



APPENDICES

1. In addition to these twelve appendices, the *Companion CD-ROM* features an additional 14. Access to some very scarce, if not rare, documents puts you in a privileged position. Enjoy your status!
2. Some documents are in the Hausa language. Non-Hausa readers, please remember that my primary target is Nigeria and, within Nigeria, the North and the Middle Belt, both places where Hausa is widely spoken.
3. Logic, mood or level of language are not the main criteria used in the selection of the documents included, though they do play a role, of course. Main criteria are originality and representative nature, admittedly sort of contradictory.
4. I have taken the liberty to correct some of the more blatant linguistic or grammatical errors.
5. Some of the copies of documents are in such bad shape that they were illegible in places. I marked those places.

▲ APPENDIX 1

SECULARISM, SHARIA AND THE NIGERIAN CONSTITUTION

by Banu Az-Zubair¹

Recurrent dissatisfaction with the politics and economics of a nation by its citizenry, the subsequent debates it ushers in and the demand for improvements or alternative set-ups are the hallmark of most democracies. Such perturbations as are going on in Nigeria, in my view, represent a robust manifestation of an evolving democracy; committed citizens trying to fulfil a fundamental responsibility of their citizenship. The principles that should guide all concerned in pursuing that noble goal is fairness, due consideration and love of peace. It is with these principles in mind that I address the issues of secularism, Sharia and the Nigerian Constitution. In so doing, I seek peace - a permanent peace to enable our beloved country to forge ahead with all its potential and compete equally with other nations. It is my view that peace can only be achieved when there is an acceptable, fair, stable and responsible government.

The single most important factor that would engender the general stability of the country now, and in the future, is the type of state or government Nigeria operates. Our founding fathers bequeathed to us Federalism. I believe the choice of a federal system of government was based on fairness, due consideration and immense sense of duty and responsibility. But why did our founding fathers choose federalism? What is the link between the state and secularism? What about the Sharia? What does it mean and what is its relevance to Muslims? How would the existence of Sharia affect non-Muslims in Nigeria? These and other questions will be addressed in this piece.

There are several types of government with different methods and systems of governance (democratic, liberal, totalitarian, etc.). These political ideologies are derived historically from the experi-

ence and consciousness of the Graeco-Roman traditions, which subsequently greatly influenced the Judeo-Christian traditions. Thus these concepts are of concern to us because they represent Western Culture and Civilization and/or Judeo-Christian traditions.

As is well known, the Nigerian society consists of two predominant religious groups, Muslims and Christians. Understanding both the history and culture of these groups and incorporating their heritage into the political structure is essential to forming any permanently stable government.

Nigerians are deeply religious people and our religious belief is a fundamental part of our individual and collective identity. The question then must be asked, what role, if any, does religion play in our political beliefs? Is there a necessary connection between religion and our political life? Islam, like Judaism and Christianity, believes in the divine origin of government. It follows, therefore, that political science for Islam, as it should be for Christianity and Judaism, is not an independent discipline aspiring to the utmost heights of intellectual speculation. Rather, it is a branch of theology, which does not distinguish between secular and spiritual characteristics. The conception of law in Islam is, therefore, radically different from the Graeco-Roman traditions. Although this should also be the case for Judaism and Christianity, both Christianity and Judaism have, however, undergone some radical transformations since their inception, through a process of secularisation.

“Secularisation” and “secularism” are derived concepts from “secular.” It is perhaps important to give a brief overview of the origins of secularism in order to appreciate its proper meaning, literally, conceptually, and practically. The word “secular” is derived from the Latin word “*saeculum*,” which denotes “this age” or “the present time” or “contemporary events.” With its emphasis on the affirmation of anything mundane and worldly, *saeculum* is therefore a negation of anything with spiritual essence. It is the preservation of vanity and destruction of virtue - the opposite of sanctity.

Being worldly, it also conveys a meaning with a marked dual connotation of time and location. Thus the concept “secular” refers to the condition of the world at this particular time, period, or age. It is this spatio-temporal connotation conveyed in the concept of secularism that has forever changed Christianity.

Secularisation gained even more prominence during the European Enlightenment, from the 17th to the 19th centuries, and with the concomitant rise of reason and empiricism and scientific and technological advances in the West. The stage, it seemed, was set for confrontation between modernist thought and Christianity. In fact, some Christian theologians already foresaw the coming of such a crisis, and, sensing the trend of contemporary events, they began to accept the inevitability of the impending religious and theological crisis that would emerge consequently. However, being already influenced by secularism, they counselled alignment and participation in the process of secularisation, which is seen by many as irresistibly spreading rapidly throughout the world like a raging fire. This marked the beginning of the transmutation of values, dubbed the rise of science and the overthrow of religion.

There are some Christian theologians and intellectuals who are not only preparing the ground for a new secularised version of Christianity, but they also accept that the very ground itself will be ever-shifting and that the new version itself will ultimately be replaced by another, as future social changes would demand. They visualise the contemporary experience of secularisation as part of the evolutionary process of human history and as part of the inevitable process of socio-political change.

These Christian theologians and laity align themselves with the forces of modernist thought so far as to assert, triumphantly, in their desire to keep in line with contemporary events in the West, that secularisation has its roots in Biblical faith and is the fruit of the gospel and, therefore, rather than oppose the secularising pro-

cess, Christianity must realistically welcome it as a process congenial to its true nature and purpose.

The tolerance by the Church of homosexuality and homosexual marriages for laity as well as priests and the ordination of women priests are examples of the sort of conviviality sought between modernist and traditional Christianity. Perhaps, Nigerian Christians (theologians and laity) do not see themselves as participants in this trend, but they and other Christians who, on the whole, probably are opposed to secularisation, are themselves unconsciously assiduous accomplices in that very process, to the extent that those aware of the dilemma confronting them still profess secularism.

It was recently reported the Northern zone of Christian Association of Nigeria (CAN), headed by Kaduna Archbishop Peter Jatau, said: "Secular law must remain the basis of the constitution. Christians will resist at whatever price the imposition of and introduction of any religion's law, such as Sharia law, into our secular constitution." The statement further added that they want to "pray for the peace of our fatherland where all should be free to practice our faith or religion according to our conscience and conviction."

Indeed, many Christian theologians and intellectuals forming the avant-garde of the Church are in fact already deeply involved in what is called "immanent apostasy," for while firmly resolving to remain Christians at all cost, they openly profess and advocate a secularised version of it, thus ushering into the Christian fold a new emergent Christianity alien to the traditional version, to gradually change and supplant it from within.

Recently, *The Times* of London had this to say: "The leader of the Anglican Church in Scotland today accuses the churches of homophobia and links this to 'ignorant' Bible texts. The Right Rev. Richard Holloway, Bishop of Edinburgh, will tell the conference of the Lesbian and Gay Christian Movement in London: 'Violent homophobia is still alive and kicking, and

much of it is motivated by religious zeal.’ He says: ‘The Bible, though it is one of our greatest treasures, is also our greatest danger.’ In his address, released yesterday to *The Times*, Bishop Holloway says that traditional religions are being abandoned as ‘primitive superstitions’ because they cannot change. ‘This is why many feminists have abandoned Christianity,’ he says. ‘They see it as incurably patriarchal and oppressive.’ He says the Bible can no longer be read as a fixed and unchanging law, and must be seen as “flawed and fallible.” Declaring that eventually the churches will accept homosexuality, he says: ‘We have recently abandoned the text’s tyranny over women, as we abandoned its justification of slavery, and soon we’ll abandon its ignorant misunderstanding of homosexuality.’”²

I am not a Christian. So I cannot tell the Christians how to resolve this problem, as disconcerting as it may seem. However, I welcome those who want to fight this scourge of secularism.

Secularisation so defined in its true nature corresponds exactly with what is going on in the spiritual, intellectual, rational, physical and material life of Western man and his culture and civilisation. It is true only when applied to describe the nature and existential condition of Western culture and civilisation.

The claim that secularisation has its roots in Biblical faith and that it is the fruit of the gospel has no substance in historical fact. Secularisation has its roots not in Biblical faith, but in the interpretation of Biblical faith by Western man. It is not the fruit of the gospel, but it is the fruit of the long history of philosophical and metaphysical conflict in the religious and purely rationalistic world view of Western man. Of all the great revealed religions, Christianity alone shifted its centre of origin from Jerusalem to Rome, symbolising the beginning of the Westernisation of Christianity and its gradual and successive permeation by Western elements that in subsequent periods of its history produced and accelerated the momentum of secularisation. This is why, for the

Muslim, there are two versions of Christianity: the original/true one, and the Western version of it.

Having made Christianity Western, the Western man has since inclined to regard his culture and civilisation as man's cultural vanguard and his own experience and consciousness as those representative of, in the secular logic, the most evolved of the species, so that we are all in the process of lagging behind them, as it were, and will come to realise the same experience and consciousness in due course sometime. It is with this attitude that they, believing in their own absurd theories of human evolution, view human history and development and religion and religious experience and consciousness. It was this trend that led to the separation of Church and State, for the Church has now lost most influence and is no longer relevant.

We reject, totally, the validity of the truth of their assertion, with regard to secularisation and their theories and interpretation of knowledge based on their experience and consciousness and belief, to speak on our behalf. We reject them, along with their clones amongst us, Muslim or Christian. The secularisation that describes its true nature clearly when applied to describe Western man and his culture and civilisation cannot be accepted as true if it is intended to be a description of what is going on around the world. It cannot be accepted as true if it is intended to be a description of man in which it is also meant to be applicable to the religion of Islam and the Muslims. Islam totally rejects any application to itself of the concepts secular or secularisation or secularism as they do not belong and are alien to it in every respect; and they belong and are natural only to the intellectual history of Western-Christian religious experience and consciousness.

Nevertheless, we must see, in view of the fact that secularisation is not merely confined to the Western world, that their experience of it and their attitude towards it is most instructive for Muslims. Islam is not similar to Christianity in this respect that secularization

in the way in which it is also happening in the Muslim world has not and will not necessarily affect our beliefs in the same way it does the beliefs of Western man. For that matter Islam is not the same as Christianity, whether as a religion or as a civilization.

However, problems arising out of secularization, though not the same as those confronting Western Christianity, have certainly caused much confusion in our midst. It is most significant to us that these problems are caused by the introduction of Western ways of thinking and judging and believing, emulated by some Muslim scholars and intellectuals and ordinary folks who have been unduly influenced by the West and overawed by its scientific and technological achievements, who by virtue of the fact that they can be thus influenced betray their lack of true understanding and full grasp of both the Islamic as well as the Western world views and essential beliefs and modes of thought that project them; who have, because of their influential positions in Muslim society, become conscious or unconscious disseminators of unnecessary confusion and ignorance. The situation in our midst can indeed be seen as critical when we consider the fact that the Muslim Community is generally unaware of what the secularizing process implies. Hence our cry for the populace to be well informed about what the establishment of the constitutional assembly meant and what it could recommend and the ramification of those recommendations if implemented.

The parallel between Christianity in the Middle Ages and Islam is very close. The evidence of history shows early Christianity as consistently opposed to secularization, and this opposition, engendered by the demeaning of nature and the divesting of its spiritual and theological significance, continued throughout its history of the losing battle against the secularizing forces entrenched paradoxically within the very threshold of Western Christianity. The separation of Church and State, of religious and temporal powers, was never the result of an attempt on the part of Christianity to bring about secularization. On the contrary, it was the result of the secular Western

philosophical attitude set against what it considered as anti-secular encroachment of the ambivalent Church based on the teachings of the eclectic religion. The separation represented for Christianity a status quo in the losing battle against secular forces; and even that status quo was gradually eroded away so that today very little ground is left for the religion to play any significant social and political role in the secular states of the Western world.

The Nigerian Christians do not have to remove all semblance of spirituality from their social and political life and suffer the same fate as their Western brethren. The choice, however, is theirs. The Nigerian Christians do not have the right or authority to dictate to the Muslims what to believe or practise, especially in matters such as the Sharia.

In Islam, the antithesis between the individual and the State or the government is not recognized, and no need is therefore felt to reconcile and abolish this antithesis. Islam knows no distinction between State and Church, so to speak. In Islam there is no doctrine of temporal end which belongs to the State and the eternal end which belongs to, and is the prerogative of the Church. No balance between the two, each equal to the other when acting in its own sphere; each equally dependent on the other when acting in the sphere of the other and no tension between the Community and the Church as custodian of the universal common elements in human existence. The basis of the State, for the Muslim, is ideological, not political, territorial, or ethnical, and the primary purpose of the State is to defend and protect the Faith, not the State.³

▲ APPENDIX 2

DA'WA AND THE CHALLENGE OF SECULARISM:
A CONCEPTUAL AGENDA FOR ISLAMIC IDEOLOGUES*by Tijani El-Miskin⁴*

[Page 1 missing]

The task of *da'wa*⁵ has been complicated because of insufficient conceptual and functional response to and critique of secularism, perhaps the single most important threat to *da'wa*. A clear understanding and critique of secularism and outlining alternative conceptual agenda is an absolute necessity to confront the threat to *da'wa* from secularism that reigns in all African countries and indeed in most of the Islamic world.

Modes of Secular Thought

A major crisis in a human vision like secularism must be characterised by plurality of origin and temporal antiquity. It was however, the occidental archetype that was transplanted in most of the former colonies in the Muslim world. As a western value system, it originated the split of the unified continuum in human appreciation of the divine in his worldly existence.

At least three major landmarks can be identified in the evolution of secularism in the west. The earliest of the three is perhaps the development of secularism as a Christian heritage, as an aspect of Christian thought in the famous words of the authors of the New Testament (illegible) to Christians who were urged “to render therefore unto Caesar the things that belong to Caesar.” It was earlier cited and attributed to Jesus. It was understood like a manifesto of the Christian relationship with the state whose secularity he must support if he is to be a good Christian, according to Paul: “Let every person be subject to governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been insti-

tuted by God. Therefore he who resists the authorities resists what God has appointed, and those who resist what God has appointed will incur judgement”—Romans 13:1-3.

Such declarations of political secularism were a kind of *modus vivendi* for coexistence of Roman political power and nascent Christianity. Peter and Paul attempted to reassure the Roman authorities that “Christianity recognized the necessity and divine origin of secular government.”⁶ The absence of an elaborate political and economic thought in Christianity meant to be applied to worldly governance made that secularist archetype not only in accord with Christianity but an element of Christian thought entrenched in no less a Christian text than the Bible.

The second landmark in secularist thought in the west pertains to the fashion among Renaissance intellectuals of self-consciously distinguishing themselves from the dominant pre-occupation of the Christian middle ages, when the power of the church was enormous, having a significant impact on western culture. The distance from the middle ages was manifested in the form of, for instance, privileging the cultural heritage of classical antiquity over that of medieval Christendom. The chief vehicle of the period was the philosophy of humanism with its implications of secular absolutism, often perceived to necessarily lead to the humanist insistence on man as the central measure of values. In the Renaissance culture of humanism, the exclusion of “religion” as a determining factor in politics, economics and general cultural matters was regarded as sophisticated manifestation of modernity.

The third major development in secular thought was the nineteenth century ethical trend associated with George Jacob Holyoake, who in 1846 expounded some of the tenets of secularism already manifest in several variants. It is generally with him that secularism as a philosophical principle is associated. As an ethical option, secularism in the nineteenth century was part of a general attack on religion and supernaturalism. Holyoake was later a leading figure in the

International Freethinkers' League founded in 1880. Thus the tendency towards "freethinking," was a major factor in the English philosophers' secularist thinking. However, he was not even a pioneer of this tendency. Joseph Glanvill (1636-1680) was seen by some as the "first true exponent" of free thought primarily through his *Vanity of Dogmatising or Confidence of Opinions* which was seen as the earliest "modern" defence of "complete open-mindedness."⁷ Interestingly Glanvill was also a believer in witchcraft and his *Sadducismus Triumphatus* was considered a justification of it. Holyoake was thus part of an English tradition of "free thought" that had much earlier roots than the nineteenth century.

The secularist venture encompasses more than the ethical realm. Freedom of thought is generally regarded as central to secular thinking. Along with this postulate, the right to difference of opinion and the subsequent right to assert this difference are regarded as secular necessities. The right to question issues like the existence of God and immortality of the soul are likewise considered part of the secularist mode of thought. It also places great emphasis on the "goodness" of the present life as opposed to the life hereafter.

Conceptual Critique

As in the case of various other trends of thought and value systems, the Muslim world experienced a wholesale transplant of secularism. The fact that its origination was not part of Muslim history and that it did not fit Muslim circumstances was put aside by the exponents of secularism. For example the presupposition that "secular" and "religious" facts do have inherently separate existence is self-evident irrelevance in the Islamic context. Yet this presupposition is pivotal to the secular alternatives promoted in the Muslim world by agents of secularism. While the separation has taken place in the West, it may not be considered as a case of inherent separability applicable to the Muslim world.

Another vital principle of the secularist view is the sharp contrast of “other worldliness” to the “goodness” of this life. The irrelevance of this to the Muslim context is glaring. The “goodness” of this life is not (illegible) in the Muslim point of view is not all that there is. It is rather a transitional bridge to a greater and more permanent existence hereafter. In the absence of elaborate political, social, economic and other detailed “this worldly” guidelines in the religious contexts of Western secularists, they are bound to assume that this world has nothing to do with the hereafter and can be regarded as separate. The fact that the Islamic value system maintains an elaborate code of conduct in these spheres of life makes secularist contrast of “this world” and the “other world” quite irrelevant. The disdain of this world which partly provoked this secularist assumption would in fact be incompatible with Islamic ethical perspective, as this world is so significant that there are elaborate instruments of its control so that comfort, for instance, does not degenerate to hedonistic pursuits in the name of “goodness” of this life.

The centrality of “free thought” in secularist thinking clearly resulted from the unfamiliarity of Western secularists with religious value systems that constantly urge contemplation and serious thinking in order to understand this world, the other world and the grandeur of creation. The Qur’an characterised such constant contemplation as a quality of true believers.⁸ What is seriously misunderstood by champions of “free thought” is that they generally fail to acknowledge the extreme limits of human knowledge. Often when the dead end of limits of human knowledge are reached, such limits are defended with further speculation justified as “free thought,” so that they can retain the option of implicitly or explicitly ruling out “supernatural” sources. (Illegible.) However, the essentially Christian character of Western heritage (which is privileged over Muslim heritage) is generally ignored.

The contradictions in the Nigerian conception of secularism are also manifest in other respects. Among the fanatical exponents of

secularism in Nigeria are the lobby groups like CAN. Israel is such an ideal of these lobby groups that they constantly urge the government to restore diplomatic relations with the Zionist state which says it is a country established and run on the basis of Jewish beliefs, privileging Jewish religion and Jewish identity over other religious groups. Theoretically, if the overt position of CAN is a guide to go by, they should not be so fascinated by Israel, since it is such a case of serious undermining of “secular values.” But the fact is that Israel is considered as an ally just as the Zionist state would also regard these lobby groups as allies. The reality is that the Israel card is played here in Nigeria as a way of neutralising the political clout of the Muslim population that generally opposes restoration of links with Israel. It is thus very clear that although secularism is viewed as a way of maintaining religious neutrality at the political federal centre, in reality it is essentially an anti-Muslim instrument targeted against the aspirations of the Muslim community.

The myth of secularist neutrality in Nigeria is also clear from the fact that the Christian community’s only political, economic and social heritage is the one inherited through Western colonialization which brought Christianity to the country. [Illegible] Then the colonially-inherited *status quo* is the ideal Christian choice (since early Christian leaders like Paul had advocated the division of the “church” and the “state” as separate realms) that contradicts with the condemnation of secular values by Islam (as it is clear from the explicit and repeated Qur’anic instances) that any view of the current political posture of Nigeria as representing neutrality is a delusion. Under these circumstances, for the Nigerian Muslim, secularism is just a synonym for Euro-Christian domination of this country’s political, economic and social set up. The domination is double-edged: The maintenance of Euro-Christian hegemony under the false cloak of neutrality and the imposition of the Euro-Christian concept of secularism upon a predominantly Muslim society.

An Agenda for Da'wa Ideologues and Activists

Historically, political secularism's earliest decisive rejection in Nigeria was the eleventh century Kanem-Borno ruler Mai Umme Jilmi's acceptance of the political necessity of Islam and its declaration as a state religion. This position was subsequently consolidated by the landmark political leadership of Dunoma Dabalemi, Idris Alauma, Ali Gaji, and, in Sokoto, by Usman Dan Fodio and his immediate successors. Muslims are instinctively conscious that their religion inherently rejects secularism and considers it a dangerous misrepresentation of the interests of the human community and their past [illegible].

Contemporary *da'wa* in Nigeria or anywhere in Africa in the Muslim world must make the critique of secularism a conceptual starting point. This is a very necessary theoretical prelude to *da'wa* in a place like Africa, all whose Muslim populations are under secular states. However, a critique of secularism alone is not enough; it is rather the necessary beginning. Once the conceptual critique of secularism takes deep root in the psyche of *da'wa* ideologues, then the two central programmes of all *da'wa* activists around the world must be instituted in its organisation. These two central programmes are, as earlier stated, expanding the demographics of Islam through large scale conversion and consolidating the existing constituency of Islam through mobilisation of the *Umma* to be conscious of and live according to the Islamic alternative.

These two central programmes are, of course, impeded by several challenges that must be confronted by the *da'wa* ideologues. These two programmes are often constituted as the operational field of the *da'wa* activist who may or may not be a *da'wa* ideologue. The *da'wa* activist may be one with a specific *da'wa* skill that may be placed at the disposal of the *da'wa* constituency. A typical example may be sending an Arabic teacher to a community, or delegating a community to enlighten a Muslim group on a political programme.

But there are also *da'wa* programmes of demographic expansion and constituency consolidation. We will focus on four of such challenges: The challenge of political models, of evolving Islamic alternatives to dominant secular ones, spiritual challenge, and rhetorical challenge.

1. The challenge of political models is seen in various forms. *Da'wa* activists in secular states which most Muslim countries are in one way or another, need to establish a definite mode of interaction with the secular order. In many African countries, for instance, there are no clear attempts to deal with this question of political models which should at least be conceived and evolved in four areas.

a) The first and most important of such areas is the theoretical design of political models of governance. The Islamic movement engaged in *da'wa* must have the long term vision of establishing, discussing and promoting a political model that is in consonance with Muslim aspirations. Such models must exist whether or not the *da'wa* goals are achieved. Such models must be evolved in view of the specific local conditions of a particular Islamic movement. While the broad goals of all Islamic movements are similar, the specific local conditions dictated by circumstances should be considered.

The political models to be evolved differ from place to place. They vary from possible models for Muslim majority zones like Ethiopia, Tanzania, and Nigeria to Muslim minority zones like South Africa, Zaire and Malawi, to mention just a few instances. Such models in both categories of countries must constantly address issues of the future of Muslims.

b) The second area of the political challenge has to do with how to attain such a model as discussed in (a) above. The

machinery must be established, as part of the potential Islamic movement's *da'wa* projects, to work towards actualisation of the political model drawn up by the Islamic movement. Such machinery for realising the models could include constant campaigns and mass involvement in promoting the model.

c) As part of the political challenge, *da'wa* programmes must try to establish clear perspectives and enlightenment procedures of the way in which the institutions and non-Muslims of the country will benefit from the new political model. As part of the enlightenment campaign, the Islamic movement involved must address the question of benefits to Muslims also while encouraging their mass involvement.

d) The challenge of establishing channels of communication and contacts with other Islamic movements must form part of the *da'wa* project.⁹ This contact helps in terms of learning from the experiences of other Islamic movements and forming a nucleus of future co-operation when the goals of the various Islamic movements are attained.

2. The second major challenge that *da'wa* programmes must address is the question of evolving Islamic alternatives not only to the reigning political model but also of other institutions such as the film industry. What would, for instance, the Islamic movement do with the massively developed and highly influential secular film industry of Egypt when the Islamic movement gains the upper hand? Such issues must be addressed by both *da'wa* activists and *da'wa* ideologues, so that non-secular options exist in reality beyond the easy phrases of Islamisation of banks, Islamisation of knowledge and the like.

As an extension of this point there must be a rapid response mechanism built into *da'wa* projects, whereby any

immediate political or economic development is responded to by the Islamic movement. When there is an emergency situation like a natural disaster, famine and influx of refugees, the Islamic movement must be seen to be actively involved in solving the emergency problems. Such a rapid response mechanism would both contribute to the conception of Islamic alternatives to the secular institutions and enhance the reputation of the Islamic movement. At present, response to such emergency situations in Africa, for instance, are monopolised by Western countries, the Red Cross, Oxfam and similar groups.

3. As part of the evolution of Islamic alternatives, the problem of technology in the Muslim world must also be addressed. Technology and the consequent material advances it has instituted has forced many under-developed nations to submit to technologically dominant countries. The Islamic movement must conceive and plan its programmes by bearing in mind that technology is a *da'wa* tool that does not only facilitate the *da'wa* but ideas. There must be a definite *da'wa* policy, however modest, so as to free the Muslim world, but it has often submitted to Western technological blackmail.

As part of its *da'wa* project the relevant movement must rise up to the spiritual challenge of forming groups of *da'wa* activists who reflect the spiritual values of Islam. Such groups could be formed through constant teaching so that such *da'wa* activists can be a nucleus of exemplary members of the Muslim community. Such measures will help establish consistency through spiritual training like engaging in extra *salat*¹⁰ and hosting sessions whenever possible. This approach will sharpen the sensitivity of *da'wa* activists' conscience. Furthermore, it will psychologically create positive disposition towards *da'wa* and make the task of defending and promoting *da'wa* projects much easier. The spiritual fortitude developed as a result would strengthen the *da'wa* activists.

4. The fourth major challenge to *da'wa* ideologues and activists is the rhetorical challenge. The development of appropriate language and rhetoric for Islamic ideologues is fundamental for the communication of *da'wa* programmes. The development of relevant Islamic vocabulary to express the *da'wa* aspirations of an Islamic movement helps to establish discourse consistency. Often it is said that Islamic groups indulge in too much talk and too little action. The reality is that it is often a case of too much irrelevant and ineffective talk. The development of Qur'anic vocabulary for Islamic movements establishes a virile Islamic discourse, makes Islam a central and rhetorically identifiable issue of discussion. It makes Islamic discourse more graspable even to its foes who will no doubt form part of the anticipatory (illegible), where various groups compete for *da'wa* hegemony. This rhetorical rivalry has a great drawback such as the many charges that plants inter-Muslim distrust and charges of irrelevance leveled against certain groups. These complications are no doubt partly fuelled by the rhetorical postures of the groups. Nonetheless, establishment of functional rhetoric is necessary. Such rhetoric must as much as possible be non-belligerent and non-confrontational towards other Muslims.

The communication benefits of evolving recognizable *da'wa* rhetoric are enormous. (Illegible) orientated conceptual models in their place, using such models and applying them to the needs of Muslim societies in Africa, Asia and elsewhere are emergency requirements. The hegemony of the west that constantly links Muslim world dependency on it with cultural export of its secularist values can only be challenged through long-term planning. Such long-term planning must be characterised by a critique of its theoretical foundations, assumptions and operative mechanisms of the secularist project. Such a critique must also project the *da'wa*-based alternative, not as an option antitheti-

cally dependent on merely negating the West, but as a long-standing Islamic alternative with historical foundations.

The four areas that we have outlined above are meant to initiate a discourse on a conceptual agenda aimed at the required long-term planning. This planning is urgently necessary to protect the two historically established *da'wa* goals of demographic expansion and consolidation of existing Muslim constituencies that are constantly threatened by such forces as the secular aggression on mankind.

▲ APPENDIX 3

RELIGION AND POLITICS

*M. Tawfiq Ladan*¹¹

Separating religion from politics was the dangerous trend that drew the Ulama and religious leaders into seclusion, and consequently dragged huge Muslim populations into a state of stagnation and stupor, in such a way that the conception of religion was envisaged as merely a few insipid religious duties, which did not play any role in the functioning of society. Even the religious duties of social and political significance, such as *haji* [pilgrimage] and congregational Friday prayers and respect for Islamic rites and customs also assumed a ritualistic status.

While Islam, from the very beginning was the religion of devotion and politics, since the prophet of Islam along with instructing the Muslims to worship one Allah, had also taught them the particulars and conditions of *jihad* [holy war]. In the days of advent of Islam, the mosque was a base for worshipping as well as for self-development. It was a place where the Qur'an and Islamic precepts were taught and from where the poor and the destitute could be easily approached and public treasure could be doled out and distributed. And finally, it was a base for the mobilisation of the Muslims for waging *jihad* against idolatry, infidelity and corruption. This was the mode of life, preserved by the Muslims through successive centuries all over the world.

Unfortunately, the colonialist and the neo-colonialist implanted this idea into the minds of the Muslims that politics is alien to the dignity of a pious and devout Muslim. And that the real Muslim is the one who walks at slow pace, who performs his obligatory and recommended prayers, who goes on pilgrimage to holy places, sits beside and sheds tears on the graves of those who were the real designers of Islamic politics and who waged war against injustice, oppression and corruption.

To separate religion from politics is to deprive Divine Law of its most important sphere of jurisdiction. It is no wonder that the colonial and neo-colonial powers and their allies—the greatest enemies of Allah’s sovereignty over human society and of the independence and dignity of nations—have always tried to separate religion from politics, because they know that the only power that can fight their encroachment is the spiritual zeal of the oppressed peoples, when it manifests itself as a political force demanding justice, freedom, independence and equality.

Also to “de-religionize” politics means to “de-legalize,” “demoralize” and to “de-spiritualize” the political behaviour of big powers, for they do not want to be encumbered by any kind of considerations, legal or moral. All that matters to them is power, wealth and domination. Although they respect international laws and agreements when it suits their interests, it is the law of the jungle that they ultimately consider supreme.

Thus, by separating religion from politics, the imperialists and their allies kill two birds with one stone. On the one hand, they stop the spiritual zeal of the masses—who are basically religious, throughout the so-called Third World—from political expression and participation in politics and, by depoliticising them, from taking their destiny into their own hands. On the other hand, they keep themselves scot-free, free of any kind of moral or legal obligation or responsibility, and shield themselves effectively from protest, criticism or interpellation.

However, in Islam, religion does not need to be politicized: Politics is already part and parcel of its eternal teaching, and it will remain so despite the efforts of imperialist stooges to depoliticize Islam and Muslims.

The purpose of Islam and the mission of the Prophet was to create a divine culture aimed to achieve the best possible conditions for the spiritual and material development of the individual and society. This culture was based on a monotheism which was not merely

theological and metaphysical, but also had equally important social, political, legal, ethical and economic dimensions. It aimed to create a world society based on a socio-political system in which ultimate sovereignty belongs to Allah, the Creator and the Law-giver, and where all human beings are equal and brethren. In order to create such a system and society, the Prophet of Islam developed a peculiar revolutionary ethos and culture among his followers.

Fifty years after the Prophet's demise, this ethos and culture had weakened to a great extent on the level of the Muslim society. Here and there did exist individuals who preserved the original spirit and ethos of Islam and the Qur'an, but to a large extent it had disappeared on the collective level. Theologically, the society worshipped the One Allah, read the Scripture and carried out the ritual duties, but it had lost the original spiritual drive and political ethos so assiduously cultivated by the Prophet and his honoured companions. Islamic political and social values had eroded to such an extent that Muslim society was prepared to submit to the evil of monarchy and despotism.

Hence, in Nigeria today, the tendency, especially in government circles, is to regard Islam as merely a "religion" among the religions of this country and to treat it as if it has no other role to play beside catering for the "spiritual" needs of the people. This is a most cynical and thoughtless behaviour.

Islam takes into consideration the fact that man, whatever be his religious persuasion, culture and nationality, has an inherent love or respect for the law in which he has faith. It is this innate love for law that impelled Muslims to give up their lives in their thousands to preserve the integrity of the Sharia against colonial usurpers. The same love now impels the Muslims of today to seek to be governed by the sacred Sharia and an end to subservience to neo-colonialism. For Allah has prescribed that laws must never be imposed on any religious community against their will, and that the system of law of each politically organized society should be duly recognised and protected.

This is the only way to ensure harmony in society and forestall friction and conflicts which may ultimately lead to the disintegration of society. This eternal law is enshrined in Qur'an 5:44-50.

The nation's pretense that Muslims have no legitimate grievances, or that they do not know their rights, or that Islamic institutions have no place in the national set-up, is a delusion that must stop. Muslims, be it noted, have no cause to accept forever what is imposed on them by an alien and hostile civilization; nor is it conceivable for any people possessing a sense of honour and integrity to accept a situation of degradation and subservience forever.

The Western concept of the separation of religion from politics, of secularism, is foreign to Islam and the adoption of it would be a stark negation of the Islamic concept of polity. Thus in a constitution inspired by Islamic faith, the Absolute Sovereign and the Law-Giver is Allah, and His revealed Law (as the Qur'an lays down) must be adopted as the law of the land. "If any do fail to establish and decide by what Allah hath revealed, they are the unbelievers...the unjust...the evil-doers." This is the dictate of the Qur'an 5:44,47 and cannot be disregarded.

▲ APPENDIX 4

CAPITALISM, DEMOCRACY AND SECULARISM AS DEVIATIONS by *Ibrahim Avagi*¹²

Yet, with that, thy Sustainer would never destroy a community without having (first) raised in its midst an Apostle who would convey unto them Our message, and never would We destroy a community unless its people are wont to do wrong (to one another) (Qur'an 28:59).

The original economic structure of all communities reflects this in-built God-consciousness in it. This system reflects the “certainty” of the existence of the Creator, who has the wisdom and the power to decide what is best for mankind. These decisions, given as injunctions, must remain inviolate. Man is free to decide for himself on any matter so long as it conforms to the injunctions of the Creator and/or so long as it does not deviate from or violate the injunctions. Capitalism is a deviation from this system. And so is the so-called democracy of Western capitalism.

Democracy is normally described as “government of the people, by the people, for the people.” People are supposed to govern themselves through their elected representatives. The decisions of the people’s representatives must be supreme. They decide on what type of constitution to have and what type of legislature and whatever laws they wish to have.

The concept of democracy originates from the Greek philosophers. It was a reaction against the economic structures and practices in ancient Greece, where the ruling dictatorships were using religion to misgovern the affairs of the people and to mismanage the economic resources available and endowed to the people. The principles of democracy evolved in reaction against the kings and emperors and the religious leaders that were perverting the Creator’s injunctions to suit their own whims and caprices. People

were, therefore, aroused to accept the principles of democracy and to revolt against the rule of the establishment as constituted by the coalitions of emperors and religious institutions.

However, the revolt did not limit itself to the dictators and the religious institutions and leaders. The revolt was also against the “certainty” of the Omnipotent Creator, who has the wisdom and knowledge to decide for people what is best for them. They rejected the supremacy of the Creator in favour of the principles of democracy which, in its absolute form, allows the decisions of people, through their elected representatives, to supercede the decision and/or injunctions of anybody else, including the Creator!

In modern times, especially in the last 200 years, history repeated itself. Democracy had already replaced the dictatorship of powerful emperors and kings in many European countries. In those countries where kings and emperors still exist, they only reign symbolically. Yet the Roman Catholic Church was still very powerful, having amassed for itself a lot of wealth and influence—mostly at the expense of the people.

The ideals of democracy were the brain behind and the main instigators of Martin Luther and his followers to rise in the 16th century in rebellion against the Christian Church. “The Reformation movement declared that every individual was responsible before God for the way he lived his life. Priests might say what they thought God wanted, but in the end it was the individual who decided.” Thus the individual (and not the Creator) is supreme in deciding for himself in a truly democratic society.

If the individual is supreme in deciding what is best for himself, then any and all authority (kings, emperors and religious injunctions or the Scripture) “had to cede their claim to decide what was best for the people they governed. It was the people themselves who would decide. Each man and woman had an equal voice in making the people’s decision. That is democracy.”¹³

Thus, democracy, as a child of the Reformation, is rebellion

against any authority that claims the right to know and to decide what is best for individuals and for people generally. Not only do people have the right to adopt and follow any religious faith they desire, but they also have the right to accept, reject or modify any injunctions of their accepted religious faith. For example, if the religious Scripture stipulates the punishment for murder to be death by hanging, the people have the democratic right to decide to repeal that law and replace it with something more conducive to their wishes.

It was these democratic ideals that culminated during the Reformation, in the establishment of the Church of England, with the English monarch assuming the title of “Defender of the Faith,” and having their own version of the Holy Bible. Thus, England became a secular state where the laws of man supercede even the injunctions of the Creator.

Thus, democracy as a system of government which claims to give the supreme power of deciding what is best for them to the people and to relegate the decisions of any other authority, including that of the Creator, is a deviation and a perversion of the system ordained by the Creator through all the Prophets He sent to mankind.

▲ APPENDIX 5

ISLAM, SECULARISM AND NIGERIA

*Ibraheem Sulaiman*¹⁴

In the name of Allah, the Compassionate, the Merciful.

If any do wish for the transitory things (of this life), we readily grant them—such things as We will, to such persons as We will: in the end have We provided Hell for them: they shall burn therein, disgraced and rejected. Those who do wish for the (things of) the Hereafter, and strive therefore with all due striving and have faith—they are the ones whose striving is acceptable to Allah. Of the bounties of your Lord we bestow freely on all—these as well as those: the bounties of your Lord are never closed (to anyone)—Qur’an 17:18-20.

Man’s foremost (illegible) is that he is a *Khalifa*, one to whom Allah has given the trusteeship of the earth to cultivate, develop and manage to his own advantage. “I am setting on earth one who will inherit it” (Qur’an 2:30), says Allah, proclaiming the emergence of man, to assume supremacy over the earth. The power thus vested in man is very extensive indeed, if not unlimited. The mandate empowers man to populate the earth, to build on it systems, nations and civilisations as well as to chart the course of his own destiny in complete freedom.

But Allah Most High has not given man this monumental mandate without first bestowing on him the necessary instruments, for man is created “in the best conformation” (Qur’an 5:4)—endowed with all possible attributes and...invested with honour, as well as the means to sustain it. As we are reminded in the Qur’an, “Now, indeed, We have conferred honour on the children of Adam. We carry them on the land and the sea, and have made provision of good things for them, and have preferred them above many of those whom We created with a marked preferment”

(Qur'an 17:70). Above all, "Allah taught Adam the nature of all things" (Qur'an 2:31), so that the range of human knowledge is such that there is hardly anything on earth or in the universe as a whole from which man cannot derive benefit.

Man is man, then, precisely by virtue of his supremacy over the earth, and his being endowed with almost unlimited scope for knowledge and initiative. That is why the world is what it is: a home for countless nations and many a great civilisation. Man's initiative capability serves as the engine of history—propelling mankind forward, from one stage to another, one achievement to another. In short, man's strength lies basically in the fact that, in terms of knowledge, initiative and drive, he is fertile and abundant.

The trusteeship over the earth cannot admit of lesser capabilities. It demands of man to labour ceaselessly, to be perpetually involved in process after process in order to keep the earth in good shape and make his own life on it more conducive. Life is a dynamic phenomenon, ever changing and moving. To cope with it, man has no choice but to move and labour hard. This is the philosophy inherent in the Qur'anic passage, "But nay! I call to witness the Sunset's (fleeting) afterglow, and the night, and what it (step by step) unfolds, and the moon, as it grows to its fullness: (even thus, O men,) are you bound to move onward from stage to stage" (Qur'an 84:16-19). There is therefore no reason whatsoever why today should not be different and better than yesterday, and tomorrow than today.

Labour, then, lies at the very root of all human achievements. It is the food that nourishes all endeavours. If you see a great and prosperous nation, a mighty civilisation, or an enterprising and self-reliant society, you are almost certain that labour has been employed. Hence Allah's eternal injunction: "Labour, O David's people, in gratitude towards Me" (Qur'an 34:13). This is the essence of being a *Khalifa*—the readiness to employ to the full all potential and invest all energy to create a more conducive environ-

ment, establish nations, and civilisations worthy of man, the possessor of dignity. There can be no greatness without great efforts, nor concrete achievements without hard and arduous labour. Man moves forward only through heroism and superhuman exertions.

It is from this perspective that the ongoing discussion on the state of the Nigerian nation may be approached. It has been said quite often—in fact, it has become a fashionable chorus—that Nigeria is a secular nation. Perhaps there can be no dispute about that, for all Christian and neo-colonial nations today are secular, and Nigeria is one of them. Secularism is simply an attempt to run a society on a basis other than religion, however true. Historically and in practice, secularism is a development peculiar to Christian civilisation. It is a child—albeit a bastard—of Christianity. Nigeria is therefore secular only by virtue of its encounter with colonialism. It remains so only by virtue of its being in a state of neo-colonialism. Get rid of neo-colonialism, and you will be rid of secularism.

Nigeria is the fruit—although for many of us a bitter, if not poisonous one—of the efforts of the British people. They came all the way across the Atlantic Ocean to create a nation for us in an enterprise which is not altogether lacking in heroism and gallantry of sorts. So inevitably we have a nation that is fashioned in a Euro-Christian model and speaks English. Logically, too, Nigeria is secular, adopts capitalism, the Anglo-Saxon legal system, and subscribes, at least in theory, to democracy. And inexorably, Nigeria is corrupt. In short, it is the “European genius”—to use Lugard’s phrase—and the European energy that created Nigeria; there is none of our energy or genius.

It should be remembered that Nigeria was created on the ruins of the states and civilisations which Britain had met and invaded. These include the Benin Empire and the Islamic States of Borno and Sokoto. All of them disintegrated to give way for Nigeria. This is the nature of existence: all things, including nations, have a life span of their own; all human achievements are bound to decay and

perish, to be replaced by other endeavours. By the same token, we cannot expect the British experiment of 1914 to endure forever, for that is not in keeping with the realities of history. As the Qur'an puts it: "All that lives on earth or in the heavens is bound to pass away, but forever will abide the Sustainer's Self, full of majesty and glory" (55:26-27). It is therefore in keeping with the imperatives of human destiny that we should be thinking of a process involving the creation of a new nation for ourselves—a nation, which because it is founded on sound principles and directed towards noble objectives, will not only be an infinitely greater Nigeria, but will serve as a platform for the development of a full-fledged civilisation: a nation which will emerge from our sweat and genius, the fruit of our labour.

One important step in this positive and far-reaching direction must be the elimination of the sense of desolation, despair and inadequacy that has pervaded the people of this country. There seems to be widespread belief that we should remain only within the bounds set for us by Britain, that we should retain all the institutions and legacies of the Empire in their essential details, and that our nation should remain as defined and fashioned by the British genius. This is the belief that has created the logic under which the chorus of secularism, and, to a large extent, nationalism, is being chanted so vociferously. As human beings possessing the power of thought and initiative, and above all as Muslims, we cannot be bound by such self-imposed limitations nor place unnecessary restriction on our own abilities. If we have the energy to establish what is greater than what we have now, then what cause have we to restrain ourselves by considerations that are wholly illogical and out of context with the imperatives of history?

Secularism imposes severe constraints on us in our search for a way of life that flows from our belief as Muslims, and one that integrates all aspects of life into an organic whole. It restricts us to materialism alone, preventing us from applying Islam in full. Even worse

is the fact that secularism has become a sinister but convenient mechanism to blackmail Muslims, and impede the progress of Islam and reduce it to the level of earthly concepts and ideologies.

The whole issue of secularism in Nigeria has to be seen by Muslims from the perspective that all efforts bear fruit. Nigeria is today secular, precisely because secular elements have worked hard towards that end. They now reap the fruit of their labour and investment. If Muslims make their own efforts, with the aim to roll back the frontier of secularism and establish the rule of Islam, their efforts will bear fruit. All things depend on the nature and extent of human labour. As is stated in the Qur'an: "To any that desires the harvest of the Hereafter, We give increase in his harvest; and to any that desires the harvest of this world, We grant somewhat thereof, but he has no share or lot in the Hereafter" (42:20). One can only wonder at so-called Muslim leaders who claim that Muslims do not want Nigeria to be an Islamic country. How inadequate is their zeal for Islam. How disgraceful their utterance!

We are apt to think that the present situation where the secular forces comprising of Christians, Marxists and Pagans—who it is claimed constitute the "non-Muslim majority" in Nigeria—alongside government organs, particularly the security network, are all marshaled against Islam is but the beginning of the end of neo-colonialism. Their coming together is the outcome of the universal panic that has gripped all secular and neo-colonial forces everywhere in the face of the emergence of Muslims. Islam, let it be known, will not bow to pressures, nor lose its nerve just because there are forces arrayed against it.

We are almost certain that the admittedly severe pressures being exerted on Muslims today in the form of harassment of Muslim leadership by agents of the secular government, the insinuations and slander by Christians and the ravings of Marxists can only strengthen the resolve of Muslims to work harder for Islam. Muslims will take all the pressures in their stride, as conflict

between Islam and forces of falsehood is natural. Colonialism met Islam already entrenched in this land, and Islam with its inner strength and dynamism will remain to see the end of colonialism. For that reason Muslims, in the face of all pressures, need not be over bothered, but should conduct themselves with absolute dignity, restraint and trust in Allah. Their overall attitude should be one of confidence in the firmness of Islam. In the final analysis it may well be that the ongoing encounter between Islam and secular forces is an indication that history, like the mighty ocean, is preparing once more to shed off its scum.

At this juncture, it may be necessary to raise a number of issues regarding certain sections of our society who seem to have pitched their camp on the wrong side of history. This refers specifically to those who as pampered and privileged groups have acquired a significant interest and stake in the dominant system. At the head of these groups is the Nigerian Army, which over the years has seen its elite grow in riches, privileges and splendour which, measured against the crushing poverty and squalor in the larger society, cannot be justified by any standard. One can only note with sadness the fact that the leadership of the army has not exercised the necessary discipline, prudence and sense of proportion demanded by the responsibility it has imposed on itself to govern the country. The nation's conscience may well have been wounded by the realisation that those who claim to be its redeemers have proven to be inordinate in their love of luxury and quest for estates and castles. Moreover, whereas the army is quick to take others to task for misdeeds and corruption, it has so far failed to bring itself to account for similar misdeeds and corruption, or curb its own greed.

We thus have all the reasons to fear for the fate of the army, even though it remains supreme today. The army has committed three errors, which it must correct or face the inevitable consequences. First, it has consistently violated the law of proportion by appropriating for itself privileges and powers out of tune with its

size and role in society. Secondly, it has sought to impose on the country, at a very high price, standards which it itself does not observe, and to judge others without subjecting itself to similar judgements. Finally, the army revels in luxury and comforts which do not befit its calling as the guarantor of the nation's security. Considering these factors, the nation should have cause to worry about the future of its protectors, for these are errors for which there can hardly be an escape from judgement—they are errors bordering on arrogant or improper use of power. As the Qur'an puts it: "O my people! Yours is the dominion today, (and) most eminent are you on earth: but who will rescue us from Allah's punishment, once it befalls us" (40:29)? The army has an urgent responsibility to purge itself of all unearned privileges, bring its greedy members to order and confine itself to its legitimate share of the national resources. A situation where it is the nation that protects the vested interests of the Army, rather than being protected by the Army is, to say the least, tenuous.

Similarly, other groups, who as rulers, public officers and others have acquired estates and privileges in a way that does harm to society should bear in mind that such privileges will not endure. All wealth and resources belong, as a rule, to Society, and they must return to Society willingly or by force. Human society stands on justice and justice demands that resources be shared fairly among all members. Where this is not done, society is bound to disintegrate, resulting in the dispossession and routing of the privileged groups. The prayer of Prophet Musa remains valid for all times: "Wipe out their riches and harden their hearts," he said to Allah in respect of oppressors (Qur'an 10:88). In answer, Allah did not only wipe out the "splendour and riches" of oppressors, but broke them up completely. "So We expelled them," He said, "from gardens, springs, treasures, and every honourable position" (Qur'an 26:58-59). This, as far as we are concerned, is the fate that awaits many a man of privilege as long as their style of life

does not take cognisance of the prevailing misery and despair in our society.

The emirs, it must be said, constitute another set of people who most urgently need to reexamine their role in society before history takes its course. In the historical tradition which gave rise to the emirate institution, the emir is, among other things, charged with the following responsibilities to safeguard the integrity of Islam and the Muslim *Umma*; to protect the weak; to uphold the sharia in all its ramifications, and finally to ensure social justice in society. The emir, as the custodian of Islamic values and the symbol of the conscience of the Muslim community, is required to lead a decent, simple and upright life and nurture the society to moral rectitude.

Today, however, the picture is different. The sharia is not being upheld. The weak, unprotected and without advocate, continues to suffer, he being the greatest victim of secular policies, which tend to dispossess rather than protect him. As for social justice, the least said the better. Yet the emirs are silent, unconcerned. The number of emirs who can confidently be singled out as the true embodiment of Islamic values or as symbolising the deeper conscience of the Muslim *Umma* has continued to dwindle to a very dangerous level. The emirs have reduced themselves to the status of Pagan rulers, supporting “the government of the day” without any consideration of morality or honour. In this way have they come to be partners in oppressing the people, from whom they extort taxes and levies on behalf of secular regimes, whose social and spiritual well being has apparently ceased to be their concern?

Above all, the emirs have allowed themselves to fall into the luxury trap. They indulge in life-styles which, considering the Islamic values they purport to represent, can almost be described as scandalous. They have amassed wealth for themselves at the expense of their people, or at least far in excess of what is acceptable to Islam. And, we venture to say, the emirs have parted ways with their most important role upon which their continued exis-

tence could be justified: the promotion of the cause of Islam. They thus have become very nearly irrelevant to Islam, if not a burden on the Muslim *Umma*, who may eventually wish to be rid of the burden. And when an institution cannot justify its existence, can it hope to last much longer? Our fear is that the luxury trap which the emirate institution has fallen into may prove to be its death blow, for the collapse of a social institution follows closely after it has succumbed to the disease of luxury. At any rate, the fact of the matter is, Islam cannot be served by luxury-loving rulers.

Any mention of the emirs cannot be entirely divorced from the mention of the *Ulama*,¹⁵ many of whom, very unfortunately, have adopted, to put it mildly, a course which is hardly beneficial to Islam. It has been the attitude of some of them to deal in trivialities in disregard of the weightier issues that affect the country and the Muslim *Umma* as a whole. They are fully aware that the fundamental laws of this country are not Islamic, and that the sharia is being applied only in accordance with secular dictates. They are aware also of other fundamental issues. Such as the ousting of Islam from the political and social arena, and the non-Islamic nature of Nigeria as a whole. In situations like this, the general expectation of the people is that the *Ulama* will provide the required leadership and direction to put matters right. But the *Ulama*, together with the emirs, have maintained a deadly silence, and almost turned their backs against Islam. We say to the emirs and the *Ulama* that they must wholeheartedly and unreservedly come to the side of Islam, otherwise the Muslim *Umma* will disown them and force them into oblivion.

Islam does not depend on any group of people or particular institutions for its existence. Nor, as it is stated in the Qur'an (5:54), does Allah ever place the care and protection of Islam on anyone but Himself. Therefore no one is indispensable to Islam: if one set of people abandon their obligations to Islam, Allah raises another set in their stead who will champion the cause of the Faith.

They will be people, in the words of the Qur'an, whom Allah loves, who love Allah, who are humble towards the believers, proud towards all who deny the truth. They will strive hard in the cause of Allah and have no fear whatsoever to be censured by anyone.

There is the business community which must also examine itself critically with a view to mending its ways and bringing its behaviour in line with the injunctions of Islam. The widely held view that this community has been thriving largely at the expense of the people may not be an exaggeration; it is in fact borne out of experience. Many a businessman has hoarded essential food items, in times of distress and hardship, to create artificial rises in price—thus dealing a body blow to the spirit of Islamic brotherhood and social justice. Many a businessman has sold to the public items that are of low quality or even dangerous to human life by deceit and fraud—disregarding the Prophet's warning that whoever cheats the Muslim public is not one of them. This community has apparently set aside or ignored the Islamic injunction that wealth should be used to promote social justice and eliminate poverty. As a result, there are today thousands of people who are having to suffer the humiliation of begging in order to live. There are millions of impoverished, malnourished, uneducated children with no one and no government to cater for them. There is a crushing poverty in a country where there are many Muslims with considerable wealth and living in perfect affluence.

Moreover, the Muslim *Umma* can scarcely be heard even in critical moments for lack of a respectable voice in an age where the print media have become a veritable vehicle for the transmission of ideas as well as promoting a cause. Yet, our businessmen have closed their eyes to this fundamental need of Muslims; instead a great many of them spend their wealth in ways that are inimical to the moral integrity of society. In short, the Muslim business community is insensitive to the plight of the ordinary people, and shows no significant zeal in protecting the vital interests of Islam.

But Islam requires Muslims to make their wealth by lawful means, to spend that wealth for the benefit of society, and the promotion of Islam. Muslim men of substance should heed the injunction of Allah and spend their lawfully earned resources for the benefit of the people, before the inevitable day of parting with the world comes to them. That is the day, we are told in the Qur'an, when man would wish to be granted a delay for a short while so that he could spend all he has in the cause of Allah. "But," says the Qur'an, "never does Allah grant a delay to a human being when his time has come; and Allah is fully aware of all that you do" (63:9-11).

We, as Muslims, have no cause higher than Islam, or apart from it. The essence of our existence is to safeguard the integrity of Islam, obey the dictates of Islam in all aspects of life, and strive to make Islam supreme on earth. Any regime, therefore, or group or religious persuasion which seeks to assault the integrity of Islam, or subvert the Muslim *Umma*, will be deemed to have declared a war on us. The Nigerian state, hiding behind the mask of secularism, consistently undermines Islamic values, carrying forward the cause of colonialism. It regards all issues relating to Islam as sensitive, which must be avoided or shelved. Thus the sharia, according to Nigeria, is sensitive, but not so the imposed Anglo-Saxon law. Islamic education is sensitive, not so the colonial education. Politics on the basis of Islamic precepts and ideals is sensitive, but not so the politics based on secular or Christian values. In essence, therefore, Islam is considered sensitive precisely because it holds the key to the future of Nigeria. The cry of sensitivity is all part of the strategy of secular forces to impede the full realisation of Islam through a sustained campaign of calumny, hatred and false alarm. Islam is not sensitive: it directs the lives of the majority of the people of Nigeria; and above all, it provides the most solid historical, social and moral basis upon which a more viable nation can be built.

The Christians, on their part, have threatened a war on Muslims if ever Muslims attempt a full application of the sharia. It will be

foolhardy for Muslims to ignore the Christian threat, or dismiss it as empty. No one in his right senses will threaten more than sixty million people with war for a joke. A little recollection will show that the Islamic States of Borno and Sokoto collapsed as a result of armed aggression by Christians. The best of the Muslim rulers in the last two and a half decades, Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Ahmadu Bello and Murtala Muhammad, as well as some of their brilliant soldiers, have died at the hands of Christian assassins. The Biafran war was fought, as Ojukwu has himself stated, to contain the “Islamic Contagion.” So on the whole, given the general pattern of the encounter between Islam and Christianity—especially during the Crusades and Colonialism—and given the nature of the encounter with Christianity here, Muslims have no choice but to believe that the threat of war is real. A war will be waged on Islam. Muslims must not entrust their fate to secular regimes, which are known to be instinctively Christian, instinctively anti-Muslim, inherently incompetent. The Muslim *Umma*, thank God, has been forewarned.

However, such threats should not detract us from the fundamental task of striving to promote the cause of Islam. Our struggle involves, in one respect, the removal of all the vestiges of colonialism in this country: hence our rejection of the imposed law, the capitalist economy, and the secular complexion of the nation. It involves, in another respect, the removal of injustice, human degradation and the abuse of power, which have been the predominant features of the neo-colonial state. Above all, however, the Muslim struggle is to nurture the Muslim *Umma* to moral rectitude and create an atmosphere where Islam can thrive.

It is difficult to see why Christians should turn themselves into enemies of Muslims and set Christianity as a buffer between Islam and Colonialism. Christians have themselves claimed that the imposed law, whose dominance we seek to reverse, is not theirs. Perhaps we share with them the basic concern about moral decadence in this country, as well as the collapse of social responsibility

and the prevalence of injustice. We are all victims of the evils of capitalism, and the nation's economic and political subservience to the West. So what cause, we may ask, have the Christians to oppose the legitimate struggle of Muslims to terminate neo-colonialism and establish a society based on Divine values and precepts?

We may be right then in our suspicion that the vehement opposition of the Christian community to Islam stems from its subservience to the West: a subservience which is utterly absurd and subversive of the independence and integrity of this country. For example, it imposes on Christians the task to war against Islam and makes them blind to the prevailing political and social realities of the nation. Perhaps it is relevant to point out to the Christian community that they must take full responsibility for whatever may result from their hostility, threats and campaign of slander against Islam. Muslims expect them to behave responsibly and to put a stop to the persistent display of lack of modesty and manners.

On our part as Muslims, however, we must bear three facts in mind. First of all, neo-colonialism is not here to stay. It is a dying phenomenon. It has strangled itself by its monumental corruption, by its sheer incompetence, by its inordinate quest for wealth, and by its inability to strike a root in society or justify its existence. On the other hand, Islam is here to stay. We are Muslims by conviction and by instinct. Islam runs deep in our blood stream. How foolish is it, then, for people, whether Christians, soldiers, politicians or whatever, to pitch their camp with a dying system! Secondly, while it is essential for us to remain alert in the face of threats from all directions, we should not be unnecessarily disturbed by the plots hatched against Islam. Allah has instructed us, regarding the people of other faiths, thus: "If good fortune comes to you, it grieves them; and if evil befalls you, they rejoice in it. But if you are patient in adversity and conscious of Allah, their guile cannot harm you at all: for, verily Allah encompasses (with His might) all that they do" (Qur'an 3:120). Thirdly, we have a moral

obligation to act fairly and equitably to all people, even those who have adopted the hatred of Muslims as a way of life. Allah has enjoined on us to defend all just causes. “Never let the hatred of others to you,” He says, “lead you into the sin of deviating from justice. Be just: that is closest to being God-conscious” (Qur’an 5:8). Whatever therefore is the legitimate right of others, we must give them. So also all dignity and respect they deserve as human beings. Restraint, prudence and patience are incumbent upon us.

We must, however, make no concession to the secular state, nor compromise our fundamental obligations to banish neo-colonialism from our soil, and put the sharia once again on full course. We view as fallacious the prevailing assumption that it is only the Europeans who have the inherent right to impose their language, law, political and economic institutions on others and that the only option left to the rest of mankind is to obey. This is how Nigeria has come to declare the imposed systems as national: thus the English language is the “national language;” the imposed law, “the law of the land” and the capitalist system, “the Nigerian economy.” It is not enough merely to challenge this absurdity; it should be reversed.

The fundamental task before all Muslims today is to strive their utmost to consolidate Islam. We should be guided by the fact that, as the Prophet has said, the whole earth has been given to us by Allah as a Mosque. The whole world, in other words, is our constituency. We are free to transverse its regions—East and West, North and South, to disseminate the message of Islam. National boundaries, racial or political barriers should be of little significance to us as our enterprise is essentially global—the dissemination of truth, the support of all just causes, the pursuit of moral excellence, the defence of human dignity. Hence, it is absolutely imperative for us to cooperate with Muslims the world over, whether in Kenya, Saudi Arabia, Iran or Libya, in the fulfillment of our responsibilities to Islam. We are an integral and a vital part of the Muslim *Umma*, with whom we share common identity, aspira-

tions, concerns and destiny, and to whom we are inexorably bound in mutual obligations of support and solidarity.

Neo-colonial pupils have suggested that racial bigotry, or, to put it in their words, “African identity,” is a cause worth pursuing even at the expense of Islam. We can only convey to them the Prophet’s warning: “He is not of us who proclaims the cause of racial partisanship.” At any rate, Muslims are never bound by racial, national or secular considerations in their endeavours to do their duties to Allah. They are guided by a moral approach to human issues. In the words of the Prophet: “Behold, Allah has removed from you (Muslims) the arrogance of pagan ignorance with its boast of ancestral glories. Man is but a God-conscious believer or an unfortunate sinner. All people are children of Adam, and Adam was created out of dust.” The pity of it is that some people, blinded by a pathological hatred of Islam, should abandon the noble precedent and sentiments of Islam and advocate fictitious causes and false sentiments. They chose to close their eyes to the devastating effects of racism on mankind. Perhaps they have never heard about South Africa or Israel.

We need to intensify the efforts to spread Islam here in Nigeria. There are many Muslims whose depth of understanding of Islam leaves much to be desired. Intimating them with deeper and wider perception of Islam has become obligatory on the people of knowledge. There are a substantial number of pagan communities in the North and particularly in the South. Islam should be made to reach these people as a matter of urgency. And there are millions of Christians whom the message of Islam has yet to reach. There is no moral justification on our part to deny all these people access to Islam, as we seem to be doing at the moment. Nor are we justified to assume that all such people are incapable of appreciating the truth or accepting it. Or that there can be people who are unworthy of Islam, and who should therefore not be invited to Islam. All mankind are potentially Muslims and have a right of access to

Islam. After all, every human being is born with the natural disposition—as a Muslim. With greater efforts and dedication on our part, the cry of “*La’illaha illa Allah*” will be heard in every home in Nigeria in the not too distant future.

Moreover, we need to create appropriate platforms and mechanisms for a sustained mobilisation of the Islamic social forces. Islam has to be disseminated, not as a faith of scattered and disorganised individuals, but as an organised and solid movement which is concerned with fundamental human problems, current on pressing social issues and alive to its political and moral responsibilities to the people. Islam must therefore be made to permeate every facet of life, every sector of society and every institution in the country. Thus the intellectual community, students’ organisations, the labour movements and similar organs should be organised on Islamic lines. Women have to be mobilised for the Islamic cause. Above all, the ordinary people of this country—the peasantry, the artisans, the tradesmen and others—should not only get the message of Islam but be mobilised in the name of Allah, and for His cause.

Let us remember that as Muslims we have no limitations at all as to where to carry the message of Islam, and to whom. As Muhammad Iqbal has put it:

*Our range is from the ceiling of the skies
To the sea’s floor, and Time and Space are both
Dusts lying on our path.*

▲ APPENDIX 6

STATE AND RELIGION IN NIGERIA: A SUGGESTED FRAMEWORK

by *Ibraheem Sulaiman*¹⁶

In the name of Allah, the Compassionate, the Merciful. And God propounds (to you) a parable: Imagine a town which was once secure and at ease, with its sustenance coming to it abundantly from all quarters, and which thereupon blasphemously refused to show gratitude for God's blessings: and therefore God caused it to taste the all-embracing misery of hunger and fear in result of all (the evil) that its people had so persistently wrought (Qur'an 16:112).

The agonising and often frantic search for a viable polity in Nigeria most eloquently testifies to the acute sense of frustration and despair which pervade Nigeria today. The search itself presupposes that the country is yet to have a direction, a goal or ideology commanding a sufficiently broad acceptance to guide her. It is clear to all those with perception or keen insight and sense of fairness that the imposed system—that is, the institutions, value-system, and way of life of colonialism—have persistently failed, and woefully so. This country has been dragged into one disaster after another, and one failure after another. She has drifted from prosperity to crushing poverty, and she is sinking now into economic disaster. Yet she continues, as if by a compulsive drive to follow in the direction predetermined for her by forces opposed to her fundamental interests. It is this imitative blind impulse that perhaps poses the greatest danger to Nigeria, for in the final analysis, not only are more viable avenues to nation building and national integration closed, but even our sovereignty has been severely compromised. Nigeria has remained only a facsimile—a most disgraceful copy of a European model: facsimiles, as we know them, do not work.

Thus has Nigeria failed to acknowledge the existence of Islam in matters of public affairs, economy and other vital sectors of life under the blind and irrational belief in secularism. She has failed to acknowledge the existence of the fundamental difference between Islam and Christianity in conception of life and methods of dealing with human problems. Christianity is content to deal with spiritual matters only, leaving all those matters concerned with politics, economy, state and society to other systems to administer. Islam, on the other hand, encompasses all aspects of life in its fold, and provides guidance for them. Accordingly, Islam has its legal, economic, political, administrative, social institutions, meant to regulate human life in its entirety. These institutions, let it be known, were in operation in the larger part of Nigeria in Borno and Sokoto Caliphate to be precise, before they were suppressed by colonialism and replaced with Euro-Christian institutions. Indeed, in one form or the other, the Islamic precepts, which form the basis of these institutions, still govern the lives of millions of Muslims in Nigeria. Yet Nigeria has persistently refused to take cognisance of these precepts, and in many instances, has displayed open contempt for them.

Moreover, it is a fact that Nigeria maintains greater inclination and respect for Euro-Christian values and institutions she adopts, to the exclusion of Islamic values and institutions, as the only national institutions and value system. What is the justification, for example, for superimposing European laws as the law of the land and relegating the Islamic law to a second rate legal system, even though Islamic law commands larger adherents and broader appeal? There are several other examples of such absurdities which can only be described as national disgrace, but which Nigeria indulges in with such relish and pride. The logical inference one can draw from this senseless national attitude is that Nigeria is innately Euro-Christian in all essential details and that she is yet to be an independent country, one that is free to accord her legitimate institutions the recognition and backing they deserve, and throw

away all the systems and institutions imposed on her. In a nutshell, even if it were possible to accept the notion that the flag independence of 1960 was a genuine independence, the fact remains that in terms of disengaging Nigeria from her colonial past, freeing Islam from the clutches of colonialism and ordering the lives of the people in accordance with their authentic values and convictions, Nigeria is yet to be free. The struggle for independence is not over yet, if at all it has begun.

It is in this respect above all, that the role of Islam in our national life in the immediate and long-term future may be properly comprehended. Right now, Islam is emerging as a most potent force of social transformation, and the single greatest challenge to colonialism and imperialism all over the world, apart from its being the fount of an irresistible spiritual energy. Everywhere in the world, this latent energy of Islam is being released, unfolding a phenomenon the dimension of which may yet prove beyond human imagination. Nigeria is not an exception to this global upsurge of Islam: thank God, she too has a fair share of the mercy of Allah that is being dispensed worldwide. After all, in terms of history and population, Nigeria has a pride of place in the Muslim world. The role which Islam will play in the Nigerian context of the process of decolonisation is threefold. First, Islam will nourish the climate for the moral transformation of the country to the end that we have men of moral integrity to lead us aright and an upright populace that can not be manipulated nor submit to immoral leadership. Secondly, Islam will provide the spiritual energy with which to break to pieces the material power of the West which has held the country in bondage, and give Nigeria a new lease of life and total respectability. Finally, Islam will provide us with alternative institutions, and more importantly, an alternative civilisational framework which will free us from having to refer to the west ever again as to how we should organise our lives or build our nation.

The tendency especially in government circles to regard Islam as merely a “religion” among the religions of this country and to treat it as if it has no other role beside catering for the “spiritual” needs of the people is a most cynical and thoughtless behaviour. Islam is not playing its full role in our society only because it has been subjected to a series of persecutions and suppression of varying degrees from the beginning of this century, when the Europeans invaded this land, to this day. Today the signs of recovery of the Muslim *Umma* from the wounds and evils inflicted upon it by European imperialism are very much in evidence. Islam will once again, God willing, play a decisive role in directing the destiny of all of its people. This fact must be taken into account by all those concerned with the well-being and future of Nigeria. There are those who would like to wish away Islam as if it were a passing and transient phenomenon, and believe that European social, economic and legal systems are affairs to stay. It is true that such people are largely in the helm of affairs today, having been brought into prominence by neo-colonial forces, which tend in general to raise up what is despicable and to bring down every noble thing. The fact of the matter, however, is that Islam is here to stay and, above all, Islam will continue to exert the most decisive influence on the destiny of Nigeria and all the countries of *Bilad al-Sudan*.

There is also the tendency to equate Christianity with Islam, and to use this unfair and irrational equation to narrow down the scope of Islam and impose secular trends on an unwilling Muslim Community. Islam concerns itself with the affairs of man in all its entirety and seeks to make its community independent of unbelievers in terms of guidance and conduct. Islam is uncompromisingly opposed to colonialism and all forms of subservience to other powers. Muslim communities everywhere are determined to cut off the roots of imperialism and to rid themselves of its influences, be it ideological, political or moral. Christianity, on the other hand, was implanted in this country by colonial powers and entrenched

as the official religion by all kinds of maneuvers and treachery. This historical fact need not be covered up or, indeed, forgotten. For it is the colonial backing of Christianity at the expense of Islam and the systematic undermining of Islam that constitute the very root of the social and political problems of Nigeria. One major consequence of this historical development is that the Christians have come to assume that their fortunes are inexorably tied up to the fortunes of neo-colonialism. Thus they have consistently defended almost everything European: the imposed law, the capitalist system, the alien educational system and so on. They also have come to see their role as that of absolute and violent opposition to all that is Islamic; their vehement opposition to the Sacred Sharia is a glaring example. It is therefore clear that Islam pursues goals and objectives which are diametrically at variance to those of Christianity; Islam wants, among other things, to abolish colonialism; Christianity, on the other hand, clings to it for survival.

This is not to say, however, that there is no basis whatsoever for a peaceful or tolerable coexistence between Islam and other religious communities. What is needed is for government to accord Islam its rightful due, and to others, theirs. This is especially in respect of law, social morality, economic set up and education, and to acknowledge the fact that Islam, unlike the others, is a complete way of life. Nigeria therefore requires fundamental adjustments in virtually every major aspect of life to reflect her multi-religious nature, and in particular to accord Islam its rightful place in the scheme of things. Four aspects of this appraisal are suggested here, as the scope of this paper is severely limited.

1. Law

To a Muslim, the type of law which should govern his life is of crucial importance, as it touches not only on his daily life, but more vitally, his faith. A Muslim is one who believes in Allah and follows His Law, as embodied in the Sharia—the corpus of laws

and injunctions contained in the Quran and Sunna. Failure to live by the Sharia is tantamount to a rejection of the Islamic faith, as the bond between a believer and Allah is anchored on the former obeying the dictates of his Lord. This injunction of Allah to the Believer is contained in the Quran 45:18-22.

It is injunctions such as these that influence Muslim attitudes to law. The foremost obligation of the Muslim is to follow the dictates of Allah to whom alone he owes his creation, life, nourishment, existence in this world, and above all, his life in the hereafter. It is when there is a justification in the Sharia to follow laws made by human beings that a Muslim is obliged to do so. A Muslim is never bound by law merely on the ground that such laws constitute the law of the land, much less when such laws have been imposed by colonial usurpers. A Muslim judges laws by their merit—for instance, whether they are just and upright and fulfil man's spiritual and mundane purposes—and not merely by political sentiments.

If Muslims reject the imposed law, the reason is that they have every justification to do so. Firstly, the law is alien to Islam and it has been imposed, among other things, to replace the Noble Sharia. Secondly, the imposed law has entrenched injustice in the country and has proved particularly hopeless in fulfilling one of the greatest objectives of law: the suppression of crime. Thirdly, the imposed law is so fluid and amoral that it has succumbed to all sorts of manipulation and perversion. This legal system has served all the tyrant governments—civil and military alike—with equal faithfulness and loyalty.

Above all, Muslims have a system of law of their own which they hold sacred, and which determines their lives. The Sharia remains the most obeyed and venerated law in Nigeria, despite the persecution it has continued to suffer in the hands of secular governments. Certainly, the security of life and property enjoyed in Muslim areas in Nigeria, in contrast to the universal insecurity experienced in non-Muslim areas is sufficient an indication of the

efficacy and sanctity of the Sharia for the intelligent observer. To ask Muslims to throw away this Noble System in order to embrace a corrupt and unjust legal system is just the limit.

Islam takes into consideration the fact that man, whatever be his religious persuasion, culture and nationality, has an inherent love or respect for the law in which he has faith. In other words, Allah has endeared law to mankind, as law is the very essence of civilised life. It is this innate love for law that impelled Muslims to give up their lives in their thousands to preserve the integrity of the Sharia against colonial usurpers. Thousands of others undertook the *hijra* (flight) to escape being governed by the laws of Roman paganism and English colonisers. The same love now impels the Muslims of today to seek to be governed by the Sacred Sharia and an end to subservience to neo-colonialism.

Allah—most exalted is He—Who has implanted this love of law in mankind, has also prescribed the way in which civilised life should be organised. He has prescribed that laws must never be imposed on any religious community against their will, and that the system of law of each human organisation should be duly recognised and protected. This is the only way to ensure harmony in society, and forestall friction and conflicts which may ultimately lead to the disintegration of society. That eternal law is enshrined in the Quran 5:44-50.

This, then, is the Islamic recipe for human society, as far as the legal system is concerned. Social tensions and upheavals come only when the Islamic injunctions recognising the rights of religious communities to maintain their laws, and enjoining upon the state to ensure that those rights are strictly observed, are ignored. In the context of Nigeria, these injunctions imply, (i) that the Sharia shall enjoy full application in all areas where Muslims predominate, and that it takes precedence over all other legal systems in Nigeria, as the law that governs the majority of her people; (ii) that such other legal systems are accorded recognition in accordance with the

extent of the following they command. Equally significant, there must be a definite commitment by Nigeria to abolish all aspects of imposed laws which are inconsistent with our fundamental values, norms and the demands of our faith. In fact, the entire colonial legal enterprise must be abolished and be replaced with our authentic and legitimate laws. This indeed is the irreducible minimum in our quest for genuine self-determination and sovereignty.

2. The Economy

All communities have a system through which their economic activities are organised in order to secure the realisation of their objectives of life. Such systems may be just or otherwise, but it will be wrong to deny their existence. In Nigeria, the secularised elite have come to assume the absence of such systems among the communities which the Europeans have suppressed and on whom they have imposed their economic system. All areas which enjoyed the rule of Islam did have a well-organised economic system: for instance, Sokoto Caliphate was an economically independent nation and self-sufficient in food resources. There was a clear guidance as to how to achieve comprehensive justice for all, and a social security scheme based on the philosophy of *Zakat* was in operation. Yet today our noisy elite, pandering to the dictates of Western and Zionist interests, have denied the rest of mankind the ability to run their economic life outside the framework of Capitalism and Socialism—the two dominant economic systems of the Western civilisation. There has never been any attempt by Nigeria to explore the Islamic economic system which operated within its borders before, nor ask Muslims to bring forth their scheme for the economic well being of this nation. This is not only an arrogant and discourteous approach to national issues—a characteristic, one must say, of all secular nations—but one which has contributed to our perennial national failures. The fact of the matter is that the genius to conceive and operate an economy is not limited to the European

race alone but is shared by all mankind. Yes, there is capitalism, and there is socialism, but there is *also* the Islamic economic system. This fact must not be brushed aside; it must be kept in mind as we contemplate a viable economic system for our country. If Nigeria does not know the nature of the Islamic economic system, then she has an obligation to learn it with a view to applying it. Ignorance of a system which still influences the lives of the majority of this nation's people is an unspeakable national disgrace. Must anyone be surprised that Nigeria has sunk into an economic disaster?

It is the contention of this paper that the Islamic economic system with its uncompromising emphasis on social justice, its abolition of *riba*—usury, and hence, all forms of unjust enrichment and human exploitation—hoarding, monopoly, gambling and dubious enterprises; as well as Islam's comprehensive social security system as embodied in the *Zakat* scheme, which compels society to take care of the poor, the needy, the debtor, the travelers and all those in vulnerable economic conditions and which aims at putting an end to want and human degradation arising from poverty. It is the contention of this paper that the Islamic system can secure in an effective manner the well being of the people as well as abolish poverty altogether. Hence, it is imperative that at the very minimum the following should be made part and parcel of a new economic arrangement: (i) Muslims must have an alternative banking system to the usurious and exploitative system that operates today so that they can transact business on the basis of Islamic Law; (ii) An Islamic Social Security scheme, under a *Zakat* (alms) agency, should be established in all Muslim states to enable these states to pioneer a programme aimed at eliminating exploitation and poverty and securing a decent life for all; (iii) The Nigerian economy must be disengaged from the global exploitative economies of the Capitalist and Communist blocks; (iv) Islamic prohibitions in the economic sphere, such as gambling, middlemanship, hoarding, monopoly, unjust taxes and levies as well as looting of public

wealth, must be enforced by the state; and (v) the Islamic positive injunctions, such as the regulation of markets for the purposes of ensuring strict justice and fairness in respect of weights and measures, enforcement of quality control measures and elimination of fraud and profiteering, the establishment of a fair wage policy which takes into account the basic human needs, the delineation of a poverty line, which entitles all those who live below it to state care and subsidy, so as to lift them to a decent life. All such injunctions should be put into effect.

3. Education

Education involves the nurturing of the human being with the aim to enable him to fulfill the purpose of existence, as conceived by a given society or civilisation, more effectively. Education thus embraces the inculcation of such values, perceptions and ideals of conduct which society regards as vital for its well being and indispensable to its existence. Prior to colonial aggression, Islamic education was the sole system of education in existence in the larger part of this country. Its aims, among other things, include the raising of scholars to serve as models of conduct for people, as guardians of society's conscience, as rulers, judges and teachers, above all as reformers of society. It was this system of education and no other that sustained the Sultanate of Borno for nearly a thousand years. It also created the condition and the men who changed the course of history of West Africa and brought into being numerous Islamic States, including the Sokoto Caliphate.

But this educational system has been suppressed today, thanks to colonialism and thanks also to neo-colonial Nigeria. As a result, the values which are being transmitted through the imposed system are at variance with the values which the society believes in and to which it is attached. In all respects we operate an alien system of education, which by virtue of its alien nature and the fraudulent and often brutal methods by which it was imposed, has found lit-

tle acceptance among Muslims. Moreover, its glaring inadequacies and failures, coupled with its imitative, unimaginative and inept character, have made the prevailing system of education almost irrelevant. If Muslims are suspicious of the kind of education their children receive, it is because it has been imposed in the first instance on the ruins and at the expense of Islamic education, and because it has so far failed to acknowledge the existence of Islam as a world view and a civilisation distinct from Western civilisation.

If the present structure of education is maintained, it means that Euro-Christian values and alien conception of life will continue to be imposed on Muslims. Hence, the need for a profound restructuring of the system on a foundation which fully caters for the fundamental requirements of Islam. If this is not done, Nigeria will be leaving the door wide open for ideological conflicts in the future, as the war between Islam and Western civilisation will inevitably escalate in this part of the world. The writing is already on the wall for the perceptive mind to see. The nation's pretense that Muslims have no legitimate grievances, or that they do not know their rights, or that Islamic institutions have no place in the national set-up is a delusion that must stop. Muslims, be it noted, have no cause to accept forever what is imposed on them by an alien, un-Islamic and hostile power; nor is it conceivable for any people possessing a sense of honour and integrity to accept a situation of degradation and subservience forever. Even more poignant is the fact that the imposed education has failed to produce men of vision and sagacity capable of saving this nation from the prospects of social disintegration and raising it to a status of self-determination and self-respect. When the elite do not usurp power and misuse it, then they are busy pilfering the nation's resources and abusing her honour. Education has been unable to nurture them morally; it has only taught them the means to exploit their fellow men and surrender their nation to imperialism.

4. Social Morality

If the prevailing system of education has failed the nation, it is because it lacks, above all, the necessary moral content. Morality is important in a nation's life, and for a Muslim community, it is central to its existence. Colonialism has sought to destroy all the values of Islam without providing an honourable and viable alternative; it has sought to deface the moral character of Islamic societies, cities and environment, and replace them with the moral debauchery of the West. Notice the breweries in the heart of Muslim cities. Notice too the brothels, gambling dens and centres of vices all over the place. It is a picture of neo-colonialism boldly challenging Islam to war.

Certain patterns of behaviour, whether at individual or governmental level, are unacceptable to Islam. Alcoholism, gambling and prostitution are unacceptable to Islam. It does not matter, therefore, whether the government derives revenues from such evils. Such revenues are all illegitimate, callous and miserable earnings. At any rate, what government that is conscious of its moral responsibilities, would ever tolerate the massive human and material destruction which alcohol causes on the pretext that it derives revenues from its sale? Similarly, it is utterly unacceptable to Islam that the honour of women should be abused in the name of secularism, or that women should be lured into exposing their bodies for the gratification of men. These are some of the crucial issues that will continue to become ever more relevant in due course as Muslims demand the observance of decency, social integrity and moral discipline in their societies.

The Islamic values do run counter in many respects to the values imposed on the country by the Europeans. Islamic values and social morality are determined by Allah, who alone possesses the prerogative to determine for human society what is right and what is wrong. Alcoholism is wrong, not merely because it runs counter to human reasoning, but precisely because Allah has forbidden it.

The same applies to prostitution, to unrestrained intermingling of male and female, to public display of immodesty and other similar evils. The imposed value system has been built upon a fundamental infidelity to Allah, and it permits and forbids things on the basis of convenience and expediency. What is good today is good only because it serves the European interest. What is bad is so only because it does not suit the immediate convenience of Europe. This is the value system imposed globally on colonized people, such that in Nigeria, good and bad, right and wrong are determined by neo-colonial rulers as suits their convenience and their immediate interests. The Islamic moral values are absolute and determined by Allah, who has no vested interest to protect, caring only for the overall well-being of mankind. This is why a moral atmosphere prevails in Muslim societies, in contrast to what obtains in non-Islamic societies, as is clear to all. It is this moral atmosphere that Nigeria has been striving to destroy, so that Muslims may sink down to the level of communities without absolute social morality or defined values. The minimum demand of Muslims is that the Islamic social morality must be restored so that Muslim cities can regain their sanctity and integrity.

Other civilisations may see their destiny as being directed by economic or social factors alone. But Muslims see their destiny as fundamentally influenced by morality. And this is precisely the reason why Muslims will find it difficult, if not impossible, to compromise their moral and social values for whatever cause. The Quran has warned mankind in chapter 22:45-48.

And how many a township have We destroyed because it had been immersed in evil doing and now they (all) lie deserted, with their roofs caved in! And how many a well lies abandoned and how many castles that (once) stood high! Have they, then, never journeyed about the earth, letting their hearts gain wisdom, and causing their ears to hear? Yet, ver-

ily, it is not their eyes that have become blind—but blind have become the hearts that are in their breasts...And how many a community that was immersed in evil doing have I given rain for a while? But then I took them to task, for with Me is all journey's end.

▲ APPENDIX 7

OBSERVATIONS ON NIGERIA'S SECULAR ARRANGEMENTS

*Awul H. Yadudu*¹⁷**Secularism: The Idea**

Secularism or secularization of society and its institutions is a political arrangement which is predicated on the twin understanding that (a) there shall be a separation between church and state and (b) that religion shall have relevance and must of necessity be confined only to the private life of individuals. Consequently public affairs shall in no way be influenced by religion. This idea has been the product of the historical struggle for power between the papal authority and the temporal leaders in Christendom.

This idea was accepted by papal authority when it lost dominion over the temporal life and affairs of the society. It appeared, and has since remained, a perfect arrangement by which the church has dichotomized human life so as to retain control over one part and surrender the other to the temporal authority which had triumphed over it in the struggle for supremacy. It was a concession made to save face and it was easily legitimated by recourse to Biblical authority.

Secularism: The Practice

Putting this idea into practice by modern states has meant many things to diverse countries. In U.S.A., it has meant a wall of separation between church and state and an almost absolute non-involvement of the state in church affairs. The ridiculous resultant effect of this has meant that no prayers whatsoever could be offered at schools which are owned by the state.

Although India boldly announces its secularity in its constitution, the courts and state policy have interpreted the constitutional provision in such a skewed way as to ensure that Hinduism is the

official religion of certain states. For instance, cows, which are sacred animals in Hindu religion, cannot lawfully be slaughtered in certain states. So India's version of secularism has amounted to the adoption and elevation of one religion and the relegation of several others to the background.

The USSR too claims to be a secular state. Of course, its secularism sanctions an unashamed state adoption of atheism and the destruction of other revealed religions. Here too state policy is informed by atheism, another contrived form of religion.

Italy, the home of Catholicism, has its own version of secularism. With the temporal authority's disengagement from the Catholic Church, a secular state was firmly established side by side with the Vatican. But the secular Italian state cannot dare step on the toes of papal authority or initiate or seek to implement any policies that may run counter to the Catholic ethics of its citizens.

Secularism in Nigeria: A Background History

Throughout the vast land which was brought under the Sokoto caliphate, the idea of secularism was non-existent. The Sharia was the basis of the legitimacy of the leadership. State policies were informed by Islamic injunction. Sharia dictated the qualities of the leadership. There was no separation between the mosque and the state.

In the Pagan communities, religion played an equally prominent role in determining state policy and who could lead. The place of the shrines and oracles in the polity of these communities testifies to this. Great Britain, the imperial power, was and still is a Christian state. The Queen must belong to the Church of England and the common law was derived from Christian ideas. During the colonial era, English political ideas, which essentially did not recognize secularism, were imported into the country. While Islam was tolerated, Christian ideals were encouraged to gain a foothold on the Nigerian soil.

It was the 1979 constitution which introduced the nebulous idea of secularism into Nigeria's body politics. Section 10 of this constitution stated thus: "The state shall not adopt any religion as the state religion." With the adoption of these words, a vague idea of secularism was imposed on the country. The question to ask is: whose version of secularism have the proponents of this section sought to dump on the country? Did they have the American, Indian or Russian version at heart? Or have they reconceived of another?

Recently the political bureau came along not only to recommend that Section 10 be retained intact but to suggest that government should desist from engaging in certain religious activities. For instance they recommended that government should disengage itself from participating in *Hajj* affairs. With this new development are we heading towards the Indian direction?

Contradictions:

It seems that Nigeria's romance with the vague concept of secularism has bred and will continue to breed further contradictions in both understanding the secularist idea and its practice. These contradictory trends are noteworthy:

- (a) In their public posture, Nigerian governments have tended to behave in a manner which suggests that governmental policies must of necessity be informed by religious precepts within the context of modern setting. But which religious precepts are to inform governmental actions—and actually do?
- (b) Successive governments have equally tended to adopt policies that are more in tune with one religion over others. We seem to be heading towards the Christianization of Nigeria!
- (c) The 1979 constitution opens in its preamble with expressing trust in God and, in some sections, requires public officers to make undertakings in the name of God. Yet it prohibits the state from adopting any religion.

(d) The press and anti-Islamic forces all hide behind the veil of secularism to wage propaganda against Islam and to ridicule Muslims. For instance they see nothing wrong with the exploitative and usurious banking systems which obtain in this country. Indeed they endorse them. Pretending to be true secularists, they attack a more humane alternative banking system, only because it has the word “Islamic” in its name. Certainly Nigerians cannot be more conscientious secularists than the Belgians, the Swiss and Americans, who have benefited from the operation of similar banks on their soils!

(e) The state of Israel is not, everybody knows, a secular state. The official religion in that state is Judaism. All Jewish people in the Diaspora have automatic citizenship in the state. Yet Christians in Nigeria, who are the most outspoken proponents of secularization of the country, are in the forefront in advocating normalization of relations with the Zionist state even as Christians, just as Muslims, are denied their inalienable rights in that country. What a contradiction! Christians endorsing racist and theocratic policies for another country, while they work tirelessly to uproot all traces of religion in governing the life of their own nation!

Recent developments such as relate to the hue and cry that Christians have raised on the issues of OIC, the Sharia, *Hajj* performance by Muslims, schools dressing, etc., all indicate an irresistible conclusion. It is that there is no contradiction in the Christian idea and perception of secularism. They sing its song whenever it suits their interest. For them, the choice is not between theocracy, a terminology which is unknown to Islam, and Secularity. They are perfectly at home with secularism. Indeed secularism is, as observed in the opening paragraph, a papal contrivance. It is a device which Nigerian Christians conveniently use to advance their geo-political cause and, at the same

time, engage the Muslims with frivolities with a view to diverting our attention. For how else does one explain why a Christian should worry that a Muslim school pupil wants to dress Islamically and grants the same privilege to his Christian counterpart? Or, what business does a Christian from Akwa Ibom have to say that a Muslim in Katsina cannot regulate his entire life according to the dictates of the Sharia?

▲ APPENDIX 8

AN ADDRESS ON THE OFFICIAL LAUNCHING OF SHARIA,
ZAMFARA STATE, BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE EXECUTIVE
GOVERNOR OF ZAMFARA STATE, ALHAJI AHMAD SANI
YARIMAN BAKURA

*On Wednesday, 18th Rajab, 1420 and 27th October, 1999,
At Ali Akilu Square, Gusau*

*Justice Muhammed Bashir Sambo*¹⁸

1. It is important to begin this short address on behalf of all the Nigerian Muslims during this historic occasion of the launching of Sharia in Zamfara State with thanking the Almighty Allah who has made Zamfara State under the able leadership of His Excellency the Executive Governor, Alhaji Ahmad Sani, Yariman Bakura, to be a Godsend to give a lead in giving the Nigerian Muslims of Zamfara State in particular and the Federation of Nigeria in general the right to have their lives governed by Sharia as a fulfillment of their fundamental rights as Nigerian citizens. What Zamfara State has done in giving the Muslims of Zamfara State the right to have their lives governed by Sharia is simply a fulfillment of their constitutional right, which the Muslims in this country especially of the Southern States have been denied for a very long time now. What the Government of Zamfara State has done in actual fact is the expansion of the application of Sharia by virtue of section 275 (1) and 277 (1) of the 1999 constitution. The 1999 constitution, as did the 1979 constitution, section 240 (1) and 242 (1), has given the state, which requires it to establish a Sharia Court of Appeal and State Law, the powers to concur additional jurisdiction and powers to establish courts and give them jurisdiction. What the Government of Zamfara has done in its expansion of the application of Sharia is fully constitutional. The Almighty Allah will reward fully the Government and people of Zamfara.

2. It is not surprising to us, Muslims, to hear the reactions of various kinds to the decision of the Government of Zamfara to make Sharia the law, which will govern the lives of the Muslims of Zamfara State. What is most surprising is the reaction of people who describe the action of Zamfara State of making Sharia to govern the lives of Muslims in Zamfara State as unconstitutional, because such an action, they say, violates section 10 of the 1999 constitution, which says: “The Government of the federation or of the state shall not adopt any religion as State Religion.” Such ignorant people interpret this section 10 of the 1999 constitution to give Nigeria a secular status. Such an interpretation of giving Nigeria a secular status is far away from the Truth. It is far away from the truth because of the following reasons:

- a) This very 1999 constitution which contains section 10 has said in its preamble that we are—the Nigerian peoples—under God. Is this not adoption of religion by government?
- b) This very 1999 constitution speaks of taking oaths in its various sections, such as 140, 149, 152, 194 and Seventh Schedule. Is this not adoption of religion by Government?
- c) This very 1999 constitution contains chapter vii, the Judicature, Part 1 and Part 11, sections on courts which apply Common Law, Islamic Law and Customary Law. The Common Law is a Christian Law; Islamic Law is Sharia, while Customary Law is Customary religion. All these courts are funded by the Government. Is this not adoption of religion by the Government? If the 1999 constitution has adopted religion, how can it prohibit the adoption of religion by Governments? What Section 10 of 1999 constitution means in essence is that Nigeria is a multi-religious nation in which the Government can assist various religions according to their structures and scopes.

3. Besides the sections in the 1999 constitution which make the Government adopt religions, there are things on the ground which show that section 10 of the 1999 constitution cannot prohibit the adoption of religions by the Government. These things are:

- a) Making every Sunday a work-free day, knowing fully well that it is a Christian religious day, is adoption of religion by the Government.
- b) Making Christmas days, Easter days, *Eid-el-Fitre* day, *Eid-el-Kabir* day work-free days is adoption of religions by the Government.
- c) Directing the Muslims and Christians by the Government to say special prayers in Mosques and Churches is adoption of religions by the Government.
- d) The use of a cross in Government hospitals and ambulances is adoption of religion by the Government.
- e) The official Government use of the Christian calendar founded by Pope Gregory is adoption of religion by the Government.
- f) This analysis of the use of religion by the Government makes it abundantly clear that it is wrong to give Section 10 of the 1999 constitution the meaning of secularism or prohibition of adoption of religion by the Government. It is therefore necessary for those people who, through ignorance or mischief, have been giving Section 10 of the 1999 constitution the wrong meaning of secularism to stop doing so in the interest of justice. Nigeria is a multi-religious state and there is no viable alternative to Nigeria opting for a multi-religious status.
- g) In the very 1999 constitution, section 14 (2), it says, "Sovereignty belongs to the people of Nigeria from whom government through this constitution derives all its powers

and authority.” This provision of the constitution has made it clear that the Government works with powers and authority given to it by the people and so it makes no sense to imagine that the government can ignore the religion of the people. Anyway, before Section 10 of the 1999 constitution can accommodate the meaning of prohibition of government to adopt religion, all the adoptions of religions in the 1999 constitution and outside it by Government must be removed first. This is an impossible thing to do.

4. *Secularism was never accommodated in [any] Nigerian constitution or law.* I would like to substantiate my assertion that there was no time, constitutionally, that Nigeria ever was a secular state. It is only Nigerians who are either misled to regard it so or those who felt they should regard it so in order to promote their own personal interest and certainly not the interest of the Nigerian nation. If we examine all the Nigerian constitutions of the past and present together with the laws, we cannot find any provision that says Nigeria is a secular state. As stated earlier, section 10 of the 1999 constitution provides: “The Government of the Federation or of the state shall not adopt any religion as a State religion.” This is the provision which is wrongly interpreted by interest groups to mean secularism for Nigeria. If we examine other provisions of the constitution in which such a provision of section 10 is made, we will find that they contradict secularism. The reason why this section 10 cannot accept the secularity interpretation is that there are other sections of the constitution which contradict secularism. The preamble to the constitution which asserts that the nation is under God contradicts secularism. Sections in the constitution on oaths contradict secularity. Section 17 (3) (b) on social objectives contradicts secularity as the section has made it clear that the government can promote religious affairs. Section 18 of the constitution on education contradicts secularism as the Government has to fund

education, and education means intellectual and moral training, and moral training of Muslims and Christians can only be taught through their religions. Section 38 of the constitution on right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion contradicts secularism. There are indeed many other sections of the constitution which contradict secularism.

5. ¹⁹ The whole chapter VII of Judicature covering section 230-284 of the 1999 constitution contradicts secularity as the government funds courts which apply Common Law, the Islamic Law and Customary Law—all of which have something to do with the religions of Christianity, Islam and Custom. If the government has to fund courts that deal with the Common Law, Islamic Law, and Customary Law, then such a state cannot be a secular one. In the case of Islamic Law and Customary Law, it is clear to everybody that they are inspired by religions. What many of us do not know—and we ought to know—is that the Common Law is also inspired by the religion of Christianity. I think it is important that this explanation should be made so that everybody should realize it, especially the Christians, who have grudges when courts having legal systems inspired by the religions of Islam and Custom are funded by the Government. I like to quote below what three legal luminaries have said about the Common Law being a Christian law as an evidence. The three Christian Legal Luminaries, two English and one Nigerian, are Hon. Lord Summer, Hon. Lord Finlay and Hon. Justice Karibi-White. Hear what they say about the common law quoted below:

- a) In a case *Bowman Vs Secular Society Limited*, Lord Summer says: “Ours is, and has always been, a Christian State. The English family is built on Christian ideas, and, if the national religion is not Christian, there is none. English law may well be called a Christian Law, but we apply many of its rules and most of its principles with equal justice and equally good

government in heathen communities, and its sanctions even in courts of conscience are material and not spiritual.”

b) Lord Finlay, the then Lord Chancellor, concerning the same case says: “There is abundant authority for saying that Christianity is part and parcel of the law of the land. But the fact that Christianity is recognized by the law is the basis to an extent for holding that the law will not help endeavours to undermine it (Christianity).”

c) Hon. Justice Karibi-White has this to say:

The claim of the Holy Qur’an to Divine revelation is not peculiar to it. The Holy Bible, which appears to contain the fundamental basis of the Common Law, claims to have been derived partly from the Ten Commandments God gave to Moses on the mountain. The several books of the Holy Bible are said to have been written on inspiration. The Roman Twelve Tablets, the Laws of the Greeks, and the laws operating in many civilised countries are founded on Divine revelations.

6. It is very important to note that these assertions that the Common Law is a Christian law, coming from these learned Christian Legal Luminaries of the Common Law, are good enough to educate the ignorant ones that it is not only the Islamic Law and Customary Law that have religious elements in them. If this is the case and the Government funds the courts which apply these laws, how can Nigeria imagine to be a secular state? It is a fact that none of our previous and present constitutions have acknowledged that Nigeria was or is a secular state. It is only those selfish Nigerians who imagine that secularism can help their selfish course that go all over the place calling Nigeria a secular state. It is not going to help Nigeria as a nation to impose a secular status on the country. Nigeria is a multi-religious state and it should continue to be regarded as such. What is really essential is that government should identify the various religions of

its people and cater for them according to their structure and scope. The government should thoroughly identify the peculiarity of different faiths in order to cater for them according to their needs. One cannot see an alternative to this for Nigeria as a united nation.

7. The provision as it is contained in the constitution which says: "The government of the federation or of a State shall not adopt any religion as state religion" is vague, and it is being subjected to wrong interpretation such as that of secularism. The provision of section 10 and together with provisions of other parts of the constitution cannot accept the interpretation of secularism. Section 10 should be amended in order to prevent it from being given the wrong interpretation of secularism. If we read the section of the constitution with other sections of the constitution which touch on and deal with religion, it will be clear to us that what the section really means is that neither the Federal nor the State Government is allowed to impose one single religion, cater for it alone and impose it on all the citizens. In other words, what Section 10 is saying is that the government shall cater for all religions according to their need, scope and structure, because Section 38 of the constitution provides freedom of religion, knowing full well that religions differ in scopes and structures. In this respect, for Muslims to have their freedom of religion fully, Sharia must govern their lives. The discussion in this paper undertakes to show that Nigeria by its constitution and its provisions in respect of what Section 10 of the constitution and its provisions, is not a secular state has been clearly vindicated. Nigeria is therefore a multi-religious state that has adopted a federal system of government in order to cater for and satisfy any differences in matters of law and fundamental rights.

Federal System Of Government

8. It is a fact that Nigeria as a multi-religious nation has consistently adopted a federal system of government. The question is why

has Nigeria continued to adopt a federal system of government? The answer to this question is simply that Nigeria consistently continues to adopt a federal system of government, because it is a country which has many tribes, ethnic groupings and religions, and in a situation like this anywhere in the world a federal system is adopted in order to satisfy the different aspirations of all the segments of the society. It is by virtue of this federal system that Zamfara State Government is able today to enact laws which will satisfy the aspirations of its people. The Zamfara State Government has utilized the provision of section 14 (2)(a) and (b) to make Sharia to be the law which will govern the lives of the Muslims in Zamfara State. Zamfara State Government has clearly answered the yearnings of the people to whom the sovereignty belongs by giving them Sharia which will be the instrument of security and welfare of the citizens of the state. Section 14 (2)(a) and (b) says: 14(2)(a)—“Sovereignty belongs to the people of Nigeria from whom government through this constitution derives all its powers and authority.” 14(2)(b)—“The security and welfare of the people shall be the primary purpose of government.” The provisions of section 14(3) and (4) which deal with Federal, State and Local Government characters, have further strengthened the powers of Zamfara State Government to give the Muslims of Zamfara State the right to have their lives governed by the Sharia as their share of the constitutional federal character designed for the peace and stability of the nation.

9. It is necessary here to advise those critics among the lawyers and laymen who doubt the powers of the Zamfara State Government to enact laws to make Sharia govern the lives of the Muslims of Zamfara State, to study soberly the provisions of section 4,5, 6, 14, 15, 38, 277 and 278, in order to see for themselves that the Zamfara State Government has full Executive and Legislative powers to enact Sharia to govern the lives of the Muslims in Zamfara

State. Such critics especially among the non-Muslims who opine that such Sharia may affect the Christians and non-Muslims should know, if they do not know, the position of Sharia to the Muslims. If they do not know the position of Sharia to the Muslims, they ought to know that only Sharia is allowed by Islam to be applied upon the Muslims. Almighty Allah sayeth in the Holy Qur'an 5:44, "And who-so-ever does not judge by what Allah has revealed, then such people are disbelievers." This verse of the Holy Quran is clear that both the Muslim leaders and the Muslim-led are allowed to have Sharia as their only law. Such critics should understand this and they should understand that the Muslims in Nigeria have for many years been governed by laws which are un-Islamic. Why should the Christians complain if they are affected by the Sharia, which is after all their law too, as pointed out by the Holy Quran where in 42:13, Almighty Allah sayeth: "He (Allah) has ordained for you the same religion of Islam which He ordained for Noah, the one which we have inspired in you, O Mohammed, and that which we have ordained for Abraham, Moses and Jesus, saying you should establish (i.e., to do what it orders you to do practically, not by talks) and make no divisions in it (religion)." It is clear from this quoted verse of the Holy Qur'an that Islam has always been the only religion of Almighty Allah as revealed to other previous Prophets sent by Almighty Allah to various nations. If the Christians study the Holy Bible sincerely, they will discover that the Holy Bible contains provisions of laws similar to those provided by the Sharia, the sources of which are from the Holy Qur'an.

10. Finally, the Muslim *Ummah* are grateful to Almighty Allah for making it possible for the leadership of the Executive and Legislature to use their constitutional powers to enact Sharia, which will from now on govern the lives of the Muslims in Zamfara State. We pray to Almighty Allah to give the leadership of other states the courage and resolve to provide Sharia to govern the

lives of Muslims in their states. We have tried in this address to educate those who criticise the introduction of Sharia in Zamfara State on the ground of their wrong interpretation of Section 10 of the 1999 constitution, to give Nigeria a secular status which prohibits the adoption of state religion by proving to them with facts and figures from the 1999 constitution and outside it, that Nigeria cannot be a secular state but a multi-religious state. The wrong use of secular status for Nigeria has been constantly used, especially by the Christians, to deny the Muslims their fundamental right of having Sharia as an instrument of law to govern their lives. This trick to deny the Muslims their fundamental rights must stop, as the Muslim *Ummah* in this country have discovered their fundamental rights through the guided Zamfara State leadership and, God willing, there will be no going back from these fundamental rights. We pray to Almighty Allah to make this historic event in Zamfara State to open doors to Muslims all over the federation, especially in the Southern States, who have been denied Sharia completely, to have their lives governed by the Sharia. May the Almighty Allah protect the leadership of Zamfara State Government and peoples and may the Almighty Allah bring peace, stability and prosperity as a result of the Muslim return to Sharia, the only way acceptable to Almighty Allah. Amen.

▲ APPENDIX 9

NIGERIA AND SECULARISM

*Misbahu Rufai*²⁰

Religion, according to Emile Durkheim and many later sociologists, is “a unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, that is to say, things apart, beliefs and practices which unite into one single moral community—all those who adhere to them.” In the *Oxford Advanced Learners’ Dictionary*, it is the “belief in the existence of a supernatural ruling power, the creator and controller of the universe, who has given to man a spiritual nature, which continues to exist after the death of the body.”

Religion in Islam is complete submission to the will of Allah. Secularism, on the other hand, means, in the words of the *Advanced Learners’ Dictionary*, “the view that morality and education should not be based on religion.” Secular here is referred to as “worldly or material, not religious or spiritual.”

In order to differentiate between secularism and religiosity, sociologists use the concepts of profanity and sacred. Profanity refers to objects that do not partake of the supernatural but are ordinary, mundane, of this world. This distinction between the sacred and the profane was introduced into sociology by Emile Durkheim in his book *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*.

In identifying the characteristics of a secular society, Harvey Cox stressed what he called *pragmatism* and *profanity* which he explained as follows: “By pragmatism we mean secular man’s concern with the question ‘Will it work?’” Secular man does not occupy himself much with mysteries. He is little interested in anything that seems resistant to the application of human energy and intelligence. The world is viewed not as a unified metaphysical system but as a series of problems and projects.

By profanity we refer to secular man’s “wholly terrestrial horizon, the disappearance of any supramundane reality. He views the

world not in terms of some other world but in terms of itself.” Other concepts applied by Harvey Cox in his characterisation of the secular society are “pluralism” and “tolerance.” He thinks that different “world views,” including different religions, peacefully coexist without the fanaticism which has been so disruptive in the past.

This latter characteristic is what most Nigerians have adopted. But Cox pointed out that in this case, religion becomes “a mere hobby, a mark of national or ethnic identification,” or it may be “an esthetic delight.” No longer does it provide for the bulk of people “an inclusive and commanding system of personal values and explanations.” A secular society, he argues, is therefore a society characterised by “pluralism,” “tolerance,” “pragmatism” and “profanity.”

Brayn Wilson, in his contribution, wrote that a secular society is one where “the sense of the sacred, the sense of the sanctity of life, and deep religiosity are absent.” According to these contributions, secularisation is “the process whereby religious thinking, practice and institutions lose social significance.” Here men do not resort to prayer for their needs but rather to science and technology. The methods of attaining these needs, according to Wilson, are “technical.”

A closer look at the various definitions and suggestions as to what constitutes a secular society in relation to Nigeria is necessary. Let us start from the *Advanced Learners’ Dictionary* and it would be found that there is an incompatibility of ideas. This is because, according to the dictionary, morality and education under secularism are not based on religion. Yet we find that there is hardly any school in the country that does not begin the day with a religious service, and moral teachings in most of these schools are based on religious indoctrinations.

On Cox’s concept of pragmatism the truth is not far fetched. Majority of Nigerians start most jobs with prayer, and success at the end is attributed to the blessings of God, while prayer is invoked to avert misfortunes. Thus human energy, intelligence and

perception of man's terrestrial horizon are based on the supramundane reality of God.

On "pluralism" and "tolerance" it is clear that different religions are coexisting, but is it without any fanaticism? And is religion a mere hobby, an esthetic delight? Has religion lost social significance in our national and private lives?

Secularism can only be claimed if the answers to these questions are in the affirmative. So long as our sense of the sacred, sense of the sanctity of life, and deep religiosity are not absent, so long as matters of religious interest are treated with great caution, so long as national programmes, including the pledge, grant recognition to religion, and so long as we are ready to draw daggers at each others' throats for the sake of our different religious inclinations, the proponents of Nigeria being a secular society should better take another look at their definition of secularism.

It is much safer to say that Nigeria is a multi-religious state and not secular, because in a secular state the belief in God has no significance in the life of the people. In Nigeria, however, religion is important to our political, social and cultural life and goes beyond the scope of the shrines, churches and mosques. Other examples are the closure of our seaports during Christmas celebrations, while there are official decorations of public institutions and the granting of Christmas bonuses in recognition of such celebrations. It will be recalled that the country was plunged into three days darkness, because workers were not given their bonuses, while there was a riot leading to the destruction of property at the Volkswagen of Nigeria as well as some banks. If the country could spend as much as three million naira of the taxpayers' money to receive the Pope, invite the Archbishop of Canterbury at the expense of the nation, set aside special days as public holidays in recognition of religion, while our radio and television stations are filled with special religious, sponsored or not sponsored, programmes, then one wonders what the advocates of Nigeria being secular mean.

Let us call a spade a spade and stop deceiving ourselves with this unrealistic concept. Nigeria is a Multi-Religious State and this writer would like our future constitutions to declare it so. Even the 1979 constitution recognizes this fact as espoused in the preamble, which says that Nigeria is a sovereign state under God. This write-up is not meant to call on the government to denounce the place of religion in our society, but rather to recognise the fact that religion has permeated all aspects of our socio-political, economic and cultural life. It has exceeded the confines of mosques, churches and shrines but claiming the country to be secular de-emphasises this fact. Religion is a very important ingredient for our national development and to relegate it to the background would mean paving the way for the nation's doom.

▲ APPENDIX 10

HAWAINIYAR OKOGIE TA KIYAYI RAMAR MUSULMI!²¹

Ra'ayin Alkalami

A cikin sakonsa na bukunkuwan ranar Ista (Easter) limanin cocin da yayi suna kan nuna kiyayya ga Musulmi da Musulunci. Olubummi Okogie ya zargi gwamnatin kasar nan da kafa dokokin da ya kira na zalunci da na son kai.

Amma fa dokar zalunci a wurin Okogie ita ce dokar da ta kafa hukumar Alhazai ta kasa. Domin kimanin makwanni biyu kenan da Kungiyar Kiristocin Nigeriya, watau CAN, wacce Okogie ke shugabanta, ta kai karar Shugaban Babangida tare da Ministan Sharia Yarima Bola Ajibola. Ta na neman kotu ta soke sabuwar dokar da ta kafa hukumar Alhazai.

Wannan zargi da Okogie ya yi da kuma abinda kungiyarsa ta yi duk ba abin mamaki ba ne, domin ba tun yau wannan hatsabibi ke bayyana kiyayyarsa kiri da muzu ga Musulmi da duk wani abu da ya shafe su wanda ya bullo daga bangare gwamnati ba.

Wani abu kuma da ya sa babatun Okogie bai zama abin mamaki ba shine tuni dai Okogie da kungiyarsa suka sha kunyata a idon jama'ar kasar nan. In ba a manta ba, ba irin zargin da CAN ba ta yi wa gwamnatin farar hula ta Shagari cewa Musulmi kadai aka baiwa kudi domin gina masallaci a sabon birnin tarayya, Abuja ba Mutanen kasar nan ba su san gaskiyar zancen ba, sai mataimakin shugaban kasa na wannan lokaci wanda Krista ne, wato Ekwueme, ya fito baro-baro ya bayyana wa duniya cewa gwamnatinsu Naira miliyan goma-goma ta baiwa kungiyoyi da ke wakiltar Musulmi da Kiristoci kasar nan.

Haka kuma a kwanan ma hukumar sabon birnin tarayya ta fito a fili ta karyata babatun nuna bambanci na karya da kungiyar ke zargin hukumar da shi wajen raba filaye domin gudanar da ayyukan addini.

To abin mamaki shine yadda gwamnati ta kyale wannan dan ta da zaune tsaye da wannan kungiya mai son tashi tsaye suka maida aikinsu zargin gwamnati da tunzura mabiyansu bisa karya. Mun

sha fadi a baya cewa lallai in ana son a kaucewa barkewar rigimar addini tsakanin Musulmi da Kiristoci, lallai a yiwa bakin Okogie linzami. Shi fa makaho baya sani ana kallonsa sai an dungure shi.

Bai kamata a ce gwanatin tarayya ta bari wani mutum guda saboda wata kiyayya da yake da ita ga wani addinin ba, ya jefa kasar nan cikin mummunan rikici.

Ya kamata Okogie ya san cewa domin kawai gwamnati na iki-rarin cewa ba ta bin tafarkin addini, shi kenan ta zamanto ba ruwanta da Musulmi. Mun san dutsen da Okogie ya taka ya ke nema ya yi wasa jifa da Musulmi, to ahir dinsa, kuma lallai gwamnati ta ja kunnensa, domin duk abinda ya jawo ba zai tsaya akansa ne ba sai ya shafi gwamnati.

Duk wannan hayaniya da Okogie yake yi, yana yi ne kawai domin son ransa da kuma neman suna. Wasu abubuwan ma yana yi ne don kawai a yi dariya. Misali yanzu ina amfanin maganganun da ya yi kimanin makwanni biyu da suka wuce, inda aka buga a jaridar *Vanguard*, inda yake cewa zai niki gari ya je ofishin Furofesa Jibril Aminu, ya fada masa cewa shi kadai ne ministan da bai iya tafiyar da aikinsa ba.

To, ka ga a hakikanin gaskiya duk wani mai cikaken hankali ba zai fadi haka ba, sai don nishadi, amma shi Okogie ba da nishadi ya fadi ba, da gaske yake yi, bai san masu magana sun ce samu yafi iyaya ba.

Shi a wautarsa duk wadannan tsegunguni da gutsuri-tsomar da yake yi, so yake gwamnati, ba a ba shi dan wani mukami kamar yadda ta baiwa sauran ‘yan’uwansa, Tai Solarin da Wole Soyinka. Nufinsu shine su samu su hada wata kafa wadda zata hana wa Musulmi rawar gaban hantsi, su kuwa su yi ta damawa abinsu, suna kece raini, a takaice dai su zama jakin maginiya, sai kaga dama aka ci kasuwa.

Mu dai Musulmi duk wannan rudani ba zai tsoratanmu ba, tunda wadanda suka fi Okogie ma sun ja sun saki, to balle shi dan tsungininsu. Sai ya yi ta yi duk wanda ya ce zai yiwa duniya jinka, sai ya mutu da lauje a hannu.

▲ APPENDIX 11

BETWEEN OBASANJO, GANA, NTA AND RELIGIOUS
BROADCASTS FROM THE VILLA CHAPEL²²

Since the assumption of power in May, 1999, President Obasanjo has left nobody in doubt about his self-declared status as a “born-again” Christian, following his conversion at the Yola Prison. To underscore this, he built and commissioned a chapel in the Aso Villa and has a resident ministering priest as part of the package. This is fair enough.

A notable practice of the different Heads of State, Governors, Ministers and other top government functionaries who have ruled and, in many cases, ruined our country, is how much effort these people have expended to underline their religious.... [?], through outward displays of religious zeal, and an unrivalled ability to manipulate the religious passion of the Nigerian people.

It follows, that the Nigerian ruling class makes very loud claims to religious piety, enjoys photo opportunities in mosques and churches, yet have always breached the basic doctrines of the great religions, where they speak about governing justly and shunning avarice and corruption.

It is part of our national legacy, that as the crises of the neo-colonial state have deepened, with the people finding escapist routes in fervent fundamentalist religious confessions, so has the proclivity of the ruling circles to exploit and manipulate religion reached new heights.

It seems to us, that no government in recent times has taken this cynical manipulation to the heights which we have been witnessing under President Obasanjo. It has become *de rigueur* every week on public television, for the viewers to be inflicted with the spectacle of a live telecast of the Sunday service at the Villa chapel, an event which is unprecedented in our national life,

ostensibly to showcase how passionately religious our president is!

We are used to television clips recorded from mosques and churches during the significant religious festivals such as Eid, Easter or Christmas, showing the religious devotion of our leaders. But to have to endure a weekly barrage from the presidency is a new departure in our rulers' political and manipulative use of religion on the nation's leading public television medium, the NTA. Knowing the way the minds of our rulers work, a new set, who are Muslims, might of course take a cue from what Obasanjo and his overzealous Information Minister, Jerry Gana, have commenced, by wishing that they also be broadcast live, from their *Jumat* service, every Friday. Thus further deepening mutual suspicion amongst adherents of the religious faiths in the country.

We believe that President Obasanjo, Prof. Jerry Gana and other habitués of the Villa Chapel, have the right to worship as fervently as they do each Sunday. However, they cannot continue to inflict their worship on us through the Nigerian Television Authority. The telecast should stop, unless there is evidence that it has been paid for just like other religious groups do. The medium of television is a national patrimony, which President Obasanjo, Prof. Jerry Gana and the authorities of NTA have absolutely no right to use for a cynical manipulative and divisive religious agenda.

The religious worship of President Obasanjo is a communion between him and God, and should be left where it belongs, in the holy sanctuary of the Aso Villa Chapel. A weekly telecast on television is certainly an abuse of presidential privilege and it intrudes into the rights of Nigerians, who are the collective owners of the Nigerian Television Authority over whose airwaves these religious services are broadcast weekly.

▲ APPENDIX 12

THE VOICE OF ISLAM

*M. Tawfiq Ladan*²³

For many decades now Muslim voices of discontent have come only in the form of whispers, scarcely capable of being heard by secular regimes more readily to be attracted by voices which promise opportunities of self-aggrandisement and personal wealth. Secular regimes, themselves an alien imposition, have always displayed an astonishing ignorance of the people over whom they exercise control; and they almost invariably are incapable of reading the signs on the wall. Whether such signs are written in such casual incidents as student riots or the more spectacular one as general uprising, it comes to them as a surprise.

Perhaps there is sense to some interest in having regimes whose ears are more attuned to the melodies of secular life - with its infinite promises of worldly glory and sexual pleasures. And of the voices representing the more sober and weighty concerns of life, the servants of the world have no interest, or cannot indeed understand. Such regimes are therefore, as a rule, unstable, or in the language of Islam, they are merely like the webs the spider weaves. A government cannot be sustained by self-enrichment, self-glory and pleasures, and this is a matter known to all civilised people; but insecure regimes offer an advantage to some powerful nations.

And so it is that the deafening sound of secularism has prevented regime after regime from hearing the whispers of Muslims, the voice of a people who have a genuine cause to be aggrieved. Government policies and thinking have consistently assumed that Nigeria in its totality is secular and that all people have accepted European civilization as their own. The logical inference of such assumptions is that Muslims do not exist, or if they do exist, they no longer believe in Islam as civilization and way of life.

To say that this is an unforgivable fallacy is indeed to understate the true state of affairs. Muslims have never failed to register their rejection of the imposed civilisation; it is rather the secular regimes which have failed to understand the language of the Muslims.

For example, Muslims have relentlessly advocated a complete restoration of the sacred sharia; they have asked for a system of education based on Islamic principles for their children; they have affirmed so many times and in many ways that politics is an integral part of Islam, not separable from it.

These, for anyone imbued with clear insight, amount to a rejection, albeit subtle, of the beliefs and traditions of secularism. Yet governments have chosen to ignore the Muslim voice. Instead, they tend to intensify propaganda aimed at convincing Muslims to abandon Islam and revert to unbelief; to abandon the sharia in favor of the imposed law, all in the name of Nigeria.

All that governments have achieved so far is merely to continue to add insult to the injury. Certainly Muslims will continue to remain Muslims even if every house is turned into a radio station for propaganda. The reasons are obvious. Islam is a religion of conscience; it asks man to worship no one but his creator alone; to obey no one but the Absolute Supreme Authority; not to dehumanize himself by engaging in scandalous affluence and pleasure; to be committed absolutely to justice and fairness; and finally to always keep in mind the coming of the Ultimate Day in which, in the words of the Quran, “You will be brought back to Allah, then every soul will be paid in full that which it has earned, and they will not be wronged.”

Islam has its own laws, which because they flow precisely from their faith, Muslims find them natural to obey and apply. Islam is a civilization which throughout its history, has uplifted Muslims and made them masters. Above all, Islam gives meaning and purpose to life, far nobler, far more dignifying than the debasing and corrupting influence of secular life.

As a religion of conscience, Islam cannot but be concerned about the social and economic conditions of the people and government's response to people's fundamental needs. Serious-minded Muslims are certainly worried that the pillars of secular government exercise no sense of restraint and responsibility at all. At a time when the nation is overwhelmed by poverty and severe deprivation, they beautify their persons, magnify their glory, consolidate their "economic base" more energetically, even as they send government functionaries to invade the homes of the poor, or waylay them on the highway to dispossess them in the name of taxation. Surely there is limit to unfairness and brazen insensitivity.

Nor will Islam be at ease in the face of continuous erosion of the supreme values of society. Television stations have refused to acknowledge their responsibility to society, even to the impressionable children, to whom we will eventually entrust this nation. Just to obtain money, they put up advertisements, which, even in their own personal judgments, are offensive to the human conscience.

But more importantly to the nation, because it is of far reaching consequences, is the fact that secular rulers cannot offer practical examples of moral probity, honesty, self-discipline, modesty and, above all, a sense of accountability for the rest of the people to emulate.

Now with the emergence of the Council of Ulama, the Muslim voice is no longer a whisper; it is being articulated and magnified, and the issues between Islam and secularism are being clarified. The secular regimes may decide to ignore this serious and, by all standards, formidable voice, trusting in its coercive power and tools of persuasion. But as long as Islam retains the unshakable loyalty of the conscience of the Muslims, it is the secular power that will have cause to blame itself for its deafness. The voice of Islam cannot be stilled.

▲ NOTES

¹ See the bibliography for origin of this article.

² I cannot vouch for the correctness of quotation marks in this paragraph. I have left them as I found them.

³ The rest of this paper will appear in the appendices of Monograph 6.

⁴ Paper for International Conference on Islam in Africa in Abuja, Nigeria, 24th-28th Nov/89.

⁵ Arabic for Muslim “mission” or “extension.”

⁶ See Harry Elmer Barnes, *An Intellectual and Cultural History of the Western World*, New Jersey: The (illegible) Company, 1937, p. 281.

⁷ See Barnes, cited earlier.

⁸ See for instance, Qur’an *Surat al-Baqara* 164 and *Surat Al-Imran* 190-191.

⁹ On the importance of the relationship of Islamic movements with each other, see the Sudanese context as discussed by Hassan Abdullah Al-Turabi, *Al-Harakat al-Islamiyya fi al-Sudan* (1989), pp. 289-310.

¹⁰ Arabic for “prayer.”

¹¹ *The Pen*, 21 Apr/89, p. 10.

¹² I. Avagi, *NN*, 15 Dec/95, p. 5.

¹³ *The Economist*, “A Survey on Islam.” 6 Aug/94, p. 13.

¹⁴ Lecture delivered to the Muslim Forum, ABU, Zaria, Nigeria, 22 Mar/86. Here and there the document is not legible. Where this is the case with Qur’anic quotations, I have filled in the blanks as best as I could with the help of two English translations of the Qur’an, namely those by M. Pickthall and A. Arberry (see the bibliography).

¹⁵ Leading Muslim theologians. They tend to be very powerful politically in Muslim nations and communities. Contemporary Iran is an example. So was Afghanistan during the Taliban regime, a group of very conservative *Ulama*.

¹⁶ Commissioned paper submitted to the Political Bureau, Lagos, May/86.

¹⁷ *The Pen*, 7-21 Apr/89. This appendix contains the second half of the article. The first half is summarized in chapter 2.

¹⁸ *NN*, 3 Nov/99, pp. 6-7.

¹⁹ In the original article, the printer listed this as the 4th point, the second time. From here on the numbers will deviate from the original.

²⁰ *The Pen*, 16 Dec/88.

²¹ *Alkalami*, Editorial. 31 Mar/89, p. 3.

²² *Daily Trust*, 3 June/2003.

²³ *The Pen*, 27 Jan/89, p. 10.

