

Interfaith  
C.M. NAIM

# Getting Real about Christian-Muslim Dialogue

Years ago, I had the occasion to sit in the audience at two Christian-Muslim dialogues in Chicago and to attend a pair of similar sessions at the 'Parliament of World Religions.' The sponsors on each occasion were different, as were the speakers; but what was said was alarmingly similar.

Interfaith dialogues, until recently, typically occurred only between Christians and Jews. And their urgency derived from the impact of the Holocaust on the Christian conscience, with the horror of the realization that what had happened to the Jews of Europe was partially a consequence of a long entrenched anti-Semitism among too many Christians. Such dialogues tended to be between those who viewed themselves as victims of unspeakable crimes and those who saw themselves, in some sense, as parties to the crimes. Surprisingly, the same modes of thought seemed to govern the proceedings at the Christian-Muslim dialogues that I witnessed.

The Christians usually began by denouncing the Crusades, the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century colonial expansions into Islamic lands, and the more recent Cold War policies of the United States against various nationalist movements in the 'Third World.' They readily identified themselves with 'the West' and its history, only to castigate all Western protagonists and proponents, past and present. Their Muslim counterparts began in the same vein. They denounced the Crusades and argued that the same crusading spirit worked equally behind the colonial expansion and the unquestioning American support of Israel against the Palestinians. These were the crucial moments, they argued, when the 'West' (Christianity) encountered the 'East' (Islam) and behaved shamefully. The listeners nodded in agreement. One Muslim speaker mentioned the expulsion of the Moors

from Spain as another such moment, and all heads were further lowered in sorrow and shame.

Amazingly, no one asked how the Moors arrived in Spain in the first place, or what had brought Muslims to the land of the Testaments. It was as if there had been no imperial expansion of Islam, no Arab conquests of Syria, North Africa and Spain. I'm not denying the horrors of the Reconquista and the Crusades. I merely wish to point out the absurdity of denying any agency to the Muslims themselves. Islamic history unfolded as a series of conquests. This is not to say that Islam spread only by the sword or that Christians and Muslims should argue over who shed less blood. It is simply to acknowledge that the sword was very much present in the story of Islam's expansion too.

When this acknowledgement is not made, interfaith dialogue soon turns into an incoherent comparison of Islam, a faith without history, and Christianity, a history without faith. More, the inordinate emphasis in such dialogues on the scriptural and the juristic aspects of religion, with the simultaneous neglect of the experiential and salvific, turns the two faiths into two ideologies, of which one seems to control all of history while the other appears to have no agency at all - one standing for a body of aggressors, the other for a cohort of victims. By the same token, the dialogues manage to suppress the plurality

of Islam - its many regional forms, the differing ways it adapted itself to local conditions and traditions. A rich and variegated religion is presented in such dialogues as a homogenous, featureless whole.

There is such a thing as Islam, of course, and there are many Islams as well. There is one Islam in the sense that there is one revealed book and one Prophet to whom it was revealed. There are many Islams in the sense that there are many different traditions of interpreting that book and understanding that Prophet. The lived Islam of a peasant in Bangladesh is similar to, but not identical with, that of his counterpart in Algeria, as is the Islam of a middle-class professional in Karachi and his counterpart in Indonesia. In each instance, the differences as well as the similarities are greatly cherished. These differences, however, found no mention in the dialogues I witnessed. They were not present in the remarks of the Muslims and formed no part of the understanding that the Christians sought.

This elision of Islamic differences has dangers not merely for the Christians engaged in dialogue, but for the Muslims as well. The Christians never scrutinized a repeated Muslim claim that what made Islam unique was that it was a totality, a complete system that covered each and every aspect of human life. That such a claim has a dangerous edge went unnoticed. Both for Muslims in self-proclaimed Islamic countries and for Muslims in such non-Islamic nations as India, Islam was said to be a total religion - which easily transposes into the demand that every Muslim be a total Muslim, a Muslim entirely in terms of the person making that demand. Any suggestion of diversity, any opposition to that proclaimed totality then becomes ruthlessly punishable. It takes very little to turn a dream of totality into a totalitarian nightmare.

The Christians who initiated these dialogues may have gained some understanding of contemporary Islamic politics. But if their aim was to get an insight into the lived religion of the Muslims, they should have brought to these dialogues their own lived religion. At none of the meetings that I attended did the Christians highlight any of the issues that are currently so problematic a part of their lives as Christians - issues related to homosexuality; women's rights; prayer in schools; and abortion. Or the three great issues of the recent past: ecumenism; race; and anti-Semitism.

The Muslims were not inclined to raise such issues either. And when they did, it was only to dismiss them with a scriptural quotation. For the overwhelming part, they used these occasions as opportunities to tell their story of grievances and hurts, placing their remarks precisely and entirely in recent history - in a narrative of defeat and loss, neglect, denial, and victimhood.

I am not blind to the brutality inflicted on Bosnian Muslims, the ferocity displayed against the Iraqis, or the unremitting injustice done to the Palestinians. But is that all there is to being a Muslim at this time? Should I not also shed a few tears for those who are victimized in the name of Islam - the Christians in Egypt and Sudan, the Ahmadis in Pakistan, the Bahais in Iran? The instances may not compare in magnitude with what was done to Bosnian Muslims, but shouldn't I at least note the horribly similar impulse behind them? As I denounce the abandonment of Bosnia by the Western powers, shouldn't I also point to their equally shameful abandonment of

the Kurds - who are also Muslims - to the mercy of three so-called Muslim states: Iraq, Turkey and Iran? Not raising that issue, I remain blind to the systemic question the two cases share: how do modern nation-states go about forming and preserving themselves?

Most importantly, the Muslim narrative of hurts not only posits an immediate colonial past of utter decline and passivity but also implies a pre-colonial period of pristine Islamic glory. Both descriptions are not merely false, but also harmful; invoking them only distorts any effort to think through our shared future. A selective memory of caliphs and kings cannot help us much in working towards a world that is not just pluralistic but also democratic.

The goal of an interfaith dialogue between Christians and Muslims should certainly not be the position taken in a Qur'anic verse that was invoked by one Muslim: 'To you your way, to me mine' (109:6). That verse is explicitly addressed to *kafirs*, 'the Unbelievers.' Christians are not *kafirs*, perhaps not even in the sight of the most absolutist Muslim. More, in its full context, the verse is a statement of an absolute parting of ways, which, of course, cannot be the aim of any dialogue - any more than a dialogue can be for the sake of a victory for one of the participants. But neither should some compromise or syncretism be its goal. The only dialogues that we should deem fruitful must either clarify something that was obscure in our own thought, or at least make a little bit opaque what we earlier thought patently clear.

Judaism and Christianity are religions explicitly affirmed in the Qur'an, but the Qur'an equally explicitly commands Muslims to 'judge between [Christians and Jews] in the light of what has been revealed by God, and do not follow their whims, and beware of them lest they lead you away from the guidance sent down to you by God.' (5:49)—which would seem to rule out any kind of dialogue. The Qur'an, however, elsewhere seems to invite dialogue when it enjoins Muslims to say to Christians and Jews, 'O people of the Book, let us come to an agreement on that which is common between us, that we worship no one but God, and make none His compeer, and that none of us take any others for lord apart from God.' (3:64) The Qur'an also clearly places Muslims, Christians and Jews on an equal footing to the extent they are capable of performing deeds that are good in the sight of God. 'To each of you We have given a law and a way and a pattern of life. If God had pleased He could surely have made you one people (professing one faith). But He wished to try and test you by that which He gave you. So try to excel in good deed. To Him will you all return in the end, when He will tell you of what you were at variance.' (5:48)

How we can differently worship one God; what makes a given deed good or bad; how these critical issues play out in the lives of ordinary Muslims, Christians and Jews, at different times and in different places - some understanding of these matters is the worthy goal of any interfaith dialogue. ♦

Dr C.M. Naim is professor of Urdu Studies in the Department of South Asian Languages & Civilizations, University of Chicago.

\* This essay is a revised version of a text published earlier in *Word & World*, XVI:2 (Spring 1996)

ADVERTISEMENT

**Books on Islam from Eurospan**

**The Broken Crescent**  
*The "Green" of Militant Islamic Fundamentalism*  
FEREYDUN KHAYYUM  
Jun 1998 230pp 0-275-08807-X Hardback £37.95  
In this volume, the author explores the historical and contemporary causes of the current wave of militant Islamic fundamentalism. He examines why fundamentalists are flocking to Muslim countries that are desperately trying to join the imperial global economy.  
Praeger Publishers

**The Future of Islam and the West**  
*Clash of Civilizations or Possible Coexistence?*  
NABELEH T. MUBINJI  
May 1998 206pp 0-275-08207-3 Hardback £43.95  
0-275-08208-1 Paperback £14.95  
An analysis of relations between Islam and the West, which offers an assessment of the relative role of civilizational factors in determining the nature of the state and prospects for Muslim-Western relations.  
Praeger Publishers

**Islamic Fundamentalism**  
LAWRENCE LOVINSKY  
May 1998 224pp 0-275-08928-1 Hardback £41.95  
This text explores Islamic fundamentalism and those who adhere to it. It examines the history of the Muslim Brothers in Egypt, the movement led by Ayman al-Rahawi in Iraq, the Wahabi brand of Islamic fundamentalism in Saudi Arabia, and Western perceptions of Islamic fundamentalism.  
Greenwood Press

**The Time of Politics**  
**(Zamanin Siyasa)**  
*Islam and the Politics of Legitimacy in Northern Nigeria (1910-1966)*  
KINSHADU T. KENYON  
Aug 1998 220pp 1-85308-272-0 Hardback £50.00  
A discussion of Islam as a political force in the creation of the first Nigerian Republic and as a political social ideology in Nigerian society at recession.  
International Scholars Publications

**Islamism, Secularism, and Human Rights in the Middle East**  
NABELEH T. MUBINJI  
Jul 1998 230pp 0-275-08807-X Hardback £42.00  
This study assesses the implications of secularization and globalization for human rights in the Middle East. Opening with a discussion of broad issues of Islamism, secular politics and democracy, the author then turns to the politics of reform in Iran, Turkey and Pakistan.  
Lyons Blazer Publishers

**Modern Tunisia**  
*A Democratic Apprenticeship*  
NABELEH T. MUBINJI  
Aug 1998 190pp 0-275-08302-2 Hardback £37.95  
How did Tunisia proceed in formulating the dream of modern Islamic fundamentalism? The author examines the nation, which began with the removal of President Habib Bourguiba in 1987, known in Tunisia as 'the change'.  
Praeger Publishers

**Oman**  
*Political Development in a Changing World*  
CAROL J. KUPPERMAN  
May 1998 266pp 0-275-08344-1 Hardback £47.95  
Oman's position is of key importance to the security of the Gulf - and to the world's oil supplies. This book examines Sultan Qaboos' use, issues of reform and the threat of Islam.  
Praeger Publishers

**Studies in Islamic Law**  
*Classical and Contemporary Applications*  
CAROL J. KUPPERMAN  
Oct 1998 304pp 1-85308-138-3 Hardback £50.00  
Compares contents and discusses civil and criminal law as well as issues of modernization in Sharia applications, law and politics. Joseph Schacht and Islamic law, tradition and human rights.  
Austin & Winfree

**The Eurospan Group**  
THE BRITISH STREET, LONDON WC1E 6LU  
TEL: 0171 240 0494 FAX: 0171 272 0492