



SEEDBED

Third quarter 1988
Subscription: \$5.00 (U.S.)

Vol. III, No. 3
Editor: Sam Schlorff

SEEDBED is a publication focusing on church planting in the Arab World. Its purpose is to serve as a forum and channel of ideas and information useful to those involved in church planting in the Arab World. Subscription is by invitation, to those associated with the missionary enterprise. Nothing contained herein may be published except by permission. Correspondence, articles or book reviews should be sent to: SEEDBED, P.O. Box 96, Upper Darby, PA 19082 U.S.A.

SEEDBED is published four times yearly. Subscriptions in U.S. dollars should be sent to the above address; addresses of agents receiving subscriptions in Pounds Sterling and French francs will be supplied on request. Subscriptions begin with the first and end with the fourth numbers of each year.

IN THIS ISSUE:

MOSES: THE MESSENGER OF GOD, by M. B.
A GREAT MISSTIOLOGICAL ERROR OF OUR TIME: KEEPING THE FAST OF
RAMADAN--WHY WE SHOULDN'T, by Donald R. Rickards
FROM THE ARABIC LANGUAGE PRESS: (translations of extracts)

MOSES: THE MESSENGER OF GOD

by M.B.

Moses is one of the key figures in the Qur'an. He brought God's word to the children of Israel. He is one of the greatest of the men of God. Next to him only Jesus and Mohamed can stand. He is a bridge to communicating the Gospel to Muslims. To begin, let's look at the presentation of Moses in the Qur'an.

The Centrality of Power Encounter

"We sent ... Moses with our signs to Pharaoh" (Sura 7:101/103). This is the earliest reference to Moses in the Qur'an, according to the official Egyptian chronology. The story plunges right into Moses' encounter with the ruler of Egypt. This power encounter is told 13 times in the Qur'an. But why is this story so important?

The signs of God are called the Arabian people to believe in God. This is exactly how Moses appeals to Pharaoh. Moses brings a message from "the Lord of all being" (7:102/104). He tells Pharaoh, "I have brought a clear sign to you from your Lord (7:103/105). Moses is really appealing to Pharaoh to acknowledge the one true God, just as Mohamed brought "a clear sign" (7:203) to his people--the Qur'an. The signs of Moses and Mohamed are different but the manifestation of the power of God is the same. The power of God is unleashed to convince men of the reality of God.

Not all men are convinced, however. The sorcerers "produced a mighty sorcery." God told Moses, "cast thy staff" (7:114/117), and "it swallowed up their lying invention." "So the truth came to pass ... and they turned about humbled. They said, 'We believe in the Lord of all being, the Lord of Moses and Aaron.'" The power of God brings conversion in the hearts of men. Mohamed was to see the Qur'an changing Arabia too.

The Signs of God

While the sorcerers saw the truth, Pharaoh and his counselors were adamantly opposed to Moses. On the one hand, Pharaoh turns on his sorcerers, "I shall assuredly cut off your hands and feet" (7:122/124), and on the other he faces Moses with "whatever sign thou bringest to us ..., we will not believe thee" (7:129/132). God then shows further signs of His power; "So we let loose upon them the flood and the locusts, the lice and the frogs, the blood, distinct signs" (7:130/133).

It is curious that the signs are described in such a summary way. The story of the rods turning to serpents is recounted in great detail but the more devastating demonstrations of God's character are deemed not worth repeating. Perhaps this omission has to do with the fact that Pharaoh did not believe, and the power encounter produced judgment, not salvation. In any case, the story skips on to the drowning of Pharaoh in the sea. "So we took vengeance on them and drowned them in the sea, for that they cried lies to Our signs and heeded them not" (7:133/136).

Thus, the final outcome of power encounter is destruction for those who do not turn to the one true God. In the same way, those who resist Mohamed and his clear sign, the Qur'an, suffer the fate of the haughty ruler of Egypt.

The Call of Moses

When we turn to the second telling of the Moses story in Sura 20, we find that it is his call that predominates. "Moses, I am thy Lord," says a voice from the burning bush. "I myself have chosen thee I am God, there is no god but I; therefore serve me" (20:10ff/12ff).

This is intriguingly similar to the account in Exodus. There is a personal call. God knows Moses by name. In Exodus, He reveals himself as YAHWEH, "the one who is," and that is echoed in the Qur'anic

version. God commissions Moses and Aaron to "Go to Pharaoh." "Say-- We are the Messengers of thy Lord, so send forth with us the Children of Israel and chastise them not: we have brought thee a sign from thy Lord" (20:47).

It is immediately striking that the passage does not tell us who the Children of Israel are, nor why Pharaoh is chastising them. There are no markers in the story to explain Moses' connection with Israel nor Israel's connection with Egypt. We'll see that this is a fertile area for sharing the revelation of God in Exodus and communicating the gospel of a God who rescues.

But if we examine subsequent accounts of the Moses story in the Qur'an we find that in Sura 26:21/22, the third version of the Moses tradition, Israel was enslaved by Pharaoh. The fifth account tells us that Pharaoh killed Israel's sons (28:3/4). Moses is connected with Israel in 28:13 & 14/15 where he kills an Egyptian to save one of his own people.

So we can surmise that Israel was a minority group in Egypt, oppressed in some way as a people, but this is never explained in the Qur'an. We can see that Moses is an Israelite who fought for his people's freedom. God calls Moses, not because Israel is suffering, but because "Pharaoh has waxed insolent" (20:25,46/24,43). We are not told why he's insolent. The insolence is connected more to Pharaoh's rejection of Moses' signs than his treatment of Israel. "Who is your lord" (20:51/49) retorts Pharaoh to Moses. But he never says, "I will not let them go."

Where is the God of Abraham?

Moses is called. God declares himself: "I am God, there is no God but I" (20:11/14). But he is not called "the God of Abraham" (Ex. 3:6). There is no recall of a covenant made by God with Abraham (Gen. 17:7 & 8). This is consistent with the presentation of Abraham in the Qur'an. God does not make a covenant with Abraham as in Genesis. How is it that the Qur'an misses a central part of the self-revelation of God in the Old Testament? It is clear that the covenant promise of God to Israel through Abraham and Moses is suppressed in the Qur'an. In fact, the covenant tradition of the Jews is replaced by a calling tradition of the prophets. The value of Abraham and Moses is not in their connection with God's election of Israel but in their fulfillment of God's call to testify to his unity. (The fact that this is so in Islamic tradition in general has come home to me in conversation with several Muslims who speak of Prophets and their testimony to the unity of God in one breath.)

The Wilderness Wandering

"Children of Israel, ... We made a covenant with you upon the right side of the Mount, and sent down on you manna and quails" (20:82/80). The "covenant" is briefly described in 2:44/47, a late sura; "I have preferred you, Israel, above all beings." This is the only explanation of God's interest in Israel, and it comes in a context where Mohamed is addressing the Jewish tribes of Arabia, rather than re-

counting the Moses story. Some of God's commands to Israel are mentioned; "You shall not serve any save God: and to be good to parents and the near kinsmen, and to orphans, and to the needy.... You shall not shed your own blood" (2:76,77). This is hardly comparable to the description of the giving of the law in Exodus. Notice too that the laws referred to are basic to Islam rather than merely to Israel. What is happening is an Islamic recollection of what it deems significant in the law of God. The context of God giving the law to Moses "on the right side of the Mount" is simply passed over.

The Golden Calf

The story of Israel's idol-making is recounted twice at considerable length. While Moses is on the mountain, God announces to him, "We have tempted thy people.... The Samaritan has misled them into error" (20:86/85). The Samaritan "brought out for them a calf" (20:92/88). Once down the mountain, Moses confronts the Samaritan, who says, "I seized a handful of dust from the messenger's track, and cast it into the thing" (20:96). Aaron is there too, exhorting the people to turn back to God; "My people, you have been tempted by this thing, no more: surely your Lord is the All-merciful; therefore follow me, and obey my commandment!" (20:93/90). Compare this with Exodus 32:4, "Aaron took what they handed him and made it into an idol cast in the shape of a calf."

Aaron Didn't Make the Golden Calf!

Why protect Aaron? Why shift the blame onto a hitherto unknown character called the Samaritan? We need to consider the nature of the crime. If Aaron made the calf he was a false guide to God's people. In the Qur'an, idolatry is the most serious of sins. It was this sin that Mohamed attacked most vigorously in Arabia, cleansing the Kaaba of its many idols. It was inconceivable that a leader of God's people could turn back from the truth. This would set an unprecedented example of treachery to the Divine mission. Once truly guided it's not possible to be misguided. Since Aaron is listed among the messengers of God he cannot be accused of desertion.

Canaan

The story of Moses closes with his appeal to enter the Holy Land. "O my people, enter the Holy Land which God has prescribed for you and turn not back in your traces" (5:24/21). This is the sole reference to the Holy Land. From the Qur'an, there is no way of knowing that it is identical with Canaan. We can tell that Israel left Egypt and crossed the sea. We know that Israel wandered for 40 years beyond the sea. So why not Arabia? It could just as well have been there. After all, Abraham is said to have erected the House of God at Mecca and called future generations to pilgrimage there.

Moses Prophesies the Advent of Mohamed!

We find God speaking to Moses at the end of his life in Surra 7:155-7. "My mercy embraces all things, and I shall prescribe it for those who follow the Messenger, the Prophet of the common folk, whom they find

written down with them in the Torah and the Gospel."

Thus, God reveals the coming of Mohamed to Moses. That this announcement to Moses is crucial to Islamic tradition is illustrated by the comment of Sayyed Qutb in his commentary on the Qur'an (fifth edition, Cairo, 1968). "This verse shows that the clear news of the Prophet (Mohamed) came to Israel through Moses (and through Jesus). And it demonstrates that the struggle that took place against the Prophet Mohamed and his religion and his people was vile and despicable, but the Jews and the Christians still persevere in this warfare to the present day."

Communicating Exodus to Muslims

Now let's turn to the Moses story as we find it in Exodus. What does a Muslim need to discover there? I believe there are four important things he needs to discover.

1) **Moses' God is also Abraham's God**(Ex. 3:6,15,16; 4:5; 6:12). Five times God reveals himself to be "the God of Abraham." God identifies himself as the One who revealed himself to Moses' ancestor. God establishes a line of calling; just as he called "Abram," so now he calls "Moses." God does not ignore the history of his self-revelation. The Qur'an makes no connection between Abraham and Moses, but Exodus does. This is significant. God builds confidence in Moses by referring to Abraham (and Isaac and Jacob). Moses knew the story of Abraham; God recalls the familiar. The awesome Creator becomes a father figure; God is not the terrifying unknown Other, but One who committed Himself to other men and now commits Himself to Moses. The same God commits Himself to us today who hear Him call us by name.

2) **God Cares for His People**(Ex. 3:7); "I have indeed seen the misery of my people in Egypt." In the Qur'an, God describes Israel in the third person, "the people of the book", "the children of Israel." In Exodus, God is personally committed to the well-being of Israel; He has a fatherly concern for his children. So it is not only Jesus who can call God "Father"; the Israelites have cause to do the same. Here are the roots of the concept of God as "Father." I've found that this fatherly care has made an impact on one of my contacts.

3) **God Promises Canaan**. "I have come down to bring my people up out of Egypt into a land flowing with milk and honey--the land of the Canaanites" (Ex. 3:8). The most powerful image in the Exodus account is God's promise to give his people a land "flowing with milk and honey." The exodus is from slavery to freedom. "The land" exercises a powerful pull on the enslaved people.

This promise was also made to Abraham. It is the sign of God's love to his covenant people. What is especially important for the Muslim reader to see is that God promises the land. The Pentateuch is heavy with that promise. Elsewhere in the Bible, it is symbolic of a promising God. We can point to Jesus' promise of resurrection and eternal life. Just as Israel trusted in the promise of the land and found God to be trustworthy, so we can be confident in the promise of

eternal life through trusting in Jesus' death and resurrection.

4) **God Ransoms His People: the Passover** (Ex. 11 & 12). The central importance of the Passover needs to be seen by Muslims. The Qur'an is silent about the sacrifice to redeem the first born from death. It is hard to imagine the Jewish tribes in Mohamed's time neglecting to share about the Passover, when they shared so many stories from the Old Testament. But pointing up the passover sacrifice would have accentuated the "chosen" nature of Israel. The Qur'an prefers to play up Abraham's sheep sacrifice and to locate it in Mecca. There is a deliberate playing down of the "election" of Israel in the Qur'an in favour of a new tradition of the continuity of Mohamed, the Arabs, and God's acts in history, especially through Abraham. The sacrifice that reportedly took place at Mecca is far more important than the one that took place in Egypt.

The discovery that God ransomed His people through the Passover sacrifice, however, leads a Muslim to understand the saying of Jesus, "I have come to give my life as a ransom for many" (e.g. Mark 10:45). This is a crucial statement of Jesus' self-understanding of his mission to act as a sacrifice for his people, those committed to him. It is here that a Muslim can understand the necessity for the death of Jesus on the cross. If the Passover sacrifice was essential to redeem the sons of Israel from slavery in Egypt, then a sacrifice like it is necessary to redeem the sons of Adam.

We can point a Muslim to the Lord's supper where Jesus turned the Passover into a remembrance of him. Some of my friends have understood "this is my body" and "this is my blood" when they have taken in the meaning of the Passover. The title "Jesus is the lamb of God" also makes sense in the passover context. This study then leads to a look at the sermons in Acts, and to the Pauline epistles, Hebrews and 1 Peter, where the theme of sacrificial redemption is further expounded.

(Qur'an quotations are from The Koran interpreted, trans. A.J. Arberry, Oxford 1964. Numbers following the "/" give the versification of the standard Egyptian edition of the Qur'an).

**A GREAT MISSIOLOGICAL ERROR OF OUR TIME:
KEEPING THE FAST OF RAMADAN--WHY WE SHOULDN'T**

by Donald R. Rickards

It has become increasingly popular for missionaries who are geared to the times to keep the fast of Ramadan. Living as we do in a day when Anthropology seems to govern Theology, some messengers of the Gospel to the Muslim world keep this important pillar of Islam's religious system. A few of them have talked freely about doing this in their newsletters to their constituents.(1) The reason most often given for doing this is, "I wish to identify with the feelings of the Muslims and to understand them better."

It is my thesis that such a practice by Christian missionaries is misguided, naive and dangerous. It is misguided because no one from the West can possibly hope to empathize with those raised in a Muslim culture, who have observed Ramadan year after year, by observing such a fast for one month.(2) It is naive because it ignores all other relationships involved in such a practice.(3) It is dangerous because all false religious systems are Enemy-inspired counterfeits to the Gospel.(4) I will list the following considerations:

1. To observe Ramadan is to engage in the occult. Every one of the pillars of Islamic faith and practice is of hostile origin. When a missionary observes any one of them, he links himself to demonic intervention and will surely reap from such investment. Would the same missionary recite the creed several times a day to discover what a Muslim feels? Or would he pray five times a day for a month to discover inner responses? To observe Ramadan is identical to observing any of the remaining four pillars of this faith.(5)

2. To observe Ramadan is to confuse Muslim converts everywhere. If there is one pillar which recurs regularly to plague the liberated Muslim convert, it is Ramadan. The pressures he then faces, every year, are beyond the Westerner's ability to experience: family, community in general, occupational and--basically--religious pressures. When the convert has broken loose from these pressures and is trusting Christ to keep him, he suddenly discovers that the missionary who carries the Gospel to bring about his liberation from Islam is now observing a pillar in that religion--a pillar used of the enemy to enslave that convert for so many years in the past. Such confusion could result in the convert's lapse into Islam.

3. To observe Ramadan is to confuse the minority churches in the East. Granted, these minority churches have resorted to all kinds of subterfuge for the past 13 centuries to survive in the midst of Islamic culture. However, they have been united in one area: never have any of them taken up any of the pillars of Islam, for whatever reason!(6) Now they learn that the Christian missionary--usually from America--is observing an important part of that system which has caused them so much grief throughout their long history. Such confusion of practice makes them either think such a missionary is a fool, childishly naive, or a person to be henceforth avoided.

4. To observe Ramadan is to confuse the serious Muslim inquirer. Consider the situation of an inquirer who has begun to question the validity of the Muslim faith. The Holy Spirit has begun to convict him as he prays, gives alms, recites the creed, goes on the Meccan pilgrimage--and observes Ramadan. He has come to see the uselessness of such observations and the human effort behind them.(7) Now he learns that the missionary he has respected for sharing the Gospel with him is observing one of these important pillars of the faith he himself has begun to question. Is it not obvious how confused he must be? Surely, he must, or might be, wrong in his present ambivalence regarding Islam. Perhaps he has been hasty in thinking to leave the cultural and religious fold in which he has been raised.(8)

5. To observe Ramadan is to send a signal to one's own family that Islam is not all bad. The child is much more impressed by Dad's actions than by his words. If Dad is keeping Ramadan, then either Ramadan is not totally evil as a practice or else it should be considered simply as a cultural practice and should be left in place.(9) The children of several missionary families may get together once in awhile and discuss what some of their dads are doing. Can you imagine the confusion evident in such discussion?

6. To observe Ramadan is to declare that external works render a person acceptable to God. Merit is to be gained by fasting during Ramadan.(10) The missionary who observes this month of fasting is declaring: "For by works are you saved through faith, and that of yourselves." When Muslims know of the missionary's participation in Ramadan observance, how difficult it is afterward for that missionary to share a Gospel of grace with the Muslim inquirer. The message is confused and has lost its distinctiveness; it is now one of a large number of human schemes to reach God.

7. To observe Ramadan is to declare that the other four Pillars of Islam are equally valid. There is no logical reason why the missionary would not perform the other pillars: creed recital, daily prayers, almsgiving and the pilgrimage.(11) How difficult for the Muslim to appreciate the missionary's inconsistency!

8. To observe Ramadan is to confess that Allah miraculously delivered Muhammad's enemies into his hands. It is an historical fact that Ramadan was not made obligatory upon Muslims until after the Muslims defeated a much larger military force than their own at both Badr and Ta'if. To participate in the fast is to commemorate and to confess that it was divine intervention and acceptance of Islam that the Muslim faith has survived.(12)

9. To observe Ramadan is to declare that the Qur'an is a book from God. The ninth month of the Muslim calendar was selected solely for the purpose of commemorating the descent of the Qur'an on the 27th night of that month. It is the holiest night in all the year to the Muslim. It is difficult for this writer to understand how a missionary can so confuse the Muslim over the matter of true revelation, as he does when he observes fasting during this month.

Ramadan should be seen in theological terms and not in anthropological ones. This is the month on the 27th night of which, the night of power or the night of the decree, the Qur'an is said to have descended--an extraction from the Mother of the Book according to Muslim tradition.(13) Pious men sit each evening in the mosque, reciting specified portions of the Qur'an. It is an extremely religious month.(14) Let us not be deceived by those to whom Ramadan is only a cultural event in the Islamic calendar. It is not.(15) Those who are not pious Muslims use the month, it is true, as a time to visit late into the night, or to frequent the burlesque cafes. These populist practices, however, do not mitigate the essential theological significance of the month of Ramadan.(16)

One suggested solution for the missionary is that he observe a different thirty day period and encourage Muslim converts to do likewise; missiologists are well acquainted with this mechanism of functional substitution. However, it will always be extremely difficult to avoid the meritorious dimension of the converts' background in Islam. A Bible conference could be held throughout the month of Ramadan itself, filling the void felt by the Muslim convert church. Any fasting by the missionary or convert, however, during Ramadan, will send an erroneous message to the Muslim community.

In the light of these considerations, it is the conclusion of this Islamicist that Christian workers among Muslims should not participate in Ramadan observance. The risk of being misunderstood is too great at every level. There are other and more biblical ways in which to identify with Muslims in their physical and spiritual predicaments. Let us be creative enough to discover such avenues and glorify the Lord in the process.(17)

Endnotes

1. "In 1982, in the Muslim country of our residence, I kept the entire month of Muslim fast. ... During these fifteen hours, for thirty extremely hot days, I ate no food and drank no liquid. I sought to follow each prohibition as prescribed by the Quran and Hadith. ... It was a special delight to share the light refreshment (iftar) at the daily breaking of the fast with Muslim friends. There was an expressed appreciation that I, a Christian missionary, would participate in such a rigorous discipline of fasting with them. This led to a time of joyous celebration together" (Parshall 1985:223-4). One must question whether they feel joy because they appreciate his expression of identification, or, what is more likely, because they think he is finally appreciating their religion as the true one?

2. Do not those who equate keeping Ramadan with spiritual maturity confuse culture with theology? Goldsmith writes: "True fasting has a significant place in Christian devotion. Is it permissible to introduce a fast month along Muslim lines into a Christian church? Of course it must be voluntary and practiced in conjunction with prayer. Good teaching from the New Testament would then instruct believers in the basic principles of Christian fasting. ... Some new converts from Islam rebel against everything to do with their old form of religion and may prefer to make a clean break, renouncing even the cultural forms of Islam. After an initial period, however, they may develop sufficient spiritual maturity to enjoy having their Christian faith dressed in Islamic cultural garb. And many other Muslims may find it easier to become Christians if this does not involve a total break with all that they have loved in their upbringing. We do not want people to be discouraged from Christian discipleship by the church's alien nature." (Goldsmith 1982:140) emphasis mine). In the same vein, Parshall writes: "It is obvious that fasting cannot be legislated for Christians. There is, however, a place for a voluntary participation in the fast within Muslim contexts. I have often protested the tendency for converts to feel liberated from Islamic legalisms and thus end up as Christians with much less spiritual discipline than they had as Muslims. There is also the issue of

inquirers. Many seekers would feel more comfortable in pursuing truth in a community where spiritual forms are not that distinct from those which they have followed throughout their lives" (1985:223, 224, 225).

3. "On the surface, an effort to empathize with Muslims during this sacred month by joining them in the fast is highly commendable. At the same time, there are hidden factors which need to be carefully explored, e.g., why are Muslims fasting? It is the month in which Muslims believe the Quran was revealed. It may be that the Christian feels uncomfortable about giving such a witness. Perhaps a better alternative would be to fast during Lent. ..." (Dretke 1979:225,226). Many missiologists, however, choose to ignore those "hidden factors."

4. Many overlook the deep convictions expressed in the Muslim's observance of Ramadan; "the validity of the fast is determined by the niyah (intention) of the Muslim." (Farah 1970:144). Marsh wisely seeks to relate to these when Muslims ask, "Why do you Christians not fast?" To which he replies: "Christians do fast ... but they do not fast during Ramadan. To understand why Christians do not observe Ramadan, you must remember why you fast (niya). You fast so that God will forgive your sins. Christians already have God's forgiveness because Christ paid their debt. God has forgiven us by His mercy without our good works" (Marsh 1975:24).

5. One prominent Muslim propagandist puts it like this: "What prayer seeks to accomplish five times a day, fasting during the month of Ramadan ... does once a year." (Maududi p101).

6. Fasting was practiced in the area long before Islam. "'Those before you' [2:183,185] alludes to other devotees of Allah, such as the Jews who fasted on the day of Atonement, but more probably to the Eastern Christians who fasted for thirty-six days. Ritual fasting was not known to Arabia of the Jahiliyah" (Farah 1970:143). That last sentence needs to be qualified, however: "The Sabaeans fasted thirty days every year and celebrated the Eid. The fast was prolonged by one day, should the new moon not be clearly visible on Eid. Again this practice was incorporated in the new religion of Islam. In the Mishna Berkhoth (Jewish Talmud) it was said that fasting should begin and stop at the time when one could begin to distinguish between a white and black thread. This custom has also been incorporated in Islamic traditions" (Nehls p97) .

7. "Muslims believe ... that during Ramadhan the gates of Paradise are open and the gates of Hell closed, and that all who keep the Fast will be pardoned of all their past venial (excusable) sins"(Budd p45)

8. Parshall evokes "... the deep emotional dimension of umrah which is resident within the rigorous ritual of keeping the annual fast. Muslims who dare to break the sociological and religious strictures of the fast are subject to legal and communal penalties. ... I have asked Muslims if spirituality can be legislated. ... Muslims believe that the life submitted to God is a total experience and must embrace law as well as spirit. Therefore, it is not inconsistent to use law to enforce that which is Islamic. So the fast, Muslims will affirm,

must be an external as well as an internal ritual. The physical body must be purified as well as the heart. Muslims declare that governmental legislation can actually assist the believer in his spiritual journey" (Parshall 1985:42, 43).

9. In 1969, President Bourguiba of Tunisia tried to abolish the fast. "He tried to secure a fetwa or religious ruling on this issue from the theological authorities in Tunis, but they refused to rule in his favor. Apparently he offered dispensations anyway, but most Tunisians kept the fast, their loyalty to Islam overriding the patriotic appeals of their president" (Fry & King 1982:145, 146).

10. "The fast is a debt owed to God (din) and an obligation (fard). It is said to partly atone for one's sins, to help control the passions, and to merit a place in paradise. The Muslim must declare his intention to fast (niya) before dawn each day" (Marsh 1975:22).

11. From an Ahmadiyya lecture in West Africa; "The Gospel is more than words to be believed. It is a message to be lived. That's why we do our prayers five times in the day. That's why we confess there is no God but God and Muhammad is His Prophet. That's why we fast during the month of Ramadan, and go on pilgrimage to Mecca. That's why we give our money to the poor" (Dretke 1979:64, 65).

12. According to Hahn, "At the Battle of Badr (2 A.H.) the Muslims, though badly outnumbered, severely defeated the Meccans. It is hardly possible to exaggerate the profound religious significance of this stunning victory, particularly for the early Muslims. God was clearly vindicating the faith of the new community" (Hahn p9).

13. "At the beginning of his ministry Muhammad fasted, as the Jews did, on the 10th day of the first month. Later he fixed instead the whole month of Ramadhan (the ninth month). During this month occurs the Laylatu-l-qadar (night of power) on which the Quran is believed to have been brought down to the lowest heaven, ready to be revealed to Muhammad" (Abd-Ul-Masih p25).

14. Maududi, a Muslim, writes: "What is it that makes us voluntarily undergo such hardships? It is nothing but belief in God and the fear of Him and the day we will return to Him. Every moment during our fast we suppress our passions, and by so doing proclaim the supremacy of the Law of God. This great test keeps us extremely conscious of our duties and so strengthens our faith. By denying ourselves of the most basic necessity of life, an unparalleled spirit of patience is built within us. Difficulty and discipline during this month bring us face to face with the realities of life and help us make our life during the rest of the year one of true subservience to God's will" (Maududi p102).

15. "Many Christians refer to this fast as the 'feast' of Ramadan, and thus show their entire lack of sympathy for the suffering Muslims. The Christian worker should not give the impression that he also is fasting, but he will abstain from eating or drinking in front of them" (Marsh 1975:23). This is a good word from a veteran of many years spent among Muslims.

16. Contrast the idealism of the Muslim apologist and the sociological explanation of the missionary. Maududi: "All Muslims irrespective of status must fast during the same month. This brings into the open the true equality of men and thus goes a long way towards creating feelings of love and brotherhood among them. During Ramadhan, evil conceals itself, while good comes to the fore. The whole atmosphere is filled with cleanliness, righteousness, and purity" (p102). Parshall: "Here one sees the society acting in concert. The fast becomes 'easy' because everyone is doing it. Celebrations of communal eating at the end of the day have a powerful bonding effect. Islam is much more homogeneous because of the fast" (1985:43).

17. In referring to I Cor. 9:22, Dretke has some suggestions as to what "all things to all men" might involve in ministry to Muslims. "Could it mean fasting and Scripture reading during the month of Ramadan? Might it mean contributing to the building of a mosque or an Arabic school? Could it mean joining in the celebration of a Muslim feast? Might it mean meditating quietly in the back of a mosque while Muslims recite the Friday prayers?" (1979:150). This writer must, however, agree with Marsh's declaration. "Some missionaries have tried to show love and sympathy for the Muslims by fasting with them during Ramadan, but without the intention of thereby gaining merit. But this has not been understood and has not really helped win any Muslims for Christ" (1975:25).

References Cited

- Abd-Ul-Masih
n.d. Islam and Christianity. Ibadan, Nigeria:
- Budd, Jack.
1981 Studies on Islam. Great Britain: Red Sea Mission Team.
- Dretke, James P.
1979 A Christian Approach to Muslims. Pasadena: Wm. Carey Lib.
- Farah, Caesar E.
1970 Islam. New York: Barron's Educational Series.
- Fry, C. George & King, James R.
1982 Islam. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- Goldsmith, Martin.
1982 Islam and Christian Witness. London: Hodder & Stoughton
- Hahn, Ernest.
n.d. Muhammad the Prophet of Islam. Hyderabad: Henry MartynInst.
- Marsh, Charles R.
1975 Share your Faith With a Muslim. Chicago: Moody Press.
- Maududi, A. A.
1960 Towards Understanding Islam. Indianapolis: I.T.C.

Nehls, Gerhard.
n.d. Christians Ask Muslims. Cape Town: Life Challenge.

Parshall, Phil.
1985 Beyond the Mosque. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

FROM THE ARABIC LANGUAGE PRESS

[The following is a sampling from 12 pages of extracts collected by an Arab Christian brother who wishes to remain anonymous. He reads widely in Arabic language publications to keep abreast of developments in the Arab World in his ministry, and has translated and collected extracts which he has sent to SEEDBED with the idea that others may also find them useful. They give an "'inside' view of the Arab mind." We decided not to publish the entire document for various reasons, but will be happy to send a copy to any reader requesting one (if you are able to send a \$1 for postage and photocopying it would be appreciated). Besides those reproduced here, other extracts criticize the policy of "Informational Security" (censorship) in the Gulf states, and the lack of democracy in the AW in general, and critique several contemporary Arab plays and books, etc. Most of the extracts are from al-Mostakbal, published in Paris. The remarks in brackets below are by the translator. Ed.]

On the Bleak Economic Prospects of the Arab World (Keywords: Future, Pessimism, Hopelessness), by Ibrahim Salameh, in al-Mostakbal, 14 June 1986.

At the beginning of 1986, the number of Arabic speaking people reached 202 million people according to the United Nations. More than 2/3 of them live in Africa (143 million): in Egypt and the Sudan (75 million) and in the Maghribi states (68 million only!). The illiteracy rate is still between 70% and 72% of the above mentioned number. According to FAO, 35 million of the Arabs living in Africa suffer from malnutrition and may reach the stage of the "Ethiopian Famine."

At the same time, those Arab countries with large populations are in debt and are suffering from economic depression. They owe only 70 billion dollars! The level of education at the universities of these countries is about 30 years behind the world level.

Let us not keep blaming the big powers for the ills of the Arab countries. Are the big powers to blame for the fact that Khartoum has not been linked to the countryside with proper roads which would have helped bring food to the capital? Have the big powers stopped the electrification of the streets of Cairo which remain dark for these ten years?

[After lamenting the backwardness of the Arabs of today, the author makes the following comment]: BETWEEN KNOWLEDGE AND IGNORANCE THERE

IS NO SUCH THING AS A THIRD OR FOURTH WAY. A SURGICAL OPERATION AT A HOSPITAL IS SUBJECT TO ONE SCIENCE WHICH REMAINS THE SAME WHETHER IT TAKES PLACE IN MOSCOW OR IN WASHINGTON.

On Differing Arab Views of their Cultural Heritage (Keywords: Heritage, Objectivity, Neutrality), anonymous author, in Huna London, August 1986.

There is a great deal of controversy in the intellectual circles of Morocco about the way to deal with the cultural heritage. Some, who cling to it greatly, have gone to the extreme of glorifying this heritage, claiming that everything can be found within it. This approach had led to some grave mistakes of horrible dimensions! In order to rectify such a distorted vision of the past, Prof. Muhammad "Abed El-Jabiri of the University of Rabat in Morocco, published a valuable book under the title of: "We and our Tradition." He recognizes that the basic motive of the contemporary Arab for self-authentication is known and recognized by all, as the modern Arab faces cultural challenges of all types and dimensions. And as it happens on the individual or on the societal level, self-authentication takes the form of a return to past positions as a point of refuge from which to launch the defense of the heritage.

We are thus dealing with the Fundamentalist wave or current of modern and contemporary Arab thought. This current has busied itself with the revival of the cultural heritage and its utilization within the framework of an ideological reading of Arab history which claims that what has been achieved in the past can also be accomplished in the future! But one cannot help noticing that most modern and contemporary Arab thought lacks objectivity. It is simply overwhelmed by the problems of the present. And as a result, what is conceived as the heritage is being duplicated in a wrong way.

Realistically speaking, we Arabs of the twentieth century should strive for objectivity and assume a position of neutrality in our attempt to understand our heritage. We should seek to develop a progressive outlook by which we seek to underline the true value of the various aspects of our heritage: cultural, literary, scientific and sociological. We must study Arab history on the basis of a dialectical relationship between several cultural and social stages which deal with the past, the present and the future.

What we need therefore is a change in the way we deal with the past. This will not happen unless we bring the past to the same level as our ordinary life. Then we may borrow from it what is useful for a specific period of time. We must engage in a dialogue with our heritage and seek to find in it the needed resources of information and points of departure for our thoughts. Without this kind of a digesting process, the past remains a great burden on our shoulders and will not contribute to the solution of our problems. This is why we believe that our cultural renaissance must be based on a trinity of cooperating activities: a love and complete knowledge of our heritage, a successful analysis of the present reality, and a total determination for the conquest of our future horizons.

We notice that contemporary Maghribi [i.e. North African] thought is preoccupied with the attempt to formulate a proper outlook for the study of modern Arab history. Some Arabs claim that it has been written in a wrong or distorted way by the European historians. These did their work according to their own perspectives, looking upon Arab societies from the standpoint of a secular worldview and classifying them at the lowest levels of civilization. But Prof. 'Abdallah el-'Arawi, who is well known for his research and his sociological studies, has a different view. He considers that what Arabs write about themselves is very weak. He does not repeat the same charge that modern Arab history has been written in a wrong way; according to him, it has been written in a deficient manner. He summarizes his objections to the historiography of several contemporary Arab historians under four points.

1- The Provincial Disease. Every Arab historian writes from within the circumstances prevailing in his own area and thus remains captive to this narrow view.

2- The Political Disease. Those writing Arab history are preoccupied with political matters and pay hardly any attention to the history of the total society such as the history of family relations, of Arab women, economics, folklore, and popular literature. In other words, these subjects receive scant attention in Arab history books.

3- The Leaders' [bosses] Disease. This means that even when political matters are considered in the history books, these are approached on the basis of the history of the leaders.

4- The Justification Disease. Often, when Arabs are against a certain point of view, they write from their own perspective with the specific aim of justifying their own positions. Their all-consuming concern for self-justification results in their loss of credibility.

More Discussion on the Arab Heritage (Keywords: Heritage, Fundamentalism, Freedom), by Jihad Fadel, in al-Hawadess, 2 Nov. 1984.

"Our Heritage and the Challenges of Our Age in the Arab Fatherland" was the theme of the conference which was organized by the Center for the Study of Arab Unity in Cairo from September 24 to 27, 1984. This is a topic which people are ready to discuss in the Arab world anywhere and at any time, which is both its strong and weak point. But there was a specific factor which gave a special flavor, both in point of time and place, and this is the fact that it was held at Cairo. It has been a long time since Arabs have come to Cairo from all over the Arab world, and with such great eagerness. The secret of this eagerness lies somewhere between the attractiveness of the topic of discussion and the Egyptian lectern which enables Arab intellectuals to speak to their fellow Arabs. There were Moroccans and Algerians, Iraqis and some from the Gulf, Sudanese, Lebanese, and Syrians, Tunisians and even some from India....

It appeared as if there were two cultural and political parties which gathered in Cairo in order to "duel" which one another: the party of

the Present Age and that of the Glorious Past! Those in the Fundamentalist camp regarded the other side almost as if they were foreigners, experts from that world which had threatened the Arabs and conquered them. On the other hand, those in the party of the Present Age looked upon those who spoke of Fundamentalism as if they were the guardians of backwardness. But really, things were far more serious than this superficial way of describing these people. It was not simply a gathering of those concerned about the past and those concerned about the present, but rather of two schools of thought concerned about how to face the challenge of our times. ...

Dr. Muhammad Arkoun (an Algerian from Kabylia) spoke of two trends in the Arab heritage: one trend fundamentalist and mythological, and the other creative and rational. He added that those generations which were educated by the West have offered some great works which were intended to resurrect this heritage from its sleep and to have it studied and taught in the schools and the universities. But in order for it to continue, it needs a liberal political system that allows complete freedom of research, of publication and of thought, without being subservient to any ideological ends.

Dr. William Suleyman Qalada, the deputy of the Council of State in Egypt lectured on: Organizational Changes in the Arab World in the Light of Western Thought and the Situation in Egypt. He called for a secular (laicized) state which binds every citizen with the goal of total progress for the country. On this basis, a national consensus is formed which binds everyone within the country. He went on to say that Arab society must become pluralistic, and not a society of one voice. He reminded the conference of the first constitutional document in the history of Islam which came out of Medina after the Hejira, and which organized the relationship between the Muhajiroon (Meccan "immigrants") and the Ansar (Medinan "partisans") on one side, and the Jews on the other side.

This lecture precipitated a great debate, as one participant felt that what lay behind the paper was the anxieties of non-Muslims in Egypt and in other parts of the Arab world vis-a-vis Islam. The response reminded Dr. Qalada that Islam, throughout all its history, has been a government of justice and equity, and within it non-Muslims enjoyed (privileges or rights) which others never enjoyed under other religions. The dhimmi status or law was a progressive one in its day, since Islam protected those classified as dhimmis, while Christians persecuted their enemies and annihilated them. Dr. Qalada answered that neither he nor non-Muslims in Egypt are anxious about their status. ...

[It is unbelievable how an Eastern Christian is "silenced" whenever he voices his fears about his second-class or third-class status within the contemporaneous Arab-Muslim world. It is as if the dhimmi status were so glorious and so fair! What a sad commentary on the inability of Arab-Muslim intellectuals to sympathize with their fellow citizens who happen not to share with them their religious faith.]