

The Use of Race and Racialisation for Critical Counter-Radicalisation Studies: A Conceptual Contribution

Student name: A.L. (Sanne) Groothuis

Student number: s4616596

Study: Research Master Philosophy

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Evert van der Zweerde

Date: 30 July 2018

Thesis for obtaining a “Master of arts” degree in philosophy

Radboud University Nijmegen

I hereby declare and assure that I, A.L. (Sanne) Groothuis, have drafted this thesis independently, that no other sources and/or means other than those mentioned have been used and that the passages of which the text content or meaning originates in other works – including electronic media – have been identified and the sources clearly stated.

Place: Amsterdam

Date: 30 July 2018

Abstract

Scholars increasingly criticise counter-radicalisation policies for discriminating Muslims. Despite literature demonstrating the relation between racism and discrimination of Muslims in other discourses, critical counter-radicalisation theories overlook the role of race and racialisation. As is illustrated by studies criticizing the British counter-radicalisation policy PREVENT, these theories are consequently unable to explain at least two issues: the relation between the logic of PREVENT, which focuses on Muslims, and the people predominantly targeted by it, South-Asians and Blacks, and how vulnerability and risk are turned into a natural aspect of being Muslim. The concepts of race and racialisation will bring conceptual clarity and allow critical counter-radicalisation scholars to analyse these and other issues while simultaneously maintaining an overview of how they are related.

Keywords: race, racialisation, counter-radicalisation, PREVENT, religion, Muslims, Islamophobia

Introduction

Counter-radicalisation has become a standard part of the counter-terrorism policies of Western European governments.¹ Although there is no consensus on the exact definition of ‘radicalisation,’ it is generally considered to signify ‘what goes on before the bomb goes off.’² Through counter-radicalisation policies and practices, governments aim at preventing people from becoming terrorists. However, scholars increasingly criticise these attempts, not only for lack of clear definitions,³ but also for being discriminatory in their focus on a specific religious group, namely Muslim populations.⁴ Considering the prevalence of counter-radicalisation discourse in media as well as its influence on everyday life,⁵ such critical research constitutes a highly

¹ Christopher Baker-Beall, Charlotte Heath-Kelly and Lee Jarvis (eds), *Counter-Radicalisation: Critical Perspectives* (London: Routledge 2015); Alex P. Schmid, ‘Radicalisation, De-Radicalisation, Counter-Radicalisation: A Conceptual Discussion and Literature Review’, *ICCT - The Hague Research Paper*, March, 2013, i - 97.

² Peter Neumann, ‘Perspectives on Radicalisation and Political Violence’, paper presented at the conference ‘International Conference on Radicalisation and Political Violence’, International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation and Political Violence, London, 17–18 January 2008, (4).

³ Schmid, ‘Radicalisation, De-Radicalisation, Counter-Radicalisation’; Arun Kundnani, ‘Radicalisation: the journey of a concept’, in Christopher Baker-Beall, Charlotte Heath-Kelly and Lee Jarvis (eds), *Counter-Radicalisation: Critical Perspectives* (London: Routledge 2015), 14-35.

⁴ Arun Kundnani, *The Muslims are Coming! Islamophobia, Extremism, and the Domestic War on Terror* (London: Verso 2014); Baker-Beall, Heath-Kelly and Jarvis (eds), *Counter-Radicalisation*; Basia Spalek, ‘Community policing, trust, and Muslim communities in relation to “new terrorism”’, *Politics & Policy*, vol 38, no. 4, 2010, 789–815.

⁵ Kundnani, *The Muslims are Coming!*; Junaid Rana, ‘The racial infrastructure of the terror-industrial complex’, *Social Text*, vol. 34, no. 4, 2016, 111-138; Yasmin Hussain and Paul Bagguley, ‘Securitized citizens: Islamophobia, racism and the 7/7 London bombings’, *The Sociological Review*, vol. 60, 2012, 715-734.

important development that allows rectification of problematic assumptions, logics, and consequences of invasive policies and practices.

Nevertheless, most critical counter-radicalisation studies, especially those focusing on Western European states, do not address certain gaps in their analyses, because they lack a theoretical framework that includes the right concepts. To repair this situation, I argue in this article that the concepts of race and racialisation should become part of the theoretical framework of critical counter-radicalisation research. The use of race and racialisation will allow scholars to both disentangle the different ways in which Muslims are constructed as the subjects of counter-radicalisation policies and produce a clear overview of how these ways are connected. I argue that the current conceptual framework does allow for an analysis of the construction of ‘the Muslim community,’ but not for how this construction is naturalised onto individual Muslims. Concepts are not neutral: they have their own effects on discourses, thoughts, and policies. One only has to think of the effect that labelling an action as ‘terrorist’ instead of ‘violent’ has on political discourse, public opinion, and media discussions.⁶ Hence, it is important to use the right concepts – ones that have analytical and explanatory power⁷ – in order to ask the right questions. In this article, I argue that critical counter-radicalisation researchers need the concepts of race and racialisation to

⁶ Brian M. Jenkins, *The Study of Terrorism: Definitional Problems* (Santa Monica: RAND 1980); Alexander Spencer, ‘Questioning the concept of “new terrorism”’, *Peace Conflict & Development*, vol. 8, 2006, 1-33.

⁷ Sophie Lauwers, ‘Is Islamophobia (always) racism? A conceptual investigation’, *Critical Philosophy of Race*, forthcoming.

analyse the intertwining of religion and race within counter-radicalisation policies and practices. This article therefore provides conceptual tools that will allow these scholars to conduct comprehensive analyses of the different ways in which the targets of counter-radicalisation policies and practices are constructed.

As the conceptual relations between race and religion are frequently questioned by politicians and scholar alike,⁸ the first section of this article explains why I assume this intertwining is plausible. It also provides the definitions of the concepts race and racialisation that I argue should be used by critical counter-radicalisation scholars. The second section goes into the critiques of PREVENT, the British governmental counter-radicalisation policy. Critical research into counter-radicalisation policies is a relatively new academic endeavour, with most of the studies focusing on the US or Britain.⁹ As there are some critical counter-radicalisation studies researching the US policies that consider the role of race and racialisation,¹⁰ this article focuses on British studies, while taking into account the literature on the US. The

⁸ Nasar Meer and Tariq Modood, 'Refutations of racism in the "Muslim question"', *Patterns of Prejudice*, vol. 43, no. 3-4, 2013, 335-354; Nasar Meer, 'The politics of voluntary and involuntary identities: are Muslims in Britain an ethnic, racial or religious minority?', *Patterns of Prejudice*, vol. 42, no. 1, 2008, 61-81; Matti Bunzl, *Anti-Semitism and Islamophobia: Hatred Old and New in Europe* (Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press 2007); Robert Miles and Malcolm Brown, *Racism* (London: Routledge 2003), 3-4.

⁹ Baker-Beall, Heath-Kelly and Jarvis (eds), *Counter-Radicalisation*; Kundnani, *The Muslims are Coming!*; Nadia Fasil, Francesco Ragazzi, and Martin de Koning (eds), *Radicalisation in Belgium and the Netherlands: Narratives of Violence and Security* (London: I.B. Tauris forthcoming).

¹⁰ Rana, 'The racial infrastructure of the terror-industrial complex'; Kundnani, *The Muslims are Coming!*.

different context of each country means that the way in which the concepts of race and racialisation can aid in the analyses also differs. As such, I believe that it is helpful to preliminarily delineate possible paths for critical counter-radicalisation studies focusing on European countries, taking analyses of PREVENT as an example of such research. This context limitation is in line with most literature on the role of race and racialisation in governmental and societal discourse.¹¹ Section three begins with a brief overview of the current most dominant theoretical frameworks in British critical counter-radicalisation research. It argues these theories fall short on at least two accounts: the link between the logic of PREVENT, which focuses on Muslims, and who it predominantly targets, namely South-Asians and Blacks, and how vulnerability and risk are turned into a natural aspect of being Muslim. Although it is beyond the scope of this article to conduct a critical analysis of PREVENT using the concepts of race and racialisation, I will briefly touch upon possible paths for such research.

1. Race, religion, racialisation

I assume that race and religion are in certain contexts – among others that of contemporary European counter-radicalisation policies – interrelated. The interrelation

¹¹ David Theo Goldberg, 'Racial Europeanization', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2006, 331-364; Anya Topolski, 'The race-religion constellation: a European contribution to the critical philosophy of race', *Critical Philosophy of Race*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2018, 58-81; Raymond Taras, "'Islamophobia never stands still': Race, religion, and culture", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 36, no. 3, 2013, 417-433.

of race and religion is argued for by several scholars.¹² For example, Topolski demonstrates how current conceptions of race are built upon religious categories of the 16th and 17th century.¹³ Whereas Topolski focuses on the European context, Maldonado-Torres illustrates how a similar intertwining between religion and race can be found in the Americas by tracing the development of colonialism.¹⁴ Moreover, several authors claim that contemporary forms of Islamophobia include or are forms of racism.¹⁵ According to Taras¹⁶ and Goldberg,¹⁷ contemporary European Islamophobia is a combination of anti-immigration, anti-minority, and anti-terrorism narratives, coupled with the idea that those adhering to Islam could never accept a secular constitution. These narratives naturalise certain characteristics thought to belong to Muslims, such as being aggressive, hostile, and emotional.¹⁸ Similarly, Lauwers explains that anti-Muslim racism, part of Islamophobia, generally produces a stereotype of ‘the Muslim’ on the basis of three main characteristics: danger,

¹² Topolski, ‘The race-religion constellation’; Nelson Maldonado-Torres, ‘Race, religion, and ethics in the modern/colonial world’, *Journal of Religious Ethics*, vol. 42, no. 4, 2014, 691-711; Meer and Modood, ‘Refutations of racism in the “Muslim question”’; Taras, “Islamophobia never stands still”.

¹³ Topolski, ‘The race-religion constellation’.

¹⁴ Maldonado-Torres, ‘Race, religion, and ethics in the modern/colonial world’.

¹⁵ Lauwers, ‘Is Islamophobia (always) racism?’; Meer and Modood, ‘Refutations of racism in the “Muslim question”’; Nasar Meer, ‘Racialization and religion: Race, culture and difference in the study of Antisemitism and Islamophobia’, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 36, no. 3, 2013, 385-398; Taras, “Islamophobia never stands still”.

¹⁶ Taras, “Islamophobia never stands still”.

¹⁷ Goldberg, ‘Racial Europeanization’.

¹⁸ Goldberg, ‘Racial Europeanization’.

backwardness, and foreignness.¹⁹ As Allen shows, this stereotype entails a particular and seemingly contradictory relation between race and religion, as these characteristics are considered a natural part of Muslims while simultaneously seen as arising from Islamic teachings.²⁰ Nevertheless, it is a common view in which Muslims are viewed as a singular people with certain inherent character traits that make them into Europe's Other.²¹

As such, I define race as a concept that encompasses more than merely a biological construct. Races are socially constructed categories that convey ideas about human capacity and the 'possibility/impossibility and the desirability/undesirability of contact between some individuals or groups and others.'²² The construction of a race naturalises ideas about certain characteristics, making them into inherent, unchangeable traits of a certain constructed category of persons. This category is considered to refer to a potentially reproductive community-like group, like a culture or an ethnicity (in contrast to, for example, carpenters or men).²³ Races delineate who does and does not belong, and what can and cannot be said about belonging.²⁴ They

¹⁹ Lauwers, 'Is Islamophobia (always) racism?'

²⁰ Christopher Allen, *Islamophobia* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing 2010); see also Lauwers, 'Is Islamophobia (always) racism?'

²¹ Milly Williamson and Gholam Khiabany, 'UK: the veil and the politics of racism', *Race and Class*, vol. 52, no. 2, 2010, 85-96; Arun Kundnani, *The End of Tolerance: Racism in 21st Century Britain* (London: Pluto Press 2007); Lauwers, 'Is Islamophobia (always) racism?'; Ambalavener Sivanandan, 'Racism 1992', *Race & Class*, vol. 30, no. 3, 1989, 85-90.

²² Maldonado-Torres, 'Race, religion, and ethics in the modern/colonial world', 691; see also Topolski, 'The race-religion constellation', 59-60.

²³ Lauwers, 'Is Islamophobia (always) racism?'

²⁴ Goldberg, 'Racial Europeanization'.

reduce groups and/or persons to the characteristics relevant to the construction. In contrast to Goldberg, I approach race as a concept that first and foremost represents how people thought to belong to a race are viewed, rather than their way of 'being in the world.'²⁵ A race is thus a category that exists within the mind of those constructing it. I define racialisation as the process of [1] placing attributes thought to belong to these socially constructed categories in a naturalised framing and [2] using the categories as tools of hierarchy and exclusion. The institutionalisation of related exclusionary and power-dividing practices is racism, which can take many forms (and thus is more aptly referred to as racisms). Examples are biological/ethnic racism, cultural racism, and religious racism.²⁶ Biological racism entails exclusionary and power-dividing practices on the basis of a belief in the existence of discrete biological groups that behave in a different way due to their biological constitution.²⁷ In contrast to biological racism, cultural racism does not argue that certain people are *innately* superior, but rather that there exists a difference in cultural superiority due to historical developments, leading to the view that the only way for the inferior group(s) to

²⁵ Goldberg, 'Racial Europeanization', 334.

²⁶ Topolski, 'The race-religion constellation'; Taras, "Islamophobia never stands still"; J.M. Blaut, 'The theory of cultural racism', *Antipode*, vol. 24, no. 4, 1992, 289-299; Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein, *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous identities* (London: Verso 2010).

²⁷ Samuel Pehrson, Rupert Brown, and Hanna Zagefka, 'When does national identification lead to the rejection of immigrants? Cross-sectional and longitudinal evidence for the role of essentialist in-group definitions', *British Journal of Social Psychology*, vol. 48, no. 1, 2011, 61-76.

overcome backwardness is to follow the superior group's guidance.²⁸ Cultural racism thus naturalises 'backwardness' not on the basis of one's potential for achievement, but on the assumed attained level of achievement, which is often connected to a certain mentality thought to belong to a specific culture.²⁹ Religious racism assumes that certain religions are threatening signs of difference and otherness, links these religions to certain negative characteristics, and naturalises characteristics thought to belong to the people following that religion.³⁰ A form of religious racism is the stereotype that all Muslims are inherently violent, because Islam is thought to promote violent fundamentalism.³¹ Although each type of racism naturalises different types of characteristics or groups, all entail naturalisation, the reduction of people to a naturalised construction, and exclusion. Moreover, different forms of racism often intersect, for example in the racist imagination existing within British discourse that all Christians are European and white, while all Muslims are coloured and from Arab, South-Asian, or African origin.³²

Before demonstrating how these definitions of race and racialisation can advance critical counter-radicalisation research, it is necessary to briefly describe this field's main findings, focusing on studies of PREVENT. Summarising these findings

²⁸ Blaut, 'The theory of cultural racism'.

²⁹ Blaut, 'The theory of cultural racism'.

³⁰ Williamson and Khiabany, 'UK: The veil and the politics of racism'.

³¹ Allen, *Islamophobia*.

³² Leon Moosavi, 'The racialization of Muslim converts in Britain and their experiences of Islamophobia', *Critical Sociology*, vol. 41, no. 1, 2015, 41-56.

will help to demonstrate where current analyses overlook the role of race and racialisation. By relating these results to the theories used in the third section of this article, it will become clear how the concepts of race and racialisation can aid to repair this situation.

2. Critical counter-radicalisation research

In 2004, counter-radicalisation became a dominant strand in governmental counter-terrorism policies.³³ Counter-radicalisation aims at signalling individuals who may be at risk of becoming attracted to propagating or committing terrorism in order to deter them from following such goals. PREVENT, the British governmental counter-radicalisation policy, specifically aims at responding to the ideas legitimising terrorism and those who promote them, at preventing ‘people from being drawn into terrorism’ and guarantee that these people are provided with advice and support, and at working with organisations and sectors ‘where there are risks of radicalisation’ that the government ‘needs to address.’³⁴ However, like other Western European counter-radicalisation policies, PREVENT is severely criticised for its assumptions, logic, and consequences.³⁵

³³ Baker-Beall, Heath-Kelly and Jarvis (eds), *Counter-Radicalisation*; Kundnani, *The Muslims are Coming!*.

³⁴ HM Government, *Prevent Strategy* (Online: The Stationary Office 2011), 7.

³⁵ Baker-Beall, Heath-Kelly and Jarvis (eds), *Counter-Radicalisation*; Charlotte Heath-Kelly, ‘Reinventing prevention or exposing the gap? False positives in UK terrorism governance and the quest for pre-emption’, *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2012, 69-87; Charlotte Heath-Kelly, ‘Counter-terrorism and the counterfactual: producing “radicalisation”

According to Kundnani, the discourse of counter-radicalisation was, from its conception onwards, guided in its assumptions by the demands of policymakers in the context of 9/11, the murder of the Dutch filmmaker Theo van Gogh in Amsterdam, and the 7/7 attacks in London.³⁶ These demands can be summarised as the demand to have knowledge on how governments can prevent terrorism before a criminal offence has taken place. This led to the following built-in assumptions within the concept of radicalisation itself: that (aspiring) terrorists come from a larger group of people who sympathise with extremist versions of Islamic religion, that one can predict who will enter this group by monitoring psychological or religious factors, and that knowing about these components will help governments construct policies that reduce the risk of terrorist acts on their soil.³⁷ Risk knowledge is thus a major part of counter-radicalisation policies, discourse, and research, as conceptions of risk make terrorism knowable and governable.³⁸ Counter-radicalisation concerns itself with the effort to govern pre-emptively, to govern the future.³⁹ Research on radicalisation aims at

discourse and the UK Prevent strategy', *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, vol. 15, 2013, 394-415; Jonathan Githens-Mazer and Robert Lambert, 'Why conventional wisdom on radicalization fails: The persistence of a failed discourse', *International Affairs*, vol. 86, no. 4, 2010, 889-901.

³⁶ Kundnani, 'Radicalisation', 16.

³⁷ Kundnani, 'Radicalisation', 15.

³⁸ Heath-Kelly, 'Reinventing prevention or exposing the gap?'; Heath-Kelly, 'Counter-terrorism and the counterfactual'; Stefano Bonino, 'The British state "security syndrome" and Muslim diversity: challenges for liberal democracy in the age of terror', *Contemporary Islam*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2016, 223-247.

³⁹ Heath-Kelly, 'Reinventing prevention or exposing the gap?'; Heath-Kelly, 'Counter-terrorism and the counterfactual'.

providing information to support that effort. Radicalisation studies can generally be divided into two approaches that overlap but focus on a different aspect. One approach mainly focuses on the supposed role of religion, aiming to find a set of religious beliefs shared by terrorists and rejected by ‘moderate’ Muslims. The other approach focuses on psychological factors, especially processes that cause some individuals to escalate from mental states of alienation or resentment to radicalisation, which is then linked to the process of supporting extremist interpretations of Islam. As such, Kundnani argues that radicalisation studies generally investigate a much narrower question than the question how terrorism comes into being, namely: ‘Why do some individual Muslims support an extremist interpretation of Islam that leads to violence?’⁴⁰ In contrast to the preventive counter-terrorism approaches of the previous century, like those against the Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA), the driver of radicalisation is thought to be a certain religious belief in combination with a certain mental state, rather than an organisation.⁴¹

Counter-radicalisation policies thus assume that a mental state of alienation or resentment, when coupled with a belief in a certain interpretation of religion, may lead to terrorist risk.⁴² As such, PREVENT ‘has developed a set of knowledges that

⁴⁰ Kundnani, ‘Radicalisation’, 16.

⁴¹ Heath-Kelly, ‘Reinventing prevention or exposing the gap?’.

⁴² Francesco Ragazzi, ‘Policed multiculturalism? The impact of counter-terrorism and counter-radicalization and the “end” of multiculturalism’, in Christopher Baker-Beall, Charlotte Heath-Kelly and Lee Jarvis (eds), *Counter-radicalisation: Critical perspectives* (London: Routledge 2015), 156-174; Heath-Kelly, ‘Reinventing prevention or exposing the gap?’; Heath-Kelly, ‘Counter-terrorism and the counterfactual’; Kundnani, ‘Radicalisation’.

articulate, classify and connect particular subjectivities with the possibilities of future violence.⁴³ According to Martin, PREVENT ties these projected subjectivities, the feeling of not belonging or being accepted, to a ‘dis-identification from the normalcy of British society.’⁴⁴ Within counter-radicalisation, this (supposed) dis-identification is constructed as a risk factor. Those who do not identify with the ‘standard’ of British norms and values are assumed to be vulnerable to radicalisation.⁴⁵ As Heath-Kelly explains, PREVENT divides its targets group into two: individuals who are at risk and those who are risky.⁴⁶ The ones at risk are presumed to be vulnerable to the ideas and attraction of radicalised, i.e. risky, individuals.⁴⁷ Hence, PREVENT simultaneously presents ‘vulnerability indicators’ for radicalisation as threats to the wider collective.⁴⁸ And because dis-identification from the normalcy of British society is assumed to make someone vulnerable and by extension a potential future risk, ‘British’ norms and values are constructed in and of themselves as preventing someone from

⁴³ Thomas Martin, ‘Challenging the separation of counter-terrorism and community cohesion in Prevent: the potential threat of the “radicalised” subject’, in Christopher Baker-Beall, Charlotte Heath-Kelly and Lee Jarvis (eds), *Counter-radicalisation: Critical perspectives* (London: Routledge 2015), 190-205 (190).

⁴⁴ Martin, ‘Challenging the separation of counter-terrorism and community cohesion in Prevent’, 194.

⁴⁵ Heath-Kelly, ‘Counter-terrorism and the counterfactual’.

⁴⁶ Heath-Kelly, ‘Reinventing prevention or exposing the gap?’; Heath-Kelly, ‘Counter-terrorism and the counterfactual’.

⁴⁷ Vicki Coppock and Mark McGovern, “‘Dangerous minds’? Deconstructing counter-terrorism discourse, radicalisation and the “psychological vulnerability” of Muslim children and young people in Britain’, *Children & Society*, vol. 28, 2014, 242-256.

⁴⁸ Heath-Kelly, ‘Counter-terrorism and the counterfactual’, 394.

becoming attracted to terrorism.⁴⁹ In a logic of infections and immunity, dis-identification with ‘Britishness’ is constructed as contagious and ‘British’ values as the vaccine. As Martin argues, PREVENT shows ‘how the demands of unthreatening similitude is itself constitutive of the outside, mapped onto and through the bodies of those now deemed potentially threatening.’⁵⁰ Similarly, Heath-Kelly claims that a gap exists between a terrorist event and its pre-emption, which is concealed by the use of force upon innocent people, who are temporarily considered guilty due to signs of ‘suspectness.’⁵¹ These signs are constructed by depicting racial characteristics and behaviours as immediately dangerous.⁵² That which is not ‘British’ or similar to ‘Britishness’ is considered a potential risk and thus worthy of investigation and governance. And within the larger discourse in which counter-radicalisation operates, those who are presumed to be most likely to inherently dis-identify with ‘Britishness’ are Muslims.⁵³ This is exemplified in the allocation of PREVENT resources: arguing that funds should be focused on the areas of highest priority, the resources were

⁴⁹ Martin, ‘Challenging the separation of counter-terrorism and community cohesion in Prevent’.

⁵⁰ Martin, ‘Challenging the separation of counter-terrorism and community cohesion in Prevent’, 192.

⁵¹ Heath-Kelly, ‘Reinventing prevention or exposing the gap?’, 69, 80.

⁵² Heath-Kelly, ‘Reinventing prevention or exposing the gap?’.

⁵³ Baker-Beall, Heath-Kelly and Jarvis (eds), *Counter-Radicalisation*; Kundnani, *The Muslims are Coming!*; Githens-Mazer and Lambert, ‘Why conventional wisdom on radicalization fails’; Rana, ‘The racial infrastructure of the terror-industrial complex’; Martin, ‘Challenging the separation of counter-terrorism and community cohesion in Prevent’; Bunzl, *Anti-Semitism and Islamophobia*; Taras, “‘Islamophobia never stands still’”.

allocated to ‘local authorities with sizeable Muslim communities,’ without explanation of why those constitute the highest priority.⁵⁴

According to Ali, ‘identifying and in so doing constituting the “Muslim community” as the site of radicalisation in need of governmental reform’ is, despite not being acknowledged as such, one of the most important functions of PREVENT.⁵⁵ This process starts with the acceptance of ‘the Muslims community’ as an unproblematic identity label in counter-radicalisation discourse and policies. As Ali shows, British radicalisation literature, upon which PREVENT is based, links ‘the Muslims community’ to a breakdown of the ethnicity and socio-economic makeup of Muslims in Britain.⁵⁶ The identity and experience of British Muslims, which is presumed to differ from ‘British’ identity, is thus sought through generic statistical information. Through this practice, the government fixes ‘the British Muslim identity,’ without questioning if that is possible and desirable, and it ultimately decides what constitutes the Muslim community.⁵⁷ As such, it is complicit in the production of the idea of the

⁵⁴ UK Department for Communities and Local Government as cited in Heath-Kelly, ‘Counter-terrorism and the counterfactual’, 403.

⁵⁵ Nadya Ali, ‘Mapping the Muslim community: the politics of counter-radicalisation in Britain’, in Christopher Baker-Beall, Charlotte Heath-Kelly and Lee Jarvis (eds), *Counter-Radicalisation: Critical Perspectives* (London: Routledge 2015), 139-155 (140).

⁵⁶ Ali, ‘Mapping the Muslim community’, 141-142.

⁵⁷ Ali, ‘Mapping the Muslim community’, 150.

Muslim community, without recognizing this role.⁵⁸ The statistical information used to ‘identify’ the community is supplemented by information from surveillance practices.⁵⁹

Surveillance takes place through both ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ approaches.⁶⁰ The hard approach uses full coercive state powers to obtain information and monitor communities. For example, in 2000 the UK legalised ‘stop-and-search powers,’ giving the police the authority to stop and search people within specified, but large geographic areas without the need for reasonable suspicion linked to a specific person.⁶¹ The people subject to these powers are more than three times likely to be Blacks and Asians than Whites.⁶² The soft approach often uses indirect surveillance methods. The government establishes collaboration with certain Muslim religious leaders, coaches, teachers, and community leaders, who provide information regarding their population and individuals who portray signals (as defined by the government) of being at risk or risky with regard to radicalisation.⁶³ The demographic investigation, monitoring, surveillance, and cooperation with people inside the target ‘community,’ coupled with

⁵⁸ Ali, ‘Mapping the Muslim community’, 150.

⁵⁹ Kundnani, *The Muslims are Coming!*; Rana, ‘The racial infrastructure of the terror-industrial complex’.

⁶⁰ Ragazzi, ‘Policed multiculturalism?’.

⁶¹ Ragazzi, ‘Policed multiculturalism?’, 159.

⁶² Ragazzi, ‘Policed multiculturalism?’, 159; Benjamin P. Ward, *Without Suspicion: Stop and Search under the Terrorism Act 2000* (New York: Human Rights Watch 2010); Christina Pantazis and Simon Pemberton, ‘From the “old” to the “new” suspect community: examining the impacts of recent UK counter-terrorist legislation’, *British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 49, no. 5, 2009, 646–666 (655).

⁶³ Ragazzi, ‘Policed multiculturalism?’; Kundnani, *The Muslims are Coming!*; Baker-Beall, Heath-Kelly and Jarvis (eds), *Counter-Radicalisation*.

the assumptions regarding the psychological and religious factors presumed to lead to radicalisation together construct a certain fixed idea of ‘the Muslim community,’ its identity, characteristics, and experience.⁶⁴ However, there exists no one identity, set of characteristics, or experience of Muslim people in Britain, as there is a variety of Muslim communities and Muslim individuals.⁶⁵ Fixating ‘the Muslim identity’ legitimises treating all Muslims in the same manner despite their differences, thereby doing injustice to the reality of their diversity.

Moreover, this fixed idea of ‘the Muslim community’ defines what an acceptable versus unacceptable form and conduct of that community and its population is.⁶⁶ As several scholars demonstrate, this is both evident in the language of PREVENT, which distinguishes ‘extremist’ versus ‘moderate’ interpretations of Islamic theology, and in the organisations and individuals it chooses to cooperate with in its governance of ‘the Muslim community.’⁶⁷ The idea of this approach is to ‘disrupt the “circle of tacit support” that terrorist may find in the community, while empowering communities and involving them in the management of what is presented as “their problem”.’⁶⁸ As terrorists are presumed to come from a larger pool of people sympathizing with

⁶⁴ Ali, ‘Mapping the Muslim community’.

⁶⁵ Ragazzi, ‘Policed multiculturalism?’; Goldberg, ‘Racial Europeanization’; Ali Rattansi, *Racism: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2007), 109.

⁶⁶ Kundnani, *The Muslims are Coming!*; Baker-Beall, Heath-Kelly and Jarvis (eds), *Counter-Radicalisation*; Heath-Kelly, ‘Counter-terrorism and the counterfactual’.

⁶⁷ Kundnani, ‘Radicalisation’; Martin, ‘Challenging the separation of counter-terrorism and community cohesion in Prevent’; Ali, ‘Mapping the Muslim community’; Githens-Mazer and Lambert, ‘Why conventional wisdom on radicalization fails’.

⁶⁸ Ragazzi, ‘Policed multiculturalism?’, 164.

extremist interpretations of Islamic religion, ‘the Muslim community’ is constructed as simultaneously at risk and risky, exhausting the entire population of Muslims with the use of two categories.⁶⁹ On the basis of this assumption, British counter-radicalisation practices ‘securitis[e Muslim communities] *in the name of others*, as a locale from which future threats might emerge, while simultaneously disciplining them for *their own good*.’⁷⁰ Through PREVENT’s governance of British Muslims, certain types of dissent are not just made illegal in the name of security, but also pathologized and thereby depoliticised: they are barred entry from public and political debate, treated as something that is not worthy of discussion.⁷¹ As Sedgwick explains, the concept of radicalisation de-emphasises the wider circumstances producing the declared grievances of a ‘radical,’ making him or her ‘often appear as a “rebel without a cause”.’⁷²

Having summarised the main critiques of PREVENT, it is now time to show why the current theoretical frameworks used in European critical counter-radicalisation research should incorporate the concepts of race and racialisation. In order to do so,

⁶⁹ Kundnani, ‘Radicalisation’; Heath-Kelly, ‘Counter-terrorism and the counterfactual’; Pantazis and Pemberton, ‘From the “old” to the “new” suspect community’; Sophie Body-Gendrot, ‘Muslims: citizenship, security and social justice in France’, *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, vol. 36, no. 4, 2008, 247–256.

⁷⁰ Heath-Kelly, ‘Counter-terrorism and the counterfactual’, 405 (emphasis in original).

⁷¹ Baker-Beall, Heath-Kelly and Jarvis (eds), *Counter-Radicalisation*; Heath-Kelly, ‘Counter-terrorism and the counterfactual’; Imran Awan, “‘I am a Muslim not an extremist’”: how the Prevent Strategy has constructed a “suspect” community’, *Politics & Policy*, vol. 40, no. 6, 2012, 1158-1185.

⁷² Mark Sedgwick, ‘The concept of radicalization as a source of confusion’, *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 22, no. 4, 2010, 479-494 (481).

section three first discusses the most dominant framework and an alternative built on criticism of that theory. Consequently, I will describe two issues that cannot be analysed using either one but could be properly analysed when using the conceptual tools of race and racialisation. These issues are examples to demonstrate the use of race and racialisation for critical counter-radicalisation research, rather than an exhaustive list of such uses. Section three will also address a possible objection to the use of these concepts for this field of studies.

3. The use of race and racialisation for critical counter-radicalisation studies

3.1. The suspect community thesis

Currently, the suspect community thesis is one of the most dominant conceptual frameworks underlying the critical analyses of PREVENT and counter-radicalisation.⁷³ This thesis draws upon the work of Hillyard, which is concerned with the effects of the British Prevention of Terrorism Act (PTA) in 1974.⁷⁴ According to Hillyard, certain features of the PTA led to the construction of the Irish as a suspect community.⁷⁵ In its contemporary use, the suspect community thesis represents how Muslims as a faith community are viewed as a group that is ‘at risk’ and that is constructed as ‘the other.’⁷⁶

⁷³ Baker-Beall, Heath-Kelly and Jarvis (eds), *Counter-Radicalisation*.

⁷⁴ Paddy Hillyard, *Suspect Community: People’s Experience of the Prevention of Terrorism Acts in Britain* (London: Pluto Press in association with Liberty 1993).

⁷⁵ Hillyard, *Suspect Community*.

⁷⁶ Body-Gendrot, ‘Muslims’; Spalek, ‘Community policing, trust, and Muslim communities in relation to “new” terrorism’; Sarah Joy Pickering, Judith McCulloch and David Peter

In a study that is illustrative of the suspect community thesis, Pantazis and Pemberton argue that Muslims have replaced the Irish as the suspect community in Britain.⁷⁷ They define a suspect community as

a subgroup of the population that is singled out for state attention as being “problematic.” Specifically in terms of policing, individuals may be targeted, not necessarily as a result of suspected wrongdoing, but simply because of their presumed membership to that sub-group. Race, ethnicity, religion, class, gender, language, accent, dress, political ideology or any combination of these factors may serve to delineate the sub-group.⁷⁸

In their definition, the term suspect does not only refer to a legal category, but also to how people experience the law. The term ‘community’ has two meanings in Pantazis’ and Pemberton’s framework.⁷⁹ Sometimes, it means a group of people perceived as being suspect, while at other times they suggest this suspicion generates a social identity in such a way that the group can be considered a community. The meaning of community thus seems to oscillate between something that only exists in the mind of

Wright- Neville, ‘Counter- terrorism policing: towards social cohesion’, *Crime, Law & Social Change*, vol. 50, no. 1–2, 2008, 91–109.

⁷⁷ Pantazis and Pemberton, ‘From the “old” to the “new” suspect community’; see Heath-Kelly, ‘Reinventing prevention or exposing the gap?’ for a study of the similarities and differences between the construction and treatment of targets within PTA and PREVENT.

⁷⁸ Pantazis and Pemberton, ‘From the “old” to the “new” suspect community’, 649.

⁷⁹ Pantazis and Pemberton, ‘From the “old” to the “new” suspect community’.

government officials and something that has been brought into reality by governmental and police practices.⁸⁰

However, scholars have criticised the suspect community thesis for treating the construction of Muslims as a suspect community as an unintended consequence of government practices.⁸¹ Rather than collateral damage, Ali⁸² and Ragazzi⁸³ argue the governance of diversity and construction of distinct communities is at the core of the modus operandi of British governmental counter-terrorism. According to Ali, one of the most important functions of the concept of radicalisation within British counter-terrorism measures is ‘to identify and in so doing constitute the “Muslim community” as the site of radicalisation in need of governmental reform.’⁸⁴ Through PREVENT, ‘the Muslim community’ has been constituted and turned into a governable entity subject to intervention and management.⁸⁵ This entity is constituted by a variety of statistical information, used to derive an image of the identity and experience of ‘the

⁸⁰ Ragazzi, ‘Policed multiculturalism?’.

⁸¹ Ali, ‘Mapping the Muslim community’; Ragazzi, ‘Policed multiculturalism?’; Martin, ‘Challenging the separation of counter-terrorism and community cohesion in Prevent’.

⁸² Ali, ‘Mapping the Muslim community’.

⁸³ Ragazzi, ‘Policed multiculturalism?’.

⁸⁴ Ali, ‘Mapping the Muslim community’, 140.

⁸⁵ There are relatively many critical counter-radicalisation studies that examine the role and/or process of governability in PREVENT. For such research, see e.g. Ali, ‘Mapping the Muslim community’; Heath-Kelly, ‘Counter-terrorism and the counterfactual’; Ragazzi, ‘Policed multiculturalism’; Therese O’Toole, Nasar Meer, Daniel Nilsson DeHanas, Stephen H. Jones, and Tariq Modood, ‘Governing through Prevent? Regulation and contested practice in state-Muslim engagement’, *Sociology*, vol. 50, no. 1, 2016, 160-177; Thomas Martin, ‘Governing an unknowable future: the politics of Britain’s Prevent policy’, *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2014, 62-78; Mohammed Elshimi, ‘De-radicalisation interventions as technologies of the self: a Foucauldian analysis’, *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2015, 110-129.

British Muslim.’ By making the presupposed ‘Muslim community’ knowable, counter-radicalisation makes it governable: ‘Whoever gets to decide what constitutes the Muslim community also decides how they [i.e., Muslims] should conduct themselves.’⁸⁶ Ali argues that, through PREVENT, the British government was the decision-maker, as government officials decided with whom to partner in order to counter radicalisation, just like they placed the causes of radicalisation within Muslim communities.⁸⁷

Ragazzi places PREVENT within a larger framework of dealing with diversity.⁸⁸ His thesis, called ‘policed multiculturalism,’ argues that counter-radicalisation consists of ‘practices of the production and management of diversity that remove fundamental questions about plurality and citizenship from the political debate, casting them instead in the expert, technical and depoliticised language of security.’⁸⁹ By involving communities in counter-radicalisation, the government produces self-managed communities, while depoliticizing what they deem unacceptable forms of dissent.⁹⁰ The government thereby partially transfers responsibility to those who it deems ‘moderate’ community leaders to deal with the ‘risky’ elements in their community. The community is to monitor and manage their own population, informing the British government of at risk and risky individuals, who are subsequently referred

⁸⁶ Ali, ‘Mapping the Muslim community’, 153.

⁸⁷ Ali, ‘Mapping the Muslim community’.

⁸⁸ Ragazzi, ‘Policed multiculturalism?’.

⁸⁹ Ragazzi, ‘Policed multiculturalism?’, 163.

⁹⁰ Ragazzi, ‘Policed multiculturalism?’; Awan, “‘I am a Muslim not an extremist’”.

to a multi-agency risk assessment and case management system.⁹¹ After a tailored programme of intervention based on this assessment, these individuals are to be turned into subjects who are able to monitor their own risk.⁹² Rather than engaging with the reasons these individuals have for portraying signs of radicalisation as defined by the government in a (potentially political) discussion, they are thus pathologized, securitised, and depoliticised.

3.2. The added value of race and racialisation

Ali's analysis⁹³ and Ragazzi's policed multiculturalism thesis⁹⁴ both present valuable insights into the workings of counter-radicalisation. Nevertheless, they lack analytical and explanatory power on at least two fronts. Firstly, they do not explain how the logic of PREVENT, which targets the religious group of Muslims, results in the construction of a specific image of embodying radicalisation. Although Ragazzi states the diversity that is recognised and managed is divided into distinct communities along ethnic-religious lines, he does not explain what the process behind the establishment of these lines is and how ethnicity comes to play a role.⁹⁵ Similarly, Heath-Kelly mentions that the community cohesion discourse, which is also part of PREVENT, demanded Asians, and particularly Muslims, to assimilate to 'core British values' without explaining the

⁹¹ Heath-Kelly, 'Counter-terrorism and the counterfactual', 406.

⁹² Heath-Kelly, 'Counter-terrorism and the counterfactual', 406.

⁹³ Ali, 'Mapping the Muslim community'.

⁹⁴ Ragazzi, 'Policed multiculturalism?'.

⁹⁵ Ragazzi, 'Policed multiculturalism?'.

link made in that discourse between Asians and Muslims.⁹⁶ And Pantazis' and Pemberton's study on British counter-terrorism demonstrates that Asian and Black people in Britain were three times more likely than Whites to be stopped and searched on the counter-terrorism powers of the police, without elaboration upon the logic of British counter-terrorism and these results.⁹⁷ Without understanding how religion can become related to racism in its different forms, it will be complicated to understand how the effects of counter-radicalisation, which seem at first hand distinct from its logic, are dependent on the deeper lying structure of its discourse and context.

Secondly, the existing conceptual frameworks do not yet enable a comprehensive analysis of how vulnerability and risk are turned into an aspect of being Muslim as opposed to being British. Current critical counter-radicalisation research shows how these characteristics are constructed as part of 'the Muslim community,' but have not been provided a theoretical foundation to research how they are also constructed as a *natural* part of being Muslim, i.e. of every individual Muslim rather than the community. Currently, analyses like those of Heath-Kelly demonstrate that Muslims as individuals are doubly identified, as both risky and at risk, in specific PREVENT programmes.⁹⁸ Nevertheless, an explanation of this process of identification (and construction) on an individual level is lacking. Without concepts

⁹⁶ Heath-Kelly, 'Counter-terrorism and the counterfactual', 410.

⁹⁷ Pantazis and Pemberton, 'From the "old" to the "new" suspect community'.

⁹⁸ Heath-Kelly, 'Reinventing prevention or exposing the gap?'; Heath-Kelly, 'Counter-terrorism and the counterfactual'.

that allow scholars to research this construction on the level of individuals, analyses will thus remain ambiguous. Expanding the existing theoretical framework of critical counter-radicalisation studies with the concepts of racialisation and race, as defined in the first section, will allow for an analysis of how vulnerability and risk are turned into characteristics of every individual Muslims, i.e. are turned into natural aspects that belong to every member of 'the Muslim community.'

Rana provides an illustrative example of a study that uses racialisation in order to unravel the relations between the targets of the practices and of the logic of counter-radicalisation.⁹⁹ Based on her ethnographic fieldwork studying everyday life in a New York neighbourhood in the decades after 9/11, she describes the 'structural violence of an emergent racial infrastructure of the War on Terror.'¹⁰⁰ In her article, it becomes clear how the focus group of US counter-radicalisation practices expanded from Pakistanis, to Muslims, to 'youth' in order to incorporate the surrounding areas of the neighbourhood, which existed predominantly of communities of colour. This expansion accepts the racial order at the centre of the US domestic War on Terror, without recognising or acknowledging that it does, because abiding by this order is presented as participation and engagement.¹⁰¹ By incorporating the concepts of racialisation and racism in the theoretical framework of critical counter-radicalisation

⁹⁹ Rana, 'The racial infrastructure of the terror-industrial complex'.

¹⁰⁰ Rana, 'The racial infrastructure of the terror-industrial complex', 115.

¹⁰¹ Rana, 'The racial infrastructure of the terror-industrial complex', 130.

scholars, similar studies could be conducted with regard to PREVENT and other European counter-radicalisation policies.

A study that illustrates how the concepts of race and racialisation can help to answer to the second critique has yet to be published. Although it is beyond the scope of this paper to provide such an analysis, I will briefly touch upon some possible paths for further research. One possibility is to focus on the treatment of radical Islam as a pathology rather than as a serious political stance that should be treated as such.¹⁰² By connecting this to the concept of race as a construct that conveys ideas about human capacity and the (im)possibility or (un)desirability of contact between people, a more comprehensive analysis of the pathologizing nature of this depoliticization of Muslims is enabled. Although the framework of suspicion and/or security enables the study of this depoliticization, it does not allow for the connection between a construction of Muslims as vulnerable to a construction of their human capacity. Studies on European Islamophobia have shown that the concepts of race and racialisation are eminently suited to such pursuits.¹⁰³ For example, Goldberg analyses how the figure of the Muslim in European imaginations, ‘read as inevitably hostile, aggressive, engaged for religious purpose in constant jihad against Europe and Christianity in particular, and

¹⁰² Heath-Kelly, ‘Counter-terrorism and the counterfactual’; Awan, “‘I am a Muslim not an extremist’”.

¹⁰³ David Theo Goldberg, ‘Militarizing race’, *Social Text* 129, vol. 34, no. 4, 2016, 19-40; Meer, ‘Racialization and religion’; Topolski, ‘The race-religion constellation’; Taras, “‘Islamophobia never stands still’”; Moosavi, ‘The racialization of Muslim converts in Britain and their experiences of Islamophobia’; Allen, *Islamophobia*.

later the West and its supposed secularist leanings more generally,' became conceived of as inferior in ability to self-govern.¹⁰⁴ Rather than using suspicion or policing as conceptual tools, race and racialisation offer the required relation with naturalisation in order to conduct such analyses.

An alternative focus for studies concerned with how vulnerability and risk are turned into an aspect of being Muslim is the construction of alienation from and/or dis-identification with 'Britishness' as radicalisation, i.e., as something to be countered. This construction indicates cultural racism. Whereas in biological racism, somatic characteristics, such as skin colour, denominate one's assumed superiority or inferiority, in cultural racism it is a specific culture, such as 'Western European,' or in this case, 'British.' By constituting the outside – the radicals –, PREVENT also constitutes the inside, the content of 'Britishness.' This is clear in, for example, the 2011 version of PREVENT, which described 'extremism' as the 'vocal or active opposition to fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect and tolerance of different faiths and beliefs.'¹⁰⁵ Using race and racialisation, critical counter-radicalisation research could study how these values are constructed as specifically British in opposition to 'extremist,' thereby constructing the target group of PREVENT, i.e. Muslims, as the 'Other.'

¹⁰⁴ Goldberg, 'Racial Europeanization'.

¹⁰⁵ HO (Home Office), *Prevent Strategy* (London: TSO 2011), 107; also see Martin, 'Challenging the separation of counter-terrorism and community cohesion in Prevent'.

However, not all scholars agree that race and racialisation can conceptually be interrelated with religion and other categories. As such, the next paragraphs consider this objection to my argument.

3.3. Objection to conceptually interrelating race and religion

In contrast to my proposal, Hussain and Bagguley argue that racism and Islamophobia should be conceptually distinguished.¹⁰⁶ Examining the impact of the London bombings of 7/7 on the communities associated with the bombers, they conceptualise racism as ‘the negative signification or cultural construction of biological or somatic characteristics’ and Islamophobia as constructing ‘the distinctiveness of Islam and its representatives – Muslims – on the basis of belief and practice.’¹⁰⁷ Although they argue the concepts are often empirically interrelated, they discard any analytical intertwinement, arguing that such an extension of the concept of racism would inappropriately inflate it, resulting in the loss of its distinctiveness and specific empirical referents.¹⁰⁸ Similarly, Miles and Brown argue that the ‘race relations paradigm’ defines race too broadly, resulting philosophically in a meaningless concept and politically in racism escaping censure, as it is turned into ‘nothing worse than a product of cultural determinism or an expression of human nature.’¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁶ Hussain and Bagguley, ‘Securitized citizens’.

¹⁰⁷ Hussain and Bagguley, ‘Securitized citizens’, 718.

¹⁰⁸ Hussain and Bagguley, ‘Securitized citizens’, 718.

¹⁰⁹ Miles and Brown, *Racism*, 3-4.

Without going into the historical co-development of race and religion,¹¹⁰ I suggest that conceptualising race beyond its biological construction is useful, especially – but not only – for critical counter-radicalisation research. As Blaut explains, different forms of racism within Europe have at their core a similar assumption: the superiority of ‘Europeans.’¹¹¹ Whether this is argued for using biological theories, e.g. Darwinism (biological racism), by referring to the superiority of Christianity over Islam (religious racism), or by stating that European values are more developed than non-Western values (cultural racism), ‘Europeanness’ is the standard. By analytically limiting racism to its biological form, it becomes impossible to analyse the role of ‘Britishness’ as preventive in and of itself against terrorism.¹¹² For this construction of ‘Britishness’ is neither purely based on a biological form of racism nor on Islamophobia. It is based on the *conceptual* intertwining of biological, religious, and cultural racism, as the elements assumed to predict radicalisation are a combination of psychological (vulnerability) and religious (extremist interpretations of Islam) factors, both of which are presumed to influence each other (adhering to an extremist interpretation makes one more vulnerable, and being more vulnerable makes

¹¹⁰ For such studies, see e.g. Topolski, ‘The race-religion constellation’; Maldonado-Torres, ‘Race, religion, and ethics in the modern/colonial world’; Ivan Hannaford, *Race: The History of an Idea in the West* (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Centre Press 1996); Tomoko Masuzawa, *The Invention of World Religions: Or, How European Universalism Was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 2005).

¹¹¹ Blaut, ‘The theory of cultural racism’.

¹¹² Martin, ‘Challenging the separation of counter-terrorism and community cohesion in Prevent’.

one more susceptible to extremists interpretations).¹¹³ Without having one concept – race – that can be used to analyse the different strands of the logic of PREVENT, the conceptual intertwinement inherent to it will be overlooked. Hence, my argument is that the concept of race does not lose its distinctiveness or empirical referents, as one can – and should – specify how different forms of racism are at play within one’s analyses. By being able to relate it to a shared structure of how race operates, however, it becomes possible to disentangle the different strands while maintaining a view of the bigger picture in which they operate.

Conclusion

In this article, I have aimed to show how the concepts of race and racialisation would be beneficial to European critical counter-radicalisation studies. As such research currently lacks these conceptual tools, it is not able to explain how counter-radicalisation policies like PREVENT, which predominantly target Muslims in their logic, result in the targeting of certain ethnic groups in practice. Moreover, it overlooks how vulnerability and risk are not only constructed as part of Muslim communities, but also as a natural part of being Muslim. Using race and racialisation, critical counter-radicalisation studies could disentangle the different ways in which counter-radicalisation policies and practices construct the people they target, while placing these ways within an overview that shows how they are connected.

¹¹³ Kundnani, ‘Radicalisation’.

Critical counter-radicalisation research currently provides important new insights for both security studies and research into Islamophobia. With the help of the concepts of race and racialisation, it could expand this influence to investigations of (religious) racism. By bringing these different but overlapping fields of research together, contemporary discourses, policies, and practices can be more comprehensively analysed. As a result, these analyses could help combat problematic assumptions and logics, because they could offer an improved view of their different aspects.

These are only some preliminary ideas for how the concepts of race and racialisation could help develop current and future research. Using these conceptual tools will, no doubt, open up many more important questions. Because asking the right questions requires using the right concepts, this article has aimed to provide a foundation that critical counter-radicalisation scholars can use to further develop their important work.

The Role of Othering in Toleration: Accidental, Potential, or Inherent?

PhD proposal

Summary (max. 200 words)

Radicalisation – the socio-psychological processes deemed a precursor to terrorism – exemplifies the ultimate test to the limits of toleration. Counter-radicalisation policies indicate the limits and risks of what the state and society ought to tolerate. In doing so, they have been criticized for (re)producing ‘another’ that is/is not to be tolerated. Although ‘the other’ is a floating signifier, the political process of othering always manifests itself on a concrete and particular other. This dichotomy of ‘us’ versus ‘them’ points to the possible use of toleration as a state technology to maintain unity in the polity. However, what remains to be analysed is whether toleration and/or tolerance *presuppose and (re)produce ‘another’ regardless of the context*, i.e. whether othering is *inherent* to these concepts. Using the Netherlands, which holds a unique position in the debate on toleration and tolerance, as a case study, this project is the first to research this question. Concretely, it will study contemporary Dutch governmental counter-radicalisation documents and investigate philosophical literature on toleration, focusing on studies by Dutch philosophers. Conducting this research is important, as

inherently presupposing and (re)producing ‘another’ is likely to violate the principles of equality and justice underlying the constitution of Western democracies.

Description of the proposed research (max. 2,500 words)

Radicalisation – the socio-psychological processes deemed a precursor to terrorism – exemplifies the ultimate test to the limits of toleration (Scruton 2007). Counter-radicalisation policies, based upon the concept of toleration, indicate the limits and risks of what ought to be tolerated/permitted. In doing so, they have been criticized for (re)producing ‘another’ that is/is not to be tolerated. Although ‘the other’ is a floating signifier, the political process of othering always manifests itself on a concrete and particular other, a subject (as used by Brown and Forst (2014) in their debate on the relation between power and toleration), based on perceptions, assumptions, and biases about this other. This dichotomy of ‘us’ versus ‘them’ points to the possible use of toleration as a state technology to maintain unity in the polity (Brown and Forst 2014). However, what remains to be analysed is whether toleration *presupposes and (re)produces ‘another’ regardless of the context*, i.e. whether this is *inherent* to toleration itself. Using the Netherlands, which holds a unique position in the debate on toleration (Buruma 2006; Schama 2011), as a case study, this project is the first to research this question. Concretely, it will, first, conduct a study of contemporary Dutch governmental counter-radicalisation documents and, second, investigate philosophical literature on the concepts of toleration. If toleration necessarily entails ‘othering,’ this project will argue that the concept needs to be rethought to avoid violating the

principles of equality and justice underlying the constitutions of Western democracies (Furedi 2011). If toleration does not necessarily presuppose and (re)produce ‘another,’ it will address how toleration should be conceptualised in order to avoid ‘othering.’

Status Quaestionis

A well-accepted academic definition of toleration is letting ‘other people [be] free to behave as they think best, though their behaviour looks objectionable and could be checked’ (Galeotti 2015: 1; see also King 1998; Nicholson 1985; Mendus 1987). Surprisingly, philosophical discussions on toleration commonly do not consider an important distinction, introduced by the political philosopher Michael Walzer (1997), between tolerance as attitude and toleration as policy. When using the term toleration, scholars often refer to tolerance as attitude. This attitude functions both on an individual and a group/collective level. Tolerance may be either horizontal or vertical, i.e. either between individuals/groups who have a choice whether to tolerate or not, or hierarchically between individuals/groups where there is only one with the power and choice to tolerate the other (top-down). With the concept of toleration, Walzer introduces a way to research toleration on a *state* level. According to Walzer, toleration is always top-down, established by an authority or power. Nevertheless, people may object to certain policies of toleration. This happened in 1795 in the Netherlands,¹¹⁴

¹¹⁴ Throughout this proposal I will use ‘the Netherlands’ to refer to the governments and region currently considered to historically have been part of the Netherlands, despite their different names (e.g. Republic of the Seven United Netherlands) and territorial boundaries.

when unrest amongst Protestants, due to public Catholic processions, led the government to retract part of its newly established religious freedom for this group (Rowen et al. 2017; Homan 1966). Moreover, some scholars argue that toleration in a democracy can be grounded in mutual respect of the tolerated and the tolerating as equals, hence requiring mutually acceptable reasons for toleration and avoiding the production of ‘stigmatized, “non-normal” identities’ (Wendy and Forst 2014, 26). Despite being conceptually different, tolerance and toleration (TT)¹¹⁵ are thus not practically separable, but rather intertwined and interdependent. Moreover, they are connected to human relationships and power, as they are connected to inclusion/exclusion. In the case of tolerance, this concerns inclusion/exclusion from the community. In the case of toleration, it involves inclusion/exclusion from the polity, a *political* community, such as the state. Therefore, these concepts are linked to inclusion/exclusion, at least in their manifestation. With the choice whether to tolerate some individual or group, perspectives on what the community or polity should include and exclude are taken into account.

This is the case for the Netherlands, which has a reputation for currently and historically being one of the most tolerant nations in Europe. This image is also reflected in the self-perception of many Dutch people (Essed and Hoving 2014). The Netherlands was one of the first countries to officially declare personal freedom of religion through the Union of Utrecht in 1579, thereby including Catholics in its

¹¹⁵ Wherever I write TT, I refer to both tolerance and toleration.

predominantly Protestant polity (Rowen et al. 2017). Moreover, it hosted people who were exiled from other countries, such as political philosophers John Locke and Pierre Bayle (Po-chia Hsia and Van Nierop 2002; Forst 2017). Starting around the 16th century, an intense academic debate took place concerning what toleration should entail in the Netherlands, in part shaped by the changes in the country's political situation (Galeotti 2010; Israel 2001; Brunner et al. 1990). As Jonathan Israel (2001) explains, two faces of toleration were prevalent in 1650-1750. There was the 'acceptable' face, expressed amongst others by Locke, which had as its core 'freedom of worship and the peaceful coexistence of dissenting Churches alongside each national, or public, Church' (ibid.: 265). Additionally, the 'radical' face existed, chiefly represented by Baruch de Spinoza, which demanded freedom of thought and expression, *including* of thoughts that were incompatible with key claims of the Churches' revealed religion (ibid.; Van der Zweerde, 2005). The Netherlands harboured both faces (and both philosophers): it was devoted to a strictly Calvinist public Church, while simultaneously being committed to religious plurality (Berkvens-Stevelinck, Israel and Posthumus Meyjes 1997; Frijhoff 2002). As such, it used a unique approach within Europe, thereby contributing considerably to international debates on TT (Haefeli 2016; Shorto 2004).

However, this reputation is questioned within fields such as history (Po-chia Hsia and Van Nierop 2002; Dupertuis Bangs 2010), secularism (Renton 2017), and racial studies (Wekker 2017; Alba and Duyvendak 2017). Surprisingly, philosophers have not yet sufficiently examined the context in which Dutch philosophical

contributions on TT were written. This is despite the flourishing of political philosophical literature on toleration in the last 30 years (e.g. McKinnon 2006; Galeotti 2012; Edyvane and Matravers 2012; Scanlon 1996; Heyd 1996), including those emphasising the importance of proper historical sensitivity (e.g. Laursen 2011; Parkin and Stanton 2013; Nederman 2000). Such research is essential. By analysing the foundational aspects of the legacy of Dutch TT, this project will fill a lacuna in these conceptually-based scholarly and societal debates. Moreover, it will provide a new perspective on the philosophical debate on the relation between tolerance, toleration and their limits. Researching the philosophical variety in definitions of TT in the Netherlands and the context of these definitions is the first step in distinguishing aspects of possible embodiments of these concepts versus features that are part of them in every context, i.e. that are inherent to them. The project will research this by examining the philosophical and contemporary meanings of TT in the Netherlands, as well as their contexts.

The contemporary meaning and functions of TT are most explicitly formulated in Dutch counter-radicalisation policies, because radicalisation is considered one of the greatest tests to the limits of these concepts in the Netherlands. Firstly, these policies test out the limits of toleration by establishing which practices are suspect, but can be tolerated, and which form a *risk* to toleration. Secondly, by cooperating with certain schools, community centres, etc. to ensure this risk is monitored and minimized, they shape the limits of tolerance. Lastly, Dutch counter-radicalisation documents explicitly use TT to provide a foundation for their strategies,

referring to them as essential values of Dutch society, thereby invoking the story of the extraordinarily tolerant Dutch history. Consequently, Dutch counter-radicalisation documents are exceptional in intertwining notions considered to belong to Dutch identity, tolerance, toleration, and the limits of and risks to both. Moreover, they contain many interesting areas of tension. For example, what to do with those who have to be tolerated, but do not display the virtue of tolerance? By dealing with the complexity of the relationship between tolerance, toleration, and counter-radicalisation, these strategies form a perfect venue for discovering potential problems with these concepts in contemporary uses, such as the production of a specific ‘other.’

This view is strengthened by the criticism on British and American counter-radicalisation policies. Research in fields such as political science, anthropology, etc., but not in philosophy, argue these strategies depend on questionable assumptions about race, religion, and liability to extremism (Baker-Beall, Heath-Kelly, and Jarvis 2015; Kundnani 2014). Specifically, they argue counter-radicalisation policies create a ‘Muslim other’ (ibid.). Similar research is being initiated in the Netherlands and Belgium (De Koning et al. forthcoming). Although some of these critical counter-radicalisation scholars mention toleration in passing, they do not discuss the potential relationship between this production of ‘another’ and TT. The lack of this research on the Netherlands is even more surprising considering its position as pioneer in the creation of these policies (Vidino and Brandon 2012; Demant and De Graaf 2010). Studying how TT are defined and function within Dutch counter-radicalisation strategies will clarify how limits to TT are established in the Netherlands, including

whether they presuppose and (re)produce ‘another.’ Hence, this project will illuminate foundational assumptions and potential structural biases at the basis of the contemporary Dutch discourse on TT.

Connecting this to the philosophical definitions of these concepts in the Netherlands, their contexts, and the philosophical debate on them will discern two main issues. Firstly, in which ways TT can embody forms of ‘othering’ (Hirschkind 2008) and secondly, if TT inherently presuppose and (re)produce ‘another.’

Research questions and methodology

The central question in my research is *whether toleration and/or tolerance inherently presuppose and (re)produce ‘another.’* As such, it does not focus on how the limits of TT entail inclusion/exclusion, but on whether this inclusion/exclusion is necessarily based on the (re)production of ‘another.’ The project will aim to answer this by researching three sub-questions.

[1] *How are TT conceptualised and used in Dutch governmental counter-radicalisation documents?*

In order to gain an understanding of the contemporary meaning and functioning of TT in the Netherlands, the first step in this project will be to research Dutch governmental counter-radicalisation documents. These documents explicitly discuss limits to toleration, justifying these limits by referring to aspects seen as central to the Dutch state, society, and identity, which should be protected against threats. By examining

how these threats are characterised and how the Dutch state defends its policies, the project will be able to clarify the role of TT in these strategies and expose assumptions and potential structural biases underlying them, e.g. regarding race and religion (Van Nieuwkerk 2006; Jansen 2013; Topolski 2017). As such, it will establish if current Dutch counter-radicalisation strategies presuppose and (re)produce ‘another’ in their use of TT and if so, how this other is constructed.

Regarding the method used for this first question, I will conduct a discourse analysis of Dutch counter-radicalisation documents, investigating the definitions, justification, and limits of TT expressed within them. With ‘documents,’ I mean Dutch governmental documents that are explicitly concerned with counter-radicalisation such as policy notes and research reports. I will focus on online documents produced by the two ministries responsible for counter-radicalisation, starting with three periods, namely the start of the counter-radicalisation approach (around 2004), the establishment of a four-year action plan (around 2007), and the institutionalisation of three laws on the basis of the counter-radicalisation approach (around 2017). The analyses will be limited to those parts of the documents explicitly concerned with TT.

Considering the criticism expressed by counter-radicalisation scholars focusing on the UK and USA, the analysis will discern whether similar problematic assumptions also play a role within Dutch counter-radicalisation strategies.

[2] *How do philosophical works on TT written in the Netherlands conceptualise toleration and/or tolerance, taking into account the context in which they were written?*

As stated above, the Netherlands is seen as occupying a unique position when it comes to debates about TT. However, philosophical literature on the conceptualisations of TT in the Netherlands has insufficiently considered the importance of proper historical sensitivity.

This project aims at repairing this situation by conducting a conceptual analysis of the concepts of TT written about by philosophers in the Netherlands, taking into account the context in which these works were produced. On the basis of the results of section 1, I will formulate questions to guide this analysis. Within this second section, I approach TT as context-dependent terms, which are shaped by discourses and (institutional) practices as well as each other, rather than as abstract concepts (Brunner et al. 1990; Foucault 1997; Brown and Forst 2014). Expanding on the work of historians like Israel (1995; 2002) and Otto Brunner et al. (1990), who discuss Thomas Aquinas, Spinoza, and Desiderius Erasmus, I begin my analysis with works published in the 16th century, researching the philosophical debate on how TT should be conceptualised and what it should entail. Focusing on works of philosophers in the Netherlands who occupy a considerable role in philosophical literature on TT and have not extensively been discussed by Israel (1995; 2002) and Brunner et al. (1990), such as Bayle, Locke, Martin Luther, Hugo Grotius, Balthasar Bekker, Bernard Nieuwentyt, and Samuel Pufendorf, I trace the changes within the conceptualisations, taking into account the context in which they took place. Hence, this part will yield a more balanced view on the potential conceptual content of TT, as well as how the context

and the conceptualisations may have influenced each other. Moreover, it will produce a foundation for discerning which aspects are not and which may be inherent to TT.

[3] *Do toleration and/or tolerance as concepts inherently presuppose and (re)produce ‘another,’ given the way that are and have been conceptualised in the Netherlands, and should either one or both be rethought?*

On the basis of the results of the first two questions, I will provide a philosophical argument on whether or not toleration and/or tolerance as concepts inherently presuppose and (re)produce ‘another.’ If both do not necessarily presuppose and (re)produce ‘another,’ this project will address how they should be conceptualised in order to avoid ‘othering.’ If one or both do entail ‘othering,’ however, this project will argue that the concepts need to be rethought in such a way as to avoid violating the principles of equality and justice. As toleration affects tolerance and vice versa, it is important to question which ‘other’ should be generated if ‘another’ is necessarily (re)produced.

Moreover, as the project includes an analysis of the role of TT in Dutch governmental counter-radicalisation strategies, this phase will indicate if the conceptualisation of toleration and/or tolerance in these strategies should be rethought so as to be in line with the philosophical argument of the project.

As such, this project is innovative, both by conducting philosophical research on Dutch counter-radicalisation strategies for the first time and by offering a new perspective on TT based on the Dutch case. Moreover, it is urgent, as numerable

practices in society are founded on contemporary discourses of these concepts, some of which may have extensive consequences for certain already marginalised groups of citizens.

Keywords

Toleration, tolerance, the ‘other,’ conceptualisation, the Netherlands, counter-radicalisation

Timetable

<i>Year</i>	<i>Research Activities</i>
Sep. 2018 – Dec. 24, 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PhD training ▪ Literature review of critical research on counter-radicalisation strategies in the UK, USA, and the Netherlands ▪ Attend conference on counter-radicalisation
Jan. 2019 – July 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discourse analysis of Dutch governmental counter-radicalisation documents ▪ Write blog on counter-radicalisation in the Netherlands ▪ Present lecture organised by Radboud Reflects on counter-radicalisation

<p>Sep. 2019 – Dec. 24, 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Literature review of philosophical publications on tolerance/tolerance ▪ Attend conference in Europe on tolerance/toleration ▪ Present at network meeting/Centre for Contemporary European Philosophy ▪ Publication article: ‘Counter-Radicalisation in the Netherlands: Good Intentions, Problematic Assumptions’ (<i>Critical Discourse Studies</i>)
<p>Jan. 2020 – July 2020</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conceptual analysis of tolerance/toleration in Dutch philosophical works ▪ Present at conference ▪ Write blog on the story of Dutch tolerance
<p>Sep. 2020 – Dec. 24, 2020</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comparison of own conceptual analysis with other philosophers’ publications on tolerance/toleration. ▪ Research abroad at University of Berkeley, USA, working with Prof. Dr. Wendy Brown, a leading scholar in the field of political philosophy with expertise on Foucault and the concept of tolerance/toleration ▪ Write blog on manifestation of tolerance and toleration as state technology

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Publication article: ‘The Interrelation of Context and Conceptualisation in the Philosophical Construction of Tolerance and Toleration in the Netherlands’ (<i>BMGN – Low Countries Historical Review</i>)
Jan. 2021 – July 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compare and contrast results from the discourse analysis, literature review and conceptual analysis ▪ Start philosophical argument regarding concepts of tolerance and toleration
Sep. 2021 – Dec. 24, 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Philosophically analyse concepts of tolerance and toleration ▪ Publication book chapter: ‘The Manifestations of the Other in Conceptualisations of Tolerance and Toleration’ ▪ Cooperate with scholars of the RU and VU to organise conference
Jan. 2022 – Jul 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Write complete draft of the dissertation ▪ Present work at conference

Summary for non-specialists (max. 500 words)

Radicalisation is the (socio-)psychological processes considered to lead people to become terrorists. This process poses one of the greatest tests to the limits of tolerance (an attitude) and toleration (a policy), i.e. to letting other people be free to behave as they think best, although you find their behaviour objectionable and have the power to

counter that behaviour. Therefore, it is within counter-radicalisation policies that tolerance and toleration play a key role. These policies [1] define the limits of toleration, [2] shape the limits of tolerance, and [3] use the concepts of tolerance/toleration to provide a foundation for their strategies. In doing so, they imply and (re)produce ‘another’ that is or is not to be tolerated. Although ‘the other’ is a term that can signify many things in different contexts, it is always concretely a specific other, based on views and assumptions about certain groups. This dichotomy of ‘us’ versus ‘them’ points to the possible use of toleration as a state technology to maintain unity in the polity – a political community, such as the state. However, what remains to be analysed is whether tolerance and toleration *presuppose and (re)produce ‘another’ regardless of the context in which they are used*, i.e. whether othering is *inherent* to tolerance and toleration themselves. Using the Netherlands, which holds a unique position in the debate on tolerance and toleration, as a case study, this project is the first to research this question. Concretely, it will conduct a study of contemporary Dutch governmental counter-radicalisation documents and a conceptual analysis of tolerance and toleration in the philosophical works written in the Netherlands about these concepts. If neither necessarily presupposes and (re)produces ‘another,’ this project will address how toleration and tolerance should be conceptualised in order to avoid ‘othering.’ If one or both do entail ‘othering,’ however, this project will argue that the concepts need to be rethought in such a way as to avoid violating the principles of equality and justice underlying the constitutions of Western democracies. Whereas society (and hence the attitudes within society) decides issues as laws and policies on

the long term, policies and especially the discourse surrounding them seriously influence the attitudes of the members of society and how they treat those around them. As toleration thus affects tolerance and vice versa, it is important to question which ‘other’ should be generated if ‘another’ is necessarily presupposed.

Bibliography

- Alba, Richard, and Jan Willem Duyvendak. “What about the Mainstream? Assimilation in Super-Diverse Times. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, Special Issue: Super-diversity in Everyday Life*, 2017, pp. 1-20.
- Ayer, Alfred. “Sources of Intolerance.” *On Toleration*. Edited by Susan Mendus and David Edwards. Clarendon Press, 1987, pp. 83-100.
- Baker-Beall, Christopher, Heath-Kelly, Charlotte, and Lee Jarvis, editors. *Counter-Radicalisation: Critical Perspectives*. Routledge, 2015.
- Berkvens-Stevelinck, Christiane, Jonathan I. Israel, and G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes, editors. *The Emergence of Tolerance in the Dutch Republic*. Brill, 1977.
- Bleich, Erik. *Race Politics in Britain and France: Ideas and Policymaking since the 1960s*. Middlebury College, 2003.
- Brown, Wendy, and Rainer Forst. *The Power of Tolerance: A Debate*. Edited by Luca Di Blasi and Christoph F. E. Holzhey. Columbia University Press, 2014.
- Brunner, Otto, et al. “Toleranz.” *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland. Band 6*, Klett-Cotta, 1990, pp. 445-605.

- Buruma, Ian. *Murder in Amsterdam: The Death of Theo van Gogh and the Limits of Tolerance*. The Penguin Press, 2006.
- Cohen, Andrew Jason. "What Toleration Is." *Ethics*, vol. 115, no. 1, 2004, pp. 68-95.
- De Koning, Martijn et al., editors. *Narratives of De/Radicalisation: Critical Approaches from Belgium and the Netherlands*. I.B. Tauris, forthcoming.
- De Koning, Martijn J.M. "'You Need to Present a Counter-Message': The Racialisation of Dutch Muslims and Anti-Islamophobia Initiatives." *Journal of Muslims in Europe*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2016, pp. 170-189.
- Dupertuis Bangs, Jeremy. "Dutch Contributions to Religious Toleration." *Church History*, vol. 73, no. 3, 2010, pp. 585-613.
- Edyvane, Derek and Matt Matravers, editors. *Toleration Re-Examined*. Routledge, 2012.
- Elshimi, Mohammed. "De-Radicalisation Interventions as Technologies of the Self: A Foucauldian Analysis." *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2015, pp. 110-129.
- Essed, Philomena, and Isabel Hoving, editors. *Dutch Racism*. Rodopi. 2014.
- Forst, Rainer. "Toleration." *The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, fall 2017 ed., edited by Edward N. Zalta, <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/toleration/>. Accessed 14 January 2018.
- Foucault, Michel. *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*. Edited by Paul Rabinow. translated by Robert Hurley and others. The New Press, 1997.

- Frijhoff, Willem. "Religious Toleration in the United Provinces: From 'Case' to 'Model'". *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*. Edited by Po-chia Hsia, Ronnie and Henk F.K. Van Nierop. Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 27-52.
- Furedi, Frank. *On Tolerance: A Defense of Moral Independence*. Continuum, 2011.
- Galeotti, Anna Elisabetta. "The Range of Toleration: From Toleration as Recognition Back to Disrespectful Tolerance." *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, vol. 41, no. 2, 2015, pp. 93-110.
- . "Toleration." *Issues in Political Theory*, 2nd ed., edited by Catriona McKinnon, Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 124-146.
- . "Toleration." *The Encyclopaedia of Political Thought*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., 2015. Wiley Online Library. Web. 9 Jan. 2018.
- Haefeli, Evan. *New Netherland and the Dutch Origins of American Religious Liberty*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.
- Hirschkind, Charles. "Religious Difference and Democratic Pluralism: Some Recent Debates and Frameworks." *The Finnish Society for the Study of Religion*, vol. 44, no. 1, 2007, pp. 123-138.
- Homan, Gerlof D. "Constitutional Reform in the Netherlands in 1848." *The Historian*, vol. 29, no. 3, 1996, pp. 405-425.
- Horton, John and Susan Mendus, editors. *Aspects of Toleration: Philosophical Studies*. Methuen, 1985.

- Isaac, Benjamin. *Empire and Ideology in the Graeco-Roman World*. Tel-Aviv University, 2017.
- Israel, Jonathan I. *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750*. Oxford University Press, 2001.
- . "Religious Toleration and Radical Philosophy in the Later Dutch Golden Age (1668-1710)." *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*. Edited by Po-chia Hsia, Ronnie and Henk F.K. Van Nierop. Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 148-158.
- . *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall, 1477-1806*. Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Jansen, Yolande. *Secularism, Assimilation and the Crisis of Multiculturalism: French Modernist Legacies*. Amsterdam University Press, 2013.
- King, Preston. *Toleration*. Frank Cass, 1998.
- Kundnani, Arun. "Radicalisation: The Journey of a Concept." *Race & Class*, vol. 54, no. 1, 2012, pp. 3-25.
- . *The Muslims are Coming! Islamophobia, Extremism, and the Domestic War on Terror*. Verso, 2014.
- Laursen, John C. "Blind Sports in the Toleration Literature." *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, vol. 14, no. 3, 2012, pp. 307-322.

- Locke, John. "A Letter concerning Toleration." *Locke on Toleration*. Edited by Richard Vernon, translated by Michael Silverthorne. Cambridge University Press, 2010, pp. 3-46.
- McKinnon, Catriona. *Toleration: A Critical Introduction*. Routledge, 2006.
- Mendus, Susan. "Introduction." *On Toleration*. Edited by Susan Mendus and David Edwards. Clarendon Press, 1987, pp. 1-16.
- . *Toleration and the Limits of Liberalism*. Humanities Press International, 1989.
- Nederman, Cary J. *Worlds of Difference: European Discourses of Toleration, c. 1100-1550*. Penn State University Press, 2000.
- Neumann, Peter R. "The Trouble with Radicalization." *International Affairs*, vol. 89, no. 4, 2013, pp. 873-893.
- Neumann, Peter R., and Scott Kleinmann. "How Rigorous is Radicalization Research?" *Democracy and Security*, vol. 9, no. 4, 2013, pp. 360-382.
- Nicholson, Peter P. "Toleration as a Moral Ideal." *Aspects of Toleration: Philosophical Studies*. Edited by John Horton and Susan Mendus. Methuen, 1985, pp. 158-174.
- Parkin, Jon and Timothy Stanton. *Natural Law and Toleration in the Early Enlightenment*. British Academy, 2013.
- Po-chia Hsia, Ronnie and Henk F.K. Van Nierop, editors. *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Popper, Karl. "Toleration and Intellectual Responsibility." *On Toleration*. Edited by Susan Mendus and David Edwards. Clarendon Press, 1987, pp. 17-34.

- Renton, James. "The Figure of the Fanatic: A Rebel Against Christian Sovereignty." *Ethnic and Racial Studies, Special Issue: Islamophobia and Surveillance: Genealogies of a Global Order*. 2017, pp. 1-18.
- Rowen, Herbert H., et al. "Netherlands." *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. London: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 2017. Encyclopaedia Britannica. Web. 8 Jan. 2018.
- Scarman, Leslie George. "Toleration and the Law." *On Toleration*. Edited by Susan Mendus and David Edwards. Clarendon Press, 1987, pp. 49-62.
- Scanlon, Thomas M. *The Difficulty of Tolerance: Essays in Political Philosophy*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Schama, Simon. *Waar is de Tolerantie Gebleven? Huizinga-lezing 2011*. Translated by Mario Molegraaf, Uitgeverij Bert Bakker, 2011.
- Schinkel, Willem. *Imagined Societies: A Critique of Immigrant Integration in Western Europe*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Schmid, Alex P. "Radicalisation, De-Radicalisation, Counter-Radicalisation: A Conceptual Discussion and Literature Review." *International Centre for Counter-Terrorism, The Hague Research Paper*, 2013, pp. 1-91.
- Scruton, Roger. *The Palgrave Macmillan Dictionary of Political Thought*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Shafiq, Qader, Felicita Vos, and Igor Van der Vlist, editors. *Hoezo Tolerant?* Osmose, 2007.

- Shorto, Russell. *The Island at the Centre of the World: The Epic Story of Dutch Manhattan and the Forgotten Colony that Shaped America*. Doubleday, 2004.
- Spaans, Joke. "Religious Policies in the Seventeenth-Century Dutch Republic." *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*. Edited by Pochia Hsia, Ronnie and Henk F.K. Van Nierop. Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 72-86.
- Topolski, Anya. "Good Jew, Bad Jew... Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: 'Managing' Europe's Others." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 2017, pp. 1-18.
- Van Amersfoort, Hans, and Mies van Niekerk. "The Waxing and Waning of a Diaspora: Moluccans in the Netherlands, 1950-2002." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 30, no. 1, 2004, pp. 323-346.
- Van der Zweerde, Evert. "All Europeans are Equal – But aren't Some More Equal than Others? Reflections on Europe and Orthodox Christianity." *Journal of Eastern Christian Studies*, vol. 57, nr. 3-4, 2005, pp.257-289.
- Van Nieuwkerk, Karin, editor. *Gender and Conversion in the West*. University of Texas Press, 2006.
- Vidino, Lorenzo, and James Brandon. "Countering radicalization in Europe." *The International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation and Political Violence*, 2012. Retrieved from <http://icsr.info/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/ICSR-Report-Countering-Radicalization-in-Europe.pdf>
- Walzer, Michael. *On Toleration*. Yale University Press, 1997.

Warnock, Mary. "The Limits of Toleration." *On Toleration*. Edited by Susan Mendus and David Edwards. Clarendon Press, 1987, pp. 123-140.

Wekker, Fenneke. "'We Have to Teach Them Diversity': On Demographic Transformations and Lived Reality in an Amsterdam Working-Class Neighbourhood." *Ethnic and Racial Studies, Special Issue: Super-Diversity in Everyday Life*, 2017, pp. 1-16.

Wekker, Gloria. *White Innocence: Paradoxes of Colonialism and Race*. Duke University Press, 2016.

Witte, Rob. *Al Eeuwenlang een Gastvrij Volk: Racistisch Geweld en Overheidsreacties in (1950-2009)*. Amsterdam University Press, 2010.

Curriculum vitae

I. Education

(only courses considered relevant for the PhD project are mentioned)

- Research Master's Programme Philosophy, Specialisation: Social and Political Philosophy

Radboud University Nijmegen, Sept 2016 – (planned) Aug 2018

Current average: 8.2

- Philosophical Research Methods and Skills I
- Philosophical Anthropology
- Social and Political Philosophy
- Capita Selecta Social and Political Philosophy

- Research Essay
- Thesis ‘The Use of Race and Racialisation for Critical Counter-Radicalisation Studies: A Conceptual Contribution’
- Master’s Programme Political Science, Specialisation: Political Theory
Radboud University Nijmegen, Sept 2015 – Aug 2016
Average: 8.3
 - Advanced Research Methods
 - Power and Persuasion in Politics
 - Power in Political Theory
 - Recognition, Redistribution and Citizenship
 - Contemporary Debates in Political Theory
 - Philosophy of Law/Jurisprudence
 - Thesis ‘The Bodies of Beirut versus the Precious of Paris: How the Guardian Reflects and (Re)Produces Power Relations’
- Bachelor in Liberal Arts and Sciences, Major: Political Science and International Relations, Minor: Philosophy,
Amsterdam University College, Amsterdam, Sept 2011 – July 2014
Exchange at Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain, Jan – Jun 2013
Average GPA: 3,85 (out of 4)
 - Theme social systems: Introduction to social policy
 - Comparative Public Policy
 - History of National Civil Rights Movements

- International Crimes
- Theories of Democracy and Justice
- Human Rights and Human Security
- Classical and Modern Political Thought
- The History of Ideas: Power and Change
- Modern Thought
- Contemporary Thought
- Ethics and Political Philosophy
- Modern and Contemporary Ethics
- Thesis ‘The Necessary Debate on Global Citizenship: An Incentive for its Revival’

II. Honours, prizes, scholarships and grants

- Erasmus+ EU Grant for exchange at Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Jan – Jun 2013.
- Certificate for Interdisciplinary Honours Programme for Master's students, Radboud Honours Academy, Aug 2015 – Jul 2016.

III. Relevant academic experience

- Coordinator of 5 teaching assistants
Radboud University Nijmegen, Aug 2017 – Jan 2018

- Beroepsethiek voor Psychologen [Professional Ethics for Psychologists] (BA Psychology)
- Teaching assistant
 - Radboud University Nijmegen, Apr 2016 – Jan 2018
 - Filosofie voor de Managementwetenschappen [Philosophy for the Management Sciences] (BA Political Science, Economics, Business Administration), Apr - Jul 2018
 - Beroepsethiek voor Psychologen [Professional Ethics for Psychologists] (BA Psychology), Sep 2017-Jan 2018
 - Sociology, Philosophy, and Ethics of Research (MSc Political Science), Sep - Oct 2016 and 2017
 - Politics, Ethics, and Practice (BA Political Science), Apr – Jul 2016 and 2017
- Participant & moderator of session on Dutch racism
 - Radboud University Race & Postcolonial Reading Group, Sep 2017 – present
- Presenter
 - Women in Philosophy’s 4th Annual Conference, Amsterdam, Jul 2017
 - Paper ‘Stupidity and Responsibility: Mutually Exclusive or Possibly Compatible?’
- Chair panel discussion
 - CLUE+ conference ‘Critical theory in the humanities. Resonances of the work of Judith Butler’, 5-7 Apr 2017

- Introducing speakers, moderating session “Processing In/Exclusion”
- Member programme council
 - Radboud Honours Academy, Sept 2016 – Aug 2017
 - Preserving the quality, actuality, and interdisciplinarity of the programme, monitoring selection
- Conversation leader
 - InScience Film Festival, 3 Nov 2016
 - Introducing movie ‘The Origami Code’ and speaker, moderate discussion
- Participant Think Tank
 - Radboud Honours Academy, Aug 2015 – July 2016
 - Researching the credibility of the WHL by the client, the Netherlands National Commission for UNESCO, in an international and interdisciplinary think tank
- Project assistant
 - Platform INS, Rotterdam, Sept 2014 – Feb 2015
 - Writing course material for “Moslim zijn in het Westen” [Being Muslim in the West]
- Intern
 - Platform INS, Rotterdam, Jan – Jul 2014
 - Writing booklets on issues related to Fethullah Gülen and Islam

- Member formatting team

Editorial Board Journal of Academic English II, Fall 2013

- Ensuring deadlines were met, deciding on and implementing journal format

IV. Publications

Groothuis, Anne. "Dual Nationality and Renunciation: A Citizen's Right." *AUC Undergraduate Journal of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Open Issue Vol. 2*, 2013, pp. 44-51. (peer-reviewed journal)