



FUNDAMENTALISM: BETWEEN PERPLEXITY, CONDEMNATION AND THE ATTEMPT TO UNDERSTAND

Jaume Flaquer García

1. A brief view of fundamentalism
2. Why?
3. Religions and fundamentalism: they too often go together.
4. Ways of hope

Notes

In the last years, words such as fundamentalism, integrist, tolerance, etc, are widely used and we can hear them from journalists, politicians, religious people... It is strange not to find them in some way in the newspaper. That means that tolerance is a value that has impregnated the democratic man, but also that many perils threaten it.

Why do we have to be tolerant? Why do we have to give way to other attitudes if we are sure we are on the right track? Even more, how can we be tolerant in subjects that concern our deepest feelings such as religion? The men of the Crusades thought they couldn't be tolerant because what it was at stake was the salvation of one's own soul and the soul of the iniquitous Moslems. Couldn't it be that the present religious tolerance were the result of the resignation at not being able to control society?

In relation to this, a Jesuit who lives with Moslem people in Chad, said one day that Moslems often surprised him with affirmations like this: "You Christians talk about dialogue now because you are weak. We don't need it because we are strong".

This is a serious accusation because it puts the sincerity of our tolerance under question. But it is also more serious because these sentences suggest a way of action: "Be intolerant while you can". Some Catholics, not many fortunately, are led by these principles when they dream about the return of other times in Christendom and Theocracy. To those, some democratic values as tolerance, freedom, etc, are second rate values when compared with the imposition and realisation of their ideology.

These examples can give rise to questions like these: Why has Fundamentalism been so often linked to religion *per se*? Are they an inseparable marriage?

This survey tries to approach these questions, as well to study other kinds of integristism together with their causes, and to propose ways of solution and hope in the face of radicalisms.

1. A BRIEF VIEW OF FUNDAMENTALISM

1.1. FUNDAMENTALISM: "IT'S SAID TO BE..."

The words fundamentalism and integrism have been usually used as synonymous of fanaticism, radicalism (in its pejorative sense), dogmatism... They are also linked to intransigence and narrowmindedness. In all those concepts, there is also the idea of excess, of paying too much attention to unimportant subjects. This is the fanatic attitude. *Fanum* means a holy place in Latin. The "fanaticus" was the servant of the sanctuary, and it began to have a pejorative meaning due to the extreme attitude of some of them. That is, a fanatic is the person who imposes an intransigent religious meaning on some aspect of reality, and when something is done in such a disproportionate way the result is that the person must fight for that cause, a fight that is frequently violent.

What we have said up to now, may suggest that the solution to fundamentalism is relativism, that is not to assume anything in life as fundamental. Relativism is the opposite to dogmatic radicalism. But the solution is toleration in its best sense. We will see later that it doesn't mean to understand everything as of nonimportance but not to justify all means of action although they tend to attain high aims, and always leave the dialogue and personal interpretation open.

When Darwin was condemned

Fundamentalist attitudes have always existed. Nevertheless its concept is quite recent. It started to be used as a name for American protestant groups rather than to denounce negative procedure. At the beginning of this century -as R. Armengol says- a series of protestant publications appeared. They had the title: "The fundamentals. A testimony to the truth". These pieces of writings claimed to define and defend the fundamental aspects of Christianity. To do that, they used the Bible as their source of information and interpreted it in its most literal sense. They criticised Darwin because he contradicted the tale of the Creation of the Genesis. If the Holy Books have been dictated by God how is it possible to admit a mistake in any of its contents?

This attitude went so far that Darwin's theories were prohibited to be taught in some areas of E.E.U.U. These extremes were caused by an unlucky interpretation of the Bible. A fundamentalist was the person who tried to read the Bible regardless of the symbols and literary genres used in the time it was written. And as it's said it's always a mistake to take out a sentence from its context and it is also wrong not to place it in its historical moment.

Integrist Catholicism

Let's not think that protestants were the only people who fell into this kind of mistake. The word integrism was used at the end and the beginning of the twentieth century by Catholics to keep their faith and traditions pure. The problem wasn't the interpretation of the Texts but it looked like so. If Protestant fundamentalism read the Texts of the

past regardless of its context, integrism assumed the idea of tradition literally keeping off its historical context.

Besides, people refused to accept incipient human sciences and tried to find in faith the answers to all private and public problems. They declared war against modernity, naturalism, laicism and communism, basing their uncompromising fidelity on the rules given by Rome. We have to take into account that theology teachers were obliged to comply with the law that they would never support its thesis. This happened up to a few decades ago. In Spain, integrism was made into a political party by the end of the 19th century.

But not everybody who takes strange rules too seriously must be called an integrist but the one who is not open to dialogue and interpretation.

It's time now to analyse if these terms can only be applied to religious matters or if they can be found in other aspects of life.

1.2. ONLY RELIGIOUS FUNDAMENTALISM?

Having described what fundamentalisms are, another question arises: where they reveal themselves and the amplitude of this term. First, we have to find out if fundamentalism is something inborn to the religious per se. Secondly, if this behaviour is seen in other aspects of life.

We ask ourselves the first question as soon as we start to study the history of other religions. Religion wars comes soon to our minds. We should remember the Crusades, the predestined radicalism of the Calvinists and the antiliberalism of the nineteenth century Catholic Church. We can see the conflicts between Palestinians and Jews, between Sunnites and Shiites in Pakistan, between Hindus and Moslems in India, the war in Bosnia, the difficult situation in Algeria among many other problems. The list could be longer. We may have a reason for pessimism.

Nevertheless, this radicalisms are not essential in religion per se but its most radical perversion ("corruptio optimi pessima") The Catholic Church has been intolerant for many years. It has needed to be criticised from outside to plead for tolerance. But it's not difficult to perceive that this "new" value is something inborn in Christ's Message. In this way, Christianity could contribute to educate the world to be tolerant.

The existence in all religions of broad minded deep believers who are open to other attitudes and who are highly tolerant (sometimes in spite of persecution) shows that intransigence is not essential to religion per se. We must still say something else: Not only is it not essential but it is opposite to it. The meeting with a Forgiving Merciful God can't lead man to the attitude of an implacable judge. When an integrist says that his attitude is based on revealed Texts he should be asked if he looks for obedience to God or his own self security when he interprets them. We'll come back to the same subject later.

It is easy to see that intransigence goes beyond religion per se. We find intransigence in politics, in confrontation between opposite ideologies, in what has been called "market

fundamentalism", in the nazi crimes and in other extreme nationalisms, such as the one practised in Yugoslavia, E.T.A., "skinheads", etc, and also in confrontations between hooligans. Finally we also find intolerance in the scientific community. How many times has a new scientific theory been strongly criticised by other scientists who refute it with also scientific arguments? T.Kuhn (6) describes the scientific conservatism that refutes other scientific discoveries that contradict its own theories as his inability to destroy the investigations of a whole life. If this happens in science...

It can be said it's human being and not religious culture or patria that is deeply involved in fundamentalistic temptation.

We are getting near the causes of intolerance: There is a profound insecurity that keeps people from being open to other ideas, to other things, to what is different. It is true that the word "fundamentalism" adapts itself better to some ways of living religions. But political parties, institutions, movements, etc, must often interpretate their tradition of their ideological founder to renew themselves while they keep their own identity. So, it is possible a literal interpretation or adaptation to the times we live in.

We can see extremisms in history, in particular in the religious field, as the whole ancient culture was impregnated with transcendental references. Later, the breach opened by the recession of religious presence in public life, made some people, who had a strong fundamentalistic character, stick to other fundamentalist ideas. That is the case with some ideologies.

We can conclude that integrist attitudes go beyond the religious field but we will see it finds a fecund ground in it. What we are interested in now, is to study the causes of its appearance to point out the ways of hope.

2. WHY?

We, men and women, need some "basic self-confidence" that enable us to accept and assume the risk inherent in a mature life that faces what is new and different as a chance of growth. When we are lacking in this basic self-confidence, or it has been destroyed, we become inflexible and intolerant.

Our first experiences of family life build this fundamental self-confidence. Human groups live it and develop it when they live in an atmosphere of which they share the same values and which offers them a meaning of life. When the social process destroys these community experiences, society creates the appropriate atmosphere for the development of "fundamentalist personalities" who look for security in inflexible and strict groups. That's why, when neoliberalism propounds a competitive individualist society, unconsciously establishes the basis from which extreme right wing, sects, integrist and fundamentalist people spring.

2.1 POSTMODERN CULTURE: THE APPROPRIATE GROUND

Fear of technological progress

There have always been fundamentalisms, as man has always had motives for being in fear of change. Nevertheless some people are afraid of a changeable technological world and stick to their own certainties. An interesting instance can be found in some sects in the United States who have decided not to move from nineteenth century attitudes.

The film "Witness" describes one of them. Why is the way of life of the last century better than our own way of life? May be, because it is more natural? If so, why not to go to most ancient times? Should we go to the time of the caverns as a cavern is more natural than a house?

Let us think that "the artificial" means "something artistically made" that is made with our own hands. Man has always made things. To withhold from using artificial things is to deny man himself. Nevertheless we can criticise a highly technological society because it doesn't see man as a human being but as an object or as a machine. The State knows us under the number of our identity card rather than under our names, and we are valued in our jobs according to what we produce. Other characteristics of the person seem to be of no importance. The importance of numbers ends in making objects of all of us.

To shape what is natural doesn't mean to supersede or destroy it as it is happening in the Amazonia against the will of its inhabitants, and with the added risk of making the lung of the Earth disappear. Due to these excesses the world has become inhospitable for many people. It is highly revealing the impact that the stressing and dehumanising

city life produces on little village inhabitants. So we can understand that many people look for their identity in totalizing groups.

"It has always been the same..."

Security derives from the culture we live in. To some extent, culture gives us the answers to the most important questions in life (where we go, where we come from, what we should do...) Tradition and customs enable us not to be always asking ourselves the meaning of everything. Nobody would stand to arguing about everything: why we perform some ceremonies instead of others, why we wear some clothes and not others... The answer would be: "because we have always done so".

Well, what happens when our society realises that time passes, that history exists, that things haven't always been done in the same way? We become bewildered when we realise that things could be different. We start to doubt when we question our own culture. The one who is able to overcome his adolescent crisis can get to adult life. The psychologically weak person closes his mind to evidence. He makes a kind of regression to his childhood, to the world of naive certainties. Then it will be impossible to reason with him.

How can we tell an integrist that a given rite could and should be adapted to the present time? It doesn't mean to change for the sake of changing, as this would be an adolescent attitude. There is no denying the fact that man needs some kind of cultural safety (his values, traditions, beliefs, rites...). So it is not surprising that tradition becomes law. That's why every system of values tries to present itself as eternal, universal and valid for good. But you need to have an open mind to face the changes needed to keep the original feeling alive.

A fundamentalist is a person who is afraid of a life that is lacking in values and meaning and irrationally stick to "prefabricated" safeties. Everything has been questioned in the present time, a time that some people call postmodernity. The lack of absolute eternal values frightens society and it is the starting point for fundamentalism

Culture as a means of adaptation

Culture is the means man has to adapt himself to his surrounding (8). Animals use their instincts to survive. The changes are imperceptible because they have to undergo a mutation. The mutation that enables an animal to face its predators is the one that survives. But man adapts through culture. This means that man doesn't have to wait for a mutation to adapt himself to his environment. If he wants to fly, he invents the aeroplane, and if he wants to work more efficiently, he invents the computer.

The particular forms of culture are the best ways man has to face his needs. That's why the culture of a country mustn't be totally destroyed. Permanence gives legitimacy. But man has to keep up with the time he lives in and look for new ways of life. Both extremes, destruction and stagnation are equally pernicious. Each one is in fear and fights against the other without trying to reach a compromise.

In our postmodernity (it is revealing that we name our age in contrast with the last one) traditional culture undergoes its most serious crisis, and modern thought falls down too. If culture is the means we have to adapt to a changeable world, our certainties shake

when culture comes to a crisis. It was difficult for the Church to assume the changes made by Vatican II because it had stuck to the authoritarian ways of absolutism.

Fear of differences

Little by little, we can see that the integrism we are talking about is mainly a reaction. Up to now, we have talked about the fear of change, and we can also say that plurality causes panic. Plurality appears as a place of uncertainty. The only existence of other opinions is a threat to my certainties, so I need to close the doors that keep me in touch with the exterior world.

Only adults can live in a plural society. A child loses his way. An intellectually and emotionally mature person can see the good and bad side of everything or everybody. But for a child, things are good or bad without a middle way. Doesn't they ask who the good and bad people are when seeing a film? They can't understand the film when these two groups can't be delimited. But little by little he learns to appreciate the different values. Well, fundamentalists also dichotomise reality in a childish way.

They are in fear of losing their identity. To define means to see where something starts and ends. In his need for definition a fundamentalist dichotomises reality, and clearly divides it into self and non-self, into good and evil, into what must be praised and what must be destroyed. But we can say that the pedagogy that looks for what people and cultures have in common is a peace keeping pedagogy. I don't depend on my self only (10). I need the others who are different from me but who have something I haven't. This happens on all levels: personal, professional, national, ecclesiastical...

2.2 RACISM

In the event of a massive North African immigration, who wouldn't be afraid of not only losing his job but also of his country's loss of identity and traditions? Who hasn't ever thought that they could start to ask for rights to live their culture socially if there were a high number of them? Democracy should allow it in so far they were tolerant.

The "skinheads", whose ideology is national-socialist (or the followers of Le Pen in France) consider it as the loss of Spanish cultural identity, and feel under the obligation of fighting against immigrants and despise a democracy that can't do so. When confronted with that attitude the psychologically mature person asks himself: What is Spain? Many different people have crossed our country, and so it is difficult to define Spain as a closed entity without falsifying reality.

Racism is mainly caused by the feeling of threat we have when we have to live with people whose features and culture are different from our own. Rivalries between different cultural zones in Spain cannot be called racism although they are based on the same feeling of threat. If the differences are only of physical features without any cultural difference, racism does not usually appear. Who despises the black players of N.B.A?

It is a complex phenomenon. The feeling of threat starts when we have to face incompatible cultural forms and also economic competitors, mainly if they are social and economically weaker than us. Why have there never been attacks against Japanese executives or Arab sheikhs and there have been against dark-skinned North Africans?

The former have the prestige of money, power and culture, and they can create jobs. The latter are accused of all the evil of our society: unemployment, drugs, etc.

If the origin of the problem is in culture and economy, perhaps we could get rid of the word racism. Besides, hardly anybody admits to have racist feelings. But if you have the opportunity of working with skinheads you will realize they feel a strong repulsion for black people.

This fear for what is different has created a powerful defensive mechanism in them. These young people are extremely violent, although there are many other racist attitudes that are less violent. Some parents would be reluctant to accept their children living in a racial mixture.

Some people are afraid of the lack of identity in our country. "Skinheads" feel themselves called to a crusade against immigrants. We are talking about racism, but is it correct to classify human beings by races? For some time past, scientists have rejected these classifications, as they argue that these genetic differences are insignificant. It is always better to talk of ethnic differences as the term "ethnic" comprises cultural ways of life and social systems.

The human being is mainly a cultural phenomenon, and his biological side is less important. We can prevent racial prejudices if we are careful not to attach great importance to the biological side when we talk, although cultural and economic conflicts will still continue, and these form the basis of racism. Cultural conflicts can be faced with an open mind and economic ones with a personal and social generosity that overcomes self-centredness.

3. RELIGIONS AND FUNDAMENTALISM: THEY TOO OFTEN GO TOGETHER.

3.1. IS FUNDAMENTALISM INBORN IN ISLAM?

An important warning to mankind

When we finish reading the Quran we come to the conclusion that this Moslem Holy Book contains an important warning to mankind. If most of the Books of the Old Testament were written by Jews in which they tell the story of God's favours and punishments, the Quran is said to be written by God Himself in the third person to be recited by Muhammad. So, although the Quran narrates events of the past, it does so with a clear pedagogical intention. It selects short stories of people who succumbed because they did not pay attention to those who were favoured by God. Below are some examples:

He is the Irresistible, (watching)

From above over His worshippers;

And He is the Wise,

Acquainted with all things. (Q VI, 18)

God guides not the rebellious. (Q IX, 24)

Verily God is well aware of all that they do. (Q X, 36)

God doth watch over all things. (Q XXXIII, 52)

There is no God But He, Most Gracious, Most Merciful. (Q II,163)

These and many other similar expressions are constantly repeated. Apart from the narratives, we can find a large number of ways of behaviour and social structure throughout the Text. God's warning is clear: To believe in an only God and take part in the Moslem community complying with the rules. If you do so, God will have mercy on you in spite of your sins. The word "merciful" is one of the most repeated adjectives in the Quran. Not even Muhammad presents himself as perfect (Cfr Q LXXX,1).

The problem is that we find constantly repeated that "Thy Lord has at His command all Forgiveness as well as most Grievous Punishment" (Q XLI,43). The warning of a hard trial is constantly repeated. Nevertheless, a Moslem knows that nobody deserves to be punished if he does something because he does not know it is prohibited (Cfr. Q VI,54).

The West is afraid of Islam

The West is afraid that Islam can only be lived in a fundamentalist way. This apprehension is being confirmed by the news we receive from Algeria, Egypt, Sudan, Iran,... Nevertheless, all these countries are in need of recovering their own identity after colonisation. Their inferiority complex in face of the technological discoveries by western culture has been strong. The fundamentalism in which they live is a given form of nationalism. Algeria has already tried the French and the socialist political system and now they cry for their own solution. Apart from this, we have to take into account the corruption of its politicians and the extreme poverty of a population whose birth rate is higher than the increase in economy.

This situation makes us forget that the Islamic culture was much more advanced than ours in the past. As we have seen, fundamentalism has a great deal to do with how we interpret the Texts. Up to the tenth century, there was a lot of freedom of interpretation in Islam (12). This was the era of *Ijtihad* which means the effort a believer must make to understand the message of the Texts. The mystical and intellectual (13) development was great at that time (14).

Nevertheless, the fear of too heterodox interpretations ended in free interpretation being prohibited. A believer must go to the appropriate institution. The *doors of Ijtihad* are declared closed. From what we have said up to now, we can infer that any view of the past will be taken from a discontextualizing position on account of the impossibility of adapting the religious language to new circumstances.

The possibility of a tolerant Islam

Will Islam be able to escape from today's fundamentalism? Many intellectual Moslems feel the need of a new opening of "the door of *ijtihad*". It is true that the news we get from some Arab countries is sometimes terrific. The task is not easy, but neither was Vatican II easy. Besides, who could have predicted in the last century that the Church would undergo so many changes?

We could fall under the temptation of saying that it is easier for us to accept the values of tolerance, dialogue, freedom, etc, because the Gospel says we have to love our enemies and we have to forgive all offences. It is true that the Gospel is very different from the Quran. Nevertheless, Islam is not without the elements that could make possible a more open way of thinking. For example, Islam does not oblige non-believers to comply with its law. This theoretical principle has normally been respected. Non-Muslims were only under the obligation to pay the taxes that were the alms a well-off Moslem had to pay.

The problem with the Quran is that the duties of the religious Texts are mixed with the political duties, but many Moslems can distinguish the importance of each. To interpret some rules according to the times and adapt them to the present means to make a non-fundamentalist interpretation.

Sometimes we feel horrified to see that the Quran contains concepts such as the law of retaliation or the Holy War. But this is not strange, as the Quran tries to organise

society. *An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth* meant a step ahead in the justice of that time as it said the same treatment, not a worse one. Jesus goes beyond that rule and forgives his enemies on the Cross. Nevertheless, justice in our countries is guided by the "law of retaliation" rather than of forgiveness although it is said that the main function of our prisons is to help wrong-doers to rejoin society. Besides, the Quran also provides the possibility of renouncing to the law of retaliation in an act of expiation. (Cfr Q V,45)

As to the Holy War (15) we can say that it is a spiritual concept rather than a military one. It is the inner fight against the evil that besets us (16). It is also a military war if Moslem faith is attacked or put into serious danger (Cfr Q VIII,39) but there is the prohibition of going too far in punishing enemies (Cfr. Q II,190).

The possibility of a tolerant interpretation of Islam would be more real and coherent. Christianity has surpassed it, because we have undergone the Enlightenment and the Catholic Church stagnation has been continually criticised. In the end, the Church has accepted modernity and Bible study from the point of view of philology, sociology, history, etc, although some opposition and obstacles have to be overcome. Islam has not settle this matter. They have not studied the Quranic Text scientifically. That explains why they deny that some contents of the Book reached Muhammad through his contact with Christians and Jews. According to them, the Text was dictated by God through an Angel, and Muhammad added nothing.

The difficulty for a religious intercourse is not in the differences between the two theologies, but in their seeing things from different paradigms. Christianity from modernity and Islam from a historically less mature position.

A tolerant interpretation of Islam is possible. Christianity went under Enlightenment: was forced to study the Bible from the point of view of philology, sociology, history... Let's see why religion has frequently been lived from fundamentalist positions. May it not be that it has some theological points that fundamentalists interpret wrongly?

3.2. POINTS THAT HELP FUNDAMENTALISM

Pardon and punishment

Religious experience should not lead to intolerance as we come into relation with God who is absolute Goodness. The portrait of a severe and punishing God is a projection of our desires of revenge and our need of social "order". Our justice understands the law of retaliation, the compensation of offences. But what is God's Justice?

We can see in the Gospel that the workers who arrive at work last, get the same amount of money as the ones who have been working all day long. This generosity with the workers who arrive last seems to us an injustice. Pardon goes beyond justice. If in the soul of a religious man there is a deep experience of undeserved pardon, it is not possible from here to give rise to intolerant attitudes. On the contrary, this must be the pattern to treat other people.

Nevertheless, the experience of pardon impels us to fight against evil. From now, the believer may feel the temptation of fighting with different weapons from the ones God

has used with him. God detests evil but He deeply loves the person who does it. A human being finds it difficult to make this distinction and tends to eliminate both.

On the other hand, some masochistic personalities look for and need to be punished. They are reluctant to accept pardon and want to redeem themselves. Such people will find in their pathological interpretation of religion a personal reassurance. They could also break down reality into the concepts of good and evil.

The temptation to control and know God

All religions assume that God has revealed Himself to man. God wants to come into contact with His creatures to give Himself to them and communicate with them. He wants to help man to find happiness and with this intention, He prescribes ways of behaving and reveals something of Who He is. One of the biggest temptations is the desire to know God completely. To know God means to know the greatest mystery, and so to know all the enigmas, as everything is in God, and the fundamentalist thinks he can control all his insecurity at last. The mystic's longing for God has a completely different origin: He wants to see God to come into full relation with his Belover but he does not try to control Him. He is conscious of His transcendence.

The great temptation of religions is to define God completely in order to control Him. God is beyond our reason and all the concepts ascribed to Him are human concepts that may point towards what God is but He defies definition. God is always bigger, always new and surprising. He is beyond any definition.

Saint John's first letter says that nobody has ever seen God (1Jn 4,12). In the Old Testament Moses wants to see God. Nevertheless, he can only get some flashes of His Back (Ex 33,23). Moslems tell their prayers while counting beads on a rosary, which they consist of repeating the ninety-nine (17) characteristics of God. The number one hundred is omitted to express "the impossibility for humans to grasp God's ultimate essence". (18)

But the temptation to control God is always present and it is not difficult to think it can be achieved through the revealed Text. It is only a question of closing the door to new interpretations. We have seen that Islam closed the door to new interpretations in the tenth century and Catholicism allowed only the Church's hierarchy to make the correct interpretation of the texts. Protestants fought against that.

The other extreme is not without danger. Since there are wrong interpretations there must be someone to sanction them. However, this person must be open to the new studies of the Holy Texts.

The concept of Revelation

Man must be talked to in human language to be able to understand what God wants to reveal. Jews received the Ten Commandments, Christianity received a God made Man and Islam received the Quran dictated by God through an angel. In all these religions, God wants to communicate with man, but He has to do it in a language man can understand. This incarnation of the message, or the adaptation of God to cultural and historical period, is an essential element against fundamentalism. So a religion must keep what is essential and adapt it to the times, so that the message can be intelligible.

It does not mean changing the message, but rather keeping it alive.

Christianity has an advantage over Islam in this task, as Christianity understands that God does not dictate to man. The Bible has been revealed by God but not dictated. God speaks to man's heart and he will try to put into words his experience of the Deity. So the Bible conveys a true experience of God through an intelligible and suitable language for that culture and vision. Nowadays it is necessary to extract from the Text what is essential and adapted it to our language, although it is not always absolutely possible.

If you consider that the Holy Text has been framed by human beings but inspired by God and that this inspiration respects personal and historical particularities, we can find it easier to accept that there are things that must be adapted to the new vision of things. But what happens when revelation has been dictated? Angel Gabriel is sent to Muhammed to reveal him the Quran. Its extraordinary poetical beauty is one of the reasons for Moslems to support this concept of revelation:

This Quran is not such as can be produced by other than God; On the contrary it is a confirmation of (revelations) that went before it, and a fuller explanation of the Book - wherein there is no doubt- from the Lord of the Worlds. Or do they say, "He forged it"? Tell me: "Bring then a Sura like unto it, and call (to your aid) anyone you can, besides God, if it be ye speak the truth! (Q X, 37-38)

Nobody could have ever written such *sures* (chapters). To understand revelation in this way makes it difficult to extract the content from the frame. Besides it deifies the classical Arabic as it was the language through which Revelation was made. If God has spoken, who can dare to change His words to adapt to new cultures and new times? That explains why people who are not Moslem are not allowed to read the Quran in Arabic (Cfr. Q LVI,79) and the translations are permitted if they can convert non-believers to the true faith. I remember when a Moroccan person asked me to cross some sentences written in Arabic before throwing the piece of paper to the dustbin, as a sign of respect for God's language. This kind of attitude is not general but it shows the danger of believing in a dictated revelation.

Moslems consider the Quran as self-sufficient. Everything you have to believe is there. This is why some Moslems have gone to the extreme of believing that the Quran contains the predictions of the scientific discoveries of the last centuries. Curiously enough this does not appear to be the idea that old Islamic authors want to convey.

But, if God has talked, who can dare change His words to adapt them to new people and new times? It seems the Quran does not give room for an interpretative study based on the context, the genesis of the Text and the meaning of words in their times. But it is not impossible. It should be enough to think that God has communicated with man at a given moment in history, with a given language to be understood by those people, and He would now convey the same message in a different way. It does not mean changing the original Text, which has a value in itself, and replacing it by a more modern one, but rather interpreting it in the light of new times.

The mission of making the message known

When a person loves something, he feels the desire to make it known. Human beings

feel propelled to share their joy, and so the person who can experience God's immense Love feels the need to make other people share his joy. The life that God produces in man is so expansive that needs to be preached.

This explains why Christianity and Islamism are passionate preachers of their message. They propose a way of life of plenitude. They both find in their Holy Texts clear orders to preach. On the other hand Judaism is unable to break its blood links: The Jews are the Chosen. Christianity and Islamism overcome that sectarianism, and invite all cultures and races to join the way of salvation. The concept of "the elect" spreads now to Christians and Moslems. But, because of this universality of their messages, they can fall into the rejection of any other way.

The sentence that said "there is no salvation out of the Church" is famous (for example, Boniface VIII in 1302) When religion is understood in this way, preaching becomes an anguishing imperative. Those who do not bring conversions, will not achieve salvation. Having said this, we have put the foundations to justify the Crusades and other methods of Evangelisation, including force. And it is logical, as any fundamentalist would say, since the salvation of many people is at stake.

Islam has also fallen into these mistakes whenever it has legitimised wars, on the plea of being Holy Wars. It feels especially called to fight against politeism and atheism. Nevertheless it is tolerant with Christianity and Judaism, as it says that the God of the Christians and the God of the Jews is the same God as theirs since God has also talked to man through these religions. The sentence that says "there is no salvation out of the Church" is famous. When religion is understood in this way, preaching becomes an anguishing imperative. Those who do not bring conversions, will not achieve salvation.

The solution to the problems caused by the desire of expansion is not to give up preaching but to respect what is different. From Vatican II the Church has been able to see positive aspects in non-religious organisations. God speaks to man but not only within the Church. This is a step to stop breaking down the world between good and evil, Christians and non-Christians.

The Church and the State

The Church has many times fallen into the temptation of identifying itself with the system in power. The Church got some benefits from it, but it has been forgotten that the Kingdom is not still in its plenitude among us, and that there are many things to change and improve. From this point of view, the Church should always be in some kind of opposition. Besides, Christianity is not so much concerned with the rules that a State chooses to govern by as much as with the principles of solidarity, justice and equality that all countries should try to achieve.

Nevertheless, Islam can not be understood without its identification with power, because it must guide its people both in material or spiritual matters. The Caliphate assumes political and religious power. Islam takes it for granted that religion can not be lived individually as it is also a social matter. This explains why it not only has rules that refer to the cult but also rules on how to organise society. The Quran has also a set of rules that regulates the government of the Muslim society. Islamic law is not compulsory for people who are not Moslems. This explains why, when this law is to be

the law of the State, it is supposed that its people are mainly Moslems. A surprising example of tolerance of the first Arab invaders with the native Christian people is *Teodomiro's covenant* (21).

When there is a great uniformity in a State (when most of its people are Moslems) this system is possible. But it collapses when there is a mixture of peoples with different beliefs. So, therefore, Islam lives in a permanent desire of independence to be able to govern itself under its own rules.

Identification with power is dangerous as the power of the State can be used to impose religion. Violence can be used as a means of persuasion. In theory, it is easier for Christianity to avoid this temptation as Jesus did not give a list of rules but a way of living. Besides, Jesus places Himself beyond the law, and feels free to make any interpretation and exception to prevent the rule from becoming unjust. We can see that Jesus also cures on Saturday, while Muhammad is a subject to the law. He has come to make it known and comply with it. Muhammad receives a word and Jesus is *The Word*. So therefore, to follow Jesus implies to be always on the look out to discern whether at any given moment it is necessary to make an exception in the rules to achieve a higher good. He who believes in Jesus follows a living Man and not a set of rules.

4. WAYS OF HOPE

4.1 NOTES FOR ACTION

A matter of sensibility

The problem of how to solve fundamentalist radicalism is very complex. If the main cause is fear of insecurity, of what is different, our teaching attitude must mainly impinge on this point. It is a matter of sensibility. It is necessary to learn how to appreciate other people's beliefs. But the work to be carried out is not so much of knowledge as of experience. It is difficult, or rather impossible, to have a rational conversation with fundamentalists. It is impossible to reach an understanding because he does not simply look for the most logical and rational solution but rather for the one that makes him feel more secure. In other words, only the experience of what is different enriches and strengthens me, instead of intimidating me, can make it possible for me to reach maturity.

Education

Teaching begins within the family. The parents are the first who accompany a child in the discovery of his surroundings. When he walks, held by the hand of a person who makes him feel safe, he dares look for something new, and little by little, he becomes aware that what is different is an amazing source. A marvellous world to discover is opened before his eyes. It is essential to maintain his curiosity. Traumatic experiences will teach him to take precautions, and if they are stronger than he can assimilate he might close himself to the experience. It is important that he first reacts with interest and amazement rather than fear.

His parents are the first "others" he meets, and this is why this first relationship is of great importance. If this were traumatic he would be under the risk of considering every unknown person as a potential enemy.

Education continues in school. He will meet his equals there and will often rivalize with them. Nevertheless, the experience of friendship will help him to trust others. Friendly meetings with different races will teach him to appreciate and respect what is different. In this sense, schools have a very important role to play. We should promote intercultural schools where different cultures could get into contact; where this is not possible and if it isn't possibly, why not organise mixed holiday camps? I think we should aim at a specific target: building up conditions in which intercultural friendship can be possible. If we get this, we shall have taken a long step towards finishing with racism.

When these vital experiences have been fully assimilated, it is time to prop up the need to respect other ways of thinking. Philosophy and History can be useful to achieve this. At this stage we emphasise the importance of knowledge.

If we were a little more philosophical and investigative...

In general, Philosophy predisposes a person to be critical when facing an affirmation: Before accepting it as valid he will study it. A philosopher looks for the truth and thus explaining why he always keep a door open to change his mind if he realises that he was wrong or if he realises that there is truth in another thought. The philosopher's attitude is the opposite to the narrowmindness of a fundamentalist. He takes an interest in different opinions from his own to analyse its values.

History is another essential instrument for criticism. History teaches us that all cultures change in time. It makes us realise that the customs we see as unchangeable are not eternal but have their origin in history. To say that "they have always been like this" it is not valid.

But not only does history throw light on historical changes but also on the roots that link us with the past. Under all transformations there are certain things that go on unchangeable. So therefore, history confers identity on people.

It also enlightens us on the mistakes of mankind in the past. It teaches us the experience that man has obtained, in order not to repeat those mistakes but to bring certain achievements up to date. When we forget the horror of nazism, we will run the risk of living it again.

It is ill-fated to limit the teaching of history to our country. We should also teach our students the history of our neighbours, in particular of Arabs, reminding them that they had a higher culture than ours in the Middle Ages. We should emphasize, when teaching natural sciences, that a man of colour is not a primitive stage in evolution but a different branch of the first hominids who were neither black nor white. Finally, we should promote trips to the Third World. There, we would value their culture from their point of view, and then, we would never see them as inferior. Even more, when we see that they prefer their culture to ours we will ask ourselves: When will we overthrow Eurocentrism? Might it not be possible that developed countries were human and culturally more degraded?

Immigration

The fact of having been born within some frontiers makes an individual citizen of that country and thenceforth has the rights and obligations set by law. But why can not a foreigner get that nationality if he agrees to comply with the rules?

It is symptomatic that we fight for equal opportunities within our borders and not beyond them. We are often lacking in a broad universal sight. The help given by rich countries to underdeveloped ones is still considered as charity gestures that serve their own interest rather than justice.

We should teach our students the history of Moslem countries, reminding them that they had a higher culture than ours in the Middle Ages.

Many peoples have crossed our country and left their mark. They are part of our identity. Immigrations are enriching, not only because they allow a mutual influence between two cultures but because the people who emigrate are usually the most

capable (24). It is also true that immigration in excess may provoke strong negative reactions in some sectors of the population. Therefore immigration should be allowed at a suitable rate and should be allowed to spread throughout the country in a homogeneous way. It is not good to form large groups of immigrants because they can result in a ghetto situation.

A country behaves like a liquid: It cannot dissolve any number of immigrants, but the power to dissolve changes according to temperature. In a country this power is the level of consciousness and openness.

We should always try to achieve the maximum integration of those who come to our country. But where do we have to integrate them? If all the immigrants start to live in the slums, we can take for granted that they will live the violence and drug-taking of those areas. We cannot be surprised if there is a high number of North Africans in prison. It is not that they come from where they come but because they live where they live.

4.2 HOPE OF DIALOGUE

Nobody has an absolute point of view

Nobody can take in all of reality at a glance. If we look at a cube, for instance, we can only see three of its sides. When we turn it to see the other three, we realise that the first ones have disappeared from our sight. The same thing happens when we debate topical issues: Two people are looking at the same object but they cannot agree with each other because they see it from their own point of view, which depends on their own character, history, economic level, place of living, etc. There is some truth in both reasoning.

Dialogue is the means we use to convey our meaning. To dialogue is not easy. To see the truth in other people's points we must forget our point of view for a second and try to see things from their side. We have to move to be able to see the cube from another angle. We are overcome by panic while we move to the other side because we have lost sight of our point of view, of our convictions, of our certainties and we still have not formed new ones.

The mass media can play an important role in the promotion of dialogue and respect. Nevertheless, debates often show the most extreme ideas to increase the impact. They help to break down the problems.

The first reason for being tolerant is that nobody has the absolute point of view. We need others. They enrich us because their history, experiences and so on, place them in an unique position.

But how can we be wise and tolerant?

Being aware of our limitations forces us to be tolerant, and not to reject other points of view too quickly. Nowadays the decay of leading ideologies and the relativism in many fields of thought has led to consider tolerance as an essential democratic value.

But this concept of tolerance as a simple weakness of thought is still dangerous. If I

believe something for certain, why must I be tolerant?

The challenge we have to face is: How can we be wise and tolerant? To answer this question, we could give reasons for being tolerant not only to wise people but to those who think they are.

1) Some subjects are not worthy of confrontation. A wise person is the one who not only knows but who knows to place things in their right place. He will attach just the right importance to everything. A wise man will be in disagreement to many issues but he will be aware that only some very essential ones are worth devoting his whole life. He will tolerate minor errors, because an aggressive attitude can cause more evil. On the contrary, a fundamentalist can give or "demand" his life for unimportant subjects. He cannot place each problem in its right place.

2) Tolerance and respect for people's dignity are higher values than the "certainties" that each group could force on their fellow citizens. A wise person will try to defend his ideas against what he considers to be his fellow citizen's error, but he will have to do it with the means given by democratic legality. A radical person will use violence to achieve his goal, instead of democratic means. A dictator thinks that the end justifies the means.

3) It is necessary to "distinguish between the sin and the sinner". The Christian order "love your enemies" can only be lived when we distinguish between the subject and his actions. In this way, we can avoid evil, be intolerant with it and tolerant and sympathetic with the wrongdoer. Every human being is worthy of being loved, due to the fact that he is God's son. The other is my brother, and therefore I accept him with all his frailties. But this concept of tolerance as a simple weakness of thought is still dangerous. If I believe something for certain, why must I be tolerant?

4.3 ARE THERE LIMITS TO TOLERANCE?

From the three reasons for being tolerant we can gather: Firstly, we can tolerate unimportant errors. Secondly, we must always tolerate and respect the individual. Thirdly, we must be intolerant with Evil but not with "wrongdoers".

Tolerance is not the same as to consider valid or to allow all points of view or all acts. It would be wrong to think so. But where does tolerance say 'Stop'? Which are the contents that we put into the concept of Evil. A fundamentalist fills the concept of Evil with too much content. For him an unreasonable number of things seems intolerable.

We can now say that the limit to tolerance is in the respect of human rights. Human rights are those minimum rights all countries have agreed to, and which must be preserved as essential for human coexistence, where people's dignity is respected.

Basically, there are two groups of rights. Some refer to individual freedom (association, political participation, private property, the right to go in and out of the country, the right of life) and others that could be called social rights (equality of opportunities, education, Social Security, a proper job and salary, and to have use of all social, cultural and economic rights to lead a decent life...)

The legitimacy of these rights is in the fact that they are not particular rights of a

country, but have been approved by the United Nations. It is true that it is a Western formulation, but beyond this, there is an underlying universal meaning. The reason is that every rational clear-sighted person who is free, and has the desire to attain goodness, can conclude (beyond the above formulation) that these rights must be preserved.

So therefore, we must fight against all kind of transgression of fundamental rights and we must never be tolerant with intolerant people. This does not mean that the fight against intolerance can violate the rights it tries to defend. In short, tolerance is inadmissible when facing poverty, oppression and slavery. If we take this seriously, we will realize that we should stop tolerating so much hunger in the world, so much poverty in the Fourth World and so much unemployment in our cities.

4.4. CONTRADICTIONS OF FUNDAMENTALISM

We know that fundamentalism also refers to a particular way of interpreting religious Texts. We shall now show that this interpretation is false and that it often falls into contradictions.

Reading literally is impossible

The branch of knowledge that studies how to interpret the Scriptures, law texts, etc, is called hermeneutics. The hermeneutists have been objecting to literal reading for many years (26). It seems strange at first sight. This expression is popularly used to urge somebody to interpret with objectivity, regardless of his own interest. We can accept it when it does not imply anything else.

But we soon find the first contradiction: Fundamentalists belonging to different Christian Churches cannot agree with one another. A fundamentalist is a person who attempts to read the Scriptures literally. But, how is it possible that two people who say they interpret a text literally can come to such different conclusions? How is it possible that a Jehovah Witness, a Protestant or a Catholic fundamentalist live religion so differently? Why has the same Text been interpreted in such different ways in history. *To read is to interpret.* It is me, the son of a particular culture that comes into contact with a piece of writing of the past. Fundamentalists are not aware of this fact.

We are not defending the validity of all kind of interpretation. What we have to ask ourselves is what meaning it wants to convey now, instead of what meaning it wanted to convey in the past (interesting as it may be). We shall clarify this in the next paragraph.

We are followers rather than imitators of Jesus

Sometimes it can be very interesting to know what Jesus meant when He preached to His disciples. Nevertheless, it is more important for us to know what He means today. To bring the Message up to date, we have to know exactly the historical context Jesus lived in.

From Jesus' way of behaviour we can deduct inspiring principles that can guide our action, rather than particular and exacting ways of behaving. We may be able to elaborate some present valid norms from these principles. The celebration of the

Eucharist is different now to the celebration made by the first Christians and also as it was celebrated fifty years ago. It is unimportant if the rite is the same or different; the important thing is that the message is invariable. What is required to be expressed will adopt the appropriate symbols of the time in question, which all share the same reference point.

A fundamentalist imitates, and when imitating he takes things out of context. A Christian takes Jesus' attitudes and tries to put them into practice. But it is the Spirit Who makes us see the message, in the light of the times. Although it is not a mathematical problem, we often treat it as a rule of three. If Jesus behaved like that in those days how must we act nowadays? Thanks to Human Sciences (History, Sociology...) we know the historical context Jesus lived in and the context we live in now, and we also know how Jesus lived through the testimony of the apostles. An example: Jesus went ahead of his time in the appreciation of woman: How must she be appreciated at present? Woman's role in society has changed. Thus her function cannot be limited to the function she had in those days.

Symbolical language of the religious Texts

There is an aspect we can not forget. Religion uses a symbolic language to convey the meaning of transcendence. A symbol is something regarded as representing something else in order that an abstract concept can be seen. A pigeon, for instance, symbolises peace when carrying an olive branch. The symbol has always some characteristic of what it tries to symbolise.

A fundamentalist thinks that the religious language is similar to the scientific one. That is why he cannot understand some Biblical Texts. The creation of Adam and Eve from mud has never claimed to be scientific, but a way to explain we are God's creatures and that Evil is caused by man not by God.

Catechists often used the image of an old man with a white beard to represent God's Goodness. It is a symbol. It would not make any sense if a boy one day complained to his catechist that God has no a beard. An adolescent that can not realise that God has been explained to him through symbols can react in two different ways: He can either reject Faith because he does not believe in a God with a beard or blindly believe that God has a beard because he has always been taught so. The latter is a fundamentalist. Neither has understood that religion per se uses symbols to convey its meaning. These two attitudes are respectively present in 19th century Atheism and Fundamentalism. But the symbol is like a finger that points to the beyond. As it has been said, "the stupid person is the one who keeps staring at the finger".

The concept of God as a Father is also analogical. We use it spontaneously, inferring what we mean. A Christian never considers himself as a "son" in a physiological sense. Fundamentalists mistake of interpretation is similar to the mistake of those who claim that God is Father in a physiological way because Jesus teaches us the Lord's Prayer.

Contradictions in the same Text

The Holy Bible is formed by a good number of books written by many different authors. It is not surprising we can find contradictory opinions in a literal interpretation. This kind of interpretation can give rise to a serious conflict. For example: What is the true genealogy of Jesus: the one presented by Matthew (Mt 1,1) or the one proposed by Luke (Lc 3,23)? They are both discordant. The Evangelists, taken literally, may present a good many number of historical contradictions. But, from this point of view, the Old Testament and the New Testament are irreconcilable: Whether to follow the Mosaic law or the new instructions given by Jesus. Most Christians are conscious of the pre-eminence of the New Testament, as Jesus breaks with many traditional rules. This means that we should not read the Old Testament literally but under the light of the New Testament and Resurrection. The passage about the disciples on the Road to Emaus is revealing. They become aware of the meaning of Jesus' Life and of all the Scriptures of the Old Book when walking with Jesus Resurrected. They disregard literal interpretation to do it under the light of the Spirit.

Some time ago, some friends of mine who were Jehovah's Witnesses tried to convince me of the need of complying wholly and literally with the whole Bible. To refute it I asked them why they did not observe the Sabbath and many other rules present in the Bible and I urged them to become Jews.

Finally, we can say that the presence of the Spirit in Christian theology is crucial in the fight against fundamentalism. Before dying, Jesus tells his disciples they will understand later what is going on in the light of Resurrection and with the help of the Spirit. So Jesus' life attains all Its meaning after Resurrection, so there is always a point from which to interpret things.

Besides, thanks to The Holy Spirit, man has been constantly interpreting Revelation throughout history. So the Gospels are not dead texts, as the Spirit allows us to understand and put them into practice in our time.

4.5. INTERRELIGIOUS DIALOGUE

A Christian must be tolerant by reason of our God's example. God has tolerated Evil even though He has made man free. From the Tale of the Flood, God has committed Himself never to destroy His people, even though they turn against Him. But God has shown us through Jesus, the way He has chosen to face intolerance: Jesus dies on the Cross (27). He tolerates what seems intolerable. His proposal, which is radical and incomprehensible, is to love your enemies. Jesus felt the temptation to use power, fame and money (the three temptations) to fight against evil to restore His Kingdom. Yet He rejects coercive methods and chooses love and dialogue.

These co-ordinates define the point from which we can dialogue with other religions. Unfortunately this dialogue between Christians, Islam and Judaism is often non-existent. A fundamentalist will say that dialogue is only for religions that feel weak or for those who doubt their beliefs, but not for them. The points of view are so far apart that it is difficult to make the effort to put oneself in the other person's place.

But the great hope is not in the use of words but in the devotion to mysticism and the poor.

To work with the poor

The devotion to the poorest in society is a language we can all understand. It is something that every human being of every culture can see as praiseworthy, provided he is not looking for his own interest. Religions unite at this point. Most of the members of religious orders present in North Africa are devoted to assist the most in need. That explains why they are deeply loved and appreciated by the people. They are a truly living testimony of faith.

Judaism is constantly drawing people's attention towards the poorest, in particular toward orphans and widows. Islam demands from its followers the "zakat" or obligatory contribution for the poor. This contribution is a percentage of his income. Christianity has Jesus' example that brings into life the concept of charity (in Greek: "agape"). Charity is the love we feel for those who have less than we have and we share with them what we have. We renounce having what the other does not have. Finally, non-believers also appreciate that devotion and generosity. As a paradigm, the French Revolution has provided them with the ideals of equality and fraternity.

So, when working for justice and the poorest, Jews, Moslems, Christians and non-believers can not just understand one another, but can also collaborate together.

Mysticism

Mysticism is the other big hope. But who is "the mystic"? It is not the person who remains in the Tabor or the one who withdraws from the world and concentrates only on God. It is the one who looks the reality through God's eyes. Although they sometimes emphasise aspects of their own religion, mystics of all religions understand one another and talk the same language: God's love. As all mystics rise towards the Holy One, they all look on the world in a similar way. God is Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End of everything. All of Creation is personified in Him, and He unifies those who approach Him. A mystic understands another mystic because they have the same point of view: God. That is why the prayer meetings of members of different religions are not difficult but profitable. They do not fall into fundamentalism because they are sadly aware of the distance between God and them.

True mystics are greatly generous because from God they have understood what is really important. Their longing is towards God (28). That explains why they live in poverty and give everything they have to those in need. Who is "the mystic"? It is not the person who remains in the Tabor nor the one who withdraws from the world and concentrates only on God. It is the one who looks the reality through God's eyes. Mystics of all religions understand one another and talk the same language: God's love. Mystics of all religions understand each other because they all see the institution of their religions as relative. Due to this attitude they have often been considered heretical. They see the Institution as a means to reach God, but not as an end in itself. Institutions do not despise it, they value it a lot. But they value it as a means.

We can therefore conclude, that we will not need to talk about tolerance when we are capable of living in a mystical way.

NOTES

1. I follow Rogeli Armengol, "El fundamentalismo de las personas y de los grupos humanos" in: Enrique de la Lama, "En defensa de la tolerancia: crítica de los Fundamentalismos", ed. Llar del Llibre, Barcelona 1994.
2. Rogeli Armengol, p.13.
3. About the history of Protestant fundamentalism see: Jean Paul Willaime, "El fonamentalisme protestant" in "El fonamentalisme", ed. Cruïlla, Barcelona 1994, p. 31-45.
4. See "Sillabus o corrección de los errores modernos" in E.Denzinger, "El magisterio de la Iglesia", tr. D.Ruiz Bueno, ed.Herder, Barcelona 1963, n.1700.
5. See "Juramento contra los errores del modernismo" in: E.Denzinger n.2145.
6. T.Kuhn, "La estructura de las revoluciones científicas", tr. A.Contín, F.C.E., Madrid 1982, p. 224-246.
7. The term belongs to Eriksson, "Infancia y sociedad", Hormé, Buenos Aires 1973, quoted in Hortal, in "Ética, 1.Los autores y sus circunstancias", Universidad Pontificia de Comillas, Madrid 1994 p. 61.
8. M.Corbí, "La religió que ve", ed. Claret 1991, p. 16
9. Cfr. M.Corbí, p.28.
10. Cfr. Hegel, "Fenomenología del Espíritu", vol.I, chap.IV. SS 10,11,12.
11. *The Holy Quran*, Text, Translation and Commentary, A.Yusuf Ali, Ed. Amana Corp., Maryland 1983
12. M^{ra} Teresa de Borbón Parma, "Magreb: Nuestro Poniente Próximo", ed. Libertarias, Madrid 1994, p. 33.
13. About Islam tolerance the best thing to do is to see the Sufi mystic. A good introduction is the piece of writing by E.Galindo, "El sufismo, corazón del Islam", p.41-60, ed. Popular, Madrid 1992.
14. For an exhaustive analysis of the Islamic thought throughout history as well as a good deal of bibliography see M.Cruz-Hernandez, "Historia del pensamiento islámico", vol.I,II,III, ed. Alianza, Madrid 1996.
15. To know the relationship between the terms Ijtihad (effort of interpretation) and jihad (badly translated as "Holy War") see: E.Galindo, "El Islam al final del siglo XX", ed. SM. Madrid 1996, p. 34-37.
16. See M.Corbí, "La religió que ve", ed. Claret, Barcelona 1991, p. 190.
17. To know what these ninety-nine names are see: Jacques Jomier, "Para conocer el Islam", tr. A.Ortiz García, ed. Verbo Divino, Estella 1989, p.41. We recommend this work for those who wish a good, clear and pedagogical introduction to Islam.
18. C.Cuevas, "El pensamiento del Islam", ed. Istmo, Madrid 1972, p.105. About the number one hundred: R.Caspar, "Para una visión cristiana del Islam", ed. Sal Terrae, Santander 1995, tr. R.Sanchís. If you prefer this subject from the Moslem apology with a whole compilation of the Quranic texts see: Dr.Maneh Hammad Al Johani, "Jesús en el Islam", ed. Centro Islámico en España, Madrid 1991. Tr. A. Maher Safi.
20. Bula Unam Sanctam in: E.Denzinger, "El magisterio de la Iglesia", ed.Herder, Barcelona 1963, n. 468.
21. See: P.Chalmeta, "Invasión e islamización", ed.Mafre, Madrid 1994, p. 215-216.
22. About the psychological causes of fundamentalism see: V.Hernández, "Fundamentalismo, narcisismo y psicosis", in E.de la Lama "En defensa de la tolerancia".
23. For a revealing comparative survey and agreeable reading of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, from the point of view of the evolution of thought of each of them see: Karen Armstrong, "Una historia de Dios", ed.Paidós, Barcelona 1995, tr. R.A. Díez

Aragón.

24. About this matter a surprising survey was made that showed that the death rate of the Moroccan emigrants to France is lower than the death rate of the French. See: Youssef Courbage, "La moralité et les causes de décès des Marocains en France 1979-1991" in: "Population, Revue bimestrelle de l'Institut national d'Études démographiques, 50e année, Janvier-Février 1995, numéro 1.

25. Very significant theory in Habermas. For example in: "Teoría de la acción comunicativa", ed. Cátedra, Madrid 1994, p.153, tr.M.Jiménez Redondo.

26. In my concept of interpretation I follow H.G.Gadamer, "Verdad y método", ed.Sígueme, Salamanca 1991, tr.A.Agudo Aparicio.

27. About Jesus and tolerance see: M.Muñoz: "Tolerancia y experiencia cristiana de Dios", in "La Tolerancia", Revista Sal Terrae, Junio 1995, v.83/6 (n.980), Santander.

28. The piece of writing about the Sufi mystics by C.Vega is very revealing. C.Vega, "La cara oculta del Islam: los místicos sufíes" in: "Conocer el Islam", Revista Sal Terrae, Mayo 1996, v. 84/5 (n.990) Santander.

© *Cristianisme i Justícia*, Roger de Llúria 13, 08010 Barcelona

Telf: 93 317 23 38; Fax: 93 317 10 94;

espinal@redestb.es; www.fespinal.com