

**English-Arabic / Arabic-English Translation
Exercises**

Translation III Course

First Semester 2012/2013

Department of English

Course Tutor

S. F. M. Alomary, PhD

College of Arts

Islamic University – Gaza - Palestine

English-Arabic / Arabic-English Translation Exercises

1. Psychology of Persecution (Week 1)
2. The Journey / Literary Trans. (Week 2)
3. US Anti-Islam Film (Week 3)
4. The Merchant of Venice (Week 4-5)
5. Obese Kids/ A Dentist Jailed (Week 6)
6. My Hijab/Social Discourse (Week 7)
7. Resistant Translation: Verse (Week 8)
8. Untranslatability: Surah 67 (Week 9-10)
9. Arabic Grammatical Terms (Week 11-12)
10. Science and Islam (Week 13-14)

Student Subtitling Projects:

Science and Islam: The Language of Science (1/6). A BBC Documentary in 6 parts:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D-n2BoPE2GE>

Dr. Murad Wilfried Hofmann: Islam -- A Rational Faith Full version

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=81oT_kyHZCg&feature=related

A Translation Project Alternative:

Can Liberalism Tolerate Islam? Dr. Abdal-Hakim Murad

Oslo Litteraturhuset, 20 March 2011

<http://www.masud.co.uk/ISLAM/ahm/AHM-Can-Liberalism-tolerate-islam.htm>

Topic No. One

The Psychology of Persecution

“When a man of real piety sees the ideas which he venerates ignored, objects which he believes to be holy scorned, he burns with a righteous indignation which no mean motive of personal ambition or revenge can kindle. The strength of his conviction carries with it not only a presage of victory, based on the belief that God will defend the right, but also the martyr’s contempt of death in a righteous cause. It is thus that there is no adversary so formidable as a man sure he is fighting the battle of the Lord of Hosts, no antagonist so relentless in pursuing opponents as he who is convinced that it is his duty to make them an acceptable sacrifice to his God.

“At first sight this intolerance seems to be a noble and fair flower springing from the cultivation of all that is best in the human heart. Of course even men filled with such fire admit that the zeal for persecution is dangerous: all recognize that the love of battle and a joy in destruction are among the lower passions of mankind, and inferior men animated by such passions are usually the instruments by which the righteous secure the conquest of evil. Apart from all ethical considerations the verdict of history condemns intolerance as both stupid and criminal. Persecution in however mild a form is usually both a mistake and a crime. It is a mistake because it so rarely succeeds: it is a crime because in the name of virtue you unchain the baser passions of mankind. The success of intolerance is always momentary; its ultimate failure remains to hamper and distress those who inherit the legacy which it bequeaths.”

Hill, A.V. (1962) *The Ethical Dilemma of Science*, Beaverbrook Newspapers Limited, London: P. 111. The Topic is written in 1913, a quote from Dr Barnes, then the Bishop of Birmingham.

Topic No. Two

The Journey

You and I, and after us the deluge. Do not be afraid. We'll go now –far, far away. We'll go to where no-one can get at either of us, where we'll be absolutely free. We'll live just as we are able, just as we desire – without fear. Do not be afraid. I have taken every precaution. Do not be afraid. Everything will turn out fine. I know that your favourite colour is navy blue. So, here are your trousers and your jacket – and you'll definitely need your maroon necktie. You see, I understand you very well – you're not that elegant, but you always wear what's right for the occasion, what's appropriate. Let me help you arrange your hair.

You don't realize it, but I love your hair – light and flowing, as if it was specially designed to cover your bald patch, but white all over and easy to comb. Let me comb it with my own hands. After that – and with the same brush – I'll do your moustache. I love this kind of moustache as well. This is something I've seen you do hundreds of times; everything you do I've come to love – the things you do by force of habit, even the things you do on a whim. Are you aware how overjoyed I am? The joy of embarking on a venture which is known only to us. You are not ill this time. I'm not taking you to the doctor's once again relatives. We're not going to visit boring relatives. So let it just be a secret between you and me.

Topic No. Three

US Anti-Islam Film Protests Spread To Europe

Sky News – 3 hours ago

Protests over a US film mocking the prophet Mohammed have erupted in Europe, while a Muslim pressure group is expected to demonstrate in London later today.

As the wave of unrest spread, non-essential US government personnel were ordered to evacuate Sudan and Tunisia following embassy attacks over the anti-Islam video.

It came after Sudan rejected a US request to send Special Forces to protect its Khartoum embassy.

Innocence of Muslims, which was produced in the United States and portrays Mohammed as a fraud, womaniser, homosexual and madman, has caused furious demonstrations worldwide - some of which have turned violent.

The US ambassador to Libya was killed in one, and demonstrators have died in Egypt, Tunisia, Lebanon, Yemen and Sudan.

On Saturday hundreds of people took to the streets of Antwerp, Belgium, and gathered outside the US embassy in Paris, France, in protest at the film. There were police scuffles and several arrests.

Riot police clashed on the same day with about 200 protesters at the US consulate in Sydney, Australia.

In the UK, Hizb ut-Tahrir, a group which campaigns for an Islamic state with sharia law, is due to protest outside London's American embassy on Sunday.

The Muslim pressure group, which has previously faced calls to be banned, said hundreds of Muslims from across Britain would rally and demonstrate "in solidarity" with others across the world.

A group statement said: "The demonstration will be condemning in the strongest possible terms any and all insults against Islam and the symbols of our religion; especially those against the greatest man sent to mankind the Prophet Mohammed, peace be upon him."

So far this weekend, Muslims have taken to the streets in more than 20 countries from the Middle East to south-east Asia, with Israel, Indonesia and the Maldives among them.

In most countries, protests were peaceful, if vehement.

But deadly clashes erupted in several places, protesters in Sudan and Tunisia tried to storm Western embassies, an American fast-food restaurant was set ablaze in Lebanon, and international peacekeepers were attacked in the Sinai.

A 14-minute excerpt from the film was described by US secretary of state Hillary Clinton as "an awful internet video that we had nothing to do with".

President Barack Obama has urged Americans not to be disheartened by images of anti-US violence, expressing confidence the ideals of freedom America stands for would ultimately prevail.

Topic No. Four

The Merchant of Venice

Shylock, the Jew, lived at Venice; he made himself very rich by lending money at great interest to Christian Merchants. Shylock, being a hard-hearted man, forced men to pay the money he lent with such cruelty, that he was much hated by all good men. And particularly by Antonio, a young merchant of Venice. And Shylock as much hated Antonio, because he used to lend money to people in trouble, and would never take any interest for the money he lent; therefore there was great hatred between the Jew and the kind merchant Antonio. Whenever Antonio met Shylock he used to attack him for hard dealings; and this Jew would bear with seeming patience, while he secretly planned to hurt him.

Antonio was the kindest man that lived. He was greatly loved by all his fellow-citizens, but the friend who was nearest and dearest to his heart was Bassanio, who having a small property, had wasted it by living in too costly a manner (as young men of high rank with small fortunes often do). Whenever Bassanio wanted money, Antonio helped him, and it seemed as if they had but one heart and one purse between them.

One day Bassanio came to Antonio, and told him that he wished to make a wealthy marriage with a lady which he dearly loved. Her mother, who was lately dead, had left her a large property. In her father's lifetime (he said) he used to visit at her house and sometimes he thought this lady had sent him messages with her eyes; but not having money to make himself appear the lover of so rich a lady, he begged Antonio to lend him three thousand pounds.

Antonio had no money by him at the time to lend his friend, but expecting soon to have some ships come home with goods for sale, he said he would go to Shylock, the rich money-lender, and borrow the money.

Antonio and Bassanio went together to Shylock, and Antonio asked the Jew to lend him three thousand pounds upon any interest he wished, to be paid out of the goods in his ships at sea. On this, Shylock thought with himself, "If I can once catch him, I will feed the hatred that I bear him; he hates our Jewish nation; he lends out money without interest; and among the merchants he curses me and my good business. May my tribe be cursed if I forgive him!"

Antonio, seeing he was thinking and did not answer, and being anxious to get the money, said, "Shylock, do you hear? Will you lend the money?"

To this question the Jew replied, "Signor Antonio, many a time you have cursed, and I had borne it quietly; and then you have called me unbeliever, cut-throat dog, and spat on my Jewish garments, and kicked at me with your foot, as if I was a dog. Well, then, it now appears you need my help; and you come to me, and say, Shylock, lend me money. Has a dog money? Is it possible a dog should lend three thousand pounds? Shall I bend low and say, 'Fair sir, you spat upon me on Wednesday last; another time you called me dog; and for these deeds I am to lend you money.'"

Antonio replied, "I am as likely to call you so again, to spit on you again, and kick at you too. If you will lend me this money, lend it not as to a friend, but rather lend it as to an enemy, that, if I cannot pay again, you may with better face punish me."

"Why, look you," said Shylock, "how you storm! I would be friends with you, and have your love. I will forget the shame you have put upon me. I will supply your wants, and take no interest for my money." This offer greatly surprised Antonio; and then Shylock still pretending kindness, again said he would lend him three thousand pounds, and take no interest for his money; only Antonio should go with him to a lawyer, and there sign in merry sport a bond, that if he did not repay the money by a certain day, he would lose a pound of his flesh, to be cut off from any part of his body that Shylock pleased.

"Content," said Antonio, "I will sign this bond, and say there is much kindness in the Jew."

Bassanio said Antonio should not sign such a bond for him; but still Antonio said that he would sign it, for before the day of payment came, his ships would come back with many times the value of his money.

Shylock, hearing this talk, cried out, "O father Abraham, what evil these Christians think! Their own hand dealings teach them to think evil. I pray you tell me this Bassano: if he should break his bond, what should I gain? A pound of man's flesh, taken from a man, is not worth so much as the flesh of mutton or beef. I say, to buy his favour I offer his friendship: if he will take it, so; if not, farewell."

At last, against the advice of Bassano, Antonio signed the bond, thinking it really was (as the Jew said) merely in sport.

Topics No. Five and Six

Obese Kids May Have Dulled Taste Buds

THURSDAY, Sept. 20 (Health Day News) -- Obese children have less sensitive taste buds than normal-weight children, according to a new study.

This diminished ability to distinguish all five types of taste -- bitter, sweet, salty, sour and savory -- may lead them to eat larger amounts of food in order to get the same taste sensation as normal-weight children, the German researchers suggested.

The study, published online Sept. 20 in the journal *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, included 99 obese and 94 normal-weight children, aged 6 to 18 years. All were in good health and not taking any medications that affect taste and smell. The children's taste sensitivity was tested by placing 22 taste strips on the tongue. The strips included each of the five types of taste at four levels of intensity, plus two blank strips.

Overall, children were best able to identify sweet and salty tastes. They found it hardest to distinguish between salty and sour, and between salty and savory. Girls and older children were better at identifying tastes.

Obese children had a significantly more difficult time identifying the different tastes and taste intensity than normal-weight children, Dr. Susanna Wiegand, of the department of pediatric endocrinology and diabetology at the Charite University of Medicine in Berlin, said in a journal news release.

Genes, hormones and exposure to different tastes early in life are believed to play a role in why people have different taste perceptions. Previous research suggests that people with heightened taste sensitivity may eat less food because they don't require as much to get the same taste sensation.

Although the study showed an association between obesity and diminished sensitivity in taste buds, it did not prove a cause-and-effect relationship.

Dentist Jailed For £1.4m NHS Fraud

By Lisa Dowd, Midlands Correspondent | Sky News

A dentist who conned the NHS out of £1.4m *by making false claims* for treating patients has been jailed for seven years for conspiracy to defraud.

Between 2006 and 2009, Joyce Trail, from Sutton Coldfield, submitted 7,000 invoices for work she had never done, 100 of which were for patients who were actually dead.

The 50-year-old used patient details, which were unwittingly supplied to her by nursing homes after she contacted them advertising her services, to claim for people she had never met. She also double or triple-claimed for patients she had treated.

Trail was caught during a random check of files at her Birmingham surgery by officials from the NHS Business Services Authority.

When they contacted a supposed patient at a care home, they discovered he had gone private.

When they delved deeper, they found fraud on an industrial scale. They checked 85,000 documents, including patient records and laboratory documents, and 14,000 exhibits to build a case.

After Trail's conviction, Judge Peter Carr said: "You have abused your position as a professional and you abused your position as a dentist.

"You have effectively stolen a large amount of money that was not available to an already overstretched health service."

Robert Lawrence, a dental technician who supplied Trail with dentures, told Sky News that his suspicions were raised when she requested new dentures after six months for some patients, when they should have lasted at least five years.

He explained: "The same patient names were coming through and the new dentures were attached to them.

"Joyce was asking us to make new dentures and when we brought it up with her that these dentures hadn't been worn, we were told: 'Never mind. Mind your own business - just make them'."

The court was told that Trail spent money on "globetrotting", Jimmy Choo shoes, Cartier jewellery and Prada clothes. She lived in a £1m, six-bedroom gated home.

Her daughter, Nyri Sterling, 33, from Oldbury, West Midlands, who worked in the administration side of the business, was sentenced to two years for helping her mother.

Topic No. Seven

My Hijab

My Culture, My Identity

At That Moment I Took Off the Hijab!

Hijab: My Journey to Peace, Serenity & Dignity

By Raudah Mohd Yunus

Freelance Writer- Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Monday, 09 April 2012 00:00

Despite the multi-racial and multi-religious nature of Malaysia, many of us were falsely led to believe that religion was something personal.

My understanding of Islam and my encounter with hijab (the Islamic dress code for women) are perhaps much different from others.

While many people first learn about hijab in various ways when they embrace Islam after being guided to the right path, I, however, have been a Muslim all my life. Also, hijab was never something new to me as I had been brought up in a Muslim family and more or less a Muslim society in Malaysia.

Being raised in such a beautiful tropical country where the light of Islam have been shining ever since Arab traders first came to the land and captured the hearts of its people with their beautiful Islamic preaching, even before the first Portuguese man arrived to conquer the nation, I can say that most Muslims around me, no matter how ignorant, have had some sort of emotional attachment to Islam.

This went back along the historical route to the Muslim Sultans who were ruling some parts of the land and the many Islamic laws they introduced. However, when the Portuguese, Dutch and British occupied the land, our ancestors were killed, enslaved, forced to accept completely alien life styles and value systems, and finally many were deprived of the guidance and harmony that Islam had brought to them. I could say that even up to 70% of my Muslim friends wore hijab; probably less than half were doing it with proper Islamic understanding. And I, unfortunately, was simply following the crowd.

Avoiding Tensions in My Early Years

Spending my early years of education at a private Islamic elementary school, many Islamic concepts were at tips of my fingers. I knew by heart almost all what was there in the Islamic subject syllabus and even started memorizing few chapters of the Qur'an since I was young.

Several years later I decided to move to a public school where non-Muslims and Muslims freely mixed. There, I had two best friends, a Christian catholic and a Hindu. We were good friends. However, never did any of us bring up the subject of religion for fear of being insensitive and disrespectful to each other.

It was also here that I began to develop a sense of inferiority as a Muslim due to my lack of adequate knowledge and deep understanding of Islam. Veiled and pious students were perceived as 'backward' and 'less intelligent' among the students and sometimes even among the teachers. Even though I had two best friends who were very kind and supportive, I tried as much as possible to avoid questions about Islam.

My perception of Islam was rather poor. This was because of the mentality and atmosphere of the society I was living in.

Despite the multi-racial and multi-religious nature of Malaysia, many of us were falsely led to believe that religion was something personal and that no one should talk openly about it, otherwise tension would occur.

Also, within the Muslim community itself, superstitious beliefs, racial obsession and conservative tendencies which had nothing to do with Islam were rampant. These altogether gave me the impression that Islam and my adherence to it should be nothing more than merely practicing daily rituals.

I saw Islam only in masjid (mosque), on the prayer carpets, and in some other deeds like charity and listening to Islamic talks. Other than these, I did not see much of Islam in my surroundings.

During these times of confusion and intellectual destitution, I wore hijab, but honestly, it was mere blind obedience. The cultural sentiment supporting 'a decent way of dressing' was strong in our society so most girls feared being criticized. Some, however, rebelled and took a totally opposite approach. I could say that even up to 70% of my Muslim friends wore hijab; probably less than half were doing it with proper Islamic understanding. And I, unfortunately, was simply following the crowd.

Having left the hijab, my feelings were mixed. I felt free to some extent, and that I was no longer restricted to anything but on the other hand, continuous guilt overwhelmed me.

Obsessions... Taking Off the Veil!

After completing my elementary school education (with excellent results and I was the best student! How I wish I had pride in Islam and my hijab at that time!), I was offered a place in an elite boarding school. I became excited as I saw a bright future awaiting there. The school was one of the best in Malaysia, and only students with

excellent academic achievements were offered places. I eagerly accepted the offer, not knowing what was ahead of me...

My early years in the elite school were full of educational activities, fun, prestige and pride. My obsession and thirst for knowledge were fully satisfied, and I began mixing with Muslim students from different backgrounds, mostly rich and so-called 'modern'.

Without realizing, I was brought into a world of material obsession, false pride, counterfeit self-esteem and arrogance. Conscience almost had no place in the 'elite' society and religious inclinations were considered taboo, outlawed and sometimes even became the laughingstock. Hijab was silently seen as 'second-class' and a sign of lowliness.

Peer pressure was immense and I did everything possible to fit in with the society and its trends. I knew I had to act 'modern' and 'elite' to be accepted, although deep inside, I could feel that there was something wrong with the way things were going.

Finally, I decided that my hijab was not so important anymore and I gradually took it off, though on certain occasions I tried to wear it.

Having left the hijab, my feelings were mixed. I felt free to some extent, and that I was no longer restricted to anything but on the other hand, continuous guilt overwhelmed me.

Without the hijab, I began to feel vulnerable, unprotected and undignified, despite the fact that I was doing so well to fit in, and I was highly accepted by my friends.

Again and again, I pushed the feelings of guilt away from my mind as I tried to believe that I was simply going through a new phase in life, and that I would eventually get used to life without hijab.

<http://www.onislam.net/english/culture-and-entertainment/traditions/456544-at-that-moment-i-took-off-the-hijab-.html>

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/witness-pioneer/message/9873>

Topic No. Eight

Resistant Translation I: Grammar

Arabic Grammatical Terminology

Noun

It is a word that includes a meaning by itself without being connected with the notion of time: *Man*. In Arabic grammar *the* noun is characterized by two different topics: its kinds and its states.

- 1- In its kinds it is divided into (1) Variable, it accepts the forms of the dual, *the* plural, *the* diminutive and *the* relative; it is divided into two kinds: Inert and derived. The inert noun includes the concrete noun, i.e. the noun of genus and the proper noun, and also the abstract noun, i.e. the original noun. The derived noun includes the agent-noun, the patient-noun, the similar quality *aff^{al}* of preference, the examples of superlative, the noun of place, the noun of time, the noun of instrument, and the augmented originals.
- (2) Invariable, it maintains one single form and includes the personal noun, the interrogative noun, the conditional noun, the conjunctive noun, the allusive noun, the circumstantial noun, the verbal noun, and the numeral noun.

2- In its states it comes under (1) Morphology, where it is divided into declined and structured. The declined noun is varied or prohibited from variation (2) Form, where it is denuded or augmented; furthermore it is called according to its ending letter: Shortened, extended, curtailed, sound, and quasi-sound; (3) Indication, where it is qualified or qualificative, definite or indeterminate, masculine or feminine, singular, dual or plural, relative, and diminutive.

Exclusive noun

It is a noun that excludes the noun placed after it from the rule of the words placed before. The exclusive nouns are called sisters of "Except" and they are four in number: *although, other than, other, not excepting.*

Interrogative noun

It is an invariable noun used to question about a thing or a matter. All interrogative nouns have a right of priority in the sentence, and they are nine in number: *whence, where, in what time, what a, how much, how, when, who and who is that, which and what.*

إعراب

تغيير يلحق بأخر الأسماء والأفعال بسبب تغيير العامل: قدم الغائب، رأيت الغائب، سلمت على الغائب.

1- العامل، حرف أو فعل أو شبهه
أومعنى، هو ما أوجب كون الكلمة
على وجه مخصوص من الإعراب.

2- الأسماء أكثرها معرب لأنها تتردد بين
المعاني التركيبية كالفاعلية والمفعولية
وغيرها فتحتاج إلى الإعراب لإظهار
هذه المعاني.

3- المعرب من الأفعال المضارع لا
غير، وقيل له المضارع لمشابهته
الأسماء لما يلحقه من الإعراب.

4- ألقاب الإعراب هي (1) الرفع
والنصب والجر للأسماء (2) الرفع
والنصب والجزم للإفعال.

Analysis of the noun

إعراب الإسم

Mentioned in the analysis of the
noun are:

- 1- Its kind: *Proper noun, agent-noun, patient noun ...*
- 2- Its state: *With regular ending, open ending, reduced ending ...*
mentioning the cause of the declension or structure by pronunciation or place.
- 3- The sign of declension, whether apparent or supposed, and the sign of structure.

- 4- If it is a circumstantial: (1) its nature: *place or time, declined or structured* (2) its signification: *Past or future, it includes the meaning of the condition ...* (3) Its attachment: *Apparent or eliminated.*
- 5- If it is a follower: (1) Its nature: *Descriptive, confirmative...* (2) Its place: *Follower in pronunciation or place.*

Analysis of the sentence

Mentioned in the analysis of the sentence are:

- 1- Its kind: *Nominal sentence or verbal sentence.*
- 2- Its place: *it has no place in the analysis or it has a place ... mentioning the reasons.*

إعراب الجملة

يذكر في إعراب الجملة:

- 1- نوعها: جملة اسمية أو فعلية:
- 2- محلها: لها محل من الإعراب أو لا محل لها ... مع ذكر السبب.

إعراب الحرف

يذكر في إعراب الحرف:

- 1- نوعه: حرف جزم، نصب، جر، نسخ، عطف، نداء، إستثناء ... إذا كان عاملاً. حرف ابتداء، استدراك، نفي، نهي ... إذا كان غير عامل.
- 2- متعلقه: ظاهر أو محذوف، محذوف مطلق أو مقيد.

إعراب الفعل

يذكر في إعراب الفعل:

- 1- صيغته: تام أو ناقص، ماضي أو أمر، معلوم أو مجهول.
- 2- حالته: مبني أو معرب، مرفوع، منصوب أو مجزوم ... مع ذكر سبب البناء أو الإعراب.
- 3- علامة البناء أو الإعراب وعلامة

الإعراب الظاهرة أو المقدرة.
1- الأصل في الفعل البناء ولا يعرب
منه إلا المضارع لأنه يشبه الاسم
في ما يلحقه من تغيير في آخره.
وإنما يعرب إذا كان غير متصل
بنون التوكيد أو نون الإناث.

2- إن الفعل المضارع يشبه اسم الفعل
في ترتيب الحروف الساكنة
والمتحركة كما في يضرب
وضارب. وفي احتمال الدلالة على
زمن الحاضر والمستقبل، ولذلك
سمي مضارعا أي مشابهها.

3- الوضع الطبيعي للمضارع المعرب
هو الرفع إذا تجرد من النواصب
والجوازم. فإن سبقه ناصب وجب
نصبه وإن سبقه جازم وجب جزمه.

4- علامات إعراب المضارع قسمان
(1) قسم يعرب بالحركة إذا تجرد
من ضمير الرفع البارز، فيرفع
بالضمة وينصب بالفتحة ويجزم
بالسكون (2) قسم يعرب بالحرف
– النون الزائدة – إذا اتصل به
ضمير الرفع البارز، يرفع بثبوت
النون، وينصب ويجزم بحذف النون
(3) يجزم أيضا بحذف حرف العلة
من آخره.

Topic No. Nine

Resistant Translation II: Verse

Arabic versification Vs. English versification

وَمَا هُوَ عَنْهَا بِالْحَدِيثِ الْمُرْجَمِ
وَتَضُرُّ إِذَا ضَرَّ يُنْمُوهَا فَتَضُرُّم
وَتَلْفَحُ كِشَافًا تَمَّ نُنْتِجُ فَنُنْتِجُ
كَأَحْمَرَ عَادٍ تَمَّ تُرْضِعُ فَتَقْطِمُ

وَمَا الْحَرْبُ إِلَّا مَا عَلِمْتُمْ وَذَقْتُمْ
مَتَى تَبَعْتُوها تَبَعْتُوها ذَمِيمَةً
فَتَعْرُكُكُمْ عَرَكَ الرَّحَى بِثِقَالِهَا
فَنُنْتِجُ لَكُمْ غُلْمَانَ أَشْأَمَ كُلَّهُمْ

And war is not aught but what ye know well and have tasted oft:

Not of her are the tales ye tell a doubtful or idle thing.

When ye set her on foot, ye start her with words of little praise

But the mind for her grows with her growth, till she bursts into blazing flame.

She will grind you as grist of the mill that falls on the skin beneath;

Year by year shall her womb conceive, and the fruit thereof shall be twins;

Yea, boys shall she bear you, all of ill omen, eviller than Ahmar of ^cAd: then suckling
and weaning shall bring their gain;¹

War ye have known and war have tasted, not by hearsay are ye wise:

Raise no more the hideous monster! If ye let her raven, she cries

Ravenously for blood and crushes like a mill-stone all below,

And from her twin-conceiving womb she brings forth woe on woe.²

وجدك لم أحفل متى قام عودي
كميت متى ما تعل بالماء تزبد
كسيد الغضا في الطخية المتورد
ببهكنة تحت الطراف المعمد

ولولا ثلاث هن من عيشة الفتى
فمنهن سبق العاذلات بشرية
وكري إذا نادى المضاف محنبا
وتقصير يوم الدجن والدجن معجب

Save only for three things, in which noble youth take delight,

I care not how soon rises o'er me the coronach loud:

Wine that foams when the water is poured on it, ruddy, not bright,

And then my fierce charge to the rescue on back of a mere

Wide-stepping as wolf I have startled where thirsty he cowers;

And third, the day-long with a lass in her tent of goat's hair

To hear the wild rain and beguile of their slowness the hours.³

¹ Lyall *Translations*, p. 113

² Nicholson, *Translation*. P. 11

³ Nicholson, *Translation*. P. 11

But for three things, that are the joy youth of the young fellow,
I assure you I wouldn't care when my deathbed visitors arrive –
First, to forestall my charming critics with a good swig
of crimson wine that foams when the water is mingled in,
Second, to wheel at the call of the beleaguered a curved-shanked steed
Streaking like the wolf of the thicket you've startled lapping water;
and third, to curtail the day of showers, such an admirable season,
dallying with a ripe wench under the pole-propped tent,⁴

⁴ A. J. Arberry, *The Seven Odes* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1957), a translation of the seven *Mu^ḥallaqat*.

A Translation Project:

<http://www.masud.co.uk/ISLAM/ahm/AHM-Can-Liberalism-tolerate-islam.htm>

Can Liberalism Tolerate Islam?

Oslo Litteraturhuset, 20 March 2011

© Abdal-Hakim Murad

Must one be liberal to belong to the West? For all the polite multiculturalist denials, this question is being put to us more and more insistently. The European Union, as it struggles to articulate a common cultural as well as economic vision, regularly toys with grand statements about Europe as a vision of human community, whose success underpins the universal model now being urged upon the rest of humanity. European liberals, with their Enlightenment, civil society, democratic institutions, and human rights codes, sometimes seem to self-define as a secular Messiah, willing and ready to save the world. To resist is, by implication, to align oneself with an unregenerate, sinful humanity.

Yet we Europeans are in fact in the middle of a difficult argument. We are constantly quarrelling with ourselves over definitions of belonging. We can unite to build an Airbus, but will we really unite around a moral or cultural ideal? What, after all, are the exact historic grounds for European cultural unity? And – this now looks like the continent's greatest concern - how can Muslims fit in?

Perhaps it helps if we look at Europe's distant roots. Homer, long ago, told us how Europa, the daughter of the King of Phoenicia, was abducted by Zeus, duly ravished, and borne off to the island of Crete, where she gave birth to the Europeans. There is something emblematic and transgressive about this myth of origin: a Lebanese maiden torn from the breast of Asia and deposited in a corner of the continent which eventually bore her name. The beginning of our story is a violent European raid upon Asia, an unhappy immigration, and a confiscation of identity.

Perhaps we can trace back this far – and Europe's literature in fact begins with Homer – Europe's ambiguity about its self and its values. But Europa only finds herself, and discovers the limits of her soul and body, long after this classical prologue. For the Romans, it was the Mediterranean which defined the core of their terrain and their commercial and religious life. Rome equally embraced the European, African and Asian shores of the Middle Sea. But while it saw itself as superior, it rarely sought to impose its philosophy or social values on others. So we will hesitate to accept the common cliché that in our time, ancient history has been reborn: America is Rome, Europe is Athens, while Islam is an endlessly troublesome Judea. Ancient Rome and Athens had no systematic programme of universalizing

their values, even within the bounds of their political sway, and still less did they encourage other nations to accept their social beliefs.

When Islam appeared in the seventh century, the African and Asian shores were lost. Thrown back on its own resources, Europe sought to define itself, then as now, as the prolongation of the rather small remnant of antiquity that the Saracens missed. From that time on, it developed ideas of its unique and universal social rightness.

The historian Fernand Braudel insists that it was the electric shock of the Battle of Poitiers in 732, when the Arab and Berber advance into France was finally stemmed, which gave the Franks and hence the Europeans their sense of self. Charlemagne's capital of Aachen seemed symbolically to straddle both banks of the Rhine, making a nonsense of the old Roman borders. The German barbarians who brought down Rome, and who now ruled in France and Germany as they had ruled in Italy and Spain, now claimed to be heirs of the imperium. The almost obsessive cult of the Latin language and classical mythology which characterised European education until well into the twentieth century shows how anxious the Germanic and other 'European' peoples were to see themselves, rather than the Saracens who controlled most of the Mediterranean, as heirs to the Roman Empire. When the Ottomans captured and sacked Constantinople in 1453, Sultan Mehmet II claimed the title of Roman emperor, but Europe rejected this absolutely. Rather as the Bible rejects Ishmael in favour of Isaac, so Europe has been united in nothing so much as its rejection of Islam's claims to legitimate participation in the blessings bestowed by antiquity, and by those other patriarchs, Plato and Aristotle.

As a matter of fact – and this is not widely noticed by liberal advocates of European uniqueness – Islam was for much of its history the principal heir of Hellenism, geographically and intellectually. Yet Europe will no more see Islam as a rightful inheritor of Athens than it will allow Ishmael legitimate authority over Jerusalem. The reason was Christianity. Christian monks saw themselves as the true interpreters of Hellenism, for all their borrowings from Ibn Rushd and Ghazali. Rome, the only remaining Christian metropolis of the classical world, was assumed to be the inheritor of that world's riches, which had moved West, rather than remaining in their place of origin in Antioch, Ephesus, Cyrene and Alexandria. The Saracen was an interloper, an upstart. Thanks to the same furor Teutonicus which baffled and brought down Rome, the Franks kept the false inheritors at bay, and even, during the Crusades, found themselves united as Europeans in a counter-attack that brought Jerusalem again into Christian hands. From that time until the present, Europe, followed by its children in the ethnically-cleansed Americas, has been sure of its sole proper possession not only of ancient Semitic prophecy, but also of the legacy of Athens with which it coexisted in such a complex and often unstable marriage.

An older Orientalism will claim that Islam, the major Semitism, sniffed briefly at Greece but then turned away from it. This is the notion of the theologian al-Ghazali sounding the death-knell of Greek philosophy in the world of Islam. Hellenism, according to the likes of Leo Strauss, could only find room in the European inn; Islam, with its burden of scriptural literalism, treated it as a resident alien at best. This applies not only to metaphysics, but also to political theory – Plato’s brief Muslim apotheosis on the pages of al-Farabi. Strauss has had many admirers: ominously, Donald Rumsfeld and Paul Wolfowitz were among them, together with various thinkers on Europe’s new Islamophobic right. And Pope Benedict’s famous 2007 lecture at Regensburg likewise seemed to present the Muslims as improper heirs to the classical legacy of rationality and rights which, according to this heir of the Holy Office, is Europe’s alone. But the best recent scholarship, such as the work of Robert Wisnovsky, has blown this apart: we are now more likely to see Juwayni, Ghazali and Razi as the great advocates of a selective but profound internalising of Greek reason. Greek ethics lives on powerfully on the pages of Miskawayh, al-Raghib al-Isfahani, and al-Ghazali. In political thought, particularly, the old themes also lived on in manuals of statecraft studied carefully by Ottoman, Safavid and Moghul emperors and their grand viziers. And if Plato was modified drastically by the Sira, that was no bad thing, given that Plato has so often been an enemy of the open society.

The internalising of ancient philosophy, including those strands from which modern liberal thinking ultimately takes its origin, did happen differently in Islam and in the Western world. That is one reason why Athens, in Europe, finally defeated Jerusalem, and philosophy of an increasingly secular bent defeated theology. Aquinas, whose *Summa Contra Gentiles* was written to help secure Christian theology in lands conquered from Muslims, proposed a symbiosis of philosophy and scripture which has, for most Europeans, now outlived its credibility. The same Christian interval in Europe which laid claim to the classical age by virtue, strangely perhaps, of the overlaps visible in the Greek New Testament, has faltered, to be replaced by vibrant paganisms, or an often militant secular officialdom. Hence the decision by the drafters of the European Constitution to include a mention of Thucydides, and to pass over the Christian centuries in silence.

A new class of triumphalist atheists – Richard Dawkins, Anthony Grayling and others - now assails faith for its inability to deliver a peaceful and just society. Ethical liberal arguments against religion are now much more commonly heard than older objections to faith grounded in the problem of evil, or the improbability of the Book of Genesis. Probably this began in the late 19th century, when all reasonable people seemed to oppose Pope Pius the Ninth’s *Syllabus of Errors*, which anathematised the Enlightenment notions of religious freedom and the separation of church from state.

As article 80 of the Syllabus proclaims, one may be excommunicated for holding that 'the Roman Pontiff can, and ought to, reconcile himself, and come to terms with, progress, liberalism, and modern civilization'.

Since the Second Vatican Council of the 1960s, such anathemas are hard to imagine, and even the Vatican is reinventing itself as an advocate of precisely the liberal opinions – or many of them – that a century ago would have resulted in the withholding of the sacraments and hence a sentence of eternal damnation. Its opposition to the death penalty, and its support for religious freedom, are two iconic examples. Liberalism's triumph is so complete that many today can hardly recall the old and fierce Christian opposition to it.

Thanks to such capitulations, the Europe that historically made itself a unit by keeping Muslims at bay, or by expelling them, in Spain, France, Sicily and the Balkans, has now substantially let go of the distinctiveness of the religious vision of society that allowed that to happen. Liberalism, whose crooked genealogy stretches back to distant concerns in ancient Athens, and whose Biblical tributaries, claimed by some Americans, are perhaps only imaginary, has replaced the older theocratic thinking, which lingers on only in fringe rightwing and royalist circles. Secularity is largely the invention of the continent which was the cradle of Christian monarchism; today, indeed, in a world where there may be secularism abroad, but not secularity, it is almost a European monopoly. God's continent has been transformed into the crucible of an increasingly assertive materialism.

Partly for this reason, as the desk pilots in Brussels think ahead, they know that the future expansion of their Union must always be to the East, not the South. The drang nach Osten of Euroland may within thirty years bring Europe, intelligibly enough, to Vladivostok, but Tangiers, only twenty miles across the sea which in classical times was a thoroughfare and not a barrier, is generally admitted to be psychologically a far foreign land. Hence we find that today, as regularly in the Christian past, Europe's arguments about itself, whether right-wing or libertarian, usually end in terms of its relationship with its significant Other, the Saracen and Turkish realm.

Following Europe's breaking of its own bounds after the great geographical discoveries, the Islamic world was progressively made to submit to European patterns of government and economic interest. Today, the elites in the postcolonial Muslim world are, substantially, Europeans themselves, rather than adherents of local values. Sometimes their fervent dislike of the indigenous makes them seem more royal than the king. With such converts Brussels has no significant quarrel, although it regularly puzzles over the deep corruption and often the cruelty of the westernised classes in the former colonies. But dealing with those regimes is no

more than a human rights issue. The elites must adhere to the constitutional norms, as well as the secular forms, of Europe. Yet as the Eurocrat is nervously aware, and as current events show, those elites can resemble a fragile skin stretched over a sea of cultural difference. The Muslim world, perhaps the non-Western world, can look like a geologist's model of the Earth. The planet, not far down, is alive and moving, a mass of liquid magma; but on the surface, plates of congealed rock uneasily coexist. Tensions between, say, Morocco and Algeria, are tensions between the cold, Europeanised classes, not the often passionately religious populations beneath, for whom the boundaries drawn by past generations of colonial mapmakers do not correspond at all to local linguistic and ethnic difference. Secular elites, claiming liberal values, hold down a mass of illiberal religious sentiment. The holding-down can be so violent that on occasion traumatised terrorists can emerge to horrify the world, and to confirm liberals in their uneasy support for the regimes.

This tension, between the autocratic elites supported by European liberal governments, and the still substantially religious masses with their desire to enter the public square, has now become so intense that the lava is emerging in very many Muslim states. The result is often a type of crisis for the liberal conscience, or a sudden and carefully-timed volte face: as we saw when on January 14 of this year, the French president offered President Ben Ali of Tunisia a contingent of riot police to shore up his rule, while the next day, when it became clear that the popular uprising had triumphed, France refused Ben Ali the right even to enter its airspace. *Des qu'on a des ennuis, elle n'est plus votre amie ...*

As they panic over demography and immigration, Europe's theorists are well aware of this. Hence the difficulty of, for instance, the current European debate over Turkish membership of the European Union. The Erdogan government presents liberals with a paradox. Less secular than its predecessors, it is more committed to human rights and democratic pluralism, and is keen to curb the military's projection in the political realm. The generals, with their tight-lipped laicism, claim to be the guardians of Ataturk's project to recreate Turkey in Europe's image; yet Europe is no longer the nationalist, often fascist continent it was in the 1920s and 1930s when Kemalism took shape. Hence the conundrum for the Eurocrats. Many European liberal statesmen, particularly in the core 'Charlemagne' states of France and Germany, oppose Turkish membership on grounds that are clearly to do with Europe's ancient habit of self-definition as something that, ultimately, is not Muslim. Europe may be economically inclusive, and passionately liberal and libertarian, but ultimately, to be itself, it must be exclusive of non-Christians, and of Muslims above all. The old Crusading cry of 'Christians are right, and pagans are wrong,' has been modified by replacing the 'Christians' with gay activists and human rights commissioners.

It is not impossible that Turkey will be admitted, perhaps after two or more decades. Yet the current proposals envisage Turkey's exclusion from the Amsterdam Treaty in respect of Turkey's Muslim population. EU citizens will be able to live in Turkey, but to allow Turks to emigrate freely to Europe would be too much for electorates to contemplate. This, currently, seems the kind of compromise that Ankara will be compelled to accept. Other arrangements with Muslim areas such as Albania, Bosnia, and perhaps Azerbaijan, may well impose the same condition. A Europe increasingly at ease with minaret and niqab bans will be happy to see such odd-handedness as right and proper.

Having thus charted our odd situation, let us deal with the question. To be

Europeans, must we be liberals? Does liberal Europe's insistence when drawing its outer borders on the partial or total exclusion of Islam have implications for internal definitions of belonging? If we bother to look at the bland Euro banknotes, the product of extended searches in the 90s for a shared European symbol, we find that the key symbol that was finally used is the outline of the continent itself, which blurs into nothingness wherever it reaches places inhabited by Muslims. The vague bridge symbols are drawn from 'seven ages' of European culture and design, but naturally there was no risk of annoying Europeans with any trace of a Moorish arch. For Brussels officialdom, there is implicitly no more appropriate symbol of Europe than one which indicates non-Muslimness. What, therefore, does a European Muslim think about himself or herself when using this currency? Does a conscious exclusion at the frontiers on religious grounds have implications for internal solidarity and belonging? Must liberal Europe create an internal firewall against Muslim migrants and their bafflingly religious progeny?

Despite all the brave talk of European unity, the reassuring reality on the ground is that there is no consensus at all. The French model, rooted in Enlightenment anticlericalism, is absolutely exclusive of religious affiliation of any kind from its sense of belonging. This is not just about Islam: it was made clear more than a century ago in the Republic's response to the Syllabus of Errors: a law was passed preventing priests from mentioning the Pope's document from the pulpits. Thus was a process established whereby liberal secularity could win victories over freedom of speech. And Catholicism, though the victim of deep anticlericalism, was at least seen as indigenous. In the republic's more recent travails with Islam, memories of Crusades and the dirty war in Algeria have made the exclusion of Muslimness in the name of Republican laicity particularly easy and emphatic. The broad-based consensus among liberals that women who wear the niqab should be arrested by the police is only the most recent example of this.

In fact, it is probably the case that the so-called far-right parties, such as Marine Le Pen's Fronte Nationale, are in fact not far to the right of the political spectrum at all. They are best seen as coercive liberal parties, their social and fiscal policies placing them somewhere in the centre-right of the political spectrum, but so passionate about the unique truth of liberalism that they seek to punish those who fail to comply with present liberal social beliefs. An example would be Geert Wilders, perhaps Holland's most popular politician. Wilders is in most key respects somewhat to the left of centre politically. But so passionate is he about liberalism that he wishes to impose a 1000 euro annual tax on hijab wearers, ban the sale of the Qur'an, and forbid the construction of new mosques. In Switzerland, too, surveys indicate that the current ban on minaret construction is more likely to be supported by left-leaning voters, than by voters on the traditional right.

It may turn out that just as Europe defines its natural boundaries as coterminous with the frontier with Islam, that its emerging definitions of citizenship, and the various tests applied to those seeking citizenship, will engage primarily with Islam as the significant alternative, as the model for what is un-European and unacceptable. A good example is the 76-page manual which guides officialdom in assessing applications for German citizenship. Formal citizenship tests in Germany include questions about freedom of religion, sexual orientation, and the status of women, to allow officials to exclude individuals whose social beliefs are considered to conflict with the liberal mainstream. In some provinces, such as Hesse, the Muslim-specific questions are very insistent. For instance: 'Should a woman be allowed to appear in public without a male relative'? And a question in Baden-Wurttemberg asks: 'Imagine that your adult son comes to you and says he is homosexual and plans to live with another man. How do you react?' Another, predictably, asks: 'What do you think if a man is married to two women at the same time?' And again: 'In Germany, sport and swim classes are part of the normal school curriculum. Would you allow your daughter to participate?'

The regulations give officials the right even to revoke citizenship if a very conservative religious orientation is suspected, or if a citizen's subsequent opinions or behaviour indicate that he or she lied when taking the test. No conservatives will be allowed to get in under the radar; if they do, their passports may be confiscated and they will be deported. According to Eren Unsal, of the Turkish Union, 'these tests are presupposing, negative, and anti-Islamic. We're seeing a more restrictive immigration policy whose face is anti-Muslim.' And another Muslim representative even says, 'The constitutional assumption of innocence no longer applies to Muslims.'

Such Muslim objections were generally brushed aside by German commentators, until the newspaper *Süddeutsche Zeitung* published a leaked internal memo from the Interior Ministry sent to immigration officials. According to this document, immigration authorities should have what it calls 'general suspicion' about the loyalty of Muslims to Germany. It goes on to explain that 'inner devotion to Germany' should automatically be doubted in the case of Muslim applicants for citizenship. The leaked government guidelines then go on to say: 'Europeans, Americans and citizens of other countries who are otherwise free from suspicion should not come into contact with the test.'

A further example of liberal intervention is provided by the German government's attempts to create a class of Muslim religious leaders whose values conform to those of the country's liberal majority. The government set up the country's first imam training programme at the University of Münster, to promote this liberal agenda, but appointed as the programme's director the historian Sven Kalisch, whose books claim that the Prophet Muhammad did not exist. The four main Muslim organisations in Germany withdrew from the programme in protest, drawing criticism from the government for alleged 'conservative-fundamentalist tendencies'. In this case, however, some liberals did agree that to appoint a man who did not believe in the existence of the Prophet to the directorship of an imam-training programme was probably a misjudgement on the part of the authorities. As with the Muslim-test, the Münster experiment generated not only resentment, but a good deal of mirth at the expense of liberal interventionists.

Overall, in Germany, deep *volkisch* impulses are quietly being reignited, dressed up in the language of liberalism, rather as Nazism in the 1930s justified itself to the unobservant as a kind of socialism. Just as the debates which led to the Nuremberg laws were preceded by passionate debates about true and pure Germanness, so too the far-right assumptions are percolating into the mainstream. In March 2011, the Interior Minister, Hans-Peter Friedrich announced: 'To say that Islam belongs in Germany is not a fact supported by history', thereby invoking perhaps the most ancient theme in German self-understanding. The old 'Semite within', obliterated under the Third Reich, has now been replaced by the ancient Semite *ante portas*, who has now acquired citizenship, but can, in Friedrich's view, never belong.

In France, as Muslims generally know, the liberal campaign to restrict Islamic practice, sometimes supported and sometimes opposed by the right wing, has generated an interesting paradox no less informative than that produced by bungling Germans. Vehemently defending the right, in 1989, of a publisher to print a French translation of Salman Rushdie's novel *The Satanic Verses*, in 1994 the French government enforced a series of interdictions which threaten with imprisonment

anyone found in possession of the booklets of the South African writer Ahmed Deedat. Those who have read his pamphlets may find this strange, since he never advocates violence of any kind; but liberal France is clear: the law of 31 May 1994 described his book *Jesus in Islam* as likely to produce 'des dangers pour l'ordre public', because of their 'violently anti-Western tone and their incitement to racial hatred'. Muslims timidly pointed out the contradiction, but the liberal establishment was clear: Deedat is dangerous, and Muslims who own his booklets must be punished.

The United Kingdom, which would not dream of banning Deedat, is generally more cautious in its attempts to encourage liberal beliefs among its minorities. But the recent British Ofsted assessment of the poor quality of 'citizenship' training in faith-based secondary schools may indicate the shape of things to come. Even without the Muslims, Ofsted has its work cut out for it. 'Citizenship' has been part of the National Curriculum for only ten years, and Ofsted confirms that teaching of this rather numinous subject is extremely patchy across the board; in fact, it is said to be the worst-taught subject in the nation's schools. So bad is the situation that one in ten pupils in Britain apparently do not even know what citizenship classes are, even though they have attended them. Few engage actively with the liberal issues raised in citizenship training. The reason seems to be the general apathy towards politics and ideology current among many teenagers, the result, perhaps, of the escapist content of mass youth entertainment, together with larger social perceptions that old definitions of sovereignty and national selfhood are being inexorably eroded by globalisation and the Internet. Only 64 percent of pupils nationwide identify themselves as 'British'.

In the Muslim schools, where citizenship training is apparently in even greater disarray, Ofsted says: 'We must not allow recognition of diversity to become apathy in the face of any challenge to our coherence as a nation. We must be intolerant of intolerance.'

Here, I think, the official finger rests on the Achilles heel of secular liberal ethics. If we must be intolerant of intolerance, then can liberalism tolerate anything other than itself? If Europe defines citizenship in terms of adherence to a set moral template, with all else defined as intolerable, how can Europe ever positively experience real difference, which more often than not is bound up with good, or bad, religion?

An icon of European exclusiveness was supplied in 2004 when the Italian politician Rocco Buttiglione was forced to resign as a European commissioner when it emerged that he supported the Vatican's line on homosexuality. Despite his insistence that his

belief in the sinfulness of the practice would not affect the decisions he took in public life, the consensus of European officialdom obliged him to resign. The Italian Justice Minister, Roberto Castelli, objected in a futile way, by calling the ban 'a decision which shows the real face of Europe, a face which we do not like. It's fundamentalist, which is absolutely not on.' But his view provoked only frowns.

Muslims have watched with concern this striking proof of how categorically Europe has walked away from its traditional Christian values and authorities. It is interesting, also, as proof that European citizenship appears to be a matter of conformity to certain sacrosanct social beliefs, in this case, the historically anti-Christian belief that conscientious opposition to homosexual practice is so wicked that those who hold such beliefs must be excluded from public office. As Buttiglione himself remarked, 'The new soft totalitarianism which is advancing wants to be a state religion. It is an atheistic, nihilistic religion, but it is a religion that is obligatory for all.'

It is possible that this imposition of social beliefs will become more intense, despite its apparent clash with principles of freedom of conscience. In 2009, Nick Clegg (now the British Deputy Prime Minister), said that children attending faith schools should be taught that homosexuality is 'normal and harmless'. Special lessons, he opined, should be required of such schools to encourage tolerance for this practice.

It seems reasonable to predict that the concretisation of such social beliefs and their imposition through law and a media monoculture will continue. Many will recognise in this a reversion to historic European norms, alien to Islam, of imposing a standard belief pattern on the king's subjects. *Cuius regio, eius religio*. Liberalism of a particular socially prescriptive kind seems to be filling the void left by religion, and, Europe being the historic land of the divine right of kings, religion here is often more closely bound up with politics than in traditional Muslim states. In this case, the condemnation of sodomy functions as a blasphemy, or a 'speech violation'. Other blasphemies include, for instance, the idea that men and women are suited for different tasks, that the death penalty is a just punishment for murder, that parents may use corporal punishment to discipline their children, and that unbelievers are less pleasing to God than believers. The list is quite a long one, and it seems to be growing.

Societies hate value-vacuums. After the Second World War, Europe and America went very different ways regarding truth: Europe lapsed into what the philosopher Heidegger called *gelassenheit* – just letting things be, a mood which eased the transition to postmodernism. America, whose heartland did not suffer RAF bombings or Nazi death camps, remained confident, in a rather simple way, about God and

family values, allowing a continuing religious alternative to the secular monoculture. But as the European continent increasingly defines itself not as the splintered wreckage of war, but as a potentially mighty unit, it needs shared values. Like America, it has fixed on Islam as its significant Other, but while America's foreign wars are religiously driven, Europe is preoccupied with internal cohesion, framing laws that in America would be strange: to shut the hijab out of sight, to ban minarets, and to prohibit in general the public expression of conservative morality. In other words, the federal and racial unity which in America is brought by external wars against Muslims, is possible in a less jingoistic Europe only by putting Muslims at the centre of an internal war of values.

On both sides of the Atlantic, liberal or religious intolerance of Muslims has now risen to worrying levels, and further restrictive legislation seems possible in many places. 9/11 intensified this atmosphere of inquisition. In the United States, a Cornell University survey concludes that 44% of Americans now support a selective abolition of civil rights for Muslim citizens, and the King Enquiry now underway in Washington may make some recommendations in this regard. Significantly, some liberal and neo-liberal public intellectuals, welcoming the results of this survey, denounce the current American mood of regret over the concentration of Japanese-Americans in camps during the Second World War.

If Europe is once again finding a kind of unity in its allergy to Muslimness, can Muslims find any allies in this landscape? Tariq Ramadan, in his book *To be a European Muslim*, implies that a marriage is possible with environmentalist and left-wing groups who are dismayed by the rise of anti-immigrant feeling. Pim Fortuyn's assassin was, after all, a militant left-wing vegetarian who wished to defend Holland's Muslims from Fortuyn's plans for a liberal persecution. And many of the emerging British and European Muslim organisations seem to sympathise with Ramadan's approach. After all, when marching against the invasion of Iraq, or campaigning against arms sales to brutal elites in the Middle East, one usually finds oneself sharing an umbrella with Fabian or CND types, not the Young Conservatives. Hence the popularity of the likes of George Galloway among Muslims.

Such an alliance, however, is likely to be, at best, a tempestuous marriage of convenience. Muslims and the left may converge on Iraq, or Israel, or globalisation, but on domestic matters they stand at opposite poles. The Green movement, and virtually all on the Left, are fiercely pro-homosexual and feminist. It seems clear, then, that European Muslims are unlikely to forge a stable relationship with the Left. Similarly with the environmentalists: Muslims are often forgetful that the roots of the green lobby in Europe are not monotheistic, but often implicitly or explicitly pagan. Nazism was very keen on the environment: Sigrid Hunke, the German

feminist and green theorist of the 1930s who is still viewed as a founder of the green movement, was revered by several Nazi ideologues.

Many Muslims, from their vantage-point in Europe's ghettos, intuit this correctly. But they then conclude that the true believers by definition have no allies. Some Salafist perspectives, in particular, seem unable to accept the possibility of partnership with non-Muslims. One recalls the embarrassing cases of Shaykh Faisal in Britain, and Anwar al-Awlaki in the United States; whose followers, mesmerised by the slogan of 'Back to the Qur'an', had to spring back in dismay when the political views of these preachers reached the media. Yet such paranoia and xenophobia seem both scripturally unnecessary and practically unwise. If Europe continues to secularise, while Europe's mosques remain full, then Islam is likely, without any planning or even forethought, to become the principal monotheistic energy through much of the continent, a kind of leaven in Europe's stodgy dough.

Yet we should note that the pressure being brought to bear on Muslim communities relates to social, not doctrinal, beliefs. No-one in Brussels is greatly concerned about Muslim doctrines of the divine attributes, or prophetic intercession; but they do care about whether or not Muslims believe in feminism. This places Muslim believers in a historically new position. It should be possible to forge close friendships with other Europeans who also have the courage to blaspheme against the Brussels magisterium. We may differ with conservative Catholics and Jews over doctrine, but we are all facing very similar challenges to our social vision. Signor Buttiglione could easily have been a Muslim, not a Catholic, martyr.

Here, I believe, a burden of responsibility rests upon the shoulders of Muslim leaders. It is in our interests to seek and hold friends. We are not alone in our conscientious rejection of many liberal orthodoxies. The statement by Bishop Michel Santer of the French church condemning the official punishments imposed on women who wear the niqab is an important sign of the possibility of cooperation. The challenge is going to be for Muslim, Christian and Jewish conservatives to set aside their strong traditional hesitations about other faith communities, and to discover the multitude of things they hold in common. To date, clearly, the interfaith industry has failed to catalyse this, partly because it tends to be directed by liberal religionists. We are more and more willing, it seems, to discuss less and less, and to conform more and more to the moral consensus of a secular and individualistic world.

However an alliance sacrée between orthodox believers in different religions would, I think, deflate the potentially xenophobic and Islamophobic possibilities implicit in the process of European self-definition. If Europe defines itself constitutionally, as I

believe it should, as either an essentially Christian entity, or as one which is at least founded in belief in God, then the fact of Muslim support for core principles of Christian ethics will give Islam a vital and appreciated place. But a purely secular Europe will always see Muslim values as problems on the margin, to be tolerated or punished according to the whims of the currently elected politicians. The relationship with European Jews is no less critical. If Orthodox Jewry – currently gaining in strength – can make common cause with Islam over core moral issues, chauvinisms and suspicions which currently exist on both sides will be seen as self-defeating.

Abdal Hakim Murad