PERFORMATIVE SOCIALIZATION IN WORLD POLITICS: ISLAMISM, SECULARISM, AND DEMOCRACY IN TURKEY AND EGYPT

A Dissertation
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Ismail Yaylaci

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Raymond D. Duvall

August 2014

Acknowledgements

This project came into being thanks to the generous support I received from many individuals and institutions. First and foremost, I am indebted to Bud Duvall, my adviser, for his endless support and encouragement. Bud is truly an intellectual role model. The deep respect with which he engages with his students and colleagues and with their work is exceptional. Bud has come to represent excellence in scholarship and teaching for me. Despite his time-demanding administrative duties over the last seven years, he always made me feel his support and always fostered my ideas and questions. I'm so glad and fortunate to have worked with him.

I also thank other members of my dissertation committee—Kathleen Collins, Ron Krebs, and Shaden Tageldin. Kathleen contributed to the development of my project from the very beginning. I am also very grateful for her hospitality. The conversations we had over brunch in her house in the freezing Minnesota winter were truly heart-warming. Ron joined my committee in the very last year, but he carefully read every single chapter and gave substantive feedback. His attentive and thoughtful comments always pushed me to make my arguments more clear and compelling. I thank him for joining my committee and for his serious engagement with my work. Shaden's comments and suggestions were really helpful, and our conversations with her about postcolonial translation and Egyptian politics were invaluable. I am truly grateful for her endorsement and for her signature kindness, respect and generosity.

Michael Barnett served in my committee when he was in Minnesota, and I thank him for his initial contribution. I also thank Nancy Luxon, Ajay Skaria, Kathryn Sikkink, and Margaret L. Werry, whose graduate seminars helped me refine my questions and ideas.

My friends in the department also commented on different sections of this project in different occasions. I am particularly grateful to the members of our dissertation group and to the participants of the Minnesota International Relations Colloquium (MIRC), including Robert Assadi, Sema Binay, Charmaine Chua, Chase Hobbs-Morgan, Mark Hoffman, Eli Mayerhoff, Haeri Kim, Garnet Kindervater, Quynh N. Pham, David Temin, and Sergio Valverde (a.k.a. Hafez Greenvalley). I am also grateful to Himadeep Muppidi for sharing his insightful comments and suggestions. I also wish to extend my thanks to the participants of the Religion and International Affairs Dissertation Workshop organized by the Social Science Research Council in California in 2011, particularly to Ebrahim Moosa, R. Scott Appleby, Cecelia Lynch, Danilyn Rutherford and Qamar-ul Huda, for their feedback on an earlier iteration of the project. I was convinced to include AK Party into my discussion after Sidney Tarrow's suggestion at a workshop in Syracuse. I want to thank him for that.

I would not be able to conduct fieldwork research or write my dissertation without the financial support I received from multiple institutions. In that vein, I thank the Department of Political Science for providing me with numerous research and teaching

assistantships, Graduate Research Partnership Fellowship, and Andrew Dickinson Summer Research Fellowship. The Interdisciplinary Center for the Study of Global Change (ICGC) not only funded my fieldwork research with a pre-dissertation fieldwork research grant and then a year-long MacArthur Fellowship, but it also became a second home at the university. I also thank the University of Minnesota Graduate School for the Doctoral Dissertation Fellowship, and Meridyen Derneği and İlim Yayma Cemiyeti for travel support they provided at different stages of my doctoral studies. I also want to express my gratitude to Bilim ve Sanat Vakfı (Foundation for Sciences and Arts) in Istanbul for being my scholarly home since my college years.

My fieldwork research in Egypt would not have been as productive and enjoyable if it wasn't for the support and friendship of many truly remarkable people. There is no way I can name all of them here, but I particularly want to express my gratitude to Abdalla Erfan, Tarık Abdulcelil, Abdelrahman Ayyash, Abdelrahman Hosam and many other Egyptian friends for their support and friendship. Hamdi Yıldız was a wonderful neighbor and an experienced guide in Cairo. I will never forget our long conversations with him in the *sha'bi* coffeeshop nearby our residence. I also thank Dr. Heba Raouf of the American University in Cairo and Cairo University for letting me participate in her class and for our conversations. Dr. Nadia Moustafa and Dr. Sayf AbdalFattah and the staff of the Center for Civilization Studies and Dialogue of Cultures were all very welcoming and supportive. I thank them all. And I also want to thank Mesut Özcan for his help during my stay in Ankara.

Finally, I thank my wife Fatıma Tuba for making this journey meaningful and beautiful. To her and to our little angel Ayşe Hilal I owe the most and to them I dedicate my dissertation.

Dedication

For my wife Fatıma Tuba and our daughter Ayşe Hilal

Abstract

How do norms and discourses travel across cultural difference? How do actors negotiate the constitutive norms of liberal global governance at the juncture of the domestic and the international? This project provides an answer to these questions by developing a performative account of norm socialization and uses this theoretical framework to analyze Islamist negotiations of secularism and democracy in Turkey and Egypt. I suggest that the International Relations scholarship often takes socialization as a pedagogic process in which the non-West is made to transition into the norms of liberal modernity in a hierarchical relationship of authority. In this perspective, actors either socialize into liberal norms or resist them. After identifying the shortcomings of these narratives, I develop a reading that takes socialization as a performative process of cultural translation and norm appropriation. By so doing, I analyze the ways in which norms can be adopted non-normatively—at once inhabited and resisted. I argue that a performative reading enables a more complex understanding of the dynamics of normalization and resistance in socialization. Then I employ this framework to analyze Turkish AK Party's and Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood's negotiation of secularism and democracy by drawing mainly on the data I collected in my fieldwork research in Turkey and Egypt. More specifically, I examine the performative politics of translation and appropriation in the AK Party's notions of 'democratic secularism' and 'conservative democracy' and the Muslim Brotherhood's notions of 'civil state within an Islamic framework' and 'Islamic democracy.'

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In his first visit to post-Mubarak Egypt in the September of 2011, the Turkish Prime Minister R. Tayyip Erdoğan, the founder and chairman of the Islamically-oriented *Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi* (AK Party, [Justice and Development Party]) which has been in power since 2002, was welcomed with enormous enthusiasm by thousands of Muslim Brotherhood members at the Cairo International Airport in the middle of the night. During his much-publicized visit Erdoğan made a surprising move. When he was asked about his opinions on Egypt after Mubarak, he stated that secularism should not be seen as atheism or irreligiousness, but as guarantor of religious freedoms, and thus should be enshrined in the constitution. These remarks came at the distaste of the Muslim Brotherhood as the latter has long been calling for an Islamic state that implements the principles of *shari'a* (Islamic norms and law) as the law of the land. The spokesperson of the Brotherhood, Mahmoud Ghazlan, immediately responded to Erdoğan by accusing him of interfering in Egypt's internal affairs and by arguing that Turkey's and Egypt's conditions and experiences were very different.[1]

This was indeed an intriguing moment. Here you had Erdoğan, whose party was convicted by the Turkish Constitutional Court in 2008 for 'becoming a hub for anti-secular activities' and who himself served a four-months prison sentence in 1999 and was forced to quit his position as the Mayor of Istanbul for an 'anti-secularist' public speech, now advocating for secularism in Egypt, whose constitution takes the principles of

[1] "Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood Criticizes Erdogan's Call for a Secular State," *Al Arabiya*, September 14, 2011, http://www.alarabiya.net/articles/2011/09/14/166814.html.

shari'a as "the main source of legislation." (*masdaru-r-raisi li't-tashri'*) Many observers saw this as the moment of crystallization of the differences between two versions of Muslim politics: an Islamist one, on the one hand, represented by the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood, aiming to establish an Islamic state that implements *shari'a* as state law, and a 'post-Islamist' one, on the other, exemplified by the Turkish AK Party, discarding the notion of Islamic state and endorsing secular liberal democracy. Stressing that difference, the local (Egyptian and Turkish) and international media as well as academic discourse overwhelmingly pointed to the AK Party as a 'model' for the Brotherhood and other Islamists in the Arab world by virtue of its socialization into secular liberal norms.[2]

However, what is as intriguing as Erdoğan's advocacy of secularism in Egypt is the politics of translation involved in the exchange between him and the Muslim Brotherhood. After returning from his trip to Egypt, Erdoğan was asked about the reactions of the Brotherhood's spokesperson to his comments. He said his words were misunderstood because of a mistake in translation: "In Arabic, there is a word for 'irreligiousness,' and the translator used that word for secularism (*laiklik*). Secularism is not about being an enemy of religion. It is about the state maintaining the same distance

[2] Ahmet T. Kuru, *Muslim Politics without an "Islamic" State: Can Turkey's Justice and Development Party Be a Model for Arab Islamists?*, Policy Briefing (Doha: The Brookings Institution Doha Center, February 2013); David D. Kirkpatrick, "Turkey's Premier, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, Takes On Regional Role," *The New York Times*, September 12, 2011, sec. World / Middle East, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/13/world/middleeast/13egypt.html; Jack Shenker, "Turkey's PM Rallies Arab World in Cairo with Call for UN to Recognise Palestine," *The Guardian*, September 13, 2011, sec. World news, http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/sep/13/turkey-rallies-arab-world. For earlier work on the Turkish AK Party as a model for other Islamists, see Seyyed Vali Reza Nasr, "The Rise of 'Muslim Democracy,'" *Journal of Democracy* 16, no. 2 (2005): 13–27; Hakan M. Yavuz, *Secularism and Muslim Democracy in Turkey* (Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009); William Hale and Ergun Ozbudun, *Islamism, Democracy and Liberalism in Turkey: The Case of the AKP* (Routledge, 2009); S. Tepe, "Turkey's AKP: A Model' Muslim-Democratic' Party?," *Journal of Democracy* 16, no. 3 (2005): 69–82. Seyyed Vali Reza Nasr, *Forces of Fortune: The Rise of the New Muslim Middle Class and What It Will Mean for Our World* (Simon and Schuster, 2009).

to all religions and acting as a custodian of their beliefs. This is what we mean when we say 'don't be afraid of secularism.'"[3] Indeed, Erdoğan's translator used the Arabic word *'almaniyya* as a translation of the Turkish word *'laiklik*'—the two words used as the equivalents of secularism in Arabic and Turkish, respectively. However, the word '*almaniyya* has negative connotations in Egypt's Islamic circles for its association with hostile attitudes toward religion.[4] Essam El-Errian, the vice president of the Muslim Brotherhood's now closed down Freedom and Justice Party, echoed this distaste with the term '*almaniyya* to back up his criticism of Erdoğan's comments: "Secularism has a very bad perception among Egyptians. We have no need for this term."[5]

This exchange has become even more interesting when Ahmet Davutoğlu, the Turkish Foreign Minister, later clarified that the term Erdoğan used ('*laiklik'*) should have been translated into Arabic as '*dawla madaniyya*' (civil state) or '*siyasa madaniyya*' (civil politics) instead of "*'almaniyya*" (secularism) since the term *'almaniyya* is often understood as not allowing Islam to play any role in public life, in a way that parallels Kemalist laicism (*laikçilik*).[6] What is remarkable here is that *dawla madaniyya* is already what the Brotherhood and its Freedom and Justice Party (FJP) have been calling for in their programs and statements since 1990s. FJP's 2011 program declares that the party

---

[3] "Erdoğan Tell Arabs His Secularism Remarks Mistranslated," *Today's Zaman*, September 16, 2011, http://www.todayszaman.com//news-257047-erdogan-tell-arabs-his-secularism-remarks-mistranslated.html.

[4] Talal Asad, "Fear and the Ruptured State: Reflections on Egypt after Mubarak," *Social Research: An International Quarterly* 79, no. 2 (Summer 2012): 271–98.

[5] Marc Champion And Matt Bradley, "Islamists Criticize Turkish Premier's 'Secular' Remarks," *Wall Street Journal*, September 15, 2011, sec. New York, http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424053111904491704576570670264116178.

[6] Ahmet Davutoğlu, Interview by the author, January 7, 2012. Fahmy Howaidy, a prominent Islamist intellectual and columnist in Egypt, also confirmed the same point in his interviews with Davutoglu. See, Fahmy Howaidy, "Hiwar 'an Al-'Almaniyyati Fi Turkiya," *Al-Shorouk*, October 11, 2011, http://www.shorouknews.com/columns/view.aspx?cdate=11102011&id=73700458-5863-4865-8fba-096d795a59d7.

envisions "a civil state within an Islamic frame of reference" (*dawla madaniyya bi'l marji'iyya'l Islamiyya*). In Brotherhood's political imagination, this is a democratic Islamic state (*dawla Islamiyya*) that is neither secular ('*almaniyya*) nor religious/theocratic (*diniyya/theoqratiyya*) but instead a civil state (*dawla madaniyya*).

Even though Erdoğan's comments attracted considerable local and international attention, his and Davutoğlu's later remarks didn't. However, they together reveal the complexity of the meaning-making practices around the concept of secularism that belies the simple binary construction of Islamist Muslim Brotherhood rejecting secularism versus the post-Islamist AK Party internalizing it as it is often depicted. Rather, as this particular instance indicates, both AK Party and the Muslim Brotherhood engage in a negotiation of secularism that has strikingly similar features as well as significant differences. These differences, however, can hardly be shoehorned into a binary narrative of the AK Party accepting and the Brotherhood rejecting secularism and democracy. Surely there are important differences between the AK Party and the Brotherhood as the exchange between the two shows. But it also shows that these differences are far subtler than it is generally described.

My dissertation aims to explore and account for such complex dynamics of norm socialization in global politics. I argue that the International Relations (IR) scholarship tends to take socialization as a process of norm adoption that is pedagogical in nature (Chapter 2), and highlighting the shortcomings of this pedagogic treatment, I develop a performative reading of socialization that attends to the dynamics of cultural translation and appropriation of norms (Chapter 3). I then use this analytic optic to analyze AK

Party's conception of 'conservative democracy' and 'democratic secularism' (Chapter 4) and the Muslim Brotherhood's notions of 'Islamic democracy' and 'civil state within an Islamic frame of reference' (Chapter 5) as their performative socialization into democracy and secularism.

The concept of socialization generally refers to the "process of inducting actors into the norms and rules of a given community."[7] Through socialization state and non-state actors come to adopt the constitutive norms, identities, and interest perceptions of a particular international society.[8] Socialization is one key mechanism through which liberal global governance produces particular subjects with particular identities, interests, and capacities[9] through the exercise of various forms of power.[10]

Chapter 2 of my dissertation argues that the IR scholarship, particularly the liberal and constructivist accounts, tend to take socialization as a pedagogic process. I identify three main components of these pedagogic frameworks. First, they view socialization as a process of *transition* of the non-West into liberal norms and Enlightenment universals. This transition seeks to induce forms of subjectivities with secular liberal sensibilities and commitments. Such renditions of socialization rest on a particular "diffusionist teleology" that constantly predicts and prescribes convergence and/or homogeneity around Western

---

[7] Jeffrey T. Checkel, "International Institutions and Socialization in Europe: Introduction and Framework," *International Organization* 59, no. 04 (2005): 804.
[8] Martha Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society* (Cornell University Press, 1996); Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Frank Schimmelfennig, "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues," in *Norms and Nannies : The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and East European States*, ed. Ronald Haly Linden (Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2002), 1–32.
[9] Alastair I. Johnston, *Social States: China in International Institutions, 1980-2000* (Princeton University Press, 2008); Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*.
[10] Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall, "Power in International Politics," *International Organization* 59, no. 1 (2005): 39–75.

norms and institutions.[11] They operate with a singular logic of modernity that originates in Europe and demands "assimilation or acquiescence on the part of other civilizations."[12] Examples of this vision can be seen in statements such as the one Daniel Deudney and G. John Ikenberry make: "[T]he foreign policy of the liberal states should continue to be based on the broad assumption that there is ultimately one path to modernity—and that it essentially liberal in character."[13] Such narratives are "Eurocentric all the way down"[14] since they position the West as the driving force of norms in world politics and 'the rest' as recipients of them. The "destiny" of the non-West, in these accounts, is "to mimic, never quite successfully, the history already performed by the West."[15] In that sense, a transitionist pedagogy also posits a 'not yet' on the part of the 'socializee' that places the latter into the "waiting room of history."[16] This ends up authorizing universalist exclusions (e.g. 'Egypt is not yet secular, therefore democracy should wait') and violent inclusions (e.g. 'Afghan women should be liberated,' 'Iraq should be democratized.')[17]

Second, pedagogic accounts of socialization produce hierarchical subject positions in relation to norms: teachers and students, nannies and children, norm setters and norm followers. Reiterating Zürn and Checkel's observation that "teacher-student constellations" are in fact not as rare in world politics as it is generally assumed, I suggest

---

[11] Sudipta Kaviraj, "An Outline of a Revisionist Theory of Modernity," *European Journal of Sociology / Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 46, no. 03 (2005): 497–526.
[12] Tim Dunne, "The Liberal Order and the Modern Project," *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 38, no. 3 (May 1, 2010): 539.
[13] Daniel Deudney and G. John Ikenberry, "Myth of the Autocratic Revival - Why Liberal Democracy Will Prevail," *Foreign Affairs* 88 (2009): 93.
[14] Barry Buzan, "Culture and International Society," *International Affairs* 86, no. 1 (January 1, 2010): 1–25.
[15] Timothy Mitchell, *Questions of Modernity* (University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 1.
[16] Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton University Press, 2000).
[17] Sergei Prozorov, "Liberal Enmity: The Figure of the Foe in the Political Ontology of Liberalism," *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 35, no. 1 (December 1, 2006): 75–99.

that they in fact underlie much of the understandings and practices of norm socialization. The pedagogic function of 'transmitting' Western liberal norms of international society to its members[18] is often carried out by international pedagogues. For example, Frank Schimmelfennig depicts international organizations (in his case, EU institutions) as "nannies" who "disseminate, teach, and enforce…the constitutive liberal norms of the Western international community and the membership norms of the Western organizations."[19] Thus, international socialization "involves several teaching and nursing activities."[20] In order for these tutelary activities to take hold, Schimmelfennig suggests, the relationship between socializer and socializee must be asymmetrical and the socializee must be weaker and vulnerable in order to change his own situation. This pedagogic rendition of socialization also stipulates a relationship of authority between a "norm setter" and "norm follower."[21] The norm follower or the socializee is placed to follow the norms of the pedagogue socializer in such a way that the latter defines it. Hence the ideal trilogy of pedagogic socialization: "Successful nannies, good pupils, smooth socialization."[22]

Third, pedagogic models of socialization tend to approach normative engagements through the binary of acceptance versus rejection. Accordingly, actors either socialize into norms or they reject them. Actors either adopt the norm together with

---

[18] Thomas Risse-Kappen and Kathryn Sikkink, "The Socialization of International Human Rights Norms into Domestic Practices: Introduction," in *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change* (Cambridge University Press, 1999), 1–38.
[19] Schimmelfennig, "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues," 2–3.
[20] Ibid., 8.
[21] Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," *International Organization* 52, no. 04 (1998): 887–917.
[22] Schimmelfennig, "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues," 18.

its normalizing logic—its hegemonic articulation—or resist the norm and reject it. As Ikenberry and Kupchan put it, non-Western elites either 'buy into' the norms articulated by the hegemon or 'resist' them.[23] They cannot do both. Therefore, pedagogic treatments of socialization fall short of fully recognizing how norms can at once be adopted and contested.

By so doing, pedagogic narratives gloss over the performative dynamics of socialization. Chapter 3 of my dissertation develops a performative reading to account for these dynamics. Along the lines of these three tendencies of the pedagogical narratives mentioned above, my performative account makes three theoretical interventions. First, it takes socialization not solely as a process of transition but also as a process of cultural translation. When the constitutive norms of liberal order that are universal in nature and global in reach—such as democracy, human rights, equality, freedom, and rule of law—travel across borders, they get translated and thus transformed through the filter of other languages and traditions. Actors negotiate the universality of liberal norms and institutions through their cultural and/or religious traditions and social imaginaries. Second, the authority relationships established around norms get troubled when actors performatively institute their own authority in appropriating the norm. Especially those who are in the margins of liberal global governance may adopt the norms non-normatively, that is, against their hegemonic articulation and normalizing logic, through various discursive strategies such as by claiming the norms from which they are excluded or by introducing difference into the norms they adopt. Hence, and this is the third point,

[23] G. John Ikenberry and Charles A. Kupchan, "Socialization and Hegemonic Power," *International Organization* 44, no. 03 (1990): 283–315.

norms can at once be adopted and contested, in ways that trouble the binaries of acceptance versus rejection in pedagogic accounts of socialization.

In that context, I suggest that the discourse of post-Islamism that locates the AK Party and the Muslim Brotherhood at the opposite sides of the binary of socialization versus non-socialization into democracy and secularism is a pedagogic story of socialization. The term post-Islamism emerged in 1990s but has become more pronounced with the Arab popular uprisings in 2011.[24] Many observers described the Egyptian and Tunisian uprisings as a "post-Islamist revolution," or a political manifestation of "new Arab street in post-Islamist times."[25] They suggested that Arab activists transcended the classical coordinates of Islamist politics by endorsing a liberal language of human rights, democracy, and equality rather than aiming at establishing an Islamic state implementing *shari'a*. In that vein, many pundits and policymakers pointed to the AK Party experience in Turkey as a 'model' for Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood and Tunisian al-Nahda for getting rid of its Islamist baggage and its ushering into a post-Islamist stage. Post-Islamism is depicted as the "privatization of Islamization as opposed

[24] When it was first coined by Asef Bayat in 1996, the term post-Islamism meant to describe the conditions and social trends in post-Khomeini Iran, but it then enjoyed a wider circulation and became an across-the board claim about the metamorphosis that Islamism was undergoing "in ideas, approaches, and practices from within and without." Asef Bayat, *Making Islam Democratic: Social Movements and the Post-Islamist Turn* (Stanford University Press, 2007), 10. In Gilles Kepel's usage, the term refers to a process of departure from jihadi and salafi variants of Islamism towards embracing democracy and human rights; and for Oliver Roy it describes a process of "privatization of Islamization as opposed to the Islamization of the state." Gilles Kepel, *Jihad: The Trail of Political Islam* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003); Olivier Roy, *Globalized Islam: The Search for a New Ummah* (Columbia University Press, 2006), 204. All point to a trend toward liberalization and secularization within the Islamist movement as a result of a disappointment with or the failure of Islamism.

[25] Asef Bayat, "A New Arab Street in Post-Islamist Times," *Foreign Policy Blogs*, January 26, 2011, http://mideastafrica.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/01/26/a_new_arab_street; Olivier Roy, "Révolution post-islamiste," *Le Monde.fr*, February 14, 2011, http://www.lemonde.fr/idees/article/2011/02/12/revolution-post-islamiste_1478858_3232.html.

to the Islamization of the state,"[26] hence as the carrier of secularization and liberalization as opposed to the anti-secular and 'illiberal' undertones of the Islamist project. As such, post-Islamism discourse describes and prescribes[27] the "end of political Islam"[28] and the rise of a "post-ideological"[29] moment whereby Islamists "embrace the universality of political modernity"[30] and give up on their claims for an Islamic alternative together with their challenge to the liberal order and its attendant norms and institutions. In that sense, post-Islamism tells the story of Islamist 'normalization' and the "absorption of an antisecular challenge" to capitalism and liberalism.[31]

Post-Islamism discourse is intimately tied to the broader debates over Islamism, secularism, and democracy. It argues that while Islamism is an authoritarian ideology that seeks top-down Islamization through enforcing Islamic law as state law, post-Islamism, on the other hand, represents a radical shift toward secular liberal democracy since it discounts the idea of a shari'a-implementing Islamic state. Rather, the latter incorporates Islam in the form of personal religiosity or ethical guidance and adopts the key liberal constructs such as individual rights and autonomy, public and private distinction, state neutrality, and free markets. Thus conceived, Islamism and post-Islamism is depicted as the story of two competing social forces: "those who want a democratic religion and

---

[26] Roy, *Globalized Islam*, 10.
[27] Post-Islamism is both a description and a prescription because it is posited as both a 'condition' *and* 'project' of integration of the Islamically-oriented political actors into the values of liberal order. See, Bayat, *Making Islam Democratic*, 11.
[28] Olivier Roy, *The Failure of Political Islam* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994).
[29] Bayat, *Making Islam Democratic*.
[30] Ihsan Dagi, "Rethinking Human Rights, Democracy, and the West: Post-Islamist Intellectuals in Turkey," *Critique Critical Middle Eastern Studies* 13, no. 2 (2004): 135–51.
[31] Cihan Tugal, *Passive Revolution: Absorbing the Islamic Challenge to Capitalism* (Stanford University Press, 2009), 3–4.

those who pursue and authoritarian version."[32] Post-Islamists, in Bayat's view, are the subjects who "make Islam democratic,"[33] as opposed to Islamists who fall short of making Islam democratic due to their insistence on putting democracy within the bounds of *shari'a*. For example, the Muslim Brotherhood's claim that democracy is acceptable as long as "it [does] not contradict the scriptures, the Quran and sunna"[34] stands, for Bayat, as the indication of its anti-democratic character. Islamists' call for democracy does not command legitimacy or authority due to the unsecular and 'illiberal' character of their conception of democracy. Then, what Islamists refer to as 'Islamic democracy' is not a genuine democracy but a variant of Islamic authoritarianism that incorporates some democratic procedures. On the other hand, post-Islamists' separation of shari'a from state law authorizes them as proper democratic subjects.

In that sense, the post-Islamism narrative is very closely intertwined with the nascent discourse of 'Muslim democracy.' The transition from Islamism to post-Islamism by and large overlaps with the transition from 'Islamic democracy' to 'Muslim democracy.' In the Islamist conception of 'Islamic democracy,' popular sovereignty and legislation are acknowledged only within the confines of *shari'a*, whose content is decided by a constitutional body—a supreme court or a council of Islamic scholars. The liberal configuration of the public and private distinction and religion's relegation to the private is squarely rejected in the Islamist model of 'Islamic democracy.' Mawdudi's

---

[32] Bayat, *Making Islam Democratic*, 6.
[33] The fundamental motive in Bayat's conception of post-Islamism is to transcend the question of the doctrinal compatibility between Islam and democracy by suggesting that it is up to the believers of a tradition to make their doctrine compatible or incompatible with democratic sensibilities. Hence, the response to the question of compatibility would arise not through a novel theological exegesis but out of a balance of power between democratic and authoritarian interpretations of the tradition.
[34] Quoted from 'Asam al-Eryan in Bayat, *Making Islam Democratic*, 177.

concept of "*theodemocracy,*"[35] Hofmann's model of "*shuracracy*"[36], and the constitutions of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan stand as examples of Islamist attempts to combine democracy and *shari'a* in various forms.[37]

In juxtaposition to this Islamist notion of 'Islamic democracy,'[38] post-Islamists foresee a 'Muslim democracy' that aims not at establishing shari'a as state law but at incorporating Islamic values in their political strategy of competing for the median voter in elections. The dynamics of political participation, the argument goes, compel Islamists to moderate their platforms and discourses so as to embrace liberal democracy as 'the only game in town.' In other words, rather than aspiring to Islamize democracy through the models of "*shuracracy*" or "*theodemocracy,"* Muslim democrats accept liberal democracy as a general framework for the organization of political life. According to this narrative, while Islamists resist secular liberal democracy, post-Islamist 'Muslim democrats' socialize into it. This socialization entails transition from one set of commitments to another, as the tables below highlight:

---

[35] Abul 'Ala Mawdudi, *Political Theory of Islam* (Lahore: Islamic Publications, 1976).
[36] Murad Wilfried Hofmann, *Religion on The Rise: Islam in the Third Millennium*, 1st ed. (Amana Pubns, 2001).
[37] Noah Feldman discusses the potential and actual institutional arrangements that "constitutionalize" and "democratize" *shariah*, whose public observance serves as the penultimate goal of the Islamist movements. See, Noah Feldman, *After Jihad: America and the Struggle for Islamic Democracy*, First edition. (FSG, 2003).
[38] Here it is interesting to note the title of a chapter in Noah Feldman's book, *After Jihad,* which reads: "Islamic not Islamist Democracy." This distinction is very reasonable if one thinks that even so-called 'Muslim democrats' who do not vie for an 'Islamic democracy' indeed do so because they believe it is more Islamic. In that sense, Feldman's point is very well taken. But here I take 'Islamic democracy' as an Islamist view of democracy. While Islamists seeks to 'Islamize' democracy by constitutionally keeping it within the bounds of shari'a, 'Muslim democrats' such as the AK Party do not seek to 'Islamize' democracy through institutional design but rather aims to produce Islamic outcomes (shari'a-compliant decisions and actions) out of the democratic process.

ISLAMISM	POST-ISLAMISM
Authoritarian	Democratic
Illiberal	Liberal
Shari‘a law	Secular law
Duties/Obligations	Rights/Compromise
Exclusive	Inclusive
Singularity (monopoly of truth)	Plurality (ambiguity)
Fixed scripture	Historicity-hermeneutic
Past-oriented	Future-oriented

Table 1.1. Islamism and Post-Islamism, derived from Asef Bayat (2007)

ISLAMIC DEMOCRACY	MUSLIM DEMOCRACY
Rule by shari‘a	Rule by Muslim values
Islamic state with narrow interpretation of shari‘a	Discount the claim that Islam demands a shari‘a state
State-centered	Society-centered
Top-down through state	Bottom-up through civil society
Idealist/Utopian	Pragmatic/Realist
Islamic trumps political	Political trumps Islamic
Illiberal, authoritarian, little room for civil liberties, cultural pluralism, rights of women and minorities	Liberalizing; harbinger, not the follower, of more liberal Islamic thought and practice.
Democracy not deeply legitimate but a tool for building Islamic state	Channels Islamic aspirations into liberal democracy to help them win votes
Islamist parties and legislative demands, mostly cadre parties	Center-right liberal democratic parties with conservative Islamic

	values, mostly catch-all parties
Anti-secular	Inevitable secularization due to electoral logic
Mixed economy	Private-sector oriented, free markets

Table 1.2. Islamic Democracy and Muslim Democracy, derived from Vali Nasr (2005)

These two discourses share the common conviction that secular liberalism is an essential *sine qua non* for democracy, but they slightly differ in where they locate secularism in the political trajectory. Post-Islamism narrative tends to see secular liberal commitments as a precondition for democracy. It stipulates that the "separation of the secular and religious domains is the prerequisite for liberating the forces of reform in the Muslim World."[39] Accordingly, in order for 'authoritarian Islamists' to become 'democratic post-Islamists,' they have to secularize their platforms and adopt liberal configurations of the public and private realms. But for the Muslim democracy narrative, secularism is not a precondition that must be met prior to having a democracy, but rather it is an unavoidable outcome of democratic mechanisms, particularly of electoral politics. As Nasr notes, "the depth of commitment to liberal and secular values that democratic consolidation requires is a condition for Muslim Democracy's final success, not for its first emergence."[40] Similar to the transformation and moderation of the revolutionary Marxist movements and parties in the nineteenth century Europe[41] and the Christian Democratic parties in the twentieth

[39] Gilles Kepel, *The War for Muslim Minds: Islam and the West* (Harvard University Press, 2004), 295.
[40] Nasr, "The Rise of 'Muslim Democracy,'" 2005, 15.
[41] Adam Przeworski and John Sprague, *Paper Stones: A History of Electoral Socialism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).

century,[42] the inherent electoral logic of competing for the median voter will force Islamist parties to transition into a 'Muslim democratic' stance. The pragmatic orientation to win elections will force Islamists to "transform their unsecular tendencies … into long-term commitment to democratic values."[43] In that sense, the desired socialization into secular liberal norms will be "the harbinger, not the follower, of more liberal Islamic thought and practice."[44]

It is important to note that the call for secularism within the discourse on post-Islamism is not solely a call for an institutional arrangement regulating the relationship between state and religion. It is also a project about fostering a particular kind of subject that bears liberal secular sensibilities. A post-Islamist, according to Dağı, is one who adopts the "secular/modern/western alternative"[45] and joins the global current by internalizing secular liberalism. Therefore, the discourse of post-Islamism reproduces the pedagogic power of secular liberalism within global politics. Secularism here functions as a form of political authority that authorizes the kinds of subjectivities that are compliant with the norms and conventions of liberal global governance. As Saba Mahmood points out, "secular liberalism cannot be addressed simply as a doctrine of the state, or as a set of juridical conventions: in its vast implications, it defines, in effect, something like a way of life."[46] In that sense, secularism's "normative impetus" is to "reorganize

---

[42] Stathis N. Kalyvas, *The Rise of Christian Democracy in Europe* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1996).
[43] Nasr, "The Rise of 'Muslim Democracy,'" 2005, 15. Note that Nasr here indexes "unsecular tendencies" as equivalent of undemocratic tendencies.
[44] Ibid., 26.
[45] Dagi, "Rethinking Human Rights, Democracy, and the West," 17.
[46] Saba Mahmood, *Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject* (Princeton University Press, 2005), 191.

subjectivities in accord with a modality of political rule."[47] Along these lines, the 'project' of post-Islamism is the project of transforming sensibilities and remaking subjects—a pedagogic project of socialization. The secularist dynamic at work in post-Islamism discourse not only aspires to neutralize the political domain from the 'inappropriate intrusion' of religion but also seeks to produce a 'proper' subject whose actions and reasonings are in line with the imperatives of secular liberal political rule. Thus, as a pedagogic discourse of socialization, post-Islamism interpellates subjects into internalizing secular liberal sensibilities and commitments.

Chapter 4 of my dissertation employs the theoretical framework developed in Chapter 3 and sets out to analyze the Turkish AK Party's notions of 'conservative democracy' and 'democratic secularism' as manifestations of its performative socialization into secularism and democracy. Post-Islamism and Muslim democracy narratives do capture important aspects of the transformation AK Party has been going through under conditions co-created by the Kemalist state and liberal international order that pressure the party toward pedagogic socialization. Yet, as stories of transition they fall short of accounting for the politics of translation that the AK Party embarks on. AK Party *translates* key political categories of Islamic tradition into modern liberal concepts (and vice versa) rather than simply *transitioning* to them. Analyzing the closure case against the AK Party at the Turkish Constitutional Court and the previous decision of the European Court of Human Rights that upheld the Turkish Constitutional Court's earlier decision to close down the Islamist *Refah Partisi* (Welfare Party)—AK Party's

[47] Saba Mahmood, "Secularism, Hermeneutics, and Empire: The Politics of Islamic Reformation," *Public Culture* 18, no. 2 (2006): 328.

predecessor—I examine how the Kemalist Turkish state understood and imposed a rigid form of secularism, how liberal international order endorsed it, and how AK Party developed its own conception of 'democratic secularism' and 'conservative democracy' in relation to and in response to these constraints. To do so, in addition to these court cases, I draw on my interviews with AK Party members, leaders, and deputies together with first-hand and secondary resources produced by them.

Similarly, Chapter 5 analyzes Muslim Brotherhood's performative socialization into democracy and (in some ways) secularism in its conception of an Islamic civil state. Drawing on my interviews with Muslim Brotherhood leaders and members together with the firsthand and secondary sources, I look at how Muslim Brotherhood translates and non-normatively appropriates democracy and negotiates the secular state.

As for methodological commitments, my dissertation works through an interpretivist epistemology and a critical discourse analytic methodology in order to capture the practices of signification in Islamists' engagement with the norms and institutions of liberal global order.[48] I take discourses as "systems of signification which construct social realities." I dwell on the theoretic commitment that power, understood as "the production, in and through social relations, of effects that shape the capacities of actors to determine their circumstances and fate,"[49] always inheres in the operations and effects of discourses. In other words, the discursive production of subjectivities as "situated social capacities of actors" is a form of power exercised diffusely through social

[48] Audie Klotz and Cecelia Lynch suggest that discourse analysis "broadly denotes methodologies that capture the creation of meanings and accompanying processes of communication." Audie Klotz and Cecelia Lynch, *Strategies for Research in Constructivist International Relations* (M.E. Sharpe, 2007), 19.
[49] Barnett and Duvall, "Power in International Politics," 42.

relations of constitution. (Barnett and Duvall 2005: 48) Hence, by deploying discourse analysis as an interpretive method I intend to "demonstrate how systems of knowledge and discursive practices produce subjects through social relations that are quite indirect, socially diffuse, and temporally distant."[50]

Chapter 2 provides a critical discourse analytic reading of the socialization literature in IR. Chapter 3 draws on postcolonial theory and poststructuralist theories to develop a performative reading of norm socialization. Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 analyze the historical, constitutional, legal, political, social, and international dynamics within which discourses and practices—both pedagogic and performative—are produced, disseminated, and articulated. In analyzing discourses, I look at their operative logics, underlying assumptions, and the ways in which concepts relate to each other. I analyze how subjects are interpellated and authorized within discourses and how actors performatively produce the authority of their meaning-making practices. I investigate the hierarchies and exclusions created and reinforced in and through discourses.

My dissertation's methodological orientation in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 is akin to what Michael Burawoy calls "the extended case method."[51] This method interlinks the micro and the macro scopes by looking at how global forces condition, restrain and produce the local and how the local relates to and negotiate or resist global dynamics.[52] Therefore it has a two-way focus: it analyzes the mutual imbrication of the constitutive and causative power of structures and the idiosyncrasies of particular locales. Thus it

---

[50] Ibid., 48.
[51] Michael Burawoy, "The Extended Case Method," *Sociological Theory* 16, no. 1 (March 1, 1998): 4–33.
[52] Michael Burawoy, "Revisits: An Outline of a Theory of Reflexive Ethnography," *American Sociological Review* 68, no. 5 (October 1, 2003): 645–79.

enables theory reconstruction through highlighting the anomalies or weaknesses in the theory that one identifies in ethnographic fieldwork. Here, I identify the problems and tendencies of the post-Islamism discourse in terms of how it represents and positions actors (AK Party and Muslim Brotherhood) and I identify the institutional and material forces, both domestic and global, that exert a pedagogic power to socialize actors and how actors navigate and negotiate these forces.

I study the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood and the Turkish AK Party as examples because they are often taken as the typical and most representative cases of Islamism and post-Islamism, respectively. Therefore, the explanatory and interpretive power of the narrative of post-Islamism must be highest in these two paradigmatic cases. By the same token, if post-Islamism narrative does not fit well to the most typical cases, then this might cast more doubt on the explanatory and interpretive framework. To probe the plausibility of post-Islamism as a pedagogic narrative of socialization and to investigate the interpretive leverage of a performative reading, I etnographically study the meaning-making practices of actors in two locales in relation to the global dynamics. In that sense, my focus is less on generalizability and more on theory reconstruction. In so doing, I bridge local examples with the broader patterns and dynamics of liberal global governance.

The data I use for my dissertation comes from my ethnographic fieldwork research that I conducted in the summer of 2010 and the fall of 2011 in Egypt and Turkey. I conducted semi-structured interviews with the cabinet ministers, parliamentarians, and other leaders and members of the AK Party in Turkey. I also

analyzed the published articles, books, speeches and interviews of these leaders in order to understand how they construct the concepts of secularism, democracy, and shari‘a as well as their interrelationship. Other firsthand sources I used include the published decisions of the European Court of Human Rights and the Turkish Constitutional Court, as well as AK Party's court defense, party program, official statements and policy proposals. I also used secondary sources such as newspaper articles, think-tank reports, and relevant academic literature.

Similarly, in my fieldwork in Egypt, I conducted semi-structured interviews with members and leaders of the Muslim Brotherhood as well as the leaders of its Freedom and Justice Party. I used various other firsthand sources such as the statements of the movement on democracy, secularism and shari‘a since 1980s, published articles of the Brotherhood leaders, and various election platforms and draft party programs declared since 2004. I also draw on my fieldwork notes I took in the events or rallies organized by the Brotherhood or the FJP. Occasionally I have found myself in natural focus group discussions in very unpredictable situations, sometimes with Coptic Christian Egyptians in a coffee shop in midnight, sometimes with current and former Brotherhood members during a protest against the Supreme Council of Armed Forces (SCAF) in Tahrir Square, sometimes with students in a classroom setting during a guest-lecture at American University in Cairo, or sometimes with secular liberal activists during a guest public talk at Alexandria Library. I also dwell on my interviews with journalists, students, and activists critical of the Muslim Brotherhood.

This project is an interdisciplinary undertaking at its core. It frames the question within the field of IR, but engages with various debates and literatures in anthropology, sociology, literary theory, history and Islamic studies. It particularly draws on postcolonial and poststructuralist theoretical insights in order to shed a different light on the question of Islamist norm socialization in global politics. In that vein, the next chapter analyzes the pedagogic character of the discourse of socialization in IR.

CHAPTER 2

PEDAGOGIC SOCIALIZATION IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

"Much of the discussion of contemporary world order is still preoccupied with the dynamics of the spread of and resistance to a universalizing West." Such was R.B.J. Walker's observation back in 1984.[1] The ongoing debates over the triumphant declarations of global homogenization around liberal norms on the one hand and the prophecies of intercivilizational clashes on the other testify that this statement still holds true. International norm socialization is one prominent analytical framework used in the International Relations (IR) discipline to address these "dynamics of the spread of and resistance to a universalizing West." Socialization in IR generally refers to the processes in which actors are made to adopt the norms of liberal international order. Therefore, socialization is the mechanism through which subjects are produced as actors with particular identities, interests, and resources. In this chapter I argue that much of the IR literature on norm socialization operates through a particular pedagogic discourse. This discourse, I argue, posits not only which norms are proper, but also how these norms are to be interpreted and practiced. It creates the hierarchically placed subject positions of 'teachers/pupils' or 'nannies/children' in world politics. Finally, I argue that this pedagogic narrative rests on a Eurocentric diffusionist teleology that takes socialization as a process of transition. In so doing, it falls short of attending to the complexity of normative engagements and reproduces the hierarchical organization of global politics.

---

[1] R. B. J. Walker, "East Wind, West Wind: Civilizations, Hegemonies, and World Orders," in *Culture, Ideology, and World Order*, ed. R. B. J. Walker (Boulder: Westview Press, 1984), 4.

This pedagogic discourse manifests itself in various ways. It often takes the form of an international organization 'actively teaching' the pupil socializee the 'correct' interpretation of 'proper' norms.[2] More often than not, it is some international organization located in the West teaching "Western norms" and "Western ways" to the rest of the world. Sometimes the teachers are transnational actors.[3] Combining the strategies of reward, punishment, and persuasion, these transnational 'entrepreneurs' engage in "moral proselytism" motivated by "the compulsion to convert others to [their] beliefs and remake the world in [their] own image."[4]These transnational proselytizers at times take the form of "epistemic communities," those professionals who can lay authoritative claim to competence in a particular policy area, who teach norms[5] and guide policy-makers on the correct practice.[6] Sometimes international institutions serve not as 'active teachers' but as 'environments' within which newcomers learn the norms of the community.[7] For some, the pedagogic function of socialization operates not necessarily through particular organizations or institutions, but through the compelling and ever expanding rules of a 'Western world-culture.'[8] Therefore, even though the dominant

---

[2] Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*; Alexandra Gheciu, "Security Institutions as Agents of Socialization? NATO and the 'New Europe,'" *International Organization* 59, no. 04 (2005): 973–1012.
[3] Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, *Activists beyond Borders : Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998); Finnemore and Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change."
[4] Ethan A. Nadelmann, "Global Prohibition Regimes: The Evolution of Norms in International Society," *International Organization* 44, no. 04 (1990): 481.
[5] Peter M. Haas, "Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination," *International Organization* 46, no. 01 (1992): 1–35.
[6] Emanuel Adler and Peter M. Haas, "Conclusion: Epistemic Communities, World Order, and the Creation of a Reflective Research Program," *International Organization* 46, no. 01 (1992): 367–90.
[7] Alastair Iain Johnston, "Treating International Institutions as Social Environments," *International Studies Quarterly* 45, no. 4 (2001): 487–515; Johnston, *Social States*, 2008.
[8] John W. Meyer et al., "World Society and the Nation-State," *American Journal of Sociology* 103, no. 1 (July 1, 1997): 144–81.

liberal constructivist theories privilege agentic accounts that identify a locus of agency actively doing the work of 'teaching,' socialization does not necessarily entail the existence of a proximate 'teacher.' The pedagogy of liberal socialization is operative as well in the absence of a pedagogue. Broader structures and institutions (such as markets and elections) and discourses (such as individual rights and autonomy) can and do socialize actors in liberal order.[9] To put it in Barnett and Duvall's terms, the kind of power exercised in pedagogic socialization is not only "compulsory" (wherein a proximate agent produces effects through material incentives and coercion) and "structural" (through interactions based on socially produced asymmetrical roles).[10] Socialization also wields "institutional" and "productive" kinds of power that produce effects without necessarily entailing proximate interaction between agents. Institutional power is exercised through designing the rules of the game, and productive power produces effects through discursive formations.[11] Pedagogic models of socialization variously combine these forms of power in inducing actors into the norms of liberal international society.

---

[9] I make an analytical distinction between pedagogy and paternalism. I understand paternalism to be a hierarchical relationship in which the immature or not yet rational is brought under the care of a superior protector, in such a way that the latter decides and acts on behalf of the former. Pedagogic relationships, however, while still hierarchical, do not necessarily entail one superior set of actors acting on behalf of the inferior other. Rather, pedagogic relationships seek to induce the desired behavior or meaning through various combinations of coercion, incentives, and persuasion. Pedagogic socialization may include paternalistic measures, as the title of the book "Norms and Nannies" suggest: Ronald Haly Linden, *Norms and Nannies: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and East European States*, New International Relations of Europe (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2002). European colonial practices in nineteenth century in Asia and Africa; American policies in post-World War II Germany and Japan and in Iraq and Afghanistan in the last decade also represent various instantiations of paternalism. Yet, they are analytically distinct modes of relationship.

[10] Barnett and Duvall, "Power in International Politics." As a process of transforming and producing subjects through various mechanisms of coercion, incentives, and persuasion, socialization is thoroughly infused with the exercise of various forms of power. Power always conditions normative engagements. Liberal accounts (including mainstream constructivism), however, rather tend to overlook that dimension.

[11] Ibid.

Either with the presence or absence of an educator, socialization often entails some thin or thick notion of 'teaching' taking place within a rigid or relaxed relationship of authority and hierarchy. The pedagogic relationship entailed here is not one between equal learners who are set to learn from each other. Rather, the prescribed relationship is one between a teacher and a student whereby the former assumes moral and expert authority and the latter is situated as the lesser party who is to learn the norms in the way that the teacher teaches them. Such hierarchical relationships produce the subject positions of "norm setter" (socializer) and "norm follower" (socializee),[12] or "norm giver" and "norm taker."[13] It grants one set of actors the power of setting a norm and of teaching and enforcing it, and produces another set of actors as the receiving end. As such, socialization is construed as the 'transition' of an often non-Western outsider into the norms of liberal global governance, the success of which is then measured by how much the newcoming 'student' internalizes the norms set by the 'teacher.'

In this chapter, I identify and discuss three main interlinked components of these pedagogic models of norm socialization. First, they rest on a Eurocentric "diffusionist teleology,"[14] that construes normative engagements as 'transitions' into 'Western norms.' This renders international socialization as the process through which "international society transmits norms to its members"[15] and transforms "norm breakers" into "norm-followers."[16]

---

[12] Finnemore and Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change."
[13] Amitav Acharya, "How Ideas Spread: Whose Norms Matter? Norm Localization and Institutional Change in Asian Regionalism," *International Organization* 58, no. 02 (2004): 239–75.
[14] Kaviraj, "An Outline of a Revisionist Theory of Modernity."
[15] Risse-Kappen and Sikkink, "The Socialization of International Human Rights Norms into Domestic Practices: Introduction."
[16] Finnemore and Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change."

Second, pedagogic accounts of socialization tend to create the subject positions of 'teacher' and 'student' and place them in a hierarchical relationship in which the former assumes authority, technical expertise, and material capability to 'teach' the correct interpretation of proper norms to the latter who then recognizes the authority of the former. Accordingly, the teacher of norms in global governance gets named as 'the West,' which renders 'the rest' the latter's students. Furthermore, this pedagogic narrative is based not on mutual learning but on a unidirectional relationship in which one party is set to teach and the other party is set to learn. As such, it reproduces the hierarchical structure of global politics.[17]

Third, they rest on a constative logic that views the interpretation and implementation of norms through the binaries of true vs. false or correct vs. wrong. This, as I will argue in Chapter 3, overlooks the ways in which norms can be and are appropriated performatively, that is, in non-normative ways. Pedagogic accounts of socialization tend to take norms as settled, saturated, and pre-given and then they concern themselves with how actors are induced to adopt the correct interpretation and performance of norms at various levels. This, I argue, misses the structurally open character of norms that allow for struggles within them and for making differential and

[17] Here I differentiate horizontal relationships of learning from hierarchical modes of teaching. Despite the fact that power relationships condition the dynamics of learning among actors, learning, understood as being directed not solely towards strategic gains but also towards mutual understanding and empathy, is one important hope for a democratically open and inclusive organization of global social life. Learning as communication can well be subordinated to the pedagogic project of liberal socialization, but they are still analytically distinct. Furthermore, collapsing learning into being one face of teaching runs the risk of giving up on the fundamental insight, embraced by both mainstream and critical constructivist scholarship, that identities and interests are not pre-given but are formed and transformed through social interactions. The concept of socialization seeks to capture these processes, and learning is but one way of such formation and transformation of subjectivities, identities, and interests. If there is not much difference between horizontal learning and hierarchical teaching, then we are most likely left with the world of instrumental rationality of pre-formed actors trying to maximize their already given interests in the most cost-effective way.

conflicting claims on them. Such models of international socialization underplay the complexity of normative negotiations in the contemporary world politics. My project is to present a systematic critique of the inadequacy of conventional treatments of socialization in the IR literature in order to create the basis for a preferable conception later in the dissertation. In what follows in this chapter, I first discuss the concept of socialization and address its different receptions in IR, then I go on to identify and critique the three main components of the pedagogic narrative— its Eurocentric teleology of transition, its positing of hierarchical subject positions, and its constative understanding of norms.

1. Defining Socialization: Mechanisms and Logics

The concept of socialization is used in many different and at times contradictory ways. There is no consensus on what socialization entails in terms of specific mechanisms and logics of action. But in general socialization rests on the fundamental idea that actors in world politics are embedded in "dense networks of transnational and international social relations that shape their perceptions of the world and their role in that world."[18] Through these global social relations, actors get "socialized to want certain

[18] Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*, 2. Even though the idea of socialization speaks to a thick notion of international society, the very analytics of socialization does not necessitate such a strong position. Many rationalist accounts in IR operate with a very thin notion of international social life but they still document the effects of socialization. This relates to the constructivist-rationalist divide within the mainstream disciplinary literature, but as I will discuss below, even though strong/thick accounts of international sociality have more to say about socialization, rationalist/individualist accounts that operate with a thin notion of international sociality also find socialization to be operative through utility-maximizing individualist logics. Hence, the debate is about how these different logics and readings of sociality interact to produce effects captured under the rubric of 'socialization.'

things by the international society." They change their goals and values, and redefine their interests "in the context of internationally held norms and understandings about what is good and appropriate." [19] Socialization thus names the process by which actors' "identities and interests get formed" in line with social expectations.[20] State and non-state actors "are socialized to accept new norms, values, and perceptions of interest" within international life by actors such as international institutions.[21] Thus, socialization is a "process of inducting actors into the norms and rules of a given community."[22] It denotes "the process directed toward a state's adoption of the (constitutive) norms of an international community."[23] Hence, it induces a change in actors' identities, preferences, and understandings of the international system toward convergence with the norms of international order.[24] As a process, socialization "creates preferences"[25] and serves as the mechanism through which social integration occurs in world politics. As such, the concept of socialization directly pertains to the broader questions of "the ends of political

---

[19] Ibid. As I will discuss below, states, international institutions, or transnational non-governmental organizations often "teach" states and their decision-makers the proper norms and their correct interpretation. For example, the literature suggests that UNESCO taught states that having a science bureaucracy was part of what was a "necessary component of modern state," ICRC taught state decision-makers the norms of conduct during war (Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*.), NATO taught states the correct norms of liberal democracy (Gheciu, "Security Institutions as Agents of Socialization?".), EU acted as a "nanny" in teaching the Central and Eastern European states the correct norms of democracy through material rewards and punishments (Schimmelfennig, "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues.")
[20] Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, 170.
[21] Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*, 5.
[22] Checkel, "International Institutions and Socialization in Europe," 804.
[23] Schimmelfennig, "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues," 1.
[24] Johnston, *Social States*, 2008.
[25] Alastair Iain Johnston, "Conclusions and Extensions: Toward Mid-Range Theorizing and Beyond Europe," *International Organization* 59, no. 04 (2005): 1015.

life and the nature of political community"[26] and speaks to the questions of stability and change in identity, community, and norms.[27]

In disciplinary terms, even though socialization is not the exclusive "home turf" of constructivism, it lies at the very heart of it. To the extent that constructivism is a critique of mainstream rationalist (both neorealist and neoliberal) accounts for having an "undersocialized" conception of actors, and to the extent that constructivism provides an account of actors and their interests as socially constructed, socialization stays at its center stage.[28] As Wendt points out, socialization is "a staple of sociological discourse" with which constructivism is aligned.[29] However, rationalist approaches also develop accounts to explain how actors come to conform to societal expectations, but constructivists are more interested in the ways in which socialization creates the identities and redefines interests.[30] There are instrumentally rational and strategic mechanisms of socialization. Therefore, socialization cannot be collapsed into internalization and logic of appropriateness. Socialization is not about constructivism versus rationalism since both approaches highlight different mechanisms of socialization. Of the three mechanisms of socialization Johnston identifies, namely mimicking, social influence, and persuasion, only persuasion operates through the logic of appropriateness that "leaves

---

[26] Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*, 5.
[27] Charlotte Epstein, "Stop Telling Us How to Behave: Socialization or Infantilization?," *International Studies Perspectives* 13, no. 2 (2012): 135–45.
[28] Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, 4.
[29] Ibid., 318.
[30] Ibid., 170. This distinction corresponds to Nye's conceptions of "simple learning" and "complex learning" respectively. See Joseph S. Nye, "Nuclear Learning and U.S.-Soviet Security Regimes," *International Organization* 41, no. 3 (July 1, 1987): 371–402. This conceptual family resemblance is also discussed in Andreas Hasenclever, *Theories of International Regimes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*; Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*.

actors with new definitions of self that provide self-evident and normal notions of expected behavior."[31] The first two fall within the rationalist paradigm in which actors seek to maximize their utility functions. Moreover, strategic action might be adopted to induce a norm-following behavior,[32] just as norms can be followed for strategic purposes.[33] Hence, to talk about socialization is not to reject strategic behavior as if socialization was an ideational process or a concept devoid of interest-bases. This points to the role of material inducements (e.g. rewards and punishments, membership conditionality) as well as ideational transformation (e.g. persuasion, internalization, social learning) in socialization. Hence, the analytics of socialization "does not fit into either a constructivist or a rationalist approach."[34]

This marks an interesting tension within the concept. Wendt, for example, argues that socialization is not a distinctively constructivist hypothesis as it can be created at different levels through force, price, or legitimacy. Put differently, there may be neorealist, neoliberal, and constructivist pathways to socialization based on considerations of power, interest, and legitimacy, respectively. But Wendt argues that only in the third degree of internalization, that is in internalizing the norm on the basis of legitimacy concerns, can one talk about a situation where "actors are really constructed by culture." And legitimacy is a "distinctively constructivist hypothesis" about socialization. Then, socialization is at the same time the turf of constructivism (because

---

[31] Alastair I. Johnston, *Social States: China in International Institutions, 1980-2000* (Princeton University Press, 2008), xxvii.
[32] Finnemore and Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change"; Keck and Sikkink, *Activists beyond Borders*; Michael N. Barnett and Martha Finnemore, *Rules for the World : International Organizations in Global Politics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004).
[33] Schimmelfennig, "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues."
[34] Johnston, *Social States*, 2008, xxvii.

"true" socialization can happen only through the constructivist category of legitimacy) but it is also not exclusive to constructivism (since there are different pathways to internalization on the basis of power and interest).[35]

A similar tension is evident in Zürn and Checkel's definition of socialization. "While socialization research has typically been construed as constructivism's home turf," they point out, "an emphasis on mechanisms and scope conditions reveals that rational choice has much to contribute here as well."[36] Yet, Checkel argues that socialization is about internalization of norms and that it is necessary to observe a shift from a consequentialist logic to a logic of appropriateness to count it as socialization.[37] That means adoption of norms ("community rules") should be "quite independent from a particular structure of material incentives or sanctions."[38] This creates a paradox within the argument, and Checkel and Zürn acknowledge that their definition of socialization ("a process of inducting actors into the norms and rules of a given community")[39] "cannot

---

[35] This also sits somewhat in tension with Wendt's surprise with Waltz's use of the term socialization. For Waltz, socialization is the mechanism through which states comply with the logic of the international system in order to survive. This, in a way, is an account of socialization that is based on an individualist logic of self-interest deduced from the imperatives of the anarchic nature of the international system. In other words, this is a Neorealist socialization based on interest defined as survival. In that sense, Wendt's surprise with Waltz's use of the term 'socialization' is surprising since he himself opens space for Neorealist and Neoliberal pathways for socialization as providing different degrees of internalization of the culture or norms of the international system. Wendt is right in pointing out that Neorealists are not fond of using the term socialization since they assume interests and preferences are exogenously given rather than endogenously produced. However, Wendt's own account of socialization creates that possibility for a Neorealist socialization, which does not really count as socialization, but still represents a step, a level, or a "degree" of internalization.

[36] Michael Zürn and Jeffrey T. Checkel, "Getting Socialized to Build Bridges: Constructivism and Rationalism, Europe and the Nation-State," *International Organization* 59, no. 04 (2005): 1047.

[37] Checkel, "International Institutions and Socialization in Europe," 804.

[38] Ibid.

[39] For them, this definition of socialization, rooted in sociology and symbolic interactionism, covers both sociological and rationalist accounts of norm adoption.

overcome the general paradox" but at least "fosters a dialogue between constructivists and rationalists" in order to build bridges across theoretical orientations.[40]

For Wendt, Waltz's notion of socialization is analogous to "natural selection" in that it rewards or punishes on the basis of conformity to norms. But Wendt develops a notion of socialization that is the equivalent of "cultural selection"[41] which operates through imitation and social learning.[42] Wendt's distinction between natural and cultural selection largely maps onto Wendt and Duvall's earlier distinction between "systemic integration" (through selection) and "social integration" (through constitution.)[43] They argue that rationalist approaches ("the new institutionalism of the 1980s") rely solely on the "systemic integration" of states through the mechanism of selection. They overlook the ways in which international life is socially integrated through mechanisms of constitution, which prepares the conditions for the possibility of meaningful interaction among actors, among with its systemic integration through mechanisms of selection.[44] Hence, both rationalist notions of selection (systemic integration) and constructivist notions of constitution (social integration) are intricately related components of socialization and both are necessary to understand the ordering of global politics.[45]

---

[40] Zürn and Checkel, "Getting Socialized to Build Bridges," 1046.
[41] Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, 320. Cultural selection here refers to "the transmission of the determinants of behavior from individual to individual, and thus from generation to generation." Ibid., 324.
[42] Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, 324.
[43] Alexander Wendt and Raymond Duvall, "Institutions and International Order," in *Global Changes and Theoretical Challenges: Approaches to World Politics for the 1990s*, ed. Ernst Otto Czempiel and James N. Rosenau (Lexington Books, 1989), 62.
[44] Ibid.
[45] The main constructivist premise that norms are both constraining and constitutive follows the same line of argument about the necessity of thinking both "systemic integration" and "social integration" together.

Hence, socialization is not exclusively about logic of appropriateness, but the latter is its pinnacle. There are consequentialist, means-ends calculating, utility-maximizing logics of norm-following action in world politics. Norms can be adopted to different degrees of internalization (power/force, interest/price, legitimacy/identity), in different forms (compliance, conformity, internalization), and for different reasons (coercion, self-interest, legitimacy), which correspond to the different pathways offered by mainstream theories (neorealism, neoliberalism, constructivism).[46]

2. Socialization as Transition

Pedagogic models construe socialization as a process of 'transition' into liberal modernity. They understand modernity and its constitutive political norms as something emerging in and belonging to the West and then transmitted to the non-West. The task then is to induce the non-West to adopt Western liberal norms in the way that the West interprets them. Pedagogic socialization seeks to produce subjects along these liberal norms by way of direct or indirect teaching by Western actors and discourses. Potentially subversive slippages that might occur within the transfer of 'Western norms' into non-Western locations are to be disciplined and policed per the pedagogic function.

Such powerful pedagogic forces and hierarchical relationships do exist in current liberal global governance. In a sense, what I refer to here as pedagogic accounts of socialization very aptly describe some of these processes. But while they describe the operations of the pedagogic power, some contribute to its reproduction by ideologically

[46] Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*.

justifying it, and only a few attend to the performative dynamics of socialization that operate alongside pedagogic forces.[47]

This pedagogic conception of socialization broadly corresponds to what Dipesh Chakrabarty calls 'History 1,' that is, the history of capital and of liberal modernity that rests on a universal logic of infinite expansion and incorporation. History 1 is the history of how capital puts the whole world under its sway and seeks to cancel out historical differences it encounters or incorporates them for its further expansion.[48] It marks capitalist modernity as a single unity, which then enables the historicist narration of different elements in the present as belonging to a past that has 'not yet' achieved the maturity of modernity.[49]This historicism is integral to the idea of modernity and has enabled the domination of the world by Europe in nineteenth century. For Chakrabarty, Marx's statement that an industrially developed country shows to the less developed "the image of its own future" and Mill's claim that Africans and Indians are not yet civilized enough to rule themselves are expressions of such historicism. The teleological logic of socialization posits a linear path that the non-West should follow. It also constantly produces a 'not yet' on the part of the 'socializee.' This pushes them back to the "waiting room of history" or seeks to incorporate them violently.

For Chakrabarty, the narratives of transition posit modernity not solely as global but as "globalizing over time, by originating in one place (Europe) and then spreading outside it."[50] The mantra of "first the West and then elsewhere"[51]epitomizes their logic

---

[47] I explicate these performative dynamics in Chapter 3.
[48] Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe*, 48.
[49] Ibid., 12.
[50] Ibid., 7.

and becomes evident in the discourses of progress, development, and catching up—discourses that not only posit Europe's past as the future of non-Europe but also portray the latter as 'not yet' ready for the universals of political modernity.

Such renderings of socialization rest on what Sudipta Kaviraj calls a "diffusionist teleology," which constantly predicts uniformity around European institutions.[52] It places the non-West at different stages of formation depending on how deep they internalize Western 'standards.' Charlotte Epstein observes that the socialization narratives in IR infantilize the socializee and embody an "inherent normative teleological design"[53] resting on a "unilinear, liberal understanding of progress."[54] This "universalizing teleology" in the literature conceals the origin of norms and "purports to cast as universal what is always necessarily a localized and historically specific set of values."[55]

What gets glossed over in the historicist pedagogic accounts, however, are the ways in which normative engagements are not solely processes of transition but also of translation. As Chakrabarty notes, modernity is not only a process of transition but also of translation of categories and institutions—an insight I develop in Chapter 3. In seeking to govern the performance of norms, socialization is thought of solely as a process of transition in which non-Western actors are made to think and act in ways authorized and prescribed by the 'West.' Translation, however, exposes the norm to resignification and

---

[51] Ibid., 4.
[52] Kaviraj, "An Outline of a Revisionist Theory of Modernity."
[53] Epstein, "Stop Telling Us How to Behave," 137.
[54] Ibid., 136.
[55] Ibid. Moreover, this unilinear view has a "progressive norms bias" which, for her, omits 'bad norms' such as colonization that are as well constitutive of the current global order. The ideological sources of this bias, for Epstein, can be traced back to the "liberal, Hegelian conceptions of history" and "the classic ideal of progress harbored by positivism's founding fathers."

displacement. Put differently, translation may put the normalizing power of the norms at risk. Hence, performance of norms has to be policed.

The transitionist pedagogy makes two analytically distinct but interrelated gestures. First, it authorizes universalist exclusions by claiming that non-Western societies are 'not yet' ready to join the club of the civilized. This is pretty much the discourse one sees in arguments about preconditions—i.e. preconditions of democracy ('Egypt is not yet secular, so democracy should wait') or preconditions of membership to organizations such as the EU or NATO ('Turkey has not yet reached the standards of civilization to be part of the EU'). This stagist logic of 'not yet' constantly gets reproduced in international politics.[56] Take NATO's relationship with the post-Soviet Eastern Europe for example. Gheciu suggests that "in the NATO discourse, the Czech Republic appeared in a position of becoming vis-à-vis the superior West: while it was more advanced than other former communist countries, it had not yet reached the end of its journey of transition to democracy."[57]

Second, it authorizes violent inclusions on the basis of these constitutive norms. ('Afghan women should be liberated,' 'Iraq should be democratized.') This, for John M.

---

[56] Even though the pedagogic discourse constantly produces 'not yet' for the socializee, the socializee can and should approximinate the 'standards of civilization' posited and represented by the socializer. For example, in many respects, post-World War II Japan is thought to have socialized into Western liberal norms, but its so-called 'collectivist culture' makes it 'not yet' fully liberal. Or post-indepence India is thought to be socializing into the norms of secular liberal democracy but the way Hindu religious customs and beliefs fuse themselves with modern institutions are referred to as 'not yet' as fully modern character of Indian society. For an endorsement of the 'not yet' perspective, see V. S. Naipaul, *India: A Wounded Civilization* (Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group, 2011). For a critique, see Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe*.

[57] Gheciu, "Security Institutions as Agents of Socialization?," 989. Exclusions are also justified through a relativist strategy. For example, some Orientalist perspectives suggest that the non-Western world, particularly the "Islamic civilization," is alien to democracy because of its 'cultural tradition.' Therefore supporting autocracies in the Muslim world becomes not only strategically necessary but also ethically justifiable.

Hobson, corresponds to an "active imperialism," whereas various universalist and relativist exclusions can be regarded as instances of "passive imperialism."[58] Partha Chatterjee's reading of the pedagogic character of the colonial encounter in India provides an insightful analysis of both dimensions—universalist exclusion and violent inclusion. Chatterjee indicates how the nineteenth century British liberal thinkers supported "paternal despotism over the morally infantile subjects"[59] in India as a "pedagogic project."[60] He identifies two ways through which the British "colonial tutelage"[61]in India, as well as today's imperial relations in world politics, were and are sustained: "pedagogy of violence" and "pedagogy of culture." That is to say, "the colony must either be disciplined by force or civilized by culture," or both.[62] To unpack that, he traces the two different conceptions and operations of norms created in the nineteenth century normative literature on politics.

First, norms have been construed as "the empirically prevailing average," and second, as "the desired standard to be achieved."[63] Chatterjee notes that the first meaning of norms (as average) have been used to measure countries via placing them on a scale to see how much they deviate from the empirically prevailing norm.[64] The pedagogic task of socialization here is to uplift the deviant to the level of the empirically prevailing

---

[58] John M. Hobson, *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics* (Cambridge University Press, 2012).
[59] Partha Chatterjee, *The Black Hole of Empire: History of a Global Practice of Power* (Princeton University Press, 2012), 179.
[60] Ibid., 182.
[61] Ibid., 156.
[62] Ibid., 344.
[63] Ibid., 186. It is worth noting that this difference parallels the distinction made in IR scholarship between behavioral and ideational treatment of norms, the former describing norms as behavioral regularities and patterns, and the latter as prescriptive and principled ideas. See, Finnemore and Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change"; Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*.
[64] Chatterjee, *The Black Hole of Empire*, 186.

average. "The imperial power," Chatterjee notes, "must take on the responsibility of educating, disciplining, and training the colony in order to bring it up to the norm."[65] However, the second meaning of norms (as ideal) were used in order to declare, when necessary, exceptions to the norm concerning the deviant. "Countries that were above the global empirical norm," Chatterjee points out, "would then set the universally desirable standard."[66] But more importantly, "the practices associated with those standards might not be considered appropriate for countries where the predominant standards were much lower."[67] Hence, exceptions were made and justified. For Chatterjee this "prerogative to declare the colonial exception" is the definition of imperial power.[68] For example, while the liberals of the early nineteenth century Britain believed that representative government with a possibly universal franchise was the best form of government, they thought this was not applicable in the colonies in Asia and Africa. Hence the formula "democracy at home, despotism abroad."[69] The "universal norm" of democracy could not be applied in the colony, but these representative institutions could possibly be established in the future "with sufficient tutelage."[70]

Here, the "liberal-colonial imaginary" deals with difference in either of the two ways; liquidation or liberation. The first one seeks to exterminate, the second to educate.[71] While liquidation is reserved for those who are cut off from access to reason

---

[65] Ibid., 344.
[66] Ibid., 186.
[67] Ibid.
[68] Ibid., 337.
[69] Ibid., 218.
[70] Ibid., 217.For example, Chatterjee discusses Woodrow Wilson's argument that the backward people of the colonies in Asia and Africa had to go through "a period of tutelage under Western supervision." Ibid., 273.
[71] Chatterjee, *The Black Hole of Empire*, 67.

and morality, liberation "encounters the Other in order to save it, to salvage it from its brutish existence, by teaching it the correct Reason, Morality, and Power."[72] This orientation to 'save' the different creates "many pedagogical moments in Self-Other encounters."[73]

Socialization discourse in IR seeks to account for, and often reproduce, such pedagogical moments of teaching norms as well as their correct meaning.[74] It works through a logic of global diffusion of liberal norms and institutions in ways that erase difference. This is for the most part due to liberalism's rather precarious relationship with difference. Liberal imaginary, Himadeep Muppidi notes, "is systematically closed to the possibility of relating democratically to difference."[75] For him this makes liberal imaginary "colonial in its orientation to the world," on the grounds that it tends to universalize a particularity and to globalize a locality.[76]

Eurocentric assumptions figure prominently in the pedagogic accounts of socialization. Schimmelfennig, for example, takes international organizations, especially EU institutions, as "nannies" who "disseminate, teach, and enforce…the constitutive liberal norms of the Western international community and the membership norms of the

---

[72] Ibid., 66.
[73] Ibid.
[74] Sergei Prozorov makes a similar argument in a different theoretical register. He claims that the 'liberal politics of enmity,' that is liberalism's turning of the public enemy into a personal foe, seeks to "transform [its Other] into a more acceptable life-form or to annihilate [it]"Prozorov, "Liberal Enmity," 84. As implied by Prozorov, liberal politics rests on two interlinked logics, the "pedagogical interventions" to render the alterity of the Other acceptable and tamed, and the annihilation of the 'foe' who is not open to incorporation and subsumption.
[75] Himadeep Muppidi, *The Politics of the Global* (University of Minnesota Press, 2004), 65.
[76] Ibid.

Western organizations."[77] The figure of the 'nanny' as the mature and reasoned owner and enforcer of norms marks the subject position of the liberal West that authorizes it to transform others in its own image. Since the role of the nanny is "to disseminate, teach, and enforce" the liberal norms of global governance, any effort to resist or differentially or subversively appropriate those norms troubles the pedagogy of socialization and deserves punishment.

Socialization for Schimmelfennig "prepares" countries for partaking in international organizations such as the EU whose membership is "conditional on successful socialization (to the degree required by the organization.)"[78] For him, "as the standard setter for legitimate statehood in Europe, the Western community is in a position to provide authoritative interpretations of the norms, to accord or withdraw international recognition, and to confer international legitimacy upon states."[79] He argues that the Western international community, constituted by liberal norms,[80] transmits and teaches these norms to others, which hierarchically situates Western countries and organizations in relation to the non-West. In this picture, Western "nannies" are set to enforce liberal norms and the novice non-West is tasked with learning and 'properly' performing the

---

[77] Schimmelfennig, "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues," 2–3.
[78] Ibid., 3.
[79] Ibid., 16. Even though Schimmelfennig argues that with respect to European regional system, his language slips into a more universalist argument and hence tacitly argues for a broader claim of authority. For example, he argus that "[g]enerally, the norms advocated by the international organizations either belong to or follow from the constitutive liberal democratic community norms of the West that have been accepted as the pan-European standard of legitimacy by all CSCE/OSCE member states at the end of the Cold War and are institutionalized in international rules."
[80] Liberal norms concerning representative government and equality often meant to be put into practice in the West. Colonies were excluded from the reach of those liberal norms. Edward Keene, *Beyond the Anarchical Society: Grotius, Colonialism and Order in World Politics* (Cambridge University Press, 2002). Hence the colonial dictum: "liberalism at home, authoritarianism outside." Chatterjee, *The Black Hole of Empire*. To the extent that this logic continues to operate in global politics, colonial modes of relations can be said to endure.

norms of the nanny. This erases the possibility of meaningful agentic intervention on the part of non-Western actors in their engagements with norms. Non-Western traditions matter only to the degree that they score on the "domestic salience" measures, which is about how much preexisting local norms and customs accord with the new Western liberal norm.[81] Local traditions, therefore, are treated either as a limit/constraint or as a facilitator depending on how much they accord with Western norms. They are not, however, taken as legitimate social textures that negotiate and rework liberal normative constructs.

Similarly, sociological institutionalism and liberal constructivism construe actors in world politics as "enactors of scripts" written in the West. The global expansion of the rules of the "Western world-culture" fosters convergence on the "highly rationalized and universalistic" Western norms.[82] Socialization here names the process of convergence through which subjects get normalized within the Western knowledge systems and practices. Western-originated norms and institutions diffuse and become global, form exogenous constraints on behavior, serve as structures of authority and sources of legitimacy, and produce normalized subjects. This Western world-culture defines the nature and purposes of actors. "The expanding and deepening Western world culture," Finnemore points out, forms "world cultural rules that constitute actors—including states, organizations, and individuals—and define legitimate and desirable goals for them to pursue."[83]

---

[81] Checkel, "International Institutions and Socialization in Europe."
[82] Meyer et al., "World Society and the Nation-State," 144.
[83] Martha Finnemore, "Norms, Culture, and World Politics: Insights from Sociology's Institutionalism," *International Organization* 50, no. 2 (April 1, 1996): 326.

Gheciu's liberal constructivist argument about NATO's pedagogic practices provides yet another example of how Eurocentric presuppositions underlie the discourse of socialization. She argues that after the end of the Cold War NATO has embarked on the task of projecting "a particular set of Western-based norms"[84] and of disseminating "a Western-style democratic culture"[85] into the Central and Eastern European countries. In doing so, she notes, NATO exported "Western-defined liberal norms and rules of international behavior"[86] in order to change the way people "think and behave."[87] That, for her, was an attempt at "socializing [them] into the Western ways"[88] and "Western ideas."[89] NATO's pedagogic task was "educating pro-reform political elites to think about democracy within Western-defined categories."[90] Once again, the goal of these educative activities, Gheciu notes, was to socialize the actors to "the values and norms of Western-defined democracy, human rights, and the rule of law, and to teach them to define national identity and interests within the framework of those norms."[91] She maintains that NATO "explicitly aimed at teaching students to regard Western-defined norms as the correct foundation of a progressive society."[92] In this hierarchical relationship between the teacher and the student the former is positioned to define the 'correct' interpretation of norms and to impose closure on their differential appropriation.

---

[84] Gheciu, "Security Institutions as Agents of Socialization?," 973.
[85] Ibid., 991.
[86] Ibid., 974.
[87] Ibid., 976.
[88] Ibid.
[89] Ibid., 1005.
[90] Ibid., 988.
[91] Ibid., 990.
[92] Ibid., 991.

Furthermore, being a student/socializee entails recognizing the teacher/socializer as "a legitimate normative guide."[93] For Gheciu, NATO entertained the position of a "legitimate educator"[94] because it was "an essentially Western institution …defined by superior attributes of freedom, stability, and progress."[95] Being regarded as an "expression of the Western world" grants the institutions of liberal order the position of a "legitimate educator."[96] One scope condition of the process of teaching norms, Gheciu notes, is the socializer's "ability to secure recognition in the eyes of its socializees" as an "authoritative guide" or a "legitimate educator." (1004) Through these efforts to institute its authority and legitimacy, the West has to constantly reinstitute its pedagogic power as the teacher and enforcer of norms so that it can discipline the performance of norms. Furthermore, it is not only that socialization necessitates an acceptance of the teacher-student relationship but also that the 'correct' way of constituting a polity is named 'Westernization.'[97] She interprets the efforts to resort to a society's past to provide a blueprint for the future as a rejection of socialization and of liberal democratic norms. Instead of searching for a country's future in its own historical resources, the prescription for the 'socializee' is to accept the idea that "Western agencies" are "authoritative guides" and "teachers" for a better polity and for better shaping of domestic institutions.[98] In this discursive matrix, challenging this pedagogy is to challenge the universally aspired global norms.

---

[93] Ibid., 983.
[94] Ibid., 1004.
[95] Ibid., 988.
[96] Ibid., 1004.
[97] Ibid.
[98] Ibid.

Likewise, the English School account of the 'expansion of international society' is depicted as a process of socialization in which Westphalian norms and institutions diffuse and become global. The international society rests on a single logic of modernity that originates in Europe and demands "assimilation or acquiescence on the part of other civilizations."[99] The "destiny" of the non-West, in these accounts, has been "to mimic, never quite successfully, the history already performed by the West."[100] As Buzan highlights, such accounts are "Eurocentric all the way down"[101] since they position the West as the driving force of norms in world politics and 'the rest' as recipients of them.[102] In his analysis of the "sense of alarm" among liberal internationalists about the rising non-Western powers, Tim Dunne suggests that these powers are seen as "either 'different, and a threat,' or 'like us,' and in need of socialization and rule compliance."[103] Dunne points out that liberal internationalism's "supreme confidence in the singularity of modernity" is coupled by "a hierarchical ordering principle in which dominance and subordination are configured."[104] In that vein, Daniel Deudney and G. John Ikenberry

---

[99] Dunne, "The Liberal Order and the Modern Project," 539.
[100] Timothy Mitchell, "The Stage of Modernity," in *Questions of Modernity*, ed. Timothy Mitchell (University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 1.
[101] Buzan, "Culture and International Society." As Dunne notes, it is "Eurocentric in the immaculate emergence of Westphalian international society; Eurocentric in demanding assimilation or acquiescence on the part of other civilisations; and Eurocentric in the reproduction of this order through contemporary levers and mechanisms associated with trade conditionality, opening up of markets (as an indicator of fiscal responsibility) and accepting the liberal humanitarian values embedded in leading security institutions." Dunne, "The Liberal Order and the Modern Project," 540.
[102] Mark Laffey and Jutta Weldes suggest that narrating the history of modernity as creation of norms and institutions in Europe and then their diffusion to or imposition upon the rest of the world is "simply inaccurate" since it fails to see the "persistent and integral relations between Europe and the non-European world and their joint role in generating the characteristic social forms of modernity, including the state itself." Mark Laffey and Jutta Weldes, "Representing the International: Sovereignty after Modernity?," in *The Empire's New Clothes: Reading Hardt and Negri*, ed. Paul Passavant and Jodi Dean (New York: Routledge, 2004), 125. For them, both the West and the non-West have been co-constituted through "processes of imperial transculturation."
[103] Dunne, "The Liberal Order and the Modern Project," 542.
[104] Ibid.

argue that "the foreign policy of the liberal states should continue to be based on the broad assumption that there is ultimately one path to modernity—and that it essentially liberal in character."[105]

As Finnemore notes, the forerunners of the English School such as Hedley Bull, Adam Watson, Martin Wight, and Gerrit Gong argue that historically "the content of international society comes from the liberal principles of Western European democracies and became internationalized with the expansion of the West."[106] Liberal human rights—individual freedoms, civil liberties, and political rights—are at the core of the Western community's identity. They are the "constitutive values that define legitimate statehood and rightful state action" in the domestic as well as in the international realm.[107] In the domestic realm, the liberal principles of social and political order—social pluralism, the rule of law, democratic political participation and representation, private property, and market-based economy—are derived from, and justified by, this liberal interpretation of human rights. Finnemore suggests that both sociological institutionalism and the English school "point to the expansive power of the West and its notions of rationality as the core of an international social structure."[108] Both theoretical orientations place at the center of their analysis "the globalization of Western standards of civilization and Western

[105] Deudney and Ikenberry, "Myth of the Autocratic Revival - Why Liberal Democracy Will Prevail," 93.
[106] Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*, 18.
[107] Christian Reus-Smit, "The Constitutional Structure of International Society and the Nature of Fundamental Institutions," *International Organization* 51, no. 04 (1997): 558.
[108] Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*, 28.

morality."[109] They rest on the idea of "the triumph of Western norms and Western rationality in contemporary international society."[110]

Amitav Acharya's norm localization account is one attempt within IR to rectify the Eurocentric narratives. He offers an alternative explanation of norm diffusion and institutional change, one that is beware of reproducing the tendency to talk about socialization as an almost uncontested diffusion of Western norms into the non-West. Criticizing the existing literature on norm diffusion for depicting local actors as "passive targets and learners"[111] and for "sidelining" the agency of non-Western actors, Acharya stresses how local actors ("norm-takers" in his language) "actively borrow and modify" transnational norms.[112] This is what Acharya calls localization of a transnational norm. Localization defies the "strictly dichotomous outcomes of acceptance and rejection" and attends to the complexity of the processes through which "norm-takers build congruence between transnational norms […] and local beliefs and practices."[113] In the case of ASEAN, he indicates how local agents "reconstruct foreign norms" through various localizing strategies such as framing, grafting, redefining, pruning, modifying, and selective adoption.[114] Acharya's stress is on how "the cognitive priors of the norm-takers influence the reshaping and reception of foreign norms," rather than on how these 'norm-takers' get converted by outside advocates or entrepreneurs.[115] Preexisting local

---

[109] Ibid., 31.
[110] Ibid., 141. The liberal trimphalist claims announcing the 'end of history' in the aftermath of the Cold War follow the footsteps of the world-culture perspective.
[111] Acharya, "How Ideas Spread," 269.
[112] Ibid., 270.
[113] Ibid., 241.
[114] Ibid., 239.
[115] Ibid., 269.

normative orders engender "variations" in the adoption of global norms such as democracy and human rights.

I share many of Acharya's core insights, yet I diverge from him on two points. First, Acharya underemphasizes the constitutive power of norms in the form of global discourses. For him, the emphasis on the constitutive effects of global discourses was a characteristic of the first wave of norms scholarship, which focused on the international systemic level and erased the crucial role of the local actors.[116] However, his abstention from talking about constitutive norms comes at the cost of barring him from addressing the question of how in the first place certain categories come to be desirable objects of localization. In Acharya's analysis, norms are principled ideas with less constitutive force. The category of socialization, however, communicates a structural constitutive dimension. In that sense, Acharya's account is more about diffusion than about socialization.

Second, even though Acharya places substantial agentic force into the process of localization of a norm, localization for him is still a category between resistance and acceptance. In other words, his analytical framework is rather ambivalent about the possibility of a resistant localization. Even though localization is marked by many gestures of resistance (i.e. 'pruning' and 'reconstitution') Acharya ends up locating 'resistance and contestation' in the 'prelocalization' stage.[117] Localization transcends the

[116] Here Acharya is drawing on Cortell and Davis's distinction between first wave and second wave norms scholarship. According to the latter, the first wave norms scholarship was operating at the level of international system to understand norm diffusion, whereas the second wave locates the explanatory weight into the domestic realm. See Andrew P. Cortell and James W. Davis Jr., "Understanding the Domestic Impact of International Norms: A Research Agenda," *International Studies Review* 2, no. 1 (2000): 65–87.
[117] Acharya, "How Ideas Spread," 251.

binary of acceptance and rejection,[118] yet it is also not the site of resistance. The advent of localization marks the end of resistance and contestation. However, that form of contestation is already recognized in Finnemore and Sikkink's claim that "new norms never enter a normative vacuum but instead emerge in a highly contested normative space where they must compete with other norms and perceptions of interest."[119] Thus Acharya and Finnemore and Sikkink converge on the idea that new norms enter into a terrain of contestation, however they diverge on where to put the emphasis in norm adoption—transnational norm entrepreneurs or local initiators and agents. There is no contestation or resistance once a norm is inhabited. Put differently, there is not much theoretical possibility of adopting a norm non-normatively—working in and outside the norm, for and against the norm, and using the norm for other purposes. Then several questions follow: How does one even start thinking about inhabiting a norm non-normatively? What does a non-normative adoption of a norm look like? How does one recognize resistance in norm-adoption? I try and address these questions in Chapter 3 through a performative reading of socialization.

3. The West as the Pedagogue: The Question of Authority

Zürn and Checkel suggest that "student-teacher relations … are seldom seen in international relations" because such constellations "amount to a form of role-playing

[118] Ibid., 241.
[119] Finnemore and Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," 897.

that is highly atypical for any conception of international relations."[120] Curiously enough, right after this remark, they make a rather different gesture. They argue that "[a]lthough one's initial reaction may be to consider such constellations as highly unusual … a closer look might reveal that they occur more often and therefore require further analysis." In this section I reiterate Zürn and Checkel's observation that "teacher-student constellations" are in fact not as rare in world politics. In fact, I argue that they underlie much of the understandings and practices of norm socialization. Frank Schimmelfennig takes it even one step further when he depicts international organizations (in his case, EU institutions) as "nannies" who "disseminate, teach, and enforce…the constitutive liberal norms of the Western international community and the membership norms of the Western organizations."[121] For him international socialization "involves several teaching and nursing activities."[122] This paternal function, named socialization, "prepares" countries for membership in the international organizations.[123] Here, the relationship between socializer and socializee needs to be asymmetrical and the socializee must be weaker and vulnerable in order to change its own situation. But the subject-position of 'teacher' or 'nanny' necessitates and establishes more than an asymmetry in power. It also attributes

---

[120] Zürn and Checkel, "Getting Socialized to Build Bridges," 1062.

[121] Schimmelfennig, "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues," 2–3.

[122] Ibid., 8.These nursing activities include "presentation of community norms to outside states, informational and technical support for the institutionalization of these norms in their domestic systems, monitoring and evaluation of institutionalization, and positive and negative sanctions to reward progress in institutionalization and punish the lack thereof." (2002, 8)

[123] Ibid., 3. Overall, this governmentalizing task of producing particular subjects were designed "to cultivate a particular type of rationality in those countries, so that certain conceptions of national identity and certain definitions of interest would come to be widely recognized as correct." Gheciu, "Security Institutions as Agents of Socialization?," 1003. Pedagogic socialization seeks to produce particular subjects, cultivate particular selves with particular sensibilities and senses of normality, belonging, and appropriateness. It is about "reshaping the orientations of societies." That also indicates the difference between socialization and compliance. Socialization is not simply behavioral conformity with particular norms or rules, but goes deeper to construct particular identities and selves with particular resources.

legitimacy and authorizes actions. This pedagogic discourse configures socialization as a relationship of authority between a "norm setter" and "norm follower."[124] Hence its ideal formula: "Successful nannies, good pupils, smooth socialization."[125]

These pedagogic relationships take various forms. Usually, international organizations are "active teachers" teaching states the proper course of action, policies to follow, institutions to build, and norms to follow, meanings to internalize.[126] Sometimes transnational advocacy networks do the pedagogic work through pressuring states to induce a norm congruent behavior. [127] Sometimes the teacher-student relationship is established around "epistemic communities."[128] These expert groups share "causal beliefs and cause-effect understandings" in a certain issue are and use their position of authority to channel policies of states toward particular directions. The pedagogic function of socialization is also operative, however, even in the absence of a proximate pedagogue. Institutions such as markets, elections, or particular organizations also exercise power and shape actors' identities and interests without necessitating immediate actors. These institutions perform the pedagogic function by virtue of their logic of operation. The very logic of global capitalist markets, for example, pressures individual and state actors to organize their social life in particular ways. Similarly, the logic of elections pushes party

---

[124] Finnemore and Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change."
[125] Schimmelfennig, "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues," 18.
[126] Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*; "Finnemore_Sociological Institutionalism.pdf," n.d.; Barnett and Finnemore, *Rules for the World*; Gheciu, "Security Institutions as Agents of Socialization?".
[127] Keck and Sikkink, *Activists beyond Borders*; Thomas Risse-Kappen, Stephen C. Ropp, and Kathryn Sikkink, eds., *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change* (Cambridge University Press, 1999).
[128] Haas, "Introduction."

actors to assume particular ideological positions.[129] Furthermore, discourses also exercise pedagogic power through constituting the conditions for the possibility of meaningful action and producing subjects with particular capacities and resources.[130] The discourse of secularism, for example, operates as a form of political authority in world politics in ways that differentially enables and authorizes actors.[131]

However, the predominant frameworks privilege agentic accounts. Finnemore, for example, takes socialization as a process driven by external actors who actively teach states the constitutive norms of Western world-culture. She argues that the constitutive norms of international society, which rest on Weberian notions of rationalization and bureaucratization, are externally supplied to states rather than internally demanded by them.[132] Hence, the fundamental mechanism of diffusion is not learning but teaching.[133] For Finnemore, this teaching is different from "imitation" or "self-teaching" which imply that the impetus is from the inside. The real impetus comes from outside.[134] The fundamental problem with the explanations based on self-learning and imitation, Finnemore argues, is that "there are no active teachers" in them.[135] Yet, in all of her cases she finds out that "there are active teachers with well-defined lesson plans for their

---

[129] Przeworski and Sprague, *Paper Stones*; Kalyvas, *The Rise of Christian Democracy in Europe*; Nasr, "The Rise of 'Muslim Democracy,'" 2005.
[130] Barnett and Duvall, "Power in International Politics."
[131] Mahmood, *Politics of Piety*; Mahmood, "Secularism, Hermeneutics, and Empire"; Elizabeth Shakman Hurd, *The Politics of Secularism in International Relations* (Princeton University Press, 2007).
[132] Saba Mahmood, *Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject* (Princeton University Press, 2005); S. Mahmood, "Secularism, Hermeneutics, and Empire: The Politics of Islamic Reformation," *Public Culture* 18, no. 2 (2006): 323; Elizabeth Shakman Hurd, *The Politics of Secularism in International Relations* (Princeton University Press, 2007).
[133] Ibid., 11.For Finnemore it was also not "bribery" because no material rewards were attached to the favored outcome directly and explicitly. Ibid., 36. (1996, 36)
[134] Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*, 64.This is her argument for the three cases she analyzes, which are the adoption of Geneva Conventions, the incorporation of poverty alleviation as a goal in economic development, and the adoption of science bureaucracies within states.
[135] Ibid., 12.

pupils."[136] International organizations "teach states new norms of behavior."[137] Imitation or mimetic action provide explanations based on "an unmediated process [which] locates the impetus for imitative actions in the imitator."[138] However, they are in fact provided by international actors. Once again, states are not "self-taught" but there are "active teachers" who teach states their wants and needs in line with the constitutive norms of liberal international society.

While the causal force behind state preference-formation may be external, it is domestic politics that mediates those externally-driven efforts of "active teaching." Finnemore points out that international organizations play "the role of teacher" for states.[139] States "may not always know what they want and are receptive to teaching about what are appropriate and useful actions to take."[140] For example, UNESCO created "teaching missions" to teach states the material and symbolic significance of establishing state science bureaucracies.[141] ICRC, which was initially composed of transnational nongovernmental actors "created and taught to decisionmakers in states" the very interest in war-time humanitarian behavior.[142]

This relationship of teaching and learning, however, is fundamentally hierarchical. Schimmelfennig points out that international socialization requires "some

---

[136] Ibid.According to Finnemore, analyzing the 'agency' within social construction of normative similarities among dissimilar states entails examining the ways in which international organizations are "able to 'teach' those [Weberian world cultural] views to states." Ibid., 25.
[137] Finnemore and Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," 399. They point to Adler's (1998) work on how Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe "uses its legitimacy and perceived impartiality to carry out 'seminar diplomacy' among its members—teaching them new values and new models of behavior."
[138] Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*, 64.
[139] Ibid., 13.
[140] Ibid., 11.
[141] Ibid., 36.
[142] Ibid., 4.

sort of asymmetrical relationship" between the socializer and "the state to be socialized."[143] Similarly, Trine Flockhart notes that her own framework of socialization rests on the implicit presupposition that "the relationship between socializer and socializee is an unequal one where the socializer either has, or believes itself to have, a greater knowledge or understanding of the norm set than those that are being socialized, and that it has the power to judge whether the required norm changes have been taken satisfactorily."[144] The figure of the 'nanny'—the mature and reasoned enforcer of norms—here marks the subject position of the liberal West and authorizes it to transform others in its own image. Since the role of the nanny is "to disseminate, teach, and enforce"[145] the liberal norms of global governance, any effort to resist or differentially or subversively appropriate those norms troubles the pedagogy of socialization and deserves punishment—through exclusion from membership into community, non-access to resources through conditionalities, etc—just as a nanny punishes the child.

Insofar as socialization is about "moving the target countries to pro-norm behavior,"[146] it creates the subject positions of "movers" and the "moved" and differentially authorizes and empowers each of them. This hierarchical relationship is

---

[143] Schimmelfennig, "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues," 14.According to that rationalist logic of socialization, the "target state" must be "sufficiently sensitive or vulnerable to the actions of the international organization to react to sanctions in the desired way." (14)

[144] Trine Flockhart, "Similar and Yet So Different: The Socialization of Democratic Norms in Post-War Germany and Present Day Iraq," *International Politics* 43, no. 5 (November 2006): 15–16. Flockhart adopts Risse et.al.'s (1999) definition of socialization as the "induction of new members … into the ways of behavior that are preferred in a society."

[145] Schimmelfennig, "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues."

[146] Zürn and Checkel, "Getting Socialized to Build Bridges," 1063.

evident in Gheciu's analysis of NATO's "pedagogic practices"[147] of "socializing Central and Eastern Europeans into the Western ways"[148] and "teaching the correct norms of liberal democracy to the Central and Eastern Europeans."[149] Gheciu recognizes that a very "significant, although subtle, form of power is involved" in this hierarchical pedagogic process, so much so that "if the pedagogic work is effective, it effectively shapes subjects, leading them to regard the schemes of thought and action disseminated by the socializing agent not as a contingent cultural product, but as the normal way of thinking and doing things."[150]

Equally importantly, in Gheciu's narrative, if actors do not see themselves as students, then they are less likely to socialize.[151] They do not recognize 'the socializer' as "a legitimate teacher of norms," and instead "articulate a different vision of the 'good' polity, and advocate norms and politicies that [do not] conform to [the teacher's] prescriptions."[152] They do not believe in the necessity of "complete (re)construction of … society on a Western model" and they "do not see Westernization as the right way of (re)constructing the identity of their country."[153] Their "vision of the future rel[y] on a

---

[147] Gheciu, "Security Institutions as Agents of Socialization?," 1002.
[148] Ibid., 976.
[149] Ibid., 988.
[150] Ibid., 979–980.
[151] Gheciu acknowledges that "some Czechs did not regard NATO as a legitimate teacher of norms, and some of them—particularly nationalist and socialist groups—associated the organization with Western imperialism, and with an American conspiracy to master the world." But for Gheciu, it was enough to have some "charismatic" politicians address their polity to "transcend this problem of legitimacy." Yet she does not consider the problem of legitimacy in thinking of this relationship as essentially unequal and hierarchical.
[152] Gheciu, "Security Institutions as Agents of Socialization?," 1003.
[153] Ibid., 1004.

particular reading of the … past as a blueprint for the future," and hence, "the idea that Western agencies might shape new domestic institutions [is] unacceptable" for them.[154]

This pedagogic vision tends to treat normative engagements as dichotomous, norms are either adopted or not adopted, which leaves very little space for recognizing differential adoptions and claims on norms. Such contestations are registered as "opposition to change" or anti-socialization. For example, for Gheciu, those who do not accept NATO as an "authoritative guide" see it as a "threat" and an "exploitative influence of the West." Therefore, the only options available are either accepting the authoritative guidance of NATO *and* accepting global norms, or rejecting the authoritative guidance of NATO *and* rejecting those norms. What is erased here is the possibility of rejecting the tutelage of NATO yet at the same time having a different relationship with global norms. Such differential engagements with norms are treated as deviations that should be made to conform to the "correct" interpretation.[155]

Once again, the problem with pedagogic socialization is not that it depicts the non-West as learners, but that they are learners only. They are produced as students in a relationship with their teacher, the West. They are not set to learn from each other. The relationship is unidirectional, one teaches, the other learns. [156] Hence, the problem in the pedagogic conceptualization of socialization is not that it is about learning, but that it is unidirectional and hierarchical. Their relationship is asymmetrically organized around

---

[154] Ibid.

[155] It is also worth noting that such policing of "correct" translation of norms into practice is carried out even within the norms of liberal democracy. That is, NATO acts as a teacher and a norm police even for those who invoke liberal democracy but fail to implement its correct implementation, let alone those who invoke a different non-liberal interpretation of democracy.

[156] Otherwise, education as "an uncoercive rearrangement of desires" is key for the formation of an open human community and cross-cultural communication. See, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Righting Wrongs," *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 103, no. 2 (2004): 523–81.

differential authorizations bestowed by the norms upon actors. The subject positions of teacher and student, nanny and child, matures and novices are unmistakenly power positions. They differentially enable and constrain actors.[157]

Epstein observes a dynamic of epistemological violence and silencing operative in such accounts of socialization. For her there is an "implicit" and "patronizing"[158] infantilization within the socialization literature which assumes that "the socializee, like the child, holds no prior legitimate identity, or whose identity is in need of being molded."[159] For Epstein, such infantilizing dynamics actively erase the past identity of the socializee and create a loss. Apparaising change "a priori as a good thing … crowds out the possibility of considering it as loss."[160] Consequently, it legitimizes treating the socializee "like a child or a blank page upon which all the 'good' norms can be written."[161] For example, Epstein suggests that in its attempts to socialize Japan into current whaling norms, Australia "implicitly cast[s] Japan in the position of the child in need of learning the norms of 'good' whale-related behavior."[162] Such infantilizing gestures delegitimize and erase the ways Japan relates to her own whaling past.[163]

Barnett and Finnemore point to another hierarchical dimension of pedagogic socialization. They point out that international organizations (IOs), as prominent

---

[157] Barnett and Duvall, "Power in International Politics."
[158] Epstein, "Stop Telling Us How to Behave," 140.
[159] Ibid., 142. Finnemore's definition of socialization as a process that is specifically about newcomers or novices and not pertinent to "preexisting groups" seems to accord with Epstein's argument about infantilization. See, Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*, 159.
[160] Epstein, "Stop Telling Us How to Behave," 144.
[161] Ibid.
[162] Ibid., 141.
[163] My argument here, however, is not about the loss of identity, but the violence enacted and legitimated through the very casting of the subject as "child" with no or less than legitimate prior identity, and presumption of a status of nanny. Further, I am interested in the ways in which such "past identities" are not really past. That is, how these presumably "past" identities are actively shaping the discourse articulated by the subjects in ways that challenge, trouble or destabilize the operations of socialization.

regulative and constitutive actors in world politics, founded by "Western liberal states" and "designed to promote liberal values,"[164] lack accountability and participation so much so that it "raises the possibility that at the global level we face an undemocratic liberalism."[165] IOs are "unabashedly undemocratic, and procedures for consent of the governed are very weak."[166] Hierarchy is one of the defining characteristics of bureaucratic organization, and for Barnett and Finnemore, "we certainly live in a bureaucratic organization."[167] This hierarchy is produced and sustained through IOs' position of authority, that is their ability to use "institutional and discursive resources to induce deference from others."[168] IOs as international "authorities" exercise power to "regulate" global social life through manipulating incentives to alter the behavior of states and nonstate actors. But they also exert a "social construction power" as they participate centrally in the constitution of global social reality. Through using their authority position, IOs are "deferred" to define "meanings, norms of good behavior, the nature of social actors, and categories of legitimate social action in the world."[169] They are "empowered to decide" on the definition and solution of problems, hence governing almost all aspects of international life.[170]

In that sense, Barnett and Finnemore point at the pedagogic character of the authority IOs claim and the power they exercise. IOs assume the role of 'teacher' who

---

[164] Barnett and Finnemore, *Rules for the World*, 15.
[165] Ibid.
[166] Ibid., 172.
[167] Ibid., 17. Barnett and Finnemore define hierarchy as the principle which stipulates that "each official has a clearly defined sphere of competence within a division of labor and is answerable to superiors." (17) They enumerate other key characteristics of bureacracies as continuity, impersonality, and expertise.
[168] Ibid., 5.
[169] Ibid., 7.
[170] Ibid.

know the proper norms and their correct interpretation, and bear the responsibility and authority to teach them to 'pupils' globally. They also punish through sanctions or reward through incentives as part of their pedagogic function. The IMF, for example, "routinely tries to teach states what it means to have a market economy." [171] They act as "missionaries of our time [a]rmed with a notion of progress."[172] The socialization process then is akin to a "conversion process."[173] Understood this way, the pedagogic function of socialization is taken one step further, to the level of the pastoral; father taking care of his flock and trying to save more souls through conversion. The strength of the language in Barnett and Finnemore's analogy speaks to the deeply pedagogic, and at times pastoral, construal of socialization in world politics and in IR.

This pedagogic function of defining what proper norms and their correct interpretations are is an exercise of power. The kind of authority that IOs claim involve more than just the ability to get states to do what they otherwise would not do; it "often consists of telling people what is the right thing to do."[174] It "supplies the social purposes" for actors.[175] The power of these IOs is produced through the authority they claim, and authority, as they point out, is a legitimated form of domination. Hence, commanding some degree of consent and mobilizing coercion, IOs participate in the

---

[171] Similarly, the UN Secretariat and OSCE together with some other IOs teach what it means to have a "democratic and rule-of-law state with certain identities and interests." UNHCR teaches how to be a "responsible state that will no longer produce the conditions that trigger refugee plight." Ibid., 164.
[172] Ibid., 33. Ethan A. Nadelmann also discusses the role of "moral proselytism" in various global prohibition regimes. He argues that "the compulsion to convert others to one's beliefs and remake the world in one's own image" describes the motivation behind the "transnational moral entrepreneurs." who mobilize to garner political support within a host country and abroad to prohibit certain practices. See Nadelmann, "Global Prohibition Regimes."
[173] Barnett and Finnemore, *Rules for the World*, 33.
[174] Ibid., 20.
[175] Ibid., 21.

social control of international life that is intimiately related with the categories of "steering, guiding, regulating, and imposing."[176] As such, Barnett and Finnemore recognize that "the distinction between power and authority is almost always blurry."[177] Authority is an exercise of power even when it achieves generating some degree of consent, because the socially produced authority "gives its bearer the capacity to get others to defer."[178]

I have so far argued that existing accounts of socialization operate through a particular pedagogy that enact and reproduce hierarchies in international politics. However, the communicative (argumentative) approach to socialization claim to offer a distinctly non-hierarchical account of persuasion. Thomas Risse, for example, claims that the argumentative approach presents a "non-hierarchical steering mode enabling actors to change voluntarily their perceptions of the situation and even their preferences through reasoned consensus."[179] Despite his attempt to present the logic of arguing as one non-hierarchical model of socialization for global governance, Risse's own account of arguing produces a similar sequential relationship with pedagogic practices. He points out that "arguing and persuasion are crucial for socialization processes to ensure the compliance of actors—whether public or private—with international norms."[180] In that sense, I will argue that instead of being an alternative to the pedagogic models of socialization, argumentative rationality is but one particular stage and mechanism of it.

---

[176] Ibid., 29.
[177] Ibid.
[178] Ibid.
[179] T. Risse, "Global Governance and Communicative Action," *Government and Opposition* 39, no. 2 (2004): 310.
[180] Ibid., 309.

To begin with, the communicative or argumentative approach does have some nuances from other pedagogic models of socialization. It recognizes that norms and their validity claims are open to contestation. It acknowledges the possibility that the three forms of validity claims, that are "the truth of assertions," "the moral rightness of the norms underlying arguments," and "the truthfulness and authenticity of the speaker"[181] may all be subject to contestation. With reference to March and Olsen, Risse points out that "the more the norms are contested, the less the logic of the situation can be captured by the statement "good people do X" than by "what does 'good' mean in this situation?" or even "what is the right thing to do?"[182] For Risse, the adjudication of norms in such situations involves the "logic of truth seeking or arguing." That is, through a communicative process, actors deliberate about the correctness of their causal assumptions and the appropriateness of their normative claims.

However, this argumentative rationality presupposes a common life-world among the interlocutors, resting on "collective interpretations of the world and of themselves," consisting of "a shared culture, a common system of norms and rules perceived as legitimate, and the social identity of actors being capable of communicating and acting."[183] But normative contestations occur precisely because actors do not share this common life-world or differently interpret its repertoire. This means that communicative rationality of supposed equals and learners can take place among those who already share the same norms or interpret them in the same way. That produces an internal tension for

---

[181] Thomas Risse, "'Let's Argue!': Communicative Action in World Politics," *International Organization* 54, no. 01 (2000): 9–10.
[182] Ibid., 10.
[183] Ibid.

it claims that normative contestation can occur among those who already have no significant contestation over norms.[184]

Parties are supposed to enter into a communicative relationship with the recognition that both can change their minds and be persuaded by the force of the better argument. It is worth noting that such a conception has as its precondition openness to being persuaded, or making oneself ready to learn from the equal other instead of being fastened on teaching to the inferior (non-equal) other. In that sense it differs from pedagogic narratives. However, scholars of argumentative logic claim that in international politics an argumentative relationship starts when governments "find it necessary to make rhetorical concessions and cease denying the validity of … norms."[185] In other words, paradoxically, argumentative rationality takes over only when the contestation over the norm ceases, hence, the arguing mode indeed ceases to be a contestatory one. But also in an interesting way, argumentative accounts could have been more suitable for a democratic thinking of the politics of constitutive norms had they not been subordinated to the logic of pedagogic socialization. Their theoretical openness to the possibility of contestation of a norm through its adoption provides a space for differential engagement with norms, yet at the same their insistence on consensus and their precondition of sharing a common life-world assumes too much "mutual acceptance of the underlying norms" and very little contestation. Therefore it finally collapses into

[184] Another internal tension in the argumentative logic is that even though it opens a space for contestation of norms, its sustained emphasis on achieving "argumentative consensus" as the goal of discursive interaction works more toward crippling of contestation than its fostering.
[185] Risse, "'Let's Argue!,'" 32.

the binaries of "defection versus socialization."[186] This consequently cripples the potential of communicative theories to provide an inclusive enough politics of normative engagement in world politics.[187]

In communicative settings, the argument goes, "socializees need not, and indeed often do not, accept their role as students in the process of learning, from an authoritative teacher, broad schemes for making sense of the world."[188] Instead, they recognize other parties as "legitimate partners in a process of (international communication)."[189] In other words, teaching is not between equals. In a communicative situation of arguing or persuasion there is no overt coercion, yet "such interactions take place within a socially constructed framework of ideas, which reflect the power of particular actors to define the "common life-world" within which certain arguments are regarded as legitimate, while others (which violate the established collective interpretations of the world) are not."[190]

This communicative setting, therefore, necessitates prior educative relationships. Gheciu suggests that "successful educational practices" can facilitate persuasion, because "if the socializees were to adopt the worldview taught by the pedagogic institution,

---

[186] Risse, "Global Governance and Communicative Action," 307.
[187] The argumentative approach treats the actors within a communicative interaction as formal equals. This differentiates them from the pedagogic accounts, which, in one way or another, assume a hierarchy because of the position of authority conferred by the norm. But I argue that this remains only a theoretical gesture in practice because of its fundamental theoretical shortcoming, that is, its self-recognized inability to account for the relations of power that infuse any kind of interaction. Its assumptions of equality, inclusiveness, and force of the better argument assumes that "relationships of power, force, and coercion are … absent when argumentative consensus is sought." Risse, "'Let's Argue!,'" 11. It assumes two relatively equal parties to exchange reasons on action, instead of a pre-given position of authority (i.e. teacher). It does not write, at least formally, the existing inequalities between parties into the form of a relationship of authority and hierarchy. The pedagogic model, on the other hand, presumes inequality and hierarchy.
[188] Gheciu, "Security Institutions as Agents of Socialization?," 981.
[189] Ibid.
[190] Ibid., 982.

further social communication would occur within a shared normative framework."[191] Therefore, through a curious twist, she envisions the (supposedly) egalitarian communicative relationship only after the hierarchical pedagogic relationship of teaching does its work. This way, the whole point in the logic of arguing and persuasion becomes emptied since it postpones it till the more favorable conditions are created by asymmetrical relationships of teaching.

Therefore, while the argumentative approach seems at first sight to diverge from the previously discussed pedagogic approaches, I argue that it represents but one phase within them. Arguing and persuasion are conditioned on prior pedagogic socialization. It is only after such pedagogic attempts to construct a "common lifeworld" on the basis of shared understandings, identities, and histories that the argumentative logic can take over. Risse recognizes that there is never an ideal speech situation in world politics. But even if we concede that there are truly argumentative situations in world politics, this can only take place after the pedagogic work of socialization is done. Risse and Sikkink point out that "the goal of socialization is for actors to internalize norms, so that external pressure is no longer needed to ensure compliance."[192]In other words, external pressure is needed in the first place to prepare the grounds for persuasion. In that sense, argumentative rationality and persuasion are expected "to prevail in later stages of the socialization process."[193]

---

[191] Ibid., 983.
[192] Risse-Kappen and Sikkink, "The Socialization of International Human Rights Norms into Domestic Practices: Introduction," 11.
[193] Ibid., 16.

This point is also evident in Risse's discussion of arguing as a further/later stage in norm socialization.[194] The rhetorical/instrumentalist stage wherein actors (mostly states) are forced to talk the talk of the norm precedes the argumentative/deliberative stage where real 'truth-seeking' behavior kicks in. In the previous stage international governmental and non-governmental organizations, through shaming and naming, and through manipulating rewards and punishments get the norm-violating state to rhetorically adopt the norms. Then only through these "civilizing effects of hypocrisy"[195] or through the efforts to rectify 'cognitive dissonance' between deeds and words, do actors enter into the presumably nonhierarchical, egalitarian, inclusive, power-free, truth-seeking deliberation. But to end up there, such intergovernmental organizations or transnational advocacy networks "legitimately claim authoritarive knowledge or moral authority (or both)" and hence exercise "moral power and authority."[196] These norm entrepreneurs "treat the norm-violating state as an international pariah, an outsider to the community of civilized nations."[197]They teach the norm violating state "what it means to be a modern and civilized state."[198] The pedagogic function has to operate in advance in order for argumentation to kick in, and indeed it serves as one tacit precondition that Risse does not openly acknowledge or problematize. Arguing in that sense is one mechanism for norm socialization[199]that explicitly claims to distance itself from a hierarchical, nonegalitarian, patronizing, exclusive understanding of socialization. But

---

[194] Risse, "Global Governance and Communicative Action," 34.
[195] Keck and Sikkink, *Activists beyond Borders*; Finnemore and Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change."
[196] Risse, "'Let's Argue!,'" 22.
[197] Ibid., 29.
[198] Ibid., 22.
[199] Ibid., 34.

even in this formulation, the pedagogic function lurks in the background and tacitly serves as a precondition.

Global governance is theorized as a non-hierarchical organization of international political life.[200]Arguing or persuasion is supposedly the least hierarchical mechanism of socialization in the reproduction of global governance, yet it becomes integral to the hierarchical organization of global life through pedagogic socialization. It differs from other pedagogic accounts in that it sees the ideal speech situation of the communicative interaction as a nonhierarchical and inclusive truth-seeking and reason-giving relationship between equals who share a common lifeworld. Conceding that such ideal situations do not exist in world politics, scholars of the communicative approach then point to the possibility and indeed actual existence of such communicative interaction after the pedagogic function of socialization (through coercion, material incentives and persuasion) pushes (putatively equal) interlocutors toward a more intersubjectively shared lifeworld. As Risse notes, "socializing actors into new norms requires more than simply manipulating cost-benefit calculations"[201]since norm violation is likely to happen when material rewards and punishments are removed. A "sustained compliance" with norms can only take place by way of "some degree of rule internalization, and for Risse, "this is where arguing and persuasion become relevant for socialization processes."[202] Persuasion is a more effective way of inducing compliance with international norms. But arguing is particularly effective "at the latter stages of a socialization process."[203] The

[200] Risse, "Global Governance and Communicative Action."
[201] Ibid., 306.
[202] Ibid.
[203] Ibid., 307.

process of "argumentative self-entrapment" starts with "rhetorical action and strategic adaptation to external pressures" but later "ends with argumentative behavior."[204] Risse admits that this is far away from Habermas's notion of an 'ideal speech situation' since states are "forced into a dialogue by the pressure of fully mobilized domestic and transnational networks" as well as by the "economic or political sanctions by the international community."[205]In that sense, supposedly nonhierarchical argumentative processes are conditioned on and preceded by the pedagogic processes that are essentially built on hierarchies of power, material and ideological. This, in a sense, accords with Partha Chatterjee's observation that even in today's global techniques of power, "the pedagogy of violence must often precede the pedagogy of culture."[206]As it is implied in Risse's communicative account, the pedagogy of violence (coercion, sanctions) should precede and prepare the grounds for deliberation among similar equals (pedagogy of culture). But this is also an impossible task, because the non-West cannot possibly share 'Western' life-world. Then the two pedagogic functions, of violence and of culture, complement each other through various combinations of the global techniques to produce violent inclusions and universalist exclusions.

4. The Binary Logic of Either/Or: Adoption versus Rejection of Norms

One key component of pedagogic models of socialization, I argue, is their tendency to reduce normative negotiations to the binary categories of adoption versus

[204] Ibid., 308.
[205] Ibid.
[206] Chatterjee, *The Black Hole of Empire*, 218.

rejection, which underplays the complexity of normative engagements in world politics and ends up imposing a closure on the meaning and practice of norms. Some pedagogic accounts either take norms as constatives[207] to be approached through the categories of true/false or correct/wrong. Accordingly, pedagogic socialization is the process in which the correct interpretation and practice of a norm is taught to the socializee. This constative rendition assumes that international norms have 'correct' interpretations that are taught by the pedagogic socializers. By so doing, it registers different interpretations of or claims on the norm as 'incorrect.'

This constative approach to norms is evident in Alexandra Gheciu's account of "NATO's pedagogical practices" in Eastern Europe. She describes NATO's role in Romania as one of "teaching" people the "true democracy" which is "a universally valid model of state-society relations."[208] For her, NATO acted as "an authoritative agent providing 'correct' interpretations of the world, including definitions of the self and others, and identifying reasonable actions in that world."[209] In that vein, it "depicted Western liberal-democratic norms … as the correct foundation of a modern democratic polity."[210] NATO's "pedagogic practices"[211] do not simply "teach Western-defined norms" but also seek to "convince [the socializees] to accept a particular interpretation of the application of those norms."[212] By doing so, it seeks to police the slippages that might possibly occur in the translation of those norms. This pedagogic activity amounts to no

[207] The term constative was used by J.L. Austin to refer to statements that are verifiable. They are reports that are either true or false. John Langshaw Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (Oxford University Press, 1975).
[208] Gheciu, "Security Institutions as Agents of Socialization?," 989.
[209] Ibid., 978.
[210] Ibid., 971.
[211] Ibid., 1003.
[212] Ibid., 993.

less than teaching the socializee "a whole lifeworld, a set of new meanings and dispositions for making sense of and acting in the world."[213] It is a comprehensive project of conversion by the norm proselytizer.

Gheciu's narrative is one example of the constative pedagogic treatment of norms within pedagogic discourse of socialization. This discourse situates the socializer to the position of "a legitimate normative guide," and the socializee in turn accepts "Western-defined interpretations of the world" as "correct."[214] Socialization may fail when the "novice" comes to "challenge [the teacher's] specific prescriptions, arguing for a different interpretation regarding the correct application of the new norms in a particular case."[215] In other words, "a different interpretation" of the norm does not count as a contestation within the norm, but rather it falls outside the norm hence counts as a failure of socialization. This binary of either acceptance or rejection of norms within Gheciu's constative pedagogic account falls short of registering contestations and differential claims within norms, thus foreclosing the norms from assuming different meanings, expressions, and practices in different contexts. What it envisions is a smooth transition, not cultural translation.

This has serious consequences for global politics and for our understanding of it. Much of the political struggles in world politics take place through interpreting and

---

[213] Ibid., 981.
[214] Ibid., 983.
[215] Ibid., 983–984. Gheciu enumerates some reasons for what can cause such a breakdown in this pedagogic process, including teacher's possible appearance as being insufficiently knowledgeable, pursuing a hidden agenda, or departing from the norms of arguing and instead dictating a particular action. These are all failures on the part of the socializer to produce the sufficient authority in the eyes of the socializee. But she does not address the question of why actors may demand a different interpretation of the norm, in this case liberal democracy. Hence she overlooks the role of different cultural contexts and historical traditions to introduce difference into norms.

contesting the meaning of constitutive norms of modernity. In other words, more often than not political struggles are forged and discourses articulated through challenging a norm's posited pedagogy—its correct interpretation and authorized enactment—rather than the norm itself. This is not, I argue, adequately captured within the norm socialization literature for it does not open much space to the idea that fundamental political categories (constitutive global norms) of modern international life are essentially contested and that their meaning gives content and reasons to political struggles. Hence, a constative treatment of norms falls short of recognizing how norms can be both accepted *and* challenged at the same time, both inhabited *and* resisted at once. As such, it tends to overlook the structural openness of norms to the possibility of their differential appropriation or performative adoption.

As Finnemore points out, "normative contestation is in large part what politics is all about: competing values and understandings of what is good, desirable, and appropriate in our collective, communal life."[216] It is the locus of politics precisely because they involve the fundamental normative goods and there is "no clear stable normative solution."[217] Such political debates are about the nature of the norm. It is precisely because of the structural openness of the norm to multiple interpretations that subjects as actors laid claim to the norm, and adopted it differently. Such normative conflicts have "no unique solutions," which means that "different and shifting solutions will be tried in different places, and local context becomes important in identifying the

[216] Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*, 135.
[217] Ibid.

particular solutions that will be tried in each place."[218] Even between the European and North American states, who are taken as coming closest to forming a community[219] there are different interpretations about the appropriate role of the market in social life.

Therefore, the socialization literature's treatment of norms as pre-established stable structures in response to which states react fails to capture the situations that Antje Wiener refers to as "contested compliance."[220] According to Wiener, the conditions of a norm can sometimes be contested by a designated norm follower, which in turn may reconstruct the meaning of norms and transform the "normative structure of world politics. [221]" She draws on Giddens's structurationist sociology to argue that norms have a "dual quality" of being both "structuring and constructed." Hence, taking compliance as contested is to attend to the ways in which the meaning of norms are produced, contested, and transformed through social practices.[222] But she claims that this possibility is not entertained in the socialization literature because of its behaviorist treatment of norms as social facts that structure, constrain, and produce behavior. Therefore it "obscures the possibility of analytically defining variation in the meaning of norms."[223] The focus of norm compliance should therefore shift from government behavior to meaning of norms.

This is especially true for constitutive norms such as democracy, human rights, equality, dignity, freedom, and development that are the key categories of political

---

[218] Ibid., 139.
[219] Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett, *Security Communities* (Cambridge University Press, 1998).
[220] Antje Wiener, "Contested Compliance: Interventions on the Normative Structure of World Politics," *European Journal of International Relations* 10, no. 2 (June 2004): 189–234.
[221] For Wiener the normative structure of world politics is built upon the "principles of the rule of law, democracy, fundamental freedoms, and human rights to which the members of the liberal community of democratic states have adhered in an albeit varying yet steady promotion of compliance." (2004, 191)
[222] Wiener, "Contested Compliance," 191.
[223] Ibid., 198.

modernity and are aspired globally.[224] These "constitutive"[225] or "generic"[226] or "generative"[227] norms provide compelling reasons for action. These norms are different from the "specific category of procedural norms" that prescribe "instructions" for specific situations[228] or "single standard of behavior"[229] in the form of regulations.[230] Constitutive norms "encompass a wider set of sociocultural information, entailing world-views or core constitutional norms and principles such as, for example, the reference to a 'community of values.'"[231] And it is quite likely to observe procedural/regulative norms conflicting with generic/constitutive norms. The example Wiener provides is the relationship between human rights and death penalty. States that acknowledge the reason entailed in the constitutive norm of human rights may adopt conflicting regulative norms.

---

[224] Chayes and Chayes note that "the broader and more general the language [of a treaty] the wider the ambit of permissible interpretations to which it gives rise." (1993:189) Furthermore, Wiener points out that "the successful signing of international agreements often depends on precisely this imprecision." (198) For her, "meanings are often left intentionally vague" and "this adds to the potential of variation in the interpretation of meaning in the different domestic contests where compliance with a norm is expected." (199) In other words, such global appeal of these norms—global norms (Franck), global values (McFaul)—are possible precisely through the possibility of multiple interpretations and imprecision in their commandments and obligations.
[225] Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*.
[226] Wiener, "Contested Compliance."
[227] Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*.
[228] Friedrich V. Kratochwil, *Rules, Norms, and Decisions: On the Conditions of Practical and Legal Reasoning in International Relations and Domestic Affairs* (Cambridge University Press, 1991), 69–73.
[229] Finnemore and Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," 891.
[230] Wiener, "Contested Compliance," 199.
[231] Ibid. International socialization is concerned mainly with constitutive norms. These are also called "community norms" that define the "collective identity of an international community." Schimmelfennig, "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues," 6. They define the collective self by the way that '"we" do things' and contain "behavioral prescriptions for the proper enactment" of that identity.Paul Kowert and Jeffrey Legro, "Norms, Identity, and Their Limits: A Theoretical Reprise," in *The Culture of National Security*, ed. Peter J. Katzenstein (Columbia University Press, 1996), 453. Schimmelfennig enumerates democracy, transparency, economic liberalization, minority rights, and multilateralist foreign policy as examples of constitutive norms, and among regulative norms he counts civilian control of the military, intellectual property rights, monetary and regional policy norms, tripartism, and norms of social policy and employment legislation. Schimmelfennig, "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues," 8. I blur this difference later in the chapter.

For example, despite the fact that the U.S. signed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 38 states within the U.S., including the federal state, have authorized death penalty. In that sense, the translation of a norm into practice is wrought with contestation even when the norm itself is adopted.[232] Hence, as I will elaborate more in Chapter 3, constitutive norms are more likely to be the subject of performative appropriation because of their structural openness to multiple and conflicting interpretations.[233]

However, not all pedagogic accounts take norms as constatives. Some do recognize the performative dimensions of norm socialization as a structural possibility and empirical fact. But they then put the emphasis on the pedagogic forces that would normalize the practice and meaning of these norms. For example, Finnemore and Sikkink do recognize that domestic structures and domestic norms serve as filters of international norms, and as such, they can "produce important variations in compliance and

[232] Wiener suggests that the implementation of human rights norms on the question of death penalty differ distinctively in the U.S. (which authorizes) and in the U.K. (which bans) "despite both countries' membership in the international community of 'civilized states' that adheres to the generic categories of norms such as the rule of law, democracy and human rights." Wiener, "Contested Compliance," 199. Even though this discourse of 'civilized states' bears colonial undertones, the point she is making is an important one; that contestation and acceptance co-exist in constitutive norms.

[233] To differentiate between regulative and constitutive norms is not to posit a hierarchy between them. It only points to the different ways they function. This does not necessarily mean that one or the other is more important. Even though I take constitutive norms as having a prior status for they organize the space within which regulative norms then seek to control behavior, there is no theoretical reason to take one or the other as being necessarily more important than the other. An IMF-imposed 'regulative norm' to reduce subsidies and social benefits and to fire government workers may have more impact on those whose lives are deeply effected by it, then the constitutive norm of keeping promises and paying debts. It also does not suggest that there is no contestation over regulative norms. Just as constitutive norms are structurally open to differential appropriations, regulative norms are always open to constestation. Just as the constitutive norms about protection of environment are open to contestation, for example, the regulative norms about the number of whales that can be hunted in a year may also be challenged. However, the difference lies in the possible range of different interpretations of a norm. Being comparatively more general and vague (hence pervasive), constitutive norms are more prone to performative appropriation. In that sense, the distinction between regulative and constative norms can only be analytical as regulative norms regulate behavior within the limits of constitituve norms and constitituve norms can only meaningfully exist in their instantiation in particular regulative norms.

interpretation of these norms."[234] But "norm entrpreneurs" coalescing with "transnational advocacy networks" effectively put domestic and international pressure on state actors to interpret norms in particular ways—as in the examples of Chinese footbinding or female genital mutilation.[235] Elsewhere, Finnemore points to the contested character of norms such human equality. She suggests that despite the fact that "the norm of human equality rarely comes under overt attack," the questions of "who is human" and "equal with regard to what" continue to introduce difference into the norm.[236] Therefore the meaning of the norm of equality is not static but rather changes dynamically on the basis of who is conceived as proper human and on what basis equality is measured.[237] Same for the other norms Finnemore mentions, markets and bureaucracy. However, the meaning of these norms are constantly under the pedagogic tutelage of Western state and non-state actors and discourses. World Bank delimits a particular understanding of the market and enforces it worldwide through various measures such as membership and conditionality. Hence, pedagogic socialization attempts to fix or arrest the meaning and practices of norms even when it recognizes contestations within norms.[238]

Despite her overall endorsement of the sociological institutionalist approach, Finnemore criticizes sociological institutionalist notions of global isomorphism as equifinality or homogeneity in that they overlook "the tensions and contradictions among

---

[234] Finnemore and Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," 893.
[235] Keck and Sikkink, *Activists beyond Borders*.
[236] Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*, 133.
[237] Ibid. Finnemore notes that the notion of human equality once meant equality of white males and equality only in the sphere of political participation among the well to do. But over time "equality has come to be measured not just in terms of political participation but also political and economic outcome." For her, "much of the [American] Civil War can be viewed as a contest over the meaning of equality: was it equality for states (states' rights?), equality for whites, or equality for all?" Ibid., 135.
[238] Barnett and Finnemore, *Rules for the World*.

social values and do not attend to the implications of those tense relationships." [239] These tensions and contradictions among norms, for Finnemore, "leave room for different solutions and different arrangements, each of which makes legitimacy claims based on the same norms."[240] That means the precise shape of the norm in a given situation reflects the interaction of both local and international factors. For example, the modern state is now dictated as the "appropriate form of political organization" in global politics, but its shape varies in different contexts that reflect the influence of "local norms and customs with which international norms have had to compromise."[241] Yet there is always the inherent possibility that such variations take the form of 'abnormalities' deviating from the norm or even 'transgressions' subverting the norm. In Finnemore's own example, the modern state has established itself as a global norm, but the different ways in which states appeal to that particular norm takes a deeply contestatory character. Take the example of communist states, autarkies, or theocracies. This differential adoption of the norm (in this case the ideological/constitutional adjective of the state) becomes a locus of political contestation. Some of the socialization literature recognizes the inherently contestatory character of constitutive norms in global politics, but then places the emphasis on the pedagogic mechanisms and actors that discipline these interpretations along liberal lines.

---

[239] Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*, 131. Finnemore notes that international norms create pressure on states toward "isomorphism," yet they "by no means create equifinality." Ibid., 66. In Chapter 4, I try to dissect this difference and distance between isomorphism (greater adoption of norms) and equifinality (homogeneity, same results). For Finnemore variations in local conditions and international coercion also have great impact on the final state of how norms shape state structures and behavior. The body of international norms "is not congruent enough to produce homogeneity or equifinality." Ibid., 136. (136)

[240] Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*, 136.

[241] Ibid.

For example, Finnemore notes that while human equality has gained a status of global recognition as a norm and as a "necessary good," understandings of human equality "may differ in Islamic societies, socialist states, and West European states."[242] In that sense, such constitutive norms leave "substantial room for interpretation and contestation, particularly in light of other strong norms in international life." [243] However, as I mention in Chapter 1, pedagogic discourses such as post-Islamism and 'Muslim democracy' seek to discipline Islamist interpretations of the character of the state, public and private distinction, the place of religion in state and politics, and gender equality. In other words, while constative treatment of norms fail to register contestation within the norm, others who recognize the inherently contested character of norms highlight the pedagogic power of socialization to transform and discipline these interpretations along liberal lines. Hence, both stripes of socialization narrative operate with a common pedagogic template that seek to normalize actors and their normative negotiations.

In a sense, if norms are collective expectations of appropriate behavior for a given identity[244]one can identify in the very structure of norms an inherent normalizing logic. After all, norms produce their effects through implicit or explicit do's and don'ts, and they "by definition embody a quality of 'oughtness' and shared moral assessment."[245] They are what "good people do (or do not do)" in particular situations.[246] Socialization seeks to produce actors who would follow the norms because "it is the normal thing to

---

[242] Ibid., 139.
[243] Ibid.
[244] Peter J. Katzenstein, *The Culture of National Security* (Columbia University Press, 1996).
[245] Finnemore and Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," 892.
[246] James Fearon, "What Is Identity (as We Now Use the Word)," *Unpublished Manuscript, Stanford University, Stanford, California*, 1999, 27.

do."[247] Hence, there is an inherent normalizing logic in norm socialization. But more important for my purposes here is that the pedagogy within liberal socialization posits meta-rules that govern how norms are to be adopted and performed. It prescribes particular ways and manners through which universally aspired categories such as human rights, democracy, equality, and freedom are to be understood. In other words, one key component of this pedagogic discourse of socialization is to impose closure on the meaning of the sullied terms of modernity by way of treating them as constatives.

Finnemore acknowledges that such expansion in the meaning of norms can happen only through a contestation of the meaning of the norm within the norm, or through practices that enact a performative contradiction.[248] As she notes, social norms and institutions are "continually being contested, albeit to varying degrees at different times."[249] Furthermore, international norms can make "countervailing claims on people" or they can "mobilize groups with opposing claims, both of which are grounded in basic, legitimate norms of society."[250] For example, when equality meant equality of white males, actors invoked the norm of equality to establish it for non-whites and non-males. Once this meant equality for women and then it took the form of equality for all genders.

Therefore, internal contestations within the norm cannot be registered in the binary of whether one socializes into it or rejects it, but they rather need to be understood as performative appropriations or differential/conflictual claims on the norm. Contestation within the norm has been fundamental to the historical evolution of the

---

[247] Risse-Kappen and Sikkink, "The Socialization of International Human Rights Norms into Domestic Practices: Introduction," 17.
[248] I discuss performative contradiction in Chapter 4.
[249] Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*, 135.
[250] Ibid., 138.

norm. It is precisely because of the structural openness of norms to multiple interpretations that actors lay differential and conflictual claims on them.

Checkel argues that norms are "certainly not accepted by all, but this is not surprising—a key insight of research on norms is their contested nature."[251] Here Checkel recognizes contestations over the norm but implies that contestation is thought only in terms of 'not acceptance' or rejection. If there is contestation, then the norm in question is not accepted. And when the possibility of contestation within the norm is entertained it is more often than not strategic manipulation of state or non-state actors to circumvent the norm. It is "talking the talk" of the norm and creating "Potemkin harmonization" to escape from the "costs of adaptation."[252] In other words, we either have "smooth socialization, good pupils" or absence of socialization and rejection or manipulation of a norm. This binary framework falls short of accounting for the complexity of political contestations over the key constitutive norms/categories of modernity, such as human rights, democracy, equality, freedom, dignity.

Take human rights for example. Both proponents and opponents of legalization of abortion invoke the discourse of human rights—right to life and right to choice—to establish and defend their claims. Similarly, states that adhere to the constitutive norms of human rights may still differ in their interpretation of whether capital punishment should be included in the penal system or whether gay marriage should be recognized. Sometimes, even the states within the same federation can differ sharply on such politically charged issues.

---

[251] Checkel, "International Institutions and Socialization in Europe."
[252] Schimmelfennig, "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues."

Pheng Cheah argues, for example, that East Asian countries' discourse about 'Asian values' and their critical position in various international human rights conferences can and should be seen not as a rejection of human rights, but as a claim to human rights that interprets the notion of human dignity differently, one that prioritizes economic development over individual rights.[253] This does not mean that such gestures are unproblematic. One may find these claims troubling in many ways. But they are contestations within the norm, not its rejection. Such gestures at once accept the fundamental prescription of the norm yet challenge its particular pedagogy—normalizing logic. Similarly there are numerous adjectives and models of democracy (liberal, social, communist, Christian, Islamic, Jewish) that overlap as well as conflict with each other. These interpretations cannot be conceived through the categories of correct vs. wrong. This does not paralyze judgment, and it is not a call for relativism. Rather it calls for an appreciation of differential adoptions of constitutive norms in different contexts. Adjudicating between those interpretations cannot be based on the constative binaries without doing considerable violence.

Norms are intrinsically ambivalent and structurally open to multiple interpretations.[254] This is why liberal pedagogy of socialization seeks to discipline how actors repeat norms. It prescribes not only behavioral compliance to norms but also solicits their internalization and habitualization as it aims at producing particular subjects with particular orientations, identifications, sensibilities. Schemmelfennig gives 'private

---

[253] Pheng Cheah, *Inhuman Conditions: On Cosmopolitanism and Human Rights* (Harvard University Press, 2009).
[254] Raymond Duvall and Arjun Chowdhury, "Practices of Theory," in *International Practices*, ed. Emanuel Adler and Vincent Pouliot (Cambridge University Press, 2011), 335–54.

property' as an example of constitutive norms and 'social policy' as an example of regulative norms.[255] But various debates such as the ones over taxation and social spending indicate that the meanings of these norms are not pre-given and the distinction between constitutive and regulative norms are not hard and fast but are rather analytical. They are negotiated through political struggles in specific contexts. In that sense, the decision on whether one practice constitutes a legitimate variation on a theme or counts as norm-violation is performative. It is a faith-like grounding of claim-making, a "mystical foundation of authority."[256]

5. Conclusion

I argued in this chapter that the current theorizing on norm socialization operates through a hierarchical pedagogic discourse that understands normative engagements as "assimilation of others"[257] (the novice, the pupil, the child, the non-West) to 'us'—the West as the embodiment of liberal norms. It does not envision a process of "reciprocal learning" informed by "reciprocity of understanding." Instead it posits a unilateral relationship whereby one is set to acknowledge the authority of the teacher and learn from him and the other to teach the pupil. The ultimate goal is to create a new subject

[255] Schimmelfennig, "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues."
[256] Jacques Derrida, *Acts of Religion* (Routledge, 2013); Stephen Hopgood, "Moral Authority, Modernity and the Politics of the Sacred," *European Journal of International Relations* 15, no. 2 (June 1, 2009): 229–55.
[257] Fred Dallmayr, "Conversation Across Boundaries: Political Theory and Global Diversity," *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 30, no. 2 (June 1, 2001): 341.

who internalizes the teacher's norms as defined by him so that it becomes taken-for-granted.

Barnett and Finnemore see in the expansion of the functions and domains of international organizations a strong possibility of "undemocratic liberalism" in global governance.[258] This chapter looks at this possibility at the level of normative negotiations and how they are framed in terms of the hierarchical positions of teachers and students and what these authority relationships entail. I argue that both the actual operations of liberal global governance and also the mainstream literature on norm socialization in IR rely on and reproduce a pedagogic understanding of normative engagements in which Western teachers are set to teach proper norms and their correct interpretation to non-Western pupils. This, I argue, reflects and reproduces the hierarchical structure of liberal global governance. Teaching is considered an occasional and rare mechanism of socialization in world politics,[259] but I suggest in this chapter that norm socialization takes place, and is studied within much of IR scholarship, in a pedagogic register. It is through various pedagogic mechanisms that liberal global governance produces and reproduces itself.

Yet at the same time, there is much that cannot be subsumed under or consumed by the pedagogy of liberal global governance. The meaning and practice of norms are constantly negotiated and contested, albeit under conditions created by liberal modernity. While the structures and actors of liberal international order exercise such disciplinary power over the 'novice non-Western,' there is always an excess that seeks to escape,

---

[258] Barnett and Finnemore, *Rules for the World*.
[259] Checkel, "International Institutions and Socialization in Europe"; Gheciu, "Security Institutions as Agents of Socialization?".

mitigate, or circumvent the hierarchies and exclusions created by these relationships. Those in the margins of liberal global governance engage with norms in ways that constantly put the pedagogy of socialization at risk. It is these performative dynamics and strategies that I now turn to in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 3

PERFORMATIVE SOCIALIZATION: CULTURAL TRANSLATION AND APPROPRIATION OF NORMS IN LIBERAL GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

In the previous chapter, I argued that norm socialization literature in IR tends to take socialization as a 'pedagogic' process in which the (often non-Western) 'newcomers' are made to transition into 'Western' norms, mostly but not exclusively by the pedagogues of liberal international order. Here in this chapter I advance an alternative account of socialization, one that attends to the performative dynamics of normative engagements in global politics.[1] To do so I draw on postcolonial and poststructuralist theoretical insights variously developed in the fields of literary theory, anthropology and history. First, I propose to read socialization not solely or simply as a process of 'transition' into the prescribed meanings and authorized practices of norms but also as a process of their 'translation' through different social imaginaries and historical traditions.

[1] The concept of 'performativity' has a diverse genealogy and is taken up very differently in different disciplinary fields. Shannon Jackson notes that in a cross-disciplinary conversation one finds out that the concept means different things to different people and it has different trajectories and intellectual histories coming from "Bakhtin or Bateson, from Turner or Goffman, from Dewey or Austin, from Derrida or Lacan, from Butler or Sedgwick." *Professing Performance: Theatre in the Academy from Philology to Performativity* (Cambridge University Press, 2004), 12. Many possible paths of intellectual influence can be outlined within the trajectory of the concept in the fields of linguistic philosophy, literary studies, anthropology, social theory, queer theory and folklore studies. But as Jonathan Culler notes, "the relations among various thinkers' notions of the performative and performance are scarcely clear." Jonathan Culler, *The Literary in Theory*, 1 edition (Stanford University Press, 2006), 138. So much so that Dwight Conquergood suggests that performance should be taken as one of the essentially contested concepts, similar to democracy, power, and authority. Dwight Conquergood, "Of Caravans and Carnivals: Performance Studies in Motion," *The Drama Review* 39, no. 4 (October 1, 1995): 137–41. But here I follow Culler's proposal that "rather than try to restrict or simplify the performative's domain, by choosing one strand of reflection as the correct one, we ought to accentuate and pursue the differences between them—so as to increase our chances of grasping the different levels and modes in which events occur." Culler, *The Literary in Theory*, 165. Therefore, acknowledging the complexity and at times contradictory deployments of the concept of performativity, I try and clarify how I use it. Here my reading of performativity draws on Austin and various postructuralist and postcolonial readings of him, particularly by Jacques Derrida, Judith Butler, Homi Bhabha, Gayatri C. Spivak, and Dipesh Chakrabarty.

Second, I discuss some of the strategies through which actors adopt norms non-normatively, and hence destabilize the pedagogy of socialization. Third, I investigate the complex and unstable dynamics of authority and authorization in socialization by analyzing the role of conventions and audiences. Fourth, I distinguish performativity from performance and investigate its implications for the study of norm socialization. Finally, I discuss performative socialization as *both* adoption of *and* resistance to norms and I delineate the scope of the performativity of socialization.

IR scholarship has used the lenses of performativity to analyze the production of state identities in and through foreign policy practices[2] and as gendered subjects[3] and to deconstruct the institution of international order.[4] Building on speech act theory, the 'Copenhagen School' has developed a theory of securitization.[5] Constructivist scholars have drawn on speech act theory to interrogate the linguistic construction of rules, norms, and identities in international politics.[6] However, the implications of the analytics of performativity for norms and socialization research in IR have not been systematically investigated. This is quite puzzling given performativity's thorough engagement with questions of normativity and socialization, hence its potential to open up new interpretive

---

[2] David Campbell, *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity* (University of Minnesota Press, 1998). For a powerful critique of the application of performative accounts of subjectivity to state actors, see Mark Laffey, "Locating Identity: Performativity, Foreign Policy and State Action," *Review of International Studies* 26, no. 03 (2000): 429–44.

[3] Cynthia Weber, "Performative States," *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 27, no. 1 (March 1, 1998): 77–95.

[4] Badredine Arfi, "Rethinking International Constitutional Order: The Auto-Immune Politics of Binding Without Binding," *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 39, no. 2 (December 1, 2010): 299–321.

[5] Barry Buzan, Ole Waever, and Jaap De Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (Lynne Rienner Pub, 1997). For an extensive review of the securitization approach, see Holger Stritzel, "Security as Translation: Threats, Discourse, and the Politics of Localisation," *Review of International Studies* 37, no. 05 (2011): 2491–2517.

[6] Nicholas Greenwood Onuf, *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations* (University of South Carolina Press, 1989); Kratochwil, *Rules, Norms, and Decisions*.

possibilities for IR theorizing. Cynthia Weber suggests that "normativity is always bound up with performativity," and performativity "takes up a critical position in relation to normativity."[7] Despite this intimate relationship, the implications of performativity for norms and socialization research are still underexplored.[8]

At its core, to attend to the performative dimensions of socialization is to explore the ways in which globally dominant norms in world politics, many of which are expressed in the language of the universal, are appropriated by, and resignified from, the margins of liberal global governance. Echoing Amitav Acharya's critique of the norm diffusion literature for its heavy emphasis on "conversion rather than contestation,"[9] a performative reading further explores the dynamics of both normalization and insurrection within socialization. In the next section I argue that cultural translation is a key mechanism through which these dynamics of normalization and contestation unfold.

1. Socialization as Cultural Translation

---

[7] Cynthia Weber, "Performative States," *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 27, no. 1 (March 1, 1998): 82.

[8] The promise of the analytics of performativity becomes evident in Jonathan Culler's discussion of performativity. Culler suggests that performativity—particularly with reference to Judith Butler's writings—is "a model for thinking about crucial social processes where a number of matters are at stake: (1) the nature of identity and how it is produced, (2) the functioning of social norms, (3) the fundamental problem of what today we call "agency" in English: how far and under what conditions can I be a responsible subject who chooses my acts, and (4) the relationship between the individual and social change." Culler, *The Literary in Theory*, 161. Evidently, all of these questions are central to much of the IR theorizing, particularly within the Third Debate and with respect to constructivist and critical approaches, and have significant ramifications for theorization of norms and socialization in IR.

[9] Acharya, "How Ideas Spread," 242. For Acharya, it is unfortunate that the literature tends to view norm diffusion as a process of teaching by transnational norm entrepreneurs—or in Nadelmann's language, "moral proselytizers"—in a way that assigns "causal primacy to 'international prescriptions,' hence downplaying the role of different social imaginaries and the agency of local actors.

"New norms never enter a normative vacuum," Finnemore and Sikkink argue, they rather "emerge in a highly contested normative space where they must compete with other norms and perceptions of interest."[10] Various discourses, traditions and social imaginaries fill in the normative space of societies into which new norms arrive. The liberal norms, discourses, and institutions that now command global dominance, or at least relevance, do not travel in thin air, but they "encounter pre-existing concepts, categories, institutions, and practices through which they get translated and configured differently."[11] Engagements with the universalizing norms of liberal global governance occur in and through the pre-existing norms and discourses, and hence call for a politics of translation. Modernity as a process involves translation of norms and institutions, and as Niranjana points out, people in postcolonial societies live "always already in translation." In that sense, translation is a metaphor for, and a mechanism of, socialization, especially (but not exclusively) in cross-cultural settings.

Translation refers to the travel of meanings and signs across languages and cultures,[12] hence socialization can be investigated as a process of cultural translation as it involves the circulation of norms and institutions across borders and cultures.[13] In its narrowest sense translation is the act of "turn[ing] something from one language into another"; accordingly, cultural translation is "the translation of one culture into terms

---

[10] Finnemore and Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," 897.
[11] Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe*, xii.
[12] Lydia H. Liu, "Introduction," in *Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations*, ed. Lydia H. Liu (Duke University Press, 1999), 2.
[13] Susanne Zwingel, "How Do Norms Travel? Theorizing International Women's Rights in Transnational Perspective," *International Studies Quarterly* 56, no. 1 (March 1, 2012): 115–29.

intelligible to another."[14] Translation is not solely an interlingual process or a linguistic question. It is also a "social practice,"[15] a "problematic," "a field," "a set of questions."[16]

Translation is a performative practice. It is so for two intimately related reasons. First, translations are inevitably mediated by language, and language itself is a mediated construction rather than a transparent medium. Therefore, translations "invent rather than represent culture."[17] As Liu points out, "one does not translate between equivalents; rather, one creates tropes of equivalence in the middle zone of translation between the host and guest languages." [18] In other words, translation does not register an already existing equivalence between meanings, but rather, it *creates* them. Therefore, translation is "the performative nature of cultural communication."[19]

Second, translation produces a relationship of difference (rather than equivalence) out of seeming incommensurabilities,[20] and any articulation of difference, "whether

---

[14] Tejaswini Niranjana, *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context* (University of California Press, 1992), 47. Shaden Tageldin defines "interlingual" translation as "the rendition of one language in another," and "intercultural" translation as "the transaction of epistemic 'equivalence' in economies of cultural exchange."Tageldin also talks about an "intersubjective" form of translation, which denotes "the translation of one's self to resemble an Other's, as in Fanon's rephrasing of the Hegelian dialectic." (p.13) Her analysis of the politics of translational seduction as the *modus operandi* of cultural imperialism in (post)colonial Egypt draws on all these three forms of translation. Shaden M. Tageldin, *Disarming Words: Empire and the Seductions of Translation in Egypt* (University of California Press, 2011), 13.
[15] Liu, "Introduction," 2.
[16] Ibid., 8.
[17] Niranjana, *Siting Translation*, 81.
[18] Lydia H. Liu, "Legislating the Universal: The Circulation of International Law in the Nineteenth Century," in *Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations*, ed. Lydia H. Liu (Duke University Press, 1999), 137.
[19] Homi K Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London; New York: Routledge, 2004), 326.
[20] As Chakrabarty points out, the relationship between non-Western histories and European thought is one of translucence instead of transparency, which neither erases the relationship nor establishes transparent equivalences between them. Cultural translation thus marks this translucence and produces difference performatively. Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe*, 18. Also see, Naoki Sakai, *Translation and Subjectivity: On Japan and Cultural Nationalism* (University of Minnesota Press, 2008).

antagonistic or affiliative," is performative.[21] Ergo, as a difference-producing practice, translation is performative. Translations are "transformations that never reproduce the 'original.'"[22] There is a structural dynamic within translation that makes deformation and displacement inescapable.[23] Through translation concepts "take on new genealogies of thought and action from the new language."[24] They get transformed. Especially those on the margins "continually stretch" the norms and discourses that govern global social life, and in so doing, create friction. Such displacements and transformations turn cultural translation from a "discursive condition of dominance" into a "ground of intervention."[25]

Norms, institutions, and discourses travel across borders through the mediation and filtering of different languages, histories and traditions if they are not imposed by sheer coercion and domination. Since there is "no cultural consensus on an international level about what ought and ought not to be a claim to universality, who may make it, and what form it ought to take," any normative claim has to go through a process of cultural translation in order to institute itself as a norm in different cultural contexts.[26] Otherwise, "colonial and expansionist logic" becomes the only way left for asserting the universality of norms and discourses.[27]

---

[21] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 3.
[22] Niranjana, *Siting Translation*, 117.
[23] Ibid., 46. Niranjana highlights that the Latin word *translatio*—the etymological root of translation—as well as its equivalents in Greek (*metaphorein*) and German (*Übersetzung*) communicate a sense of "movement, disruption, displacement." Ibid., 8.
[24] Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing, *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection* (Princeton University Press, 2005), 224.
[25] Niranjana, *Siting Translation*, 46.
[26] "Without translation," Butler points out, "the very concept of universality cannot cross the linguistic borders it claims, in principle, to be able to cross." Judith Butler, "Restaging the Universal: Hegemony and the Limits of Formalism," in *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*, ed. Judith Butler, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj Žižek (Verso, 2000), 35.
[27] Ibid. Similarly, Susan Buck-Morss suggests that "there is no Archimedean point in space at which we could station ourselves while putting the globe in dry-dock for repairs," this is why there is no option

The narratives that construe modernity as a process of 'transition' do not necessarily reject the role of translation, but rather they adopt a particular model of translation, a "sociological" or "modern" one as Chakrabarty names them, which relies on a universal third-term to enable exchange and equivalence between two categories.[28] This mode of translation lies at the heart of what Chakrabarty calls "History 1"—the "universal and necessary" history created by the global expansion of capital. History 1, and hence sociological translation, is "indispensable" for understanding how the commodifying, abstracting, and generalizing logic of capitalist exchange transformed the world.

However, as much as it is indispensable, this "sociological" translation is also "inadequate" for it erases differences between categories and falls short of accounting for "History 2s"—the "affective histories" or "histories of belonging" that "always" modify History 1— "constitutively but unevenly."[29] History 2s are the domains of "diverse ways of being human" and "historical difference"[30] that constitute different social imaginaries and discursive traditions. They "interrupt" and "punctuate" the universalizing and homogenizing logic of History 1 by resisting the generalizing force of sociological

---

"except the slow and painful task of a radically open communication." This radically open communication is "the task of translation as a political project," and as such, it is performative. Susan Buck-Morss, *Thinking Past Terror: Islamism and Critical Theory on the Left* (Verso, 2003), 6-7.

[28] In his example, H_2O is the general universal third-term that mediates and creates a relationship of equivalence between *pani* in Hindi and "water" in English. Or in Marx's account, "abstract labor" becomes the universal currency that enables the commodification of things by making them available for exchange. Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe*, 85.

[29] Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe*, 68-70.

[30] Ibid., 70.

translation. In so doing, History 2s do not reject or transcend History 1, but rather supplement and provincialize it.[31]

Chakrabarty's categories of transition/translation and History 1/History 2s are quite suggestive for thinking about dynamics of norm socialization. Pedagogic narratives of socialization are articulated within the realm of History 1, hence one can think of them as Socialization 1—the processes through which actors are made to adopt the norms of liberal global governance. Similarly, performative socialization can be construed as Socialization 2—processes in which the homogenizing force of Socialization 1 is negotiated and tamed. Just like the relationship between History 1 and History 2s, pedagogic and performative socializations are intimately related but deeply wrought with tension. A performative reading seeks to account for the ways in which cultural translation supplements and displaces the transition narrative (Socialization 1).[32]

In that sense, translation is a terrain of contestation. Translation, especially in a post-colonial context, is a "struggle"[33] to unsettle the homogenizing force of norms and discourses by "interrupting the Western discourses of modernity."[34] It marks a resistance to the "assimilationist technologies" of modernity.[35] As Bhabha notes, "the power of the postcolonial translation of modernity rests in its performative, deformative structure."[36] Through translation the norms and institutions of modernity (i.e. citizenship, public-

---

[31] Ajay Skaria, "The Project of Provincialising Europe: Reading Dipesh Chakrabarty," *Economic and Political Weekly* 44, no. 14 (April 4, 2009): 56. Chakrabarty argues that a "nonsociological" and "nonmodern" mode of translation, which does not rest on a universal third-term (i.e. H2O) and instead takes "barter" or one-on-one form of exchange between categories as its model, is better equipped to understand the relationship between History 1 and History 2s.
[32] Ibid.
[33] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 348.
[34] Ibid., 346.
[35] Ibid., 9.
[36] Ibid., 346–347.

private division, secular reason) get transformed and cultural difference get written over them.

However, even though cultural translation entails a form of strategic agency, it is not necessarily bound to challenge existing relations of hierarchy and domination. In fact, hierarchies and power differentials often get written into language also through translation. The fact that translation transforms does not necessarily mean that it subverts. This is so for two main reasons. First, the liberating potential of cultural translation is constrained by the original text. The original commands a certain force on the translation to remain faithful to the original, despite the displacements enacted in translation.[37] As Asad suggests,

> the original text constrains in a way that a translation of it does not; that while one argues about the original one cannot, as a translator, argue with it. The latter activity can be properly carried on only in relation to the translation. Like the medieval translations, all translations must seek to articulate the power of the relic in its new habitat, and remain faithful to that power.

The relationship between the 'original' and the 'copy' is often constructed in asymmetric and hierarchical ways. The expectation to be 'faithful' to the original exerts a pedagogic pressure on translating actors. Susan Bassnett lucidly captures this dynamic:

> "Europe was regarded as the great Original, the starting point, and the colonies were therefore copies, or 'translations' of Europe, which they were supposed to duplicate. Moreover, being copies, translations were

[37] Talal Asad, "A Comment on Translation, Critique, and Subversion," in *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross-Cultural Texts*, ed. Anuradha Dingwaney and Carol Maier (University of Pittsburgh Pre, 1996), 331.

> evaluated as less than originals, and the myth of the translation as something that diminished the greater original established itself. (…) The notion of the colony as a copy or translation of the great Original inevitably involves a value judgment that ranks the translation in a lesser position in the literary hierarchy. The colony, by this definition, is therefore less than a colonizer, its original."[38]

In other words, the constraining power of the original text casts significant doubt on the resisting force and liberating claims of translation. After all, in order for a translation to be appropriate, it must convey the ideas in the original text with as much fidelity as possible so as to be a successful translation.[39] In the colonial context the colonizer 'invites' the colonized into "the modern world culture" and at the same time "insists, as its authentic originator, on being the judge of successful enculturation."[40] The juridical metaphor Asad uses here ('judge') only multiplies the force of the pedagogic dynamics of rendering socialization as transition and acculturation—as the process of adopting the norms and ways of the dominator.

However, when we shift the unit and scale of translation from literary or philosophical texts to broader concepts, norms, and institutions, the constraining power of

---

[38] Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi, *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practice* (Routledge, 2012), 4.; quoted in Sathya Rao, "From a Postcolonial to a Non-Colonial Theory of Translation," in *Translation, Biopolitics, Colonial Difference*, ed. Naoki Sakai and Jon Solomon (Hong Kong University Press, 2006), 74.

[39] Strikingly, in "The Politics of Translation" Spivak addresses this aspect of translation as a transformation that the translator goes through—a transformation through which translator surrenders her sovereignty or autonomy by "work[ing] at someone else's title." This for Spivak is the translator's "surrender to the text" that she translates. But Tageldin points out the perils created by power asymmetries in such relinquishing of autonomy. She writes, "Spivak's call on the self to surrender itself in translation enjoins humility on the dominant but holds peril for the dominated. For where does the colonized translator fly after she or he bids the self good-bye? Into the master-Other. If, for the colonized, the eros of translation fabricates a dangerously seductive "likeness" in the face of difference—the deep difference power makes—then the politics of (post)colonial translation beg retheorization […]." Tageldin, *Disarming Words*, 24.

[40] Asad, "A Comment on Translation, Critique, and Subversion," 330.

the 'original' lessens. That power diminishes even further when one thinks of the universalizing norms of the Enlightenment, which are mostly essentially contested concepts, such as democracy, human rights, equality, freedom, or sovereignty. Hence, the dynamics of 'fidelity' to a text in translation vary.[41] The performative force of translation is located in the potential of the 'copy' to destabilize the expectations of fidelity to the 'original.'[42]

Furthermore, the dynamics of cultural translation can also transform processes of 'enculturation' into processes of 'transculturation.' While acculturation or enculturation speaks to a linear process of transition and homogenization, transculturation results from and in turn produces cultural translation.[43] The heterogeneity introduced by translation into the claimed purity of the 'original' concepts and categories presents a possibility of intervention.[44] Translations "contaminate" the supposed purity of the 'original.'[45]

---

[41] The examples Asad provides are his own translations of the sermons of a Saudi Arabian Islamic preacher into English, or the translation of Rushdie's *Satanic Verses*. He points out, quite rightly, that a competent translation of a text "is not itself a critique." Ibid., 331.

[42] In that vein, Niranjana notes that "the notion of fidelity to the 'original' holds back translation theory from thinking the 'force' of translation." Niranjana, *Siting Translation*, 58.

[43] Similarly, in her discussion of Partha Chatterjee's critique of the discourses that depict Eastern nationalisms as "failed imitations of Western political formations" and as "the illiberal, 'evil' mistranslations of a 'good' liberal original," Shaden Tageldin suggests that "Chatterjee's nationalism is neither mistranslation nor perfect translation but a crossing of the two: a response by the colonized to the loss of self-determination that takes the historically 'necessary' form of the nation in order to be heard by empire but just as purposely diverts that form to its own ends." Tageldin, *Disarming Words*, 197–198. This insight captures the performative dynamics of socialization—in this case, into the norm of nationalism. It denotes a particular kind of political strategy—"response"—of differential and non-normative adoption of a norm (in this case "nationalism").

[44] As Walter Benjamin argues, translation is "a removal from one language into another through…transformations." Quoted in *Siting Translation*, 156.

[45] Ibid., 120. The relationship between translation and the original is one that Derrida calls supplementarity: "Translation is belated, always comes after the original, is always a supplement. Bu the 'original' lives on only in translation." Ibid., 160. As Liu points out, both Benjamin's and Derrida's accounts of translation based on the notion of supplementarity "refuses to privilege the original over the translation." Lydia H. Liu, "The Question of Meaning-Value in the Political Economy of the Sign," in *Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations*, ed. Lydia H. Liu (Duke University Press, 1999), 14. Susan Buck-Morss also builds on Benjamin's remarks that "a successful translation leaves neither the original nor

Transculturation emerges out of cultural translation and "inflects rather than effaces" what is deemed to be the original. That inflection brought about by translation is a locus of intervention in norm socialization.[46]

Second, the liberating force of translation is curtailed by the very conditions of power within which translation occurs. "The process of cultural translation," Talal Asad notes, "is inevitably enmeshed in conditions of power—professional, national, international."[47] Power asymmetries condition and influence translation in various ways. For example, the Chinese language was transformed in its interaction with English in the nineteenth century, in ways that English language was not. Many neologisms were created in Chinese to create the sense of equivalence between the languages—for example, the word *quanli* was created in order to counter the concept of 'right' in English—but no English neologisms were perceived to be necessary or created in that interaction.[48] This suggests that although translation opens both the receiving and original languages to transformation, the material conditions of asymmetry and inequality end up transforming languages differently and asymmetrically.

---

the receiving language unchanged," and envisions translation as an attempt to "force each language to extend itself creatively, becoming more than it was, producing an open space in which a new politics might take root." Buck-Morss, *Thinking Past Terror*, 6–7. Buck-Morss recognizes that "translation among political languges is [not] easily accomplished" since "real differences exist." However for Buck-Morss it is precisely in those "apparent incommensurabilities" that the promise of translation lies. The project of cultural translation treats political languages as "mutually open to transformation." In so doing it "challenges the unequal arrangements of global power" and expands the discursive field. Susan Buck-Morss, *Thinking Past Terror: Islamism and Critical Theory on the Left* (Verso, 2003), 6–11.

[46] As Dingwaney argues, "insofar as translation designates the space within which the dominant language and culture is rewritten, inflected, subverted by the 'subaltern,' [it] functions as a form of resistance." Dingwaney, "Introduction: Translating 'Third World' Cultures," 8.

[47] Talal Asad, *Genealogies of Religion : Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 198.

[48] Liu, "Legislating the Universal: The Circulation of International Law in the Nineteenth Century."

As Asad puts it, "global patterns of power created by imperialism and capitalism" asymmetrically situate languages, and this inequality creates "asymmetrical tendencies and pressures in the languages of dominated and dominant societies."[49] These power dynamics point to the necessity of attending to the social and institutional forces and relations that condition various kinds of literary, cultural, and institutional translation.[50] Cultural translation may well work "in full complicity with the logic of colonial expansion, when translation becomes the instrument through which dominant values are transposed into the language of the subordinated, and the subordinated run the risk of coming to know and understand them as tokens of their 'liberation.'"[51] As Shaden Tageldin points out, translation has been "both an instrument of and a response to cultural imperialism."[52] Translation served as "a significant technology of colonial domination" in the colonial enterprise.[53] The colonizers translated the native's texts and practices into their own languages, and in so doing domesticated, purified, and objectified them. [54] The task of translation in the colony was to "purify the debased native texts"[55] and "to domesticate the Orient" in order to turn it into "a province of European learning."[56] As a

---

[49] Asad, *Genealogies of Religion*, 199.
[50] Asad, "A Comment on Translation, Critique, and Subversion," 329.
[51] Butler, "Restaging the Universal: Hegemony and the Limits of Formalism," 35.
[52] Tageldin, *Disarming Words*, 2.
[53] Niranjana, *Siting Translation*, 21.
[54] Ibid., 34. For example, translating the authentic, indigenous literary and legal texts of the colonized was a central preoccupation of the British colonial administrators. British colonial administrators in India were motivated by a "desire to translate in order to contain and to contain and control in order to translate." This was an integral part of the European 'civilizing mission.'
[55] Ibid., 16.
[56] Ibid., 12. Through translation the colonial administrators, some of which were influential translators of Indian and Persian texts into English, as well as Western ethnographers aimed at "constructing" the world of the indigenous people, "representing" them and "speaking on [their] behalf." Ibid., 70.

social practice enmeshed in relations of power, translation was and is utilized to render the local languages "weaker"[57] and "nonuniversal."[58]

Yet, it was not only the colonizer who engaged in translation. The colonized also did. Nevertheless, under conditions of colonial or imperial asymmetries, the colonized often translated, and still translates, his cultural tradition in ways that would fit into that of the colonizer in order to prove the 'equivalence' and 'commensurability' between his own language and culture and those of the colonizer. In such settings, the disciplinary powers of liberal modernity operate in part through a mode of translation that, as Asad suggests, "reinterprets non-European traditions in order to make them compatible with Western ideals." For example, the fact that many "modernist and progressivist Islamic movements" aim to "demonstrate a Western essence in Muslim traditions" stands as an expression of the "structured inequality in power between Western and non-Western traditions." [59] Likewise, Tageldin argues that the logic of "imperial translationality"

---

[57] Asad, "A Comment on Translation, Critique, and Subversion," 330.

[58] Liu, "Introduction." For Niranjana, colonial enterprise of translation rested on the ideas of the transparency of representation, immediacy of reality, fidelity to the original meaning, and equivalence between languages. It was also accompanied by a historicist teleology. The historicist framework of this translation rested on and reproduced the structured asymmetries and hierarchies between languages and cultures in the colonial setting. In treating historical difference as "natural" and "essential," and the non-Western societies as "static," "unchanging," and "outside of history," the historicist framework of translation performed what Johannes Fabian calls "a denial of coevalness." She points out that the kind of translation that conceives representations as being immediate and transparent "colludes with or enables the construction of a teleological and hierarchical model of cultures that places Europe at the pinnacle of civilization, and thus also provides a position for the colonized." Niranjana, *Siting Translation*, 18. For her the "liberal impulse of humanism" was the "credo" of colonial translation. Ibid., 59. Niranjana further remarks that especially since the Renaissance translation has been regarded in the West as the "the quintessential humanistic enterprise" since it was tasked with "bridging the gap between peoples." Ibid., 47.

[59] Talal Asad, "Conscripts of Western Civilization," in *Dialectical Anthropology: Essays in Honor of Stanley Diamond*, ed. Stanley Diamond and Christine Ward Gailey (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1992), 347.

pushed (post)colonial Egypt to "eradicate all local incommensurability with a European "universal"."[60]

This suggests that the distinction between pedagogic and performative socialization cannot be easily mapped onto the binary between domination and resistance. Cultural translation—the realm of the performative production of difference—may very well reproduce the pedagogic logic of transition. Since translations are carried out under conditions created by modern institutions of power, they may rewrite the asymmetries and inequalities of the material field into language. In addition, this asymmetric structure of linguistic and cultural exchange does not have to be one of imposition. Rather, as Tageldin points out, translation does not simply or solely impose. It also seduces. It lures the colonized toward what Tageldin calls the "fantasy" of equivalence—the illusion of equivalence despite the unmistakable inequality between the colonizer and the colonized.[61] It works through "a politics of translational seduction" that "represses the inequalities between those dominators and themselves." [62] Such translational seduction

[60] Tageldin, *Disarming Words*, 30.
[61] Tageldin, *Disarming Words*. Though the relationship between the colonized and the colonizer is "decidedly unequal," there is still a "love-logic at work in an Orientalism usually understood as simple 'domination'" which creates an illusory affective economy that enables the colonized to imagine herself as being "equal to or greater than" the colonizer. Ibid., 9. Tageldin's notion of 'seduction' marks this complex relationship. For her, through "[u]nderstanding cultural imperialism as willful imposition—not attractive proposition—the reigning discourse conceals the undertow of seduction, which often transmits colonial culture." The colonizer and the colonized together "converted instruments of coercion into those of seduction and thereby solicited—and often elicited—the complex 'love' of the colonized and their (post)colonial heirs." This dynamic of seduction, Tageldin argues, "haunts both empire and decolonization." In the Egyptian (post)colonial context that Tageldin is writing about, this amounts to what she calls "fantasies of modern Egyptian sovereignty." At the same time, the colonizer "translated Europe" into the language of the colonized (in Tageldin's case, to "Arab-Islamic terms,") in order to tempt them "to imagine themselves 'masculinized' masters of the Europeans who were mastering them." The colonized is captivated by the colonizer as much as captured by the colonizer. Ibid., 7.
[62] Tageldin, *Disarming Words*, 10.

gives an illusion of equal footing in language despite the relationship of domination in the colonial situation.

Cultural translation is conditioned by the productive *and* repressive powers of modern norms and institutions. The task then is to investigate "how power enters into the process of cultural translation" and defines its possibilities and limits in socialization.[63] To do so, one has to look at historically specific cases to investigate the kinds of interventions actors make through cultural translation.

2. Strategies of Appropriation: Performative Contradiction and Inscription of Difference

Along with translation, there are other ways in which actors appropriate norms performatively and trouble the pedagogy of socialization.[64] Here I highlight two intimately interrelated but still distinct forms of appropriation: (1) performative contradiction, and/or (2) inscription of difference. The first happens when actors claim to partake in a norm from which they are excluded (unauthorized to claim); and the second occurs when actors claim to differ from the normalizing logic of the norm while

[63] Asad, *Genealogies of Religion*, 199. As Asad puts it, "modern world culture has no difficulty in accommodating unstable signs and domesticated exotica, so long as neither conflicts radically with systems of profit." Asad, "A Comment on Translation, Critique, and Subversion," 331.

[64] Ashcroft et al. define appropriation as "a term used to describe the ways in which post-colonial societies take over those aspects of the imperial culture –language, forms of writing, film, theatre, even modes of thought and argument such as rationalism, logic and analysis—that may be of use to them in articulating their own social and cultural identities." The colonizer may well appropriate the language of the colonized, yet as Ashcroft et al. point out, post-colonial theory focuses on exploring "the ways in which the dominated or colonized culture can use the tools of the dominant discourse to resist its political or cultural control." In that sense, appropriation, as a mode of 'norm-taking,' is a "strategy of usurpation" that does not follow the normalizing pedagogy of the norms and discourses, but rather seeks to displace it. See, Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies* (Psychology Press, 1998), 19–20.

remaining within its bounds (unauthorized to differ). Put differently, performative socialization takes the form of a claim for inclusion within a norm or for difference within a norm. While the former challenges "universalist exclusion," the latter resists "violent inclusion" in the form of assimilation or homogenization.[65] Such claims denote a form of appropriation that is "beyond the assimilationist's dream or the racist's nightmare"—the 'assimilationist's dream' of violent inclusion into norms through negating difference, and the 'racist's nightmare' of undoing the protocols of exclusion, e.g. from the norms of equality, self-rule or freedom.[66] In both instances the pedagogy of the norm gets troubled, but in different ways and with different effects.

Through performative contradiction, those who are excluded from the reach of a norm appropriate that norm. It takes place "when one with no authorization to speak within and as the universal nevertheless lays claim to the term."[67] In the performative contradiction of claiming the norm from which one is excluded, one "speaks from a split situation of being at once authorized and deauthorized."[68] One is not properly authorized by the existing conventions and relevant audiences to claim the norm, but nevertheless claims it with authority. The force of the performative contradiction is negotiated in this very gap. For example, Rosa Parks's act of sitting in the front of a bus in a segregationist society takes place in this ambivalent space. Parks authoritatively laid claim to a right that she was not authorized to within the existing normative structure, and as such, hers

[65] Prozorov, "Liberal Enmity."
[66] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 322.
[67] Judith Butler, *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative* (Routledge, 1997), 91.
[68] Ibid., 90.

was a performative contradiction. Her unauthorized act endowed her with a certain authority and challenged the codes of legitimacy of the existing social order.[69]

Similarly, when colonized peoples invoked the Enlightenment belief in equality in opposition to the colonial practices of inequality, they performed a contradiction by laying claim to a norm from which they were excluded. In that sense, they socialized into the norm of equality, but their socialization was performative: their rearticulation of the colonial script was not a straightforward assimilation into the norm since the normative order in the colony rested on their exclusion. Or, when equality meant equality of Christian white males only, actors invoked the norm of equality to expand the norm—to establish it for non-Christian, non-white, non-males.[70]

In that vein, when the colonized claimed self-rule against the 'not yet' of the pedagogy of the colonizer and the postcolonial elite, their appropriation of democratic norms was a performative contradiction. By so doing the colonized subverted the structure of tutelage that expected him or her to master the "art of waiting."[71] In the pedagogic historicist discourse invoked by both the colonizers and the postcolonial elites, the non-West is not yet ready and mature enough to exercise the norms of political modernity, such as equal citizenship and self-determination. In J.S. Mill's imaginary, for

---

[69] Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 2006). In a similar but still different register, Derrida discusses the American Declaration of Independence as an example of the productive ambivalence of authority in performativity. The "good People of these Colonies" invoked in the Declaration as the ultimate authority in whose name the "Representatives" sign the Declaration do not exist prior to the signing of the document. (Derrida 1986) The Declaration creates the very people in whose name it speaks. It attempts to create the conditions for its own felicity, yet as such, it is an infelicitous speech act. It can at best be taken as a promise that can be assessed through looking at how it manages to realize itself. James Loxley, *Performativity* (Routledge, 2006), 103.
[70] Finnemore 1996, 138.
[71] Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe*, 8.

example, the colonized were "not yet civilized enough to rule themselves."[72] They had to wait in the "waiting room of history" till they acquire the "public spirit" and "historical consciousness" necessary for self-rule. This pedagogic discourse invoked, and still invokes, various preconditions derived from European history to make the non-West ready for exercising democracy and equal rights, and the norms of political modernity in general.[73] Performativity of socialization lies in the subaltern's assertion of 'maturity' and institution of authority (self-authorization) to inhabit the norm against the exclusions of the pedagogic discourse of 'immaturity.'

Universalism figures prominently, and at times paradoxically, in such performative contradictions. On the one hand, universal claims "justify coercion into internationally mandated standards of progress and order," and as such, they are "at the center of neocolonial disciplinary programs—just as they were to colonialism."[74] On the other hand, Enlightenment universals (i.e. reason, rights, equality, freedom) have also been central to anticolonial struggles and thinking. The colonized have forced these Enlightenment universals to expand so as to include themselves. This reveals a "deep irony" in the logic of the universal: "universalism is implicated in both imperial schemes to control the world and liberatory mobilizations for justice and empowerment."[75] "When those excluded from universal rights protest their exclusion," Tsing writes, "this protest

---

[72] Ibid.
[73] Dipesh Chakrabarty, "Legacies of Bandung: Decolonisation and the Politics of Culture," *Economic and Political Weekly* 40, no. 46 (November 12, 2005): 4812–18.
[74] Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing, *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection* (Princeton University Press, 2005), 9.
[75] Ibid.

itself has a twofold effect: It extends the reach of the form of power they protest, even as it gives voice to their anger and hope."[76]

For example, when environmental activists mobilize around the "universalizing rhetorics of rights and justice," they are at once "making their case to the world" through the power of these discourses and are being "shaped by liberal logics."[77] Invoking such universals expands the reach of their power, but these universals are inevitably transformed when they are translated, actualized, and "engaged" in a place. This is why "all universals are engaged when considered as practical projects accomplished in a heterogenous world," and "engaged universals travel across difference and are charged and changed by their travels."[78] Historical and cultural differences transform the way in which the universals of political modernity are received. This process of normative negotiation is woven with "friction."[79] In order to make these global discourses work within particular situations they have to make "compromises and collaborations" through which "new meanings and genealogies are added to liberalism."[80] As Tsing notes,

> "[a]ctually existing universalisms are hybrid, transient, and involved in constant reformulation through dialogue. Liberal universals mix and meld with the universals of science, world religions (especially Christianity and Islam), and emancipatory philosophies including Marxism and feminism. Moreover, the embrace of universals is not limited to just one small section of the globe. The West can make no exclusive claim to doctrines of the universal."[81]

---

[76] Ibid.
[77] Ibid., 5.
[78] Ibid., 8.
[79] Ibid., 10. I draw on Tsing's metaphor/concept of 'friction' more extensively in the next section.
[80] Ibid., 5.
[81] Ibid., 9.

In that sense, performative contradiction denotes a form of appropriation beyond the conventions of authority and propriety for enacting the norms. This is why, Butler argues, a norm adopted through a performative contradiction does not amount to "a simple assimilation" (read, pedagogic socialization) to that norm for it is "predicated on the exclusion of the one who speaks [in the name of the norm], and whose speech calls into question the foundation of the universal itself."[82] Rather it is a challenge to the limits of the norm to open it up for future possibilities (read, performative socialization). In that sense, performativity compels the constitutive norms and categories of modernity "to embrace those they have traditionally excluded."[83] In so doing it "exposes the failure of the norm to effect the universal reach for which it stands," and thereby highlights "the promising ambivalence of the norm."[84] As such, performative contradiction exposes the limits of the norm and the parochiality of its claims to universality.[85] It exceeds, Butler argues, the normalizing discipline of pedagogic felicity:

> What happens, for instance, when those who have been denied the social power to claim "freedom" or "democracy" appropriate those terms from the dominant discourse and rework or resignify those highly cathected terms to rally a political movement? If the performative must compel collective recognition in order to work, must it compel only those kinds of recognition that are already institutionalized, or can it also compel a critical perspective on existing institutions? What is the performative power of claiming an entitlement to those terms—"justice,"

[82] Butler, *Excitable Speech*, 90.
[83] Ibid., 161.
[84] Ibid., 90.
[85] Ibid.

> "democracy"—that have been articulated to exclude the ones who now claim that entitlement?[86]

While pedagogic forces of socialization seek to discipline actors toward 'proper' and 'competent' enactment of norms, performative dynamics of socialization point toward and capitalize on the potentials of 'improper' performances or, what Raymond Duvall and Arjun Chowdhury dub "imcompetent practices." Duvall and Chowdhury take issue with the practice turn's exclusive focus on 'competent performances' of actors—those perpetrated by the right subjects in right situations and recognized as such by the audience community. They argue that there are also situations "where actors either reflexively or self-consciously act incompetently in order to establish their identity—or more precisely, their identity itself is constituted by departing from what would constitute 'competent performance.'"[87] These deliberate "incompetent" performances might unfold in the form of reflexive "acting-outs" or self-consciously subversive "transgressions." [88] Such incompetent performances "can mark a refusal to abide by the current rules, and can be the basis for a challenge to those rules—and potentially, change in the rules themselves."[89]

One important political effect of incompetent performances is their opening up of the possibility of change in international politics through contesting existing rules. Duvall

---

[86] Ibid., 157–158.
[87] Duvall and Chowdhury, "Practices of Theory," 341.
[88] Ibid., 342.
[89] Ibid., 348. Hence, Duvall and Chowdhury suggest that practice turn's stress on "pattern, regularity, and repetition, albeit with a bit of 'wiggle room'" ends up exaggerating the stability of existing structures. Therefore it "can obscure both the social processes that generate change and the inherent instability of practices themselves." Ibid., 337.The exclusive focus on competent practices "serves to reify the existing order, because competence is always in relation to existing norms and mores." Ibid., 349.

and Chowdhury discuss the example of anti-dam activists, who are not recognized as legitimate interlocutors by policymakers and development experts, and hence are unauthorized as actors, but who nonetheless "forced major changes in the perceptions of the utility of dam projects" precisely through their 'incompetent performances' that failed to abide by the rules of economic rationality.[90] Similarly, when the French slave colony San Domingo revolted and established the independent state of Haiti in 1804, this transgressive act was an incompetent performance in that it was not authorized within the texture of the colonial world order of the time. Yet it was able to authorize itself and initiate a transformation in international order.

The second strategy of appropriation that can trouble the pedagogy of socialization is the inscription of difference into norms even when the subject inhabits them. In general this is a mode of 'negotiation' (rather than negation) in which "words or concepts [are] wrested from their proper meaning."[91] Inscription of difference in norms becomes a strategy of survival within the pedagogic 'matrix' of socialization. It raises a challenge to the homogenizing dynamics and forces of socialization. This is akin to the challenge that History 2s pose to History 1's pressures to "evacuate the local by assimilating it to some abstract universal."[92] History 2s reinscribe and resignify modern norms and discourses, and as such, become the "grounds for claiming historical difference."[93]

---

[90] Duvall and Chowdhury, "Practices of Theory," 343.
[91] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 263.
[92] Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe*, 18.
[93] Ibid., 71.

One strategy of such insertion of difference in norms is grafting and paleonymy. While the former refers to the situations where one discourse is inserted into another,[94] the latter refers more specifically to "the retention of old names while grafting new meaning upon them."[95] For Derrida, paleonymy is a tactic that seeks to maintain "an old name in order to launch a new concept."[96] In paleonymics, the name of the norm is kept as a "leverage for intervention" in order to "keep a handle" on the operations of the norm.[97] Through grafting and paleonymy, difference gets inscribed into the norm while it is adopted, hence the graft becomes a form of intervention.[98]

For example, the meaning of 'sovereignty' has changed from a state's right to non-intervention to a state's responsibility to protect the rights of its citizens.[99] This, in Duvall and Chowdhury's terms, is a "synchronic" change since the signifier (sovereignty) remains the same in time while its meaning gets transformed. Similarly, the very meaning of the norm of equality has changed in line with the changes in the responses to the questions of "who is human" and "equal with regard to what."[100] This change also speaks to the polysemic and contested nature of the meaning of norms primarily because of their dependence on language. The relationship between norms and signifiers can and does change. Even presumably straightforward signifiers get signified and interpreted in multiple, crisscrossing, and conflictual ways.

---

[94] Jonathan Culler, *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1982), 135.
[95] Ibid., 142.
[96] Vincent B. Leitch, *Postmodernism - Local Effects, Global Flows* (SUNY Press, 1996), 28.
[97] Culler, *On Deconstruction*, 142.
[98] Ibid., 141.
[99] Duvall and Chowdhury, "Practices of Theory," 348.
[100] Finnemore 1996, 133

In his account of norm 'localization' Amitav Acharya includes grafting as a strategy of norm-taking. He takes grafting as "a tactic norm entrepreneurs employ to institutionalize a new norm by associating it with a preexisting norm in the same issue area, which makes a similar prohibition or injunction." He takes issue with constructivist scholars' treatment of grafting as a strategy that transnational actors employ for changing local norms. In those accounts, "there is no sense of whether, to what extent, and how the preexisting norm helps to redefine the emerging norm at least in the local context, or at the receiving end." Hence, he presents his framework of localization as a "more complex process of reconstitution" that goes beyond simple repetition of the norm.[101] Acharya aptly levels a critique against mainstream constructivism for its treatment of grafting and framing as strategies of transnational actors, but I argue that Acharya too underemphasizes the performative force of strategies of grafting. For him grafting is only an "adaptive process" that makes "an outside norm congruent with a preexisting local normative order."[102] However, as Duvall and Chowdhury point out, grafting may well be reconstitutive of the norm.

Another strategy of inscription of difference in a norm is 'catachresis.' *The Oxford English Dictionary* defines *catachresis* as "improper use of words; application of a term to a thing which it does not properly denote; abuse or perversion of a trope or

[101] He gives the example from Richard Price's discussion of how campaigns against chemical weapons were grafted onto the prior norm against poison. Acharya finds this use of grafting rather weak. For him grafting and framing are rather "acts of reinterpretation and representation rather than reconstruction." Even though this critique might hold in the case of Price's account of anti-chemical weapon norm, grafting may well be reconstructive.
[102] Acharya, "How Ideas Spread," 244.

metaphor."[103] A catachrestic engagement with a norm then is one in which the norm is "wrongly used, misapplied, and wrested from its proper meaning."[104] Extrapolated from its original meaning, catachresis in the postcolonial condition refers to "the process by which the colonized take and reinscribe something that exists traditionally as a feature of imperial culture."[105] As the etymological root of the word 'catachresis' suggests ('perverted use'), it is a form of negotiation "in terms of reversing, displacing and seizing the apparatus of value-coding."[106] For Spivak, "claiming catachresis from a space that one cannot not want to inhabit [the sentence, sententious], yet must criticize [from outside the sentence] is then, the deconstructive predicament of the postcolonial."[107] In other words, catachresis is a strategy of non-normative adoption of norms within the postcolonial condition. Through catachresis, those in the margins of liberal global governance reinscribe the constitutive norms of political modernity. Put differently, one of the ways in which subalterns socialize into the constitutive norms of liberal order is through their catachrestic appropriation that reinscribes difference into norms and hence unsettles the pedagogy of socialization. Through catachresis, the norm is at once adopted and challenged. One example of such catachresis can be found in Spivak's discussion of the postcolonial appropriations of parliamentary democracy. As Ashcroft et.al. point out,

> When Spivak speaks, for instance, of the ability of the subaltern 'to catachretize democracy', she means 'the insertion and the reinscription of something which does not refer literally to the correct narrative of the

[103] "Catachresis, N.," *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed April 25, 2014, http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/28665.
[104] "Catachrestic, Adj.," *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed April 25, 2014, http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/28666.
[105] Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin, *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies*, 30.
[106] Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *Outside in the Teaching Machine* (Psychology Press, 1993), 63.
[107] Ibid., 183–184.

> emergence of parliamentary democracy.' That is, while parliamentary democracy emerges from a specific European history and culture, its adoption into, and adaptation by, the culture of the postcolonial society, including the assertion, for instance, that there exists a pre-colonial native tradition of parliamentary democracy, may offer an empowering avenue of self-determination to the subaltern subject.[108]

Indeed the debates over the proper meaning and practice of secularism in India in the Constituent Assembly that drafted the Indian Constitution in 1940s present various catachrestic adoptions of secularism. For example, one member of the Assembly suggests that the state must be secular in the sense that it must unite politics and religion. The Western historical experience has shown, he argued, that separating religion and state was necessary to prevent bloodshed and that the state "should not identify itself with the religion of any particular section of the population."[109] But for this representative, there was a difference between a particular religion and *dharma* as the latter was standing for "the true values of religion or of the spirit" which all states need in order to solve their problems: "When I say, Sir, that the State shall not establish or endow or patronise any particular religion, I mean the formal religions of the World; I do not mean religion in the widest and in the deepest sense." De Roover et al. note that this was a "conceptual distortion" envisioning a secular state that was "both separated from and unified with religion."[110] Through catachresis the terms of a discourse gets appropriated "for other kinds of purposes." This possibility of breaking with the ordinary meanings and acquiring

---

[108] Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin, *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies*, 30.
[109] Jakob De Roover, Sarah Claerhout, and S. N. Balagangadhara, "Liberal Political Theory and the Cultural Migration of Ideas: The Case of Secularism in India," *Political Theory*, July 29, 2011, 587.
[110] Ibid.

non-ordinary meanings is the promise, and possibly also the peril, of performative catachresis. Through the "rehearsal of conventional formulae in non-conventional ways,"[111] catachresis embodies non-normative adoption of norms and "contests what has become sedimented in and as the ordinary."[112] Therefore, performative adoption of norms may not simply reproduce norms, but may as well transform them by engendering new possibilities, creating new meanings and functions. Such resignifications constitute a locus of normative change.[113]

Furthermore, inscription of difference in a norm can also take the form of mimicry.[114] According to Bhabha mimicry is the colonized's repetition of the colonizer in a form that is "almost the same but not quite."[115] As a "mode of repetition and reinscription" mimicry appropriates in inappropriate ways.[116] Through mimicry, actors insert cultural difference into norms and trouble the normalizing logic of the norm. Alastair Iain Johnston takes 'mimicking' as a mechanism of socialization in international relations. For him, mimicking is a "microprocess" of socialization whereby "a novice

---

[111] Butler, *Excitable Speech*, 147.
[112] Ibid., 145.
[113] Just as Chakrabarty does not necessarily value History2s over History 1 for the former can be as violent and exclusionary as the latter, Butler also recognizes that such appropriations may well be morally troubling. She gives the example of the "appropriation of 'civil rights' discourse to oppose affirmative action," which for her is an example of "a perilous expropriation." Ibid., 93. However, she suggests that it can only be countered and interrupted by "an aggressive reappropriation" of the civil rights discourse. Ibid. It should also be noted that performative modes of engagement is not exclusively for the weak, powerless, or the postcolonial. The powerful as well make differential and non-normative claims to the norms. For example, the U.S. government redefined the norm against torture in a way that radically expanded the sphere of permissible punishments on prisoners in order to redefine these as falling short of being labeled as 'torture.' This, in its own way, was a non-normative adoption of the norm: the U.S. did not reject the norm against torture. But it resignified and re-appropriated that norm non-normatively—against the pedagogy of the norm that banned physical and psychological torture.
[114] Butler's discussion of parodying a norm in the examples of queer drags also provides another example of inscription of difference within a norm.
[115] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 122.
[116] Ibid., 358.

initially copies the behavioral norms—including discursive practices—of the group to navigate through an uncertain environment."[117] This kind of "borrowing" is a "safe, first reaction to a novel environment," which restricts the options available to the novice.[118] In that sense, mimicking for him is a "survival strategy."

However this rendition of mimicking undercuts the performative force that mimicry commands. In Johnston's notion of mimicking, unlike Bhabha's, there is not much room for inscription of difference into the norm, rather, the impetus is to conform to the normalizing logic of the norm in order to survive. Johnston construes mimicking as a "satisficing first step designed simply to be able to participate in the group by following its most basic rules, even before the actor has a clear sense of what its interests might be that need maximizing."[119] And through the repetition of such mimicking of "prosocial behaviors," actors may internalize them as a taken-for-granted script down the road.[120] Thus construed, mimicking does not have a potential to trouble the pedagogy of socialization. On the contrary, it works to consolidate the normalizing logic of norms.

These strategies can manifest themselves in various combinations. For example, in Anna L. Tsing's notion of 'engaged universality' performative contradiction and inscription of difference come together:

> [T]he universal is what, as Gayatri Spivak has put it, we cannot not want, even as it so often excludes us. The universal offers us the chance to participate in the global stream of humanity. We can't turn it down. Yet we also can't replicate previous versions without inserting our own

[117] Johnston, "Conclusions and Extensions," 1021. Also see, Johnston, *Social States*, 2008, 23–25.
[118] Johnston, *Social States*, 2008, 25.
[119] Johnston, "Conclusions and Extensions," 1021.
[120] In that sense it is quite similar to Checkel's discussion of Type 1 socialization as behavioral conformity without deep-down internalization. Checkel, "International Institutions and Socialization in Europe."

> genealogy of commitments and claims. Whether we place ourselves inside or outside the West, we are stuck with universals created in cultural dialogue. It is this kind of post- and neocolonial universal that has enlivened liberal politics as well as economic liberalism as they have spread around the world with such animation since the end of the Cold War. Nor is scholarly knowledge exempt; every truth forms in negotiation, however messy, with aspirations to the universal.[121]

Here Tsing outlines a performative mode of engaging with the universal norms and discourses of liberal global governance. Hers is a call for adopting the universalizing norms and discourses ("participate in the global stream of humanity") without succumbing to their normalizing pedagogy ("replicating previous versions"). She seeks to appropriate these universals by inserting difference and through cultural translation ("cultural dialogue" and "negotiation"). Construed this way, universals become "practical" and "engaged," that is, wrought with contestations and frictions.

Strategies of non-normative adoption of norms are by no means limited to performative contradiction and inscription of difference through paleonymy, grafting, catachresis, and mimicry. Rather, these are examples of discursive strategies that seek to insert agency and difference into the adopted norms and discourse.[122] They all indicate, in different ways, a "subversive strategy of subaltern agency that negotiates its own authority through a process of iterative 'unpicking' and incommensurable, insurgent

[121] Tsing, *Friction*, 1.
[122] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 264.

relinking."[123] This brings us to the question of authority, which I now turn to in the next section.

3. The Force of the Performative: Conventions, Audience, and Authority

"All performativity," as Butler argues, "rests on the credible production of authority." [124] Then, what makes normative enactments authorized in world politics? To answer this question we need to explore both the 'illocutionary' and 'perlocutionary' power of normative enactments. The illocutionary power of an act is the effect it creates *in* the very act (in the conditions of its enunciation), whereas its perlocutionary power is the effect it creates *through* the act (in the dynamics of its reception).[125] While the former necessitates setting forth the conventions that make a particular performative possible and successful,[126] the latter channels our attention to the role of the audience(s) for the success of the performative. Conventions and audiences are both crucial for a performative to produce the authority it seeks to be effective. I argue that the force of the performativity of socialization is negotiated in between its illocutionary and perlocutionary effects, that is, its simultaneous reliance on and troubling of the conventions, norms, and discourses that make the act possible as well as of the reactions of audiences.

---

[123] Ibid., 265.
[124] Butler, *Excitable Speech*, 151.
[125] Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*. I thank Shaden Tageldin for helping me on this formulation.
[126] Culler, *On Deconstruction*, 114.

J.L.Austin coined the term 'performative' in his theory of speech acts in order to distinguish between different functions of language. While 'constatives' are utterances that report a falsifiable statement and "describe some state of affairs"[127] about the world, 'performatives,' for Austin, are speech acts that actually do the action they name, as in the examples of promising, apologizing, declaring, ordering, affirming and naming. Constatives are statements that are either true or false; but performatives are utterances that enact a world-creating power. Hence, while constatives can be tested on the basis of their correspondence to the outside world, performatives cannot simply be true or false for they do not report or describe.[128]

Rather, the force that performatives command derives from their compliance with the conventions that authorize them (illocutionary force) and from their effect on the audience (perlocutionary force).[129] In order for performatives to be "felicitous" and "successful"—to achieve what they refer to—they must be uttered by proper actors, through proper procedures, and in proper circumstances. A performative would be "infelicitous" if it does not abide by the conventions and conditions that authorize it. [130]

---

[127] Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*, 1.

[128] However, Austin later blurs this distinction between performatives and constatives by showing that performatives report as much as constatives posit. This leads him to give up on the idea of coming up with a list of performative verbs. Instead, he goes on to investigate the performative power of all speech acts. By differentiating the locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary speech acts, he moved to consider "the senses in which to say something is to do something." Ibid., 121. Also see, Culler, *The Literary in Theory*, 137–149.

[129] By so doing Austin puts the emphasis on the social and linguistic context rather than on intentions to grasp the meaning of an utterance. Culler points out that Austin here repeats in a less explicit way "the crucial move made by Saussure: to account for signifying events (parole) one attempts to describe the system that makes them possible." Culler, *On Deconstruction*, 111. Hence, even though Austin takes "insincerity" in performatives as causing "abuse" rather than "misfire," still performativity is driven, for the most part, a structuralist logic, one that Derrida later draws upon. See, Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*, 14–17.

[130] Austin writes that for a performative to be felicitous, "(A.1) There must exist an accepted conventional procedure having a certain conventional effect, that procedure to include the uttering of certain words by

For example, the utterance 'I do' in a marriage ceremony is a performative that enacts a marriage bond. However, as Austin points out, it can only create the aimed effect (e.g. marriage contract) if the 'I do' is uttered by the right person, in the right moment, in line with proper procedures. If one of those conditions is not met, the performative 'I do' fails or "misfires." Hence, for Austin performatives are felicitous only when they perform a "public, authorized act, according to the socially stipulated rules."[131]

That also means all performatives carry the structural "illness" of infelicity or "misfire" due to their conventional nature,[132] and this is where Jacques Derrida takes up Austin's notion of the conventionality of performative acts. "Wherever there is the performative, whatever the form of communication," Derrida writes, "there is a context of legitimate, legitimizing, or legitimized convention."[133] Derrida refers to this conventionality as "citationality" and "iterability" of performatives. Iterability is the simultaneous repeatability and alterability of a sign, such that the trace of the old context is conserved while the context gets transformed.[134] However, because performatives are iterable, they are always haunted by the structural possibility of failure. As Culler puts it, "something cannot be a performative unless it can go wrong"—unless it can misfire.[135]

---

certain persons in certain circumstances, and further, (A.2) the particular persons and circumstances in a given case must be appropriate for the invocation of the particular procedure invoked. (B.1) The procedure must be executed by all participants both correctly and (B.2) completely." Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*, 14–15.

[131] Culler, *The Literary in Theory*, 152.

[132] Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*, 18–19.

[133] Jacques Derrida, "Performative Powerlessness: A Response to Simon Critchley," *Constellations* 7, no. 4 (2000): 467.

[134] Jacques Derrida, "Signature Event Context," in *Margins of Philosophy* (University of Chicago Press, 1982), 307–30. A sign must be citable and repeatable in both felicitous and infelicitous contexts in order to functions as a sign. In order for a performative to exist and create effects, it must be preceded by conventions and norms that authorize it.

[135] Culler, *On Deconstruction*, 114.

Derrida then goes on to ask: "Could a performative utterance succeed if its formulation did not repeat a 'codified' or iterable form, in other words if the formula I utter to open a meeting, christen a boat, or undertake marriage were not identifiable as conforming to an iterable model, if it were not thus identifiable as a kind of citation?"[136] In answering this question, Derrida argues that performatives can break with their contexts and create new contexts by authorizing themselves without being authorized by existing conventions. In that sense, while Austin looks at how socially accepted norms and conventions authorize or de-authorize speech acts, Derrida investigates the ways in which performativity of language and practices may enact something new by breaking rules or troubling norms. Performatives can destabilize "the political and institutional structures that make possible and govern our practices, our competencies, our performances."[137] For Derrida the performatives that are not priorly authorized can trouble existing norms and hence inaugurate a change, while this inauguration is made possible by the very norms and conventions that unauthorized performatives unsettle. This is why the meanings and practices of norms are under constant surveillance and policing in order to produce them in line with their normalizing logic. "If the police is always waiting in the wings," Derrida writes, "it is because conventions are by essence violable and precarious."[138]

Butler draws on Derrida's notion of citationality in her account of gender performativity. For Butler identity categories, including gender, are not constative truths

---

[136] Jacques Derrida, *Limited Inc* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1988), 18.
[137] Jacques Derrida, "Mochlos, or the Conflict of Faculties," in *Eyes of the University: Right to Philosophy 2* (Stanford University Press, 2004), 102.
[138] Derrida, *Limited Inc*, 105.

but rather performative effects produced in and through social relations.[139] Gender is enacted and produced by one's actions. Through stylized repetitions of socially established ways of behaving as a woman or a man, one assumes a gender identity.[140] Therefore, the "forcible citation of gender norms" (socialization into gender norms) is the condition of possibility for being recognized as a gendered subject.

However, since performatives are citational and historical, they carry the possibility of introducing difference, reinscribing meanings, and displacing and recontextualizing conventions. Such reinscriptions indicate the possibility of political intervention into the norms and discourses "by attempting to capture and redeploy" them.[141] The performativity of socialization into norms, then, takes the form of differential repetition. Such repetitions bring about socialization into these norms, but this socialization is also the resource for inflecting and destabilizing the norms:

> Performativity is a matter of reiterating or repeating the norms by which one is constituted: it is not a radical fabrication of a gendered self. It is a compulsory repetition of prior and subjectivating norms, one which cannot be thrown off at will, but which work, animate, and constrain the gendered subject, and which are also the resources from which resistance, subversion, displacement are to be forged.[142]

The perlocutionary power of performatives, however, depends in large part on the audience. The ability of a performative to produce effects *through* the act is negotiated in its co-constitutive relationship between the actor and audience(s). Since the

---

[139] Culler, *The Literary in Theory*, 157.
[140] Butler, *Gender Trouble*.
[141] Culler, *The Literary in Theory*, 160.
[142] Judith Butler, *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"* (Psychology Press, 1993), 230.

perlocutionary force of performatives is unconventional and depends on the audience, the performativity of enactments and claims does not guarantee or ensure political outcomes. Yet the influence of audience varies according to the kinds of performatives. For example, audience is more central for the success of "contractual" performatives, such as 'I bet,' compared to "declaratory" performatives, such as 'I declare.' In order for a bet to be made successfully, it should be accepted by the taker.[143] But for declarations to be effective the concurrence or authorization of audience may not be as significant. Indeed, declaratory performatives can create the very audience they address more so than they are being permitted by that audience.[144] They are self-authorizing and self-grounding, and in a way, unilateral. [145] The question then is "how far can acts be unilateral?" and "what counts as [an act's] completion?"[146] A person, if he or she is in the right role, can appoint another person to a position without the consent of the latter, but one cannot marry without the consent of the other party. Hence, the role of the audience is contextual.

Furthermore, there can be discordances between conventions regulating a norm and audiences participating in an enactment, and at times a hard and fast distinction between conventions and audiences may not hold. For example, according to the existing conventions in place, the Egyptian military's ousting of President Mohammad Morsi in July 2013 appears as a typical example of a military coup; however, the international audience, particularly the key state and interstate actors, opted to not recognize it as such.

---

[143] In another, similar example, Austin points out that in order for someone to have promised, he must "(A) have been heard by someone, perhaps the promisee; (B) have been understood by him as promising." (22)
[144] Jacques Derrida, "Declarations of Independence 1," *New Political Science* 7, no. 1 (1986): 7–15.
[145] J. H. Miller, "Performativity as Performance / Performativity as Speech Act: Derrida's Special Theory of Performativity," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 106, no. 2 (April 2007): 219–35.
[146] Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*, 37.

In that sense, there was incongruence between conventions and audience as to whether the Egyptian military's intervention was a coup d'état. But on the basis of the very same example, one can argue that the reason why the liberal international community failed to name Egyptian military's intervention a coup is the prevalent liberal ideological conventions that consider non-liberal and particularly Islamist actors as essentially anti-democratic, justifying military interventions against them. In that sense, conventions and audiences are very much intertwined.

Likewise, until very recently same-sex marriage was not authorized by existing social and legal conventions in Western liberal democracies, but liberal audiences have been able to transform these conventions significantly. In that sense, conventions, audiences and the relationship between them are dynamic and open to change, though with significant variations depending on the issue-area. But at the same time if a marriage ceremony fits into the accepted social conventions authorizing the act, then the reception of audience or even the sincerity of parties involved would *not* render the performative void. In that sense, the force of the performative is affected by varying combinations of conventions (formal and informal rules and institutionalized practices) and audiences (actions and reactions of relevant spectators). The ways in which conventions and audiences interact in particular speech and non-speech acts, however, is a matter of empirical investigation.

This point about the joint role of conventions and audiences in determining the force of performative enactments has been powerfully made in the securitization literature. In its original statement, the securitization theory developed by the

'Copenhagen School' draws on Austin's speech act theory and suggests that securitization occurs when actors in appropriate positions carry out speech acts that define a certain issue as an existential threat to the core values of a political community that demands extra-political emergency measures. As Buzan, Waever, and de Wilde put it, in order for a securitizing move to be successful "the particular persons and circumstances in a given case must be appropriate for the invocation of the particular procedure invoked."[147] Therefore securitization occurs performatively through actors' articulations in line with existing conventions of discourse and status.[148] Yet Buzan et al. argue that "securitization is not decided by the securitizer but by the audience of the security speech act."[149] The success of the securitizing speech act is measured by the degree to which the audience accepts something to be an "existential threat to a shared value." Hence, it is the audience that gives the securitizing actor "the permission to override the rules that would otherwise bind,"[150] but the securitizing move is made possible by the conventions in place.

However, the subsequent scholarship on securitization finds Buzan et al.'s attention to the interaction between audience(s) and securitizing actors less than adequate. Thierry Balzacq argues that Buzan et al. appeal to the role of the audience but their framework ignores the ways in which audiences provide formal and moral support as

---

[147] Buzan, Waever, and De Wilde, *Security*, 32.
[148] However, key to this distinction here is the differential emphasis put on the two kinds of speech acts that Austin talks about: illocutionary acts that are achieved in the act of uttering, and perlocutionary acts that are achieved through their utterance. While the former comes out of a self-referential and self-grounding act, the latter comes off basically through its influence on the audience.
[149] Buzan, Waever, and De Wilde, *Security*, 31.
[150] Ibid., 26.

well as limits.[151] However, the goal in securitizing moves is "to persuade a target audience, drawing on contextual clues, to issue a mandate for action to defeat or reduce the identified threat."[152] Hence, Balzacq argues that security pronouncements should not be taken as speech acts which become successful if they follow rules, but rather as "discursive techniques allowing the securitizing actors to induce or increase the [public] mind's adherence to the thesis presented to its assent." (Balzacq 2005, 172) Audience holds the key for the success of securitizing moves, while conventions authorize security moves in the first place. For example the securitizing audiences can agree with the 'securityness' of an issue but may not authorize extraordinary measures to deal with it, hence creating an ambivalent situation as to the success of the securitizing moves of actors.[153]

Other IR scholars also stress the role of audiences in different contexts. Some rationalist scholars argue that talk is not always cheap in international politics since relevant audiences, both domestic and international, could make it quite costly for state elites if they back down in a war of attrition or fail to follow through their threats.[154]

---

[151] Thierry Balzacq, "The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context," *European Journal of International Relations* 11, no. 2 (June 1, 2005): 171–201, doi:10.1177/1354066105052960.
[152] Ibid., 172.
[153] Paul Roe, "Actor, Audience(s) and Emergency Measures: Securitization and the UK's Decision to Invade Iraq," *Security Dialogue* 39, no. 6 (December 1, 2008): 615–35. Roe argues that the British public did agree with Tony Blair in taking Iraq's alleged weapons of mass destruction under Saddam Hussein as a security threat but did not agree with the use of military force. In that vein, Mark Salter suggests that securitizing speech acts should not be seen as individual discrete acts of naming an issue a security issue but rather should be taken as dramaturgical acts of performance whose influence depends on the audience and the context alike. Mark B. Salter, "Securitization and Desecuritization: A Dramaturgical Analysis of the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority," *Journal of International Relations and Development* 11, no. 4 (2008): 321–49.
[154] James D. Fearon, "Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes.," *American Political Science Review* 88, no. 03 (1994): 577–92; Michael Tomz, "Domestic Audience Costs

Audience here serves as a limit or constraint on speech capable of incurring reputational costs. Others investigate the ways in which rhetoric can exert causal and even coercive force. For example, Krebs and Jackson identify dynamics of "rhetorical coercion" when actors seek to outmaneuver their political opponents by strategically linking their own claims to the deeply ingrained norms of the audience, and by so doing, depleting their opponents from resources to sustain a counter-argument.[155] In these situations, political actors devise strategies to rhetorically "threaten" their opponents to bring the public/audience in on their own sides and against their opponents.[156] They therefore "must craft their appeals with an eye to some audience which sits in judgement of their rhetorical moves." [157] For example, the Druze invocation of their participation in the Israeli military to compel Israeli politicians to concede them full-citizenship rights;[158] the coercive power that the discursive fixation of the meaning of 9/11 as war commands in the American public sphere;[159] or the local legitimacy-boosting or -bashing effects of states' rhetoric about their opponents or allies[160] can all be taken as examples where the heart of the question is winning the audience to compel the opponent toward a certain course of action.

---

in International Relations: An Experimental Approach," *International Organization* 61, no. 04 (2007): 821–40.

[155] Ronald R. Krebs and Patrick Thaddeus Jackson, "Twisting Tongues and Twisting Arms: The Power of Political Rhetoric," *European Journal of International Relations* 13, no. 1 (March 1, 2007): 35–66. Also see, Ronald R. Krebs and Jennifer K. Lobasz, "Fixing the Meaning of 9/11: Hegemony, Coercion, and the Road to War in Iraq," *Security Studies* 16, no. 3 (2007): 409–51.

[156] Krebs and Jackson, "Twisting Tongues and Twisting Arms," 47.

[157] Ibid., 44.

[158] Krebs and Jackson, "Twisting Tongues and Twisting Arms."

[159] Krebs and Lobasz, "Fixing the Meaning of 9/11."

[160] Arjun Chowdhury and Ronald R. Krebs, "Talking about Terror: Counterterrorist Campaigns and the Logic of Representation," *European Journal of International Relations* 16, no. 1 (March 1, 2010): 125–50; Ronald R. Krebs, "Rethinking the Battle of Ideas: How the United States Can Help Muslim Moderates," *Orbis* 52, no. 2 (2008): 332–46.

However, there are modes of contestation and claims-making which do not take the form of a rivalry between two parties to rhetorically corner each other, or where the goal is not primarily to win the audience against an opponent, or where the audience is not as directly implicated. For example, in cultural translation of norms, the contestation is not between antagonistic parties rebutting each other's claims to force the opponent toward a particular course of action. Rather it is about the hegemonic articulation of a norm and its travel and transformation across cultural difference. When the AK Party in Turkey invokes 'democratic secularism' as a universal norm, it speaks to various domestic and international audiences (i.e. the European Union, the US, the Islamic world, the Kemalist state, the pious electorate), but the question of secularism and democracy for the AK Party is not solely a question of how its 'performance' would be received by the audience(s). Equally important, it is about what the Islamically most appropriate course of action would be in a given domestic and international circumstance. Similarly, when the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt invokes 'Islamic democracy,' it does not seek to deny its opponents the "rhetorical materials out of which to craft a socially sustainable rebuttal."[161] Rather, it is attempting to rework modern political norms in line with its reading of an Islamic tradition to which it claims adherence.

Or take Rosa Parks for example. The dynamics of contestation in her sitting in the front of a bus in a segregationist society are different from those of a competition to win the audience. The audience is not directly or primarily implicated in her insurrectionary act. She did not openly or primarily seek to get the authorization of the audience. Her transgressive act was not authorized by the conventions of the society she was lived in;

[161] Krebs and Jackson, "Twisting Tongues and Twisting Arms," 42.

rather, she contested the hegemonic articulation of the norm of equality by laying a differential claim to it. Hence her adoption of the norm was non-normative, and her act performatively authorized itself without a direct appeal to, or authorization from, the audience. Therefore, an audience's reception is not always determinative of the felicity of performatives. That felicity is, rather, a function of the varied and combined effects of conventions and audiences in particular sociopolitical contexts. Audience is necessary for any speech act to take place, but what force does audience compel in such claims? To what extent do utterances successfully institute themselves unilaterally? Such questions require empirical investigation of specific contexts to parse out the effects of the complex interaction of conventions and audiences on the force of enactments.[162]

4. Performance, Performativity, and Socialization

One may think that the performative reading of norm socialization I develop here is a reading of socialization as performance. However, despite significant overlaps in meaning, I suggest that performativity and performance are different and that this difference matters for students of norm socialization.[163] Performance and performativity share the same etymological root (French *parfunir*: to furnish, to accomplish) and as concepts they were developed independently of each other roughly around the same time

[162] Likewise, when the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) transforms the norms of 'cooperative security' and 'flexible engagement' in their regional context, it does not necessarily seek to win an audience but to rework the norm in line with its conventions. Acharya, "How Ideas Spread."
[163] I thank Ronald R. Krebs for pressing me to flesh out these differences more clearly and explicitly.

in the mid-1950s.[164] They are used interchangeably in various contexts,[165] which, according to Eve Sedgwick and Andrew Parker, end up creating "a carnivalesque echolalia of what might be described as extraordinarily productive cross-purposes."[166] They point out that "the oblique connection between performativity and the loose cluster of theatrical practices, relations, and traditions known as performance" has proven very productive but remains underarticulated.[167] Despite this proximity, however, there are differences between the two. So much so that J. Hillis Miller, a prominant theorist of performativity, claims that "performativity as performance style and performativity as the felicitous operation of a speech act have almost nothing to do with one another."[168] Treating the two as the same or almost the same, for him, creates "considerable confusion." Thus it is important to differentiate "the force of a performative speech act" from "the condition of being performed, as by an actor or a dancer." [169] When applied to the question of socialization in IR, these differences are not hard and fast, but rather differences in emphasis and context. Then how are the two different, and why and how does that difference affect our reading of socialization?

First, performance and performativity entail different roles for audience. Dramaturgical accounts that take socialization as performance place the audience at the

---

[164] The concept of the performative was introduced by J. L. Austin in 1955 and on the other hand Erving Goffman's seminal work on social action as theatrical performance was published first in 1956. Gregory Bateson's account of behavior as performance in "A Theory of Play and Fantasy" also appeared in 1955.
[165] For example, Butler's theory of gender performativity suggests that gender is a stylized performance of what it means to be a boy or girl. And Marvin Carlson's oft-cited book on performance discusses Austin's concept of performativity under the title of "Performance of Language: Linguistic Approaches." See, Butler, *Gender Trouble* and Marvin A. Carlson, *Performance: A Critical Introduction* (Routledge, 2004).
[166] Andrew Parker and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Performativity and Performance* (Routledge, 1995), 1.
[167] Ibid.
[168] Miller, "Performativity as Performance / Performativity as Speech Act," 219.
[169] J. Hillis Miller, "Resignifying Excitable Speech," *WSQ: Women's Studies Quarterly* 39, no. 1 (2011): 225.

center stage in social action, whereas performativity places more emphasis on the force of conventions to authorize and de-authorize enactments despite its recognition of audience. Performance entails a sense of audience that is more immediate, proximate and effective. As Marvin Carlson notes, performance is "always performance for someone, some audience that recognizes and validates it as performance even when, as is occasionally the case, that audience is the self."[170] Performance invokes a rather proximate and even physical presence of audience in its various uses related to theatricality (e.g. ritual, ceremony, public display), display of skills (e.g. an athlete in a competition), standard of achievement (e.g. a student in a test), or "culturally coded pattern of behavior." (e.g. social role of a father.)[171]

The sociologist Erving Goffman, a leading mid-twentieth century theorist of social performance, defines performance as any and all kind of activity that seeks to influence the audience.[172] His conception of socialization as performance is one in which actors constantly play socially ascribed roles by offering performances to spectators. Socialization then is the process through which people come to inhabit roles in social plays as actors performing on stage—e. g. doctors filling in the role of care-giver. Therefore, socialization is focused on how actors present themselves before audience(s) when they perform norms, and hence are driven by strategies of impression management, role-playing, stagecraft, and manipulation.[173] Constructivists who applied Goffman's

---

[170] Carlson, *Performance*, 6.
[171] Ibid., 5. Dictionary defines performance as "a presentation, especially a theatrical one, before an audience." (American Heritage Dictionary, quoted in Miller 220)
[172] Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Doubleday, 1959), 15.
[173] Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*; James C. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (Yale University Press, 1990).

performance theory of socialization to IR have argued that actors socialize into the norms and institutions of international society by adopting the roles defined in it. For example, Alex Wendt considers role-taking as the primary mechanism of socialization through which states 'fit in' to particular roles defined by international institutions.[174] Similarly, Michael Barnett discusses how states deal with role-conflicts that emerge out of their participation in multiple institutions.[175]

On the other hand, the sense of audience that performativity implies is rarely as proximate, direct and causal as it is in theatrical performance. Instead, as an analysis of the world-making powers of speech (and nonspeech) acts, it is focused more on the social and linguistic conventions, norms, and structural conditions that authorize an enactment. For Austin what is necessary for a performative to bring off its effect is that it should be uttered in right circumstances and by right procedures.[176] He claims that a performative utterance would be "hollow or void if said by an actor on the stage, or if introduced in a poem, or spoken in soliloquy."[177] This statement, in a curious way, both establishes the necessity of audience for any speech act to be heard and understood, and at the same time deprives the performative of its force if it is staged. Hence in order for a performative to be felicitous, it needs an audience to witness it, but what ultimately authorizes the speech

---

[174] Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics," *International Organization* 46, no. 02 (1992): 391–425, doi:10.1017/S0020818300027764; Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics (Cambridge Studies in International Relations)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
[175] Michael Barnett, "Institutions, Roles, and Disorder: The Case of the Arab States System," *International Studies Quarterly* 37, no. 3 (September 1, 1993): 271–96, doi:10.2307/2600809; Michael N. Barnett, *Dialogues in Arab Politics* (Columbia University Press, 1998).
[176] Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*, 8. The necessary condition for a performative to be forceful is that "there must exist an accepted conventional procedure having a certain conventional effect, that procedure to include the uttering of certain words by certain persons in certain circumstances." Ibid., 14.
[177] Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*, 22.

act is not the audience (at least not primarily) but the conventions and procedures that prescribe what a proper initiation of marriage entails.

Second, I argue that performance accounts of socialization have a hard time registering the performativity of non-normative adoption of norms. They take socialization as a process in which actors mold and modify their performances in order "to fit into the understanding and expectations of the society in which it is presented."[178] Performances presented before others "tend to incorporate and exemplify the officially accredited values of the society"[179] and "highlight the common official values of the society" in which they occur.[180] In that sense, socialization "fixes" actors by putting them to a "strict test of aptness, fitness, propriety, and decorum."[181] Therefore in Goffman's structural account of social encounters, performances constantly reinforce the disciplinary power of socialization. Actors constantly seek to show that they properly "fill in" the roles society expects and that they live up to social standards.

This theatrical analogy about role-playing, impression-management and stagecraft provides useful insights for analyzing the disciplinary and normalizing dynamics in international politics. However, it does not attend to how actors translate, resignify and appropriate what those roles are and what they entail. It sheds very useful light on how social life gets reproduced through induced competent performances, but it does not account for what Duvall and Chowdhury call conscious "incompetent performances" and how these can destabilize conventions. Goffman's account does not offer much insight

---

[178] Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, 35.
[179] Ibid.
[180] Ibid.
[181] Ibid., 55.

into the situations where norms are at once adopted and challenged, or adopted non-normatively.[182] Likewise, even though Wendt's socialization as role-taking serves as a possible source of change in international system, he does not have much to say about whether and how roles can be taken up non-normatively—e.g. adopting the role but contesting its posited behavioral patterns or standards of appropriateness.

Similarly, James Scott's perceptive analysis of everyday resistances also develops a reading of socialization as performance and role-taking.[183] In his account, the subordinate learns the knack of acting like a slave, a serf, or a racial inferior in the course of socialization. In Scott's analysis of performance, socialization exerts an immensely domineering pedagogic force, yet he shows that even in such tightly disciplined contexts domination fails to achieve ideological conversion or hegemonic incorporation. For Scott, "most subordinates conform and obey not because they have internalized the norms of the dominant, but because the structure of surveillance, reward, and punishment makes it prudent for them to comply."[184] In other words, compliance with norms does not

[182] Indeed Austin's conception of performativity also does not offer much on this score. Similar to Goffman, Austin was interested only in the public, conventionally authorized, and socially stipulated speech acts. He did not explore how speech acts could actually produce their effects by breaking or eluding the rules. His account does not address whether an enactment unauthorized by the existing conventions can still take place. It was Derrida and Butler who probed this question later.
[183] Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*, 49. Scott looks at the gap between what he calls "public transcripts"—the open interaction between the powerful and the subordinate—and the "hidden transcripts"—"offstage" discourses that are "beyond direct observation by powerholders." (4) While in public transcript the dominant actors "compel performances from others," the subordinates use the strategies of disguise and impression management (17) and then challenge the public transcript in their hidden discourses—e.g. jokes, rumors, gossip, folktales, songs, and so on. These two discourses are meant for different audiences and are produced under different constraints of power. (5)
[184] Ibid., 193.

necessarily indicate internalization of them—an observation with which mainstream socialization accounts concur.[185]

However, Scott's account of the hidden (speech and non-speech) acts of resistance to domination does not explore how the less powerful can take up the prevalent norms and discourses non-normatively. He comes closest when he discusses one of the strategies of resistance that subordinates employ, the one in which subordinates realize that some of their own interests could "find representation in the prevailing ideology" of the dominant elites and hence they utilize the rhetorical space provided by it.[186] For example, slaves in the U.S. South used the paternalistic discourse of their masters as a ground to achieve further concessions from them for better conditions of living—food, treatment, mobility, and so on.[187] However, in performative modes of adopting a discourse the less powerful not only adopt the 'prevailing ideology' but also appropriate it and rework it to a different effect, in ways that might run counter to the disciplining logic of that ideology. The socializee-as-subordinate in Scott's account constantly keeps an eye on "what is permitted on stage"[188] and presses against its limits only in private. A performative reading of socialization, however, explores how actors publicly take up these norms and discourses non-normatively. This is more in line with what Scott later

[185] Checkel, "International Institutions and Socialization in Europe"; Risse-Kappen, Ropp, and Sikkink, *The Power of Human Rights*; Schimmelfennig, "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues."
[186] Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*, 18.
[187] This is in some ways similar to Krebs and Jackson's model of rhetorical coercion, except that in the case of the relationship of master and slave, one can hardly talk about an audience to which the master would be accountable for the kinds of claims slaves would make.
[188] Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*, 196.

refers to as "the imaginative capacity of subordinate groups to reverse or negate dominant ideologies."[189]

Since they view socialization through the lenses of pedagogic forces only, the performance frameworks tend to register non-normative adoption of norms not as contestations within the norm but as insincere performances or misrepresentations. The question of differential claims on norms then gets transformed into a visceral question of sincerity. For Goffman sincere actors are those "who believe in the impression fostered by their own performance,"[190] and cynical actors are those who do not believe in what they do or have "no ultimate concern with the beliefs of [their] audience."[191] On that basis Goffman distinguishes between performances that are "real, sincere, and honest" and those that are "contrived" and "false."[192] Then for a performance to "come off," the audience "by and large must be able to believe that the performers are sincere."[193] In other words, in Goffman's dramaturgical model of socialization, the audience's evaluation of the sincerity of actors is key to the success of performance of a norm.[194]

However, there is ultimately no way to decisively know the intentions of another since there is no way to get into that other's head. There are no consensual standards of

---

[189] Ibid., 91.
[190] Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, 18.
[191] Goffman notes that cynical actors need not necessarily act out of self-interest. Sometimes their roles or audience "do not allow them to be sincere," as in the example of a doctor giving a placebo to a patient. Ibid.
[192] Ibid., 70.
[193] Ibid., 71.
[194] Although part of the distinction lies in the intentions of the performer, Goffman also refers to the social conventions through which audiences judge the performer: "Sometimes when we ask whether a fostered impression is true or false we really mean to ask whether or not the performer is authorized to give the performance in question, and are not primarily concerned with the question itself." Ibid., 59. A "legitimate" and "competent" performer is differentiated from "impostor," "out-and-out fraud," or "masquerade" if it is discovered that he "did not have the right to play the part he played, that he was not an accredited incumbent of the relevant status." Ibid.It is worth noting that these descriptions very closely parallel J. L. Austin's discussion of conventions regulating performative utterances.

sincerity and definitely no way to conclusively measure it. Even personal reports, private conversations or interviews cannot help on this front since they can also be manipulated strategically.[195] Likewise, one can also not know conclusively the intentions of the audience. Therefore there is no theoretically compelling reason for why anyone or any performance could pass the test of sincerity. It does not mean actors do not have intentions and audiences do not judge on the basis of intentions. They both do, but this cannot ground an analysis of social action. Moreover, as was discussed above, not all enactments need to get the approval of the audience or pass the test of sincerity held by the audience. Declarations, proclamations and even a marriage ceremony can still create the effect they seek even if the audience puts the sincerity of the enactors in question.

Furthermore, the distinctions between competent versus incompetent, sincere versus impostor also become more open to contestation in international politics where the institutional setting is less total and the definition and implication of roles are less clear and more contested.[196] For example, we may more easily accept that one who attempts to do a brain surgery without proper medical certification is an impostor, but it is not as readily apparent and uncontroversial to call a state an impostor democratic state if it is allowing or disallowing abortion, euthanasia, death-penalty, gay-marriage, or

[195] Indeed this is what critics of Robert McNamara argued after the documentary Fog of War. Critics argued that he was strategically trying to give the impression that he regrets for his key role in the Vietnam War. Although McNamara's appearance in the documentary is surely a performance, there is no way to decide his intentions, and about whether he is "sincere" or "cynical."

[196] Even a supposedly total institution such as military often fails to create effect of socialization it seeks. See, Ronald R. Krebs, "A School for the Nation? How Military Service Does Not Build Nations, and How It Might," *International Security* 28, no. 4 (April 1, 2004): 85–124.

unregularized markets.[197] It is precisely because of the deeply contentious nature of political issues and concepts that labels such as sincere or insincere performances and competent and imcompetent performers lose their sharp edge. In the institutional setting of liberal international order, what a democratic state is and what being a democratic state entails is more contested than what it means to be a professor at a college.

This observation leads to the third difference between performance and performativity; that is, performance accounts of socialization fit better to situations where governing power relationships are more hierarchically organized and where the institutional setting is more controlling and roles are more clearly delineated, such as doctors in a hospital or officers in a military. For example, Scott focuses almost exclusively on the relationships of domination between slaves and masters, untouchables and Brahmins, or feudal farmers and their landlords. Similarly, Goffman emphasizes that his dramaturgical model of social action fits more aptly to interactions "organized within the physical confines of a building or plant"[198] or where "persons enter into one another's immediate physical presence."[199] He then goes on to admit that these kinds of "highly ceremonial occasions" and highly institutionalized settings, which that dictate certain kinds of routine behaviors, are the exception rather than the rule.[200]

---

[197] As Goffman points out, "claims to be a law graduate can be established as valid or invalid, but claims to be a friend, a true believer, or a music-lover can be confirmed or disconfirmed only more or less."Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, 60.
[198] Ibid., xi.
[199] Ibid., 254.
[200] Ibid., 30. Furthermore, Goffman suggests that he is not interested in "the specific content of any activity presented" by actors, rather he is interested solely in the actors' "dramaturgical problems of presenting the activity before others." (15) However, there is more to norm socialization than impression-management and stage-craft. Attention to the processes of cultural translation and resignification necessitates looking inside the norms and discourses. Thinking and acting through different cultural and discursive traditions and

Normative negotiations in liberal global governance, however, are hardly driven by sheer domination, even though it also exists. Rather, various pedagogic, disciplinary, persuasive and seductive mechanisms are at work and various direct and indirect forms of power are operative in these processes. Even though domination and brute force always remain on the back stage and occasionally make it into the front stage, much of international normative political activity takes place outside the domain of brute force or sheer domination. In many contestations over the constitutive norms of liberal global order, the exercise of power is rarely as direct and "tyrannical" as in domination. Furthermore, for Scott the powerful do not seek to gain the agreement of the subordinates but rather coerce them to comply with their rule.[201] Such relationships of domination are built "against the will of the dominated."[202] Socialization, however, is the process in which the powerful seek to get the agreement, and if possible the conversion, of the weak.[203] The powerful attempt to gain the consent and transform the will of the 'socializee' in order to have the latter adopt the norms of liberal international order.[204]

5. Both/And: Power, Resistance and the Scope of Performativity

Even though the pedagogic accounts tend to approach socialization through the binary of acceptance versus rejection of norms, the performative reading attends to the

---

social imaginaries, actors negotiate both their own traditions and the norms and institutions of political modernity.

[201] Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*, 67.
[202] Ibid., 45.
[203] Ikenberry and Kupchan, "Socialization and Hegemonic Power."
[204] Schimmelfennig, "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues."

ways in which it is both. For example, Ikenberry and Kupchan posit socialization against resistance. The elites of the "secondary states" either "buy into" the norms of the hegemon or resist them. They cannot do both.[205] However, cultural translation and various strategies of appropriation indicate a seemingly paradoxical but fundamental dimension of socialization: norms may at once be adopted and resisted. They can be taken up non-normatively—against their normalizing logic. In so doing, the normative and normalizing dynamics of norms can be disjointed.[206] Performativity of socialization is then located in this gap where a norm's normative and normalizing powers are negotiated.[207]

Consequently, contestations within the norm are registered either as taking place outside the norm or as anomalies to be corrected down the road. Non-normative adoptions are registered as "Potemkin socialization"[208] or "strategic socialization"[209] that lacks deeper 'internalization' of the norm. This framing of contestation as a problem of sincerity also reproduces the either/or logic. However, in myriad and conflicting claims to universal normative categories such as freedom, equality, justice, independence, autonomy, sovereignty, representation, participation, rights, and democracy, the question

---

[205] Ikenberry and Kupchan, "Socialization and Hegemonic Power." Such accounts tend to treat norms as rather stable and pre-given, downplaying their inherently multivalent and unstable character. See, Duvall and Chowdhury, "Practices of Theory."

[206] As Cheah points out, "normativity cannot be reduced to existing norms or their historical conditions." (174)

[207] For an extensive discussion of the relationship between the normative and normalizing aspects of a norm, see Partha Chatterjee, *Lineages of Political Society: Studies in Postcolonial Democracy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011); Chatterjee, *The Black Hole of Empire*.

[208] Schimmelfennig, "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues."

[209] Risse-Kappen, Ropp, and Sikkink, *The Power of Human Rights*.

is not whether to reject or to accept the norm, but rather how to repeat the norm, or how to participate in it.

Undoing the binary of socialization (as norm-adoption) versus resistance (as norm-rejection) is necessitated in part for the "structural collusion" of the two.[210] Here Tageldin's notion of 'transymmetry' provides helpful insights into thinking about the both/and form of normative engagements. For Tageldin transymmetry marks the "a/symmetry of translation" in which domination and resistance are "mutually, but not equally, constitutive."[211] Transymmetry suggests that resistance often "derives from imposition, works through and displaces it (as Bhabha suggests)."[212] Tageldin suggests that Said himself intimates this insight in his *Culture and Imperialism* when he talks about the form of anticolonial resistance:

> If modern European imperialism began with a "voyage out" to non-Western lands, the non-Western decolonization movements of the mid-twentieth century represent what Said calls "the voyage in": a "conscious effort to enter into the discourse of…the West, to mix with it, transform it." Such a definition of resistance implies its hybridity—however strategic—with imperialist discourse. Yet Said goes on to posit decolonizing resistance as always and only a radical "alternative" to the historical logic of domination, retracting his intimation that it might also *couple*—"mix"—with hegemonic discourse.[213]

---

[210] Tageldin, *Disarming Words*, 17.
[211] Ibid., 18–19. Tageldin uses transymmetry as an alternative to what she calls a Foucauldian notion of symmetry (the moral equivalency of power exercised by authority and power exercised against it) as well to Edward Said's notion of asymmetry (nonequivalency of the two and a radical separation of power and resistance).
[212] Ibid., 19.
[213] Ibid., 19–20.

In other words, Said's "voyage in" represents a performative, non-normative adoption of norms and discourses that destabilizes the pedagogy of socialization encapsulated in the metaphor of "voyage out." Here, Said's "voyage in" recognizes the normalizing power of norms yet at the same time attends to the ways in which they are differentially appropriated and metamorphosed. As Vivienne Jabri points out, Said's notion of 'voyage in' (as well as 'contrapuntal reading') mark a kind of postcolonial agency that is "not external to the inscriptional practices and structures of domination through which the postcolonial subject emerges."[214] In that sense, the socialization that 'voyage in' entails is both an adoption of and a resistance to norms.

The dynamics of this coupling of adoption and resistance are also powerfully captured in Butler's revision of Althusser's conception of interpellation. In Althusser's well-known example, when the policeman hails a person "Hey, you there!" the person's turn toward the policeman interpellates the subject. This 180-degree turn is the moment of 'subjectivation,' which is at once subjectification (constitution as subject) and subjection (submission to the ideology that constitutes the subject).[215] In Althusser's account interpellation by the systems of power—i.e. the State, the Law—often succeeds as subjects often do the metaphoric 180-degree turn: they answer when they are hailed and they get constituted as the subject of power. In this way discourses and norms materialize their effect.

---

[214] Vivienne Jabri, *The Postcolonial Subject: Claiming Politics/Governing Others in Late Modernity* (London ; New York: Routledge, 2012), 132.

[215] Althusser suggests that "the individual is interpellated as a (free) subject in order that he shall submit freely to the commandments of the Subject, i.e. in order that he shall (freely) accept his subjection, i.e. in order that he shall make the gestures and actions of his subjection 'all by himself.'" Louis Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses," in *Lenin and Philosophy, and Other Essays* (London: New Left Books, 1971), 127–188.

However, for Butler this narrative rather overstates the stability of norms, institutions and discourses. The power of such interpellations rests on their discursive reproduction through "chains of iteration." If the power of norms is sustained by reiteration, then this power "can be deflected, parodied, turned against dominant norms."[216] In other words, the possibility of failure is inherent in processes of interpellation. They might not work towards their desired ends.[217] When the policeman hails "Hey, you" and the subject of the call becomes interpellated by his/her turn to the policeman, the possibility of a "different kind of turn" embodies the possibility of a performative misrecognition or failed interpellation.[218] In that sense, pedagogic socialization interpellates subjects into the authorized meanings and practices of norms, but the performativity of non-normative adoptions point to a "different kind of turn" and to the possibility of the failure of such interpellations to fully achieve themselves, that is, to fully produce the authorized, proper, normalized subject.[219]

Likewise, Bhabha's notion of mimicry also embodies this logic of both/and. In mimicry the colonized adopts the ways of the colonizer—i.e., his norms and institutions—in a way that is "both against the rules and within them."[220] Through

---

[216] Stephen K. White, "Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative. The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection. By Judith Butler." *The Journal of Politics* 60, no. 03 (1998): 881.
[217] Judith Butler, *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection* (Stanford University Press, 1997), 95.
[218] Butler, *Gender Trouble*, 130.
[219] This also parallels Tageldin's reading of Niranjana's notion of translation. Niranjana takes the colonizer's translation of the native's language into his own as an example of such Althusserian interpellation. In Niranjana's reading, Tageldin argues, "the colonized may 'freely' accept his or her subjection and resubjectification on the colonizer's terms—à la Althusser—but always, and only, in passive response to the colonizer's acts of translation." Tageldin, *Disarming Words*, 60. However, Tageldin finds Vicente Rafael's reading of translation "more productive" since the latter "acknowledges the intervention of the non-European language of the native in the meaning-making of colonial translation and thus adumbrates a potential revision of the dynamics of interpellation as Niranjana understands these." (Tageldin 61)
[220] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 89.

mimicry actors "challenge the boundaries of discourse by subtly changing its terms."[221] This creates ambivalent hybrid forms: the outcome of repetition is "almost the same, but not quite" with respect to that which is repeated. Actors "use the powers of hybridity to resist (…) the project of conversion" entailed in the normalizing and disciplining pedagogy of norms and discourses.[222] For example, in the radically asymmetrical encounter between the natives and the Christian missionaries in colonial India, some natives demanded an Indianized Gospel, some rejected baptism, and some who conceded to be baptized said they would never take the Sacrament. Such examples, for Bhabha, communicates the nature of colonial mimicry as "at once a mode of appropriation and of resistance."[223] Mimicking a norm can entail a "mockery" of its normalizing logic, hence, it "poses an immanent threat to both 'normalized' knowledges and disciplinary powers."[224] As a "peculiar replication" of a norm or discourse, mimicry can disturb the authority of the dominant discourse[225] and as such it "marks the moments of civil disobedience within the discipline of civility."[226]

The form of resistance that mimicry sets forth is not one of outright rejection ("negative consciousness"), but one of differential repetition ("cultural hybridity").[227] Through mimicry, norms are not rejected, but rather "repeated, translated, misread, displaced."[228] Just as Bhabha's mimicry represents the ambivalent third choice when

[221] Ibid., 169.
[222] Ibid.
[223] Ibid., 172.
[224] Ibid., 122.
[225] Ibid., 123.
[226] Ibid., 172.
[227] Ibid., 295.
[228] Ibid., 146.

faced with Frantz Fanon's two options ("turning white or disappearing"),[229] performative socialization represents a third choice between pedagogic socialization and rejection. In that sense, performativity of socialization troubles the either/or logic of pedagogic socialization (either socialization or resistance) and seeks to attend to the ways it is both.[230] The question then is not "whether" to adopt a norm, but "how" to adopt it.[231]

In a different register, Karen Zivi similarly argues that as a performative practice, rights-claiming at once follows and challenges existing normative conventions. She suggests that "analyzing rights theory and practice from a performative perspective means, then, appreciating the extent to which our claims both reference and reiterate social conventions and norms, and yet have forces and effects that exceed them."[232] In that sense, "from the perspective of performativity, rights claiming is both a rule-bound and a rule-breaking practice that opens up the possibility of the new, and this is precisely what makes it suitable for contemporary democratic politics."[233] In other words, performative modes of socialization works both within the norm ("rule-bound") and against it ("rule-breaking.")

---

[229] Ibid., 172.
[230] As Saba Mahmood points out, "agentive capacity is entailed not only in those acts that resist norms but also in the multiple ways in which one inhabits norms." Saba Mahmood, "Agency, Performativity, and the Feminist Subject," in *Bodily Citations: Religion and Judith Butler*, ed. Ellen T Armour and Susan M St. Ville (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), 186. Moreover, differential inhabitation of norms may possibly resist the normalizing power of norms. This is what Bhabha refers to with his notion of the resisting potential of hybridity. He writes, "resistance is not necessarily an oppositional act of political intention, nor is it the simple negation of exclusion of the 'content' of another culture." Rather, "it is the effect of an ambivalence produced within the rules of recognition of dominant discourses as they articulate the signs of cultural difference and reimplicate them within the deferential relations of colonial power—hierarchy, normalization, marginalization and so forth." Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 157–158.
[231] Butler, *Gender Trouble*.
[232] Karen Zivi, *Making Rights Claims: A Practice of Democratic Citizenship* (Oxford University Press, 2012), 19.
[233] Ibid.

Anna Tsing's metaphor of friction also exemplifies this 'both/and' dynamic in norm adoptions. For her, frictions emerge in the varied and unequal encounters between universalizing norms and cultural difference. It is those frictions that keep "global power in motion" yet at the same time they "get in the way of the smooth operation of global power."[234] They create "new arrangements of culture and power,"[235] and hence, through friction "hegemony is made and unmade."[236] In a sense, friction emerges when actors *both* adopt *and* contest norms. In adopting the norm actors contribute to its further circulation, but introducing difference in it they also trouble its smooth normalization.

Nevertheless, this also means that friction and mimicry do not necessarily entail subversion. Normative negotiations may well be "antagonistic or affiliative," or both.[237] But they are deeply conditioned by various asymmetries of power. Furthermore, Albert J. Paolini suggests that although Bhabha's notion of mimicry is said to produce "an autonomous position for the colonial subject within the confines of the hegemonic discourse, one needs to ask how active and effective this autonomy is."[238] That is, one has to empirically investigate the possibilities and limits of reworking the dominant discourses and norms of global politics.

In that vein, highlighting the power of these asymmetries and conditions, Pheng Cheah questions Bhabha's conception of mimicry and hybridity for its overemphasis on

---

[234] Tsing, *Friction*, 6. Recognizing this aspect of global connections enables one to avoid both the idea that "new forms of empire spring fully formed and armed from the heads of Euro-American fathers" (read, pedagogic socialization) as well as "too eager a celebration of a [global] southern cultural autonomy capable of absorbing and transforming every imperial mandate" (read, unsocialized agency).
[235] Ibid., 5.
[236] Ibid., 6.
[237] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 3.
[238] Albert J Paolini, Elliott, and Anthony Moran, *Navigating Modernity: Postcolonialism, Identity, and International Relations* (Boulder, Colo.: L. Rienner Publishers, 1999), 58.

the powers of culture and signification to shape economic and political conditions.[239] For Cheah, postcolonial theorizing, in particular Bhabha's, locates the cultural at the moment of enunciation and signification and hence seeks to enable change in social life through discourse and resignification. Although this move breaks with positivist accounts that take the social and cultural as 'given,' Cheah is skeptical of the "commonplace assertion that discourse produces the real."[240] He criticizes Bhabha for "unmooring cultural agency from the field of empirico-material forces that overdetermine it."[241] Doing so, for Cheah, misses the crucial constitutive and disciplining power of the material basis of socio-economic relations. "Social transformation," he writes, "is not achieved simply by 'relocating alternative hybrid sites of cultural negotiation.'" Linguistic dynamism or "cultural-symbolic flux alone" is not adequate for an "emancipatory consciousness" to be materially effective.[242]

Central to Cheah's critique is his claim that Bhabha rests his argument on a "simplistic analogy" between "the contingency of sociocultural formations" and "the contingency of signification."[243] Therefore, hybridity overdraws on the analogy of linguistic performativity and social performativity, the latter being thoroughly

---

[239] Cheah, *Inhuman Conditions*, 101.
[240] Ibid., 85.
[241] Ibid., 91. Indeed, for Cheah, postcolonial agency is "not unmoored or relatively independent from material forces" (Ibid., 107) and therefore, Bhabha's "paradigm of postcolonial agency in globalization" ends up producing a "closet idealism" (Ibid., 93) and "linguistic culturalism." (Ibid., 90). For him, locating the hope and possibility of change at the moment of cultural signification and resignification is a thoroughly idealist hope.
[242] Cheah, *Inhuman Conditions*, 90.
[243] Ibid., 84.

conditioned and limited by the material social relations within global capitalism.[244] However, the "constraints and tendencies of politico-economic processes" cannot be reduced to "cultural-significatory practices."[245] "The social," he suggests, "is not coextensive with, or exhausted by, its symbolic dimensions."[246] Thus, locating resistance in "the contingency of language as a sign system"[247] and in the possibility of its subversive use "exaggerates the role of signification and cultural representation in the functioning of sociopolitical life and its institutions."[248]

Echoing Cheah's critiques in a different register, David Scott takes issue with the tendency in postcolonial theory to rely heavily on a negative view of the power of colonialism which is always repressing, oppressing, and preventing. This reading, however, underplays the productive power of modern norms and institutions that fundamentally reshape social life and create the conditions within which non-Western actors have to make their history as its "conscripts."[249] This calls for renewing the

---

[244] Cheah argues that "the resistance to global forces promised by contemporary postcolonial rearticulations of national culture is severely curtailed by the fact that they arise in response to economic globalization and can be manipulated by state elites in the indirect service of post-Fordist global capital." Ibid., 103.
[245] Ibid., 89.
[246] Ibid., 90.Yet pointing out the insufficiency of ideological means in securing the order also does not mean to deny the importance of "cultural legitimation in the formation of sociopolitical institutions and collective identities."
[247] Ibid., 86.
[248] Ibid., 90. Anticipating the line of materialist critique that Cheah provides here, Bhabha insists that his focus on signification and language is essential for understanding the meaning and workings of cultural difference: "If this sounds like a schematic, poststructuralist joke—it's all words, words, words…"—then I must remind you of the linguistic insistence in Clifford Geertz's influential statement that the experience of understanding other cultures is 'more like grasping a proverb, catching an illusion, seeing a joke [or as I have suggested reading a poem] than it is like achieving communion.' My insistence on locating the postcolonial subject within the play of the subaltern instance of writing is an attempt to develop Derrida's passing remark that the history of the decentred subject and its dislocation of European metaphysics is concurrent with the emergence of the problematic of cultural difference within ethnology." (84)
[249] He suggests that for the non-European, modernity was not a choice but was "itself one of the fundamental conditions of choice." Scott, *Conscripts of Modernity*, 19. As he points out, "the conceptual and institutional terrain of modernity" created by the "modern disciplinary techniques, modern institutions of government, modern forms of subjectivity, and modern conceptions of rationality" imposes itself onto

"problem-space"[250] within which we make sense of issues.[251] Modern liberal forms are "built into our lives" as they are constantly negotiated and readjusted.[252] These modern conditions, Scott argues, define the options available to the subjects and make these options intelligible as options. Therefore, rather than taking modern power solely as negative and hence construing a model of agency as resisting and overcoming these negative structures, Scott suggests that the focus should be placed on the productive/positive dimensions of modern norms and institutions that create new desires, rationalities, technologies, and subjectivities.[253]

A performative reading of socialization integrates these two strands of thinking about postcolonial agency. First, it addresses the productive *and* constraining power of

---

the non-Western subject. Ibid., 129. In the example Scott discusses, Toussaint Louverture, the leader of the Haitian Revolution, "was restrained to imagine and make the revolution he imagined and made within the conceptual and institutional terrain of modernity." Ibid. This terrain created by slavery and the plantation was not up to his choice. It was not an option for him. He "could not choose not to be modern." In Asad's language, he was not a volunteer of the modern project, but was its conscript. Hence, the political projects that the non-West undertook in making their futures were given a distinctive shape by the conditions made by modern power. Ibid., 131.

[250] A problem-space for Scott is a "discursive context, "context of language, […] a cognitively intelligible arrangement of concepts, ideas, images, meanings." Scott, *Conscripts of Modernity*, 4. It is a historically changing "ensemble of questions and answers around which a horizon of identifiable stakes (conceptual as well as ideological-political stakes) hangs." Ibid.With the changing of historical conditions old questions might lose their "salience" and "bite" and might appear "lifeless" and "quaint."

[251] Scott, *Conscripts of Modernity*, 111. The old problem-space puts the negative power of colonialism at the center and hence "obliges one to look for the agency that transgresses it, survives it, overcomes it, and to look in turn for the sources (cultural or otherwise) that enabled or fed that transgression, survival, or overcoming." However, modern liberal norms and institutions have so deeply structured the social and the political sphere that postcolonial subjects cannot but act within its boundaries and on its terms. The postcolonial subject cannot choose not to be modern. Ibid., 129. This echoes Niranjana's claim that the postcolonial lives always already in translation.

[252] Ibid., 21.

[253] Ibid., 7. For that reason Scott takes issue with various postcolonial theories of subaltern agency and alternative modernities for their construction of a "normative expectation of resistance, of overcoming." Ibid., 114. One central reason for this is their operation within a mode in which the modern still signifies a "largely passive or negative environment merely waiting to be surmounted or mastered or translated or displaced by preconstituted subjects." The mode of thinking here is one that sees the subalterns as innovatively responding to modern transformations. Yet, Scott argues that this reading underrates the productive dimension of modern structures of power that create the conditions and the subjects acting within it.

modern structures, norms and institutions through the notion of socialization, which communicates the deeply conditioned nature of agency. Second, it attends to the strategies of differential adoption of liberal norms and institutions as the performative dimensions of socialization. In that sense, it speaks to the paradox of subjection in socialization: actors are simultaneously being subjected to the normalizing power of norms while being made the subject of norms. Put differently, actors put to risk the normalizing power of the norms into which they socialize. This deeply conditioned sense of agency in global social life is akin to the relationship Chakrabarty establishes between History 1 and History2s—the latter are deeply conditioned by the former but still interrupts its thrust. Chakrabarty invokes neither an outside to capital nor a heroic subject escaping or transcending it. Just as subaltern histories cannot be thought of outside the global forces and narratives of capital, performativity of socialization cannot be thought outside the pedagogic and disciplinary forces governing socialization. In that sense, to provincialize Europe, and to understand socialization performatively, is to hold these two contradictory forces in constant tension.[254] For Chakrabarty this leaves us at "the restless and inescapable politics of historical difference" in which History 1 and History 2s perpetually seek to interrupt each other. This is a kind of resistance that participates in what it resists.[255]

This both/and dynamic also points to the scope conditions of the reading I lay out in this chapter. Even though I do not offer a predictive theory, still there are conditions under which performative modes of socialization are more likely to take place. First,

[254] Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe*, 254.
[255] Skaria, "The Project of Provincialising Europe," 56.

constitutive norms (norms that define identities, core community values, and meta-rules) are more conducive to cultural translations and appropriations compared to regulative norms (norms that have specific rules or injunctions).[256] Performativity can be operative in all normative engagements, but it is more salient in relating to constitutive norms such as democracy, human rights, equality, and freedom since they offer more space for divergence and contestation. Many such norms are essentially contested with no final definition that would foreclose the debate over them. For example, the European Union's political criteria for membership (known as the 'Copenhagen criteria') include constitutive norms of liberal global governance such as democracy, human rights, rule of law, protection of minorities and market economy, which are more open to differential adoptions and contestations compared to the Union's economic criteria for membership (known as the 'Maastricht criteria') that outline very specific regulative norms in economic field (e.g. national debt cannot exceed 60% of GDP, or annual budget deficit cannot exceed 3% of GDP).

Second, performative modes of socialization cannot take place if a norm is rejected squarely or if a norm is adopted without any conditions, reservations, or difference. For example, state actors such as Saudi Arabia and non-state actors such as Al-Qaeda repudiate democracy as a desirable norm. They do not invoke the norm; therefore, there is no space to negotiate and rework it. For them democracy is untranslatable to an Islamic context as they see it contradicting with the principle of God's sovereignty. They do not adopt the norm non-normatively since they do not adopt

[256] For the distinction between constitutive and regulative norms in international relations, see Onuf, *World of Our Making*; Kratochwil, *Rules, Norms, and Decisions*; Finnemore and Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change"; Wiener, "Contested Compliance."

it in the first place. Therefore there must be some form of prior socialization into a norm in order for that norm to be reworked. It should also be noted that unconditional rejection or unconditional acceptance of norms are rather rare in international relations, which leaves a very broad spectrum for performative modes of engagements.

In a sense, this also suggests that the kind of resistance that performative modes of socialization put forth is not 'revolutionary.' The performative inaugurates a change, but it is a particular kind of change, one that is "not rule-governed" but at the same time "made possible by the rules and procedures in place, which language cites as it attempts something new."[257] Performativity does not account for the 'event' such as a revolution that erupts. The force of the event is irreducible to the force of the performative.[258] As Butler puts it, performativity is not a matter of "radical fabrication" but rather one of repetition of prior norms "which cannot be thrown off at will."[259]

Third, one can expect performative modes of socialization to be operative the more the hegemonic articulation of a norm gets into conflict with a local norm. The inflecting effects of translation can be expected to be higher the further the norm travels across cultural difference. If the norm in question destabilizes or transforms the norms upheld by actors, then performativity may be more salient. In addition, the higher those vernacular norms perceived to be under risk are in the local hierarchy of norms, the more transformative its appropriations may get. For example, the norms about scientific management of state bureaucracies might not be seen by non-Western actors as being

[257] Culler, *The Literary in Theory*, 162.
[258] Jacques Derrida, *Without Alibi* (Stanford University Press, 2002), 235.
[259] Butler, *Bodies That Matter*, 230.

'costly' or culturally threatening [260] as the emerging norms about humanitarian intervention and Responsibility to Protect.[261] Likewise, to actors such as the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood, democracy as a norm may not appear as culturally threatening as the norm of secular liberalism that is usually posited as its precondition.[262] In addition, translation also happens within a language across subgroups. For example, a well-established constitutive norm of liberal international order, right to life, gets translated into particular ideological and political languages not only across countries but also within the factions of domestic politics.

6. Conclusion

R. B. J. Walker suggests that "the way in which the universal validity of the discourses of dominant groups is *both claimed and challenged* has long been central to critical social and political thought." [emphasis added][263] This has only recently started to be the case for norm socialization research in IR. In this chapter I argued that performativity is a helpful analytical framework to uncover these dynamics of claiming *and* challenging dominant norms and institutions. What happens when actors (state or non-state) claim to participate in norms differently? How can resistance be recognized when it takes place not outside the norm (as rejection) but within the norm (as appropriation)? How do norms and discourses travel across cultural difference? The

[260] Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*.
[261] Acharya, "How Ideas Spread."
[262] F. Zakaria, "Islam, Democracy, and Constitutional Liberalism," *Political Science Quarterly* 119, no. 1 (2004): 1–20.
[263] R. B. J. Walker, *Culture, Ideology, and World Order* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1984), xii.

performative reading I develop in this chapter seeks to address these questions by attempting a more complex theorization of norm socialization, one that attends to the dynamics of cultural translation and discursive appropriation in liberal global governance. It explores the ways in which difference is inserted into norms in ways that may put the hegemonic articulation of a norm at risk. It highlights how and to what effects normative power of norms can be disjointed from their normalizing power.

In that sense, a performative reading of socialization explores "how marginal groups are challenging the pedagogical delimiting" of norms and discourses such as equality, democracy, human rights, and citizenship and how they are appropriating them "for quite different projects."[264] In attending to non-normative adoption of norms in liberal global governance, this reading attempts to extend Chakrabarty's project of rethinking Enlightenment norms and universals from the margins and against their hegemonic articulations to the field of norm socialization in IR. This is also the democratic promise of performativity's analytical intervention: it keeps open the constitutive norms and discourses to different meanings and possibilities.

[264] Skaria, "The Project of Provincialising Europe," 58.

CHAPTER 4

AK PARTY'S 'DEMOCRATIC SECULARISM' AND 'CONSERVATIVE DEMOCRACY'

Speaking at the meeting of a non-governmental organization in March 2012, Mustafa İsen, the General Secretary of the Presidency of Turkey and a professor of classical Turkish literature, said: "Just as the conservative section of society has an understanding of democracy so that we are able to talk about something called 'conservative democracy,' then we're also under the obligation of talking about 'conservative aesthetics' and 'conservative art' and of establishing its norms and structure."[1] This statement sparked a heated debate in Turkish media about whether one can or should talk about 'conservative art.' What was quite intriguing, however, was that although many commentators challenged İsen's remarks about the possibility and desirability of a 'conservative art,' his point about democracy went virtually unchallenged. No one seemed to question whether a conservative understanding of democracy exists or whether its norms and structure are so well established that it can serve as a benchmark. This becomes even more puzzling when one considers that the term 'conservative democracy' was introduced to Turkish politics only with the establishment of the AK Party (Justice and Development Party) in 2001.[2]

---

[1] Mustafa İsen's speech at the meeting of the İstanbul Suriçi Grubu Derneği, March 29, 2012. İsen was also a candidate for nomination for MP from AK Party, but he was not nominated. "Suriçi Grubu Mustafa İsen'i Ağarladı," accessed September 3, 2013, http://www.suricigrubu.net/?Syf=18&Hbr=312116&/Suri%C3%A7i-Grubu-Mustafa-%C4%B0sen%27i-A%C4%9Farlad%C4%B1.

[2] One issue that arises in writing and talking about the AK Party is one's preference for the acronym. Itself standing as an evidence of polarization in Turkish politics, most critics of the party use the acronym AKP

How does a political party with roots in Islamism come to adopt conservatism as a framework for democracy and secularism as a feature of state? What kind of a politics of translation is at play in this transition? How does AK Party negotiate the categories of secularism, democracy, and Islamic tradition—particularly shari'a? If AK Party's adoption of 'democratic secularism' and 'conservative democracy' constitutes a particular socialization into liberal international norms, then what are the conditions, contours, and modalities of this socialization? How does AK Party negotiate the domestic and international meanings and practices of secularism and democracy? How is AK Party's adoption of secularism related to liberal global governance? How does AK Party construe its commitment to Islamic normativity under conditions co-created by the Turkish state and of liberal international order?

In this chapter I seek to address these questions. I first lay out the context within which AK Party interprets secularism and democracy. To do so, I focus on the case of the litigation at the Turkish Constitutional Court to close down the party in 2008. I analyze the indictment filed by the General Prosecutor of the Supreme Court of Appeal (hereafter the Prosecutor) as an illustration of the domestic conditions and limits set by the Kemalist Turkish state. I then analyze the European Court of Human Rights's (ECtHR) upholding

---

instead of AK Party, since the word 'ak' in Turkish means 'white' and 'clean.' Expressing their refusal of associating the party with those qualities, critics usually argue that the sympathizers of the party use the label AK. I find this position less than persuasive primarily because the party's acronym is officially registered as AK Party and its name appears as AK Party on the ballot box. This line of critique is also puzzling because the same writers who attribute a certain partisanship in referring to the party as AK does not see it as particularly partisan in using the acronym ANAP for Anavatan Partisi, which must have been AP if we use the same logic, or HADEP for Halkin Demokrasi Partisi instead of HDP, or HAS Party for the Halkin Sesi Partisi, instead of HSP ('Has' in Turkish means 'authentic'), among many other examples. Similarly, neither do any of those writers argue that we should not use the acronyms such as HAMAS. One can reasonably claim that AK Party is indeed not quite 'ak' ('clean') just as one might claim that HAMAS indeed is not 'enthusiastic' (which the acronym means as an Arabic word). But this is hardly a good reason for refusing to use the official names of these parties. Therefore, in this chapter and throughout the dissertation, I use the officially registered, self-declared name of the party as AK Party.

of the Turkish Constitutional Court's verdict to dissolve the Islamist Refah (Welfare) Party—AK Party's predecessor—as an affirmation of the Kemalist conception of secularism by the liberal international order. Subsequently I try and delineate the political imaginary driving AK Party's negotiation of secularism and democracy. For that purpose I first analyze AK Party's court defense in terms of the politics of universality and difference in its appropriation of 'democratic secularism.' Then I examine the politics of cultural translation in AK Party's negotiation of Islamic discursive tradition[3] with secularism and democracy. In the following section I move on to discuss how AK Party's disavowal of the idea of Islamic state (a state that implements shari'a as the law of the land) contests and transcends the contours of Islamist imaginary from within the Islamic tradition. Finally, I analyze how AK Party's discourse of 'conservative democracy' reconfigures (rather than drops) the question of shari'a observance by shifting its focus from the state to 'people' (*halk*).

I draw on two kinds of sources in making these arguments: First, I use official AK Party documents, firsthand writings and speeches of prominent AK Party members who are influential in shaping the discourse and policies of the party, together with the original documents of the Prosecutor's indictment, the Turkish Constitutional Court's verdict, and the verdict of the ECtHR. Second, I draw on the ethnographic data I collected during my fieldwork research in Turkey in the winter of 2011—the indepth interviews I conducted with AK Party ministers, MPs, advisors, and members, and the

[3] Talal Asad suggests that Islam is "neither a distinctive social structure nor a heterogeneous collection of beliefs, artifacts, customs, and morals." But rather, it is a "discursive tradition" in which actors seek appropriate actions and interpretations with regard to the constitutive texts of Islam. Talal Asad, *The Idea of an Anthropology of Islam* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Contemporary Arab Studies, Georgetown University, 1986), 14–15.

secondary resources such as scholarly writings and journalistic reports in Turkish and international media.

In previous chapters, I argued that the socialization literature in international relations (IR) predominantly views normative engagements as pedagogic processes in which norms and their authorized ('correct') interpretations are transmitted—directly or indirectly, coercively or noncoercively—by Western actors and institutions to their non-Western counterparts. (Chapter 2) After identifying the problems with the pedagogic narrative, I offered a reading of socialization as a performative process of translation and appropriation. (Chapter 3) Now in this chapter, I provide a reading of AK Party's adoption of secularism as a performative process of translation and negotiation whose countours and limits are shaped by the conditions co-created by the Kemalist state and liberal international order.

Over the last decades Islamist political movements went through an ideological transformation and increasingly endorsed the legitimacy of democracy as a political regime. They formed political parties or platforms and participated in the electoral politics of their respective countries. However, the kind of democracy that Islamists invoke is rather different from secular liberal democracy. Islamists generally envision a democracy within an Islamic state implementing Shari'a as state law—hence, the term "Islamic democracy." They call for an 'Islamized' version of democracy in line with their ideology's general program of Islamizing social, political, and economic life.[4] The

[4] Islamism in that sense is an ideology of Islamization. This program also reveals its modernist bend since Islamist discourse, especially the Muslim Brotherhood school of thought, is an effort to Islamize modern institutions, practices, sciences, and technology—rendering them 'Islamic'—rather than rejecting them. Noah Feldman notes that the adjectival usage of the term 'Islam' as 'Islamic' is a modern trend that is

Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood is usually seen as the origin and the paradigmatic example of this line of Islamism.

The Turkish AK Party, however, presents a quite different trajectory. In contrast to classical Islamism, AK Party's party program and electoral platform do not call for establishing an Islamic state implementing shari'a as state law. Rather, the party has insistently declared, since its inception in 2001, that it endorses secularism understood as state neutrality toward religions and protection of religious freedoms of all citizens. As a result, within scholarly and policy circles as well as in media debates, AK Party has come to represent a break with Islamism and a transition into liberalism. AK Party's official identity of 'conservative democracy' has been taken as a liberalizing and secularizing, if not yet entirely liberal and secular, discourse.[5] It comes to stand for a 'post-Islamist' endorsement of secular liberal democracy under the rubric of 'Muslim democracy' (or its official identity of 'conservative democracy'). As such, AK Party is often juxtaposed to the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood, which comes to embody an Islamist rejection of secularism and liberal democracy.

Central to this narrative, which has proved to be a very powerful one, both globally and locally, is the argument that post-Islamist Muslim democrats exemplified by the AK Party give up on the idea of a shari'a-implementing Islamic state and instead move toward constructing a distinctly secular and liberal form of political rule and of

---

"largely absent from classical vocabulary. "Noah Feldman, *The Fall and Rise of the Islamic State* (Princeton University Press, 2010), 111.

[5] Nasr, "The Rise of 'Muslim Democracy,'" 2005.

Muslim subjectivity. AK Party's "Shari'a-free" politics[6] or its "Muslim politics without Shari'a"[7] marks its difference from Islamists in the Arab world and beyond and elevates it as a 'model' for the latter. AK Party is signified as the transition from a shari'a-based Islamism to a shari'a-free post-Islamism; from illiberalism to liberalism. As such, it represents "liberal normalization" and a disciplining of Islamist discourse according to the pedagogy of liberal socialization.

These narratives capture important aspects of the transformation AK Party has gone through under conditions co-created by the Kemalist state and liberal international order.[8] After all, there is no single reference to shari'a in any official AK Party document or speech. Yet, these accounts fail to capture the performative dimensions of AK Party's socialization. AK Party engages in a process of cultural translation, and cultural translation is performative. It is productive of difference. It negotiates different social imaginaries.

Yet it is also conditioned by, and in turn reinscribes, relationships of power and hierarchy. Performativity of socialization and cultural translation is deeply wrought with

---

[6] Hakan M. Yavuz, "Ethical Not Shari'a Islam: Islamic Debates in Turkey," *The Review of Faith & International Affairs* 10, no. 4 (2012): 28–34.

[7] Kuru, *Muslim Politics without an "Islamic" State: Can Turkey's Justice and Development Party Be a Model for Arab Islamists?*.

[8] Liberal international order has cherished the Kemalist rule in Turkey. This is, I argue, because of the Orientalist presuppositions they both share. Bernard Lewis represents a clear example on that score. John Stuart Mill has (in)famously argued that democracy could only be achieved within Western civilization. This Eurocentric construal of democracy is shared by both liberal international order and the Kemalist rule in Turkey. Kemalist authoritarian rule has been backed by liberal international order precisely because of their concurrence on the Orientalist assumption that the Muslim world needs 'Enlightened despots' and pro-Western dictatorships in order to have a democracy in some time in future. The most recent example of this was seen in Egypt after the military coup on July 3, 2013. Muhammad Al-Baradei, a Nobel Peace Price laureate prominent liberal figure who was first appointed as the Prime Minister by the junta, but then upon the opposition of the Salafi Nour Party was moved to the Deputy President, was hailed as "liberal modernizer" of Egypt. Roger Cohen, "Political Islam Fails Egypt's Test," *The New York Times*, July 4, 2013, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/05/opinion/global/political-islam-fails-egypts-test.html.

liberal pedagogic practices and relations.[9] Liberal international order seeks to discipline these translations in order to keep them within the confines of secular liberalism. In that context, AK Party negotiates the propriety of secularism within Islamic discursive tradition on the terrain co-created by the Kemalist state and liberal international order. This is why in the next section I lay out these conditions that impose a secularist pressure on the AK Party. Then, I go on to analyze the political imaginary of the AK Party through which it negotiates the categories of secularism, democracy, and shari'a.

1. Conditions of Performativity: Mechanisms of Secularist Pedagogy in Turkey

There are various dynamics that condition AK Party's negotiation of secularism and democracy in Turkey. I consider these dynamics as mechanisms of pedagogic socialization and categorize them under three groups in terms of the way they exert their force: institutional, ideological/discursive, and coercive mechanisms.[10] The institutional mechanisms socialize actors because of their inherent logics. These include i) electoral politics that exert a pressure on parties to moderate their platform and move toward the political center in order to win elections[11]; ii) capitalist markets and integration with global economy[12]; iii) the conditionality of European Union accession process, especially the Copenhagen political criteria (democracy, human rights, and rule of law) and the

[9] Asad, *Genealogies of Religion*.
[10] These distinctions between these categories are analytical and they mix and mold in different ways and forms. Also in some ways this classification parallels the IR socialization literature's discussion of material incentives, coercion, and suasion as distinct mechanisms of socialization.
[11] Przeworski and Sprague, *Paper Stones*; Kalyvas, *The Rise of Christian Democracy in Europe*; Nasr, "The Rise of 'Muslim Democracy,'" 2005.
[12] Nasr, *Forces of Fortune*; Tugal, *Passive Revolution*; Humeira Iqtidar, "Secularism Beyond the State: The 'State' and the 'Market' in Islamist Imagination," *Modern Asian Studies* 45, no. 03 (2011): 535–64.

jurisdiction of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)[13]; iv) and the 1982 Constitution of Turkey drafted under the supervision of the military after the coup in 1980. These four institutional mechanisms provide, in different ways, incentives to adopt secularism as a norm. Participating in those institutions—elections, capitalist markets, the conditionality of EU accession, and the constitutional-legal structure of the Turkish state—socializes AK Party into secularism.

Second, there are ideological/discursive mechanisms that socialize AK Party into the pedagogy of secularism. These include i) the liberal intellectuals' elevation, both by the international media and by their own depiction, to a tutelary role to teach AK Party proper norms and their authorized and 'correct' interpretations with the powers to grant and deprive it international legitimacy[14]; ii) and the discourses of the 'end of Islamism,' 'post-Islamism,' 'Muslim democracy,' and 'illiberal democracy,' all of which are

---

[13] Bahar Rumelili, "Turkey: Identity, Foreign Policy, and Socialization in a Post□Enlargement Europe," *Journal of European Integration* 33, no. 2 (2011): 235–249; Joerg Baudner, "The Politics of 'Norm Diffusion' in Turkish European Union Accession Negotiations: Why It Was Rational for an Islamist Party to Be 'Pro-European' and a Secularist Party to Be 'Anti-European'," *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 50, no. 6 (2012): 922–938.Turkey has recognized the compulsory jurisdiction of the European Court of Human Rights in 1990 under the Article 46 of the European Convention on Human Rights (1954).

[14] In his speech to an Egyptian liberal audience at the American University of Cairo in the November of 2011, Şahin Alpay, an erstwhile Maoist and now liberal democrat columnist, suggested that one crucial dynamic that led to the transformation of the AK Party from an Islamist into a conservative/liberal democratic party was the role of liberal intellectuals—the others were neoliberal market reforms that started in 1980 and the strands of democratic Islamist thinking in Ottoman-Turkish history. Şahin Alpay (presented at the Turkish-Egyptian Conversations on Contemporary Democratic and Political Transformations, American University in Cairo, Cairo, Egypt, October 11, 2011). Reflecting on the same question, Markar Esayan observes that liberal intellectuals, despite sharing "common sociological codes" with the Kemalist elite, have entered into "a tacit alliance" with the AK Party after it won the elections in November 3, 2002 elections and "as figures who support Turkey's EU integration," they had "a substantial impact in garnering legitimacy for the AK Party." However, he notes that after 2010, with Erdogan's stance at the Davos Meeting and the constitutional changes that curbed the power of the Kemalist judiciary, the liberal intellectuals' "project of domesticating Erdogan has collapsed." They "wanted to establish a tutelage over Erdogan" but Erdogan rejected that. For Esayan the fundamental problem of liberal intellectuals was that their relationship with the AK Party "was never based on an assumption of equality, but rather based on the idea that equality between them is within the range of the possible." Markar Esayan, "Imagine, There Is No Erdogan," *Yeni Şafak*, October 9, 2013, http://yenisafak.com.tr/yazarlar/MarkarEsayan/imagine-there-is-no-erdogan/39974.

mobilized, in slightly different ways, to ideologically discipline the party along the pedagogy of liberal secularism.[15]

Third, there are coercive mechanisms that seek to socialize AK Party into secularism through punitive measures. These include i) the imminent and credible threat of a military coup—as it happened in 1960, 1971, 1980, 1997 (the 'bloodless,' 'postmodern' coup), and 2007 (this was not a coup but the military issued a memorandum tacitly threatening with a coup d'etat); ii) and relatedly, the imminent and credible threat of a ban on the party by the Constitutional Court—which was attempted in 2008 and previously happened to the predecessors of AK Party four times in 1971 (National Order Party), 1980 (National Salvation Party), 1998 (Welfare Party), and 2001 (Felicity Party).

All these conditions together exert a pedagogic pressure on the AK Party toward adopting secularism as a constitutive norm of liberal international order. The scope of their impact, however, transcends the party. They transform the way people understand and practice religion and politics.[16] In this chapter, however, I will focus on the litigation

---

[15] Asef Bayat, "The Coming of a Post-Islamist Society," *Critique*, 1996; A. Bayat, "What Is Post-Islamism?," *ISIM Review* 16, no. 5 (2005); A. Bayat, *Islam and Democracy: What Is the Real Question?*, vol. 8 (Leiden University Press, 2007); Bayat, *Making Islam Democratic*; Nasr, "The Rise of 'Muslim Democracy,'" 2005; M. Hakan Yavuz, *Secularism and Muslim Democracy in Turkey*, 1st ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2009); Dagi, "Rethinking Human Rights, Democracy, and the West"; I. Dagi, "Turkey's AKP in Power," *Journal of Democracy* 19, no. 3 (2008): 25–30.

[16] For example starting with Turkey's shift in 1980 from import-substitution to an export-oriented industrialization strategy, Turkey has increasingly integrated into global economy. AK Party policies further deepened economic liberalization and hence allowed capitalist market relations to further penetrate into society. This immersion into global economy was one of AK Party's strategies to confront the Kemalist state on questions such as secularism. Through promoting privatization and international trade, AK Party sought to lessen the grip of the Kemalist state on economy, which traditionally favored Istanbul-based big bourgeoisie and restrained the more pious Anatolian bourgeoisie—the support base of Islamism. This strategy delivered for the AK Party in ultimately shifting the balance, yet as many commentators note, some with celebration and some with complaint, the capitalist markets deeply transformed the

by the Chief State Prosecutor of Turkey to dissolve the AK Party on the allegation that it has become "a center for anti-secularist activities." The Kemalist Turkish state's threat to ban the party in the name of defending its interpretation of secularism was so imminent and real that deeply conditioned the terms and contours of AK Party's discourse on secularism. This court case lucidly displays the ways in which the Kemalist state coercively delimits the field of politics and seeks to foreclose the meaning of secularism and democracy. The Turkish state receives full authorization by the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) and by the rest of the core actors of liberal international order. This is why I also analyze the ECtHR's judgment authorizing the dissolution of AK Party's predecessor, the Refah Party.

The problem space of secularism in Turkey is not formed solely within domestic dynamics. The contestations over the discourse and practice of secularism in Turkey take place at the level of domestic and international politics at once. It is simultaneously a local and an international question. As AK Party's vice-chairman put it, "secularism in Turkey is not only a domestic issue, it is an international issue." Hence, AK Party's negotiation of secularism and democracy in Turkey lies at the interface of domestic and international politics. Both the Kemalist state and the AK Party negotiate alternative claims to universality and cultural difference while contesting the meanings and practices of secularism and democracy as international norms. In that sense, AK Party's translation of Islamic political thought into the language of secular conservative democracy takes place on a social, political, legal, and discursive terrain co-created by the Kemalist

---

understandings, lifestyles, consumption patterns, daily practices, and political views of Islamist sections of society.

Turkish state and liberal global governance, which, I will argue, converge on Orientalist presumptions.

1.1. The Kemalist State: *Laiklik* and the AK Party Closure Case

Kemalism has been formulated as the official ideology of the Turkish state in 1930s. As a typical example of postcolonial secular nationalism, Kemalism deemed radical Westernization as being inevitable for 'catching up' with the West.[17] It launched a pervasive state-led program of social transformation. In the eyes of the Kemalist elite, this was a "civilizational conversion."[18] In doing so, Kemalism internalized an explicitly Eurocentric and Orientalist narrative.[19] This was a case of "Orient Orientalizing itself," as Edward Said put it.[20] It identified the norms and institutions of the Islamic tradition as the main reasons for 'lagging behind' the West, which, for the Kemalist elite, represented the endpoint of the historical progress of 'civilization.' Aggressive secularization in the form of purging religion from public and even private spheres was the key to achieve this project of modernization.[21]

---

[17] Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Constitutions and Culture Studies," *Yale Journal of Law & the Humanities* 2, no. 1 (1990).
[18] Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (Taylor & Francis US, 1998).
[19] Sukru Hanioglu, "The Historical Roots of Kemalism," in *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*, ed. Ahmet T. Kuru and Alfred C. Stepan (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 32–60.
[20] Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (Vintage Books, 1979). For a reading of Kemalist ideology as "orientalizing the Orient," see Salman Sayyid, *A Fundamental Fear: Eurocentrism and the Emergence of Islamism* (Zed Books, 1997).
[21] Ahmet T. Kuru, *Secularism and State Policies toward Religion: The United States, France, and Turkey*, 1st ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2009).

For the Kemalist state, this task inevitably required a pedagogic and at times paternalistic approach.[22] The people were 'not yet' mature and competent enough to decide what was good for them and for the country. They hence had to be guided, educated, and corrected—through persuasion if possible, and coercion if necessary. Kemalism as a project was an attempt to create the proper subjects authorized by the secularist norms of the nineteenth century European positivism. Proper citizen of the republic was a secularized, Westernized, urban, ethnically Turkish individual who achieved the transition from membership to '*ümmet'* (religious community) to '*ulus'* (nation), from being a '*kul'* (subject of the sultan as well as servant of God) to being a '*vatandaş'* (citizen).[23] Secularism has been the constitutive core of this historicist narrative that served to justify the pedagogic/paternalist order guarded by the civilian and military bureaucracy of the Turkish state, who acted as self-assigned educators of the people.[24] They viewed themselves as the instruments for socializing the people into secularism.

The court case against the AK Party reveals the contours of this Kemalist imaginary of *laiklik* (secularism). The Prosecutor argues in his indictment that *laiklik* is "the most fundamental feature" of the Turkish state. He cites an earlier ruling of the Turkish Constitutional Court stipulating that "the Turkish Revolution has attained its

---

[22] Ümit Cizre, "A New Politics of Engagement: The Turkish Military, Society, and the AKP," in *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*, ed. Ahmet T. Kuru and Alfred C. Stepan (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012).

[23] The prosecutor makes this point very clearly. For him, it is only through secularism that "the citizens became, via national consciousness (*ulus bilinciyle*), the individuals of the Turkish Nation that established the Turkish Republic."

[24] For Kemalism, Mustafa Kemal was the chief educator/teacher of the nation and the military and civilian bureaucracy were tasked with following his footsteps. The military interventions and coup d'états since 1960 institutionalized the pedagogic (and paternalist) politics of Kemalist state.

meaning through secularism." Secularism is "the essence of Turkish Revolution and the Republic and the foundation of national life (*ulusal yaşam*)." Forming "the basis of the constitutional order," secularism is "sovereign over all other principles embraced by the constitution." It is the sovereign principle of the Turkish state in whose name exceptions to law can justifiably be created. It may justify banning a ruling party that managed to take half the votes of the electorate.[25] Democracy can in no way level up to the authority that secularism commands; hence when necessary secularism overrides democratic mechanisms, rights, and liberties. The prosecutor makes this point abundantly clear with his references to an earlier ruling of the Constitutional Court:

> Activities against the constitutional principle of secularism cannot be considered as democratic rights. The principle of secularism enjoys a constitutional privilege (*ayrıcalık*) and this is not against democracy. Besides, all rights and liberties must be assessed on the basis of this basic principle. The constitution attaches a special importance and superiority to the principle of secularism, and seeks to protect it meticulously against liberties. Hence it does not allow the butchering (*kıydırılmasına*) of this principle [of secularism] by liberties.[26]

The fundamental reason why secularism must override and if necessary postpone democracy is that Islam as a religion of the majority in the country has a radically different historical trajectory compared to Western Christianity that gave rise to secularism. The Prosecutor justifies the secularist pedagogy of Kemalism by introducing

[25] AK Party attained 34% of the votes in 2002 elections and formed a single party government. In 2007, the party won a landslide victory by increasing its votes to 47%. The Prosecutor filed the litigation in 2008.
[26] The Prosecutor's Indictment.

a historical difference into the discourse of liberal secularism. His statement in the indictment brings home this point:

> "The concept of secularism taken from the Western world necessarily has to take on a different meaning and implementation in Turkey [due to] the unique (*özgün*) conditions of the country, the importance of secularism in the establishment of the Turkish Republic, the role of secularism in the creation of a modern state, and the special structure of the religion of Islam."

For the Prosecutor, the historical and theological differences between Islam and Christianity necessitate a 'different' implementation of secularism in Turkey, one that is overtly pedagogic and often paternalistic.[27] An earlier ruling of the Constitutional Court provides the reason why Kemalist state has to engage in pedagogic and paternalistic practices: "Islam does not suffice with merely regulating the religious faith that belongs solely to the conscience of individuals, but it also regulates the entirety of social relationships, activities of the state and law." Therefore, the court argues, liberal secularism that may fit to a Christian context is not apt for Turkey, whose Islamic heritage necessitates an authoritarian control of religion. He further elaborates on this claim:

[27] As I also note in Chapter 2, I make an analytical distinction between pedagogic and paternalistic modes of relationship. I understand paternalism as a hierarchical relationship in which the immature or not yet rational is brought under the care of a superior protector, in such a way that the latter decides and acts on behalf of the former. Pedagogic relationships, however, while still hierarchical, do not necessarily entail one superior set of actors acting on behalf of the inferior other. Rather, pedagogic relationships seek to induce the desired behavior or meaning through various combinations of coercion, incentives, and persuasion. Pedagogic socialization may include paternalistic measures, yet they are analytically distinct modes of relationship.

> The application of the principle of secularism in Turkey is different from the practices of secularism in some Western countries. It is natural for the principle of secularism to be inspired by the conditions of countries and by the characteristics of religions, and to produce different implementations and qualities based on these. Because of the different features of the religions of Islam and Christianity, the applications in our country and in the Western countries have been different. Besides, the understanding of secularism has differed even among the Western countries that adopt the same religion.

He argues that due to "her historical experiences"—her Islamic past and the Kemalist "revolutions" (*inkılaplar*)—the Turkish state "enjoys a wide discretionary power (*takdir hakkı*)" on the question of secularism He points out that in Europe the constitutive norm of secularism took the form of a political doctrine separating state and religious authority. But this idea of secularism as political doctrine, he argues, cannot be implemented in Turkey since Islam has not gone through the process of secularization that Christianity has. That is why in the Turkish context secularism "cannot be narrowed down to the separation of the affairs of the state and religion." Rather, secularism in the Turkish context is a substantive doctrine about good life built on science and reason. It is "an environment of civilization, freedom, and modernity, and its dimensions are larger and its space is wider. It is Turkey's modernization philosophy, method of humane life, and ideal of humanity." As such, it should "actively seek to control religious faith and practice."[28] This "civilized way of life," according to the Prosecutor, not only "saves religion from

[28] This point is also made in Andrew Davison, *Secularism and Revivalism in Turkey: A Hermeneutic Reconsideration* (Yale University Press, 1998).

politicization and from being an instrument of government" but also "keeps religion in its real and respectful place, which is the conscience of individuals." Conscience of individuals is the sole proper place for religion in the Kemalist project. In order to keep religion in its 'proper place,' Kemalist *laiklik* requires "an absolute separation of sacred emotions of religion from politics, worldly affairs, and legal regulations." In that sense, Kemalism does not aspire to separate religion and state, but rather wants to constantly police religion in order to extirpate it from public life, and in an indirect way, also from private life.[29] In other words, Kemalist *laiklik* has to reject the Anglo-American model of secularism, broadly understood as 'twin tolerations'[30] between the state and religions, in order to be able to defend an interpretation of secularism that is inimical to any public expression or embodiment of religion and that posits the visceral as the only proper space for religion. This, as Andrew Davison aptly points out, is indeed a form of political Islam, albeit one that seeks to reproduce and interpret it so as to relegate it to the sphere of the visceral and private. [31]

Here, the Prosecutor again refers to an earlier ruling of the Constitutional Court, which forbids "being inspired by religion" in administering the state. The Constitutional

---

[29] The Prosecutor stresses that the state has the right and the responsibility to do "inspection (*denetim*) and surveillance (*gözetim*) in religious issues." However, by reference to the interpretation of the Article 2 of the Turkish Constitution of 1982, the prosecutor also suggests that secularism cannot be interpreted as "atheism" (dinsizlik) and that secularism "does not require that social relations would be abstracted from spiritual (manevi) values." Hence, as the two statements indicate, Kemalist secularism is tasked with a constant regulation, control, inspection, and surveillance of religion rather than promoting "atheism." Indeed, it established institutions (such as the Directorate of Religious Affairs) to control and manage religion rather than annihilate it. Ironically, it was Kemalist establishment, instead of Islamists, who forged attacks on Christian missionaries on the allegation that they were a threat to national security. See, Esra Özyürek, "Christian and Turkish: Secularist Fears of a Converted Nation," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 29, no. 3 (2009): 398–412.

[30] See, Alfred C. Stepan, "Religion, Democracy, and the 'Twin Tolerations,'" *Journal of Democracy* 11, no. 4 (2000): 37–57.

[31] Andrew Davison, "Turkey, a 'Secular' State?: The Challenge of Description," *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 102, no. 2: 333–350.

Court reasoned that "the principle of secularism that accelerates modernization and from which Turkish Revolution originates aims at keeping the society away from the irrational and unscientific (*akıl ve bilim dışı*) thoughts and judgements." Raised to the level of a "way of life," "environment of civilization," and "philosophy of modernization," Kemalist secularism perpetually attempts to prevent citizens from falling into the immaturity of irrational and unscientific dogmas and emotions of religion. Again, this pedagogic task necessitates controlling religion and relegating it to the visceral:

> "The sovereign power governing the state is not religious rules and necessities but is reason and science. Religion, in its own place—that is, in the conscience—is an issue of belief between God and the human. It is unthinkable to take religion, which is the regulator of one's own interior world of faith, as having a say in state affairs and as the source or basis of legal regulations and hence supplanting modern values and law."

Here it is crucial to note that in translating the concept of secularism differently in the Turkish context and in justifying an illiberal and undemocratic conception of secularism for the Turkish polity, Kemalism still invokes the authority and legitimacy of liberal norms and liberal international order. For the Prosecutor, one fundamental reason why any allusion to shari'a must be banned is that shari'a is "incommensurable with the European public order that Turkey belongs to." The article 3 of the Political Parties Law in Turkey stipulates that all parties must aim at "reaching at the level of modern civilization." Liberal secularism is still the highest norm for Kemalism, yet the religion of the people (Islam) is not apt for it and the Turkish society is not yet ready for it. Hence, paradoxically, liberal secularism must be rejected in Turkey precisely because it is the

ultimate norm to reach. It must be perpetually suspended in order to be able to end up there finally. AK Party should be excluded from the reach of liberal secularism since it does not fulfill its necessary preconditions—prior secularization. Therefore in order to affirm the universality of the norm of secularism as a principle of the guidance of reason and science, the norm should not apply to Turkey and to AK Party. There should first be a long pedagogic process of socialization into Kemalist secularism before any liberal secularism can appear on the horizon. This pedagogy was, in a sense, the Kemalist performativity of secularism.

The Prosecutor argues that since Islam and Christianity are radically different in that the latter is kept "between God and individual" whereas the former seeks to regulate "the rules of state and society" as well, "there is no similarity between the political Islamic parties in Turkey and the Christian democratic parties in Europe." In other words, the European states should not mistake AK Party as a Muslim version of Christian democracy. It is because AK Party is a "political Islamic party" (*siyasal İslamcı*) and "the fundamental maxim (*düstur*) of political Islam is *Shari'a*." Shari'a, he points out, is made up of rules that not only regulate individual faith and "worldly life" but even "state and social life." These rules, he argues, are "not only unchangeable but cannot even be debated." This is why, the Prosecutor claims, "political Islam and *Shari'a* as its constitution are not democratic but totalitarian." To back his argument, he refers to a Constitutional Court ruling which stipulates that "a democratic order is contrary to a *Shari'a* order […] Any regulation that gives weight to religious necessities cannot be democratic. A democratic state can solely be a secular state." Hence, shari'a would mean

nothing but "annihilation of democracy." Noting that there is no democratic state ruled by religious principles, the Prosecutor defines secularism as the way through which "the Turkish people were able to transition from *umma* to nation, from servanthood (*kulluk*) to citizenship." This discourse posits a linear history of stages that reaches its pinnacle in the principle of secularism. Secularism, as the Prosecutor puts it, marks "the final stage of the intellectual and organizational evolution." As a "civilized way of life [that] demolished medieval dogmatism," secularism developed "an understanding of freedom and democracy under the leadership of reason and in the light of science." Since this has already been achieved in the West, understanding secularism as a political doctrine of the separation of religion and state may suffice there. But Islam is different in that it has not yet achieved its own reformation and hence, Turkish society is not yet ready for the full exercise of democratic rights and liberties. It has to be pedagogically socialized into secularism.

1.2. The Authorization of Kemalist Secularism by Liberal International Order: The European Court of Human Rights's Verdict on the Refah Party Case

When AK Party was founded in August 14, 2001, most of its founders were leading members of the Fazilet (*Virtue*) Party (FP), which was dissolved by the Constitutional Court just a few weeks before in June 22, 2001. The Turkish Constitutional Court ruled that the FP became a center for anti-secularist activities by acting as a continuation of the Refah (*Welfare*) Party (RP), which was banned by the

same court in 1998 for the same allegation—being a center for anti-secularist activities.[32] When the Constitutional Court banned the Islamist RP in 1998 a year after the 'soft' military coup in Turkey, the party appealed to the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) in Strasbourg by arguing that its right to free association protected under Article 11 of the European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR) was violated. In July 31, 2001, the ECtHR upheld the Turkish Constitutional Courts' verdict by suggesting that there were "compelling reasons justifying Refah's dissolution and temporary forfeiture of certain political rights imposed" on the party leadership.[33] The Court agreed with the Turkish state that RP had "a long term policy of setting up a regime based on shari'a within the framework of a plurality of legal systems and that Refah did not exclude recourse to force in order to implement its policy." [34] The ECtHR found RP guilty of seeking to establish a "theocratic regime" based on a sharia state within the framework of multiple legal orders. Therefore, Turkish Constitutional Court's dissolution of the Refah Party "met a pressing social need" [35] and that it was neither a disproportionate measure[36] nor was it in violation of Article 11 of the ECHR.[37] On the contrary, the ECtHR

---

[32] It is worth noting here that the allegations the Chief Public Prosecutors put to RP in 1998 and to AK Party in 2007 were essentially the same—that both political parties became a center for anti-secularist activities with a secret aim to establish a shari'a state.
[33] "Case of Refah Partisi (The Welfare Party) and Others v. Turkey" (European Court of Human Rights, February 13, 2003), §135, 41340/98, 41342/98, 41343/98 and 41344/98, http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/pages/search.aspx?i=001-60936#{%22itemid%22:[%22001-60936%22]}. Three of the seven judges dissented to the decision of the ECtHR and found the dissolution of the party as a disproportionate measure. The Refah Party appealed the decision of the ECtHR to the Grand Chamber of the Court. On February 13, 2003, all 17 judges of the Grand Chamber decided with unanimity to uphold the ECTHR's decision that upheld the Turkish Constitutional Court's dissolution of the Refah Party.
[34] Ibid., §132.
[35] Ibid., §106.
[36] Ibid., §132.
[37] Ibid., §136.

concluded that the dissolution of the Refah Party was "necessary in a democratic society"[38] because of the "tangible and immediate danger" it posed to democracy.[39]

What is intriguing here is that the ECtHR completely endorsed the discourse of Kemalist secularism (*laiklik*) which stipulates that secularism in Turkey cannot simply be a political doctrine of separation of religious and state authority but that it should actively seek to control and transform religion because of the particular history of the country and the peculiarities of Islam as a religion. The reasons that the ECtHR considers make the dissolution of Refah "necessary in a democratic society" replicates Kemalism's Orientalist readings of the West and Islam.[40] Despite the fact that since its formulation in 1930s, Kemalism has been a quintessentially illiberal and undemocratic state ideology, it shares with liberalism an Orientalist imaginary, which the European Court of Human Rights vindicates.[41] It was not only the ECtHR that embraced Kemalist secularism and its

---

[38] Ibid., §135.
[39] Ibid., §131.
[40] Here Orientalism refers to the Eurocentric idea that Europe (and the West in general) represent the ultimate stage of human civilization and the East, particularly the Muslim societies, are marked by a number of 'lacks' that prevent them from achieving the status of Western civilization. These lacks mostly relate to the cultures and religious traditions of the East and particularly of Islamic tradition. According to this teleological reading, Islam has failed to achieve Reformation and secularization, and it is one crucial reason why Islamic societies could not catch up with modernization. This Orientalist reading suggests that Islam as a religion is inimical to democracy since it does not separate religion and politics, which is a precondition for democracy. As a result, Islamic societies should better be ruled by 'enlightened despots' who would introduce them into secularism and modernity.
[41] The strategy of Kemalist Orientalism was to repudiate Turkey's geography—the 'East' or 'Middle East.' The reason was not that Kemalists saw these terms as Eurocentric—which they indeed were—but that they saw Turkey as "the representative of the West in the East" and as "the nation that triumphed Western civilization in the East." Kemalist Orientalism assumed a "civilizing mission" toward all sectors of society who still carried the backward traditions and conventions of Islam. (Turk Ocaklari Mesai Programi 1926) The official Turkish History Thesis developed in 1930s argued that the founders of Western civilization were proto-Turks, hence Turks should be considered part of Western civilization and not the East. As Sukru Hanioglu notes, in the imaginary of "Turkish Orientalism" East (and by implication Islam) came to mean a society that is "sluggish, ignorant, static, linguistically and culturally primitive, closed to any kind of innovation, and immersed in superstitions." See, Hanioglu, "The Historical Roots of Kemalism"; Sukru Hanioglu, "Türk Oryantalizmi'nin 'Doğu'su Olarak Ortadoğu," *Sabah.com.tr*, accessed October 5, 2013, http://www.sabah.com.tr/Yazarlar/hanioglu/2013/05/19/turk-oryantalizminin-dogusu-olarak-ortadogu.

dissolution of the Islamist RP, but the liberal international order as a whole offered its tacit or explicit approval. There were no significant criticisms of the Turkish Constitutional Court's verdict to dissolve the RP (and later the ECtHR's upholding of that verdict) from any of the individual states of Europe and North America, the EU and its many institutions, international institutions, and non-governmental human rights organizations.

The ECtHR backs the Kemalist claim that because of the special historical and actual circumstances of the country, the Turkish state is justified in assigning "a special role" for secularism in Turkey.[42] It reiterates "the importance of the principle of secularism for the democratic system in Turkey"[43] and considers that "in light of its historical experience" Turkey can prevent "the political movements based on religious fundamentalism" from seizing power.[44] The ECtHR concurs with the Constitutional Court's observation that secularism is "one of the indispensable conditions of democracy" and backs the Turkish state's claim that secularism must be safeguarded "on account of the country's historical experience and the specific features of Islam."[45] This necessitates an interventionist secularism that goes beyond being a political doctrine but functions as a way of life, philosophy of modernization, acceptance of the guidance of Reason and Science. ECtHR provides its support of this vision of secularism by suggesting that "intervention by the State to preserve the secular nature of the political

[42] "Case of Refah Partisi v. Turkey," §128.
[43] Ibid., §67.
[44] Ibid., §124.
[45] Ibid., §25.

regime had to be considered necessary in a democratic society."[46] Considering "the historical context in which the dissolution of the party concerned took place," the ECtHR affirms the Kemalist state's "general interest in preserving the principle of secularism in that context in the country" in order to "ensure the proper functioning of a 'democratic society.'"[47] Accordingly, the ECtHR fully endorses Kemalist interpretation of "a special secularism" by pointing out the history of the country rooted in "Islamic theocracy" of the Ottoman Empire:

> The Court further observes that there was already an Islamic theocratic regime under Ottoman law. When the former theocratic regime was dismantled and the republican regime was being set up, Turkey opted for a form of secularism which confined Islam and other religions to the sphere of private religious practice. Mindful of the importance for survival of the democratic regime of ensuring respect for the principle of secularism in Turkey, the Court considers that the Constitutional Court was justified in holding that Refah's policy of establishing sharia was incompatible with democracy.[48]

Given the historical background of the country, the Court fully endorses the Kemalist "form of secularism" which relegated Islam to the conscience of the individual. The

---

[46] Ibid., §25.
[47] Ibid., §105. To illustrate the gravity of the threat RP poses to secularism in Turkey, ECtHR refers to some public opinion polls (and it does not cite any source) which is reported to show that the RP's votes, which was 22% in 1995 general elections, could go up to 38% in 1997 (had there been a general election that time) and to 67% in 2001. (§11) This expectation of ever increasing popularity and electoral success was found to be alarming by the ECtHR. (§107) Here the ECtHR drops a cautionary note: "Notwithstanding the uncertain nature of some opinion polls, those figures bear witness to a considerable rise in Refah's influence as a political party and its chances of coming to power alone." (§107) On this particular reference to an unspecified opinion poll, Judge Anatoly Kovler issues a concurring opinion suggesting that he finds it "rather strange" that opinion poll figures, whose use "would be natural in a political analyis," are used "in a legal text which constitutes *res judicata*."
[48] Ibid., §125.

Court later remarks that 'private religious practice'—the sphere of Kemalist secularism's proper place for religion—does not mean private law. Rather, the proper place of religion is individual conscience. As the Court reiterates, "freedom of religion, including the freedom to manifest one's religion by worship and observance, is primarily a matter of individual conscience, and stresses that the sphere of individual conscience is quite different from the field of private law, which concerns the organization and functioning of society as a whole."[49] For example RP's policy suggestion of applying some of sharia's private-law rules "fall outside the private sphere to which Turkish law confines religion" and at the same time "contradicts with the Convention system."[50] Accordingly, the ECtHR finds the Turkish state totally justified in its interventions to control religion and confine it to the realm of the visceral. This relegation of religion to the sphere of individual conscience reaffirms Kemalist secularism. Furthermore, the Court also ruled that in dissolving the RP and in instituting an aggressive form of secularism, the Turkish state "did not go beyond the margin of appreciation left to them under the Convention."[51] In other words, Kemalist secularism as it is interpreted by the state is authorized by the norms of secularism and democracy within the system of European Convention on Human Rights. In that vein, the Court suggested that the Turkish state's ban on wearing headscarf was authorized by the Convention system,[52] and considered RP's demands

[49] Ibid., §128.
[50] Ibid., §127.
[51] Ibid., §110.
[52] The ECtHR relied on the Kemalist argument that encouraging and wearing headscarves in public and educational establishments "exerted pressure on persons who did not follow that practice and created discrimination on the ground of religion or beliefs." (§27)

such as changing the working hours for civil servants to accommodate fasting in Ramadan as in violation of the principle of secularism.[53]

Central to this convergence between the Kemalist state and the ECtHR is their common Orientalist reading of Islamic history and concepts—particularly of shari'a. The Court's political-historical claim that the Ottoman Empire was an "Islamic theological regime" is deeply controversial and rather superficial. Scholars from very different perspectives and disciplines contest such a claim.[54] Just as controversial is the Court's depiction of the RP's goal as establishing a "theocratic regime." In suggesting that "sharia is incompatible with the fundamental principles of democracy"[55] the Court entirely converges with Kemalism's interpretation of Islam and shari'a. The ECtHR brings home this point:

> Like the [Turkish] Constitutional Court, the Court [ECtHR] considers that sharia, which faithfully reflects the dogmas and divine rules laid down by religion, is stable and invariable. Principles such as pluralism in the political sphere or the constant evolution of public freedoms have no place in it. […] It is difficult to declare one's respect for democracy and human rights while at the same time supporting a regime based on sharia, which clearly diverges from Convention [ECHR] values, particularly with regard to its criminal law and criminal procedure, its rules on the legal status of

[53] On November 15, 2005, The ECtHR decided, in the case of Leyla Şahin v. Turkey, that the Turkish state's ban on wearing headscarves in universities did not constitute a violation of the right to education and the right to freedom of religion.
[54] The ECtHR's claim that Ottoman Empire had an "Islamic theocratic regime" is a dubious one and hence its allegation that RP's activities represent a return to this theocratic history is rather weak to form a basis for legal judgement. Many scholars suggest that Ottoman Empire did not have a theocratic regime. Some argue that it practiced a blend of Islamic law with conventional law (töre hukuku) and sultanic decrees. (e.g. Halil Inalcik, Mustafa Şentop) Others maintain that it had a secular ruling structure (e.g. Rifa'at Abou al-Haj) or that it had practiced a "pragmatic and not philosophical" secularism (e.g. Gayatri Spivak 1990). The baseline here is that the ECtHR's ruling is based on a shaky ground.
[55] Ibid., §123.

> women and the way it intervenes in all spheres of private and public life in accordance with religious precepts… In the Court's view, a political party whose actions seem to be aimed at introducing sharia in a State party to the Convention can hardly be regarded as an association complying with the democratic ideal that underlies the whole of the Convention.

Here the Court's representation of sharia as stable, invariable, anti-pluralistic, totalitarian, and essentially contradictory with the fundamental principles of democracy are but excessively broad and problematic generalizations that rest on and reproduce Kemalist Orientalism. Similarly, the Court also makes very problematic claims about the concepts such as 'jihad' ("holy war and the struggle to be waged until the total domination of Islam in society is achieved"[56]) and 'amel-i salih' ("peacetime activities"[57]). Although the way the Court interprets *jihad* is controversial, its translation of *amel-i salih* ('good deeds') as 'peacetime activities' is a gross mistake. According to the Court, Turkey's "historical experience" ('Islamic theocratic regime of the Ottoman Empire') and "the specific features of Islam" ('sharia's incompatibility with democracy and its inherent totalitarian and anti-pluralistic nature')[58] justifies Kemalist secularism that posits secularism as a norm but immediately points to the necessity of deviating from the norm by creating a "special form of secularism"—a decidedly more interventionist and pedagogic one.

[56] Ibid., §130.
[57] Ibid., §33.
[58] Ibid., §25.

2. Challenging Kemalist *Laiklik* through Appropriating Secularism: The Performative Politics of Inclusion and Difference in AK Party's Court Defense

As the Prosecutor's indictment makes it clear, Kemalist discourse at once affirms and rejects the universality of secularism as a norm. It does so by introducing a historical difference into the meaning and practice of secularism. Kemalism argues that secularism in Turkey must be 'different' (and decidedly more pedagogical) in order to control religion and encounter the difference Islam introduces into the social and political life. The liberal international order affirms the universality of liberal secularism on the one hand, yet backs the Kemalist claim that Islam (and by implication Islamist parties) should be evaluated on a different standard. Kemalist claim that European or American secularisms are inapplicable to Turkey is backed by the institutions of liberal international order. This is the Orientalist/Eurocentric middle ground that sutures the secularist pedagogies of the Kemalist state and liberal global governance.

Here is where AK Party's paradox is located: on the one hand, having its roots in Islamism and now identifying itself as a 'conservative democratic' party, it seeks to introduce a difference into secularism and democracy; but on the other it opposes the Kemalist demand for introducing difference into secularism and democracy because of the peculiarities of Islamic history and theology. Paradoxically, AK Party's differential adoption of secularism in the Turkish context rests on the claim that secularism should not be taken differently in different contexts and that it should be harmonious with the 'universal standards' of 'contemporary civilization' to which, AK Party claims, Kemalist

secularism does not live up to. It invokes the authority of "universal norms," "international standards," "international treaties," "global values," and "contemporary civilization" to foreclose the Kemalist attempt to introduce an authoritarian spin to secularism and to garner support from liberal international order in its encounter with Kemalism. AK Party's 'conservative democracy' registers Anglo-American liberal secularism as universal in order to counter the Kemalist claim that Turkey is not yet ready for a more democratic settlement of secularism in which the state opens (rather than closes) the public sphere equally to all citizens. In that sense, AK Party's performative politics of non-normative adoption of secularism is forged from within a process of socialization—that is, through being constituted and enabled by the existing normative matrix of both the Turkish state and liberal international order.

In that vein, AK Party frames its legal-political conflict with Kemalist state not in terms of secularism versus anti-secularism, but rather in terms of "a democratic and pro-freedom" interpretation of secularism versus a "dogmatic" one.[59] That is to say, AK Party does not reject secularism as a political norm but challenges its particular Kemalist instantiation. It launches a challenge to the norm from within the norm. AK Party builds its defense on the argument that the Prosecutor's (hence Kemalist) "interpretation of democracy and secularism is incompatible with the universal understanding."[60] In its reply to the Prosecutor's indictment, AK Party identifies the fundamental issue in that litigation as being "the incompatibility between AK Party's understanding of democratic

[59] "Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi'nin Kapatma Davası Hakkındaki Esas Savunması," June 16, 2008, 16, Esas No: 2008/1 (Siyasi Parti Kapatma).
[60] Ibid., 1.

secularism that is in harmony with universal standards and the Prosecutor's understanding of secularism that objectifies (*nesneleştiren*) the individual and society."[61] AK Party describes the Prosecutor's understanding of secularism as being "entirely problematic, unscientific, unclear, internally contradicting, subjective, not compliant with legal standards, and most importantly, corrosive of the entire principle of secularism that it purports to protect."[62] AK Party argues that the indictment does not advocate the principle of secularism, but rather "it supports a totalitarian ideology, a philosophical opinion, and most dangerously a belief system in competition with others in the name of secularism."[63] As such, it is "not harmonious with social realities and with the universal accumulation (*birikim*) of secular thought."[64] It then goes to great lengths in trying to show in each of the Prosecutor's myriad allegations that the activities that the indictment describes as being "anti-secularist" do not erode but indeed consolidate secularism, properly understood.[65] AK Party's defense stresses that it does not pose a threat to secularism, on the reverse, it has "accelerated the process of its socialization (*sosyalleşme*) through democratizing it."[66] Hence, AK Party seeks to "reinterpret" and "democratize" secularism through challenging its Kemalist meaning and practice.

The Prosecutor, however, takes issue with AK Party's notion of 'democratic secularism' and describes it as an attempt to dilute secularism upon which entire Turkish Republic is founded. For example, the Prosecutor considers Erdoğan's statement that

---

[61] Ibid., 16.
[62] Ibid., 5.
[63] Ibid.
[64] Ibid.
[65] Ibid., 41.
[66] Ibid., 13.

“secularism is an attribute of the state and not of the individual” as one such anti-secular act of dilution that should be severely penalized. The Prosecutor makes it clear that questioning secularism is a Kemalist taboo: "It is fundamentally opposed to the principle of secularism for political parties to express their ideas directed towards emptying or changing the content of the principle of secularism defined in the Constitution." The implication is that it is against secularism to debate secularism. Democratic debate on secularism should not be allowed in order to protect secularism *hence* democracy. Within this formula, secularism is a precondition for democracy, and ‘diluting’ secularism through debate undermines democracy. Therefore, the meaning of democracy should be fixated on Kemalist terms.

In return, AK Party takes issue with the Prosecutor’s unease with the notion of ‘democratic secularism’ and claims that any understanding that is at odds with democratic secularism can protect neither democracy nor secularism.[67] AK Party defines secularism as a “political principle that recognizes different religions and faiths (*inanç*) as a sociological reality and seeks to establish their peaceful coexistence.”[68] Secularism means a state’s “equidistance to all faiths.” As such, secularism is “the implementation of the principle of state neutrality—a principle endorsed by modern democracies—in the field of state-religion relationship.”[69] It claims that this can be achieved only if the state “does not base its political and legal order on the principles of any religion.”[70] For the AK Party, the “modern understanding of secularism requires that state order does not rest

[67] Ibid., 3.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Ibid., 4.
[70] Ibid.

on religious rules and that the state protects the individuals' freedom of belief and conscience."[71]

Opposing the indictment's definition of secularism as "a civilized way of life" and as "an ideal social order," AK Party argues that secularism cannot be a "life-style."[72] Otherwise, it turns into an attempt to govern the "totality" of life.[73] Secularism should instead be taken as "a very important and valuable legal principle for enabling peaceful and free coexistence of different lifestyles."[74] To accept secularism as a life-style would be "to abolish secularism" since it would turn the state into "a totalitarian and imposing state" that would "impose a particular life-style on different segments of society."[75] As such, AK Party argues that defining secularism as a life-style is unconstitutional since it guarantees freedoms and keeps the state neutral.[76] In that sense, AK Party tries to rescue secularism from its Kemalist interpretation.

Furthermore, AK Party insists that secularism also should not turn into another religion. What damages secularism most and "wipes out its legal value" is the attempt to turn it into "a religion, a faith, or a principle that seeks to eliminate others."[77] AK Party quotes the preamble to the Article 2 of the Turkish Constitution which suggests that secularism does not mean atheism (*dinsizlik*) but means that every person can adhere to and practice any faith or sect and that s/he is not subjected to a differential treatment by

---

[71] Ibid.
[72] Ibid., 9.
[73] Ibid., 5.
[74] Ibid., 6.
[75] Ibid., 7.
[76] Ibid., 8.
[77] Ibid., 4.

other citizens because of his/her religious beliefs. By doing so, AK Party invokes the authority of an Anglo-American version of liberal secularism against a Kemalist one. It deploys the norm of secularism against its Kemalist signification.

This amounts to a transgressive move under Kemalist conditions. AK Party lays claim to the norm of secularism from which it is excluded within Kemalist discursive regime. In that sense, AK Party's appropriation of secularism stands as a performative contradiction. Its speech acts endorsing secularism are not authorized by Kemalist secularism, therefore they are 'infelicitous performatives'[78] within the conventions of Kemalist normativity. AK Party's performative politics of differential repetition challenges the authority of the official Kemalist pedagogy of how to properly repeat the norm of secularism and hence what the proper place of religion should be. In doing so, AK Party adopts and resists secularism at once.

In trying to overcome the Kemalist pedagogy of 'not yet' that posits a particular conception of 'proper' religion, secularism, and democracy, AK Party seizes the 'now and here' and challenges Kemalist notions of propriety. Kemalist deferral or suspension of democracy rests on a particular notion of maturity understood as the capacity to exercise the Enlightenment reasoning with absolute belief in science, and this was what the populace utterly lacked according to Kemalist elites, as they were still steeped in religious irrationality. AK Party's appropriation of secularism issues a performative affirmation of the competency and maturity of the people to self-rule, hence subverted the

[78]Sukru Hanioglu, "The Historical Roots of Kemalism," in *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*, ed. Ahmet T. Kuru and Alfred C. Stepan (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 32–60; Sukru Hanioglu, "Türk Oryantalizmi'nin 'Doğu'su Olarak Ortadoğu," *Sabah.com.tr*, accessed October 5, 2013, http://www.sabah.com.tr/Yazarlar/hanioglu/2013/05/19/turk-oryantalizminin-dogusu-olarak-ortadogu.

basis of Kemalist pedagogy.

Much of AK Party's challenge to Kemalist pedagogy is forged through a critique of positivism that Kemalism subscribes to. AK Party rejects the Prosecutor's definition of secularism as a "positivist and rationalist philosophical belief."[79] It claims that the Prosecutor's positivistic notions of "scientific life" and "secularism as life-style" rest on the presumption of a "single correct life-style" embraced and imposed by the state. The Prosecutor's invocation of "a political, social, and cultural life based on science," for the AK Party, is a form of "scientism (*bilimcilik*) that belongs to 19th century positivism." As such, it is "primitive, backwards and out of date in terms of the point that modern science has reached."[80] Furthermore, this is also a feature of "totalitarian ideologies," and the Prosecutor is indeed "defending this [totalitarian] ideology in the name of secularism."[81] For the AK Party, such a "strict positivist and ideological approach" to secularism ends up treating "any difference as a threat and seeks to abolish it, and envisions the individuals and the society as objects who are to be transformed according to pre-determined templates."[82] Here AK Party's reaction to "pre-determined templates" is a critique of the historicist teleology that underpins Kemalism.

In instituting secularism as universal, AK Party ends up affirming the Prosecutor's depiction of secularism as the "final stage of the intellectual and organizational evolution of societies." [83] It is only through elevating liberal secularism to the level of the universal that AK Party can forestall the Kemalist attempt to implement

[79] "AK Parti Esas Savunması," 8.
[80] Ibid., 9.
[81] Ibid., 10.
[82] Ibid., 76.
[83] Ibid., 8.

secularism differently—in a more restrictive and authoritarian way. Invoking liberal secularism's universality—and socialization into it—becomes the condition for an effective challenge to the practice of secularism in Turkey. While elevating secularism to the level of the universal, AK Party at the same time challenges Kemalist secularism's "universalist and positivist logic of uniformity." In other words, while AK Party rejects Kemalist particularism ('liberal secularism does not apply to Turkey,' 'secularism and democracy must be implemented differently') it also rejects its claim to universalism ('Enlightenment reason and science are the sole guides in personal and social life.')

In order to thwart Kemalist pedagogic claims to justify the deferral or suspension of democracy through some reference to unique conditions, AK Party anchors itself in the idea of a secularism at universal standards, which, for it, finds its expression in Anglo-American liberal secularism.[84] It insistently argues that secularism should be implemented in line with 'universal norms' and should not be transformed into a *bon-pour-l'orient* model. Even though it accepts that there are different practices of secularism in Europe,[85] AK Party rejects the Prosecutor's attempt to develop a secularism that is 'proper' and 'unique' to the Turkish context alone. At the same time, AK Party

[84] It should also be noted that AK Party's invocation of a "democratic" and "pro-freedom" secularism is not made in the name of liberalism even when it invokes the authority of secularism practices in the UK and the US. AK Party, defining itself as a 'conservative democratic' party, seeks to widen the space for religion in public life through challenging with the strictures of Kemalism. AK Party adopts a liberal vision of secularism but for purposes that are not rooted in liberalism and not reducible to liberalism. This can even be sensed in its choice of using the term 'pro-freedom' (*özgürlükçü*) instead of liberal in describing its position. In his speech to a group of Egyptian Revolutionary Youth in their visit to the AK Party headquarters, Bülent Turan, an AK Party MP from Istanbul, said: "AK Party has succeeded in translating the conservative values into the language of the age. In that sense, it has made a modern interpretation of classical (*kadim*) Islamic thought and has implemented it successfully." (Interviews by the author, December 11 and December 13, 2011.) Here, Turan claims that although AK Party's politics parallels the liberal notions of state neutrality, it is rooted not in liberalism but in a new interpretation and translation of Islamic political thought.

[85] "AK Parti Esas Savunması," 15.

draws upon the same idea that there are different secularisms in Europe and the U.S. in arguing that Kemalist secularism is only one interpretation that may be criticized and modified. For the AK Party, "the idea that 'our secularism is unique to us' can only ground anti-democratic positions." The only uniqueness of Turkish secularism has been the "production of anti-democratic interpretations […] that amounts to a defense of dictatorship of a minority"[86] Secularism should rather be taken as "a universal repertoire." (*birikim*)

In that sense, the Prosecutor's pedagogic politics rests on a performative appropriation of secularism for the Turkish context, and AK Party's performative politics of challenging Kemalist pedagogy rests on the invocation of the authority and universality of another—liberal—secularism. AK Party challenged Kemalist secularism's claim to universality, but only at the cost of affirming the universality of liberal secularism. As the sovereign constitutional norm of the Turkish state, Kemalist secularism was above the law. It could create exceptions to law and could overturn democracy in order to protect itself. For Kemalism, the universal essence of secularism was a life-style based on positivistic belief in science and reason, and suspending law was justified to secure this universal essence. Hence, what we have here is a complex negotiation of the universality of secularism and of the kinds of differences that can legitimately be introduced into a national context. Hence, a straightforward narrative of socialization that tries to understand AK Party's appropriation of secularism through the simple binary of acceptance or resistance does not capture the ways in which AK Party both inhabits and displaces the norm. Similarly, taking socialization as transition into the

[86] Ibid.

normalizing pedagogy of norms does not account for the ways in which norms can be adopted non-normatively.

AK Party insistently claims that the Prosecutor's "interpretation of democracy and secularism (*laiklik*) is incompatible the universal understanding."[87] On the contrary, AK Party argues that the Prime Minister Erdoğan's statement that 'secularism is a feature of the state and not of the individual' "reflects the modern understanding of secularism yet is regarded as anti-secular in the indictment."[88] AK Party describes its understanding of secularism as being "completely compatible with the pro-freedom (*özgürlükçü*) [89] interpretation of secularism of modern democratic societies" Defending the totalitarian idea of a scientific and correct life-style, as AK Party claims the Prosecutor does, "directly goes against the modern world and the dominant scientific understanding of today."[90] The Prosecutor's vision of proper religion as being relegated to the individual conscience, lived within the walls of the mosque, completely cut off from worldly affairs, and experienced in a way that cannot form any social and cultural webs is rejected as having "no equivalent in any of the Western democratic secular systems."[91] Overall, the understanding of religion and especially of Islam in the indictment is criticized as being a product of "a reductionist and dogmatic ideology [which] contradicts the outlook of our global world on religious feelings and phenomena and also the stage that humanity has reached in the freedoms of belief and expression."[92]

---

[87] Ibid., 3.
[88] Ibid.
[89] It is worth noting that the text uses the term 'pro-freedom' (*özgürlükçü*) instead of 'liberal.'
[90] "AK Parti Esas Savunması," 10.
[91] Ibid., 12.
[92] Ibid.

In that vein, the norms, conventions, and treaties of the European Union figure as prominent sources of authority in AK Party's defense. It argues that it is a "clear and simple fact that a party that took so many important steps toward EU integration cannot be a hub for anti-secularism."[93] To make its case stronger, AK Party refers to the EU Progress Reports that speak highly about the party's reforms to meet with the Copenhagen political criteria regulating the fields of democracy, rule of law, and human rights. "By struggling to elevate its domestic legal system to European standards and to EU's legal order," AK Party argues that it seeks to "adapt to universal law" (*evrensel hukuk*).[94] To show its commitment to these standards, AK Party disowns the idea of multiple legal orders, which incorporates shari'a into legal order.[95] It claims that it has strengthened the legal dimension of secularism by "adapting the main order of the state to European standards."[96] It suggests that it is merely a misperception to see a political party as "violating the principle of secularism" which indeed "has modernized the social, legal, political, and economic orders of the state by adapting it to the European law, and has expanded the sphere of religious freedom as a second pillar of secularism."[97]

In contrast to the Prosecutor's attempt to foreclose the meaning of secularism, AK Party notes that "secularism is being debated all over the world"[98] and seeks to open it to discussion and toward different meanings. In order to be able to do that, it once again invokes the authority of European standards to appropriate Kemalism's single claim to

---

[93] Ibid., 15.
[94] Ibid., 60.
[95] Ibid.
[96] Ibid., 14.
[97] Ibid.
[98] Ibid., 15.

Europeanize the country and to garner the support of liberal international audience. It gives the example that secularism was one of the most important issues in the debates over European Constitution. It is only through claiming to fit within the parameters of European debates that AK Party feels that it can garner the authority to challenge Kemalist secularism. The indictment stipulates that "in the face of the founding philosophy and basic constitutional rules of the Turkish Republic that Ataturk founded, it is impossible to open secularism to debate and to question its legitimacy and applicability."[99] For AK Party, the indictment "does not come to terms with the fact that secularism as a phenomenon democratized over time."[100] Secularism is a "dynamic concept" that democratized in the process of the democratization of states. This even happened in France where "secularism is implemented in the most strict way."[101] Through time secularism got rid of "radical and militant applications and attained a democratic posture by respecting the freedom of conscience and religion more."[102] By "highlighting the pro-freedom interpretation of secularism," AK Party seeks to open up Kemalist *laiklik* to debate.

AK Party challenges the Prosecutor's claim that the true place of religion is individual conscience. To begin with, this understanding of religion is "incongruent with the sociological reality."[103] The perception of religion that grounds the Prosecutor's understanding of secularism is "far away from the sociological phenomenon of religion in

[99] Ibid., 11.
[100] Ibid., 13.
[101] Ibid.
[102] Ibid.
[103] Ibid., 11.

real life."[104] It is one thing, for the AK Party, "to have religion as the fulcrum for legal regulations", but another thing to have it as "a source of value and action for believing people in their individual and communal lives."[105] AK Party insists that the indictment is internally contradictory since it refers to religion as a social institution but also purports that in a secular state religion cannot intervene in worldly affairs. The Prosecutor depicts secularism as a principle that transforms the servant (*kul*) into an individual (*birey*). The word 'kul', however, has two meanings in Turkish, one being the servant of God (in Arabic '*abd*) and the other as subject (of a ruler). The indictment uses the term without differentiating its two meanings, and hence, in a way, alluding to both. AK Party suggests that "if what is meant by the word 'individual' is to cut off all relationship with the Creator, then it is obvious that there is no chance that religion can exist even in the conscience of the individual in a secular system."[106]

3. Translating Lifeworlds: Secularism, Democracy, and Negotiation of Cultural Difference in AK Party's Political Imaginary

In his speech to a delegation of Egyptian Youth, Bülent Turan, an AK Party MP for Istanbul and an erstwhile youth leader in the banned Refah Party, argued that AK Party "has succeeded in translating conservative values into the language of the age." He suggested that it has "developed and successfully implemented a modern interpretation of

[104] Ibid., 12.
[105] Ibid., 11.
[106] Ibid.

classical Islamic thought."[107] For him, the party has "internalized conservative values but at the same time received and synthesized global values." This is why, he argues, it is not possible to "squeeze AK Party into the confines of any single ideological framework." In doing so, Turan points out, "AK Party is both in power with popular vote but at the same time in opposition—in opposition to the system." And he adds that AK Party's split position of being at once in power and in opposition is valid for both domestic and international politics. In domestic politics, he notes, AK Party "has deciphered the dirty nature of the struggle between the center and the periphery, and returned the power to the people that was usurped from them by the power elites in the center." In international politics, it is "trying to make Turkey once again a center country that has been put on the periphery after the Second World War." As such, AK Party is "both harmonious with and challenging against the global system." It is "putting a mirror to the hypocricies, cruelties, double standards, and injustices of the [global] system."[108]

If AK Party is translating "conservative values into the language of the age" by developing "a modern interpretation of classical Islamic thought," as Turan claims it does, then what are the terms, modalities, and content of this translation? İbrahim Kalın, a professor of Islamic philosophy and the Chief Advisor to Prime Minister on Foreign Affairs, argues that Islamism had a "parochial language" that spoke only to the "insiders." "But now," he notes, "we must develop a universal language [that speaks] through concepts that has become common (*müşterek*) to all." In other words, Kalın is pointing to the necessity of a politics of translation that will give voice to the

[107] Bülent Turan's speech titled 'The Main Philosophical Components of AK Party Politics' delivered to a delegation of Egyptian youth in December 2011. I attained the text of that speech during our interview.
[108] Bülent Turan, Interview by the author, interview by the author, December 13, 2011.

reinterpreted and reclaimed Islamic tradition through categories that have become common to humanity. This notion of translation as speaking through common categories is at once a recovery of the Islamic tradition and an affirmation of the possibility of the universal. Kalın argues that

> "Islamic civilization in the classical age had a universal language. We have the idea of the dignity of the human in our tradition. While exploring these [our tradition] we are coming into contact with the modern liberal internationalist language. And this [contact] is facilitating our work. Why should we abandon that? It is only natural that it can at times parallel and at times conflict [with liberalism]."

In other words, it is not a particular concern for Kalin that the outcome of this process of the reinterpretation of Islamic tradition would run alongside or away from liberalism. "Fusions and intersections can always happen," he notes: "Why should we shun these [fusions and intersections with liberal language]?" For example, on the question of whether wearing headscarf is to be defended as a 'human right' or as 'God's command,' Kalın suggests, "these are false dichotomies. It is both. It is both a human right and God's command."[109] For him this is indicative of the mistaken logic of saying "if I'm a Muslim then I'm nothing else." And Islamism very much relied on such a "conflictual and sharp attitude." (*çatışmacı ve keskin tavır*) However, Kalın notes that this attitude is "quite modern." Islamic tradition, he argues, "has always had multiple layers."[110]

---

[109] Many scholars and journalists argue that defending the right to wear headscarf as a human right instead of as a religious obligation is a radical departure from Islamism and a move toward a liberal post-Islamism. For an example, see Dagi, "Rethinking Human Rights, Democracy, and the West."

[110] Classical scholars, for example, could simultaneously be mystics, theologians, and *hadith* scholars—three traditions that are usually thought in tension with each other. İbrahim Kalın, Interview by the author, December 22, 2011.

Here Kalın makes a clear case for cultural translation as a modality of engaging the concepts of liberal modernity from within Islamic tradition. The problem with Islamism's "binary thinking" and "conflictual and sharp attitude" is indeed a problem of not lending itself to a politics of cultural translation. The idea of 'being a Muslim and nothing else' is that it rests on the idea of incommensurability. Such a position forecloses the possibility of a translation across concepts and lifeworlds since it renders them hermetically sealed and radically different totalities. Kalın clearly rejects such a politics of anti-translation. On the other hand, he also refuses the idea of a translation as equivalence—that cultures can be mapped onto each other. Rather, he endorses a politics of translation that is both the possibility of reaching a universal and of producing difference. He rejects the idea of equivalence (liberal pedagogic socialization) and incommensurability (both Islamist and liberal versions of 'clash of civilizations' argument)[111], and instead affirms "universal concepts common to all" while recognizing the possibility that it is productive of irreducible difference. In that sense translation is a performative production of difference.

This politics of cultural translation is also evident in Ahmet Davutoğlu's extensive writings on Islamic civilization, secularism, and democracy.[112] Davutoğlu reinterprets Islamic tradition in the light of modern categories while trying to retain its irreducible difference. Hence, similar to Kalın, his vision of translation rests neither on

---

[111] Tariq Ali, *The Clash of Fundamentalisms: Crusades, Jihads and Modernity* (London: Verso, 2002).
[112] Davutoğlu is the Foreign Minister of Turkey and the architect of AK Party's foreign policy doctrine, who also served as the Chief Advisor to Prime Minister since the party's coming to power in 2002. His article was published two years before the party's establishment; hence it sheds light on the political imaginary that leads to the formation of AK Party's political identity. Davutoğlu was not affiliated with any part at the time he wrote this article.

the idea of incommensurability (hence the impossibility of translation) nor on equivalency (that cultures can be mapped onto each other through a third term). Rather, Davutoğlu engages in a process of cultural translation in which contesting universals come to recognize and interact with each other.

In that vein, in his 1999 article titled "Globalization, Mentality Crisis and Democracy," Davutoğlu starts with refusing the question of 'compatibility' between Islam and democracy. For him, Islam is a comprehensive belief system that "provides individuals with a consciousness of being," and hence, it can be neither in "absolute harmony" nor in "absolute contradiction" with any political, social, or economic mechanism. Trying to prove it either way ends up in a "methodological cul-de-sac."[113] Instead, one can examine whether "the basic parameters of the mentality and the social norms that breed from this belief system is compatible with the fundamental presuppositions of a mechanism."[114]

For Davutoğlu, the fundamental mistake in analyzing this complicated question lies in "the Eurocentric reading of history [which] identifies human history with the history of the West and renders non-Western societies history-less through an object-subject relationship." [115] Such an "egocentric self-perception" creates a "clear-cut polarization between the West as the subject having the power to lead history and the

---

[113] Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Küreselleşme, Zihniyet Bunalımı ve Demokrasi," in *İslam ve Demokrasi* (İstanbul: Ensar Neşriyat, 2000), 89.
[114] Ibid.
[115] "Buradaki temel celiski insanlik tarihini Bati tarihi ile ozdeslestiren ve bu anlamda bir tur ozne-nesne iliskisi cercevesinde Bati-disi toplumlari tarihsizlestiren bir bakis acisinda yatmaktadir." ("The main contradiction here lies in the imaginary that identifies the history of the West with the history of humanity and that de-historicizes non-Western societies through a subject-object relationship.") Ibid., 99.

Rest as the passive objects of this historical process."[116] He maintains that the established paradigm of history presumes the universality of the historical trajectory of the West starting with Ancient Greece, passing through Rome, Christianity and Medieval Age and arriving at "modern and secular age". This approach, according to Davutoğlu, "imagines a single and standard secularism and places it at the heart of modernity."[117]

What is crucial here is that Davutoğlu's criticism of a singular and fixed conception of secularism is not a rejection of secularism per se. Rather, he effectively provincializes secularism. He recognizes secularism as a product of European history, hence it is not to be turned into a teleological necessity and precondition for democracy. However, its European origin is not a sufficient reason to disown it. While opposing the imposition of a frozen notion of secularism—which tacitly but clearly refers to Kemalist *laiklik*—Davutoğlu at the same time argues that Islamic political thought allows a "rational" and "humane" conception of political authority which can be deemed akin to secularism.

Here, Davutoğlu makes a distinction between two conceptions of secularism. First is the one that builds on the nineteenth century positivist idea of 'stages' of thinking. Within this Eurocentric vision, Western historical experience comes to define the universal moment, and secularism is understood as a belief in science and reason against religion.[118] Davutoğlu levels multiple critiques against this narrative. First, the "civilizational crisis" the West is going through and the philosophical discrediting of the

---

[116] Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Philosophical and Institutional Dimensions of Secularization: A Comparative Analysis," in *Islam and Secularism in the Middle East*, ed. Azzam Tamimi and John L. Esposito (New York: New York University Press, 2000), 172.
[117] Davutoğlu, "Küreselleşme, Zihniyet Bunalımı ve Demokrasi," 99–100.
[118] This is also the line of argumentation and definition of secularism in the Prosecutor's indictment.

"absolutist claims of modernity" render the positivist project unsustainable. Second, "taking secularism as an absolute standard with universal validity" and consequently turning secularism into an "ideology" and into "an alternative faith system" contradict with the pluralist ethos of democracy. It effectively excludes non-Western societies' experiences and creates hierarchies on the basis of standards derived from Western history. Third, and related to this last point, reducing secularism to "the standard schemes of dogmatic/radical French experience" dissociates secularism from its "rational kernel."[119]

Contrary to the positivist, ideological, and even theological secularism ('secularism as an alternative religion') that Kemalist *laiklik* is built on, the second conception of secularism, Davutoğlu argues, despite emerging out of the European context, has some important overlaps with the Islamic conception of political authority. He claims that "contrary to Christianity which gave rise to secularism out of a dialectical opposition within itself, Islam does not exclude rational political mentality and institutionalization."[120] There is a "clear epistemological basis" in Islamic tradition to construe the legitimacy of political power on humane and rational basis. In that sense, secularist emphasis on human authority is not alien to Islamic tradition. Indeed, he argues that it lies at the very root of it. He supports this claim with the example of Abu Bakr's selection as the first Caliph immediately after the death of Prophet Mohammad. Even though the Prophet's political authority was unique in terms of his position as God's messenger, Abu Bakr's political authority was based solely on the consensus of the

[119] Davutoğlu, "Küreselleşme, Zihniyet Bunalımı ve Demokrasi," 101.
[120] Ibid.

community (*ijma*) and hence humane. Even though Abu Bakr enjoyed the same rights and obligations as political ruler, he never claimed any metaphysical status. This marks a "transition from a metaphysically-based political authority to a rational political authority resting on the participation of individuals." It exemplifies the transformation of the Prophet's metaphysical authority into "a political and social authority produced among people."[121]

This, for Davutoğlu, was not the case in Christianity since St. Paul, which centuries later stirred a backlash and produced secularism through its internal tensions. Besides, Islam never had an institution like the Church that claimed a metaphysical authority in the first place.[122] It also did not have religious wars within it that can be comparable to the ones in Europe. In addition, non-Muslims and particularly people of the book (Christians and Jews) were granted communal autonomy in Islamic tradition. [123] For him, these are but some of the reasons why it is a mistake to project European history as universal and singular. Despite these historical differences between Western Christianity's historical trajectory that produced secularism and Islamic tradition (especially the experience of the Ottoman Empire), there are crucial elements in Sunni Islamic tradition that posit "rationality" and "humaneness" as the basis of political authority. These different historical experiences—divergences and convergences—constitute the grounds for a cultural translation of secularism and democracy.

---

[121] Ibid.
[122] Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Medeniyetlerin Ben-Idraki," *Divan Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi*, no. 1 (1997): 1–53; Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Bunalımdan Dönüşüme Batı Medeniyeti ve Hristiyanlık," *Divan Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi*, no. 2 (2000): 1–74.
[123] Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Tarih İdraki Oluşumunda Metodolojinin Rolü: Medeniyetlerarası Etkileşim Açısından Dünya Tarihi ve Osmanlı," *Divan Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi*, no. 2 (1999): 1–63.

Davutoğlu argues that because of the trace of Western Christian history in secularism, turning it into a universal precondition for democracy is highly problematic. Reducing democracy to secularism makes it difficult to transform democracy into a "common experience of humanity." The turning of secularism into "an alternative religion," for him, contributed to the failure of the global discourse of democracy "to institute an inclusive and universal value system."[124] In other words, positing secularism as a precondition derails the universality of democracy. For Davutoğlu, "ontological equality and freedom" constitute the universal essence of democracy. Hence, "the transfer of its formal aspects to non-Western societies" puts the latter's "life-worlds" at risk and faces them with "the paradox of de-historicization." (*tarihsizleşme açmazı*)[125] He points out that even in the Western experience, there is not one but multiple modalities of interaction between democracy and different "value systems."[126] To miss these different trajectories and to fixate democracy on an "ideological" notion of secularism is to "attribute a meta-historical meaning to both secularism and democracy."[127] Democracy then should not be taken as "static." Rather, it is undergoing "one of the most dynamic process in its history" since the "linear relations between capitalism, democracy, and secularism are being disentangled and the internal contradictions among these three constitutive institutions of European nation-state formation are weakening their inner

[124] Davutoğlu, "Küreselleşme, Zihniyet Bunalımı ve Demokrasi," 94.
[125] Ibid., 99.
[126] Ibid., 103.
[127] Ibid., 104.

fabric which were interconnected within the frame of positivism and progressivist (*ilerlemeci*) understanding of history."[128]

Here Davutoğlu raises a double critique: first, of the Kemalist discourse, and second, of the liberal universalist discourse. In other words, Davutoğlu levels a critique against the secularisms advocated by both the liberal global governance and the Turkish Kemalist state. For him, both converge on an Orientalist and Eurocentric reading of history in general. He points out that "the modernizers of Turkey in the early decades of this century adopted the process of modernization in the belief that it was an inevitable universal phenomenon, with secularization as its rational essence." [129]

Hence, Davutoğlu neither rejects secularism and democracy, nor signs on to the pedagogy of their Kemalist or liberal articulations. Rather he engages in a project of translation. This project of translation is an affirmative response to the question he asks in the article: "Will democracy remain only as an experience of Western societies or will it be the common experience of humanity?" This, according to Davutoğlu, brings forth the question of the relationship between "the lifeworlds of non-Western societies and the philosophy and practice of democracy."[130] This reference to "life-worlds of non-Western societies" seeks to introduce the difference of Islamic political tradition in the Turkish context into the concept of secularism and democracy that carry the trace of European history, yet at the same time invokes the authority and universality of what Davutoğlu takes to be the essence of democracy ("ontological equality and freedom") and

---

[128] Ibid., 89.
[129] Davutoğlu, "Philosophical and Institutional Dimensions of Secularization: A Comparative Analysis," 170.
[130] Davutoğlu, "Küreselleşme, Zihniyet Bunalımı ve Demokrasi," 99.

secularism ("rational legitimation of political authority"). Therefore, cultural translation is the only way secularism and democracy can attain a universal significance and relevance ("the common experience of humanity"). Closing it to translation and imposing a fixed meaning of secularism and democracy by foreclosing its other possible meanings will render it "only an experience of Western societies." In that sense, he provincializes secularism. He challenges the positing of secularism as universal and religions as local since this "ignores the universal values of religions," yet at the same time, he finds in secularism a potentially universalizable kernel, which for him is the rational/human legitimacy of political authority—locating himself and speaking within Islamic tradition.

He refuses the Eurocentric and Orientalist narrative that depicts modernization as "civilizational conversion,"—which is, again, common to the discourses and practices of both the Kemalist state and liberal international order—yet at the same time pushes for exploring the points of overlaps or 'equivalences' between different social imaginaries. The question, for him, is to figure out how to make the political institutions produced in Western civilization's historical experience harmonious (*uyumlu*) with Islamic worldview. This is "the biggest challenge facing Islamic political thought," that is transforming Islam's "egalitarian and liberatory existence-knowledge-value paradigm into a universally valid political culture and institutionalization."[131]

While calling for and practicing translation, Davutoğlu also acknowledges the conditions under which cultural translation takes place. Davutoğlu emphasizes two coexisting dynamics: First, Western modes of thinking and organization have come to

[131] Ibid., 108.

dominate the world and formed the conditions upon which any alternative can be thought of. It is these conditions upon which cultural translation will take place: "The non-Western societies, including the Islamic world, face the necessity of reinterpreting their traditions and experiences on the basis of the existing historical-spatial terrain."[132] Second, there is now a "civilizational resurgence" in almost every major cultural basin toward reclaiming their history and agency, which defies the narratives of endism—end of history, end of idelogies, end of religion, so on.[133] In other words, the constitutive and transformative power of modern conditions are unmistakable,[134] but at the same time the door must be open to an agentic space through performatively appropriating the concepts and institutions of modernity in translating local concepts into these categories. While doing this, he also tries to abstain from positing these categories as universal and cultural life-worlds as local. Rather, he wants to institute the universality of these institutions through processes of translation, which, inevitably and willfully, transforms both languages.

This line of reasoning frames democracy as at once a universal value and a particular institutional arrangement. Yet, speaking especially for the context of the Muslim world, Davutoğlu ties the question of the universality of democracy to the question of secularism. He suggests, "clinging to an absolutist (*mutlakçı*) neo-secular understanding within a modernist framework obstructs the process of reinterpreting

---

[132] Ibid., 102.
[133] For Davutoğlu's critique of the "theses of endism" (*sonculuk tezleri*), see Davutoğlu, "Bunalımdan Dönüşüme Batı Medeniyeti ve Hristiyanlık," 1–12.
[134] David Scott forcefully makes this argument about the necessity of attending to the productive and positive dimensions of power, more than focusing on restrictive and negative dimension. See, Scott, *Conscripts of Modernity*. I discuss this at more length in Chapter 3.

democracy in an inclusive/comprehensive (*kuşatıcı*) and universal way."[135] For him, secularism did emerge together with the nation-state form, capitalism and democracy, yet their interconnections are getting looser and internally contradictory. In order for democracy to diffuse as a global norm, it should accept the provinciality of European experience. Otherwise, an approach that "reduces the repertoire of humanity to the experience of the West and then justifies it through a globalization discourse stifles the life-worlds of local cultural and civilizational basins on the one hand, and hinders the harmonization of democratic mechanisms with local textures of mentality on the other."[136] In that sense, Davutoğlu stresses the need to resist "sacralizing" (*kutsamak*) democracy as "a static good" (*statik iyi*) or a fixed recipe—especially in a world in which "Western societies are trying to overcome the crisis of representative democracy." "When looked beyond its legitimizing enchantment," Davutoğlu argues, "democracy is going through a transformation in multiple dimensions which necessitates its redefinition in both its universal meaning and local practices."[137] Yet at the same time he affirms democracy's universality. But its universality can only be instituted if it opens itself to the possibility of local appropriations and interpretations. Put differently, Davutoğlu comes to suggest that only through cultural translation can democracy democratically assert itself as a global norm and a universal value.

Hence, Davutoğlu's negotiation of democracy and secularism speaks of a particular mode of socialization into these categories. It affirms these norms while putting at risk the normalizing logic and power of these norms. It affirms their universality while

[135] Davutoğlu, "Küreselleşme, Zihniyet Bunalımı ve Demokrasi," 110.
[136] Ibid., 111.
[137] Ibid., 110.

exposing their particularity. It does not give up on the universals, yet also does not subscribe to their liberal or Kemalist significations. In that sense, it does not submit to the normalizing pedagogies of these norms. Rather, it enacts a performative appropriation. He rejects both the "neo-secular globalist discourse" (read liberal pedagogy) and "autarkic and cynic religious discourse." (read Islamist rejection)[138] The former is a story of absorption, subsumption, transition, and pedagogic socialization. The latter is one of rejection and clash of hermetically-sealed civilizations. Davutoğlu's account is a negation of both. His narrative makes a double call: first, for a reinterpretation of the political norms of modernity in a more egalitarian and open way; second, for a reinterpretation of non-Western historical traditions and experiences on the basis of "the existing historical-spatial plane."[139]

Despite his critique of the idea (shared by both liberal global discourse and Kemalist discourse) that secularism is a precondition for democracy for its marginalization of non-Western traditions, he comes to affirm a particular understanding of secularism as a basic pillar of democracy. In the Al-Ahram Weekly's interview with him, he suggests that "the rational legitimacy of political power" is one of the four fundamental principles of a democracy—others are participation, accountability, and elections.[140] In his 1999 article, Davutoğlu argues that non-positivist and non-ideological model of secularism rests on the idea that political authority is rational and humane and that this mode of secularism overlaps with the experience of Islamic tradition. In other

---

[138] Ibid., 102.
[139] Ibid.
[140] Ahmet Davutoğlu, Harmonising Immutable Values and Ever-changing Mechanisms, interview by Omayma Abdel-Latif, Al-Ahram Weekly Online, November 11, 2004, http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/716/focus.htm.

words, taking secularism as the synonym of "rational legitimacy of political power," Davutoğlu effectively posits secularism as one of the four basic pillars of democracy. In that sense, while criticizing the idea of turning secularism into a precondition for democracy, Davutoğlu institutes a particular secularism—one that he takes compatible with Sunni Islamic tradition—as key feature, if not precondition, of democracy. Therefore, his critique is not to reject secularism, democracy, and their interrelationship, but to open up space for cultural negotiation and translation of these categories.

Crucial to Davutoğlu's treatment of democracy is the way he locates the question of Islam and democracy within its global and international context. He points to the double standards operative in the discourses and practices of liberal global governance on the question of democracy in the Muslim world. He criticizes Western states' support for autocratic regimes in the Muslim world in the name of stability and contrasts it to the same countries' support for democratization in the post-Soviet countries. He points to the cynic irony that it is those who staunchly support dictatorships in the Middle East who also fervently support the idea of a supposed 'incompatibility' between Islam and democracy. More recently, commenting on the Western countries' tacit support for the July 3, 2013 military coup in Egypt, Davutoğlu described their attitude as 'neo-orientalist': "While the West supports democratic demands in Eastern Europe, she thinks it can be lived with autocratic regimes when it comes to the Middle East. This is neo-orientalism. But the Arab world got the taste of democracy, there is no return."[141]

[141] "Avrupa ülkeleri Mısır'da Neo Oryantalist davrandı," *Star Gazetesi*, July 18, 2013, http://haber.stargazete.com/politika/avrupa-ulkeleri-misirda-neo-oryantalist-davrandi/haber-773188.

Despite his criticism of the double standards in world politics on the question of democracy in the Muslim world, Davutoğlu considers democracy as "the most prominent global value in current international order."[142] Democracy functions as "a magical concept legitimizing different political systems."[143] However, the tacitly governing model of democracy in today's world is a version of Athenian democracy based on "ontological unfreedom" (the institution of slavery) and "ontological inequality" (the category of the metic). Through these institutions most Athenians were excluded from the exercise of democratic rights.[144] In addition, Western support for authoritarian regimes in the Muslim world for strategic considerations reveal that democracy is instrumentalized and taken as a universal value only for some, hence, not genuinely universal. Similarly, the ambivalent situation of non-European immigrants in Europe, for Davutoğlu, undermines the liberal discourse of democracy. All in all, he asserts that "the discourses of globalization and democracy that legitimize the existing understanding of hierarchical and exclusionary political order" lacks the "philosophical depth" that would provide "ontological equality and freedom."[145]

In an interview he gave to Egypt's Al-Ahram Weekly in 2004, Ahmet Davutoğlu, then chief advisor to the prime minister, was asked about whether Muslim intellectuals could develop an 'Islamic democracy' by fusing Islamic and Western democratic ideals. His response to this question starts with a distinction between values and mechanisms.

---

[142] Davutoğlu, "Küreselleşme, Zihniyet Bunalımı ve Demokrasi," 97.
[143] Ibid., 109.
[144] For Davutoğlu, at the international level the international institutions such as the UN Security Council and G-7 (now G-8) are but manifestations of an outlook that translates inequalities in economic and political power into ontological inequalities. See, Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Civilizational Transformation and the Muslim World* (Mahir Publ. Sdn. Bhd., 1994).
[145] Davutoğlu, "Küreselleşme, Zihniyet Bunalımı ve Demokrasi," 94.

For him, Islam does not stipulate a particular mode of government and hence opens a vast space for Muslims for devising mechanisms of rule: "Al-Qur'an Al-Karim contains no detailed or given political mechanism which Muslims must adhere to." Rather, what the Qur'an provides is "the values of the political system—justice, dignity, equality and freedom—but it does not impose any particular political mechanism on human beings, because political systems are subject to change over time."[146] For Davutoğlu democracy as a mechanism rests on four principles, and none of them contradicts the core values of Islam: "(i) the rational legitimacy of political power; (ii) political participation as a way of creating political power; (iii) political and legal accountability of political leaders; and (iv) the possibility of changing political power through elections." These mechanisms, however, "must further the core values of Islam". These core values, Davutoğlu argues, are the "Maqasyd," more commonly known as Maqasid al-Shari'a, or, the Purposes of Shari'a.[147] These core values and goals of shari'a, as Davutoğlu enumerates in the interview, are protection of life, intellect, generation, religion, property, and realisation of justice. For him "any mechanism can be legitimate as long as it achieves these values."[148] He gives the example of the different ways in which the first four Righteous

[146] He gives the example of Al-Mawardi's *Ahkam al-Sultaniya*, one of the most authoritative sources of Sunni Islamic political thought since eleventh century, which takes monarchy, a mechanism of rule adopted from Roman, Byzantine, and Persian empires, as a legitimate model of governance. Davutoğlu, Harmonising Immutable Values and Ever-changing Mechanisms.

[147] This refers to a body of Islamic jurisprudence developed in thirteenth century that inductively identifies overarching purposes of shari'a as a template to guide particular interpretations.

[148] He does not use the word 'shari'a' since, probably, that would cause legal trouble in Turkey, but he does use the term 'maqasid' and argues that mechanisms that observe and foster these principles of the shari'a can well be deemed legitimate.

Caliphs came to power after the Prophet[149] indicating the possibility of a "flexible and innovative approach to institutionalization."[150] And the task for Muslim scholars "is to identify those political mechanisms which are best able to realise the universal values of Islam."

Here, Davutoğlu effectively construes democracy as one possible mechanism to achieve the purposes of Islamic Shari'a. Yet at the same time, he resists the instrumentalization of democracy—in two senses: first, its strategic use by hegemonic powers for pursuing material interests, and second, its reduction to a mere mechanism stripped of its core constitutive values—that is equality and freedom, together with the four others mentioned above. Davutoğlu first makes an analytical separation between values and mechanisms in thinking about democracy, but then blurs that distinction by suggesting that all mechanisms are sedimentations of particular values. After tacitly recognizing the difficulty of neatly separating values and mechanisms, he goes on to assert a "hierachy" between the two. For him, there is a "hierarchical distinction" between "substance" and "form," which in his account corresponds broadly to the difference between value and mechanism, respectively. On the question of democracy, he takes the "mental texture" and "social norms" derived from Islam as the substance/value according to which democracy as a form/mechanism should be interpreted and adapted. This adaptation, for him, cannot run against the core values of democratic mechanisms—freedom and equality. However, this is a rather vague condition that needs specification,

[149] "General election and consensus, consenting to a nominee, forming a group of selectorate among the wisest, taking the consent of majority." Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Devlet," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi (DİA)* (İstanbul, 1994), 237.
[150] Ibid.

something Davutoğlu hardly provides. In other words, democracy is understood both as a mechanism (representation, accountability, elections) and as a value (freedom and equality) and as a mechanism it is hierarchically subordinated to the values of Islamic normativity, which for him are compatible with Islamic norms. Hence democracy should be reinterpreted in order to render it "harmonious" with Islamic norms provided that such an adaptation does not violate democracy's core values of "ontological freedom and equality" as well as the hierarchy between Islamic norms and democratic mechanisms.

Similarly, in his article on the different conceptions of the sources of sovereignty, Mustafa Şentop, a professor of constitutional law and legal history and an AK Party vice-chairman and MP, who is also the vice-chairman of the Constitutional Committee in parliament, makes broad comparisons between Western Christianity's historical trajectory and Islamic political and legal thought. By making a similar distinction between values and mechanisms, Şentop argues that Islamic law provides only the fundamental values for political governance and not a specific model. He notes, "Islamic law does not institute any model for political sovereignty. Therefore, from the very beginning, different political understandings have been prevalent in different states that Muslims formed. These understandings were shaped by the conditions of the time, the repertoire of rulers and the traditions they were influenced by."[151] Again, what is important here is "the criteria of compliance with Islamic law."[152]

---

[151] Mustafa Şentop, "Siyasi Hakimiyetin Kaynağı Meselesi ve Osmanlı Telakkisi," (The Question of the Source of Political Sovereignty and the Ottoman Understanding") *E-Akademi Hukuk, Ekonomi ve Siyasal Bilimler Aylık İnternet Dergisi* no. 29 (July 2004): para.71, http://www.e-akademi.org/incele.asp?konu=Siyasi%20Hakimiyetin%20Kayna%C4%9F%C4%B1%20Meselesi%20ve%20Osmanl%C4%B1%20Telakkisi&kimlik=1088765050&url=makaleler/msentop-1.htm.
[152] Ibid., para.76.

In a way, Şentop's discussion of the Ottoman legal system provides a reading that comes close to the Islamic democracy model. Implicitly drawing on the theme of *siyasa al-shariyya* (shari'a politics) in classical jurisprudential literature, Şentop points out that "in Islamic law the head of the state's authority to legislate is limited with the general framework of Islamic law and with the spheres that it did not explicitly regulate."[153] The customary law that were legislated by the sultan were not explicitly derived from the sources of shari'a, but they were part of the shari'a system because they were regulating the spheres that Islamic law intentionally left void.[154] Şentop suggests that "Islamic law (shari'a law) (*şeri hukuk*) is not an order that posits consummate legal rules for every sphere of life." Rather, "within the general perspective of a worldview, the fundamental immutable principles of the legal order are determined and a very wide space is left open for legislative activities on the condition that it does not go against these fundamental principles."[155] According to Şentop, it is precisely these limitations that Islamic law puts on the ruler in legislation and execution that effectively prevents the idea of an "absolute power." And interestingly, Şentop argues that this is what makes the Ottoman rule a "limited power that rests on religious principles yet it is not a theocracy."[156] This is an important argument that needs closer attention.

Şentop makes a clear distinction between religious-based and theocratic rule. He argues that theocracy belongs only to the European experience between the eleventh and

[153] Ibid.
[154] Ibid., para.77.
[155] Ibid.
[156] Ibid., para.78.

fifteenth centuries.[157] The main character of theocracy is that the source of political sovereignty is divine, and those who hold political power act in the name of God and are granted the right to be unaccountable (*sorumsuz*).[158] In a religious-based rule, such as the one in the Ottoman Empire, political power is subordinated to a legal system that is formed outside the political power.[159] It was not the state but the class of scholars (*ulema*) who enjoyed a considerable degree of autonomy who formed the shari'a.[160] The ruler does not have the right to speak in the name of God and his laws and decisions are not considered divine.[161] Muslim rulers did not claim an absolute divine right to rule and their political sovereignty was not absolute or unlimited but was rather under the rule of Islamic law—hence, their governance was religious-based but not theocratic.[162] The head of the state derives his legitimacy from his compliance with Islamic legal system and it has most certainly been acknowledged that there would be no obedience to the ruler on matters that clearly contradict shari'a. Nearly all scholars living in late nineteenth century Ottoman Empire, Şentop notes, "argue within the framework of Islamic principles that

[157] For him Shi'ite political theory of Imamate (political ruler) comes close to theocracy because of its conception of the ruler as divinely ordained and innocent (*masum*). However, Şentop points out that even Shi'ite political theory is different from Western theocracies in that the latter had an absolute authority in legislation, executive, and judiciary and has not bound itself with the rules it itself posited. However, in Islamic law, including the Shi'ite tradition, the ruler is bound with both the revealed law and the legal rules he posits through ijtihad. Ibid., para.44.
[158] Ibid., 78.
[159] Ibid.
[160] Ibid., 63.
[161] Ibid., 78.
[162] Shi'ite political theory of 'imamate' significantly differs from the Sunni theory of 'caliphate' by moving toward a theocratic conception. The fact that *imamate* (political rulership) is seen as a doctrinal matter divinely ordained by God rather than a political question decided upon by the community (*umma*), and that the ruler is makes Shi'ite political theory closer to theocracy.

governing a state is not a religious task, various systems can be adopted on the basis of public interest (*maslahat*), and political sovereignty resides in people."[163]

Şentop finds it noteworthy that despite the prevailing understanding in the early periods of Islamic history that God is the ultimate sovereign but political sovereignty is humane, those intellectuals (note the difference from the *ulema*) who argue in the modern era that political sovereignty belongs to God are mostly from Muslim countries who lived under colonial rule. Colonialism disavowed the political and social aspects of Islam which also started to be neglected by the Muslim populace.[164] According to Şentop, colonial conditions led the Muslim intellectuals in Pakistan and Egypt [165] to "excessively evince" those political and social aspects of religion in a way that "wrapped up some political and conjunctural discourses in a religious form."[166] Despite that, intellectuals such as Mawdudi, Sayyid Qutb, and Abdulkader Udah do not call for theocracy. Rather they think that authority is derived from the umma and the ruler is to be accountable. In other words, while "the absolute and unlimited sovereignty" (of the kind that Şentop finds in Bodin's thought) belongs to God alone, political sovereignty understood as the "representation of sovereign will on earth is completely deferred to human beings."[167] Therefore, for Şentop, the question of whether sovereignty belongs to God or to people is a misleading one. The two can be translated into each other (*telif edilebilir*).[168]

---

[163] He cites Seyyid Bey, Ali Abdurrazik, Said Halim Pasha as intellectuals supporting this line of argumentation. Şentop, "Siyasi Hakimiyetin Kaynağı Meselesi ve Osmanlı Telakkisi," para.55.
[164] Ibid., para.45.
[165] The reference here is to Mevdudi and Sayyid Qutb, as he makes it explicit in paragraph 50.
[166] Şentop, "Siyasi Hakimiyetin Kaynağı Meselesi ve Osmanlı Telakkisi," para.45.
[167] Ibid., para.60.
[168] Ibid., para.62.

4. Transcending Islamism: Disowning 'Islamic State' for Islamic Reasons

When we look beyond official party documents and statements to attend closely to the political imaginary and the intellectual vision behind AK Party, it becomes apparent that AK Party denounces the idea of an Islamic state for Islamic reasons in a particular context—that is, through the logic of Islamic normativity in negotiation with liberal secularism. That does not fit neatly with either of the rejection or transition narratives. To start with, in AK Party's political imaginary it is problematic to use the term 'Islamic' with every modern institution. The adjectival form of 'Islam' as 'Islamic' is a signature term of classical Islamist discourse as represented by the Muslim Brotherhood. As a defensive modernist ideology seeking public implementation of Islamic norms,[169] Islamism takes modern institutions, practices, ideologies, and sciences and seeks to 'Islamize' them.[170] The adjective 'Islamic' is attached to various modern categories such as state, party, finance, banking, democracy, feminism, liberalism, socialism, science, sociology, economics, etc.'[171] Among them, the term 'Islamic state'

---

[169] Muhammad Qasim Zaman, "Shari'a and the State in Pakistan," *The Review of Faith & International Affairs* 10, no. 4 (2012): 53. For an extended version, see Muhammad Qasim Zaman, "Shari'a and the State in Pakistan," in *Shari'a Politics Islamic Law and Society in the Modern World*, ed. Robert W Hefner (Bloomington [Ind.]: Indiana University Press, 2011).

[170] Feldman, *The Fall and Rise of the Islamic State*.

[171] Recently in a conference on "Technology, Civilization, and Values" Alparslan Açıkgenç, a Turkish academic who studied under FazlurRahman at the University of Chicago, provocatively claimed that "an Islamic bicycle" could be produced. By referring to a famous tradition attributed to Prophet Muhammad, he argued that in Islam all deeds are judged according to intentions. Hence, "a bicyle produced with the intention of seeking God's approval (*rıza*) and prioritizing its usefulness for people" would count as an Islamic bicycle. It is worth noting that in his case, 'Islamization' refers more to the intentions in engaging with such institutions than effecting a transformation in them. But in his book, Acikgenc lays out a vision of 'Islamization' that is not restricted to intentions. But rather, he points to the fundamentally different "worldviews" (*dünyagörüşü*) of Islamic and Western civilizations that deeply impact any production of knowledge. Hence, the need to make them compliant with Islamic "worldview". This is akin to the Islamist conception of 'Islamization' as changing institutions in order to render them compliant with Islamic norms

has been particularly salient in Islamist discourse so much so that it has become its trademark. This usage, however, is quite new and alien within Islamic tradition. As Noah Feldman notes, the term 'Islamic state' has been "largely absent from the classical vocabulary."[172] It only emerged as a response to the pressing demands and penetrating institutions of modernity. It emerged as a defensive strategy of modernization among Muslim reformists through appropriation of modern norms and institutions.

İbrahim Kalın, Chief Advisor to the Prime Minister, notes that using the adjective 'Islamic' with every modern concept or institution sits uneasily with Islamic tradition.[173] He draws on the example of Avicenna, a leading Muslim philosopher of the 11th century, to make this point: "Avicenna said this is the problem of contingency and substance (*araz ve cevher*) [in philosophy]. He didn't say I will look at this problem also from an Islamic perspective. Attributing an Islamic reference to everything is a modern attitude. Islamizing everything. Instead we should be able to immerse (*yedirmeliyiz*) our Muslimness into everything we do."[174] This statement very neatly summarizes the reasoning behind AK Party's abstention from the label of 'Islamic' or even 'Muslim' despite its concern for acting in accordance with Islamic norms. In other words, Kalin's remarks explain why AK Party affirms, in the words of an AK Party deputy, "a pious but not a religious perspective." (*dini değil dindar bir bakış açısı*).[175] It endorses "pious politicians" yet disowns "the politics of religion" (*din siyaseti*) or "religionism" (*dincilik*).

---

and law. Alparslan Açıkgenç, *Bir Kavram Ve Süreç Olarak Bilginin İslamileştirilmesi* ("Islamization of Knowledge as a Concept and Process") (İstanbul: Nesil Yayınları, 1998).

[172] Feldman, *The Fall and Rise of the Islamic State*, 111.

[173] As the quotation from him makes it clear, as a scholar of Islamic philosophy, he launches a critique of the very idea of an 'Islamic' philosophy.

[174] Kalın, Interview by the author.

[175] This phrase was used by İsmet Uçma . Author's interview with İsmet Uçma . December 13, 2011.

This, according to İsmet Uçma , is a putting into practice of the Quranic injuction (1/141) to be *ummatan wasatan* ("community of the middle path").[176]

In various occasions, AK Party leadership has revealed their distaste with the adjectival use of Islam particularly for state or political parties.[177] Abdullah Gül, the co-founder of the AK Party and now President of Turkey, suggested that using the term Islamic for a party would only harm Islam. Tayyip Erdoğan repeatedly stated that AK Party was not an Islamic party. He made this point clearly during his first visit to Egypt after the fall of Hosni Mubarak. In that visit, Erdoğan spoke at a dinner to an Egyptian audience that included political party leaders, journalists, academics, and civil society activists from both Islamist and secular wings. In the Q&A session, an old lady in the audience started her question by leveling a lengthy critique of Islamists in Egypt and then asked Erdoğan what advice would he give to the Islamic parties of Egypt as leader of an Islamic party in Turkey. Erdoğan started his response by rejecting the lady's description of his party as Islamic: "The program of my party is based not on Islam, but on the constitution of the Turkish Republic." He disowned the idea of an 'Islamic party' and even refused the label 'Muslim democrat' for the party:

> "Some are calling us 'Muslim Democrat.' We do not accept the Christian Democrat understanding we see in the West. There can't be a party understanding like Muslim Democrat. This is wrong. As a person I'm Muslim. But if I call my party Islamic then I bill my own mistakes as a

[176] İsmet Uçma, Interview by the author, December 13, 2011.
[177] It is interesting to note that the AK Party did not show as much of a distaste with the term 'Islamic banking' or 'Islamic finance'. AK Party government has created the necessary legal, institutional and political infrastructure to attract more of 'Islamic finance.' Indeed the AK Party government declared many times that it wanted to be a hub for Islamic finance. But it should also be noted that the term used in AK Party's discourse is usually not Islamic finance but "interest-free banking."

> human being (*kul*) to Islam. This would be wrong. For example the main opposition in Turkey calls itself social democratic, but when you ask them they also say 'we are Muslim'. Then we should call them Muslim social democrats? As a human being I can make mistakes in politics. But my religion doesn't have any mistakes. Why should I bill my mistakes to my religion?"[178]

The reason Erdoğan provides for his abstention from identifying his party as Islamic or as Muslim is not the secular norms of liberal democracy but concerns about its Islamic appropriateness. He finds claims to being an Islamic or Muslim party as antithetical to and harmful for Islam. Not only that claiming Islamicity for a party holds Islam responsible for what are indeed human mistakes (and indirectly, by making Islam an instrument of daily politics), but also that these labels are divisive. Putting Islam or even Muslim in the title or identity of the party would exclude a party like the main opposition party CHP (Republican People's Party) whose cadres, despite having a staunchly secularist Kemalist ideology, do express their Muslimness. "If you develop a religious politics," argues İsmet Uçma, one of the founders of the AK Party and a deputy of Istanbul who studied theology and labour economics, "then the opposition against you will be an opposition against religion." [179] Such monopolization of Islam for Uçma is Islamically wrong.

---

[178] Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, September 13, 2011, Four Seasons Hotel, Cairo. My own translation from my notes at the dinner.
[179] Uçma, Interview by the author.

Ahmet Davutoğlu makes the same point in his interview with the Al-Ahram Weekly in 2004. When asked about the major dilemmas an Islamic party faces in power, he starts his response with problematizing the adjectival use of Islam with the word party:

> Let me first clarify one point. The concept of an "Islamic party" is a false concept, because any political party is by nature a dividing rather than a unifying force. Islam, on the other hand, is a unifying factor, a common element. So the concept of an "Islamic party" should be used cautiously. But we can refer to the different ways different political parties refer to Islam, or their relation to religion in general. By the same token, one can extend the argument to American politics: for example, US President George Bush made far more reference to Christianity in his campaign than did Senator John Kerry. We should not reduce Islam to a political group or party, because then you end up with certain parties monopolising the representation of Islam. The leaders of the AK party did *not* use this concept of an "Islamic party", but tried instead to present themselves as part of the Turkish political tradition.

Upon this response, the interviewer changes her description of AK Party from "an Islamic party" to "a party with an Islamic orientation" and Davutoğlu tacitly affirms the new label. Interestingly, this exact same argument (that Islam unites people while political parties divide them) was made decades ago by people such as Hasan Al-Banna, the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood, to claim that party politics was going against Islam's injunctions banning *fitna* (a charged term in Islamic tradition that usually means chaos, but also understood as division). Davutoğlu and Erdoğan, however, use this same Islamic reasoning but end up at a rather different destination. They affirm party politics while recognizing its divisiveness; this is why they want to keep Islam outside of this

division.[180] In other words, instead of disowning party politics, AK Party disowned the idea of what Davutoğlu referred to as "monopolizing the representation of Islam."[181]

For the AK Party, there is nothing in Islamic teachings and history that posits the necessity of an Islamic state. As Emrullah İşler, a professor of Arabic language and AK Party deputy for Ankara who serves in the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Parliamentary Committee of the Organization of Islamic Conference, argues: "The Prophet Muhammad's state did not have the adjective 'Islamic.' The phrase 'Islamic state' just didn't exist."[182] For him, "the addressee (*muhatap*) of the Qur'an is not the state but the human." However, "with the fall of the Caliphate, Muslims turned to political Islam *(siyasal Islam)* under a sense of oppression and humiliation." Furthermore, he sees the inclusion of Islam or shari'a in the constitutions of the Arab states as cynical strategic moves to contain social unrest:

> "It means nothing to have it [Shari'a] in the constitution. All dictators in the Arab world are using this. On paper. To satisfy their people. That's unnecessary. It is not important to write it down, what is important is human rights, individual rights, religious freedom, and being able to live

[180] Here it must be noted that Islam has never been out of political debates in Turkey. All major political parties, including the AK Party, has drawn upon Islam in different ways. The Kemalist main opposition party, CHP, occasionally fielded candidates such as Yasar Nuri Ozturk and Ali Ihsan Ozkes who were mufti or academics in theology faculties, builded strong electoral coalitions with Alawite constituencies, and occasionally organized ostentatious ceremonies when accepting fully-veiled women to the party especially in the wake of elections. Similarly, the BDP, the political wing of PKK, despite having a stauncyly secularist political platform, organized "civil Friday prayers" against the Friday prayers led by state-appointed imams. AK Party also drawn upon Islam in order to articulate an opposition of what they see as Kemalism's oppressive policies toward religion and Muslims (and non-Muslims alike).

[181] It is also worth noting here that Davutoğlu feels the need to refer to the role religion plays in American politics in order to justify his party's orientation to religion. When the interview was conducted in 2004, AK Party could not yet consolidate itself in power, it was seeking to justify itself in the eyes of the Kemalist establishment and liberal international order as an Islamically-oriented but not Islamist party. AK Party sought to garner international and domestic legitimacy through drawing comparisons with the public salience of religion in the U.S. This is one of the subtle indicators of the international politics of secularism in Turkey.

[182] Emrullah İşler, Interview by the author, December 13, 2011.

> according to your religion. There is no community with one single religion. Prophet Muhammad lived with Jews and Christians. Mosque, synagogue, and church are side by side."[183]

Not only that Islam does not necessitate an Islamic state, but for the AK Party leadership the idea of Islamic state does not befit Islamic tradition. For example, Ahmet Davutoğlu points out that "the contemporary conception of the Islamic state emerged as an outcome of the defense mechanism of Islamic culture" against the "Westernized elites" who denied a space for Islam's ethico-legal ideals.[184] However, Islamic state rests on and reproduces "the Hegelian-inspired nation-state model" that contradicts the principles of the state established by Prophet Muhammad—these principles, for Davutoğlu, are inclusive membership to community and state's embeddedness in and responsiveness to society.[185] Davutoğlu argues that classical conceptions of state within Islamic tradition were tightly interconnected with the concepts of *umma* ("a universal spiritual/political union") and *dar al-Islam* ("politico-legal world order").[186] This relationship between state, *umma*, and *dar al- Islam* formed a "Muslim imagination of politics based on an alternative Weltanschauung." [187] Yet, the idea of Islamic state severs it. Within this "Muslim imagination of politics," the 'Hegelian-inspired' modern nation-state's tendency of disciplining and monitoring society and of individual in the name of the state is not acceptable.[188] And Islamic state is no exception. In classical Islamic political thought the

---

[183] İşler, interview.
[184] Ahmet Davutoğlu, *Alternative Paradigms: The Impact of Islamic and Western Weltanschauungs on Political Theory* (University Press of America, 1994), 194.
[185] Davutoğlu, "Devlet," 236.
[186] Ibid.
[187] Davutoğlu, *Alternative Paradigms*, 202.
[188] Davutoğlu, "Devlet," 236.

state has been seen "solely an instrument to realize the moral and social ideals of the belief system." The state was "an instrument that puts into practice the legal and moral understanding of life."[189] Hence, the idea of nation-state being "detached from society, abstracted, and imposing"[190] does not befit Islamic tradition. With ascendance of the nation-state form, he argues, "state began to be visualized as a sovereign element within the international system instead of a political instrument for the ethico-legal ideals of the Islamic belief system."[191]

This is because of the centrality of human freedom in Islam. "Human beings believe through their capacity to choose. Coercion violates the essence of faith."[192] Davutoğlu suggests that "may be for the first time in Muslim political thought, now we must take freedom (*özgürlük*) as being equal to justice in significance."[193] Because "resisting your ego (*nefs*) is an act of will, and using your will is freedom. If you are restricting freedom there is no value in believing."[194] However, he stresses that this is not "liberalization (*liberallik*) bereft of identity." Rather, "this is liberation without liberalization (*liberalleşmeden özgürleşmek*)." It is the recognition of the freedom God has given to people in choosing what to believe as a condition of just rule.

What is noteworthy here is Davutoğlu's recurring references to "an alternative Weltanschauung," "Islamic paradigm," or "Islamic civilization" and his sensitivity to differentiate them from liberalism. These are references to the existence and effectiveness

---

[189] Ibid., 238.
[190] Ibid., 236.
[191] Davutoğlu, *Alternative Paradigms*, 193.
[192] Davutoğlu, Interview by the author.
[193] Ibid.
[194] Ibid.

of another logic of appropriateness operating within Islamic discursive tradition. In other words, while AK Party adopts particular constitutive norms of liberal global governance, and becomes part of the 'liberal global social,' there is also another 'social' with its own standards of appropriateness, which AK Party as an actor comes from and has already been socialized into. What is clear in Davutoğlu's vision is an affirmation of this other social in conversation with the social of liberal global governance. Hence, a process of translation is in order—a translation that collapses neither into a claim of equivalence nor of incommensurability between the two socials, but rather, a performative production of difference within socialization.

Islamic state's claim to public implementation of Islamic norms with the force of law is also very problematic for AK Party policymakers. For example, İbrahim Kalın notes that "it is debatable as to whether a state should legalize an ethics. To what extent should a state protect an ethics? That's debatable. I think there is no need for a state to enter into such a business. If it legalizes or codifies an ethics then it stops being ethics." Similarly, Mustafa Şentop argues that "Islam's comprehensiveness (*kuşatıcılığı*) is not legal but ethical."[195]

Emrullah İşler similarly recognizes that "there will be [alcohol] drinkers in society, and they should have places to do that. If even Allah Teala Hazretleri grants the freedom to not to believe in him, then we also must recognize this right to them."[196] After stressing his expertise in Arabic language, İşler continues:

[195] Mustafa Şentop, Interview by the author, December 16, 2011.
[196] İşler, Interview by the author.

> "Allah says '*la iqraha fiddin'* (there's no compulsion in religion) and here 'iqraha' is indefinite (*nekre*). That means all sorts of compulsion is forbidden. Not only for non-Muslims but also for Muslims alike. It wouldn't be a prayer or a fast if you do it because you are forced to. Even Sayyid Qutb writes this in *Fi Zilal* [his Quranic exegesis]. You can also see this in Elmalili['s Quranic exegesis.] Compulsion and imposition (*zorlama ve dayatma*) are definitely wrong. (…) For example I cannot force my daughter to wear headscarf. I can only try to convince her with soft words and clemency. I tell her why it is important, but I cannot impose if she doesn't accept, it is her decision."

In that vein, Davutoğlu considers the modern idea of an Islamic state was first put into practice in Pakistan after partition from India[197] as a kind of "defensive communitarianism"[198] that sought to "re-balance the internal consistency of the Islamic *Weltanschauung* and its practical reflections."[199] Yet, it could not go beyond the nation-state logic. It could not form "an alternative international legal and political system."[200] For him, why 'Islamic state' emerged in post-colonial India is understandable, but the conditions have changed, hence the mechanisms and institutions should also change. Sticking to the postcolonial idea of Islamic state "harms (*yipratir*) Islamic values."[201]

Likewise, Mustafa Şentop, points to the impact of colonialism in the emergence of the idea of an Islamic state. For him, anti-colonial sentiments drifted the colonized Muslim societies to an anti-state position, which was then translated into a demand for a

---

[197] Noah Feldman notes that Pakistan indeed has borrowed this model of Islamic state from Iran's constitution of 1906-7. Feldman, *The Fall and Rise of the Islamic State*.
[198] Davutoğlu, Interview by the author.
[199] Davutoğlu, *Alternative Paradigms*, 202.
[200] Davutoğlu, "Devlet," 238.
[201] Davutoğlu, Interview by the author.

new 'Islamic state.'[202] For him this constitutes a fundamental difference between Turkey and the formerly colonized Muslim countries. Since Turkey has never been colonized, Islam in Turkey has never been mobilized around the idea of destroying a colonial/anti-Islamic state and establishing an Islamic one. On the contrary, people in general endorsed the state as their own—even in the single party period between 1924-1945, whose policies were openly hostile to religion.[203] For example Necmettin Erbakan's political discourse since 1970s has centered on the demand for a Heavy Industry Initiative (*Ağır Sanayi Hamlesi*) instead of an Islamic state.[204] That was in part because Islam in Turkey has always been a significant political practice in implicit and explicit ways even when its political expressions were repressed by the state.[205]

Related to this history of not having the experience of a colonial state, Şentop notes that Turkey's difference and advantage has been that "Islam in a political sense, that is Islam that includes politics, emerged as a practice and not as a theory. In other words, "Islamism in Turkey has always walked through social realities."[206] However, in places such as Pakistan and Egypt the idea of an Islamic state first emerged as a rather "rigid theory" (*sivri teori*), and then it was put into practice. Şentop suggests that "ideologies are based on a shared delusion that provide mental comfort" and they are in "square shape." However, "life is indented (*girintili cikintili*) and ideologies don't fit life.

---

[202] Şentop, Interview by the author.
[203] Ibid.He notes that endorsing the state has been one important consequence of not being a former colony. But he also notes the negative side of that: people did not show a big reaction to state's actions and policies that could only be done by colonial administrations.
[204] Ibid.
[205] Ibid.
[206] Ibid.

Islamism is an ideology too. It is a response given in particular conditions. Now we have different conditions."[207]

In challenging the notion of Islamic state, AK Party also challenges the concomitant Islamist model of 'Islamic democracy.' 'Islamic democracy' presumes and rests on the idea of 'Islamic state." Pakistan, Egypt, and Iran all display certain features of 'Islamic democracy' that combines democratic procedures with particular conceptions of shari'a enforced by the state. But its critique of Islamic democracy is carried out not in the name of secular liberal democracy, but rather in the name of Islamic notions of appropriateness. This is quite evident in İsmet Uçma's remarks. Uçma argues that the model of 'Islamic democracy' is highly problematic. The reason is not that it does not comply with secular liberal norms, but that it does not fulfill the Islamic injunction of justice:

> "Islamic democracy. I don't approve that. Iran tried and failed miserably (*son derece basarisizdir*). This [understanding of Islamic democracy] results from a lack of proper understanding of the Quran. There is no divinely ordained mode of governance in Islam, except for the injunction of justice. Even rule of law and democracy don't suffice. Our civilization commands a state of justice (*adalet devleti*). Whichever instruments you use, it must establish justice."[208]

AK Party is compelled, by both international and domestic structures, to translate its own vision into the language of secularism and conservatism. Because of the legal-political constraints imposed by the Kemalist state and endorsed by liberal international order, AK

[207] Ibid.
[208] Uçma, Interview by the author.

Party cannot not invoke secularism as its foundation. Yet, at the same time, regardless of the pressure, AK Party is opposed to the idea of an Islamic state—state's monolithic enforcement of shari'a—for principled Islamic and historical reasons. This is because of AK Party's particular configuration of the relationship between shari'a and people within a secular democracy.

5. People as the Guardian of Shari'a: The Politics of Translation in AK Party's 'Conservative Democracy'

The classical Islamist notion of 'Islamic democracy' stipulates an 'Islamic state' in which shari'a is constitutionalized, that is, written in the constitution as *a* or *the* source of legislation. In addition, some kind of a judicial mechanism is foreseen in order to review, and if necessary annul, the actions of the legislative and executive on the basis of their compliance with shari'a —either in the form of a Constitutional Court, a Council of Scholars, or various combinations of both. In AK Party's 'conservative democracy,' Islam and shari'a does not have any constitutional appearance, and hence there is no court or council to do Shari'a review. Rather, observing shari'a compliance is deemed as a responsibility onto Muslims individually and communally, yet it does not make its way into state and its constitution. In other words, while shari'a is not constitutionalized (written into constitution), it is, in some ways, democratized—the task of ensuring non-repugnancy to shari'a is given to the people as civil society members and electorate.

One of the definitive differences between the 'Islamic' and 'Muslim' forms of democracy is that while the former tries to secure a notion of Islamicity—implementation of and compliance with Shari'a —through constitutional mechanisms, the latter does not resort to such constitutional mechanisms to secure the Islamicity of state actions and decisions, but rather leaves it to civil society and to the electorate as a personal and communal religious obligation to check for Islamicity. As a result, while in the Islamic democracy you would have a constitutional court (Pakistan, Egypt), or Guardians of the Constitution (Iran) or an institution of scholars (Egypt) to review legislation to ensure compliance with the Shari'a, in AK Party's 'conservative democracy,' civil society groups and individual citizens bear the burden of judging and assessing the Islamicity of legislation and state action. While in the Islamic democratic model the state itself is responsible for securing that its actions are in accordance with Shari'a, in AK Party's conservative democracy, it is the responsibility of Muslims as individual citizens and collective actors, not of the state, to ensure non-repugnance to shari'a. This becomes even more interesting when one considers that among the Turkish public the level of support for shari'a is very low.[209]

[209]As Yavuz points out "Shari'a as a term was criminalized and those who resisted the centralizing and modernizing reforms of the state were also accused of seriatci." Yavuz, "Ethical Not Shari'a Islam," 32. Such criminalization of shari'a in official state discourse "gave shari'a a highly pejorative meaning in Turkish society and politics." Ibid. For the ordinary Turkish citizen shari'a meant a frontal confrontation with the state. In addition to the legal/constitutitonal limitations, the very low level of support for shari'a politics in Turkish society can also be taken as a condition that shapes AK Party's discourse and practice. This is the consistent finding of various opinion polls conducted by local and international institutions. The surveys conducted by Pew, Gallup and Carkoglu and Toprak's studies show the lowest levels of support for shari'a in the entire Muslim world. Carkoglu and Toprak find 12% support for shari'a. See, Ali Çarkoğlu and Binnaz Toprak, *Religion, Society and Politics in a Changing Turkey*, Democratization Program, trans. Çiğdem Aksoy Fromm, TESEV Publications (İstanbul: TESEV, 2007); M. Heper, "Does Secularism Face a Serious Threat in Turkey?," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 29, no. 3 (2009): 413; Ali Çarkoğlu, "Religiosity, Support for Şeriat and Evaluations of Secularist Public Policies in Turkey," *Middle Eastern Studies* 40, no. 2 (2004): 111–36.

If shari'a denotes "Islamic normativity"[210] and "Islamic way of doing things,"[211] then it provides a logic to evaluate appropriateness. In Islamic tradition, this is referred to as 'fiqh'—jurisprudence, or logic and method of appropriateness broadly construed. As the court cases I discussed earlier indicates, shari'a has been securitized and criminalized in Turkey.[212]AK Party cannot and does not invoke shari'a, but that does not entail its eradication from politics. Rather, shari'a is incorporated into AK Party's discourse in more indirect ways and in the form of broad norms and values. For example in his address to his party group in the parliament, R. Tayyip Erdoğan said: "It is our duty to protect the security of property. It is our duty to protect the security of life. It is our duty to protect the security of intellect. It is our duty to protect the security of progeny and ancestry. It is our duty to dwell on these."[213] Interestingly, all these four items that he enumerates (protection of life, property, intellect, progeny) are known in Islamic tradition as the 'purposes of Shari'a' (*Maqasid al-Shari'a*). 'Protection of religion' is also one of the five purposes of shari'a mentioned in the literature, which is, quite tellingly, the only missing item in Erdoğan's list probably in order not to attract the wrath of the Kemalist judiciary—indeed three months after this speech the Prosecutor filed the litigation at the Constitutional Court to ban the party. Şentop defines Islamic civilization as a

---

[210] Armando Salvatore, "After the State: Islamic Reform and the 'Implosion' of Shari'a," in *Muslim Traditions and Modern Techniques of Power* (Münster [u.a.: Lit, 2001).

[211] Nathan J. Brown, "Egypt and Islamic Sharia: A Guide for the Perplexed," *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, May 15, 2012, http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/05/15/egypt-and-islamic-sharia-guide-for-perplexed/argb.

[212] Yavuz, "Ethical Not Shari'a Islam"; Burhanettin Duran, "The Experience of Turkish Islamism: Between Transformation and Impoverishment," *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies* 12, no. 1 (March 2010): 5–22.

[213] Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, Address to his party group, December 25, 2007. Quoted in Abdurrahman Tığ, İsak Baydaroğlu, and Şakiye Erdem, eds., *Başbakan Recep Tayyip Erdoğan'ın Konuşmalarından Seçmeler* (Selections from Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's Speeches), (Ankara: AK Parti Tanıtım ve Medya Başkanlığı, 2010), 129.

"civilization of *fiqh* or law." Shari'a is not the entirety of law, but rather, it is "the unchanging sphere of constants." Shari'a provides "the fundamental legal rules that would bind the state." Constitutional democracy is a democracy that recognizes such unchangeable principles. The question then is about the content of such principles.[214] Against those "who think that Islamism is implementation of criminal law" Davutoğlu argues that the real "value" and purpose of is protection of rights. (*Maqasid al-Shari'a*). Here, he rejects the arguments about the end of Islamism, and suggests that AK Party is producing a new interpretation: "This is not a collapse in the way that Olivier Roy talks about. This is a reinterpretation of power, sovereignty, and social reality from within our own resources."[215]

In line with AK Party's critique of the notion of Islamic state, İbrahim Kalın suggests that classical Islamism was concentrated on the nation-state but what is needed now is a "social movement led by non-state actors."[216] That's because "the source of legitimacy has shifted from state to people."[217] Kalın maintains that "just as liberalism's biggest illusion was its belief that everyone would become a liberal, Islamism's biggest illusion is to believe that everyone will become a Muslim. Such flaws estranged Islamism to society, and rendered it stiff and reductionist."[218] In part due to the trauma of Kemalist top-down policies and in part due to its particular interpretation of Islamic tradition, AK

---

[214] Şentop argues that in the post-World War II period, there has been established "a new Shari'a, a new supra-constitutional order." Shari'a, in that sense, is "the determination of the fundamental legal rules that will bind the state." It is the "grounding of the law in prior to state." (devlet oncesinde temellenmis halidir). This is constitutional democracy, that is, a democracy that recognizes unchangeable principles. The only difference between a religious and a secular constitution would then be its content. Şentop, Interview by the author.
[215] Davutoğlu, Interview by the author.
[216] Kalın, Interview by the author.
[217] Ibid.
[218] Ibid.

Party has positioned itself as a challenge to Kemalist project of state-led social engineering. Hence, classical Islamism's similar state-led projects of radical transformation in the name of Islam face a principled objection from the AK Party. [219]

In that vein, in his analysis of the intellectual roots of authoritarian tendencies in Turkish politics, Ahmet Davutoğlu notes that in the republican period "the state has started to be seen as a mechanism of enlightening (*nurlandırma*) society by a privileged group who explore the West's 'wisdom' ('*hikmetini'*) and 'light' ('*nurunu'*)."[220] For him, Turkish intellectuals' "enlightening mission" is similar to Rudyard Kipling's 'White Man's Burden.'[221] These "light-importing" (*nur ithalatçısı*) intellectuals "looked down on the masses" whom they considered as "deprived of any light" (*nurunu kaybetmiş*).[222] That is why they "insisted on the bigotry of 'despite the people for the people' " (halk ragmen halk icin) and they "could not show the courage of saying 'with the people for the God'" (*halkla beraber Hak için*).[223] Starting with the İttihat ve Terakki Partisi (Union and Progress Party) the "elitist recipes" that were "mostly restrictive and prohibitive" and that "excluded people from distribution of power" were "imposed" on society through the civilian and military bureaucracy.[224] The fundamental method that this state-centric top-down modernization project has employed is not communication and exchange of ideas,

---

[219] This observation has been challenged by some who argue that AK Party has indeed turned into a conservative Kemalist party. This criticism has some purchase on particular questions—i.e. abortion, alcohol consumption. However, these critiques mostly do not judge the party with its self-declared promises and identifications. The party puts the adjective 'conservative' before its conception of democracy in order to communicate its commitments on matters about family values. Second, even when these criticisms are entertained, still they do not change the main orientation of the party to not to intervene in people's lifestyles.
[220] Ahmet Davutoğlu, "Türk Entellektüel Geleneğindeki Baskıcı Temayüllerin Kökenleri," *İlim ve Sanat*, June 1987, 17.
[221] Ibid., 16.
[222] Ibid., 17.
[223] Ibid.
[224] Ibid., 18.

but rather "intimidating opponents through oppressive judgements and prohibitions."[225] Therefore, the Kemalist method of deploying state power to transform society toward a political ideal has been rejected by the AK Party, and the Islamist tendency to deploy state's coercive power for 'Islamic' ends is similarly disavowed. That is why, for example, one usually hears from AK Party circles the critique of both Kemalism and the Iranian experience, which are seen as the mirror images of each other—one imposes wearing headscarf while the other prohibits it. AK Party claims to be the via media. This is what Tayyip Erdoğan suggested in his speech at the international conference on 'conservative democracy' organized by the AK Party:

> "All kinds of imposing, authoritarian, homogenizing, and social engineering approaches are obstacles against a healthy democratic system. No one should attempt to give directions or shape to societies from their armchairs. Our conservative democratic identity opposes any kind of social and political engineering." [226]

Under conditions co-created by liberal international and Kemalist domestic order, AK Party translates its critique of Kemalist top-down modernization project into the language of conservatism's critique of radical projects of Enlightenment rationalism. In that sense, AK Party couches its opposition to Kemalism within the framework of conservative reaction to "the Jacobin interventions that impose French-type Enlightenment to everyone without taking society into consideration."[227] What is appealing for the AK Party here is

---

[225] Ibid., 21.
[226] Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, "Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's Keynote Speech" (presented at the International Symposium on Conservatism and Democracy, İstanbul, January 15, 2004).
[227] Ali Bulaç, "AK Parti ve Muhafazakar Demokrasi," *Köprü Üç Aylık Fikir Dergisi*, K 2007, 3.

the stress conservatism puts on society, tradition, religion, and family values.[228] However, Ali Bulac, a renown Islamist writer and a critic of the AK Party, argues that "if AK Party's conservatism does not have deep-rooted Islamic reference" then that means it only fosters "a religiosity bereft of any creedal (*itikadi*) and jurisprudential (practical) dimension."[229] Then the stress on conservatism would become "the political discourse of marginalizing religion, restricting it to private sphere, and relativizing it." "Global capitalism is not against such a religiosity," Bulaç notes, "rather it is in dire need of it."

Having a claim to represent the religiously-oriented masses that have suffered under Kemalism's radical and authoritarian project of transformation, AK Party positions itself on the side of gradual change and evolution—hence, the lure of conservative recipe for it. This entails two things. First, AK Party categorically rejects any radical transformation of society through state power, law, or police force—the instruments of Kemalism.[230] Second, the critique of radical Enlightenment and the endorsement of the idea of tradition within conservative thought have opened up a space for the AK Party in Turkish politics and international politics.[231] AK Party's deployment of conservatism as part of its party identity was an attempt to garner international legitimacy through invoking the experience of Christian Democrats in Europe. At the same time, the category of conservative was something AK Party did not want to own. For that purpose AK Party sought to adopt the concept by transforming[232] and diluting it.[233] In its attempt

---

[228] Yalçın Akdoğan, *Ak Parti ve Muhafazakar Demokrasi* (Istanbul: Alfa Basın Yayım Dağıtım, 2004), http://www.idefix.com/kitap/ak-parti-ve-muhafazakar-demokrasi-yalcin-akdogan/tanim.asp?sid=LB2QSHEHJP7PRWSCX2R8.
[229] Bulaç, "AK Parti ve Muhafazakar Demokrasi," 12.
[230] Erdoğan, "Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's Keynote Speech."
[231] AK Party's deployment of conservatism as part of its party identity was an attempt to garner in
[232] Turan, Interview by the author.

to both be included within and differ from conservatism, AK Party engages in a performative politics of appropriation. Bülent Turan's comments exemplify this mode of engagement with the concept:

> "If conservatism (*muhafazakarlık*) is about being pro-status quo we are not conservative. In the past when we invoked the term [conservative] we used to refer to some other people. Like Özal, Demirel. We aren't like them. If we are still speaking with the terms of the 90s we are not conservative. And we are proud of not being such conservatives. But we are conservative in the sense of being ethical, respectful, developmentalist, modern, and respectful towards religion. These terms will settle down in time. It is the times and conditions that maturate the terms. *We are using these terms by transforming them*. Conservative Democracy. Receptive (*yenilikçi*) and respectful to religion. I was also against the term 'conservative' at the beginning. But now conservative means placing one leg of the divider (*pergel*) into our civilization and then opening out to the environment. We are different from the right wing. We are Muslim. We are committed to our ancient, deep-rooted civilization.[234]"

Ömer Özbay, an advisor to Prime Minister on economic issues, suggests that this attitude toward the people is one important difference between the National Outlook (*Milli Görüş*)—the Islamist political movement from which most AK Party founders come—and the AK Party: "National Outlook was a right-wing Kemalist structure. It was viewing the people with the same glasses. It was conservative Kemalist. It was an inverse Ittihat-ism (*tersten İttihatçılık*). Just like Kemalism, it was belittling the people. This was

[233] Şentop, Interview by the author.
[234] Turan, Interview by the author.

wrong."[235] That is why, Özbay argues, Erdoğan sought to reach out to people instead of imposing something on them. He mentions Erdoğan's initiation of the party's women's wing for the first time, his abstention from rigid slogans, his effort to find a proper language to reach out to general public, and his visits to bars to talk with people and to earn their support as examples of the centrality of 'people.' Özbay suggests that "he [Erdoğan] never demanded a shari'a state. His purpose was to reach out to people and convey his message to them. He did not want anything other than what the people want."[236] In that sense, "AK Party is not an Islamist party, but a party established by Muslims. It's definitely not Islamist, but was founded by pious people. It doesn't have a demand like Islamic state. Otherwise it would be a nostalgic party with about %3 support. But it also did not anchor itself in right-wing politics (*sağcılığa da demirlemedi*)."

In a similar vein, Mustafa Şentop finds any claim, Islamist or Kemalist, to change society quite arrogant. One can at best hope for and await the prospect that the society will transform itself.[237] Along these lines, Bülent Turan stresses that "nothing can be done against or despite the society."[238] "I believe you cannot prevent someone from drinking alcohol with the force of the state, you cannot prohibit it. You cannot just say 'this is God's order, get rid of it.'"[239] Turan then stresses that this perspective is derived not from secular norms of liberalism but from Islamic injunction of justice: "I'm not a

---

[235] Ömer Özbay, Interview by the author, December 20, 2011.
[236] Ibid.
[237] Şentop, Interview by the author.This also refers to the verse in the Quran (13:11): "Indeed, Allah will not change the condition of a people until they change what is in themselves. And when Allah intends for a people ill, there is no repelling it. And there is not for them besides Him any patron."
[238] Turan, Interview by the author.
[239] He points out that AK Party's politics is based not on "prohibitions" (*yasaklar*) but on "production of alternatives." During the times of the Milli Görüş, he says, "we used to think that not watching TV is a virtue. Is it more virtuous and logical to say we should have moral and righteous TV channels or to say do not watch TV? We should see both positives and negatives." Ibid.

liberal. Neither is AK Party. But this is a party that doesn't act despite people (*insanlara ragmen).* It acts not with reference to religion but with reference to justice."

Furthermore, as a critique of the Islamic state's tendency to legalize Islamic code of ethics, Şentop suggests that using law as an instrument of social change is a sign of weakness. Social change should come organically through practice and "in its own natural course."[240] For example it is better that the ban on headscarf in Turkey is lifted not through the force of law but through the bottom-up social dynamics. What is striking here is that Şentop launches this critique against Islamic state not through the protocols of liberal political imaginary but from a rather different standpoint that prioritizes and highlights the prevalence of Islamic normativity—shari'a—in society so much so that social change through law does not become an option. Put differently, arguing against the Kemalist pedagogic project of transforming society along secularist lines with the force of law (and sometimes with the force of exceptions to law), and at the same time disowning the same pedagogic practices of 'Islamic states' that seeks to transform society through the force of law and the state, Şentop opts for a politics that is aimed not at the state as the agent of transformation but society itself. In a way, this is a political project that seeks to pressurize the state to respect social demands and sensitivities, rather than forcing people to endorse state's project.

Emrullah İşler recognizes that there are certain laws that do not comply with shari'a and suggests that it is possible to change these laws "if society demands that, but only if the people demand it."[241] He gives the hypothetical example of a shari'a-related

[240] Şentop, Interview by the author.
[241] İşler, Interview by the author.

legislation that is put on referendum and rejected by the majority of the public. For him, "there is nothing one can do if the people reject it." Conservatism, in Isler's view, is "living your faith and culture," but it would be "Jacobinism if you impose it." Here it is also worth noting that İşler's argument about the inappropriateness of state-enforced impositions and prohibitions on the basis of religion is closely linked with the question of "integration with the world." "How can you integrate with the world with prohibitions?" asks Isler. "Otherwise you'll close yourself to the outside world. You'll become unsuccessful. And then your mistakes will be billed on Islam as it happened in Afghanistan and elsewhere."

In that sense, in AK Party's political imagination, shari'a is the Islamic normative order that speaks first and foremost to individual and community—not to state. Organizing life in accordance with shari'a is a religious obligation on the Muslim community, but its relationship with the state is rather complex and risky. That is to say shari'a inevitably shapes the way Muslims think and act, yet it cannot be enforced by the state. Put differently, AK Party stands against the idea of incorporating shari'a into the constitution, but it seeks to foster a politics in which society—as individual voters and as organized citizens—take on the responsibility of observing shari'a in politics and in other domains. In a sense, AK Party is against "constitutionalization of shari'a" but approaches favorably to "democratization of shari'a" in the sense of incorporating shari'a into politics through social demands and individual preferences.[242] Shari'a comes to influence

[242] Nathan J. Brown, "Debating the Islamic Shari'a in 21st-Century Egypt," *The Review of Faith & International Affairs* 10, no. 4 (2012): 9–17. Here, Brown defines democratization of shari'a as the dispersion and diversification of the authority to interpret shari'a. AK Party's gesture toward translating shari'a's moral authority in society into politics through democratic channels is partly compatible with

politics not through forming 'Islamic' constitutional courts or scholarly councils to strike down state laws or actions deemed repugnant to shari'a. This is the fundamental characteristic of "Islamic democracies" as variously practiced in Iran, Pakistan, and Egypt. AK Party, however, leaves the task of shari'a compliance to people. Shari'a observance is to be sought not through the force of law but through bottom-up social relationships and civic activism.

According to Ahmet Davutoğlu, democracy is the belief in the idea that "the choice of the general public would not contradict common reason (*ortak akil*)."[243] Here, the word 'common reason' has indirect Islamic references. In a famous tradition (*hadith*) Prophet Muhammad is reported to say "my community will not reach a consensus on the wrong." One question that arises—and has been asked time and again in the modern Islamic political thought—is what if the majority's demands or their representatives' legislations contradict shari'a? What if public makes its choice in a direction that goes against Islamic normativity? In other words, what if *vox populi* contradicts *vox dei*? The answer of the Islamic democracy model is that a supreme body—a constitutional court or a council of scholars—annuls the move. AK Party's response differs from the 'Islamic democracy' model of Islamism, and Davutoğlu neatly summarizes it: "If it [*vox populi*]

Brown's definition of democratization of shari'a. But it should also be noted that AK Party does not invoke a mode of religious authority in which "everyone is a preacher onto himself." On the reverse, AK Party kept and buttressed the state's institutions that seek to control religious field (such as Directorate of Religious Affairs [DRA]). Furthermore, on questions such as the headscarf ban in Turkey, R. Tayyip Erdogan suggested that determining whether headscarf is a religious obligation or not is not the business of the court but of the Islamic scholars (*ulema*). Similarly, on various occasions, AK Party acted on the *fatwas* (jurisprudential opinions) issued by the DRA. The AK Party government's withdrawal from its original proposal to build breast milk banks for babies upon the fatwa of DRA. Rather, what I mean by democratization of shari'a is its incorporation into politics through democratic mechanisms and by virtue of its capacity to muster a normative status in society. This is more akin to the conception of the relationship between shari'a and politics articulated by writers such as Khaled Abou Al-Fadl, Mohammad Fadel, Asifa Quraishi, Ebrahim Moosa, and Abdullahi An-Naim.

[243] Davutoğlu, Interview by the author.

contradicts [*vox Dei*], then it means we've lost something else."[244] This short statement conveys the gist of AK Party's configuration of the relationship between Shari'a and democracy. If democratic mechanisms produce results that sit uncomfortably with Shari'a, then the 'problem' and its 'remedy' is to be sought in the domain of the social. In Davutoğlu's words, the priority must be given to "the institutional construction of religious consciousness (*idrak*) and mentality (*zihniyet*)" through "vivid, diffuse, and horizontal civil society activism."[245]

6. Conclusion

I argued in this chapter that AK Party at once accepts and resists secularism, hence adopts the norm non-normatively. AK Party's adoption of secularism as a norm is at once normalization and a challenge to normalization. It appropriates secularism, wrests it from its proper 'authorized' meanings delimited by the Kemalist state, and reinscribes difference in its very repetition. In that sense, neither the 'transition' ('pedagogic socialization') nor the 'rejection' ('Islamist anti-sociality') narratives capture the ways in which AK Party 'translates' these norms ('performative socialization.')[246] Rather, one has to account for the dynamic and context-specific interaction of the conditions and forces

[244] Ibid.
[245] Ibid.
[246] In a sense this also troubles the binaries in the norm socialization literature in IR between accepting norms (at different degrees of socialization from mere conformity to deep-down internalization) or rejecting the norms (hence lack of socialization) There is little space in these accounts to analyze situations like AK Party's endorsement of secular democracy. Categories of strategic manipulation or strategic acceptance speak to acceptance of norms for strategic reasons without internalizing them. Johnston, *Social States*, 2008; Finnemore and Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change." However, its radical separation between 'strategic reasons' and 'normative reasons' cannot capture the instances—such as AK Party's adoption of secularism—where both logics are operative and where different logics of appropriateness enter into a process of translation that potentially transforms both logics.

that exert a normalizing power on actors such as the AK Party and how they engage with those conditions and forces. Here, I tried to demonstrate that AK Party's adoption of secularism as a norm took place under the pedagogic pressure of the conditions co-created by the Kemalist state and liberal international order. Yet, in normalizing into the norm of secularism, AK Party engaged in a politics of translation that sought to insert cultural difference and to destabilize the normalizing logic of the norm. The party used its own normalization as a resource for resisting normalization. In that sense, AK Party neither assimilates into the norm of secularism (since it seeks to differ in it) nor negates it (since it adopts it). Rather, it negotiates the norm through a performative process of cultural translation.

This is why its socialization into secularism can be better understood in performative, and not solely pedagogical, terms. AK Party's performative politics challenged the terms of Kemalism's negotiation of cultural difference within liberal global governance. It invokes the universality of secularism where Kemalism defends the necessity of a different secularism for Turkey; and it introduces cultural difference into secularism where Kemalism universalizes it. AK Party's "conservative democracy" invokes the universality of "democratic secularism" and seeks to be included within it in order to thwart the authoritarian practices of Kemalism's "militant democracy." This claim to be included within the norm of secularism is a performative gesture against the 'not yet' of Kemalist Orientalism—that Turkey is not yet ready for full exercise of democratic rights since it has not yet achieved reformation in religion and secularization in life. However, through seeking to introduce difference into secularism (with the

adjective ‘democratic’) and into democracy (with the adjective ‘conservative’), AK Party engages in a politics of cultural translation in which it negotiates Islamic and liberal (and Kemalist) ‘socials’—standards of appropriateness, historical experiences, and claims to universality.

Yet, these complex negotiations and translations could only happen under strict secularist conditions that criminalize and securitize any distant reference to shari‘a. AK Party is conscripted, by both the Kemalist state and liberal international order, to translate its Islamic political orientation into the language of secularism. However, it appropriates secularism through a logic of appropriateness that seeks authorization from within Islamic discursive tradition. It draws on a repertoire of ideas that discredits the category of ‘Islamic state’ for Islamic and historical reasons. In that sense, AK Party’s ‘conservative democracy’ is not so much a shari‘a-free Muslim politics—‘pedagogic socialization’—as it is a different modality of shari‘a politics—one that considers the enforcement of shari‘a as state law as being repugnant to the principles and purposes of shari‘a. Therefore, its negotiation of secularism and ‘conservative democracy’ is better understood as a cultural translation under liberal conditions—hence as performative socialization.

CHAPTER 5

MUSLIM BROTHERHOOD AND 'ISLAMIC DEMOCRACY': NEGOTIATING DEMOCRACY, SECULARISM AND SHARI'A THROUGH THE CIVIL STATE

"Do Arabs have the right to decide—through the democratic process—that they would rather not be liberal?"[1] This question Shadi Hamid asks goes to the heart of the debate around Islamism, secularism and democracy in Egypt and elsewhere. Can popular participation through free and fair elections with attendant rights to assembly and expression generate democratic legitimacy if it does not strictly follow secular liberal precepts? Can there be democracy without liberal secularism? Can one say 'Islamic democracy'? After the July 3, 2013 military coup in Egypt that toppled Mohammad Morsi, the first-ever democratically elected President of the country and a leader of the Muslim Brotherhood and its political wing the Freedom and Justice Party (FJP), these questions have become even more pressing. The Egyptian military and many secular liberal activists justified the coup and the subsequent banning of the Muslim Brotherhood as "a way to stop the Islamization of Egypt."[2] A self-proclaimed 'secular liberal' Egyptian friend of mine told me that he supports the coup because "secularism in Egypt was in danger"—a sentiment widely shared among other liberals inside and outside Egypt. But was there secularism in Egypt before Morsi came to power? In what sense

---

[1] Shadi Hamid, "The Brotherhood Will Be Back," *The New York Times*, May 23, 2014, http://www.nytimes.com/2014/05/24/opinion/more-democratic-less-liberal.html.
[2] Jocelyne Cesari, "Why the Muslim Brotherhood Will Not Die," *Al Jazeera America*, May 29, 2014, http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2014/5/muslim-brotherhoodpoliticalislammuslimcountriesegyptlibya.html.

was the Brotherhood a threat and to which secularism? If the Brotherhood was not secular did it also mean it was not democratic? How then are we to make sense of the Brotherhood's notion of 'Islamic democracy' and its call for a "civil state within an Islamic frame of reference"?

For sure, Egypt's liberals were not alone in supporting and rationalizing the coup. Many salafi scholars, sufi shaikhs, and the prestigious Islamic institutions such as Al-Azhar University and Dar al-Ifta also joined the coup coalition, in part for their ideological distaste for the Brotherhood and in part for protecting themselves from the wrath of the military and for securing themselves a favorable spot in the post-coup environment that would create a vacuum with the ban of the Brotherhood and its party FJP. But still, despite a rather sizable acquiescence if not full support from Islamic sectors and institutions, it was the secular liberal politicians (e.g. Mohamed El-Baradei), intellectuals (e.g. Khaled Fahmy, Samir Amin, Saadeddin Ibrahim, Alaa al-Aswany) and movements (e.g. Tamarrod) which were in the forefront of mobilizing support for the coup, both domestically and internationally.

For them the problem was the Brotherhood's Islamist ideology and its dubious commitment to democracy because of its expressly anti-secular and politically illiberal orientation.[3] It is probably true that "policy makers and academics in the West tend to be more concerned with the Brotherhood's views of Hamas than with its understanding of

[3] Economic difficulties were also part of the complaints but was trumped by the politics of secularist fear. For a discussion of the secularist fear in Egypt, see Asad, "Fear and the Ruptured State: Reflections on Egypt after Mubarak."

Shariah."[4] After all, it was the U.S. who helped enshrine shari'a in the Iraqi Constitution after invading the country[5] and it was the US that annulled the results of democratic elections in Palestine in 2006 that brought Hamas to power—not to mention the long history of its support for the coups against secular nationalist governments such as Mosaddegh in Iran in 1953 and in various Latin American countries during the Cold War. But when Morsi was toppled down by a military coup, the dominant discourse of justification was less about Brotherhood's relationships with Hamas than its illiberalism and anti-secularism.

The discourse used to justify the coup is anything but new. Since the rejuvenation (or the second birth) of the Brotherhood in Egypt in 1970s in professional unions, syndicates and student organizations, and particularly after its participation in the electoral politics of the country since early 1980s, the main ideological opposition to the movement has claimed that the Brotherhood "can't be democratic" because it does not endorse secularism and liberalism since it seeks to enshrine shari'a in the constitution.[6] By blending religion and politics, the argument goes, the Brotherhood is bound to produce an Iranian-style theocratic dictatorship. Some went further and suggested that the obstacle for democracy was not simply Brotherhood's brand of Islamism, but Islam itself

---

[4] James Traub, "Islamic Democrats?," *The New York Times*, April 29, 2007, sec. Magazine, http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/29/magazine/29Brotherhood.t.html.

[5] The Article 2 of the Constitution of Iraq defines Islam as the "official religion of the state" and as "a fundamental source of legislation." Section A of the same article stipulates that "no law that contradict the established provisions of Islam may be established," while the Section B and C of the article suggest that laws cannot contradict "the principles of democracy" and "the rights and basic freedoms" stipulated in the constitution. Article 89 of the Constitution posits that the Federal Supreme Court will be made up of judges and law experts as well as "experts in Islamic jurisprudence" whose selection criteria will be determined by a law by the Council of Representatives. "Iraqi Constitution," n.d., http://www.iraqinationality.gov.iq/attach/iraqi_constitution.pdf.

[6] Bassam Tibi, "Why They Can't Be Democratic," *Journal of Democracy* 19, no. 3 (2008): 43–48; Bassam Tibi, *The Sharia State: Arab Spring and Democratization* (Routledge, 2013).

as a religion;[7] while others tried to show the opposite by pointing out the compatibility between Islam and democracy[8] and the potential of Islamists to contribute to the democratization of their polities.[9] Others saw the Brotherhood not as a theocratic threat but rather as a harbinger of 'illiberal democracy.' Accordingly, the danger is less about Egypt's turning into another Iran than into another Russia with illiberal policies coupled with relatively free and fair elections.[10] In those accounts what derails Brotherhood's democratic credentials is not Islam per se, but rather its anti-secularist commitment to incorporate shari'a into political life.[11]

I argue that such accounts posit a secular liberal pedagogy around the norm of democracy—a tutelage that is instituted and sustained by the cooperation of the Egyptian state/military, secularist intelligentsia and liberal international order. This pedagogy not only posits secular liberalism as the precondition of democracy, but also claims that the Brotherhood must give up its ideological program, endorse secular liberal framework and move toward a 'post-Islamist' direction in order to gain the authority to properly claim democracy. In that sense, it is quite noteworthy that those who argued that the

---

[7] Bernard Lewis, *What Went Wrong?: The Clash Between Islam and Modernity in the Middle East* (Harper Perennial, 2003); Samuel P. Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?," *Foreign Affairs* 72, no. 3 (July 1, 1993): 22–49; Elie Kedourie, *Politics in the Middle East* (Oxford University Press, 1992); Gilles Kepel, *The Revenge of God: The Resurgence of Islam, Christianity and Judaism in the Modern World* (Polity Press, 1994).
[8] John L. Esposito and John O. Voll, *Islam and Democracy* (Oxford University Press, 1996); John L. Esposito, *Islam and Politics* (Syracuse University Press, 1998); John L. Esposito, *The Islamic Threat: Myth or Reality?* (Oxford University Press, 1999).
[9] Nathan J. Brown, *When Victory Is Not an Option: Islamist Movements in Arab Politics* (Cornell University Press, 2012); S. V.R Nasr, "The Rise of' Muslim Democracy,'" *Journal of Democracy* 16, no. 2 (2005): 13–27.
[10] Fareed Zakaria, "How Democracy Can Work in the Middle East," *Time*, February 3, 2011, http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,2046038,00.html.
[11] Bayat, *Making Islam Democratic*.

Brotherhood must secularize and liberalize their program in a post-Islamist direction also endorsed the July 3, 2013 coup as a major pedagogical instrument.[12]

This secular liberal discourse in the Egyptian and Western media and scholarship tends to depict the Brotherhood as a movement that either repudiates democracy *tout court* or fails to create the authority to properly claim democracy for failing to live up to its secular liberal preconditions. These are narratives of anti-socialization in which Islamism as a counter-hegemonic discourse and movement rejects 'Western' democratic norms. While 'post-Islamists' such as the AK Party in Turkey are considered as 'socializing' into democracy by coming to adopt secular liberal norms, the Brotherhood on the other hand, stands as the anti-social movement that repudiates democracy by clinging on the idea of incorporating shari'a into its political platform.[13]

In this chapter I put these pedagogic narratives under scrutiny. I argue that a closer and contextual analysis of the Brotherhood yields a much more complex picture than these representations allow. Even though the MB expressly repudiates secularism as "unacceptable," it endorses the idea of the "civility of the state" (*madaniyyat al-dawla*). For many Egyptian liberals civility of the state means secularism, but in the Brotherhood's lexicon it refers to a non-theocratic and non-militaristic political governance. The Brotherhood negotiates Islam's relationship to politics and the state through its double rejection of both theocracy and secularism. It calls for an "Islamic state that is not religious," and for a civil state that is Islamic. It invokes the normative

---

[12] Ashraf El-Sherif, *What Path Will Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood Choose?*, September 23, 2013, http://carnegieendowment.org/2013/09/23/what-path-will-egypt-s-muslim-brotherhood-choose/gnx6; Micheline Ishay, "Forum: What Killed Egyptian Democracy?," *Boston Review*, 2014.
[13] Bayat, *Making Islam Democratic*.

authority of democracy but claims to build it on the Islamic notion of *shura* (consultation) and within the bounds of the principles of shari'a, hence the idea of 'Islamic democracy.'

Clearly, these rather complicated and seemingly paradoxical statements indicate that the Brotherhood's engagement with modern democratic norms cannot be shoehorned into a story of 'rejection' of socialization just as it cannot be seen as an unconditional endorsement of these norms in a way that could be called "smooth socialization." Rather, what is at stake here is a sustained attempt to negotiate these democratic norms and institutions, to translate modern categories and classical Islamic categories into each other, partaking in democracy but also seeking to escape from its secular liberal discipline, bringing shari'a and democracy together, and thus at once adopting and challenging democracy as a norm. As such, I argue that the Brotherhood's brand of 'Islamic democracy' is a catachrestic form of appropriation which wrests democracy from its 'proper' secular liberal configurations and inscribes cultural difference into it.[14] In short, Brotherhood's relationship with democratic norms is neither one of rejection ('anti-socialization') nor of complete or unconditional endorsement ('smooth socialization'). Rather, it is one of translation, appropriation and non-normative adoption ('performative socialization').

In this chapter I analyze how the Brotherhood seeks to 'Islamize' democracy through establishing an ambivalent equivalence between democracy and *shura*, and how it at once resists *and* negotiates secularism through the concept of the 'civility' of the

[14] Established in 1928 by Hassan Al-Banna in Isma'iliyya province in Egypt, Muslim Brotherhood (MB) has been the progenitor of numerous movements and parties, some ideologically breaking with the MB such as the Islamic Jihad and some breaking with its organization such as the Wasat Party. This is why observers and members of MB make a distinction between MB "school of thought" and MB "organization."

state. I also look at how the MB reflects these ideas into the 2012 Constitution which was drafted under heavy influence of the movement and Islamist factions in general. I occasionally provide comparative analysis of the 2012 Constitution with the preceding 1971 Constitution and the succeeding 2013 Constitution in order to indicate continuities and discontinuities.

To do so, I dwell on primary sources I collected during my ethnographic fieldwork research in Egypt in the summer of 2010 and the fall of 2011. These include my interviews with the Brotherhood leaders and members and the fieldnotes I took in Brotherhood meetings and events. I also analyze the movement's official statements, issued programs and platforms, and published pamphlets as well as the published or broadcasted interviews and articles or commentaries of Brotherhood leaders. The secondary sources include the journalistic or scholarly reports and comments on the movement's past and present.

But before going into an analysis of Brotherhood's conception and practice of 'Islamic democracy,' I first explicate the domestic and international contexts within which this engagement takes place. Among these factors, the Egyptian state and its liberal international supporters exert a pedagogic power on the Muslim Brotherhood to transform it into a more secular liberal political actor. Yet, the constitutional recognition of Islam as the religion of the state and shari'a as the main source of legislation together with the public support for the public role of Islam in politics serve as dynamics and windows of opportunity for the Muslim Brotherhood to engage with secularism and democracy performatively. In that vein, I discuss the ambiguous secularism and

Islamicity of the Egyptian state system, the popular support for the public role of religion, the secular pedagogy of the Egyptian state and military and the secularist support for this tutelage both in Egypt and in liberal international order.

1. The Domestic and International Conditions of Muslim Brotherhood's Appropriation of Democracy

1.1. "Sometimes the regime is more Islamist than we are"[15]: The Ambiguous Secularism and Islamicity of the Egyptian State

"Is Egypt a secular or a religious state?" This seemingly simple question Hussein Ali Agrama asks turns out to be a notoriously difficult and complex one. For Agrama, "this is neither an answerable nor a false question." Rather it is expressive of the fundamentally contested nature of secularism as a question of where to draw the line between religion and politics. In its entire organizational life since its foundation in 1928, the Muslim Brotherhood has lived under constitutions that recognized Islam as state religion. But it was the 1971 Constitution, promulgated a year after Anwar Sadat replaced Gamal Abdul Nasser, that first enshrined shari'a in the constitution as a source of legislation. The original version of the Article 2 of the 1971 Constitution suggested that "Islam is the religion of the state; Arabic its official language. Principles of Islamic law

[15] Interview with Essam El-Errian conducted by the Crisis Group, October 2007, Cairo; quoted in "Egypt's Muslim Brothers: Confrontation or Integration? - International Crisis Group," 20, accessed June 26, 2014, http://www.crisisgroup.org/en/regions/middle-east-north-africa/egypt-syria-lebanon/egypt/076-egypts-muslim-brothers-confrontation-or-integration.aspx.

(shari'a) are a principle source of legislation."[16] In May 22, 1980, a national referendum changed the article by elevating Islamic Sharia from being "a" source of legislation to being "the" main source. This formulation of the Article 2 remained untouched during the thirty-years rule of Hosni Mobarak, and it was also kept same in 2012 and 2013 constitutions.

What Mubarak did touch, however, was the Article 7 of the 1971 Constitution. The original formulation of that article defined the political system of Egypt as a "multiparty system." In a controversial 2007 amendment, Mobarak government added two sentences to this article that read: "The citizens have the right to establish political parties according to the law. It is prohibited, however, to exercise any political activity or to found any political party based on religious considerations or on discrimination on grounds of gender or race." This created a very curious paradox within the constitutional logic of the Egyptian state. The state was at once adopting an official religion and at the same time banning any political activity on the basis of that official religion.

Importantly, the standard that Article 7 brought for prohibiting or banning parties was not discrimination on the basis of religion—a standard used in matters pertaining to gender and race—but rather any "religious consideration" was barred from entering the political field. This was also not confined to political parties since the article stipulated the prohibition of "any political activity" inspired by "religious considerations." In other words, the article dramatically expanded the power of the state to stifle political arena for

[16] "State Information Services Constitution of the Arab Republic of Egypt 1971," accessed June 21, 2014, http://www.sis.gov.eg/En/Templates/Articles/tmpArticles.aspx?CatID=208#.U6WX86iLFhI.

Islamist politics, and in particular, it "closed off any avenue for the formation of a political party by the Muslim Brotherhood."[17]

Indeed this new amendment to the Constitution was already present in a similar form in the law that regulates political parties.[18] The Article 4 of the Political Parties Law embodies the same tension between the Article 2 and Article 5 of the Constitution. The second paragraph of the Article 4 of the law stipulates that "the principles, purposes, programs, policies, or methods of the party in exercising its activities shall not contradict the Constitution or exigencies of preserving national unity, social peace, and the democratic system." The fourth paragraph of the same article, however, suggests that "the party, in its principles, programs, the exercise of its activity, or the election of its leadership or members, shall not be founded on a religious, class, sectarian, categorical, or geographical basis, or on the exploitation of religious feelings, or discrimination because of race, origin, or creed."[19] Since the Constitution defines Islam as the religion of the state and requires legislation to be compliant with shari'a, second paragraph's requirement that political parties' principles, programs, and activities cannot contradict the constitution also means they cannot run against the Islamicity of the state—per Article 2 of the Constitution. However any such allusion can easily be registered as an

[17] This 2007 ammendment in fact was the regime's response at the constitutional level to Brotherhood's electoral success in 2005 elections for the lower house of the parliament in addition to another round of arrests and investigations. See, Nathan J. Brown, Michele Durocher Dunne, and Amr Hamzawy, *Egypt's Controversial Constitutional Amendments* (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace Washington DC, 2007), http://carnegieendowment.org/files/egypt_constitution_webcommentary01.pdf.
[18] Law No. 40/1977 as amended by Law No.177/2005.
[19] Article 22 and 23 of the same law stipulates that the founders and members of parties deemed illegal by the provisions of the law will be imprisoned "even if this party is under any religious veil."

"exploitation of religious feelings" and hence be outlawed per Article 4 of the Political Parties Law.[20]

Such constitutional and legal articulations manifest the contradictions within, and ambiguities about, the nature of the Egyptian state. While the Article 2 of the Constitution adopts a state religion and makes this religion the fundamental source of legislation, it also prohibits parties that claim to act according to the dictates of this constitutional clause. The Egyptian state adopts Islam as official religion,[21] but it bans religiously inspired parties in order to "maintain a secular political environment."[22] Befuddled by this apparent contradiction between Article 2 and newly amended Article 5 of the Constitution, James Traub asked Hossam Badrawi, a reformist member of Mubarak's National Democratic Party, in 2007: "How can a self-professed religious state prohibit a political activity with a "religious background"?" Badrawi responded by resorting to what is sometimes referred to as '*reductio ad Hitlerum*': "If I go to Germany and I want to start a Nazi Party, would I be allowed to do that?" When Traub questioned

---

[20] *Monopolizing Power: Egypt's Political Parties Law* (Human Rights Watch, January 2007), http://www.refworld.org/docid/45a4e0a92.html. The Muslim Brotherhood did not apply for being registered as a political party before January 25 uprisings, but the Wasat (Centrist) Party under the leadership of Abu'l 'Ila Madi, who broke with the MB in early 1990s, applied for officially registering his party for several times. All his attempts at legal recognition were turned down by the Political Parties Committee, a body instituted by the 1977 Law and that gives the government, and in practice Mobarak's party, National Democratic Party, the right to allow or disallow the formation of new political parties, hence tightly control the party political landscape.

[21] It should be noted that the Constitution refrains from the language of 'Islamic state' despite adopting Islam as the religion of the state and the fundamental source of legislation. This stands as an interesting question for further investigation. The Islamists demands for 'Islamic state' is precisely one that wants to make Islam the state religion and shari'a its foremost source of law. One reason for not using this language might be a sensitivity on the part of the state to distinguish itself from Islamist parlance. But more importantly, as Kristen Stilt indicates, the way the Egyptian state puts Article 2 of the Constitution into practice differs from Islamist projects. I will return to this question below. Kristen Stilt, "Islam Is the Solution: Constitutional Visions of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood," *Texas International Law Journal* 46 (2011 2010): 73.

[22] Mohamed S. Abdel Wahab, "An Overview of the Egyptian Legal System and Legal Research," *Hauser Global Law School Program*, October 2006, http://www.nyulawglobal.org/globalex/egypt.htm#_Political_Parties.

whether this was a fair analogy, Badrawi rejoined: "Yes, because they don't respect the constitution, which lays out a separate role for religion and politics."[23] Indeed there was no such injunction in the Constitution separating religion and politics, except for the amendments that were being prepared at the time of that conversation.

The Egyptian constitution accepts shari'a as the fundamental source of legislation but still the Egyptian state claims to have "secular underpinnings."[24] The fact that the constitution recognizes Islam as state religion "does not have significant repercussions on the organization of power within the State or on the functioning of the public institutions," hence proclaiming a formal religion of the state "does not lead to the establishment of an Islamic regime."[25] Egypt has a "mixed-secular system"[26] or a "hybrid system"[27] that embodies an ambiguity about where to draw the line between religion, politics, and the state.[28] The inherent indeterminacies of secularism in Egypt do not undermine secularism but rather enable to state to further expand its reach and power.[29] As Dina Shehata puts it, "Egypt's political system is mixed, it is a mixed state, not a shari'a state. 1st Article of the Constitution set up *dawla madaniyya* (civil state) based on equal citizenship, then the 2nd Article establishes shari'a as the source of legislation. So

---

[23] Traub, "Islamic Democrats?".
[24] Tamir Moustafa, "Law versus the State: The Judicialization of Politics in Egypt," *Law & Social Inquiry* 28 (2003): 884.
[25] Nisrine Abiad, *Sharia, Muslim States and International Human Rights Treaty Obligations: A Comparative Study* (British Institute of International and Comparative Law, 2008), 37–38.
[26] Dina Shehata, Interview by the author, Cairo, August 4, 2010.
[27] Pakinam Rachad Elsharkawy, "Religion and State in the Muslim World: Comparative Perspectives" (Foundation for Sciences and Arts, Istanbul, December 13, 2010), http://www.bisav.org.tr/merkez.aspx?module=yuvarlakmasaayrinti&turid=18&menuID=8_6_18&merkezid=6&yuvarlakmasaid=502.
[28] H. A Agrama, "Secularism, Sovereignty, Indeterminacy: Is Egypt a Secular or a Religious State?," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 52, no. 03 (2010): 495–523; Hussein Ali Agrama, *Questioning Secularism: Islam, Sovereignty, and the Rule of Law in Modern Egypt* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012).
[29] Agrama, *Questioning Secularism*, 105.

the state engages in a balancing act between more secularist and Islamist wings. It is a semi-secular system."[30]

This mixed and ambiguous nature of the state in matters about religion and state also becomes glaringly apparent in the Egyptian Civil Code of 1948 which suggests that "where no provision is made in the present text, the Judge must have recourse to custom (*'urf*), then to the principles (*mabadi'*) of the shari'a, then to natural law (*qanun tabi'i*) and then to equity (*'adala*)."[31] This suggests that the sources of legislation and jurisprudence are both religious and secular. In that vein, the shari'a-based legal principle of '*hisba*,' that is, the policing for preventing vice and commanding good and controlling markets, is a particularly curious practice that stirs heated debates inside and outside Egypt. Most famously, in 1996, Egypt's highest civil and criminal appellate court, the Court of Cassation (*Mahkamat al-Naqd*), convicted Nasr Hamid Abu Zayd, a professor of Arabic and Islamic studies, for apostasy because of his writings and forced him by decree to divorce from his wife.[32]

For some this mixed constitutional structure is an outcome of the regime's strategy of cooptation for survival. Accordingly, given that the Egyptian public is self-expressedly religious and want to see more public role for religion, the authoritarian regime offers such constitutional "concessions" in order to "buy in" the masses into the regime or to disarm any political opposition that can come from religious circles.[33]

---

[30] Shehata, Interview by the author.
[31] Maurice Borrmans, "Cultural Dialogue and 'Islamic Specificity,'" in *Islam, Modernism and the West: Cultural and Political Relations at the End of the Millennium*, ed. Gema Martín Muñoz (I. B. Tauris in association with the Eleni Nakou Foundation, 1999), 88.
[32] Agrama, *Questioning Secularism*.
[33] Elsharkawy, "Religion and State in the Muslim World: Comparative Perspectives."

Indeed one can argue that this strategy worked quite well in Egypt with the Islamists outside the Brotherhood, particularly with Salafis and Sufis, who were pointing at the Article 2 to suggest that Egypt was already an Islamic state and hence Brotherhood's political activism was entirely wrong-headed.[34] In formulating its vision of Islamic democracy, the Brotherhood capitalizes on this ambiguous character of the Egyptian state as at once Islamic and secular in order to push for more space for shari'a governance.

1.2. Popular Support for Enshrining Shari'a in the Constitution and for Public Role of Religion

In one of the largest bookstores in Cairo's Talat Harb Square in November 2011, I was conversing with a gentleman. "I'm liberal," he said, "I support Baradei. I hate Islamist parties. I never supported them." When I asked what he meant by the term liberal, he said, "I want human rights, democracy, and secularism ('*almaniyya*)." Since he described himself as a secular liberal, I asked if he would like to see shari'a not implemented and if he would want the Article 2 of the Constitution changed. He was almost offended by the question. "How can I not apply shari'a?" he said with befuddlement. "I'm Muslim. I'm liberal but I pray and fast and everything. Of course I would implement shari'a. That's not what secularism is about. Secularism is not atheism (*ladiniyya*). We're religious people. For thousands of years that has been so."

[34] Many Salafis I talked to expressed these views. One of them was a 'born-again Salafi' who was a strong supporter of Nasser and a high-ranking buraucrat at his time, who went to Saudi Arabia to work and came back as a more devout and Salafi person. For him, "Ikhwan went too far in politics" as it went to "pressure the authority" to take certain measures. What was true was the way of the Al-Azhar scholars, that is to "tell the authority what is right and not right" and it is up to the ruler to listen or not. "Ikhwan is using Islam in order to reach to power," he told me, and then he grabbed the chair he was sitting on and continued, "they want to sit on the chair, nothing more." Abdulhamid Salem, Interview by the author, Cairo, July 9, 2010.

Such conversations turned out to be not so infrequent during my fieldwork in Egypt. As one Egyptian academic observed, "there is an Islamist hegemony in Egypt so that even secularists cannot argue against shari'a."[35] Nathan Brown finds a "surprising consensus" over the "general themes" of shari'a.[36] There is nearly a consensus among Egyptians about adopting shari'a, particularly over personal status issues such as marriage, divorce, and inheritance.[37]

Almost every poll conducted in Egypt continuously finds a very strong public support for inclusion of shari'a in the constitution as the primary or only source of law, including the criminal punishments derived from it. The Arab Barometer Survey finds that 80 percent of Egyptians believe that laws should be made in accordance with the shari'a.[38] But large majority of people also do not want the "men of religion" to control politics. But the large majority of Egyptians also believe that democracy is preferable to any other kind of government. According to the Pew survey in 2011, 82 percent of Egyptians support stoning as a punishment for adultery, 84 percent favor the death penalty for Muslims who leave the religion. Also on questions such as homosexuality, divorce, gender equality, and adultery, the public favors an illiberal attitude.[39]

---

[35] Ashraf El-Sherif, "Shari'a and the Civil State in Egypt" (American University in Cairo, Cairo, Egypt, October 11, 2011).

[36] This aspect of Egyptian politics is what makes it quite different from Turkish politics. In Egypt many of the liberals I interviewed—those who staunchly supported secularism either as 'almaniyya or as madaniyya—expressed their adherence to shari'a. Their criticism of Islamists, it turned out, was about how Salafis or Muslim Brotherhood interpreted it. In Turkey however, not only that the general public does not express an interest in shari'a, but even the Islamists do not use the term shari'a that often, and definitely, AK Party does not and cannot refer to shari'a in any way.

[37] Brown, "Egypt and Islamic Sharia." Brown, "Debating the Islamic Shari'a in 21st-Century Egypt."

[38] Mark Tessler, Amaney Jamal, and Michael Robbins, "New Findings on Arabs and Democracy," *Journal of Democracy* 23, no. 4 (2012): 89–103, doi:10.1353/jod.2012.0066.

[39] "The Tahrir Square Legacy: Egyptians Want Democracy, a Better Economy, and a Major Role for Islam," *Pew Research Center's Global Attitudes Project*, accessed June 19, 2014,

Tarek Masoud and Wael Nawara's interrogation of the question "Will Egypt's Liberals Ever Win?" provides an interesting way to track the impact of this 'Islamist hegemony' and the broad consensus over shari'a in Egyptian public. For them, liberals can win the political battle against Islamists, but "they must forget Shariah and focus on painting Egypt's Islamist president [Morsi] as just another Mubarak."[40] The authors report a survey conducted by one of them in November 2011 which shows that 80 percent of Egyptians believe that the government should set up a council of religious scholars to oversee legislation's conformity with shari'a, 75 percent believe that religious authorities should be able to censor media, and 67 percent believed that having a female president was not a good idea. Hence, surveys find that a non-secular and non-liberal democracy, which incorporates shari'a into the constitution but is not run by religious scholars, is what majority of Egyptians demand.

1.3. The Military Tutelage over Politics and Society and Secular Liberal Endorsement of It

For the Egyptian state, it was an unmistakably pedagogical project to protect the ambiguous secularity of the state against Islamists, particularly against the Brotherhood. What is usually referred to as the 1952 Revolution, or the Free Officers Coup, paved the way to a form of socialist Arab nationalism which was both secularist and authoritarian in orientation. For Nasser, if political parties were permitted, they would act like the stooges

---

http://www.pewglobal.org/2013/01/24/the-tahrir-square-legacy-egyptians-want-democracy-a-better-economy-and-a-major-role-for-islam/.

[40] Tarek Masoud and Wael Nawara, "Will Egypt's Liberals Ever Win?," *Slate*, December 4, 2012, http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/foreigners/2012/12/egypt_s_liberals_can_defeat_mohammad_morsi_if_they_ignore_the_muslim_brotherhood.html.

of foreign intelligence agencies or the feudalists. If he had allowed party pluralism, "there would be a party acting as an agent for the American CIA, another in the pay of MI6, the British intelligence service, and a third working for the Soviety KGB."[41] For Nasser, Egyptian society was not yet ready for democratic self-rule. For this it had to go through a fundamental social change that would overcome feudal relations. This vision becomes crystallized in his response to a question asked by an Indian journalist in 1957 about whether he would think about introducing democracy:

> "Can I ask you a question: what is democracy? We were supposed to have a democratic system during the period 1923 to 1953. But what good was this democracy to our people? I will tell you. Landowners… ruled our people. They used this kind of democracy as an easy tool for the benefits of a feudal system. The feudalists [would] gather the peasants together and drive them to the polling booths. There the peasants would cast their votes according to the instructions of their masters. I [on the other hand] want to liberate…the peasants and workers to be able to say 'yes' and 'no' without any of this affecting their livelihood or their daily bread. This in my view is the basis of freedom and democracy."[42]

This vision continued in Sadat's presidency, yet with significant changes in the constitutional structure of the state, particularly on matters pertaining to the relationship

---

[41] Adeed Dawisha, *The Second Arab Awakening: Revolution, Democracy, and the Islamist Challenge from Tunis to Damascus*, 1 edition (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2013), 73.

[42] Roger Owen, *State, Power and Politics in the Making of the Modern Middle East* (Routledge, 2000), 149. Also quoted in Dawisha, *The Second Arab Awakening*. It is worth noting that Hasan Al-Banna, the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood, was also holding similar views about party pluralism. For him, at a time when the Muslim community was struggling against colonialism for its independence, party politics would open the door for foreign interference and would boost those who are only concerned with selfish gains. He said, "We the Muslims are neither communists nor democrats nor anything similar to what they claim; we are, by God's grace, Muslims, which is our road to salvation from Western colonialism." Ahmad S. Moussalli, "Hasan Al-Bannā's Islamist Discourse on Constitutional Rule and Islamic State," *Journal of Islamic Studies* 4, no. 2 (July 1, 1993): 172.

between religion, state and politics. The 1971 Constitution promulgated under Sadat introduced Islam as state religion and the principles of shari'a as the source of legislation, By introducing these Islamizing moves Sadat sought to appease and buy off the ever more consolidating Islamist movement against his encounter with the left.[43] This was the time when Egypt was reshuffling its alliances in the Cold War and enshrining shari'a in the constitution was Sadat's way of coopting the public against the pro-Soviet left. After Egypt's humiliating defeat in 1967 War under the secular-nationalist-populist Nasser, Egypt's international alliances has been reshuffled under Anwar Sadat. Against the Russian-sympathizer left, Sadat eased the repression on Muslim Brotherhood and allowed (and at times encouraged) them to flourish in student unions and professional unions.

The Hosni Mubarak period also started with the easing of the relationship between the state and the MB in a bid to contain violent jihadi groups which assassinated Sadat in 1981. However, with Mubarak's support for the Gulf War and its policies in the US-Israeli orbit together with the Brotherhood's growing presence in electoral politics, professional unions and social service provision, the relationship between Mubarak and Brotherhood increasingly deteriorated. Several campaigns of crackdown with arrests, bans, and confiscations followed. Even the modicum of democratic governance was constantly deferred and suspended by the Mubarak regime on the grounds that people were not yet ready and mature enough for exercising self-governance. Mubarak once

[43] Tamir Moustafa, "Law in the Egyptian Revolt," *Middle East Law and Governance* 3, no. 1–2 (March 25, 2011): 190.

said, "we are providing doses of democracy in proportion to our ability to absorb them."[44] The Mubarak regime portrayed itself to the secular liberal audience, inside and outside Egypt, as defender of the secularity of the regime against 'Islamist fundamentalists.' For example, when asked on Al-Jazeera English in 2007 about whether there was a political future for the Muslim Brotherhood within Egypt, Maged Reda Boutros, a spokesperson for the regime, said: "Yes of course, if they secularize their program. If they reintroduce themselves, if they reorient themselves. Because simply it is not just a political debate or an argument, it is rather a choice between stability and chaos. No government would allow chaos in its arena or in its environment. So it is very natural that the Egyptian regime would ask the MB or urge them to convert into a secular political program."[45]

What is really interesting is that despite such calls for "conversion" of the MB into secularism as a precondition for political participation, the regime was also keen on keeping a public image as the defender of the faith. One instance where this became evident was during the public uproar that erupted in 2006 after Egyptian Culture Minister Farouk Hosni said that headscarf was "a symbol of backwardness." The Egyptian daily Al-Masri Al-Youm quoted him saying that Islamic headscarf represented a "backward thinking" and that he longed about the times when women "went to universities and work

---

[44] May Kassem, *In the Guise of Democracy: Governance in Contemporary Egypt* (Ithaca Press, 1999), 54. This very much echoes what Abdelraouf al-rawabda, a former Jordanian prime minister, said in support of deferring democracy to a time when people and conditions get mature enough: "Democracy is an evolving being, gets born and grows up. It is never created all at once. Whoever asks for something pre-maturely, one will be punished by not getting it. The baby that is born bigger than its natural size either will die; the mother will die or both will die." Quoted in Moataz A. Fattah and Jim Butterfield, "Muslim Cultural Entrepreneurs and the Democracy Debate," *Critique: Critical Middle Eastern Studies* 15, no. 1 (April 2006): 65, doi:10.1080/10669920500515135.

[45] *Inside Story* (Al-Jazeera English, July 29, 2007).

places without headscarf."[46] After various demonstrations in universities and elsewhere the Egyptian Parliament held a joint session of the Culture and Religious Affairs committees to address the issue. In the meeting, the Brotherhood MP for the Delta governerate of Gharbiyya stormed Hosni for making "a contemptuous remark about a religious and a Quranic decree." What was surprising, however, was the reaction of some NDP MPs. While some NDP MPs defended Hosni, others shouted at him, called on him to resign, and even one of them attempted to physically assault him. One NDP MP, Mohamed El-Omda, accused the Minister for spreading "an American agenda of liberal Western values in Egypt." El-Omda said that he had filed a complaint with the prosecutor-general, inviting him to intervene "to save Egypt and Islamic world from which America and the Egyptian regime leads against Islamic values and identity."[47] This short-lived instance vindicates what Essam El-Errian, a leader of the Muslim Brotherhood and FJP, once told in an interview a few months after this controversy: "Sometimes the regime is more Islamist than we are."[48] In that sense, while the Mubarak regime acted as a pedagogue for forcing to "convert" the Brotherhood into a secular movement, at times, it also has given reactions that surpassed the Brotherhood in its Islamist coloration.

The tutelary role of the military in Egypt still continues under Al-Sisi. Nasser's crackdown on the Brotherhood radically stalled the growth of the movement till 1970s, and Sadat and Mubarak's policies were a blend of repression and opening. But since the

---

[46] Adam Morrow, "Headscarves Dispute Travels to Egypt," *Inter Press Service*, December 1, 2006, http://www.ipsnews.net/2006/12/religion-headscarves-dispute-travels-to-egypt/.
[47] Essam El-Din, "Hosni Makes No Apology," *Al-Ahram Weekly*, December 7, 2006, http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2006/823/eg4.htm.
[48] "Egypt's Muslim Brothers," 20.

July 3, 2013 coup and his subsequent rise to the presidency, Al-Sisi has clearly communicated his will and determination to exterminate the Brotherhood altogether from Egyptian society and politics. Along with Al-Sisi's policies of bloody repression, we have an interesting source to discern the broader vision that informs Al-Sisi's stance toward democracy and secularism. This is the thesis Al-Sisi wrote as a student at US Army War College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania in 2006. In this 17-page thesis, Sisi makes two points. First, democracy should not be pushed or promoted "hastily" because the Middle Eastern society is not yet ready for it and the results would embarrass American policies in the region, particularly on the question of Israel. So rather than talking about democracy, American and Egyptian policymakers should talk about economic development and education that may (or may not) lead to democracy in the future. It should be kept in mind that this thesis was written at a time when the Bush administration was using the pretext of promoting democracy as an ideological justification for US aggression toward Iraq. Perhaps more importantly, it was produced at a time when the Bush administration was toying with the idea of promoting democracy in the Middle East and was pressuring Mubarak to further liberalize the system. Indeed, under US pressure, the Mubarak regime did make a change in 2005 by allowing more Brotherhood MPs into parliament (88 out of 454), which, for many, was Mubarak's way of warning the US what would happen if he would allow for truly democratic elections. Ultimately the US pressure was watered down as Bush administration discarded its so-called 'Freedom Agenda' after Hamas's electoral victory. Second, Al-Sisi suggests that democracy in Egypt cannot be implemented a la secular liberal model. Rather, he argues, democracy

must be built on Islamic principles and secular liberal values should not be imposed on Muslim societies.

What is also worth noting is the support that the Mubarak and Al-Sisi regimes get from secular liberal intelligentsia in its pedagogic effort to socialize the MB into secular liberal coordinates. The most recent example of this was the July 3, 2013 coup, which was hailed by most secular liberal figures.[49] The pedagogic pressure of these self-identified liberal and/or secularist intellectuals, allying themselves with the discourse of the Egyptian state, urged the Brotherhood that the only way it could be given a chance to join in public political life was through a radical transformation of its Islamist ideology toward a more liberal 'post-Islamism' that is in peace with secularism as a precondition of democracy.[50]

This precondition argument that posits secularism as a necessary if not sufficient condition for democracy has two dimensions. First, it is a theoretical and historical explanation about which institutions, mechanisms, or norms have led to the rise, survival, and consolidation of democracy. The second is a more overtly political claim that used the explanatory argument about the emerging conditions of democracy to deny democracy to societies which have not gone through these steps, such as secularization. The distinction between the two is not hard and fast and there are significant overlaps. Yet still these are two different modes of thinking about preconditions of democracy. The liberal discourse in contemporary global politics often depicts Brotherhood's critical

---

[49] Amr Mahmoud El-Shobaki, "The End of Muslim Brotherhood Rule in Egypt," *Carnegie Middle East Center*, August 1, 2013, http://carnegie-mec.org/2013/08/01/end-of-muslim-brotherhood-rule-in-egypt/gk93.
[50] Ishay, "Forum: What Killed Egyptian Democracy?"; El-Sherif, *What Path Will Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood Choose?*.

stance to secularism as the proof of its unfitness to democratic rule. Such arguments that view secularism as a precondition and liberalism as the only framework for democracy led self-identified liberal democrats to justify and buttress the pedagogic role of the military over Egyptian society, as one can see in Fareed Zakari'a comments:

> My hope is that Egypt avoids this path [of illiberal democracy]. I cannot tell you in all honesty that it will. But much evidence suggests that democracy in Egypt could work. First, the army, which remains resolutely secular, will thwart any efforts to create a religious political order. The Egyptian army may well fight the efforts of democrats to dismantle some elements of the military dictatorship — since the elites of the armed forces have benefited mightily from that system — but it is powerful and popular enough to be able to draw certain lines. In Egypt, as in Turkey, the army has the opportunity to play a vital role in modernizing the society and checking the excesses of religious politics.[51]

Similar arguments that buttressed the army's tutelage over civilian politics, especially on Islamist factions, have found support from inside and outside Egypt. These political supports rested on various arguments that depicted Egyptian people and/or conditions of the country as being 'not yet' mature enough to exercise democratic self-governance. "I'm not sure the time is right for the Arab region to go through the democratic process," said the Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu during the protests in Tahrir Square in January 2011, and continued: "You can't make it with elections, especially in the current situation where radical elements, especially Islamist groups, may exploit the

[51] Zakaria, "How Democracy Can Work in the Middle East."

situation. It might take a generation or so."[52] A similar sentiment was also echoed by the Egyptian Minister of Culture Mohamad Saber who was appointed by the military after the July 3, 2013 military coup: "There is no time for democracy during the circumstances and times that the country is going through."[53] Moreover, in his quarrel with Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan at the World Social Forum in 2009, Shimon Perez rejected Hamas's democratic legitimacy by repeating the same distrust in elections in a striking way. "Democracy is not about elections," Perez argued, "it is a civilization." Hence, not belonging to the civilization of democracy, HAMAS and the Muslim Brotherhood from which it emerged get discursively deprived of making a credible and authoritative claim on democracy as a norm.

1.4. "Absolutely Necessary Rescue of a Nation": Liberal International Support for Egypt's Military Tutelage

As the largest Arab country and the cultural and geographical gravity center of the Arab world, Egypt is arguably the most important Arab ally of the United States in the Middle East. After fighting wars with Israel in 1948, 1967, and 1973, Egypt then became the first Arab country to recognize and make peace with it. Since then, Egypt has been the second largest recipient of US aid after Israel.[54] Brotherhood has long been one of the

---

[52]He then called on the U.S. and European countries to "curb their criticism of President Hosni Mubarak to preserve stability in the region" since it was "in the West's interest to maintain the stability of the Egyptian regime." Barak Ravid, "Israel Urges World to Curb Criticism of Egypt's Mubarak," *Haaretz.com*, January 31, 2011, http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/israel-urges-world-to-curb-criticism-of-egypt-s-mubarak-1.340238.

[53] Ahmed Naje, "Culture in the Age of Sisi: The Continued Propaganda of Illusions," *The Tahrir Institute for Middle East Policy*, March 12, 2014, http://timep.org/commentary/culture-in-the-age-of-sisi.

[54] Egypt receives an average of $ 2 billion annually since the Camp David Accords in 1979. Regularly about $1.3 billion comes as military aid and the rest is economic aid. Jeremy M. Sharp, *U. S. Foreign Assistance to the Middle East: Historical Background, Recent Trends, and the FY 2010 Request*

most vocal critics of the terms of Camp David Treaty with Israel and is the progenitor and one of the closest supporters of Hamas in Palestine. Even though the Brotherhood had declared that it would abide by Egypt's international agreements, it also suggested that it would demand a renegotiation of the terms of Camp David (a widely popular demand in Egypt shared across ideological and religious aisles) [55] The Brotherhood's party program consistently refers to Israel as the "Zionist entity" without mentioning its name, affirms "the right of the Palestinian people to liberate their land" and highlights "the duty of governments and peoples of Arab and Muslim countries, especially Egypt, to aid and support the Palestinian people and the Palestinian resistance against the Zionist usurpers of their homeland."[56]

When the international community did not recognize the results of the Palestinian elections, the Brotherhood issued an official statement in 2007, criticizing the West for being hypocritical and insincere about democratic reform in the Middle East. "Democracy, freedom and human rights and all other values propagated by the West and the United States are a tool for achieving Western and US interests without any real impartiality or fairness," it argued. The Brotherhood observed that "if democracy brings

---

(Congressional Research Service, January 2010). Up until the 2005 amendments, the Political Parties Law was prohibiting any leader or member of a political party from being "affiliated with, related to, or in cooperation with any party, organization, group, or political power that has called for the abrogation of Egypt's peace treaty with Israel." Interestingly, this clause was lifted in the very same amendment that lifted the requirement for a political party's "founding pillars, principles, goals, programs, policies, or methods" to be compliant with Islamic jurisprudence as well as "the principles of both the July 23, 1952 and the May 15, 1971 revolutions." *Refworld | Monopolizing Power*.

[55] As the Crisis Group report on the MB points out, "[r]ejection of the Camp David treaty as illegitimate is a view shared by a sizeable poirtion of the opposition, whether secular or Islamist, either on the grounds that Israel has not lived up to its commitment to pursue peace with Palestinians or that the manner in which President Anwar al-Sadat pursued the agreement was illegitimate." However, the same report also quotes an interview with Essam El-Errian, a senior MB leader, saying that the movement's political party would "respect previous agreements" even if the movement itself would not. See, "Egypt's Muslim Brothers," 20.

[56] "Freedom and Justice Party 2011 Parliamentary Elections Program," n.d., 36.

in US and Western agents, it will be welcomed and praised, and if it brought freemen who oppose Western and US plans, it would be considered illegitimate, to reveal the ideological hypocrisy of the Western civilization." For the Brotherhood, "the United States has realized that the free choice of Islamic peoples contradicts with its interests, leading to US procrastination in asking for holding free elections and making political reforms." Since "the US policy doesn't achieve region's interests," the Brotherhood stresses that those who are "willing to be politically liberated from tyrannical regimes related to US interests" should take the issue in their hands and create an "international awakening against the US project that want to dominate the futures of the people."[57] It calls for "the awakening of Islamists…to face the Western project that aims to attack the Nation" by drawing on a "comprehensive cultural view of Islam and its moderate method." Therefore, the Brotherhood clearly articulates an opposition to American regional order in the Middle East.

Egyptian military, on the other hand, thrives on the $1.3 billion annual American foreign aid that is conditioned on keeping the treaty with Israel. As the military that fought with Israel in 1948, 1967, and 1973, its military has very much become dependent on the US, financially and politically. The Egyptian military is not as strictly secularist as the Kemalist ideology of the Turkish military. It never expressed any distaste with ordinary people's religiosity. For example, it is quite ordinary to see Egyptian military officers in their uniforms praying in mosques, something that is beyond the pale for the Turkish military officers. However, similar to the Turkish military, the Egyptian military

[57] "Reading into The Muslim Brotherhood's Documents," *Ikhwanweb*, June 13, 2007, http://www.ikhwanweb.com/article.php?id=818.

has took on the task of fighting 'Islamist fundamentalism,' a category that is overstretched to include non-violent Islamists such as the Brotherhood. Therefore, the Egyptian military acts as the defender of the American regional order in the Middle East in fighting political Islam. The fact that the Egyptian military bombed the underground tunnels from Rafah to Gaza in the second day of the coup was a strong signal to the West as to the strategic value of the coup. This also transforms secularism from being solely a domestic matter of the institutional relationship between religion and state into an international geopolitical question. [58]

In this light, democracy seems unfit for the region for strategic reasons,[59] and the claim that secularism is a precondition for democracy attains a high geopolitical value in sustaining and supporting the pro-American autocracies in the region. Right after the fall of Bin Ali in Tunisia, and three days before the start of the uprising in Egypt, Robert Kaplan suggested that "in terms of American interests and regional peace, there is plenty of peril in democracy." He then went on to explicate the fundamental paradox between democracy and imperial power in Egypt:

> It was not democrats, but Arab autocrats, Anwar Sadat of Egypt and King Hussein of Jordan, who made peace with Israel. An autocrat firmly in charge can make concessions more easily than can a weak, elected leader—just witness the fragility of Mahmoud Abbas's West Bank government. And it was democracy that brought the extremists of Hamas to power in Gaza. In fact, do we really want a relatively enlightened leader

[58] Agrama, *Questioning Secularism*.
[59] Charles Krauthammer, "In Defense of Democratic Realism," *The National Interest*, n.d.; Francis Fukuyama, "After Neoconservatism," *The New York Times*, February 19, 2006, sec. Magazine, http://www.nytimes.com/2006/02/19/magazine/neo.html; Ray Takeyh and Nikolas Gvosdev, "Democratic Impulses versus Imperial Interests: America's New Mid-East Conundrum," *Orbis*, no. Summer 2003 (n.d.): 415–31.

> like King Abdullah in Jordan undermined by widespread street demonstrations? We should be careful what we wish for in the Middle East.[60]

This advice the US government and other Western states did listen, and they have been careful of what they wished for.[61] Later, the international community offered a rather warm welcome to the July 3, 2013 coup. The United States, European Union, Arab League and other international organizations (e.g. UN, WB, IMF, OSCE, G-8) did not air any serious criticism of the coup and endorsed the language of the military (i.e. "Egypt's right to defend itself against terrorism"). The US government did not recognize the event as a coup to continue its military aid to the new military-backed government. The Gulf monarchies not only provided political support but also poured billions of dollars to make the coup economically successful. The key actors of liberal global governance and their regional clients have almost unanimously given a free pass to Egypt's new military-backed regime.[62]

Despite his killing of more than 2500 nonviolent protestors and injuring more than 4000 of them in one single day of August 14, 2013 in Cairo's Raba'a Square; Abdel Fattah El-Sisi did not face any international condemnation let alone prosecution, but was

---

[60] Robert D. Kaplan, "One Small Revolution," *The New York Times*, January 22, 2011, sec. Opinion, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/23/opinion/23kaplan.html.

[61] Obama first called for an "orderly transition" in Egypt—a transition that would give enough concessions to the protestors yet would not allow the regime to lose the hold on power. And the liberal international community offered a warm welcome to the July 3, 2013 military coup that ousted Morsi from power, and did not raise any serious voice against the military regime when it committed mass atrocities, when it turned power to the hands of the military that would protect the West from "perils of democracy."

[62] Marc Lynch, "Peak Middle East?," *Foreign Policy*, November 21, 2013, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/11/21/obama_administration_egypt.

rather endorsed as the leader to head the country toward democracy.[63] Upon his election as the President with 96 percent of the votes, Canadian Foreign Ministry issued a statement congratulating Sisi for the results of the election, endorsing the language the Egyptian regime uses in repressing the Brotherhood ("We continue to stand with Egypt in its efforts to confront terrorism"), describing Sisi's election as a sign of "making a peaceful and meaningful transition to democracy, based on respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms and the rule of law."[64] Similarly, the US Secretary of State John Kerry also paid a visit to Cairo to congratulate Sisi, which has been understood by the Egyptian political establishment as a clear support to the regime.[65]

As another typical example of Western support for the military coup in Egypt, and by extension for the Mubarak regime before it, Tony Blair, former Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, agreed to work as El-Sisi's business advisor through a United Arab Emirates-funded consultancy project. Blair congratulated Sisi on "winning the support of people" with 96 percent of the votes in what the British daily Guardian calls "a dictatorial-style election" in which the biggest political force in the country was banned and the media totally controlled. Blair suggested that Sisi "deserved the support of the whole international community." As *The Guardian* notes, in April 2014, Blair singled out the Brotherhood and other Islamists as "the enemy that the west and east should unite

---

[63] It should be noted that Saddam Hussein was convicted of crimes against humanity and was therefore executed for his killing of 148 civilians in the city of Dujail in 1982 after a failed assassination attempt against him. "Saddam Hussein Executed in Iraq," *BBC*, December 30, 2006, sec. Middle East, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/6218485.stm.

[64] Foreign Affairs Government of Canada, "Canada News Centre - Statement on Egyptian Election Results," News Releases, (June 4, 2014), http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?nid=853509.

[65] "Party Leaders: Kerry's Visit to Egypt Official Recognition of 30 June | Egypt Independent," *Al-Masry Al-Youm*, July 24, 2014, http://www.egyptindependent.com/news/party-leaders-kerry-s-visit-egypt-official-recognition-30-june.

against," and hailed Morsi's overthrow as "the absolutely necessary rescue of a nation." And he joined with the autocracies of Arab Gulf region such as UAE and Saudi Arabia who see themselves as the "spearhead of a life-and-death regional struggle against political Islam."[66] What bothered Blair in his support of Sisi was not the killing of 2500 protestors, injuring of more than 17000, and jailing of more than 16.000 (80 of which died in custody) and detaining and inditing 40.000 in one single year, nor its systematic torture campaigns and its complete ban of all political and media presence of opposition.[67] But rather it was only the jailing of three Al-Jazeera journalists that Blair felt was worthy of mentioning.

2. The Muslim Brotherhood's Notion of 'Islamic Democracy'

Operating under these domestic and international conditions, how did the Brotherhood engage with democracy as a norm? Over the last decade, Egyptian and international observers of the Brotherhood have rightly pointed out that there were

---

[66] Seumas Milne, "Tony Blair to Advise Egypt President Sisi on Economic Reform," *The Guardian*, July 2, 2014, sec. Politics, http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2014/jul/02/tony-blair-advise-egypt-president-sisi-economic-reform. A potential success of the MB government posed an existential threat to the oil-rich and Western-backed monarchies of the Gulf, boosting the voices demanding the end to the autocratic rules of these tribal monarchies. After all, the MB's program explicitly states its willingness to "play an active role in supporting the Arab revolutions," which poses an existential threat to the tribal monarchies of the Arab Gulf states. Securing those monarchies would also secure the Western-backed regional order. These are only some of the reasons that led the key actors liberal international order and its regional backers in the Middle East and North Africa to support a military coup against MB's democratically elected President in the country's first free and fair elections in her thousands years of history.

[67] For numbers, see Michele Dunne and Scott Williamson, "Egypt's Unprecedented Instability by the Numbers," *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, March 24, 2014, http://carnegieendowment.org/2014/03/24/egypt-s-unprecedented-instability-by-numbers/h5j3?reloadFlag=1; "Egypt: Rampant Torture, Arbitrary Arrests and Detentions Signal Catastrophic Decline in Human Rights One Year after Ousting of Morsi | Amnesty International," July 3, 2014, http://www.amnesty.org/en/news/egypt-anniversary-morsi-ousting-2014-07-02.

significant ambiguities and gray areas in the movement's constitutional vision on the question of democracy and shari'a.[68] It was not only outside observers, but also members of the MB who were criticizing the movement for its lack of clarity in program and discourse.[69] Khaled Hamza, the head of Brotherhood's official English website Ikwanonline, acknowledges that there are "gray areas" in the Brotherhood's program, but he then adds: "But sometimes there should be gray areas. Because muslims live under tyranny (*zulm*). How can we make the balance (*mawazin*) between resistance and democracy, and between international alliance and liberation from colonization?"[70]

Under Mubarak's repression, this was in a way understandable given the fact that there were no real prospect for the Brotherhood to rule the country and hence there were no pressing demands or incentives to come up with a detailed program whose details may alienate potential supporters.[71] Similarly, Samer Shehata points out that the Brotherhood is sometimes put to an unfair test by expecting too much of clarity and specificity when we do not expect the same from other political factions. After all, before January 25,

---

[68] Nathan J. Brown, Amr Hamzawy, and Marina Ottaway, *Islamist Movements and the Democratic Process in the Arab World: Exploring Gray Zones*, Middle East Series (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, March 2006), http://carnegieendowment.org/2006/03/08/islamist-movements-and-democratic-process-in-arab-world-exploring-gray-zones/2cvu; Stilt, "Islam Is the Solution."

[69] One former member of the movement who worked very closely with Esam El-Errian once told me that he was a member of the committee that works on developing policies for MB but he even does not know what the MB wants in domestic and foreign policy Abdulla, Interview by the author, Cairo, July 7, 2010. The criticism was echoed by another former MB member, who is also son of a member of MB's highest ruling body (*Maktab al-Irshad*), after long conversations I had with him: "Ikhwan doesn't have a strategy. It doesn't know where it wants to go, with what means, and so on. You'll do months of research on Ikhwan. And before you leave Egypt, if you have any idea what Ikwan wants, then you tell me." Abdurrahman, Interview by the author, Cairo, October 8, 2011.

[70] Khaled Hamza, Interview by the author, Cairo, August 12, 2010.

[71] Brown, Hamzawy, and Ottaway, *Islamist Movements and the Democratic Process in the Arab World*.

2011 (and now after July 3, 2013) they were participating in an electoral game in which, as Nathan Brown aptly puts it, "victory is not an option."[72]

Up until 1970s, the Brotherhood viewed democracy as a foreign idea. Some saw it as a repudiation of God's sovereignty (*hakimiyya*). Others, including Hasan Al-Banna, founder of the Brotherhood, saw party politics (*hizbiyya*) as undermining the unity of the Muslim community (*umma*) and making it weaker in the face of Western colonialism and imperialism.[73] But beginning in 1970s and accelerating in '80s and '90s, Brotherhood went through a transformation that increasingly adopted democracy as a legitimate form of governance and the only game in town.[74] Starting with its electoral coalition with the Wafd Party in 1984, the Brotherhood has been an active participant in the country's radically narrowed-down space of electoral politics. As a result, the movement has started to issue public official statements about its endorsement and interpretation of democracy in early 1990s, and in mid-2000s it published several platforms, programs, and reform agendas before the parliamentary and municipal elections. In the 2005 parliamentary elections, the Mobarak regime allowed the Brotherhood to win 88 of the 454 seats in the lower house of the parliament (*majlis al-sha'b*).[75] Since the prospects of further inclusion and greater participation was increasing, the Brotherhood issued a Draft Political Party Platform in 2007 to lay out its basic constitutional vision and policy framework. This

---

[72] Brown, *When Victory Is Not an Option*.

[73] This point was particularly more pronounced in Hasan Al-Banna's speeches and writings. See, On this question, see Ibid., 79.

[74] Mona El-Ghobashy, "The Metamorphosis of the Egyptian Muslim Brothers," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 37, no. 03 (2005): 373–95. For the rejuvenation of the Brotherhood in 1970s, see Carrie Rosefsky Wickham, *Mobilizing Islam* (Columbia University Press, 2002).

[75] Because of the massive electoral fraud by the regime, the MB could win only as many seats the regime allowed. The MB had slated only 161 candidates to signal to the regime that they are not seeking the majority in the parliament. Many observers believe that Mobarak allowed the MB to win that much of seats to signal to the international community what would happen if he allowed free and fair elections.

rather lengthy document attracted signfiicant attention from domestic and international observers, and caused concerns, even within the young and moderate sections of the movement, about the Brotherhood 's stance on the relationship between shari'a and democratic state. This document has never been finalized; it remained as a draft.

But in the aftermath of the January 25, 2011 uprisings, the Muslim Brotherhood became a legal organization and formed its own political party with its own finalized, official party program. In addition, it has spearheaded the drafting of a new constitution that went into effect in December 2012. Hence, we now have more tangible evidence of Brotherhood's constitutional vision of the relationship between shari'a and democratic state. In this section I will analyze these documents alongside other official statements and publications of the Brotherhood and my interviews with Brotherhood leaders and members in order to explore how the Brotherhood appropriates both the Egyptian state's notion of Islamicity of the state (per Article 2 of the Constitution) and democratic norms and institutions.

2.1. Muslim Brotherhood's Catachrestic Appropriation of Democracy

At the height of the protests in Egypt in the faithful January of 2011, Essam El-Errian—then the spokesperson of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood, later the vice chairman of the group's Freedom and Justice Party, and now sixth-time political prisoner after the July 2013 military coup—wrote an op-ed article for the *New York Times* two days before Hosni Mubarak stepped down. In that piece El-Errian took on the task of communicating Brotherhood's vision for the future of Egypt to a skeptical international

audience and affirming the movements commitment to democratic mechanisms and to the rights of all Egyptians. Also key to his task was to pronounce the difference Brotherhood's Islamist outlook would interject into the concept and practice of democracy. In carrying out this daunting task, El-Errian first highlights the movement's long-held principles of gradual reform and denunciation of violence, and points at its history of peaceful participation in the electoral process in Egypt despite being legally banned since 1954. He then explains Brotherhood's vision:

> As our nation heads toward liberty, however, we disagree with the claims that the only options in Egypt are a purely secular, liberal democracy or an authoritarian theocracy. Secular liberal democracy of the American and European variety, with its firm rejection of religion in public life, is not the exclusive model for a legitimate democracy. In Egypt, religion continues to be an important part of our culture and heritage. Moving forward, we envision the establishment of a democratic, civil state that draws on universal measures of freedom and justice, which are central Islamic values. We embrace democracy not as a foreign concept that must be reconciled with tradition, but as a set of principles and objectives that are inherently compatible with and reinforce Islamic tenets.[76]

These few sentences succinctly encapsulate the core of Brotherhood's view of the relationship between Islam, secularism and democracy in the Egyptian context. Here El-Errian "embraces" democracy but repudiates "secular liberalism" as its sole modus operandi and he thus invokes alternative models of "legitimate democracy." In El-Errian's language, "a purely-secular liberal democracy of the American and European

[76] Essam El-Errian, "What the Muslim Brothers Want," *The New York Times*, February 9, 2011, sec. Opinion, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/02/10/opinion/10erian.html.

variety" indexes a pedagogic mode of socializing into democratic norms. On the other hand, "authoritarian theocracy" signifies a rejection of socialization. El-Errian clearly states that this binary does not exhaust the menu of meaningful possibilities for the Brotherhood and for Egypt. What he seeks, instead, is a performative mode of socializing into democratic norms by differently adopting them. For El-Errian this difference stems from religion which "continues to be an important part" of Egyptian social life.

The word 'continues' here stands as a covert reference to the secularization of Western societies. He implies that religion no longer matters in "purely secular" Western societies and that they allow no space for religion in the public sphere, whereas religion still matters in Egypt and hence will inevitably inform the way democracy is conceived and practiced. In many respects his claim that both American and European secularisms "firmly reject" religion's role in public life is an overstatement, since especially for American-British form of secularism where public sphere is more open to religious expressions, signs, and arguments.[77] In addition, whether religion has left the public square is also debatable.[78] However conceived, this indicates the Brotherhood's reading of Western liberal democracies as providing only too tight a space for religion by relegating it to the private realm, which in his reading would not befit Islamic tradition and the Egyptian society.

---

[77] Most recently, the US Supreme Court decided that corporations are not obliged to offer health insurance coverage for birth control methods which they regard as abortion. In another recent decision, the Supreme Court found it constitutional to open board meetings with religious prayer. Richard Wolf, "From Politics to Prayer, a Supreme Court Game of Inches," *USA Today*, July 2, 2014, http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2014/07/02/supreme-court-term-conservative-incremental/11915611/. More generally, the divisive political issues such as abortion, stem cells, death penalty, financing of contraceptives all highlight and exemplify the role of religion for the public debates. In that sense, El-Errian's claim about a "firm rejection of religion in public life" does not quite hold.
[78] José Casanova, *Public Religions in the Modern World* (University of Chicago Press, 1994).

What is also noteworthy in El-Errian's op-ed is his negotiation of the dynamics of authority and universality established around democracy. In arguing that the Brotherhood does not see democracy as a foreign concept to be reconciled with Islamic tradition but as a "set of principles and objectives that are inherently compatible with and reinforce Islamic tenets," El-Errian makes two gestures. First, he blurs the historical origins of modern democracy by declaring that it is not a Western or "foreign" concept. In so doing he strongly affirms the universality of democracy as a normative ideal, so much so that he even evades the role of cultural translation by suggesting that there is no need to make it congruent with Islamic norms since it already is. However, and this is the second point, for El-Errian the universality and normativity of democracy stems from its "inherent compatibility" with Islamic tradition. That is to say, what grants democracy its universal normative force and appeal is its authorization by Islamic principles. In addition, El-Errian's statement embodies another paradox. If democracy is not a foreign concept and if it is inherently compatible with, and reinforcing of, Islamic tenets, then why call it Islamic democracy?[79]

A similar tension appears in El-Errian's claim that secular liberal democracy does not exhaust the possible forms of legitimate democracy. By invoking the notion of legitimate democracy, he recognizes that there are models or practices of democracy that are not legitimate. He does not elaborate on what constitutes this legitimacy and what practices are beyond the pale from the perspective of that legitimacy. He only mentions and denounces theocracy as being beyond the pale of "legitimate democracy." But El-

[79] El-Errian does not mention it here but as I will indicate later, in MB's vision the "Islamic principles and objectives" that democracy is "inherently compatible with and reinforce" is the principle of Shura (consultation). I discuss this in more detail in section 2.3.

Errian makes it clear that secularism is not one of the constitutive principles or necessary preconditions of democracy. It is not part of the definition or prerequisite of a "legitimate democracy." This is why for him the non-secular and non-liberal form of democracy that the Brotherhood espouses is still within the limits of "legitimate democracy." By so doing, he destabilizes the liberal secular authority established around democracy.

In doing so, El-Errian works through a performative contradiction. He invokes the universality of the norm of democracy and claims to be part of it, but the dominant articulation of the norm excludes him from the proper invocation of that norm. But he rejects the limits imposed by the pedagogy of the norm and lays claim to the norm nevertheless. Thus he catachrestically appropriates the norm by wresting it from its 'proper' secular liberal meanings and practices. He disentangles the normative power of democracy as a good for society from its normalizing power—that is, from its hegemonic articulation as "secular liberal democracy of the American and European variety." In that sense, it unsettles the secular liberal pedagogy attached to democracy. Secular liberal conventions do not authorize him to properly participate in the norm, but he performatively institutes the authority of Brotherhood's brand of Islamic democracy.

However, such a production of authority (or self-authorization) occurs at two levels: illocutionary and perlocutionary. In trying to buttress the legitimacy of an Islamic democracy through democratic conventions (i.e. that there can be different legitimate forms of democracy in response to popular demands), El-Errian produces the authority of his claims at the illocutionary level. But at the perlocutionary level, the force of his utterance depends on the reaction of his audience—both domestic and international. It is

hard to measure the attitudes and response of domestic and international audiences in relation to authorizing Brotherhood's vision of democracy. But it is also not difficult to discern that in a liberal international order constituted by secularist sensibilities, Brotherhood's claims to democratic governance is at best viewed with a high dose of skepticism or at worst dismissed squarely as "wolf in sheep clothing" whose coming to power through democratic mechanisms would mean nothing but "one man, one vote, once."[80]

With this op-ed El-Errian addresses the international audience in order to engender their support for the protests in Tahrir Square and to urge the US to withdraw its support from Mubarak. But while he seeks to communicate and possibly persuade, he does not seek authorization since he makes it clear that the Muslim Brotherhood's vision of democratic Egypt would not follow the footsteps of secular liberalism. In that sense, to put it in Edward Said's terms, if secular liberal democracy represents a "voyage out," that is the worldwide expansion of Western-originated norms and institutions, then Brotherhood's Islamic democracy is a form of "voyage in"—a "conscious effort to enter into the discourse of the West, to mix with it, transform it." It is an appropriation of democracy that inscribes difference into it by contesting its secular liberal discipline within liberal global governance.

Then how does the Brotherhood bring together shari'a and democracy in its constitutional vision? This is the question I address next.

---

[80] Bernard Lewis, "Islam and Liberal Democracy," *The Atlantic*, February 1993, http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1993/02/islam-and-liberal-democracy/308509/.

2.2. Shari‘a and Democracy: The Question of Religious Authority

The FJP's 2011 program for parliamentary elections envisions a "national constitutional Islamic modern democracy, based on sharia (Islamic law) as a frame of reference."[81] Hence it expressly invokes an "Islamic democracy" which operates as a modern constitutional democracy but under the guidance and within the limits of shari‘a.[82] Within the Brotherhood and among its observers as well, the debate has centred around "what specifically should be understood by a democracy bounded by shari‘a,"[83] or more specifically by Brotherhood's catch-phrase "democratic civil state within an Islamic frame of reference"? Many questions follow. First, what is Islamic democracy, and what is Islamic about it? How does Brotherhood understand shari‘a and its relationship with state and politics? Who decides what shari‘a prescribes in a particular situation or whether a particular law is in compliance with shari‘a? Second, how does the Brotherhood understand democracy? Is it merely a procedural mechanism of peaceful transfer of power through free and fair elections, or are there other institutions that are prerequisite for a democracy? If there are, what are they? Is secularism one of them? Third, what is a "civil state"? In what ways it is similar to or different from a secular

[81] "Freedom and Justice Party 2011 Parliamentary Elections Program," 10.
[82] Mohammad Morsi's appearance on CNN denying the idea of 'Islamic democracy' shows that not only these concepts are theoretically well-founded and developed but that the MB and FJP leadership are more practically-minded people than theoretically careful and elaborate: "There is no such thing called an Islamic democracy. There is democracy only. And democracy is the instrument that is present now. People are the source of authority. The social mindset is there are a people and the people chooses. There are people and people chooses. That is democracy and that agrees with consultation called for in Islam. With that we are eager for freedom and justice, social justice in a democratic state. We see Egypt as a democratic country and the people's will should be implemented." *Muslim Brotherhood Candidate for Egypt's President*, 2012, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yjpbceIANmc&feature=youtube_gdata_player.
[83] Chris Harnisch and Quinn Mecham, "Democratic Ideology in Islamist Opposition? The Muslim Brotherhood's 'Civil State,'" *Middle Eastern Studies* 45, no. 2 (2009): 193.

state? I will address these questions in order to explicate Brotherhood's conception of Islamic democracy.

As an ideal-type, Islamic democracy refers to a constitutional configuration in which democratic norms and procedures are put into practice within the bounds of the principles of Islamic shari'a. For Kathleen Collins and Erica Owens an Islamic democracy is "a regime based on some fundamental democratic institutions (e.g., elections and accountability) but allowing illiberal religious influence on the constitution and laws at the expense of state religious neutrality and some core liberal principles and individual rights."[84] Here I work with a rather narrower definition. I suggest that the distinct character of 'Islamic' democracy is its stipulation of some form of a constitutional body that would check the activities of the legislature and the executive in terms of their compliance with shari'a. I distinguish this from the ideal type of a 'Muslim democracy' (or 'conservative democracy' in the case of the Turkish AK Party) which does not take shari'a as a (or 'the') source of legislation and hence does not institute a constitutional body for ensuring that legislation is compliant with shari'a.

Brotherhood and FJP envisions an Islamic democracy, but they are not the only ones. Countries such as Iran[85] and Pakistan[86] enshrine shari'a in the constitution and

---

[84] Kathleen Collins and Erica Owen, "Islamic Religiosity and Regime Preferences Explaining Support for Democracy and Political Islam in Central Asia and the Caucasus," *Political Research Quarterly* 65, no. 3 (September 1, 2012): 501. In 'Islamic democracy,' it is not only the parliamentary legislation or presidential actions that are put within the bounds of shari'a, but in general, rights, freedoms, and duties are also configured—expanded and curtailed—on that basis. For example, Article 11 of the 2012 Constitution repeats the 1971 Constitution enshrines equality between men and women but "without prejudice to the provisions of Islamic law"—a formulation that repeats the 1971 Constitution. As part of the secularizing and liberalizing moves of the 2013 Constitution drafted after the military coup, this shari'a conditionality was also removed from the article.

[85] Article 4 paragraph 1 of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran stipulates that "all civil, penal, financial, economic, administrative, military and political law and other laws and regulations, shall be

recognize Islam as the religion of the state, but they also allow for party pluralism and electoral politics. Elected representatives and leaders make and execute laws with one significant condition: their decisions and actions must be within the boundaries set by the principles of shari'a. Both states establish constitutional bodies for monitoring laws and regulations and are given the power to strike them if they are deemed unIslamic and hence unconstitutional.

Likewise, the Brotherhood envisions a democratic state operating within the bounds of Islamic law.[87] It foresees institutional guarantees for making sure that laws and regulations comply with the provisions of shari'a. The Islamic modernist tradition of which Brotherhood is a part, modern notions such as democracy are endorsed but on the

---

based on the Islamic standards." The second paragraph of the same article creates a constitutional hierarchy among norms by suggesting that all laws have to be in compliance with Islamic principles and that this principle applies "absolutely and generally to all articles of the Constitution as well as to all other laws and regulations." In accordance with that, Article 91 of the Iranian Constitution tasks the Guardian Council with reviewing whether the decisions of the Iranian Parliament (*Majlis*) are repugnant to shari'a: "The Guardian Council shall be established with a view to safeguarding the rules of Islam and the Constitution and to see that the decisions of the Majlis are not inconsistent with them." Similarly, Article 72 of the Constitution reiterates the same point for the Consultative Assembly: "The Islamic Consultative Assembly cannot make laws that are contradictory to the principles, official religion of the country or the constitution. Discretion on whether such contradictions exist, as stated in article 96, is assigned to the Guardian Council."

[86] Islam was defined as state religion in Pakistan's 1973 Constitution—the 1956 Constitution did not recognize Islam as official religion. Article 227 of the 1973 Constitution clearly institutes an Islamic judicial review by stipulating that "all existing laws shall be brought in conformity with the injunctions of Islam as laid down in the Holy Quran and the Sunnahh… and no law shall be enacted which is repugnant to such injunctions." Article 230 of the Constitution establishes an Islamic Council whose mission is to advise leglislators as to whether a proposed law complies with injunctions of shari'a. In addition to this advisory body, the Eighth Constitutional Amendment instituted a new Federal Shariat Court that would decide whether a law or regulation is repugnant to shari'a. If the court deems a law or regulation running against Islamic principles, then it may ask the concerned governmental unit to present its point of view. If the court finally decides that the law is repugnant to shari'a then it requires the President or the governor to change the law to make it compliant with shari'a. See Abiad, *Sharia, Muslim States and International Human Rights Treaty Obligations*.

[87] This is a core idea of the MB since its inception. Hasan Al-Banna, the founder of Muslim Brotherhood, considers the state as "an appendix to Shari'a" such that its goals must be "within the postulates of Shari'a." See, Moussalli, "Hasan Al-Bannā's Islamist Discourse on Constitutional Rule and Islamic State," 168.

condition that they do not transgress the limits drawn by God's shari'a.[88] It accepts new mechanisms and values "as far as they do not contradict authentic and well-established sharia."[89] The Muslim Brotherhood Initiative for Reform in Egypt, a reform program declared in 2004, calls for "changing the laws and purifying them to be in conformity with the principles of Islamic Shariah as it is the major source of legislation, under the second article of the constitution."[90] The Brotherhood's program for the parliamentary elections of 2005 similarly underlines the movement's commitment to "making use of the experiences of modern civilization which do not clash with the fixed principles of the Shari'ah, such as: separation of the authorities, plurality of parties, and peaceful circulation of power through elections."[91]

However, what is worth mentioning here is that Egypt already recognizes this idea of an Islamic judicial review under the authority of the Supreme Constitutional Court (SCC). This was clearly stated by the SCC in one of its decisions:

> The principles of the Islamic Sharia are the major source of legislation. This imposes a limitation curtailing both the legislative and executive power, through which they are obliged that whatever laws or decrees they enact, no provision contained in them may contradict the provisions of Islamic law which are definite in terms of their immutability and their

---

[88] Mohammad Fadel, "Modernist Islamic Political Thought and the Egyptian and Tunisian Revolutions of 2011," *Middle East Law and Governance* 3, no. 1–2 (March 25, 2011): 94–104; Moussalli, "Hasan Al-Bannā's Islamist Discourse on Constitutional Rule and Islamic State"; Roxanne L. Euben, "Premodern, Antimodern or Postmodern? Islamic and Western Critiques of Modernity," *The Review of Politics* 59, no. 03 (1997): 429–60; Rachel M. Scott, "Managing Religion and Renegotiating the Secular: The Muslim Brotherhood and Defining the Religious Sphere," *Politics and Religion* 7, no. 01 (2014): 51–78.Mousalli, Euben, Brown, Fadel,

[89] Fattah and Butterfield, "Muslim Cultural Entrepreneurs and the Democracy Debate," 61.

[90] "Muslim Brotherhood Initiative on the General Principles of Reform in Egypt," March 3, 2004.

[91] "The Muslim Brotherhood's Program for the Parliamentary Elections of 2005," *Ikhwanweb*, June 13, 2007, http://www.ikhwanweb.com/article.php?id=811.

> meaning. (…) Whatever legislative enactment contravenes them must be declared null and void.[92]

In that sense, the Egyptian state has already been operating within the broader constitutional framework of 'Islamic democracy.' Then what does the Brotherhood demand? The Brotherhood fundamentally articulates a demand for a more expanded and consistent application of this principle. Many MB leaders whom I interviewed stressed that Egyptian legal system was already requiring laws to be compliant with shari'a but that the corrupt political regime and its elites were not following it through.[93]

If shari'a will serve as a framework for laws and regulations, then there is a fundamental question to be answered: who will decide whether a law was in conformity with shari'a? Whose interpretation of shari'a would be taken as more authoritative, or who would get to decide what a proper interpretation of shari'a entails in a particular situation? These questions pertaining to interpretive authority are central to the debates over shari'a.[94]

The first time the Brotherhood offered an explicit answer to this question was in its 2007 Draft Political Party Program. This draft program, which was distributed to

---

[92] Appeal no 5257/43 on December 28, 1997. Quoted in Abiad, *Sharia, Muslim States and International Human Rights Treaty Obligations*, 48.

[93] For example, Ahmed Diab, Interview by the author, Cairo, October 11, 2011; Saad Al-Hoseiny, Interview by the author, Cairo, October 15, 2011.

[94] The question of religious authority is also a deeply political question in Egypt. With Nasser's abolition of the waqfs (charitable foundations) which provided the financial support for Al-Azhar to be independent of the state, religious institutions such as Al-Azhar and Dar al-Ifta' (the State Mufti's Office) have become incorporated into the state and religious scholars have been rendered salaried state employees dependent completely on the state. This creates a paradox and a tension for the MB vis-à-vis religious institutions. On the one hand they call for a more prominent position for religious institutions in society and politics as well as more state support for these institutions. But on the other hand, they are highly critical of these institutions because of their cooptation into the regime. Brown, *When Victory Is Not an Option*, 76.

journalists and intellectuals for getting their feedback, was stipulating the establishment of a Council of Religious Scholars (*majlis 'ulama*) to be consulted before passing laws to check if they were compliant with shari'a. The decisions of the council would not be binding but senior Islamic scholars of Al-Azhar University, not the public, would elect the council. This created heated debates in Egypt about whether the country was moving toward an Iran-like clerical regime. Upon widespread criticisms, the then Deputy General Guide of the MB, Mohammad Habib, suggested that this council of scholars would not be like the Council of Guardians in Iran which has the right to strike down legislation, but rather, it would be a consultative body: "It is a consultative committee that could be part of al-Azhar and that parliament could use as consultants. But of course parliament would have the final decision, and the Supreme Constitutional Court could also be appealed to should parliament pass legislation thought incompatible with the freedoms guaranteed by the constitution."[95]

This provision also caused an internal debate within the Brotherhood. Some members openly expressed their disagreement and calling it a "total fiasco"[96] and others conceded that it was a "mistake" and a "poorly worded" idea. The moderate and more politically open faction within the Brotherhood was excluded from the body drafting the

[95] Interview with Mohammad Habib conducted by the Crisis Group, quoted in "Egypt's Muslim Brothers," 17.

[96] In a Crisis Group interview, one senior reformist MB leader (who wanted to remain anonymous) referred to the draft as a "total fiasco" and continued: "It's a ridiculous program that does not take into account all the things that have happened in the last 30 years. The program was drafted in a very hasty way and without enough consultation. It's a rushed job and the Society should apologise for it, because we're stuck with the image of a very negative program. There have been other programs that have been more coherent than this in the last 50 years, but there was no introspection, no look at past attempts. It fails to tackle the issue of how to exist as a group in Egypt. If we are to be a major presence, then we must make some major decisions." See, Ibid., 18.

program at the time of its writing.[97] Consequently, the Brotherhood dropped this proposal from the platform. The Brotherhood confirmed that the only body with the right to strike down legislation would be the Supreme Constitutional Court—as was already posited in the Constitution. The parliamentarians themselves would judge whether a law is in accordance with shari'a and act upon their own interpretations. Following these lines, the 2011 Party Program of the FJP did not mention anything like a council of Islamic scholars, and instead it invoked the SCC as the solely authorized body to do an Islamic judicial review.[98]

However, the Article 4 of the 2012 Constitution, drafted by a council dominated by Islamists after the fall of Mubarak,[99] stipulated that "Al-Azhar senior scholars are to be consulted in matters pertaining to Islamic law." This was meant to be a consultative body only, but many liberal commentators and human rights organizations expressed their concern that unelected and unaccountable religious scholars would block legislation proposed by elected representatives. Here it is important to note that this demand for adding a provision to the 2012 Constitution featuring the Al-Azhar as the referential

---

[97] Essam El-Errian and his cadre was not included in the penning of the draft and he later declared his unease with the outcome. He suggested that the draft should not be seen as the final position of the movement. See, "The Draft Party Platform of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood: Foray Into Political Integration or Retreat Into Old Positions?," *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, 7, accessed June 24, 2014, http://carnegieendowment.org/2008/01/14/draft-party-platform-of-egyptian-muslim-brotherhood-foray-into-political-integration-or-retreat-into-old-positions/5g4; Stilt, "Islam Is the Solution," 85; "Egypt's Muslim Brothers," 17.

[98] For more on Islamic judicial review, see Feldman, *The Fall and Rise of the Islamic State*.

[99] The 2012 Constitution was drafted by a committee that initially had 100 members, majority of whom were Islamists from MB or Salafi groups since they were selected by the elected parliament in which Islamists were in majority. However, the non-Islamist members of the assembly almost immediately walked out of the body by claiming that it was dominated by the Islamists. Then the assembly was dissolved by the court on the grounds that it was unconstitutional for including members of the parliament and unrepresentative for including few women, minority representatives and young people. When the second assembly was formed the secularists again boycotted the assembly. The Constitution was put to referendum on December 15, 2012 and was accepted. It remained in effect till the July 3, 2013 coup d'etat.

authority for interpreting the shari'a and monitoring compliance with it came not from the Muslim Brotherhood but from the shaykh of Al-Azhar during the Constituent Assembly meetings. The Brotherhood agreed with that but when it faced criticisms from secular opposition it declared that "it would not insist" on the provision and "would agree to the idea that the reference of authority could remain with the Supreme Constitutional Court."[100]

Furthermore, the practical implications of Article 4 were not readily apparent. While it was positing an advisory body made up of senior Al-Azhar scholars (elected among the scholars of Al-Azhar), the Article 175 of the same Constitution was exclusively authorizing the SCC to "undertake the judicial control of the constitutionality of the laws and regulations," including questions pertaining to Islamic law. Hence it was still the Supreme Constitutional Court that held the power to strike down legislation, which has been the constitutional norm under 1971 Constitution, which was kept same in the 2013 Constitution promulgated after the coup. Hence in terms of the Supreme Constitutional Courts' exclusive right to oversee legislation and assess compliance with Article 2, there was "considerable continuity—albeit arguably added ambiguity—with the pre-revolutionary semi-secular order."[101]

One important difference Muslim Brotherhood's vision of democratic civil state within the bounds of shari'a would make is that it would transform the practice of Article 2 of the Constitution from being a negative regulation into an active one. The SCC is not

[100] Scott, "Managing Religion and Renegotiating the Secular," 64.
[101] Ibid., 65. Furthermore, the Article 219 of the Constitution was clarifying what it means by "the principles of Islamic shari'a" in Article 2. Accordingly, shari'a includes "full evidences, rules conforming to prevailing jurisprudential principles, and sources valued by the Sunni schools of law and the community."

by itself authorized to inquire into a court case or a legislation, but it only considers the cases where a party claims the unconstitutionality of a piece of legislation at a local court, and the court then refers it to the SCC if deemed necessary. In other words, the SCC is not consulted ahead of legislation to inquire its compliance with shari'a, and it is not authorized by itself to strike legislation without a local court carrying the case to it. 2012 Constitution kept this process in place, but adding that a council of Al-Azhar scholars are to be consulted ahead of legislation. Perhaps the most publicized and internationally highlighted change the 2013 Constitution made was to remove this paragraph of Article 4 that formed an advisory body of Islamic scholars from Al-Azhar. For many secular liberal commentators this was the most important change in the new constitution for securing the 'secularity' of the Egyptian state.

Then, how does the MB understand shari'a? In Brotherhood's vision, shari 'a stands for the system of ethical principles and binding rules that regulate individual and collective life. It refers to "Islamic normativity"[102] and to the "Islamic way of doing things."[103] Shari'a is not the exact equivalent of law since it includes issues that go beyond the sphere of law (bodily purification, prayer rituals, etc) as well as normative categories of behavior that exceed the language of the law, such as the jurisprudential categories of legally mandatory, approved, legally indifferent, disapproved, and legally

[102] Salvatore, "After the State: Islamic Reform and the 'Implosion' of Shari'a."
[103] Brown, "Egypt and Islamic Sharia."

prohibited.[104] Shari‘a comprises both Islamic law and ethics and as such it is “the hallmark of the Islamic order” that gives it its “moral and political purpose.”[105]

For the Muslim Brotherhood, one of the fundamental characteristic of shari‘a is its comprehensiveness. Hasan Al-Banna suggested that Islam was “both religion and society, a mosque and a state, of this life and of the hereafter. It has dealt with practical life more than the issues of worship… Religion then is a part of the Islamic system, and Islam regulates it exactly as it does with life. We, as Muslims, are asked to base religion and the world on Islamic rules.”[106]As Richard P. Mitchell observed in 1960s, the idea that Islam is “a total system, complete unto itself, and the final arbiter of life in all its categories” has been established as one of the core principles of the Brotherhood in a decade of its foundation.[107] This notion still constitutes the core of Brotherhood’s claim that ‘Islam is the Solution.’ (Al-Islam huwa Al-Hall) FJP’s 2011 Program explains the party’s understanding of shari‘a:

> By its nature, Sharia nurtures aspects of faith, worship and morality, and also regulates various aspects of life for Muslims and their non-Muslim partners in the homeland. However, in some (few) cases, Sharia regulates these aspects through definitive texts with direct relevance and significance. It can also regulate through general rules and principles, leaving details for interpretation and legislation as suits different times and environments, in the service of justice, righteousness and the interests of

---

[104] Talal Asad, “Boundaries and Rights in Islamic Law: Introduction,” *Social Research: An International Quarterly* 70, no. 3 (2003): 684.
[105] Gudrun Kramer, “Techniques and Values: Contemporary Muslim Debates on Islam and Democracy,” in *Islam, Modernism and the West: Cultural and Political Relations at the End of the Millennium*, ed. Gema Martín Muñoz (I. B. Tauris in association with the Eleni Nakou Foundation, 1999), 179.
[106] Majmu‘at Rasa’il al-Imam al-Shahid Hasan al-Banna (Bayrut: Dar al-Qalam, n.d.), 304, quoted in Moussalli, “Hasan Al-Bannā’s Islamist Discourse on Constitutional Rule and Islamic State,” 170.
[107] Richard P. Mitchell, *The Society of the Muslim Brothers* (Oxford University Press, USA, 1993), 14.

> the homeland and citizens. This is to be entrusted to legislative councils, while the Supreme Constitutional Court is charged with monitoring the constitutionality of resulting legislation.[108]

Here Brotherhood not only highlights the idea of the comprehensiveness (*shumuliyya*) of shari'a but also provides its own approach to how this comprehensiveness unfolds itself. The Muslim Brotherhood's 2004 Initiative on the General Principles of Reform in Egypt defines the goal of the movement as a comprehensive reform "through constitutional and legal channels in a bid to apply Allah's Shariah (Islamic Legal Code) which is best for this world and the Hereafter." (p.4) Here the Brotherhood defines shari'a as "legal ways and laws of the Islamic Monotheism." (5)

Following the Islamic modernist thinkers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, Brotherhood argues that even though shari'a covers the entirety of one's individual and collective life, much of the content of shari'a is left, by God's grace, to the interpretation of Muslims in different historical and spatial contexts.[109] For the Brotherhood, "God deliberately left Muslims with some legislative vacuums that may be filled by the human mind performing *ijtihad* (independent reasoning) within the boundaries of Islamic sharia."[110] What is left out of this independent reasoning is the verses in the Quran and in the hadith (Prophetic tradition) whose legal and/or normative injunctions are clear-cut and definitive. For the Brotherhood, these constitute only a small section of shari'a, which leaves much of shari'a open to independent reasoning and

---

[108] "Freedom and Justice Party 2011 Parliamentary Elections Program," 11.
[109] On this see, Khaled Abou El Fadl, Joshua Cohen, and Deborah Chasman, *Islam and the Challenge of Democracy: A Boston Review Book* (Princeton University Press, 2004). This is a classical argument within Islamic political thought developed most forcefully by Ibn Taymiyya in his treatise *Al-Siyasa Al-Shar'iyya*.
[110] Fattah and Butterfield, "Muslim Cultural Entrepreneurs and the Democracy Debate," 61.

adaptation. For example, Abdul Mun‘im Abou Al-Fotouh, a leader of the Brotherhood who left the movement shortly after Mubarak’s fall, suggests that only 5 percent of shari‘a is fixed and unchanging, and the remaining 95 percent consists of principles and values that can manifest themselves in different forms in different contexts.[111] In fact, almost all members and leaders of the Brotherhood I interviewed stressed this point rather strongly, which suggests that it is a fundamental message conveyed in the movement’s discourse and internal education programs (*tarbiya*). Such a construal of shari‘a expands the domain of human interpretation and agency for which the Brotherhood gets heavy criticism from more Salafi groups. [112]

In Brotherhood’s political reading, shari‘a becomes the constitution of Muslims. As ‘Abd Al-Qadir ‘Awda, a prominent judge and a member of the Brotherhood, put it: “The Islamic shari‘a is the basic constitution for Muslims, and all that agrees with this constitution is true and all that violates it is invalid, whatever the changes of time and the developments of opinion in legislation, because the shari‘a came from God by way of his

[111] Abdul Monem Abul Futouh, “The Muslim Brotherhood Comments on Gray Zones’’ Carnegie Paper,” *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, July 13, 2006, http://carnegieendowment.org/2006/07/13/muslim-brotherhood-comments-on-gray-zones-carnegie-paper/2x77.

[112] Brotherhood’s stance differs rather significantly from that of Salafis, for whom only “what has been accepted anciently by sharia and consensually condoned by the *al-salaf al-saleh* (the pious predecessors)” can be Islamically acceptable. Therefore, much of new interpretations (*ijtihad*) to respond to new challenges are considered *bed‘a* (man-made innovation in religion). For Salafis such innovations not only corrupt the legacy of the tradition but also violates the consensus (*ijma*) of earlier scholars. See, Fattah and Butterfield, “Muslim Cultural Entrepreneurs and the Democracy Debate,” 61. This is also reflected in the debates over the Article 2 of the 2012 Constitution of Egypt which posits principles of shari‘a as the leading source of legislation. The Salafis pushed hard to include the term “ahkam al-shar‘iyya” (rulings of shari‘a) in the Article but Brotherhood disagreed and instead succeeded in keeping it as “mabadi’ al-shari‘iyya” (principles of shari‘a). Thus the Brotherhood put more daylight between the norms of shari ‘a and actual social and political practice, highlighting the importance of reasoning and reinterpretation of classical rulings in implementing shari ‘a.

prophet, peace be upon him, to work by it in each place and time."[113] Within Islamist imaginary "only shari 'a can safeguard justice, harmony and stability."[114] This is why Noah Feldman concludes that the demand for shari'a among vast numbers of Muslims is indeed a demand for rule of law—a law that restricts the ruled and the ruler alike.

However it is essential to note that claiming the comprehensiveness of shari'a also represents a demand for independence from the legacies of colonialism and imperialism and a search for (or a recovery of) cultural authenticity. This is because of the intertwined history of imperialism and legal change in Egypt. One of the most significant results of European colonialism has been its implementation of Western civil and criminal law in Egypt and its relegation of shari'a to the sphere of personal status law that dealth with matters pertaining to marriage, divorce, inheritance, and custody. Indeed the very concept of 'personal status law' (*qanun al-ahwal al- shakhsiyya*) "does not exist in its present form in the pre-modern period"[115] and is a modern construction under the impact of European colonialism.[116] As Muhammad Ma'mun El-Hudaiby, the sixth guide-general of the Brotherhood puts it, it is part of the struggle of "the countries and peoples occupied by the armies, creed, and social, economic, and ethical systems of the west … to attain

---

[113] 'Abd Al-Qadir 'Awda, Al-Islam wa-awda'na al-qanuniyya (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-risala, 1985), p.62; quoted in Brown, *When Victory Is Not an Option*, 172. Another widely-known slogan of the MB, which President Morsi cited in at least one of his public speeches, refers to the Qur'an as the constitution: "Al-Qur'an dusturuna," (The Qur'an is our constitution).
[114] Kramer, "Techniques and Values: Contemporary Muslim Debates on Islam and Democracy," 179.
[115] Saba Mahmood, "Religious Freedom, the Minority Question, and Geopolitics in the Middle East," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 54, no. 02 (2012): 58.
[116] Talal Asad, *Formations of the Secular Christianity, Islam, Modernity* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2003), 205–256; Ebrahim Moosa, "Colonialism and Islamic Law," in *Islam and Modernity: Key Issues and Debates*, ed. Muhammad Khalid Masud, Armando Salvatore, and Martin van van Bruinessen, First Edition (Edinburgh University Press, 2009), 158–84.

their independence and be liberated from the sway of the west."[117] For him, the most fundamental outcome of Western colonialism and imperialism ("the foreign Christian invasion of the Islamic countries," as he sometimes refers to it) has been its dislocation of shari 'a from Egypt's legal, political, social, and educational life:

> In the period of colonial Christian invasion, the Islamic shari'a was excluded from serving as the constitution and law of the state. Egypt was occupied by the British in September 1882; less than a year later, in July 1883, Islamic religious courts were replaced by "national courts." Most of the new judges were non-Egyptians, and the law they applied were translated French laws, which became the dominant laws in civil commercial and criminal cases. The jurisdiction of Islamic religious courts was restricted to areas of personal status, marriage, divorce, and the related issues of establishing lineage, dowries, and alimonies. The Islamic economic system was replaced by a system of banks, despite the prohibition of the interest rate under Islamic shari'a. In the educational realm, new schools offered few opportunities for the young to learn the creed and tenets of their religion. The social system permitted alcohol prostitution, gambling, and other activities forbidden in Islam.[118]

But the Brotherhood's demand for an 'Islamic democracy' is justified through a rather paradoxical logic. Brotherhood leaders love to emphasize that Egyptians are very religious people and that they want to see shari'a to be adopted as the frame of reference. But the question is, if Egyptian people are already very religious and convey their

---

[117] Muhammad M. El-Hodaiby, "Upholding Islam," *Harvard International Review* 19, no. 2 (Spring 1997): 20.
[118] Ibid., 21.

religious preferences to the political field, why is there a need to institute a constitutional body to check whether laws are in conformity with shari'a?

This highlights the difference between Brotherhood's Islamic democracy and AK Party's 'conservative' democracy. While the former believes in an Islamic state adopting democratic rights and procedures within the confines of shari'a and a constitutional body monitoring the Islamicity of legislation and executive action; the latter believes in a democratic state equidistant to religions. In the latter, shari'a is not enshrined in the constitution and hence there is no constitutional body to check legislation for its conformity with shari'a. That means, if the laws passed by the legislators contradict with Islamic precepts, there is no institutional body that would thwart them. Rather, it is up to the people to debate and create awareness for the Islamic appropriateness of pieces of legislation, and it is through electing the legislators that the public takes on the task of monitoring the conformity of legislations and regulations with Islamic precepts.

This logic is clearly articulated in Khaled Abou El Fadl's attempt to wed democracy and shari'a in a liberal framework: "And in the worst case—if the majority is not persuaded by the '*ulama*, if the majority insists on turning away from God but still respects the fundamental rights of individuals, including the right to ponder creation and call to the way of God—those individuals who constituted the majority will still have to answer, in the Hereafter, to God."[119] In other words, the if the representatives of the majority passes a law that contradicts Islamic law, it is not prevented by a higher body of

[119] Khaled Abou El Fadl, *Islam and the Challenge of Democracy: A Boston Review Book* (Princeton University Press, 2004), 36.

scholars but it is addressed as a question of individual moral and religious responsibility to choose the right representatives.

Indeed some Brotherhood leaders already point toward that direction. For example Ahmed Al-Raysouni, the former head of the Moroccan chapter of the Muslim Brotherhood (Justice and Development Party), suggests that the fears that democracy would pave the way for revoking shari‘a is "only mental and theoretical" rather than real. Indeed historically "the abolition of some shar‘i rules in the laws of some Muslim countries was done in a dictatorial, not democratic, way. Some of these abolitions were imposed by foreign occupation and some by Muslim rulers under foreign pressure or out of their totalitarian will. Democracy is not to be blamed for this." Furthermore, even when these fears materialize and a democratically elected legislature acts against shari‘a, the problem here is not democracy but "the existing reality": "Democracy in such a case would have only exposed these problems, not been the reason behind them. In fact, this should make us approve of and hold onto democracy, not reject, criticize, and level accusations against it."[120]

2.3. Islamizing Democracy: The Ambivalent Equivalence of *Shura* and Democracy in Muslim Brotherhood's Discourse

"Assuming that they [Islamists] are acting in good faith and that they have adopted democracy as their 'strategic option,'" writes Gudrun Kramer, "is there an

[120] Abdel Lawy Lakhlafah, "Democracy: One of the Objectives of Shari`ah?," November 7, 2012, http://www.onislam.net/english/shariah/contemporary-issues/human-conditions-and-social-context/450278-democracy-and-the-objectives-of-shariah.html?Social_Context=.

Islamic path to a pluralist democratic society?"[121] This important question is widely asked in cross-disciplinary discussions over Islamism and democracy. However, Islamists such as the MB who seek to wed shari'a and democracy, ask the same question that Kramer asks, but in reverse order. For them the question is: Is there a pluralist democratic path to an Islamic society? In this lies the difference between liberal and Islamist approaches to democracy in the Egyptian context.

This has become very clear in a guest-lecture I delivered at the American University in Cairo one day before the first parliamentary elections in post-Mubarak Egypt. While discussing Islamism in Egypt, a self-identified liberal student said that she was not opposed to implementing shari'a since it was "the most significant social norm for both Muslims and Christians, and therefore it was not wrong to include them in law." When I asked her in what ways then this was different from Brotherhood's proposal of a "civil state within an Islamic frame of reference," she replied: "the Muslim Brotherhood isn't very flexible, but liberals want to modernize Islam." Upon these remarks a self-identified Islamist student, who sympathizes with but is not a member of the Muslim Brotherhood, entered into the conversation and said: "Liberals want to modernize Islam but Islamists want to Islamize modernity."

This crucial point captures an important dynamic about Brotherhood's relationship with modern norms and institutions, but in fact it cuts both ways. While the Brotherhood seeks to Islamize modernity, it also modernizes Islam in the process by refashioning classical concepts to fit modern conditions. In translating modern concepts into the categories of Islamic tradition (and vice versa), the Brotherhood ends up

[121] Gudrun Kramer, "Islamist Notions of Democracy," *Middle East Report*, no. 183 (July 1, 1993): 2–8.

transforming both. This selective and transformative adoption of Western originated norms and discourses marks Brotherhood's mode of engagement with modernity from its very inception. The founder of the Brotherhood, Hasan Al-Banna, argued that "instead of slavishly aping Western ideas, a return to the precocious wisdom of Islam was the solution."[122] But this 'return' to the original wisdom of Islam did not entail a rejection of "Western ideas," rather it entailed a differential adoption of, and participation in, them.[123] According to Mohammad 'Abduh, whose work deeply influenced Al-Banna,[124] "adapting to modernity need not require Westernization," but rather, through the use of reason ('*akl*) it was possible to create "an indigenous path to modernity that will free Muslims from blind imitation both of Western models of secular society and tradition-bound views of Islam."[125]

The mainstream Islamist movements, especially the Brotherhood, develop a critique of modernity particularly for its secularist tendencies to exile religion from public life or even from individual conscience. This critique brings about not a total repudiation of modernity, but rather a negotiation and appropriation of it. As Abdessalam Yassine, a Morroccon Islamist writer and activist, puts it, "we should appropriate to ourselves whatever positive aspects of modernity are useful to us, without letting ourselves be fooled by the glitter of post-modernity, without letting ourselves be overshadowed by

---

[122] Quoted in El-Ghobashy, "The Metamorphosis of the Egyptian Muslim Brothers." Studying the history of the movement, El-Ghobashy concludes that the MB "was poised to be a highly adaptive political creature, weathering the permutations of ordinary parties and experiencing their usual crises."
[123] Al-Banna's own stance toward party pluralism can be taken as one example. On the one hand he was highly critical of the dividing nature of party politics—a common theme in his time as was echoed also in Nasser's comments above—but he "enthusiastically embraced elections and ran and lost in parliamentary contests in 1942 and 1945." Ibid., 377.
[124] Ibrahim Abu-Rabi, "Facing Modernity," *Harvard International Review* 19, no. 2 (Spring 1997): 12.
[125] Euben, "Premodern, Antimodern or Postmodern?," 439.

modern advertising that tries to fob off what is false at an exorbitant price.[126] What he calls for is a performative mode of socialization, which seeks to appropriate modernity and translate its concepts and institutions into a different context with different historical traditions. Yassine makes these points crystal clear:

> Thus we will embrace modernity, but on our terms. We will need to conduct ourselves as canny purchasers of modernity. A shrewd buyer examines the merchandize in order to uncover damages and spot the cheat. It is along these lines that we ask such questions of modernity and insist that the past be taken into account. And it is with the intention of requiring justice and equity from modernity that our plan of making modernity Islamic must begin, by posing such questions and exploring meeting points.[127]

This mode of engagement with modernity is in line with the Brotherhood's general strategy for social and political reform. As Quintan Wiktorowicz points out, "the Brotherhood's method of change is not the erection of a new system of politics; it is a reformist strategy of working through the current system to imbue it with more Islamic tones."[128] The Brotherhood not only subscribes to the project of individual and social reform (*islah*) in line with Islamic norms, but it also seeks to 'Islamize' modern norms and institutions by rendering them compliant with shari'a; and as a "model and mother movement" of Islamism, Brotherhood seeks to 'Islamize' democracy by placing it within an Islamic frame of reference.

---

[126] Quoted in Aksikas Jaafar, *Arab Modernities* (Peter Lang, 2009), 106.
[127] Ibid.
[128] Wiktorowicz, the management of Islamic activism, 2001, p.94.

In Brotherhood's imaginary, democracy is more a mechanism of peaceful transfer of power than a philosophical and social ideal. It is a 'technique' for addressing the needs and aspirations of the Muslim community[129] and a mechanism to realize the goals and principles such justice, mutual consultation, equality, freedom, mercy, and compassion stipulated by the Quran and the *Sunna* (Prophetic tradition). Brotherhood endorses free and fair elections but also accepts the key political rights that make participation and contestation possible and meaningful. In a sense, the Brotherhood adopts a minimalist liberal vision of democracy based on the rule of majority through elections and the rights of the minority through rule of law.[130] But it insists that the substance of democratic politics would be informed not by liberal norms but by Islamic shari'a.[131] Through disjointing democracy's mechanisms and background philosophy, it seeks to 'Islamize' democracy, that is to put it within the bounds of shari 'a. By so doing, it envisions a form of democracy that is expressly not liberal and not secular.

The Brotherhood's party platforms place a sustained emphasis on rights. But they place communal rights and the shari'a-derived norms above individual rights, including freedom of expression, particularly in the field of artistic production. It envisions Egyptian society not as a composition of autonomous and religiously unaffiliated individuals but as members of religious communities.[132] Therefore, when it highlights religious freedoms and liberties, it is often based on the membership of these individuals

---

[129] Kramer, "Techniques and Values: Contemporary Muslim Debates on Islam and Democracy."
[130] This acceptance of the procedural formulation of democracy represents a change in the movement's history. It was only in 1980s, and more clearly in 1990s that the movement expressed its open endorsement of democracy.
[131] Shehata, Interview by the author.
[132] Scott, "Managing Religion and Renegotiating the Secular," 71.

into a 'divine' religion—that is Islam, Christianity, and Judaism. In that vein, Article 3 of the 2012 Constitution stipulated that "the principles of Christian and Jewish laws are the main source of legislation for followers of Christianity and Judaism in matters pertaining to personal status, religious affairs, and the nomination of religious leaders." These rights are defined through membership to particular religions (three Abrahamic religions).

However, religions outside this tradition ('non-divine religions') are not granted these rights. For example, Bahais, not being recognized as followers of a divine religion, cannot build temples, cannot have their own personal status laws or cannot officially register their religion on their national identity cards.[133] In terms of religious freedoms, Muslim Brotherhood recognizes the communal rights of non-Muslims, particularly the Coptic Christians but does not recognize religious conversion. In addition, the non-liberal nature of Brotherhood's platform is also apparent in its treatment of women's rights issues. As Brown notes, its vision of personal status law depends on "a set of reciprocal but not identical obligations between husband and wife."[134] It recognizes the equality of men and women but it stresses women's roles "as wives, mothers and makers of men, and aims to better them for this role" by extending services to women such as social security benefits, family guidance programs, and home-based 'friendly' loans.

One discursive strategy through which Brotherhood advances an 'Islamic' notion of democracy is through establishing an ambivalent equivalence between the modern

---

[133] Ibid., 70. "In December 2006, the Supreme Administrative Court argued that the interpretation of Article 46 of the 1971 Constitution on the freedom to practice religious rites applies to the three divine religions only. It also stated that registering any other religion (other than the three divine religions) is a breach of the law. However, in January 2008, an Administrative Court ruling gave Baha'is a small concession and allowed that the religion box on identity card to be left vacant or have a dash in it. The court declared that the ministry of interior should not force citizens to officially belong to a religion they do not believe in." ft. 26.

[134] Brown, *When Victory Is Not an Option*, 170.

concept of democracy and the Islamic concept of *shura* (consultation), a Quranic commandment for Muslims. (Quran 3:159, 42:38) It is through the politics of translating these notions into each other that Muslim Brotherhood seeks to institute an 'Islamic' form of democracy. In Brotherhood's discourse, *shura* is often used either alongside with democracy or solely by itself in order to communicate the idea that the kind of democracy the movement espouses is one that is rooted in Islamic discursive tradition and guided by Islamic teachings. For example, the preamble of the FJP's 2011 program calls Egyptians to "strive arduously" for "building a strong democratic political system that safeguards the citizens' rights and freedoms, applies the principle of *Shura* (consultation), and builds an institutional state where the rule of the law is the title of civilized modern human life."[135] In this formulation, the Brotherhood envisions a democratic form of governance that implements the principle of *shura*. Later, it refers to *shura* and then explains it in the brackets: "(democratic/Islamic consultation)"[136] In that passage, the Brotherhood describes democratic demands of the people in the Arab Spring as a demand for *shura*, defined as an Islamic form of democratic consultation and participation.

In that vein, the 2012 Constitution stipulates that "the political system is based on principles of democracy and on *Shura*," coupling the two concepts.[137] This constant coupling of *shura* and democracy through establishing an ambivalent equivalance between them is also reflected in 2012 Constitution of Egypt. The 1971 Constitution did not refer to *shura* as a principle for political governance. Rather, it only appears in the

[135] "Freedom and Justice Party 2011 Parliamentary Elections Program," 2.
[136] Ibid., 36.
[137] Importantly, the 2013 Constitution completely dropped the term 'shura.'

Constitution as the name of the upper chamber of the parliament, which is Shura Council (*Majlis Al-Shura*). The Shura Council was, and is, technically a body of consultation with a wide range of purview: drafting social and economic development plans, laws that are referred to the Council by the President, and public and foreign policy matters. However, it does not make an explicit reference to *shura* as a principle. But what is *shura* and what difference does it bring in to democracy? The 2011 Program explains:

> The State is Democratic, based on the Shura (consultation) principles, which the FJP believes are essential for the foundation of the state with all its institutions. Shura is not merely a political principle governing only the forms of political relations. Indeed, it is a pattern of behavioral and a general approach to managing the various aspects of life in the State, in addition to being a frame of work for faith and a moral guide for the behavior of individuals and their social relations, instilled in the hearts and minds of indivuduals, families, societies and the rulers, in order for it to become part and parcel of the patriotic character and an important ingredient thereof, and to engage all citizens.

As this rather long, complicated and at times confusing paragraph suggests, in basing democracy on the principle of *shura*, the Brotherhood in fact wants to suggest that their conception of democracy is one that draws on the resources of Islamic tradition and that is within the bounds of shari'a. In Brotherhood's vision, "shura is what makes authority legitimate, and the continuation of legitimacy hinges on the application of the Shari'a."[138] But it recognizes liberal democratic institutions as the best available mechanisms for implementing *shura* in modern times. Modern democracy constitutes "a means whereby

[138] Moussalli, "Hasan Al-Bannā's Islamist Discourse on Constitutional Rule and Islamic State," 174.

to achieve justice and equality; prevent tyranny and oppression; and guide the management of common public affairs."[139]

Hence, the Brotherhood reinterprets democracy as "one of the objectives of Shari'ah."[140] As Ahmed Al-Raysouni, a prominent Moroccan Islamic scholar and the former head of the Muslim Brotherhood chapter in that country (Justice and Development Party), points out, democracy is "an aspect of Shura in its moral and spiritual sense" and "a tool for liberation from political autocracy in most Muslim countries."[141] He discusses verses from the Quran and examples from the life of the Prophet that encourage learning from, and following the example of others "whenever they act rightly and perfectly" for which the criterion is "whether what they do is in accordance with Islam, benefits Muslims, and serves their interests." That also means democracy is not to be accepted "exactly as it is, without tackling its flaws." Rather, as a modern category democracy needs to be "rectified and adapted to our Islamic environment so that it can reach the desired objectives." Clearly, Al-Raysouni seeks to disentangle the normative power of democracy (which he finds completely compatible with Islamic principles) from the normalizing power of democracy (when it contradicts Islamic principles.)

This for Al-Raysouni is an attempt to "treat the drawbacks of democracy." He writes, "[a]s it is our destiny, we Muslims, to live in this age of democracy and its globalization, being invited or forced to adopt it entirely or partially, we may also be destined to be the nation that rectifies democracy, elevates it, and treats its ills."[142] In this

---

[139] Lakhlafah, "Democracy."
[140] Ibid.
[141] Ibid.
[142] Ahmed Al-Raysouni, Shura in the Battle of Development, 167-168; quoted in Ibid.

passage, Al-Raysouni recognizes the defining discursive regime of global governance ("this age of democracy") and points at its pedagogies of violence and education ("being invited or forced to adopt"). In the face of these pedagogic forces, Al-Raysouni neither rejects democracy nor adopts it as it is. Rather, he seeks to adopt it non-normatively ("rectifying it"). He calls for performatively socializing into the norm of democracy by grafting it on shura and by establishing a form of equivalence between *shura* and democracy.

In a similar vein, Yassine argues that "democratic forms and methods, applied with precaution and discernment, cannot harm shura." Rather, democratic mechanisms complement the notion of *shura*. While Yassine hails democracy as a significant progress for human society, he also suggests that "the other face of democracy—the religion of secularism—is unacceptable."[143] So he presents *shura* as "the name of our kind of democracy"—an Islamic democracy.[144] He explains:

> "Shura and democracy belong to radically different reference points. The historical itinerary of democracy, a Greek word and practice, is utterly other than that of shura. The first begins at pagan Athens and ends in "advanced" modern societies as a secularist practice, atheist and immoral, while the second has its beginning at pious Medina and remained a dead letter for nearly fourteen centuries. Today it is both a vital need for Muslims and a divine system that forms a party of our Islamic plan. It

[143] Jaafar, *Arab Modernities*, 117.
[144] MB's vision of an Islamic democracy based on shura and within the bounds of shari'a is very neatly formulated in Murad Hoffman's notion of Shuracracy. Hoffman, a German ambassador to Morocco who converted to Islam, suggests that rather than talk about democracy Muslims better adopt the notion of shuracracy, a political governance based on shura and that takes the Quran as "the supreme constitutional norm." Hoffman's Shuracracy adopts the representative government, free and fair elections, and separation of powers. Hofmann, *Religion on The Rise*.

> remains to be put back into practice by means of a process yet to be found or borrowed from the wisdom of the people.[145]

However, the problem here is that despite certain similarities such as the emphasis on deliberation and consent, the classical idea of *shura* is radically different from modern democratic practice. This disjunction between the two creates numerous questions about a conception of democracy based on *shura*, questions such as: will consultation be binding on the ruler, who will be party to consultation, which matters will be subject to consultation, will the consultants be elected or selected and how, and how will the consulted body decide? Most Brotherhood-affiliated Islamists consider *shura* to be "both required and binding on the ruler (*wajiba* and *mulzima*), to include religious as well as other experts and community leaders, and to accept majority decisions as normal and legitimate."[146] Brotherhood's refashioning of the notion of *shura* as "a formal process and an institution" and its attempt to build a general yet ambivalent equivalence between democracy and *shura* transforms both ends, since democracy gets wrested from its dominant liberal secular valence and *shura* takes on a new meaning and form that is unprecedented in classical Islamic history.[147]

---

[145] Jaafar, *Arab Modernities*, 118.
[146] Kramer, "Techniques and Values: Contemporary Muslim Debates on Islam and Democracy," 186.
[147] Gudrun Kramer also points out that in Islamic conception of *shura*, consultation is poised to produce consensus and harmony among the ruler and ruled in order to safeguard the unity of the community. As such, this classical conception does not open much space for modern political pluralism of liberal democracies. The procedure of *shura*, is not for pursuing particular interests or demands that would be considered divisive. But rather, what is prioritized is public good (*al-maslaha al-'amma*), unity (*wahda*), consensus (*ijma'*) and harmony (*tawazun*). At that point, Nathan Brown makes an interesting analogy between the classical idea of shura and the republican conception of democracy, both of which stress public good and shun the divisiveness of particular interests. See, Ibid.

Besides the point about commonalities between *shura* and democracy, it is hard to indicate any specific institutional mechanism or principle in Brotherhood's platform that come directly and exclusively from the historical practice of *shura*. This shows that Brotherhood's constant stress on *shura* is not a real attempt to provide a synthesis of two sets of practices under the rubrics of *shura* and democracy, but rather it is an attempt to secure a space for cultural difference within the dominant liberal democratic practices. The Broterhood refers to *shura* as "the basic principle in Islamic State system,"[148] but since there is no particular mechanism that derives directly from *shura*, it only serves as a proxy for locating democracy within the limits and frame of reference of shari'a.

In that sense, the Brotherhood's attempt to translate *shura* as democracy and vice versa and its attempt to build an ambivalent relationship between the two that is at once equivalent ("*shura*/democracy") and not equivalent ("*shura* and democracy") is an expression of claiming the norm of democracy and differing from it. By articulating *shura* into a modern Islamic democracy the Brotherhood participates in the normative desirability of democracy and but seeks to escape from its normalizing secular liberalism.

As a modernist Islamist movement, Brotherhood often engages in cultural translation by trying to establish relationships of equivalence between a desirable modern concept and a related concept from Islamic tradition. However, as much as these translations introduce difference into modern Western concepts, it also refashions and reconstructs Islamic tradition along the lines of modern demands, sensibilities and necessities. For example, the FJP's 2011 program describes itself as being "founded on

[148] Mohammad Ma'mun El-Hudaibi, "The Principles of The Muslim Brotherhood," *Ikhwanweb*, February 1, 2010, http://www.ikhwanweb.com/article.php?id=813. A shorter version of that paper was published in El-Hodaiby, "Upholding Islam."

four fundamental principles, which represent the great purposes of Sharia (Islamic law), namely: Freedom… Justice… Development… Leadership."[149] The purposes of shari'a (*maqasid al-shari'a*) refers to a well-established literature in Islamic jurisprudence developed mainly in 12th century jurist Al-Shaybani which suggest that Islamic rulings and norms should be interpreted in line with the 'purposes of shari'a' which are the protection of life, reason, property, religion, and progeny.[150] Recently there has been intense scholarly attention to the idea of purposes of shari'a since it gives more flexibility and latitude in negotiating modern conditions.[151] But what is striking is that no Islamic scholar, classical or modern, has taken 'development' or 'leadership' (and to a certain extent 'freedom') as part of the 'great purposes of shari'a.' Even though one can argue that development or leadership can be extrapolated as an objective of Islamic law with a finer interpretation, the point still remains: in engaging with modern norms and institutions and in its effort to come up with a modern program derived from Islamic tradition, the Brotherhood transforms the Islamic tradition too.

Furthermore, such modernist interpretations of shari'a create other kinds of problems. For example, in an unprecedented gesture, the FJP defines 'leadership' as an objective of shari'a but then when the entire program is studied, one realizes that leadership comes into the picture only in the section about party's foreign policy which talks about Egypts "regional and political leadership" and vies for "restoring the historic leading role of Egypt in the Arab and Islamic regions and the whole world."[152] That is to

[149] "Freedom and Justice Party 2011 Parliamentary Elections Program," 3.
[150] Wael B. Hallaq, *Sharī'a: Theory, Practice, Transformations* (Cambridge University Press, 2009), 507.
[151] Tariq Ramadan, *Radical Reform: Islamic Ethics and Liberation* (Oxford University Press, 2008).
[152] "Freedom and Justice Party 2011 Parliamentary Elections Program," 35.

say, the Brotherhood not only transforms Islamic tradition through its politics of cultural translation, but it does so in ways that put Islamic concepts to the service of a form of modern nationalism.

2.4. "Islamic But Not Religious"? Muslim Brotherhood's Negotiation of Secularism through the Concept of the Civil State

FJP declares in its 2011 program that it seeks to establish an Islamic state (*dawla Islamiyya*) but not a religious state (*dawla diniyya*). This claim seems rather paradoxical. After all, the same program refers to Islam as a religion,[153] then how can an Islamic state not be a religious state? Or put differently, if the state is not to be religious, how is it then not secular? I argue that the Brotherhood navigates this paradoxical terrain through the concept of the 'civil state.' On the one hand, the Brotherhood clearly refutes secularism as unacceptable. But on the other hand, the Brotherhood in practice reworks secularism by affirming the civility of the state.

In differentiating what is religious, secular and civil, the Brotherhood articulates a particular negotiation of secularism, one that is expressly, if paradoxically, anti-secular. Or better put, in formulating an Islamic civil state the Brotherhood negotiates a particular form of secularism (understood as rule of lay people) in repudiation of another form of secularism (understood as radical separation of religion and politics and relegation of religion to the private sphere). It does so by pointing out the cultural and historical differences between Egyptian-Islamic and European-Christian contexts. The Brotherhood finds a conception of secularism as endorsement of civil state and rule of lay people to be

[153] Ibid., 41.

compatible with Islamic tradition, but considers the latter account of secularism as separation of spheres to be repugnant to Islamic teachings. For the Brotherhood an Islamic state—a state which implements shari'a—is not a religious state since a religious state is by nature theocratic (*dawla theokratiyya*) and Islam does not approve theocracy.

A theocratic state would be a state in which clergy rules, but there is no such distinct clerical class in Islamic tradition. Muslim Brotherhood denounces the idea of a religious state "governed by the clergy or by Divine Right"[154] for there can be "no infallible people who can monopolize the interpretation of the Holy Koran and have exclusive right to legislation for the nation and are characterized by Holiness." Rulers are not divinely ordained clergymen holding exclusive rights because there is no such clerical class in Islam and "the rulers in the Islamic state are citizens elected according to the will of the people; and the nation is the source of authority."[155]

Secularism has been translated into Arabic language as '*almaniyya* or '*ilmaniyya*. Both neologisms were produced in late 19th century as equivalents of the term 'secularism.' As Bernard Lewis notes,

> The words for "secular" and "secularism" in modern Islamic languages are either loanwords or neologisms. There are still no equivalents for the words "layman" and "laity." Jurists and other Muslim writers on politics have long recognized a distinction between state and religion, between the affairs of this world and those of the next. But this in no way corresponds to the dichotomy expressed in such Western pairs of terms as "spiritual"

[154] Ibid., 11.
[155] Ibid.

> and "temporal," or "lay" and "ecclesiastical." Conceptually, this dichotomy simply did not arise.[156]

While '*almaniyya* is derived from the word '*alem* (world) and comes to denote a sense of profanization, the letter is derived from the word '*ilm* (knowledge, science) and has connotations of positivist scientism. In other words, both terms refer to a settlement of the relationship between religion and politics in which religion is either denied any public role and/or thought to be sent to the dustbin of history.[157] Both terms have generally been perceived as carrying hostile overtones toward religion and its public role.[158] In the Egyptian context secularism ('*almaniyya*) refers to a kind of settlement that defies this incorporation of shari'a. This was also later acknowledged by Ahmet Davutoğlu, Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs, about the controversy around the Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's advice to the Muslim Brotherhood for endorsing secularism in the constitution before and during his visit to Egypt and Tunisia in September 2011. According to Davutoğlu,

> What Erdogan meant by secularism (*laiklik*) was indeed *siyasa madaniyya* (civil politics). But it was mistranslated into Arabic as '*almaniyya*. So it didn't match up well. Because '*almaniyya* corresponds to our laicist state (*laikçi devlet*). Islam is already enshrined in Arab constitutions. So '*almaniyya* comes to mean a demand for a structure that has no reference to Islam whatsoever, that is a demand for laicism (*laikçilik*)."[159]

---

[156] Bernard Lewis, "A Historical Overview," *Journal of Democracy* 7, no. 2 (1996): 62.
[157] In that sense, it comes close to what Charles Taylor calls in A Secular Age, substraction stories of secularism, that is the narratives within secularization theory of elimination of religion altogether. See, Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Harvard University Press, 2009).
[158] Asad, "Fear and the Ruptured State: Reflections on Egypt after Mubarak," 289.
[159] Davutoğlu, Interview by the author.

However, the concept of the civil state in Muslim Brotherhood's discourse operates as the equivalent of the rule of laity that Lewis talks about. While the Brotherhood squarely rejects an idea of secularism understood as '*almaniyya* or '*ilmaniyya*, but it endorses the 'civility' of the state. The fact that Islamists offer a "vocal denunciation of secularism" does not imply that they "make no distinction between the spheres of religion proper and of worldly affairs, between the sacred and the profane, the eternal and the temporal."[160] Rather, the Brotherhood insistently makes distinctions between theocracy ("rule by men of religion or a ruler of divine grace") and *dawla madaniyya*, that is "a civil or, to be more precise, lay state." As Kramer points out, this important distinction often gets neglected by observers.[161]

For the Brotherhood, civility of the state refers to its non-theocratic character. That is, rulers are just fallible human beings with no religiously-derived authority. "While the government in Islam is required to abide by the principles of the Islamic Shari'ah," writes Ma'mun El-Hodaiby, the guide-general of the group, "it is still a civil government that is subject to accountability."[162] He suggests that "Islam knows no infallible religious government that speaks in the Name of Allah that claims that its decisions are part of religion." But this does not mean that Islam is separated out of the sphere of politics. On the contrary, for El-Hudaiby, "the teachings of the Islamic Shari'ah have introduced and

[160] Kramer, "Islamist Notions of Democracy," 4.
[161] Ibid., 6. Also see, Raymond William Baker, *Islam Without Fear: Egypt and the New Islamists* (Harvard University Press, 2006); Scott, "Managing Religion and Renegotiating the Secular."
[162] El-Hodaiby, "Upholding Islam."

regulated the principles of justice, equality, and human rights." The shari'a is "an integral part of politics" and its "injunctions should be adhered to and acted upon."[163]

For the Brotherhood, a civil state is one that is not a police state and also not a religious state or theocracy. Rather it is a state run by civilians. Civilian here refers to people who are not actively serving in the military, but also to people who are lay, or not clergy. The idea is that since there is no clerical class in Islam and religious authority is rather dispersed, decentralized, and communally negotiated. Hence, shari'a-guided political rule will be Islamic but not theocratic. As many statements, platforms, and position papers of the Brotherhood, including the 2011 Program of the FJP, emphasize, "people" or "the nation" are "the source of authority."[164] The Brotherhood rejects a secularist compartmentalization of religious and other social and/or political spheres, but instead argues that Islam is both religion and state (*din wa dawla*) or religion and world (*din wa dunya*). But through the idea of 'civility' the Brotherhood advances a particular rendition of secularism as rule of laity—a non-secular secularism.[165]

However, this civil state in Brotherhood's imagination is a "civil Islamic State."[166] For the Brotherhood "the State is civil and civilian, for the Islamic State is civilian in nature."[167] Interestingly, the Program uses the two terms, 'civil' and 'civilian,' as the characteristic of the state. While the former stands as a repudiation of theocracy and religious state, the latter expresses a refutation of "a military state ruled by armed

---

[163] Ibid.
[164] "Freedom and Justice Party 2011 Parliamentary Elections Program," 10–11.
[165] As Yamen Nouh, a member of the Al-Wasat Party, noted, Al-Wasat was the first among the broader 'Ikwan School' movements and parties to use the term "civil party with Islamic reference." Interview Yamen Nouh.
[166] "Freedom and Justice Party 2011 Parliamentary Elections Program," 10.
[167] Ibid., 11.

forces who get in power by military coups, and (…) rule like a dictatorship, [or] a police state controlled by the security forces."[168]

This also points to the very interesting struggle taking place over the term 'civil state' especially after the fall of Mubarak. Many self-proclaimed secularists suggested that civil state meant secular state and some saw the military tutelage over Egyptian politics as the guarantor of the civil state. Some secularists make an indirect preconditions argument by suggesting that the civil state means equal citizenship rather than secularism; however equal citizenship can only be established and sustained through secularism. Hence, secularism is posited as a precondition for civil state.

The Brotherhood's program for 2005 parliamentary elections reiterates the movement's conception of civility as a non-theocratic and non-secular settlement of the relationship between religion and politics. It points out that "there is no one in Islam who has religious authority—whoever he is—except the authority of good preaching, calling for good and warning of evil," and this kind of authority, the program claims, is "granted by Allah (Exalted and Glorified be He) to every Muslim regardless of his/her social status." "Due to the fact that Islam denies the religious authority," it suggests, "the state in Islam is a civil one where the nation sets up its systems and institutions, as the nation is considered to be the source of authorities." But again, it is a civil state "based on applying the Shari'ah and the restrictive ordinances of the Almighty." This Islamic civil state "combines both religion and state" and "this world and Hereafter." But since the state is civil and the rulers are "civil governors," their authority rest on a "social contract" and the people has the right to "choose the ruler, control him, and depose him" if they

[168] Ibid.

wish.[169] The President has no religious authority, but as the leader of the community, he is charged with the task of executing shari'a and overseeing its execution. In other words, "while the state rests on a religious foundation, its leadership carries no religious sanction." [170]

When interviewed by AlJazeera English about Brotherhood's (and FJP's) notion of 'Islamic democracy,' Saad Al-Katatny, the chairman of FJP and the first speaker of the People's Assembly after the 2011 uprisings, said:

> If you want to know what principles guide our party let me tell you—the principles of the Islamic Sharia law and they are included in the Egyptian Constitution. Our party is not a religious party but it's a civil party…that seeks a modern and democratic state but with an 'Islamic reference.' We see the principles of Islamic Sharia as the framework that governs us when we enact laws. We are not against any different reference as long as it does not conflict with our constitution. The important point is not to have parties based on religion and not to have parties with military wings to achieve any goals.[171]

Similarly, in a roundtable discussion among leaders of Egyptian political parties and groups organized by the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies in 2007, Hussein Abdel Razeq, the Secretary General of the leftist Tagammu' Party, suggests that the Article 2 of the Constitution stipulating Islam as the religion of the state and shari'a as the principle source of legislation "strengthens the idea of religious state" hence calls upon changing

---

[169] "The Muslim Brotherhood's Program for the Parliamentary Elections of 2005." The same points are reiterated in the Electoral Programme of the Muslim Brotherhood for Shura Council in 2007.
[170] Kramer, "Islamist Notions of Democracy," 6.
[171] Mohamed Saad Katatni: "Not a religious party": What does the Muslim Brotherhood want for Egypt's future?, Talk to Al Jazeera, November 27, 2011, http://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/talktojazeera/2011/11/2011112694418337373.html.

that article by including "all sacred religions" in the Constitution rather than only one of them. In response, Dr. Ahmed Abou Baraka, a member of the Brotherhood parliamentary bloc, argued that "a proper implementation" of Article 2 of the Constitution "would eventually lead to the establishment of a civil state, since Islam did not impose the 'deification' of the ruler."[172] In other words, if shari'a is implemented properly, then this would strengthen the civil state.

The Muslim Brotherhood on the other hand defines the civil state as the state run by civil (lay) people and civilians (non-military and non-police). Interestingly, its reworking of secularism through the civil state was simultaneously positioning civility against the military's encroachment over civilian life. When explaining their vision of the civil state, the Muslim Brotherhood leaders always couple the rule of the lay people with the rule of the civilians, hence constantly seeking to curtail the power of the military tutelage through its negotiation of secularism.

This contrast in liberal and Muslim Brotherhood interpretations of the civil state stem in part from their different readings of what poses the real danger to realizing aims of the 2011 Uprising (what was called January 25, 2011 Revolution). For the secularists religious difference (between Coptic minority and Muslim majority, and between Islamists and secular liberals) is the real source of instability and injustice. For the Muslim Brotherhood it is the military, the bureaucracy and their international allies that threaten the revolution. These different diagnoses bred different significations of the civil state among secular liberals and the Muslim Brotherhood. This why while Islamists such

[172] "Progressive National Unionist Party (Tagamu') and Wafd Party Reject Constitutional Reforms and Request the Amendment of Article 2 of the Constitution," March 7, 2007, http://www.cihrs.org/?p=4988&lang=en.

as Fahmy Huwaydi insist that "the political obsession with secularism as a constitutional guarantee of freedom, toleration, and equality will only make justice and democracy harder to achieve,"[173] many secularists called on the military to intervene in order to protect the 'civil state' from Islamists.

In Brotherhood's discourse, both religious and secular states are two sides of the same coin and are both perils to be avoided. Hence, the 'civil' state stands as Brotherhood's non-religious and non-secular third way. For the Brotherhood, the sensibilities that are commonly placed under the category of secularism (i.e. rule of lay people, freedom of religion) in liberal democracies are protected under a 'civil' state that is 'Islamic.' Therefore, practically, if not literally, the MB translates the Western category of secularism into the Egyptian context as civil state (*dawla madaniyya*). MB never invokes secularism. It is not part of its vocabulary.

This also points to the limits of the language of the religious versus secular binary in understanding political life in Egypt.[174] The binaries of Islamist versus secularist or religious versus secular hides as much as uncovers the way Islamist and secularist groups understand and foresee the role of religion in public life and the relationship between religion, politics, law and the state. Ascribing too much stability and cross-cultural resonance to the concepts such as the religious and the secular and pitching them as the polar opposite of each other makes it more difficult to understand the complex articulations and intertwinement of them, such as the Brotherhood's call for an Islamic state that is not religious, and a civil state that is not secular. Not attending to such

---

[173] Quoted in, Asad, "Fear and the Ruptured State: Reflections on Egypt after Mubarak," 290.
[174] Jocelyne Cesari, *The Awakening of Muslim Democracy* (Cambridge University Press, 2014); Scott, "Managing Religion and Renegotiating the Secular"; Agrama, *Questioning Secularism*.

seemingly paradoxical complexities in historically rooted and culturally produced differences ends up in the arguments that the Brotherhood is hiding its true intentions and agenda and waiting for the right time to terminate democracy and establish its theocratic dictatorship. Hence, it either rejects socialization into democratic norms, or its socialization is strategic and instrumental with no internationalization of the norm—a 'Potemkin socialization.' Some easily discard these distinctions the Brotherhood makes as oxymoronic.[175]

What these accounts often do not pay attention to the fact that Brotherhood negotiates these categories of religion, secularism, civility and democracy in the Egyptian context. They also miss the essentially contested nature of these categories.[176] The Brotherhood did not impose an Islamic state over a presumably secular Egyptian state. What it did was to offer a different negotiation of the 'secularity' of the Egyptian state (through the notion of the civility of the state) and different mechanisms to incorporate religion into state and politics (through the advisory body of Al-Azhar scholars).[177]

Again, when one digs deeper into the discourses articulated in the ideological battles over constitution in post-Mubarak Egypt, one realizes that the positions of the parties do not conform to the coordinates of the binaries such as religious and secular. The facts that the Brotherhood rejects a 'religious state' and that many 'secularists' want to enshrine shari'a in the constitution suggest that the narratives of Islamists as rejecting

[175] Mariz Tadros, *The Muslim Brotherhood in Contemporary Egypt: Democracy Redefined Or Confined?* (Routledge, 2012), 66.
[176] Hurd, *The Politics of Secularism in International Relations*, 12.
[177] Scott, "Managing Religion and Renegotiating the Secular," 54.

secularism versus the secularists adopting it fail to attend to the complexities of discourses and demands.

3. Conclusion

As Kathleen Collins and Erica Owens note, "Islamic democracy is an increasingly salient concept and its appeal needs to be studied."[178] In that vein, this chapter inquires into the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood's articulation of Islamic democracy as an example of performative socialization into democracy as a norm. Over the last few decades, the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt has come to accept key institutions of liberal democracy, such as free and fair elections, party pluralism, government accountability, political and civil rights for assembly and expression (within the bounds of shari'a), and the rule of law. However, as Gudrun Kramer points out, the movement "has not adopted liberalism, if that includes religious indifference."[179] The Brotherhood advances a vision of 'Islamic democracy' that repudiates secular state. However, it also repudiates a religious state, calling it a theocracy that is unjustified in Sunni Islamic tradition. Rather, it calls for a civil democratic state within an Islamic frame of reference.

I argue that the Muslim Brotherhood's double negation of both secularism and religious state and its affirmation of a civil state within an Islamic frame of reference constitutes a reworking of secularism within the Egyptian context. The MB's endorsement of civil state (*dawla madaniyya*) against secularism ('*almaniyya* or

[178] Collins and Owen, "Islamic Religiosity and Regime Preferences Explaining Support for Democracy and Political Islam in Central Asia and the Caucasus," 501.
[179] Kramer, "Islamist Notions of Democracy," 8.

‘*ilmaniyya*) in some ways parallels AK Party’s endorsement of ‘democratic secularism’ against Kemalist secularism. Even though AK Party does not call for enshrining Islam or shari ‘a in the constitution, still both political actors seek to open up more space for religion in public life without putting the state under the command of religious authority.

In performatively socializing into democracy, the Muslim Brotherhood translates democracy into *shura* (and vice versa) and establishes an ambivalent equivalence between the two. In doing so it transforms both concepts and traditions. In addition, it appropriates democracy catachrestically by disjointing it from its ‘proper’ secular liberal norms. As such the Brotherhood claims democracy as a norm but seeks to escape from its secular liberal pedagogy by introducing a non-secular non-liberal difference into it. By so doing, the Brotherhood destabilizes the liberal conventions that posit secularism as a precondition for democracy. It claims democracy and self-rule ‘here and now’ against the ‘not yet’ of the Egyptian state and liberal international order. The Egyptian regime has long been, and still is, postponing democracy till the time people reach the sufficient level of maturity. The Brotherhood performatively institutes the authority and maturity of the people by claiming their right to self-governance.

I started this chapter by asking if Arabs have a democratic the right to be non-secular and non-liberal. One observer of Muslim politics has a bleak answer to this question: “Secularism or liberal democracy is no longer regarded as ‘a’ way (one of many possible paradigms albeit for some the best way) but ‘the’ way, the only true path for political development. In the name of enlightenment (reason, empiricism, pluralism) a new absolute, a new norm is posited. Alternative paradigms, especially religious ones, are

necessarily judged as abnormal, irrational, retrogressive." [180] Liberal global governance operates with a "Mecca or mechanization" binary that stipulates secularism as the only way for Muslims to make their way into modernity and democracy.[181] However, as Robert Hefner notes,

> "There is no one-size-fits-all democracy but a variety of forms linked by family resemblances. Democracy's values of freedom, equality, and tolerance-in-pluralism do not come with unbending instructions for all places and times. The general values take their practical cues from the particularities of the place in which they would work. Even in modern Western Europe, we know, the balance struck among democratic values has varied across countries and epochs."[182]

This chapter tries to show that through taking its "practial cues" from the Egyptian-Islamic context, the Muslim Brotherhood advances an Islamic notion of democracy that negotiates the relationships between rights and duties, public and private, individual autonomy and communal obligations. Hence, as Hefner reminds, "we should not be surprised to see that democratization in the Muslim world will strike its own balance among values."[183] But this democratic experiment and experience of striking its own was cut abruptly by the Egyptian military. Then what future awaits the Muslim Brotherhood? Will the Brotherhood survive the most bloody and comprehensive crackdown of its eighty-six years of history? Writing on the MB in late 1960s, Richard Mitchell suggested

---

[180] John L. Esposito, "'Clash of Civilizations'? Contemporary Images of Islam in the West," in *Islam, Modernism and the West: Cultural and Political Relations at the End of the Millennium*, ed. Gema Martín Muñoz (I. B. Tauris in association with the Eleni Nakou Foundation, 1999), 106.
[181] Daniel Lerner, *The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East* (Free Press, 1958), 405. Also see, Hurd, *The Politics of Secularism in International Relations*.
[182] Robert W. Hefner, *Civil Islam: Muslims and Democratization in Indonesia* (Princeton University Press, 2000), 216.
[183] Ibid., 217.

that the movement "has had its way in history" so much so that "for very few of its leaders will historians reserve a place larger than a footnote."[184] Similarly, at the height of Nasser's crackdown, many observers had declared the end of the Muslim Brotherhood. There is a cottage industry of declaring the end of Islamism. Not only in 1960s was Islamism declared dead, but also in 1990s, during the Arab Spring, and now with the July 3, 2013 coup. Clearly, this round of obituaries for the Brotherhood and for Islamism in general has some good reasons. The arrests, killings, tortures, confiscations, and harassments perpetrated by the Egytian military since the coup is unprecedented, far surpassing the Nasser era. It is of course hard to tell what future awaits the movement. But if the history of the movement tells us anything, it is that repression succeeds only in controlling the expansion of the movement, but leaves its core more determined to survive and flourish in the future.

[184] Mitchell, *The Society of the Muslim Brothers*, xxxi.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

"The vast majority of contemporary international theorists," Siba Grovogui observes, "have failed to recognize the validity of non-Western languages of politics and their intended moral orders as legitimate contexts for imagining the alternatives to the present moral order."[1] The commitment, particularly within liberal and constructivist approaches, to take secular liberalism as "the ultimate one path to modernity"[2] contributes to this failure to take alternative social imaginaries and vocabularies as legitimate sources for political thinking and organization. This non-recognition, however, creates a fundamental problem that plagues the liberal politics of our time. This is the problem of the failure of liberal global governance to relate democratically to difference. It operates with a politics of modernity that seeks to neutralize and tame difference through pedagogy of education and/or to eliminate and liquidate it altogether by pedagogy of violence.[3] It does not envision a global life that embraces "difference in equality."[4]

My dissertation attempts to address this problem first by identifying the dynamics, contours and problems of the pedagogical construction of norm socialization processes, and then by developing a performative reading of socialization that accounts for cultural and historical difference in normative negotiations. It problematizes the ways in which

---

[1] Siba N. Grovogui, "Rituals of Power: Theory, Languages, and Vernaculars of International Relations," *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 23, no. 4 (October 1, 1998): 500–501.
[2] Deudney and Ikenberry, "Myth of the Autocratic Revival - Why Liberal Democracy Will Prevail."
[3] Chatterjee, *The Black Hole of Empire*.
[4] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*.

pedagogic narratives of socialization builds implicit and explicit hierarchies between 'liberal socializers' and 'illiberal socializees.' In those narratives the West—a shorthand for the constellation of powerful states, international organizations, transnational networks—assumes the position of the pedagogue with the prerogatives to "disseminate, teach and enforce" secular liberal norms.[5] As such, they discursively produce a Eurocentric liberal secular tutelage on a global level.

The performative reading I develop in my dissertation aims to attend to the ways in which those who are on the margins of liberal global governance—the non-West, the postcolonial societies and actors, the Global South—engage with the constitutive norms and institutions of liberal modernity. I particularly look at how different Islamist formations in Turkey (AK Party) and Egypt (Muslim Brotherhood) negotiate secularism, democracy and their interrelationship with *shari'a* (Islamic norms and law). This performative account makes three theoretical interventions: First, it argues that socialization should be taken as a process of cultural translation (and not simply as a process of straightforward transition). Second, it explores the ways in which actors appropriate norms non-normatively through various strategies such as performative contradiction and inscription of difference. And third, it argues that through cultural translation and appropriation, actors resist the norms they adopt. Therefore, my performative reading analyzes how norms are transformed and negotiated through translation and appropriation. It thus shifts the question from *whether* a norm is adopted to *how* it is adopted and what effects get produced and made possible in and through it.

[5] Schimmelfennig, "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues," 2–3.

Socialization takes place within contexts co-created by local and global pedagogic forces that seek to transition actors into modern norms as they are articulated by liberal norm entrepreneurs. Yet at the same time, actors seek to unsettle these pedagogic dynamics through various strategies. In this project, I focus on cultural translation and non-normative appropriation as strategies of adoption *and* resistance. As such, the analytics of performativity helps us think together the universalizing patterns of liberal modernity *and* the cultural differences that supplement and potentially punctuate them. It points toward the possibility of a non-imperial diffusion of norms and a more democratic mode of engaging with cultural difference in liberal global governance.

One of the fundamental requirements for a democratic engagement with difference is to resist attempts to foreclose the meaning of the constitutive norms of liberal modernity. As Klotz and Lynch suggest, "[l]iberalism, or any other form of discursive dominance, shuts down alternative ways of thinking and acting."[6] Pedagogic frameworks of socialization participate in the closure of the meaning of norms either by construing them as constative categories (correct versus wrong interpretations) or by endorsing disciplinary measures to adopt a particular liberal interpretation as the most appropriate one. By stressing translation and appropriation, performative approach to socialization seeks to keep norms open to differential claims on them. This expands the sphere of democratic politics globally. In fact, much of the political struggles in world politics take place by way of contesting the meaning of constitutive norms of political modernity rather than challenging these norms themselves. Liberal global governance operates with the premise that " the road to emancipation can only traverse the mountains

[6] Klotz and Lynch, *Strategies for Research in Constructivist International Relations*, 51.

and valleys of Western Reason."[7] As Mustapha Kamal Pasha notes, "the possibility of other pathways leading to different places outside the spatio-temporal horizon of Western modernity is scarcely entertained," a constriction whose major consequence is limitation of "the field of emancipation" and construction of hierarchies.[8]

In this dissertation, I detect the limitations and hierarchies created by the global politics of secular liberalism in the particular issue area of Islamism. My entry point for this debate is the globally prevalent discourses of post-Islamism and 'Muslim democracy' that depict Islamists as rejecting socialization into secularism and democracy and the post-Islamists as socializing into them. I analyze these discourses as examples of the pedagogic vision of socialization that seek to discipline Islamists. In doing so, I concur with Hurd's observation that liberal global governance seeks to "lure [Islamists] toward a European model of secularism and punish them economically and politically should they stray from this trajectory." [9] My empirical discussions in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 develop a reading of the AK Party's and the Muslim Brotherhood's negotiations of the categories of secularism and democracy in terms of their relationship to shari'a. Moreover, I highlight the secularist hierarchies and exclusions established and naturalized within these discourses.

These chapters conclude that pedagogic narratives of post-Islamism and Muslim democracy capture significant aspects of the transformation Islamist politics has been going through, yet they fall short of attending to the complexity of normative negotiations

---

[7] Mustapha Kamal Pasha, "The 'Secular' Subject of Critical International Relations Theory," in *Critical Theory in International Relations and Security Studies* (Routledge, 2012), 111, http://www.tandfebooks.com/doi/abs/10.4324/9780203145494.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Hurd, 128.

operative in this transformation. I suggest that these two actors performatively socialize into secularism and democracy in ways that does not fit into the binary of Islamism versus post-Islamism. Both actors translate and appropriate secularism and democracy in ways that transform and contest their normalizing power. They both attempt to rethink Enlightenment universals from and for the margins. Thus they fit neither into a narrative of post-Islamist absorption into secular liberal hegemony nor into a narrative Islamist rejection of secularism and democracy. They seek neither liberalism nor illiberalism. It is neither subsumption into secular liberal norms nor their outright rejection. Rather, they both attempt to configure a non-liberal form of politics that has significant overlaps with liberal democracy.[10]

However, both AK Party and the Muslim Brotherhood translate, negotiate and appropriate secularism and democracy under the pedagogic conditions co-created by the states of their respective countries and the liberal international order that lends these states full support in sustaining their tutelage over politics. This is why performativity, even when it takes the form of a strategy, is in no way a voluntaristic celebration of agency. Rather it is one effort to account for the deeply conditioned nature of agency in normative negotiations in world politics.

As a project of creating an Islamic modernity, Islamism seeks to adapt and mold modern norms, discourses, institutions, and practices. It entails is a mode of engagement with modern norms that is neither rejectionist nor celebratory. Thus, Islamism is a form of modernism that contests the fundamental categories of modernity—such as its

[10] For an exposition of a non-liberal conception of politics that is neither liberal nor illiberal, see Bhikhu Parekh, "The Cultural Particularity of Liberal Democracy," in *Prospects for Democracy: North, South, East, West*, ed. David Held (Stanford University Press, 1993), 156–76.

conceptions of humanism, individualism, and secularism. Hence the binaristic reading of Islamism as repudiating modernity and of post-Islamism as openly endorsing it misses the ways in which both actors are critically adopting modern norms and institutions. It also underemphasizes the constitutive force of modern norms and institutions. Much of Islamist interpretations of modern norms and institutions take place on the "glacial terrain" created by modern power. Rather than forging a total critique of modernity, Islamism of the Muslim Brotherhood and the Justice and Development Party invokes an alternative mode of inhabiting modernity.

Noah Feldman suggests that Islamist demands for shari'a is an index for a demand for justice and rule of law.[11] However, what Islamism does not fully recognize is the potential of the modern state to be a source of tremendous injustice when the state's totalizing power is merged with shari'a-based claims. Modern state's practice of Islamic shari'a brought about many problems and created many injustices—the case of Nasr Hamid Abu Zayd being only one prominent example.[12] There are deep problems that peril attempts to put an Islamic face on the modern state. Islamists fall short of recognizing the dangers of the totalizing and corrupting force of the modern state. Thus simply trimming its operations to keep it or shari'a-compliant would not necessarily bring about the deep constitutive values of Islamic shari'a. Put differently, unquestioned wedding of the modern state with shari'a may betray shari'a more than it betrays liberal sensibilities and conventions.

---

[11] Feldman, *After Jihad*; Feldman, *The Fall and Rise of the Islamic State*; Noah Feldman, "Why Shariah?," *The New York Times*, March 16, 2008, sec. Magazine, http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/16/magazine/16Shariah-t.html.
[12] Agrama, *Questioning Secularism*.

In a bid to counter the secularist claims that Islam has nothing to offer to the modern world, Islamists targeted the state as a major instrument for achieving their own project of Islamization. Yet the marriage of the state power and shari'a has created many injustices that contradict the purposes and principles of shari'a.[13] As Scott points out, "the project of the Islamic state has a number of similarities with that of the modern nation state, in the sense that it is the state that manages, disciplines, and defines religion."[14] In other words, just adding the adjective 'Islamic' to the state does not make it Islamic. Or, for that matter, simply incorporating shari'a into a state also does not make it Islamic. As Heba Raouf, a former member of the Muslim Brotherhood and an influential academic and activist, once noted,

> Islamists said if the state is so powerful, why don't you just Islamize it? Why don't you convert it? But some say, "no dear, its nature is secular." If you apply shari'a in a modern state, it turns into hell. You re using the law without mercy, without attention to social dynamics, morality and ethics, as we saw in Sudan. You neglect ethical, moral, social compass. If you separate from context you have a huge problem.[15]

Echoing the same sensibility, one member of the Muslim Brotherhood and its Freedom and Justice Party, and son of one top-ranking Brotherhood leader, said, with the idea of Islamic state, "you're just putting a label on a stupid machine."[16] Thus, by Islamizing the state Muslim Brotherhood does not solve the problem but makes it Islamic.

---

[13] Fadl, *Islam and the Challenge of Democracy*.
[14] Scott, "Managing Religion and Renegotiating the Secular," 54.
[15] Heba Raouf, Lecture notes, AUC, September 22, 2011. Course: Contemporary Political Islam.
[16] Abdurrahman Hosam, Interview with the author, October 9, 2011.

Islamists have long argued that secularism was a European cure for a European problem.[17] Drawing attention to the different historical trajectories of Christian European societies and Muslim societies especially in terms of the nature of the relationship between religious and political authorities, Islamists suggested that secularism was an alien import that was imposed by the westernizing elites of their own countries. As Rashid al-Ghannushi, the intellectual and political leader of An-Nahda, the Tunisian chapter of the MB, once said: "Secularism came to us on the back of a tank, and it has remained under its protection ever since."[18] However, Bernard Lewis once argued that

> Separation of church and state was derided in the past by Muslims when they said this is a Christian remedy for a Christian disease. It doesn't apply to us or to our world. Lately, I think some of them are beginning to reconsider that, and to concede that perhaps they may have caught a Christian disease and would therefore be well advised to try a Christian remedy.[19]

Realizing that the 'Christian disease' is no longer reserved only for the Christian world, Islamist intellectuals and actors have negotiated the terms of secularism for their own contexts. The Turkish AK Party expressly adopts a 'democratic' version of secularism—one that is akin to American secularism. The Muslim Brotherhood expressly rejects

---

[17] Indeed, Islamists were not alone in making this claim. Ashis Nandy argues that secularists in India were mistaken in taking secularism as a universal political norm. For him secularism as a model was efficacious in Christian Europe but not for India. The extensive debates over the meaning and practice of secularism in India point at its deeply contested character. Roover, Claerhout, and Balagangadhara, "Liberal Political Theory and the Cultural Migration of Ideas."

[18] Rashid al-Ghannushi, Muqarabat fi'l 'ilmaniyyah wa'l mujtama' al-madani (London: al-Markaz al-Magharibi li'l Buhuth wa'l Tarjamah, 1999), 175; quoted in Ibrahim M. Abu-Rabi', *Contemporary Arab Thought: Studies in Post-1967 Arab Intellectual History* (London ; Sterling, Va: Pluto Press, 2003), 203.

[19] Joseph Liu, "Islam and the West: A Conversation with Bernard Lewis," *Pew Research Center's Religion & Public Life Project*, April 27, 2006, http://www.pewforum.org/2006/04/27/islam-and-the-west-a-conversation-with-bernard-lewis/.

secularism but its endorsement of the idea of the civil state amounts to no less than a negotiation of secularism as non-theocracy.

In their normative negotiations, two perils haunt postcolonial actors, including Islamists: these are the Scylla of *bon pour l'Orient* democracy (Orientalist relativism) and the Carybdis of democracy without difference (Eurocentric assimilation). The task is to chart a path that does not fall into either of these traps—renunciation of cultural difference in the name of secular liberalism, or a tout court rejection of democracy and secularism in the name of cultural difference. This cannot be achieved, however, through a renewed faith in secular liberal redemption, as pedagogic discourses seem to suggest. Rather, the first step toward achieving this task is to engage democratically with difference and to open modern categories and norms to differential inhabitations. Performative understanding of socialization, I hope, contributes to this daunting yet urgent task.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abdel Wahab, Mohamed S. "An Overview of the Egyptian Legal System and Legal Research." *Hauser Global Law School Program*, October 2006. http://www.nyulawglobal.org/globalex/egypt.htm#_Political_Parties.

Abdulla. Interview by the author. Cairo, July 7, 2010.

Abdurrahman. Interview by the author. Cairo, October 8, 2011.

Abiad, Nisrine. *Sharia, Muslim States and International Human Rights Treaty Obligations: A Comparative Study*. British Institute of International and Comparative Law, 2008.

Abu-Rabi, Ibrahim. "Facing Modernity." *Harvard International Review* 19, no. 2 (Spring 1997): 12.

Abu-Rabi', Ibrahim M. *Contemporary Arab Thought: Studies in Post-1967 Arab Intellectual History*. London ; Sterling, Va: Pluto Press, 2003.

Abul Futouh, Abdul Monem. "The Muslim Brotherhood Comments on Gray Zones'' Carnegie Paper." *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, July 13, 2006. http://carnegieendowment.org/2006/07/13/muslim-brotherhood-comments-on-gray-zones-carnegie-paper/2x77.

Acharya, Amitav. "How Ideas Spread: Whose Norms Matter? Norm Localization and Institutional Change in Asian Regionalism." *International Organization* 58, no. 02 (2004): 239–75.

Açıkgenç, Alparslan. *Bir Kavram ve Süreç Olarak Bilginin İslamileştirilmesi*. İstanbul: Nesil Yayınları, 1998.

"Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi'nin Kapatma Davası Hakkındaki Esas Savunması," June 16, 2008. Esas No: 2008/1 (Siyasi Parti Kapatma).

Adler, Emanuel, and Michael Barnett. *Security Communities*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Adler, Emanuel, and Peter M. Haas. "Conclusion: Epistemic Communities, World Order, and the Creation of a Reflective Research Program." *International Organization* 46, no. 01 (1992): 367–90.

Agrama, H. A. "Secularism, Sovereignty, Indeterminacy: Is Egypt a Secular or a Religious State?" *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 52, no. 03 (2010): 495–523.

Agrama, Hussein Ali. *Questioning Secularism: Islam, Sovereignty, and the Rule of Law in Modern Egypt*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.

Akdoğan, Yalçın. *Ak Parti ve Muhafazakar Demokrasi*. Istanbul: Alfa Basın Yayım Dağıtım, 2004. http://www.idefix.com/kitap/ak-parti-ve-muhafazakar-demokrasi-yalcin-akdogan/tanim.asp?sid=LB2QSHEHJP7PRWSCX2R8.

Al-Hoseiny, Saad. Interview by the author. Cairo, October 15, 2011.

Ali, Tariq. *The Clash of Fundamentalisms: Crusades, Jihads and Modernity*. London: Verso, 2002.

Alpay, Şahin. presented at the Turkish-Egyptian Conversations on Contemporary Democratic and Political Transformations, American University in Cairo, Cairo, Egypt, October 11, 2011.

Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." In *Lenin and Philosophy, and Other Essays*, 127–88. London: New Left Books, 1971.

Arfi, Badredine. "Rethinking International Constitutional Order: The Auto-Immune Politics of Binding Without Binding." *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 39, no. 2 (December 1, 2010): 299–321. doi:10.1177/0305829810380629.

Asad, Talal. "A Comment on Translation, Critique, and Subversion." In *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross-Cultural Texts*, edited by Anuradha Dingwaney and Carol Maier, 325–32. University of Pittsburgh Pre, 1996.

———. “Boundaries and Rights in Islamic Law: Introduction.” *Social Research: An International Quarterly* 70, no. 3 (2003): 683–86.
———. “Conscripts of Western Civilization.” In *Dialectical Anthropology: Essays in Honor of Stanley Diamond*, edited by Stanley Diamond and Christine Ward Gailey, 333–51. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1992.
———. “Fear and the Ruptured State: Reflections on Egypt after Mubarak.” *Social Research: An International Quarterly* 79, no. 2 (Summer 2012): 271–98.
———. *Formations of the Secular Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2003.
———. *Genealogies of Religion : Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.
———. *The Idea of an Anthropology of Islam*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Contemporary Arab Studies, Georgetown University, 1986.
Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies*. Psychology Press, 1998.
Austin, John Langshaw. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press, 1975.
“Avrupa ülkeleri Mısır’da Neo Oryantalist davrandı.” *Star Gazetesi*, July 18, 2013. http://haber.stargazete.com/politika/avrupa-ulkeleri-misirda-neo-oryantalist-davrandi/haber-773188.
Baker, Raymond William. *Islam Without Fear: Egypt and the New Islamists*. Harvard University Press, 2006.
Balzacq, Thierry. “The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context.” *European Journal of International Relations* 11, no. 2 (June 1, 2005): 171–201. doi:10.1177/1354066105052960.
Barnett, Michael. “Institutions, Roles, and Disorder: The Case of the Arab States System.” *International Studies Quarterly* 37, no. 3 (September 1, 1993): 271–96.
Barnett, Michael, and Raymond Duvall. “Power in International Politics.” *International Organization* 59, no. 1 (2005): 39–75.
Barnett, Michael N. *Dialogues in Arab Politics*. Columbia University Press, 1998.
Barnett, Michael N., and Martha Finnemore. *Rules for the World : International Organizations in Global Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.
Bassam Tibi. “Why They Can’t Be Democratic.” *Journal of Democracy* 19, no. 3 (2008): 43–48.
Bassnett, Susan, and Harish Trivedi. *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practice*. Routledge, 2012.
Baudner, Joerg. “The Politics of ‘Norm Diffusion’ in Turkish European Union Accession Negotiations: Why It Was Rational for an Islamist Party to Be ‘Pro-European’ and a Secularist Party to Be ‘Anti-European’*.” *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 50, no. 6 (2012): 922–38.
Bayat, A. *Islam and Democracy: What Is the Real Question?* Vol. 8. Leiden University Press, 2007.
———. “What Is Post-Islamism?” *ISIM Review* 16, no. 5 (2005).
Bayat, Asef. “A New Arab Street in Post-Islamist Times.” *Foreign Policy Blogs*, January 26, 2011. http://mideastafrica.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/01/26/a_new_arab_street.
———. *Making Islam Democratic: Social Movements and the Post-Islamist Turn*. Stanford University Press, 2007.
———. “The Coming of a Post-Islamist Society.” *Critique*, 1996.
Berkes, Niyazi. *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*. Taylor & Francis US, 1998.
Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London; New York: Routledge, 2004.

Borrmans, Maurice. “Cultural Dialogue and ‘Islamic Specificity.’” In *Islam, Modernism and the West: Cultural and Political Relations at the End of the Millennium*, edited by Gema Martín Muñoz, 81–93. I. B. Tauris in association with the Eleni Nakou Foundation, 1999.

Bradley, Marc Champion And Matt. “Islamists Criticize Turkish Premier’s ‘Secular’ Remarks.” *Wall Street Journal*, September 15, 2011, sec. New York. http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424053111904491704576570670264116178.

Brown, Nathan J. “Debating the Islamic Shari’a in 21st-Century Egypt.” *The Review of Faith & International Affairs* 10, no. 4 (2012): 9–17.

———. “Egypt and Islamic Sharia: A Guide for the Perplexed.” *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, May 15, 2012. http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/05/15/egypt-and-islamic-sharia-guide-for-perplexed/argb.

———. *When Victory Is Not an Option: Islamist Movements in Arab Politics*. Cornell University Press, 2012.

Brown, Nathan J., Michele Durocher Dunne, and Amr Hamzawy. *Egypt’s Controversial Constitutional Amendments*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace Washington DC, 2007. http://carnegieendowment.org/files/egypt_constitution_webcommentary01.pdf.

Brown, Nathan J., Amr Hamzawy, and Marina Ottaway. *Islamist Movements and the Democratic Process in the Arab World: Exploring Gray Zones*. Middle East Series. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, March 2006. http://carnegieendowment.org/2006/03/08/islamist-movements-and-democratic-process-in-arab-world-exploring-gray-zones/2cvu.

Buck-Morss, Susan. *Thinking Past Terror: Islamism and Critical Theory on the Left*. Verso, 2003.

Bulaç, Ali. “AK Parti ve Muhafazakar Demokrasi.” *Köprü Üç Aylık Fikir Dergisi*, K 2007.

Burawoy, Michael. “Revisits: An Outline of a Theory of Reflexive Ethnography.” *American Sociological Review* 68, no. 5 (October 1, 2003): 645–79.

———. “The Extended Case Method.” *Sociological Theory* 16, no. 1 (March 1, 1998): 4–33.

Butler, Judith. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of “Sex.”* Psychology Press, 1993.

———. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. Routledge, 1997.

———. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

———. “Restaging the Universal: Hegemony and the Limits of Formalism.” In *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*, edited by Judith Butler, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj Žižek, 11–43. Verso, 2000.

———. *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection*. Stanford University Press, 1997.

Buzan, Barry. “Culture and International Society.” *International Affairs* 86, no. 1 (January 1, 2010): 1–25.

Buzan, Barry, Ole Waever, and Jaap De Wilde. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Lynne Rienner Pub, 1997.

Campbell, David. *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. University of Minnesota Press, 1998.

Çarkoğlu, Al[idot]. “Religiosity, Support for Şeriat and Evaluations of Secularist Public Policies in Turkey.” *Middle Eastern Studies* 40, no. 2 (2004): 111–36.

Çarkoğlu, Ali, and Binnaz Toprak. *Religion, Society and Politics in a Changing Turkey*. Democratization Program. Translated by Çiğdem Aksoy Fromm. TESEV Publications. İstanbul: TESEV, 2007.

Carlson, Marvin A. *Performance: A Critical Introduction*. Routledge, 2004.

Casanova, José. *Public Religions in the Modern World*. University of Chicago Press, 1994.

"Case of Refah Partisi (The Welfare Party) and Others v. Turkey." European Court of Human Rights, February 13, 2003. 41340/98, 41342/98, 41343/98 and 41344/98. http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/pages/search.aspx?i=001-60936#{%22itemid%22:[%22001-60936%22]}.

"Catachresis, N." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. Accessed April 25, 2014. http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/28665.

"Catachrestic, Adj." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. Accessed April 25, 2014. http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/28666.

Cesari, Jocelyne. *The Awakening of Muslim Democracy*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.

———. "Why the Muslim Brotherhood Will Not Die." *Al Jazeera America*, May 29, 2014. http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2014/5/muslim-brotherhoodpoliticalislammuslimcountriesegyptlibya.html.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. "Legacies of Bandung: Decolonisation and the Politics of Culture." *Economic and Political Weekly* 40, no. 46 (November 12, 2005): 4812–18.

———. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton University Press, 2000.

Chatterjee, Partha. *Lineages of Political Society: Studies in Postcolonial Democracy*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.

———. *The Black Hole of Empire: History of a Global Practice of Power*. Princeton University Press, 2012.

Cheah, Pheng. *Inhuman Conditions: On Cosmopolitanism and Human Rights*. Harvard University Press, 2009.

Checkel, Jeffrey T. "International Institutions and Socialization in Europe: Introduction and Framework." *International Organization* 59, no. 04 (2005): 801–26.

Chowdhury, Arjun, and Ronald R. Krebs. "Talking about Terror: Counterterrorist Campaigns and the Logic of Representation." *European Journal of International Relations* 16, no. 1 (March 1, 2010): 125–50.

Cizre, Umit. "A New Politics of Engagement: The Turkish Military, Society, and the AKP." In *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*, edited by Ahmet T. Kuru and Alfred C. Stepan. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

Cohen, Roger. "Political Islam Fails Egypt's Test." *The New York Times*, July 4, 2013. http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/05/opinion/global/political-islam-fails-egypts-test.html.

Collins, Kathleen, and Erica Owen. "Islamic Religiosity and Regime Preferences Explaining Support for Democracy and Political Islam in Central Asia and the Caucasus." *Political Research Quarterly* 65, no. 3 (September 1, 2012): 499–515.

Conquergood, Dwight. "Of Caravans and Carnivals: Performance Studies in Motion." *The Drama Review* 39, no. 4 (October 1, 1995): 137–41.

Cortell, Andrew P., and James W. Davis Jr. "Understanding the Domestic Impact of International Norms: A Research Agenda." *International Studies Review* 2, no. 1 (2000): 65–87.

Culler, Jonathan. *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1982.

———. *The Literary in Theory*. 1 edition. Stanford University Press, 2006.

Dagi, I. "Turkey's AKP in Power." *Journal of Democracy* 19, no. 3 (2008): 25–30.

Dagi, Ihsan. "Rethinking Human Rights, Democracy, and the West: Post-Islamist Intellectuals in Turkey." *Critique Critical Middle Eastern Studies* 13, no. 2 (2004): 135–51.

Dallmayr, Fred. "Conversation Across Boundaries: Political Theory and Global Diversity." *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 30, no. 2 (June 1, 2001): 331–47.

Davison, Andrew. *Secularism and Revivalism in Turkey: A Hermeneutic Reconsideration*. Yale University Press, 1998.

———. “Turkey, a ‘Secular’ State?: The Challenge of Description.” *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 102, no. 2 (n.d.): 333–50.
Davutoğlu, Ahmet. *Alternative Paradigms: The Impact of Islamic and Western Weltanschauungs on Political Theory*. University Press of America, 1994.
———. “Bunalımdan Dönüşüme Batı Medeniyeti ve Hristiyanlık.” *Divan Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi*, no. 2 (2000): 1–74.
———. *Civilizational Transformation and the Muslim World*. Mahir Publ. Sdn. Bhd., 1994.
———. “Devlet.” *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*. İstanbul, 1994.
———. Harmonising Immutable Values and Ever-changing Mechanisms. Interview by Omayma Abdel-Latif. Al-Ahram Weekly Online, November 11, 2004. http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/716/focus.htm.
———. Interview by the author, January 7, 2012.
———. “Küreselleşme, Zihniyet Bunalımı ve Demokrasi.” In *İslam ve Demokrasi*. İstanbul: Ensar Neşriyat, 2000.
———. “Medeniyetlerin Ben-Idraki.” *Divan Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi*, no. 1 (1997): 1–53.
———. “Philosophical and Institutional Dimensions of Secularization: A Comparative Analysis.” In *Islam and Secularism in the Middle East*, edited by Azzam Tamimi and John L. Esposito, 170–208. New York: New York University Press, 2000.
———. “Tarih İdraki Oluşumunda Metodolojinin Rolü: Medeniyetlerarası Etkileşim Açısından Dünya Tarihi ve Osmanlı.” *Divan Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi*, no. 2 (1999): 1–63.
———. “Türk Entellektüel Geleneğindeki Baskıcı Temayüllerin Kökenleri.” *İlim ve Sanat*, June 1987.
Dawisha, Adeed. *The Second Arab Awakening: Revolution, Democracy, and the Islamist Challenge from Tunis to Damascus*. 1 edition. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2013.
Derrida, Jacques. *Acts of Religion*. Routledge, 2013.
———. “Declarations of Independence 1.” *New Political Science* 7, no. 1 (1986): 7–15.
———. *Limited Inc*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1988.
———. “Mochlos, or the Conflict of Faculties.” In *Eyes of the University: Right to Philosophy 2*, 83–112. Stanford University Press, 2004.
———. “Performative Powerlessness: A Response to Simon Critchley.” *Constellations* 7, no. 4 (2000): 466–68.
———. “Signature Event Context.” In *Margins of Philosophy*, 307–30. University of Chicago Press, 1982.
———. *Without Alibi*. Stanford University Press, 2002.
Deudney, Daniel, and G. John Ikenberry. “Myth of the Autocratic Revival - Why Liberal Democracy Will Prevail.” *Foreign Affairs* 88 (2009): 77.
Diab, Ahmed. Interview by the author. Cairo, October 11, 2011.
Dingwaney, Anuradha. “Introduction: Translating ‘Third World’ Cultures.” In *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross-Cultural Texts*, edited by Anuradha Dingwaney and Carol Maier, 3–20. University of Pittsburgh Pre, 1996.
Dunne, Michele, and Scott Williamson. “Egypt’s Unprecedented Instability by the Numbers.” *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, March 24, 2014. http://carnegieendowment.org/2014/03/24/egypt-s-unprecedented-instability-by-numbers/h5j3?reloadFlag=1.
Dunne, Tim. “The Liberal Order and the Modern Project.” *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 38, no. 3 (May 1, 2010): 535 –543.

Duran, Burhanettin. “The Experience of Turkish Islamism: Between Transformation and Impoverishment.” *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies* 12, no. 1 (March 2010): 5–22.

Duvall, Raymond, and Arjun Chowdhury. “Practices of Theory.” In *International Practices*, edited by Emanuel Adler and Vincent Pouliot, 335–54. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

“Egypt: Rampant Torture, Arbitrary Arrests and Detentions Signal Catastrophic Decline in Human Rights One Year after Ousting of Morsi | Amnesty International,” July 3, 2014. http://www.amnesty.org/en/news/egypt-anniversary-morsi-ousting-2014-07-02.

“Egypt’s Muslim Brotherhood Criticizes Erdogan’s Call for a Secular State.” *Al Arabiya*, September 14, 2011. http://www.alarabiya.net/articles/2011/09/14/166814.html.

“Egypt’s Muslim Brothers: Confrontation or Integration? - International Crisis Group.” Accessed June 26, 2014. http://www.crisisgroup.org/en/regions/middle-east-north-africa/egypt-syria-lebanon/egypt/076-egypts-muslim-brothers-confrontation-or-integration.aspx.

El-Din, Essam. “Hosni Makes No Apology.” *Al-Ahram Weekly*, December 7, 2006. http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2006/823/eg4.htm.

El-Errian, Essam. “What the Muslim Brothers Want.” *The New York Times*, February 9, 2011, sec. Opinion. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/02/10/opinion/10erian.html.

El-Ghobashy, Mona. “The Metamorphosis of the Egyptian Muslim Brothers.” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 37, no. 03 (2005): 373–95.

El-Hodaiby, Muhammad M. “Upholding Islam.” *Harvard International Review* 19, no. 2 (Spring 1997): 20.

El-Hudaibi, Mohammad Ma’mun. “The Principles of The Muslim Brotherhood.” *Ikhwanweb*, February 1, 2010. http://www.ikhwanweb.com/article.php?id=813.

El-Sherif, Ashraf. “Shari’a and the Civil State in Egypt.” American University in Cairo, Cairo, Egypt, October 11, 2011.

———. *What Path Will Egypt’s Muslim Brotherhood Choose?*, September 23, 2013. http://carnegieendowment.org/2013/09/23/what-path-will-egypt-s-muslim-brotherhood-choose/gnx6.

El-Shobaki, Amr Mahmoud. “The End of Muslim Brotherhood Rule in Egypt.” *Carnegie Middle East Center*, August 1, 2013. http://carnegie-mec.org/2013/08/01/end-of-muslim-brotherhood-rule-in-egypt/gk93.

Elsharkawy, Pakinam Rachad. “Religion and State in the Muslim World: Comparative Perspectives.” Foundation for Sciences and Arts, Istanbul, December 13, 2010. http://www.bisav.org.tr/merkez.aspx?module=yuvarlakmasaayrinti&turid=18&menuID=8_6_18&merkezid=6&yuvarlakmasaid=502.

Epstein, Charlotte. “Stop Telling Us How to Behave: Socialization or Infantilization?” *International Studies Perspectives* 13, no. 2 (2012): 135–45.

Erdoğan, Recep Tayyip. “Recep Tayyip Erdoğan’s Keynote Speech.” presented at the International Symposium on Conservatism and Democracy, İstanbul, January 15, 2004.

“Erdoğan Tell Arabs His Secularism Remarks Mistranslated.” *Today’s Zaman*, September 16, 2011. http://www.todayszaman.com//news-257047-erdogan-tell-arabs-his-secularism-remarks-mistranslated.html.

Esayan, Markar. “Imagine, There Is No Erdogan.” *Yeni Şafak*, October 9, 2013. http://yenisafak.com.tr/yazarlar/MarkarEsayan/imagine-there-is-no-erdogan/39974.

Esposito, John L. “‘Clash of Civilizations’? Contemporary Images of Islam in the West.” In *Islam, Modernism and the West: Cultural and Political Relations at the End of the Millennium*, edited by Gema Martín Muñoz, 94–108. I. B. Tauris in association with the Eleni Nakou Foundation, 1999.

———. *Islam and Politics*. Syracuse University Press, 1998.
———. *The Islamic Threat: Myth or Reality?* Oxford University Press, 1999.
Esposito, John L., and John O. Voll. *Islam and Democracy*. Oxford University Press, 1996.
Euben, Roxanne L. "Premodern, Antimodern or Postmodern? Islamic and Western Critiques of Modernity." *The Review of Politics* 59, no. 03 (1997): 429–60.
Fadel, Mohammad. "Modernist Islamic Political Thought and the Egyptian and Tunisian Revolutions of 2011." *Middle East Law and Governance* 3, no. 1–2 (March 25, 2011): 94–104.
Fadl, Khaled Abou El. *Islam and the Challenge of Democracy: A Boston Review Book*. Princeton University Press, 2004.
Fadl, Khaled Abou El, Joshua Cohen, and Deborah Chasman. *Islam and the Challenge of Democracy: A Boston Review Book*. Princeton University Press, 2004.
Fattah, Moataz A., and Jim Butterfield. "Muslim Cultural Entrepreneurs and the Democracy Debate." *Critique: Critical Middle Eastern Studies* 15, no. 1 (April 2006): 49–78. doi:10.1080/10669920500515135.
Fearon, James. "What Is Identity (as We Now Use the Word)." *Unpublished Manuscript, Stanford University, Stanford, California*, 1999.
Fearon, James D. "Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes." *American Political Science Review* 88, no. 03 (1994): 577–92.
Feldman, Noah. *After Jihad: America and the Struggle for Islamic Democracy*. First edition. FSG, 2003.
———. *The Fall and Rise of the Islamic State*. Princeton University Press, 2010.
———. "Why Shariah?" *The New York Times*, March 16, 2008, sec. Magazine. http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/16/magazine/16Shariah-t.html.
Finnemore, Martha. *National Interests in International Society*. Cornell University Press, 1996.
———. "Norms, Culture, and World Politics: Insights from Sociology's Institutionalism." *International Organization* 50, no. 2 (April 1, 1996): 325–47.
Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change." *International Organization* 52, no. 04 (1998): 887–917.
"Finnemore_Sociological Institutionalism.pdf," n.d.
Flockhart, Trine. "Similar and Yet So Different: The Socialization of Democratic Norms in Post-War Germany and Present Day Iraq." *International Politics* 43, no. 5 (November 2006): 596–619.
"Freedom and Justice Party 2011 Parliamentary Elections Program," n.d.
Fukuyama, Francis. "After Neoconservatism." *The New York Times*, February 19, 2006, sec. Magazine. http://www.nytimes.com/2006/02/19/magazine/neo.html.
Gheciu, Alexandra. "Security Institutions as Agents of Socialization? NATO and the 'New Europe.'" *International Organization* 59, no. 04 (2005): 973–1012.
Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Doubleday, 1959.
Government of Canada, Foreign Affairs. "Canada News Centre - Statement on Egyptian Election Results." News Releases, June 4, 2014. http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?nid=853509.
Grovogui, Siba N. "Rituals of Power: Theory, Languages, and Vernaculars of International Relations." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 23, no. 4 (October 1, 1998): 499–529.
Haas, Peter M. "Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination." *International Organization* 46, no. 01 (1992): 1–35.
Hale, William, and Ergun Ozbudun. *Islamism, Democracy and Liberalism in Turkey: The Case of the AKP*. Routledge, 2009.
Hallaq, Wael B. *Sharī'a: Theory, Practice, Transformations*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Hamid, Shadi. “The Brotherhood Will Be Back.” *The New York Times*, May 23, 2014. http://www.nytimes.com/2014/05/24/opinion/more-democratic-less-liberal.html.
Hamza, Khaled. Interview by the author. Cairo, August 12, 2010.
Hanioglu, Sukru. “The Historical Roots of Kemalism.” In *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*, edited by Ahmet T. Kuru and Alfred C. Stepan, 32–60. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.
———. “Türk Oryantalizmi’nin ‘Doğu’su Olarak Ortadoğu.” *Sabah.com.tr*. Accessed October 5, 2013. http://www.sabah.com.tr/Yazarlar/hanioglu/2013/05/19/turk-oryantalizminin-dogusu-olarak-ortadogu.
Harnisch, Chris, and Quinn Mecham. “Democratic Ideology in Islamist Opposition? The Muslim Brotherhood’s ‘Civil State.’” *Middle Eastern Studies* 45, no. 2 (2009): 189–205.
Hasenclever, Andreas. *Theories of International Regimes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
Hefner, Robert W. *Civil Islam: Muslims and Democratization in Indonesia*. Princeton University Press, 2000.
Heper, M. “Does Secularism Face a Serious Threat in Turkey?” *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 29, no. 3 (2009): 413.
Hobson, John M. *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
Hofmann, Murad Wilfried. *Religion on The Rise: Islam in the Third Millennium*. 1st ed. Amana Pubns, 2001.
Hopgood, Stephen. “Moral Authority, Modernity and the Politics of the Sacred.” *European Journal of International Relations* 15, no. 2 (June 1, 2009): 229–55.
Howaidy, Fahmy. “Hiwar ‘an Al-’Almaniyyati Fi Turkiya.” *Al-Shorouk*, October 11, 2011. http://www.shorouknews.com/columns/view.aspx?cdate=11102011&id=73700458-5863-4865-8fba-096d795a59d7.
Huntington, Samuel P. “The Clash of Civilizations?” *Foreign Affairs* 72, no. 3 (July 1, 1993): 22–49.
Hurd, Elizabeth Shakman. *The Politics of Secularism in International Relations*. Princeton University Press, 2007.
Ikenberry, G. John, and Charles A. Kupchan. “Socialization and Hegemonic Power.” *International Organization* 44, no. 03 (1990): 283–315.
Iqtidar, Humeira. “Secularism Beyond the State: The ‘State’ and the ‘Market’ in Islamist Imagination.” *Modern Asian Studies* 45, no. 03 (2011): 535–64.
“Iraqi Constitution,” n.d. http://www.iraqinationality.gov.iq/attach/iraqi_constitution.pdf.
Ishay, Micheline. “Forum: What Killed Egyptian Democracy?” *Boston Review*, 2014.
İşler, Emrullah. Interview by the author, December 13, 2011.
Jaafar, Aksikas. *Arab Modernities*. Peter Lang, 2009.
Jabri, Vivienne. *The Postcolonial Subject: Claiming Politics/Governing Others in Late Modernity*. London ; New York: Routledge, 2012.
Johnston, Alastair I. *Social States: China in International Institutions, 1980-2000*. Princeton University Press, 2008.
———. *Social States: China in International Institutions, 1980-2000*. Princeton University Press, 2008.
Johnston, Alastair Iain. “Conclusions and Extensions: Toward Mid-Range Theorizing and Beyond Europe.” *International Organization* 59, no. 04 (2005): 1013–44.
———. “Treating International Institutions as Social Environments.” *International Studies Quarterly* 45, no. 4 (2001): 487–515.
Kalın, İbrahim. Interview by the author, December 22, 2011.

Kalyvas, Stathis N. *The Rise of Christian Democracy in Europe*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1996.
Kaplan, Robert D. "One Small Revolution." *The New York Times*, January 22, 2011, sec. Opinion. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/23/opinion/23kaplan.html.
Kassem, May. *In the Guise of Democracy: Governance in Contemporary Egypt*. Ithaca Press, 1999.
Katzenstein, Peter J. *The Culture of National Security*. Columbia University Press, 1996.
Kaviraj, Sudipta. "An Outline of a Revisionist Theory of Modernity." *European Journal of Sociology / Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 46, no. 03 (2005): 497–526.
Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. *Activists beyond Borders : Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998.
Kedourie, Elie. *Politics in the Middle East*. Oxford University Press, 1992.
Keene, Edward. *Beyond the Anarchical Society: Grotius, Colonialism and Order in World Politics*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
Kepel, Gilles. *Jihad: The Trail of Political Islam*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003.
———. *The Revenge of God: The Resurgence of Islam, Christianity and Judaism in the Modern World*. Polity Press, 1994.
———. *The War for Muslim Minds: Islam and the West*. Harvard University Press, 2004.
Kirkpatrick, David D. "Turkey's Premier, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, Takes On Regional Role." *The New York Times*, September 12, 2011, sec. World / Middle East. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/13/world/middleeast/13egypt.html.
Klotz, Audie, and Cecelia Lynch. *Strategies for Research in Constructivist International Relations*. M.E. Sharpe, 2007.
Kowert, Paul, and Jeffrey Legro. "Norms, Identity, and Their Limits: A Theoretical Reprise." In *The Culture of National Security*, edited by Peter J. Katzenstein, 451–97. Columbia University Press, 1996.
Kramer, Gudrun. "Islamist Notions of Democracy." *Middle East Report*, no. 183 (July 1, 1993): 2–8.
———. "Techniques and Values: Contemporary Muslim Debates on Islam and Democracy." In *Islam, Modernism and the West: Cultural and Political Relations at the End of the Millennium*, edited by Gema Martín Muñoz, 174–90. I. B. Tauris in association with the Eleni Nakou Foundation, 1999.
Kratochwil, Friedrich V. *Rules, Norms, and Decisions: On the Conditions of Practical and Legal Reasoning in International Relations and Domestic Affairs*. Cambridge University Press, 1991.
Krauthammer, Charles. "In Defense of Democratic Realism." *The National Interest*, n.d.
Krebs, Ronald R. "A School for the Nation? How Military Service Does Not Build Nations, and How It Might." *International Security* 28, no. 4 (April 1, 2004): 85–124.
———. "Rethinking the Battle of Ideas: How the United States Can Help Muslim Moderates." *Orbis* 52, no. 2 (2008): 332–46.
Krebs, Ronald R., and Patrick Thaddeus Jackson. "Twisting Tongues and Twisting Arms: The Power of Political Rhetoric." *European Journal of International Relations* 13, no. 1 (March 1, 2007): 35–66.
Krebs, Ronald R., and Jennifer K. Lobasz. "Fixing the Meaning of 9/11: Hegemony, Coercion, and the Road to War in Iraq." *Security Studies* 16, no. 3 (2007): 409–51.
Kuru, Ahmet T. *Muslim Politics without an "Islamic" State:Can Turkey's Justice and Development Party Be a Model for Arab Islamists?* Policy Briefing. Doha: The Brookings Institution Doha Center, February 2013.

———. *Secularism and State Policies toward Religion: The United States, France, and Turkey*. 1st ed. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
Laffey, Mark. "Locating Identity: Performativity, Foreign Policy and State Action." *Review of International Studies* 26, no. 03 (2000): 429–44.
Laffey, Mark, and Jutta Weldes. "Representing the International: Sovereignty after Modernity?" In *The Empire's New Clothes: Reading Hardt and Negri*, edited by Paul Passavant and Jodi Dean, 121–42. New York: Routledge, 2004.
Lakhlafah, Abdel Lawy. "Democracy: One of the Objectives of Shari`ah?," November 7, 2012. http://www.onislam.net/english/shariah/contemporary-issues/human-conditions-and-social-context/450278-democracy-and-the-objectives-of-shariah.html?Social_Context=.
Leitch, Vincent B. *Postmodernism - Local Effects, Global Flows*. SUNY Press, 1996.
Lerner, Daniel. *The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East*. Free Press, 1958.
Lewis, Bernard. "A Historical Overview." *Journal of Democracy* 7, no. 2 (1996): 52–63.
———. "Islam and Liberal Democracy." *The Atlantic*, February 1993. http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1993/02/islam-and-liberal-democracy/308509/.
———. *What Went Wrong?: The Clash Between Islam and Modernity in the Middle East*. Harper Perennial, 2003.
Linden, Ronald Haly. *Norms and Nannies: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and East European States*. New International Relations of Europe. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2002.
Liu, Joseph. "Islam and the West: A Conversation with Bernard Lewis." *Pew Research Center's Religion & Public Life Project*, April 27, 2006. http://www.pewforum.org/2006/04/27/islam-and-the-west-a-conversation-with-bernard-lewis/.
Liu, Lydia H. "Introduction." In *Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations*, edited by Lydia H. Liu, 1–13. Duke University Press, 1999.
———. "Legislating the Universal: The Circulation of International Law in the Nineteenth Century." In *Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations*, edited by Lydia H. Liu, 127–64. Duke University Press, 1999.
———. "The Question of Meaning-Value in the Political Economy of the Sign." In *Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations*, edited by Lydia H. Liu, 13–44. Duke University Press, 1999.
Loxley, James. *Performativity*. Routledge, 2006.
Lynch, Marc. "Peak Middle East?" *Foreign Policy*, November 21, 2013. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/11/21/obama_administration_egypt.
Mahmood, Saba. "Agency, Performativity, and the Feminist Subject." In *Bodily Citations: Religion and Judith Butler*, edited by Ellen T Armour and Susan M St. Ville, 177–224. New York: Columbia University Press, 2006.
———. *Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject*. Princeton University Press, 2005.
———. "Religious Freedom, the Minority Question, and Geopolitics in the Middle East." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 54, no. 02 (2012): 418–46.
———. "Secularism, Hermeneutics, and Empire: The Politics of Islamic Reformation." *Public Culture* 18, no. 2 (2006): 323.
Masoud, Tarek, and Wael Nawara. "Will Egypt's Liberals Ever Win?" *Slate*, December 4, 2012. http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/foreigners/2012/12/egypt_s_liberals_can_defeat_mohammad_morsi_if_they_ignore_the_muslim_brotherhood.html.

Mawdudi, Abul ’Ala. *Political Theory of Islam*. Lahore: Islamic Publications, 1976.
Meyer, John W., John Boli, George M. Thomas, and Francisco O. Ramirez. “World Society and the Nation-State.” *American Journal of Sociology* 103, no. 1 (July 1, 1997): 144–81.
Miller, J. H. “Performativity as Performance / Performativity as Speech Act: Derrida’s Special Theory of Performativity.” *South Atlantic Quarterly* 106, no. 2 (April 2007): 219–35.
Miller, J. Hillis. “Resignifying Excitable Speech.” *WSQ: Women’s Studies Quarterly* 39, no. 1 (2011): 222–26.
Milne, Seumas. “Tony Blair to Advise Egypt President Sisi on Economic Reform.” *The Guardian*, July 2, 2014, sec. Politics. http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2014/jul/02/tony-blair-advise-egypt-president-sisi-economic-reform.
Mitchell, Richard P. *The Society of the Muslim Brothers*. Oxford University Press, USA, 1993.
Mitchell, Timothy. *Questions of Modernity*. University of Minnesota Press, 2000.
———. “The Stage of Modernity.” In *Questions of Modernity*, edited by Timothy Mitchell. University of Minnesota Press, 2000.
Mohamed Saad Katatni: “Not a religious party”: What does the Muslim Brotherhood want for Egypt’s future? Talk to Al Jazeera, November 27, 2011. http://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/talktojazeera/2011/11/2011112694418337373.html.
Monopolizing Power: Egypt’s Political Parties Law. Human Rights Watch, January 2007. http://www.refworld.org/docid/45a4e0a92.html.
Moosa, Ebrahim. “Colonialism and Islamic Law.” In *Islam and Modernity: Key Issues and Debates*, edited by Muhammad Khalid Masud, Armando Salvatore, and Martin van van Bruinessen, First Edition., 158–84. Edinburgh University Press, 2009.
Morrow, Adam. “Headscarves Dispute Travels to Egypt.” *Inter Press Service*, December 1, 2006. http://www.ipsnews.net/2006/12/religion-headscarves-dispute-travels-to-egypt/.
Moussalli, Ahmad S. “Hasan Al-Bannā’s Islamist Discourse on Constitutional Rule and Islamic State.” *Journal of Islamic Studies* 4, no. 2 (July 1, 1993): 161–74.
Moustafa, Tamir. “Law in the Egyptian Revolt.” *Middle East Law and Governance* 3, no. 1–2 (March 25, 2011): 181–91.
———. “Law versus the State: The Judicialization of Politics in Egypt.” *Law & Social Inquiry* 28 (2003): 883.
Muppidi, Himadeep. *The Politics of the Global*. University of Minnesota Press, 2004.
Muslim Brotherhood Candidate for Egypt’s President, 2012. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yjpbceIANmc&feature=youtube_gdata_player.
“Muslim Brotherhood Initiative on the General Principles of Reform in Egypt,” March 3, 2004.
Nadelmann, Ethan A. “Global Prohibition Regimes: The Evolution of Norms in International Society.” *International Organization* 44, no. 04 (1990): 479–526.
Naipaul, V. S. *India: A Wounded Civilization*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group, 2011.
Naje, Ahmed. “Culture in the Age of Sisi: The Continued Propaganda of Illusions.” *The Tahrir Institute for Middle East Policy*, March 12, 2014. http://timep.org/commentary/culture-in-the-age-of-sisi.
Nasr, S. V.R. “The Rise of‘ Muslim Democracy.’” *Journal of Democracy* 16, no. 2 (2005): 13–27.
Nasr, Seyyed Vali Reza. *Forces of Fortune: The Rise of the New Muslim Middle Class and What It Will Mean for Our World*. Simon and Schuster, 2009.
———. “The Rise of ‘Muslim Democracy.’” *Journal of Democracy* 16, no. 2 (2005): 13–27.
Niranjana, Tejaswini. *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context*. University of California Press, 1992.

Nye, Joseph S. "Nuclear Learning and U.S.-Soviet Security Regimes." *International Organization* 41, no. 3 (July 1, 1987): 371–402.
Onuf, Nicholas Greenwood. *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations*. University of South Carolina Press, 1989.
Owen, Roger. *State, Power and Politics in the Making of the Modern Middle East*. Routledge, 2000.
Özbay, Ömer. Interview by the author, December 20, 2011.
Özyürek, Esra. "Christian and Turkish: Secularist Fears of a Converted Nation." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 29, no. 3 (2009): 398–412.
Paolini, Albert J, Elliott, and Anthony Moran. *Navigating Modernity: Postcolonialism, Identity, and International Relations*. Boulder, Colo.: L. Rienner Publishers, 1999.
Parekh, Bhikhu. "The Cultural Particularity of Liberal Democracy." In *Prospects for Democracy: North, South, East, West*, edited by David Held, 156–76. Stanford University Press, 1993.
Parker, Andrew, and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick. *Performativity and Performance*. Routledge, 1995.
"Party Leaders: Kerry's Visit to Egypt Official Recognition of 30 June | Egypt Independent." *Al-Masry Al-Youm*, July 24, 2014. http://www.egyptindependent.com/news/party-leaders-kerry-s-visit-egypt-official-recognition-30-june.
Pasha, Mustapha Kamal. "The 'Secular' Subject of Critical International Relations Theory." In *Critical Theory in International Relations and Security Studies*, 105–14. Routledge, 2012. http://www.tandfebooks.com/doi/abs/10.4324/9780203145494.
Professing Performance: Theatre in the Academy from Philology to Performativity. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
"Progressive National Unionist Party (Tagamu') and Wafd Party Reject Constitutional Reforms and Request the Amendment of Article 2 of the Constitution," March 7, 2007. http://www.cihrs.org/?p=4988&lang=en.
Prozorov, Sergei. "Liberal Enmity: The Figure of the Foe in the Political Ontology of Liberalism." *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 35, no. 1 (December 1, 2006): 75–99.
Przeworski, Adam, and John Sprague. *Paper Stones: A History of Electoral Socialism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
Ramadan, Tariq. *Radical Reform: Islamic Ethics and Liberation*. Oxford University Press, 2008.
Rao, Sathya. "From a Postcolonial to a Non-Colonial Theory of Translation." In *Translation, Biopolitics, Colonial Difference*, edited by Naoki Sakai and Jon Solomon. Hong Kong University Press, 2006.
Ravid, Barak. "Israel Urges World to Curb Criticism of Egypt's Mubarak." *Haaretz.com*, January 31, 2011. http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/israel-urges-world-to-curb-criticism-of-egypt-s-mubarak-1.340238.
"Reading into The Muslim Brotherhood's Documents." *Ikhwanweb*, June 13, 2007. http://www.ikhwanweb.com/article.php?id=818.
Reus-Smit, Christian. "The Constitutional Structure of International Society and the Nature of Fundamental Institutions." *International Organization* 51, no. 04 (1997): 555–89.
Risse, T. "Global Governance and Communicative Action." *Government and Opposition* 39, no. 2 (2004): 288–313.
Risse, Thomas. "'Let's Argue!': Communicative Action in World Politics." *International Organization* 54, no. 01 (2000): 1–39.
Risse-Kappen, Thomas, Stephen C. Ropp, and Kathryn Sikkink, eds. *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Risse-Kappen, Thomas, and Kathryn Sikkink. "The Socialization of International Human Rights Norms into Domestic Practices: Introduction." In *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change*, 1–38. Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Roe, Paul. "Actor, Audience(s) and Emergency Measures: Securitization and the UK's Decision to Invade Iraq." *Security Dialogue* 39, no. 6 (December 1, 2008): 615–35.

Roover, Jakob De, Sarah Claerhout, and S. N. Balagangadhara. "Liberal Political Theory and the Cultural Migration of Ideas: The Case of Secularism in India." *Political Theory*, July 29, 2011, 0090591711413545.

Roy, Olivier. *Globalized Islam: The Search for a New Ummah*. Columbia University Press, 2006.

———. "Révolution post-islamiste." *Le Monde.fr*, February 14, 2011. http://www.lemonde.fr/idees/article/2011/02/12/revolution-post-islamiste_1478858_3232.html.

———. *The Failure of Political Islam*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Rumelili, Bahar. "Turkey: Identity, Foreign Policy, and Socialization in a Post‐Enlargement Europe." *Journal of European Integration* 33, no. 2 (2011): 235–49.

"Saddam Hussein Executed in Iraq." *BBC*, December 30, 2006, sec. Middle East. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/6218485.stm.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. Vintage Books, 1979.

Sakai, Naoki. *Translation and Subjectivity: On Japan and Cultural Nationalism*. University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

Salem, Abdulhamid. Interview by the author. Cairo, July 9, 2010.

Salter, Mark B. "Securitization and Desecuritization: A Dramaturgical Analysis of the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority." *Journal of International Relations and Development* 11, no. 4 (2008): 321–49.

Salvatore, Armando. "After the State: Islamic Reform and the 'Implosion' of Shari'a." In *Muslim Traditions and Modern Techniques of Power*. Münster [u.a.: Lit, 2001.

Sayyid, Salman. *A Fundamental Fear: Eurocentrism and the Emergence of Islamism*. Zed Books, 1997.

Schimmelfennig, Frank. "Introduction: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and Eastern European States--Conceptual and Theoretical Issues." In *Norms and Nannies : The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and East European States*, edited by Ronald Haly Linden, 1–32. Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2002.

Scott, David. *Conscripts of Modernity: The Tragedy of Colonial Enlightenment*. Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 2004.

Scott, James C. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. Yale University Press, 1990.

Scott, Rachel M. "Managing Religion and Renegotiating the Secular: The Muslim Brotherhood and Defining the Religious Sphere." *Politics and Religion* 7, no. 01 (2014): 51–78.

Şentop, Mustafa. Interview by the author, December 16, 2011.

———. "Siyasi Hakimiyetin Kaynağı Meselesi ve Osmanlı Telakkisi." *E-Akademi Hukuk, Ekonomi ve Siyasal Bilimler Aylık İnternet Dergisi*, no. 29 (July 2004). http://www.e-akademi.org/incele.asp?konu=Siyasi%20Hakimiyetin%20Kayna%C4%9F%C4%B1%20Meselesi%20ve%20Osmanl%C4%B1%20Telakkisi&kimlik=1088765050&url=makaleler/msentop-1.htm.

Sharp, Jeremy M. *U. S. Foreign Assistance to the Middle East: Historical Background, Recent Trends, and the FY 2010 Request*. Congressional Research Service, January 2010.

Shehata, Dina. Interview by the author. Cairo, August 4, 2010.

Shenker, Jack. “Turkey’s PM Rallies Arab World in Cairo with Call for UN to Recognise Palestine.” *The Guardian*, September 13, 2011, sec. World news. http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/sep/13/turkey-rallies-arab-world.

Skaria, Ajay. “The Project of Provincialising Europe: Reading Dipesh Chakrabarty.” *Economic and Political Weekly* 44, no. 14 (April 4, 2009): 52–59.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “Constitutions and Culture Studies.” *Yale Journal of Law & the Humanities* 2, no. 1 (1990).

———. *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. Psychology Press, 1993.

———. “Righting Wrongs.” *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 103, no. 2 (2004): 523–81.

“State Information Services Constitution of the Arab Republic of Egypt 1971.” Accessed June 21, 2014. http://www.sis.gov.eg/En/Templates/Articles/tmpArticles.aspx?CatID=208#.U6WX86iLFhI.

Stepan, Alfred C. “Religion, Democracy, and the ‘Twin Tolerations.’” *Journal of Democracy* 11, no. 4 (2000): 37–57.

Stilt, Kristen. “Islam Is the Solution: Constitutional Visions of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood.” *Texas International Law Journal* 46 (2011 2010): 73.

Stritzel, Holger. “Security as Translation: Threats, Discourse, and the Politics of Localisation.” *Review of International Studies* 37, no. 05 (2011): 2491–2517.

“Suriçi Grubu Mustafa İsen’i Ağarladı.” Accessed September 3, 2013. http://www.suricigrubu.net/?Syf=18&Hbr=312116&/Suri%C3%A7i-Grubu-Mustafa-%C4%B0sen%27i-A%C4%9Farlad%C4%B1.

Tadros, Mariz. *The Muslim Brotherhood in Contemporary Egypt: Democracy Redefined Or Confined?* Routledge, 2012.

Tageldin, Shaden M. *Disarming Words: Empire and the Seductions of Translation in Egypt*. University of California Press, 2011.

Takeyh, Ray, and Nikolas Gvosdev. “Democratic Impulses versus Imperial Interests: America’s New Mid-East Conundrum.” *Orbis*, no. Summer 2003 (n.d.): 415–31.

Taylor, Charles. *A Secular Age*. Harvard University Press, 2009.

Tepe, S. “Turkey’s AKP: A Model‘ Muslim-Democratic’ Party?” *Journal of Democracy* 16, no. 3 (2005): 69–82.

Tessler, Mark, Amaney Jamal, and Michael Robbins. “New Findings on Arabs and Democracy.” *Journal of Democracy* 23, no. 4 (2012): 89–103. doi:10.1353/jod.2012.0066.

“The Draft Party Platform of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood: Foray Into Political Integration or Retreat Into Old Positions?” *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*. Accessed June 24, 2014. http://carnegieendowment.org/2008/01/14/draft-party-platform-of-egyptian-muslim-brotherhood-foray-into-political-integration-or-retreat-into-old-positions/5g4.

“The Muslim Brotherhood’s Program for the Parliamentary Elections of 2005.” *Ikhwanweb*, June 13, 2007. http://www.ikhwanweb.com/article.php?id=811.

“The Tahrir Square Legacy: Egyptians Want Democracy, a Better Economy, and a Major Role for Islam.” *Pew Research Center’s Global Attitudes Project*. Accessed June 19, 2014. http://www.pewglobal.org/2013/01/24/the-tahrir-square-legacy-egyptians-want-democracy-a-better-economy-and-a-major-role-for-islam/.

Tibi, Bassam. *The Sharia State: Arab Spring and Democratization*. Routledge, 2013.

Tığ, Abdurrahman, İsak Baydaroğlu, and Şakiye Erdem, eds. *Başbakan Recep Tayyip Erdoğan’ın Konuşmalarından Seçmeler*. Ankara: AK Parti Tanıtım ve Medya Başkanlığı, 2010.

Tomz, Michael. “Domestic Audience Costs in International Relations: An Experimental Approach.” *International Organization* 61, no. 04 (2007): 821–40.

Traub, James. “Islamic Democrats?” *The New York Times*, April 29, 2007, sec. Magazine. http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/29/magazine/29Brotherhood.t.html.
Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt. *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton University Press, 2005.
Tugal, Cihan. *Passive Revolution: Absorbing the Islamic Challenge to Capitalism*. Stanford University Press, 2009.
Turan, Bülent. Interview by the author. Interview by the author, December 13, 2011.
Uçma, İsmet. Interview by the author, December 13, 2011.
Walker, R. B. J. *Culture, Ideology, and World Order*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1984.
———. “East Wind, West Wind: Civilizations, Hegemonies, and World Orders.” In *Culture, Ideology, and World Order*, edited by R. B. J. Walker. Boulder: Westview Press, 1984.
Weber, Cynthia. “Performative States.” *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 27, no. 1 (March 1, 1998): 77–95.
———. “Performative States.” *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 27, no. 1 (March 1, 1998): 77–95.
Wendt, Alexander. “Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics.” *International Organization* 46, no. 02 (1992): 391–425.
———. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
Wendt, Alexander, and Raymond Duvall. “Institutions and International Order.” In *Global Changes and Theoretical Challenges: Approaches to World Politics for the 1990s*, edited by Ernst Otto Czempiel and James N. Rosenau, 51–73. Lexington Books, 1989.
White, Stephen K. “Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative. The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection. By Judith Butler.” *The Journal of Politics* 60, no. 03 (1998): 881–84.
Wickham, Carrie Rosefsky. *Mobilizing Islam*. Columbia University Press, 2002.
Wiener, Antje. “Contested Compliance: Interventions on the Normative Structure of World Politics.” *European Journal of International Relations* 10, no. 2 (June 2004): 189–234.
Wolf, Richard. “From Politics to Prayer, a Supreme Court Game of Inches.” *USA Today*, July 2, 2014. http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2014/07/02/supreme-court-term-conservative-incremental/11915611/.
Yavuz, Hakan M. “Ethical Not Shari‘a Islam: Islamic Debates in Turkey.” *The Review of Faith & International Affairs* 10, no. 4 (2012): 28–34.
———. *Secularism and Muslim Democracy in Turkey*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
Yavuz, M. Hakan. *Secularism and Muslim Democracy in Turkey*. 1st ed. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
Zakaria, F. “Islam, Democracy, and Constitutional Liberalism.” *Political Science Quarterly* 119, no. 1 (2004): 1–20.
Zakaria, Fareed. “How Democracy Can Work in the Middle East.” *Time*, February 3, 2011. http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,2046038,00.html.
Zaman, Muhammad Qasim. “Shari‘a and the State in Pakistan.” In *Shari‘a Politics Islamic Law and Society in the Modern World*, edited by Robert W Hefner. Bloomington [Ind.]: Indiana University Press, 2011.
———. “Shari‘a and the State in Pakistan.” *The Review of Faith & International Affairs* 10, no. 4 (2012): 53–60.
Zivi, Karen. *Making Rights Claims: A Practice of Democratic Citizenship*. Oxford University Press, 2012.

Zürn, Michael, and Jeffrey T. Checkel. "Getting Socialized to Build Bridges: Constructivism and Rationalism, Europe and the Nation-State." *International Organization* 59, no. 04 (2005): 1045–79.

Zwingel, Susanne. "How Do Norms Travel? Theorizing International Women's Rights in Transnational Perspective1." *International Studies Quarterly* 56, no. 1 (March 1, 2012): 115–29.

Inside Story. Al-Jazeera English, July 29, 2007.