

FROM DIAPRAXIS TO DIALOGUE.

Christian-Muslim Relations

by Lissi Rasmussen

in "Dialogue in Action - in honour of Johannes Aagaard."
eds. Lars Thunberg, Moti Lal Pandit, Carl Vilh. Fogh-Hansen
New Delhi 1988

Dialogue only becomes meaningful when rooted in a common praxis. Dialogue is disclosed in 'diapraxis'. It is only by sharing our lives, struggles, and pains together, by working together creatively and changingly that we can deal with our theological differences meaningfully. This is what eight years of experience with Christian-Muslim dialogue in Africa and Europe have taught me.

Dialogue as a necessity of life.

Dialogue has become a jargon word, a cliché often used and abused. It has so many definitions that one hardly knows which one to consider. It is a very theoretical and almost mechanical term. It is used here in its original sense indicating a two-way communication, undertaken in mutual trust and respect. Understanding is the key word: dialogue is the willingness to understand the other as she/he understands her/himself. In John V. Taylor's words dialogue is "a sustained conversation between parties who are not saying the same thing and who recognize and respect the differences, the contradictions, and the mutual exclusions between their various ways of thinking."¹

It is not a question of placing people in categories but being ready to listen and be challenged by them. It is our relationships with people rather than our concepts about them that count. Dialogue is readiness to set forth what we have in common without neglecting or hiding the differences. It is to accept a common understanding of faith without which our divergent beliefs have no relevance or meaning.

Thus the question of dialogue with Muslims is not a question of how we perceive Islamic doctrines but whether we see Muslims as our fellow human beings with the same kind of questions, problems, and hopes as we have as Christians.

Given the world situation, there is no other way than dialogue in relation to Muslims. There is neither the time nor the resources to do anything else. We need each other. Dialogue is necessary not only because of what we have in common but also because of our differences. We cannot continue to fight each other but we have to stand together and do what is God's will in the world. S.Wesley Ariarajah has said that very clearly:

"We have no choice in this matter.

Either we learn to live in mutual acceptance, openness and in
brotherhood with our neighbours or miss the mission of God of
bringing all things under His love." ²

Muslims and Jews stand in closer relation to Christians than do other religious people because we are united in a relationship of loyalty and obedience to God - an historical God who has revealed himself (herself or itself) and wants to be believed through his word.³ We are the

¹ The Theological Basis of Interfaith Dialogue, Reprints No.209, Apr. 1980 (Gaba, Kenya).

² Faith in the Midst of Faith, WCC Geneva 1977, p.57. Ariarajah is leader of the WCC department on dialogue and has his background in the Methodist Church in India and Sri Lanka.

³ I shall not go into the question (mainly asked in Europe) of different concepts of God in Christianity and Islam. The Qur'an is very clear that there is only one God for Christians and Muslims: "Our God and your God is One; and it is to Him we bow." (S.29,46) See also S.42,15;10,94. Qur'an references are made to A.Yusuf Ali, The Holy Qur'an. The Islamic Foundation. London 1975.

children of Abraham. Therefore Rev. Peter Jennings, a Methodist, director of a mission in the East End of London has gone as far as to say "we should stop calling Muslims people of another faith and start calling them other faithful people."⁴ We are all muslims with a small m, i.e. human beings who have given ourselves to God. This is the destination of all human beings according to Islam: we are created to be God's servants (Ar.abd) - we are created towards God. We are human beings who have responded to God's call. For Muslims this call is clearest in the Qur'an, for Christians it is clearest in Christ. We have a common ground, however, on the basis of which we are able to tackle these differences in a better way. The two different understandings of revelation must be seen in this context of God's whole revelation, the love of the Creator embracing the whole human being and all human beings. Besides, God is always greater than anyone's understanding of God.

Dialogue is a necessity of life. "We need to build up our relationships expressing mutual human care and searching for mutual understanding."⁵ Approximately 800 million people in the world build their lives on the Qur'an as God's address to people. Islam gives something to these people and demands something from them. If we continue to live with caricatures of one another, in opposition to each other, our relationships will suffer. The experience of dialogue can break these narrow convictions and perhaps challenge us to change them. Furthermore, through dialogue, through understanding the convictions of another person, one is better able to understand oneself and to relate critically to one's own tradition. If one is able to listen with empathy to what the Muslims want to tell about their faith it can be an enrichment to one's own faith.

Critique of dialogue.

There have been various objections to the idea of dialogue and the way it has been expressed in Vatican II and by the World Council of Churches (WCC). Some people see dialogue as a liberal watering down of Christian doctrine. Others see it as a betrayal of the Gospel or of Mission - a threat to their own faith. Then there are those who use an invective like "syncretism" against those who involve themselves in dialogue.

There are Christians who in their "dialogue attempt" tend to construct a Christianized form of Islam, tend to interpret the Qur'an in a Christian way paying little attention to what the Muslims themselves see or experience as central or peripheral. This is based on a tendency within ourselves that we only want to be sympathetic when we recognize in others what we like in ourselves. The ultimate expression of this is the term "anonymous Christians"⁶ which indicates that we can only express our approval of others by claiming that they are like us, although anonymously. What is at stake in dialogue, however, is a clear recognition that the other who is not like oneself can be right and even righteous in the eyes of God.

"Dialogue is the ability to accept the other in his or her otherness. If we cannot accept others as God's children until they believe as we do, then we do not act

⁴ Newsletter of the Office on Christian-Muslim Relations, Hartford Sem. Jan. 1987, No.34 p.7.

⁵ Guidelines on Dialogue with People of Living Faiths and Ideologies. WCC Geneva 1979, p.10.

⁶ The theory of "anonymous Christianity" was originally proposed by Karl Rahner as an attempt to break through Christian exclusivism. It became a model accepted by most Roman Catholic theologian though later refashioned and expanded by some. See for instance Schlette, Küng, Rahner, Anonymous Christianity: A Disputed Question. Theology Digest 24 (1976) pp.125-31.

or speak from within the message of the gospel." ⁷

To use the invective "syncretist" is a derailment of the dialogue. For what is syncretism? Is not every faith syncretistic in nature? Faith, if it is to be relevant to one's life as a holistic interpretation of reality, changes constantly in relation to one's experiences and is thereby syncretistic in the literal sense of the word.

In the west the systematic concept of dialogue, however, has in practice become a preoccupation with abstract theories. Dialogue has come to take place among theologians and scholars at conferences without many results on a grass root level. This critique of dialogue as being too cerebral was put forward first of all by the WCC.

The WCC began (from 1974) to turn to "community" as a focus for dialogue. ⁸ Dialogue was not only to be a theoretical discussion but a way to live - a form of life. Whereas the Vatican expresses more theologically the very open attitude to Islam, the WCC dialogue takes place more on the ethical level, in order to improve the ways we live with each other. "Dialogue begins where people live together" is one of the WCC mottoes. Dialogue is not only activity of meetings and conferences but a way of living one's Christian faith in relation to one's neighbours.

Later the recommendation from the Mombasa conference for theologians sounded that
 "Christians and Muslims spare no effort to live and work with each other, and with others, towards reconciling conflicts and helping local communities to act upon their own choices in self-development towards a more just and participatory society." ⁹

This critique has been useful as a counteraction to the intellectual approach to dialogue in the west. It reminds us that dialogue must take place from below (in the communities) and not from above (in conferences). It seems, however, that the WCC has not really come to grips with this theme. No concrete dialogue-model has come out of it, a model to be used in practice in, for instance, Europe. Consensus statements have been produced at various conferences but without the sense of human passions and frailties bound up with a daily practical struggle by Christians and Muslims, separately and together, for social and political justice, for recognition and dignity as individuals.

Dialogue and diapraxis.

Against the background of my experiences in Africa and Europe, I see dialogue as a living process, a way of living in co-existence and pro-existence. Therefore I want to introduce the term "diapraxis". While dialogue indicates a relationship in which talking together is central, diapraxis indicates a relationship in which a common praxis is essential. Thus by diapraxis I do not mean the actual application of dialogue but rather dialogue as action. We need a more anthropological contextual approach to dialogue where we see diapraxis as a meeting between people who try to reveal and transform the reality they share. From there theological questions can be asked and dealt with. Out of a diapraxis may emerge a deeper meeting, a dialogue.

Diapraxis is to question the status quo. For instance in Europe this might involve a religious critique of processes and structures in society, with reference to a changed future. Christians and Muslims must not only wait for religious prejudices and misunderstandings to disappear but must begin to remove the social differences that contribute to keeping these prejudices alive.

Both in the Bible and in the Qur'an God's word is not understood as a conceptual communication but as a creative event, a history that requires obedient participation - whether in action or in suffering - in God's active righteousness and mercy. As far as Christianity is

⁷ Ariarajah, The Bible and People of Other Faiths, WCC 1985 p.32.

⁸ This is clearly outlined in Guidelines on Dialogue.

⁹ Unpublished conference paper 1980.

concerned, "a careful reexamination of the life and teachings of Jesus shows that Christian faith is primarily about relationships and not about beliefs, about human fellowship and not about an institution to preserve doctrines."¹⁰

If we want to stick to the example of Jesus and the Qur'an our life must be lived in identification with others in their concrete life conditions. This identification was for Jesus (and for us Christians) connected with the cross, whereas in the Qur'an (and for Muslims) it is connected with the destination of human beings as God's servants. The opposite of diapraxis - working against Islam and Muslims - would be, in Kosuke Koyama's words, to "carry the cross in the handle", to control others and control the power of God.¹¹ It would be to neglect what we really are as human beings, submitted to God, to cover reality, our own nature. In Ariarajah's words:

"Christian theology should allow God to be God; it should not own God, as we own a piece of private property. We cannot fence God in and say: "Well, if you want to know God, come through this gate". We do not own God; God owns us, and God owns the whole of creation. This is the message of the Bible."¹²

This is very much in line with Latin American liberation theology: in the same way as theology is only authentic as a history so also dialogue becomes authentic when rooted in a history of diapraxis - a history that comprises a response to the reality God has shown us. Doing comes before knowing in liberation theology. It is practice that illuminates theory rather than praxis that is predetermined by theory.¹³ In this way interreligious dialogue serves as a hermeneutic of praxis.¹⁴

Diapraxis is not an idealist matter but rather, unlike most dialogue approaches, takes the uneven power relations between Christians and Muslims seriously. A power relation always arises when two individuals or groups of individuals meet and talk. These relations are both historical and actual and have been a hindrance to Christian-Muslim dialogue. Muslims often find it difficult to understand the interest of Christians in dialogue - Christians who often find themselves in a position of power. This power relation is not taken into account in most dialogue attempts.

It is our ethical attitudes to human beings rather than our concepts about them that count. These ethical goals are the concern of some Muslim theologians who advocate dialogue.¹⁵ People who believe in one God (Christians, Muslims and Jews) have a duty to realize God's will on earth - a mission to resist the evil and godless in the world. Some of them advocate Christian-Muslim cooperation in the struggle for liberation from political, social and economic oppression, inspired by Christian works on liberation theology exploring its relevance for the Islamic community and its relation to the world. To enter the struggle for peace is for them more important than being stuck in dogmas about salvation of individual souls. Asgar Ali Engineer is one such theologian. According to him, the Christian view of God and human beings is not only tied to a Christian view of God but is also in profound accord with Islamic "stewardship" (Ar.khilafah) of God's creation. This is an area where Christians and Muslims could come together:

¹⁰ Ariajah in Faith in the Midst of Faith p.56.

¹¹ Koyama, No Handle on the Cross. London 1976.

¹² Ariajah, The Bible... p.11.

¹³ Paul E.Knitter, No Other Name. A Critical Survey of Christian Attitudes Toward the World Religions. London 1985 p.205f.

¹⁴ *ibid.*, p.206.

¹⁵ It must be noted that dialogue is only a marginal theme among Muslims as such.

"Will Islam, will the other religions petrify into rigid dogmas and remain mainly exclusively preoccupied with their traditional business of saving the individual soul or will they grow into dynamic movements, throwing away the flotsam and jetsam from their surface and respond to the new constructive and destructive forces in their world? Will they, for instance, be able to meet the challenge of the atom and the atomic war that hangs like a doom over mankind and teach people how to live in this atomic age?"¹⁶

Other writers on Christianity and Christian-Muslim dialogue stress mutual love and enrichment as the goal of dialogue. The most prolific and challenging of them all was Ismail al-Faruqi, who says:

"It is my sincere and humble opinion that the best road to follow is that of sharing sorrow for what happened in the past and of choosing resolutely, all of us, to open ourselves not only to dialogue and encounter, but to mutual love."¹⁷

Also Faruqi pleads for a dialogue on the ethical level:

"In the circumstances in which Muslims and Christians find themselves today, primacy belongs to ethical questions, not the theological. Dialogue should seek at first to establish a mutual understanding, answers to the fundamental question, What ought I to do?"¹⁸

Ali Merad (from Algeria) Considers that Christians and Muslims need each other to stimulate and deepen their appreciation of what each has. In his book, "Charles Foucauld: ou Regard de l'Islam",¹⁹ he attempts to see what the life of a Christian saint could mean for a Muslim. Other Muslims in recent years have explored the life of Francis of Assisi for the same purpose.²⁰

For many Muslims the goal of dialogue is the creation of an atmosphere in which an honest and open exchange of views and even critique of each other may take place. Knowledge about each other implies that contempt and anger which would otherwise develop in a bad direction can be expressed and responded to. The main point in this critique of Christianity is that Christian churches still are tools for North Atlantic political and economical dominance. Christians have submitted themselves to western civilization and by so doing have sacrificed their religious and moral values. Western civilization has made Christians different from the Nasara (original Christians) who are mentioned in the Qur'an with so much respect and reverence (S.5,82;57,27). Muslims do not consider these views about Christians as destructive to dialogue but rather its essence.

The common basis for diapraxis.

The **umma** (community of Muslims) and the church consist of human beings who belong to God. They are God-oriented and therefore have greater responsibility - a responsibility that must

¹⁶ K.G. Saiyadin, Sanctions for Peace: Islam, World Religions No.23, p.54-55.

¹⁷ Trialogue of the Abrahamic Faiths. Brentwood 1982. p.3-4.

¹⁸ Islam and Christianity: Diatribe or Dialogue? Journal of Ecumenical Studies 5,1, 1968 p.58. Faruqi was Palestinian, was killed in his home in the United States last year.

¹⁹ Paris 1975.

²⁰ Cf. Fuad Allam, 'Islam e Christiani: conosceri costruire la pace', in Francesco: un 'pazzo de slegare. Assisi 1983 pp.213-22 and Roger Garaudy 'Per un dialogo per un civilta' in Francesco pp.203-212.

be shared together. The common basis for diapraxis is as follows:

- 1) The respect for God's word which leads to faith and active obedience together with the task of bringing human beings near to God. Christians and Muslims are under an obligation to love their fellow human beings and to see to it that the image of God is not made false in the world.
- 2) Human beings are God's creation. They belong to God - are sacred material. Therefore there is a shared high respect for human life regardless of race, sex, belief, nationality and social status. Human beings are created in God's image. According to Islam, human beings share in the absolute freedom which strictly speaking only belongs to God. Besides, all human beings are born Muslims, i.e. created towards God and thereby totally dependent on God. They have been given special qualities in creation such as intelligence, free will, speech etc. Finally human beings are created to be God's **caliphs** (vicegerents) on earth which implies that human beings are to represent their creator and reflect the qualities of the creator (S.2,30-39).
- 3) God has revealed himself in history - as Abraham's, Isaac's and Jacob's God. God intervened in human life in order to make his message known, in Judea and in Arabia. Thus God is Lord over history and can change it. That is the intimacy of revelation between God and human beings - revelation which is a reality in the Qur'an as well as in Jesus Christ. Both are gifts unobtainable for human beings by their own effort.
- 4) Common appeal to serve humanity. Both Christians and Muslims believe that they are called by God to fight against structures destructive of human beings. They believe that God demands justice and acts in all areas of life and that the final victory over evil powers is in God's hands. This gives us courage and strength to work together. Christians and Muslims are called to love God and the neighbour. The Qur'an especially calls for taking care of orphans, the poor and the needy.
- 5) Common responsibility. The whole of life belongs to God to whom human beings are responsible for all their social, political and economic activities. God condemns all kinds of abuse of creation. Modern technological developments affect the relationship of human beings to their creator and to moral and ethical values. Both religions stand for freedom, justice and peace.

Diapraxis as living and working together.

Africa is the continent where Christians and Muslims have lived together most harmoniously. Most African Christians would say that they live a life as Christians in a daily positive experience of neighbourliness with Muslims. This is a harmony that grows out of a situation of living and working together. It also grows out of a tradition of tolerance and togetherness - a tradition in which religion can never be exclusive. The dictum 'I am because we are' as a definition of the African experience can not be seen as applying to separate Christian and Muslim groups but is all-encompassing. It is not the one or the other religious affiliation that conditions the WE but the WE conditions the he and the she of the different religious affiliations.

This was especially my experience in two African villages, in Mdandu - one of the more successful Ujamaa-villages in southern Tanzania,²¹ and in Korot - a village outside Jos in Plateau State, Northern Nigeria.²² In Mdandu the effort to build up networks of production and contribute to the wellbeing of the village was much more important than the theological differences that may have been there between Christians and Muslims. The villagers saw themselves first of all as WAJAMAA (Ujamaa-people) and only secondarily as Christians and Muslims. There was no room for prejudices and theological controversies. The common experience of going out with the hoes and cultivating the land together became experiences of hope and God's intervention in their daily life. Diapraxis came first and led to dialogue, a mutual understanding for each other's faith.

In Korot it was their family tradition that brought Christians and Muslims together, brought

²¹ Mdandu is appr. 50% Christians and 50% Muslims. I was there in 1980.

²² In Korot appr. 25% are Muslims and 35% are Christians. Research was done 1977-81.

solidarity to the villagers. It was not Islam that determined the relationship between Christians and Muslims. Kinship gave a person his/her place in society. Similar experiences could be mentioned from other African countries where many families are multi-religious and both Christians and Muslims are strongly involved in their ethnic identity. A western understanding of dialogue, a constructed dialogue would be absurd and artificial in the African context where diapraxis is already existing. Christians and Muslims in Africa do not have to learn how, but they just continue to live with each other. This also applied traditionally to countries in the Middle East and still does in certain areas.

From the African example we can learn that it is by taking our starting point in our common life based on common work that we reach a mutual understanding. In Europe it is in existing communities where families meet as neighbours and children play together that spontaneous dialogue may develop. It is in kindergardens, schools, youth clubs, social services, unions, hospitals, offices, factories etc. where we meet as neighbours in and through our common existence and common work that we can have diapraxis - where we can struggle together for a daily life that makes it worth living and religion possible as an interpretation of that life.

Diapraxis as co-witness.

Diapraxis is the occasion for witness - concrete common witness in the actual life realities. It is a witness, never **against** others, but a witness **for** others and **with** others. It is a mutual witness of the hope within us, to each other and to the world. We have a message for each other and we have a common message to a world in which humanity is threatened, and human beings are in danger of being reduced to a part of an incomprehensible bureaucratic social machine. We have to be God's witnesses to a common human existence and dignity before God. This is the common responsibility of Christians and Muslims toward God - a responsibility to live in service of the world, in service of each other and in service of God (cf. S.22,78).

For Muhammad Talbi (from the University of Tunis) the very *raison d'être* of dialogue is simply this common witness and service of God on earth. It is obedience to God's will:

"It should be radically disinterested collaboration without ulterior motive in the service of God, that is to say, of the Good and the True. In a climate without equivocation, relaxed, cleansing, and serene, dialogue in the future could be carried out to the profit of all, without exception or exclusion."²³

Diapraxis as sharing common experiences and activities.

On the basis of a common life with Muslims and a mutual trust, diapraxis is to work together in common projects and activities, to exchange services and friendship. Christians and Muslims who share so far-reaching views regarding the world and human responsibility in it must be able to work together in service to the community in areas such as peace, ecology, education, and health and implement them locally.

This could be a model for Europe - Christians and Muslims working together in various activities as for instance in struggling for the rights of the Muslim minority and in meeting the common challenge of the new religiosity - inspired from the East and from the United States - and of secularization, the vacuum created by the kind of society we have built up.

Both Christians and Muslims have difficulties in maintaining human and religious identities in our contemporary secularized societies. The power relation, however, is unbalanced. Christians are better prepared for this situation being at home and economically stronger, whereas the Muslims are strangers and often come from rural areas, i.e. fairly closed societies. They come from a monoculture in which culture and religion are so intimately intertwined that they can not be distinguished. In the European situation, therefore, Islam is used as a defence, as a symbol of

²³ Islam et dialogue: Reflections sur un theme d'actualité. Tunis 1972.

identity. Muslims become insecure when they meet not only European culture but also other forms of Muslim culture. In spite of these difficulties we can work for diapraxis in which we make room for religious identities.

Diapraxis as common social and political involvement.

According to the Qur'an and the Bible, our task in the world is to be God's stewards, God's caliphs who must administer life and property according to God's will, i.e. to the benefit of the whole community (S.2,30; 6,165; 35,39; NT Lk.12,45; 16,1-7; Mt. 24,8f.; Eph.3,1-13; 1,10; 1.Pet.4,10). As a Muslim one has to be both physically and conscientiously involved in the world. Thus the Muslims must fight in order to change her/himself and the world for the better. This is what the caliph-position implies.

Peace and justice are the two most important ethical values for Muslims and are intimately interconnected (S.49,9). To "strive in the way of God" is to strive for peace and justice (S.4,75) against oppression. The Arabic word for "strive" is **Jihad**. Jihad does not mean "holy war" which in Arabic would be "harb muqaddasa", and this term does not exist in the Qur'an nor in the Hadith (the tradition of Muhammad). Jihad means "to try", "to struggle" or "to right the wrong" and is normally connected with the expression "in the way of God". Jihad is a double process, involving the individual's spiritual growth and the growth of human beings in relation to each other.

Jihad has two meanings: Jihad Akbar (the great jihad) which is the **jihad bi'nafs** (struggle of the ego). This is the individual's constant struggle to break down his/her self-centredness and egoism and replace it with obedience to God's will. Only after success in the Jihad Akbar, over one's selfishness can one be victorious in the Jihad Asghar (the lesser jihad) for righteousness, against tyranny and oppression, against those who attack and threaten human lives. Any struggle against circumstances which are in contradiction to the revealed will of God for human life counts as jihad. This jihad, according to the Qur'an, has nothing to do with "holy war" but is rather the opposite, a progressive struggle to remove conflicts between human beings.

According to the Qur'an, only "tawhidi-religions", i.e. monotheistic religions have the potential to differentiate between oppression and justice - the potential to "strive in the way of God", identify and remove the various forms of oppression and inequality that exist in the human order. Consciousness of the roots of injustice is an important part of the God-oriented consciousness. Thus diapraxis is a common jihad in the Qur'anic sense for peace as a total elimination of contradictions. It is a struggle away from self-centred life to a life in which God is the centre. It is a struggle within ourselves and in the world to make it better. "Verily never will God change the condition of a people until they change it themselves." (S.13,11)

We all bring assumptions drawn from our own experience of faith to such a struggle. Difference in Christian and Muslim approaches leads to different answers in areas of war, violence and peacemaking. All the more reason is there to take care of the forces that unite us - rather than those that separate us. For it is the forces that unite us which create unity in our goals to struggle for peace. "All you who believe, enter into peace" (S.2,208).

Diapraxis and dialogue as common worship, prayer, and meditation.

Sharing together in prayer and meditation is an important part of our diapraxis and our dialogue. It is in our prayer and meditation that we make ourselves open to the work of God within us and among us, and therefore also open to one another. In our dialogue with each other, God is constantly in dialogue with us. In our common prayer and meditation our dialogue becomes more experiential rather than analytical, something that takes place not only in our intellect but in the experiences of our heart, experiences of God's presence. This means that we western Christians have to learn from the eastern tradition, not only from Muslims but also from eastern Christianity about intuition, meditation and silence. We have to learn to be fascinated by God's greatness and glory. Our theology must become based less on reason and more on the

heart, the experience.

Conclusion: From diapraxis to dialogue.

Although the conflicts in the world are not primarily religious conflicts, hostility between Christians and Muslims for instance in Lebanon acts as a hindrance to peace. Christians and Muslims, who belong to religions that preach peace have down through history attacked each other because of misinformation about each other. They have constituted and still constitute a danger to social harmony and on the whole to peace in the world. This history must be turned.

A turn of history requires that we look to the situation outside Europe, to Africa and Asia where Christians and Muslims have practiced diapraxis and dialogue. From Africans and Asians we can learn that only through diapraxis in and for the world can we have a meaningful dialogue. Because God is on the move we must be. In that common diapraxis where we involve ourselves politically and socially, it is not enough to have one perspective. We must have two, united in a dialectic relationship: visions must go together with tenderness, creativity with attentiveness, and activity with the hope in God's future.

I shall end this contribution with a reproduction of a poem that originates in South Africa. The poem uses the picture of the rainbow - a picture of God's brother/sisterhood. All colours are contained in the rainbow. No colour has a favour or an advantage. The rainbow is the sign of hope in God's future. We see God's peace in the rainbow, and at the same time we see our sisters and brothers in the world. We are all in this brother/sisterhood although we are different. We are there each with her/his colour. We are kept together in the same bow. Where the rainbow ends, a new situation develops, and there will be no difference between people.

Where the rainbow ends, brother
 there will be a place eventually,
 where the world shall sing all its songs,
 and we shall sing them together, brother,
 you and I, although you are a Muslim and I a Christian
 though you are black and I am white,
 though you are a man and I a woman.
 It will not be beautiful singing, brother,
 for none of us knows the tune.
 However, we can learn it, brother, you and I.
 There is no such thing as a Muslim tune,
 there is no such thing as a Christian tune.
 Only music, my brother.
 And it is music we shall sing,
 where the rainbow ends.²⁴

²⁴ The original poem is written by Richard Rive, South Africa. Translated into Danish by H.F. Rasmussen in "Ind Under Regnbuen". Savanne 1983, p.149. From this translation I have adapted it to Christian-Muslim dialogue.