The Many Meanings of *dimuqratiyyah*: The PJD Elite and the Recoding of Democracy

Ahmed Khanani

INTRODUCTION

In their most euphoric moments, activists who collectively constituted the "Arab Spring" anticipated the rise of *true* democracy in the region. Just a year removed, a broad sense of disillusionment amongst reformists set in on the heels of "failed" efforts to democratize across the region. Simultaneously, other pro-democracy activists across the region celebrated "genuine reforms" in spite of seemingly stalled democratization. What should we, Western analysts, make of these contradictory responses?[1]

This paper explores the possibility that democratic activists in the Middle East and North Africa mobilize different conceptions of democracy than those that we, as Western analysts, typically employ. Rather than assume continuity across linguistic, religious, and political contexts, I suggest we study how people positioned at the peripheries of the democratic world apprehend and embody democracy. In examining how "democracy" affords marginal actors a vocabulary to situate their actions and politics, we also identify the limits of—and tensions buried in—Western articulations of democracy.

To this end, this paper takes a set of Moroccan *islamiyun*—alternatively referred to as Islamists, radicals, and/or fundamentalists[2]—as its primary interlocutors and asks, what does "democracy" mean to them? In pursuit of this broad question, I also ask: what

---

[1] Following Dipesh Chakrabarty, amongst many others, I use "West" here to denote a "hyperreal" space that "refer[s] to certain figures of imagination whose geographical referents remain somewhat indeterminate" (2000: 27). Chakrabarty acknowledges that he works within the Western intellectual framework: indeed, it is precisely this paradigm that creates the possibility of his criticism (see also Prakash (1994) or Young (2001)). He is not unique in locating himself in this space: several different analytic literatures have identified the split/multiply-constituted position of minority groups globally, though particularly in the (hyperreal) West, including, Bhabha (1999), DuBoise (1994 [1903]), Fanon (2008 [1952]).

[2] Although standard practice in Western academic texts is to refer to socially conservative, Islamically-inspired political actors as "Islamists," I prefer *islamiyun* for the simple reason that it is a term with broad currency in Arabic texts about the same actors and is employed by *islamiyun* themselves. Please see contributions to Martin and Barzegar (2009) for the stakes associated with the term "Islamist."

actions, institutions, and norms does this group of Moroccan *islamiyun* associate with democracy? Do they connect democracy to Islam—if so, what are the specifics of this linkage? How does this group of Moroccan *islamiyun* encounter and challenge the hegemony of Western conceptualizations of democracy?

Rather than engage the full range of *islamiyun* active in Moroccan politics, this paper focuses on a very specific set of actors: elites in the Party of Justice and Development (PJD) and its parent organization,[3] the *Mouvement Unité et Réforme* (MUR).[4] Like *an-Nahda* in Tunisia and both *al-hurriya wa al-'adalaah* and *an-nour* in Egypt, the Moroccan PJD is an "Islamist" party with a track record of electoral success. In contrast with parties of *islamiyun* across the Arab world, the PJD has competed in relatively free and fair elections since 1997. As a consequence, the PJD has expanded its share of seats in the Moroccan Parliament in every subsequent election. As such, elites in the PJD have a longstanding commitment to "playing the game" in the Moroccan arena; coupled with the regime's decision to privilege the PJD as the sole *islamiyun* active in

---

[3] I count as "elites" any member of the PJD or MUR who has either been elected to a leadership position at the national or local level, whether within the party or in a public election. Thus, for example, I include MPs and leaders of local party offices in my definition of "elites." Please see pages 14-15 for a discussion of the PJD elites I was able to interview.

[4] The relationship between the PJD and MUR is hardly a simple one. Wegner and Pellicer have recently argued that the PJD has, since the late 1990s, sought to decrease dependence on the MUR and created its own autonomous space—including grooming its own leaders, developing financial independence, and staking out policy positions at odds with those of MUR leadership—as a political actor in the Moroccan system (2009). In my own interviews the gap between the PJD and MUR is hardly cut-and-dry. I hope two examples will suffice: first, that of M. Khalfi, formerly editor-in-chief of the *tajdeed*, a newspaper affiliated with the MUR and whose affiliations with the MUR precluded him from taking a role in PJD electoral politics. Nevertheless, with the electoral victory of the PJD in 2011, Khalfi was appointed the Minister of Communications and is no longer formally affiliated with the newspaper. If not for a close, institutional relationship between PJD and MUR leadership, why would he have been nominated by the PJD for the position? Second, PJD elites, in any case, seem to believe that the institutions overlap in terms of membership, if not focus. To this end, an `ee disclosed that "we [members of the PJD] have a different group, the MUR, they focus on *deen*, but the party is part of the movement that is interested in politics. We are interested in politics, but all of us, all the parliamentarians, are in the MUR" (author's interview with A. Basri, Rabat (4/13/2011)).

formal Moroccan politics, this commitment affords PJD elites a unique position vis a vis the idea and practice of democracy.

In short, I find that elites in the PJD espouse visions of democracy that both coincide with and depart from Western articulations of the concept. I suggest it is precisely because of the PJD elites's commitment to Moroccan electoral politics—with all its attendant corruption and lack of legislative power—that they ubiquitously invoke free and fair elections, the "right of the people to rule the people," and "accountability," as foundational to democracy. I contend that this emphasis on the institutions and procedures of democracy renders the PJD elites's perspectives on democracy largely commensurate with minimalist articulations of democracy.[5] In spite of these similarities, I argue that there are two foundational departures in the ways that the PJD elites think and talk about democracy.

First, without fail, elites in the PJD made reference to *shura* (usually translated as consultation) in the course of their discussion about democracy. Often *shura* was invoked as the "Islamic" equivalent of democracy: "Look, democracy, in our opinion, in the beginning is the appearance among appearances of *shura* that is expressed by *islamiyun*."[6] That *islamiyun* often invoke *shura* in discussions of democracy is a widely-noted—and often lauded—trend.[7] It is far less often that scholars note the implications of this move: if *shura* is, in the eyes of *islamiyun*, the "Islamic" equivalent of democracy,

---

[5] For example, without fail, each of the twenty-one PJD and MUR elitess I interviewed between December 2010 and May 2012 argued for free and fair elections as crucial to democracy. As is discussed below, everyone I interviewed also connected democracy to *shura*, which is reflective of the PJD's "Islamic referent" and, in an important departure from minimalist claims, is suggestive of the *metaphysical* worthiness of democracy as a political system.

[6] Author's interview with Dr. A. Aftati, MP, Rabat, 3/30/2011.

[7] The volume of scholars whose work directly speaks to *shura* as it connects to democracy is profound. Some that I have found particularly interesting are those of Abootalebi (1999), Kramer (1993), Jillani (2006), and Piscatori (2000).

then it follows that *democracy is metaphysically condoned*. In other words, if we take *islamiyun* at their word—and we have no reason not to—then their commitment to democracy is literally driven by extra-worldly motives. While it may be the case that the figure of "the individual" that undergirds minimal—and especially liberal—articulations of democracy is transhistorical and thereby approximates the metaphysical, it is certainly not the same as *shura*.

The second foundational difference between PJD elites and minimalist articulations of democracy is far more practical. In the course of discussions about issues of democracy in the world and contemporary and historical events—including the French colonial era in Morocco and the American-led interventions in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Libya—elites in the PJD gave voice to arguments that closely parallel those of radical, post-structuralist critiques of "democracy." When members of the PJD elites insisted that the domain of "foreign policy" impacted a state's level of democracy, their claims were the practical implications of what Keenan dubs Rousseau's paradox: that the autocratic production of "a people" produces a foundational paradox for democratic theorists (2003, *passim*). I suggest that because of their position as post-colonial and Third World peoples, PJD elites are cognizant and critical of the apparent paradoxes in the Western rhetoric and practice of democracy, including a perceived lack of *karamah* (dignity) afforded to home and foreign Muslim populations.

The body of this paper is structured as follows. First, I offer a cursory overview of the Moroccan regime since the inception of the PJD in 1996; I couple this with a brief discussion of the role of the PJD in Moroccan politics and contextualize them amongst "Islamist" movements in Morocco. Second, I discuss the methods that undergird the

interviews I conducted with Moroccan *islamiyun* and I provide a demographic summary

of the PJD elites I interviewed. Third, I turn to the ideas and claims about democracy

articulated by PJD elites. I begin the third section by exploring the PJD elites's overlap

with Western, and particularly "minimalist," articulations of democracy and then turn to

the features of PJD elites discourse on democracy that work as criticisms of the idea and

practice of democracy in the West, focusing on the poststructuralist argument mentioned

above. I conclude this essay by examining how *islamiyun's* understandings of Islam

inform their criticisms of Western claims and practices of democracy.

THE PJD IN MOROCCAN POLITICS

In 1996 King Hassan II of Morocco initiated a public referendum that led to

seemingly drastic constitutional changes, sending shockwaves through the Middle East

and drawing an enormous amount of mass media and academic attention.[8] Perhaps the

most striking reform was the creation of a directly elected lower house, which allowed

for the victory and subsequent ratification of the first opposition government in Moroccan

history in 1998—the famed government of *Alternance*.[9] Many commentators observed

that the 1996 reforms, while important, did not go far enough.[10] From the very beginning

some analysts doubted that the reforms were intended to democratize; instead, they

---

[8] Please see, for example, Leveau (1997) or White (1997).

[9] See, for example, Ketterer (2001) or Maghraoui (2001). Some have argued that a series of government actions leading up to the referendum indicated the possibility of the government of *alternance* (e.g. Denoeux 1998: 114-15).

[10] Please see, for example, Burton-Rose (1998) or Cavatorta (2005). Others maintained more skepticism than disappointment, please see, for example, White who writes, "[T]he palace is opening up the country's political system slowly to counter criticisms… By gaining the opposition's support for the reforms, Hasan hopes to counter or perhaps even co-opt the opposition, a tactic he has used in the past" (1997: 390).

speculated that the regime was meeting its demographic and economic challenges through a gradual process of liberalization.[11]

In addition to marking constitutional reforms, Moroccans witnessed the birth of their first, officially-recognized party of *islamiyun* in 1996, when leaders of *al-islah wa tawhid* (*Mouvement pour Unite et Reforme—MUR)* were granted permission by the *makhzen*[12] to join a largely dormant, regime-friendly party, the *Mouvement Populaire Démocratique et Constitutionnel* (MPDC).[13] From the very beginning the fact that a group of *islamiyun* decided to enter Moroccan electoral politics was controversial across the board. Leftists feared the agenda of the *islamiyun*: would the PJD seek to scuttle the system? Could they be trusted? Would they be reliable political partners? The move was also met with skepticism by other groups of *islamiyun*—most notably Abdesslam Yassine's group, *'adl wa ihsan* (the Justice and Spirituality Movement, JSM)—who doubted that the MPDC would be able to effect real change. In October 1998, on the heels of effective participation in both local and national elections in 1997, the MPDC formally renamed itself *hizb 'adalah wa tanmeeyah—Parti de la Justice et du Développement*—and the PJD was formally launched.[14]

The ascent of King Mohammed VI to the throne in 1999 furthered Moroccan democrats' hopes that the spate of increased political openings that characterized the last years of King Hassan II's reign would consolidate and expand.[15] These expectations were

---

[11] Please see, for example, Denoeux and Magrhaoui (1998).

[12] The term *makhzen* literally means storehouse; in Morocco it has long referred to the monarchy and its powerful domestic allies.

[13] Please see, for example, the detailed account of the formation of the PJD in Willis (1999) or Wegner (2009) for a discussion of the relationship between the

[14] The PJD's first national-level electoral effort, in 1997, resulted in the party obtaining only 9 (out of 325) seats in the Moroccan lower house and was marred by allegations of vote buying and discrimination against the PJD. For more on the problems with the 1997 election please see Willis (1999: 51-2) or Munson (1998).

[15] As discussed by, for example, Sweet (2001: 22).

borne out in many ways, although they took place alongside political closures as well. For example, since the ascent of King Mohammed VI in 1999 Moroccan elections have been both freer and fairer than under the late King, press freedoms have increased, and women have been consciously brought into almost all political spaces.[16] Yet, Moroccan politics have also witnessed retrenchments of palatial power and sharp and directed suspensions of civil liberties—including the detainment and alleged torture of many Moroccan *salafis*—on the heels of the 2003 terrorist bombings in Casablanca.[17]

It comes as no surprise that analysts of regime type that expressly mention Morocco often identify it as one or another form of "hybrid regime". To this end, Larry Diamond locates Morocco into the category "hegemonic electoral authoritarian" system (2002: 31), Schedler writes that Moroccan politics feature "strategies of electoral confinement" that ultimately renders elections nondemocratic (2002: 42), and Carothers argues that Morocco exhibits the tendencies of a "dominant-power system" (2002: 14).[18] Widely used indices of democracy corroborate these claims insofar as Morocco is consistently identified as neither fully authoritarian nor fully democratic,[19] particularly in light of the regime's draconian anti-terrorism laws passed in 2003, with PJD support.[20]

---

[16] Please see, for example, Kausch (2008) or Khrouz (2008).

[17] Please see, for example, Hamzawy (2008: 12) or Slyomovics (2005) for a broader discussion of abuse of prisoners in Morocco.

[18] Please see also Brumberg who identifies Morocco as a "liberalized autocracy" (2002).

[19] Several indicators of democracy identify Morocco as one of the 'most democratic' – or, in any case, least authoritarian – regimes in the Muslim Middle East (alongside Yemen). To wit: Gastil's Freedom House rates Morocco as having a 3.67 on a 1-7 scale (1 being 'most free') in terms of civil liberties, a 3.30 on the same scale for 'accountability and public voice' and a 3.04 in terms of 'rule of law'. By contrast, coders in the Polity project evidently were less impressed by Moroccan reforms: it ranked (-8) on the primary indicator – a composite scale ranging from (-10) to 10 (most democratic) until 1992 at which point it moved to a (-7) where it stayed until another minor move away from authoritarianism to a score of (-6) in 2001. Even prior to the reforms of 1996 Morocco was considered the most democratic Arab state. For example, it received a score of 61 on Bollen's "liberal democracy" indicator (0-100); other than Israel (94), this is the highest score in the region by a long-shot: the runner up was Lebanon (50) followed by a handful of states with scores in the low 30s (Bollen 1993). In short, although no scholar contends that Morocco is a 'full' or 'liberal' democracy, several have indicated that Morocco is a 'semi-democracy' and has

Indeed, the post-2003 political environment has been marked by several challenges for PJD leadership, including discord within its ranks and heightened costs for the PJD's decision to stay active in formal Moroccan politics. Commentators have observed that since 2003 the PJD has been compelled to accept positions they would not have otherwise backed, including, for example, supporting the *mudawwana* (family code) in parliament in 2004.[21] While the PJD's role in the passage of the *mudawwana* and support of the *makhzen's* anti-terrorism program[22] secured the PJD's continued activity in Moroccan politics, these decisions also confirmed, to many, the widespread belief that the costs of staying in Moroccan politics could not outweigh the benefits. In other words, the PJD was, in the eyes of critics, failing to make any real change in Moroccan politics.[23] This partially explains why the PJD was unable to take the widely expected leap in seats captured in the 2007 election;[24] the PJD won only 46 seats, giving it the second largest bloc in the lower house.[25] The precarious and often conflicted position of

---

'transitioned' towards democracy since the early 1990s.

[20] Please see, for example, Kalpakian, who documents the PJD's collusion with the regime in passing supporting the state's "anti-terrorism project" (2005: 122).

[21] Please see Kalpakian (2005: 114). Corroborating this is that in an interview an elites member of the PJD—who has served the party as one of its lawyers and also was elected to both local and national councils—alleged that the Ministry of Awqaf contacted Abdelilah Binkirane the head of the PJD and insisted that there would be no conversation about the *mudawwana* in Parliament, and that PJD MPs would vote for it. Moreover, this interviewee clearly stated that he and another prominent figure in the PJD (A. Risouni) had behind-closed-doors conversations with Binkirane who told them that while he knew the *mudawwana* was "against Islam… but we work in politics; we are compelled" (author's interview with M.T., Rabat, 4/1/2011).

[22] It is unclear whether the PJD elites would have supported the anti-terrorism legislation if they had complete freedom of choice; as it was, they had very little room to maneuver, with leftist groups going so far as to suggest that the PJD supported the suicide bombings that ripped through Casablanca in 2003 and others calling for the dismantling of the PJD (please see for example, Clark and Young (2008, 340) or Willis (2004)).

[23] For example, virtually all adherents of the JSM I interviewed suggested that the PJD was "playing the game" with the *makhzen* and losing (e.g. author's interview with Fouadh A., Salé, 7/31/2012).

[24] This is discussed by, for example, Hamzawy (2008: 18)

[25] To be sure, the change in the electoral system and a massive decline in voter turnout also adversely impacted the PJD in its bid to gain the most seats in Parliament; please see, for example, Kausch (2008).

the PJD, and especially its elites, came to light as the events of the "Arab Spring"

unfolded in Morocco.[26]

Widespread protests across the region spread to Morocco and in early 2011 a

group of activists formed an opposition group that took on the name of the first major

protest it launched, the Movement of February 20th (heretofore Feb20). Feb20 was

composed of a range of actors with disparate backgrounds—from leftists to different

groups of *islamiyun*—and quickly emerged as an important, if somewhat incoherent,

counterhegemonic voice in Moroccan politics.[27] The *makhzen* responded in short order,

having witnessed the collapse of seemingly entrenched regimes, prompting King

Mohammed VI to make a rare public speech broadcast on television and radio stations in

which he declared:

> The sacred character of our immutable values that are unanimously supported by the
>
> nation—which are Islam as the religion of a state, which guarantees freedom of practices
>
> of worship, the institution of the Commander of the Faithful, the monarchy, national
>
> unity and territorial integrity, and commitment to democratic principles—provide strong
>
> guarantees for a historic agreement and a new agreement between the throne and the
>
> people.[28]

Over the course of the next three months protests continued unabated under largely

peaceful conditions; security forces only rarely, and seemingly randomly, employed

---

[26] I use the appellation "Arab Spring" with a great deal of consternation for the reasons detailed by Maytha Alhassen in "Please Reconsider:

[27] This scenario prompted an observer to note, "[C]rippled by inexperience as well as internal conflict between Islamists and leftists, Feb20 failed to produce key leaders, central structures, or much of an agenda beyond 'Down with absolutism!' sloganeering" (Benchesmi 2012, 58). Please see also Maghraoui for similar claims (2011, 687-88).

[28] My translations for the most part—when I am unfamiliar with a standard Arabic word I consult Lane's lexicon and for *darija* (Moroccan colloquial) I contact native speakers. If I draw on extant translations or if my translations are one of several possible translations I will alert the reader. For example, I translate "sha'abi al-aziz" as "my dear people," though this phrase can be translated in several ways. First, *sha'abi* (شعب) can be translated as: tribe, people, nation, or race. Second, *'aziz* (يزعز) can be translated as: dear, beloved, cherished, treasured, or sweet. Since the King uses the suffix ي , which indicates possession, I translate *sha'abi al-aziz* as "my dear nation."

force.[29] Allegations abound, however, that the *makhzen* paid disenfranchised youth to mobilize pro-regime movements whose protests coincided with those of Feb20 and, often, involved minor skirmishes between protesters.[30] King Mohammed VI followed this historic speech by appointing a committee to reform the constitution, which was presented to the Moroccan people on Friday, June 17, 2011, and was subject to a referendum exactly two weeks later. Official statistics reported, rather dubiously, that 73% of eligible voters cast ballots, and that the referendum passed with over 98% of the voters in favor and a mere 1.5% against.[31] That the PJD ultimately supported the constitutional referendum was not particularly surprising.[32] The PJD elites, perhaps following the *makhzen*'s lead, manifested ambivalence with regards to Feb20.

The official PJD party line—arrived at through intra-party debate and voting[33]—was to support some of the calls for reform, with the understanding that the PJD had long

---

[29] Police violently stifled protests, for example, in mid-March and again in late-May, but were generally otherwise content to let the protests transpire with minimal formal intervention. Please see, for example, "Police Break Up Moroccan Protest," *Al Jazeera*, 13 March 2011 (available at: < http://english.aljazeera.net/news/africa/2011/03/2011313212948314417.html >) or Jay Martin, "Police Violence Reaching New Levels in Morocco with Sunday Beatings," *CNN*, 30 May 2011 (available at: <http://edition.cnn.com/2011/WORLD/africa/05/30/morocco.protests.violence/index.html>).

[30] Several interviewees made these claims, primarily adherents of Abdeslam Yassine's Justice and Spirituality Movement (JSM)—e.g. author's interview with Adil A., Salé, 6/19/2011. Please see also Benchesmi, who writes, "the Interior Ministry began to mobilize counterdemonstrations. Unlike the nonviolent Feb20 people, these proregime toughs showed up armed with stones and clubs, openly spoiling for fights while the police looked the other way" (2012, 58). Please see also Maghraoui (2011, 690-91, 694, and fn. 33).

[31] The claim that 73% of the population voted is shockingly high because: (1) there was a strong, organized opposition that called for a boycott—much like in opposition to the 1992 constitution, which allegedly mustered 99.8% approval rates among 97.4% of the population and was widely viewed as a sham (see Maghraoui 2012, 685); (2) in interviews I encountered several accounts of vote-buying and other falsifying practices (e.g. dead people receiving ballots and "voting"), and; (3) the fact that official statistics, which set the ceiling at possible voter turnout, reported 37% of the population had voted in the previous federal elections (of 2007; please see, for example, National Democratic Institute, 2007), which makes the proclaimed 73% turnout rate even less credible. Please see also Benchesmi, who registers suspicion about the veracity of the purported turnout (2012).

[32] Please see, for example, Maghraoui who argues that the *makhzen* has been able to produce a party system that caters to its every desire; this prompts Maghraoui refers to Moroccan parties as "domesticated" and produces the interesting neologism: *makhzanisation* (2012, 686).

[33] This was both widely known information and also conveyed to me in several distinct interviews (e.g. author's interview with Bassima Hakkaoui, Rabat, 4/13/2011).

voiced similar requests, but ultimately to abstain from formally supporting Feb20.[34] The

party insisted, however, that it afforded individual members the space to make their own

decisions. Accordingly, several elites in the PJD partook in protests—and others took on

leadership roles in Feb20—including many MPs, arguing that it was a popular movement

that pushed for democratic reforms in accordance with the aspirations of the PJD.[35]

In contrast, some PJD elites explained their reasons as to why they chose to not

attend, including that: while they were sympathetic to Feb20, PJD elites did not want to

facilitate similar circumstances to those that created the civil war in Libya;[36] others felt

strongly that the aims of Feb20 were too expansive and that the Movement might be co-

opted by "extremist" voices within it,[37] and others suggested that the protests were

simply "too much" in light of the relatively good governance in Morocco.[38] It is against

this backdrop—of revolutions across the Arab world and an emergent opposition

movement in Morocco—that I conducted interviews with elites in the PJD about their

views on the concept of democracy. Prior to discussing their visions of democracy, we

turn, briefly, to the methods that guided the interviews.

METHODS & INTERVIEWEES

[34] In its decision to have a broad-based intra-party debate, the PJD again demonstrated its dedication to democratic ideals. Please see, for example, Wegner and Pellicer who argue that the PJD has "moderated" precisely because of its ideological flexibility and internal structures (2009, passim). To this end, several elite emphasized the PJD's "internal democracy" as manifested in term-limits and elections for leadership positions (e.g. author's interview with M. Naji, Rabat, 4/7/2011).

[35] Including several MPs, for example, Jamila Moussalli (author's interview, Rabat, 5/3/2011) and Soumaia Benkhaldoun (author's interview, Rabat, 5/11/2011).

[36] For example, the prominent PJD Parliamentarian, Bassima Hakkaoui, who is currently the "Minister of Solidarity, Women, Family, and Social Development" referred to Feb20 as "important and necessary," but personally chose to not attend and explained the party's stance as fearing that with the PJD's backing, Feb20 would grow too large and create the possibility of a civil war, as with Libya (Rabat, 4/13/2011).

[37] Including, for example, Mohamed Yatim who was formerly a MP for the PJD and remains on the general secretariat (author's interview, Rabat, 4/23/2011).

[38] Author's interview with Fatma Z., (Rabat, 6/9/2011).

This project is informed by Wittgenstein's contention that the meanings of words often exceeds dictionary definitions; that words' meanings accrue through patterns of usage. In fact, this seemingly trivial insight—that the extension and intension of concepts shifts based on patterns of usage—informs both the motivation for this project and the specific mode of interviewing that I employed. I draw on the work of Frederic Schaffer, who develops an approach to interviewing that he dubs "ordinary language interviewing," in his work that examines the shifting extension of the (Wolofone) articulation of *demokaraasi* and (Francophone) *démocratie* (2000).

Schaffer identifies three primary claims underpinning ordinary language analysis: first, that "every day words reflect the accumulated wisdom or shared culture of a community;" second, that the meaning of a word is not fixed by formal measures – that is, dictionaries – but instead by the way that words are used, and; third, that "a word can be used in a variety of different, and sometimes contradictory, ways" (2006: 151 and 153, respectively). That Schaffer employs this approach to language allows him to treat concepts as *dependent* variables and to explore patterns in how they are articulated and enacted. It is precisely this attention to the shifts in the meaning of a word in a given politico-religious context that makes Schaffer's vision of ordinary language interviewing so useful to this project.[39] In other words, insofar as the goal of this paper is to identify the range of meanings and practices associated with the concept "democracy" as articulated by a set of Moroccan *islamiyun*, "ordinary language interviewing" is an ideal tool.

---

[39] Schaffer's notion of "ordinary language analysis" is usefully thought of as a specific type of "semantic exploration" (see, for example, Ayalon 1987) or "discourse analysis" (see, for example, Brown and Yule 1983; van Dijk 1985; or, more recently, several of the contributions to Wetherell et al. 2001a,b).

Drawing extensively on the apparatus mapped out by Schaffer (2006), I

conducted semi-structured interviews that focused on the way that *islamiyun* talk about

democracy. Moreover, the interviews drew out both abstract and practical articulations of

democracy in an effort to apprehend interviewees' idealized conceptualizations of

democracy and then to flesh these abstract statements out,to get a sense for what real-

world democracy might look like from the vantage of PJD elites. As such, I conducted all

my interviews in *darija*,[40] and asked all interviewees the following questions:

> In your opinion, what is the essence of "democracy"?
>
> Is there democracy in Morocco? Why?
>
> Are there any practices associated with democracy? Why?
>
> Is there a country or place in the world that has // has no democracy? What
> makes it (non-) democratic?
>
> Does democracy have a relationship with Islam? With human rights? What are
> those relationships?
>
> What do you think of the *mudawwana*?[41] Was it democratic? Why?
>
> What do you think of the protesters in Mohammadia?[42] Did they have the right to
> protest? Why (not)?

---

[40] Moroccan colloquial Arabic is known as *darija*: it is a far cry from Modern Standard Arabic in both the range of words in its service and their articulation. I spent roughly 13 months—courtesy of a FLAS and then a Fulbright (I.I.E)—learning *darija* in an effort to conduct research in a language that afforded my interviewees comfort, so that they could express themselves in, as it was, their ordinary language. In the event that an interviewee switched the language of our interview to French or Fusha I followed their lead. At times language switching occurred at particularly revealing moments. For example, my interview with Dr. Abuali Hamieddine, the youngest member of the PJD's guidance council, stayed in a register of "high *darija*" until the a discussion of rights (in which he discussed the writings of John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau), at which point Dr. Hamieddine switched to French (author's interview, Rabat, 2/13/2011)!

[41] The *mudawwana* is Morocco's family law that was most recently revised in 2004 at the behest of the King and with broad Parliamentary support. Although the PJD elites all supported the *mudawwana* in Parliament and in public media, it was hardly so clear in the lead-up to 2004: the initial plan (infamously known in Morocco as, simply, *al-khouta*) confronted widespread public criticism by *islamiyun* of all stripes, including massive protests that featured the PJD. Due to space constraints, I cannot discuss PJD Elites's responses to the *mudawwana* in this paper. For more on the *mudawwana* please see, for example, Cabre (2007), Clark and Young (2008), Dieste (2009), Maddy-Weitzman (2005), or Hamzawy (2008).

[42] In September 2009, human rights campaigners in the Alternative Movement for Individual Freedoms (MALI) arranged via Facebook to meet en masse so that they could collectively, publicly break their fast in a town between Casablanca and Rabat to protest a law that forbids precisely this action. Police and journalists met the protestors; the former broke the rally up and detained leaders whereas the latter provided several journalistic accounts of the episode. Moroccan *islamiyun* were particularly vocal in their criticism

Unsurprisingly, elites in the PJD do not give voice to a consistent or singular vision of democracy.

Indeed, it is precisely the presence of inconsistencies in the way the PJD elites discuss and enact democracy that prompts skeptical analysts to argue that the PJD is disingenuously "using" democracy. These analysts suggest that rather than hearing PJD elites voices as committed to a fractured concept of democracy, we should witness the PJD elites as failing to engage in ideological moderation[43] and doing whatever they can to get in power.[44] Yet, the premises of ordinary language philosophy anticipate this conceptual quagmire and, indeed, suggest that virtually all concepts that have everyday currency will also be rife with contradictions. Moreover, post-structuralist insights have recently been deployed to identify paradoxes that cut at the very foundations of Western democratic theory, suggesting that Moroccan *islamiyun* are hardly alone in their seemingly troubled usage of the word "democracy." Prior to unpacking the range of meanings the PJD elites intend with the term "democracy," it is important to describe who, exactly, I consider part of the "PJD elites."

While this is an admittedly imperfect indicator, I consider anyone who is in a position of leadership at the national or local level to be an "elites" member of a party. This means that I include cabinet members, MPs, members of the national "guidance council," and leaders of local *iqlimiyyah* (regional offices) to be elites in the PJD. Given

_____

of MALI, though all major political parties condemned the protest in the spirit of national unity. Whereas the responses of Moroccan *islamiyun* to the passage of the *mudawwana* have been documented and analyzed in great depth, this particular episode has not received academic attention in spite of extensive journalistic accounts. Unfortunately, due to space constraints, I cannot discuss PJD Elites's responses to the *mudawwana* in this paper.

[43] Of course, this begs the question of what, exactly, constitutes ideological moderation. On this topic please see the writings of Clark (esp. 2006), Schwedler (2007, 2011), and Wegner and Pellicer (2009).
[44] There are simply too many trenchant, unwavering critics of *islamiyun* to enumerate here. Please see, for example, Tibi (2008) for a particularly skeptical perspective on *islamiyun*.

this indicator, I conducted a total of twenty interviews with people I consider PJD elites, even as two of them are formally leaders in the MUR. The interviews all took place between December 2010 and August 2011, with my first interview taking place immediately after the first protests of the "Arab Spring" were launched in Tunisia, and my last interview on the heels of the passage of Morocco's new constitution.[45] I interviewed eleven current or former MPs, six current ministers in the current Moroccan government, six members of the PJD's guidance council, three local elites, and the (elected) President of the PJD's youth wing, the JJD (*Jeunesse de la Justice et du Développement*). Although the PJD boasts an exceptionally high rate of women's participation for Moroccan politics, this was not reflected in the people I was able to work with: only four of the twenty interviews I conducted were with women.[46] Yet, the fact that the majority of PJD elites I interviewed were men does not hamper the goals of this paper. Specifically, the goal of this paper is *not* to draw generalizations about how the population of PJD elites imagine and enact democracy, but, instead, to identify themes that have currency across PJD elites and to put these themes in conversation with Western articulations of democracy. Having discussed the methods informing this paper and the interviewees whose voices will guide the remainder of this paper, we now turn to what the PJD elites had to say about democracy.

PJD ELITES & MINIMALIST DEMOCRACY

[45] It is important to bear in mind that while I am collapsing MUR elites into the category PJD elites, members of both the MUR and PJD often want to demarcate the line between the two. Nevertheless, the two people I consider "PJD elites" whose leadership position is in the MUR both clearly stated that they belong to the PJD and the MUR.

[46] While I made an effort to meet and interview more women in the PJD, I was unable to secure more interviews. I am all but certain that this connects to practices of modesty and that I am both Muslim and a man, though that was never expressly mentioned by anyone. In any case, I conducted an interview everyone who consented to meet with me.

The primary goal of this section is to illustrate that both the language the PJD elite employ in expressing their thoughts on democracy and also the substance of their claims connect to minimalist claims about democracy. I argue, first, that they espouse this orientation towards democracy at least in part because the *makhzen* has so effectively prevented the occurrence of free and fair elections, which the PJD believes it would otherwise win. Second, I trace how members of the PJD elite mobilize the discourse of democracy in discussions of Islam itself.

Over the past four decades a recurrent criticism of Western democratic theory is that it is Western-centric. This claim typically focuses on one of two issues: either that Western—and especially liberal—democratic theory overemphasizes individual rights,[47] or that it fetishizes a set of formal institutions connected to democracy.[48] This paper examines the PJD elite in light of the latter critique, a critique that has motivated extensive fieldwork. Lisa Wedeen's fieldwork in Yemen, for example, reveals the importance of informal, non-governmental networks and spaces in fostering democratic sensibilities and arenas (2008, esp. ch. 3).[49] While it may be the case that Third World actors are often uncertain about the role of formal institutions in the idea of "democracy," there is little ambivalence in the case of the PJD elites. Indeed, every member of the PJD elites who I was able to interview linked democracy to formal institutions and broad

---

[47] To this end, Parekh, writing on the heels of revolutions across the post-Communist world and the triumphalist narrative of the "end of history," voiced concern with the prominence of the *individual* as the ontological foundation for liberal democracy. Parekh argues that this focus on the individual is "culturally particular" and thereby cannot possibly fulfill the universalist drive of liberal democracy Parekh (1992, *passim*). The problems with liberal democracy's fixation on the individual have long been noted by critics from a range of perspectives, including those with a communitarian bend (e.g. Barber 1974; Sandel 1996) and feminist theoreticians (e.g. Pateman 1970; Phillips 1991).

[48] Please note that these concerns are distinct from the "electoral fallacy," which emerged in the research of scholars of Latin American politics (please see the foundational essays by Karl (e.g. 1995) or Przeworski (e.g. 1991)).

[49] Please see also Schaffer's work on Senegal (1997; 2000).

norms that are lock-step with Western, and especially minimalist, articulations of democracy.

"Democracy, foundationally, is fair elections. If there aren't fair elections, there isn't democracy" -A. Baha, PJD Minister of State[50]

As evinced by Dr. Baha's statement, elites in the PJD are committed to elections as a constitutive feature of democracy. In this measure, they concur with Robert Dahl, who famously identified several "conditions" or "institutions" of democracy that link democracy to elections. For example, in his *Dilemmas of Pluralist Democracy* Dahl identifies seven "conditions," four of them are exclusively connected to elections.[51] Similarly, in a book that summarizes decades of his writings on the topic, Dahl identifies six "institutions" that "large-scale democracy requires," chief among them are "1. Elected officials [and] 2. Free, fair, and frequent elections" (1998, 85). It is precisely because this emphasis on elections that Dahl's vision of democracy has been dubbed minimalist.

Although Western analysts of *islamiyun* have long been skeptical of the latter's dedication to elections, coining the expression "one man, one vote, one time," PJD elites have, invariably, called for free and fair elections.[52] For example, Dr. Daoudi, who was an MP at the time of the interview and is currently a Minister in the Moroccan government, said, "[S]o the foundational principles of democracy are, a space of justice, freedom of expression, eradication of corruption, *fair elections—elections that empower the majority*" (emphasis mine).[53] Similarly, Mrs. Benkhaldoun, also an MP at the time,

---

[50] Author's interview with A. Baha, Rabat, 3/31/2011. In a similar vein, Nezha el-Ouafi, an MP, was rather frank: "democracy is elections" (author's interview, Rabat, 5/4/2011).

[51] For example, Dahl writes, "[E]lected officials are chosen in frequent and fairly conducted elections in which coercion is comparatively uncommon" (1982, 11).

[52] The first expression of this phrase is difficult to track down; it is, nevertheless, widely cited (e.g. Piscatori (2000, 6), who cites Tibi's writings (1994) as symptomatic of this mode of thinking).

[53] Author's interview, Rabat, 1/21/2011.

argued that democracy is that "the people rule themselves, and *this can only be expressed in elections* in which the people choose their representatives, and among them [the representatives] they choose a Prime Minister" (emphasis mine).[54] I want to suggest that the PJD elites's insistence that "free and fair elections" are the surest path to "the rule of the people" is informed, at least partially, by the regime's manipulation of elections to undermine the PJD's electoral strength.

In the past decade the *makhzen* has enacted at least two measures that impede the PJD's electoral success, and a third—electoral fraud, including vote-buying[55]—has been widely reported.[56] First, the *makhzen* redrew district lines in 2003 and then, in 2007, the *makhzen* passed a new measure on seat distribution, "the aim… [of which] is not specifically to bring about fragmentation, but rather to limit representation of the party that was augured as the victor of the elections: the PJD… The new distribution favoured a priori those parties with close ties to the Monarchy" (Szmolka 2010, 20).[57] Second, in addition to creating an electoral structure that would limit the PJD's ability to win seats, the *makhzen* supported the formation of the Party for Authenticity and Modernity (PAM), which was headed by a former Minister of Interior, in 2008.[58] Perhaps the most striking features about the birth of PAM are its rabidly anti-PJD stance and also the fact that PAM has been able to enact extra-legal maneuvers on a seemingly regular basis.[59] Collectively, these measures prompted one set of commentators to observe, "of the included political players in the Moroccan party system, the PJD has by and large been the recipient of the

---

[54] Author's interview, Rabat, 5/11/2011.

[55] Please see, for example, the National Democratic Institute's *Final Report on the Moroccan Legislative Elections* (2007, 3).

[56] Indeed, the dire state of elections in Morocco recently prompted one analyst to observe, "[E]lections in Morocco, through recently freer than in the past, are still controlled by the state" (Daadaoui 2010, 195).

[57] Please see also Kausch (2008, 80)

[58] Please see Szmolka (2010, 15).

[59] Please see Liddell (2010) or Wegner and Pellicer (2011, 313-14).

harshest treatment by the regime" (Wegner and Pellicer 2011, 313). To be sure, PJD

elites notice their maltreatment and lament the paucity of Moroccan elections—one elite

noted, "elections in the Arab world, and the entire Third World, they're rigged elections.

There aren't transparent and fair elections."[60] Thus, I submit that part of the reason PJD

elites are deeply invested in free and fair elections is that they have been a relative rarity

in Moroccan politics.

Much like minimalist claims regarding the function of elections, PJD elites also

suggest that the goals of elections are, first, that citizens choose their representatives and,

second, that citizens have an opportunity to hold public officials accountable for their

actions. To this end, a member of the PJD's guiding council contended that "political

democracy is the right of people to choose who rules them, the right of people to hold

their rulers accountable, and this choice and accountability have to be grounded in

elections."[61] In a similar vein, an elected leader of the JJD argued that "the third principle

of democracy is that of leaders with accountability. If there is responsibility without

accountability, there is no democracy."[62] Often statements of the importance of

accountability for those in power—and especially this latter quote—stand as thinly-veiled

concerns of the role of the *makhzen* in Moroccan politics, and, highlight the regime's lack

of accountability. In other words, for elites in the PJD, the role of elections is not

restricted to the choice of leaders, but also serves to hold elected officials accountable.

In addition to responding to their immediate political context, interviews with PJD

elites suggest that at least some of them witness Islam as a democratic *din* that grounds

---

[60] Author's interview with A. Basri, Rabat, 4/13/2011.
[61] Author's interview with A. Hamieddine, 2/3/2011.
[62] Author's interview with M.B., Rabat, 3/29/2011. Along these lines, a member of the PJD's legal council said, "democracy is built upon accountability, meaning that any person who has responsibilities must be made accountable" (author's interview with T.M., Rabat, 4/1/2011).

itself in the rights of the majority. In other words, some elites in the PJD embed

minimalist principles in the Islamic tradition. To this end, some interviewees projected

democracy into their faith: "Islam is a *din* of the majority."[63] In a similar trend, other

interviewees suggested that *shura* itself was a manifestation of democracy: "the

foundational principle of Islam on social and governing issues is *shura*. And *shura* is,

foundationally, democracy."[64] Another interviewee, the Mrs. J. Mossalli categorically

states, "the essence of Islam is based on democracy, because the principle of *shura* is

democracy."[65] This articulation of the relationship between *shura* and democracy inverts

the typically stated relationship: Mossalli articulates *shura* as approximating democracy,

and not the other way around. In other words, at least a portion of the PJD elites is

recoding key concepts in their religious tradition in the language of "the majority" and

"democracy," which only enhances the centrality of elections in the imaginary of the PJD

elites.

PJD CRITICISMS OF WESTERN IDEAS AND PRACTICES OF "DEMOCRACY"

      Even as PJD elites often give voice to minimalist articulations of democracy, they

also express reservations about Western articulations and practices of "democracy."

Indeed, in the course of interviews, elites in the PJD often convey two related criticisms

of Western democratic theory: first, they situate a post-structuralist criticism about the

founding of the *demos*, and, second, PJD elites suggest that "foreign policy" should be

considered part of a state's democratic credentials. Let us tackle these in turn.

---

[63] Author's interview with Dr. A. Baha, MP, Rabat, 3/31/2011. In a similar vein, Dr. Lahbib Choubani, currently a Minister in the Moroccan government, said that "what is most important [in Islam] is that the *'ummah* has governing power" (Author's interview, Rabat, 4/5/2011).
[64] Author's interview with Dr. Amara, MP, Rabat, 1/20/2011.
[65] Author's interview with Mrs. Jamila Mossalli, MP, Rabat, 5/3/2011.

First, we turn to the post-structuralist criticism, which I suggest is a useful heuristic to apprehend PJD elite criticisms of the boundaries of the *demos*. Specifically, Chantal Mouffe, in *The Democratic Paradox*, argues that "liberalism" and "democracy" push in fundamentally different directions—towards liberty and equality, respectively— and that this creates a tension that inheres in liberal-democratic theory insofar as either liberty or equality is always compromised.[66] The practical tension between equality and liberty also gestures towards another issue: who gets to decide the make-up of the *demos*? It is in this vein that Alan Keenan highlights an autocratic move that is commonly elided in democratic theory: the inception of the people. In short, Keenan argues that in order for there to be a *demos* that can rule itself, there must first be a *demos* and the decision as to who is included and who is excluded from the *demos* cannot be made in accordance with democratic procedures or norms.[67] Keenan finds the imperative to delimit the *demos* prior to enfranchising the *demos* shoots through the works of seminal democratic theorists—Rousseau, Arendt, Laclau and Mouffe, and Benhabib—and suggests that this theoretical paradox is intractable. To this end, Keenan writes, "the vision of the people ruling itself clearly and directly is an impossible one—for the very ideal of democratic openness and freedom is at odds with itself, torn between the closure necessary for the people's identity and rule, and the openness of contestation and revisability [sic]" (2003, 13). While Mouffe and Keenan both explore the implications of this foundational exclusion in democratic theory, they do not locate spaces in the world where people autocratically called themselves into democracy, as it were.

---

[66] To this end, Mouffe writes, "liberal democracy results from two logics which are incompatible in the last instance and that there is no way in which they could be perfectly reconciled" (2000, 5).
[67] Please see also the work of Karl Schmitt, who identifies a similar tension in liberal-democracy (1988 [1926]).

Claims issued by Moroccan *islamiyun* with regards to democracy suggest that there is much more at stake than scholarly criticism of "democracy" insofar as Moroccan *islamiyun* are the children and grandchildren of people who were violently excluded, not from an abstract *demos*, but from French citizenship. To this end, Dr. Choubani, currently a Minister in the Moroccan government, in discussing the situation of freshly independent Morocco noted, "Muslims who were colonized were told they had democracy, but this democracy was evil (*shar*)."[68]Why was this democracy "evil"? Choubani argued that colonialism "caused ignorance" (*jahl*).

I want to suggest colonialism was also "evil" to Moroccan subject for excluding them from the *demos*: the ignorance it caused was a function of an apartheid empire in which "locals" were routinely denied rights—to education, work, etc. That is, the French Empire ruled Moroccans without ever extending Moroccan subjects full enfranchisement. As such, Moroccans became a liminal group: forcibly connected to the *demos* but without actually constituting the *demos.* As such, French democracy in the era of French colonialism was evil to Moroccans in that it was staked—in its inception and the everyday trappings of colonial power—to an autocratic production of a bounded *demos*. Thus, suggestions by the PJD elite that France was not a "true" democracy when Morocco was a French colony advance the post-structuralist claim: the production of a bounded *demos* is not only an autocratic gesture at the theoretical moment of the inception of the *demos*, it is also, as Keenan suggests, an omnipresent threat to democracy at all times.

The second challenge posed by PJD elite's articulations of democracy is at least as daunting in that, just as PJD elite implied that the construction of the *demos* was a

---

[68] Author's interview, Rabat, 4/5/2011.

continuous occurrence, their second concern is also a near-perpetual criticism. In

particular, like many citizen-subjects across the Muslim Middle East, PJD elites criticize

Western—especially American—foreign policy towards Muslim-majority states, though

the PJD elite offer an interesting twist to their criticisms. Specifically, many in the PJD

elite articulate their concerns about American foreign policy—e.g. the wars in Iraq or

Afghanistan, the prison at Guantanamo—as failures in American democracy. At times

this prompts PJD elites to afford democracy adjectives that are absent in Western

discourses: internal and external democracy. In this vein, an elected leader in the JJD

observes, "even America: they talk about internal democracy, and America prohibits

others from democracy. They [Americans] don't practice democracy in Iraq and not in

Afghanistan."[69] A particularly striking instance of the collapsing of "foreign policy" into

the concept of democracy emerged in an interview with a PJD elite the day after Osama

bin Laden's death:

> Democracy in the world is always partial. There is no recipe for democracy.
> Perhaps what happened yesterday confirms what I'm saying. It is unreasonable to
> throw a person's body in the sea. We can agree or disagree with them, they can
> be Jewish, Christian, or Zionist, but I do not accept throwing a corpse in the sea.
> That a Muslim was thrown in the sea? This brings us back to the concepts of
> human rights and democracy. There is no country that is completely democratic;
> it is always partial.[70]

What I find most interesting in this account of the disposal of Bin Laden's corpse is not

that this person— the MP, Mrs. Mossalli—took offense at the specific logistics: Muslims

and non-Muslims alike found this "solution" perturbing without compromising their

---

[69] Author's interview with M.B., Rabat, 3/29/2011. Other members of the PJD elite identify, for instance, Guantanamo as an instance of American "hypocrisy" (author's interview with I.B. Rabat, 1/19/2011); yet others suggest that American support for dictators in the MENA region constitutes a failure in American practices of democracy (interview with A. Hamieddine, Rabat, 2/3/2011).
[70] Author's interview with J. Mossalli, Rabat, 5/3/2011.

belief that Bin Laden was a terrorist. Rather, what is most striking is that the disposal of a corpse—an issue of geo-political and military salience—speaks to Mrs. Mossalli as an issue of democracy. Thus, elite in the PJD insist that "democracy" has implications for a state's *foreign* policy, above and beyond domestic considerations.

CONCLUSION

To this point I have provided evidence that elites in the PJD both connect "democracy" to elections and also articulate elections as producing a system that enacts the "democratic" norms of choice and accountability. I contend that the PJD elites are committed to minimalist visions of democracy both because of their immediate political context and also because they read seemingly minimalist principles away from Islam. I have also located PJD elites' criticisms of the practices of Western democracy in a post-structuralist criticism of democratic theory, and argued that PJD elites' accounts of French colonialism usefully map theoretical arguments onto the every day trappings of colonial power. Moreover, several elites in the PJD voice concerns about foreign policy that suggest new adjectives for democracy (internal and external) while also refiguring what it means for a state to fully embody democracy. I conclude by suggesting that while these latter two criticisms launched by elites in the PJD certainly connect to Third World politics and a Du Boise-esque double consciousness, they also connect to the way the PJD elite encounter and produce Islam.

Earlier I argued that we should read the PJD elites' decision to connect democracy to *shura* renders "democracy" a metaphysical good. I now want to advance this claim by suggesting that the PJD elites' criticisms of Western democracy should also be read in light of their articulations of the Islamic tradition. Specifically, in discussions of democracy elites in the PJD routinely invoke the Qur'anic *ayah*, "Indeed We honored

bani Adam."[71] PJD elite employ this *ayah* to argue that because God honors all humans, we, as created beings: (1) are all essentially equal; (2) should uphold human rights; (3) must "honor" all *people*, regardless of their religious disposition and their political stances, and; (4) we must, therefore, accept democratic procedures and their outcomes, regardless of their standing in metaphysical terms. In other words, this *ayah* affords elites in the PJD a pluralism grounded in the fact that God honored all humans.

I submit that in addition to justifying democratic procedures in the eyes of PJD elites, the metaphysical claims that all humans are created and have been honored by God helps explain why the PJD elites condemn colonial articulations of the *demos* and how "foreign policy" figures into democracy. Specifically, PJD elites suggest that the fact of humans' createdness is ontologically prior to which *demos* they belong to. In other words, for *islamiyun* who collapse *shura* and *karamah* with democracy, what is crucial is a boundary-less enactment of the principles of democracy, and not simply the protocols of "internal" democracy.[72] Thus, just as *islamiyun* draw inspiration from a tradition with universal scope in their articulation of democracy, their conceptualization of democracy is bounded only by the Islamic tradition.

---

[71] Quran (17: 70). I translate the key verb *k-r/r-m* as "to honor" though there are, of course, several viable options. This verse was cited by several PJD elites I interviewed, including L. Daoudi (Rabat, 1/21/2011). Others among the PJD elite made a similar theological move without invoking this particular *ayah*, including Dr. H. Bounchita, who referred to God as the agent "who created humans" (author's interview, Fes, 4/19/2011).

[72] This, of course, is in contrast with liberal articulations of democracy that purportedly locate "the human" as ontologically prior to citizenship. Against this, though, we might fruitfully read Talal Asad's perspective on human rights, whereby *in practice* what emerges as the most important factor in the allocation of human rights is not the actuality of humanness, but rather to which state one owes their citizenship (2003, esp. 129).