

THE NEUTRALITY EQUATION

Advocates of secularism usually defend their approach by arguing that it represents a neutral, rational and objective platform. It is a rational “space” where people with all kinds of subjective opinions, including religions, can find a safe and common haven. It is the place where objective reason reigns, where people have things in common. Religion and faith divide; reason unites. Classical Islam tends to resist this perspective in principle. In Nigeria, most Muslims have vigorously rejected it, especially since the 1977 debate around the Constituent Assembly. In this chapter, secularism and neutrality are often treated as synonyms. Christians insist that secularity and neutrality go together; most Muslims find that secularism is deeply partial.

However, there are some notable exceptions to the mainstream-Fundamentalist view in this regard that I want to clear up before proceeding. In chapter seven, I write about Muslims who, under the influence of Marxism, are calling for secularism. Many Islamists or Fundamentalists revile these brothers. In addition, there is at least one mainstream personality that is also more open

to secularism precisely because he thinks to recognize its neutral character. Ibrahim Sulu Gambari wrote the following:

The meaning of secularity of a state or country has been misunderstood and mis-applied to confuse the citizens of the actual meaning of secularism to the effect that Nigeria or the state has no religion at all. I.e., the state or country recognises no religion. However, this country can be called a multi-religious country and that no state in Nigeria shall adopt any religion as a state religion. The American Constitution (First Amendment) says:

Secularism is thus neither anti-God, nor pro-God. It treats alike the devout, the antagonistic and the atheist. It eliminates God from the matters of the state and ensures that no one shall be discriminated against on the ground of religion. The state can have no religion of its own. It should treat all religions equally. The state must extend similar treatment to the church, the mosque and the temple. In a secular state, the state is only concerned with the relation between man and man. It is not concerned with the relation of man with God.

Section 10 of the 1999 Federal Constitution of Nigeria provides in clear and unambiguous [language] that “The government of the Federation or a state shall not adopt any religion as state religion.”¹

Gambari is not some upstart. He is the Emir of Ilorin, a prestigious Muslim position. Christians have accused him of engineering the closure of Christian schools in his city,² an action that would place him either in the Fundamentalist or mainstream camp. His tolerance for secularism is unique in my sources. He seems to regard secularism as a vehicle for neutrality of the state towards all religion—and non-religion.

Part of the problem is that Muslims insist on describing the Christian position as “secularism” while Christians often promote

“secularity.” In Monograph Five, I show that many Christians reject secularism as strenuously as do Muslims, though not as radically. Muslims never acknowledge that distinction and appear oblivious of this Christian insistence.

That problem has two reasons. One is that Christians are often careless in their commingling of the two terms. The second is that Muslims, once they have settled on their interpretation of a Christian standpoint, are not open to correction. No matter how many times Christians try to correct them, Muslims will stick to their original interpretation of the Christian position. This is true of their views on the Trinity and Jesus as well as of secularism. The reason for that posture is, I believe, a strong defensive attitude and uncertainty. The end result is that we sometimes end up comparing apples with pears or contrasting mangoes to avocados. But this discussion takes us into the next monograph.

Already during the days of the original Constituent Assembly of 1978, Muslim scholars objected to secularism precisely because it is *not* neutral. Sociologist Ahmed Beita Yusuf asserted that “positing a neutral non-religious zone in life” amounts to the “oppression of the true genius” of Islam. Limiting the scope of a religion is in effect to replace it with secularism and atheism. Neutrality is a false principle that gives “undue preference to secularism and atheism.” “The false principle of neutrality” constitutes “a callous indifference to religious groups.” It is to favour “those who believe in no religion over those who do believe.”³

Back in 1979 I explained the main Muslim viewpoint as follows:

If Islam is wholistic, then the positing of a neutral non-religious zone in life must result in oppression of its true genius. Then limiting the application of Islam and, for that matter, of Christianity, is in effect to replace these religions with secularism and atheism. For the government to refuse to finance religious education constitutes “the advancement of secular-

ism, while at the same time tolerating all forms of religious teachings, practices and observances,” insists A. B. Yusuf. It “is next to condemning religious propagation, thus giving undue preference to secularism and atheism.” He emphasizes that “the false principle of neutrality” encourages “a callous indifference to religious groups and interests. That would indeed amount to favouring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe.”²⁴

This rejection of the neutrality principle is a common theme in the literature from the beginning. Beita and Yusuf said it better than most in those earlier days. They represented their community well.

Most Muslims then reject secularism and its alleged neutrality, but not only for philosophical or principial reasons. They also detect what they consider inconsistencies in the policies of the Christian advocates of secularism.⁵ While Christians claim that secularism spells neutrality, Muslims observe that it repeatedly leads to partiality. The issue is an emotional one that generates much heat.

One of the reasons for this inconsistency, according to K. A. Balogun, is that the constitution is vague on the subject, a situation that “has been the major source of religious disintegration.” He offers the following three points in support of his contention:

1. “State secularism in Nigeria has not only been [im]properly defined but has also been loosely interpreted.” This situation has created inconsistencies. How do you explain a secular state that organizes and funds religious pilgrimages for Muslims and Christians? Or the existence of a government National Religious Council?
2. There is a “fundamental difference” between Muslim and Christian concepts of secularism. It refers to the separation of church and state, something Christians support but

Muslims reject. “This fundamental difference has major implications for Nigeria” and has detonated “a series of religious time-bombs.” Membership in OIC versus diplomatic relationships with the Vatican was one of those.

3. “State secularity within the framework of the Nigerian constitution is, more often than not, the maintenance of a balancing between Muslims and Christians to the detriment of less mainstream religions like African Traditional Religion (ATR), which is often simply ignored.”⁶

Though a core value of secularism is a dualistic separation of religion from the marketplace, including government, it is applied differently in various countries, according to Yadudu. In the USA, it has led to a “wall of separation between church and state and an almost absolute non-involvement of the state in church affairs.” It has also had “the ridiculous effect” of the prohibition of prayer in public schools. In India, secularism has not prevented the adoption of Hinduism as the official religion in some states. It is even illegal for anyone in these states to butcher cows, a Hindu taboo imposed on all. Other religions have been pushed aside.⁷ The secular version of the former USSR included the unashamed adoption of atheism, a “contrived form of religion,” that led to the “destruction of other revealed religions.” The government of “secular” Italy does not “dare step on the toes of papal authority or initiate any policies that may run counter to the Catholic ethics of its citizens.”⁸

Great Britain is seen in a different light. Yadudu describes it as a Christian state. The Queen must belong to the Anglican Church. Its “common law was derived from Christian ideas.” And that is how Nigeria’s troubles started. “English political ideas, which essentially did not recognize secularism, were imported into the country. While Islam was tolerated, Christian ideas were encouraged to gain a foothold on Nigerian soil.”

At this point, without any appropriate transition, Yadudu suddenly leaps into the controversy about secularism in Nigeria. The “nebulous idea” was introduced into Nigeria in connection with the 1979 constitution, he affirms. This document declared “‘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.” But whose secularism were its advocates dumping on the country? American, Italian, Soviet? Shortly afterwards, the Political Bureau recommended that the government “desist from engaging in certain religious activities such as the pilgrimage.” While government support for Islam was thus discouraged, its support for Christian and/or secular causes was encouraged, a policy both flagrantly contradictory and partial. From here on, Yadudu offers an expose of various contradictions he and others have observed in the skewed practice of secularism. These contradictions point not to a secular stance so much as to a Christian one. Similarly, the press uses secularism “to wage propaganda against Islam and to ridicule Muslims.”⁹

During the interview with *Quality* magazine, Gumi denied that Nigeria is a secular country. It is constantly contradicted by the government. In fact, the government did not say Nigeria is a secular state. For example, in court “they give you either Qur’an or the Bible.¹⁰ That means they are believing in religion.” Ibrahim Aliyu uses the same objection: “If the government of Nigeria is a secular government, then why did the president and his vice swear by the Bible and Qur’an respectively, when they were sworn in on May 29, 1999, at the Eagle Square? Why must Nigerian Muslims or Christians swear by the Qur’an or Bible, before giving testimony in court or before holding positions in public offices?” He wonders, “Is it that we Nigerians don’t understand what secularism means?” Then he presents his definition that is recorded in chapter two.¹¹

Ibrahim Ado-Kurawa similarly finds that

On the one hand, CAN insists that the Nigerian state should hold its secular principle of neutrality as between religions, against the desire of Muslim pressure groups like JNI to associate the state with Islam. On the other, it is drawn to compete with them for state favours, such as subsidies for pilgrimages or religious buildings, and to adopt an attitude of automatically endorsing Christians in office, irrespective of their competence or probity.

In other words, Muslims have every reason for “their apprehension of the Christian notion of secularity.” Impartial? Neutral? Those may be the reasons Christians advocate secularism, but “they never acknowledge that they are advocating [a] Christian notion of secularity.”¹²

El-Miskin argues that Christians advocate a pro-Israel stance for Nigeria “as a way of neutralizing 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 centre, in reality it is essentially an anti-Muslim instrument targeted against the aspirations of the Muslim community.” This “myth of secularist neutrality in Nigeria” becomes clear also from the fact that both secularism and Christianity were introduced by colonialism. Encouraged to do so by an alleged Pauline “division of church and state,” Christians chose for the colonial setup. This secular neutrality is a delusion. “For the Nigerian Muslim, secularism is just a synonym for Euro-Christian domination.”¹³

Such inconsistencies are detected all along the way. Kabiru Yusuf writes about two parallel incidents far removed from each other in time and space. Sometime during the early 80s, the Catholic Governor of Lagos State, Michael Otedola, had promised to return thirty-eight “mission” schools to their former owners. The aim was the improvement of morals. Muslims, though in favour of moral improvement, opposed the move strongly. It was allegedly

“against public opinion.” Lateef Adegbite, Secretary to the Nigerian Supreme Council of Islamic Affairs, called it a “manifestation of religious politics.” He pledged Muslims would oppose the move with all constitutional weapons available. It would be “unfair” to Muslims. The former Muslim Governor, Lateef Jakande, referred to the plan as “impossible, immoral, illegal, incorrect.” But the people who, according to Yusuf, should have screamed in opposition to this assault on secularism, i.e., Christians, were silent. No CAN official or editorial raised a voice against this “assault.” Asks Yusuf, “Where are the secularists?” So far, so good—or, so bad?

Fast forward to the early 1990s. Governor Yahaya Abdulkarim of Sokoto State, under pressure of the Jama’atul Nasril Islam (JNI) and the Sultan of Sokoto, agreed to the establishment of a number of Muslim model schools. The aim, again, was to improve the moral climate in the state. Immediately, CAN state chairman, Zakari Dandare, raised the issue about “creeping Islamisation” in the state. It was feared that the five percent Christian children in the schools would either be taught Islam or would have to move to other schools. Several editorials were published against this “assault on secularism.”

These two incidents have left Yusuf with the “impression that the campaign for secularism is neither principled nor disinterested. Most efforts in that direction are against Islam, often by people totally ignorant about its precepts.” Why were Christians silent about such mixing of church and state in the first case? And why did they raise a ruckus during the second? These are mere rhetorical questions that require no answer. Someone, Yusuf suggests, ought to have told Otedola “to leave his Catholic knighthood at his church, until his term as governor is over.”¹⁴ Yusuf seems not to have realized that his interpretation leaves Muslims equally contradictory in the reverse and equally unprincipled! Furthermore, he left out the inconvenient but relevant fact that the Lagos govern-

ment had earlier simply confiscated these schools from their founders without compensation. That would not have been the case in Sokoto. Such logical and factual niceties easily fall between the cracks when mutual anger and suspicion dominate the climate.

The story continues with a humorous twist. Fast forward once again to 2004, now back to Lagos, where it all started. Alhaji R. O. Oyenubi, national President of the well-known Muslim organization, Anwar-ul-Islam Movement of Nigeria, commended the Muslim Governor Bola Tinubu of Lagos State for returning forty-eight “mission schools” to their former private owners. The latter had built them, according to Oyenubi, “for the benefit of society.” This was Muslim to Muslim. I have not heard any Adegbite complain of “religious politics” as we did earlier, though I regard the chance that the incident slipped past him as slim. Obviously, different vested interests played a role in each case. Ah, such blessed inconsistency—or pragmatism?¹⁵

Another example of alleged Christian inconsistency is their lack of gratitude towards the federal government that Muslims regard partial towards Christians, even though it claims to be a secular government. Muhammad Bello, an official of the Muslim Corpers’ Association,¹⁶ professes not to “understand the mental imbalance of Mr. Okogie¹⁷ and his ilk.” “I dare say that even as a surrogate and stooge of the Western Euro-Christian ungodly, nay devilish, world, Mr. Okogie is simply over acting.” This outburst had reference to Okogi’s suing the government on behalf of CAN over the establishment of a national Muslims Welfare Board to support them in their annual pilgrimage to Mecca.¹⁸ Bello should not have been surprised at this move, since it was fully consistent with the Christian secular emphasis. What surprised him was the lack of gratitude expressed in this action to a government that, according to Muslims, leans over backwards to support Christians. To Bello this seemed like biting the hand that feeds you, since the government generally favours Christians. He bitterly comments,

Muslims see the present secular arrangement in the country as detrimental to their very essence and well-being. Their very rights secular-wise are continuously being challenged by intolerant kleptomaniacs like Okogie.¹⁹ It is clear to the present administration that all its efforts to favour the Christian minority in the country under the guise of secularism is in vain. The Christians still remain the ungrateful they are known to be. Their recent utterances and activities vindicate this assertion. But then, we believe that there is a limit to the favour the government can afford to shower on the non-peace loving Christians of this country. One of the unaffordable favours is to do as demanded by them in respect to the Pilgrims Welfare Board and the sharia. Denying the Muslims any of them spells doom for the nation!²⁰

According to the editor of *Alkalami*, Okogie's action was not surprising, for "this cantankerous fellow has long bluntly demonstrated his hatred for Muslims and for everything from the government that affects them."²¹ Okogie's action allegedly was revenge for the international humiliation he had suffered recently. The federal government had contributed ten million naira each for both a Christian national cathedral and a Muslim national mosque as religious showcases in Abuja, the newly-constructed national capital. However, Okogie claimed that only the Muslims were given money. The record was put straight by Alex Ekwueme, the Christian Vice President, who publicly announced that both parties had received their grants equally.²² Furthermore, the Abuja authorities had denied the Christian accusation that they were showing favouritism to Muslims in the allotment of land for religious purposes.²³ The *Alkalami* editor is surprised that the government does not rein in CAN, this troublesome organization that insults the government and emboldens its followers with lies. *Alkalami* has long ago stated its opinion

that, if we want to contain the bad atmosphere between the two religions, we have to rein in Okogie.²⁴

Almost all Muslim writers on the subject complain about the inconsistency or selectivity with which Christians apply the secular criterion they so strenuously advocate. In an address to the Constituent Assembly in 1988, Hamzah Dawood discusses a number of these alleged inconsistencies and expressions of government support for Christian causes. There are two Christian radio stations that he assumes have a connection with Nigeria's government communication satellite. There are "airfields serving the Vatican and other Christian missions" that represent "a negation of our sovereignty" as well as being dangerous for Nigerian security.²⁵ Then there is the affiliation of Christian theological schools with various universities. These schools produce evangelists.²⁶ As Christians are annoyed with mosques on public properties, so is Dawood. And then, of course, the usual complaint about government media supporting Christianity.²⁷

A well-known Muslim preacher, Sheikh Abubukar Muhammad Tureta, strongly took Jerry Gana to task. Gana was the founding Christian director of government agency setup for citizen awareness building and rose to the position of Federal Minister of Information under President Obasanjo. It appears he was also on the national Executive Committee of CAN. Tureta berated him for his public announcement that his agency would "make sure that politics and religion were not mixed come next republic." Tureta comments, "It is playing with the people's intelligence for an executive member of CAN to divorce himself from religious politics. After all, even the Pope had recently instructed all Christians to fight any government that is not religiously inclined." CAN is full of religious politics, according to Tureta. He further claims that CAN is using Gana's government agency "to present gubernatorial candidates in all northern states." He dismissed Gana's statement as an "empty ploy."²⁸ So much for the Christian pretense of secularist neutrality.

MAMSER is not the only so-called secular tool of the government seen to undermine Islam. Another is National Youth Service Corps (NYSC). Adam Ahmad, a staff member of Bayero University, gave a lecture in which he warned of the dangers NYSC presented to Muslim youth. It was specifically designed as a ploy to lure them away from Islam. They are force-fed opinions that are hostile to Islam. Among them are songs with anti-Muslim texts. During the orientation camp, males and females mix freely, something Islam frowns upon. There is a lot of drinking, gambling and prostitution, while no opportunity is allowed for prayer time.²⁹ Where is the neutrality?

A very blatant inconsistency is the weekly Christian NTA broadcast from Aso Rock, the seat of the presidency. “It has become *derigueur* 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!” This takes religious manipulation up to the next level. It is “a new departure in our rulers’ political and manipulative use of religion on the nation’s leading public television medium.”³⁰

On May 27, 2004, the day before I write this report, CAN held yet another fund-raising effort to complete the shamefully-stalled construction of the National Ecumenical Centre in Abuja. Without much comment, the *Daily Trust*, generally regarded as a pro-Muslim daily, published a report on who donated what. Huge donations were pledged by Muslims—yes, Muslims, including Vice President Atiku—banks, contractors and other business people. Politicians and various governments were prominent among the donors, with a group called “friends of President Obasanjo” donating a cool N400 million.³¹ What is important here—and this is probably a major reason the paper published such a detailed report—is the close mingling of church and state this event represents. Even while CAN is in the midst of a bitter squabble with the

President over his declaration of a state of emergency in Plateau State, he was the “chief fundraiser” for the occasion. The paper could not resist the closing remark, “Construction of the centre, which has a 25-story tower, began almost at the same time as the National Mosque, Abuja, but was abandoned in the early eighties due to internal wranglings among Christians.”³² When you see the magnificent mosque Muslims built just down the street from the centre, then it is indeed a sharp contrast in achievement.

Yadudu finds much confusion on the issue of neutrality among Christians. They have a “list of do’s and don’ts” that is highly contradictory but that Christians insist must be observed if we are to protect the secular purity of the state. A major point, of course, is the rejection of sharia, something to be discussed in Monograph Six. But how can the Christian insistence on the Sunday as a work-free day be considered secular or neutral?³³

Christo-secular inconsistency is not limited to Nigeria. It is also rampant in the “Christian” West. Taji Mustafa Fombo forwarded an article to the *Gamji* Web site that is not his. The article exposes inconsistencies by the secular West that shows such strong concern for the fate of Muslim women under the threat of the death penalty, while it shows little concern for “the death of thousands of Muslims in Palestine or the millions that die as a result of starvation in the developing world. Indeed, if life is considered so precious, why was there not even a murmur of criticism aimed at the USA on the recent 57th anniversary of the attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki?” I reproduce a particularly pungent paragraph:

With regards to the stated belief that people should be free to commit adultery if they want, this opens up a further series of questions. For example, why is taking heroin banned, but the use of alcohol glorified, despite the many problems resulting from the latter’s use? Why is bigamy banned, but adultery allowed, despite the problems of abortion, children growing up

without a mother or father, as well as the emotional devastation visited upon partners of adulterers? When we examine adultery and illicit sexual relations, it cannot escape the aware observer that it is one of the main selling points for magazines, newspapers, soap operas, films and much of the entertainment industry. The societal consequences of this constant marketing of sex is completely ignored by the liberal lobby. Consequently, there is no major outcry over the thirteen or so women who fall victim to a rapist every single day in Britain.

These are some of the many contradictions one finds in the value systems of capitalist societies. What should be clear is that these contradictions are a natural outcome of an ideology, which holds that human beings can decide right and wrong.

Leaving humans to decide what is right and wrong is a recipe for the contradictory values and the societal degeneration one witnesses in capitalist societies. Islam as an ideology maintains that such decisions of right and wrong should be left to the Creator of humans, an independent and unbiased source that has full awareness of the human condition. Islamic values and morals are unchanging and lead to a constant safeguarding of society.³⁴

With so much at stake for Muslims, I close this chapter with this stout declaration of the Muslim Students Association (MSS): “Muslims will never subscribe to secularism as a way of life, for they have an inalienable right to the practice of Islam.”³⁵ In that context, the much-vaunted neutrality of secularism cannot stand. It evaporates into thin air. Vamoosed! Gone!—as is invariably the case whenever it is exposed to scrutiny.

▲ NOTES

¹ I. Gambari, 18 Feb/2000. Though Gambari's intention is clear, his interpretation of the First Amendment is another story.

² J. Boer, Vol. 3, p. 140.

³ A. Yusuf, *NN*, 23 Sep/77. J. Boer, 1979, pp. 478-479; 1984, p. 143.

⁴ J. Boer, 1979, pp. 478-479; 1984, p. 143. A. B. Yusuf, *NN*, 23 Sep/77. See also H. Yadudu, *NN*, 28 Sept/77.

⁵ As recorded in Monograph Three, Christian leaders themselves occasionally reprimand each other for similar inconsistencies.

⁶ Balogun, pp. 185-187. For a similar discussion of secularism in other countries see *Nasiha* in the bibliography.

⁷ The Muslim-inspired Institute of Islamic Studies in Numbai, India, with Islam occupying a minority position in a sea of Hinduism, is a strong proponent of secularism, by which it means government "neutrality." Asghar Ali Engineer, the Director, attended a recent conference in Abuja, Nigeria, that was called by a human rights group in Nigeria in the face of the international controversy over the death sentence of Amina Lawal, about whose case we will hear more in this series. See <www.csss-islam.com> about the Institute itself as well as Engineer's comments on the Abuja conference, "Shari'ah Law, Civil Society And Human Rights."

⁸ Ado-Kurawa similarly lists various inconsistencies in Europe between official secularism and pro-Christian practice (*Shari'ah in Nigeria*, p. 16).

⁹ A. Yadudu, 7 Apr/89. Appendix 7. For similar arguments see also A. Yadudu, 2000, p. 39. Please do note that these descriptions of various secular situations are Yadudu's, not mine.

¹⁰ This protocol is common throughout Nigeria's government culture. A one-time military governor of Oyo State, Colonel Oresanya, was criticized by the Oyo branch of the National Council of Muslim Youth Organizations for swearing in his appointees on the Bible and the Qur'an (*The Pen*, 24 Feb/89). I vividly remember the coronation of the Aku Uka of Wukari, Taraba State, in the early 70s, during which he was sworn in on the Bible—by a white Christian missionary no less, Dr. Harry R. Boer, the founding principal of the Theological College of Northern Nigeria.

¹¹ *Quality*, Oct/87, p. 38. I. Aliyu, 13 Dec/99.

¹² Ado-Kurawa, "Islam and Non-Muslim." *Shari'ah in Nigeria*, pp. 17, 46-47.

¹³ El-Miskin, 1989, pp. 6-7.

¹⁴ K. Yusuf, 1 Feb/93.

¹⁵ O. Bajulaiye, 14 Apr/2004.

¹⁶ "Corpers" has reference to the National Youth Service Corps (NYSC), a sort of internal Peace Corps, under which all tertiary graduates are assigned to serve in another part of the country for one year at usually very low compensation. Both Muslim and Christian corpers have their religious organizations.

¹⁷ Okogie was at the time the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Lagos and national president of the Christian Association of Nigeria. In the latter capacity he was the main national spokesman for Christians. Though no longer CAN President, in 2003 he was appointed Cardinal. *Vanguard*, 29 Sep/2003. He publicly faulted President Obasanjo for not having acknowledged his elevation properly, an incident Muslims will immediately have recognized as another inconsistency by this warrior for secularism and separation of church and state.

¹⁸ See articles "CAN Sues Babangida," *The Pen*, 10 Mar/89, pp. 1-2. "Kungiyar CAN Ta Kai Karar Babangida," *Alkalami*, 17 Mar/89, p. 16. "Ra'ayin Alkalami: Hawainiyar Okogie Ta Kiyayi Ramar Musulmi." *Alkalami*, 31 Mar/89, p. 3 (Appendix 10) for an explanation for this action.

¹⁹ The alleged right referred to is for Muslims to have a Nigerian Pilgrims Commission that caters to their religious obligations at deep government financial involvement and, thus, at deep tax payer's expense.

²⁰ M. Bello, 21 Apr/89.

²¹ Original Hausa: "...domin ba tun yau wannan hatsabibi ke bayyana kiyayyarsa kiri da muzu ga Musulmi da duk wani abu da ya shafesu wanda ya bullo daga bangaren gwamnati ba."

²² Whatever may have happened, CAN Vice President at the time, Tanko Yusuf, indicated that there was a problem of corruption with regards to these building funds (L. Grissen, pp. 99-100).

²³ I. Biu, 14 Aug/88.

²⁴ *Alkalami*, 31 Mar/89. Appendix 10.

²⁵ These “airfields” are “bush” airstrips located in areas served by the Society for International Missions, formerly the Sudan Interior Mission, the Christian Reformed Church branch of the Sudan United Mission (SUM) and the United Methodists, formerly of the SUM. The Roman Catholics do not operate any. These strips and the airplanes themselves are entirely legal and closely monitored by the government, while the pilots painstakingly respect all pertinent Nigerian laws. I personally know some of them well.

²⁶ Could someone please tell us the purpose of publicly-funded university departments of religious studies that study Islam and Arabic? What do their graduates do? In the case of the seminaries, they are funded privately. They pay hefty fees for their associate status with these universities.

²⁷ H. Dawood, “A Memo.” Appendix 13 on *Companion CD*.

²⁸ M. Galadima, 24 Feb/89.

²⁹ M. Z. Sirajo, 14 Apr/89.

³⁰ Editorial, *DT*, 3 Jun/2003. Appendix 11.

³¹ The report constitutes Appendix 25 on *Companion CD-ROM*.

³² R. Yunana, 28 May/2004. The comment on the Muslim orientation of *TD* is not meant to be a disparaging one. A paper has the right to choose its orientation. It should also be pointed out that it seems Yunana, the author of the article itself, judging from his name, is a Christian. On the one hand, the implicit comparison is not fair, since the centre is totally financed by Nigerians, while the Mosque is said to have been supported generously with Arab oil. On the other hand, there is a shameful aspect in that an element of corruption within CAN retarded progress, according to T. Yusuf (Grissen, p. 99).

³³ A. Yadudu, 1988. Boer, Monograph 2, pp. 52-53.

³⁴ T. J. Fombo, “Condemnation of Adultery Sentence.”

³⁵ I. Bello, 2 Dec/88.

