PISSN : 2571-9904 - EISSN : 2602-7763

The Problematic of Religious Identity Among Muslims in Western Societies: Between Integration and Religious Freedom in the Context of Contemporary Media Discourse — A Jurisprudential, Legal, and Communicational Approach

Jihane Louabdia

Echahid Cheikh Larbi Tebessi university (Algeria), jihane.louabdia@univ-tebessa.dz

Received: 07 / 06 / 2026 **Accepted**: 26 / 07 / 2026 **Published**: 31 / 07 / 2026

Abstract:
This study examines the dilemma of the religious identity of Muslims in Western societies within the framework of integration, religious freedom, and contemporary media discourse through a jurisprudential, legal, and communicational approach. It analyzes the role of minority jurisprudence in regulating Muslim presence in non-Muslim contexts and explores the legal and media dimensions influencing religious practices and identity representation. Using analytical, comparative, critical, and media discourse methods, the study finds that Muslim identity is dynamic and negotiated between religious commitment and civic belonging. It concludes that balanced integration requires legal accommodation, jurisprudential adaptability, and media narratives supportive of pluralism and coexistence.

Keywords: *Citizenship; Integration; Media Discourse; Minority Jurisprudence; Religious Freedom; Religious Identity.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Contemporary societies are undergoing profound transformations in their social and cultural structures as a result of increasing migration flows and the growing religious pluralism within Western communities. These developments have led to the emergence of a new social reality characterized by the expanding presence of Muslim communities as active religious and cultural constituents within Western societies. This presence can no longer be regarded as a temporary or transitional phenomenon; rather, it has evolved into a structural component that asserts itself across various spheres of public life, raising a range of issues concerning the nature of the relationship between religion and the state, the limits of religious freedom, and the requirements of integration within the framework of the modern state.

Amid these transformations, both traditional and digital media have become influential actors in shaping the image of Muslims within Western societies through the representations and narratives they construct around issues such as integration, religious freedom, the veil, and migration. Consequently, debates surrounding Islamic identity are no longer confined to legal and political arenas; they are increasingly formed within the media sphere, which plays a decisive role in directing public opinion and constructing perceptions of Islam and Muslims.

Within this context, the issue of the religious identity of Muslims in the West emerges as one of the most complex and contested subjects due to the intricate interplay between theological, legal, and social dimensions. Religious identity extends beyond mere doctrinal affiliation to encompass a broader system of values, practices, and symbols that reflect the distinctiveness of Muslim communities within a different cultural and legal environment. As a result, this identity remains in a continuous process of interaction with its surrounding context, balancing the preservation of fundamental religious principles on the one hand and responsiveness to contemporary realities and compliance with the legal frameworks of host countries on the other.

However, this interaction is not without tension. Muslims often find themselves confronted with a complex and sometimes contradictory challenge in reconciling their religious commitment, as a constitutive element of their identity, with the demands of integration within societies whose secular models may, in certain cases, tend toward limiting the public expression of religion. Furthermore, some Western legal systems may not provide sufficient space for the exercise of religious particularities and may impose direct or indirect restrictions that constrain this right.

Study Problem

Against this backdrop, the central research question of this study is formulated as follows:

To what extent can a balance be achieved between preserving the religious identity of Muslims in Western societies and meeting the requirements of integration within contemporary legal frameworks and media discourses, and how has the jurisprudence of Muslim minorities addressed this challenge?

This main question gives rise to the following subsidiary inquiries:

- What is meant by the religious identity of Muslims within the Western context, and what are its principal components?
- How has contemporary Islamic jurisprudence, particularly through the jurisprudence of Muslim minorities, regulated the relationship between Muslims and non-Muslim states?

- What are the limits of religious freedom within Western legal systems, and what are the manifestations of its protection or restriction?
- How does the judiciary, particularly the European judiciary, contribute to redefining the boundaries of religious practice?
- What form of integrative model can ensure a balance between religious particularity and civic belonging?
- What role does media discourse play in shaping the image of the religious identity of Muslims within Western societies?

Study Significance

In light of the aforementioned research problem, the significance of this study stems from its positioning at the intersection of several fields of knowledge, namely Islamic jurisprudence, constitutional law, the sociology of religion, and media and communication studies, which grants it both theoretical and practical relevance. Its importance is further reinforced by its contemporary relevance, particularly in view of the intensifying debates surrounding Islam in Western societies and the associated issues of the veil, religious symbols, integration, and cultural pluralism. Moreover, the study gains additional significance through its examination of the impact of media discourse in shaping perceptions and representations of Islam and Muslims within the Western public sphere.

Study Methodology

To address the subject under investigation, this study adopts the following methodological approaches, as they are deemed most appropriate to the nature and scope of the research:

- **Analytical Method:** employed to examine and deconstruct the central concepts associated with religious identity and integration.
- **Comparative Method:** used to analyze the relationship between Islamic jurisprudential perspectives and Western legal frameworks.
- **Critical Method:** applied to assess the effectiveness of legal and jurisprudential structures in achieving the desired balance.
- **Media Discourse Analytical Method:** utilized to examine the role of media narratives in shaping the image of Islam and Muslims within Western societies.

Study Structure

The nature of this study necessitates its division into the following sections:

- **First: The Conceptual Framework of the Religious Identity of Muslims in the West**
  This section addresses the concept of identity and its constituent elements, while examining the role of the jurisprudence of Muslim minorities in establishing and legitimizing the Islamic presence within non-Muslim contexts.
- **Second: Legal and Media Protection of the Religious Rights of Muslims in the West**
  This section explores the legal foundations of religious freedom and the various forms of its restriction. It further analyzes the role of both media discourse and judicial institutions in redefining the boundaries between religious rights and the requirements of integration within the Western public sphere.
- **Third: Social Integration Between the Islamic Jurisprudential Perspective and Contemporary Legal Applications**
  This section discusses the concept of integration from the perspective of Islamic jurisprudence, examines the mechanisms for reconciling religious identity with civic engagement, and ultimately proposes a balanced model capable of fostering

coexistence and social stability.

II. The Conceptual Framework of the Religious Identity of Muslims in the West

1. The Religious Identity of Muslims in the West

For Muslims living in non-Muslim societies, religious identity constitutes a protective shield against the risks of cultural and civilizational assimilation. In many respects, it resembles the shell carried by a turtle, safeguarding it from being absorbed or consumed by stronger terrestrial or marine creatures. Consequently, the central issue addressed in this study cannot be meaningfully examined without deconstructing the concept of *religious identity* within its diasporic context. In this setting, identity is not merely a static inheritance; rather, it is a living construct formed at the intersection of immutable doctrinal foundations and the sociological and legal transformations characterizing Western societies.

This subsection seeks to explore the essence of Islamic identity as a normative reference framework that engages with the philosophy of the "neutral public sphere," and to examine how it evolves from an individual ritual practice into an ongoing process of negotiation between Muslims, society, and the state, situated between doctrinal continuity and social transformation.

Religious identity among Muslims in Western societies should not be understood merely as an individual devotional affiliation detached from social reality. Rather, it represents a complex and multilayered construct shaped by the interaction of faith, ritual practice, language, collective memory, and social and legal representations. Thus, identity cannot be reduced to simple adherence to Islam; instead, it manifests itself in patterns of everyday life, in the boundaries between what is religiously permissible and impermissible, and in the continuous effort to preserve religious particularity within a distinct legal and cultural environment.

Accordingly, examining Muslim identity in the West requires moving beyond reductionist interpretations that confine it solely to ritual observance. It must instead be approached as a comprehensive normative framework that guides both individual and collective behavior while regulating the Muslim's relationship with the self, the state, and the host society (Cesari, 2004, pp. 62-89).

This understanding becomes even more evident when considering that Muslims in Western contexts confront not merely religious difference, but also divergent conceptions of the public sphere itself. Many contemporary Western systems are grounded in notions of neutrality and secularism that tend to situate religion within the private domain rather than the public one. From this emerges the central question: Is the Muslim expected to practice religion solely within the boundaries of individual conscience, or does the individual retain the right to express religious identity in the public sphere, provided that such expression neither infringes upon public order nor violates the rights of others?

This question extends beyond the domain of Islamic jurisprudence and enters the broader field of rights and freedoms within the modern constitutional state (Modood, 2013, pp. 37-58).

In seeking avenues of accommodation with Western environments in general, and European societies in particular, Islamic identity in the West has demonstrated a degree of flexibility and adaptability. Contemporary sociological studies have highlighted that Islamic identity in Western settings is not static; rather, it is continuously reconstructed under the influence of three interrelated dimensions: the original religious reference framework, the

pressures exerted by the legal and political environment, and the lived experience of Muslims as a minority community.

Therefore, Islamic identity cannot be viewed merely as an inherited identity; it is more accurately described as a *negotiated identity*, constructed through everyday interactions within educational institutions, workplaces, judicial systems, media environments, and broader public debates concerning Islam (Cesari, 2013, pp. 21-44).

Consequently, the genuine challenge does not lie in the existence of difference itself, but rather in the ability of legal systems and political communities to transform difference into legitimate diversity instead of treating it as a deviation from the dominant cultural model. From this perspective, debates surrounding the hijab, halal slaughter practices, mosque construction, and religious education should not be interpreted as discussions over isolated religious details; rather, they represent broader debates concerning the extent to which the state recognizes religious pluralism and the limits of its legal and cultural accommodation (Gole, 2002, pp. 173-190).

An analysis of the religious identity of Muslims within the Western context reveals a dynamic structure that transcends conventional understandings of fixed identity. It is not merely the reproduction of patterns of life originating from countries of origin; instead, it constitutes a *negotiated identity* emerging from the interaction between doctrinal reference systems and newly encountered legal and social realities. This complex construction transforms identity into a normative framework governing Muslim conduct toward both the self and the host society, particularly within the context of Western conceptions of the public sphere, which may tend to restrict the visibility and presence of religion.

2. Minority Jurisprudence as an Ijtihadi Framework for Grounding Muslim Presence within Non-Muslim Contexts

The presence of Muslims within non-Muslim societies necessitates the search for normative foundations capable of preserving their distinct religious identity while facilitating their integration into the social fabric of these environments. In light of the increasing complexity of Muslim social realities in the West, contemporary Islamic legal thought has been compelled to develop interpretive tools that move beyond the traditional classifications of Islamic political geography. Within this context, *Fiqh al-Aqalliyyat* (minority jurisprudence) emerged as a methodological response aimed at transforming Muslim existence from a paradigm of "temporary necessity" into one of "stable settlement and sustainable coexistence." This section therefore seeks to examine the maqasid-based foundations of this jurisprudential approach and its contribution to shaping the concept of "Muslim citizenship" within the framework of the modern state.

Minority jurisprudence has emerged as one of the most significant contemporary juristic developments addressing the condition of Muslims residing outside Muslim-majority societies, particularly in Europe and North America. This approach did not arise as a departure from the foundational principles of Islamic law; rather, it developed in response to a profound historical transformation marked by the transition of large numbers of Muslims from the status of "temporary migrants" or "transient newcomers" to that of settled residents and legally recognized citizens. Such a transformation necessitated the reconstruction of legal reasoning in accordance with this new social reality (Al-Qaradawi, 2001, pp. 15-38).

Against this backdrop, traditional jurisprudence encountered a fundamental challenge, as many of its classical classifications and formulations had been shaped within political and legal contexts substantially different from those faced by contemporary Western Muslims. Consequently, these inherited frameworks became insufficient, on their own, to address critical

questions arising in modern contexts: How should Muslims engage with positive law systems? What is the legitimacy of participation in electoral processes? What are the limits of civic loyalty? How should employment within institutions not governed by Islamic law be understood? What is the status of the Muslim family within alternative legal environments? And how should necessity, need, and religious freedom be interpreted within such settings? Minority jurisprudence emerged precisely to provide a renewed interpretive framework that does not abandon established legal principles but rather reactivates them through contextual jurisprudence, maqasid-oriented reasoning, and consideration of legal consequences and outcomes (Al-Alwani, 2003, pp. 09-27).

Leading scholars associated with this intellectual orientation, most notably Taha Jabir Al-Alwani and Yusuf al-Qaradawi, sought to shift legal reasoning from the paradigm of "temporary exception" toward one of "juridical grounding for permanent residence." Muslims in Western societies are not necessarily individuals in transit; they may instead be fully integrated citizens possessing complete legal affiliation. This reality requires a jurisprudential framework capable of balancing immutable doctrinal principles and definitive legal rulings on the one hand, with areas of flexibility and ijtihad on the other. Hence, minority jurisprudence relies on principles such as the removal of hardship, the contextual adaptation of legal opinions according to time, place, and circumstance, the elevation of need to the level of necessity in specific situations, and the evaluation of both public and private consequences (Nielsen, 2003, pp. 111-127).

Nevertheless, the significance of minority jurisprudence does not render it free from criticism. Several scholars and jurists have argued that it may expand the sphere of legal facilitation to an extent that threatens the structural integrity of established rulings, or that it risks evolving from a jurisprudence aimed at managing reality into one characterized by gradual concession under the pressures of integration. This critical perspective remains important because it prevents minority jurisprudence from being treated as a "universal solution" and underscores the need to regulate it through rigorous methodological constraints. Foremost among these are preserving immutable legal principles and preventing social reality from becoming authoritative over scriptural sources, while instead treating reality as the context within which texts and maqasid are applied (Cesari, 2004, pp. 435-449).

Accordingly, the true scholarly value of minority jurisprudence lies in its attempt to establish a jurisprudence of Muslim citizenship within the modern state, enabling Muslims to integrate legally and civically without relinquishing their religious reference framework. This places minority jurisprudence at the very center, rather than the margins, of contemporary debates concerning Muslim religious identity in Western societies (March, 2009, pp. 69-102).

Minority jurisprudence may therefore be understood as an intellectually sophisticated ijtihadi response to the transformation of Muslims from "wayfarers" into "settled citizens," requiring a shift from the classical binary of *Dar al-Islam* and *Dar al-Harb* toward a jurisprudence of citizenship. The analytical depth of this approach resides in its activation of the objectives of Islamic law and principles of hardship alleviation to enable coexistence without assimilation. In this sense, it functions as an instrument for grounding Muslim presence as a structural component of the modern state rather than treating it as a temporary or exceptional condition.

Based on the foregoing discussion, it may be concluded that the religious identity of Muslims in Western societies has acquired its juristic and intellectual foundations through minority jurisprudence, which seeks to integrate Muslims into their new social environments

while preserving their distinctive identity. However, this theoretical framework faces a central challenge concerning the extent to which Western legal systems accommodate and protect such presence. This challenge necessitates moving beyond the domain of jurisprudential theorization toward that of legal application in order to examine the scope of protection afforded to these rights within Western legislation and judicial practice.

III. Legal Protection of the Religious Rights of Muslims in the West

1. Religious Freedom Between Constitutional Recognition and Legislative Restriction

While Islamic jurisprudence has established the legitimacy of Muslim presence from a religious perspective, this presence directly encounters the positive legal frameworks governing Western societies. Although constitutions and international instruments recognize freedom of religion as a fundamental right, the challenge arises at the level of legislative implementation, where a divergence emerges between "theoretical freedom" and the "practical restrictions" imposed by the philosophies of secularism and neutrality. This section therefore examines the gap between supreme constitutional provisions and their legislative application.

Most Western constitutions and international legal instruments recognize freedom of religion and belief and regard it as an essential component of fundamental freedoms intrinsically linked to human dignity. However, the issue does not generally lie in the realm of formal recognition, but rather in the practical scope of this freedom: does it merely encompass the right to hold beliefs, or does it also extend to the right to manifest religion and practice it collectively and publicly? It is at this point that the distinction emerges between abstract recognition and effective accommodation (Brems, 2006, pp. 249-267).

Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, extends beyond the protection of internal freedom of belief to include the freedom to manifest religion or belief through worship, observance, practice, and teaching. Nevertheless, numerous Western national legislations and judicial practices have adopted expansive interpretations of restrictions associated with public order, state neutrality, and public institutions, sometimes resulting in greater limitations on visible expressions of Islamic religiosity compared with other forms of religious expression (United Nations, 1993).

In this context, the extent of religious freedom afforded to Muslims appears closely linked to the constitutional model adopted by each state. Within the French republican model, for example, secularism is understood as a strict regulatory framework governing the institutional public sphere, a conception reflected in legislation concerning religious symbols in schools and certain public functions. By contrast, other models, such as that of the United Kingdom, adopt a more flexible approach, allowing broader space for practical accommodations and institutional adjustments. This divergence demonstrates that the Western legal framework is not monolithic; rather, it consists of multiple models for managing religious pluralism (Bowen, 2007, pp. 25-71).

Accordingly, the question of Muslims' religious rights cannot be examined solely through the lens of general legal provisions, but must also be assessed in light of the constitutional philosophies that govern their interpretation: is diversity presumed to be legitimate unless demonstrable harm is established, or does the principle of abstract neutrality prevail, potentially requiring the exclusion of religious expressions from the public sphere? This interpretive distinction ultimately determines the actual extent of protection or restriction (Malik, 2007, pp. 21-39).

The legal dilemma thus becomes evident in the gap separating constitutional guarantees

of freedom of belief from legislative practices that may, at times, restrict visible manifestations of religiosity. A deeper analysis reveals that the concept of "neutrality" differs fundamentally across Western models. Whereas the French model tends toward an exclusionary form of neutrality within the public sphere, the Anglo-Saxon model adopts a more inclusive conception that accommodates pluralism, thereby reflecting divergent constitutional philosophies in the governance of religious diversity.

2. The Hijab, Halal Slaughter, and Mosque Construction as Legal Tests of Recognition for Religious Pluralism

The intensity of legal controversy extends beyond the theoretical discourse on rights and freedoms to encompass symbolic issues and everyday practices that constitute the core of Islamic particularity. The hijab, halal slaughter, and mosque construction are not merely ritual details; rather, they represent genuine "testing grounds" through which the extent of Western states' acceptance of religious pluralism within the public sphere can be assessed. Accordingly, this section seeks to demonstrate how these practices become sites of legal contestation that reveal the boundaries of tolerance and cultural recognition.

These three issues constitute some of the clearest indicators of the nature of the relationship between Islam and law in Western societies, as they combine religious symbolism with practical implications affecting daily life.

The hijab, in particular, extends beyond being a form of dress to embody dimensions of identity, culture, and values. In certain contexts, it may evolve into a symbol of tension between religious freedom and prevailing notions of neutrality or social integration. In reality, the legal debate surrounding the hijab is not centered on a piece of fabric itself, but rather on a broader identity-related question: does a Muslim man or woman possess the right to manifest religious affiliation within the public sphere? (Bowen, 2007, pp. 89-126).

Within the contemporary Western context, the hijab can no longer be viewed merely as an individual religious practice expressing personal conviction or devotional choice. Through media circulation and political discourse, it has evolved into a highly symbolic marker situated at the intersection of debates concerning religion, identity, integration, freedom, modernity, and secularism. Media institutions, as producers of meaning rather than mere transmitters of information, have played a central role in relocating the hijab from its private religious sphere into a public arena saturated with cultural and political representations. Consequently, discussions surrounding the hijab no longer focus exclusively on the legitimacy of its religious or legal observance; they increasingly concern the ways in which it is represented in the media and the meanings attributed to it within Western public discourse.

Studies on media representation demonstrate that media outlets do not reflect reality in a neutral manner; rather, they reconstruct it through mechanisms of selection, coding, framing, and meaning production. Meaning does not reside inherently within objects themselves but is produced within systems of representation and discourse, an approach extensively developed by Stuart Hall in his analysis of the relationship between media, culture, and identity. Accordingly, the image of the hijab within Western media does not constitute a direct reflection of a religious practice; instead, it is a discursive construct shaped through language, imagery, headlines, news framing, and the political context in which the issue is situated (Hall, 1997, pp. 15-64).

As a result, the hijab may be portrayed at times as an expression of religious freedom and, at other times, as a symbol of social isolation, discrimination, or resistance to integration,

depending on the media framework through which the process of interpretation and reception is guided.

This issue becomes even clearer when examined through the lens of media framing theory, which argues that the media do not merely inform audiences about events but also shape the perspective through which those events are interpreted. As explained by Robert Entman, framing involves selecting certain aspects of reality and emphasizing them within communicative texts in order to define a problem, identify its causes, provide evaluative judgments, and propose appropriate responses (Entman, 1993, pp. 51-58).

When the hijab is framed within a security-oriented discourse or within narratives of cultural conflict, audiences no longer perceive it as an ordinary religious practice; instead, it is reconstructed as a "social problem" requiring legal or administrative regulation. Conversely, when it is framed within the discourse of rights and freedoms, it appears as an expression of religious liberty and freedom of belief. Accordingly, debates surrounding the hijab are not solely disputes over the symbol itself, but also over the communicative framework through which its public meaning is produced.

In numerous contexts, Western media have contributed to transforming the hijab into a "visual symbol" of broader contestations surrounding Islam within the public sphere. Media representations of the hijab are often embedded with meanings that extend beyond Muslim women themselves, becoming associated with wider questions: Is Islam compatible with integration? Do religious symbols conflict with secular neutrality? Does the hijab signify freedom or subordination? Such questions are not generated exclusively through legal texts; rather, the media actively participate in formulating, intensifying, and circulating them.

In this regard, John Bowen demonstrates in his study of the French headscarf controversy that the dispute was not purely religious in nature. Instead, it was deeply connected to the historical trajectory of French secularism, republican ideals, and the boundaries governing the visibility of religion within schools and the broader public sphere (Bowen, 2007, pp. 89-126).

From a communication perspective, it may therefore be argued that the hijab has undergone a process of *symbolic politicization* within Western media discourse. It is no longer represented merely as religious attire; rather, it has become a political and cultural marker through which the relationship between Islam and the West is interpreted. This process is reflected in the use of headlines, imagery, and terminology that position the hijab within broader narratives concerning the "integration crisis," the "failure of multiculturalism," or the "threat to Western values." Consequently, the hijab shifts from being an individual religious practice to becoming a public issue governed by the logic of symbolic contestation. In this sense, the media become active agents in constructing the issue rather than simply reporting it.

Moreover, media representations of the hijab are frequently associated with what may be termed *identity reductionism*, whereby Muslim women are reduced to a single symbol, namely the hijab, and Islamic identity itself becomes confined to one visible external marker. Such representations marginalize the multiple dimensions of Muslim women's lived experiences, including education, employment, civic engagement, individual choice, and national belonging.

Elizabeth Poole demonstrated in her study of Muslim representations in British media that media coverage frequently tends to associate Islam with controversy and conflict rather than portraying Muslims as diverse social actors participating within society (Poole, 2002, pp. 65-112). This reductive representation contributes to the production of stereotypical images in

which the hijab becomes a fixed marker of difference rather than one among many forms of religious expression within a pluralistic social order.

The problematic nature of this reductionism becomes even more pronounced when the hijab is linked to discourses surrounding security, migration, and extremism. In many instances, the hijab is not discussed within its rights-based framework associated with freedom of religion and belief; rather, it is incorporated into broader media narratives centered on fear of Islam, failed integration, or the rise of extremist movements. At this point, media discourse intersects with what Edward Said described as *"Covering Islam"*, understood as a cognitive and political process inseparable from relations of power and representation. Within this framework, the image of Islam is often constructed through experts, media institutions, and political actors who approach it as an object of controversy or threat (Said, 1997, p. 55). Consequently, the hijab is not consistently interpreted in Western media as a religious practice, but rather as a marker of cultural "otherness" requiring explanation, surveillance, and regulation.

The effects of such media framing extend beyond public opinion into the legal and political spheres. Legislative debates concerning the prohibition or regulation of religious symbols do not emerge in a vacuum; they are shaped by pre-existing symbolic and media environments. When the media portrays the hijab as a problem associated with integration, security, or neutrality, public opinion becomes more receptive to restrictive legislation. Conversely, when the hijab is presented as an expression of religious freedom and cultural pluralism, legal debates may shift toward protection and recognition rather than prohibition and restriction. This reveals the close relationship between media and law, whereby media discourse influences the social context within which legal texts are interpreted and public policies are accepted or contested.

This dynamic is particularly evident in the French model, where the hijab became closely associated with debates surrounding secularism (*laïcité*) and republican neutrality. The hijab has frequently been framed as a challenge to republican values and the public school system rather than as an individual practice linked to religious freedom. John R. Bowen argues that the French controversy surrounding the hijab cannot be understood without reference to the French state's conception of the public sphere and the historical relationship between religion, the Republic, and public education (Bowen, 2007, pp. 65-97, 127-159). Consequently, the media did not merely accompany this controversy; it became an integral component of the process through which the hijab was transformed into a major national issue, where law intersected with political history and republican symbolism.

Western media, however, does not constitute a single homogeneous discourse. Approaches to the issue of the hijab vary according to the political and cultural orientations of media institutions. Nevertheless, a considerable proportion of media coverage tends to frame the hijab as an object of symbolic controversy rather than as an ordinary religious practice.

With the evolution of digital media, the issue of the hijab has increasingly shifted to social media platforms, enabling Muslim women to express their religious identities beyond traditional media frameworks. At the same time, this digital sphere has also facilitated the spread of digital Islamophobia and hate speech, transforming online media into a dual space that simultaneously enables image reconstruction and the reproduction of discrimination.

Accordingly, the significance of media treatment of the hijab lies not merely in the fact that it receives media attention, but rather in the nature of the framing through which it is presented: is it depicted as an expression of religious freedom, or as an indicator of failed

integration? This question demonstrates that the media has become a central actor in shaping the position of the hijab within the Western public sphere.

By contrast, halal slaughter clearly reveals the constructed tension between religious freedom on the one hand and animal welfare legislation or public health regulations on the other. The sensitivity of this issue derives from the fact that food in Islam is not merely a social custom; it constitutes an essential component of religious observance. Consequently, excessive restrictions on halal slaughter may affect a fundamental dimension of the freedom to practice religion (Poncet, 2019, pp. 194-205).

Such restrictions in Western contexts take multiple forms, including measures justified by animal welfare considerations, the protection of public health, the preservation of environmental cleanliness, and related regulatory concerns.

With regard to the construction of mosques and minarets, the issue is often not merely legal in nature, but also political and cultural. As both a religious and social institution, the mosque symbolizes the presence of Islam within the urban landscape. Consequently, urban planning and municipal regulations frequently intersect with cultural anxieties and populist anti-immigration discourse. The obstacles imposed on mosque construction may therefore reveal the limits of societal acceptance of Islam as an integral component of the national public sphere (Laurence, 2012, pp. 141-188).

Moreover, the construction of mosques extends beyond a purely legal issue and often becomes a symbolic and media-related matter closely tied to the representation of Islam within Western urban spaces. The manner in which media outlets frame mosque-related debates can significantly influence public opinion and shape the attitudes of local authorities toward either accepting or rejecting Islamic presence (Laurence, 2012, pp. 141-188).

These examples demonstrate that legal disputes do not always revolve around the "substance of the right" itself, but rather around the conditions governing its exercise and the limits of its social visibility. It is precisely at this point that the risks of indirect restriction become apparent. The state may not explicitly prohibit the exercise of a right, yet it may render its practice difficult or subject it to conditions that undermine its practical effectiveness. Consequently, legal analysis must distinguish between the formal recognition of religious freedom and its effective accessibility in practice (Evans, 2001, pp. 76-103).

Accordingly, issues such as the hijab, halal slaughter, and mosque construction constitute a genuine test of the effectiveness of legal recognition of pluralism. These matters transcend their technical dimensions and emerge as symbols of the tension between the "right to difference" and the "requirements of public order." Restrictions imposed on such practices under the guise of health regulations or urban planning laws represent a form of indirect limitation that may deprive religious freedom of its substantive practical value, reducing it from an enforceable right to mere formal recognition.

3. European Judiciary and Its Role in Redefining the Boundaries of Muslim Religious Visibility

Amid legislative and political tensions, the European judiciary emerges as the ultimate reference point for resolving disputes concerning religious freedom through the development of interpretive standards that extend beyond the literal wording of legal texts. This subsection highlights the balancing approach adopted by European courts between individual rights and institutional interests, and examines how judicial reasoning contributes either to restricting or expanding the scope of Muslim religious visibility in public spaces and workplaces.

In this regard, European courts, whether at the level of the European Court of Human Rights or the Court of Justice of the European Union, play a pivotal role in shaping the effective boundaries of religious freedom. These courts do not merely apply legal texts; rather, through

their jurisprudence, they develop interpretive frameworks that influence national policies as well as the positions adopted by employers and educational and administrative institutions (Evans, 2001, pp. 104-129).

Several judicial decisions, particularly those concerning religious symbols in the workplace, have demonstrated that European courts do not adopt a single fixed position. Instead, they tend to apply a balancing approach between religious freedom and competing interests such as institutional neutrality, the rights of others, or legitimate commercial objectives. While this methodology is significant, it also creates room for considerable variation in application, as the principle of proportionality may be interpreted either narrowly or broadly depending on the national and judicial context (Martinez-Torron, 2005, pp. 587-636).

One of the most prominent examples in this field is the *Achbita* case, which raised the question of whether prohibiting an employee from wearing a headscarf in a private company constituted direct religious discrimination. The European judiciary ultimately held that a general prohibition on religious symbols within a neutral internal policy did not necessarily amount to direct discrimination, while leaving open the possibility of examining indirect discrimination. Although this reasoning appears balanced on its face, it nonetheless grants private institutions substantial discretion to restrict religious visibility, particularly in positions involving direct interaction with the public (Court of Justice of the European Union, 2017).

From a critical perspective, this judicial orientation reveals that the center of gravity in protecting religious freedom no longer resides solely in constitutional texts, but increasingly in judicial interpretations of the concept of "neutrality" and the limits attached to it. The broader the notion of neutrality becomes, particularly when extended to encompass the exclusion of religious symbols, the narrower the scope of practical religious freedom becomes, and vice versa (Howard, 2012, pp. 131-156).

Accordingly, the European judiciary assumes the role of a "normative architect," continuously redefining the boundaries of religious practice through a logic of balancing individual rights against institutional interests. Critical analyses of judicial decisions, particularly the *Achbita* case, demonstrate a shift toward granting employers broader authority to restrict religious symbols under the justification of "visual neutrality," thereby rendering the protection of religious freedom increasingly dependent upon judicial interpretation.

If judicial and legislative practices in Western societies have revealed inconsistencies in safeguarding the religious particularities of Muslims, this reality places Muslim communities before the necessity of seeking an "integrative model" that neither conflicts with the legal order nor compromises fundamental doctrinal principles. This, in turn, requires a renewed engagement with the Islamic legal perspective in order to define the concept of integration and establish mechanisms capable of reconciling identity requirements with the obligations of civic belonging. This issue will be examined in the following section.

IV. Integration Between the Islamic Jurisprudential Perspective and Contemporary Legal Applications

1. The Concept of Integration in Islamic Jurisprudence Between the Principle of Citizenship and the Preservation of Religious Particularity

Integration represents the central issue through which the tension between identity and belonging is most clearly expressed. Within contemporary Islamic thought, integration does not signify forced assimilation or cultural dissolution; rather, it is understood as a form of "positive coexistence" grounded in the objectives of Islamic law (*maqasid al-shari'ah*) and the

framework of citizenship. This section seeks to establish the jurisprudential foundations of integration by activating principles such as the fulfillment of contractual obligations and consideration of consequences, with the aim of formulating an approach that enables Muslims to achieve full civic participation without compromising their doctrinal identity.

The concept of integration in Islamic jurisprudence cannot be examined independently of the broader purposive framework of Islamic law, which is founded upon the realization of benefits, the prevention of harm, and the preservation of social stability while maintaining essential religious commitments. From this perspective, integration does not imply absorption into the dominant culture or abandonment of religious particularity. Rather, it denotes the capacity for constructive coexistence within a different legal and social order while preserving the minimum level of religious commitment that constitutes Muslim identity (Al-Alwani, 2003, p. 45).

A number of contemporary jurists have emphasized that Muslim residence outside traditionally Muslim-majority territories can no longer be regarded as an exceptional circumstance; it has become an established social reality requiring the development of a specialized jurisprudence regulating the relationship between Muslims and the states in which they reside or whose citizenship they hold. Within this context, the concept of citizenship has emerged in contemporary Islamic thought as a legal and ethical framework defining the rights and obligations of Muslims within the modern state (Al-Qaradawi, 2001, pp. 72-85).

This perspective is founded upon several major jurisprudential principles, including:

- The principle of fulfilling contracts and obligations, including the social contract of citizenship.
- The principle of considering consequences and outcomes (*i'tibar al-ma'alat*).
- The principle of promoting public benefit and preventing harm.
- The principle of removing hardship and alleviating undue burden.

Accordingly, when a Muslim enters into the framework of citizenship, he or she assumes an obligation to respect the laws of the state, provided that such laws do not compel the violation of definitive religious injunctions. This relationship has been described by some scholars through the concept of "civic loyalty," which is not considered incompatible with "doctrinal loyalty." (March, 2009, pp. 95-110).

However, the issue becomes more complex when determining the limits of this obligation, giving rise to two central questions:

- When does compliance with the law become obligatory?
- Under what circumstances does such compliance become religiously impermissible?

Islamic jurisprudence addresses this issue by distinguishing between two categories:

- Matters falling within the sphere of *public interest considerations* (*maslahah mursalah*) and *ijtihad*, where adaptation and contextual accommodation are permissible.
- Matters belonging to the sphere of definitive religious principles and established certainties, in which compromise or relinquishment is not permitted.

This distinction prevents the drift toward what may be termed *assimilative integration*, while simultaneously establishing the foundations for *interactive integration*, based on maintaining equilibrium between religious identity and civic belonging (Nielsen, 2003, pp. 118-121).

Accordingly, integration in Islamic jurisprudential thought is not merely a political concept; rather, it is a purposive legal concept grounded in the reconciliation of religious commitment with civic participation without any inherent contradiction.

On this basis, integration within the purposive jurisprudential framework is not

understood as a process of *dissolution* that negates identity; rather, it constitutes a form of *positive coexistence* founded upon the social contract of citizenship and adherence to legal obligations. Jurisprudential analysis distinguishes here between *civic loyalty*, which requires respect for the laws of the state, and *doctrinal loyalty*, which pertains to the essence of faith. Such a distinction opens avenues for an interactive model of integration that balances rights and obligations while avoiding the pitfalls of alienation and social isolation.

2. Mechanisms for Reconciling Religious Identity and Integration Requirements in the Western Context

Moving integration from theoretical discourse to practical implementation requires flexible *ijtihadic* mechanisms capable of accommodating the constraints and realities of Western societies. Reconciling religious constants with the demands of modern civic life necessitates activating the jurisprudence of objectives (*fiqh al-maqasid*), principles of facilitation, and the removal of hardship. The following discussion examines these mechanisms while emphasizing the methodological safeguards that prevent flexibility from devolving into unregulated dilution of religious rulings.

The central challenge facing Muslims in the West is not merely the preservation of religious commitment itself, but rather the manner in which this commitment can be reconciled with the requirements of modern civic life, particularly within legal systems that may not always recognize religious particularities. Consequently, there has emerged a need for practical *ijtihadic* mechanisms capable of achieving this balance without leading to conflict or confrontation (Caeiro, 2010, pp. 440-443).

Among the most significant of these mechanisms are the following:

2.1 The Jurisprudence of Objectives (*Fiqh al-Maqasid*)

The jurisprudence of objectives represents one of the most important methodological tools for moving beyond rigid textualism toward a more flexible understanding of Islamic law. Rather than restricting interpretation to the literal dimensions of legal texts, it emphasizes the higher objectives of the Sharia, including the preservation of religion, life, intellect, lineage, and property. This approach enables the formulation of practical solutions that accommodate the realities of Muslims in Western societies while remaining faithful to the spirit and purposes of Islamic law (Al-Shatibi, pp. 08-15).

3.2.2 Consideration of Consequences (*Mura'at al-Ma'alat*)

This principle is based on evaluating the anticipated outcomes of actions, such that legal rulings are not considered independently from their practical implications. Excessive rigidity in certain matters, for example, may result in social exclusion or the marginalization of Muslims within society, outcomes that conflict with the objectives of the Sharia concerning coexistence and social stability (Ibn Al-Qayyim, pp. 03-05).

2.2 The Principle of Facilitation and Removal of Hardship

The principles of facilitation and the alleviation of hardship constitute major foundations within Islamic law. They permit the granting of legal concessions in cases of necessity or need, thereby providing an important basis for minority jurisprudence, particularly in issues related to employment, education, and social relations (Al-Alwani, 2003, pp. 66-72).

2.3 Gradualism in Religious Commitment

Gradualism represents an essential principle for engaging with social realities. Muslims are not expected to attain immediate perfection; rather, adaptation to a new environment is approached progressively in a manner that preserves religious commitment while minimizing

potential tensions with the surrounding society (Ramadan, 2004, pp. 63-79).

However, despite their significance, these mechanisms may be misapplied if they become instruments for unregulated concession or if they are detached from their foundational jurisprudential constraints. For this reason, a number of scholars emphasize the necessity of regulating their application through several essential parameters:

- Adherence to definitive scriptural texts and immutable legal principles.
- Avoiding the transformation of necessity into a general rule.
- Preventing legal rulings from becoming wholly subordinated to contextual pressures.

Thus, the issue does not lie in these mechanisms themselves, but rather in the manner of their application. They may serve as instruments of equilibrium and accommodation, yet they may equally become tools of excessive dilution if not governed by a rigorous methodological framework.

Accordingly, reconciling religious identity with social integration is both jurisprudentially and practically achievable; however, this remains contingent upon the existence of a disciplined interpretive approach capable of combining flexibility with sound methodological control.

Within this framework, the principles of *maqasid al-shari'ah* (objectives of Islamic law), consideration of consequences (*i'tibar al-ma'alat*), and hardship alleviation (*raf' al-haraj*) constitute the principal mechanisms driving balanced integration. These principles enable the development of flexible solutions responsive to the realities of minority communities without compromising definitive legal foundations. Nevertheless, methodological analysis requires that such mechanisms be subject to strict jurisprudential safeguards to prevent flexibility from evolving into an unwarranted dilution of legal norms under the pressure of social realities. This ensures that integration remains situated within the boundaries of disciplined ijtihad.

3. Toward a Balanced Integration Model that Secures Legal Recognition while Preserving Religious Identity

In conclusion, overcoming the dilemma arising from the perceived conflict between identity and integration requires the construction of a “balanced model” founded upon mutual recognition between the state and minority communities. This section proposes a forward-looking vision of an interactive integration model grounded in the legal protection of pluralism and civic commitment to public order, with the aim of achieving social stability capable of dismantling stereotypes and fostering sustainable civilizational coexistence.

Addressing the challenges associated with the relationship between Muslims and Western societies requires moving beyond a paradigm of “conflict” toward one of “balance.” This may be achieved through the development of an integration model based on reciprocal recognition between the state and the Muslim minority. Such a model does not presume that Muslims must relinquish their religious identity, nor that the state must abandon its foundational principles. Rather, it seeks to establish a shared space that enables coexistence without exclusion (Modood, 2013, pp. 59-78).

Accordingly, this model is founded upon three principal pillars:

- **Legal recognition of religious pluralism**, whereby the state acknowledges that society is religiously and culturally diverse and that such diversity constitutes not a threat but a source of enrichment. This recognition is reflected through:
    - Protection of religious symbols
    - Facilitation of religious practices and rituals
    - Respect for cultural particularities
- **Commitment to the rule of law by Muslims**, who, whether as citizens or residents,

remain bound by compliance with public order and legal norms. Such commitment strengthens mutual trust and prevents the instrumentalization of religion for political or legal conflict (March, 2009, pp. 120-135).

- **Promotion of intercultural and civilizational dialogue** through:
  - Educational institutions
  - Media platforms
  - Civil society organizations

This aims to dismantle stereotypes and foster mutual understanding between Muslims and non-Muslim communities (Cesari, 2013, pp. 80-102).

Nevertheless, this model faces several challenges, including:

- The rise of right-wing anti-immigration discourse
- The conflation of Islam with extremism
- The limited institutional representation of Muslim communities

The absence of a balanced framework therefore risks leading to one of two problematic outcomes: either forced integration resulting in the erosion of identity, or social withdrawal leading to isolation.

Accordingly, the most appropriate approach lies in interactive integration, founded upon the principles of recognition, balance, and coexistence.

The optimal solution to the identity and integration dilemma thus resides in a balanced model grounded in mutual recognition: recognition by the state of diversity as a source of social enrichment, and commitment by Muslims to the rule of law as the foundation of shared citizenship and coexistence. This interactive model requires the promotion of intercultural dialogue and the deconstruction of stereotypical representations so that integration becomes a conscious and constructive process capable of ensuring social stability while simultaneously safeguarding religious dignity.

At the conclusion of this analytical exploration, spanning the principles of Islamic jurisprudence and the provisions of Western legal systems, a number of key findings and conclusions emerge that delineate the contours of the complex and dynamic relationship between identity and integration. These findings will be presented in the concluding section of this study, accompanied by both scholarly and practical recommendations.

V. **Conclusion**

This study demonstrates that the issue of the religious identity of Muslims in Western societies can no longer be regarded as a marginal or temporary concern. Rather, it has evolved into a structural issue reflecting the complex relationship between religion, law, and society within the framework of the modern state. The Muslim presence in the West is no longer peripheral or transitional; it has become a permanent component of the social fabric of Western societies, thereby necessitating a reconsideration of traditional models that have historically governed the relationship between majorities and minorities, as well as between the public sphere and religious affiliations.

The study has shown that the religious identity of Muslims in the West constitutes a multidimensional and composite identity that cannot be reduced solely to doctrinal affiliation or outward manifestations such as dress. It also encompasses cultural, linguistic, and social dimensions and is continuously reconstructed through interaction with legal and social environments. Consequently, it is neither a fixed and isolated identity nor one entirely absorbed through assimilation. Rather, it is a dynamic identity shaped through an ongoing

process of negotiation between the demands of religious belonging and the requirements of civic integration.

The findings further indicate that the jurisprudence of Muslim minorities represents one of the most significant contemporary fields of Islamic legal reasoning aimed at establishing this balance. This development has been marked by a transition from the jurisprudence of traditional territorial classifications toward a jurisprudence of citizenship, and from a logic of exceptionality to one that legitimizes and conceptualizes the Islamic presence within non-Muslim societies. Nevertheless, despite its importance, this field still requires greater methodological refinement to prevent it from becoming merely an instrument of unregulated adaptation to social realities. Instead, it should remain an interpretive framework capable of preserving the foundational principles of Islamic law while simultaneously accommodating contextual transformations.

Conversely, the study reveals that Western legal systems, despite their formal recognition of religious freedom, are not free from inconsistencies in implementation. Their approaches fluctuate between protection and restriction depending on constitutional models and prevailing political orientations. While some states adopt flexible approaches that accommodate broad forms of religious pluralism, others favor stricter models of neutrality which may, in certain instances, result in limitations on religious expression, particularly where visible symbolic manifestations are concerned.

The study also highlights the pivotal role played by the judiciary, particularly at the European level, in redefining the boundaries of religious freedom through the application of balancing mechanisms among competing rights, freedoms, and public interests. However, despite the significance of this approach, its implementation remains uneven and may, in certain circumstances, lead to indirect restrictions on religious practice, especially within the fields of employment and education.

With regard to integration, the study concludes that the concept, within the Islamic normative perspective, does not imply assimilation or the abandonment of religious and cultural particularities. Rather, it is founded upon positive coexistence based on maintaining a balance between religious commitment and civic participation. In certain respects, this understanding converges with some contemporary models that seek to manage cultural and religious diversity. Nevertheless, it differs from them in that it is grounded in a doctrinal and purposive reference framework that defines its boundaries and prevents it from drifting either toward excessive concession or toward isolationism.

Comparative analysis further demonstrates that the central challenge does not lie in the existence of religious difference itself, but rather in the management of such difference within a legal and political framework capable of recognizing pluralism without undermining social cohesion. The broader the scope of legal recognition granted to religious particularities, and the stronger the mechanisms of dialogue and interaction, the greater the prospects for achieving balanced and sustainable integration. Conversely, policies based on exclusion or the coercive imposition of a single cultural model often produce counterproductive outcomes, including the intensification of alienation and the reinforcement of exclusionary tendencies.

Accordingly, achieving equilibrium between religious identity and the requirements of integration necessitates moving beyond binary approaches that place Muslims before two seemingly contradictory options: either complete assimilation or total isolation. Instead, what is required is the construction of an interactive model of integration founded upon mutual recognition, respect for particularities, adherence to the rule of law, and sustained civilizational dialogue.

This study further reveals that the issue of the religious identity of Muslims in the West is no longer confined to the domains of jurisprudence and law alone. It has increasingly become associated with the nature of media discourses that contribute to shaping the image of Islam within the Western public sphere. Media institutions may reinforce values of pluralism and coexistence, yet they may also contribute to reproducing stereotypical representations of Muslims. Consequently, the media dimension has emerged as a significant factor influencing both the boundaries of integration and the dynamics of social acceptance.

Study Findings

The present study yields several key findings, which may be summarized as follows:

- The religious identity of Muslims in Western societies constitutes a dynamic and multidimensional identity shaped through continuous interaction with legal and social contexts.
- Minority jurisprudence (*Fiqh al-Aqalliyyat*) represents an important interpretive framework for grounding Muslim presence within non-Muslim societies; however, it requires further methodological refinement and stronger engagement with contextual realities.
- Although religious freedom is formally recognized within Western legal systems, its practical implementation continues to face significant challenges, particularly regarding visible religious expressions and practices.
- The judiciary plays a decisive role in defining the boundaries of religious freedom through the application of balancing approaches between competing rights and interests.
- Integration, from the Islamic perspective, is founded upon achieving equilibrium between identity preservation and social participation rather than assimilation or isolation.
- The study demonstrates that media discourse contributes significantly to shaping representations of Islamic identity within Western societies.
- The findings further reveal that media coverage relating to the hijab and mosques indirectly influences legal and social debates concerning Muslim communities.

Study Recommendations

In light of the foregoing findings, the study proposes the following scholarly and practical recommendations:

- Greater attention should be devoted to developing minority jurisprudence through context-sensitive application grounded in maqasid-oriented and methodological foundations while preserving the immutable principles and definitive rulings of Islamic law.
- Efforts should be made to strengthen the education and training of imams and religious leaders in Western societies to enable them to better understand local legal and social contexts.
- Western legal systems should be encouraged to adopt more flexible approaches in addressing religious particularities rather than relying on broad restrictive measures or blanket prohibitions.
- Educational and media institutions should play a more active role in promoting cultures of pluralism and coexistence while countering stereotypes and reductionist representations.

- Dialogue among religious, legal, and institutional actors should be encouraged in order to develop a consensual model capable of promoting social stability and sustainable coexistence.
- More balanced and nuanced media approaches should be adopted in addressing issues related to Islam and Muslim communities within Western media environments.
- Interdisciplinary research integrating media studies, Islamic jurisprudence, and legal scholarship should be encouraged to better understand the transformations affecting religious identity within Western societies.

- **Referrals and references:**

Al-Alwani, T. J. (2003). *Towards a Jurisprudence of Muslim Minorities.* Herndon: International Institute of Islamic Thought (IIIT).

Al-Qaradawi, Y. (2001). *On the Jurisprudence of Muslim Minorities: The Life of Muslims within Other Societies.* Cairo: Dar Al-Shorouk.

Al-Shatibi. (n.d.). *Al-Muwafaqat fi Usul al-Sharia* (Vol. 2). Dar Al-Ma'rifa.

Bowen, J. R. (2007). *Why the French Don't Like Headscarves: Islam, the State, and Public Space.* Princeton University Press.

Brems, E. (2006). Freedom of Religion and the European Court of Human Rights. *Religion and Human Rights*.

Caeiro, A. (2010). The Power of European Fatwas: The Minority Fiqh Project and the Making of an Islamic Counterpublic. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*.

Cesari, J. (2004). *When Islam and Democracy Meet: Muslims in Europe and in the United States* (1st ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cesari, J. (2013). *Why the West Fears Islam: An Exploration of Muslims in Liberal Democracies.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Court of Justice of the European Union. (2017, 3 14). Samira Achbita v. G4S Secure Solutions NV, Case C-157/15, Judgment of 14 March 2017. *Court of Justice of the European Union*. European Union: Court of Justice of the European Union.

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication*.

Evans, C. (2001). *Freedom of Religion under the European Convention on Human Rights.* Oxford University Press.

Gole, N. (2002). Muslims in the Public Sphere: Islam, Publicity and Secularism. *Public Culture*.

Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices.* London: Sage Publications.

Howard, E. (2012). *Law and the Wearing of Religious Symbols: European Bans on the Wearing of Religious Symbols in Education.* Routledge.

Ibn Al-Qayyim. (n.d.). *I'lam al-Muwaqqi'in* (Vol. 3). Dar Al-Jeel.

Laurence, J. (2012). *The Emancipation of Europe's Muslims: The State's Role in Minority Integration.* Princeton University Press.

Malik, M. (2007). Religious Freedom, Free Speech and Equality: Conflict or Cohesion? *Res Publica*.

March, A. F. (2009). *Islam and Liberal Citizenship: The Search for an Overlapping Consensus.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martinez-Torron, J. (2005). Limitations on Religious Freedom in the Case Law of the European Court of Human Rights. *Emory International Law Review*.

Modood, T. (2013). *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Nielsen, J. S. (2003). Muslim Minorities and the Challenge of Fiqh al-Aqalliyat. *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*.

Poncet, P. (2019). Ritual Slaughter, Religious Freedom and Animal Welfare in Europe. *European Food and Feed Law Review*.

Poole, E. (2002). *Reporting Islam: Media Representations of British Muslims.* London: I.B. Tauris.

Ramadan, T. (2004). *Western Muslims and the Future of Islam.* Oxford University Press.

Said, E. W. (1997). *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World.* New York: Vintage Books.

United Nations. (1993). International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 18. *Human Rights Committee, General Comment No. 22*. United Nations.