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SORRY, BUT IT'S THE LAW: The Westernization of Islam

This undertaking inevitably bound itself up with the political structure, especially in the case of Christianity; and back of that lies the assumption, which found its expression in missionary undertakings, that this social principle, this recognition of the brotherhood of men, is the basis for a universal society (Mead 1956:257).

A reformation of Muslim religious practices is occurring in the immigrant host nations of the West. Yet, it is not the transplanted Muslims themselves who lie behind this "modernization" of Islam. Indeed, there is little evidence that diasporic Muslims are in favor of facilitating the incorporation of Islam into the secular culture that prevails in their newly adopted Western homelands. In fact, evidence to the contrary abounds, such as the participation of diasporic Muslims in an International Day of Protest on January 17, 2004, to demonstrate their solidarity with Muslims in France where a ban on religious adornment in French schools means Muslim females may not wear hijab to school.

Closer to home, the same type of resistance to the secularization of Islam is evident in a lawsuit brought against Whirlpool Corp. for violating the civil rights of Muslim employees at its Tennessee plant, where it is alleged Whirlpool managers "yanked scarves off women's heads and followed workers into restrooms to make sure they weren't praying" (Star-Ledger 2002). Here, again, there appears to be some solidarity among diasporic Muslims in that the lawsuit on behalf of the Tennessee Muslims was filed by a Washington D.C. Muslim civil rights group--The Council on American-Islamic Relations (Washwani 2002). Moreover, Muslims have garnered considerable support in Western academic and intellectual circles where there is strong sentiment that the assault on Muslim religious practices represents a threat to the tradition of religious freedom that has long been the hallmark of democratic governance (Furseth 2000, Beckford 2001, Leirvik 2001, Star-Ledger 2003).

Nonetheless, in the West, Islamic religious practices are being brought into line with the prevailing norms of these predominantly Christian host nations. Although, I focus on Islam in this paper, the argument extends to all of the non-Western, non-Christian religions that arrived on the Western secularist tundra during the ground swell of westward migration in the last quartile of the 20th Century. In managerial states like those in the West-- with a penchant for social-engineering-- there will invariably be a well-developed body of statutory law. Of course, laws reflect the shared norms, social customs and worldview of a particular society. Therefore, laws of predominantly Christian cultures differ significantly from the laws of Muslim, Hindu, or Buddhist cultures. Particularly sensitive, in terms of teasing out cultural differences, are laws dealing with matters of personal status as these laws determine the legality of marking
rites of passage with theologically dictated rituals or customs. As an example, in 2001 Sweden passed a law regulating circumcision of boys as a medical procedure and discontinuing a previous exemption that allowed the procedure to remain unregulated as a religious practice. Now the procedure must be performed by a doctor in all cases where a boy is two months or older. Even where a male child is under two months of age, the person performing the circumcision must receive a permit from the Department of Social Services in advance of performing the circumcision, and medication for reduction of pain must be administered.¹

In a similar vein, Sweden has animal protection laws prohibiting the slaughtering of animals in accordance with the theological dictates of Islam (and Judaism)—the theologically dictated method is considered cruelty to animals. Hence, Muslim butchers operating in Sweden are forced to modify their butchering technique by pre-stunning animals prior to slaughtering. The occurrence of these types of clashes between Swedish culture and Muslim religious practices is explained by Swedish sociologist Jonas Alwall in the following manner:

_A very obvious aspect of the Swedish lack of preparation is the unfamiliarity with people's way of being religious in everyday life. Among other things this has to do with the dominant Swedish view of religion. On one side, the starting point is a narrow concept of religion, where religion is seen as divorced from politics, economics, law, health, hygiene, diet, dress, ritual for greetings and sex life. On the other side, religion is above all seen as something spiritual, religion is faith, feeling and inner life—not rite, rules and prescriptions_ (Alwall 1998, 190).

**The Western World in Microcosm**

Nowhere is the proliferation of legislation aimed at social control more evident than in Sweden, a land where 1 in every 33 residents is a Muslim. Consequently, I have chosen Sweden as an ideal site for introducing a theoretical model that allows for an objective analysis of statutory law from the standpoint of its impact upon religious freedom. The Tripartite Theoretical Model (TTM) facilitates analyzing statutory law as a micro-level structure. Laws are effective on the societal level where social groups (dominant and minority) interact with each other and at the same time attempt, with differing degrees of success, to navigate the constructed social reality of their particular habitat. TTM has great probative value in terms of teasing out power relationships. By use of its lawmaking power, a state can enhance the moral autonomy of individuals domiciled within its domain or it can severely constrict the sphere within which individuals are free to behave in accordance with their own personal convictions.
TTM (Tripartite Theoretical Model)

Three types of legislation have a critical impact upon whether religious activities wind up (1) within the private domain beyond the jurisdiction of the state’s governing authority, (2) within the public domain and under governmental regulatory authority, or (3) in a gray area between the private and public domains. The three types of legislation are DML (de minimus legislation), RFL (religion-friendly legislation), and UNL (universal norm legislation). I will discuss these three categories of legislation in kind.

**DML (De Minimus Legislation)**

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

U.S. Constitution, First Amendment

> Each citizen shall have the right to [...] alone, or together with others, practice his religion.

Swedish Constitution (SFS 1974:152, Chap. 2, Sec. 1)

Legislation establishing religious life and personal morality as the private concern of the individual and thus outside of the scope of the state's governing authority is herein referred to as DML (de minimus legislation). DML is the minimum amalgamation of statutes, acts and case law required to (a) guarantee religious freedom to the individual, and (b) strip the state of authority to regulate religious life. DML allows the individual to adopt either a secular or a religious worldview in accordance with her own personal conscience. It does this by creating an enforceable right that the individual can exercise to hold the state at bay in matters that do not directly affect the community at large. Since DML protects individual rights, one does not have to belong to a group to seek redress in the judicial system of a democratic state for violation of rights secured by law - generally these rights consist of freedom of conscience, religion, speech, association, assembly, and the right to privacy.

Not all democratic governments have DML in place. To illustrate, in democratic states which have establishment religions (e.g., Great Britain, Norway, Ireland, Greece, etc.), the second prong of the two-prong DML standard is missing; namely, the state is not stripped of authority to regulate the religious lives of its inhabitants. Indeed, in states with establishment religions, the clergy of the establishment church are paid from the general tax revenues thereby forcing all taxpayers (religious and non-religious, members of the established church and non-members) to support the national religion. Moreover, there is generally mandatory religious instruction in the primary schools and even where the instruction is broadly Christian
rather than narrowly sectarian (e.g., Anglicanism, Lutheranism, Catholicism, Greek Orthodox, etc.), it undermines the right of parents to determine what, if any, religious training they wish their impressionable young children to have. Below, Chart I summarizes the benefits DML confers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit Conferred:</th>
<th>Right of self-determination with respect to how and whether to pursue a lifestyle that is religious, secular, or some hybrid of the two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Protected:</td>
<td>Individual Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with legal standing to enforce their right to moral autonomy:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believer in Traditional Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believer in Non-Traditional Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irreligious Individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiously Indifferent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHART I**

**RFL (Religion-Friendly Legislation)**

*Above all, in democratic societies like ours is it essential to teach the child this wholesome self-control. For, since in some measure the conventional restraints are no longer effective -- barriers which in societies differently organized rigorously restrict people's desires and ambitions -- there remains only moral discipline to provide the necessary regulatory influence (Durkheim 1961, 49).*

Legislation that serves to ensure a continual religious presence within a state is here referred to as RFL (religion-friendly legislation). Generally, RFL is enacted to create a "public good" or to advance the "public interest" as currently being defined by those in control of the government. RFL usually contains a statement setting forth the public purpose to be achieved by the legislation. Thus, unlike DML which sounds more of paraenesis than of law, RFL is directed legislation. With RFL, one does not find the broad-sweeping language of DML that lends itself to diverse interpretations. In fact, RFL is always
accompanied by detailed regulations that specify requirements for qualifying for the benefits of the legislation. Often RFL creates an agency to oversee compliance with the regulations and to ensure that the religious groups receiving benefits have not lost their eligibility by violating any of the regulatory guidelines. Table 1 below sets forth RFL currently in force in Sweden and the U.S.

**TABLE 1. RFL (Religion-Friendly Legislation) in Sweden and the U.S.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Swedish Legislation</th>
<th>U.S. Legislation and Case Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3) Subsidization of Theological Education (SFS 1999:974, Sec. 4)</td>
<td>3) Tax Deductibility of Gifts to Religious Groups on Donor Income- and Estate-Tax Returns, I.R.C. 501(c)(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the “Table 1 RFL,” religious groups in Sweden and the U.S. can qualify for free state services, public funds (subsidies, grants, and government contracts for which funds will be allocated from the tax revenue of the state), and tax incentives (tax credits, tax exemptions, or reduced tax rates). As is typical for RFL, only groups - not individuals - can qualify for the benefits. RFL is always aimed at the religious sector as a distinctive segment of the private sphere, a segment that is both non-commercial and ethically motivated.

The state is irresistibly drawn to the religious sector because the state sees the religious mission as one of moral uplift and thus as being compatible with the government function of social control. RFL is crafted using the religious practices of the predominant religio-cultural group in the state of enactment as the norm. Hence, RFL sanctions the prevalent societal notion of what constitutes religion and what qualifies as a religious practice by offering benefits to religious groups that conform to the norms embedded in the legislation. This means that non-traditional religious groups will have a difficult time qualifying for benefits under RFL (and for their rightful share of the tax revenues that are used to pay for these benefits) unless they are willing to "repackage" themselves so as to more closely resemble the predominant religio-cultural group. Hence, in the long run, RFL tends to standardize religious practices among the diverse religious groups that are receiving benefits under the legislation. This is ironic in the case of Sweden, which enacted all of
the legislation listed in its column of the Table 1 RFL in order to promote religious pluralism. Consequently, even when RFL is enacted for the purpose of advancing religious pluralism (e.g., by alleviating financial barriers to becoming an established religious group in the state), it will actually work against long-term religious diversity since the very rules establishing qualification for the benefits under RFL serve to standardize the religious practices of all religious groups in the state.

*Membership fees are completely alien to the concept of Islam; one is not a member of a mosque. All Muslims are one large denomination expanding the globe. Sweden is already religiously diverse because there are many religions here. But the initiative to help in collection of church dues shows that it is the perspective of the Church of Sweden that guides the laws.*

. . . Hüseyin Ayata, IKUS (Islamic Culture Center in Sweden)ii

Ayata’s point is well-taken. Sweden is experiencing the same "institutional isomorphism toward Congregationalism" that Sociologist Stephen Warner has noted in the U.S.iii That imported religions are discarding the particularities of their respective theological underpinnings in order to organize into congregational groups may be the result of voluntary assimilation into a Christian culture where the religious community does not encompass an entire denomination (i.e., religious tradition). However, isomorphism may be evidence of religious oppression; i.e., coerced congregationalism in order to qualify for government entitlements.

Of course, there is a cost to religious groups for partaking of the state largesse by way of RFL. Dealing with the government always involves compliance with a certain amount of administrative detail. For example, both Sweden and the U.S. require religious groups to become incorporated and to adopt by-laws in order to qualify for any of the benefits flowing from the Table 1 RFL. Being an incorporated entity necessitates complying with annual reporting requirements to keep the state apprised of the holding of the yearly meeting, the election of officers, and the continuing validity of information previously supplied as to the group's registered agent. Thus, at a minimum the incorporated religious group is required to maintain minutes of all annual meetings. A continuing reporting obligation generally constitutes an undesirable burden for groups that have been organized mainly for religious purposes and which rely on a staff of volunteers to carry out most of their operations.

Moreover, the need to become incorporated and to adopt by-laws injects a profane element--one that hails from the corporate business world of limited liability and protection of material assets--into sacred space. This detracts from the spiritual purpose of most religious
organizations. The requirement that incorporated bodies have an elected Board of Directors—a hierarchical structure within the religious community—is problematic for those faiths that take a normative stance against inequality among believers. For instance, according to Islamic theology, there is no need for a mediator between Allah and the believer. Therefore, Muslims do not have professional clergy, and even the concept of membership in a particular congregation—i.e., belonging to a particular mosque—is foreign to Islam. Chart II, below, summarizes RFL:

### UNL (Universal Norm Legislation)

The third type of legislation, UNL (universal norm legislation) is enacted to enforce what are deemed to be universally valid standards for human behavior. Therefore, it has strong public policy

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits Conferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Free State Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Public Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Tax Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Exemptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Tax Rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Entitled to Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated Religious Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parachurch Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectarian Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools for Clergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiously Affiliated Hospitals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*State sets standards and has complete discretion in determining whether or not a group qualifies to receive benefits under RFL!!*

---

**Chart II**
implications in that it is legislation aimed at moral uplift. Thus, even where the standards are not really universal—and the UNL has embedded Christian norms—UNL will be upheld and requests for exemptions from adhering to the standards (in order to engage in religio-cultural practices that are inconsistent with the standards) will be denied. Tension between UNL and DML arises most often when UNL has been enacted for protection of human rights, animal rights, and the natural environment. Local courts will invariably find justification for limits being placed on civil liberties where unabridged exercise of a civil right would violate UNL.

Sweden’s animal protection laws (mentioned above as prohibiting the slaughter of animals in accordance with the theological dictates of Islam and Judaism) are examples of UNL. The more managerial the state, the more likely it is that a well-developed body of statutory law is in existence, much of which will be UNL. UNL is enacted to keep public space free of behavior that cannot be rationally and logically justified. For example, a group of men engaging in ritual prayer in the middle of a busy international airport may scarcely attract notice in Cairo or Jerusalem; however, when this same behavior takes place at Newark Liberty International or Stockholm Arlanda airports, more than a few people will stare aghast. And, the worshippers are likely to be violating some fire or safety ordinance by disrupting the flow of traffic in a public place. Because pervasive statutory law implies an expansive role for the state in everyday life, it raises special problems for religious traditions that do not accept the notion that religion is separate from daily life; e.g., Hinduism, Islam, and Judaism:

In both Islam and Hinduism, the notion that religion is separate from life is unthinkable. In many states Islam describes itself as a way of life rather than as a faith; and Hinduism as a term of reference to a ‘faith’ is something of an external creation. The name was introduced by the Persians to describe all beliefs in India - across the River Indus. Hindus themselves see what they believe as being how they live. There is no sense of one set of beliefs for everyday life and another for religious life. Judaism is also particular, since it is both a way of life and an ethnic identity - not always linked to religious belief or practice.

Where adherents to these “not-easily secularized religions” constitute different believers in a society, they are often unable to rely upon the civil liberties protections of DML for redress when UNL prohibits them from following certain theological mandates of their faith. Indeed, the general response of the secular authorities will be that the practice in question has nothing to do with religion. (Gustafsson 2000, 109). For example, the UNL prohibition against polygamy found in all Western states cannot be circumvented on the grounds that polygamy is a religious practice, even if such is the case. In the U.S., Mormons attempted to defend polygamy as a religious practice back in the 19th Century, but the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that it is not a permissible religious practice in the U.S. In short, UNL is social
engineering and as such it tends to result in homogenization of religious practices in much the same way that RFL does. Invariably, what is allowed under UNL coincides closely with the religious practices of the dominant religion in society.

The Swedish Burial Law is an example of expansive UNL in that it contains provisions vesting the local public cemetery authorities with power to override individual decision-making with respect to grave design in order to “protect the environment, the safety of those visiting the cemeteries, and the work milieu of cemetery employees.” This, of course, leaves a good deal of leeway for the cemetery administrators to let personal preferences (in terms of religions or even aesthetics) influence decisions about the suitability of headstones or other grave markers—all under the guise of protecting the public safety.

The [Swedish] state continues to have a tight grip on burial. This is clearly evident in the Burial Law that became effective in 1990 that contains more detailed rules than the law from the 1950s, which it replaced. The twelve paragraphs in the 1686 Church Law have become 98 and additionally there are Burial Regulations consisting of fifty paragraphs. The new Burial Law emphasizes even more than the previous law that the cemeteries are a public charge, not a private affair; and it is interesting that during the surge in liberalism at the end of the 1980s--when the new Burial Law was being discussed--no one questioned the provisions which mean that operation of private cemeteries, other than by faith-based communities, is not allowed under any circumstances (Gustafsson 2000a, 44).

The Burial Law designates the recently privatized Church of Sweden (“The Church”) as Trustee for the burial industry and puts the public cemeteries under the authority of the 2,500 Lutheran parishes of The Church. Hence, immigrant religious groups must obtain the blessing of The Church to have a portion of the national burial tax - euphemistically referred to as a “Burial Fee” (Begravningsavgift) despite its universal, mandatory and perpetual nature - allocated to building cemeteries specifically geared to meeting their respective religious needs. There are virtually no private cemeteries in Sweden because the Burial Law bans commercial operation of cemeteries, and only permits nonprofit entities (religious groups and foundations) to establish private cemeteries under very limited circumstances. The nonprofit applicant must establish to the satisfaction of the government (a) that there is a special need for a private cemetery, and (b) that it has the financial wherewithal to maintain a private cemetery in accordance with the same "Good Burial Culture" (god gravkultur) standard that applies to public cemeteries. Even where a nonprofit entity can overcome these hurdles to establishing a private cemetery, the Burial Law authorizes the government to attach additional conditions to the construction permit received by the nonprofit entity.

Although a burgeoning immigrant population of non-Lutherans led to the historic end of a five-century old union of church and state at the turn of the millennium, the Church trusteeship of the burial industry demonstrates that a cohabitation of church and state continues even after the divorce. Along with
birth, coming of age, and marriage, death is a rite of passage that is typically observed by engaging in theologically dictated ceremonies or rituals. In Sweden, where nationwide 70% of all decedents are cremated and the National Burial Plan covers use of a grave site for a limited period of 25 years, the theologically driven burial practices of Islam are out of sync with the norm. According to the eschatology of Islam, at the end of time, the body shall rise from the grave and be judged. Therefore, Islam prohibits cremation and a 25-year limit on grave occupancy is clearly an unacceptable time constraint viewed from the standpoint of a practicing Muslim.

It is important to Muslims that there not be Christian symbolisms near a Muslim grave site. This is made evident by a news story that recently appeared in a Swedish newspaper. The story reports that a section of Furets Woodland Cemetery (Furets skogskyrkogården) in Mark—an area in Western Sweden not far from Gothenburg—is being used to build a new Muslim cemetery. According to the piece, a growing Muslim population in Mark justified subdividing off a portion of the Furets Woodland Cemetery for a Muslim graveyard. Moreover, the Muslims had complained about having to travel to a distant cemetery for Muslim burials. Apparently, the negotiations for the Muslim site had been long and drawn out since the story states that "the one thing that the Muslims insisted upon" for the new cemetery section was that there be no Christian symbols in eyesight when they turn toward Mecca.

Worth special note is what the Muslims were willing to give up in exchange for not having Christian symbolisms near Muslim graves. According to the news story, the Muslims’ non-negotiable demand is being complied with by locating the Muslim cemetery on the easternmost section of the Furets Woodland Cemetery up against a forest, but in exchange for this "accommodation" on the part of the cemetery authority, the Muslims had to agree to use caskets for the Muslim decedents that are buried in the new cemetery. In other words, the Muslims were required to forego just enshrouding corpses in accordance with Islamic burial ritual. This type of "rehabilitation" of those adhering to non-conforming burial practices (i.e., forcing them to bring their burial practices in line with those of the dominant Christian groups) occurs despite Sweden's existing DML. Both the above cited section of the Swedish Bill of Rights and the Religious Freedom Statute of 1951 guarantee religious liberty to all Swedish residents. However, UNL—in the form of the Burial Law—undermines DML, and the standardization of religious practices in Sweden moves forward.

There are now over 300,000 Muslims living in Sweden. Muslims begin arriving in Sweden in large numbers in the last quartile of the 20th Century. They came from Turkey, the former Yugoslavia,
Albania, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Egypt, West Africa, and East Africa. In his classic essay on human relations, "The Stranger," Georg Simmel speaks of the outsider who "comes today and stays tomorrow." This is, indeed, an apt description of the Muslim immigrants in Sweden; and since they will not return to from whence they came, they must eventually be buried on Swedish soil. Surely, it is with the Muslim burial ritual that the need to confront "inner enemies" will surface in Sweden:

The stranger, like the poor and like sundry 'inner enemies,' is an element of the group itself. His position as a full-fledged member involves both being outside it and confronting it (Simmel 1950, 402).

Chart IV, below, summarizes the foregoing discussion of UNL.

---

**UNL (Universal Norm Legislation)**

**Nature of Legislation**
- General Laws
- Municipal Ordinances
- Agency and Departmental Regulations
- Administrative Laws
- Procedural Manuals and Guidelines

**Purpose of**
- Social Control
- Public Interest
- Public Welfare

**Enacted By**
- Local Municipalities
- Education Departments
- Governmental Departments and Bureaus
- Public Health and Welfare Agencies

---

Chart IV
CONCLUSION

It will be useful at this point to summarize TTM. In Western democracies, DML is the sole protector of religious liberty and moral autonomy—the only barrier to homogenization of religious practices in a given society. The protective canopy of DML shrinks in proportion to the growth of RFL and UNL. RFL is enacted to accomplish important public policy goals by enlisting the aid of the religious sector. Thus, enactment of RFL is an irresistible temptation for the managerial nations of the West. Of course, UNL is an unavoidable fact of life in modern industrial societies; there are instances where community rights must take preeminence over individual rights. Hence, the only issues are whether UNL is overly abundant and whether existing UNL is embedded with religious bias. This generally becomes evident when after careful analysis of a statute or ordinance, the only identifiable basis for its enactment is its correspondence to the religious practices of the dominant group (e.g., Sunday Closing laws). One final point, the effectiveness of TTM depends upon the willingness of the sociologist to engage in fieldwork; i.e., \textit{in situ} investigation is necessary to determine whether heavy-handed use of RFL and UNL embedded with the norms of a predominant religious group are undermining existing DML (Burawoy et al. 1991).

**********
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