

---

# The Politics Of The Veil

---

Downloaded from  
[www.everybodystreet.com](http://www.everybodystreet.com)  
by McConnell &  
Mariana

*The Politics Of The Veil*

---

## INTRODUCTION: MORE THAN A PIECE OF CLOTH

---

The veil, in its many forms—from the **hijab** and **niqab** to the **burqa** and **chador**—is one of the most visually potent and emotionally charged symbols in contemporary global discourse. It is far more than a simple garment. For some, it is an act of profound faith and personal devotion. For others, it is a marker of cultural identity or a tool of patriarchal oppression. And increasingly, it has become a political football, kicked back and forth in debates over secularism, integration, national security, and women's rights. Understanding **the politics of the veil** requires peeling back layers of history, colonialism, religious interpretation, and modern statecraft. This article explores how a piece of cloth can become a lightning rod for some of the most contentious issues of our time, examining its role in identity, governance, and feminist discourse across different societies.

---

## A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE VEIL IN POLITICAL CONTEXT

---

The practice of veiling predates Islam by centuries, with evidence of head and face coverings in ancient Assyrian, Greek, Roman, and Persian societies, where it often signified high social status and respectability. In the pre-Islamic Arabian Peninsula, veiling was a marker

of wealth and honor, not a universal religious requirement. When Islam emerged in the 7th century, it incorporated and adapted these existing customs.

The key Quranic verses often cited (Surah An-Nur, 24:31, and Surah Al-Ahzab, 33:59) instruct both men and women to dress modestly and for the Prophet's wives to draw their cloaks around themselves to be recognized and not harmed. Importantly, classical Islamic scholarship never produced a single, universal consensus on exactly what this modesty entails. The diversity of veiling practices across the Muslim world—from the colorful headscarves of Indonesia to the full-face veils of Afghanistan—testifies to the role of local culture, tradition, and climate in shaping interpretation.

The politicization of the veil escalated dramatically with European colonialism. In countries like Algeria, Egypt, and India, colonial powers often portrayed the veil as a symbol of Muslim backwardness and the subjugation of women. The famous 1930s photograph of Egyptian feminist **Huda Shaarawi** dramatically removing her veil in a public act was not just a personal statement but a political one, aligning with a nationalist movement that sought to modernize Egypt along Western lines. This created a lasting and painful binary: the veil as a symbol of either authentic anti-colonial resistance or of reactionary traditionalism.

---

## SECULARISM VS. RELIGIOUS IDENTITY

Perhaps nowhere is the state's role in **the politics of the veil** more apparent than in the contrasting models of France and Turkey. Both are fiercely secular republics, but their histories with the veil have taken different paths that illuminate the complex relationship between the state, religion, and the individual.

### The French Model: Laïcité and the Public Sphere

France's approach is rooted in *laïcité*, a strict form of secularism that aims to keep religion out of the public sphere. The principle was originally designed to limit the power of the Catholic Church, but in recent decades, it has been applied most forcefully to Islam. The 2004 law banning "conspicuous religious symbols" (including the Muslim headscarf) in public schools was a landmark moment. This was followed in 2010 by a ban on face-covering veils (niqab and burqa) in all public spaces.

French lawmakers argued that the veil, especially the full-face veil, is a symbol of female submission, incompatible with the republican values of liberty, equality, and fraternity. They framed the bans as acts of liberation, freeing women from an oppressive tradition and upholding the principle of a public space free from religious division. Critics, however, argue

that the ban on religious symbols targets Muslim women, stigmatize their faith, and ironically curtail their freedom of religious expression. By dictating what women can and cannot wear, the state, critics contend, is exercising its own form of patriarchal control. The French debates have become a global template for arguments about the veil, pitting women's rights and secularism against religious freedom and anti-discrimination.

that the ban on religious symbols targets Muslim women, stigmatize their faith, and ironically curtail their freedom of religious expression. By dictating what women can and cannot wear, the state, critics contend, is exercising its own form of patriarchal control. The French debates have become a global template for arguments about the veil, pitting women's rights and secularism against religious freedom and anti-discrimination.

### The Turkish Model: From Ban to Normalization

Turkey, under the founding ideology of Kemalism, also pursued a radical form of secularism. For decades, a ban on wearing the headscarf in universities, public offices, and other state institutions was strictly enforced. The Turkish state, led by the military and the judiciary, saw the headscarf as a symbol of political Islam and a threat to the secular order. Women who chose to wear the headscarf were effectively barred from higher education and many careers, a profound limitation on their life opportunities.

This began to change with the rise of the Justice and Development Party (AKP) under Recep Tayyip Erdogan in the early 2000s. For the AKP and its conservative base, the headscarf ban was a symbol of state oppression against religious Muslims. The lifting of the bans, completed by 2013, was a major political victory. The transformation in Turkey illustrates how the same piece of cloth can be assigned opposite political meanings depending on who is in power.

What was once a symbol of reactionary politics for the secular elite became a symbol of democratic inclusion and religious freedom for the conservative government.

---

### THE VEIL AND FEMINIST DISCOURSE: A SOURCE OF DEEP DIVISION

---

The feminist perspective on the veil is far from monolithic. **Feminist discourse** around the hijab reveals a deep and often painful split between Western liberal feminism and various strains of Islamic and post-colonial feminism.

## Liberal and Universalist Feminism

This perspective, often prominent in Western media and policy circles, views the veil as a primary symbol of women's oppression under patriarchy. It argues that the veil is a tool of male control over the female body, designed to regulate female sexuality and enforce modesty. From this viewpoint, the goal of feminism should be to liberate women from such garments, which are seen as inherently unequal. Laws banning the veil are sometimes supported by this camp as a way to protect women from coercion. The strongest version of this argument focuses on regimes like the Taliban's Afghanistan or the Islamic State, where the veil is indeed part of a brutal system of gender apartheid.

## Islamic and Post-Colonial Feminism

This perspective offers a powerful critique of the liberal view. It argues that Western feminism often replicates a colonial, orientalist gaze that treats Muslim women as a monolithic group in need of saving. "Muslim women are not a single story," the argument goes. Many women who choose to wear the veil describe it as an act of empowerment, piety, and personal agency. They see it as a way to reclaim their identity from both Western consumer culture and patriarchal interpretations of their faith.

Furthermore, post-colonial feminists point out that in many contexts, the real oppression comes from economic inequality, war, and authoritarianism, not from a piece of clothing. For them, focusing on the veil as the ultimate symbol of oppression is a distraction from more pressing issues. A woman forced to wear a hijab by the state or her husband is certainly being oppressed, but so is a woman forced by her government *not* to wear one. The core principle for this feminist perspective is **choice and agency**: the act of veiling must be understood in its specific cultural and personal context, and the right to choose whether or not to wear it must be protected.

---

### THE VEIL AS A MARKER OF IDENTITY AND BELONGING

---

In many Western societies with growing Muslim populations, the veil has become a powerful and visible marker of **religious identity** and belonging. For

many young Muslim women born and raised in the West, taking the hijab is a conscious and often difficult decision. It can be a way to assert their faith in a secular society, to challenge negative stereotypes about Islam, and to connect with a global *ummah* (community).

However, this visibility also makes them targets. Hate crimes and discrimination against Muslim women wearing the hijab have risen sharply in many countries. The veil makes them walking targets of Islamophobia. In this sense, **the politics of the veil** is also a politics of identity and belonging: Who is considered a "real" citizen? What does it mean to be French, British, German, or American? For women who wear it, the hijab can be a daily act of courage, a public declaration of faith in the face of hostility. The debates over "burkini" bans on European beaches in 2016 perfectly capture this tension, where a modest swimsuit was framed as a political provocation or a threat to secular values, rather than a pragmatic choice for a day at the beach.

---

### ECONOMIC AND CLASS DIMENSIONS

---

The **politics of the veil** is also an economic story. The "modest fashion" industry is now a multi-billion dollar global market, with luxury brands like Nike, Dolce & Gabbana, and H&M launching hijab and modest-wear lines. For some, this represents a positive trend, normalizing the hijab as a fashion choice and integrating it into the mainstream economy. For others, it risks commodifying a religious practice, turning piety into a consumer trend.

Economically, wearing the veil can have profound consequences for a woman's career. In many countries, there is

documented discrimination against hijabi women in hiring and promotion. A woman wearing a headscarf might be passed over for a job in retail, law, or hospitality, forced to choose between her faith and her livelihood. This economic penalty is a very real and material aspect of the political battles over the veil. Conversely, in some conservative societies, not wearing the veil can be a barrier to employment. This double bind shows how the politics of the veil are not just about ideology but about daily survival and economic opportunity for millions of women.

---

### CONCLUSION: THE PERSONAL IS THE POLITICAL

---

The web of meanings woven around the veil is dense and often contradictory. It can be a symbol of faith, a statement of identity, a sign of resistance, a tool of control, or a fashion accessory. The most important lesson from exploring **the politics of the veil** is that there is no single truth about it. The meaning of the hijab, niqab, or burqa is always specific to a time, place, and individual.

While grand political debates rage about secularism, security, and women's rights in parliaments and newspapers, the most important conversations happen in living rooms and on street corners, between women and their families, and between a woman and her God. Ultimately, the most just and effective politics of the veil is one that centers on **human agency**—the right of each woman to choose her own path, free from coercion by governments, communities, or families. Deeper understanding requires moving beyond the symbolic shorthand the veil represents and listening to the diverse voices of the women who wear it, and

those who choose not to. Only then can the political debate be grounded in the reality of lived human experience, rather than ideological projection.