AUTHORITY, IDENTITY AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PEOPLE OF GOD: UNDERSTANDING THE POLITICAL CHALLENGE OF ISLAM

by
Ida Glaser

*Ida Glaser, Ph.D.
(University of Durham),
is Other Faiths Secretary
of CROSSLINKS and is
based in Newcastle-on-
Tyne, England, UK. She
is a visiting lecturer at the
Caribbean Graduate
School of Theology.*

The Church Challenged

It is not natural for religion to be segregated from life in this world, nor is it natural for the Divine system to be confined to conscientious feelings, ethical rules and ritualistic worship. Nor is it in its nature to be immured in a restricted corner of human life and labelled 'a personal affair'.

Thus writes Sayyid Qutb, the founding father of the Islamic Brotherhood in Egypt, in a polemic essay[1] which levels at Christians the common Islamic accusation that they suffer from a 'hideous schizophrenia' encapsulated in the exhortation to 'render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's.'

Since its inception, Islam has presented unprecedented challenges to the Christian church:

* **The challenge of truth:** While Judaism offers a different interpretation of a shared story of God's activities, and systems related to Hinduism offer a different story, Islam offers a different version of the same story. While the Qur'an claims to affirm and confirm the previous scriptures, Muslims see its accounts of biblical history as the authorized version, correcting the corrupted version to be found in the Bible. That is, it is in direct competition with Christianity.

* **The challenge of mission:** A glance at any map of the Muslim world shows that the first strongholds of Christianity are now almost entirely Islamic: few Christians are now to be found in Alexandria or in Damascus, or in what

were Carthage and Constantinople. Even Jerusalem has experienced long Islamic domination. Islam is a missionary faith—and an effective one.

This has become increasingly evident since the rise of oil wealth in the Arabian peninsula and the Iranian revolution in 1979. Active *da'wah*—calling others to the faith —has been encouraged and financed throughout the world, and is taking effect both in recalling Muslims to a more rigorous faith and practice, and in seeing non-Muslims embrace Islam. The latter is not least significant amongst young black people who are offered a new identity and rooting. The popular icon Malcolm X, in a leaflet distributed by the Islamic Council of Jamaica, testifies:

> Islam...is the one religion that erases from its society the race problem. Throughout my travels in the Muslin world, I have met, talked to, even eaten with people who in America would have been considered 'white', but the 'white' attitude had been removed from their minds by the religion of Islam.[2]

The leaflet explores this and concludes

> The entire Muslim community would like to invite every one to the light of faith, reason and humanity. To the light of Islam.

At the same time, Christian evangelism amongst Muslims has been noted for its lack of effectiveness, and it is a hard fact that, until recent years, only a tiny percentage of Christian missionary activity has been directed towards Muslims.[3]

* The challenge of politics: While Christians have traditional —if not always effective —ways of dealing with truth and with mission, we tend to be ambivalent about politics. Qutb's challenge holds some truth: we have too often relegated our faith to the personal realm. Yet it also indicates a fundamental difference between Christianity and Islam. While we may see the Church as having much to say to the state, we have not since Christendom considered that the Church should be directly involved in government. Islam, in contrast, envisages a theocratic state, to the extent that some would define Muslims as people belonging to a theocracy rather than as individual believers.[4] Current Islamic movements therefore present themselves as

political challenges as well as calls to faith: the two are intrinsically linked.

It is this third challenge on which I propose to focus in this paper. This is not only because it has been the area least explored in evangelical responses to Islam, but also because the political agenda has, historically, undergirded the other challenges. The very Qur'anic material giving rise to accusations of distortion of the former scriptures came into being in the context of the establishment of the Islamic state in Medina: the Jews there were a political threat, in that some refused to accept Muhammad's leadership and undermined the Muslims in their confrontations with the Meccans.[5]

Conversion too has been in the context of the political agenda. The heartlands of early Christianity were first conquered by the Arabs, and the Jews and Christians treated as *dhimmi* —-protected minorities. Conversion to Islam followed slowly,[6] but it was certainly hastened by social pressures and the vagaries of politics. The Pact of 'Umar,[7] which has functioned as the basis for relationships with *dhimmi*, offers citizenship and protection, but clearly assumes the superiority of Muslims. *Dhimmi* must not, for example, build houses higher than Muslim houses, display crosses or build churches in Muslim areas, nor even wear the same clothes as Muslims. In some places, it has to be admitted that *jihad* —holy war —has been considered a major road to conversion.[8]

The recent upsurge of Islamic missionary activity is also linked with the political. It is not only that political and economic change has increased confidence and provided resources for mission: it is also that the call to faith cannot be separated from the call to socio-political change. The new Islamist movements[9] have, according to many analysts, arisen as direct reactions to the failure of post-colonial governments to deal with social and economic problems.[10] They see Islam as a total system which offers the only satisfactory form of government, so that the call to Islam is also, for many, a call to revolution. The consequent rejection of current governments —perceived as non-Islamic —underlies much current tension in Islamic states.[11]

These Islamist movements do not represent all Muslims, or even a majority of Muslims. There are many who recognise that Islam does not have a single, total political system that can simply be applied to solve the problems of the world, and some of the most influential revivalist movements have no overtly political thrust.[12] However, revival of personal faith has strong social and political dimensions. The very

nature of Islam is to determine ways of action, from family organisation through food and clothing to economic activity. All these raise questions for majority regimes in countries where Islamic practice is not the norm.

The political challenge is, then, foundational, and the other challenges cannot be fully addressed apart from it. It is a challenge not only to Christian believers, but also to the many 'secular' societies which have grown from Judaeo-Christian roots. 'Liberal', 'tolerant', 'secular' Britain found itself shaken in 1989 when one of its citizens —Salman Rushdie —was sentenced to death by the leader of a distant Islamic state. Suddenly, politically correct journalists were decisively rejecting a whole system. Long denied prejudices emerged:

> Islam, once a great civilisation worthy of being argued with...has degenerated into a primitive enemy fit only to be sensitively (sic) subjugated...if they want jihad, let them have it...(Islam) once a moral force, has long been corrupted by its own variations of the European heresies, fascism and communism—a poisonous concoction threatening seepage back into Europe through mass migration.[13]

No longer were all religions equally acceptable: a religion had raised its head which simply did not fit in with the secular pluralist paradigm. Muslims—at least the ones reported in the press—were not acting as if their religion was just a personal preference, and some were refusing to give the nation state in which they happened to be living precedence over the world-wide Islamic *ummah*.[14]

From an evangelical perspective, such a development can only be positive. It demonstrates that our insistence on the importance of truth is not purely idiosyncratic, and affirms analyses of western culture that point out the dangers of dichotomising private and public truth.[15] It also brings us a new challenge: as one of the few groups in the western world that has continued to assert that our faith is true, we have the possibility of helping our peoples to understand and respond to Muslim minorities in our midst. In Britain, for example, those responsible for social and political policy have systematically ignored religion. Legislation has concerned race and culture, and has seen religion as only an expression of these. The current Islamic surge is forcing a re-assessment. At national levels, the challenge is to be so involved in that re-assessment that we assist the development of societies in which both the Gospel can have its full effect and Muslim minorities can be afforded full human dignity. On an international level, the challenge is to assist governments to respond in ways that take account of the ways in which Islamic states function.

Galatia and Medina as Keys to Understanding

I will not venture here to propose policies or courses of action. Rather, I want to suggest that we can only rise to the challenges if we can learn to understand the workings of Islam and how they compare to our own faith, and to bring the questions raised to the Bible. It is not that Islam 'has degenerated into a primitive enemy', but that it has always been based on assumptions different than those of liberal western journalists, and of the Judaeo-Christian tradition which spawned them.

Understanding is, I suggest, best achieved not by theoretical consideration of Christian and Islamic concepts of state, but by concrete examples which epitomise the two systems. I therefore offer a taste of a reading, in comparative perspective, of Galatians, a foundational document of Christianity, which

> takes us right back into the period of Christianity's foundation and initial expansion, a letter which evidently helped to establish the authority of Paul the apostle, and which thus also helped to shape the character and self-perception of early Christianity, both in terms of its fundamental principles and in relation to the Jewish matrix from which Christianity emerged.[16]

Galatians has concerns which parallel those of the first Islamic state, established in Medina under the leadership of Muhammad.

- Galatians is situated in the midst of a conflict: Paul's battle over circumcision for the Gentiles has been won in Jerusalem; the battle at Antioch had been, it seems, indecisive, and now Paul was fighting what would be a decisive victory with the Galatians.[17] The parallel situation in the establishment of the Islamic community in Medina concerns battles with the Meccan opposition. A first victory was obtained at the battle of Badr, there was then an indecisive outcome with severe losses for the Muslims at Uhud, and a victory at the battle of the Trench which was not reversed before the final occupation of Mecca itself.

- Galatians focuses on a concern which arose out of the initial expansion of Christianity. The message was universalising, as it moved from the particular people of Israel to incorporate new peoples. In parallel, Muhammad in Medina had to incorporate different tribal groupings, and even Jews, into his new community.

- Galatians begins its argument with the question of authority, and of the authority of Paul as apostle in particular. Authority was also the key question in Medina. Muhammad had been invited there by

representatives from particular groups who had accepted Islam. He was asked to lead the Medinan community, and to bring unity to its disparate peoples. Much of the Qur'anic material can be seen as justifying his authority as Prophet—the Arabic word for which is often translated, 'Apostle'.[18]

- The issues discussed in Galatians not only 'shaped the character' of early Christianity, but determined how the early Christians perceived themselves—Galatians establishes the fundamental nature of Christian identity. Similarly, the issues dealt with in Medina, particularly following the defeat at Uhud, can be seen as shaping the character of Islam and as determining Islamic identity.
- Galatians is concerned to define the way of Jesus 'in relation to the Jewish matrix'. Relationships with Jews and to the Jewish scriptures are at the heart of many of the Medinan discussions.

Systems reflect their origins. We can therefore expect that a reading of Galatians in the context of a comparison with some of the Qur'anic material arising after the battle of Uhud should assist a comparative understanding of the fundamentals of the faiths, and therefore of some of the underlying world views of Islam and Christianity.

An influential text for children summarises standard Islamic perceptions of the Medinan struggles:

> The society was growing and the task of making it strong, solid and dynamic also continued. Muhammad (*pbuh*[19]) during this time was virtually fighting on four fronts:
>
> 1. To maintain cohesion and discipline among the rank and file of the Islamic society;
>
> 2. To guard against the intrigues and conspiracies of the Hypocrites *(Munafiqin)*;
>
> 3. To remain alert to the dangers from the Quraish of Makkah, and
>
> 4. To remain vigilant about the sinister motives of the Jews in Madinah.[20]

It is immediately clear that, despite the parallels, Muhammad's battles were in a very different context than Paul's. Muhammad was seeking to establish a political entity, and this fact underlies all Islamic understandings of identity. So too does the fact that he succeeded, and that the success is perceived as necessary to the establishment of the faith. The children's text continues:

History shows how wonderfully Allah's messenger faced all these dangers and led the Islamic state towards more and more success and victory.[21]

Of Muhammad's opponents, the 'hypocrites' most closely parallel Paul's opponents. Both groups have the names of being believers, but both are offering opposition to apostolic authority and are perceived as threats to the establishment of the faith. Paul's opponents threaten to destroy the freedom of the new community and to undermine the truth of the message (Gal 2: 4-5). The 'hypocrites' threaten the very survival of the Muslims, as they may refuse to fight with them and accept Muhammad's authority except when it suits them. This latter idea of accommodating behaviour to circumstances rather than standing for truth at whatever personal cost is common with Galatians, as is the idea of 'hypocrisy' (3: 11ff).

The most extended Qur'anic treatment of the 'hypocrites' is in Surah 4: 60-91, which is set in the aftermath of Uhud.[22] Here are some of the relevant verses:

> [60] Hast thou not turned thy vision to those who declare that they believe in the revelations that have come to thee and to those before thee? Their real wish is to resort together for judgement (in their disputes) to the evil one, though they were ordered to reject him. But Satan's wish is to lead them astray far away. [61] When it is said to them: 'Come to what God hath revealed, and to the Apostle': thou seest the Hypocrites avert their faces from thee in disgust.

> [64] We sent not an Apostle but to be obeyed, in accordance with the Will of God. If they had only, when they were unjust to themselves, come unto thee and asked God's forgiveness, and the Apostle had asked forgiveness for them, they would have found God indeed Oft-returning, most Merciful. [65] But no, by thy Lord, they can have no (real) faith until they make thee a judge in all disputes between them, and find in their souls no resistance against thy decisions, but accept them with the fullest conviction. [66] If We had ordered them to sacrifice their lives or to leave their homes, very few of them would have done it: but if they had done what they were (actually) told, it would have been best for them, and would have gone farthest to strengthen their (faith).

> [69] All who obey God and the Apostle are in the company of those on whom is the Grace of God—of the Prophets (who teach), the

Sincere (lovers of Truth), the Witnesses (who testify), and the Righteous (who do good): Ah! What a beautiful fellowship!

71 O you who believe! Take your precautions, and either go forth in parties or go forth all together. 72 There are certainly among you men who would tarry behind: if a misfortune befalls you, they say: God did favour us in that we were not present among them.' 73 But if good fortune comes to you from God, they would be sure to say—as if there had never been ties of affection between you and them—Oh! I wish I had been with them; a fine thing I should then have made of it!' 74 Let those fight in the cause of God who sell the life of this world for the Hereafter. To him who fighteth in the case of God—whether he is slain or gets the victory—soon shall We give him a reward of great (value).23

We choose for reflection three issues which parallel Galatians: the effects of desertion of a party on the rest of the community, the authority of the apostle, and ultimate spiritual rewards. The different contexts imply different contents for these concerns.

Desertion

The Galatians are in danger of deserting God Himself, by 'turning to a different gospel' (1: 6). The 'hypocrites' are accused of not doing what they were bid (Surah 4: 66) and of 'tarrying behind' (72). The story behind this is that a group led by the arch-hypocrite 'Abdullah ibn Ubayy24 came out to fight alongside the Muslim army, but then returned to Medina before battle was joined. This is a literal desertion in the face of the enemy, and the near disastrous result was largely blamed on them. They had broken ranks with the community.

Paul is also concerned for the maintenance of the community—the *ekklesia*, which he himself once persecuted as he sought to maintain the purity of what he saw as the people of God—the Jews.25 The twin foci of his conversion as recounted in 1: 15-16 indicate a revolution in his understanding of God's people:

• the call by grace

• the inclusion of the Gentiles.

The two are intrinsically related. Grace implies that salvation does not depend on the 'traditions of the fathers': the practices for which he had fought so hard, had suddenly been relegated to a particular expression of ethnicity. The immediate implication is a universalised Gospel to be preached amongst all ethnic groups. Where Paul had seen

the way of Christ as desertion from Judaism, he now sees desertion from Christ as reversion to the attitudes from which he needed to be converted. These attitudes were at the heart of his own persecution of the *ekklesia*. He knows from his own experience that they will undermine the whole Christian enterprise, even though they present as movements within the church.

The Meccan persecution of the Muslims, which Ibn Ubayy and his companions were tacitly assisting by their withdrawal from battle, was about social control, economic survival and political power. The treachery of Peter and Barnabas under the influence of the 'men from James' (2: 11-13) was about the relationship between grace, culture and ethnicity.

Apostolic Authority

The main reason for the desertion was that the 'hypocrites' did not accept Muhammad's authority. All the problems facing Muhammad, as summarised above by Sarwar, were to do with the solidarity of the community, for on this depended its very survival. It is in this context that the Qur'an exhorts, 'Come to what God revealed, and to the Apostle' (61); 'We sent not an Apostle but to be obeyed' (64); 'they can have no (real) faith until they make thee judge in all disputes between them' (65); 'all who obey God and the Apostle are in the company of those on whom is the grace of God' (69). A later passage states the issue more starkly:

He who obeys the Apostle, obeys God. (80)

The authority of Muhammad is therefore established as a direct representation of the authority of God Himself. The Qur'an is elsewhere at pains to convince of this—accusations of forgery and possession are refuted (10: 38, 68: 2-7), and its inimitable form and content (2: 23, 10: 37) as well as the witness of the previous prophets and Books[26] (41: 43, 43: 44-5) are cited as evidence. It is not only that the 'revelations' received by Muhammad are said to be from God, but also that whatever he says and does functions authoritatively. In Medina, all Muslims should follow his rulings and his lead. The rulings then stand for all time, and Muhammad's example, even down to details of washing and dressing, is to be followed by all those who acknowledge his prophethood.

There are some interesting contrasts here with the authority claimed by Paul in Galatians. **First,** Paul's claim to authority lies not in himself but in his message. The whole argument of chapter one is to establish

that the message does not come from him, nor from the Jerusalem apostles, but from Christ. That this is not personal to Paul—nor to anyone else—is indicated by his insistence that even if he himself preaches 'another gospel', he should be accursed (1: 7). While Muhammad's primary claim to authority is the Qur'an, his personal authority as community leader became paramount for the establishment of the Muslims in Medina.

Second, Paul is but one of several apostles. Although his authority is not dependent upon theirs, it is important that they recognise the gospel he preaches as the same gospel which they preach. Although the Jerusalem church has evident leaders, there is no question of seeking to unite the community behind any particular personality. Muhammad is considered but the last of many equal prophets, but because their messages are said to be lost or distorted Islam is in practice based on the authority of one man; and he was certainly the single authority in Medina.

Third, there is no suggestion of Paul's authority extending to tell the Galatians what to do in particular instances. Rather, he is seeking to establish them in faith, and insisting that regulations about what to do will in fact disqualify them. Chapters five and six indicate that specific actions are not indifferent, but these must grow out of their relationship with Christ through the Spirit, and not in response to rulings from Paul. The corollary is that he writes against regulations—in particular, against the circumcision and food laws that later became incorporated into Islam.

This indicates difference in the locus as well as the nature and content of the authority envisaged by the two systems. The Medinan situation opens the way to authority vested in political as well as religious leaders, to the two being merged in theocracy, and even to all authority being vested in a single individual as has been the case in, for example, the Shi'ite regime in Iran.

Ultimate Rewards

Obedience to Muhammad admits to 'the company of those on whom is the Grace of God' (69), and those who 'fight in the cause of God'—that is, those who join Muhammad in the battles establishing the Islamic community—'sell the life of this world for the Hereafter.' (74) The ensuing 'reward of great value' (74) might be in temporal victory, but will certainly be in paradise after death:

> Whether (in appearance) they win or lose, in reality they win the prize for which they are fighting—viz. Honour the glory in the

sight of God. Note that the only alternatives here are Death or Victory! The true fighter knows no defeat.[27]

'Grace' in 69 needs some explanation: the Arabic *an'am* does not mean the same as the Greek _chaire_, despite the same word being used to translate them. *An'am* is, perhaps, better translated 'favour'. It holds the idea of God's benevolence and beneficence towards human beings, and the context shows that it is those who 'obey God and the Apostle' who are to receive it. Islam sees faith and works as intrinsically related, as does Christianity, but the idea that one might be saved by faith alone is alien. Muslims often accuse Christians of easy forgiveness: 'You can do anything you like and know you will be forgiven,' they say. 'No wonder your societies are in such a mess!'

The focus in the Islamic system is on obtaining God's favour, in both this world and the next. The focus of Galatians is that this favour is obtained only through faith. Its mark is the gift of the Holy Spirit which enables right living: it is not right living which gains favour.

Implications

The two systems are, then, different. Similar words can veil differences so fundamental that effective communication is all but impossible. The challenge to Christians is so to listen to the other's thinking that we are able to relate and ultimately to share the gospel. The relationship is at least as important as the evangelism. We are exhorted to pray for the people responsible for social structures that will leave us free to live gospel lives and enable others to be saved (I Tim. 2: 1-7); but it is also part of our distinctiveness as children of God to relate to all people, however different they seem and whatever their attitude to us (Matt. 5: 46-8). This is the fundamental challenge: to live out the Gospel as we relate with Muslim individuals, families, communities and nations. If we do not do that, our evangelism will be ineffective and our socio-political relations disastrous.

Our comparative study shows us how the essentials of the faith are seen in situations in which the believing community is challenged. In the case of Islam, what was developed was social cohesion which came to be expressed in a system which regulates every aspect of life. In the case of Christianity, Galatians signals a different way—that in which all regulations become secondary to the grace of God appropriated through faith alone.

What happened in both cases was that the process of universalisation called in question the practices of a particular people—the *sunna*[28] of

Muhammad, or the religious laws of the Jews. How, it needed to be decided, should such ethnic practices be regarded when the faith embraced new peoples. The stark choice is between universalising particular practices and relegating them to matters of free choice. Islam, in setting up a social entity, chose the former: Christianity decided that no culture, even the God-given culture of the Jews, could be insisted upon. While Islam effectively absolutised a tribal culture which had previously been regarded as relative[29], Christianity relativised a culture which had previously been regarded as God-revealed.

One consequence of this is that, while Christians can happily differentiate between for example, western society and Christianity, Muslims cannot easily do so. They tend to see their whole cultures as well as their states as 'Islamic'. Although most would differentiate between Muslims who really follow their faith and Muslims who are simply part of the system, the system itself is considered Islamic. The word 'secular' is translated into most Islamic languages as 'atheist', so the concept of a secular state as westerners would understand it is not part of their thinking. The general perception is that westerners are Christian, so that what is seen in western society is at least a result of Christianity.

Another consequence is that Islam needs control in order to function. Their system is set up on the assumption that the whole of society is Islamic, and that people of other faiths will be protected minorities under an Islamic state. It therefore has no considered way of functioning in a minority setting. Reflecting on competing attempts to deal with the position of his co-religionists in a secular state, a leading British Muslim writes:

> The practice of the community rather than the theories of the theologians provided a solution. Nevertheless Muslim theology offers, up to the present, no systematic formulation of the status of being a minority.... It is hoped that the matter will be brought into focus and that Muslim theologians from all over the Muslim world will delve into this thorny subject to allay the conscience of the many Muslims living in the West and also to chart a course for Islamic survival, even revival, in a secular society.[30]

If Islamic minorities present challenges to Christians, their situation also presents challenges to Muslims. The differences between us give rise to problems for both.

Our comparative reading has highlighted some of these differences. It can also, I suggest, offer hope of ways forward. In particular, the Galatians understanding of grace and culture might determine our responses. Unconditional, free grace given to us by God can, perhaps,

88

help us towards approaching Muslims with love rather than judgement, and in confidence rather than in fear. Recognition of the provisionality of our—and every—culture can, perhaps, free us to relate to people on their own terms, in ways that make them feel comfortable with us. At a political level, it can teach us that our particular national perceptions of how the world should be run may be inappropriate elsewhere, and enable us at least to be open to listening to the other's point of view. That is, we can learn the lesson that Peter learnt at Caesarea (Acts 10) and needed to re-learn at Antioch (Galatians 2): that no people is intrinsically unclean, and that there is no human being with whom we cannot meet and eat.

Experience in Europe indicates that Christians are unlikely to reach out to Muslims, or even to form relationships with them, until and unless they come to be perceived as a threat. The early immigrants were at best ignored, and at worst suffered racist abuse and discrimination. It was only as the communities became more visible and began to make demands on society that people began to take notice, and even now there are many churches with Muslims—few or many—in their area who choose not to reach out because 'We don't have a problem.' So the communities remain separate, opportunity to offer hospitality is lost, Muslims are left to conclude what they can about the Gospel from what they see on the television, and the 'problem' comes into being.

What, I wonder, will the churches of the Caribbean learn from our slothfulness?

NOTES

1. 'That Hideous Schizophrenia.' In Christianity through non-Christian eyes, ed., P. J. Griffiths, (New York: Orbis, 1990), 74.

2.   From Darkness to Light, Islamic Circle of North America, New York.

3.   It is now fashionable for young Christian people interested in mission to focus on Islam, but as recently as 1978 D. M. McGavran noted that, while 1 in 6 of the world's population were unreached Muslims, only 2% of North American protestant mission efforts were directed to their evangelisation. A time for new beginnings, 13. In The Gospel and Islam: A 1978 Compendium, ed., D. M. McGavran (California: MARC, 1979), 13-21.

4.   For example, F. Mernissi, Women and Islam. (Basil Blackwell, 1991), 20-1.

5.   For example, Surah 59: 2ff describes the opposition of the Jewish tribe of Banu Nadhir, and the siege of their village by the Muslims. Resistance to Muhammad is seen as resistance to God (4).

6.   T. W. Arnold, <u>The Preaching of Islam: A History of the Propagation of the Muslim Faith</u>, Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, various editions 1896-1979 is a classic text which counters the idea that 'Islam was spread by the sword'.

7.   For a discussion of its effects, see M. Nazir-Ali, <u>Islam: A Christian Perspective</u>, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983), 37-8. The text of the pact can be found in B. Lewis, <u>Islam: From the Prophet Muhammad to the Capture of Constantinople</u>, (New York: Walter and Co., 1976, Vol. 2).

8.   J. S. Trimingham, <u>Islam in the West Africa</u>, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959, p. 24-30, notes the effects of 18th and 19th century *jihad* movements in the spread establishment of Islam. See also R. Peters, <u>Islam and colonialism: The Doctrine of Jihad in Modern History</u>, (New York: Moulton, 1979).

9.   Such as the Islamic Brotherhood in Egypt, the Jama'ati Islami in Pakistan, the Islamic Foundation in the UK.

10.   See, for example, the analyses of G. Kepel, <u>The Revenge of God</u>, and L. Ahmed, <u>Women and Gender in Islam</u>, (Yale University Press, 1992).

11.   For example, Algeria, Egypt, Afghanistan. In the west, the *Hizb ut-Tahrir* (party of freedom) is active. It has been banned in many Islamic states because of its strong anti-government stance, which has included assassination attempts. The freedom of the west gives it a platform, and it has been effective in recruiting many Muslims of student age.

12.   From the Indian sub-continent, for example, the Deobandis and the associated missionary Tabligh movement have been largely apolitical.

13.   Peregrine Worsthorne, <u>Sunday Telegraph</u>, 3d Feb. 1991, quoted in P. Lewis, 'Christian-Muslim Relations in a Cold Climate', in <u>The Month</u>, (Sept.-Oct.: 1991), 405.

14.   The Arabic word which describes the Muslim community is usually translated 'people', but this does not do justice to the idea of world-wide solidarity and theocracy that the word implies.

15.   See for example L. Newbigin, <u>Foolishness to the Greeks</u>, SPCK, 1986.

16.   J. D. G. Dunn, <u>The Epistle to the Galatians</u>, Black's New Testament Commentaries, (Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1993), 1-2.

17.   Dunn (ibid. 12) suggests that the Antioch battle had actually been lost, but this is inferred from the silence of the text, on the assumption that Paul would have recorded any clear victory for his views.

18.   *Rasul* is most closely translated 'messenger', but in Islamic thinking this carries an authority superior even to that of a prophet *(nabi)*. The *rasul* is

messenger in that he is given a book—a message—from God. In his life and teaching, he is the authorised interpreter and interpretation of that message.

19.   'Peace be upon him'—an anglicised version of an Arabic formula calling down blessings on the Prophet which is used by all Muslims every time his name is mentioned.

20.   G. Sarwar, Islam: Beliefs and Teachings, 3d ed. (London: Muslim Educational Trust, 1985), 110.

21.   Ibid.

22.   For a discussion of context, see A. Yusuf Ali, The Holy Qur'an: Text, translation and commentary, (Jeddah: Islamic Education Centre, 1946), 177.

23.   All Qur'anic quotations are from Yusuf Ali, ibid.

24.   He was a leader in Medina before the arrival of the Muslims, and resisted Islam for some time. After he embraced it, he is said never to have relinquished his jealousy of Muhammad, and there are several stories about his undermining of the Prophet's authority, collaboration with the Jews, and threatening the security of the *ummah*. See A. Guillaume, The Life of Muhammad: A Translation of Ibn Ishaq's Sirah Rasul Allah, Oxford University Press, 1955, 371ff on the battle of Uhud, and 277-9, 363-4, 491ff on his enmity towards Muhammad. For a western account of the battle, see W. M. Watt, Muhammad: Prophet and Statesman, (Edinburgh University Press, 1961), 135-8.

25.   The use of the word 'Judaism' together with the 'traditions of the fathers' implies a focus on nation and purity of religion. See Dunn, Galatians 56-61.

26.   i.e. The Taurat (Torah) of Moses, the Zabur (Psalms) of David and the Injeel (Gospel) of Jesus. Although the original Qur'anic references are to the extant versions of these, most contemporary Muslims would say that God gave books to these prophets and that our Bible contains replacements or distortions. The originals having been lost.

27.   Yusuf Ali, The Holy Qu'an, N591.

28.   This word describes traditional practice, or ways of doing things.

29.   It is at least arguable that the disparate groups at Medina were united by being drawn into the *sunna* of Muhammad's tribe. See Watt, Muhammad 93-101.

30.   Z. Badawi, Islam in Britain, (London: Ta Ha, 1981), 26-7, quoted in C. Chapman, Cross and Crescent, (Leicester: IVP, 1995), 141.