Similarly, the "Conseil Musulman" established in France, is suspected in the eyes of many Muslims. On the other hand, one can hardly have authority unless there is a certain form of recognition, not only among the community that one represents, but also within the host community. The recognition on behalf of the host community constitutes a prerequisite for legitimisation. These two factors are not entirely antagonistic. Every leader is aware of the fact that he or she needs to be capable of asserting his or her independence vis-à-vis the State, as well as managing simultaneously to be recognized, but not recognized *too much.* The question that seems to arise is the following : what strategies have been used by this younger generation in order to replace the older generation ? Which is the strategy used to de-legitimise either the traditional Imams, or the leaders of political Islam, or the State-appointed "Muftis" and "Conseil Musulman"?

---

[128] Islamic Party founded in Pakistan by Mawdudi.

In the Dutch case, the most fascinating attempt to proceed to citizenization – the initiative of which derived from the Milli Görüsh and not the State – indicated clearly the lesser importance of Imams. In Holland, Imams are considered as THE religious authorities par excellence. And this has always been strange in the eyes of all Muslims, insomuch as in their home countries Imams are not taken very seriously in reality. There is an attempt to take them seriously because to some extent they represent Islam, but they could never be accepted as a real important authority! The genuinely important authority within every Mosque organization is the Mosque committee. The Mosque committees within the Turkish communities of Holland are nowadays gradually taken over by the second generation. It is them that take all important decisions, for instance what can or cannot be said by an Imam in a Mosque. If The Imam says something that they do not approve of, either they get rid of the Imam, or they warn him that he should not repeat such uttering. And the Imam has no other alternative than to obey. In Milli Görüsh there was only one case of a person which instrumentalized a great change. Milli Görüsh, like the British Islamic Foundation, started out as a political Islamic organization and at least in Holland, and to some extent perhaps in Germany too, it has shifted to a very different discourse and is fighting to create a space within Dutch and German public spheres. The following questions can be raised: has there been any internal conflicts? How did this younger generation succeed in freeing itself of these traditional, grotesque, caricatured figures, with wooden bodies, language and discourse, that used to represent the Turkish Islam?

Debate

Sean McLoughlin: To come to the question of the Islamic Foundation and how that shift was negotiated: one of the things I did not talk about was the role of Khurshid Ahmed, who was obviously instrumental in the establishing of the Islamic Foundation in the UK. Khurshid Ahmed belonged to a different generation of Islamists than Mawdudi (founder of Jama'at-i Islami). It is quite common now to hear people like John Esposito talking about how, within an Islamic movement (any movement), ideas and orientations are (re)negotiated from generation to generation, from place to place. Therefore, I would say that it is not simply a question of how the Islamic Foundation has been transformed in Britain but that transformation has been an integral

part of the development of the movement from Mawdudi to Khurshid Ahmed and now the British-born 'reformist Islamists'.

Focusing briefly on the Islamic Foundation in Britain, if you look at Khurshid Ahmed's activity, he had a much less ideological opposition to the West than Mawdudi. So, for example, even in the 1970s, in Birmingham he was engaging in interfaith relations; what we see is simply a gradual transformation over time rather than some radical break with the past. And I think that the Foundation, rather like Jama'at-i Islami in Pakistan, has always had an eye on the mainstream, how through accommodationist politics it can influence the mainstream and perhaps undertake some sort of Islamization from below.

Coming back to the significance of the Islamic Foundation and how the people working there have managed to renegotiate its orientation, if you go to the Foundation you will find people of second generation, of different ethnic backgrounds, you will find converts to Islam, some who are within or without the Jama'at-i Islami tradition. In terms of who the Foundation chooses to employ, it seems clear that the old guard have allowed this, perhaps also because they are the personnel who are available. What sorts of people, actually, could realistically be employed to work in an English medium institution which, of course, has been at the forefront of developing educational materials in English? I think it is various factors that have produced the shift. That would be one point.

A second point is the question of de-legitimization, which is very interesting. About the MCB in Britain: it is very careful, not to be too outspoken in terms of de-legitimating its grassroots. The MCB would love dearly to have a close relationship with the grassroots. So I think it is important for it not to alienate its grassroots more than is the case already. I think the question for MCB is rather how it can gain more legitimacy with the grassroots. And one of the ways you can do that, I think, is by trying to tap into the sort of projects that the Islamic Foundation is undertaking. It is actually getting involved with people rather than shaking the hands of politicians on a regular basis. The MCB has always got caught up in this sort of fantasy of being a 'major player' in British politics. It is now talking about itself now as a "cabinet". We have a cabinet of politicians at 10, Downing Street, and it seems that the MCB also wants to talk about a "cabinet" over and

above its various committees. So, I think that it really needs to understand that there is an outside of politics and that it needs to reconnect to that.

Valérie Amiraux: Your question on Kechat and how it works out the issue of actively de-legitimizing the others: first I would say that Kechat is not as clear as it seems, in the sense of apparently when you just go to his place as a customer, trying to identify who is who and who is speaking to whom. It seems very clear, it seems very marketing-oriented in the terms of seducing an audience which is made of believers, of non Muslims, of scholars, of politicians… So, it is a very open space. But when you look at the religious public who is sitting usually in the front of the scene, it is also a very pluralistic spectrum. So, it does not seem officially to have a clear group of followers. For instance, 10 days ago there was a meeting on discrimination and minorities and in the audience you had people from the Tabligh, two English representatives from the Hiz-at-Tahrir, persons from the "Conseil Français du culte musulman", representatives of local associations, etc. So, it is very open, not systematically discussing between each other.

But still sitting in the place and giving a kind of authority and legitimacy to what Kechat is doing. I think that the central point is not so much how is working at criticizing or explicitly showing that it does not agree with certain initiatives; it is the fact that it is not participating in any. This does not mean that it is not influential on how the process of institutionalization of the board has been conducted. I will give you an example: he was interviewed officially by the Ministry of Interior, last January. He was asked by the Ministry to give an advice on certain things and he was completely frightened by the fact that eventually the Ministry could ask him to participate actively and he would not like to have to say "no, I do not". And at the end nobody asked him anything but at the next meeting of the COMOR, there was a commission organizing the representation of the Board before it was elected. Sarkozy[129] started by addressing to Dalil Boubakeur, the rector of the Paris Mosque, who is actually the president of this Board, telling him: "Oh, by the way, dear Dalil, I have met Larbi Kechat yesterday and I can tell that this guy is absolutely exquisite and charming, and in case of need I know where I could eventually ask somebody to give me an advice on any religious point (…)". So, it is a kind of playing a card not explicitly playing it.

The last point I would mention, going in your direction on the Mosque committee: in the case of Kechat it is also very very strong; I mean the Mosque committee is the main actor of Kechat's Mosque. It is the Mosque committee which says where it goes, to whom it speaks, eventually also withdrawing an invitation after having accepted it. So, the Mosque committee is, I think, the central issue to be investigated in the next years in all local Mosques. Also in terms of succession, because one of the big issues actually at the center of Larbi Kechat is the question of who will be the next Larbi Kechat. And there is obviously one who is now becoming more visible: in terms of profile it is absolutely equal to what Larbi Kechat was 25 years ago: not a French-speaking Muslim, not educated here, almost the opposite of what you could expect from Kechat in terms of his activities nowadays. So, there are a lot of contradictions to be explored.

Welmoet Boender: Several questions like the ones you posed arose while I was writing this paper. For instance: is there a shift in generation? Does such a course increase an Imam's authority, or his prestige? But I thought it was still too difficult to really treat them, because I have to ask Imams in Mosque communities and the people who go to the Mosque and that is my research topic and so I am still very much in the middle of that process. Two things: it is clear that *inburger* courses are successful till now, although the official ones were only established recently. But it is considered as something neutral or at least it is clear who pays for it and that is very important, because the wish for language courses training is strong and it costs a lot of money. In my research I go deep into the Milli Görüsh community in one Milli Görüsh Mosque, and there are three Imams who regularly preach there and the one who is there the most often came to the Netherlands only one and a half year ago. And I have not really talked to him in an interview without the presence of someone from the Mosque committee. The other two: one is Mufti and the other has been the Imam for eight or ten years. I talked to them alone, without the Mosque committee, so in that sense all those smaller and bigger details I try to integrate and then go back to those questions.

Jocelyne Cesari: I found very interesting what you have described in the shift of posture towards a British society from Islamic Foundation, with all that background in Jamaat-Islami and all we

---

[129] Current French Minister of Interior who patronized the elections of the representative body of Islam.

know about this in the Muslim world. My question is: you talked a lot about declaration and a kind of interaction with the British society. Do we know more? Because you mentioned the question of seminars and the way of transmitting Islam coming from the Islamic Foundation. This is one thing. And then there is something more elaborated that tells more about the eventual changes of ideology. What kind of transmission of Islam these people are organizing today in the British society? Can you give us some examples of that?

Secondly, how can you reposition them in the full picture of the different Muslim clans? Because Philip Lewis talked about this issue this morning. We can have a discussion about tradition, all national versions of Islam, living in the UK. But what do they explicitly differentiate themselves from these other trends? Do they have a discourse on the Wahhabi movement, for instance? Do they have a discourse on the national versions of Islam in the Muslim world? Martin was talking about de-legitimizing the others, so how does it work in the ghettos of the Islamic Foundation?

Sean McLoughlin: I think one of the things that is significant about the Islamic Foundation is that it appears to have moved to a place where it is not really in the business of de-legitimizing others. So, for example, I attended a day conference of the Foundation a year ago and the first speaker of the day was Tim Winter, who we talked about yesterday. Tim Winter (an academic and convert to Islam known as Abdul Hakim Murad) can be located within a traditional formation of Islam, and is very critical, sharply critical, of the Salafis, etc. So, I think that that was a very significant gesture, that they were prepared to have him on their home soil as it were. So, I think that is one way in which they actually have moved beyond this attempt to de-legitimize. Another example is that of a young academic and Muslim convert called Yahya Birt. Again, he can be located within traditional Islam, with its respect for both the *madhabs* (law schools) and Sufi masters. He is actually working at the Foundation now. I think that they have moved (or are moving) to place of engagement with (Muslim) difference and perhaps even beyond the need for de-legitimization [but seem comments on 'extremists' below].

The other thing that you asked about which I think is very significant: when you were referring to the courses that the Foundation runs on Islam cultural awareness. This is very significant in the sense that it actually gets people interacting. And if you talk to Dilwar Hussain who runs these

courses, it is not an attempt to provide an overbearingly normative account of Islam. Dilwar describes it as "a warts and all account". So, it is actually unpacking, deconstructing Islam for the participants. To facilitate this requires is a staff with a very high level of self-consciousness and reflexivity about their own identities. I think that this is why we can talk about a kind of post-Islamism, a more post-modern Islamic identity. I do not want to make too much of this idea but I think that there is a real sense of moving across establishing boundaries here and doing it with a relative ease. And the Foundation is a relatively safe space to do that sort of thing.

The other thing that you asked me to do is try and locate this trend in a broader picture and comment on the relationship with the work of Philip Lewis. One of the things that is mentioned in my abstract, is some observations about the traditional Islam I mentioned a moment ago and the way in which, that too, is increasingly able to access traditions hospitable to notions of citizenship etc, etc. In the long term I can see this sort of discourse evolving to maybe challenge the reformist Islamist discourse I have focused on today. I think it connects to the grass roots perhaps in a way that the reformist Islamist discourse does not. One of the things I mentioned in the abstract is that this allows young people with a certain cultural capital, with a certain experience of the world, who want to talk about their relationship to British society to do that, without cutting themselves off from the tradition of their parents. So, in the long run, this may well be a more significant trend. But then of course, we do not know where reformist or post-Islamist trend is going to go either. At the moment, what I would say is that the reformist Islamist scene is much more able to translate Islam into modern political discourse.

Question (person non identified): What I was thinking during this lecture is that you could create a possible link to Jonas' paper this morning, about individual sort of standing out and saying things within public and having some kind of authority in public. Also in terms of representing the community without really representing it. You could call it some kind of counter discourse way. As I heard your papers, you were all dealing with organizations or levels of organizations in one way or another, bodies that represent Muslims or created to represent Muslims within the public. But at the same time you have these individuals who pup up all the time and are either claimed or claim themselves to represent the community. And actually one of the things that you were mentioning in the discussion was this aspect of de-legitimization. And I

would also say that these individuals can pup up as having a role to play there. An example of that I could mention was from the Danish context just after 9/11, where the Danish Prime Minister called in some Muslim organizations to discuss the aspects of 9/11. And the impact that this had on the Muslim community generally. But actually one of these "professional Muslims" or "Muslim individuals" or whatever you can call them, who stand out as authorities within public discourse, came in and said "well, you know, that and that organizations are fundamentalists, so do not invite them!" And he did not. I mean, you have this counter discourse of individuals coming in, and there is a sort of destabilization, a formation of bodies that can also represent the Muslim community but also have this power to ask being individuals, actually standing forth somebody who represents Muslims as such, ideal Muslims within broader society.

Sean McLoughlin: Actually regarding the whole point about de-legitimation: it made me think about one way in which particularly the MCB does go about de-legitimating one constituency. As 'moderate Muslims' they seek to delegitimise the so-called "radicals" and get very upset about the amount of coverage these groups receive in the press. MCB representatives are constantly talking to the newspaper editors, writing letters, etc, etc on this point. There is an explicit de-legitimation that is going on there.

Welmoet Boender: I could make a remark connecting to the inburgering courses. It has not really something to do with language as such, the legitimacy of spokespersons. There was a Surinamese Imam who has presented himself as Imam and he was believed to be an Imam as such during the 9/11 commotion. And it appeared that he did not keep his legitimacy as Imam because from one side, the media said "You are not an Imam because you do not have a diploma, you did not get the right education"; and from the side of Muslim organizations, they said that he was not an Imam because he did not have a Mosque congregation, as his followers. And this man is fluent in Dutch and he was able to speak the right voice, just after 9/11 but he could not keep up because his utterings in one time were very liberal, but on the other they were not at all because he wanted to express the Muslim voice. And he was not a theologian, so he totally got into problems. My point is that language ability and knowledge of Dutch culture has nothing to do with legitimacy as such. At least, for this person it did not work. You have different levels of legitimacy.

Abdelwahid Pallavicini, President of COREIS (Italian Muslim Religious Community): Mr. Bruinessen rightly said, speaking about the representation of Islam to European governments, that taking the example of Holland, people are trying to turn Imam into a Dutchman. My surprise is that there is no connexion between national identity and belonging to a certain religion. Why could not Holland, or France, or England make Imam by their own British, French or Dutch citizens? So that they will be already integrated and intellectuals and they will not need an integration. So it will not happen what happened to us in Italy, where we are not taken as Italians because we are Muslims and Muslims do not take us as Muslims because we are Italians.

Martin Van Bruinessen: You seem to be answering your own question already! The Dutch government would love to have Imams who are born in Holland, who are ethnically Dutch, or ethnic Turkish. But Dutch-born Imams would even be better! But, converts never acquired this sort of legitimacy that they needed. There was a brief period when converts were the only people who could play a bridging role. And then there was one Dutch person who for the Turkish community became an authority. He was recognized as an authority by the Turks. But gradually he has become marginalized, partly because of his relatively liberal views, and he has been replaced by authorities coming from Turkey, who still, for secular reasons, managed to maintain a high degree of legitimacy in the view of the Turkish community. I think, another interesting case was the case that Boender just mentioned, the person who is a native Dutch speaker but who is very dark, he was born in Surinam, he dresses up in a fancy Muslim costume, looking South Asian and the television loved him! He spoke very very well and he had always a very reasonable point of view; but he looks so exotic! And they wanted an exotic Imam! You have ordinary Imams… but it is not exotic enough. So, they never got these people. They wanted someone who looks very exotic, speaks fluent Dutch and represented the Muslims. But then the press at once also started to provoke these men into statements that prove that Islam does not really fit a democracy. So, they tried to ask him questions like: "Well, what about homosexuality?"

Welmoet Boender: But also "What about your opinion about young people who demonstrate pro-Palestine? And Swastikas?" And then he said: "I can understand that they do." But then he was interpreted as "I understand and I think like that as well". So, he was very easily misunderstood.

Martin Van Bruinessen: It is really a pity because this man could potentially have played an important regime role but it was first the Dutch press who tried to destroy him, by putting him forward all the time as the spokesman for THE Muslims, asking "what does your constituency think about this issue?", whereas Muslims said: "they are not **his** constituency!" So that was de-legitimizing him at once in the eyes of the Muslims and in the eyes of the Dutch community. So, he was destroyed within two or three months. Created and destroyed.

Welmoet Boender: Now he does not call himself Imam anymore but he is talking on his personal initiative. So, he continues to play a role but not as Imam.

Sean McLoughlin: An interesting example to finish with: in Bradford, in one of the more traditional (not Jama'at-I Islami) mosques, there is now an American convert to Islam working as an imam. He spent the last ten years in Turkey. One of his remarks to me was that he felt that perhaps it was the Muslims that have employed him to legitimize themselves, in the sense that there is a big discourse in Britain on the need for imams to speak English, being able to navigate two cultures and so on. This was an example not so much of the legitimacy from outside (the state) but the legitimacy from inside (Muslims responding to the state) showing that the Muslims were quite adept, strategically and politically …. It is quite unusual.

SESSION III: RELIGIOUS AUTHORITIES IN THE GLOBAL ERA: ETHNICITY AND DIASPORAS

MUSLIM LEADERSHIP IN EUROPE: WHAT CONNECTIONS WITH THE UMMAH?

JOCELYNE CESARI, GSRL-CNRS, PARIS AND HARVARD UNIVERSITY

The planet's "Coca-Cola-ization" is the most palpable facet of globalization. Another facet — that receives less media attention but which is just as prevalent — is cultural heterogenization, a phenomenon that becomes apparent not only in cultural crossbreeding, but also by the fact that different groups (communities, nations...) continue to survive and recreate themselves against the cultural imperialism of the West. The excessive homogenization of lifestyles can indeed be viewed as a danger and lead in return to all kinds of self-preservation and self-reconstruction, sometimes in the more excessive incarnations such as "fundamentalism". Planet "Coca Cola", built around cultural products that have been standardized by the entertainment industries (music, television, cinema), and around communications industries is a place where the search for true authenticity becomes difficult. "Authenticity", this new buzzword to enter onto the international stage, refers to any movement that expresses within the political arena a need for specificity whether in the form of Eastern nationalism, provincialism of Western democracies, or religions.

The above ideas lead us directly to the following dilemma: is it impossible, as Samuel Huntington claims, to disassociate the quest for authenticity from all the varied forms of

fundamentalism[130], as well as from the notion of the clash of civilizations? Or, on the other hand, does this quest allow for the concept of individuality to be redefined?[131] Certain people are inclined to favor the clash of civilizations hypothesis. According to this theory, Islam clearly becomes, in the period that follows the end of the Cold War, the enemy of the West. Islam can only be considered a major cause of conflicts because of the supposed incompatibility between the Islamic value system and that of the West.[132] Other thinkers, such as Bryan Turner, prefer a postmodernist interpretation according to which the Islamic quest for authenticity confirms the defeat of the *Aufklärung*. According to this approach, it is understood that the anti-consumerist ethics (based on traditional Islamic doctrine)[133] are a response to the West's cultural domination; and it is posited that Muslims seek security (regarding their identity and authority) in a literal interpretation of the Islamic tradition, applicable to all areas of life.

My approach is not based on either of these interpretations. Neither religion in general nor Islam in particular will be considered merely as a cause of international conflict, nor as a reaction against modernity.[134] I opt rather for a sociological investigation of Islamic religious identities and practices using analytic tools that have applied to other religious groups in order to dissolve the artificial opposition between East and West (the "Orient" and the "Occident") inside which the analysis of Muslim populations are still all too often enclosed and that leads to Islam being considered as a "special case exception". This sociology of religious practices is based on the

---

[130] I define fundamentalism as a shutting-off of thought (whether religious or not), that means one rejects all opinions and beliefs that are in contradiction with one's own convictions. See Cesari, J. (1999), "Intégrisme Islamique" and "Sectes" items in *Dictionnaire des Idées rebelles*, Larousse, pp. 295-296 and pp. 556-557.

[131] Lee, Robert D. (1997), *Overcoming Tradition and Modernity, The Search for Islamic Authenticity*, Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, p. 3.

[132] Hungtinton's perception of Islam falls pray to the "Orientalist syndrome" in its use of an essentialist and fixist approach to the Islamic tradition. See Lee, *op. cit*., p. 12.

Unfortunately, the meta-narrative attached to the term Islam too often provides the chief framework for coping with this unprecedented situation. The presence of Muslims in Europe is commonly perceived as a cultural or terrorist threat. With this reductive and biased point of departure, many reflections on Islam in Europe fail to reach any enlightening conclusion. The very question that many of these analyses seek to answer—"Do Muslims fit into European societies?" – presupposes a radical opposition between Islam and the West. This opposition formed the basis of Orientalism, which has implicitly informed many subsequent theories on Islam and politics, such as Samuel Huntington's theory of "clash of civilizations. Orientalism is primarily a tradition of knowledge on Islamic culture and civilization. But it is also a set of representations on Islam and Muslims, characterized by an essentialist approach to religion and a linear vision of history, that associates Islam, violence, and fanaticism. The meta-narrative based on the clash between Islam and Europe is continuously reactivated by political events such as the Islamic Revolution in Iran during the 1980s, the civil war in Algeria mid-1990 or the September 11th terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. It is shared by politicians and intellectuals as shown for example by declarations of Silvio Berlusconi in Italy, Pim Fortuyn in the Netherlands or the recent bestseller of Oriana Fallaci translated into French. See Cesari, Jocelyne (ed.) (2002), *Musulmans d'Europe*, *op. cit*.

[133] Turner, Bryan (1994), *Orientalism, Postmodernism and Globalization*, London, New York: Routledge, p. 92.

hypothesis that religions have the ability to accelerate the process of globalization by promoting the move from community ties to association-based ties. In other words, in the response to globalization, religions do not merely strengthen pre-existing identities (based on gender, family, or geography), but also offer resources for constructing new forms of individualization and globalization. The ideoscapes described by Arjun Appadurai are not exclusively tied to those promotions of Western culture such as Coca-Cola or McWorld.[135] Religious and cultural facts that spread the ideas of justice, morality, dignity, and authenticity, also play a crucial role in the shaping of ideoscapes in the same way that the Declaration of Human Rights, democracy, etc. In this respect, Muslim minorities within Western democracies come to be a very appropriate example of the complex relationships between modernity and globalization.

Western Muslims are faced with a radically new situation: the integration of the Islamic tradition at the heart of secularized democracies. Throughout this process, the compatibility of Islam with the notion of Western citizenship, the adaptation of tradition within a situation of pluralism, the transmission of and education in Islam within a minority situation, are topics which necessarily become of key importance. These questions are not only raised within the context of each national area, but echo and respond across national boundaries, an effect of cultural globalization. European Islam is connected with the stakes and political and cultural difficulties of the Muslim world, as demonstrated by the September 11 attacks. However, beyond sometimes radical networks of political activism, it is a whole collection of *doxa*, debates, controversies, and figures of authority that Western Muslims share with the *Ummah*. At the same time, they are far from being merely an echo chamber for the political and cultural issues that are taking place elsewhere for they are, on the contrary, at the heart of religious and cultural innovations linked to their European context.

---

[134] Halliday, Fred (1994), "The politics of Islamic fundamentalism, Iran, Tunisia and the Challenge to the Secular State" in Akbar S. Ahmed and Hastings Donnan (eds.), *Islam, Globalization and Postmodernity*, London: Routledge, pp 91-113.

[135] Appadurai, Arjun (1990), "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy" in Michael Featherstone (ed.), *Global Culture, Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity,* London: Sage Publication, pp. 295-311. Arjun Appadurai distinguishes five categories of cultural flux that he names ethnoscapes, mediascapes, technoscapes, finanscapes and ideoscapes: " *I use terms with the common suffix – scape to indicate first of all that these are not objectively given relations which look the same from every angle of vision, but rather that they are deeply perspectival constructs, inflected very much by the historical, linguistic and political situatedeness of different sorts of actors: nation-States, multinationals, diasporic communities, as well as sub-national groupings and movements*…" (p. 296). "*ideoscapes are composed of elements of the Enlightenment world-view, which consists of*

Muslim Minorities in the West as Part of Worldwide Islam

More than twelve million Muslims currently live in the main countries of Western Europe.[136] This Muslim presence is the consequence immigration channels leading from the former colonial empires in Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean to continental Europe, channels that grew to significant dimensions in the early 1960s. The official end to work-based immigration in 1974 meant that the taking root of these populations has become irreversible and is linked to the increase in policies regarding the reunion of dispersed families, thus leading to reshaping and increasing the size of families within Europe. Within such a context, an individual's belonging to the Islamic faith constitutes a major dimension of sedentarization. It is thus around the visibility of Islam that inquiries, doubts, and sometimes violent oppositions connected with the integration of these "new arrivals" within the different national collectivities will be crystallized.

The vast majority of immigrant Muslims come from countries where Islam is, if not a State religion, at least the religion of most people in the country. The transplanting of population, that implies interdependency with a majority non-Muslim environment represents an unprecedented challenge to which Muslims are currently inventing responses that vary according to their competency in matters of Islam (in the sense Anthony Giddens gives to this concept). This competency is shaped in a first instance by the large variety of cultures, and the place given to Islam at the heart of the cultures and nations from which Muslims originate. However, this competency is also affected by the cultural traditions and national mindsets specific to each host society. Therefore, a double tropism is at the center of the integration of Muslims in Europe: the first is oriented towards the *Dar-Al-Islam* (the world of Islam); the second is anchored in the specificities of each host nation. In respect of the *Dar-Al-Islam* we find solidarity networks and forms of mobility that form connections between European populations and the geographic and national spaces of the Muslim world. Regarding the host societies, the urban context is a determining factor because the global city is the privileged location for the settling and adaptation of Muslim immigrants to their new national and social contexts. Paris, Berlin, London, New

---

concatenations of ideas, terms and images, including freedom, welfare, rights, sovereignty, representation and the master-term, democracy." (p. 299).

York, and Los Angeles (amongst others) are henceforth Muslim capitals given their high concentrations of Muslim immigrant populations.

Whereas an industrial city would be organized around groups whose defining lines do not coincide with ethnic and cultural borders (but rather along more universal aggregates: the proletariat, other employees, private sector versus the public, etc.), the global city tends to give preference to, and to preserve, ethnic differences.[137] The development of "ethnic business" as well as of all forms of self-employment within the service sector create economic opportunities for the masses of new arrivals at the heart of the more larger cities. Given such circumstances, we have to wonder how Muslims can articulate their religious and spiritual needs in terms that take into account both the Islamic way of life and the host societies' dominant structures and systems, at the local and the national level.

In this process of accommodation, the role played by globalized forms of Islam is decisive. Over the past two decades, two different globalized forms of Islam have attracted more and more followers in different parts of the Muslim world and beyond. One form of global Islam refers to diasporic communities that develop solidarity beyond the boundaries of nations and culture, and that are often labeled "transnational networks". It refers to non-governmental participants such as religious leaders, immigrants, entrepreneurs, and intellectuals, who foster bonds and identities that transcend the borders of nation States. To achieve transnational status, a group must possess three main traits: (1) awareness of an ethnic or cultural identity, (2) existence of group organizations across different nations, (3) development of relations — whether monetary, political or even imaginary — linking people in different countries.[138] It is in fact a double relationship to time (memory) and to space (networks of relationships, the construction of a

---

[136] The estimations vary according to the sources available in each country. According to Felice Dassetto, the number of Muslims currently living in Europe is approximately eleven million. Cf. Dassetto, Felice (1996), *La Construction de l'Islam européen*, Paris: L'Harmattan.

[137] According to Sasskia Sassen's definition, the global city is, indeed, a "dual" city in which the most developed segments of the world capitalist market live alongside and interact with the least qualified (possibly illegal) immigrant labourers. See, by Sassen, S. (1999), "La métropole: site stratégique et nouvelle frontière " in Jocelyne Cesari (ed.) (1999), *Les anonymes de la mondialisation, Culture et Conflit*, Paris, n°33/34, Summer 1999, pp. 123-140.

[138] Diaspora is a form of deterritorialized identity that links dispersed populations with their country of origin. In the case of Muslims, even if their bond with their country of origin is strong, it is challenged by a broader solidarity with the Muslim world at large. To understand how the term "diaspora" is now used beyond its historical origin to designate transnational identities of immigrants see: Gabi, Sheffer (1996), "Whither the study of ethnic Diasporas? Some theoretical, definitional, analytical and

mythical place) that is crystallized in the condition of Muslims living as a minority in the West. Certain Muslims preserve or even strengthen their links with their country of origin, which very often means the relocalization of local religious communities from Pakistan, Bengladesh, Lebanon, Algeria, Turkey, or Egypt. This relocalization is sometimes accompanied by a rigidification/fossilization of Islamic references originating from the home countries, especially when the relocalization concerns rural groups. The relationship between men and women, as well as the status of women, are the most delicate questions of this eternalizing reproduction of traditionalist Islam.

The other form of global Islam refers to theological and political movements that emphasize the universal link to the Community of Believers (*Ummah*) such as the Muslim Brotherhood, the *Jamaat-Tabligh*, or the Wahabi doctrine. Today, the conditions for communication and the free movement of people/ideas make the *Ummah* all the more effective, without mentioning the fact that national ideologies have declined. Unlike Protestantism, where the diversification in interpretations of religious belief led to the founding of separate communities and the proliferation of different sects, the unity of the *Ummah* as an imagined and constantly renewed community based on an understanding of a shared fate is maintained. It is important to make a distinction at this juncture between radicalism and fundamentalism. It is the desire to believe in an Islam based on a direct relationship to the divinely-revealed that is often the cause of people's decision to join salafi or wahabi movements.[139] They are thus fundamentalists, i.e. they refer back to the sources of the religion, the *Qur'an* and the *Hadiths*. This return to the source texts can be conservative or puritan as is shown by the growing success of the *Jamaat At-Tabligh*, and by the fact that a part of the new generations find their source for inspiration in schools of thought such as the one built around sheik Al- Albani[140].

---

comparative considerations", in George Prévélakis (ed.), *The Networks of Diasporas*, Paris**:** L'Harmattan, pp. 37-46; Cohen, Robin (1997), *Global Diasporas: An Introduction,* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

[139] Historically the Muslim Brothers, founded in 1928, and the wahabi movement which is the foundation of the Saudian-Arabian monarchy**,** are part of the salafist current. The institutional and political evolutions of these two trends have made the term "salafist" a synonym for conservatism, even for "reactionary stance", notably within the context of Europe. Let us note that wahabism is hostile to all forms of intellectualism, religious establishment, and even to mysticism. However, this is not true of all trends based on a return to the word of the religious texts. Not all Muslim Brothers, for example, were originally anti-modern or anti-intellectual.

[140] A shaykh at the University of Medine, a specialist in Hadiths, who died several years ago.

However, this return to the divinely-revealed sources can also give rise to more open-minded interpretations that are in touch with the social and political facts and contexts of various European contexts. Indeed, the global city liberates individuals and promotes the emergence of new ways of forming a Muslim identity that is not derived from ethnicity.

Individualization and Secularization of Islam

The emergence of a minority of "new Muslims", a minority that is growing in size, has been an unexpected consequence of Muslim settlement in the West. What is new to this group is their decision to separate religion and ethnicity. New Muslims have chosen to primarily anchor their identity within the transnational concept of the *Ummah* (the timeless community of believers), rather than in national culture. Their solidarity with their "brothers" abroad was demonstrated by their protests against *The Satanic Verses,* their opposition to the Gulf War, and their support for peace-keeping efforts in Bosnia, and Kosovo.

New Muslims exercise new levels of individual choice in the course of religious observance. Their encounter with democracy has fundamentally altered their relationship as individuals to Islamic tradition. Religion is experienced, first and foremost, as a matter of spirituality and personal ethics. In the Muslim world, where Islam is a part of the dominant social norms, as well as the religion of both State and the majority of citizens, the group – not the individual -- serves as the vehicle for Islamic identification. New Muslims have not only adjusted to postmodernity, urbanity and globalization, they have also adapted to a "culture of separateness," one that presupposes autonomy and independence even in the religious realm.[141] Consequently, identities that are integrated elements in Muslim countries are automatically deconstructed into their religious, social and ethnic components when transposed to a Western context.

Generally speaking, the increase in individual autonomy is weakening Muslim ethnic and family ties within the West. In Islamic countries, children are taught parental deference, especially toward their usually authoritarian fathers. Muslim children in the West are acculturated within a

[141] See Myrdal, Gretty (2000), "The Construction of Muslim Identities in Contemporary Europe" in Felice Dassetto (ed.), *Islamic Words, Individuals, Societies and Discourses in Contemporary European Islam*, Paris: Maisonneuve Larose, *op.cit.,* pp. 35-47.

relatively permissive society that explicitly represents authoritarian parenting practices as outdated, if not damaging, and implicitly denigrates Muslim fathers on the basis of socio-economic status, educational background, and ethnicity. A "clash of civilizations" results within families, themselves, where a generation gap separates fathers from children, one that is considerably wider among Muslims than amongst first generation non-Muslim immigrants. In extreme cases, children, generally adolescent males, develop adjustment difficulties when their efforts to reconcile incompatible values fail. Ironically enough, it is often new Muslims who heal rifts within their immigrant family by showing respect to his parents as a freely exercised religious choice.

Abandonment of both ancestral languages, such as Arabic, Turkish and Urdu, and cultural habits also weakens ethnic identification. Loss of cultural practices and of the ancestral language, however, has not signaled the end of religious observance. Rather, it has led to the growth of "vernacular" forms of Islam in Europe and America, where sermons, religious literature, and public discussions are increasingly in English, a language that is now becoming the second language of Muslims all over the *Ummah*.

When they don't identify with ethnic Islam, new Muslims in the West generally base their religious identities upon one of two foundations: either a secularized bond with Islam that relativizes its needs and requirements, or a fundamentalist attitude that demands respect for Islamic tradition in its totality, included the various minute details. Secularized Muslims resemble the "pickers and chooses" of other religions in the West. Like "consumers", they tailor their religious practice and tradition to their own subjective specifications.[142] The devout amongst new Muslims define Islam as a faith-based ethical system in which commitment of inner self takes precedence over rigid and public forms of observance. Even their fundamentalist practices are the result of individual choices, such as the decision of women to wear the *hijab*, independent of male pressure, as an expression of their spiritual self. Emphasis of true meaning over display affords new Muslims a universalistic perspective that enables their dialogue with

[142] For a longer explanation of this use of Islam, see Cesari, J. (1998), *Musulmans et republicains: Les jeunes, l'islam et la France,* Brussels: Complexe.

non-Muslims. Such dialogue highlights shared values which are legitimizing Islam in Western eyes.

Many "new Muslims" who are socio-economically disadvantaged or marginalized embrace Islam as a means to salvation. For these otherwise alienated groups within the global city, Islam facilitates integration into mainstream society. Islam has been mistakenly viewed as an obstacle to economic advancement, not only in Europe, but also in America, where a substantial Muslim presence is growing within the historically disenfranchised African-American community. The reality is that adherence to Islam can help protect the disadvantaged against the temptation of self-destructive activity (e.g., crime, delinquency, drugs, and promiscuity). As one young Muslim from a low-income suburb of Paris told me: "*We're not delinquents because we are Muslim. We are delinquents because we are not Muslim enough*!"

The importance of individual choice in religious practice is accelerating the pace of transnational Islamic developments. Firstly, "small-scale do-it-yourself societies of prayer and believers,"[143] which have always existed as amorphous forms of Islam, today play an increasingly important role at the international level. As Dale Eickelman has noticed, mass education and mass communication are actually yielding self-trained religious micro-intellectuals, who are competing with formally- trained imams. The unprecedented access that ordinary people have gained to sources of religious information and knowledge makes the creation of monopolies by official preachers more difficult, if not impossible.

Secondly, "electronic religiosity" is expanding Islam transnationally through the circulation of audio and video tapes, the broadcast of independent television satellite shows, and —most significant of all— the continued birth of new web sites. Bulletin boards, chat rooms, and discussion forums on the Internet are promoting alternative, even contradictory, understandings of Islam, where only nationally-based ones previously existed. In so doing, they exert a

[143] Hoeber-Rudolph, Susanne (2000), "Dissing the State? Religion and Transnational Civil Society", *International Political Science Association Congress*, Quebec City, August 1-5 2000.

moderating effect on Islamic discourse and break up the monopoly of traditional religious authorities over the management of the sacred.[144]

Global cities are thus veritable laboratories where we can see the renewal of Islamic religiosity that gives to European Islam its particularities. It is a notable fact that within such a context a cosmopolitan Muslim elite is currently forming.

Characteristics of the Cosmopolitan Muslim Elite.

This elite is cosmopolitan not only because it is transnational but, especially, because it mixes cultural references of different registers and which are often described as antagonistic, i.e. those of the Muslim world and those of European societies. It thus distinguishes itself from those leaders who have influence over Muslims at the level of the neighborhood or housing project, and which seek to give new life within a European context to cultural models that originate from Islamic home countries. Such leaders (who might be described as "parish" leaders) have often received little training, and are often bound directly to a specific ethnic group (e.g. from North Africa, Turkey, Pakistan) from which their authority derives. The cosmopolitan Muslim elite is also different from the official leaders sent to Europe by certain Muslim countries, and which have institutional authority and international connections.[145]

The elite is currently creating a space for exchange at the heart of which ideas, controversy, and slogans can circulate, at least in their English-language versions. This role of dispersing and transmitting information is probably the group's most manifest characteristic.

This cosmopolitan elite is composed of students and intellectuals, activists, and converts. The university and intellectual milieu is particularly favorable to Islamic activism. A significant number of students pursuing higher education in Europe and who were already politically

---

[144] Mandaville, Peter (2000), "Information Technology and the Changing Boundaries of European Islam" in F. Dassetto (2000), *op. cit*., pp. 281-297.
It would be misleading, however, to consider on-line Islam as an exclusive indicator of a new democratic public space without paying attention to specific social changes within specific Muslim contexts. In other words, to assess accurately what Muslim websites are accomplishing in terms of knowledge, perspective, and affiliation, sociologists must investigate how electronic religiosity is resonating with significant social changes in general.

involved while in their home country come to refocus their actions on the Muslim populations living in their newly adopted country. It is not rare to find at the head of major Islamic organizations leaders who arrived from their home country as students. For example, there is the case of the Union of Islamic Organizations in France (UOIF) that was founded in 1983 by Tunisian intellectuals having close ties with Ennahda.

It is the presence of new generations of intellectuals educated in Europe that is specific to the European element of this cosmopolitan elite. The associations Young Muslims (UK), Young Muslims of France and the AGMT, founded in the 1980s and 1990s, illustrate this trend. Born in 1992, the Young Muslims of France association is lead by young men, either students or otherwise climbing the ladder towards middle class, who wish to "wake up the minds" of Muslim youth in France. In the United Kingdom, it is in the 1980s that the first activism by generations educated in the country began: on December 4, 1984 Young Muslims (UK) was founded, and by 1993 it brought together more than 2000 members, a number that keeps growing. In Germany, there are Avrupa Milli Gorus Teskilatari and Europaische Moscheebau und Unterstutwungsgemeinschaft e.V. It is also important to mention the special place of converts within the functioning of associations that work within the political and social sphere in Europe and America, even if this place is not always the most visible.

This cosmopolitan elite is not made up of clerics; it can be best described as being composed of independent entrepreneurs who, according to Weber's terminology, deal in salvation. Having continued their studies as far as higher education, their knowledge about Islam is either inherited from the family milieu, or acquired autodidactically or in educational contexts that are separate from those connected directly with Islamic clerics. Members of this elite are distinct from Doctors of the Law and from Ulemas whose authority is based on their knowledge and their ability to interpret divinely-revealed texts. They are also distinct by their social origins: generally from the middle or upper classes from urban areas in the Maghreb, Egypt, Iraq, India, or Pakistan, they are clearly distinct from "parish" leaders who are, in general, less well educated and from the lower-middle- or working-classes of the same Muslim countries.[146] The

---

[145] I borrow this terminology from Felice Dassetto, *La construction de l'islam européen*, *op. cit*., p. 154.
[146] See Kepel Gilles and Richard, Yann (eds.) (1990), *Intellectuels et militants de l'islam contemporain*, Paris, Seuil.

cosmopolitan elite has a more personalized and more critical relationship to the Islamic tradition than the "parish" leaders who have a greater tendency to reproduce the tradition — or Islamic competency, in Anthony Giddens' terminology — of the Muslim country they are from. This also separates them from the "official" leaders who are in charge of upholding the doxa of the country of origin (like Algeria, Morocco, Turkey, or Tunisia). This is, for example, the difference between, firstly, Bachir Dahmani, president of the Islamic Federation of Marseille, a first generation Muslim immigrant with a typical parish leader profile; secondly, Dalil Boubakeur, the current rector of the Paris Mosque and president of the new representative body of Islam (for which the elections took place in April 2003), is an example of an official leader; and, finally, Tariq Ramadan, the cosmopolitan leader, grandson of Hassan El Banna and professor at the University of Fribourg. Charisma is often a supplementary resource that makes up for the shortcomings of social origin or cultural capital.

Members of the cosmopolitan elite came to the West, in most cases, to pursue higher education in Europe, subsequently find there opportunities for employment and political expression that outstrip those available in their country of origin. For these intellectuals, the transmission of knowledge is no more institutionalized than the place of transmission. That places them in the same current as many members of the middle classes of the Arab-Muslim world who opted for the salafi movement. Everyone is allowed to speak about Islam: their relationship to the texts and their ability to speak their opinion in complete freedom contributes to a democratization of the Islamic message insofar as the average believer can have a religious opinion, which constitutes to a desacralization of interpretation within an Islam that becomes multiple and contradictory. Although this democratization of Islamic interpretation exists in the Muslim world, it is in fact exacerbated by the context of democracy and the condition of being a minority. What predominates at the heart of this cosmopolitan Muslim elite is its concern for preserving Islamic references within the European pluralist context, and to make them coexist with other religious and philosophical systems. The main trends include a recognition of the dominant political institutions, a refusal to contest the regimes in place, and a search for systems that can explain life at the heart of secularism.

Although Europe has long been the promised land for the Westernized Muslim intellectual, it has also become, in a surprising move, a haven for the creativity and inventiveness of Islamic intellectuals. The fact of living alongside Muslims from different cultures and civilizations, as well as regular contact with non-Islamic religions, confer on Islamic intellectuals a cosmopolitan ideology and a sensitiveness to differences that has no comparable situation in the countries of origin. The conditions linked with one's role as citizen, inter-faith dialog, the attempt to locate the borders between that which is open to negotiation and that which is not, the redefinition of orthopraxis, such are the favorite themes and the ways of approaching the Islamic tradition. Within such a context, democratization no longer means merely the extension and individualization of Islamic references but also a reflection about adapting to the Other, including when this means tolerance for atheism.

Conclusion

The condition of European Muslims brings to light the fact that the opposition between fundamentalism and universalism is insufficient in accounting for the complex relationship to religion that is generated by cultural globalization, a process that simultaneously promotes defensive reactions in the name of Islam, what Homi Bhabha calls forms of "contra-modernity".[147] It is thus not difficult to understand how and why Islam can be called upon as a resource for fighting against a West that has been essentialized as destructive and oppressive. It is in such a context that the more conservative interpretations of the Islamic message (wahabism and fixed forms of salafism) have so many followers in all parts of the Muslim world.

At the same time, cultural globalization accelerates the crossbreeding or hybridization between the Islamic message and the European or American cultural context by generating an unprecedented reflection on the conditions necessary for tolerance, and for proper respect of the Other. Islamic thought, which has long been primarily focused on governing Islam, is thus currently taking on a new dimension that emphasizes the terms of a coexistence between different religions at the heart of a shared national collectivity, and between religions and non-believers at the center of a shared tradition. One of the unexpected consequences of September 11th has been

the way this trend has moved towards the heart of the Muslim world, bringing to light for the first time an opposition between the 'local' and the 'foreign' Muslim. To this opposition can be added a further one, between fundamentalists and radicals insofar as a return to the fundamental texts of Islam, i.e. fundamentalism, need not automatically be a synonym for religious extremism, i.e. the shutting off of one's thoughts and the block rejection of other belief systems. It is important, however, not to make the hasty deduction that the trend of universalism is restricted to the Western world alone. It is also present in many sectors of Muslim societies, even though the Western world functions as a kind of sound box for the ideas that are elsewhere silenced by authoritarian regimes.

As Humphrey has stated: "The Western frontiers actually represented an opening which might engender skepticism about the authority of tradition; the possibility of challenging the World through the engagement of traditions in new spaces constructed by relations outside their control".[148] It is, therefore, not surprising to find that the emblematic figures of modernism nowadays live in Europe and America, where they are reconciling Islam and the West. Their presence alone constitutes a challenge to dominant historical narratives that continue to submit Muslims to the oppression of Western imperialism.

In addition, as interpretations of Islam become ever more numerous, debate intensifies over the use of Islamic symbols. "*Increasingly, discussions in newspapers, on the Internet, on pirated cassettes, and on television cross-cut and overlap, contributing to a common public space. New, accessible modes of communication have globalized these activities, so that even local issues take on a transnational dimension. The combination of new media and new contributors to religious and political debates fosters an awareness of the diverse ways in which Islam and Islamic values can be created. It feeds into a new sense of a public space that is discursive, performative, and participative, and not confined to formal institutions recognized by State authorities*".[149] However appealing they may be, romanticized visions of transnational religious networks as a pre-condition for democratization must be resisted. Authoritarian regimes can take control of or

---

[147] Bhabha, H. (1994), *The Location of Culture*, London: Routledge.
[148] Humphrey, M. (1998), *Islam, Multiculturalism and Transnationalism, from the Lebanese Diaspora*, Oxford: IB Tauris, *op. cit*., p. 18.
[149] Eickelman, Dale F. (1999). "The Coming Transformation of the Muslim World", in *Global Politics and Islam.* pp. 1-5.

manipulate transnational groups, as the secular leader, Saddam Hussein, did when he invoked Islam in his media broadcasts during the Gulf War.

In a challenge to pluralistic democracy, transnational Islam is also raising questions about religious freedom and tolerance, as well as limits to public expressions of faith. Pluralism in Western secularized society no longer refers to the integration of socially subordinated groups or the representation of social diversity, but rather to the balance between cultural diversity and cohesion within the national community.[150] Democracies are thus forced to answer a number of questions regarding the possibility of reaching a collective agreement on cultural, political, and religious values,[151] and on the possibility of evolving beyond shallow civility to genuine acceptance of the Other.

As a final conclusion, it is useful to recapitulate that in the global era, Muslims in the West are currently formulating new debates on Islam, democracy, and modernization, and are involved in a process of translating Islam into more universalistic terms. Secularization is changing the meaning of Islamic observance and altering the relationship between the individual and religious tradition. Western Islamic communities have become participants within transnational networks and Western Muslims have become legitimate members of the *Ummah*. The ways Western Islam will challenge the Muslim world's regimes remains to be seen.

---

[150] See Cesari, J. (2003), "Muslim Minorities in Europe: the Silent Revolution", in F. Burgat & J. Esposito (eds.), *Modernizing Islam: Religion in the Public Sphere in the Middle East and in Europe,* London: Rutgers University Press.
[151] This dilemma is illustrated by the opposition between liberals and communautarians in the USA.

'GOD IS GREAT', THE TRANSNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF PENTECOSTALISM IN AN AGE OF SECULARIZATION

SÉBASTIEN FATH, GSRL (CNRS/EPHE), PARIS

Introduction

"*Allahu Akbar":* this formula has become the trademark of militant Islam, proclaiming everywhere, even in the suburbs of secularized Europe, that God is great today as he was in the past. But such a formula cannot be confined to Islam alone. In contemporary Christianity, it is not so exotic to proclaim that God is great, able of miracles, of healings, especially in its most militant form, I mean Evangelical Christianity. According to Peter Berger, "*the two most dynamic religious upsurges in the world today" are "the Islamic and the Evangelical*"[152]. Evangelicals, along with Muslims, proclaim on a transnational basis that a unique and normative God rules, *hic et nunc*. This contribution aims to deal with the historical and sociological frame of a specific Evangelical identity, the Pentecostal one. In terms of numbers, it is, by far, the most successful variety of Evangelicalism worldwide, as we will see. At first, a historical overview is needed to describe the international growth of Pentecostal Churches. On all continents – and Europe is no exception –, the Pentecostal Movement has spread from year to year, reaching hundreds of Million. This new Protestant wave, based on the importance of charisma, has set its footsteps everywhere, even in the heart of Paris, city of Voltaire and Jean-Paul Sartre[153]. The beginnings of this movement (first part) and its partial achievements at the end of the XXth Century (second part) must be described. How can we explain this expansion, in an age of secularization? Different sociological approaches (third part) help to understand this apparent paradox.

---

[152] Berger, Peter (et alii) (1999), *The Desecularization of the World. Resurgent Religion and World Politics*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, p.7.

[153] Cf. the title of Stotts, George R. (1981), *Le Pentecôtisme au pays de Voltaire*, Paris: Viens et vois.

The Pentecostal Beginnings in the XXth Century: from one Convert[154] ...

The historical context for Pentecostalism's emergence is found in Evangelical Protestantism. This important trend of American Christianity, which finds its roots in the "Radical Reformation"[155] of the XVIth Century, can be defined by four main features. They have been specified by David Bebbington. One common feature is a stress on "conversion" (or "being born again"). Whether sudden or gradual, it is understood as a radical change of life after a religious experience. A second emphasis is on "activism". The conversion must develop into a militant life, normally devoted to evangelism, and also (but not always) to social work. A third characteristic is biblicism, "*the great respect with which all evangelicals treat the Bible*"[156], received and interpreted as the "Word of God". A fourth characteristic is what the Anglican theologian John Stott (linked to the evangelical tendency) called, in 1956, "the centrality of the cross"[157]. This "crucicentrism" focuses on the doctrinal theme of the redemptive work of Jesus-Christ on the cross, in an event which happened almost 2000 years ago, and which is considered as the turning-point of human history. As David Bebbington says, all "*those displaying conversionism, activism, biblicism, and crucicentrism are evangelicals*"[158]. In this Evangelical Protestantism emerged the "Holiness Movement" during the XIXth Century, in reaction to what was considered too intellectual a piety in the Methodist Church. This tendency emphasized the importance of "sanctification", ascetic discipline in order to be transformed in a militant Christian, devoted to "the Lord", Jesus-Christ. African-American Churches played an important role in this "Holiness Movement". The Church of God in Christ, for example, founded in Memphis in 1897 by two ministers, C.H. Mason (1866-1961) and C.P. Jones (1865-1949) became later the largest of Black

---

154 A previous version of this text (not to be published) was: "From One Convert to Hundreds of Million: the Pentecostal Paradox in an age of Secularization (XXth Century). A Historical and Sociological Overview", conference on Christianization of Oceania (CEIFR and CREDO, CNRS/EHESS, May, the 11th and the 12th, 2000).

155 Cf. Williams, George Huntston (1962), *The Radical Reformation*, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 3rd ed., 1975. For Williams, this radical trend (which involved Spiritualists and Anabaptists, who refused any relations between Churches and State) can be clearly defined: "*Embracing peasants and princes, artisans and aristocrats, devout wives and disillusioned humanists, it was as much an entity as the Reformation itself and the Counter Reformation*", p.846.

156 Cf. Bebbington, David W. (1994), "British and American Evangelicalism Since 1940", in David W. Bebbington, Mark A. Noll, and George A. Rawlyck, *Evangelicalism. Comparative Studies of Popular Protestantism in North America, the British Isles, and Behond, 1700-1990*, New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, p.366.

157 Stott, J.R. (1956), *Fundamentalism and Evangelism*, London: For the Evangelical Alliance by Crusade, p.28, in David W. Bebbington, Mark A. Noll, and George A. Rawlyck, *Evangelicalism, op. cit*., p. 366.

158 Bebbington, David W., in David W. Bebbington, Mark A. Noll, and George A. Rawlyck, *Evangelicalism, op. cit.*, p.367.

Pentecostal Churches of America. Its streams of thought can be found also in the Revivalist tradition (especially in the Reformed or Keswick emphasis on the need of a "higher Christian life"). Although there is a considerable variety in this movement, the common current is a deep fascination with the experience of Spirit baptism, however it is defined. This theme was also a cornerstone of the Welsh Revival, in 1904 and 1905, which nurtured the early beginnings of American Pentecostalism through "well-established transatlantic networks"[159].

However, the real beginnings of Pentecostalism as a clearly identified Movement lie in the ministry of an itinerant Methodist preacher, Charles F. Parham (1873-1929). He belonged to the Holiness Movement, a Methodist tendency which emphasized the importance of "sanctification", and was also a faith healer. While superintending a Bible school in the town of Topeka (Kansas), Parham introduced his students to a different reading of the Book of Acts and encouraged them to search for "Bible evidence" of what he called "Baptism in the Holy Spirit". This "Baptism" was supposed to occur after the "Baptism of water", leading to a complete conversion. This search met spectacular results when a female student, Agnes Ozman, began speaking in tongues. It happened on New Year's Day, 1901. We can suppose it was a kind of symbol for the early Pentecostal believers. Symbolically, their movement began with one convert at the very beginning of the XXth Century, receiving - so they thought - God's clear approval. The experience of glossolalic baptism which Agnes Ozman experienced soon swept Parham's school and the members became convinced that glossolalia was the physical evidence, the real (and necessary) accompaniement of the baptism of the Spirit. This belief then became the doctrinal hallmark of what would be named "Pentecostalism". Glossolalia was not unknown before Parham, neither the concept of Spirit baptism, but Parham's insistence that glossolalia was the normative and necessary sign of Spirit baptism is what clearly distinguished the early Pentecostals from the Holiness mainstream.

Charles Parham proclaimed his discovery in several meetings throughout the mid-West (from Kansas to Texas), generating the "Apostolic Faith Movement", a small fellowship of Churches. During that time, a young African-American Holiness minister with a Baptist background,

---

[159] Blumhofer, Edith L., "Transatlantic Currents in North-Atlantic Pentecostalism", in Mark A. Noll, David W. Bebbington and George A. Rawlyck, *Evangelicalism, op. cit.*, p.351.

William J.Seymour (1870-1922), came under Parham's influence (in spite of Parham's racist views) during a campaign in Texas (Houston). After his experience in Houston, Seymour moved to Los Angeles, California. There, he began to preach the Pentecostal message in his Church in Azuza Street, in a nondescript neighborhood in downtown Los Angeles. Within weeks, Seymour's ministry had sparked a spectacular "revival". The Azuza Street Mission, located in one of the most dynamic American towns, facilitated Pentecostalism's transition from a regional sect to an international presence. It became early Pentecostalism's most widely publicized center, and initiated a part of its early expansion in America and worldwide.

Pentecostalism referred to a Protestant ecclesiology, defined by an emphasis on personal choice rather than on a sacred central institution, to an Evangelical background (defined by conversion, biblicism, activism and crucicentrism) and to the belief that glossolalia was the absolute and necessary sign of Spirit Baptism. Apart from these three points, the Pentecostals proclaimed two main convictions, which shaped their further history all around the world. The first was a certainty that Jesus Christ's "second coming" was imminent, and that they had to proclaim it and to be its heralds. This implied a resolute emphasis on proselytism. In fact, Pentecostals set out to penetrate the Church worldwide and to empower it. For them, proclaiming the Gospel in every nation was not simply fulfilling Jesus' Great Commission, expressed at the end of the *Book of Matthew*: "*Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you*"[160]. Their compulsion to evangelize gained also its momentum from their identity as "end-times people". The second conviction held that in the events unfolding among them, they witnessed the first shower of what they called God's "latter rain". What did they implied by this? This understanding of a "latter rain" referred to the Old Testament, in Joel 2. 23, and 2.28-29. These verses mentioned a "former" and "latter rain" (v.23), and said: "*And afterward, I will pour out my Spirit on all people. Your sons and daughters will prophesy, your old men will dream dreams, your young men will see visions. Even my servants, both men and women, I will pour out my Spirit in those days*" (vv.28-29)[161]. This scriptural text became a key

---

[160] *Book of Matthew*, chapter 28.19&20. It ends with: "*And surely I am with you always, to the very end of the age*", New International Version Study Bible, Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1985, p.1489.
[161] *Old Testament, Book of Joel*, chapter 2, v.28 and 29, *op. cit.*, pp.1342-1343.

reference for the whole of Pentecostal history. Its insistence on the role of the Holy Spirit, on miracles, dreams, visions, on a democratic religious expression (men *and* women, masters *and* servants, old people *and* young people) shaped in many ways the religious practices of Pentecostals. Their understanding of the "former rain" identified it with the day of Pentecost (described in the New Testament, Book of Acts), and the "latter" was considered to be the last days immediately before the "second coming" of Christ. For the Pentecostals, this second fulfilment of God's grace would usher in a full and spectacular restoration of New Testament Christianity - complete with all signs and wonders described in the Bible. So restored, the Christian Church could sweep the world with one final great revival. I will not risk myself in a vast comparison with Islam, but I would just suggest, at this stage, that this primitivism doe not seem foreign to some Islamic fundamentalist's emphasis, who also want to restore primitive and authentic religion, as they see it, against "modernists" and skeptics.

At a very early stage, the Pentecostal movement spread from the United States to other parts of the World through both efforts of missionaries and evangelists and written reports. At first, the quasi-practical synchronicity of the Pentecostal beginnings in America and the Welsh Revival facilitated the spread of Pentecostalism in Europe. In a span of twenty years, almost all European countries were reached by Pentecostal evangelism. Meanwhile, Pentecostalism began to develop in several countries located in the so-called developing countries. In Brazil, for example, Pentecostalism began as early as 1910 (even if its rapid growth in this country started in the late 1940s). These early development were followed by a real "take off" after World War Two. From one convert at the beginning of the XXth Century, Pentecostalism had moved to a mass-phenomenon.

A Pentecostal Triumph? Hundreds of Million Believers in Year 2003

At the end of the XXth Century, many speak of a "Pentecostal triumph". For Harvey Cox, author of *The Secular City* (1965), Pentecostalism brought back "Fire from heaven[162]". In his new book, he describes Pentecostalism as a possible paradigm of the Christian Church in the XXIth

[162] Cf. Cox, Harvey (1994), *Fire from Heaven. Pentecostalism, Spirituality, and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty-first Century*, Addison: Wesley Publishing Company.

Century. In the French translation of this synthesis, the title becomes: God's return"[163], which is a very good shortcut of Harvey Cox's thought. Through Pentecostalism, Christianity, which seemed so eroded by the effects of secularization in the Mid-XXth Century, seems to be revived on a transnational basis, even if many observers do not know how to interpret such a "rebirth" (or such a "revival"). According to Paul Freston, in countries like Brazil, where Pentecostalism comprises about two thirds of the total Protestant community, estimated at around 15% of the population, making it the largest Pentecostal community in the World (at around 15 million), Pentecostalism "*has replaced the Catholic Base Communities as the academically fashionable subject in sociology*"[164]. In this process, many scholars find it convenient to distinguish between "classical" Pentecostalism and "neo-Pentecostalism". The second variety would be characterized by an extensive use of the media, a particular emphasis on health and wealth, and an active involvement in the political arena, instead of an ascetic rejection. This distinction does not seem to be very appropriate, even if it can be of heuristic interest. Indeed, as Jean-Paul Willaime and Paul Freston have pointed out, the differences are generally more in degree than in kind. As David Lehman says (quoted by Paul Freston), the so-called "*neo-Pentecostals*" are "*a vanguard... the sharp end of a broader process*"[165]. In fact, what might be called "neo-Pentecostalism" seems to be the last wave of the dynamic and changing history of Pentecostalism.

This debate about "classical Pentecostalism" or "neo Pentecostalism" reminds us that Pentecostalism, like Catholicism or Islam, is a real "world", which comes in a bewildering variety of packagings. This complexifies the analysis. For example, in the part 2 ("Directory Listings") of the second edition of *The Encyclopedia of American Religions* (by Gordon Melton)[166], it is fascinating to confront the 10 pages dedicated to the Lutheran Family (from p.237 to p.247), the 18 pages dedicated to the Reformed-Presbyterian Family (from p.247 to 265), and even the Pietist-Methodist Family (18 pages) or the Baptist Family (26 pages), with the 54 pages dedicated to the Pentecostal Family (pp.309 to 363). In the Christian movement, the "Pentecostal Family" is, by large, the richest one in terms of internal diversity. In the American

---

163 Cox, Harvey (1995), *Retour de Dieu. Voyage en pays pentecôtiste*, Paris: Desclée.

164 Freston, Paul (1999), "Neo-Pentecostalism" in Brazil : Problems of Definition and the Struggle for Hegemony", *Archives de Sciences Sociales des Religions*, 105, Jan.-March 1999, p.145.

165 Lehman, David (1996), *Struggle for the Spirit*, Cambridge: Polity, pp.129-130, quoted in Paul Freston, *op. cit.*, p.152.

religious landscape, only one "family" seems to be more diverse and fragmentated: the "Spiritualist, Psychic, and New Age Family" (62 pages, from p.531 to p.593). Many subdivisions are proposed by Melton to organize this Pentecostal diversity, from the "White Trinitarian Holiness Pentecostal" to the "White Trinitarian Pentecostal" to "Delivrance Pentecostal", "Apostolic Pentecostal", "Black Trinitarian Pentecostal" and so on...

By any count, the number of Pentecostals in the world today is really staggering. At the dawn of the XXth Century, there were none. By some counts, more than five hundred million Christians worldwide identify today with the Pentecostal and Charismatic tendency (in a large sense), according to David Barett[167]. These statistics seem to exaggerate slightly the Pentecostal's number, even if Harvey Cox's evaluation is not far from it[168]. David Barret counts Pentecostal Christians in almost all denominations, an approach which could be criticised. But even casual observers of the world religious scene must acknowledge the extent and visibility of this twentieth-century phenomenon. We can consider that almost 20 to 25% of the total number of Christians belong to this Protestant tendency. In some areas of the world, especially in Latin America, parts of Africa or Asia (Korea), Pentecostalism seems today virtually uncontainable. David Martin[169] did not hesitate to chose the following title for his synthesis about Pentecostalism in Latin America: *Tongues of Fire : The Explosion of Protestantism in Latin America*. "Explosion"! What a big word! Big, but appropriate to the facts. Hundreds of million people all around the world have found in Pentecostalism their religious identity, a meaning to their life, which attests both to its remarkable appeal to individuals, and to its ability to accommodate and adapt to widely different cultural identities. In many areas, Pentecostals have direct contacts with Muslim missionaries, and both religious offers compete in many countries, even in French suburbs. How do Pentecostal and Islamic networks interact? It is a huge field of research, and everything is still to be done, especially in France where such studies are not yet available.

---

166 Melton, Gordon (1987), *The Encyclopedia of American Religions,* 2nd. ed., Detroit, Mich.: Gale Research Company.

167 The trend by mid-2002 is: 543,578,000 people. Source: Barrett, D. and Johnson, Todd (2001), *International Bulletin of Missionary Researc*h, Jan. 2002. See also *World Christian Encyclopaedia*.

168 Cox, Harvey, *op. cit.*, p.10, counts 410 Millions of Pentecostals.

An Emotional Protestantism Adapted to Modernity? Sociological Perspectives

If we reject the American conspiracy theory which would interpret Pentecostal Churches as American religious colonies[170] (even if the American influence through some Pentecostal networks is obvious, and deserves analysis), four main factors of explanation can be found to the extraordinary growth of Pentecostalism in an age of secularization. Jean-Paul Willaime, in a recent synthesis, has remarkably explained the post-modern, modern and traditional (pre-modern) dimensions of this movement. To these factors could be added the Pentecostal specific regulation by charismatic authority instead of theology, which traditionally upholds legitimacy in Protestantism. The combination of these four dimensions might be the key to the "Pentecostal paradox".

A Postmodern Movement

Part of the reason for the Pentecostal expansion through the XXth Century is clearly rooted in Pentecostalism's populist character. Pentecostal Churches seem particularly attractive to many victims of Modern society, especially the poor, marginalized, the kind of people Pierre Bourdieu and his team interviewed in *La misère du monde*[171] (*The World's Misery*). For those people, Pentecostalism represents "*essentially a new version of the theme of anti-structure*"[172], a protective haven, or a "*social strike*" in the sense of André Corten[173].

---

169 Martin, David (1990), *Tongues of Fire: The Explosion of Protestantism in Latin America*, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

170 Cf. David Martin, about Latin America: "*The evidence is that the existence of The USA is a facilitating factor, but not itself the main reason why some forty million Latin Americans now call themselves "evangelicals". Moreover, the influence of the USA varies. It may be strong in the networks which bind together USA-supported missions to the great cities; it may be almost non-existent in some movement to create a "free space" in rural Mexico. IT may be strong in Haïti and Puerto Rico; it is quite weak in Brazil*". Martin, David (1993), "The Evangelical Expansion South of the American Border", in Eileen Barker, James A. Beckford and Karel Dobbelaere, *Secularization, Rationalism and Sectarianism, Essays in Honour of Bryan Wilson*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, p.111.

171 Cf. Bourdieu, Pierre (1993), *La misère du monde*, Paris: Seuil, 1993.

172 W. Williams, Peter (1989), *Popular Religion in America, Symbolic Change and the Modernization Process in Historical Perspective*, Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, p.150.

173 Corten, André (1995), *Le pentecôtisme au Brésil. Émotion du pauvre et romantisme théologique*, Paris: Karthala, pp. 196 à 201.

It is in this ability to respond to people wounded by modernity that Jean-Paul Willaime sees the post-modern dimension of Pentecostalism. A classical study by Robert Mapes Anderson[174] has pointed out this aspect about the early American movement, but many studies, after this, have confirmed this dimension. Pentecostalism seems to mirror and respond to the deepest longings of "common people". With its form of expressive and emotional democracy, with its emphasis on practical purposes (improve health, economic condition...), Pentecostalism has been remarkably successful in offering religious answers to marginalized people in cultural transition. But this "populist" character of a religion made by the people for the people must not be exaggerated. Recent studies suggest that most early Pentecostals came from the blue-collar working-class, not from the ranks of the most disinherited. Nevertheless, Pentecostalism thrives among the poor and marginalized members of society. It provides for those people a warm, friendly, affirmative environment unlike anything they would have been likely to find in the so-called mainline Churches. Pentecostal Churches have been conceived and perceived as places of refuge[175] in a hostile world. In those refuges, people can "*rebuild an identity shattered by destabilizations of all sorts*"[176]. It is quite clear that such analysis can be recycled in the Muslim field, in order to explain some aspects of the worldwide process of islamization today.

The social and relatively egalitarian dimension of Pentecostalism seems to be partly confirmed by the initial racial diversity of these Churches. This was a trademark of early Pentecostalism, which seemed to show that the "class solidarity" between the poor was stronger in the Pentecostal assemblies than racial barriers built by the whole society. The West Coast missions in particular were known for a real religious "melting-pot" of different ethnic identities: Hispanics, Scandinavians, Orientals, Eastern European Immigrants worshipped alongside their Anglo-Saxon and African-American brothers and sisters. Many Christians of other denominations were scandalized by such a diversity, which was interpreted as a sign of Evil... Within a few decades, pressures to segregate took their toll, but the populist and egalitarian character of most

---

174 Anderson, Robert Mapes (1979), *Vision of the Disinherited*, New York: Oxford University Press.

175 Cf. the classical work of d'Espinay, Christian (1968), *El Refugio de la Masas, Estudio Sociologico del Protestantismo Chileno*, Santiago de Chile: Editorial del Pacifico.

176 Jean-Paul Willaime: "*Les pentecôtistes s'insèrent dans la société à travers une intégration forte dans un groupe primaire (...) qui leur permet de reconstruire une identité mise à pal par les déstabilisations de toutes sortes qu'ils ont vécues*." Cf. "Le pentecôtisme : contours et paradoxes d'un Protestantisme émotionnel", *Archives de Sciences Sociales des Religions, op. cit.*, p.22.

Pentecostal Churches remained an important dimension, helping them to manage the cultural and social ruptures of modernity.

The Pre-Modern (or Traditional) Dimension

Another point is certainly the compatibility of Pentecostals' emphasis on the Holy Spirit with practicies and themes deeply rooted in indigenous religions. In this aspect, we can see, with Jean-Paul Willaime, the pre-modern (or traditional) dimension of Pentecostalism. As a religion based on miracles, emotions, experience instead of rationalization, Pentecostalism has proved its ability to re-enchant the world. In Pentecostal Churches, a mighty God is back, and with him, Satan and several demons, demoniac forms are back too, shaping the day-to-day life of millions of believers. This dimension has been noticed and analysed by several researches, like André Mary's study about the Church of Heavenly Christianity, created in Benin in 1947. Though not strictly Pentecostal, this Church shares with Pentecostalism an emphasis on visionary charisma, linked to the efficiency of prayer and divine healing, and to an absolute belief in the divine characteristics of the Bible. From his anthropological perspective, André Mary considers, in his conclusion, that although Pentecostalism proclaims its Christian identity, it "*rehabilitates all the pagan categories of thinking*"[177], in a world dominated by spiritual forces of all kinds. Even if such a conclusion could probably be ponderated by other studies, it shows the extraordinary ability of the Pentecostal type of Christianity to re-enchant the world. In traditional societies outside or in the western world, such an ability adopts a semi-syncretist strategy. As Harvey Cox notices, "*Pentecostals succeed in beeing highly syncretist, although their leaders preach against syncretism*"[178]. In Benin, for example, the practice of prophetizing by the power of the Holy Spirit is combined with an African-inspired culture of divinatory trance.

Pentecostalism seems to adapt itself to traditional religions, even if the cultural relation goes on two ways: Pentecostalism reuses certain aspects of traditional and local religions, but rejects others. For instance, while Catholicism will be very syncretist in reusing sacred places, holy

---

[177] André Mary: "*Cet univers qui se dit avec force chrétien, qui ne jure que par la Bible et par Christ, reprend à son compte toutes les catégories de pensée du paganisme qu'il dénonce et pourchasse*". Cf. "Culture pentecôtiste et charisme visionnaire au sein d'une Église indépendante africaine", *Archives de Sciences Sociales des Religions, op. cit.*, pp. 48-49.

tombs, sacred shrines, combined with the local animist traditions, Pentecostalism will refuse all kinds of animated places or objects. Pentecostalism is not only a Christian syncretism, it has its own Protestant identity. While we can observe the influence of syncretist religions on Pentecostalism, we can also observe a Pentecostalisation of traditional religions.

An Adequation to Modernity

The third sociological factor which might explain the "explosion" of Pentecostal networks worldwide in an age of secularization seems to be its adequation to modernity. Pentecostalism is not only a post-modern, and a pre-modern (traditional) form of Christianity: it is also almost a completely modern form of religion. Firstly, it provides a common ethos to individuals and groups without reverting to anything like a single national Church. Like Evangelical Protestantism in general, Pentecostalism is part of the long-term history of the erosion of the unity of the Church and the State. Secondly, Pentecostalism accepts the pluralistic religious market, creating a multiplicity of different offers. In this perspective, it emphazises the importance of personal choice. Pentecostalism offers clear values to individuals. In a world saturated with contradictory messages, Pentecostal Churches display a strong message: Jesus is Truth, He saves and heals, He comes back soon. By the process of conversion to such a Gospel, the individual can find clear landmarks; he can also break the power of former links of obedience, the Pentecostal God beeing stronger than traditional authority. Every individual theoretically has his chance, through conversion, to escape from what he did not like in his life. The teaching on the "spiritual gifts" destinated to each believer also allows each individual to develop his potential in the group setting. He can also express cultual creativity in worship, choose between a wide range of practices. In that sense, Pentecostalism fits with what Danièle Hervieu-Léger calls the "*religion on the move*"[179], characterized by the figures of the pilgrim and the convert, who choose what they want on the religious market, out of the inheritated religious traditions. It is thus no wonder that Harvey Cox has been so interested by such an analysis, as we can see in his last book on Pentecostalism, where he relates his discussions with Danièle Hervieu-Léger[180]. In

---

[178] Cf. Cox, Harvey, *Retour de Dieu, op. cit*., p.221.
[179] Cf. Hervieu-Léger, Danièle (1999), *Le pèlerin et le converti. La religion en mouvement*, Paris: Flammarion.
[180] Cf. Cox, Harvey, *op. cit.*, pp.268-269.

this view, the Church is not a hierarchy anymore, but a relational network in which the individuals choose what they need, without the "sacred canopy" of the "so-called" historic Churches. Pentecostal Churches (but not only them) fit remarkably with this new culture of religious choice, adapted to Modernity.

The Emphasis on Charismatic Authority

The fourth factor of Pentecostal "prosperity" is the emphasis on charismatic authority. It is questioning, in some ways, its Protestant identity. For Jean-Paul Willaime and many observers, the Protestant dimension of Pentecostalism seems to be obvious, through two main distinctive characteristics: the biblicism and the emphasis on individuals instead of sacred institutions. This Protestant identity has often been translated into different forms of precarity[181]. Indeed, the major role of interpretation of the Bible generated fragility. Theology is not an easy way to regulate Churches. From a generation to another, theology changes. It can also be contested by the believers. From this point of view, Pentecostalism might be interpreted as a radical way to escape from the traditional Protestant precariousness. In some ways, Pentecostalism seems to have refused theology as source of legitimation (which was the traditional Protestant way), it refuses also any kind of tradition, to the benefit of the charismatic authority of the prophet-pastor. In this perspective, like Catholicism, Pentecostalism would emphasis vertical authority, but replacing institutional legitimacy by individual charismatic authority. This attempt to enforce authority in Protestantism, without referring to a sacred institution would be one of the secrets of the "Pentecostal prosperity", confronted to the usual "Protestant precariousness"[182]. This emphasis on personal charisma might be not far from what some observers see in contemporary Islam, where charismatic "imams" contest the legitimacy of traditional authority in the name of their calling. While traditional Protestantism, as it might be in traditional Islam, produced, in the past, a kind of static and national religion, linked to the political power, the new emphasis on charismatic authority might produce, in both cases, new networks. These transnational networks

---

[181] Cf. Willaime, Jean-Paul (1992), *La précarité protestante. Sociologie du Protestantisme contemporain*, Paris-Genève: Labor et Fides.

[182] This analysis is developped in Fath, Sébastien (2001), "L'autorité charismatique au coeur de l'Église : pentecôtisme et débat sectaire", *Etudes Théologiques et Religieuses*, 2001/3, pp.371-390.

are much more connected to individuals, charismatic figures, than to former sources of legitimation.

Conclusion

It is probably in this combination of an emphasis on charismatic authority, mixed with traditional, modern and post-modern aspects that the Pentecostal explosion in the XXth Century can be best explained. Brazil seems to provide an impressive empirical verification of this interpretation. In this country, the separation between Church and State has led to a kind of modernity which weakened the former dominant catholic Church, without leading to a secularization of culture. Pentecostalism used its traditional dimension to offer a religious alternative to Catholicism. It also used its' modern dimension to emphasis personal choice, in a pluralistic religious market, and its' post-modern ability to socialize the many victims of capitalism, marginalized people of the favellas. It also succeeded in maintaining forms of vertical authority inherited from catholic culture, but in translating them from a sacred institution to a charismatic personal authority. Many so-called developing countries share such a profile. South Asia, Northern Africa, in some aspects, are not far to this model, displaying sometimes both a Pentecostal and an Islamic spread. Between a strong emphasis on the greatness of an Almighty God, personal charisma and various mixtures between tradition and modernity, these movements might both work, even in Europe, on "*the deprivatization of Modern religion*"[183], in specific modalities. This context offers, thus, fascinating opportunities for comparison.

[183] Casanova, Jose, "The Deprivatization of Modern Religion", in *Public Religions in the Modern World*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1994, pp.211-234.

McJihad: Globalization, Radical Transnationalism and Terrorism of the Diaspora

Yngve G. Lithman, University of Bergen

In this presentation I will be using the word « Diaspora »: I want to point out that it does not really reflect homeland, people away from their homeland. But it will be used more in a loose sense of people dispersed. So if the general idea about the Diaspora is homeland and dispersed people, my emphasis is on dispersal, not as much on homeland. Secondly, what I will be giving you is a more or less a condensed version of an article which I have called "Mc Jihad". I will try to explain you why I used this word.

Jihad is a term with many elaborations, from exertions in the direction of living a pious life to, more commonly, holy war. In a highly interesting book, which also has influenced many later writers, Barber's *Jihad vs. McWorld* (1995), Jihad is formed into a symbol for 'tribalism,' the localized, the non-globalized. Barber wants to show the dialectic between on the one hand mass society and market globalization, McWorld, and on the other a fragmentation of nation-States and other political entities into e.g. ethnically or religiously argued political particularisms, i.e. Jihad. Even if the battle between Jihad and McWorld is a major concern for Barber, he stresses not only their interdependence, but also and importantly their independence, and makes ontological distinctions between them. They are, so to say, engaged in a battle where one of them potentially can be a winner. (This is not to deny that the mutually formative dynamics between them, as Barber shows, is crucial to any analysis of their constituent and manifest features.)

Much of the analysis that have been made of what led up to the destruction of the World Trade Center Twin Towers on September 11, 2001, 9/11 as it is now commonly called, fits into Barber's framework (although seldom with explicit referencing). The terrorists are somehow representative of Jihad, and their target of McWorld. In this article, an argument will be presented to the effect that with proper weight to the formation of and the dynamics of the diasporic dimensions behind this event, a different interpretation can be advanced. This particular form and manifestation of Islamistic Jihad (in the minds of its executioners) should in all its relevant

aspects be seen as not just in a dialectical relationship with globalization. Instead, it can be seen as a prime example of the forces of globalization. These shape and form an expressivity that is widely regarded as Jihadist (in Barber's sense), and is claimed to be Islamic Jihadism by its perpetrators. However, in the alternative interpretation the diasporic dimensions formed, put in place, and energized, all the necessary requirements for 9/11. Such an analysis is then in contrast to the symbolic screen with which 9/11 manifested itself by its perpetrators, as an Islamic-Jihadist act. Similarly, the search for explanations of 9/11 has focused on particularities such as Islam, the situation in Muslim countries, etc. (Barber's Jihad), and/or the interaction between these singularities and globalization (McWorld). The analysis suggested here points in another direction, that 9/11 is not in a dialectical relationship to globalization, but analytically rooted in it. As a globalized phenomenon, it nevertheless draped itself in the language of Jihad, both in Barber's and an Islamic sense, making itself a kind of 'McJihad.'

It is well known to all of us that a lot of people have said that 9/11 is hard to decipher. And that is of course in large measure true. However, one thing which I think has not been taken into account at all to the degrees that it should, is what we can call radical transnationalism. What I mean by "radical" here is that it is a transnationalism…. I will talk here about 9/11 to quite a degree and I will make a distinction between terrorism *in* the Diaspora and terrorism *of* the Diaspora.

Terrorism *in* the Diaspora would for example be when the Croatian Ustaja movement killed the Yougoslavian Ambassador in Sweden. Terrorism *of* the Diaspora, is a terrorism which is analytically, generically rooted in the Diasporic situations perceived. So, one of my arguments here is that we have a tendency to look at transnationalism and Diasporic situations for too much in terms of for example the homelands and dispersal. Instead, I want to argue that the transnational situations, the diasporic situations in themselves carry the possibilities which may not exist within this more confined analysis, where the focus is on the dialectic between homeland and diasporic situations.

Radical transnationalism has significant features of emergence and creation and demonstrates ideological developments, modes of belonging and a new cartography of social relations. A cartography with specific qualities. The "radical" in radical transnationalism, refers to that, as

different from perhaps many other transnational diasporic conditions, we are here dealing with a transnationalism which does not have the spatial grounding, for example homeland, diasporic communities, etc. which is usually the case.

In standard sociological usage, the organizational vehicle for radical transnationalism resembles the social movement, in this case a movement existing in transnational space. However, in spite of its features of being social movements, instead of recurring primarily upon onto the specific State that has fostered them as it is usual with social movements, these movements transcend; they are, to use a metaphor from Castells, "non-patriarchical", not defined within hierarchical structures of domination where the State and the father are major icons of social world. The cartography of radical transnationalism is that it is neither configured around, nor constrained within activities within specific States. Similarly, belongings and the their social expression are not contained within narrow categories of persons, for example with a shared national, ethnic or local origin. Instead a radical transnationalism cut across both State boundaries, as well as, for example, specific Diaspora constituted along national or ethnic lines. Also when these are distributed over several countries. This radical transnationalism is in this sense against specific national ethnic and immigrant community boundaries. At least, it ignores them as far as ideological developments and organizational capacities are concerned. They are against also in the sense that much of the belonging and organizational work in radical transnational movements are also not just transcending but in fact oppositional to such boundaries. The radical transnationalism must hence be seen as an organizational and expressive potential in the diverse society, more precisely that the diverse societies flatter in the Castells' sense.

And then I talk about how Internet for example is one of the very important vehicles through which this radical transnationalism organizes itself. So an other example example of radical transnationalism would be – as I had the occasion to observe in Sweden some years ago – around the generalized immigrant identity, where people with all sorts of diverse backgrounds in terms of nationality, ethnic backgrounds or religions, still constituted themselves as an effective part of Swedish immigrant life.

What I then go on to discuss is the emergence of the Muslim Diaspora in Sweden? And I know that this combination of terms "Muslim Diaspora" has all sorts of problematic attached to it. The background for this diasporic phenomenon is the historical development, especially during the post-WWII era in the relevant countries (Saudi Arabia, Iran, Iraq, Palestine, Pakistan, etc.), which produced a Diaspora, internally divided along many lines. It is within this Diaspora, as constituted both in the conditions of its production, in its present conditions of existence, as well as in its relationship to the surrounding world, that we find the potential for those particular forms of social organization and religious-ideological developments which ultimately manifest themselves in 9/11.

First will follow a brief commentary about common explanations to 9/11 and also an outline of some of the puzzling questions as to how and why it took place. It will continue with an account of a particular form of diasporic organization, radical transnationalism, and Al Qaeda is seen as a representative of this. Brief accounts of the diaspora production in the relevant countries and the conditions facing the members of this diaspora will provide the background for how people organize along the lines of radical transnationalism, and how the requirements in terms of symbolic umbrellas for such organizational features are shaped. Insights from the sociology of religion, with its tradition of linking forms of denominationalism with social realities and social organizational possibilities and opportunities are particularly helpful in this regard.[184]

9/11 – "Hard to Decipher"

Commenting upon the hijacking of an Air France Airbus in 1994 by members of an Islamist terrorist organization, Kepel (2002:308) in his *Jihad: The Trail of Political Islam*, a work of great scholarship, makes the comment that "*this onslaught remains as hard to decipher as every other major Islamist terrorist operation against the West, including the World Trade Center attacks and other terrorist acts imputed to Osama bin Laden*." There are certainly many factors, in different combinations, that various authors recognize have to be included in an explanation of

[184] Several discussions with my colleague at the University of Bergen, Bruce Kapferer, have significantly helped sharpen the argument presented here. The forum on 9/11 he edited (Kapferer: 2002) contains a number of interesting comments. I also want to acknowledge the input from participants at the international migration seminar, organized by ANU in Sydney, February 18-20,

such acts. To these belong e.g. the US support in the creation of bin Laden and the Talibans, the "*anger, alienation and resentment felt by a generation deliberately excluded from the domestic political process*" (Burgat 2003:XIV), the role of oil in ensuring the support by the US and other Western States to corrupt and dictatorial regimes in the Middle East, the Israeli-Palestine conflict, etc. The role of Islam is also debated, with positions ranging from on the one hand "Muslim rage" and fourteen centuries of conflicts between Islam and the West (cf. e.g. Lewis 2003) to a much more reduced role of the religious/Islamic component. Globalization perspectives also contribute to the debate about the causes of the Al Qaeda type terrorism, not only in the shape of the oil trade, but also, and prominently, pointing to the inflammatory distinction between rich and poor in this world.[185] It is noteworthy, that e.g. three leading European intellectuals all discuss 9/11 in terms of (Us and) the Others (Baudrillard 2002, Virillio 2002, Zizek 2002). Several, including Kelly (1998:31f), argue that the US, "…*inhabiting the superpower role means that the discontented and embittered may hold the United States responsible for their poverty, their weakness, their ignorance, and their irrelevance*." Lewis (2003) introduces Saudi Wahabism as a singularity of particular importance. Kepel (2002), again, is organized to provide a superb account of the emergence, spread and - according to Kepel - now dissolution of 'political Islam.' A similar ambition is evident in Huband (1999), which however has a much stronger focus on the developments within each of most of the crucial countries, and admonishes the reader to remember how many different kinds of political Islam there is.

There has, thus, obviously been no lack of effort to explain terrorism of the 9/11 type. However, in spite of the many obviously contributing factors that have been identified, most attempts to explain "9/11" and similar terrorism rest on one or more of three fairly incomplete or common-sensical models. One of these focuses on Islam, and how specific political developments in

---

2003. I want to thank the University of Calgary, Canada, for their assistance during my stay there as a visiting scholar when this article was written.

[185] In this article, problematic terms will have to be used. Terrorism and Islamism belong to these. Terrorism is a loaded word, and rightly so, also because one person's terrorist may well be person's freedom fighter or holy warrior. However, without detracting from the horrors of terrorism, we must also attempt to understand its logic, and this is what this article deals with. Islamism, political Islam, Islamic fundamentalism, Islamic revivalism, Islamic activism are terms which are used at least to some extent interchangeably. This article will not attempt to sort out this terminological issue. Its use of the term Islamism refers to making Islam the emblematically organizing principle of a symbolic universe (this will be discussed at some length towards the end of the article). The term fundamentalism, originally used to connote certain Protestant/Evangelical sects, is for several reasons not a very good term. It stresses the Quranic texts, rather than the 'integrated' social, political, and economic life within Islamic life that those called 'fundamentalists' strive for. However, since the designation fundamentalists appears to become the standard term it will for the sake of brevity and simplicity occasionally be used.

relevant countries leads to an amalgam of religion and armed/terrorist struggles. Another model suggests that the misery in these countries leads to the same result. The third model highlights we-them/other distinctions, either related to oil or the inequalities of the world. Historical accounts, ranging from evaluations of the 'clash of civilizations' thesis (e.g. Esposito 1999) to the specificities of the Islamist movements (Kepel 2002), are prominently used as explanations, perhaps more than with respect to any other significant issues of the day, such as e.g. the general debate about global inequalities.

Notwithstanding the value of these contributions, it appears that a number of crucial issues still remain puzzling. Why, for instance, did Islam become the ideologically organizing banner for the participants in 9/11, especially given that many of the Al-Qaeda members on the whole seem to have lived lives where for the better part religion was a fairly unobtrusive component?[186] Further, how is one to understand the role of religion? There is a clear plurality of views here. Some argue – more or less explicitly - that Islam is in itself a religion with a strong propensity for violence, others, including such renowned scholars as Karen Armstrong (2001:70) state that "*the terrorists and their extremist cohorts hijacked not only several planes, but one of the world's great religions*." What made it possible for an organization such as Al-Qaeda, based on Islamistic premises and with a strong political agenda, to lift itself out of various local/regional/national contexts, especially since "*diversity rather than monolithic unity is more the norm that the exception in Islamic politics*" (Esposito1999:286)? For this question to make sense, one must of course see al-Qaeda not as basically a Saudi-Arabian phenomenon, such as a reaction against the Saudi-Arabian leadership, with some minor garnishing of members from other countries.[187] Another of the puzzling questions is how it was possible for the al Qaeda members to collaborate and share even in suicidal and life-threatening activities for people of such diverse backgrounds, geographically, nationally, yes – religiously (although all of course had a Muslim background), linguistically, in terms of socio-economic background, in terms of their wide range of occupational careers in Islamic/Muslim as well as in Occidental countries.[188]

---

[186] On this issue, see e.g. Kepel (2002) or Bergen (2002).

[187] This article will argue that a main energizing factor of the Al-Qaeda was its international composition, and that this composition was of great significance for why it could develop as an Islamist organization.

[188] It is easy to be misled by terms such as "members," the Al Qaeda "network," etc. These terms are here used in a most general sense, not suggesting any particular organizational firmness. As for the network qualities, one should regard these as without fixed boundaries and understood to include those who could be recruited for various Al Qaeda-related acts.

9/11 as a Case of Radical Transnationalism

This article will attempt to contribute to answering these questions. It will do this through pointing to certain between themselves related phenomena or perspectives, the empirical base of which is readily found in the literature, but whose analytical dimensions are largely un-explored.

One crucial dimension, in fact a *sine qua non,* has gone mainly over-looked – that 9/11 has to be understood as a diasporic phenomenon. It is an example of terrorism *of* the diaspora as distinct from *in* the diaspora. To terrorism *in* the diaspora would count e.g. the IRA activities in England, and the Croat Ustaja-related killing of the Yugoslav ambassador in Sweden some years ago. In cases such as these, we are dealing with activities of a kind that have their ideological and social action grounding for example, and perhaps most prominently, in nationalistic movements. The terrorist acts take place in the diaspora, but this is virtually incidental – the acts are aimed at an occupant/aggressor in the homelands. The diasporic quality is not a definatory constituent quality of the terrorist activity. Terrorism *of* the diaspora, on the other hand, would mean acts of terrorism that are analytically constituted in, emergent in, and expressed in, the diasporic condition. In fact, the argument here suggests that terrorism *of* the diaspora has certain paradigmatic qualities.

The diasporic situation provides certain possibilities for thinking and action which are unlikely to emerge in non-diasporic situations. If one so wishes, this can be regarded as a structural-functional argument (and in spite of the criticism against such arguments: who can do without structural and functional arguments in a social science analysis?). With this basis, it is also obvious that the argument here is a sociological-anthropological one; contrary to what the individualism ideology in which we live our everyday lives tells us, it is important make an analysis steer away from making personal decisions by people like bin Laden supremely important in an analysis, or even turning specific biographies into explanations - the focus of an explanation has to be founded in an analysis of social and cultural processes. In terms of the thematic, terrorism of the diaspora, the genesis of specific diasporic situations carries with it opportunities and closures as to the possibilities that are contained within the diasporic situation,

i.e., related to the social dimensions of the diaspora, the varieties it provides in how to interpret the world, and how to action-wise relate to it. And, as will be demonstrated later, the sociology of religion has provided us with some exceptionally clear insights as to how religious beliefs and activities are likely to shape up under different conditions.

The Islamistic diasporic situation can be seen as a form of radical transnationalism.[189] Radical transnationalism has significant features of emergence and creation and demonstrates ideological developments, modes of belonging, and a new cartography of social relations, a cartography with some specific qualities. The 'radical' in radical transnationalism refers to that, as different from most transnational or diasporic conditions, we are here dealing with a transnationalism which does not have the spatial grounding, e.g. homeland, diasporic communities, etc., which is usually the case. In standard sociological usage, the organizational vehicle for radical transnationalism resembles the social movement, in this case a movement existing in a transnational space. However, in spite of its features of being social movements, instead of recurring primarily onto the specific State that has fostered them as is usual with social movements, these movements transcend. They are, to use a metaphor from Castells, non-patriarchical (1997), i.e. not defined within hierarchical structures of domination where the State and the father are major icons of social order.

The cartography of radical transnationalism is thus neither configured around, nor constrained within, activities within specific States. Similarly, belongings and their social expression are not contained within narrow categories of persons with e.g. a shared national, ethnic or local origin. Instead, a radical transnationalism cut across both State boundaries as well as e.g. specific diasporas constituted along e.g. national or ethnic lines), also when these are distributed over several countries. This radical transnationalism is in this sense 'against' specific national, ethnic, and immigrant community boundaries, at least it ignores them as far as ideological developments and organizational capacities are concerned. They are 'against' also in this sense that much of the belonging and organizational work in radical transnationalism movements are also not just transcending but in fact oppositional to such boundaries. The radical transnationalism must hence

[189] Building on insights from other projects, radical transnationalism in now a theme in a research program at the IMER center-unit at the University of Bergen. Dr. Mette Andersson first suggested this term for the kind of phenomena discussed here.

be seen as utilizing an organizational and expressive potential in 'the diverse society,' more precisely that the diverse society is 'flatter' in the Castells (1996) sense.

To understand the emergence of this radical transnationalism, we obviously have to understand how some features of cultural, political, and economic, globalization have increased the possibilities for such organizations to emerge in the first place. A second issue if how they offer themselves as vehicles for personal identification. A third is what being a 'member' of such a movement means. We can see these movements, due to their ability under conditions of globalization, to function 'trans' national/ethnic boundaries, and therefore also to represent manifest alternatives as collective identity categories.[190] These radical transnational movements create new combinations of ideology- and identity-constructions, combinations of course energized by their members' experience of life, at the same time rearranging or creating categorizations and other cultural understandings in order to give expressivity to these experiences.

The radical transnationalism has a strong affiliation with migration experiences, migrant life, ethnic apartness, the outsidership associated with having been born outside the State-sponsored fatherhood (or the parenthood only reluctantly acknowledged). One may make a claim that the most important social referencing for many of the members, often young people, are transnationally manifest and imagined 'communities.' This global fellowship may be their by far most central reference, the pivot on which their belongings are leveraged.

In terms of its organizational features, it is likely that the pattern we find with regard to Islamistic radical transnationalism may be found also in other instances. One feature, and it is primarily the Western European scene which will be illustrated here, is a fairly non-hierachical network, tying together both individuals and organizations. The organizations, such as certain local 'mosques,' may provide a membership, where the participation or allegiance varies considerably. Key persons appear to be a prominent feature. Specific tasks, such as acts of terrorism, will be performed by what in sociological terms would be called action sets.

---

[190] An excellent and obvious example of this are Muslim youth movements in Europe, whose patterns of association, modes of claiming belongings, as well as religious habits and theology are in all these dimensions 'trans' that of their parents (cf., for an

It is perhaps impossible to underestimate the role of the Internet in the work of radical transnational movements. Although it has only been an effective mode of communication for something like a decade, it now is of huge importance in terms of ideology-creation through net publishing and discussion groups, as well as in terms of coordinating other activities. There is now a large number of web sites devoted to radical transnationalism, and the Internet has shaped up as a major factor in a variety of meta-and proto-political work, at least of the Islamist kind.

The Emergence of the New Muslim Diaspora in Europe

In 1777 the envoy of the Sublime Porte, Resmi Ahmed Effendi, wrote a report to Sultan Abdul Hamid I where he enthusiastically recounted his reception in Berlin, and stated, "*the population of Berlin recognizes the prophet Mohammed and would not be afraid to accept Islam*" (Thomä-Venske 1988:78). History, as we all know, turned out to be a bit more complicated than that. While we have had a significant Islamic presence in parts of Europe, it was not until almost 200 years later that there was a notable number of Muslims in northern Europe. This came mainly about through what can roughly be described as the streams of labor migration in the post-war, pre-oil crisis times. It would be mistaken to believe, however, that we are just dealing with laborers; on the contrary, significant numbers were in fact also students, marriage partners, etc., and their motivations for moving to northern Europe also included a variety of dissatisfactions with the conditions in their home countries. This was, after all, virulent times associated with de-colonization and nation-building in many of the countries from which Muslims came. The result of all this is fairly well known in its broad outlines, this period resulted in the establishment of notable minorities with Muslim background. In all likelihood, there was more social mobility and assimilation than we usually recognize, but there was also the formation of neighborhoods of people with such backgrounds having difficulties to achieve any reasonably dignified existence in the new countries. It should be pointed out, that Muslim or Islamic here does not denote socially effective entities. On the contrary, there were a variety of divisions and distinctions, running a.o.

---

early case that can be interpreted this way, Kepel 1987).

along sectarian, home country, ethnic, and linguistic lines, as well as along a general secular-religious continuum.[191]

The period after the mid-1970s saw a different kind of immigration, mainly by refugees and people who came through family (re)unification openings. Hereby the diversity of the Muslim populations increased further, as this refugee-generation encompassed situations in a variety of countries, including the Iran-Iraqi conflict, the collapse of former Yugoslavia, the wars in Ethiopia, Sudan, Nigeria, and also smaller numbers from Asian conflicts. There are significant indications, that these refugees, especially those from Arab and African countries, have had perhaps bigger problems than any other immigrants to find good or even acceptable conditions in the receiving countries. The children, and by now grandchildren, of these migrants are often marginalized in their countries of residence, and their relative or total lack of experience of a homeland may also be seen as a contributing factor to why some of them come to embrace a radical transnationalism along Islamistic lines (one example of this will be given below).

The Developments in the Islamic Heartlands

Many commentators to 9/11 have pointed to the role of the Western States in shaping the present Arab world, and rightly so. The Cold War and superpower involvement in the Arab world, of course energized by the oil fields, included a role in largely destroying a budding State-bounded or Arab nationalism.[192] Much has also been made of the presumed Saudi inability to protect the Islamic heartlands against 'the infidels,' particularly against the Americans in relations to the Iraqi war. More generally, many claim that the coalition between the US and Saudi-Arabia has prohibited a proper development in the Muslim/Islamic world. The Israeli-Palestine conflict has also, of course, received attention as a festering conflict involving super-power(s). A number of other issues have been rightly noted in order to account for the 'background' to the presumed frustrations on the part on those advocating an Islamic fundamentalism.

[191] There is a fairly large but uneven literature about these issues. Kepel deals excellently with some of the Islamic issues in a number of works. Gerholm and Lithman (1988), although depicting a somewhat earlier period, also deals with the situation in several countries.

As regards the Islamic heartlands, it is possible to focus on certain processes and their inter-relationship, and to see these as parts of 'explaining' what led up to 9/11. Three processes in particular are to be dealt with here, the arrest of an incipient nationalist, the arrest of an incipient capitalism, and the dynamics of diaspora formation. The import of these processes have to do with three things, the way in which they open for interpretations of how the world is configured (and this will lead to a sociology of knowledge application), the ways in which they served to create part-diasporas with specific features, and the way they led to certain characteristics of the present Arab/Muslim heartlands. It is the combined, mutual energizing that took place as a result of these processes that should be primarily kept in mind.

The Arrest of an Incipient Nationalism

After the Second World War, there were a number of reasons to believe that the Middle East would develop along nationalistic principles of structuring. Countries such as Iran certainly took significant steps in that direction, and even the ousting of Mossadeq did not put a complete end to this development. A modernization project under the management of the Shah did not, however, more than to a very limited degree involve democratization and the building towards nationalism. Defining the political unit as the *people* within a geopolitical unit was not to be reconciled with an increasingly despotic regime in collaboration with major oil interests and seeing as one of its tasks to counter any Soviet expansion towards the Gulf. The absence of virtually any democratic institutions left few vehicles for organization and resistance, and it would be political theology that would carry Khomeyni to his peak achievement, backed by a frustrated middle class. In the early 1970s, there were also various Marxist groups who, inspired even by persons like Che Guevara and Mao and also supported by Iranians in the European diaspora, attempted to achieve a change of regime. The end of all this is well known – Khomeyni's return in triumph after a fifteen-year exile.

Looking at several other countries in the region, including Iran, we find up to and including the 1960s, and also later, a strong tendency towards a separation of Islam and public life. Socialism,

---

[192] The Mossadeq overthrow is a paradigmatic example; the CIA planning, available on the Internet (http://www.cyberiran.com/history/post-mossadeq.shtml), makes Greene's quiet American seem a very straightforward guy.

anti-Zionism and trends towards a pan-Arabic nationalism are some features. It should not be forgotten that Saddam Hussein in his career was a Baathist, a supporter of a pan-Arabic nationalism (of sorts).

The list of countries could be made longer, and would contain roughly the same ingredients.[193] Does that mean that the thwarted nationalistic attempts all should be explained on a case-by-case basis? Not really. One can see how certain dimensions of social, political, economic, and religious life are constantly present as obstacles to nationalistic developments both in specific countries and also on a more regional basis. For one thing, there is, or in this context, was, the distinction between the monarchies, Saudi Arabia and Jordan, and the often-called progressives, primarily Egypt, Syria, and Iraq. Furthermore, and more generally, these countries were virtually all constructions during the 20th century. As such, they reflected little development based on internal homogeneity. Instead, they were all characterized by significant divisions that made any all-embracing nationalism all but impossible. Iraq is of course a splendid example. It was thrown together by the British, with the remarkable Gertrude Bell as kingmaker, after the First World War. Its name means 'the well-rooted country' – while in fact the British expected that all the divisions within it, religious, ethnic, class-wise, would make it easy to control. The British also installed Faisal 1 as king – a man who was the son of the Sharif of Mecca, who had never visited what was to become Iraq, and who was voted ruler by an English-staged congregation where no-one had met the king to be – which did not prevent the candidate from receiving a virtually unanimous support. In Anderson's (1988) terms, the history, geography, religious and ethnic division of Iraq makes it virtually impossible to imagine what kind of discourse that could have promoted the development of a sustainable nationalistic ideology.

The story from Iraq is –with variations – the story from several of the countries in the area. Once formal de-colonization had run its course, once the resistance against occupying forces was void, the nationalistic ideologies also got into progressively worse problems. However, one effect of the nationalistic movements was the creation of a diaspora, not least comprised of refugees, for whom their home countries represented un-fulfilled political developments.

Saudi Arabia of course stands out as something of a singularity. Maybe Bernard Lewis (2002:III) has the most striking formulation:

"*Imagine … if the Ku Klux Klan or Aryan Nation had obtained total control of Texas and had at its disposal all the oil revenues, and used this money to establish a network of well-endowed schools and colleges all over Christendom peddling their particular brand of Christianity. This is what the Saudis have done with Wahhabism. The oil money has enabled them to spread this fanatical, destructive form of Islam all over the Muslim world and among Muslims in the west. Without oil and the creation of the Saudi kingdom, Wahhabism would have remained a lunatic fringe in a marginal country*."

Egypt and nationalism is of course tied to the name of Nasser, who led the failed war in 1967 against Israel. Nasser, the self-described progressive got threatened by leftist students, and his successor, Sadat, saw the Islamization of the campuses as a way of defusing the leftist threat – and at the same time gave up the State prerogative regarding ideological expressions in the public space.

The Arrest of an Incipient Capitalism

If the nationalistic option, if this is what we can call one type of development, as a part of modernization was largely closed, so was another potentially significant development associated with what we usually call modernity. For the sake of brevity, this can be called the development of a capitalist society, a society where the conflict between different segments of society is a major structuring vehicle. In a more reduced version, we find capital pitted against workers, and with the State providing the mediation and ensuring the functioning of the economy. (This is not intended as a particularly Marxist version of sociology, but rather a kind of description pretty close to data, as exemplified by many Western European States.) The main point in this argument is that the emergence of a class-based society, in the sense of worker collectivities, etc., never emerged as major instruments of or in social change. This, however, took place against a background where socialist and Marxist ideas (more or less contained within nationalistic or postcolonial discourse) had been very prominent parts of the de-colonization struggle, and also

[193] While my argument is somewhat different, Kepel (2002) is an excellent source for many of the issues covered here.

afterwards. There was also a number of manifestations of attempts by workers to appear as a collectivity in these countries, such as the first student rebellion in Egypt against Nasser in 1968, backed by workers from the industrial city of Helouan. However, especially in the big oil countries, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, the major economic activities came to be defined within State power, and what Kepel (2002) and others so fittingly calls Petro-Islam was a development within this context. There were certainly capitalists, and Bin Ladin's father was one of those who made it big, in his case in construction. However, there never emerged a class of capitalists, for example through the expansion of the bazaar economies, which was able to function outside the State apparatus to the extent that it could assert itself as a class with a significant measure of autonomy vis-à-vis the State. Similarly, there never emerged a sustained working class in the sense of class belonging being a significant reference for consciousness formation or social action.

The situation in Iran towards the end of the previous century, as described by Kepel (2002: 106), was of course in some sense unique, "*…massive unemployment moral repression, and a cataleptic social order that was completely dominated by the religious hierarchy, the 'pious foundations' that controlled the economy in collusion with the bazaar merchants, and a whole crew of profiteers who prayed on the Islamic Republic*." At the same time, it illustrates very well the arrest of a capitalist development. In so doing, it also points to the collusion between State power and its encompassment of economic opportunities.

To this should be added, that the western States, in particular the US, is continuously interpreted as being one or the major source of the troubles. The US had in large measure supported the Islamist trend, not just in its collaboration with the Taliban but also in a variety of other ways, including the initial support of the Islamists in Algeria. At the same time, the Islamists from Saudi Arabia and everywhere else saw the West, in particular the US, supporting Israel and the US as the symbol of the western world was made out (partly as a legacy of left-wing intellectual legacies in Arab countries going back decades) to be responsible for the economic and political squeeze resulting in dire circumstances facing the Islamic heartlands and Islamic countries everywhere. Its collusion with the government of Saudi Arabia secured this regime. By Islamists, Saudi Arabia's granting the US to station troops in the 'holy lands' during the first Gulf War was

made out to be a gross breach of Quranic injunctions against infidels. Given the ideology of the religious hardliners, Saudi Arabia betrayed its trust – it was, to put it that way, not Wahhabi enough. From another perspective, the US collaboration with the Saudi government gave no additional room for expanding the public space.

The Diasporic Conditions

The developments outlined above in the States in the Islamic heartlands (and countries such as Pakistan and Indonesia have not been dealt with above, but could easily be included in the analysis) led to diasporic processes with some specific qualities.

For one thing, we had a large number of people who migrated from largely Muslim countries due to any variety of political, economic or other reasons. Here we find those populating the poor suburbs in our major western European cities. While these millions were not involved in anything relating to the 9/11 terrorism, by Islamists (this term used somewhat loosely), their conditions were seen as emblematic of the disdain with which the West treated Muslims. They also had another important role in the new cartography of the world created by the Islamists, they provided an alibi for claiming that at least parts of Europe in the 1990's were, or were in the process of becoming, *dar-el-Islam*, Islamic heartlands. The implication of this was, that Islamic observances should be much more forcefully upheld. When the Muslim worker interviewed by Schiffauer (1988) in the 1980s stated as a fact that 'this is Germany', he also meant that this was a place where you could not be a Muslim; an attitude coupled with a resigned utilitarianism.

These millions of migrants, however, were neither without interest to their sending countries, nor to the dissidents in these countries. Petro-Islam, via countries such as Saudi-Arabia, Iran, Libya, and also, almost as a counter-measure, Turkey, got heavily involved in trying to assume some ideological control over these diasporic populations. The reasons were manifold. The migrants represented significant economic resources, e.g. through remittances, but perhaps even more important was their possible influence, ideologically, politically, over the future shape of Islamic expansion – and also what repercussions this would have in the Islamic heartlands. To some extent, youth from these diasporic conditions were also recruited for various Islamistic courses.

This diaspora also provided the basis and legitimacy for a number of activists and organizers who grafted themselves onto it. We can see this as a second diasporic development, and with very different roots from the general migration from countries with a heavy Muslim population. It is now that e.g. 'Londonistan' became a phrase to denote the coexistence of a variety of groups related to the battles, military or otherwise, going on in Afghanistan, Algeria, Saudi Arabia, etc. The emergence of this variety of groups, headed by assorted intellectuals, imams, jihadists, etc., had significant consequences, also for how several western States related to Islamic concerns. It also led to much more articulated demands on these States about how to relate to Islam and the diasporic populations – including exhortations that Chirac should embrace the Muslim faith. This Islamistic development was of course of major interest and concern the 'the sending countries,' which were anxious to maintain control of the diaspora.

In very general terms, one may say that England became much more important than France for this second diasporic development. Initially, there appears to have been a great degree of caution on the part of this second diaspora to create issues in France, and the designation of France as a dar-el-Islam, an Islamic land, served to restrain from e.g. violence (but also led to e.g. an emphasis on veils). This situation changed during the latter part of the 1990s, with violence erupting in France. To this second diasporic development belongs figures such as the 'blind sheik', Omar Abdel Rahman, known for his involvement in the first World Trade Center bombing in 1993.

The third diasporic development to note here is the movements associated with Afghanistan. The war against the Soviet Union was turned into a jihad, and attracted a number of 'Arab' fighters, as well as Muslims from other countries, to help in the battle. After the cease of that war, these fighters constituted a "*milieu ... cut off from social reality; its inhabitants perceived the world in the light of religious doctrine and armed violence …*", and "*they constituted a pool of manpower that could be used by the secret services of a number of States who might find it opportune to manipulate unattached extremist militants*" (Kepel 2002:219). Their ideology, jihadist-salafism, advocated a return to the ways of the devout ancestors and was hostile to any and all religious

innovation. The ideologues included Abu Qatada, a Palestinian, Abu Musab, a Syrian naturalized in Spain, the Egyptian Mustapha Kamel, naturalized in Britain.

The Diversity of the Muslim Diaspora

The diaspora of people with Muslim backgrounds in diasporic situations is as varied as it can get. Many immigrants to Western Europe have 'disappeared' into the host country societies, but many more have settled, or, rather, ended up in immigrant suburban low-standard living around major cities. For these latter, discrimination, high unemployment rates, insecurity, both with regard to permits and in terms of access to the benefits of the welfare States, contribute to marginalization and outsidership.

During the last couple of decades, we have seen a notable Islamistic vitalization in the Muslim diaspora.[194] It is also evident, that this is not a development indigenous to each diaspora/country, but instead reflects a specific process. One part of this process is the export of Islamicists or domestic protesters of other political persuasions from Islamic heartlands, Pakistan, Bangla Desh, Sudan, Nigeria, etc. To a very considerable degree, the movements in this refugee production were between these countries, but it also involved a large number of persons going to Western Europe and North America. Another part of this process was a radicalization along religious/Islamistic lines, to be dealt with below. We now get a diasporic situation where people from very different backgrounds in fact constitute themselves as an Islamic or Islamistic diasporic intellectual and religious leadership. In spite of the fact that organizations such as Jamaat-e-Islami, with roots in Pakistan, had attempted to organize the Muslim diaspora, we now for the first time get much more successful attempts to organize the Muslim diaspora by people not tied to or working on behalf of specific States. The significance of the de-spatialized character of the leadership is crucial, as is the diversity of backgrounds. There is no reason to exaggerate how big the firm following was to this leadership, but its generalized and Manichaean (Islam/Muslims against the West) message certainly had attraction to some of those who felt their situation in the diaspora was one of marginalization from the surrounding society. For the sake of

[194] This author is more familiar with the Western European situation, but judging from the literature (e.g. Kepel 2002), this general assertion holds true.

brevity, rather that as a subscription to a psychologizing explanation, one may State that there was an appeal to the frustrated, rather than to those who felt that they could realize a good, or at least partly rewarding, life in the diaspora.

The best illustration to the diversity in the diaspora as concerns the adherents to the Islamistic message is perhaps some short biographies.

Sheik Abu Hamza al Masri led the activities of the North London Central Mosque in Finsbury Park, described as a community center for terrorists.[195] Richard Reid, the 'shoe bomber' and Zacharias Moussaoui, supposed to be 'the 20th hi-jacker' on 9/11, had connections with this mosque, as well as Feroz Abassi, a Briton who fought with the Taliban, now held in Camp X-Ray, Cuba. Sheik Hamza was born as Mustafa Kamel in Egypt to an upp-middle class family. Describing himself as a 'bad Muslim' when he moved to England, he studied at Brighton Polytechnic, but ended up as a karate instructor, a builder and a London nightclub bouncer. Fathering a son, he married and divorced. A radicalization led him to join the Mujahadeen in Afganistan. His Salafist-jihadist persuasions make him openly preach Jihad against the West.

Osama bin Laden's life story is well-known, and it fits well to the thesis outlined in this article.[196] It was in fact a photo of him in a Swedish paper that energized some of the thinking presented here. The photo, from a provincial paper in the late 1960's showed a holiday picture of a large Arabic family that had rented the whole of a small hotel. One of the young boys was Osama bin Laden.

The family came from Yemen to Saudi Arabia, where the father became a hugely successful builder. The family belongs in many ways to a globalized elite. The father helped Adan Khashoggi, whose nephew was Dodi Fayed who died in the car crash which also took the life of Princess Diana, to make his first financial deals. One of Osama bin Laden's brothers is married to the stepdaughter of the Marquess of Queensberry. The family business now includes everything from Porsches to the Hard Rock Café and Disney franchises. Osama bin Laden was pious already

[195] This presentation builds a.o. on Jimenez (2003).
[196] A good and balanced presentation of Osama bin Laden's life is found in Bergen (2001).

as a teenager, and at the university where he studied, two professors were Abdullah Azzam, who founded the first truly international Jihadist network, and Muhammad Qutb, who became the warden of his brother Sayyid's legacy – Sayyid Quth's *Signposts* is the founding text of the Jihadist movement.[197] The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, in addition to many trips to this country, led Osama bin Laden to organize a Saudi Arabia-based assistance. He ran a guesthouse in Peshawar in Pakistan for Muslims from different countries who came to offer their help to the Afghan Jihad, and this for some time was his permanent residence. The charge that bin Laden was 'created' by the CIA is most certainly overblown (cf. Bergen 2001:66f), but his Afghan experience certainly put him in close contact with all sorts of Islamistic groups and a multitude of agencies from Muslim countries, etc; his whole experience here was very much a transnational one. His opposition against US troops in Saudi Arabia during the Gulf War leads to his exile in Sudan after another and short spell in Afghanistan. Here al Qaeda established itself as an international trading concern and forged alliances with a large number of Islamistic organizations in different countries. In 1996, pressure on the Sudanese government lead to bin Laden's resettlement in Afghanistan.

If bin Laden is the great star, maybe Abdullah al-Muhajir is an example of how one convert came to join the Jihad.[198] Born in Brooklyn as Jose "Pucho" (Chubby) Padilla, of Puerto Rican descent, he moved to Chicago as a child and eventually become a member of the street gang Latin Disciples (Latin King according to some sources). He served a couple of jail terms for robbery and assault charges. He converted to Islam in the beginning of the 1990's, and studied at a mosque in Pembrok Pines, Florida. He spent time in Pakistan and Afghanistan in 1998 and 2001. His mother was worried because her son "*had left the country and become a member of a cult*." (June 11, 2002, http://www.BBC NEWS/ world/americas/Profile: Jose Padilla). He eventually became known as the 'Dirty Bomber,' alleged to have participated in planning a terrorist act in the US with radioactive material.

[197] It is worth noting that both Azzam and Qutb had significant diasporic experiences. Azzam, a Palestinian, studied in Damascus and Cairo, worked in Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and, finally, Pakistan. He traveled widely around the world to drum up support among Muslims for the Afghanistan Jihad. Qutb spent some hugely formative years, 1948-51, in the US as a student, was jailed in Egypt in 1954 and executed in 1966.
[198] This account builds mainly on a presentation in The Economist, June 15-21, 2002, pp23ff.

Khaled Kelkal was shot to death in 1995 by French gendarmerie after a chase through the forests around Lyon.[199] In his backpack was the pistol with which Sheikh Sahraoui had been assasinated. Sheikh Sahraoui was the guarantor that Islamistic violence would not take place in France. Kelkal was born in Algeria, grew up in a French banlieue, felt ostracized by his schoolmates because he was the only Arab, and felt more comfortable in the outsider atmosphere, among thieves. He was sent to prison, and rediscovered Islam through a cellmate. In the 1992 interview, he declares that he wants to go home to Algeria. He did go to Algeria the next year, and returned 'a fanatic' according to his girlfriend. He became a member of one of the activist cells that was created as the interface between Algerian Islamicists and youth in the French banlieues. While the Algerian side wanted to strike a blow against the French State on account of its policies against Algeria, for Kelkal, a fan of the movie of *The Autobiography Malcolm X*, his engagement and activities had to do with a much more globalized idea of Islam.

The Logic of Religious Action

The analysis of 9/11 has so far contained virtually no real treatment of what led up to it from the perspective of the sociology of religion. This is all the more notable since there is a great literature about what forms of religiosity that is likely to emerge under which social, cultural and economic circumstances. While such an analysis will contribute significantly to grasp the issues at hand, it will of course just be one part of the puzzle with which this article is concerned.

The classical tenet of the sociology of religions is that there is a correspondence between social situation and form of religiosity. In Weber's (1965) classical schema, he makes a distinction on the one hand between asceticism and mysticism on the one hand, and inner- and other-worldly orientations on the other. Islam, he sees representing a kind of inner-worldly asceticism, but he (if anyone!) is also fully aware of the shaping societal forces. Rex (1988) points out that pragmatic and quietist adjustments seem to characterize Islam in the early period of immigration and minority status in the western European States,[200] and that in Niebuhr's (1975) typology, the

[199] This biography builds on material in Kepel 2002; cf. article by D. Loch in *Le Monde*, October 7, 1995, containing a sociological interview with Kelkal.
[200] Rex deals with England, the extension to the rest of Western Europe is by the present author. Justification for this can be drawn from the other articles in the volume.

Muslims in the diaspora fell somewhere between 'the Churches of the middle classes' (a doctrine of individual piety is substituted for any social doctrine) and 'the Churches of the disinherited' (the Churches demanding a reversal of the social order). In actual practice, the reversal of the social order was pretty well confined to those aspects of existence that related to Islamic family life and sexuality, and the implications this had for changes in the educational system, a.a.

The Muslim populations in Western Europe, with the exception of the tiniest of minorities, had of course no relationship to the executioners of 9/11. Their situation, however, became a part of an ideologizing which provided a general interpretation of the world where terrorism (against the west, the US) became a result. This ideologizing has the characteristics of what Berger and Luckmann (1967:103) called a '*symbolic universe*,' '*a comprehensive integration of all discrete institutional processes. The entire society now makes sense*.' In the case of Al Qaeda and similar groupings, what makes up this symbolic universe? The answer has to deal both with closures of other ways of conceptualizing the world, and also show how this 'symbolic universe' was constructed and what energized people to act on this image of, as it were, the world.

The main ingredient in this ideologizing can be said to be a globalized version of an *integrismo* Islam, an Islam where all parts of society is organized according to Islamic prescriptions. It further reflected a globalization of ideology and message much more pregnant and going far beyond some general admonition by a religious founding father to have his disciples preach his gospel. It was created out of what was perceived as and underpinned by real and often painful experiences of global forces, and structured as a globalized counter-attack. The ideologizing was totalizing – the whole world made sense, if interpreted within its schema. It should also be pointed out, that this totalizing was not new in Islamic circles. The best known example is perhaps the ideology behind Jamaat-I-Islami, the creation of Mawlana Mawdudi, a trans-national who was born in India and in the 1920's started to produce what was to become Pakistan's perhaps main contribution to such ideologizing. Sayyid Qutb, an Egyptian, and Khomeyni are others who should be mentioned in this context.

The first step in explaining the totalizing ideology has to go back to the situation in the Muslim countries (literary expediency forces the use such a poor expression), and the terrible State of

many of these countries. At the same time, the mechanisms for change are in many ways blocked – reference was made earlier to the arrest of the nationalist and the capitalist options. The attempts at socialist developments have also collapsed. The causes of the bad shape in which these countries find themselves, in this ideologizing, was a combination of corrupt and/or infidel leadership in these countries together with their collaboration with the Western States, particularly the US. The condition facing the Muslim immigrants in Western Europe was just proof of the denigration of Muslims.

Two singularities impacted upon this situation, the war in Afghanistan and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The war brought together also a transnational band of fighters for the Islamic cause, and showed (rightly or wrongly) that Islamic forces could successfully defeat a superpower. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict was, in this interpretation of the world, expressive of that justice and equity was not to be had from the hands of infidels – and that the Palestinian suffering could only be ended through violence against the oppressors.

Who were those who created this ideology? And who acted upon it, even to the degree of the suicide acts of 9/11? To say that this ideology was created by people like Bin Laden is not very correct – Mawdudi and others had spelled out its essentials half a century ago. However, it was picked up and energized by persons who were in many ways really characterized by their transnational qualities. Not only did they come from different States, but they were also in large measure dispossessed by these States. They represented the excluded, and their identification was with a variety of Muslim situations: the conditions in the Middle East, Afghanistan, Pakistan, the Muslim minorities in Europe, the Palestinians. We are, with a very peculiar example, back to Niebuhr's religion of the dispossessed. The logic goes: the dispossessed demands a reversal of the social order, and since this social order is seen as manifest in a global web of deceit and dependencies, as far as the loci of powers are concerned in this ideologizing, the global order of things have to be changed. And the transnationals, unrestricted by a homeland geography and secular solidarities within the homelands, were the one's who could see themselves as the vanguard of transformation. The fact that some of these, with bin Ladin as the paradigmatic example, of course, were born into wealth and status does not detract from the characterization of dispossession. What he, and his ideological compatriots reacted against, was not their private

situations, but the denigration of the social world which they felt they were a part of – and this social world came to be interpreted as the global Muslim community.

The fractionalization of nationalist, socialist and capitalist endeavors as well as fractionalized class belongings, is one thing to remember when trying to understand why 'no other' ways of formulating protests were available. To avoid misunderstandings, it should be pointed out that other 'solutions' of course existed. Niebuhr would presumably point to other-worldly asceticism as one possible avenue, and doubtless many have gone this way. In the rough and tumble of human existence, however, we can be fairly certain that all possible avenues of ideologizing and acting will be tried out, each by few or by many.

Conclusions

This article presents an argument to the effect that Islamism and fundamentalism may be firmly generated out of and contained within modernity and globalization [201] This, of course, also means that the distinction here is not between McWorld and Jihad, but that there are varieties of McWorld, and one of them is McJihad. It also follows, that a focus on religion (in this particular case Islam) is misguided - religion always encodes social, political and economic circumstances, and expresses them in culturalized understandings. Similarly, an argument which denies the religious component will be impoverished – contextual factors –political, economic, social- will be appropriated into the shape and form of religion and religiously argued expressivity. This brings us to the issue of context, in the case discussed above with a focus upon the diasporic conditions. It is notable that the literature about 9/11 has dealt with it within bounded categories, such as Islam, Muslims, the Arab world, the West, conditions in particular States, etc. Once the diasporic dimension is introduced, in terms of its historical developments, in terms of its relationships with what causes there was for the diaspora to emerge, in terms of what different social organizational potential and ideological developments that were/are possible in the diaspora, then it is possible to trace the process through which a totalizing ideology resulting in 9/11 could emerge.

This process is, of course, just one of several organizational and ideological expressions in the diaspora. That it would embrace a fairly small number of people and that it represents an unstable organization is also clear. So would, e.g., investments in families, careers, and property, in the countries of residence serve to steer life careers in another direction than totalizing actions/ideologies.

The European nation-States showed a violence during the past century which surpassed anything else. In a contemporary world, where the diasporic condition is a prominent fact, the general lack of diasporic violence is notable. To understand violence *of* the diaspora, both within the diaspora as well as towards countries hosting diasporas, we have to understand what the diasporic conditions in themselves provide in terms of ideological and social possibilities and closures.

References

Anderson, Benedict (1987), *Imagined Communities.Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso.

Baudrillard, Jean (2002), *The Spirit of Terrorism: and Requiem for the Twin Towers*, London: Verso.

Bergen, P. L. (2002), *Holy War, Inc.: Inside the Secret World of Osama bin Laden*, London: Phoenix.

Berger, Peter L. & Luckmann, Thomas (1967), *The Social Construction of Reality,* Garden City: Anchor Books.

Burgat, François (2003), *Face to Face with Political Islam*, London: I.B. Tauris.

Gerholm, T. & Lithman, Y. G. (1988), *The New Islamic Presence in Western Europe*, London: Mansells.

Jimenez, M. (2003), 'Imam of Terrorism' calls police, *National Post* (Ottawa).

Kapferer, B. (ed.) (2002), "Forum – The World Trade Center and Global Crisis", *Social Analysis,* 46:1.

Kepel, Gilles (1987), *Les banlieues de l'Islam: Naissance d'une religion en France*, Paris : Seuil.

Jihad: The Trail of Political Islam (2002), Harvard, Mass.: Belknap.

Kelly, R.J. (1998), "Armed Prophets and Extremists: Islamic Fundamentalism, in Kushner, H.W. (ed.), *The Future of Terrorism: Violence in the New Millenium*, London: Sage.

Lewis, Bernard (2002), "Fundamental Truths", *Financial Times*, August 10/11 (Interview).

The Crisis of Islam: Holy War and Unholy Terror, (2003), New York: Modern Library.

Marty, M. E. & Appleby, R.C. (eds.) (1993), *Fundamentalisms and Society: Reclaiming the Sciences, the Family, and Education*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Niebuhr, R. (1975), *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*, New York: Meridian.

Rex, J. (1988), "Urban Sociology of Religion and Islam in Birmingham", in Gerholm & Lithman, *op. cit*.

[201] The most comprehensive argument that fundamentalism is a reaction against modernity is perhaps Marty & Appleby, 1993.

Schiffauer, W. (1988), “Migration and Religiousness”, in Gerholm & Lithman, *op. cit*.

Thomä-Venske, H. (1988), “The Religious Life of Muslims in Berlin”, in Gerholm & Lithman, *op. cit*.

Weber, Max (1965), *The Sociology of Religion*, London: Methuen.

Virillio, Paul (2002), *Ground Zero*, London: Verso

Zizek S. (2002), *Welcome to the Desert of the Real! Five Essays on September 11 and Related Dates*, London: Verso.

THE FORMATION OF TRANSNATIONAL IDENTITIES AMONG YOUNG MUSLIMS IN DENMARK

GARBI SCHMIDT, DANISH NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL RESEARCH AND THE ACADEMY OF MIGRATION STUDIES IN DENMARK

Introduction

It was a Friday evening. The close knit group of young Muslims that I had frequented for the last one month held their weekly meeting in the Islamic school, located on the outskirts of a larger Swedish city. Why took the role as teacher varied. None of the participants had any formal training in Islamic theology and religious authority was mainly a product of dedication to the group, to independent studies of Islam and outspokenness during the sessions.

On that evening Malik, a young man in his mid-twenties, spoke. Obviously he had prepared himself thoroughly, bringing a disordered stack of letter-size papers with him. From where I sat I could easily see from where he had gathered his material. The layout of the pages and the indication of Internet addresses at the bottom of each of them, suggested that the source of his information was the Internet. The abundance of material fostered the imagery of Malik, sitting in front of a computer, printing a word, a concept, a sentence in an Internet search engine, coming up with hundreds, perhaps thousands of web pages that all fitted his quest. Or perhaps Malik had surfed into an Internet page on Islam that he liked, using the (numerous?) links that it contained to find the material he wanted to cover the evening's topic?

Malik's talk that evening was on the violent confrontations between Palestinians and Israeli forces that had increased within the last weeks. A third actor in the conflict whose role he dwelled on at length was that of the United States. The United States, he stressed, was a supporter of the unjust and violent acts of the Israeli government. People should consider what kind of food and other product they were buying. If they bought Coca Cola or burgers at McDonalds' they invested in Israeli bullets used to shoot at Palestinian ambulances. Was the blood of martyrs

cheaper than McDonald's ketchup? There was a *fatwa* on this issue, Malik stated, emphasizing the religious significance of his statement.

***

The above example grants us a view of a real life situation in which Internet produced and distributed Islamic knowledge is used and applied into daily life. Documents were downloaded, printed and then voiced as authoritative arguments within a small group of Muslim youth. Unfortunately, it is infrequently that we as researchers have the opportunity to peep over the shoulders of our informants when they search the "Net". Given the random, individualized nature of Internet searches[202] this is an important, yet rather unexplored aspect of how Islamic transnational communities and identity formations based on knowledge and interpretations considered authoritative are created through this medium. The Internet is not the only facilitator of transnational community building that are difficult to investigate or determine the importance of. What are, for example, the implications of mobile phones, SMS, or just the old-fashioned snail-mail letters in gray envelops that people send to each other? These are aspects of national and transnational networking that deserve more attention, not least if the goal is to develop a methodological approach for empirical studies of their significance.

In this paper my intention is not to give an answer to this important question. Rather, raising the question is a way to frame what I see as the present limitations that we face when seeking to describe transnational identity and community building through means of communication, as well as aspects that I believe we have to discuss further in the future. I base my present study on Muslim Internet activities on material that I have gathered through 1: my membership of Muslim Internet forums in Denmark, Sweden and the United States and 2: my fieldwork ("real life") experience among Muslims in the very same countries. In my research work the two aspects have been intertwined from early on: the Internet was a way to gather information about communities in which I intended to carry out fieldwork before I got there, and it was and is a way to continuously update and extend my knowledge about them when I left again. In that sense it

[202] See also Gary Bunt, 2000:3.

could be argued that I created my own transnational networks, my own imagination of the transnational.

However, a central hypothesis of this paper is that transnational Islamic communities and transnational Islamic identity formations are indeed created through what is generally known as CMC (Computer Mediated Communication). We are dealing with entities that are not only *imagined* (by, for example researchers) but *real* in the sense that they play roles in peoples' lives. The significance of Internet communities can be underlined by the amount of time that people spend on them. To give an example, it is not uncommon that 30 emails are distributed daily through one of the email forum, DFC, that I discuss in detail below. To skim, delete, read or answer some of these emails may take from several minutes to hours, hereby underlining that membership is a timely investment, a priority. Time in front of the computer is time taken away from work, families and "real-life" friends. In that sense writing emails and surfing the Internet is serious business with a motivating "spin-off", not just fun. Belonging to an Internet forum, for example, grants access to knowledge and contacts; a place to belong in the seemingly placeless and faceless friends to share the journey with. And it may, depending on the purpose of the forum, grant answers to questions that a person find of relevance to his or her life situation and values.

Although the paper started out with a fieldwork based account of how Internet information was used, in one instance, by young Muslims in Sweden, my focus will from now on be on Denmark. In other words: Although the paper seeks to explore how transnational communities and identities are established through the Internet, it does so from the perspective of one national context. I argue that transnational aspects of the everyday life of Muslims in the West, based or not based on CMC, are dependent on, limited by, and lived according to the condition of (secular) nation States. Networks and mobility do not necessarily terminate the importance of national borders, national legislations and certainly not the (to some romantic, to others horrific) construction of national identities.[203] Transnationalism in whatever form it takes is perceived and lived according to the challenges that people face in everyday life.

The Internet transmits an overwhelming amount of information on Islam. At the time that I prepared this paper the search engine Google found more than 4.3 million pages containing the word "Islam" and more than 3.1 million pages containing the word "Muslim."[204] The question is: what segments of this massive amount of information generates and supports transnational Muslim communities and identities? Are they all doing so? Looking on websites only, the answer is that because such documents are accessible to anyone (unless censored) anywhere in the world, they are all *potentially* transnational. But the term "potentially" must be stressed here. No matter how beautifully designed and well structured an Internet page is created there is no guarantee that it is actually visited by the curious members of the wider Net-community. Information on the Internet is clustered information, created on one hand by narrowed searches (if you search on the word Islam and the million of pages come up you will probably narrow your search to fit your expectations more closely) and on the other by the hypertext[205] – linked – structure of many web pages. Much the same can be said about Internet based discussion forums, although their potential to be known and visited by a wider audience can be (consciously) limited. Many forums have rules concerning the kind of members they permit to participate, and the kind of information that members may circulate outside the forum.

In this paper I will mainly concentrate on Internet based community and identity building among young well-educated Muslims in Denmark. I will do so mainly by referring to material gathered on the Internet forum DFC (Danmarks Forenede Cybermuslimer – Denmark's United Cyber Muslims) a closed and moderated discussion forum for subscribing members. However, to put the debate and information into a transnational perspective, I equally refer to forums based outside Denmark, be it in other Scandinavian countries and the United States.

The Internet – a Frontier of Networks and Identities?

One frontier that can serve to link up the Ummah is cyberspace, or the Internet. We may ask ourselves if cyberspace is the means by which we can revitalize the Islamic way of life. I firmly

---

[203] Schmidt, 2003.
[204] Just for comparison: Documents containing the word "sex" was found by Google more than 69,8 million times and the word "Christ" 12.3 million times. The term "Internet community" was mentioned in 640,000 documents.
[205] Bolter, 1991.

believe that the Internet can be used to organize a society based on Qur'anic principles…. This is a prime way to reach out to our brothers and sisters and galvanize us into an active citizenship of the Ummah, thus strengthening us individually and collectively as well as preserving our Islamic heritage and ideals.[206]

The above quotation was posted by a member of an American email list in the mid-1995. The Internet was not a new invention at that time; however, it was new that so many so easily had access to the medium. The Internet was growing rapidly, creating hopes for a brighter future, based on information. It was on the basis of information and a shared interest in niches of information that new communities were – ideally - to be created (or recreated).

Both communities and identities were perceived as being possibly virtual. New concepts were created in the process. For example, the concept of "CyberMuslim" was launched on the website "Dunya". Mas'ood Cajee, who created the site, presented it as a "*caravansary on the electronic frontier of the world wide web, brought to you by the CyberMuslim Information Collective*." DUNYA was "*a virtual Islamic community in Webspace*."[207] The concept of the CyperMuslim soon spread to other contexts, other localities of the world. In 1996, three young Swedish Muslims established SFCM (Sveriges Förenade CyberMuslimer; Sweden's United CyberMuslims[208]), and in 1998 the Danish equivalent, DFC[209], another "CyberMuslim" forum appeared. That the term within a couple of years spread from the United States to more "remote" corners of the world suggests two things: On one hand the Internet as a medium generate ideas, inspiration and concepts *particular* to this space and, on the other hand, that these ideas, trails of inspiration and concepts are shared (in this case) by Muslims in different corners of the world.

In that sense CyberIslam is an element of a broader - in the words of Peter Mandaville – "*global infrastructure for the maintenance, reproduction and dissemination of Islam*."[210] The Muslim use of the Internet for religious purposes and the effect that this endeavor has on the creation of a transnational Muslim identity and sense of community is intertwined with the use of satellite

[206] Rabbani, 1995 (email).
[207] Cajee, 1995 (email).
[208] Internet: http://hem.passagen.se/sfcm/. For an introduction to the mailing list, see Schmidt 1999.
[209] Internet: http://www.islam.dk/.

dishes, the distribution of Islamic literature by Islamic publishers based in various parts of the world, by migration, by travel. Therefore it is difficult, if not impossible, to measure the *size* of impact that Internet communication may have. However, what can be done is to point to some of the trails and forums sharing that are can be monitored on the Internet, to present and analyze the content of such information, and also – as I tried to do in the introduction – point to and analyze the settings and situations outside the Net where information gathered on the Internet is presented and how it is received by a larger audience of peers.

Transnational Muslim Identities

Before proceeding to concrete examples of how the Internet is used within the "global infrastructure" of current Islam, it is of importance to describe the fabric of transnational Muslim identities. Such identity formation is by no means to be understood as a general, conform way of interpreting and living Islam, neither is it to be seen as occurrences mainly created by Internet communication. Transnational Muslim identity formation can be described as a number of themes and arguments that seem to flourish among Muslims in different national contexts. In my own work it was revealing to me when I, after 1 year of fieldwork among immigrant Muslims in Chicago returned to Copenhagen and heard similar arguments and ways of self perception repeated among immigrant Muslims in Denmark. Themes such as Islam and democracy, Islam and human rights, Islam and women's suffrage, Islam as "beyond cultural", and Islam as a rational, personal choice were and are enthusiastically presented and explained in ways that appear context independent, stereotypical.

One example of such context independent formulations of an Islamic identity is when young Muslims claim to return to a non-cultural, pristine Islam. Such interpretation of Islam is argued independent of regional or any other boundaries; as a matter of fact the very transgression of boundaries through the process of migration (as well as the use of technology) has furthered the return to genuine Islamic practices. Whereas young Muslims frequently argue that the religious practices of the parental generation are mixed up and degenerated by the traditions of their homelands, they are convinced that life in Diaspora has given their own generation a chance to

---

[210] Mandaville, 2002.

see Islam in a new light. By meeting fellow Muslims in high schools or schools of higher learning they have come to see what they religiously have in common and what sets them apart. And by focusing on commonalities they believe themselves able to return to a pristine, progressive Islam where human difference is not a devaluating factor but a resource for communal action (and attraction), granted and wanted by Allah. As stated by young Danish Muslim:

What I see is that some [of the parents] do not at all consider carefully that they are Muslims. It is not something that runs deep… You are just Muslim because your forefathers have been so for centuries. That is the way that they practice Islam. It is just rituals that have to be done … But what I see is that when young Muslims begin to study, begin to read and want to understand what is written, their [Islamic] practice also changes. They are somehow moving away from the cultural barriers that are . . . It is of less importance to be Pakistani, Yugoslav or Turk, or wherever people are coming from…[211]

The above quote introduces another element of current Islamic identity formations across national lines: that of an Islamic identity as something that is achieved through studies. Although you may be a Muslim by birth, you can only truly be identified as a Muslim if you know what this identification is about. Not only because your non-Muslim surroundings frequently demand that you are capable of defending your religion from early on in your life, but equally because it a token of personal dedication to present your Islamic identity as a well considered choice. You were aware of an almost indefinite magnitude of options, you were aware of the bad image that Islam has on almost every niche of the public arena (nationally as well as internationally), but you still made the choice. Further, since the choice of an Islamic identity is argued a product of intense study and scrutiny, it is also presented as rational. Hereby the choice of an Islamic identity becomes a way to fulfil perfectly the expectations of societies in which claims to individualization and rationality are buzzwords within dominant discourses.

[211] Interview (taped by author), September 26, 2001.

Interestingly, both aspects of identity formation (or, perhaps better, identification[212]) relate in one way of another to consequences of transnational networks, flows of information and norms. The focus on a non-cultural formulation of Islam is presented as having its foundation in migration, in the creation of Muslim diasporas (particularly in the West). To get "beyond" culture and find a common agenda within the framework of religion is accentuated to an ideal, based on real life experiences and challenges. Islam becomes *the* means to transcend difference altogether, be it the differences between believers, or the experience of being a migrant citizen in a "new" host society. It is possible to be Muslim *and* Pakistani *and* Danish. Thereby it is – arguably – possible to find common grounds with fellow the believers, coming from other parts of the world, that pray next to you in the local mosque. Just as importantly, it becomes increasingly possible to imagine oneself as connected and sharing a common identity with Muslims in other parts of the world.

Similarly, the personal choice of Islam relates to transnationalism in the sense that it is presented as (partially) based on the awareness of religious diversity. Young people born into Muslim families seldom claim a deep and profound knowledge of other (religious) philosophies, but they still present their choice of Islam as based on comparison: They chose Islam because they found this religion superior to other ways of thought, containing an innate logic that could only be God-given. More explicit are the stories by converts, of which quite a number are available on the Internet.[213] A common theme in these stories is the convert's experiments with other religions – Christianity, Buddhism, Hinduism – before finding a safe-haven in Islam. For both "born and "revert" Muslims Islam is acknowledged and presented as one possible way of living and believing and, using the comparative perspective as an implicit and explicit aspect of their argumentation, to be the most attractive one.

One important transnational aspect of Islamic identity formation that must be taken into account is the idea of the *Ummah*, the community of Muslim believers. The *Ummah* is repeatedly

---

[212] Cesari, 2003. Cesari writes on the distinction between identity and identification: "*Identity is not to be perceived as a structure, but as a dynamic process. This is why it is more relevant to talk about identification (rather than identity), in order to put the emphasis on the fact that an individual defines him/herself as multidimensional and likely to evolve over time*" (p. 4-5).

[213] A number of Danish conversion stories can be found on www.islam.dk. Internationally (and including an international perspective), the following pages can be useful: "Conversion: Islam, the Growing Religion":

mentioned in the Qur'an, but it is not until globalization in its "modern appearance" that Muslims have come to see their community as truly global.[214] Travel, migration and the speed of communication are facilitators of this development, which is both a religious idea(l) as well as something utilized and *experienced*.[215] Some of my young informants in Denmark, involved in the two (local) youth chapters of the global movement Idara Minhaj al-Qur'an describe how they spend their summer holiday traveling from one European chapter of the movement to another. Other informants participate in Muslim conferences in other Scandinavian countries. Further, speakers from outside Denmark (for example, Tariq Ramadan and Anne Sofie Roald) are invited to conferences and lectures, adding to the sensation of belonging to something "larger". Finally, we have the Internet through which experiences of community that cannot merely be determined virtual (that is, not truly true) are generated.

To get more specific again, the experience, effect and use of Muslim transnational spaces on the Internet, I would argue, is factual, not virtual. What is virtual and imagined is the egalitarian, democratic access to such effects and utilizations. For one thing they cannot be separated from a class perspective: The people who can allow themselves to study Islam in dept, who can verbalize their findings authoritatively, who have the temporal and financial surplus to create well-structured web-pages are mainly well-educated middle and higher middle class people. Secondly, the ideas distributed through the structures of the Internet (and other aspects of the transnational arena) are by no means implemented similarly within different contexts. Here, it truly makes sense to talk about the trans-*national* in the sense that although Internet forums may create the sense of a boundless community, the ideas circulated are still applied to the particular expectations and challenges that are dominant within the context where people actually live. The nation State with its particular set of legislation and identification and objectification of a national self (a process that in some countries has intensified as a result of globalization) produces a framework, a framed stage, that even ideas claiming to transcend and defy such limitations are constrained by. The activism of young Muslims look different in countries such as Denmark,

---

http://www.salaam.co.uk/themeofthemonth/june02_index.php?l=6; "Islam: The True Religion: Converts" http://www.thetruereligion.org/converts.htm.

[214] Esposito, 1992:10, Turner, 1994:86.

[215] Friedman, 2000: 640.

Sweden or the United States (to give a few examples[216]), although ideas circulated between Muslims living in these contexts may look similar.

The Virtual *Ummah*

So how is it then that Muslim Internet communities are created through the Internet? I will start out with some general considerations on the fabric of such communities, continuing with some examples of how such communities share and distribute information transnationally.

Muslim communities on the Internet are created in multiple ways. One way can be defined as *consultative*, that is, a person may use and identity her/himself with certain information available on the Internet (Web pages) according to a conviction that such pages express Islam in a way that he or she finds inspiring, authoritative, trustworthy. The existence of such consultative communities is underlined by a common, innate feature of the Internet: that of links. Most Internet pages contain such links, underlining the function of the page and frequently the identity of the person/s behind it. If we take a page such as www.islam.dk the stress is on function, whereas an (American) page as www.jannah.org, created by the young computer graduate Huma Ahmed underlines aspects of personal interest and even personal inadequacies, as when she presents a cluster of five links to Muslim scholars as based on her limited knowledge on *fiqh*.[217] Identity and through that a sense of community is created by information that other Muslims have made available.

Other forums, however, are much more intimate and communicative. Examples of such communities are discussion groups such as DFC. On a national level DFC has, according to its moderator, created a community that has both heightened the level of Muslim activism beyond the Internet and has created a place where even those who are busy with other of life's endeavors have time to discuss their religion. Internet forums such as DFC give intimacy in the sense that people "get to know each other" though the sharing of information and experiences. Interestingly,

[216] Schmidt, 2002; Schmidt, 2003.
[217] http://www.jannah.org/me/

such "virtual" experiences are not necessarily seen as inferior to "face-to-face" meetings. As underlined by the moderator's account of a meeting with a DFC member outside the Internet: *After three years of acquaintance I met one of the active people in DFC in [name of city]. It was quite interesting. We knew each other and said to each other that it would be a good idea if we met each other one day.[but the meeting] did not give, how can I put it, any "physical" results*.[218]

As a matter of fact, to some Muslims, Internet forums can be the only "place" where they meet other Muslims. A young female convert that I spoke to in the fall of 2000 described that after having chosen Islam, her only contact to other Muslims took place in a moderated discussion forum for Muslim women, living in several nations of the world. To her, the Internet actually generated an intimate sense of community, and did so across national boundaries.

How is it then that ideas and information is circulated and shared *transnationally* within and across such communities? Is the transnational ever consciously *excluded*? As noted by Peter Mandaville there is "*no central authority and there is very little co-ordination between [the] various constitutive elements*"[219] of the global Islamic infrastructure. In that sense there is no determined standards for communication or "commando roads." Although people may belong to several forums on the Internet, it can by no means be taken for granted that they transmit information from one forum to another. The Internet is vitalized by individual action: if nobody is doing something, be it sending emails, creating or visiting websites, the Internet is not "there". In that sense the Internet is a construction of human action, the people who take action at a certain moment in time, and the kind of action that they take.

If we take DFC as an examples, far from all emails posted within this forum highlight transnational aspects of the *Ummah*. Many emails deal with a number of "localized" reactions, such as discussions about the role that Islam should play in Danish society, inquiries about where to buy *halal* meat, question about Internet viruses, complaints about too many mails, recommendations of the best shawarma bars in Copenhagen[220]… Until September 11, 2001[221] the

[218] Interview, January 7. 2001.
[219] Mandaville, 2002.
[220] See www.islam.dk.
[221] Email: "Re: dansk??" Private correspondence with the moderator of DFC, Fatih Alev. June 5. 2003.

policy of the list was that emails send to the list should be kept in Danish only. The idea was that Muslims living in Denmark should be able to discuss aspects of their life and faith, unrestricted by aspects such as language proficiency. This is a philosophy that still impacts the direct correspondence between members of the forum. Danish is used as the language of discussion, thereby leaving out potential members of DFC who do not speak or understand this language.

However, the impact of a transnational circulation of information, a transnational presence, is noticeable in the forum in two ways. Firstly, although language in many ways restricts the number of potential members to the list, this does not mean that it is only people living in Denmark who participate. DFC has members who live in Great Britain, Germany, Sweden and Norway. Some of these have been born in Denmark and then moved elsewhere, others participate because they understand Danish, which is close to the other Scandinavian languages. Such members are aware of and relate to the DFC's *Sitz im Leben* as that of Denmark, but they frequently do so according to the perspective of comparison: In Britain, Germany, Norway the situation is so and so while it is so and so in Denmark. Also, members of DFC may participate in other forums, such a SFCM, posting information from such lists on DFC whenever it seems applicable.

Secondly, the impact of transnational connections on DFC is that of downloads. Although – as remarked above – DFC tried to restrict the posting of downloads in other languages than Danish before September 11, 2001, something happened around that date. The impact of an event taking place in the United States but with noticeable effect on Muslims in Scandinavia (as elsewhere) marked – at least on DFC – a change in perspectives. The "world got so close", so urgently felt within a local context, that certain borders could no longer be upheld. This tendency was undoubtedly furthered by the fact that only a limited amount of information was and is available in Danish on the Internet. For example, searchable Qur'ans and hadith collections are available on the Internet in English, but not in Danish.[222] In that sense a strict observance of linguistic rules would limit the sharing of information and knowledge, thus hampering the options for discussion. After all, to download on the Internet is to know. Not in the (old-fashioned?) sense of remembering, but of knowing how to fast and precise search and find the facts and arguments

that can strike an audience (on or beyond the Net) with awe. To make trustworthy material available to others increases one's status – identification – as a Muslim.

September 11: the Web of Suffering

As remarked above, what happened on September 11, 2001 affected the transnational perspective of DFC. As a matter of fact, September 11 is one of the most intense examples of how Muslim communities spread and share information considered as relevant to them all on the Internet, and how the Internet serves as a facilitator for the experience of a transnational *Ummah*. My description of the event is complex in the sense that it takes place in several places at one time. The locations that I cover here are Denmark, Sweden and the United States – many more could be included, but these were the online spaces where I was present at the time, being able to follow parallel flows at information from hour to hour.

In Denmark, September 11th to begin with was a great day for Muslims. On that day several media published the news that a coalition of the country's Muslim youth organizations had taken an initiative to bring down the number of serial rapes committed by second generation youth. On the Danish Muslim Internet list DFC people were discussing the situation in Palestine and an upcoming Muslim youth conference.[223] On MSANEWS, the United States' probably largest distributor of news on Islam and Muslims at the time, people were encouraged to reserve seats for the upcoming CAIR banquet in Los Angeles.[224] The first email on the Danish list dealing with the tragedy in America was posted 7:51pm Danish time, almost 5 hours after the first plane crashed into the North Tower of the World Trade Center. The email encourages people to participate in a demonstration taking place on the city hall square of Copenhagen.[225] On MSANEWS reactions to the crash came much earlier and in a much larger number. The Muslim Public Affairs Council was probably the first to act, posting its statement on the terrorist attacks less than two hours after they had started.[226]

---

[222] So far an authorized Qur'an does not exist in the Danish language.
[223] "Believe it or not". DFC, email, September 11. 2001, 12:57am (6:57am EST). "Konference i Århus", DFC, email, September 11, 2001, 4:15pm (10:15pm EST).
[224] "CAIR-LA: Annual Banquet - Reserve Your Seats" MSANEWS, email, September 11, 2001 (3:20am EST)
[225] "Rådhuspladsen 20:30!" DFC, email, September 11, 2001, 7:51pm (1:51pm EST).
[226] " MPACnews: Statement on Terrorist Attacks", MSANEWS, email, September 11, 2001 (10:53am EST)

In Denmark and Sweden, statements from Muslim organizations came a little later. ON SFCM, a Swedish online forum, the Swedish organization Swedish Young Muslims (SMUF: Sveriges Unga Muslimer) posted a press release the same evening, which both included reflections on the tragedy of the event as well as statements that Islam, a religion of peace, in no way could be seen as responsible for the event.[227] Interestingly, the Danish equivalent to SMUF (FASM, Foreningen af Studerende Muslimer) submitted a press release on the following day in Denmark that included an exact translation of the Swedish press release.[228]

The Internet became an important means to communicate on the event in the following days and months. Early emails include reactions from other parts of the Muslim community, particularly from organizations in the United States, examples of hate mails,[229] and warnings. An email posted on a local email list for Muslims in the Los Angeles area warned people that their phones might be tapped, encouraged people not to walk alone, and encouraged Muslim girls to keep a low profile and to invest in pepper sprays.[230] In the same city a contact list, including phone numbers and emails, was created "for the safety and personal convenience" of Muslims on and off campus.[231] Similar warnings were posted on SFCM.[232] In that sense the Internet became a means through which (young) Muslims could update themselves on the global situation of the *Ummah* (e.g. by quoting other newsmedia or sources than the ones referred to on national television), and as a means to create local safety nets. Sharing of hate mails and warnings show us the urgency and *angst* of the situation. The risk of violence was intimately felt and shared.

Over the next couple of weeks the content of the emails changes. First, there was the condemnation of US interference in Afghanistan (starting October 7th) and the loss of innocent lives. There was the question why the West mourned the victims at WTC but not the victims in Palestine.[233] Then appeared emails discussing whether others than Osama bin Laden could have

---

[227] "VB: Sveriges Unga Muslimer fordömer terroristattackerna." email, SFCM, September 11, 2001.
[228] "Pressemeddelelse: Nej til terror!" To be found at the Web page Islamisk studiebogssamling, www.islamstudie.dk.
[229] "Mails til islam.dk", DFC, September 12, 2001.
[230] "***Important Safety Info***UCI Campus***", MSU-UCI, September 13, 2001.
[231] "///URGENT CONTACTS///", MSU-UCI, September 13, 2001.
[232] "Mana varandra till försiktighet" email, SFCM, September 11, 2001.
[233] " FW: [*** LLP ***] America, We Feel your Pain, Do you Feel Ours? (Ramzy Baroud)" DFC, September 15, 2001.

masterminded the attacks.[234] Were there not many other agents on the international and American scene that could benefit from the attacks more than Muslims, such as Israel, Sharon, Mosad, or the CIA? Such emails can be seen as examples of how Muslims slowly regained a foothold, sometimes defensively, by clinging to conspiracy theories that pointed to other agents than Muslims (or, in the case of Saudi Arabia, a country and a regime considered corrupt by many Western Muslims). The American military action in Afghanistan and later the escalation of the conflict in the Middle East served as important means to (re)gather Muslims around a common cause, having the defense of the suffering *Ummah* as a focal point.

Whereas most statements on the Internet in the wake of the attack were made by organizations and newsagents (Muslim as well as non-Muslim), one individual in particular became an icon for how Muslims coped with the trauma in several localities: Imam Hamza Yusuf. That exactly he became a central figure in the formulation of a transnational Muslim individualized response to 9/11 can be attributed to several factors. For one thing he was invited to the White House on September 20th together with other religious leaders to talk with the President on the tragedy.[235] Although having a well-established "pop star" status among Western Muslims, his (at least temporary) transformation into "*the West's most influential Islamic Scholar*" (to quote the British newspaper *The Guardian*) was a post-September 11th event.[236] Imam Hamza had often spoken critically on the global dominance of the West and the English language[237] but still used it – through audiotapes, videos and Internet – to reach an audience outside America. In that sense he highlighted the hybridity and dilemma of many Westernly born Muslims. On the one hand the West (especially the United States) was/is seen as playing an antithetical and oppressive role in relation to Muslims in non-Western parts of the world, on the other hand the West was/is the environment that these youngsters/young adults live and act in, e.g. speaking Danish or English

---

[234] " WHO CRASHED THEE PLANES?" DFC, September 16, 2001; "Fw: HAAERTZ: 5 Israelis detained for `puzzling behavior' after WTCtragedy" DFC, September 18, 2001; "Masterminds Behind The American Tragedy," DFC, September 26, 2001; " FW: (Fwd) SAUDI/CIA CONNECTIONS." DFC, November 2, 2001.

[235] "Interview with Shaykh Hamza Yusuf by Michael Enright on the September 11 Tragedy" MSANEWS, September 27. The impact of Hamza Yusuf in the days and weeks after September 11 was also noticeable in the two Scandinavian discussion forums DFC and SCM. Mails containing speeches and interviews with Hamza Yusuf were posted on SFCM on at least three dates (September 18; September 23; October 9), while postings appeared on DFC on September 19 and September 24.

[236] Jack O'Sullivan: "If You Hate the West, Emigrate to a Muslim Country." *The Guardian*, October 8, 2001. Internet: http://www.guardian.co.uk/g2/story/0,3604,564960,00.html

[237] "Interview with Sheikh Hamza Yusuf by Nuh Ha Mim Keller" *al-Qalam* 1998. Internet: http://www.users.globalnet.co.uk/~iidc/qalam/index.html

better than the language of their parents.[238] The critical yet inclusive rhetoric of Imam Hamza before September 11th compared to his rhetoric after the event made him a well chosen symbol for the emotional reactions and reflective transformation that many Western Muslims (young and old) recognized from their own lives. Two days before the attack Imam Hamza gave a speech including the words: "*This country is facing a terrible fate. And the reason for that is this because this country stands condemned*."[239] After the attack he said that "*Islam has been hijacked by a discourse of anger and a rhetoric of rage*"[240] calling the hijackers of the planes "*mass murders, pure and simple*," and stating that the real martyrs were "*those brave firefightes and police that went in there to save human lives and in that process lost their own*."[241] Imam Hamza's speeches and interviews in the days after 9/11 were both introspectory (what went wrong and why?) and defensive, defending the ethical and humanitarian qualities of "true Islam" and calling for strategies to show these qualities in a Western environment:

Conspiracy or not, we are to blame for the terrible backlash against Muslims. The simple reason is that when a crazy Christian does something terrible, everyone in the West knows it is the actions of a mad man because they have some knowledge of the core beliefs and ethics of Christianity. When a mad Muslim does something evil or foolish they assume it is from the religion of Islam, not because they hate us but because they have never been told by a Muslim what the teachings of Islam are all about[242]

September 11, 2001 was a global event. Although the fire was seen on Manhattan the smoke was everywhere, dark and suffocating. The urgency of the situation created similar responses among Muslims in different places of the Western world (the above examples did not include examples from regions such as Africa, the Middle East or Asia), and highlighted the interconnectedness of Muslim communities in these places. It was not that people were not forced to relate to the events of the local, but information shared through channels such as the Internet created a common platform of behavior, and – I am almost tempted to say – a common *psyche*. The element of a community was important in this process. The sense of belonging to a community – suffering,

---

[238] E.g. interview (taped by author), September 18, 2001.
[239] Moore, Solomon (2001): "Fiery Words, Disturbed Meaning", *Los Angeles Times*, November 3, 2001.
[240] Goldberg, Kate (2001): "Islam 'Hijacked' by Terror*." BBC News*, October 11, 2001.Internet: http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/world/americas/newsid_1591000/1591024.stm.
[241] Scheinin, Richard (2001): "Muslim Scholar: Terrorists are Mass Murderers, not Martyrs", *Mercury New*s, September 15, 2001.
[242] Private email from Pr. Marcia Hermansen: "Another Hamza Yusuf Piece" October 25, 2001.

shocked, but not falling apart – was underlined by the sharing of news and thoughts, from fellow Muslims within or outside national borders, fostering a renewed focus and renewed strength among the participants, living in different countries of the world. In this process the Internet played a significant role by spreading news, thoughts and inspiration rapidly to Muslims living in diverse contexts. Speed created simultaneity, and simultaneity underlined community.

Concluding Remarks: Centers and Peripheries

The Internet is one of the aspects of how Muslim communities and Muslim identities are formed and formulated across boundaries. However, one question that I find of importance in conclusion of this paper, is whether Muslim community building and formations across the Net is a circular process or is determined by a few centers of the world. Taking the events of September 11th as an example it is obvious that much of the information circulated on various lists had its origin in the United States. This was, on one hand, a consequence of the fact that the terrorist attack took place in that country, on the other hand it was undoubtedly a consequence of such messages being written in English. The majority of people in countries such as Denmark and Sweden speak and write English, thus making information in that language accessible and useful. Contrarily, messages in Swedish and Danish cannot be understood by most people in the United States (including Muslims), thereby making such information inaccessible and useless.

The impact of English reading and writing skills is important when we deal with the Internet, since this medium is predominantly a creation of text. Certainly, we got picture, sounds, movies, but most dialogue is created through what people write to each other. Whenever we look for information we write our search terms (again, a linguistic limitation) into a search engine. If something comes up in a language that we do not understand we skip it. And if we skip it, it is not there. As remarked above, the Internet, as known by an individual or a community, is made up by the pages that are activated.

As pointed out by Jørgen S. Nielsen, English has become the *lingua franca* of the world today, including that of many Muslims.[243] The dominance of English both creates a common language that Muslims can use when sharing information across borders, but equally the language creates certain power centers of discourse. One result may be that events taking place in one part of the world is presented as being relevant to a global audience, while events, taking place elsewhere, are invisible. When Muslims in Texas demonstrate against an x-rayed film defaming the Prophet Muhammad the news may actually appear on a list in Denmark.[244] The chance that similar information about event in Denmark (whether written in Danish or English) may appear in an American forum is practically non-existent.

The question is where the "old" Islamic world is left in this discourse. Judging according to the emails that appear within an Internet forum such a DFC there is no doubt that it plays a role. Information on the critical situation in Palestine, Afghanistan, Kashmir, Iraq is distributed and discussed. The awareness is there. However, much of this information is passive in the sense that it is created by Western news media or people living in the West. In contract, distributed downloads from Internet pages in the United States or England is active. It presents, directly, perspectives on religious questions and does so with a *voice*. Information from the Middle East is predominantly news *on* while information from Western sources is news *from*. Hereby not to say that the inspiration from Muslim communities in the Middle East and Asia is non-existent among Muslims in the West. But the impact of people living in non-Western parts of the world on information shared in a forum such as DFC (or SFCM) is limited, because most people do not understand languages such as Arabic or Urdu.

The Internet creates its own space, and within that space certain communities are created. Information is transmitted, downloaded, used as a basis for discussion, generating new thoughts about what it means to be a Muslim, what Islam is about. Although such ideas do not always look the same they play on similar themes to such an extent that one may question the relevance of concepts such as "American" and "European" Islam. As stressed above, this does not imply that the local is irrelevant. Rather, what is local is contextualized within a wider space of networks

[243] Nielsen, 2001:17.

and knowledge, sometimes as entities subordinate to such structures and sometimes as guiding and formative principles.

References

Anderson, Benedict (1991), *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso.
Appadurai, Arjun (1996), *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization,* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Bolter, Jay David (1991), *Writing Space. The Computer, Hypertext, and the History of Writing,* Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
Bunt, Gary (2000), *Virtually Islamic. Computer-Mediated Communication and Cyber Islamic Environments,* Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
Cesari, Jocelyne (2003), "The Construction of Muslim Identities and Group Relations in Europe and the U. S." Paper prepared for the Russell Sage Foundation planning meeting on ""Islam and Muslims in the United States and Europe: Processes of Mutual Accommodation", New York, April 10-12.
Friedman, Jonathan (2000), "Globalization, Class and Culture in Global Systems", *Journal of World-System Research,* VI, 3. Fall/Winter.
Goldberg, Kate (2001), "Islam 'Hijacked' by Terror*", BBC News*, October 11 (Internet: http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/world/americas/newsid_1591000/1591024.stm).
Mandaville, Peter (2002), *Reimagining the Ummah: Transnationalism and the Changing Boundaries of Muslim Political Discourse*. Paper presented at the conference "Globalization, State Capacity and Islamic Movements." Center for Global, International and Regional Studies. Santa Cruz, March 7-10.
Moore, Solomon (2001), "Fiery Words, Disturbed Meaning", *Los Angeles Times*, November 3.
Nielsen, Jørgen S. (2001), "Transnational Islam and the Integration of Islam in Europe." Paper presented at the Second Mediterranean Social and Political Research Meeting, Florence, March 21-25.
O'Sullivan, Jack (2001), "If You Hate the West, Emigrate to a Muslim Country." *The Guardian*, October 8
Internet: http://www.guardian.co.uk/g2/story/0,3604,564960,00.html).
Scheinin, Richard (2001), "Muslim Scholar: Terrorists are Mass Murderers, not Martyrs." *Mercury New*s, September 15.
Schmidt, Garbi, "Sveriges Förenade CyberMuslimer - Blå-gul islam på Internet." (The United CyberMuslim Community of Sweden – Blue and Yellow Islam on the Internet) in *Blågul Islam?* Eds. David Westerlund and Ingvar Svanberg, Nora: Nye Doxa, pp.107-122.
Schmidt, Garbi (2003), "Dialectics of Authenticity: Examples of Ethnification of Islam among Young Muslims in the United States and Denmark" *The Muslim World,* Spring Issue.
Schmidt, Garbi (2003), *Islamic Identity Formation among Young Muslims in Three Western Countries*, Paper prepared for the Russell Sage Foundation planning meeting on ""Islam and Muslims in the United States and Europe: Processes of Mutual Accommodation", New York, April 10-12.

Emails
"Believe it or not". DFC, email, September 11. 2001.
"CAIR-LA: Annual Banquet - Reserve Your Seats" MSANEWS, email, September 11, 2001
Cajee, Mas'ood. 1995. "DUNYA: The CyberMuslim WWW Site!! ***". Email sent to the Internet list Net-Happenings. March 24.
Fatih Alev. 2003. "Re: dansk??" Private correspondence with author. June 5.
" FW: (Fwd) SAUDI/CIA CONNECTIONS." DFC, November 2, 2001.
"FW: [*** LLP ***] America, We Feel your Pain, Do you Feel Ours? (Ramzy Baroud)" DFC, September 15, 2001.
"Fw: HAAERTZ: 5 Israelis detained for `puzzling behavior' after WTCtragedy" DFC, September 18, 2001.
"***Important Safety Info***UCI Campus***", MSU-UCI, September 13, 2001.

[244] "Fwd: TEXAS MUSLIMS PROTEST X-RAYED FILM DEFAMING PROPHET MUHAMMAD." DFC, email, September 18, 2002.

”Interview with Shaykh Hamza Yusuf by Michael Enright on the September 11 Tragedy” MSANEWS, September 27, 2001.
”Konference i Århus”, DFC, email, September 11, 2001, 4:15pm.
”Mails til islam.dk”, DFC, September 12, 2001.
”Mana varandra till försiktighet” email, SFCM, September 11, 2001.
”Masterminds Behind The American Tragedy,” DFC, September 26, 2001.
”MPACnews: Statement on Terrorist Attacks”, MSANEWS, email, September 11, 2001.
Rabbani, Faraz Fareed. 1995. “Do you feel trapped here?” Email sent to the Internet list MSA-L. February 20.
”Rådhuspladsen 20:30!” DFC, email, September 11, 2001.
”VB: Sveriges Unga Muslimer fordömer terroristattackerna.” email, SFCM, September 11, 2001.
”///URGENT CONTACTS///”, MSU-UCI, September 13, 2001.
” WHO CRASHED THEE PLANES?” DFC, September 16, 2001.

Internet Pages
Interview with Sheikh Hamza Yusuf by Nuh Ha Mim Keller. www.users.globalnet.co.uk/~iidc/qalam/index.html
Islam.dk. www.islam.dk/
Islamisk studiebogsamling. www.islamstudie.dk.
Jannah.og: Islam, the eternal way to peace. www.jannah.org
Sveriges Förenade CyberMuslimer. hem.passagen.se/sfcm/

DISCUSSION LED BY JONATHAN FRIEDMAN, EHESS, PARIS

I think that the idea of formation of a Muslim Diaspora in Europe, as some papers have indicated, needs to be deconstructed. On one hand, it is question about very different kinds of migration, which took place in different periods and, on the other hand, about various kinds of identification and re-identification. At this point, I would like to State the importance of perceiving identity as something which people *practice*, not as a theoretical concept. I would even go further, claiming that essentialism is something that people practice quite often and increasingly so, therefore it has to be perceived as a social reality and not as something which is simply subject to criticism. It seems to me that we witness a paradoxical situation: while we are claiming that people are *not* essentializing, that there is *no* essentialism, we claim, on the opposite, the existence of orientalism. Some of the persons claiming all these, are very busy essentializing themselves and the world around them! This is one of the challenging and important issues that need to be discussed and which is source of real conflict.

Comparing the terms "trans-nationalism" and "Diaspora", I think that the use of "trans-nationalism" is more flexible. "Trans-nationalism" is a neutral term that designates the movement of people across national boundaries – it implies the existence of Nation-States, or at least State boundaries, otherwise there can be no trans-State, transnational relationships – On the other hand, diasporization is a complex issue, subject to debates and polemics since a very long time. All of these phenomena are at least two thousand years old, therefore we can claim that they do not constitute what could be called "a new stage of evolution", or "globalization", a term used by certain sociologists such as Manuel Castells who were very much infatuated with the evolutionary nature of these phenomena. I believe that this is not the case. An illustrative example is the Chinese Revolution, which was run almost entirely from outside by the Chinese Diaspora. This was the case as well regarding the Chinese economy. Approximatively 50% of all investment in China derives from the Chinese overseas populations. And as there are fifty millions of them, one realizes that it is quite a large sum. In fact, they are all quite wealthy, except from the slaves of the system which are often family members. This is another interesting aspect related to these questions.

Consequently, we have to examine these matters in terms of practices. Many of the papers indicated that this is in fact the direction that we need to follow. I would add the following consideration: the existence of a particular cultural identity outside of the so called "homeland" needs to be perceived in terms of identification. In other words, migration itself, the demographic movement itself, does not produce anything. It produces neither hybridity, nor Diasporas, unless people *practice* those identities. Therefore, we can claim that it is the conditions under which people practice these identities that need to be understood, since the circumstances *do* change overtime. For instance, there were periods of massive migration which lead to very rapid integration via assimilation. This was the case hundred years ago, when the level of migration and globalization was equivalent – or even more important in terms of percentage – compared with the one of nowadays. There was more globalization of capital, there was the same kind of migration on a massive scale and there were even debates around these issues. In fact, the word "transnational" was first used in 1909 in the *Atlantic Monthly*, as an attempt to create a new kind of American society based on what some people called "pluralism". This attempt was not successful, because of the oppositions of the State and of some elites. America finally experienced assimilation in the period 1918-1920.

It is thought-provoking to note that in France, a very famous sociologist Maurice Halbwachs went to Chicago in the 1920s to study the situation of migrants and the status of this migrant city. Within sociologists, there were lots of debates about migration and ethnicity. It was the main issue in American sociology in the 1920s. When the sociologist in question returned to France, he wrote an article in the *Annales*, in which he claimed that the United States was a very interesting country, a country of immigration, which was not the case about France. Maurice Halbwachs had not even looked at the statistics, according to which France had in fact more migrants per capita than the United States at the same period of time -the early 1920s- ! But they were not classified as migrants, nor as ethnics. Indeed, ethnics in France did not really exist until 1973, when they became an official category, subject of potential studies. The sociologist Durkheim was completely against this notion of *ethnicity*, he believed that it was an uninteresting category, which could not be considered as scientific and therefore as part of the social sciences' research subjects.

As a conclusion, the understanding of host societies, of Nation-States, of their modes of organization, their way of categorization and incorporation of the people who install in these societies, needs to be understood in a very serious manner, dealing with this particular kinds of problems. Other aspects which I consider important to examine at this point, are certain numbers of the parallels that have been raised: for instance, the waves of Pentecostal expansion that took place during this century might be comparable to waves of other religious expansions and other periods of very strong identification. All the preceding considerations lead us, finally, to the situation of nowadays phenomena. But there is a number of certain issues that need to be raised before we proceed to the analysis of the contemporary situation. One of these issues is related to the particular usage of a tool, to which a lot of the speakers have referred to: the Internet. I believe that the question of the Internet is stimulating and needs to be studied. This has not been very often the case, though there is a necessity to proceed to this study. The issue in question is very often used as a rhetorical device to claim that Internet constitutes part of the globalization process. A friend of mine, who has studied the Alevites[245] in Germany, made the observation that the Internet site of this group is particularly developed. After a study on the so called "cookies", it turned out that more than half of them were the secret police. In other words, this question is immediately raised: *who* is watching? Another question: *who* is imagining? We have to look at *who* is imagining these relationships. When we talk about community, we have to be much clearer about precisely what we are referring to. Just as when we talk about Diasporas, we have to understand what we are referring to. Many Diasporas, in fact, do not exist as social realities, since they are basically composed of dispersed populations within which an important part of the interaction is taking place between family *members* across national boundaries and *not* between different *families* in the same local. This depends basically on political organization and on the way people identify. The significance of this phenomenon is quite important. One of the best studies conducted on this topic comes from an anthropologist named Minnie Gotchilla, who studied patients in New York, during a period of 35 years, and discovered that people were not adapting to the *other* society, except from an economical point of view. There are very interesting aspects of these kinds of transnational relationships which could be developed.

[245] Subgroup of Kurd population.

Another aspect of the transnational relations is language, which constitutes a very interesting issue for study. English has become a trade language of the global system, but I would say that it was a pigeon language, in the formal sense. It is a second language for the people that use it, a fact that has very interesting repercussions on the hierarchy of communication. Especially in a context such as the one of the contemporary period, in which we experience the use of Internet. Nowadays there is an opposition to this phenomenon of wide spreading of the English language, coming from East Asia. For instance, the Chinese and the Japanese, are often using as a communication language Finnish –instead of English – and are cooperating for the construction of an operative system which, when accomplished, will completely destroy Microsoft because of the importance of their population size. To conclude, there exist interesting kinds of alternative possibilities that could be discussed. I found very interesting parallels between the different papers and discussions, relating to the modes of identification of people nowadays. The fact that we are here, talking about Muslim identity in Europe, constitutes an issue closely linked to the way the world looks today. In Western Europe, we have experienced a process which started in the seventies and lead to a weakening of the Nation-State as an assimilation machine –basically due to financial reasons- with an accompanying increase of local identities: regional, immigrant, indigenous identities, as well as a transformation of national identity. Indeed, national identity got transformed from citizen-based identity, into a culturally based or ethnicized identity. It seems to me that this process includes as well all forms of religious identities.

The outcome of this is that a common denominator can be found between the proliferation of local identities, which applies equally to the question of Muslim identity, and the question of other religious identities in Europe, which have also begun to proliferate and become stronger. It is question of practice: it is nothing that is simply there, one is not *born* into these contexts, one has to *practice* these identities, otherwise they are simply non existent. It is precisely this practice, mentioned above, that has changed. This change is illustrated by the fact that henceforth people are not practicing by integrating themselves into larger national societies but, on the opposite, they are practicing to become separate and to maintain their separateness. This situation has several repercussions, including on the transnational relationships themselves, which simply constitute an ethnification of migration.

Concerning religion, it may seem to you that I omit taking it into account in these considerations but, on the opposite, it seems to me that religion *is* part of all this context. Religion has followed the same kind of process regarding identity transformation as other kinds of identities: for instance, the rise of regional identities in Europe, as well as the increase of indigenous identities on a world scale. Today, there are half a billion self-identified indigenous peoples in the world, who are represented by a global organization in Geneva and have made significant strides towards developing a certain kind of sovereignty, although this is a very conflictual issue. All these events that are taking place simultaneously, begun in the West between 1970 and 1975. Since then, they have continued in the same direction. This is the most recent period of massive economic globalization, which has its roots in the seventies.

Conclusively, there is a certain kind of set of correlations which are interesting to examine. As regards the various events that are taking place nowadays, we witness for instance the phenomenon of many Westerners who were born in the society and used to be modernists, and who are loosing faith. And when they loose faith, they find new faiths and they convert. Consequently, conversion is an important part of the decline process of modernist identity which, in my view, is connected to the decline of hegemony. This consideration can be analyzed further, within the whole context of trans-nationalization. There is an understanding of the world which, in my view, is related to this declining hegemony. And although America has imperial desires, it seems to me that, just like Rome, after a long "career" of expansion, it is in a process of declining. The United States is on the way to bankruptcy. So there are interesting kinds of connections here that can be made. This movement, as described in one of the papers, fits very well into what I am trying to describe. The competition becomes a possibility for discourse which gets used in the Diaspora as a way for people who are marginalized to re-identify.

My last observation relates to what happens within societies in periods of globalization. I think that Jocelyne Cesari's paper made an important mention of the following aspect: the formation of elites at the top of the system who become transnationalized. This transnationalization process is often linked to a process of hybridization. We witness a re-combination of elements of different religions within the same set of identities - but mostly in the form of consumption items, decorative elements used for instance to decorate one's living room: it is very nice and it tends to

become increasingly superficial as well, since it is not deep, it is a new way of living things, with a lot of distance. As we move down on the system, we witness a particularly different situation going on: lot of people referred to as fundamentalism. There are various kinds of fundamentalism: next to the Islamic one, there are lots of other kinds which tend to become increasingly transnational. People become anti-Nation State because the Nation State has simply deceived them. They can be based either on race, or shared religion, identity, etc. And we see this tendency increasing on a very broad scale. All the papers, in my understanding, fit to some extent into these kinds of global processes. In my view, there is a connection between globalization *and* these processes, linked to the increase of new religious identities as well as other types of identities which are increasing simultaneously and are not necessarily religious but can be cultural. I consider this to be part of a much larger process, than simply one that could be understood on the basis of studying the content of religion itself : it has to be stressed that the question here is *not* about the *content* of religion.

Debate

Jose Casanova: I have a comment to Sebastien. I think you offer a very comprehensive analysis of the complex phenomenon of Pentecostalism. But I think you overemphasized the continuity with Evangelical Christianity. What is important is that the global expansion of Pentecostalism is a complex phenomenon; it is symptomatic that the fact in Brazil, the two larger Pentecostal Churches were founded by European immigrants coming from Chicago: an Italian immigrant went to Chicago where he became Protestant, going to Brazil established the most important Pentecostal Church in the world, at first attracting Italian immigrants in Brazil but now no ethnic any more). The second largest Church was established by two Swedish pastors, again through Chicago (and again Chicago is the centre of a global immigration is symbolic). Already immediately, Brazilian Pentecostalism cannot be understood as a derivation of American Pentecostalism. Everywhere in the world, Pentecostalism is simultaneously global and local. It is a form of deterritorialized, decentered form of Christianity which has broken away from European Christianity and it is why it can thrive everywhere in the world. I think you overemphasized the continuity with the Anglo-Evangelical Protestantism.

A second thing: if Pentecostalism is something different from Evangelical Christianity, but also charismatic Christianity is larger than Pentecostalism: in Brazil, there are 15 M Pentecostals, but there are more charismatic Catholics than Pentecostals Protestants. So, you have a charismatic revival in the European Churches – the Coptic Church which had no revival for 15 centuries has a charismatic revival today, you have even a charismatic revival in the Thomas Church in India – so charismatic Christianity is a global phenomenon which is not only linked with Evangelical Protestantism.

Sébastien Fath: I agree with you globally. The issue is to compare with Islam so I won't be too technical. There is indeed some differences between Pentecostals and Evangelical roots so I said we have to refuse the American conspiracy theory, but this does not mean that there is not an American type behind the way doing religion through Pentecostals.

Lars Dencik: I want to return to the question raised by Jonathan on the notion of diaspora: how it has been used in the presentation. Crucial to the question is the way we categorize groups: according to religion? But we can also categorize them according to nation or according to ethnicity. And it has to do with: how people subjectively identify in the process of identification? Because to be in the diaspora is to identify with someone who belongs: it has to do with belonging. Yesterday we mentioned the notion of ethnification of religion and my question to all of you is: to identify in a certain group is to go together in the closeness, it can be also that you close yourself out of the world and into a ghetto. My question is: how does that reconcile with adopting Western values? I mean: is there really a strong tendency toward hybridity between Muslim religion and Western ideas? Is it a dream, a tendency, a strong tendency that you could notice in sociological terms? Because it can go both ways: it can dissolve, it can close and that has to do with the relation to real or imagined homeland, the old Islamic world. How does that relate to this relation: it can be independent of that. I think it is very complicated to understand this relationship.

Jocelyne Cesari: Long time ago, when I was living in Aix-en-Provence, we had a research program on transnational networks between the South of Europe and North Africa and we had intense debates with colleagues, especially from North Africa: could we call people coming from

Maghreb and living in Turin, Madrid or Marseilles, diaspora ? And it was an interesting debate because it was a time when the term was used by migrants themselves to describe their condition and by sociologists as well. And we decided to do not use the term because if you look at the literature about diaspora, it is not only because you get out of your country of origin that you constitute a diaspora; even if you maintain a relationship with your country of origin, there is something in the term diaspora that involves a specific culture, something of a specific narrative of exile or nostalgia. Migrants from Muslim countries living in the West, even 10 years after we had this debate, have not created this kind of culture, related to the feeling of loss. We so should be extremely careful using the term, not because the agents themselves use it (when you are an engaged Muslim you don't define as diasporic automatically). Every political, national, cultural link beyond national boarder does not mean that you are diaspora. So we prefer using the term transnational. I think that Jonathan is on the same line. You complicated the question with the aspects of religious activities among these different groups. Once again, we said it yesterday, we are not sure that religious activity is the major part of the definition of collective identity today among Muslims in Europe. If we look at the different tendencies asking about "where are the processes of hybridization?", we have to be clear : if you look at the grass root level (what people do on a daily basis ? They hybridize each day, they accommodate and negotiate and they really are in a changing process in term of practices. They have the competence to do it on a daily basis, but they do not have automatically the reflexive attitude putting a narrative on it, explaining it. Most of the time, the narrative you get is more conservative than the practice itself and if you look at the way that people are living, you get something different. There is secularization, there is acceptation of some norms and values, but sometimes the narrative is more conservative. The hybridization process is going on anonymously and in a certain kind of silence (to talk like Jonas) and the narrative is still very much in a sort of distance with this kind of hybridization and changing of practices. The cosmopolitan elite is trying to accompany for a different narrative the kind of changes which is occurring at the grassroots level.

Garbi Schmidt: Unless we can see a certain group or the elites among these groups but they engage in de-ethnification in order to get a core of religious identity. If you come (and it was what I was pointing on in this description of pristine Islam), we come together from definite ethnic national groups, for example in the European countries, and we do away with our past

ethnic identity in order to gain our religious identity. Will that have its signification? I mean Jonathan has said that ethnicity is practice but at least in some formal levels, you can see that as an ideal and that is something that people see when you talk to them trying to gain, I mean try to be Muslim first. Also in order to create a community, it's again a part of the essentialism, that people from the outside, for example, by the press of by researchers are described as Muslims because they come from Muslim countries. But what it means to be a Muslim community then? And also the pressure from inside in order to create a common identity so there is de-ethnification and ethnification.

Jonathan Friedman: I avoid using the word essentialism because it means anything that can be defined, because everything has to be open, porous. And if it's porous, then you can't identify, and if you can't identify, this is essentialism. It can change tomorrow, it doesn't mind. Culture is just like that, because people identify with something, even if they don't like it. They can change it, they can make into something else during week-ends and this is how culture changes very often in situation of emigration as relationship that people have when the content changes and that can be very important because it can loose a certain signification it can has, but the social significance in the sense it becomes the old life. People can go into another country in period of very strong assimilation and it is usually painful, but people do it and people even disappear ethnically and religiously. And in other periods, when they loose their jobs, things go bad, they see no future, and there is a model and they can begin to take it up again, re-identify, start a practice, learn a new language, and so on. It is practiced by real existing essences in that sense they are hardly definable things that people identify with, it's just not porousness.

Jose Casanova: I would be a little careful in trying to reduce religion to ethnicity: sometimes we think we understand the phenomenon better if it was just ethnicity or if it was just one of the identities that globalization produces. Now we have to de-exoticize, they said, Islam and not simply why because immigrants from Muslim countries automatically are Muslims in the sense of practicing Islam. But there is an element of this identity, the Oumma: it's an identity which is not only with religious practices, but the way people practice this identity precisely and the fact that today, in the context of globalization, these world-religions they were meant to a certain extent to disappear The crisis vis-à-vis the primary prominent imagined community of the nation

obviously, they were re-imagined at the global level. And there is somewhat different, the practice of a religious imagined community is different from the practice of an indigenous global imagined community that is simply a different structure in we have to take this reality of religion specific and different from the reality of other phenomena very seriously. Otherwise, we would simply reduce this phenomenon to other things we think we understand better. We have to be careful with thinking that when calling ethnicity we understand what it is. The Swedish case you mentioned it is true, but the Jewish identity in America is very different. It is true that there are many secular Jews in America but the fact that Judaism in America was redefined again as a religion vis-à-vis Catholics and Protestants. So Judaism in America is a religion even those who are not practicing religion define themselves. And the immigrants from former Soviet Union: they are more than hundred fifty thousands in New York, they do not want to be part of the Jewish religious American community. They are Jews but they are not part of American Judaism. And it has been conflict between the American Jews who precisely were… the whole process to save Jews and to bring Jews in America and now they come here they don't want to be like us. Those relationships between ethnicity and religion simply changes and we have to contextualize those relations according different places.

Jonathan Friedman: In the globalization literature, there is an attempt to subsume the local in the global and to think them as the same and that is absolutely ridiculous: the global is nothing but the relationship between localities. There is nothing except the local in fact: anyway you are going, you are somewhere and being somewhere is being local, even if you live in a plane, in a very local place. So that is different substances just as different religious, ethnic, national corpuses. And these substances with things are elaborated and they produced different effects. That may be different from what you say. You can say that a religion coming from ethnicizes, for example from an island, but that does not mean that a corpus does not have specific characteristics.

Lars Dencik: Yngve used the notion of radical transnationalism and you defined it the way that it no special grounded, that means no locality, no context , can we think about that. You have to ground up in a certain space …and the question is: can we think of a movement that is so out of

space, that is not grounded in any context? So we speak of euro-islam, we contextualize, we place it a specific setting.

Yngve Lithman: I have a lot of respect for Jonathan as an intellectual but that is not to say that I agree with him, at least on everything. I think basically the whole discussion here has demonstrated that we have really difficult epistemological problems and my argument (but I 'am not suggesting it's the only argument we can make there) is we are all in a sense living in a rhetorical discourse that was formed in connection with the nation-State and that gives a certain way of looking at things, a certain type of terms and expressions. And the word diaspora is a one example to my mind of the way our language is confined within certain pre-established ways of thinking and communicating. And ways of thinking and communicating which are not necessarily all that act to the situation or the context that we are talking about, especially in the context of migration, globalization or non-globalization of Islam, etc. In some sense, we are all locals: we have to eat, we have to sleep, we have to be in one place at one specific time. But for specific purposes, I mean when we look at specific dimensions of social action, it is quite possible and fruitful to disregard the dimension of the local what we are studying. I think it is possible to think the construction of an ideology which as an ideology is in a very large measure delocalized, the rule is not interpreted in terms of me and my family, my neighbourhood, my town, my county, and my country and so on. Instead I think it is possible to show that this terrorism of the diaspora we talked about in fact as a fundamental premise is not contained within the local. If it had been contained within the local in any meaning full sense of the word local, we would have seen these people doing what they did during the 60 our 70s, organizing demonstrations at Egyptian university… But all these local expressions are in a way located. At a same time, these people develop an understanding of their world where the local is very much significant in their interpretation of the world and aims these guy been in Florida and planned to fly their plane to the WTT and believe in fact, with a sense of perfect ideological congruence with some guys in Peshawar and others in Bali, and so forth.

I really don't agree with Jonathan when he suggests that the local has solely to be the starting point to the global. I think we have to be more porous in our thinking. I don't really get this argument when it comes to two things: he talked about definable things that people identify with

and these definable things are open to change, fair enough, no problem there. But, one comment: why do we have to talk about people in terms of their identifying with something. Is that a good way of describing the modelization for why people do things that they do? And this brings me to another thing : Jonathan stressed the practice dimension of things (they do not exist if people don't practice them), but how can they exist in a sense of a porous fundamentalist existence outside of practice ? So it seems to me that there is some way, and I think the argument you were talking about the porous essential stuff existing and on the other hand, nothing exists outside practice.

Jonathan Friedman: I understand what you are talking about as the no-local in the same sense that an empire defines the world. The Third International is not local in that sense because it defines a world and that world is the globe and it's defined in one place and it's become local therefore just in the sense as when you talk about a postnational world, you can have a postnational without a national world. If you really create a postnational world, you have a world government and you have one place again. It's always like in some sense because we have space. So I have a problem with that and I give an example very quickly: we have studied a Muslim community and you could say it is transnational, OK, in a certain sense : they live transnationaly, but they don't say that. They have problems with the border and they bring in people from outside and they live almost entirely inside of their transnational relationships. They live in a very close social space. And that social space is confused by some people simply because it goes across national borders as something was open, but it's just as closed as anybody else space. The same for multinational cosmopolitans: they go to the same hotels, they marry very often in the same milieux, they live the same kind of life, they live in a very small world. People live in a very small world: I think it's a general tendency. And they can define themselves, but that definition is not the way what they live. That seems to me solves to some extent the whole question about whether it can be an essence or not. I don't think porousness is well adapted. Porousness to me is an intellectual construction that is used by people who refuse to define or not to define them. But people in the street, I mean very often in the border going across the street, it can be a lot worse coming across the border (in some parts of Chicago it's very much like that). The world is full of borders and essentialism is really what's going on in a very big way.

Abdelwahid Pallavicini: I don't know if I understood what Prof. Casanova said about original and immigrate country. What I want to stress is that a religion is always the same because it is based upon the same practice. In one particular religion there is no difference between Far Eastern practice of Islam and the immigrated European practice in France. From an inside point of view, what counts is the practice and not the interpretations given by some theologians. Religion is not an ideology but a revelation which connects men to the archetypal realities.

SESSION IV:

ISLAM AND EUROPEAN URBAN LIFE

MAPPING THE MUSLIM LEADERSHIP IN SPANISH URBAN CENTERS

GEMA MARTÍN-MUÑOZ, AUTÓNOMA UNIVERSITY OF MADRID

To start with I would like to mention the specific features of the Spanish case as regards the Muslim representatives, their leadership and their relations with the State. As a matter of fact, the existence of a representative Islamic institution to deal with the State, has not resulted from the ever increasing presence of Muslim migration in Spain, but originated from the Spanish Constitution itself, long before the Muslim population was of any significance in our country. For this reason, the legal representation for Muslims was embodied at the time when the Muslim Community was nearly non-existing in Spain and included mainly the converted Spanish. This situation brings about that migrant Muslims rarely feel identified with this leadership and entails the rise of other independent leaderships with different course of actions and demands.

The Spanish Constitution of the year 1978, which started the democratic transition, declared Spain as a non confessional State but, at the same time, accepted cooperation agreements with the so called "historically rooted" religions in the country. Besides the prevailing Catholicism that secured specific agreements, also Protestantism, Judaism and Islam were included in the mentioned category. In 1984 the agreement was signed by Protestants and Jews.

Muslims had been unable to undertake a sole leadership due to internal divisions, and only in 1989 the two larger federations assembling most of the associations finally approved to make up

The Islamic Commission which signed the State agreement. These two federations stand for the official Muslim leadership in Spain, namely, Federación Española de Entidades Religiosas Islámicas (FEERI) – the Spanish Federation of Islamic Religious Institutions – and Unión de Comunidades Islámicas de España – Spanish Union of Islamic Communities – , being the majority of its members Spanish converted Muslims.

It is remarkable that the State agreement signed in 1992 placed Spain as one of the leading countries to acknowledge Islam in Europe. Besides, it was proclaimed that "*Islam is backed with hundreds of years of tradition in our country and makes an exceptional contribution to the formation of Spanish identity*". The legal measures included: acknowledgment of the statute of religious leaders and imams, protection of mosques, civil ratification of the religious Islamic marriage – excluding polygamy and repudiation –, recognition of religious Islamic teaching in public or semi-public schools and the celebration of Islamic holidays.

Actually, this leading position of the Spanish State did not adjust to the social influence of Islamic religion which was almost non existent at the time. However, it reaped political benefits of the relations between Spain and the Arab countries.

The situation has changed at present, with an ever increasing number of migrants entailing the Muslim visibility which did not exist before and a new social reality exceeding the mere symbolic presence of the converted Spanish, makes now rise many Spanish voices protesting against the rights granted to the Muslims. The lack of political will stops the implementation of the agreements (for instance, Islamic teaching at school has not taken place while Catholic religion has been reinforced) and the new coming Muslims do not identify with the official leaderships who do not understand their reality nor their needs.

So, the Spanish case counts with an official representative, the Islamic Commission, that originated from an internal Spanish-Muslim process, previous to the presence of Muslim migration in the country. For that reason, they can't help solving the migrants' problems and can't gather enough social support from the approximately half a million Muslims living in Spain today.

In addition, a more and more excluding Spanish migration policy as regards Muslim migrants, preferring Latin American and East European migrants, the increasing public opinion that Muslims clash with the Spanish society's values, and the lack of implementation of the provisions of the State agreements relating to the acknowledgment of Islam. Furthermore, Muslim worship in Spain today is undergoing more difficulties than in most European countries.

Facing this situation, our research has shown that a new "decentralized" and autonomous leadership is gradually emerging in the various urban centres, as Madrid and Barcelona, where Muslim migrants are concentrated. These people have been in Spain for quite sometime already, they know the social context well, from the Spanish as well as from their community side, and their understanding of what it means to be Muslim in Spain today has ripened. They know better what they do not want to give up and the transformations they are ready to undergo.

It is interesting to stress that they mistrust just as much the official representatives of Islam in Spain (the two Federations who make up the Islamic Commission in Spain). Actually, their objectives, needs and concerns differ from those asserted by the Federations and despite both Muslim spheres are considered non excluding, interaction between them is very poor.

For the migrant communities to get or adapt premises for praying is a priority, whereas the Federations are interested in creating large cultural and religious centres; the first ones try to secure coranic teaching in the mosques as their main concern, while Federations claim the teaching of Islam at the Spanish schools, as per the State agreements, and their aim is to develop the curricula and teacher's training. Furthermore, the migrant communities relations with the administration are based on usually complicated requests such as the opening of praying rooms or the temporary use of public space to celebrate Islamic festivities, while Federations are entitled to deal directly with national, regional or local Authorities as the legal representatives of the Islamic Community. In short, the main purpose for the first ones is to achieve gradually the worship organization and for the second ones to support their representation and to assert the official acknowledgment of Islam.

So, there is a gap between the representatives recognized as such by the Spanish institutions and the Muslim migrants who can only act within their communities and whose main concern is to transmit the religious heritage to their children. They think that it has been necessary for them to get organized in new structures, since the main mosques, the Federations, the civil society associations and the host country institutions have failed them. Their criticism is centered around the reluctance of the administration to grant them subsidies or to acknowledge them (when other associations do get funds). So, there is a gap between the representatives recognized as such by the Spanish institutions and the new grass root leaders.

This new rising leadership, among part of the Muslim community in Spain have the following characteristics: It is still very local, and active among migrants who have been here longer. It plays its role as leadership through the informal mobilization of the community (very often through cultural associations or local mosques, sometimes in informal meeting places, such as shops, markets and leisure grounds) and the help they provide, especially in the family regrouping procedures. They have a fairly good economic situation (at least compared to the rest of the community), they have contact with Spaniards at work, they think of themselves as practising Muslims (one of their main concerns has to do with how to transmit the values of Islam to the next generation), they live with their families, and their children have been educated in Spain, and generally speaking they do not wear in their daily lives clothes that are any different from the Spanish population. They only wear clothes that make them conspicuous as Muslims on certain occasions (mainly on Fridays) and for religious or other community celebrations, and they are used to dealing with public institutions (because it is necessary in their daily lives and when they are responsible of an association, because of their activities as such). They all are rather pessimistic as for the development of the situation and the reaction of public opinion in Spain, but they are nevertheless convinced that it should not be incompatible to live in Spain and practise Islam. On the other hand they are confident that with an ever increasing community, Spanish society and politicians will have to take more realistic measures in accordance with their specific needs.

In some cases, their leadership was informal at first, and then became institutionalized through the creation of an association or organization of some sort. As a matter of fact, they have very

often been convinced or encouraged by friends, relatives or colleagues to take up their positions and they enjoy therefore a legitimacy granted by the community that often does not want younger elements to take over the tasks they perform. As a rule they do not trust Spanish institutions nor some of the civil society organizations ("they are full of good will, but they do not know who we are and what are our needs").

There is also another key factor that explain the emergence of these new groupings or associations, and that is the presence and settlement of new generations, and above all a pessimistic view as to the future of their children. When it comes to the young, the elders on the one hand reject some of their attitudes and are worried on the other. They tend to think that if the younger generation drifts away from the "good behaviour" (that is to say what is requested from the faithful), it is not so much due to the influence of Spanish society (or at least they do not say so explicitly), but to the lack of attention devoted by the parents to their children, (exhausted by the hardships of work and administrative constraints). They also mention the lack of religious bodies, or of an official recognition of Islam (on a real equal footing) on the part of Spain.

In fact, one of the most frequent claims is the plead for equal opportunities (in all aspects including the religious field) in the context of a non confessional State. They claim that the religious dimension is avoided or even excluded in the integration model that is proposed to them by the Spanish administration. ("*Islam is viewed as an obstacle to integration*", "*we are asked to give up our religious heritage*"), and this seems to them unfair and discriminatory compared to the way other religions are treated in Spain.

When these new leaders are asked about the way their religious practice has changed because of emigration, the answer is always the same. The experience of emigration has not altered their beliefs nor their practice. The faith is the same, practice is the only thing that needs to be adapted to the new circumstances, and it requires but a short period of transition to get used to this new rhythm. It is possible to live a normal and respected life in Spain and at the same time feel Muslims and be practicants. They feel however that the integration model used by Spanish authorities envisage diversity in its ethnical dimension but tend to forget the religious and cultural one. In fact, from the Spanish responsibles of Immigration exist the general consideration that

"*we will accept a multiethnic or multiracial society but not a multicultural one*" (*El País*, 23/2/2002).

The point is that the representatives who are the administration partners do not include this new type of leaders who have emerged from within the community, with a real legitimacy, and in some instances, a potential for mobilization, even if in a rather discrete way so far. Nevertheless, in our opinion, they will probably play an important role in the accommodation and integration process of the Muslim population. They are seen as immigrants and integration policies have provided for health, education and social welfare, but not for religion. Furthermore, many experts and local responsibles in charge feel puzzled when it comes to religious demands, since they expect the immigrant communities to behave as planned, that is to say, setting their priorities according to the established models of the programmes. Nevertheless, these new leaderships, scattered around districts with high density of Muslim population, focus their demands on questions relating to the religious practice, which is in an abandonment State, undergoing difficulties. Local authorities usually deal with this new leadership in an informal way to reach particular agreements, although they try to substitute them as soon as they consider they are not assuming moderate positions (Moreras, 2002).

Besides all this, one has to take into account that in our society laicism is the political reference as to religious affairs, which is a useful means to deny subsidies and religious demands by argueing that public administration is not allowed to interfere in any religious questions.

Although this does not correspond to our historical tradition nor to the existing relationship model between the State and the different religions. Applying to laicism justifies the non intervention administration policy as regards religious plurality, avoiding at the same time the renewal and diversity of the Muslim religious leadership officially recognized by the Spanish State.

In fact, a new 'internal' Muslim leadership is consolidating in two aspects, its real legitimacy within the local community, with no links with Islamic institutions or their fundings in the countries of origin. They intend to create a new experience of Islam to accommodate to the new

minority frame and to the sometimes opposing reaction by the host society. They are playing a key role in the arising conflicts in relation with the construction of mosques, and the acute reaction of some of the neighbours, and they are called to be important mediating actors that, in our opinion, should be considered when designing and implementing integration policies.

MUSLIMS IN BRITISH CITIES: ARE THEY DIFFERENT FROM OTHER MIGRANTS?

DILWAR HUSSAIN, THE ISLAMIC FOUNDATION, LEICESTER

Background

The presence of Muslims in European urban life has been perceived, by some, to be a real challenge to the status quo of the culture and traditions of European States. This introductory paper looks at the Muslim presence in some of the larger British cities and compares the situation with other 'migrants'. Given the time available, this is not a detailed analysis, but rather the start of a series of questions that will attempt to outline the important similarities and differences that exist between the Muslim presence and that of other comparable 'migrants'. The paper relies heavily of data released from the UK Census of 2001 to give an overview of the most recent statistics on British Muslims as well as other religious and ethnic groups. I am most grateful to Chris Allen, a fellow researcher, who has worked with me in collecting some of the data presented. Some of our findings will published in due course. I would also like to thank Jocelyn Cesari and the rest of the NOCRIME team for the useful debates and discussion that have been initiated through this network and for giving me an opportunity to speak at the events and present this paper.

It should be mentioned that I will at times use the word 'community' as a sociological construct to refer to the Muslim presence in Britain, though the term has its limitations. Firstly, some approaches in Europe are not comfortable with the term because of its connotation of group life and perhaps even ghettoisation, for example in France the individual citizen is given a very prominent place in social space and the nature of the relationship between the individual and the State is seen to negate the sense 'community' as used in the UK. The second reason is that due to the diverse nature of the British Muslim presence it is difficult to always talk of a single entity where so much difference exists in terms of first language, political allegiance, religious sub-denomination etc. It may therefore be more accurate to talk of 'communities' in plural. An example could be given of comparative differences between the Muslims of Gujarati/East African origin living in Leicester and the Muslims of Mirpuri/Pakistani origin in Bradford. There

are significant difference of class, educational levels, employment skills base and household income, leading to very different dynamics of community formation and interaction with the life of these respective cities. What makes matters worse and better at the same time is the ambiguity surrounding, and number of different sociological definitions of, the term 'community'. Another point of clarification is needed for the term 'migrant' especially as it is used in the title given to me. The presence of the Muslim communities, and other groups, in Britain has been sustained to the degree that there are a significant number of people that were born in Britain, have grown up in Britain and feel themselves to be British. Strictly speaking, it is therefore inaccurate to call them 'migrants'. However the term is sometimes used in this paper to delineate new communities and their specific settlement processes as opposed to those communities that been settled for centuries.

Muslim Communities in Britain

The UK contains one of the most diverse Muslim communities in Europe. It may come as a surprise to some that Islam and the British Isles have had centuries of interaction. The mention, in Arabic, of the Muslim declaration of faith on coins minted by King Offa (d. 796) is a cryptic example of this. One such coin along with the Ballycottin Cross (dated to the 9th century), containing an inscription of the '*basmala*', were, until recently, held in the British Library. Despite this early interaction it was in the early 19th century that the first Muslims began to form communities in Britain. As the migrants were mainly sailors, most of these communities were formed in areas of the major port cities such as Liverpool, Newcastle and London. These communities were quite small and localised and it was much later, after the Second World War, that more significant numbers of Muslims settled. A key reason for migration was that the post-war economy needed labourers. Additionally, in the recently decolonised regions of the world, economic and educational conditions were not satisfactory. This lead to a 'push-pull' effect which, over two decades, brought a significant number of Muslims to the UK, mainly from the rural areas of Pakistan and Bangladesh. In addition to this South Asian presence, a number of Muslims came from different parts of the Arab world, mainly for educational purposes. Over the years, these communities have been joined by Muslims originating from Africa, Europe and far

East-Asia, as well as converts from the UK, to form an ethnically diverse community. About half of the 1.6 million British Muslims now present were born in the UK.

The UK does not have a system of 'recognition' of Religion as found in some other EU States such as Germany or Belgium. Instead the relationship is a complex one governed by less formal arrangements and discrete references in the legal system that may be of relevance to the minority concerned. The Jews and Sikhs are viewed as ethnic groups and are therefore protected when it comes to discrimination. There are also some limited provisions for Jews to observe elements of Jewish law in personal matters. Citizenship has generally been easier to obtain in the UK as compared to some other countries in Europe and most people from the minorities residing in the UK today are British citizens.

With the arrival of migrants in the 1960s and 70s a very pronounced debate started to take place as to the position and status of these migrants. The tone of the debate in the early stages was very similar to that in other parts of Europe. Should these minorities be sent back? Would they take away jobs from British people? Would they be an economic burden? Perhaps the most vociferous participants in the political debate were Enoch Powel of the Conservative Party and Roy Jenkins of the Labour Party. They stood poles apart. It was within this debate that the British notion of Multiculturalism was crystallised:

"*…a flattening process of uniformity, but cultural diversity, coupled with equal opportunity in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance*."[246]

Though Muslim communities began to form in the UK from the early 19th century, the most significant institutions that remain in existence were initiated by migrants who settled around the time of, and after, the Second World War. The first major initiative to establish Muslim organisations in the post-war period was the formation of the Islamic Cultural Centre and the Mosque Trust in 1944 and the subsequent opening of the London Central Mosque at Regents Park in 1977.

---

[246] Jenkins, Roy (1994), *Essays and Speeches.* 1967. Quoted in Lewis, Philip, *Islamic Britain: Religion, Politics and Identity among British Muslims, op. cit*. London: I.B. Tauris, p. 3.

Statistical Data on Muslims in Britain

The 2001 census was the first one in recent times to include a question on religious affiliation[247]. This was a quite a controversial step and initially created a great deal of debate within the different religious communities of the UK and also among liberal circles. Eventually it seemed that the major faith communities endorsed it. The response to the question was surprisingly high considering that it was left as a voluntary one with just over 92 per cent of people answering the question. About 15.5% of the UK population stated that they had no religion. Some of the data on religious affiliation is still being cross correlated with other factors such as economic deprivation, crime, housing and employment but the most basic datasets were released from February 2003 onwards.

Census 2001 Figures for Religious Affiliation in UK[248]

Religious Affiliation	Value	Percentage
Christians	42,079,000	71.6
Muslims	1,591,000	2.7
Hindus	559,000	1
Sikhs	336,000	0.6
Jews	267,000	0.5
Buddhist	152,000	0.3
Other	179,000	0.3
No Religion	9,104	15.5
Not Stated	4,289	7.3

As the census data for 1991 was based on ethnic categories alone a real comparison cannot be made with the last census. However analysts had relied on the groups with known significant Muslim populations to extrapolate a figure ranging from 1.3 – 1.6 million for 1991.

[247] A similar question did exist prior to this one but was removed in the 1800s.

Regional Distribution of Muslims in England

The largest Muslim communities have been formed around the old industrial cities and nearly half the Muslims are located within the greater London area. English cities with five largest Muslim populations were:

London	607,000
Birmingham	140,000
Gtr Manchester	125,000
Bradford	75,000
Kirklees	39,000

The breakdown in terms of local government administrative authorities shows that London contains the local authority with the highest Muslim percentage – Tower Hamlets – with 36.4%. Also of the top ten populated local authorities, four (Tower Hamlets, Newham, Waltham Forest and Hackney) are in London.

Local Authority	**Value**	**Percentage**	**Ranking**
Tower Hamlets	71,389	36.4	1
Newham	59,293	24.3	2
Blackburn with Darwen	26,674	19.4	3
Bradford	75,188	16.1	4
Waltham Forest	32,902	15.1	5
Luton	26,963	14.6	6
Birmingham	140,033	14.3	7
Hackney	27,908	13.8	8
Pendle	11,988	13.4	9
Slough	15,897	13.4	10

[248] All the census data mentioned is crown copyright and can be found on www.statistics.gov.uk.

Age Profile

The table below shows the numbers of adherents of different faith groups in England and Wales broken down according to age profile.

	Christian	Buddhist	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh
0 - 15	6,824,189	17,286	115,808	44,577	522,860	80,755
16 - 24	3,463,825	19,491	83,620	25,489	281,628	55,113
25 - 49	12,619,115	75,177	238,774	82,385	567,182	134,397
50 - 59	5,217,434	20,264	56,787	36,617	81,944	28,259
60 - 64	2,121,798	4,584	20,956	13,004	36,510	10,566
65 - 74	3,726,398	5,092	25,779	25,375	42,850	13,506
75 and over	3,365,727	2,559	10,697	32,480	13,652	6,762

The table shows that age profiles vary considerably across the faith communities and that Muslim and Sikh communities have a very high proportion of young people. 33.8 % of Muslims and 24.5 % of Sikhs are aged 0-15, and 18.2 % of Muslims and 16.7 % of Sikhs are aged 16-24. The England and Wales average is 20.2 per cent aged 0-15 and 10.9 per cent aged 16-24. The table also shows that Christian and Jewish groups have an aging population; the average is 16% whereas there are 19% Christians and 22.3 % Jews above the age of 65.

Economic Life

Economic activity is also a very important factor in community formation, and while much of the data from the 2001 census is still in the process of analysis a study conducted by the Policy Studies institute in 1994 shows the differences across some of the ethnic groups[249].

[249] Tariq Modood et al. (1997), *Ethnic Minorities in Britain: Diversity and Disadvantage*. Policy Studies Institute.

Total household income

column percentages

	White	Caribbean	Indian	African Asian	Pakistani	Bangladeshi	Chinese
Up to £115 per week	26	32	25	19	27	24	21
£116 to £230	23	24	26	23	48	55	18
£231 to £445	27	27	26	27	17	13	27
£446 to £620	12	12	10	17	3	7	17
£621 or more	12	5	14	14	4	2	18
Average weekly income	£294	£249	£308	£334	£202	£196	£350
Average for non-pensioner households	£343	£259	£317	£338	£203	£196	£354
Weighted count	*2450*	*1059*	*348*	*403*	*285*	*117*	*206*
Unweighted count	*2457*	*778*	*362*	*395*	*454*	*283*	*115*

The Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups which form a significant core of re of the Muslim communities in the UK, fair averagely in the lower income brackets, but when it comes to the higher income brackets they feature very poorly making their overall average significantly less than other groups. It is also interesting to note that among the African Asian and Indian groups there is a much greater leaning towards the high income bracket than among the Pakistani and Bengali groups. The former two also consist of significant numbers of Muslims and this shows how there are intra-community differences as well as the more obvious inter-community differences.

Political Life

British Muslims began joining the mainstream political parties in the 1960s and the first councillor, Bashir Maan, was elected in 1970. Until quite recently the affiliation was almost exclusively with the Labour Party. Currently there are over 200 Councillors[250], 2 Members of the House of Commons, 4 Members of the House of Lords and 1 Member of the European Parliament, that are of Muslim origin. It is difficult to estimate the number of Muslims that are members of the various parties.

[250] Based on figures for 2000.

Table: Number of Muslim Councillors according to Party in 2000.[251]

Party	Number of Muslim Councillors
Labour	166
Liberal Democrat	27
Conservative	20
Justice	6
Total	219

According to the Institute of Public Policy Research (IPPR) there is still a strong case of under representation of ethnic minority candidates (including Muslims) in political positions[252]. The report, which calls for urgent positive action, found that there are only 12 black and Asian MPs, a figure which should be around 47[253] in order to be more reflective of the demographic situation of the UK. 2.5% of the councillors are from ethnic minority backgrounds while there should be around 6% and there should be around 6 black and Asian members of the Greater London Assembly (GLA) whereas in reality there are only 2.

Table: IPPR Estimate of Ethnic Minority Under-representation in Political Positions.[254]

	Current Situation	More Reflective Situation
No. of MPs	12	47
No. of Councillors	2.5% (530)	6% (1,272)
Members of GLA	2	6

[251] "Muslim Councillors in the UK: May 2000", compiled by *The Muslim News*, 2001

[252] Rushanara, Ali and O'Cinneide, Colme, *Our House? Race and Representation in British Politics*, London: IPPR, April 2002.

[253] According to Muhammad Anwar this figure should include about 20 MPs of Muslim origin, see: Anwar, Muhammad (2003), "British Muslims: Socio Economic Position", in Mohammad Seddon et al., *British Muslims: Loyalty and Belonging.* The Islamic Foundation and COF, Leicester, p. 65.

[254] Rushanara, Ali and O'Cinneide, Colme, *op. cit.*

Muslims have traditionally been keen supporters of the Labour Party. However in recent years there has been a gradual increase in support for the other two mainstream parties as well. This has probably been egged on by dissatisfaction with some of the Government's foreign policy choices and also domestic stances on matters such as the repeal of Clause 28 and the lowering of the age of consent for gay relationships. The reasons for supporting the Labour Party find their roots in the immigration stance that Labour took in the 1970s, along with of course the fact that being factory workers, first generation Muslims would have had strong links with the unions. The local elections of 2003 saw Labour loosing a large number of seats. Though there are no studies yet to prove why, it is thought that anti-war sentiment played a large role in shifting votes from Labour to the Liberal Democrats. In Leicester for example, the previous four Muslim councillors (all Labour) lost their seats. At the same time there were four new councillors of Muslim background, but this time with affiliation to the Liberal Democrats. Patricia Hewitt, a Labour MP for Leicester commented that Muslims were registering their protest against the Labour party and acknowledged that she was not surprised by the lack of support for Labour in the Muslim community[255]. A number of groups including the Muslim Association of Britain (MAB) led vociferous campaigns asking Muslims not to vote for Labour out of protest for the Government's stance on the war in Iraq.

Especially after the events of September 11th 2001 there has been considerable scrutiny on the Muslim communities in the UK, especially in terms of loyalty, identity and belonging. A MORI Poll, a national survey, carried out on behalf of a British-Asian newspaper, *Eastern Eye*, in November 2001 showed that there were only minor differences between Muslims and other Asian religious groups in expressions of loyalty. The question asked was: "How loyal, if at all, would you say you are to Britain?"

	All %	Hindu %	Muslim %	Sikh %
Very loyal	49	62	42	55
Fairly loyal	41	30	45	40
Not very loyal	5	4	6	4

[255] Hetherington, Peter (2003), "Lib Dem surge changes the landscape", *The Guardian*, Friday May 2, 2003.

Not at all loyal	1	0	2	0
Don't know	4	3	5	1
Not stated	*	1	0	0

Major Issues of Concern to Muslims

The Muslim community faces numerous issues and challenges, some of which are common to other migrant communities that are in the phase of settlement and acculturation. A survey was conducted by the National Interim Council for Muslim Unity (NICMU), the precursor to the Muslim Council of Britain (MCB) in 1995[256]. The twenty most common issues of concern are listed below in order of frequency of response.

Muslim educational needs / funding / RE syllabus / Girls schooling
United, authentic and business-like representation to Government, local authorities, media / lobby work / political leverage
Civil rights / legislative protection against religious discrimination, right to hijab
Youth work – careers advice / leisure provision / Islamic courses / tackling alienation, runaway teenagers
Media representation / positive images
Community welfare / help & support / information & advice on social issues / care of the elderly, care of the disabled / housing
Standards & supervision of mosques / allocation of imams / advice on mosque projects / zakat / audit / fundraising
Employment / creation of trade associations / promotion of Muslim businesses, cooperate stores
Dialogue with non-Muslims / da'wah
Research, documentation & analysis of Muslim needs, demographic patterns
Communication – TV / radio channels / line of communication with every Muslim household / national database of organisations & individuals
Regulation of Islamic calendar / national holidays / moon sighting

[256] NICMU Poll of over 200 people, July 1995.

Advice on ethical & moral issues / protection of family life & Islamic life-styles / matrimonial / fostering / marriage guidance
Conciliation & arbitration body when disputes between Muslims & mosque disputes / Islamic shari'ah court
Muslim halal food and diet
International concerns / humanitarian aid / arguing for a just stand on global issues affecting Muslims
Tackling racism / working for social harmony
Banking, saving schemes
European wide co-ordination / use of EC funds for Muslim development projects
Training of Islamic workers in management, leadership skills

As it can be seen the most pressing concerns were related to education, representation and discrimination. The latter, or Islamophobia as it has been named, was discussed in some depth in a report published by the Runnymede Trust[257] as well as two research projects commissioned by the Home Office and conducted in the Universities of Derby and Cambridge. While the ranking order of the above list may have changed somewhat over the last eight years, it is probable that the most popular concerns expressed in 1995 still remain at the top of Muslims' priority list.

Other Religious Communities

The six major religious traditions[258] of England and Wales[259] are covered here to give a sense of comparison of numbers as well as geographical breakdown. While British Christians are obviously not a minority, nor are they seen as a 'migrant' community, the Christian communities are mentioned here to give a sense of the overall religious landscape. The Census figures do not differentiate between what might be readily described as practising, nominal and notional believers. The data presented below looks at the national, regional and local authority scenario.

---

[257] See *Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All*, Runnymede Trust, 1997.

[258] Based upon the work of Ninian Smart, these are Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism and Sikhism

[259] As these figures are for England and Wales only, they exclude Scotland. It should be noted that the figures in this section will hence be slightly different to the UK figures quoted above. This mismatch is present due to the timing of the data released.

Christians

37.3 Million people in England and Wales State that they are Christian. It is important to add that whilst the levels of attendance at Church has dramatically fallen over the past few decades – suggested at being less than 10% of the adult population[260] – identifying oneself by one's Christian denominational allegiance (e.g. Church of England, Roman Catholic, Methodist etc) when required, for instance when being admitted to hospital, has remained prevalent, hence nearly 72% of people professed to being Christians. Christian communities are very diverse, and apart from the denominational differences, they are also multi-ethnic and multi-racial. Whilst many Christians would have been typically 'white' in the ethnicity report, it is worth noting the rise in 'Black' Pentecostal and Evangelical Churches across the country in recent years. However it may be that the number of Christians in England and Wales is actually higher than the Census suggests due to the fact that many smaller denominations and Christian derived groups were also listed separately under 'Other Religions'. Whether this is an attempt by some of these groups to distance themselves from the mainstream of Christianity and its associations with the institutionalised nature of British Christianity remains unclear but could be posited as a valid reason. On a regional basis, the North West has the highest proportion of Christians, where 80.1% of the population State Christianity as their religion.

In terms of the distribution at local authority level, the figures are as follows:

Local Authority	**Value**	**Percentage**	**Ranking**
St. Helens	153636	86.9	1
Wigan	261781	86.9	2
Copeland	59825	86.3	3
Knowsley	128834	85.6	4
Ribble Valley	46031	85.3	5
Easington	80129	85.2	6
Allerdale	79695	85.2	7

[260] Brierley, P. (2000), *Steps to the Future: Issues Facing the Church in the New Millennium*, London: Scripture Union.

South Ribble	87983	84.7	8
Wear Valley	51933	84.7	9
Sefton	238773	84.4	10

Buddhists

The Buddhist community in England and Wales is the smallest of the six religious traditions under consideration and constitute approximately 3% of the population. Whilst the religion is popularly perceived as being 'Eastern' and indeed originates from the Indian subcontinent, many Buddhists in England and Wales are converts to the religion, and some groups have formed to engage with creating new Buddhist traditions for Western societies. One of the largest groups is the Friends of the Western Buddhist Order[261]. Despite this, there are also significant numbers who originate from the Sinic countries and also from South East Asia. Regionally, the highest density of Buddhists can be found in London where they account for approximately 0.8% of the capital's population.

Local Authority	**Value**	**Percentage**	**Ranking**
Westminster	2392	1.3	1
Camden	2592	1.3	2
Kensington and Chelsea	1849	1.2	3
Hackney	2321	1.1	4
Lewisham	2721	1.1	5
Barnet	3422	1.1	6
Southwark	2621	1.1	7
Haringey	2283	1.1	8
Islington	1840	1.0	9
Cambridge	1139	1.0	10

[261] For more information, see www.fwbo.org.

Hindus

The Census puts the numbers of Hindus in England and Wales as just over half a million (552,000) accounting for just on 1.1% of the entire population. In numbers alone, Hinduism is the third largest religion. Significant Hindu communities have been present in England and Wales since the influx of economic migrants in the 1950s and 1960s. Contemporarily, Hindu communities are now in their second and third generations, and whilst the overriding majority will be of Indian ethnic descent, during the 1970s a further wave of migrants came to Britain from East Africa. On a regional basis, London is home to the highest density of Hindus, where 4.1% of the population identify themselves as such.

Local Authority	**Value**	**Percentage**	**Ranking**
Harrow	40548	19.6	1
Brent	45228	17.2	2
Leicester	41248	14.7	3
Redbridge	18661	7.8	4
Ealing	23384	7.8	5
Hounslow	16064	7.6	6
Newham	16901	6.9	7
Barnet	21011	6.7	8
Oadby and Wigston	3339	6.0	9
Croydon	16781	5.1	10

Jews

Judaism is probably the oldest religion in England and Wales after Christianity. The first Jewish communities were said to have arrived in Britain with the Norman invasion in 1066. In the 2001 Census, Jews make up for approximately 0.5% of the total population, numbering 260,000, making them the fifth largest religion. As with other religious communities, Jews are multi-ethnic. However unlike other religious groups, Jewish and Sikh communities are treated as ethnic

groups under the Race Relations laws of the UK. The capital is home to the highest proportion of the population on a regional basis, where 2.1% of the population are Jewish.

Local Authority	Value	Percentage	Ranking
Barnet	46686	14.8	1
Hertsmere	10712	11.3	2
Harrow	13112	6.3	3
Redbridge	14796	6.2	4
Camden	11153	5.6	5
Hackney	10732	5.3	6
Bury	8924	4.9	7
Westminster	7732	4.3	8
City of London	226	3.1	9
Epping Forest	3715	3.1	10

Sikhs

0.6% of the population, a total of 329,000 people, State that their religion is Sikhism in England and Wales. As a result, Sikhism is the fourth largest religion within the context of the Census. As with the Hindu communities, many Sikhs came to Britain following the Second World War and their numbers grew significantly through the 1960s and 1970s. Ethnically, Sikhs are relatively singular with the vast majority being of Punjabi descent. As a result of this, Sikhs along with Jews are protected under existing race legislation. At the regional level, the highest density of Sikhs can be found in the West Midlands where they account for 2% of the region's population.

Local Authority	Value	Percentage	Ranking
Slough	10820	9.1	1
Hounslow	18265	8.6	2
Ealing	25625	8.5	3
Wolverhampton	17944	7.6	4
Sandwell	19429	6.9	5

Gravesham	6379	6.7	6
Redbridge	13022	5.5	7
Coventry	13960	4.6	8
Hillingdon	11056	4.5	9
Leicester	11796	4.2	10

No religion

Just over 7.7 million people in England and Wales described themselves as being of no particular religion, a total that makes up 14.8% of the entire population. On a regional basis, the South West has the highest incidence of non-adherents where those of no religion account for 27.8% of the population.

Local Authority	**Value**	**Percentage**	**Ranking**
Norwich	33766	27.8	1
Brighton and Hove	66955	27.0	2
Cambridge	28965	26.6	3
Rhondda Cynon Taf	58665	25.3	4
Blaenau Gwent	17575	25.1	5
Nottingham	66312	24.8	6
City of London	1767	24.6	7
Bristol	93322	24.5	8
Caerphilly	40948	24.2	9
Oxford	32075	23.9	10

Conclusion

There are a number of important similarities and differences when comparing the Muslim communities with other groups. While this has not been an exhaustive study, it is merely and introduction to the religious diversity of the British landscape, it is easy to see that there are very complex factors such as migratory experience, levels of education, experiences of discrimination,

skills and potential for wealth creation etc. that are important variables when comparing the different ethnic and religious of Britain. One could for example focus on the notion of integration which is a source of debate among Muslim, Hindu, Sikh and Jewish communities, or look at the discussions around political allegiances as are present among the Catholic Irish and Muslim communities or look at social exclusion as debated within the Chinese and Asian communities.[262] Some of the similarities and difference when comparing the Muslim communities with other communities could be summarised as below:

Similarities:
Experience of migration, often due to push-pull factors
Discussions around identity and shifting identities
Education of the second and third generations
Desire to climb the social ladder for greater personal opportunity and to be more integrated in society
Problems of intra-community politics, leadership and lack of role-models in many cases
Shattering of the myth of return and the growing consciousness of settlement
Issues and debates around integration, loyalty and belonging
Balancing priorities in efforts given to the local (country of settlement) and the international (often country of origin)
Challenge of racism and xenophobic discrimination
Clash between rural and urban life experiences in many cases, as often migrants have come from rural origins
Low levels of language fluency among first generation migrants leading to some degree of isolation

Differences:
Islam has become a highly politicised issue due to the current geo-political climate
Islam as a religious force seems to be growing as there is a perception of a global resurgence of Islam

[262] See for example: Chau, Ruby C. M. & Yu, Sam W. K. (2001), "Social exclusion of Chinese people in Britain", *Critical Social Policy.* London: SAGE Publications, Vol. 21(1).

The number of Muslims represents a very large world-wide community, and Islam is the second largest religion even in many minority situations, hence creating a greater visibility of Muslims Most Muslim migrants were ethnically and culturally different again adding to the visibility of Muslim communities.

Although other ‘migrant’ communities have also suffered from poverty and underachievement, the Muslim community seems to have been a particularly acute case in this regard.

DISCUSSION LED BY JOSE CASANOVA,
NEW SCHOOL UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK CITY

My task within this conference is going to consist in bringing a comparative perspective from the United States. I have co-directed with my colleague Aristide Zolberg from The New School of Social Sciences in New York City a three-year research, in which we studied the totality of immigrant groups within the various immigrant religions. The research on Islam and Muslim migrants constituted only a part of the various immigrant groups studied. In spite of my Spanish origins, I am not familiar with the situation of Muslims in Spain. In that respect, Gema Munoz's paper constituted an opportunity to bring into light some of the issues which, even though specific to the Spanish context, allow us to make a generalization regarding the European situation.

I believe that a part of the stimulating analysis that Gema Munoz made - maybe implicitly - regards the distinction operated between State, government policies and society. Each of these three levels may be positioned within a different relationship context concerning immigrants. In this respect, Spain is characterized by a rather positive relationship with immigrants, namely there is an official recognition of Islam. Local government policies are, naturally, different than in other countries. At the level of society, there is a very clear resistance to the incorporation of Islam in Spain. Maintaining the existence of these different levels is of the utmost importance.

Some of the papers were more focused on the issue of society-immigrants relations, for instance Gerdien Jonker's paper which was centered on the relations between the German society and immigrants. Other papers concerned more specifically a State policy vis à vis the immigrants. As the official theme of the conference is "European Muslims and the Secular State", it has to be stressed that in the U.S.A, we have an interesting issue concerning the three levels mentioned above: officially, the American federal State is secular. We can claim that it is one of the most secular States in the world, if we consider the rigidity of separation which is stronger than, for instance, in France. In fact, the American State has no right to intervene at all in religious affairs. Therefore, the issue is not that religion cannot penetrate the State, but that the State has no right

to penetrate religion, according to the dual clause of the First Amendment which stipulates that there is "No intervention, no establishment of religion at the State level, but there is a free exercise of the religion in society". There is a relatively well accepted pattern of maintaining this structure.

Regarding the question relative to the way the State deals with different immigrant groups, I have always been astonished by the fact that, when we consider the way that the different European countries are treating the new immigrants, we come to the conclusion that, to a certain extent, they are repeating the pattern of original settlement of Church and State separation in dealing with different internal religious minorities. In this respect, the differences observed in the way the different European States deal with Islam, coincide with the existing pattern of incorporation of their majority Churches or of their religious minorities.

When we compare with the situation in the U.S.A, we observe that the Muslims that immigrated in this country found themselves in a context characterized by a long history of problematic integration of other non-American religions. The United States was on one hand defined as a Secular State but, on the other hand, it was also defined as a Christian Nation, "Christian" being a synonym for "Protestant": Catholics could not be Americans. Indeed, it took a very long time before Catholicism could finally be accepted as an American religion. A similar process can be observed regarding Judaism in the U.S.A., though it seemed much easier to incorporate Judaism than Catholicism, to consider Judaism as an authentic American religion. The explanation does not consist in the absence of an Anti-Semitic attitude in this country, in fact, theologically, American Protestantism was never Anti-Semitic - there was social Anti-Semitism, there was no theological Anti-Semitism - The fact is that Judaism and Catholicism were both widely accepted as American religions. It is noteworthy that one cannot simply talk about Judaism or Catholicism *in* America, but it is rather question of a truly *American* Judaism and *American* Catholicism. This situation lead to an open door for other non-American religions, which brings us to the situation of the U.S.A nowadays, characterized by an immigration which is much more global compared to the one of Europe. Immigration and Islam are related in Europe to a much larger extent than they are related in the U.S.A. There is a double explanation for this: the first consists in the fact that most immigrants in most European countries are Muslims and most Muslims are immigrants,

whereas this is not the case in the U.S.A, where Muslims as immigrants constitute a relatively small minority (perhaps 10% of all immigrants are Muslims). Moreover, half of the Muslims present in America are not immigrants but are African-Americans who are converted to Islam. Consequently, this reality differentiates the relationship of Islam and immigration. And the relations of immigrants with the American society are also different from the ones observed in Europe. The second element of explanation consists in the socio-economical condition of Muslim immigrants which is not the same in the U.S.A and in Europe. In Europe, Muslim immigrants come from the lower classes of society, they confess non -European religions, and have very different cultures. The outcome of this context is a rather difficult integration, whereas this is not exactly the case in the U.S.A.

The largest immigrant group in New York are the Dominicans, who are almost half a million and though constitute only 13% of all immigrants in New York. The largest ten immigrant groups counted together, do not even constitute 50% of the totality of immigrants. This gives us an idea of how diverse immigration is. As a result, completely different relationships are created between the host society and the immigrant groups, since the questions of identity, practices and their identification is always contextual in relational, situational process. Therefore, the relation of the immigrant populations with the host society differentiates from one context to the other. The American society is so diverse religiously, ethnically and racially that it creates a very different context. And the existing process in America today is that all the other non Judeo-Christian religions are becoming Americanized, in the same way that Judaism and Catholicism became Americanized. This has been the case for Islam, Buddhism, as well as Hinduism. American Hinduism is a very unique form of Hinduism, in the same way that American Judaism is a new form of Judaism: it is a completely new form of Judaism in the human history. The same applies to Catholicism, which has become more globalized with its "*aggiornamento"* but which is, still, different from the Catholicism developing in the U.S.A. The same remark applies to Islam. Naturally, one should not forget the events of the 11th of September, one needs to be cautious in this respect. On the one hand, there is no doubt that the 11th of September may bring something new, create a new historical pattern. But on the other hand, we should not be too overwhelmed by this event and make an effort to look at long perspective. My own interpretation is that incorporation of Islam in America will occur, in spite of the existing ugly situation, namely the

American security policies of the ministry of Justice and the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Another question which seems to be raised in different terms regarding Islam in America compared to the European Islam, is the following: which is the pattern to follow? In final analysis, the Jewish pattern, the American and Catholic patterns, are all very different. Sometimes Muslims like to compare themselves to the Jewish peoples. Their way of reasoning can be resumed as follows: that since Jewish constitute a very small minority - approximatively 5% of the population - though they are extremely effective, it could be interesting for Muslims to follow their patterns. The difference that can be made regards the identification to the Ummah as a one-single community. American Judaism follows more the pattern of American Protestantism, namely the division into different denominations: Orthodox, Traditional, Reformed or Reconstructed Judaism.

Due to the dynamic of a relativist anti-Muslim feeling in America, I believe that it is more the Catholic pattern that is being reproduced. The Catholic immigrants developed their whole life within a Catholic pillar, an attitude that lead to the polarization of society, like it is the case in Holland. In America, the Catholic immigrants lived all their life within this pillar from primary school, to high school and university. Then they used to exercise Catholic professions, to practice Catholic sports, Catholic, etc. Everything was Catholic! It was only after the Fifties that Catholics became fully integrated in the society. Today, there is the same kind of debate within Muslims as the one that among Catholics at the turn of the century. A series of questions can be raised in this respect: in which way should Muslims be incorporated in the American public life? Should they assert their presence in the same way that the Jewish people did it? Or should they proceed to the creation of separate Muslim structures, in order to maintain their identity separately?

Gema Munoz mentioned the issue regarding the difficulty of forming Muslim associations or congregations in Spain. In the U.S.A, on the contrary, this is relatively easy. The U.S.A, being a *secularized State* with a very *religious society*, it grants a lot of facilities for the formation of religious groups or associations. It was by the means of conserving their “religious difference” that most immigrants became incorporated in the American society. Religious diversity was the

only diversity tolerated, even viewed as positive. And today this pattern is going to be reproduced: immigrants tend to practice their religious identity, more than other forms of identity, because there is a premium in practicing religious identity in America: it is considered good to be a religious person in America. If one defines oneself as member of a religious group, one is accepted and well-viewed, more than if one define oneself as member of other kinds of groups.

Within this conference, we have been discussing about immigrants in Europe, without discussing really about race. In America, on the opposite, it is impossible to discuss immigration without immediately discussing about race or racialization. Dynamics of racial or group identities are particularly intermixed in America, since the process of racialization is extremely strong. As a result, immigrant groups tend to practice their religious and group identity, so that they do not get categorized in a different race. This brings us to the question of laicism and secularism in Europe. European countries define themselves as liberal, fully accepting liberty of religion, freedom of practicing privately religion. However, it is much more difficult to accept public organization of religious identities and to incorporate these into society, into the nation. One can be incorporated individually, as a citizen, and can confess a different religion. On the opposite, when it comes to the acceptance of a religious identity in terms of group incorporation, it becomes much harder for laicism or secularism which seem to constitute more a prominent feature of the official European ideologies, rather than a tangible reality.

The existence of different types of Etatisms in Europe may be an element of the explanation. In fact, the American State is less interventionist than the European States in both the religious and immigrant spheres. It has relatively open borders with legal and also non-legal immigrants. But while the U.S.A are open to immigrants, on the contrary, there exists no State policy for incorporating these immigrants. This means that immigrants have to organize themselves as a group. Conclusively, we witness a combination of the fact that on one hand the State does not help immigrants at all and, on the other hand, the fact that there exist a much more open process of civil society, formation of associations - particularly the religious ones - and therefore the immigrants need to use their collective social and cultural capital for their self-organization. There is no official recognition from the State. In other terms, the government never recognizes a

particular rabbi, or a particular Protestant minister, there is no official representation of any religion, at any level. There exist only a symbolic representation. There is no official recognition of any particular group or leadership, but there is a kind of symbolic recognition. The representation of the various religious groups becomes a question of competition among these groups: for instance, the Jewish compete among themselves to select their representative for this or the other administration, and so forth. This context of competitiveness is at the origin of the government policy and lobbying. So in the U.S.A it is question about a complete different dynamic of recognition. There is a constant relationship between the State and the various immigrant groups, but officially there exist no State recognition of any religious group.

Another remark that can be stressed is the following: if we intend to de-exoticize Islam, we simply need to consider Muslims in the same way as other immigrants and at the same time consider Islam as a religion among other religions. In the context of our comparative research project on Muslims and Islam, avoiding any notion of Islamic exceptionalism, I would like to make the following remark: in the U.S.A, Muslims are considered to be what we could call today's Catholics. They are undergoing a similar process as Catholics used to do and there is a similar treatment. This also applies from a geopolitical point of view: for a long time, Catholicism was defined as an anti-modern fundamentalist religion, incompatible with the American republicanism. It was argued that republicanism and Romanism were incompatible. A long process of adjustment was necessary, before this discourse came to an end. It is interesting to note that there was no theological anti-Muslim discourse in the U.S.A, until very recently. I do not believe that this is exclusively due to the events of the 11th of September. But, undoubtedly, the 11th of September has initiated something that did not exist before. Now there are some "evangelical voices" trying very explicitly to delegitimize Islam as an authentic religion. According to them Islam is a non-authentic monotheistic religion. But fortunately, the country is pluralistic enough and there are many other evangelical voices that are against this new anti-Islam tendency. As a conclusion, we can claim that it is a very complex issue.

Debate

Jocelyne Cesari: Could you describe the relations between the official representatives of Islam in Spain and the Muslim leaders in a local way? What are the themes that are spoken about in Spain today? Who leads the discussions and how do the negotiations take place?

Gema Munoz: In Spain the question is all about the leadership of the converted. They do not have a conflict relationship with the immigrants that come from abroad but they do not interact, it is two different universes. They have different goals and different behaviors because their needs and their vision of Islam are totally different. So, the associations focalize themselves on the converted.

In the 1970s there was a very big competition between the leaders in Spain; the first generation that came to Spain belonged to the most radical movements of the left wing and they did not find a space where to continue their cause. They were Muslims in Cordoba and Seville, in the south of Spain, ant they found in Andalousia the nostalgia and a new reason for living. And they started to organize themselves in different associations; and when the Constitution of Spain was established they took benefit of the Constitution to sign agreements. And it was quite easy to sign these agreements, which answers to a certain fantasy and dream, because in Spain there was not a hope that there would be a bigger Muslim community that would come from Northern Africa. So it was very interesting, politically and socially, regarding the relationship between other countries and Spain. So they signed the agreements formally; and the agreements were supposed to be very open-minded toward the Islamic people of Spain. So Moroccans started to come, Algerians too, Pakistanis and they localized in Barcelona. But the question of the Muslims in Spain has changed completely because the Muslim immigration was the strongest and the process was very intense, the immigration process was very intense in Spain. The converted Muslims just continued in their own universe, they had their jobs; and their approach of Islam is very neutral. They considered their approach to the Muslim religion as more pure than the vision of the immigrants, which is supposed to be based on a cultural basis, for example a Moroccan or an Algerian basis.

So they are very interested to re-inforce the institutionalization of Islam, to deal with the official representation of Islam in Spain. Of course the Muslims are defended in Spain and they deal with the situation of the Moroccans and the Algerians, they try to solve the problems of the Mosques for example; and they try to organize these communities in Spain, but there is no interaction really. There is no dialogue, there is no political discussion, there is no interaction between the Spanish, the Spanish society, and the Muslims, nor between the converted and the Muslim Moroccans for example, who started to develop a local leadership which is very autonomist. These are very critical towards the Spanish institutions and are not interested to develop the religious question in Spain. They are also critical towards other Muslim leaderships, which are foreign, linked for example to the worldwide Islamic Ligue or to other groups which are completely autonomous and work alone. And this is the reason why they are in a first stage; what helped them to organize themselves is the fright, the fears relatively to the transmission of Muslim religion towards the younger generations. The objectives are very diverse now. They do not dare to organize themselves; to ask for example the teaching of the Islamic religion in public schools, because they do not have the power, nor media possibilities, or links with the Administration. So what they wanted, is to find means *in* the community, to transmit the religion and exercise their faith. Their major fear is the children and the transmission, the heritage of the religion. Therefore the transmission is very internal and it does not get out of the borders of the local limits. So for example the municipality is trying, little by little, to find negotiations; so they find a certain way of living. But today this is the stage which exists in Spain.

Question (Person non identified): I understand that when Moroccan Muslims come into a country, where there is already a Muslim community of people belonging to the Spanish Nation, that they experience the same sort of ethnic discrimination that non Muslim immigrant would have. I imagine that they probably experience on the part of the Spanish Muslims a similar type of discrimination that non Muslim immigrants would experience from the non Muslim Spanish. So it is not at all surprising that they do not at once join the established Muslim associations. My question is: how do Moroccans in the first place want to be represented? They have interests, you mentioned specifically the religious interests, but is that the way they State their primarily interests, are they only interested in transmitting religious values to the children? Wouldn't their primarily interest be more purely economic interest in representation? *Who* is speaking for the

Moroccans? Are they speaking as *Moroccans*, are they speaking as *Muslims*? What sort of statements do they try to make when they speak to the majority community or to the authorities? Do they make statements *as Muslims*, statements *about* their religion, or are they in the State when they primarily represent their group interests as people in a particular economic niche, who feel perhaps the threat of loosing their culture? Are they trying to find mechanisms to teach the children their language, or is it only religious rituals? It struck me, you just gave a book that you wrote, which is called "Moroccans in Spain" not Moroccan Muslims in Spain, or Muslims from the Maghreb in Spain. You yourself define these people primarily as Moroccans, so I would not be surprised if their own self definition would be Moroccan or *Berber* perhaps *first*, and Muslims second or even third. So, who are their leaders? And are these religious leaders or is there within the Moroccan community a struggle for leadership between people who primarily speak as Moroccan, nationalists, as Berber ethnic nationalists, as Labor activists, as religious activists?

Gema Munoz: The question is the following: firstly, in Spain the Muslim community is composed of Moroccans essentially. There are Algerians also of course, but not as much as Moroccans. And there are certain Pakistanis. But the majority is Moroccan. The Spanish situation at a first stage, for example what happened at the 1990s was a priority for the Moroccans and for some associations of Moroccan workers. The most recognized associations in this domain are Moroccan associations which are called "The Moroccan Workers in Spain". This association had goals which were: work, social rights and legal rights. And the legalization of the Moroccans in Spain. And during all this period there was only one strategy, a main strategy which was socio-economical relative to work and health. And there was no debate over religion and over the religious question. This association, which is the most representative, has continued with its own goals, the ones that I have just mentioned. It is very politicized and they consider that the question of the integration of Moroccans can be seen only on the social and economic view.

Everybody has talked of the Moroccans or of the North Africans but the question was linked to the nationality of the Moroccans. What has started to change is the following: after the installation of the authorities, what has evolved is that this community, in certain neighborhoods in Spain, they started to change some things. They really felt the need to organize themselves relatively to the religious demands, revendications and recognition. They do not think about their

return to Morocco of course, they know that they will stay in Spain and that their kids will become Spanish, at least nationality wise. So there is a need to organize in a religious way and to ask themselves *who* they are in Spain.Who are they as Muslims in Spain; and they want to develop their situation, to organize the community and to guarantee a stability for the community and also for the children which are considered to be the future.

Their leadership, are very often people that know the community very well and the people that constitute the community. The community asks them to become the leader of the group. The leaders started to talk about themselves as Moroccans but also as Muslims.

In Spain, the way of identifying and naming this collective has changed. We speak more about *Muslims* and not of *Moroccans*. So, we are in a special moment, a historical moment, which is very significant. It is a change in the elaboration of the Muslim identity in Spain. So there is a change, an evolution from the Moroccan identity towards the Muslim identity. So they were critical towards the association of Spanish Workers for example. They were very critical towards this association, because they consider that they forget the question of culture and religion. They forget that the religious question is part of their future and of the solutions that will be found in the future. So we are living a period of very big transformation.

Question (Person non identified): I would like to thank Mrs. Munoz, because she has had lots of courage in defining the difference between the converted and the immigrants. There is only one reason when you become a Muslim: it is all about faith. But what you said, gives the impression that there are some countries like Bosnia, that were countries until the Ottoman Empire. The ones that stayed Muslim after the reign of the Ottoman Empire do not get along with the New Islam, which is an immigrated Islam. So it is not a question of nationality, because they all come from the place; but the ones that were under the Ottoman Empire are still traditionally linked to religious principles, whereas the immigrants, not only in the Balkans but also in Europe and in the States, are sort of influenced by ideologies that are present in Islam but only for maybe 60 or 70 years. So I am asking you if you can see in this difference between the Old and New Islam an issue of traditional Islam in today modern ideology that comes from countries across the

Mediterranean, an Islam which is exercised by the young populations which are maybe the most influenced of all.

Gema Munoz: I have nothing to add. The only question is the following: I was not trying to judge the converted or the immigrant Muslims, but I tried to analyze the situation: the existence of two groups that are completely different and there is a lack of real interaction between the two groups. They do not have common goals. It is true that the converted play a positive role, if we look at the media, because of course they have access to the media, as they are Spanish. And sometimes they can put on to the media some questions, when there are very important conflicts like for example Fatima's case a year and half ago, "the veil case": it was a Christian religious school and the Sisters refused to make Fatima enter in the school because she was wearing the veil (hajab). The question was not the veil, the question was that private schools, which are under State control, have the obligation to admit foreign children. These schools do not want immigrants. So they found a pretext to get rid of this Moroccan girl who was wearing a veil. So in this case the converted have more means to get through the media and to transmit their ideas. But if we can still say that there is no interaction because it is two different universes, two different worlds, in the converted population it is not sufficiently active to transmit their ideas.

Gerdien Jonker: As to our European situation – and maybe it is nice to finish on an overview –, I have always been intrigued by the difference USA – Europe as to the different places that is attached to religion. I do not have a clue where to start systematic comparison. Our European situation is that there is more or less an official religion of the country, which has been a State religion, or still is a State religion and which is more or less Protestantism in the North, Catholicism in the South and Orthodoxy in the East.

The difficult point is: where to make a place for new religions, for migrant religions? The religions of the State are rooted into their countries legally and institutionally and the country is dependent on them and how they function. And they have taken as their responsibility to make a little place for other religions but I cannot compare this with the American situation which has taken community building right away as a place for migrants to start communicating with the New World.I am expressing a doubt with this: I do not know where to start and I also have a

question. Looking from America on Europe: do you see something that we miss? We are looking at our situations of State or not State religions, but this fixed situation, is there something we are missing? Something you would say about: "why don't you start from there or speak about this?"

Jose Casanova: I myself come from Europe and it took me very very long time to understand the American situation. It looks so strange for us Europeans because we have taken the secularization thesis for granted, that modern people are secular people. We know that Americans claim to be more religious than they truly are. When they are asked how frequently they go to Church, they say: "ten times" although they may only go five times. And they say that they pray every day although we know that they do not pray every day. So they feel guilty if they are not as religious as they think they ought to be. So American people are supposed to be religious and there is a social pressure for people to be religious there. Here in Europe it is the other way around: Are you religious? God forbid! Of course I am not religious!

It is *this* notion: I cannot dare publicly to say that I am a religious person. And I am a modern, secular person. There is *this* element. Of course, in terms of the internal differences within countries in Europe it is the Churches – State relations, the difference between Protestantism and Catholicism which counts for the internal difference. But it is *this* common element of *secularism* in what we have inherited from the Enlightenment critic of religion, that we take for granted, which makes the European situation exceptional. And this is the paradox: Europe claims to be secular, and therefore should have no problem accepting other religions! And our liberal heart tells us of course: I am tolerant for religions, I look down upon them because, you know there are still religions. But the fact is that underneath, there is this Christian culture and this Christian identification. Turkey? Of course Turkey cannot be European! Well, human rights? No, no, no! How can be Muslim Turkey European? It is *this* problem! And unless it is faced more systematically and we face with what secularism means and the way the secularist as a sort of regime has been institutionalized in Europe, and we take it for granted; these were our world view! We need to deconstruct this secularist ideology; and it is part of the problem of precise both: identifying people by *their* religion, essentializing them and also making this essential identification the very same obstacle for incorporating them!

Question (Person non identified): The difficulty, the integration between the different Islamic elements, is reducing to dichotomy. And there is incompatibility: we have on one side traditional Islam and on the other side among moderate Islam, which asks a distinction in an individual way.

Jose Casanova: I do not know sufficiently the European situation phenomenologically, to be able to offer an explanation. There is a general explanation: we know that young generations – and this is not only a question in Europe but a question of a return of the second younger generation to traditional religion. It happens within Judaism in America: the children are more religious than their more secular parents. It happens obviously, you know, the Islamic movements within Muslim countries… So it is not the phenomenon of this primitive rural people: being more religious. It is a very complex reaction situation, I do not really have an explanation for it. I do not know phenomenologically the situation from country to country, to be able to explain it. I think that it is different from one European country to the other.

Gema Munoz: This division between the fathers and the children cannot be very crucial. In reality, one of the things that is very representative in Spain is that the young women who are educated that ask for their Islamic religion but also are critical towards their patriarchical habits and lows that try to give them a social role that they do not believe in. And the women consider that it is not part of Islam. They consider that the Islam is something else, a personal, individual faith. Among the youth, and especially among the women, they really ask for their faith and they are belonging to Islam, and their practice of Islam: they wear the veil but they do a very intense critic of the traditions because they think that this is not in accordance with the role that they want to have in the Islamic religion, in their families for example. So it goes beyond the generations, it is more complicated I think.

Question (Person non identified): Yesterday you talked of integration, of secularization, of representativeness and of legitimization. So, you have spoken more of intersubjectivity so, I would like to ask if there is a possibility to talk of intersubjectivity and the interactions at the lower level to measure if the institutional speech is really enacting or is it a real political will.

Jocelyne Cesari: I think that we should not even raise the question of Muslim citizenship within the French society; namely, it is not in technical terms of acquisition of a citizenship which gives you the right to vote, or the possibility to be eligible, all this is already acquis. If we look at the Muslims in the French society, those who are citizens an those who are not citizens, they have a very civic behavior, for the most. I do not think that there is a real question on citizenship and the legitimization of the political institutions. In most of the cases, we are facing a population that accreditates the reality of the French institutions and political values. So I think there is no problem about this. So the question of the institutionalization of Islam is not an answer to citizenship. It exists in a model of relation between the French State and the religious organizations. And there is a gap in this subject today in France. But it does not explain the citizenship of the local Muslims. In terms of sociology this question should not be asked.

Question (Person non identified): My question is about the representativeness in the Muslim movement. I think that when we try to ask… the question of representativeness or of the crisis of representativeness in the Muslim community, we try more to observe a phenomenon in the time being, instead of analyzing the history of this immigration. In France you have talked of the personification of Islam, I do not think that this kind of observations, which are very immediate, should always be integrated in more broad analysis and put into context, a historical context. I think that this observation will always be limited if we still look at it like this. The debate becomes very reductive. I think that we have to put all these discussions into the historical context. It was said that from an observation of the communication of the Muslims all over the world, we could understand better the Muslim community. Can we theorize the relation between Muslims themselves just by looking at the media and the communication that are used from them, to spread the Muslim ideas and to express their ideas and beliefs? I think that an effort should be made to get the debate in broader limits and to put all these discussions into the historical context.

Valérie Amiraux: I think that there is a major problem of language. I think that there is a major problem of language. We do not speak the same language... It is true that the creation of the French Council is fundamentally political in its electoral appeal, and if we try to constitute a cartography of political positions on regional elections, it is obvious. So we have to wonder

whether it is a process of institutionalization which is aimed to give electoral benefits on the long term and which has a pragmatic meaning corresponding to more sociological stakes. But I think your question was less in terms of citizenship than in terms of political aspirations or willing to engage a process of putting in representation worship stakes. This first part of the question seems to me completely legitimate; it is set in France in a distorted manner due to the colonial heritage but it is set in the same way in Germany where the colonial context is not at stake and in Italy where negotiations between the State and Muslim representatives are stopped due to the same influence of some personalities and stakes of power. So we have approximately the same kind of scenario with political stakes that are completely different.

For the second part of the question I am not fully convinced by your critic which says that we make generalities based on little facts. Garbi Schmidt tried this morning to put in evidence a process of mediatisation (in the sense of putting in discussion) which uses a particular space, the cyberspace in order to put forward some claims with some inedited repertoires to question the problem of authority. But I agree with you to say that on the same problem, you have postures of researchers and postures of believers: we observe the same thing but we cannot draw the same conclusions because we don't have the same positions on their stakes. I conclude by saying that the network tried from the beginning to engage a discussion with Muslims and we had some difficulty to establish it. I refute the critic made to Garbi that her object of research is anecdotal meanwhile it shows a process which is now being invented of what is believing and how actually beliefs are put in practice.

CONCLUSION, TARIQ RAMADAN, UNIVERSITY OF FRIBOURG

There is obviously the necessity to proceed through observation and it has to be stressed that there has been significant strides made by researchers to avoid generalization on Islam and Muslims in Europe. We witness in this respect, an important progress. Nevertheless, we should bear in mind that we *need Muslim* researchers, as well as we need a strong, sincere *motivation* to understand Islam and contribute in the spreading of its ideas, otherwise there can be no evolution of Islam. If we study, for instance, the results of the research conducted on Jewish communities, researchers from the community bring into light new facts and elements, contributing to the evolution in this field. The same remark applies to the research field regarding the Muslim community.

Another point concerns the rapidity of social change among Muslim communities in Europe and in the US. We can claim that the question of representativeness in Europe is closely linked to politics, since it is altogether linked to the population representativeness, the question of immigration, as well as to the cultural homogeneity. These links are considerably significant from a political point of view. It is, undoubtedly, a political issue. I believe that *it is* political but it is not *just symbolic*. It has concrete consequences on Islam and Muslims through policy-making and administrative decisions.

It is stimulating to hear that in the United States the question of representativeness is different than in Europe. The question of communautarism is not alike either. We also have to raise the following question: what are the political repercussions? The link between the State and the society has been underscored during this conference, which I believe is very significant. Two months ago I visited Spain, where I heard that the Muslim converts were claiming to e treated separately from the other Muslims by the State. They believed that the Spanish State had finally realized that it had to take them seriously. They argued that it is not possible to ”play” with them, since they perfectly know their rights and are determined to claim these rights. They also know *how* to discuss with the State. Finally, they underline that they have signed an agreement with the State, in 1992, which is not respected today.

My last point is about the existing confusion between *access to modernity* and *loss of religiosity*. This is a very significant question that we should examine today. It may be more an element of *speech* than of *reality*, however I believe that we should not neglect raising this question in a serious manner. In France for instance one has the impression that this connection made between modernity and loss of religiosity is taken for granted. But some social facts contradict this opinion. For example, within the younger population the return to religious practice is considered to be on the rise. The reality of this shift can be observed within the youth all over Europe: in a general way, young students do no longer believe that access to modernity implies necessarily a loss of religiosity. We are obliged to deconstruct the link between religiosity and *secularization.* Secularization is the "laicization" of the French system. We need to work hard on this process of deconstruction. Nowadays, in France, as well as in other European countries and in the United States we witness an important reflection on this subject, which can be considered a real process - a very constructive one - that could serve as a guiding line, in order to find a way to maintain at the same time religion *and* a sphere of neutrality, aiming at eradicate discrimination.

FINAL CONCLUSION

JOCELYNE CESARI, GSRL-CNRS, PARIS / HARVARD UNIVERSITY

It is the moment to conclude, to synthesize the different questions debated and try to unify them. We need to remind that the theme of this two-day conference: "European Muslims and the secular State in a comparative perspective", was part of the research agenda of the Nocrime team for a period of two years. We adopted the method of a collective work on Islam in Europe, since we believe that this is the only way to have fruitful research results in this field. The key idea of our collaboration on this project consisted in getting out of the traditional deconstruction of misrepresentations surrounding Islam.

We are aware that it is not possible to avoid essentialism completely since it is part of social life. Our goal was to adopt a dialectic approach that implies a work on the identity of Muslims, their countries of origin, their degree of religiosity, as well as on the internal differences among the various Muslim communities. This implies to proceed to the deconstruction of the European societies themselves. In this respect the following question was raised: what is the perception of religion and what kind of political debates reacted to the Muslim presence are now emerging within the different European societies?

In this conference, we try to adopt a bi-dimensional approach of the Muslim condition: a diachronic approach, throughout different periods of time, and a synchronic one, namely in the same time but in different places. According to the diachronic approach, it was stimulating to observe the process of evolution of other religious groups, through different stages, and their integration in the national context. The case of Jews in Denmark presented by Lars Dencik in particular was very interesting. It is particularly important to study the question of institutionalization of Islam diachronically. We become aware of the fact that institutionalization of Islam cannot is influenced by historical relations between the European countries and the religions that exist today in Europe. Nowadays, there is an attempt in Europe today to constrain

Muslims in specific frames and models of relationship between State and Churches that were used in the past but which, meanwhile, have been transformed.

The synchronic approach is also very relevant. Some of the reports presented in the conference addressed this synchronic dimension by presenting the situation of Muslims in the different countries within the same period of time. For instance, the urban influence plays a major role today. We can therefore raise the following questions: what is happening in different urban spaces in Europe today where Muslims and non Muslim immigrants have to coexist? And how do they negotiate their belonging to the various religious traditions? All the reports highlighted the influence of the dominant culture on the interactions between Muslims and non Muslims. And it has to be here underlined that we have to make the distinction between the State and the society and the way that Muslims themselves perceived the interactions between political institutions and the society in which they live. In a synchronic perspective, the influence of globalization on the development of Islam in Europe has also to be emphasized. We need to study as well the influence of globalization on other religions in order to stop thinking of Islam as an exceptional case. That's why some reports were presenting case studies from other globalized forms of religions such as Sebastian Fath's.

To conclude, if Muslims in Europe are not exceptional, they have however some specificity. One concerns the *definition* and *nature* of authority. If we wish to understand the specificity of Muslims in Europe, we need to pay more attention to the formation of the authorities. The second is the status of women in the Muslim religion. In the report on Spain, it was mentioned for instance that women in Spain asked for more power and claimed to stop being represented in a traditional way. The third specificity concerns the relationship to the *other* i.e. non believer or non Muslim. for instance, where do Muslims put the limit of tolerance vis-a-vis atheistic persons or apostates within their religious groups? Outside their religious groups? Finally, a last point is the increase of Muslim researchers in the academy and their attempt to develop a critical and historical approach to their religious tradition.

These specificities of Western Muslims will and have already started to affect the cultural and religious debate in the Muslim world at large.