Moderation Among Salafists & Jihadists

By

Syed Kamran Bokhari

Abstract: A stream of scholarly work has emerged on Islamist moderation over the past decade. Jillian Schwedler, Carrie Wickham, Michaelle Browers and others have employed the inclusion-moderation hypothesis to examine moderation among Muslim Brotherhood style Islamist groups. Others such as Omar Ashour have used the notion of de-radicalization in an effort to explain how certain militant Islamist movements abandoned the path of armed struggle. The bulk of this work, however, suffers from two shortcomings. First, it predates the Arab spring, which has greatly re-shaped the regional landscape and thus needs updating. Second, and more substantively, it cannot explain why Salafist and jihadist groups are undergoing behavioral and ideological change. This paper tries to fill this lacuna in the literature by arguing that because there are different forms of radicalisms there will be different type of moderations. I try to demonstrate this by examining two unique cases of Islamist moderation: 1) Egypt's Salafist Hizb al-Nour, which since the 2011 ouster of the Mubarak government has not only embraced democratic politics but has also shown a great of pragmatism & 2) Afghanistan's jihadist Taliban movement, which has been negotiating a power-sharing arrangement with the United States. Considering the situation in the greater Middle East this paper has significant policy relevance. The search for moderate non-state actors has been expanded to include Salafists and jihadists. Understanding how behavioral and ideological change takes place among Salafists and jihadists can provide valuable insights vis-à-vis international security.

Note: This is a working paper based on my research at the beginning of the 3ʳᵈ year of my PhD and prior to my fieldwork, which I will be doing in January/February 2015.

Introduction - Moderation: An Increasingly Contested Concept

We live in a time where democratization and Islamism constitute the twin parallel trends driving the geopolitics of Arab and Muslim countries.[1] The conventional wisdom is that if democracy is to take root in the Middle East and South Asia, Islamists of various types (at least a majority of them) will have to bring their ideas and conduct in conformity with democratic norms.[2] This involves change in political thought, religious norms, and by extension the overall behavior of a highly diverse array of actors we identify as Islamists.[3] However, religio-political transformation is not simply an issue related to Islamists.[4] Islamist evolution is a subset of the wider question of the politics of modern Islam and Muslims, which has gained a great deal of global attention beginning shortly after the 1979 revolution in Iran that ousted a pro-western secular monarchy and led to the establishment of the world's first Islamist state.[5] However, since al-Qaeda's attacks on the United States over a dozen years ago, the global debate on this subject has exponentially intensified, especially given the "search for moderate Muslims" (as opposed to simply Islamists).[6] In fact, there have been attempts from within the American policy community to set the criteria for Muslim/Islamist moderation.[7] Indeed there are a great many Muslims (a majority of whom are not Islamists) who continue to view the prefix of "moderate" as part of a hostile American/western attempt to tamper with their religion and secularize it.[8] There are also quite a few American and western policy people who have criticized the moderate-radical conceptual dichotomy as superficial.[9]

On the other hand, there is no shortage of those who acknowledge a dire need to deal with the extremism plaguing their societies.[10] While this camp does not agree with the western prognosis, it realizes that the trend that began in the 18ᵗʰ century towards social, political, and economic revival of Muslim societies has gone awry.[11] In particular, there is a sense that the interaction between Islamist opposition forces and the post-colonial secular authoritarian orders has given way to both violent and non-violent extremism that needs to be countered.[12] This internal realization from within the Muslim world began in the early 1980s, shortly after the assassination of former Egyptian president Anwar El-Sadat at the hands of a group of Islamist insurrectionists.[13] These early efforts did not progress much as the geopolitical context was one

of growing polarization between secular autocracy and a radicalizing Islamism. The first substantive practical effort to counter radicalism and militancy came when Egypt's Gamaah al-Islamiyah in 1997 decided to renounce violence and embarked upon a process to purge its ideology of extremist tendencies.[14] Four years later, the attacks of September 11, 2001 proved to be a watershed event in that the U.S.-led global "war on terror" brought to bear a great deal of pressure across the planet demanding moderation among Muslims.

The western *demand* for moderation has been met with a Muslim *supply*, which has many shapes.[15] The growth of the discourse (both popular and scholarly) triggered Muslim academics and advocates alike to engage in a lively debate with each other and their non-Muslim counterparts in an effort to intellectually grapple with the notion of "moderate Islam".[16] At the same time, given the rise of terrorism and militancy (the bulk of which is taking place in the Muslim world) there have also been calls from within the Muslim milieu for the forging of an anti-extremism ethos.[17] Even on the eve of the Arab spring, it appeared that moderation was not just a trait being sought among Islamists; rather in Muslims in general.[18] The discourse of moderation was appropriated by a host of Muslim actors who sought to position themselves as moderates.[19] Broadly speaking, four different types of Muslim actors remain involved in this practice. These are: Islamists pursuing goals through legal and democratic means, traditionalists, secularists and certain Muslim regimes.[20] Moderation thus became a topic of interest at all three levels of analysis (individuals, groups & states).

Since 9/11, there have been a number of geopolitical developments involving the notion of moderation across the globe. For starters, seizing upon a historic opportunity to advance its sectarian and national interests, the Khatami administration in Iran (which came close to war with the Taliban regime in 1998) sought to present itself as a moderate Islamist force and even collaborated with the Bush administration in the move to effect regime-change in Kabul. The subsequent establishment of the Karzai regime was described as having put Afghanistan on the path of moderation. In 2002, Pakistan's former military ruler, Gen Pervez Musharraf, coined the phrase 'enlightened moderation' and called upon the Muslim world to shun religious extremism and radicalism and move towards the path of socio-economic development.[21] Similarly, Egypt's president Hosni Mubarak also latched on to the discourse of religious moderation as a means of justifying his authoritarian rule.[22] Many Muslims countries, particularly Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Pakistan, and Syria, which historically cultivated jihadist proxies as instruments to further their foreign policy objectives, are now are dealing with the blowback in terms of extremism and terrorism.[23] Other countries like Malaysia and Indonesia were cited as examples of moderate Muslim polities.[24] Perhaps the most celebrated model of a "moderate" Muslim state has been Turkey, which has gone through two separate iterations. For decades, Turkey, due to its status as a secular republic and a fellow NATO member state, was viewed in the west as a model for the rest of the Muslim countries to emulate.[25]

With the rise of the Justice & Development Party to power in 2002, the Turkish model took on a whole new meaning as an ideal blend between Islam and democracy.[26] However, following the Arab Spring, the limits of how far the Turkish model could be embraced began to be acknowledged.[27] Under pressure from the United States following the events of Sept 11 and particularly after the American toppling of the Baathist regime in Iraq, Saudi Arabia also engaged in a major initiative to moderate the ultraconservative Salafist discourse in the country.

This effort gained additional momentum after the 2003-05 al-Qaeda insurgency, which further pushed the Saudis to accelerate their efforts towards Salafist moderation in the kingdom. A key element that Riyadh used in this endeavor was the use of its 'ulema establishment to counter radical and militant impulses – at the behavioral as well as discursive levels.[28] Despite being an undemocratic polity whose ideology is steeped in Salafist thought Saudi Arabia has had remarkable success in ensuring that extremism is kept in check on the home front.[29] The Saudi successes, however, do not serve as a model for others to emulate given the kingdom's unique political economy.[30]

There have been other limited cases of as well. For instance, in Iraq in 2007, the United States was able to negotiate an agreement with Sunni nationalist insurgents who had for four years fought hand-in-glove with jihadists against U.S. troops as well as the forces of the Shia-dominated government. Many of these tribal militias were actually jihadist themselves but agreed to turn against al-Qaeda and join the political process built by the United States.[31] The political principals of the Iraqi Sunnis, the tribal shayukh joined the political process and their militiamen were in significant numbers integrated into the security system of the al-Maliki regime.[32] On the other side of Iraq's Shia spectrum is the case of Muqtada al-Sadr. The al-Sadrite movement was outside the Shia establishment that emerged following the toppling of the Saddam Hussein regime. Sadr's journey from using his militia in 2003 to create space for himself in the Shia-dominated political order in Baghdad represents a major case in moderation of a radical Islamist force – a process that extended over a period of six years.[33]

During the mid-2000s, yet another prominent case of moderation was that of Hamas which after nearly a decade of renouncing the framework of the Fatah-dominated Palestinian National Authority participated in the legislative elections.[34] The largest Palestinian Islamist movement represents an exceptional case in that it is both a non-state actor and at the same time, the ruling authority of a sub-national entity, i.e., Gaza Strip.[35] Thus, its armed forces that periodically battle Israel can be treated as militants or soldiers of an unrecognized but de facto government. Making the situation more complicated is that Hamas is the successor to the Palestinian Muslim Brotherhood, which for four decades (1949-89) remained a social movement.[36] From the late 1980s onwards, and for a period of 15-years, Hamas was simultaneously engaged in three different enterprises, i.e., a social movement, the main political rival to Fatah and a militant group fighting Israeli occupation. After the 2004 decapitation of its apex founding leadership followed by the 2005 unilateral Israeli withdrawal from Gaza, Hamas decided to join the Palestinian political process in 2006. In 2007, the view that Hamas was engaged in armed struggle only against Israel and in the Palestinian national context sought power only through democratic means was shaken. Its forces forcibly seized control of Gaza and threw out officials and security personnel affiliated with Fatah amid fears of a coup after attempts at a power-sharing agreement broke down.[37] Following the Arab spring, especially as neighboring Egypt has been experiencing a series of upheavals, Hamas has largely exhibited a desire to maintain calm along the Israeli-Gaza border and sought to move further moderate its behavior, especially as Salafist-jihadist groups began to consolidate both in the Strip and the Sinai Peninsula.[38] All these moves towards pragmatism have led to internal rifts within the movement.[39] In recent months it has made a serious effort towards reconciliation with Fatah – a process complicated by the latest Israel-Gaza war.[40] Thus, the group has been straddling between militancy and moderation depending upon contexts.[41]

Elsewhere in the Horn of Africa, Somalia has also experienced relative moderation after fragmentation of jihadists into two broad camps of nationalist and transnational entities. By the late 2000s, there was a U.S-led effort to counter the rise of the latter type led by the group known as al-Shabaab. This initiative led to the incorporation of nationalist Islamist militias into the transitional government led by secularists.[42] That effort paved the way for leader of the Supreme Islamic Courts Council, Sheikh Sharif Ahmed to become president of the country.[43] Since then there have been examples of further moderation among Somalian jihadists with the decision of Hizb al-Islam led by Sheikh Hassan Dahir Aweys to part ways with al-Shabaab and even splits within Al-Shabaab itself.[44] As recently as this year, Prime Minister, Abdiweli Shaykh Ahmad, March 15, in a meeting with religious leaders announced the creation of a government office for ulema as part of the effort to activities and ideology of the al-Shabaab jihadist organization.[45] The new office is intended to improve the relationship between the federal government and the ulema so as to have a more effective policy-making process and the shaping of public opinion in the Horn of Africa nation. The meeting, which was attended by deputy prime minister, Ridwan Hirsi (who also holds the portfolio of religious affairs), the minsters of justice/ constitutional affairs, information as well as 16 religious scholars, was geared towards bringing the ulema community closer to the state so as to create a mechanism to achieve the task of wresting control of religious discourse away from the jihadists.

Similarly, on the western end of the continent, in Nigeria, the military as well as state governments are leading the efforts towards the spread of religious moderation. Professor Zakariyau Useni, who heads the Arabic department at the University of IIorin, delivered a paper titled Moderation as Religious Leaders' Effective Instrument for Sustainable Peace, Security, and Progress in Nigeria," at a conference organized by the Nigerian Army's Islamic Affairs directorate in Ibadan.[46] Prof Useni stressed that the ulema needed to be aware that moderation was a centerpiece of Islam as a pre-requisite for adherence to moderation in their teachings and conduct. While Useni argued that the various ulema should collaborate with one another and be mindful that not all interpretations that they come across are correct, the army's director of religious affairs, Bri-Gen. Muhammadu Abdussalam pointed out that Islam is not only moderate; it should also be practiced moderately. In the country's Kwara state, Governor Alhaji Abdulfatah Ahmed, advocated the need for the creation of an ulema body consisting of "reputable and knowledgeable scholars, who could ensure that the community of religious scholars would propagate moderation and thus help "insulate" the youth "from fundamentalist preaching" available on the Internet and via other mediums.[47]

On the northern rim of the continent, in the Maghreb region, by the end of the 2000s, a five-year process of dialogue between the Libyan government and the North African state's main jihadist group culminated in renunciation of violence by the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group.[48] The success of the ousted Qaddhafi regime is not without precedent as Libya's western neighbor Algeria had gone through its own experience of moderating Islamist insurgents who had waged a bloody insurgency during the 1990s. In Algeria, the military-led regime's efforts garnered mixed results with the military wing of the main Islamist movement, Front Islamique de Salut disarming as well as factions from the more hardline groups.[49] Shortly after his first election, President Abdelaziz Bouteflika initiated an amnesty program to incentivize moderation of militants. While many Arab and Muslim states through a mix of coercion and encouragement

have sought to get militants to give up armed struggle some have also established what have come to be known as rehabilitation centers. These facilities are designed to ideologically de-program and re-program militants who have been captured or have surrendered so as to prevent recidivism and more importantly re-integration in mainstream life.[50] Some of the more prominent ones where former militants are subjected to ideological, sociological and psychological treatment include Yemen, Saudi Arabia, and Pakistan.[51]

There are also cases of prominent Muslim individuals involved in charting a path of moderation in what appears to be an age marked by extremism. Most prominent among them is the Qatar-based Egyptian scholar, Sheikh Yusuf al Qaradawi under whose name the Qatar Faculty of Islamic Studies in 2008 established the Al-Qaradawi Center for Islamic Moderation and Renewal.[52] Another noteworthy name is that of Prof Khaled Abou El Fadel, an Egyptian academic who teaches Islamic law at the UCLA.[53] While on one end we have Muslim theologians, jurists, and academics, the post-9/11 decade also saw the emergence of activists from across the political spectrum, especially former radical Islamists who have taken the call of moderation.[54] Such individuals have been welcomed by western governments as well as by groups within Muslim countries who are anxious to advance the cause of religio-political moderation. In fact an entire discourse has been developed around the notion of countering violent extremism and radicalization.[55] Furthermore, a number of governmental, the private sector, and even academic institutions have been created to conduct studies on how to combat radicalization and promote moderation.[56] Similarly, since Sept 11, countless conferences, symposiums, seminars have been organized in order to understand radicalization and identify ways and means of fostering moderation.[57]

Since President Barack Hussain Obama assumed the U.S. presidency, Washington and its NATO allies have sought to end the military mission in Afghanistan, which began with the toppling of the Taliban regime in October 2001. A key component of this effort to drawdown western forces from the southwest nation has been to reach a negotiated a settlement with the Taliban movement that has been waging a steadily growing insurgency. The idea has been that the Afghan insurrectionist Islamist movement is a nationalist jihadist force and thus not irreconcilable as is the case with al-Qaeda.[58] Consequently it could potentially be nudged towards the Afghan national mainstream.[59] What this implied was that the Taliban can be moderated.[60] This search for moderate Taliban has been going on since shortly after the Taliban regime fell.[61] However, it is only in the last 4-5 years that the Afghan Taliban leadership has shown signs that it is prepared to moderate its stance.[62] This process remains highly fragile and has become increasingly complex and its direction remains unclear, which is one of the key reasons why I have chosen it as one of my two case studies for this research.

Undoubtedly the event that has had the most impact on the issue of Islamist moderation is the Arab spring. Tunisia, the cradle of the popular uprising against authoritarianism continues to lead the region in that the country's Islamist movement, Ennahda (which won the first elections held in fall of 2011 after the uprising that toppled the country's long-serving dictator, Zine El-Abideen Ben-Ali) has emerged a model of Islamist moderation given its ability to hammer out disputes with its secular opponents. In sharp contrast, Egypt is hurtling towards the opposite direction given the Summer 2013 coup led by former military chief, Field Marshall Abdel-Fattah El-Sisi as well as the use of force by the regime to put down resistance from the Brotherhood,

moves that have reinforced the perception that moderation doesn't pay.[63] As a result, we are seeing youth elements of the Brotherhood becoming radicalized with some engaging in violent protests while others being lured towards outright armed struggle and aligning with jihadist forces.[64] The various responses to the coup from different Egyptian Islamists have further convoluted the notion of moderation. At a time when the Brotherhood has taken to the path of public unrest, the country's largest Salafist party, al-Nour (the other case study that I will be examining) supported the putsch against Morsi. Between these two positions is the stance of Gamaah al-Islamiyah, which has opposed the coup but has refrained from the path of confrontation and instead calls for the military regime to reconcile with the Brotherhood. Hizb al-Wasat, a party that was formed in the mid 1990s by former members of the Brotherhood has over the years gained a great deal of attention as a moderate group that some have argued cannot be classified as an Islamist group. Al-Wasat's moderation has been in fluctuation as is evident from the fact that it aligned itself with the Brotherhood though a couple of months ago its leader, Abdel "Ala Maadi was released by the military authorities. There is also the case of the former MB leader, Abdel-Monem Abul Futouh, who since his decision to part ways with the Brotherhood and enter the 2012 presidential race has been described as a moderate.[65] Abul Futouh's moderation is unique in that he is the founder of the Strong Egypt Party – a centrist movement that seeks to attract Egyptians of various ideological persuasions (Islamist, leftist, and liberal) in the struggle to establish a democratic polity. The group supported the public uprising against Morsi but opposed the coup that ousted the former president and has since rejected the political roadmap but has avoided any practical steps against the post-coup political process.

In neighboring, Syria, where an extremely fragmented rebel landscape is fighting the Alawite-dominated regime of President Bashar al-Assad and each other, the notion of moderation has seen rapid evolution.[66] It was not long ago that the nationalist oriented Free Syrian Army (FSA) was touted as the moderate force in contrast with the various Islamist militias.[67] By late 2012, it became clear that the various Salafist-Jihadist groups, especially Jabhat al-Nusrah had eclipsed the FSA and the Iraqi node of the al-Qaeda network had expanded itself into Syria and sought a merger with JaN forming what became the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS). JaN was not completely comfortable with the Iraqi transnational jihadists' attempts to render the Mesopotamian-Levantine landmass into a singular battlespace.[68] JaN both aligned with ISIS but also retained its separate organizational structure especially after al-Qaeda's global leader Ayman al-Zawahiri declared the two groups as separate in terms of their responsibilities. ISIS defiant rejection of al-Zawahiri's decision eventually led to al-Qaeda declaring in early 2014 that ISIS was not affiliated with it citing the latter's "extremism. By this time, a number of relatively moderate Salafist-jihadist groups began distancing themselves from ISIS and to a lesser extent JaN because the two groups were seen as engaged in extremist excesses. Al-Zawahiri issued guidelines that forbade: fighting "deviant" Muslim sects such as the Shia; killing non-Muslim groups such as Christians, refrain from targeting non-combatants women and children, harming Muslim life and property, and attacks in mosques, markets, and other places of gatherings.[69]

Bizarrely, al-Qaeda appeared as a relative "moderate" when compared to ISIS. As a result, al-Qaeda's official Syrian affiliated JaN began to fight with ISIS. The global jihadist network wasn't the only trying to isolate Syrian Salafist-jihadists from "extremists". Saudi Arabia knew that the only way it could fight Iran and its Arab Shia allies is if the Syria rebels were not all seen as al-Qaeda.[70] It thus has put it cobbled together a relatively moderate Salafist-jihadist rebel

alliance called the Islamic Front that opposed both JaN and ISIS.[71] The Saudis also declared ISIS and JaN as terrorist entities because they knew that they needed Salafist-jihadist militias to effectively fight against the Alawite regime and its Iranian and Shia supporters (primarily Hezbollah) but they did not want to empower transnational jihadists. Al-Qaeda and its rival transnational jihadists such as ISIS could easily exploit sectarian motivations to advance their cause at a time when the region is in turmoil, and even threaten the Saudis on the home front where the monarchy is already trying to balance between the need for reforms and assuaging the conservatives.[72] The Saudi kingdom is especially worried about setbacks to its rehab program that has been a signature program in its efforts towards promoting moderation on the domestic front.[73]

Perhaps the most dramatic development since the 9/11 attacks has been the re-establishment of the caliphate by ISIS after its resurgence in Iraq last June. ISIS also changed its name to simply IS, meaning Islamic State. The expansion of this transnational jihadist force in center of the Middle East has increased the calls for Islamist moderation even if it is in relative terms. What is interesting is that over the past year, the concept of moderation has been employed by a number of Muslim leaders in different contexts.

Key among these actors is Iranian president Hassan Rouhani who has referred to his government as one of "hope", "prudence" and above all, "moderation". Rouhani began using the moderation discourse during his election campaign in early 2013 in order to distinguish his political platform from the "radicalism" of his predecessor Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. After his election his pragmatic conservative administration has used the moderation v extremism/radicalism dichotomy in his struggle against hardline clerical and security establishments.[74] The moderation mantra of the Rouhani government has much more to do with the foreign policy front where Tehran is in the midst of historic negotiations with the United States geared towards the Islamic republic's rehabilitation in the international community. Foreign Minister Mohammad-Javad Zarif, in an April 9 statement explained that his country began negotiations over the country's controversial nuclear program because of "its moderate spirit and tendency towards moderation and peacefulness." The Rouhani government's use of the moderation discourse has elicited strong reactions from his domestic opponents. Rouhani has been criticized for what his opponents see as compromises on the country's strategic interests and for trying to undermine the revolutionary fabric of the republic. Rouhani's opponents feel that the reformists whom the hardliners have labeled as "seditionists" (for their role in the 2009 Green uprising) as having infiltrated the Rouhani's government of moderation and are trying to secularize and westernize the country.[75] Thus, in the Iranian context, the current government and its opponents see moderation both as a political tool as well as an ideological position though from the opposite ends of the political spectrum.

Next door in Afghanistan, on March 2, 2014 the government formed a Moderation Center in the capital, Kabul. Deputy Education Minister for Islamic Studies described it as a body tasked to combat religious and other forms (ethnic, tribal, racial, and linguistic) of excesses and extremism. President Hamid Karzai's adviser on religious affairs, Prof. Nematallah Shahrani, who was appointed as its director told the gathering at the inauguration ceremony that the group would organize activities aimed at dealing with both extremes. Shahrani explained that promotion of virtue and prevention of vice was a key motivating factor behind the center's

establishment. It was this attempt to claim ownership over normative Islam that the Islamic law minister, Dr. Yusof Neyazi explained with his remark: "Moderation does not mean, God forbid, to decrease Islamic orders and values. Never! It is not allowed at all. However, we should understand it well. Friends and foes should be identified."[76] Thus in the Afghan case we have the state pursuing a moderation campaign that is seeking to marginalize the Taliban movement but at the same time fearful that their effort may not be exploited by the jihadist insurgents who would characterize the moderation center as an outfit seeking to dilute the country's religious norms. The statements of these two officials also betray their own fears that the effort to combat religious extremism could end up undermining the role of religion in society.

In other countries such as Azerbaijan the religious leadership's promotion of moderation is informed by sectarian impulses mainly Salafist intolerance for the Shia. Allahsukur Pasazada, the head of the Board of Muslims of the Caucuses, called for a struggle against the "Wahhabi sect". In a related development, the chairman for the State Committee for Work with Religious Structures, Elsad Isgandorov, said that measures such as training courses for ulema would be organized as part of its efforts to thwart the spread of radicalism.[77]

In the context of the most noteworthy case of geo-sectarianism, i.e., Bahrain, moderation is being viewed from a very different perspective. With the help of security forces Saudi Arabia and other GCC states, Manama's monarchical regime dominated by the country' Sunni minority was able to put down a largely Shia uprising that emerged as part of the Arab spring phenomenon. A key reason for the success of the al-Khalifa regime was that the largest Shia movement, al-Wefaq, was of the participatory Islamist genre and did not seek the overthrow of the monarchy. It is for this reason that the group has sought to engage with the regime in a national dialogue process but one that is not making much headway because the talks are all but derailed. The net effect has been that insurrectionist groups have found ground among the Shia majority community and weakened the influence of al-Wefaq – a trend that is referred to as the disappearing of moderation within the Persian Gulf island nation.[78]

In Southwest Asia, in 2014 we had a major decision by the new Pakistani government of Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, which took office after last year's elections, to negotiate with the Taliban rebels.[79] A number of factors informed this decision. These include the fact that Washington's negotiations with the Afghan Taliban were not progressing well; the Afghan state is going through a risky transition towards a post-Karzai era, and the fast approach end of 2014 deadline for the completion of the NATO drawdown.[80] While previous attempts by the secularist Musharraf and Zardari governments to talk to the jihadist insurgents have not succeeded, the current right of center government feels it is better positioned to pull some of the factions within the domestic Taliban alliance towards the political mainstream. Towards this end it is using "moderate" Islamist groups as the main mediators, however, the Taliban rebels, instead of moving towards moderation, actually began using the government's channels to enhance the support network for radicalism within both state and society. Ultimately, the government was forced to launch the long-awaited military offensive in North Waziristan.[81]

Yet another recent rendition attributes the lack of moderation to the "demise" of Islamic epistemic bodies. Hassan Hassan, a columnist for the Abu Dhabi-based UAE daily, The National, in a February 2013 article argues that the proliferation of extremism in Muslim

societies stems from the decline of Islamic religious institutions.[82] Focusing on the case of Egypt's al-Azhar University, which he refers to as "the last bastion of pan-Islamic rationalism," Hassan contends that between its official integration into the state after the Nasserite coup in 1952, the efforts of the Muslim Brotherhood, as well as the rise of Salafism, al-Azhar's traditional Asharite rationalist outlook has suffered.

What is fascinating about this discourse of moderation is that it continues to be used by a growing number of extremely diverse actors. The afore-mentioned examples highlight how moderation within the highly globalized Islamic religious milieu has become a convoluted concept. A basic step towards unpacking it entails being mindful of the three broad contexts, i.e., jihadist, Islamist and Muslim and then within each of these categories there is a great deal of internal gradation. The Geopolitics involving the western and Muslim worlds but more importantly the intra-Muslim ideological and identity contentions has led to an over usage of the term 'moderation'. The end result is a situation where one must ask the basic question: What does it mean (anymore)? Since the Sept 11 attacks, there has been a notable surge in academic scholarship to try and make sense of this highly relativized notion

Scholars have referred to such type of transformation or expected change in different terminological and conceptual terms. At one level there are different names to discuss what is essentially a shift in ideas and behavior and the varying nomenclature is nothing more than a set of synonyms used to talk about the same phenomenon. That said different scholars are looking at different aspects of the broader dynamic of moderation. In the next section, I will identify the four broad theoretical constructs that have gained traction among the scholarly community on the issue of moderation.

Attempts at Theoretical Disambiguation

Before, I examine, the existing corpus of scholarship on Islamist moderation, it is essential to examine the earlier work in non-Muslim settings. Indeed, in this context, there is a rich literature on radical groups moderating their objectives and modus operandi to embrace democratic politics. In order to understand how radical Islamists moderate, it would be highly instructive to examine how Catholic and Marxist groups in the West moderated. In fact, a good deal of the scholarship on Islamist moderation is built on the findings of those who studied post-revolutionary groups that integrated into institutional politics. Well before, the bifurcation of Islamists into the broad categories of moderates and radicals this dichotomy was in vogue among scholars of modernization theory and democratic transition. In western contexts the focus has been on the process by which post-revolutionary groups were brought into party and institutionalized politics.

A. **Catholic and Marxist Contexts**

There is a vast corpus of scholarship that specifically looks at Catholic and Marxist groups that entered into party politics in the last century. This literature helped establish the concept that groups undergo behavioral change because of the constraints they have to operate in once after they embrace systemic competition. Among the most influential works on behavioral change in parties owing to constraints are those of Anthony Downs, Joseph LaPalombara & Myron

Weiner, and Scott Mainwaring & Timothy Scully.[83] Others such as Frances Fox Piven and Richard A Cloward delve into how institutions place limits on the conduct of social movements.[84] These studies, however, refer to moderation as the adoption of "system-friendly behavior" triggered the participation incentive. We also have the work of Adam Przeworski and John Sprague on socialists and Stathis Kayvas on Catholics.[85] These scholars say that these actors joined the existing political systems in the hope that doing so would allow them to acquire swift dividends but as they became increasingly invested in the system they began to accept compromises.

Indeed, scholars from diverse intellectual and methodological traditions have employed different variations of the inclusion-moderation hypothesis. These range from liberal thinkers like John Stuart Mill (1859) to social democrats such as Habermas (1989).[86] Diverse discourses including those on rational choice, political parties, social movements, etc. have debated the variant aspects of the mechanics of how radical movements moderate and transform themselves into democratic parties. The roots of the concept of ideological and behavioral moderation can be traced back to the work of the German sociologist, Robert Michels (1876-1936); whose 1911 work Political Parties is a seminal work on the behavioral evolution of political elites.[87] Among the foremost students of Max Weber, Michels work on the Germany's Social Democrat Party makes the case that bureaucratization of movements leads their leaders to deviate from the preferences of their followers who are still committed to the original mission.[88] Michels, who engaged in normative studies, abhorred the moderating effects of organization, which he saw as weakening "revolutionary currents" in society. Organizational structures and functions propel elites towards the needs of self-preservation, which result in concessions manifesting in policies and positions. This happens not just within the group but more so at the level of the state, where the leadership is forced to reassess values – a process that produces changes in the character of Socialism. In Michels' words, "a recognition of the demands of everyday life of the party divert attention from immortal principles". May (1965) describes this shift as stemming from an emphasis on "legalism and electioneering" which produces "a deviation from principle." Michels asserts that many facets of the original socialist vision are rendered inexpedient vis-à-vis the games of party politics involving the securing of votes. Once parties partake in the electoral process "principles" are seen as obstacles to the aim of increasing membership. While Michels see this moderation of socialist parties as a negative development, his was nonetheless a pioneering work that shaped the theory of moderation.

A classic work on this subject is Downs (1957) who viewed party leaders as either 'vote/seat maximizers' or 'office-seekers'. The former tend to align their ideological positions with voter preferences while the latter prioritize winning elections over effecting political change.[89] But as Sanchez-Cuenca (2004) shows, in contrast to office-seekers we also have 'message-seekers' who display a great deal of 'ideological rigidity' and seen as engaged in a bottoms-up approach to effect their envisioned social changes, which in turn will aid the party to victory.[90] In others words, message-seekers, despite inclusion, are running in a direction opposite to the moderation path. Such forces could potentially un-moderate the systems in which they operate and push forth 'radical' policies into the political center-stage when mainstream parties begin to include their causes into their policy agendas.

On the issue left-wing radical groups in Europe evolving under systemic pressures, Adam Przeworski and John Sprague (1986) examine at what happened to socialist movements who sought to come to power via electoral politics.[91] In this study of national elections in seven European countries: Belgium (1894-1971), Denmark (1901-71), Finland (1908-72), France (1902-68), Germany (1874-1933), Norway (1908-72) & Sweden (1911-64), Przeworski and Sprague explain that workers represented a minority the party leadership was forced to broaden their appeal to the middle classes, which eventually led to their inability to pursue their class-based ideological goals. In their own words, "to recruit allies a [socialist] party generates ideological and organizational transformations which continue to weaken the salience of class identification among workers."[92]

Nancy Bermeo calls for a reconsideration of the "moderation argument," according to which radical popular organizations constitute a threat to democratization if they do not moderate their agenda in line with the elites who have made a decision to democratize.[93] In her work, which examines five different cases across Latin America, Europe & Asia, Bermeo takes a tactical look at the developments between autocratic collapse and the completion of the first democratic election. Bermeo provides sufficient evidence that high levels of mass mobilization do not necessarily derail democratic transitions and thus demonstrates that moderation of radical forces is not a pre-requisite for democratization. While the transitions literature looks at moderation as a critical attribute of elites or masses, more recent studies are centered on the debate whether radical actors become more moderate after being included in pluralist political systems and if so then what are the mechanics of such a transformation. Naturally, a key part of this scholarly debate began with how to define the terms moderate and radical.

Studies on transitions identify moderates as those who support the elite-driven democratic initiatives whereas radicals are those who support the revolutionary goals popular among the masses. Schwedler (2011) opines that moderates are "those who don't rock the boat" and are content with limited reforms that do not undermine the interests of the incumbent elite. In contrast, she notes that radicals are those who reject the status quo and demand systemic change. Based on this definition, Schwedler asserts that the real democrats are the radicals, which complicates the linkage of moderation with democratization. In other type of literature, moderate and radical highlight the difference between an actor's stances towards the incumbent regime. According to this definition, moderates are those who seek change while working within the confines of the system in place while radicals desire its overthrow. During the '60s and '70s progressive left-wing democratic movements seeking the overthrow of military or monarchical orders were deemed as radical.

Kalyvas, in his assessment of the emergence of Christian Democrat parties in Germany, Italy, Austria, The Netherlands, and Belgium between 1860 and 1920, using rational choice theory, shows how these groups emerged from fundamentalist Catholic movements that opposed liberalism and sought theocratic polities. Over the decades they have transformed themselves into full-fledged democratic movements – a shift that Kalyvas explains as the choice of the then nascent confessional parties to embrace the idea that voters were their ultimate support bases. He makes the case that these Christian parties made choices based on the limited menu of options during their developmental stage that played the key role in their transformation. Put differently,

their evolution into democratic forces was not so much the outcome of ideational acceptance of secularism or democracy as much as it was the adoption of democratic practices.

The work of the late Samuel P Huntington on this notion that if groups moderate they can be allowed to participate in politics is an early version of what anymore is widely called the inclusion-moderation hypothesis. Huntington argued that openings in an authoritarian political state combined with constraints incentivize groups seeking regime-change to operate within the limits of the political system.[94] In other words, the non-state actors in question should abandon the path of armed struggle and/or mass uprising and seek power and authority through electoral processes and institutional mechanisms. Huntington refers to this process as a "participation-moderation trade" as well as a 'democratic bargain'. For him, moderation entails radical actors bring their ideology and behavior in conformity with the "rules of the game" as laid out by the state. The incentive for groups who take advantage of political inclusion and engage in negotiated compromises is that they can achieve gains that they were unable to hitherto realize. But the pre-requisite is that they modify their objectives and moderate their approach. Huntington explains that this transformation generally entails the actors in question abandoning of violence and revolution as means of political change and instead pursue their aims via institutions, elections, and the parliamentary process.

More recently, Mainwaring and Scully (2003) filled a key lacuna in the literature on comparative study of the evolution of a diverse set of Christian Democratic parties in Latin America over the past half a century. A key theoretical contribution that the authors of this expansive work on Christian Democrats in Chile, Peru, Venezuela, Mexico, El Salvador, and Guatemala is that these parties (unlike their counterparts in Western Europe) emerged under autocratic or nascent democratic circumstances. Mainwaring and Scully (who are among the world's leading experts on Latin American politics) highlight what they call the dual game that these parties had to play vis-à-vis the incumbent political system. On one hand they were engaged in electoral game, i.e., competing in elections while on the other they are partaking a regime game, which entailed maneuvering to benefit from potential regime-change. These twin processes contributed to the Latin American Christian Democrat parties becoming less ideological. Perhaps the most significant takeaway of this work is that it shows how a majority of these religious parties declined due to the lack of adequate democratic environments, which is something that can be tested in my work where my two case studies are also religious forces on the path of moderation under either authoritarian conditions (Egypt) or extremely nascent democratic one (Afghanistan).

B. Islamist Contexts

The literature can be divided into three broad genres

(i) Inclusion-Moderation Hypothesis

The inclusion-moderation hypothesis is the most theory that is most in vogue among scholars seeking to understand how Islamist radicals moderate. There are a number of reasons for this. First, it has been an established part of the literature on democratization especially in western contexts with regards to how Catholic and Marxist parties shed their radicalism and embraced institutional politics. It was therefore only natural for scholars of contemporary political Islam to

apply it to make sense of what appeared to be similar ideological and behavioral modifications within the Islamist landscape. Second, the inclusion-moderation hypothesis fits well within the recent evolution of research on democracy and Islam where the discussion has moved beyond normative debates on the compatibility of the two to empirical studies about how Islamists when provided space by autocratic regimes engaging in limited liberalization of the polity tend to modify their ideas and actions. Third, democratization and Islamism are the two main trends in the Arab Middle East and the wider Muslim world and the inclusion-moderation principle offers significant theoretical purchase. Fourth, there is an expectation that democratization will be able to tame at least the bulk of Islamists who operate in societal mainstreams by including them in institutional structures and processes. And since until very recently very few Islamists who reject democracy decided to participate in elections, there was no need to look beyond the inclusion-moderation framework.

In the context of political Islam, the pioneering work has been that of Jillian Schwedler whose 2006 book, Faith and Moderation, applies the inclusion-moderation principle on the Islamic Action Front (IAF), the political arm of the Jordanian branch of the Muslim Brotherhood and Yemen's al-Islah movement. Schwedler points out that while inclusive political institutions are necessary but they alone do not produce moderation. She acknowledges that many Islamists who are referred to as 'moderate' have always been moderate – a characteristic, which becomes apparent via processes of inclusion. Such groups, Schwedler notes, the inclusion experience doesn't demonstrate that they have undergone ideological change. Nonetheless, she asserts that inclusion must be encouraged because it produces a general climate of moderation – regardless of whether groups become more moderate due to inclusion.

She explores a number of critical questions. What is political moderation? How can moderation be identified and what are the conditions in which radical groups moderate? More specifically when are Islamists groups genuinely moderating in terms of their embracement of democracy? And when are they pretending to be moderate in order to take advantage of systemic openings in order to advance a radical agenda? She explores these questions in her ethnographic field research in Jordan and Yemen in an effort to comparatively understand how the behavior of the IAF and al-Islah was impacted by participation in pluralist public spheres, especially with regards to their respective Weltanchauungs. Among the most salient points she makes his her problematization of the terms 'moderate' and 'radical' – pointing out that these two categories are extremely superficial and in fact misleading. Though she suggests alternative terms such as accommodationists and nonaccommodationists or legalists and contextualists but she does not develop these. In fact, she continues to use the moderate and radical terminology.

Schwedler offers a very balanced definition of moderation, which is the "movement from a relatively closed and rigid worldview to one more open and tolerant of alternative perspectives". Perhaps the most critical aspect of her study is the three conceptual lenses she deems as necessary to truly understand the moderation of (or the lack there of) in her two case studies. She identifies these as: i) State-controlled liberalization, ii) internal structure of the subject groups, and iii) ideational dimensions of public political space. She examines how the shifts in the first two dimensions inform a "justifiable" reconceptualization of long-held beliefs and attitudes. Her conclusion is that the IAF become more moderate while al-Islah because of the differences on each of these three factors. Though both states engaged in liberalization, Jordan's was rooted in a

long history of parliamentary practices while Yemen lacked such a culture. Similarly, the IAF was a much more coherent organization with significantly democratized internal structures and processes whereas al-Islah was more an umbrella for at least three different types of actors and thus remains an incoherent entity. Because the two parties were operating in almost polar opposite contexts, the IAF was able to make the leap towards justified moderation where in a matter of a few years it went from justifying participation in elections to aligning with leftist parties. In contrast, al-Islah was unable to engage in internal debates over the democratic process and could not expand beyond its narrow boundaries of religiously justifiable behavior. Through these two cases she demonstrates how inclusion does not necessarily lead to moderation.

Two years before Schwedler published Faith and Moderation another American scholar of Islamism, Carrie Rosefsky Wickham, explicated moderation as a function of 'political learning' in her study of Egypt's Hizb al-Wasat.[95] This was a case of moderation in the absence of democratization or even inclusion. She argues that even highly circumscribed openings in the political system could be enough to trigger interest among some actors propelling them towards moderation. According to Wickham, even limited liberalization creates the prospects for political learning or changes in the core concepts of individual leaders based on experience. She explains the defection of a number of Muslim Brotherhood members from the movement to found Hizb al-Wasat as the result of three factors: 1) In addition to strategic calculations, ideological moderation stemmed from political learning, i.e., changes in the core values and beliefs of the leadership; 2) These attitudinal shifts was enabled by interaction with secular ideological rivals in pursuit of the common goal of seeking democratic reforms; & 3) A combination of regime accommodation and repression of Islamist groups created institutional opportunities and encouragements towards this type of interaction. These factors, she posits, are behind the trend towards centrism – seeking a midpoint between a rigid demand for the implementation of shariah and total rejection of Islamic tradition in favor of western political thought. Hizb al-Wasat emerged as a moderate version of the Muslim Brotherhood as a result of this tendency. Wickham acknowledges that while very different from the Brotherhood, al-Wasat too had its limits when it came to moderation because of the lack of "ideological flexibility on issues around which there is a strong consensus within the movement." One can sense a disappointment in her tone, which is because she defines moderation as adoption of western liberal democratic values. While Schwedler shows that Islamist cooperation with Leftists is the result of moderation, Wickham's assessment reverses the causal arrows when she says cooperation led to moderation.

Building upon the works on Catholic and Marxist groups, Mona El-Ghobashy examines the evolution of Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood movement over the decades.[96] El-Ghobashy finds that the Brotherhood's experience with ideational and organization change is very much in keeping with any other group. It too went through "splits along generational lines, intense internal debates about strategy, and a shift in their ideological plank from politics as a sacred mission to politics as the public contest between rival interests." She makes a compelling case for how the Brotherhood has enthusiastically jumped into the electoral game because of its interactions with the masses, political rivals, and the regime. El-Ghobashy demonstrates how even groups exceedingly committed to their ideational objectives and their organizations are subject to transformation through participation in institutional politics and that "Islamists are no exception" to this rule.

Janine Astrid Clark takes issue with the model of moderation that advances the notion that ideological moderation is the logical outcome of behavioral moderation.[97] In her 2005 study of Jordan's Higher Committee for the Coordination of National Opposition Parties (HCCNOP), Astrid illustrates how the IAF cooperated with secular, leftist, and liberal groups remains unconvinced that cooperation with ideological competitors causes Islamists to moderate. Though such cooperation is quite common on a host of issues, there are certain redlines that Islamists will not be breach regardless of the allure of incentives. She notes that a significant number of Islamists are of the view that "issues that are fully addressed by shari'a are not open for discussion with other parties".

Since Schwedler published her path-breaking work, there has been a proliferation of scholarly research trying to revisit the inclusion-moderation – both in theoretical terms and its application in different contexts. A notable critique of Schwedler's work is the idea of Centrism (the trend towards cross-ideological cooperation whereby Islamists and secularists cooperate on a limited basis – a process that over time pulls both away from the extremes and towards the political center) is that of Michaelle Browers (2009).[98] She looks at cooperation among Islamists, socialists, and liberals in Yemen under the umbrella of the Joint Meetings Party. Browers, in her research examines the role of individuals, and her definition of moderation does not involve a departure from radicalism or the Islamist actors making progress towards adoption of liberal/democratic values. Instead, she defines moderation as the manner in which individuals locate themselves "both as a member of a community and as an intermediate between existing positions deemed extreme" in some shape or form. Her conception of moderation does not involve the adoption of values such as rights, inclusivity, pluralism, or tolerance. For Browers, moderation revolves around the notion of wasatiyya: "an intellectual trend characterized or claiming characterization as centrist or moderate (wasti), or said to occupy the middle (wasat) between extremist alternatives." She privileges the individual as opposed to the group as well as reorients the discussion of moderation toward "intellectual and ideological contexts, and from parties to individuals and networks of individuals that cross or work outside party lines." Browers' argument is that the processes of moderation necessitate the presence of moderates at the beginning of the processes. Thus for her, internal debates and the emergence of new justifications is not evidence that moderation is taking place and instead a manifestation of pre-existing moderation. Browers argues that the focus on the groups over individuals fails to provide an adequate understanding of how and why Islamist groups are changing. Instead she calls for an emphasis on ideological content and on individuals and the ways in which they are in dialogue with each other.

Eva Wegner and Miquel Pellicer in their 2009 research on Morocco's Party of Justice & Development examine a case of moderation without democratization.[99] Drawing upon the Bermeo (1997) who makes the case that moderation is not necessary for democratization, Wegner and Pellicer argue that it is not even sufficient. Their research examines the evolution of the PJD's relationship with its parent organization, the Movement for Unity and Reform. It focuses on a singular channel of moderation, i.e., the interactions between an Islamist party and the social movement it emerged from. Over time the party subjected to institutional politics tends to break orbit from the mothership's agenda and moderates its behavior. However, Wegner and Pellicer maintain that this distancing is inversely correlates with the party's dependency on the founding movement. The article covers the PJD-MUR relationship between 1992 and 2007

during which time the PJD became increasingly independent. A key finding of this study is that the moderation of the PJD actually caused the monarchy to partially reverse course with regards to the process of liberalization because it is not the ideological rigidity of an Islamist party that threatens ruling elites in the Middle East and North Africa; rather its political strength.

In his 2010 study of moderation in Turkey and Iran, Gunes Murat Tezcur, argues that political openings alone do not lead to ideological moderation and that other factors are at work.[100] His comparative work examines the Reform Front in Iran (which won the 2000 parliamentary elections three years after the election of reformist President Mohammad Khatami) and the current Turkish ruling Justice & Development Party. Among his important findings is that behavioral moderation does not necessarily lead to ideological moderation. Rather the two forms of moderation can be taking place in parallel. His most critical theoretical contribution is what he calls the *paradox of moderation* whereby even when Islamist non-state actors moderate this does not necessarily lead to a democratization of the state. In this regard, he refers to moderation as a "double-edged sword" because in some cases the newly moderated party has been tamed to the point where it no longer has the capacity to reform the authoritarian polity. Simply put, moderation happened in accordance with the aims of the state, which was to defang forces that posed a challenge to the regime. In addition to demonstrating that moderation can take place in a variety of sequences, Tezcur draws examines moderation at both individual and group level.

In a 2012 article, Dirk Tomsa engages in a rare study of moderation of a Southeast Asian Islamist party.[101] Tomsa looks at why, how, and to what extent Indonesia's Islamist Prosperous Justice Party (PKS) evolved into a more moderate group via its participation in democratic processes. Relying considerably on the work of Schwedler he shows how the PKS went from being a staunchly anti-system Islamist group to a mainstream (albeit quite conservative) democratic party via the efforts of its leadership to push the boundaries of justifiable action. His work shows that the party has indeed made progress towards greater moderation but in the process serious challenges have emerged to the party's integrity. These challenges include internal divisions, damage to its credibility among its core supporters and failure to attract new voters. According to Tomsa, moderation is neither a linear process nor a positive for the cause of democratization.

Karakaya and Yidirim (2013) offer a comparative study of moderation between Islamist and communist parties in Morocco and Italy respectively.[102] Drawing upon the inferences of scholarly work on the moderation of communist parties, the scholarly pair develops a two-level framework, involving tactical and ideological moderation, in order to explain the differences in moderation of Islamist parties. They define tactical moderation as the type that occurs when radical parties (in response to structural factors such as political liberalization, international factors and state repression) decide "to accept electoral democracy as a means to achieve ideological goals without compromising their platforms." Ideological moderation on the other hand is defined as "shifts in a platform from a radical niche to more moderate lines to respond to societal changes (economic liberalization, economic growth, electoral loss and changing voter preferences) to gain greater popular support." The empirical work of Karakaya and Yidirim is a comparative analysis of the Italian Communist Party and the Moroccan PJD.

While most of the works on Islamist moderation are based on one rendition or another of the moderation resulting from inclusion paradigm. Carvatorta and Merone (2013) in their study of the evolution of Ennahda make the case for moderation via *exclusion*.[103] The authors answer the question why the Tunisian Islamist movement moderated from the 1970s onwards despite the lack of opportunities for inclusion into the political process by highlighting its exclusion. And here they do not mean exclusion in the sense of state suppression. Rather one of social rejection, which forced the party to overhaul its ideology so as to make it attractive to the masses who unlike Ennahda's original vision held a highly favorable view of the French-style secular nationalism of the country's founder Habib Bourguiba. The radical Islamism of Ennahda's early years increasingly gave way to a more liberal Islamist program because of the pressure from society. By the time of the Arab spring, Ennahda's under the leadership of its principal theoretician, Rachid al-Ghannouchi, had profoundly moderated its views.

(ii)   De-radicalization

Omar Ashour's 2009 work 'The De-Radicalization of Jihadists: Transforming Armed Islamist Movements' represents the most critical research on De-Radicalization. In this ground-breaking scholarship examines Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood, Egypt's Gamaah al-Islamiyah and Tandheem al-Jihad and Algeria's Armee Islamique du Salut to explain the conditions in which insurrectionist Islamist movements give up jihadism as a means towards establishing their envisioned "Islamic" states.

Ashour has also referred to de-radicalization of jihadist groups largely in North African context as Post-Jihadism.[104] Ashour examines the renunciation of armed struggle in late 1990s and the 2000s by groups such as Gamaah al-Islamiyah (GaI), Armée Islamique du Salut (AIS), Libyan Islamic Fighting Group (LIFG), and Tandheem al-Jihad (TaJ). Ashour argues that deradicalization can occur on three planes: ideological, behavioral, and organizational and that the various combinations of these three types produces distinct paths towards deradicalization. He highlights three types of deradicalization processes. The most advanced type is *comprehensive* deradicalization, which involves successful processes on all three levels and he cites the Egyptians cases of GaI (1997-2002) and the various militias of the Muslim Brotherhood (1969-73). The second type of deradicalization is what he calls *substantive* in which there is success on the ideological and behavioral levels but on the organizational level the process fails leading to fragmentation of the group in question. For Ashour, factions of the TaJ, GaI and those from Indonesia's Jemaah al-Islamiyah who parted ways with the core group and partnered with al-Qaeda movement. The third type of deradicalization, according to Ashour, is *pragmatic, which entails behavioral and organizational* deradicalization but ideologically the groups did not ideologically de-legitimate the use of fore to realize political objectives. For Ashour, the AIS as well as Tajikistan's Islamic Renaissance Party are representative of this type of deradicalization.

In his pioneering work on the subject, which was an in depth study of GaI, Ashour identified a combination of four factors that could trigger deradicalization among jihadist groups.[105] These include: state repression, charismatic leadership in the organization, interactions with the 'other' as well as with the self (different layers of the group), and selective inducements. He identifies a pattern involving an interplay of these four elements that begins with the arrest of the top

leadership of the movement leading to interaction with competing Islamist and non-Islamist ideas that affects the ideas and actions of the leadership of the armed group. Such interaction initiates three endogenous processes: strategic calculations based on a cost-benefit analysis, political learning, modification of the worldview stemming from crises, frustration, and changes to the operating environment. These developments push the leadership to initiate a deradicalization process encouraged by the state through limited incentives as well as through interaction with mid-ranking leaders and the rank and file. A successful delegitimization of violence by ex-jihadists, Ashour contends, has led to the birth of the new trend of post-jihadism, which is essentially former jihadists ideologically de-constructing jihadism, with a focus on *fiqh al-unf* (jurisprudence justifying violence). Essentially, post-jihadism is about the creation of a new literature based on principles of jurisprudence established by traditional fuquha, peaceful Islamists, and apolitical Salafists that seeks to dismantle the arguments upon which the jihadist ideology was constructed. Ashour goes into considerable detail about the jurisprudential and theological counter-arguments put forth by the leaders of groups such as GaI and TaJ.[106]

He acknowledges that post-jihadists largely limit themselves to the goal of abandoning armed struggle as a means of effecting political change. Most post-jihadists do not offer an alternative peaceful means of pursuing the objective of an "Islamic' state. In fact, Ashour says that while post-jihadism in theory is a step towards moderation of radical and militant Islamists to where they can embrace democracy in some shape or form, there is little in the way of evidence that shows that post-jihadists are on the path towards democratization. There are few exceptions (as he calls them) and cites the example of former GaI and TaJ leader 'Abboud al-Zumur publishing a book called The Third Alternative: Between Authoritarianism and Surrender. In this work, the former military intelligence official calls for participation in electoral processes and forging coalitions with non-Islamist forces.[107] Most post-jihadists may have made the journey away from violence but accepting democracy is a bridge too far. As Ashour correctly points out post-jihadists have found the religious justification to renounce what they used to consider as jihad but their underlying ideas about sovereignty prevent them from accepting democratic politics. In addition he also notes that the question of political participation is a moot one given that they continue to operate in largely authoritarian contexts, especially after the July 3, 2013 coup that ousted the country's first elected president and a leader of the Muslim Brotherhood, Mohamed Morsi.

There is also extensive discourse on the related topic of counter-radicalization, which is preventative and pre-emptive in nature. Counter-radicalization focuses on ways and means of thwarting potential subjects from becoming radicalized. This is well beyond the scope of my research, which focuses on actors that are already radical and are on a trajectory away from radicalism.

(iii) Post-Islamism

Post-Islamism represents an ideational evolution whereby Islamists abandon their signature narrative of the need for an "Islamic" state. Post-Islamists feel that a democratic state offers the best possible means of establishing an observant Muslim society. Bayat, examines the evolution of the Islamic Republic of Iran beginning in the 1990s to demonstrate how yesterday's Islamists have begun to emphasize rights as opposed to duties; plurality of ijtihad as opposed to singular

interpretations. Post-Islamism is in essence a reinterpretation of religious principles as well as secularism.[108] Post-Islamists are thus somewhere between Islamism and secularism. This is a very similar to the notion of post-communism.

Coined by Bayat (1996) to explain the transformation of post-Khomeini Iran during the Rafsanjani presidency, post-Islamism has been understood differently by others.[109] Kepel (2000) used the term to note the rise of the reformist presidency of Mohammad Khatami in Iran.[110] Roy (1998, 2012) sees the term as confirming his *Failure of Political Islam* thesis that that the Islamists' ideology could not solve the problems of Muslim societies.[111] Lauzire (2005) used the concept to interpret the political thought of Abd al-Salam Yasin, Morocco's prominent Islamist thinker and founder of its more conservative Islamist movement.[112] Boubekeur (2007) examined the notion in cultural terms and as it applies to sociopolitical mobilization.[113] Mahdavi (2011) identified the phenomenon in the Islamic republic's trajectory since its founding.[114] Husnul Amin (2010) has analyzed the issue with respect to certain significant post-Islamist religio-political currents within Pakistan.[115]

Although the term "post-Islamism" has been used for nearly two decades, there is still little agreement on its meaning. Bayat offers the clearest definition: Post-Islamism "represents both a condition and a project, which may be embodied in a master movement. It refers to political and social conditions where, following a phase of experimentation, a rethink about the Islamist project takes place, leading to emphasizing rights instead of duties, plurality instead of singular authoritative voice, historicity rather than fixed scripture, and the future instead of the past."

Yilmaz has done the most to apply this idea to Turkey by examining the AKP's evolution from the Milli Gorus (National Vision) movement that spawned the Islamist political parties that preceded the current ruling party. In addition, he looks at the role of the Turkish-led international socio-religious Gulen Movement and its impact in influencing the rise of the AKP. Yilmaz draws an interesting distinction between post-Islamism and what he calls *non-Islamism*: The former is a combination of Islamism and democracy, whereas the latter is a discarding of Islamist values in order to more firmly embrace democratic ones. In Yilmaz's view, Fazilet Partisi (Virtue Party), which succeeded the Refah Partisi (Welfare Party) in December 1998, is an example of a post-Islamist group, whereas the AKP that succeeded Fazilet is a case of a non-Islamist party.

Yilmaz considers post-Islamism as a stage in which the actors can either move forward and leave Islamism altogether or revert back to Islamism. He argues that the AKP was created as a break with Necemettin Erbakan, the founder of the modern Turkish Islamist movement. While Erdogan and his allies founded the AKP, Erbakan reverted back to Islamism by founding of the Saadet Partisi (Felicity Party). Yilmaz points out that Fazilet's discourse is no longer Islamist, in practice Fazilet was never anything more than a slightly milder version of Refah, for it constituted both the reformist elements led by Erdogan and Gul and the old guard led by Erbakan, who never really left Islamism. Therefore there was no reverting back, as Yilmaz claims. The group still included Erbakan and was actually led by his long-time associate Recai Kutan. That Erdogan and his faction parted ways with their ideological leader only after Fazilet was outlawed further shows that Fazilet was a somewhat modified version of Refah. In other words, it was not really post-Islamist, which brings us back to the issue how to define this particular term.

For Bayat though post-Islamism is a secularizing process, as opposed to a mid-point between Islamism and secularism. In fact, it is a rejection of Islamism because it does not call for the establishment of an Islamic state. To use Yilmaz's preferred terminology, post-Islamism *is* non-Islamism, which in a general sense can also be referred to as secularism. But certain Islamists can renounce Islamism, but they are unlikely to cease being observant Muslims. Bayat, in his examination of Iran, shows how the post-Islamists are those who have realized through experience that there is a need to go beyond religious texts in order to address the social, political, and economic problems facing modern societies.[116] He does, however, distinguish between secularization and secularism; the former is the process of acknowledging the need for extra-religious ideas, whereas the latter is the marginalization of religion.[117]

Therefore, post-Islamism is an exiting from Islamism and a possible heading toward a secularism that is not based on rejecting religion's role in public affairs. Instead post-Islamists, as Bayat points out, have recognized the inadequacies inherent in their ideological formulations and hence the need to adopt secular modalities. Post-Islamists have therefore reinterpreted both Islamic religious principles as well as revised their older view of secularism as being anti-religion. For them, secularism is not something un-Islamic, and embracing it does not necessarily mean that they have to compromise on their religious principles. Post-Islamists can thus be defined as former Islamists who have relinquished their rigid ideological positions on enforcing Islamic principles through the state and now seek to realize their religious ideals through democratic politics and a secular state.

In comparison with the inclusion-moderation hypothesis, post-Islamism has even less consensus on what it means. Nonetheless, it is an important contribution to the debate on how Islamists moderate.

Making Sense of Moderation Paradigms

As is evident from the previous section, a significant amount of literature on Islamist moderation has emerged – at least in the last decade. And the demand and supply of moderation both continue to grow as political conflict in the Muslim world, especially in the greater Middle East region, expands. But we are nowhere near any clarity on the subject. A great deal of the confusion has to do with terminological chaos, which further compounds the task of conceptualization. The one key area on which we have a consensus is that for democratization to succeed moderation is essential as the process of democratization is taking place simultaneously with the rise of the Islamism and jihadism. It is natural that the bulk of the moderation literature focuses on these religio-political actors – considering that these forces are seen as undemocratic.

However, they are not the only ones threatening nascent democratic experiments. Indeed, secular states and non-state actors have demonstrated a distinct autocratic streak. Egypt's post-Arab spring trajectory clearly highlights that both sides of the ideological divide have behave undemocratically – albeit in different ways. There is thus a symbiotic relationship between Islamist and secularist radicalism and thus there is a need for both sides to moderate and come to the political center. The work of Browers (2007) touches on this aspect in her discussion of accommodation between both camps. Islamist moderation thus entails that secularists moderate

their views and accommodate their ideological rivals, which is what Schwedler (2006) talks about when she mentions the need to get "political inclusion right" especially in a situation where "pluralist institutions and practices are not yet well established".

Given that the issue under study is moderation therefore, scholars have delved into the definition of moderation. Schwedler offers a rather strong and sufficiently broad enough definition, which she says is the "movement from a relatively closed and rigid worldview to one more open and tolerant of alternative perspectives." The problem with this definition is that it applies to groups that were willing to participate in mainstream politics long before the states moved towards inclusion and does not shed light on the ideational and behavioral change in groups that either passively rejected the state or worse engaged in armed struggle against it. Intrinsic to this shortcoming is the way in how moderates and radicals are defined.

Defining moderates as those who support liberal democratic reforms and radicals as those who oppose such efforts highlights a western bias in the way moderation should unfold. This is not to say that ideas and actions of Islamists do not change, as is evident from how Bayat describes the phenomenon of post-Islamism. Islamists undergo ideological and behavioral change and the question is to what degree and in what ways.

Contrary to most theorists who subscribe to the inclusion-moderation principle, external pressures on radical Islamist parties leaded to internal changes and well before the inclusion stage. As the work on Ennahda explains there are cases where inclusion does not happen. In other words, we have moderation taking place pre-inclusion and moderation independent of inclusion.

While Schwedler and Wickham both accept that the terms radical and moderate are highly problematic there is still the tendency to rely on them. Radicals can be of different types – both those who engage in violence (jihadists) and those pursue radical agendas but do not adopt armed struggle (Hizb al-Tahrir). Likewise we have the issue of relative moderates as is clear if one were to take into consideration the Brotherhood, Hizb al-Nour, Ennahda, etc.

In the inclusion-moderation hypothesis there is talk of both opportunities and constraints but how does each shape the behavior of radical actors to become more moderate is under-explored. How do previously excluded groups go from entering the system to abiding by the constraints? With regards to moderation as modification in ideology and behavior, what happens to ideology such that it affects behavior? Also, political inclusion does not necessarily provide incentives for groups to negotiate and compromise. There are other intervening variables such as faith in the stability of the system, political ideology and level and state of political development. What if states don't exclude and it is the actors who exclude themselves? Salafists and jihadists are not excluded per se; rather they reject the system. And when they enter they do not encounter incentives. Here is why it is important to note that the path of moderation for Islamists will be different from the Catholic and Marxist groups because in the case of the former it will be a function of the extent to which they appreciate extra-religious or secular ideas, i.e., expansion of mubah, plurality of ijtihad. While there has been an effort to view moderation in ideologically neutral terms but what is less studied is moderation as evolution of religious notions.

In terms of the sequencing of moderation some of the scholars surveyed in this review suggest that behavioral effects come first followed by ideological effects while others argue that it is the other way around. There are levels of moderation. Initially, it entails moderating the means by which a group is willing to pursue its goals. A secondary stage would emerge when it begins to adjust its agenda. Still a third one would entail acceptance of alternate prescriptions.

Moderation could take place at the macro level where a genuinely radical actor engages in substantive alteration of its political program. In contrast, many of those groups that have long maintained parties experience moderation at the micro or incremental level. Additionally, many different types of Islamist actors are moderating but they are following different paths. The notion of political learning is touched upon vis-à-vis Islamist actors but is not very well developed in explaining how changes in norms occur or how new norms are created. The path towards compromises remains largely uncharted. Wickham tries to address this issue and focuses on individuals but those cannot be generalizable

A key issue with the afore-mentioned four discourses on moderation is to what extent are they varied understandings on how moderation unfolds and to what degree do they address essentially different processes. Though Schwedler admits that many of the moderate groups are moderate prior to inclusion but then she does not explore this idea. Instead she focuses on inclusion rendering the group additionally moderate.[118] She cites Hizb al-Wasat of Egypt as an example of such a group. Her view is that the establishment of the group was the result of distanciation of its founders from the Brotherhood and not because of ideational moderation. Turning to her own case studies, Jordan's Islamic Action Front and Yemen' al-Islah, she says these groups prior to electoral participation were neither radical nor even opponents of the regime. While recognizing that the moderate behavior of such groups should not be seen as mechanically stemming from inclusion, she stresses that their engagement in more moderate, pluralistic and inclusive practices. Fundamentally, her thesis concentrates on

Islamist moderation differs from the cases of Catholic and Marxists contexts is because democratic consolidation and thus an anchor with which to pull these radicals in. In the Muslim context there are very few democratic states and thus democratization and moderation are processes taking place in parallel. Schwedler acknowledges this but if the institutions themselves are authoritarian then how can they create constraints and opportunities and thus how will inclusion-moderation work? How will they steer dissenting actors into state-controlled structures and processes to compete. There is also the issue of ideological barriers to acceptance, which must be factored in.

In order to understand what moderation is we need to first understand what radicalism. Here is where there are different types of radicalisms. Different starting points and hence moderation paths, and distances traveled. Islamists as religious/ideological actors by definition need to moderate but given that there are different Islamists there will be different moderations and radicalizations. Another overlooked issue is that Islamists are not the only ones who need to moderate. Their secular opponents also must undergo the process. Browers' work is the rare one that addresses this point.

The existing literature fails to explain why the recently established Egyptian Salafist party, Hizb al-Nour, was established when its parent organization not only bid farewell to its decades old apolitical path but also gave up its long-held view that democracy was un-Islamic and decided to participate in elections. Similarly, the de-radicalization literature falls short in explaining why the Afghan jihadist group (which officially refers to itself as the Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan and is more popularly) known as the Taliban movement decided to negotiate with the United States as well as the Afghan state. Both represent two very different forms of moderation.

Schwedler offers a strong definition of moderation by identifying it "as movement from a relatively closed and rigid worldview to one more open and tolerant of alternative perspectives."[119] However, it is too broad and is unable to address the actual changes in the behavior of the groups in question. Behavioral changes manifest in a variety of ways in different political groups on the path towards moderation. Some will take advantage of an opening in the system as underscored by the inclusion-moderation hypothesis. On the other hand there are those who will offload ideological baggage. Still others will give up armed struggle as per the de-radicalization theory. What is common among each though is the willingness of the groups to renounce their goal of radically altering the status quo and accepting a negotiated path towards political power and change.

The moderation literature is all over the place – in terms of nomenclature, conceptualization, and application. De-radicalization is a subset of the overall process of moderation and does not apply to groups that are not armed. Furthermore, de-radicalization is a misleading term in that there are groups that give up armed struggle but do not join the political process. Furthermore, they continue to harbor radical agendas. Therefore, what we are really dealing with here is de-militarization and not de-radicalization, which is a work in progress – subject to the group joining the political mainstream. This later process is complicated by the fact that in many cases there is not much in the way of a mainstream to join.

Though the extent to which such engagement transforms the ideology and behavior of Islamists is unclear, the move towards accommodationist or centrist politics does imply that Islamists are not the only ones who need to moderate; rather the other side does as well.

IV. Filling the Lacuna

As the previous sections encapsulate, there has been a significant amount of scholarly work on the issue of Islamist moderation. Different scholars have concentrated on four different paradigms to try and explain how different types of Islamist actors have undergone ideological and behavioral moderation. These various theoretical models offer critical insights regarding disparate pieces of the overall phenomenon known as moderation. These are less competing theories on the same process than they are explanations of different forms of moderation. Even when it comes to the latter, they are partial renditions on moderation that focus on very different types of Islamist actors and that too on a wide range of aspects. In other words, the literature is all over the place and conceptual deconstruction of moderation is taking place in bits and pieces.

The Inclusion-Moderation hypothesis applies to groups that initially had been excluded from the political process but the key thing here is that it focuses on groups that were already moderate to begin with in the sense that they sought inclusive political structures/processes in which to participate in. On the other hand, the discourse on de-radicalization looks at armed groups and sees moderation as a function of their abandonment of violence. Post-Islamism is about Islamists ceasing to be Islamists in that they no longer seek to impose what they deem as shariah and instead seek a pious society through a democratic state.

My thesis seeks to make an original contribution to the subject in two ways. *First*, I will advance the theoretical debate on the matter by a strategic examination of all the various theories – a 70,000-foot view – something, which has not received adequate attention.[120] In doing so, I will point out their value and shortcomings but more importantly, I will argue that the process of moderation can only be truly understood by first making sense of radicalism, which I will show exists in various forms and levels. Here is where I will introduce the notion of 'starting points', which not only explains the variance in the existing theories but is central to understanding how different types of radical Islamists begin to moderate and have different trajectories and end states. For example, the Inclusion-Moderation hypothesis is most relevant to the study of moderation among participatory style Islamists of the Muslim Brotherhood genre that adhere to manifestos with varying degrees of radicalism but do not seek radical change. De-radicalization, on the other hand offers insights on how groups that have a clear radical agenda of overthrowing the incumbent order through violent means, renounce armed struggle but in most cases have not abandoned their original political vision. Post-Islamism looks at groups that had long been committed to the democratic rules of the game and have now given up the desire to establish an "Islamic" polity. The discourse that sees Islamists coming to the political center and cooperating with their ideological rivals are those who have long been active in civil society and as well as the state's institutional politics and are now making limited but significant compromises.

A comparative study of these various theories shows that we are essentially talking about multiple forms of radicalism and hence variant forms of moderation. Now this may seem very intuitive but what is significant is that *moderations* in the plural sense has been under-appreciated by the scholarly community, which has focused on one particular form or another and disproportionately on the inclusion-moderation postulation. As a result moderation has become an over-used and abused term or what Sartori (1970) referred to as 'conceptual stretching'.[121] By using the same term to denote different forms of changes in the ideas and actions of Islamists the term has been almost gutted of meaning. It is for this reason there is a lack of scholarly consensus on what do we really mean by moderation. Because we are dealing with numerous types of moderations that stem from a multiplicity of radicalisms a grand narrative that explains how radical Islamists become moderate is highly unlikely.

Second, my thesis will examine two unique cases of Islamist moderation, which are not explainable by the existing corpus of scholarship. Not only will my work highlight these recent cases, I will also attempt to

In the last five years key Salafist and jihadist groups have moderated their ideology and behavior. Egypt's al-Dawah al-Salafiyah movement in the aftermath of the Arab spring shed its apolitical status and embraced democratic politics by forming a political party called Hizb al-

Nour, which participated in elections. Over the past year its moderation took on a whole new meaning when it supported the coup against the Morsi government and more recently is supporting former military chief, Field Marshal, Abdel Fattah El-Sisi's presidential bid. In fact it has gone to great lengths to justify the latter. The Taliban movement in Afghanistan in the context of the western military drawdown has been negotiating with the United States a post-NATO power-sharing arrangement. Why have these two movements experienced shifts in their ideology and behavior? What do these changes tell us about Islamist moderation? More importantly, the existing literature on moderation does not explain the changes in either of these groups.

The behavior of these two movements in recent years underscores two very different forms of moderation.

In the Egyptian case, we have a group giving up the idea that politics should be avoided as well as the belief that democracy is un-Islamic. Inclusion-moderation principle does not explain the formation of al-Nour. Egypt's largest Salafist movement rejected politics – let alone democracy and therefore it did not change its behavior after being included in a political process. There was no process after the ouster of Mubarak other than a military-led effort to limit democratic concessions. Furthermore, it is extremely unlikely that the opening of the authoritarian system in the wake of the Arab spring all of a sudden forced the Salafist movement to abandon its decades old policy of shunning politics. Clearly, there was a great deal of internal change taking place well before the toppling of Mubarak that informed the movement shift from opposing protests against Mubarak to joining them. In this case, we are looking at moderation independent of inclusion, which is a function of the shift in the religious ideas of these Egyptian Salafists. Likewise the other three theories do not offer an explanation of what led the apolitical Salafist movement to engage in politics and exhibit a great degree of political pragmatism. That said, al-Nour has not abandoned its rather ultra-conservative socio-political agenda and thus has not moderated on that level.

With regards to the Afghan Taliban, we have a movement that has moved away from the idea that it can revive the emirate it lost in the aftermath of the Sept 11 attacks via a jihadist approach. The movement's decision to enter into negotiations with the United States and (indirectly) with the Afghan state over a power-sharing agreement is a unique form of moderation. Intuitively, one would think that this ideological and behavioral shift away from the goal of recreating its former regime through armed struggle is a classic case of Ashour's de-radicalization thesis. Upon closer inspection, however, it becomes clear that de-radicalization explains the moderation of armed Islamist groups who have been militarily defeated by the state and its leadership is incarcerated, which is not the case with the Taliban. Indeed there are limits to the firepower of its insurgents but the state is far from inflicting defeat upon the largely Pashtun militia. Furthermore, the vast majority of its leaders remain at large. And instead of being lured by inducements the Taliban responded to peace feelers from the United States given the latter's conclusion that the former cannot be militarily defeated. If anything, Washington is relying on the fact that the Taliban's nationalist jihadist doctrine conflicts with the transnational worldview of al-Qaeda. Most important of all is that the Taliban are not showing any signs that they are willing to give up its guns and it is not clear to what extent the movement has given up on its ultraconservative

agenda.[122] Hence, in the case of the Taliban we also have to examine other factors that have caused it to want to be a recognized as an internationally recognized legitimate political entity.

[1] Bokhari, Kamran, and Farid Senzai. 2013. *Political Islam in the Age of Democratization*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

[2] Robinson, Glen E. 1997. "Can Islamists Be Democrats? The Case of Jordan". *The Middle East Journal*. 51(3) Summer: 373-87.

[3] Hoveyda. Fereydoun. 2001. "Moderate Islamists?" *American Foreign Policy Interests*, 23: 53-59.

[4] By no means is a transformation of Islamists the only pre-requisite for Muslim democratization. Indeed there is a need for non-Islamists to embrace democratic values, civilian supremacy over the military, economic development, and many other ingredients. However, given that my thesis focuses on trying to understand how the ideology and behavior of Salafists and jihadists have begun to change, I will limit the discussion to this ongoing transformation within Islamism.

[5] Scholarly renditions about the political evolution of Islam/Muslims go back to the 1960s, e.g., Hourani, Albert. 1962. *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age: 1798-1939*. Oxford: U.K.: Oxford University Press, but really gained momentum during the 1980s and more so in the 1990s with works such as Rahman, Fazlur. 1982. *Islam and Modernity*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press; Enayat, Hamid 1982. *Modern Islamic Political Thought*; Binder, Leonard. 1988. Islamic Liberalism: A Critique of Development Ideologies. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago; Al-Effendi, Abdelwahab. 1991. *Who Needs An Islamic State?* London, U.K.: Grey Seal; Mernissi, Fatima. 1992. *Islam and Democracy: Fear of the Modern World*. London, UK: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company; Al-Azmeh, Aziz. 1993. *Islams and Modernities*. London: U.K.: Verso; Roy, Olivier. 1994. *The Failure of Political Islam*. London, UK: I.B. Tauris; Sayeed, Khalid Bin. 1995. *Western Dominance and Political Islam: Challenge & Response*. Albany, NY: State University of New York; Esposito, John L. and John O. Voll. 1996. *Islam and Democracy*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; Esposito, John L. (ed). 1997. *Political Islam: Revolution, Radicalism, or Reform*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner; Kurzman, Charles. 1998. *Liberal Islam: A Sourcebook*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; Mousalli, Ahmed. 1999. *Moderate and Radical Islamic Fundamentalism: The Quest for Modernity, Legitimacy, and the Islamic State*. Gainesville, FL: The University of Florida Press. Hefner, Robert W. 2000. *Civil Islam: Muslims and Democratization in Indonesia*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; & Tamimi, Azzam. 2001. *Rachid Ghannouchi: A Democrat Within Islamism*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

[6] Muravchik, Joshua and Charles P. Szrom. 2008. "In Search of Moderate Muslims". *Commentary*. 2 (February): 26-34

[7] The RAND Corporation came out with a number of reports between 2003 and 2007, which included "Building Moderate Muslim Networks", "Civil Democratic Islam: Partners, Resources, and Strategies", "Five Pillars of Democracy How the West Can Promote an Islamic Reformation" & "The Muslim World After 9/11".

[8] See: Jan, Abid Ullah. Though Muslims Exist, Islam Does Not" in *Debating a Moderate Muslim: The Geopolitics of Islam and the West*, ed. M.A. Muqtedar Khan, Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2007); Jan, Abid Ullah. "Moderate Islam: A Product of American Extremism" in *Debating a Moderate Muslim: The Geopolitics of Islam and the West*, ed. M.A. Muqtedar Khan, Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2007)

[9] Leiken, R.S. and Brooke, S. 2007. "The Moderate Muslim Brotherhood", *Foreign Affairs*, 86(2): 107-121; Crooke, Alistair. 2009. "Getting It Wrong: 'Extremism & 'Moderation' in Islam After Gaza". *The RUSI Journal*. February 154(1): 30-35; Malley, Robert and Peter Harling. 2010. "Beyond Moderates and Militants". *Foreign Affairs*. September/October 85(5): 18-29

[10] Khan, M.A. Muqtedar. "Islamic Democracy And Moderate Muslims: The Straight Path Runs Through the Middle" in *Debating a Moderate Muslim: The Geopolitics of Islam and the West*, ed. M.A. Muqtedar Khan, Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2007)

[11] In many ways the question of how to embrace western modernity while remaining faithful to Islamic traditions that 19th century Muslim thinkers such as Rifa'a al-Tahtawi grappled with remain unsettled some 200 years later. A detailed elaboration of the intellectual challenges that Tahtawi, Khayr al-Din al-Tunisi and others faced can be found in Hourani, Albert. 1962. *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age: 1798-1939*. London, UK: Oxford University Press

[12] Khan, M.A. Muqtedar. " Moderate Muslims Are the Key to the Future of Islam and American-Muslim Relations" in *Debating a Moderate Muslim: The Geopolitics of Islam and the West*, ed. M.A. Muqtedar Khan, Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2007); Safi, Louay. Reflections on Ijtihad And Moderate Islam" in *Debating a Moderate Muslim: The Geopolitics of Islam and the West*, ed. M.A. Muqtedar Khan, Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2007); Afsaruddin, Asma. Accommodating Moderation: A Return to Authenticity or Recourse to Heresy?" in *Debating a Moderate Muslim: The Geopolitics of Islam and the West*, ed. M.A. Muqtedar Khan, Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2007)

[13] One of the earliest works on moderation from within the Muslim world was Al-Qaradawi, Yusuf. 1987. *Islamic Awakening between Rejection and Extremism*. Herndon, VA: International Institute of Islamic Thought.

[14] Ashour, Omar. 2009. *The De-Radicalization of Jihadists: Transforming Armed Islamist Movements*. New York, NY: Routledge.

[15] Bokhari, Kamran. 2003. "Who Are "Moderate" Muslims?" *Q-News*. 354 (March): 34-35.

[16] Mazrui, Ali. "Liberal Islam Versus Moderate Islam: Elusive Moderates and Siege Mentality" in *Debating a Moderate Muslim: The Geopolitics of Islam and the West*, ed. M.A. Muqtedar Khan, Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2007)

[17] Bokhari, Kamran. 2006. "Developing a Philosophy of Counterterrorism". *Muslim Public Affairs Journal*. (April): 11-19.

[18] In Sept 2010, the Wall Street Journal published a symposium titled "What is a Moderate Islam" in which six notable western and Muslim figures (Anwar Ibrahim, Bernard Lewis, Ed Husain, Reuel Marc Gerecht, Tawfik Hamid and Akbar Ahmed) participated.

[19] Bokhari, Kamran and Farid Senzai. "Defining a Moderate" in *Debating a Moderate Muslim: The Geopolitics of Islam and the West*, ed. M.A. Muqtedar Khan, Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2007).

[20] Esposito, John L. "Moderate Muslims: A Mainstream of Modernists, Islamists, Conservatives, and Traditionalists" in *Debating a Moderate Muslim: The Geopolitics of Islam and the West*, ed. M.A. Muqtedar Khan, Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2007)

[21] Musharraf, Pervez, "A Plea for Enlightened Moderation," *Washington Post*, 1 June, 2004; Aziz, Sadaf. 2011. "Making a Sovereign State: Javed Ghamidi and 'Enlightened Moderation'". *Modern Asian Studies*. 45(3): 597-629

[22] http://berkleycenter.georgetown.edu/resources/quotes/hosni-mubarak-on-moderate-religious-discourse?q= & http://www.usip.org/events/the-challenge-moderation-in-islam-egypts-religious-institution-vs-extremism (accessed March 9, 2014).

[23] Bokhari, Kamran. "State Sponsors of Jihadism: Learning the Hard Way". *Stratfor*. 18 July, 2007. http://www.stratfor.com/state_sponsors_jihadism_learning_hard_way

[24] See Kurlantzick, Joshua, "A Muslim model What Indonesia can teach the world," *Boston Globe*, 13 September, 2009. http://www.cfr.org/indonesia/muslim-model-indonesia-can-teach-world/p20199 (accessed March 9, 2014) and "Najib Tells BBC that Muslim Nations Can Copy Malaysia," *The Malaysian Insider*. 24 February, 2011. http://www.themalaysianinsider.com/malaysia/article/najib-tells-bbc-that-muslim-nations-can-copy-malaysia/ (accessed March 9, 2014).

[25] Unver, H. Akin. 2013. "The Forgotten Secular Turkish Model Turkey, Past and Future". *The Middle East Quarterly*. 20:1 (winter): 57-64.

[26] Yavuz, Hakan. ed. 2006. *The Emergence of a New Turkey: Democracy and the AK Parti*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

[27] Gumuscu, Sebnem. 2012. "Egypt Can't Replicate the Turkish Model: But It Can Learn From It. January 12." http://carnegieendowment.org/sada/2012/01/12/egypt-can-t-replicate-turkish-model-but-it-can-learn-from-it/ffip (accessed March 9, 2014).

[28] Meijer, Roel and Paul Aarts. Eds. 2012. *Saudi Arabia Between Conservatism, Accommodation & Reform*. The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael'. http://www.clingendael.nl/sites/default/files/20120000_research_report_rmeijer.pdf (accessed March 11, 2014)

[29] See "Saudi Arabia: A Shift in al-Qaeda's Thinking". *Stratfor*. 24 February, 2006. http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/saudi-arabia-shift-al-qaedas-thinking (accessed March 15, 2014) and "Geopolitical Diary: Saudi Arabia's Resilience". *Stratfor*. 8 October, 2007. http://www.stratfor.com/geopolitical-diary/geopolitical-diary-saudi-arabias-resilience (accessed March 15, 2014)

[30] "Limits to Exporting the Saudis' Counterjihadist Successes". *Stratfor*. 14 May, 2009. http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/20090513_limits_exporting_saudis_counterjihadist_successes (accessed March 15, 2014).

[31] Friedman, George. "Iraq: Positive Signs". *Stratfor*. 13 November, 2007. http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/iraq_positive_signs (accessed March 15, 2014).

[32] McCary, John A. 2009. "The Anbar Awakening: An Alliance of Incentives". *The Washington Quarterly*. 32:1 (January): 43-59.

[33] Stratfor has chronicled in detail the evolution of the al-Sadrite movement. In particular see the following reports:

http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/iraq-will-al-sadr-be-moderated

http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/iraq-muqtada-al-sadr-stays-politics

http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/iran-al-sadrs-disbandment-context

http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/iraq-mehdi-armys-transformation

http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/iraq-al-sadrs-difficult-disbanding-proposition

http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/iraq-al-sadr-accepts-state-control

http://www.stratfor.com/geopolitical-diary/geopolitical-diary-al-sadr-silences-his-guns

http://www.stratfor.com/sample/analysis/iraq-al-sadr-will-disarm-militia

[34] Hovdenak, Are. 2009. "Hamas in Transition: The Failure of Sanctions." *Democratization*. 16(February): 59-80.

[35] "Hamas' Strategic Dilemma". *Stratfor*. 9 June, 2011. www.stratfor.com/geopolitical-diary/hamas-strategic-dilemma (accessed March 12, 2014).

[36] "Hamas Looks to Revive the Palestinian Muslim Brotherhood". *Stratfor*. 16 October, 2012. http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/hamas-looks-revive-palestinian-muslim-brotherhood (accessed on March 12, 2014).

[37] Within 18 months of the takeover of the Gaza, the Hamas regime in the Strip faced the largest scale military re-intervention from Israel in the form of Operation Cast Lead, which further had an impact on its moderation trajectory. See Wagemakers, Joas. 2010. "Legitimizing Pragmatism: Hamas' Framing Efforts From Militancy to Moderation and Back?" *Terrorism and Political Violence*. 22: 357-377.

[38] "Special Report: Hamas in Transition". *Stratfor*. 13 February, 2012. http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/special-report-hamas-transition (accessed March 12, 2014).

[39] "Share Pragmatism Exacerbating Intra-Hamas Fault Lines". *Stratfor*. 26 May, 2011. www.stratfor.com/geopolitical-diary/pragmatism-exacerbating-intra-hamas-fault-lines (accessed March 12, 2014).

[40] "Is the Palestinian Civil War Coming to an End?" *Stratfor*. 13 February, 2014. http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/palestinian-civil-war-coming-end (accessed March 12, 2014).

[41] "An Opening for Hamas in the West Bank". *Stratfor*. 13 December 2012. http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/opening-hamas-west-bank (accessed March 12, 2014).

[42] "Somalia: Washington Pressures the SICC to Negotiate." *Stratfor*. 24 January, 2007. www.stratfor.com/analysis/somalia-washington-pressures-sicc-negotiate (accessed on March 13, 2104).

[43] "Somalia: A Moderate Islamist Takes Power, But the Struggle Continues". *Stratfor*. 2 February, 2009. www.stratfor.com/analysis/somalia-moderate-islamist-takes-power-struggle-continues (Accessed March 13, 2014).

[44] See "Somalia: Al Shabaab Changes Its Name". *Stratfor*. 6 December, 2011. http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/somalia-al-shabaab-changes-its-name (accessed on March 13, 2014) & "Somalia: Tactical Shifts Mark an Internal Struggle for al Shabaab". *Stratfor*. 22 September, 2013. http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/somalia-tactical-shifts-mark-internal-struggle-al-shabaab (accessed on March 13, 2014).

[45] "Somali premier co-opts religious leaders to defeat al-Shabaab". *Mareeg news website*, 16 March 2014 (courtesy BBC Monitoring).

[46] Malik, Oluwatoyin."Islamic scholars advised on moderation as effective instrument for peace, security in Nigeria". *Nigerian Tribune*. 20 August 2013. http://www.tribune.com.ng/news2013/index.php/en/news/news-headlines/item/19529-islamic-scholars-advised-on-moderation-as-effective-instrument-for-peace,-security-in-nigeria.html

[47] Hammed, Shittu. "Kwara Governor Canvasses for Moderation of Islamic Sermons". *This Day Live*. 06 May 2013. http://www.thisdaylive.com/articles/kwara-governor-canvasses-for-moderation-of-islamic-sermons/146864/

[48] Ashour, Omar, 2011. "Post-Jihadism: Libya and the Global Transformations of Armed Islamist Movements". *Terrorism and Political Violence*. 23 (3): 377-97.

[49] Ashour, Omar. "Islamist De-Radicalization in Algeria: Successes and Failures". *The Middle East Institute Policy Brief*. No. 21 (November 2008).

[50] Zoepf, Katherine. Deprogramming Jihadists. The New York Times. 7 November, 2008. http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/09/magazine/09jihadis-t.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0; Boucek, Christopher. 2008. "Saudi Arabia's "Soft" Counterterrorism Strategy: Prevention, Rehabilitation, and Aftercare". *Carnegie Papers*. 97 (September); Martin, David. "Reeducating Osama Bin Laden's Disciples". *CBS News 60 Minutes*. 30 April, 2009. http://www.cbsnews.com/news/reeducating-osama-bin-ladens-disciples/; Porges, Marisa L. "The Saudi Deradicalization Experiment". *Council on Foreign Relations*. 22 Jan 2010. http://www.cfr.org/radicalization-and-extremism/saudi-deradicalization-experiment/p21292; Bryant, Christa Case. "For Saudi ex-jihadis: a stipend, a wife, and a new life". Christian Science Monitor. 25 May, 2012. http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2012/0525/For-Saudi-ex-jihadis-a-stipend-a-wife-and-a-new-life ; Knickmeyer, Ellen. "Saudi Center Aims for 'Life After Jihad'". *Wall Street Journal*. 24 April, 2013. http://blogs.wsj.com/middleeast/2013/04/24/saudi-rehab-center-aims-to-shape-life-after-jihad/

[51] Shepherd, Michelle. "Where Extremists Come to Play". *Toronto Star*. 9 August, 2009. http://www.thestar.com/news/world/2009/09/19/where_extremists_come_to_play.html ; Kaiser, Fawad. "Swat deradicalisation project — I". *Daily Times*. 20 January, 2014. http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/opinion/20-Jan-2014/swat-deradicalisation-project-i

[52] The research center devoted to promoting moderation and the revival of Islamic thought through scientific research was an initiative of Sheikha Mozah bint Nasser, Chairperson of Qatar Foundation and the wife of His Highness the Emir of Qatar, Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa al-Thani. See http://www.qfis.edu.qa/al-qaradawi-center.

[53] Though he has written prolifically on the subject of moderation, his most acclaimed work is El-Fadel, Khaled M. Abou. 2005. *The Great Theft: Wrestling Islam from the Extremists*. SanFrancisco: Harper.

[54] Husain, Ed. 2007. *The Islamist: Why I joined radical Islam in Britain, what I saw inside and why I left*. London: Penguin & Nawaz, Maajid. 2013. *Radical: My Journey from Islamist Extremism to a Democratic Awakening*. London: WH Allen are two of the more prominent former radical Islamists who are now engaged in anti-extremism efforts.

[55] El-Said, Hamed and Jane Harrigan. 2012. *Deradicalising Violent Extremists: Counter-Radicalisation and Deradicalisation Programmes and their Impact in Muslim Majority States*. London: Routledge.

[56] The United States and the United Kingdom as well as many other western governments have created programs within various government departments to deal with the issue of extremism. These include the U.S. departments of State and Homeland Security as well as the UK Home Office. A number of think tanks and civil society groups have emerged as well, including International Centre for the Study of Radicalization, Quilliam Foundation, Radical Middle Way, Khudi Pakistan. Pre-existing think tanks in recent years have launched counter-extremism initiatives such the Institute for Strategic Dialogue. In the private sector, Google, Inc. created an intellectual arm called Google Ideas, which is billed as a think/do tank and organized a Summit Against Violent Extremism (SAVE) in June 2011 in Dublin, which I had the opportunity to attend. The summit led to the establishment of an Against Violent Extremism (AVE) network composed of former militants, academics, activists, policy analysts, and government officials from across the world.

[57] One such event was the Rethinking Jihad conference organized by the Center for the Advanced Study of the Arab World at the University of Edinburgh in September 2009, which brought together, academics, analysts, journalists, Islamists, and political, military, and intelligence officials from several western countries.

[58] Gerges, Fawaz. 2005. The Far Enemy: Why Jihad Went Global. New York: Cambridge University Press offers the most comprehensive work on the distinctions between nationalist and transnational forms of jihadism.

[59] "The Mainstreaming of the Afghan Taliban". *Stratfor*. 20 December, 2012. http://www.stratfor.com/geopolitical-diary/mainstreaming-afghan-taliban

[60] "Afghan Taliban: A Case of Jihadist Moderation?" Stratfor. 19 June, 2013. http://www.stratfor.com/geopolitical-diary/afghan-taliban-case-jihadist-moderation

[61] "Geopolitical Diary: The Second Search for Moderate Taliban". *Stratfor*. 7 March, 2007. http://www.stratfor.com/geopolitical-diary/geopolitical-diary-second-search-moderate-taliban

[62] "The Afghan Taliban's Strategic Conciliatory Turn". *Stratfor*. 29 August, 2011. http://www.stratfor.com/geopolitical-diary/afghan-talibans-strategic-conciliatory-turn

[63] "The Egypt Coup's Implications for Mainstream Islamism". *Stratfor*. 5 July 2013. http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/egypt-coups-implications-mainstream-islamism

[64] "Egypt's Challenge to Contain the Muslim Brotherhood and Jihadist Militants". *Stratfor*. 24 July 2013. http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/egypts-challenge-contain-muslim-brotherhood-and-jihadist-militants.

[65] Kirkpatrick, David. "Top Challenger is an Islamist and a Moderate". *New York Times*. 24 March 2012. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/14/world/middleeast/top-challenger-in-egypt-vote-is-an-islamist-and-moderate.html?pagewanted=print

[66] "Are there Moderate Salafists & Jihadists?". *Stratfor*. 5 Dec 2013. http://www.stratfor.com/geopolitical-diary/are-there-moderate-salafists-and-jihadists

[67] Bokhari, Kamran. "Jihadist Opportunities in Syria". *Stratfor*. 14 Feb 2013. http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/jihadist-opportunities-syria

[68] "Jihadists Seek a New Base in Iraq and Syria". *Stratfor*. 28 May 2013. http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/jihadists-seek-new-base-syria-and-iraq

[69] Zelin, Aaron. "The Clairvoyant: The Guidelines: Measuring al-Zawahiri's Influence". *Jihadology*. 9 March 2014. http://jihadology.net/2014/03/09/the-clairvoyant-the-guidelines-measuring-zawahiris-influence/

[70] "Saudi Arabia Battling al-Qaeda for Regional Primacy". *Stratfor*. 6 Jan 2014. http://www.stratfor.com/geopolitical-diary/saudi-arabia-battling-al-qaeda-regional-primacy

[71] "Saudi Arabia Overhauls its Strategy for Syria". *Stratfor*. 26 Feb 2014. http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/saudi-arabia-overhauls-its-strategy-syria

[72] "Saudi Arabia Balances Between Liberals and Conservatives". *Stratfor*. 21 Apr 2014. http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/saudi-arabia-balances-liberals-and-conservatives

[73] Carey, Glen. "Saudis Fearing Syrian Blowback Expand Rehab for Jihadis". *Bloomberg*. 9 Dec 2013. http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-12-08/jihadis-offered-rehab-as-saudis-seek-to-avert-syria-war-blowback.html.

[74] "Iran: The Nature of the Resistance from Within". *Stratfor*. 21 April 2014. http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/iran-nature-resistance-within

[75] "Mr. President! We are concerned about the infiltration of seditionists in the Government of Moderation". *Keyhan*. 25 February, 2014.

[76] BBC Monitoring translation of Afghan Channel One (1TV) Kabul report in Dari aired at 1315 GMT on 2 March 2014.

[77] BBC Monitoring translation of Azeri language reports on: ANS TV, Baku, aired at 0800 GMT on 15 March 2014; Anspress.com posted 0716 GMT on 14 March 2014 & ANS TV, Baku, 1700 GMT 13 March 2014.

[78] Dickinson, Elizabeth. Bahrain's Disappearing Moderates. Al-Monitor. 22 April, 2014. http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2014/04/bahrain-violence-opposition-moderates-disappearing.html

[79] "Drone Strikes and the New Pakistani Government". *Stratfor*. 30 May 2013. http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/drone-strikes-and-new-pakistani-government

[80] "Pakistan: Neither the Government Nor the Taliban Want to Talk". *Stratfor*. 23 August, 2014. http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/pakistan-neither-government-nor-taliban-want-talk

[81] Pakistan: The Coming Conflict in North Waziristan. Stratfor. 6 February 2014. http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/pakistan-coming-conflict-north-waziristan

[82] Hassan, Hassan. "Al-Azhar and and Pan-Islamic Rationalism: The Demise of Islamic Centres of Moderation". *Qantara*. 19 February 2013. http://en.qantara.de/content/al-azhar-and-and-pan-islamic-rationalism-the-demise-of-islamic-centres-of-moderation

[83] Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row; LaPalombara, Joseph, and Myron Weiner, eds. 1966. *Political Parties and Political Development*. Princeton: Princeton University Press; Mainwaring, Scott, and Timothy Scully, eds. 2003. *Christian Democracy in Latin America: Electoral Competition and Regime Conflicts*. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

[84] Piven, Frances Fox, and Richard A. Cloward. 1977. *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*. New York: Vintage Books.

[85] Kalyvas, Stathis n. 1996. *The Rise of Christian Democracy in Europe*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

[86] Mill, John Stuart. 2009 [1859]. *On Liberty*. Eastford, CT: Martino Publishing; Habermas, Jurgen. 1989 [1963]. Cambridge: MIT Press.

[87] Michels, Robert. 1962 [1915]. *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy*. New York: Free Press.

[88] May, John D. "Democracy, Organization, Michels". *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 59, No. 2, (Jun., 1965), pp. 417-429.

[89] Op Cit, 83

[90] Sanchez-Cuenca Ignacio. 2004. "Party Moderation and Politicians' Ideological Rigidity". *Party Politics*. 10(3). pp.325–42.

[91] Przeworski, Adam, and John Sprague. 1986. *Paper Stones: A History of Electoral Socialism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[92] Ibid, pp.66-67.

[93] Bermeo, Nancy. 1997. "Myths of Moderation: Confrontation and Conflict During Democratic Transitions". *Comparative Politics*. 29(4): 305-322.

[94] Huntington, S. 1991. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

[95] Wickham, Carrie R. 2004. "The Path to Moderation: Strategy and Learning in the Formation of Egypt's Wasat Party." *Comparative Politics* 36, no. 2 (January): 205–28.

[96] El-Ghobashy, Mona. 2005."The Metamorphosis of the Egyptian Muslim Brothers." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 37, no. 3 (august): 373–95

[97] Clark, Janine Astrid. 2006. "The Conditions of Islamist Moderation: Unpacking Cross-Ideological Cooperation in Jordan." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 38, No. 4 (November): 539–60

[98] Browers, Michaelle L. 2009. *Political Ideology in the Arab World: Accommodation and Transformation*. New York: Cambridge University Press

[99] Wegner, Eva and Miquel Pellicer. 2009. "Islamist Moderation Without Democratization: The Coming of Age of the Moroccan Party of Justice and Development?" *Democratization*. Vol. 16, No. 1 February 2009, 157-75.

[100] Tezcur, Gunes M. 2010. *The Paradox of Moderation: Muslim Reformers in Iran and Turkey*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

[101] Dirk, Tomsa. "Moderating Islamism in Indonesia: Tracing Patterns of Party Change in the Prosperous Justice Party. *Political Research Quarterly*. 65(3): 486-98.

[102] Karakaya, Suveyda and A. Kadir Yildirim (2013) "Islamist Moderation in Perspective: Comparative Analysis of the Moderation of Islamist and Western Communist Parties". *Democratization*, 20:7, 1322-1349,

[103] Cavatorta, Francesco and Fabio Merone. 2013. "Moderation Through Exclusion? The Journey of the Tunisian Ennahda From Fundamentalist to Conservative Party". *Democratization.* Vol. 20, Issue 5: pp. 857-75

[104] Ashour, Omar. 2012. "Post-Jihadism and the Ideological Revisions of Armed Islamists" in *Contextualizing Jihadi Thought* eds. Deol, Jeeva and Zaheer Kazmi. London: Hurst & Company and op cit 41.

[105] Ashour. Omar. 2007. "Lions Tamed: An Inquiry into the Causes of De-Radicalization of Armed Islamist Movements: The Case of the Egyptian Islamic Group". *The Middle East Journal*. Autumn 61(4): 596-625.

[106] Op Cit 50, pp. 129-141.

[107] Op Cit, pp. 141-142.

[108] Bokhari, Kamran. "From Islamism to Post-Islamism". *Stratfor*. 18 April, 2005. http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/islamism-post-islamism

[109] Asef Bayat, "The Coming of a Post-Islamist Society," *Critique* (fall 1996): 43–52.

[110] Gilles Kepel, "Islamism Reconsidered," *Harvard International Review* 22, no. 2 (summer 2000): 22–27.

[111] Olivier Roy, "Le post-islamisme," *Revue des Mondes Musulmans et de la Méditerranée* (1998): 85–86, 11–30. Also see Olivier Roy, "The Transformation of the Arab World," *Journal of Democracy* 23, no. 3 (July 2012): 5–18.

[112] Henri Lauzire, "Post-Islamism and the Religious Discourse of Abd al-Salam Yasin," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 37, no. 2 (2005): 241–61.

[113] Amel Boubekeur, "Post-Islamist Culture: A New Form of Mobilization?" *History of Religions* 47, no. 1 (2007): 75–94.

[114] Mojtaba Mahdavi, "Post-Islamist Trends in Postrevolutionary Iran," *Comparative Studies of South Asia*, *Africa, and the Middle East* 31, no. 1 (2011): 94.

[115] Husnul Amin, *From Islamism to Post-Islamism: A Study of a New Intellectual Discourse on Islam and Modernity in Pakistan,* 2010.

[116] Bayat, "Post-Islamist Society," 44–46.

[117] Asef Bayat, *Making Islam Democratic: Social Movements and the Post-Islamist Turn* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007), 95.

[118] Schwedler, Jillian. "Democratization, Inclusion, and the Moderation of Islamist Parties." *Development.* 2007, 50(1), pp. 56-61.

[119] Schwedler, Jillian. 2006. *Faith in Moderation*. New York: Cambridge University Press. p.3

[120] Schwedler, Jillian. 2011. "Can Islamists Become Moderates?: Rethinking the Inclusion-Moderation Hypothesis". *World Politics*. Volume 63, Number 2, April 2011, pp. 347-376 is a recent attempt at looking at the various theories but it privileges the Inclusion-Moderation Hypothesis and sees the rest of the theories from its vantage point. In contrast, what I will being doing in this thesis is to stand at an equidistant point from all the theories and examine them in terms of what forms of moderation do they really address.

[121] Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics". *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 64, No. 4 (Dec., 1970), pp. 1033-1053.

[122] Yadav. Vikash. 2010. "The Myth of Moderate Taliban". *Asian Affairs: An American Review*. 37: 133-145.