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2. There are, however, a few critical studies that reconstruct the development of the term “political Islam” and the emergence of Islamism as a political discourse in the postcolonial context and during the Cold War period through leftist and postmodernist perspectives. These cannot be categorized as parts of the dominant paradigm on political Islam. See Armando Salvatore, Islam and the Political Discourse of Modernity (Reading, UK: Ithaca Press, 1997); Bobby Sayyid, A Fundamental Fear: Eurocentrism and the Emergence of Islamism (London: Zed Books, 1997) and Susan Buck-Morss, Thinking Past Terror: Islamism and Critical Theory on the Left (London: Verso, 2003). For a concise and up-to-date summary of Islam and politics in modern history, see Peter Mandeville, Islam and Politics (London: Routledge, 2014).


5. Throughout the seventeenth century, traditional German Lutheran theologians and scholars such as Daniel Clasen (1622–1678), Johann Heinrich Boecler (1611–1672), Michael Wendeler (1610–1671), and Daniel Morhof (1639–1691) argued that one had to maintain the strength of Christianity, spirituality, and religiosity against the opportunist “Catholic” Machiavellians and political elites (politici in Latin). Lutheran scholars were analyzing the concept of “political religion” from the early seventeenth century onward. Luthers understood “political religion” not as a component of “reason of state,” but as the political dimension and function of religion that the political elites were using as a tool for domination. Many Lutherans of the late seventeenth century saw this development as a dangerous form of politics. They believed religion must never be used to achieve political ends since religion contributes only to the spiritual good. Most prominent Islamists such as Sayyid Qutb, Abul A’la Mawdudi, Ayatollah Khomeini, Mahmoud Taleghani, and Ali Shariati during the Cold War period held the diametrically opposite opinion. For a summary of Daniel Clasen’s thought, see Martin Mulsow, *Enlightenment Underground: Radical Germany, 1680–1720* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2015). In my book *Islamic Thought through Protestant Eyes* (London: Routledge, 2021), I explore the post-Reformation Lutheran perception of Islamic thought and political religion.

6. German biblical scholarship, under the influence of Lutheran “Two Kingdoms Theology,” has highlighted the “nonpolitical” character of the Christian Gospel, from the early seventeen century onward. This interpretation has contributed to the view that earlier Christianity was nonpolitical and spiritual, dominated by the eschatological expectation (end of the world) and thus free from worldly political and material concerns. Therefore, this view emphasized that the Christian religion is separate from politics. For a detailed examination of the Christian political thinking in the Bible, see Christopher Rowland, “Scripture,” in The *Cambridge Companion to Christian Political Theology*, ed. Craig Hovey and Elizabeth Phillips (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 157–75.

7. Since around the turn of the century, the definition of “secular” has become intricate and convoluted. This has been the result of the resurgence of religion or the “triumph of religion” in the words of Jacques Lacan, within so-called secular societies. As a result, Jürgen Habermas, Charles Taylor, John D. Caputo, Jose Casanova, Talal Asad, and Henk de Vries have redefined the term “secular” and have proposed a postsecular model for understanding the relationship
between religion and democracy. Although they all agree on this issue, their postsecular models differ to varying degrees.


11. For a review of the recent scholarship on Ottoman Islamist thinkers, see Mehmet Karabela, “Islamist Thinkers in the Late Ottoman Empire and Early Turkish Republic,” *Insight Turkey* 19, no. 1 (2017): 225–27.


18. As part of my quest, Forough Jahanbakhsh and I launched an international conference at Queen’s University in Canada in 2015 on the religious and political transformations in modern Muslim societies. The conference, titled “Islamism and Post-Islamism: Religious and Political Transformations in Muslim Societies,” brought together established scholars from around North America and the globe to discuss the changing faces of political Islam and its implications for the
continued validity of post-Islamism in contemporary scholarship raised by Roy and Bayat. The significance of the conference comes from the fact that it was a reconsideration of the ongoing relevance of post-Islamism as a project and as a historical condition in the wake of Arab Spring and ISIS. For a summary of the conference, see Mehmet Karabela and Brenna Drummond, “A Distinctive Form of Muslim Politics,” *Turkish Review*, 5/4 (2015): 349-352.


22. Ibid., 105–7.
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38. There is also literature on the reception of Schmitt in the Muslim world. See Joshua Ralston, “Political Theology in Arabic,” *Political Theology* 19, no. 7 (2018): 549–52. For the use of Schmitt in the postrevolutionary Iranian context, see Milad Odabaei, “The Outside (Kharij) of Tradition in the Aftermath of the Revolution: Carl Schmitt and Islamic Knowledge in Postrevolutionary Iran,” *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 39, no. 2 (2019): 296–311; and for different interpretations of political theology in the Indian context, see SherAli Tareen, “Competing Political Theologies: Intra-Muslim Polemics on the Limits of Prophetic Intercession,” *Political Theology* 12, no. 3 (2011): 418–43.

40. Ibid., 28.


42. Schmitt, *The Concept of the Political*, 22.
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48. I do not consider Islam as being universally unified by the idea of one collective friend-enemy split and do not minimize internal differences in Islam such as the well-known Sunni and Shi’ite division, among many others. In this chapter, so far, I have focused on the external enemy (public enemy) as the sign of “the political” and chiefly on the friend-enemy paradigm. However, a different type of enemy, what I would call the internal enemy, is the less studied question. To illustrate, an individual who transgresses against the state or religious community by committing a crime or sin, transgresses not only against another, which is a private “enemy,” but also against a state or religious community, thus making the lawbreaker a public enemy of the State or God. Therefore, I think internal enemy is an interesting development in the concept of the political as it transforms an “expected friend” into a public enemy despite belonging to the same community. The idea of the enemy within is certainly an interesting one since it locates the “potential enemy” not just in the public sphere, but within the individual, or the inner circle, or within a community. I will elaborate on the category of the enemy within in my future work.