Universiteit Leiden
The Netherlands

Towards a 'World Society'? The Muslim Brotherhood's Place in International Relations

MA International Relations

Global Conflict in the Modern Era

Name: Christopher Schneider

Student Number: s2184532

Email: c.j.schneider@umail.leidenuniv.nl

Academic Year: Feb 2018-Feb 2019

Thesis Supervisor: Dr. John-Harmen Valk

Second Reader: Dr. Andrew Gawthorpe

Word Count: 14,995

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Introduction

Following the political upheaval of the 2011 uprisings across the Middle East, Islamist group the Society of the Muslim Brothers (al-Jama'at al-Ikhwān al-Muslimīn) briefly assumed power in Egypt upon the election of their candidate Mohammed Morsi in what were hailed as the first truly democratic elections the country has seen since the overthrow of the monarchy in 1952 (Milton-Edwards, 2016). After little over a year, the military and its supporters among the Egyptian elite removed Morsi from power, embarked on a campaign of violent persecution of the Brothers and their supporters, framing their opposition to them in the security language of threats to the state's existence, and designating the group a terrorist organisation in the winter of 2013. As a result, and as a consequence of the Saudi Arabian and Emirati governments following suit, the Muslim Brotherhood (MB or Brotherhood) have been confined to a space at the margins of political engagement in these arenas, the application of the 'terrorism' label having severely damaging consequences for their reputation. The nature of this securitisation and marginalisation is reflective of the deeper bias against Islamist expressions of community in international relations and the exclusionary politics as a means to preserve the status quo of Western-style statehood. A major characteristic of contemporary global society is the relations between an expanded Western international society and the non-Western societies it now encompasses, and the effects these relations will continue to have on issues of global conflict and cooperation (Thomas, 2005: 155). One remarkable trend has been the resurgence of religion worldwide, and the inability of International Relations and international society to conceptualise a manner of engagement with religious identity groups, evident in the proliferation of violence involving such movements. The global resurgence of religion denies the preconceived notions held by theories of modernization and development, namely that as modernity unfolds, religion would retreat (Esposito & Tamami, 2000: 1). In the case of political Islam, Elizabeth Hurd states that it cannot solely be described as a backlash against modernity, nor economic deprivation or psychological displacement due to processes of colonisation and decolonisation (2008: 119). Rather, Islamist projects in the Middle East and beyond can be seen as a critique of the Western meta-narrative that modernity requires secularisation, previously presumed to be a universal truth. Therefore, the nature of this critique has often been overstated in Western discourse, discussed in conflictual language, with Islamism portrayed as the successor of communism as the next 'existential' threat to the West's

established order (Esposito, 1999; Euben, 2001), also famously embodied in Samuel Huntington's 'Clash of Civilizations' thesis (1993). Many accounts express a 'fear' that exists within the West that Islamism represents an ideology diametrically opposed to its way of life and value-systems (Sayyid, 1997). This is in part due to the fact that Islamism questions the validity of the 'Westphalian presumption' which has dominated academic and practical international relations, namely 'the notion that religious and cultural pluralism can not be accommodated in international society, but must be privatised, marginalised, or even overcome' (Thomas, 2000: 815). Since the emergence of the modern nation-state in Europe involved this privatisation of religion, many assessments of Islamism have positioned it as 'anti-modern' as it can't be reconciled with preconceived ideas of progress, whereas Bobby Sayyid describes them as 'an attempt to decentre the West' that 'distinguishes between modernity and the West' (1997: 117; 98). Islamism can thus be seen as an expression of cultural authenticity possessing continued saliency in the face of the exogenous Western-led global order that has sought to impose the institution of a secular nation-state through imperialism and colonialism, an expression finding form in non-state and transnational actors variably engaged in cultural reform programmes or violent destabilisation of the current political order. Islamism's existence outside of, and its criticism of, the secular state can thus lead to its marginalisation from engagement in Westphalian international relations, formed of a society of states. The MB's experience in Egypt and the wider Middle East is an example of this exclusion due to its perceived threat to the 'Westphalian presumption'.

The state-centricity of some theories or conceptions of international order is symptomatic of the embeddedness of this 'Westphalian presumption' in the practice and theorisation of international relations. The state is taken as the primary actor in international relations, and due to institutionalised Eurocentrism, the secular ontology of the state and society as found in Europe is presumed to be universal. One such conceptualisation entailing state-centricity is the Copenhagen School's securitisation theory, which assumes the universality of European understandings of society and state (Wilkinson, 2007: 5; Greenwood & Waever, 2013). Securitisation's applicability in a non-Western context is thus called into question. Due to the European genealogy of the state, and securitisation's usual focus on the state as the referent object, applicability of this paradigm outside of Europe and its societal particularities involving strong and liberal democratic states, the application of the securitisation model is a dubious prospect in non-Western societies, particularly in Middle Eastern societies. In this regional context, the separation between religion and state is not as inherent a tradition as in Europe,

nor does the state possess the same degree of centralised power and legitimacy; indeed the Middle East is generally characterised by strong religions and weak states (Thomas, 2000: 824). Secularist evaluations of political Islam, when coupled with the linkage of security language linked to discourses of terrorism have very real implications on the world of policy (Hurd, 2008: 119), resulting in exclusion of large swathes of global society that express an opinion on world order outside of secular modernity as it emerged in Europe. These implications were evident in the 'Global War on Terror' discourse, most recently manifested in the securitisation and designation of the MB as a terrorist organisation by the Egyptian regime under army general-turned-President Abdel Fattah al-Sisi in the winter of 2013. Securitisation's Western epistemic context and its exclusionary nature, in conjunction with opposition to Islamism in the Middle East, can lead to excessive degrees of marginalisation of such groups, and indeed as Hurd states 'not *all* forms of what is categorised by secular authority as political Islam pose a threat' to be met with the imposition of secularisation or political exclusion in its various guises (2008: 11). The continued saliency of religion and religiously motivated groups has resulted in calls for new conceptualisations of international order 'which overcomes the 'Westphalian presumption' in International Relations' (Thomas, 2000: 815). In light of the securitisation of the Brotherhood, resting on a state-centric exclusion from politics, this call appears ever more relevant. Since Islamist projects are an attempt 'to articulate modernity that is not structured around Eurocentrism' (Sayyid, 1997: 105), in order to better conceptualise a modern international order that is more inclusive of non-Western or non-European perspectives, 'religious and cultural pluralism' must be 'taken seriously' (Thomas, 2000), as such Islamist perspectives need also be taken into account. Such a move is desirable, according to Hidemi Suganami, due to it representing progress 'towards greater justice in international relations' (2003: 264). This thesis, then, seeks to explore the problematic of whether a paradigm of engaging Islamist groups exists or can be devised that doesn't involve exclusionary state-centric methods perpetuating secular Eurocentrism, as in the case of securitisation.

The theory of 'world society' provides such an opportunity to move towards more culturally plural international relations, in that it sanctions examination and engagement of actors outside of the secular nation-state, with differing worldviews and values. Thus far however, discussions of world society in international relations have remained somewhat Western-centric, focussing on the interactions between international society and NGOs and other Western non-state actors (Clark, 2007). The theory originated with the English School, whose

associated theories of 'international system' and 'international society' present a narrower conception of global order since they largely take the state to be the primary unit of analysis, obfuscating the role of non-state actors. The English School's principal debate surrounding the nature of global society, namely the pluralism-solidarism debate is crucial for the study of the non-West's place in international relations. The solidarists believe a degree of cosmopolitanism is necessary for peaceful international relations and a world society to develop, while the pluralists within the school follow a tradition of recognising the need to maintain the broader existing diversity in global order. 'World society' can reflect the calls for greater diversity in global order, while emphasising trends of cosmopolitan value convergence among culturally pluralist entities, thus occupying space somewhere between the two English School camps. Therefore, 'world society' can be of use to the incorporation of non-state identity based groups in discussions of international relations. Highlighting the exclusion of Islamist viewpoints from international society based on the securitisation of the 'secular subjectivity' in Egypt, the thesis will discuss how 'world society' constitutes a less exclusionary platform for engaging Islamist groups, thereby facilitating the move to globalised post-Westphalian world politics. The present thesis will focus on the Muslim Brotherhood, discussing its potential compatibility, and actual interaction, with a global society that embraces plurality as an inherent factor of progress.

The securitising move against the MB will be explored as a form of exclusionary tactics by the Egyptian military regime based on upholding the government and protecting the secularity of the state, which reflects wider discourses of state-based exclusion in the present Western-led international order such as the still powerful and potentially damaging narratives of terrorism. In order to conceptualise a global order that strays from such exclusion in favour of cross-cultural dialogue, the theory of 'world society' will be discussed as a potentially more inclusive layer of international relations, which can facilitate the development of a more 'pluralistic' global community that incorporates more non-Western voices. Charting a course through the English School's pluralism-solidarism debate in Chapter Two, will allow the formulation of a working framework for the discussion of a non-state actor manifesting a religious and communal identity, thus hoping to address whether world society can incorporate such expressions in a move to a 'post-Westphalian' international relations that recognises the diverse nature of the world today. The purpose of the MB's selection for this discussion is twofold. By selecting an identity based non-state actor such as the MB for discussion of world society, we are able to satisfy some of the calls from English School pluralists to take into account global

cultural diversity (Thomas, 2000; 2005), while providing a means of discussion of such groups that doesn't replicate the usual state-centric exclusion from international society. Furthermore, selection of the MB rather than another Islamist group, rests on the rich history and textual heritage of the group, in conjunction with its highly organised nature and the transnational influence it wields. Once the importance and characteristics of world society has been laid out, Chapter Three's analysis of some of the MB's main ideological writings, and interactions in Egypt and beyond will show the degree to which value convergence with a world society committed to inclusion and dialogue is possible and indeed has already begun.

The statements used from the Egyptian regime have been sourced from their government portal, since they are addressed to international society in an official capacity. Their relevance to this piece is due to the employment of security language by a political actor. The tracts of the Muslim Brotherhood analysed were written by the group's chief ideologues, widely credited for their influence on the present-day movement and on other Islamist groups, and they provide a good overview of their thought and some of their foundational principles during the group's formative years which are of relevance to the themes of my project. Where I have been able to, I have used my own translations from the Arabic, however on occasion I have used English translations by researchers of the Brotherhood to aid my analysis.

Ch.1: Securitisation as Exclusion—The Fate of the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt

The removal of Mohammed Morsi and the Muslim Brotherhood-backed Freedom and Justice Party (henceforth FJP) from office in the summer of 2013 after just one year in power was construed in national security terms by the coup's leaders, but the subsequent crackdown went above and beyond, outlawing the Brotherhood and designating them a terrorist organisation[1], effectively assigning them to a political space occupied by the 'extremist other' and thereby completing the total marginalisation of the group from Egyptian politics. This response to the ascension of an Islamist group to a position of power is reflective of wider tactics of exclusion employed by insecure Middle Eastern regimes hoping to preserve their 'deep state' secular foundations, often with the backing of Western partners, employing discourses of state security against any religious fundamentalist elements who seek to disrupt the status quo. The success with which these moves are carried out will be shown to rest on the state-centricity of the securitisation and terrorism discourses, drawing on perceived threats that Islamists pose ontologically to the state, thus benefitting the extractive elite at the core of the Egyptian state, while further alienating Islamists from the sphere of political engagement.

As Hafez (2003) has shown, the dominant approaches to dealing with violent Islamism, namely economic development and repression, are ineffectual and fail to address the root of the problem, namely access to the political process in order to democratically express themselves. Repression is most often used to prevent Islamists from achieving power, in a tactic of total exclusion from the international state system, particularly in places where they possess a broad appeal among religiously oriented populations. The approach in Egypt vis-à-vis the MB has varied from extreme repression, reaching its zenith during Gamal 'Abd al-Nasser's era in the

[1] Example of the use of terrorist label on MB: http://www.sis.gov.eg/Story/135155/Egypt's-national-security-forces-arrest-6-MB-elements?lang=en-us

1950s, to co-option, as during the reigns of Anwar Sadat and to a varying extent Hosni Mubarak. Presently, the Sisi regime's strategy mirrors that of Nasser's, employing an extensive securitisation against the group, having designated them a terrorist organisation in the winter of 2013, and detained vast numbers of the group's members and leadership, ensuring continuity of the status quo for its allies internationally and in what has been termed the 'deep state' domestically. Following Laustsen & Waever's theorisation of securitisation as 'how security issues are produced by actors who pose something (a referent object) as existentially threatened and therefore claim a right to use extraordinary measures to defend it' (2000: 708) through a speech act, one is able to posit the actions of the Egyptian military under the Sisi regime against the Muslim Brotherhood as a securitising move. A speech act signifies that, in Buzan's words, 'it is the utterance itself that is the act. By saying the words, something is done' (1998: 26). The pronouncement of an object, in this case the Egyptian state, as 'existentially threatened' has the effect of immediately placing it above the domain of ordinary politics, justifying the (re)allocation of resources to address said threat. Moves against the MB and its supporters in the course of this repressive securitisation have been deemed abuses of human rights, such as the massacres at the Raba'a al-Adawiya and al-Nahda squares in Cairo (Human Rights Watch, 2014), although they have drawn no corresponding response from Western states, who continue to engage the Egyptian government diplomatically. The lack of a significant response from international society regarding the undemocratic removal of Egypt's first democratically elected president, and the mass killings perpetrated against his supporters, may in part be explained by the framing of the issue within discourses of security and terrorism. By marshalling powerful narratives of an existential threat posed to Egypt's national security (al-Amn al-Watanī), the leaders of the coup justified their undemocratic removal of an undesirable group from power to their domestic Egyptian and global audiences. It will be argued here that the nature of these security narratives rests largely on state-centricity and the diametric dualism of positioning the state as the referent object, thus designating any entity threatening the Eurocentric belief in the secularity of said object, i.e. an Islamist organisation, as in direct opposition to its survival. The interlinked discourse of terrorism, represents the extreme manifestation of this process, and reflects the height of political exclusion.

The language of securitisation is grounded in Eurocentric assumptions about the 'universal' nature of society and the present state system (Wilkinson, 2007), thus perpetuating Western-held tropes about international relations, and as such prejudices against alternate expressions of community that stray from the secular state of the European propagated international system,

such as Islamism. A number of authors have remarked on the Western nature of securitisation, among them Eroukhmanoff who discusses its limited capability outside of Europe (2015: 246); since assuming the validity of Eurocentric notions that modernity entails the separation between state and religion, use of this paradigm in societies where said separation is not naturalised proves complicated. As Buzan states, 'international society still has some imperial qualities, and understanding these opens up the way to problematizing the status quo, West-centric perspective that too often marks security analysis' (2015: 137). The belief in IR that the state is the sole actor, 'the moral referent point' in Steve Smith's words, thus embellishes its privilege over the role played by other actors such as non-state groups or individuals (2004). Thus it is the security of the state that matters more than that of individuals or other non-state actors. What results is, as Mavelli states, the securitisation of Islam and Muslim subjects, which 'carried out by secular regimes [,] is instrumental to uphold the primacy of secular subjectivity' of the state (2013: 161). This indeed contributes to the homogeneity of international society of which Fred Halliday (1992) spoke, by which outside pressures force the conformity of local conditions to the international norm. The use of Western concepts by the implementation of securitisation, particularly in a non-Western context, assumes the homogeneity of such concepts due to colonisation and decolonisation, despite vastly different societies entailing vastly different realities under the same conceptual names (Greenwood & Waever, 2013: 486). What has occurred in Egypt following the removal of Mohammed Morsi and the Muslim Brotherhood-backed FJP by the military forces, is emblematic of this experience. Egypt's 'secular subjectivity' has been preserved by the existence of a 'deep state' that benefits from the secular status quo. In the present case it indeed enabled and participated in the securitising move to preserve a degree of profitable homogeneity with the outside world. The deep state's opposition to Islamist elements rests on the Middle East's post-colonial past and the relatively new concept of statehood in the region.

The state of the state in the Middle East and Egypt

The post-colonial states of the Middle East haven't shared Europe's experience of state-formation, which involved military competition that fed into bureaucratic and economic consolidation, leading to the development of the national and eventually democratic political entities known in the West as states. The nation-state is a relatively new concept in the Middle East, since Arab and Muslim communities were subsumed as part of the Ottoman Empire until its dissolution and the subsequent takeover of by European colonialists. As such, the existence

of competing communal identifiers should be no surprise, and as Buzan and Waever correctly note, the Middle East started its post-independence life 'equipped with pan-regional identity movements:…pan-Arabism and pan-Islamism…' (2009: 185). As the Middle East has not shared in European state-formation experiences, it has not experienced a similar progressive development the secular-religious separation inherent in the Westphalian treaties of European history. Even today, 'many, if not most, non-Western societies and communities have still not entirely made, or are struggling to make, this transition' (Thomas, 2000: 823). That is why these regions are often characterised by strong religions and weak states (824). Thus, the pan-Arabist and pan-Islamist ideologies both possess a greater salience in the region than any comparable one in Europe has done. Indeed, according to Buzan and Waever, the importance of these ideologies lies in 'the challenge they raised to the viability of a post-colonial state system based on national identity and sovereignty' (2009: 185). These ideologies are perceived as threatening to the construction of specific national identities (Buzan et. al, 1998: 132). This experience has in turn shaped the domestic security concerns of the Middle East's post-colonial regimes, obsessed with 'making themselves secure within their states' (Buzan and Waever, 2009: 194). While it is obvious that pan-Islamism and pan-Arabism have failed to supplant the entire exogenous state-system, 'trans-national ideological and subversive threats have shaken, and occasionally helped bring down, regimes in the Arab world' (Gause III, 2003: 278), as visible in the Islamic revolution in Iran, and most recently in the calls for democratisation of the 2011 Arab Spring. Following the disastrous effects of the 1967 Arab-Israeli war for the pan-Arabism project, pan-Islamism has been left the primary contender for the citizens of the Middle East's loyalties (Hafez, 2003: 56), posing a threat to the secular foundations of the nation-state over which generally authoritarian regimes preside. However, as is evident recently in the many failed revolutions post-2011, autocratic rulers fearful of Islamism's appeal have often suppressed waves of democratisation, in order to preserve the status quo which benefits both them and the West's interests in local natural resources (Almond et. al, 2003: 241). Islamism has had to accommodate itself to this system, and its many manifestations have sought to do that in different ways (Buzan & Waever, 2009: 186). Extremist and militant Islamic fundamentalist groups reject this political reality and perpetrate violent acts against the state and its populations, while more moderate groups tread a finer line. Having officially denounced violence some time ago, the Brotherhood has sought to exist within the system, engaging in bottom-up Islamist societal change in order to affect Egyptian political reality. Egypt possesses the 'longest traditions of coherent statehood' (Springborg, 2018: 9) and as such, despite the relative strength and resilience of the Muslim Brotherhood organisation, its

political bodies have resisted Islamist appeals. Indeed, the group has been repressed extensively at various points in its history (Milton-Edwards, 2016; Hafez, 2003). Feelings of nation have been strongest in Egypt in relation to the rest of the Middle Eastern states, and this has further consolidated the state's coherence through centralisation of power.

Egypt's different experience of state-formation, through the rule of successive military regimes, has allowed for the growth of what is termed 'the deep state' (Springborg, 2018; Faris, 2013; Barak, 2018), a group of what Faris terms 'predatory, extractive elites' who have ever sought their survival and continued enrichment, at the expense of Egypt's democratic institutions. Entrenched in the state system and jealously guarding its 'extractive political institutions' (Linz, 1990), this core of well-connected families and military elites have proven unable or perhaps unwilling to address the country's economic and sectarian tensions (Faris, 2013: 99). This position has been consolidated through a 'pernicious military-industrial-service complex' (2013: 103) which has repressed political opposition, most of all the Brotherhood, usually acting clandestinely to 'correct' the path of Egyptian political developments should they deviate from their desired outcome (Barak, 2018: 449). In Egypt, Islamism poses both a political threat (evidenced by the Muslim Brotherhood's democratic election) and a security threat (jihadi terrorist attacks and IS insurgency in the Sinai) to the regime, which in turn has conflated the two, by designating the MB a terrorist organisation, claiming that 'the Brothers are at best stepping-stones to violent extremism, or, at worst, violent extremists themselves' (Springborg, 2018: 133). While the Brotherhood's Islamist rhetoric may appeal to a wide audience in Egyptian society who believe the country should be run more closely along the lines of the *shar'ia* (Springborg, 2018: 121), their failure to engage effectively with other layers of civil society or the political opposition 'has rendered civilians as a whole unable to effectively stand up to the deep state and the superstructure that rests upon it' (136). Due to decades of repression by the Egyptian state, and a focus within the Brotherhood on survival (Milton-Edwards, 2016), resultant policies among the organisation's leadership of pandering to the ruling elite or engaging in stiff resistance have left it unable to form a coherent civilian opposition (Sprinborg, 2018: 135). The Egyptian deep state's network comprising of security officials, members of the Ministry of Interior, 'wealthy businessmen, and civil society actors', possess the capacity to influence Egypt's political machinations to such a degree as to suppress any serious threat posed by the Muslim Brotherhood (Barak, 2018: 454). The deep state in Egypt is thus reminiscent of Mehtap Söyler's description of the 'authoritarian, criminal, and corrupt segments of the state that function in a democratic regime by exploiting and

reproducing its deficiencies' in his discussion of the Turkish progenitor of the concept (2015: 1).

The structure of the deep state in Egypt then, 'particularly the bureaucracy and its connections with business interests—was inherently resistant to democracy and its Islamist incarnations in the Muslim Brotherhood' (Milton-Edwards, 2016: 46). The central position at the core of the Egyptian state provided them with the essential means to employ security rhetoric in order to shut down the Brotherhood and the revolution. Indeed, according to Filiu, Egypt's 'counter-revolution' is the most successful of its kind, operating 'through the revamping and mobilization of a merciless 'Deep State'' (Filiu, 2015: xii). This occasion of deep state success gives weight to Barak's statement about the potentially undemocratic impediment they can pose to civilian regimes if they are 'anathema to their members (e.g. Islamic movements)' (2018: 450). The massive bureaucracy that the MB inherited from Mubarak was already opposed to the newcomers, and the nature of state apparatus made it difficult to address the country's deep rooted socio-economic issues. Following Mubarak's resignation, Egypt's deep state incarnation quickly acted to 'safeguard and further expand its privileges through the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces (SCAF)', while exacerbating the crisis with engineered resource shortages (Filiu, 2015: 176; Barak, 2018: 456), evidently destabilising the situation even further for the Brotherhood-backed FJP in order to accelerate their fall. While it would have been a stretch to ask the group to accommodate to the military who had so long repressed them (Milton-Edwards, 2016), the organisation failed to make allies of its enemies in order to secure a broad base of support, and ultimately its exclusion of secular elements in the government's make-up in favour of Islamist nominations signalled its downfall. Now, many acts of violence perpetrated by other militant groups are ascribed to the MB by the regime, in order to further discredit it domestically and internationally, and perhaps to deny the existence of a wider militant Islamist problem (Springborg, 2018: 139-140). As indication of the Egyptian security regime's unsubstantiated efforts to discredit the Brotherhood, they have claimed to be able to prove the link between the Muslim Brotherhood and the main jihadi group agitating in the Sinai province, the *Ansar Beit al-Maqdis* ('Champions of Jerusalem'), though these claims have never been verified (Filiu, 2015: 181). The armed forces have always been economically and socially strong, receiving support from the Gulf countries and the US (in the sum of $1.3 billion). With consistent approval ratings of 80%, direct control by the military is stronger than ever, as military personnel occupy key political positions (Springborg, 2017: 480). Despite decreasing levels of jihadi violence, Sisi's regime succeeded in amplifying 'the

jihadi menace to such an extent that it kills the democratic process' (Filiu, 2015: 191). Securitizations were increasingly being used to delegitimize political opponents' standing in society and thus legitimate military action (Greenwood & Waever, 2013: 495), a tactic inherent in the regime's use of the terrorist label against the Brotherhood. Therefore, the military and the elite's use of militaristic securitisation rhetoric enabled them to, as of 2013, entirely exclude the Muslim Brotherhood from any legitimate political dialogue, and thus exploit the local deficiency of democracy for their continued benefit while posing as the protectors of regional stability.

Securitisation against the Muslim Brotherhood post 2013: A Reversal of Fortunes

The statement on 1st July 2013 by the Egyptian military following their successful coup-volution expressing the great danger posed to the 'national security of the State', which conveys them with responsibility 'to act in a way that is commensurate with these dangers'[2], can be seen as the elevation of state security above the normal conduct of democratic politics. As such, the democratically elected Freedom and Justice Party, while largely unpopular in Egypt following failures to address the country's post-revolutionary needs, has been forcibly removed from power, and in its place sits an autocratic military leader who has repressed any Islamist or revolutionary opposition. Through enunciating a threat to the national security of Egypt[3], the government under Sisi has claimed to be acting in the name of national interests, when the concern is more likely the survival of the government and its 'deep state' supporters, as well as the establishment of its legitimacy in power (Buzan et. al, 1998: 146). Waever & Laustsen themselves recognised how state-centric approaches to securitisation can prove to be undemocratic (2000: 708), since the urgency of the matter suspends practice of democratic politics and enables extraordinary action. Furthermore democratic consultation is foregone, since the 'logic of state security will tend to privilege the power holders as the natural interpreters of what should be done to secure the state' (Buzan et. al, 1998: 123). The designation of the Muslim Brotherhood as a terrorist organisation in December 2013, allowed the military to defend its referent object, the Egyptian (deep) state, by the extraordinary means in which it is currently engaging, i.e. the extrajudicial arrest and execution of hundreds of Brotherhood leaders and members, along with the killings of almost a thousand of their

[2] Statement by the Armed Forces on Monday, 1 July 2013: (http://www.sis.gov.eg/Story/101255/Statement-by-the-Armed-Forces-on-Monday%2c-1-July-2013?lang=en-us) (accessed 14/01/2019)
[3] https://www.elwatannews.com/news/details/267637 (accessed 16/01/2019)

supporters in the Raba'a al-Adawiya and al-Nahda Square Massacres (Milton-Edwards, 2016). Indeed, the repression exercised by the regime resulted in one of the biggest mass killings of demonstrators in the past century, in raids that lasted almost twelve hours and established complete state control over Egypt's public spaces (Grimm & Harders, 2018: 9).

The labelling of the Brotherhood as a terrorist organisation is a powerful discursive action, drawing on internationally significant narratives of terrorism and security, which reached their peak following the 9/11 attacks on American soil. The framing of the Islamist organisation as such conjures up powerful associations, and passes judgement on the group's political and social legitimacy (Jackson, 2007: 247), relegating the Brotherhood to a marginal position of extremist 'other'. Of importance to this discussion is the idea elaborated above of securitisation being a speech act (Buzan et. al 1998). This equally holds true for the labelling of something as a terrorist organisation. The latter act cannot be seen outside of the broader context of the 'Global War on Terrorism' (GWoT) discourse initiated by the USA following the 9/11 attacks. The war on terror constitutes what Buzan and Waever term a 'macrosecuritisation' (2009), an overarching mobilisation of political and security power that encompasses smaller and lower-level securitisations to coordinate them to its benefit. This benefit can work in reverse as well however; by 're-articulating and adapting various local security concerns in terms of the macrosecuritisation' (Buzan and Waever, 2009: 266), perhaps conveying the local securitising actor greater legitimacy on the wider international scene by expanding the audience for its security act. The GWoT strives to be a universalising securitisation, encompassing 99.9% of the international community's population, all but the terrorists (Buzan and Waever, 2009: 264). In the case of the Egyptian regime's speech act of designating the Muslim Brotherhood as a terrorist organisation, it has served in removing the group to the political margins of that 0.1%, taking a significant step to ostracising the organisation from all international engagement. Since, as Jackson put it, to use the label is to imply 'a political judgement about the legitimacy of actors and their actions' (2007: 247). By positing the MB and its actions as illegitimate, the al-Sisi regime attempts to constitute its own legitimacy and the legitimacy of the 2013 coup. It has placed itself as diametrically opposed to Islamist terrorism, and as such within the Western 'limited collectivity' (Buzan and Waever, 2009: 255), which has constituted itself and its 'we-feeling' through opposition to terrorism, most frequently of the Islamic fundamentalist variety. The label 'terrorism' holds a significant degree of power, which triggers 'vivid imagery' and invokes certain discourses familiar to the international community (Buzan and Waever, 2009: 267). The inherent vagueness of the US securitisation of terrorism as a threat in terms of

'referent object, threat and relationship between specific countermeasures and specific threats' (Buzan and Waever, 2009: 266) has benefitted the regime, allowing it to posit the group as a security threat not just to its own domestic audience, but also the international audience, 'without elaborate arguments about the securityness of the specific case' (267).

This loose definition of securitisation has contributed to the success of the Sisi regime in avoiding international reprimand for the severity of its crackdown on Muslim Brotherhood supporters, evident in continued Western arms-sales to the country[4]. Furthermore, as Dixit has shown, the use of terrorism rhetoric is a way in which 'state actors attempt to establish control over their citizens and over the space within which state security forces can operate' (2015: 33). Alongside the dismantling of the MB's organisational structure, the regime has carried out an estimated 11,700 arrests in the two years between the coup and January 2016 (Springborg, 2018: 141). As justification, President Sisi claims that the Muslim Brotherhood is the root of the world's Islamic extremist issues, stating in an interview with *Der Spiegel* that 'all these other extremists emanated from them' (143). In broadening the context of Egypt's domestic security concerns to include 'all these other extremists', Sisi has constructed a transnational dimension to his security act, and thus, in the eyes of his security audience of the West and the Gulf, legitimated extreme measures. This transnational dimension has come to include the Gulf states Saudi Arabia and the UAE who have joined Egypt in its designation of the Brotherhood as a terrorist organisation, following their funding and support of secular opposition groups in the lead up to the 2013 coup (Milton-Edwards 2016: 49). Fear of an Islamist challenge to the Gulf states' regimes, and fear among the West of an Islamist party as head of state has allowed the Sisi regime to continue its repression unfettered, as the Muslim Brotherhood's opponents marshalled discourses about security and terrorism in relation to a battle of secularism vs Islamism to garner domestic and foreign support (53). Ayoob (1995) has shown that the most common security threats in Third World Countries are usually internal, and as such Greenwood and Waever have pointed out that the security policies aimed towards the population tend to be the norm in the Third World, elaborating that 'even if security politics stays within the rubric of 'international politics', the centre of gravity remains regime security' (2013: 489). This is particularly instructive as to the case in Egypt, where the Sisi regime's security policies have

[4] https://foreignpolicy.com/2015/08/06/sisi-is-the-best-gift-the-islamic-state-ever-got/

led to the arrest and conviction of at least 41,000 people between Morsi's overthrow and May 2014, according to Human Rights Watch reports[5].

Through the criminalization of protests and the designation of the Muslim Brotherhood as terrorists, room for resistance has been kept to a minimum (Springborg, 2018: 14). The Brotherhood has thus been marginalised from the realm of political activity and interaction by current Egyptian president, Abdel Fattah al-Sisi, resulting from what Buzan terms 'the Manichaean "with us or against us" rhetoric associated with the "war on terrorism"' (2004: 266), with its polarising effect of non-negotiation or engagement. Sheikh's (2014) discussion of the doctrine sector in securitisation as the defence of non-negotiable values or ideologies, shows how the conflict between the doctrines of secularism and liberalism, and Islamism, as embodied most famously in the War on Terror discourse, can lead to over-securitisation of Islamist groups, as in the Brotherhood case. Resting on historical assumptions of a 'secular' state, the application of a state-centric template of securitisation to Islam, a religious doctrine which conflates *deen wa dawla* (faith and polity), would necessarily result in suggestions of 'secularism or Protestant Islam as a solution to Islamist violence' (Sheikh, 2014: 259). It is considerations such as these which lead to the propensity in international relations to exclude religious actors from the political dialogue, since they threaten the imagined Western 'secular subjectivity' (Mavelli, 2013). Though this move can be attributed to a small group of jealous military, political, and business elites forming the 'deep state' unwilling to relinquish power, it fits into a trend of excluding Islamist groups in order to protect the secularity of the state.

Persistent military rule, while popular amongst the layer of society that benefits from the structure of the deep state, also serves to alienate large sections of the population, particularly in its most recent anti-Islamist guise. Successive disappointing military regimes have turned more people to radical fundamentalism (Springborg, 2018: 33-34), and the severe repression of the Muslim Brotherhood will radicalise even more Egyptians, particularly among the young. The military regime's crackdown has left many in the country disillusioned, and the imposition of direct military rule 'essentially took the Republic [of Egypt] back to its starting point of… July 1952' (Springborg, 2017: 479). Disillusionment is particularly widespread among the youth, as Sisi's repression has spread from attacks on the Brotherhood's supporters, to encapsulate the young revolutionaries, and even the nation's university students, over 3000 of

[5] https://www.hrw.org/middle-east/n-africa/egypt (accessed 13/01/2019)

which have been arrested in the year 2013-2014 (Filiu, 2015: 180, 190). Ultimately, as Hafez (2003: 22) has shown regarding Islamism worldwide, Egypt can now expect an increased level of radicalisation of its Islamist entities, as the exclusionary and repressive domestic environment forces the occurrence of this process. This alienation of moderate Egyptian Islamists represents a fault of bias in the securitisation paradigm, with the discourse of terrorism employed by the Egyptian state evoking Western fears of Islam due to the perception that it represents a potentially problematic 'all-encompassing system of belief that conflates religion (private) and politics (public)' (Mavelli, 2013: 161). While the idea of an Islamist organisation being the governing party may seem unpalatable to many in Egypt, and indeed the West, the wholesale exclusion of a moderate group who advocate working through the system does not advance dialogues in international relations addressing the engagement of religious fundamentalist movements. As Hafez states, it has the opposite effect of giving 'credence and legitimacy to the claims of radicals' (2003: 55). The Muslim Brothers have long occupied a space in Egyptian Islamic society, that seeks to reinvigorate the religiosity and linked morality of the population and balance it with the secular nature of the state (Springborg, 2018: 121; Mitchell, 1993), goals that are representative of moderate Islamist movements everywhere (Hafez, 2003: 4). The acquisition of power in 2012, and Morsi's subsequent manoeuvres to secure governmental power for the organisation belie the group's professed nature as a 'religious movement with an abiding social-welfare agenda' (Milton-Edwards, 2016: 5). However, outlawing such a form of religious communal expression contributes to the marginalisation of an entire worldview for the purpose of perpetuating the 'secular subjectivity', from which the country's business and secular-oriented deep state may profit. Furthermore, the use of the label 'terrorism' only worsens this exclusion, placing the Brotherhood, and thus the viewpoint they represent outside of legitimate political discourse, setting progress in the engagement between Islamist and secular modernities back to mid-20th century conditions.

Through the framing of the Muslim Brotherhood as an existential threat to state security by the regime and deep state, under the umbrella of the 'War on Terror', the undemocratic and state-centric approach to issues of security and religion are highlighted, in particular following the removal and repression of a democratically elected entity articulating a moderate Islamist political doctrine. As a victim of these politics of exclusion, and something to say on the political and societal situation of Egypt and the wider Middle East, the MB lends itself to a discussion of how to develop more inclusive international relations.. As such, this thesis

continues with an analysis of the manner in which the 'world society' paradigm accounts for the presence and activity of non-state actors on the global scene, and takes into consideration worldviews existing outside the political imaginary of a Western order of secular nation-states, to which peripheral societies attempt to conform with varying success and not always positive effects on their domestic, and indeed the international, stability.

Ch.2: Unpacking a theory of 'World Society'

If the securitisation of the Muslim Brotherhood and Islamist projects more generally are understood as tactics of state-centric political exclusion, this chapter concerns itself with a formulation of a more inclusive global order that foregoes the Eurocentric assumptions about international society, or the society of *states*, elaborating on the notion of 'world society' proposed by the English School (ES) of international relations as a medium for this inclusion. World society recognises the interactions between state and non-state actors in pursuit of a global community of humankind, accommodating solidarist aspects of the English School, and furthermore acknowledges and celebrates the diversity present in contemporary world politics which may be suppressed by the international society, thus satisfying calls by the pluralist wing of the ES to take alternative viewpoints into perspective. Therefore, world society will be shown to be a useful starting point for the incorporation of previously marginalised non-Western voices into a global dialogue, and thus a productive arena for the engagement of the Islamist Brotherhood, who have shown capacity for compromise with other global actors.

The theory of 'world society's' potential for discussion of a global order which is witnessing a rise in religious fundamentalism, and for better engagement between actors across different categories of capacity as well as of identity, locus, and purpose speaks to the possibility to counter Mustapha Kamal Pasha's discussion of the non-West in IR as 'an absence', reappearing only to constitute the West, or in relation to Western projects (in Shilliam, 2011: 218). The *mission civilisatrice* of imperialism and colonialism (Pasha, 2011: 217), predicated on standards of civilization (Gong, 1984), has wielded discourses of modernity and established a logic whereby the West defines itself in relation to what the non-West isn't, or has not yet achieved, thus confining non-Western actors to a locus and temporality different [read inferior] to its own (Pasha, 2011: 218). The fact that the nation-state, as well as the dominant morality of the present society of states has arisen 'in one society and claimed to be applicable universally' (Burton, 1972: 6), has had the effect of a greater focus on the state as the sole unit of analysis and the disregard for other actors outside of the Western-propagated nation-state. As a result, no space is left for discussion of other actors, except as 'additions to the rule that the state is the core actor in international relations' (Smith, 2004). Furthermore, the assumption of 'sameness' on the global scene has ignored the subjectivities of other cultures regarding the conduct of international relations (Smith, 2004). The rise in conflicts at the intersection of the secular and the religious as well as conflicts between state and non-state actors, shows the need for conceptualisations of global order less focussed on exclusion based on a desire for homogenously secular nation-state actors. Immanent in this is what Scott Thomas recognises as the "civilising" 'suppression… of the indigenous practices of non-Western states-systems as part of their incorporation into a global (but Western) international society' (2000: 927), against which the Muslim Brotherhood is trying to act. The current marginalisation of the MB as an 'extremist other' through Cairo's terrorism and security discourses would belie their essential quest for cultural authenticity in the midst of this exogenous world order that emphasises the 'universal' norms of secularity of state, and increasing individualisation inherent in the liberal ideology (Mitchell, 1993: xvii; Postel-Vinay, 2007 in Tibi, 1997: 202). What the world society paradigm provides is a way to transcend this order and recognise those global actors that express a worldview, wide-reaching in its saliency, different to that prescribed by the global order inherited from the particular Western locus and temporality, and provide a platform for movements towards a more common morality. Since, as John Burton elaborates 'the only morality or ethical system that is applicable in world society is that which arises out of the whole' (1972: 6). Too often, norms deemed 'universal' privilege the Western

particularity. As such this chapter will seek to draw out pluralist currents in world society theorisation, that might allow for discussions of the MB in such an order, since the proliferation of religious fundamentalist movements negates ideas of an eventual homogenisation of global society. Indeed, In defence of a pluralist conception of world society, John Williams takes a sceptical view of 'universal moralities' due to the durability of diverse ideologies, stating that 'in the absence of sufficiently convincing grounds for asserting the superiority of one ethical schema over another, the only acceptable way forward is to agree to disagree.' (132).

Development of the notion 'World Society'

The theory of 'world society' is the latest development in an English School tripartite conception of the order of global relations, following 'international system' and 'international society' (Green, 2014: 1). While the ES are not the only ones using the framework, ES theorists have been the primary contributors to the body of literature on these concepts, and on 'world society' particularly. There was recognition among the English School as early as 1962 of an aspect of international relations existing 'within, beneath, alongside, behind and transcending, the national society of states' (Manning, 1962: 177 in Buzan, 2004: 31), though the states-system at times obfuscates this and analysis of its effects and interactions. In 'International Theory', Martin Wight recognised that 'it was only at a superficial and transient level that international politics was about relations among states at all' (1991: xii), linking world society to revolutionist cosmopolitanism, which 'implies the total dissolution of international relations' (1991: 45). This latter view would seem to suggest that world society will at some point in the future take over from international society, in a utopian idealist sense of what Hedley Bull terms the 'community of mankind, which existed *potentially'* (1991: xii) (my italics), showing that while the English school theorists believe in its potential and future existence, not much thought has been given to its actual manifestations or development. Rather than the three being rigid independent notions of how global society is ordered, Green explains how the concepts are conceived in overlapping phases, while Buzan sees them as capturing 'the simultaneous existence of state and non-state systems operating alongside and through each other' (2004: 3), with 'world society' being the latest development involving admittedly the least scholarship. 'International society' still maintains the traditional focus on a state-based, 'structurally induced pattern of security maximisation' (Williams, 2010: 129), corresponding to Wight's tradition of Hobbesian realism (1991). 'World society' on the other hand offers a more normative approach, highlighting how the states-system may slowly be undermined by

international 'value convergence' (Green, 2014: 1), reflecting Wight's tradition of Kantian 'Revolutionism' (1991: 40). Bull's understanding of the concept was a human community linked by shared values, norms and common interests upon which common institutions could theoretically be built (1977: 269). As such the model focuses on the interactive values of different actors which bring them together, and potentially influence norms in international society (Clark, 2007). The development of the concept may be due to the ES's concern 'from the beginning… with the incorporation of "the Other" as international society expanded' (Thomas, 2005: 153). Williams shows that 'world society' has the potential to be the arena where irreconcilable diversity can be negotiated (2005: 30), overcoming the problem of what Blaney and Inayatullah call the 'Westphalian deferral' in international society, namely that the issue of dealing with human diversity in Europe was deferred at the treaties of Westphalia to the responsibility of the emergent sovereign states (Williams, 2005: 22). The English School's position on 'world society' therefore remains largely confused, as Suganami highlights, particularly due to the 'tension' between the state-centricity displayed by some of the School's concepts on global order, namely 'international system' and 'international society', and the awareness among some scholars of the importance of non-state entities in dealing with human diversity, in addition to their calls to incorporate more of the non-West and its values (2003: 266).

This tension in the English School is best embodied in the debate between the solidarist and pluralist traditions within the school, the zero-sum logic of which has at times threatened to spell the end for English School theory (Weinert, 2011: 30). The pluralist account within the school maintains the importance of global diversity, however believes the state and international society's essential principles of sovereignty and non-intervention to be the primary defenders of said diversity. The English School proponents of the solidarist camp are associated with world society, and emphasise the necessity of some degree of shared values in order for such to develop, with Bull elaborating that the vehicle for shared values may be through coercion, cosmopolitanism, or through the development at the level of states (cited in Buzan, 2004: 65). Weinert has pointed out that stated as such, the concepts take on a very dualistic zero-sum likeness, almost removing their utility for analysis, since designating the complexity of global society as one or the other is nigh impossible (2011). Indeed, according to Williams, English School debates have tended to 'assume solidarism is "hard-wired" into world society' (2005: 19), most often emphasising liberal solidarism as the desirable framework for a world society to develop. Weinert advocates instead the recognition of both

concepts' co-existence, which in today's more multicultural and globalised international scene is a more feasible proposition. Pluralism's recognition of diversity offsets solidarism's propensity to homogenisation, as shown by Halliday's work on homogeneity in international society, which elucidates that due to international pressures, 'states are compelled more and more to conform to each other in their internal arrangements' (1992: 435), visible in Egypt's securitisation of the Muslim Brotherhood in the name of preserving the separation between religion and state. Indeed, Williams believed that a pluralist-leaning conception of world society is 'ethically desirable' (2005: 19), in order to truly bring the global and all its peculiarities in to play. In arguing for a pluralist conception of world society, he states that movements towards it are occurring 'when established mechanisms and institutions of international society have to take into account processes, institutions and normative critiques rooted in global practices and conceptualisations' (21). The 'global' does not equal 'Western', and thus of necessity must include Islamism and its critique of the international society established by the West. Williams elaborates that this 'taking into account' cannot occur through the heretofore attempts at 'containment' or 'co-option' in the face of diversity, an example of containment being the process of securitisation discussed in the previous chapter. Rather, the development of shared institutions and practices which foster a 'genuinely global dialogic ethic' (Williams, 2005: 29) should be encouraged. A world society paradigm that took religious and cultural pluralism seriously would have to move away from the 'Westphalian deferral' of diversity to the state that ES pluralists support, however ethically need remain more pluralist than the liberal cosmopolitanism that ES solidarists hope for.

Where the ES literature may be hampered by its debates, and found lacking in its tangible conceptualisation and definitional precision of world society, Buzan's (2004) work contributes to clarifying the values and uses thereof for developing a deeper understanding of global society. Buzan recognised the degree to which the English School idea required elaboration and unpacking, thus discussing theorists of world society outside of the school, in order to better conceptualise a more pluralistic version of the theory that moves away from Western and state-centricity. A common theme among these theorists (Burton, 1972; Shaw, 1992) was to broaden the definitions of 'world' and 'society', so as to incorporate interactions and communications among and between non-state actors, individuals, and states on a wider basis than that of the cosmopolitan 'shared values' proposed by the solidarists of the ES (Buzan, 2004: 67, 69). Buzan highlights the Stanford School's approach, which acknowledges the existence of groups outside of individuals and states that express 'religious, ethnic,

occupational, industrial, class, racial and gender-based' interests and functions (Meyer et al., 1997 in Buzan, 2004: 73). These divergent views on the criteria of values for world society highlight a point perhaps neglected in ES thinking: 'that the values of world society are often inconsistent and conflictual', thus not necessarily adhering to the liberal solidarism desired by English School theorists (Buzan, 2004: 74). By deepening and widening the definition of world society, to incorporate differing values and characters of the actors in analytical focus, space is created for a discussion of non-state identity-based groups such as Islamist movements. This is important for the present shift towards a post-Westphalian framework of international relations, in which tensions and conflicts are no longer confined to the material interstate level (Buzan, 2004: 88), but entail more frequent clashes over identity and ideology, particularly at the secular-religious or religious-religious intersections.

However, in relation to world society's development Buzan maintains that, in terms of effective vehicles of change states remain the most powerful actor, 'not least because of their dominant command of the instruments of coercion' (2004: 259). This view is shared by Weinert and Clark, who believe any significant changes are only likely to occur at the level of international society (2011; 2007). The question is raised whether coercion is a legitimate tool to bring about faster value convergence towards the dominant societal norms than the modes of belief or calculation, in the case of a lagging behind of developments in the interhuman domain. It is precisely the exercise of this coercion of which the Egyptian regime's securitisation of the MB is an example, elaborated on in the previous chapter. This speaks to the power that the state still holds in the contemporary international society, where they still decide the fate of non-state actors (Buzan, 2004: 263). The 'war on terrorism' discourse for example has conveyed even more legitimacy and power to the state in employing coercive methods, particularly the progenitor United States of America, allowing more control of civil (or uncivil) society (Buzan, 2004: 266). The American departure from engagement with multilateral and secondary institutions that Buzan describes as justified by its 'war on terrorism' empowers the institution of the state again, allowing for the disengagement with non-state actors by the interstate society and a move away from engagement with a world society. Thomas asserted that states could, 'with sufficient political will or imagination', construct new practices for international conduct, thus giving rise to the potential to 'transform an anarchical international society into a cosmopolitan world order' (2000: 833). This process would be made easier with the guidance of a superpower, however the direction that the contemporary superpower has taken has proved more polarising. In many ways the questionable results of the 'war on terror' have perpetuated

the 'collapse of confidence in the way Western modernity has understood the world' (Thomas, 2000: 839), and indeed led to the further proliferation of opposing religious fundamentalist groups. The failures of international society and indeed IR theory to engage expressions of Islamism effectively begs the question of 'how many quantitative changes will produce a qualitative change in international relations?' (Weinert, 2011: 39). Due to the neglect perpetrated by the states paradigm in international relations of the problem of ethical diversity among global communities through the Westphalian settlement (Williams, 2005: 22), the need for a way of thinking non-Western communities into a global international society more representative of the diverse reality is brought into focus, and the recognition thereof can be seen as rejecting the elision of non-Western elements and thought perpetrated by the majority of Western scholarship and political actors (Pasha, 2011: 218). This deferral of responsibility in dealing with diversity to the state has led to the undemocratic suppression of particular groups in the pursuit of homogeneity, and has drawn limited responses from international society due to its principles of sovereignty and non-intervention.

The attitude of homogenising international relations to fit its secular modern paradigm is also reflected in the securitization of religious groups and the construction and demonization of the 'other' in order to construct the 'we' of modern Western society (Hurd, 2008: 49). While Buzan recognises that ideological convergence between Islam and liberalism may or may not lead to conflict, adoption of a pluralistic attitude as proposed by the formulation of world society discussed above, would assume 'that some common interests and values can be found… on the basis of a logic of coexistence' (Buzan, 2004: 257), without having to resort to coercion to enforce a Western-flavoured solidaristic international society. In light of the failure of coercive value convergence in the Middle East, through the Western democratic state-building projects in Iraq and Afghanistan, or sponsorship of and partnership with autocratic leaders willing to violently repress calls for democratisation, the pursuit of a logic of coexistence appears a suitable alternative. In that vein, recognition of the existence of varying values and actors within the world society paradigm is a step in the right direction, and can facilitate mutual democratic engagement. As Buzan puts it, 'difference could breed indifference or tolerance' (2004: 257). Buzan's move to incorporate thought on world society outside of the English School is important in bypassing the latter's reliance on historical context and the more narrow view among the solidarists that a shared culture is necessary for an international society to flourish, a view which Williams accuses of ignoring 'globalisation to an unjustifiable extent' (2005: 23).

The world society framework then, constituting in Clark's words, the 'non-state social world, that takes a transnational form, and is distinct from the society of states' (2007: 22), places less of an emphasis on the sanctity of the state as the 'universal' basic unit of analysis in international relations, and can thus avoid the state-based exclusionary policies of international society. Therefore it is of use for discussions of the 'transition from Westphalian to post-Westphalian international politics' elaborated by Buzan (2004: 3). This would suggest that world society is working in contention to international society (a view described by Buzan as 'Wightean') (2004: 267), and progressing towards a relationship of displacement, however the relationship has often been complementary, as put forward by Ian Clark in his discussion of how world society has impacted norm development in international society's legitimacy projects (2007: 7). Following Clark, international society's projects of legitimacy consolidation have involved interaction with world society in the form of norm constitution and acceptance (2007: 14), highlighting their ongoing coexistence. However, due to the limited number and Western ontology of his case studies, solidarism is inherent in his thought on the subject. In order to avoid the perpetuation of international society's and IR's West-centricity, further such explorations of world society must incorporate voices from outside the core. Indeed, Bull recognised that in order for a truly *global* international society to develop, this cosmopolitan Western culture would inevitably 'have to absorb non-Western elements to a much greater degree' (Thomas, 2000: 832).

World society still lacks the same degree of institutionalisation that international society boasts. As Clark put it, due to structural differences, world society, within which the MB classifies as an actor, 'lacking its own political system, or system of rule… has been compelled largely to operate through the machinery of international society' (2007: 26). Thus the Brotherhood, traditionally lacking a platform upon which to have its voice heard internationally, took part in the Egyptian political process for that very reason, and gained success in the 2011 elections. Despite the theory's relatively undeveloped conceptualisation, according to Clark, 'indirect evidence for the development of world society is best traced in the manner it registers upon, and helps reconstitute, the norms operating within international society' (2007: 34). In Clark's analysis, evidence of world society is best seen in the 'value added' to international society's legitimacy projects, such as the human rights movement (2007: 24). The influence the Brotherhood has had on Egyptian and Middle Eastern politics throughout its history, as successive regimes have sought to co-opt or contain its message of "Islam is the Solution"

(Hafez, 2003), represents a visible form of norm development, at least specific to Egypt, and added value to the legitimacy of said regimes vis-à-vis the population. Furthermore, if we take the 'war on terrorism' to be a new norm of international society, by declaring war on non-state actors, evidence is provided of a world society, however not in the positive manifestation (with which this thesis is preoccupied). Positive normative debates have also been encouraged during occasions of interaction between the MB and other societies, as discussed in Meijer & Bakker's book on their place in Europe (2012), or Weber's article on the Brotherhood's place in Egyptian civil society. A move towards pluralism, as espoused by Williams, can thus benefit from the discussion of the Brotherhood's concepts and interactions with other actors within the parameters of world society, by assuming its world views and ethical systems as part of the diverse plurality that is not confined to territoriality, but is a natural part of the human condition (2005). As Williams put it however, the move towards such a pluralist world society 'should not enable violently intolerant groups, identities and communities to find a new place in which to live and thrive,' (2005: 33), and indeed this thesis is in no way intended as an apology of some of the Brotherhood's more reprehensible historical chapters (see Meijer & Bakker, 2012: 1). William's statement can in equal measures condemn aspects of the Brotherhood and the Egyptian regime's behaviour. The difference between the two lies in one's ability to act in its benefit on the global platform, while the other is deprived of said platform due to the present intractability of the contemporary international society in its defence of the secular subjectivity.

Analysis of the MB through the world society paradigm and in the context of a wider emergence of religious fundamentalism may challenge the concept, particularly in the solidaristic Bull & Wight tradition of meaning the existence of shared values, if these values are assumed to be Western liberal. However this examination can also strengthen the theory by incorporating actors that are perhaps otherwise neglected from involvement in discussions of 'world society', and by showing to what degree value convergence can be achieved despite cultural pluralism. Clark himself admitted to the fact that his study only covered Western liberal civil society action (2007: 214), representative of what Fred Halliday calls "the cultural empire of the liberal establishment of the North Atlantic" (cited in Thomas, 2005: 97). The possibility that the paradigm provides for emphasising the commonalities of global society despite cultural pluralism, can help move away from the exclusionary nature of securitisation based on a desire for homogeneity. Therefore, the compatibility of Muslim Brotherhood thought and civil activity with the dominant Western paradigm, as well as its influence on the norm development of Egypt, the Middle East and Europe will be analysed in the light of a

world society emphasising dialogue and cultural pluralism, in order to show how engagement rather than containment or exclusion of alternative worldviews may foster 'a global dialogic ethic', and so further conceptions of 'world society'.

Chapter Three: Towards a 'world society'? Perspectives within and of the Muslim Brotherhood

The search for cultural authenticity in an exogenous world order that the Muslim Brotherhood represents would place the group at the 'centre of the modern experience of Muslims and not on the margins of an extremist "other" as often claimed (Mitchell, 1993: xvii). By 'adding

value' to the discussions on the characteristics of modernity and international relations from a viewpoint outside of the West, the Brotherhood thus 'distinguishes between modernity and the West'. It is this provincialisation of the Western experience of modernity which will allow the engagement 'with the irreducible yet inter-related plurality of modern world development' of which Shilliam speaks (2011: 3) and proponents of 'world society' hint at. In that conceptions of world society and its advocates from the English School have enabled a more diverse discussion of modern society, the alternative perspective that the Muslim Brotherhood provides, if engaged productively, can be a step in the direction of embracing different subjectivities that provincialise the dominant Western ones, thereby preventing the further perpetuation of exclusionary Western tropes in international society. The incorporation of the MB allows the possibility of addressing the 'absence' of non-Western voices Pasha refers to, while simultaneously contributing to a conceptualisation of world society that moves away from the 'cultural empire of the liberal establishment of the North Atlantic' (Thomas, 2005: 97) that has plagued discussions of non-state actors so far. Yet, as evidenced by authoritarian repression following the recent wave of democratisation in the Arab world, suppression and exclusion of Islamist elements, moderate or otherwise, remains the norm. This repression has been argued to stem from the deficiency of international relations theories and international conduct to address Islamism, and the propensity to marginalise such groups due to the threat the pose to Western international society's homogeneity. However, evidence of the Brotherhood's contribution to world society arguably exists in the interactions where they have been allowed a platform for political and civic engagement and activism, since the group has shown capacity for moderation and compromise in Egypt and abroad, and provided an important support network for sections of the weakened Egyptian population. Thus, the success of dialogue in these situations shows the Brotherhood's perspective can be taken into account with regard to globalising politics. Furthermore, arguments that the group's founding ideologies as espoused by Hassan al-Bannā' and Sayyid Qutb justify violent action are arguably based on misreadings by Western scholars and jihadists alike, and they in fact reflect a nativist critique of Western meta-narratives on modernity.

The Sisi regime's securitisation of the Brotherhood has, in conjunction with the use of the terrorism label and ascription of various terrorist attacks to them (El-Shimy, 2015: 95), sought to blur the line between the more moderate Muslim Brotherhood and violent jihadist groups, which has effectively tarnished the group's reputation with the same brush as internationally vilified groups such as Dā'esh (Islamic State). Despite this and other political setbacks, Milton-Edwards claims 'the Brotherhood is still understood as a global movement that remains

relevant to discourses about political Islam, extremism, jihad, the Middle East, Islam, and the West' (2016: 161). It is at the interplay of these themes that a discussion of the MB's relevance for the 'world society' paradigm can prove useful. Since these intersections are where conflicts are most likely to happen, it would prove beneficial to encourage a way to view and engage a moderate Islamist group in a light that isn't heavily influenced by state and global security, which tends to marginalise said groups (Zollner, 2009: 2). After briefly covering the movement's beginnings, this chapter will focus on some of the Muslim Brotherhood's concepts as elaborated in their chief ideologues' main tracts, with a view to unpack the organisation's views on democracy and other Western concepts, and thus place them within a culturally pluralist framework of a world society that seeks to transcend the Eurocentrism of its international society starting point. Some of the Western scepticism regarding the group may be due to the fact that, early on, the MB in Egypt and beyond were 'in the habit of expounding on the evils of nationalism and the virtues of a Muslim project' that transcended the nation-state (Milton-Edwards, 2016: 163), though the degree to which accommodation and dialogue has influenced the group since is evident in its political participation in Egypt's 2011 national elections, and its interactions with European societies (Meijer & Bakker, 2012).

The Muslim Brotherhood's Founding Fathers

If Islamism represents an articulation of modernity outside of Eurocentrism, its engagement (or lack thereof) by an international society propagated and maintained by the dominant Western ideals shall of necessity entail some degree of conflict. Pluralist advocates of world society in the English School would welcome the participation of such attempts to conceptualise global modernity, and the Muslim Brotherhood represents a manifestation thereof that does not resort to violence to express its worldview. Nevertheless, the dualism involved in theses enunciating a 'civilizational conflict' (Huntington, 1996), and partly implied in narratives involved in the 'War on Terror' (Kellner, 2003), would conflate all manifestations of Islamism under the umbrella of a monolithic bloc of anti-democratic radicalism (Zollner, 2009: 2), with some observers claiming the only variation being the degree of militarism employed (Khatab, 2011). This rests on the high degree of visibility accorded, and indeed desired by, Islamist acts of violence in world media and discussions in the fields of policy and academia (Zollner, 2009: 2). That idea ignores the reality of wide-ranging differences between the various groups that espouse a doctrine of political Islam. The Muslim Brotherhood for one, though viewed with suspicion by many, has sought to distance itself from the extremist

incarnations espousing jihadist intentions to overthrow the state system in order to create an Islamic caliphate (Khatab, 2011). It has long renounced violence, and its chief ideologues, Hassan al-Bannā', Sayyid Qutb, and Hassan al-Hudaybi, have professed moderate, bottom-up means to achieve its desired societal change (Zollner, 2009; Khatab, 2011), despite the view among many that Qutb is the 'ideologue of Islamist radicalism, whose concepts trained extremist groups' (Zollner, 2009: 1). In fact, the group began out of concerns that al-Bannā' had regarding the deviating values and decaying morality he witnessed in Egyptian Muslim society (Pargeter, 2013: 9). It was believed this moral decay was a result of the encounter with the West through the imperial occupations by the French and British, and subsequent perceptions of Western superiority. In formulating a path for Muslim society to follow, the Muslim Brothers were heavily influenced by the modernising Islamic Reformers before them, and sought the middle ground between 'pure traditionalism and pure Westernism' (Keddie, 1972: 1), since Western superiority in some fields was evident, though Western cultural mores were deemed undesirable to al-Bannā' and his early followers.

The external perception of Islamism, and within that the Muslim Brotherhood, is that it stands in total opposition to Western thought and political practice (Zollner, 2009:2), however the group's anxieties regarding liberal democracy were not motivated by the democratic concepts themselves, rather by the inherent prioritisation of the material well-being of the individual over the community, 'which for the movement has a negative impact on public morality' (Pargeter, 2013: 250). This was Hassan al-Bannā's (1906-1949) primary concern in the early 20th century, and his motivation for forming the group in 1928, not the often-claimed aim of violently overthrowing the Egyptian state due to its Western tint. Indeed according to Richard P. Mitchell, al-Bannā' believed Egypt's code of law to be in accordance with Islam, since it was based on *Shari'a*, enshrined in the constitution of 1923, thus satisfying the needs for a Muslim state (1993: 235). Sayed Khatab has shown in his work on Islam's view of democratic participation, that the *Shari'a* has the capacity and inclination 'toward modernity, democracy, and human rights' (2011: 91-92). The Islamic reform project that al-Bannā' embarked upon, was predicated on the belief that Islam was a comprehensive ideology, and its proper implementation, through proper and incorrupt application of law, would guarantee the good society. The comprehensiveness of Islam, he believed, would 'negate the need to borrow philosophies and systems from other cultures' to allow for Muslim progress (Moussali, 1993: 168), since it already contained all of the concepts that Western international society prescribed. The concept of *shura* (consultation), essentially the selection of an individual for

rule by *ijma'* (consensus), employed prior to dynastic rule under the Ummayads, is reminiscent of democratic elections. Therefore, al-Bannā' was not in opposition to the laws or the constitution of Egypt per se, which he deemed to be compatible with Islam, rather it was the 'misapplication' and resultant corruption which he complains about (Mitchell, 1993; Khatab, 2011: 92). This was arguably the crux of Sayyid Qutb's (1906-1966) concept of *jahiliyya* (ignorance/pre-enlightenment); a concept from which many modern day radical organisations have taken strength and justified aggression domestically and internationally. He believed the amoral governance of Egypt, stemming from what he viewed as negative materialist European influences, was part of un-Islamic societies' rebellion against the *hakimiyya* (sovereignty) of God, since they claim the right to create values and legislate collective norms of behaviour without a view to the morality 'God has prescribed' (1980: 14-15). *Hakimiyya* in the thought of Qutb and al-Bannā' was not like the doctrine espoused by radical groups such as al-Qa'ida that humans are incapable of legislation, as Khatab has shown (2011: 99). Rather, for these ideologues, *hakimiyya* expressed God's sovereignty over all, that all men are equal before God, and that any society where some men stood in positions of superiority over others was *jahili* (Sharabi, 1970: 12). What this meant for al-Bannā' was the affirmation of 'the brotherhood of all peoples, the mutual assistance of all human societies, and the extirpation of those greedy ambitions which are inspired by fanaticism and whose fires sow dissension and mutual aversion among the nations' (1978: 78), reflecting the degree to which Islam is construed as capable of dialogue with other political systems, and also of recognising the importance of human rights.

Qutb advocated the imposition of *Shari'a* to negate the *jahiliyya* of these societies, since he believed 'Islam to be a comprehensive ideological system *(nizam)* covering politics, society and the economy' (Calver, 2010: 4), which may coincide with other human systems (democracy) or diverge (Khatab, 2011: 102; Qutb, 1983), but his emphasis was on Islam's comprehensiveness as a means to rescue Muslim societies from amorality. His view of Egypt was that the 'materialist ethos of the West had so deeply penetrated the Muslims' there, that 'they were no longer truly Islamic in character' (Calver, 2010: 1). He claims Egyptians ignored their cultural heritage, that importing systems, principles, and ideas from abroad has weakened their society and claims that foreign solutions will not help Egyptian problems (Qutb, 1983: 7), hence the emphasis on embracing Islam more fully, epitomised in the Brotherhood's slogan 'Islam is the solution' *(al-Islam huwa al-hal)* (Hafez, 2003: 50). The use of Qutb's intellectual heritage as a manual for modern day radicals may stem from some of his more violent language

for example advocating forceful strikes at Islam's enemies, the traditional ones of Christian and Jewish societies, but also 'the *faux* Muslims who fed from the troughs of Western-inspired barbarism' (Calver, 2010: 3). Scholars have pointed out that his more aggressive tone may have stemmed from long years of imprisonment by the Egyptian regime (Zollner, 2009: 1: Calver, 2010). Khatab has shown that Qutb was not essentially in opposition to the West or its principles of democracy and human rights, nor the concept of modernity against which so many Islamists rail (2011: 106-107), but resistance to Western secularism and occupation remained an important part of Qutb's, and al-Bannā's thought (Mitchell, 1993: 227). This reflected itself in their critique of Muslim materialism and greed in writings on *hakimmiya* and *jahiliyya*. They are not opposed to modernity *per se*, but rather the prescription of a modernity modelled on an 'idealized Western Europe' (Shilliam, 2011: 3), which relegates Muslims' views on the world 'to an object of inquiry rather than as thinking subjects of and on modernity' (ibid.). In showing that the Muslim Brotherhood's essential principles are not inherently anti-democratic or anti-human rights, but rather an expression of modernity and anti-imperialist sentiment, this discussion highlights the existence of a minimal degree of 'shared values' that can foster engagement between actors of different worldviews within 'world society', and already has done to an extent. Though a global society that recognises both Islamist expressions of community and Western liberal society may perhaps never achieve the degree of solidarism desired by theorists such as Wight, Bull, and Linklater due to Islamism's inherent critique of Western modernity, the resultant more plural scenario, will allow progression towards a more desirable 'genuinely global dialogic ethic' (Williams, 2005: 29). In a globalised world where religion is not receding as predicted in theories of modernisation, this cross-cultural dialogue is essential, and may indeed result in the convergence of values among different political actors around values geared toward the human community and removed from strategic concerns (Linklater & Suganami, 2006: 117) as has occurred with Cairo's securitising move.

The Contemporary Muslim Brotherhood

The exclusion of the Muslim Brotherhood, as discussed above, follows a long history of repression by Egypt's military regimes who have sought to shore up their own governments against the political threat that the group poses, obscuring the fact that the group has been engaged in dialogue and compromise throughout. Their alternate expression of community is perceived as destabilising to the secular order over which these regimes preside, and they are too readily securitised against, based on the latter framework's defence of the state. Shifting

the perspective away from the state and towards world society foregrounds the processes of cross-cultural dialogue the Brotherhood is engaged in, as for example in Europe, while also highlighting the compatibility of its principles with those of Western society, which are still deemed dominant. The New Muslim Brotherhood that emerged in the 1970s and 1980s distanced themselves from the framework of *jahiliyya* set out by Qutb, taking inspiration from Hassan al-Hudaybi's 1978 posthumously published work *Du'at la Qudat* (Preachers not Judges) (Zollner, 2009; Weber, 2013). As is suggested in the title, al-Hudaybi believed it the organisation's responsibility to reconnect Egyptians with their faith through preaching, and not pass judgement on whether their society was *jahili* or not, which could provoke the use of violence (Calvert in Meijer & Bakkers, 2012). However, despite the compatibility of some Muslim Brotherhood concepts with the dominant Western international norms that scholars such as Khatab (2011) expound, the degree to which the group's fundamentalist discourse has been tempered remains in question with regard to topics such as Israel (Wickham, 2011: 205), the mingling of the sexes, or the consumption of alcohol (Milton-Edwards, 2016: 174). Certainly, the group's failure in power can be chalked down to intervention by the deep state, or the enormous economic issues they inherited from Mubarak (El-Shimy, 2015; Springborg, 2018); however, the fault lies equally at the vagueness with which their slogan 'Islam is the solution' treats very tangible issues of importance to secularist groups. Whereas this may be an important stance for the treatment of Muslim society's morality, the degree to which it can work in conjunction with other belief-systems is another issue. Many scholars believe that the MB hasn't wholly internalised democratic principles as it claims to have done, and is rather using them to pursue its own goals (Wickham, 2011: 205-207). Following the 2011 coup-volution, the Brotherhood has taken up the familiar anti-Western line in their mouthpiece press-releases, admonishing the West for its lack of a response to the un-democratic military takeover despite their professed support for human rights, reiterating their opposition to 'all foreign interference in the affairs of our country'[6]. The Brotherhood, in reflection of the purpose for their creation, still seeks a nativist Islamic solution to Egypt's problems.

Nevertheless, Almond asserts that 'political involvement… tends to alter the exclusivist, dogmatic, confrontational mode of the fundamentalist' (2003: 12), a line this thesis has tried to tread through the refutation of securitisation's politics of exclusion, and the argument for the engagement of the Muslim Brotherhood as part of world society. Indeed, as Weber's

[6] http://www.ikhwanweb.com/article.php?id=31366 (accessed 22/01/19)

exploration of the MB's participation in Egyptian civil society shows, prior to securitisation, the group had entered into political dialogue and conflict with the state and other civil society actors (2013: 522). Despite the professed compatibility of the Muslim Brothers' essential principles with democratic traditions, and their turn to moderation under al-Hudaybi's influence, this engagement with civil society is perhaps the best reflection of their commitment to pluralism and dialogue. It shows that, the MB is capable of replacing 'strategic orientations with cosmopolitan political arrangements' involving dialogue rather than coercion (Linklater & Suganami, 2006: 117). Part of the reason why the MB still entails huge influence in Egypt and beyond is, aside from the nativist Islamic programme appealing to disillusionment with Western influence and the Western state system, also due to these civil services they provided where the Egyptian state has previously been found lacking. During the Mubarak regime's impoverished reign, the MB filled the gaps of service provision, establishing 'medical clinics, educational centres, business enterprises and charitable programmes' (El-Shimy, 2015: 79). Add to this their engagement in labour unions as well as university student unions, political engagement, and a truly expansive membership, and the threat they pose to Egyptian state institutions becomes more tangible. They have been an important part of the "third sector" civil society, and are thus 'as much a part of world politics as the secular NGOs that are a part of global civil society' (Thomas, 2005: 98). The organisation is able to challenge state legitimacy, not solely through its public services, but also through its criticism of the latter's un-Islamic nature, a message surely found appealing by large sections of Egypt's Muslim-majority population, seventy-four percent of which favour imposing *shari'a* as official law (Springborg, 2018: 121). Discussing the MB's history of political engagement, Weber shows their willingness to adapt to varying socio-economic conditions (2013: 516), solidifying their spot in the sphere of political discussion, and not at the margins as the proponents of securitisation would have it. This positive sign of the MB learning of a pluralist conception of democratic participation in Egyptian society would facilitate extrapolation of the same principle onto immersion in a broader world society, provided the same willingness to learn cross-cultural dialogue was shown by other actors and academics globally. Weber states that the debate around global civil society focuses on 'solutions to the *problematique of political modernity*' following the division of society into political and civil spheres (2013: 513), whereas the MB, through enumeration of their civil programme, and their participation in Egypt's political scene, straddle the middle ground of this debate, and their transnational aspect shows the degree to which the MB are engaged with a world society of human individuals. Securitisation approaches by the Egyptian regime, in playing up to secular fears of Islamist programmes to

protect themselves, would obscure the fact that MB values can be seen as similar to Western ones.

The experience of MB interaction in Europe is particularly instructive as to their compatibility with world society geared towards dialogue and mutual respect, for as Roald points out regarding Islamist politics on the European continent, as they engage 'in socio-political activities together with people with different perspectives, compromises have to be made on all sides' (in Meijers & Bakker, 2012: 78). The Brotherhood's presence in these contexts shows the group's remarkable adaptability to different contexts, incurring it with massive appeal for young European Muslims, where the French chapter has shown its acceptance of 'diversity, freedom of speech, and organisation as well as equality' (Meijer & Bakker, 2012: 18). The convergence of secular societies in Europe and the Muslim Brothers in their midst could suggest the 'thickening' of these global civil society actors (Thomas, 2005: 116). Indeed, in these cases Western secular society is regarded as more favourable than the secularism at home, which is associated with dictatorship, since it allows pluralism and religious freedom (ibid. 73-74). Here the MB's ideology has become 'personalised in the European context', to focus more on individual 'fulfilment and material success' (Brooke in Meijers & Bakker, 2012: 44). According to Brooke, similar ideological developments are taking place in Egypt, which are more in line with processes of globalisation (2012: 44-46), indicative of the norm development which takes place as a result of interaction within a world society context as elaborated by Clark (2007). Through positive encounters between Muslim students and the European societies that host them, openness towards secular viewpoints may be taken back to Egypt or other Middle Eastern countries, which could influence the old guard of the MB there to change their stance on the evils of secularity (Roald in Meijers & Bakker, 2012: 82), a development that according to some accounts already occurred throughout the 2011 revolution (El-Shimy, 2015). Indeed, in response to the Brotherhood's youth joining the protests early on despite the older Brothers calling for restraint, the movement fully committed and formulated official calls for 'increased governmental accountability, greater respect for law, and improved protection of citizens' rights' (Rutherford, 2008). The apparent positivity of encounters between secularists and the Brothers highlights the validity of foregoing the exclusionary tactics against moderate Islamist projects like the MB, that have been carried out previously through fear of their perceived intractable fundamentalism. The fact that the MB has shown willing to engage in dialogue and adapt to differing contexts is evident in the way their fundamental principles

tend to undergo a degree of secularisation in order to open up to other global viewpoints (*infitah).*

World society brings into focus the interplay of actors not usually involved in the society of states, and therefore allows for a broader conception of the present global order, where non-state actors are playing a visibly important role. Thus, examination of the MB's engagement, as an expression of community navigating the modernity of Western propagated nation-state system, contributes to the world society paradigm's work of 'taking into account practices, institutions and normative critiques rooted in global practices and conceptualisations' (Williams, 2005: 20). Doing so emphasises the possibility of a social order dealing with such actors outside of the heretofore norms of 'containment' or 'co-option', which can be seen in Egyptian policies toward the group (Hafez, 2003). As Clark elaborated, world society is seen in the 'value added' to discussions of norms in international society, therefore if Islamism can be seen as a critique of modern international society and its legitimacy, value is added to the international debate on modernity. The discussion is not solely an analysis of the total social interaction, but an exploration of the possibility of building 'common rules and institutions' (Bull, 1977: 279), built on a more universal consensus than the present Eurocentrism. The experience of MB interactions in Europe and as part of the Egyptian political and civil spheres, founded on the Brotherhood's conceptual compatibility with democratic principles, shows the potential to work towards common rules, and thus foster greater international justice that isn't propelled by West-centrism.

Conclusion

Discussions of world society thus far have focussed on its existence primarily in the Western context (Clark, 2007), or have focussed on the model's dubious empirical reality (Buzan, 2004: 303). As of late, attention has returned to the subject in order to challenge accusations of state-centricity in international relations. Thus, broadening the scope of analysis to include the MB, contributes to discussion of the theory and its utility for progressive debate about the nature of international relations, through incorporation of a non-Western non-state expression of modern community into the paradigm. The latter problem pointed out by Buzan highlights the need for more research into empirical manifestations or potential institutionalisations of a world society and its possible implications for post-Westphalian international relations. Through an examination of the Muslim Brotherhood and its interactions and compatibility with world society, the latter has been highlighted as a political medium capable of inclusionary engagement of non-state Islamist groups, foregoing the state-centric securitisation discourse that protects the 'secular subjectivity' of Egypt's ruling elite and the wider society of states. Such engagement can facilitate the progression from an international society stemming out of the Westphalian settlements to a globalised political order that reflects the totality of its constituent parts. The portrayal of the MB as an existential threat to the Egyptian state places it in diametric opposition to the present order of international society. Thus the exploration in Chapter One of the West-centricity of present theories and practices of securitisation, that seek to exclude and obscure the democratic capacity of actors previously considered anathema to the West's narrative of secular modernity, such as the Brotherhood, shows the propensity to perpetuate Western-centric particularities within said society of states at the expense of actors outside of this specific socio-political reality. The thesis proceeded in Chapter Two to discuss the utility of the English School's world society paradigm to address the question of moving beyond such an exclusionary and dualistic global order, which has resulted in the marginalisation of the MB. The world society paradigm was shown to enable more global inclusion by encompassing interactions between state and non-state actors, and satisfy calls from the theory's advocates among the English School's pluralist wing to diversify conceptions of modern international relations with the incorporation of non-Western voices. The theoretical

compatibility of the Brotherhood with a conception of global society that advocates pluralist dialogue and engagement was analysed in Chapter Three, with reference to its views on prevalent normative principles such as democracy and human rights, as well as its interactions with other actors, political or otherwise, globally and within Egypt. The Brotherhood's turn to more democratic practices is an encouraging sign, however it remains to be seen if a form of institutionalisation can occur, and whether this will temper some of the group's more vitriolic views, as regards the state of Israel for example. World society provides a platform for dialogue among a wide range of global actors varying in scope and opinion, thus in a sense providing the opportunity to move toward a greater human solidarity, and transcend exclusionary biases that have tangible effects on the real world. The MB, despite being labelled terroristic and extremist, have displayed capacity to progress to accommodative compromise with other worldviews, thus justifying a democratic approach to the group, rather than the present repression it is experiencing.

Bibliography

al-Bannā', H. (1978). *Five Tracts of Hassan al-Bannā' (1906-1949): A Selection from the Majmū'at Rasā'il al-Imām al-Shahīd Hasan al-Bannā'.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Almond, G. A., Appleby, R. S., & Sivan, E. (2003). *Strong Religion: The Rise of Fundamentalisms around the World.* London & Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ayoob, M. (1995). The New-Old Disorder in the Third World. *Global Governance*, 59-77.

Barak, O. (2018). Security Networks, Deep States, and the Democratic Deficit in the Middle East. *Middle East Journal*, 447-465.

Bull, H. (1977). *The Anarchical Society.* Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Burton, J. (1972). *World Society.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buzan, B. (2004). *From International to World Society? English School Theory and the Social Structure of Globalisation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buzan, B. (2015). The English School: A Neglected Approach to International Security Studies. *Security Dialogue Vol. 46*, 126-143.

Buzan, B. e. (1998). *Security: A New Framework of Analysis.* Boulder CO etc.: Lynne Reiner.

Buzan, B., & Waever, O. (2003). *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buzan, B., & Waever, O. (2009). Macrosecuritisation and Security Constellations: Reconsidering Scale in Securitisation Theory. *Review of International Studies*.

Calver, J. (2010). *Sayyid Qutb and the Origins of Radical Islamism.* New York: Columbia Press.

Clark, I. (2007). *International Legitimacy and World Society.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dixit, P. (2015). Securitization and Terroristization: Analyzing States' Usage of the Rhetoric of Terrorism. In B. Koch, *State Terror, State Violence in Global Perspectives* (p. 33). Vieweg.

El-Shimy, Y. (2015). The Muslim Brotherhood. *Adelphi Series*, 75-104.

Eroukhmanoff, C. (2015). The Remote Securitisation of Islam in the US post-9/11: Euphemisation, Metaphors and the "Logic of Expected Consequences" in Counter-Radicalisation Discourses. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 246-265.

Esposito, J. L. (1999). *The Islamic Threat: Myth or Reality?* New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Euben, R. L. (1999). *Enemy in the Mirror-Islamic Fundamentalism and the Limits of Modern Rationalism.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Faris, D. M. (2013). Deep State, Deep Crisis: Egypt and American Policy. *Middle East Policy*, 99-110.

Filiu, J.-P. (2015). *From Deep State to Islamic State.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Gong, G. W. (1984). *The Standard of "Civilization" in International Society.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Green, D. M., & Navari, C. (2014). *Guide to the English School in International Studies.* John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Greenwood, M. T., & Waever, O. (2013). Copenhagen-Cairo on a roundtrip: A security theory meets a revolution. *Security Dialogue*, 485-506.

Grimm, J., & Harders, C. (2018). Unpacking the Effects of Repression: The Evolution of Islamist Repertoires of Contention in Egypt after the Fall of President Morsi. *Social Movement Studies*, 1-18.

Hafez, M. M. (2003). *Why Muslims Rebel: Repression and Resistance in the Islamic World.* London: Lynne Rienner Publishers .

Halliday, F. (1992). International Society as Homogeneity: Burke, Marx, Fukuyama. *Millenium Vol.21*, 435.

Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Hurd, E. S. (2008). *The Politics of Secularism in International Relations.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Jackson, R. (2007). The Core Commitments of Critical Terrorism Studies. *European Political Science*, 244-251.

Keddie, N. R. (1972). *Sayyid Jamal al-Din "al-Aghani": A Political Biography.* Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.

Kellner, D. (2003). *From 9/11 to Terror War: The Dangers of the Bush Legacy.* Lanham, Md. : Rowman & Littlefield.

Khatab, S. (2011). International Relations of modernity in Sayyid Qutb's thoughts on sovereignty: the notion of democratic participation in the Islamic canon. In R. Shilliam, *International Relations and Non-Western Thought* (pp. 87-106). New York: Routledge.

Laustsen, C. B., & Waever, O. (2000). In Defence of Religion: Sacred Referent Objects for Securitisation. *Millenium Journal of International Studies*, 705-739.

Linklater, A., & Suganami, H. (2006). *The English School of International Relations: A Contemporary Reassessment.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Linz, J. (1990). The Perils of Presidentialism. *Journal of Democracy*, 51-69.

Mavelli, L. (2013). Between Normalisation and Exception: The Securitisation of Islam and the Construction of the Secular Subject. *Millenium*, 159-181.

Meijer, R. &. (2012). *The Muslim Brotherhood in Europe.* London: Hurst & Co.

Milton-Edwards, B. (2016). *The Muslim Brotherhood: The Arab Spring and its future face.* London and New York: Routledge.

Mitchell, R. P. (1993). *The Society of the Muslim Brothers.* London: Oxford University Press.

Moussalli, A. S. (1993). Hasan al-Bannā's Islamis Discourse on Constitutional Rule and Islamic State. *Journal of Islamic Studies 4.2.*, 161-174.

Pargeter, A. (2010). *The Muslim Brotherhood: The Burden of Tradition.* Saqi.

Pasha, M. K. (2007). Human Security and Exceptionalism(s): Securitization, Neo-Liberalism and Islam. In G. Shani, & S. Makoto, *Protecting Human Security in a post 9/11 World: Critical and Global Insights* (p. 177). Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Qutb, S. (1980). *Milestones.* Beirut & Damascus: The Holy Koran Publishing House.

Qutb, S. (1983). *Al-'Adalah, al-Adalah al-Ijitma'iyyah fi al-Islam.* Cairo: al-Shuruq.

Roald, A. S. (2012). Democratisation and Secularisation in the Muslim Brotherhood: The International Dimension. In R. Meijer, & E. Bakker, *The Muslim Brotherhood in Europe* (pp. 71-88). London: Hurst & Co.

Rutherford, B. K. (2008). *Egypt after Mubarak: Liberalism, Islam, and Democracy in the Arab World' .* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sayyid, B. S. (1997). *A Fundamental Fear: Eurocentrism and the Emergence of Islamism.* London & New York: Zed Books Ltd. .

Sharabi, H. (1970). *Arab Intellectuals and the West: The Formative Years, 1875-1914.* Baltimore & London: John Hopkins Press.

Sheikh, F. (2016). *Islam and International Relations.* London, New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Sheikh, M. K. (2014). The Religious Challenge to Securitisation Theory. *Millenium Journal of International Studies*, 252-272.

Smith, S. (2004). Singing Our World Into Existence: International Relations Theory and September 11. *International Studies Quarterly Vol. 48*, 499-515.

Springborg, R. (2017). The Rewards of Failure: Persisting Military Rule in Egypt. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 478-496.

Springborg, R. (2018). *Egypt.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Suganami, H. (2003). British Institutionalists, or the English School, 20 Years On. *International Relations*, 253-272.

Thomas, S. M. (2000). Taking Religious and Cultural Pluralism Seriously: The Global Resurgence of Religion and the Transformation of International Society. *Millenium Journal of International Studies*, 815-841.

Thomas, S. M. (2005). *The Global Resurgence of Religion and the Transformation of International Relations: The Struggle for the Soul of the Twenty-First Century.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tibi, B. (1988). *The Crisis of Modern Islam: A Pre-Industrial Culture in the Scientific-Technological Age.* Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Tibi, B. (1997). Part V: Between Arab Nationalism and Islam. In B. Tibi, *Between Islam and the Nation-State* (pp. 199-233). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Weber, P. C. (2013). Modernity, Civil Society, and Sectarianism: The Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood and the Takfir Groups. *Voluntas 24*, 509-527.

Weinert, M. S. (2011). Reframing the Pluralist-Solidarist Debate. *Millenium 40*, 21-41.

Wickham, C. R. (2011). The Muslim Brotherhood and Democratic Transition in Egypt. *Middle East Law and Governance Vol. 3*, 204-223.

Wight, M. (1977). *Systems of States.* Leicester University Press.

Wight, M. (1991). *International Theory.* Leicester and London: Leicester University Press.

Wilkinson, C. (2007). The Copenhagen School On Tour in Kyrgyzstan: Is Securitization Theory Useable Outside Europe? *Security Dialogue*, 5-25.

Williams, J. (2010). The International Society-World Society Distinction. In *Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of International Studies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zollner, B. H. (2009). *The Muslim Brotherhood: Hasan al-Hudaybi and Ideology.* London & New York: Routledge.