

Oddbjørn Leirvik:

Christianity and Islam: Dialogue, or More?

Lecture in a Diakonia conference in Beni Sueff, Egypt, October 2003

Introduction: dialogue, diaconia and diapractice

In 1990, my wife and I gave two parallel contributions to a missionary conference about Christian-Muslim relations in Norway. At that time, both of us were involved in pastoral work in the inner city of Oslo, I myself as a parish minister and my wife as a deacon. Together, we had made our first attempts at bridge building between Christians and Muslims. The title of our shared session in the conference was “Dialogue and Diaconia in the Encounter with Muslims in the Inner City”. The intention of our double contribution was to cover both the theoretical and practical aspects of Christian-Muslim relations in Norway. In contrast with Egypt, Norway has only thirty years of experience with Christian-Muslim coexistence. But it does not take many years to realise that when people of different faiths meet, we have to reconsider our *words* as well as what we *do* to one another. For the church, the challenge is both “dialogue” and “diaconia”.

The title of my present contribution is “Christianity and Islam: Dialogue, or More?” The word dialogue goes back to the Greek expression *dia+logoi* and means simply “through words”. Interreligious relations, however, is about more than words. Lissi Rasmussen, a Danish colleague of mine who has also a strong commitment to Christian-Muslim dialogue, has proposed that the word “dialogue” should be substituted for the word “diapractice”.¹ Lissi Rasmussen and other Christians run an Islamic-Christian Study Centre in Copenhagen, in which Christians and Muslims dialogue and *do* things together on an equal basis. When you do things together, in partnership, the words you use to describe the Other, gradually change. Through more than 15 years involvement in Christian-Muslim dialogue and diapractice in Norway, I have experienced this myself. Through face to face encounters and cooperation, my thoughts and words about the Other have changed.

Diapractice corresponds to the Greek expression *día+praxeis* that means “through deeds”. Only by doing things together can people involved in dialogue change anything, and one another. This is also the recognition of the World Council of Churches, which has had a global program for Christian-Muslim dialogue during the last 30 years. When in 2002, the World Council of Churches convened Christians and Muslims to discuss the future of Christian-Muslim relations, the title that was chosen for the conference was “Christians and Muslims in dialogue *and beyond*”. The groups discussed such issues as working together in education, fostering co-citizenship, striving together for justice, and how to overcome violence.²

In many contexts, from Indonesia via Egypt to Norway, these are burning issues in Christian-Muslim relations. They need more than dialogue – something beyond words – to be resolved. What is needed is joint action to overcome stereotyped images in education, joint efforts to build a society without discrimination, practical solidarity across religious divides in the struggle for social justice, and common action to overcome violence.

What lies beyond dialogue, is diapractice. Differently from the term diaconia, diapractice does not belong to the traditional Christian vocabulary. As a neutral construct, it may be well fit to become a shared term for Christians and Muslim when speaking about the practical aspects of interreligious relations. But words too are deeds. By searching for

inclusive terms, we prepare the road towards a more inclusive society – and for common action.

Christians and Muslims today – united or separated?

In Christian-Muslim relations, both inclusive words and common action are desperately needed. In so many contexts worldwide, Christians and Muslims are suspicious of each other and do not expect anything good from their neighbour. In Africa, in such countries as the Sudan and Nigeria, Muslim-Christian conflicts coincide more or less with ethnic differences and historical competition for control over certain geographical areas. In Asia, we hear of violent clashes between Christians and Muslims in Indonesia, Pakistan and elsewhere. In the Middle East, the number of Christians is rapidly decreasing in many countries, most notably in Palestine where Christians are squeezed between Israeli occupation and militant Islamic resistance. In Europe, both the secular society and many Christian groups are highly suspicious of a steadily growing number of Muslim immigrants whom are accused of trying to Islamise Europe step by step. In the Balkans, both Bosnia and Kosovo have suffered a civil war in an area in which Christians and Muslims have competed for control through centuries and inflicted many wounds on each other. In the background of European and Middle Eastern conflicts looms also the traumatic memory of the medieval Crusades, in which Christian Europe tried to strike back at the Muslims after having lost ground in so many regions after the Islamic conquest some centuries before. To make things worse, the current rise in global terrorism and the United States' violent response to it, is also perceived by many as a conflict between Islam and the Christian West.

Most of us know that the cited examples do not give an entirely true picture of reality. In all the cases and places that I have mentioned, stories can also be told of Muslim-Christian cooperation, confidence building and joint attempts at conflict resolution. In Indonesia, where Christians and Muslims have set fire to mosques and churches, there are many examples of Muslim-Christian cooperation in conflict resolution. Leaders of the largest Muslim networks in Indonesia have even volunteered to protect churches during Christmas celebrations. I have heard such witnesses myself, when visiting Indonesia. In the World Council of Churches conference last year, a bishop and imam from Nigeria gave a joint witness of their common struggle to overcome mutual suspicion between ordinary Christians and Muslims in the conflicted city of Kaduna.

Why are not these stories more widely known? Why is that conflicts are more interesting than confidence building?

With regard to ethnic bonds, they may either separate Christians and Muslims or unite them. In the Sudan, the dominant conflict is seemingly one between Muslims in the north and Christians and traditional practitioners in the south. A closer look, however, shows that the ethnic component may be more decisive than the religious one. There are in fact many examples of Muslims in the south who have sided with Christian southerners. In this perspective, the Sudanese civil war could be seen as a war between Arabs and Africans rather than between Muslims and Christians. Since the Arabs have used Islamic legislation to strengthen their control, the religious component of the conflict cannot be overlooked. But if one looks beyond the Sudan, one will find that Black African Muslims in other countries may be more sympathetic to the Christian Africans in the south than to their Arab co-religionists in the north. When a group of Sudanese church leaders visited Norway in 2000, the National Contact Group of Christians and Muslims in Norway facilitated a meeting with the president of the Islamic Council. The then president was a West African who made no secret of his sympathy with the black African cause of the Christians.

In Europe too, so many stories can be cited of Christian-Muslim trust building. The Sudanese church leaders who visited Norway would never have met the president of the Islamic Council in Norway were it not for the personal bonds that have been knit between Christian and Muslim leaders in my country, through our first decade of organised dialogues. Although in Norway, we have just begun speaking together, we are already *doing* things together on an interreligious basis. In 1998, the Interfaith Council of Norway set up an international network called the Oslo Coalition of Freedom of Religion or Belief. Here, Christians and Muslims work together with Jews, Buddhists and even secular humanists in order to safeguard freedom of religion or belief and stimulate dialogue and diapractice in conflicted areas of the world. We cooperate with likeminded people in other countries, such as Indonesia. We are trying to do something together, across religious divides, on the basis of shared human rights standards. The coordinator is a Muslim woman.

So what is the truth of Christian-Muslim relations today? There is no uniform truth. Confidence competes with suspicion, enemy images with sympathy. In some places, relations are far better at the leadership level than at the grassroots. In other places, the opposite is true. Whatever the constellation may look like, is up to us – as responsible believers – to determine which tendency that shall have the upper hand, and which stories that shall be told in the future.

The words of the Scriptures

What resources do we have in search for dialogue and diapractice, and what are the obstacles? Unfortunately, we are not always helped by the Holy Scriptures. When conflicts break out and Christians and Muslims use religion to promote their cause, we often say that religion is misused. But increasingly, I have been led to recognise that the Scriptures themselves are ambiguous and may be part of the problem. They contain both inclusive and exclusive passages.

Let us have a look at the Qur'an first. When the Qur'an talks about interreligious relations, it has sometimes a theological and sometimes a more practical outlook. In terms of beliefs, it may either confirm what was revealed to the Jews and the Christians, or criticise their interpretation of God's Word. In terms of good deeds, the Qur'an is often quite inclusive in its approach. Sura 3 refers to "righteous people" among the People of the Book (i.e., the Jews and the Christians) who "bid the right and forbid the wrong and hasten to do the good deeds." The righteous Christians are even praised for reciting God's revelations "throughout the night, while prostrating themselves" (3: 111-115). These verses of the Qur'an indicate that Muhammad and his followers were deeply impressed by the monastic Christianity that they had met in Syria, in the Arabian Peninsula, and in Ethiopia. Some of them had a very personal experience of Christian goodness when they were granted political asylum across the Red Sea, by the Christian king of Abyssinia (i.e., Ethiopia).

There is no doubt that the Qur'an affirms the common capacity of Christians and Muslims to perform good deeds inspired by faith in a God who in both religions is spoken of as gracious and merciful. In fact, the Qur'an admonishes the children of Abraham to *compete* in good words, in the way that God has pointed out for each of them. In sura 5, God is reported as saying to Jews, Christians and Muslims: "To each of you, We have laid down an ordinance and a clear path. Had Allah pleased, He would have made you one nation, but [He wanted] to test you concerning what He gave to you. So compete with one another in good deeds. To Allah is the ultimate return of all of you, that He may instruct you regarding that on which you differed" (5:48).

According to the Qur'an, this is the secret of religious differences: God has indicated different paths for Jews, Christians and Muslims in order that we should compete – or as

another translation runs – that we should “strive as in a race” in good deeds. This is the test: not what we say but what we do.

It sounds good, doesn't it? The question, however, is whether the Qur'anic admonition to “strive as in a race” in good deeds should be taken as a call to cooperation or competition. It cannot be denied that there are verses of the Qur'an that warn against friendly *cooperation* with people of a different faith. Only three verses after the admonition to strive as in a race in good deeds, the Muslims are told that they should “not take the Jews and the Christians as friends ... Whoever of you takes them as friends is surely one of them” (5:51). Maybe the logic of the Qur'anic admonition, then, is exactly to *compete* in good deeds, not to cooperate. In order to compete successfully, you need to keep some distance to the others, so that your good deeds are marked off as either Muslim or Christian. This is the reality of good works in many contexts today, where churches and mosques compete (or “strive as in a race”) in offering social services to a needy population.

To the extent that the spirit of competition is rooted in the Scriptures, the problem is not only with the Qur'an. Neither the New Testament does always encourage Christians to cooperate with adherents of other faiths. On the one hand, we find Jesus in the Gospels constantly crossing religious barriers, doing good without asking whether the receiver is Jew, a Samaritan woman, or a Roman official. And in the Sermon of the Mount, we find Jesus saying: “Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven” (Matthew 7: 21). It is the good works that count, more than what we confess by our mouth – as Jews or heathens, Christians or Muslims.

But on the other hand, there are many parts of the New Testament that totally dismiss the capacity of non-Christians (Jews and heathens) to do the will of God. In the Gospel of John, the Jews as a group are accused of having the devil, not Abraham, as their father (John 8: 44), and in the Revelation of John, the Jews are condemned as the “synagogue of Satan” (Revelation 2: 9). As for the Roman or Greek neighbours of the first Christians, their style of life is dismissed as “lust, drunkenness, revelries, drinking parties, and abominable idolatries” (1 Peter 4: 3-4). In general, the epistles of the New Testament have nothing good to say about non-Christian neighbours. So why should one cooperate with them? Wouldn't it be wiser to keep a safe distance?

I could have cited many other examples from the Holy Scriptures, for better or for worse. The point I am making is that in terms of interreligious relations, the Scriptures are ambiguous. The same is true of our classical traditions, which may occasionally show understanding towards the other faith but are more often imbued with enemy images of the Other. The point I am making is that those who advocate Christian-Muslim diapractice are not always helped by the *words* of our traditions. We must rather seek to balance the exclusivist and isolationist tendencies of our traditions with our own good *deeds*.

Rethinking Self and Other, against the background of Muslim-Christian diapractice

As for the Scriptures, they are always liable to interpretations. What seems in them to be an obstacle to Christian-Muslim diapractice, may be reinterpreted in the light of current experiences that demonstrate that interreligious cooperation in good works is in fact possible. On the Muslim side, an inspiring reinterpretation of what the Qur'an says about the Muslim Self and the religious Other has been made by the South African thinker Farid Esack. His most well known book carries the title *Qur'an, Liberation and Pluralism. An Islamic Perspective of Interreligious Solidarity against Oppression* (1997).³ The book was written against the background of his experiences from the struggle against apartheid. The author

stood side by side with black Christian leaders, he was imprisoned with them, and experienced the liberation together with them. After the liberation, Esack has been engaged in governmental work for gender equality and also committed himself to the HIV/AIDS-problem, which in South Africa and elsewhere constitutes a common challenge to Muslims, Christians and adherents of traditional beliefs. In his book, Farid Esack describes the shared (although not identical) experience of “black” Christians and “Asian” Muslims during apartheid, their common struggle, and their shared hopes. The experiences he made challenged him to reinterpret what the Qur’an says about other believers. In his book, Farid Esack demonstrates that those passages of the Qur’an that are most critical with regard to Jews and Christians, reflect social contradictions rather than religious ones. The “unbelievers”, he argues, are not those with other articles of faith but rather those who – across religious divides – kept people down and were not willing to submit themselves to the one God in a community based on “oneness” and equality.

In the South African context, Farid Esack has experienced that religious divides did *not* in any way coincide with the fault lines of injustice and oppression. The starting point for his new reading of the Qur’an is the shared experience of *some* Muslims and *some* Christians who joined hands not only against other Christians (the white majority), but also against the many Muslims who lived relatively comfortably with the apartheid regime because they were “Asians” and thus more privileged than the blacks.

His experience coincides with that of many others, namely that the most dramatic differences in today’s world do not fall between the faith communities, but rather between rich and poor, oppressor and oppressed, man and woman in all societies and thus also in every religion. Enlightened by such experiences, it is possible to read the Qur’an in a different way. For instance, Esack understands the term *islam* (submission) not as the name of a separate religious community but rather as a fundamental attitude, which creates community and makes a difference right across religious divides. He gives the same open-ended interpretation to the Islamic key term of *iman*, faith. According to Esack, true faith is directed towards a God who is greater than all the lords of this world. As such, it may inspire controversial alliances for liberation across religious barriers.

Esack’s reinterpretation of the Qur’an, in the light of Muslim-Christian diapractice, should inspire Christians to a similar reinterpretation of the Bible, so as to make our faith more compatible with reality – and more inclusive.

The bond of conscience

In my own reflection and research on Christian-Muslim relations, I have been trying to think through how we understand *the voice of conscience* in us all. In my view, conscience is something in us that unites us across different faiths. In the following part of my lecture, I will therefore share with you some reflections on conscience as a potential bond between Christians and Muslims.⁴

The term conscience is rooted in the New Testament and in the Christian history of ideas. But today, we see that the word conscience has become truly globalised and equivalent terms are being used in nearly all languages of the world.

One important factor behind the globalisation of the term conscience is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which in article 1 states that human beings are “endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood”. This is well in tune with the understanding of Paul, who in his Epistle to the Romans refers to a natural law that is shared by Jews, Greeks and Christ-believers: “They show that what the law requires is written on their hearts, to which their conscience also bear witness; and their

conflicting thoughts will accuse them or perhaps excuse them on the day when ... God ... will judge the secret thoughts of all” (Romans 2: 15).

In Paul’s epistles, human conscience is referred to as a human capacity for moral judgement that is shared across religious divides. In 1 Corinthians, he also speaks of human conscience as that in us that incites us to become *sensitive to others*: “Do not seek your own advantage, but that of others ... for the sake of conscience – I mean the other’s conscience, not your own” (1 Corinthians 10:28f). Admittedly, there are also parts of the New Testament that speak of conscience in a more narrow way, as a specifically “Christian” conscience purified by baptism in the name of Christ (1 Peter 3: 21). But in Paul, conscience is spoken of as a moral capacity that unites what we know by ourselves and what we know – in an obligating way – with others (be they fellow Christians, Jews, heathens – or Muslims).

In terms of etymology, the word conscience means “co-knowledge” or “knowing together”. The question is *together with whom*: does conscience mean that I know something by myself, or does it refer to a moral knowledge that is shared with others? As I see it, it is exactly the dialectic between knowing by oneself and knowing with others that constitutes the notion of conscience. Conscience is simultaneously the most personal property that we have, and that which unites us – in empathy – with other people.

In European modernity, the voice of conscience has primarily been seen as an *individual* property. It has been conceived of either as the seat of the individual’s moral autonomy (as in Kant) or as the source of individual authenticity (as in Rousseau). When I was researching the notion of conscience, it was therefore interesting to read an article by Benézét Bujo about conscience in African ethics that stressed instead the *social* dimension of conscience: “In the African perspective ... conscience involves a speaking and listening to one another”.⁵ In this understanding, conscience can also be associated with the Zulu concept of *ubuntu*, which the government of South Africa has adopted as part of their national ideology: “The principle of caring for each other’s well-being ... and a spirit of mutual support ... *Ubuntu* means that people are people through other people”.⁶

In tune with the general globalisation of the term, Muslims too have annexed the word conscience and integrated it into Islamic ethics. The modern Arabic word for conscience is *damir*, which in classical Arabic refers to innermost thoughts. But in modern Muslim usage, we can also find that the term *damir* has been used to denote what Muslims and Christians “know together” in the moral realm. I am referring here to a number of Egyptian Muslim authors who in the 1950s and 60s referred to conscience (*damir*) as the axis around which all moral guidance revolves. The authors I am referring to are well known to an Egyptian audience: ‘Abbas Mahmud al-‘Aqqad, Khalid Muhammad Khalid and Kamil Husayn. In 1958, Khalid wrote a book entitled “Together on the road: Muhammad and Christ”, in which he portrayed both prophets as great defenders of the human conscience, against all attempts by the powerful in this world to silence it. Four years earlier, al-Aqqad wrote a biography of Christ (“The Genius of Christ”) in which he praised “the law of conscience and love” preached by Christ.⁷

Perhaps the most challenging book from this period about Christ, Muhammad and human conscience is a novel that was written by Kamil Husayn in 1954 and translated into English three years later as *City of Wrong*.⁸ In this novel, which deals with the events of Good Friday, Husayn approaches the sensitive issue of Christ’s death. His main point is that the drama of Good Friday is about the crucifixion of human conscience. Without challenging the traditional Muslim view that Christ was not in the end crucified but rescued by God, Husayn fully confirms the *intention* of Christ’s adversaries to crucify him. It is this intention to crucify that he interprets as a crucifixion of conscience: “When they resolved to crucify him it was a decision to crucify the human conscience and extinguish its light. They [i.e., the Jewish leaders and the Roman officials] considered that reason and religion alike laid upon

them obligations that transcended the dictates of conscience”. They all knew that what they were up to was wrong, but communal allegiances and the fear of being seen as a dissenter, made them stifle the voice of conscience.

For this Muslim author, the drama of Good Friday is a truly *universal* drama, which reveals our common propensity to give up what we know is right, out of loyalty to fellow believers or people in power. It is exactly this tendency of ours to crucify conscience that prepares the way for unthinkable atrocities that again and again are being committed in the name of religion, race or nation. In the view of Kamil Husayn, the crucifixion of conscience is a common sin to be confessed and a common challenge to be tackled by Jews, Christians and Muslims together.

The inclusive voices of those Muslims who wrote about human conscience in the 1950s testify to a century-long experience of Muslim-Christian coexistence in Egypt that has forged a kind of *national* conscience. When the Egyptians rose against British domination in the first decades of the 20th century, the main nationalist party Wafd had “Religion for God, and the motherland for everyone” as its slogan and one of their main symbols was the combination of the crescent and the cross. In spite of later attempts by the Muslim Brotherhood to assert the Islamic nature of Egypt, it has been common both among Muslims and Christians to emphasise their shared Egyptian identity and their equal commitment to the wellbeing of their nation. From the 1970s, however, this may have changed somehow. Revival movements among both Copts and Muslims have led many to put more stress on their religious identity than on their shared citizenship. The revival movements have deepened the spirituality of both Christians and Muslims in Egypt and have made both religions more visible in daily life. But what has happened to the sense of a shared national identity, and of co-citizenship? Does one still find thinkers and religious leaders who speak of the common bond of conscience, as strongly as in the 1950s and 60s? What is the reality among ordinary believers? Do they feel the common bond of conscience, and act upon it? Or are Muslims and Christians more divided than before?

I believe that the question of conscience across religious divides is as pressing in Europe as in Egypt. In the Qur’an, we read in sura 49: “O mankind, We have created you male and female and made you nations and tribes, so that you might come to *know* one another.” (49:13). Coming to know each other presupposes that we meet as *individuals*, not only as “nations and tribes”. This is why I have come to believe that only conscience can be the bond that truly unites us across religious divides. It is conscience that tells us that we have a responsibility towards the human other, not only our fellow believers. It is also conscience that makes us mentally prepared and motivated for diapractice. But how can conscience work if we don’t meet regularly *face to face*?

Spiritual diapractice

In a concluding reflection, I will raise the question of how far we can go, as Christians and Muslims, in diapractice. Can we also do things together spiritually?

When the Danish theologian Lissi Rasmussen speaks of diapractice, she thinks not only of social action but also of spiritual practice. This is one of the most controversial questions in interreligious relations: can we pray together across religious divides? The questions vary, also among those seriously committed to dialogue. But sometimes, social and spiritual action becomes two sides of the same coin. When the US went to war against Iraq, many churches voiced their protest – in some cases, together with local Muslims. Christians and Muslims alike have been deeply concerned about the long-term negative effects of the still ongoing war. This has also been the case in Norway. When the war broke out, two churches and three Muslim organisations summoned Christians and Muslim to a joint

gathering in the main mosque of Oslo. Together, we voiced our protest and our concern. Prayers were also said, not exactly jointly, but at least side by side. When the Catholic priest began saying the Lord's Prayer, all the Christians joined him spontaneously. In the middle of the mosque, side by side with the Muslims, we said the Lord's Prayer aloud. It was not planned, it just happened, and nobody seemed to be uncomfortable with it. On other occasions, I have also experienced Muslims reciting from the Qur'an in the church and even invited them to do so. In one of these cases, in 1994, we shared out common grief for the recent massacre of Muslims in prayer at Abraham's mosque in Hebron (committed by an Israeli extremist). Shouldn't we then pray, side by side?

As I see it, giving space to the Other's prayer in one's own sacred space, can be seen as a kind of spiritual hospitality – as at the time of the Prophet, when Christians from Yemen who came to Medina to discuss Muslim-Christian coexistence in the Arabian peninsula were invited to pray in the Prophet's mosque.

In a wonderful book by Andrew Wingate about Christian-Muslim dialogues in Birmingham, entitled *Encounters in the Spirit*, we learn about the experience of Christians and Muslims who for a period of time decided to share a great deal of their lives with one another. In the course of the process, they were also confronted with illness in some of the group members' families. In some of these cases, tells Wingate, they felt it natural to pray together for the sick person. The hard realities of life, and the Spirit, brought them together. When the Gulf War broke out in 1991, members of the same group were active in organising joint Christian-Muslim prayers for peace. This is how Andrew Wingate sums up his experiences: "With the particular group of Muslims we have been fortunate to be with, there is also a common sense of grace, and the understanding that we are nothing before the greatness of God, totally dependent on God's mercy, and always in need of God's forgiveness".⁹

Other Christians and Muslims involved in dialogue have not felt that praying together was the right thing to do. In a Norwegian book entitled "Dialogue with and without the veil"; we learn about the experiences of a Norwegian group of Christian and Muslim women who also (for a period) shared much of their lives and recognised many common concerns as women.¹⁰ For them, *refraining* from joint prayer was felt as the right way of respecting each other's differences.

In the question of prayer, then, both Christians and Muslims will judge differently. If not praying together, we can at least pray for each other that we may be brought closer as Christians and Muslims.

Conclusion

Should we also pray that the Other leaves his or her spiritual community, and joins mine? Until now, I haven't made any reference to mission, or "call" (*da'wa*) as they say in Islam. With regard to the title of my lecture, some of you might have expected me to speak about mission as that which is "more" than dialogue. I didn't do so. That is why I regard mission as something *different* from, not "more" than dialogue. Mission is to share the Word of God as we have received it, in words and works, and to invite those who listen to join the community of Christ (or the Muslim *umma*).

Dialogue is something different. Dialogue takes place on a common arena, be it neighbourhood, school, society at large, or the international community. Dialogue presupposes equality, or at least the will to be equals. Correspondingly, diapactice means that we are doing something good *together* across religious barriers, in equal partnership with those of another faith.

As I see it, that too belongs to the "mission" of the church.

Endnotes:

- ¹ Lissi Rasmussen: *Dialog og diapraxis mellem kristne og muslimer*. Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag 1996.
- ² For reports, see <http://www.wcc-coe.org/wcc/what/interreligious/octconsul-rep.html> and <http://www.wcc-coe.org/wcc/what/interreligious/octconsul-docs.html>
- ³ Oxford: Oneworld Publications.
- ⁴ This part builds on a doctoral research published in the book *Knowing by Oneself, Knowing with the Other. Al-damir, Human Conscience and Christian-Muslim Relations*. Oslo: Unipub 2002. Cf. the article “Al-damir, Human Conscience and Christian-Muslim Relations” in *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 3: 2003, pp. 277-297.
- ⁵ Benézét Bujo: ”The Understanding of Conscience in African Ethics”, in *Studies in Interreligious Dialogue* 2: 1992, p. 19.
- ⁶ *Government Gazette*, 02/02/1996, No. 16943, p.18, paragraph 18.
- ⁷ *Abqariyyat al-Masih*, 1954, cf. English translation in F. Peter Ford Jr.: *The Genius of Christ*. Binghamton, NY: Global Publications 2001.
- ⁸ Translated by Kenneth Cragg, last edition 1994 by Oneworld (Oxford).
- ⁹ Andrew Wingate: *Encounters in the Spirit. Muslim-Christian Meetings in Birmingham*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1988 – p. 68.
- ¹⁰ Anne Hege Grung and Lena Larsen: *Dialog med og uten slør*. Oslo: Pax forlag 2000. Cf. the English article “Dialogue can be a liberating experience for women”, *Current Dialogue*, vol. 35, July 2000 (<http://www.wcc-coe.org/wcc/what/interreligious/cd35-06.html>)