

YUSUFU TURAKI A VOICE AGAINST MUSLIM INTERNAL COLONIALISM

In this chapter you will find two of numerous papers written by Yusufu Turaki. Turaki hails from Southern Zaria, also known as Southern Kaduna, the place where quite a few religious riots have occurred during the last few decades.¹ He has been in the forefront of freeing his people from an alien Muslim regime imposed on them by the colonialists or from, as it is sometimes called, “internal colonialism.”²

He has, in fact, been at many forefronts. After he returned from Boston University with a doctorate in Social Ethics, he soon rose to top administrative positions in his church, the Evangelical Churches of West Africa, known widely as ECWA. He became General Secretary. He also served as Provost of the Jos ECWA Theological Seminary, known popularly as JETS. He went as far as one can go in ECWA’s denominational administration. Since then he has served for some years at the International Bible Society (IBS), publishers of the New International Version Bible, first at their Enugu office and later in Nairobi, Kenya. At the time of writing, it looks like he will return to Jos to pick up again at JETS.

During his years with ECWA he also rose to prominence in CAN, ending up as a National Vice-Chairman. Through all these years Turaki has become increasingly popular as an authoritative lecturer, writer and consultant in private and public forums at both national and international levels. His doctoral dissertation, published in 1982,³ deals with the colonial subjugation of his people to the Zaria Muslim Emirate of Zazzau. The combination of his research and wide experience has propelled him to the forefront of his people's battle for the liberation from alien Muslim domination—and from their sharia.

Reading the materials referred to in endnote 2 will give you important background to much of Turaki's writing. It will also help you understand the anger that underlies much of it, legitimate anger, righteous indignation. I can feel it along with him. But it is still anger—and that is often a powerful obstacle to objectivity and listening to the opposite side. You've seen the anger operate among Muslims; you have seen it among Christians. Now you will see it in Turaki. Nevertheless, he manages to restrain his anger so that, though it comes through occasionally, he has not allowed it to run away with him.

Turaki's papers are powerful arguments against sharia and constitute wholesale rejection of it. He shares deep insights with us derived from his scholarship but even more from the experience of his people, living as they have for many decades under an imposed alien regime. But he only describes situations in general without concrete examples and stories. I therefore urge you strongly to read Volume 3 of this series, for there you will find most of Turaki's generalities fleshed out with concrete examples. These papers and that volume are perfect companions.

I have referred to the colonial imposition of an alien Muslim regime on Turaki's people. This arrangement continued unchanged after independence in 1960. Ethnic groups from ATR background but now largely Christian, have been placed in the hands of non-

indigenous Muslim rulers.⁴ I append an article by Nath Maitakama, also from Southern Kaduna, who, in a plea to Governor Makarfi, describes the situation and feelings of their people under this internal colonialism. Turaki's anger has a solid basis, according to Maitakama's article.⁵ This was an important factor in various riots in Kaduna and Bauchi States. Turaki knew from the experience of his people that colonialism, together with its aftermath, was an unjust system: "The colonial system was founded upon an unjust social order, an unbalanced political structure, and unjust moral values of tribal or religious superiority...."

Not only the structures were unjust, but also their new post-colonial custodians. According to Turaki in his papers below, politicians and other leaders had been "groomed to take-over or step into the shoes of the colonial masters, but not in order to restructure the colonial system in terms of human values, principles of justice, peace, equality and freedom. They had imbibed and sanctioned colonial values and practices and used the inherited colonial system along with the inherited primordial values and institutions to boost, strengthen and entrench their tribal or regional dominance."⁶

Subsequently, the military took over to supposedly "rescue" the country from those gatekeepers, but they turned out to be no better. Most would say "worse." When Solomon Lar, former civilian Governor of Plateau State and currently one of the political fathers of the nation, suggested at a conference that more Christians should "join active politics," Turaki wondered whether that would necessarily bring emancipation. His very sad but revealing comments were to the point:

Remember that our sons controlled the Nigerian Army and the Armed Forces, a very potent tool for socio-political and economic change, but what became of their advantaged position? They were ignorant of the very things raised in this

paper. I have had extensive discussions with some of our retired Generals on the issues raised here. Some of them have confessed complete ignorance of these socio-political-religious and economic issues. I remember sharing in a certain conference similar issues. One retired General could not sleep because of the guilt that haunted him all night. The next morning, he had to call me to tell me of his negligence and ignorance. Our problem has been that our educated and privileged people have ignored the historical roots and destiny of their peoples. They lack affinity, loyalty and obligation to the survival of their own people and their geographical areas.

Turaki recognized a serious problem here. He lamented, “Even though some of the Generals who ruled Nigeria came from the Middle Belt, unfortunately they did not critique their inherited political, cultural and religious ideology, let alone to redress the question of the Christians of Northern origin (CNOs) and the Middle Belt.”⁷ How could they, having lost their identity and past? It would appear that their new identity in Christ did not help them chart new paths for the nation. Again, the result of missions with a truncated Christian Gospel.⁸ They were all tied up in an unhealthy mixture of tradition, religion and secularism, not to forget the primordial human lust for power and wealth, an impulse few human beings can resist successfully. Though they had the money generated by oil, they lacked the tools of the Spirit to use it in a socially constructive way.

The loss of our past, origin, identity and primordial values is indeed a serious crisis in the Northern States. This grave loss has contributed immensely in producing crisis and conflict between Christians and Muslims in the Northern States. Who were we before the arrival of Islam and Christianity? What were our origin, destiny and identity? This great loss is contributory to unnecessary violence, conflict and crisis between

Christians and Muslims. Some have lost this sacred origin in the name of religion and foreign culture. Instead of using religion and foreign culture to enhance and promote the dignity and rights of one another, some have sought to hide under that and destroy their kith and kin.

Turaki is here bemoaning a loss of identity and cultural awareness of his people similar to what Muslims bemoan in their people.⁹ Colonialism and secularism did everybody in! “We cannot know where we are going, without a thorough knowledge of where we came from. Many of our politicians and scholars have no grasp of our roots and origins. No wonder, they have no solution.”¹⁰ The parallels between Christian and Muslim problems just won’t end. We keep running into them throughout this series.

One of Turaki’s major emphases is that, *though Muslims may have many good ideas, they are largely irrelevant to the issue of the imposition of sharia on Christians. You may study these ideas all you want—as I have done in all these volumes!—but the only reliable guide towards the solution of the sharia impasse is the experience of Christians under Muslims. That is where the truth comes out; that is where reality debuts. The rest is mere camouflage and deceit*, much of it self-deceit on the part of Muslims. Wonderful ideas? Indeed, many of them. Turaki acknowledges them. I have brought out many of them. But the final word is that of experience.

I suggest that Christians would do well to weigh some of these social ideas Islam offers. You will find them explained in Volumes 2, 4 and 6 in this series. Some of them are correctives and reminders of Christian ideas that have been distorted or even simply lost under the influence of secularism and capitalism. These Christian distortions constitute artificial barriers to Muslim understanding of genuine Christian faith and must be done away with if we are to work our way towards a new era of cooperation. They even are barriers to Christians’ understanding their own faith.

Nevertheless, Turaki's emphasis on the importance of Christian experience with sharia must be heard loud and clear. These lectures help that process along.

I have earlier explained that the inclusion of documents does not always mean full agreement on my part. Though I mostly enthusiastically endorse Turaki's views, there is that issue of the "driving force" for the new sharia. Turaki insists that this "is definitely political, not religious." I have not only stated clearly in Chapter 4 that I disagree with this emphasis, but also that most Christians who take this line, eventually end up in confusion. Sani and his friends may be "responding to the Obasanjo factor," as Turaki puts it, but that is itself an expression of the Islamic thrust for unity and control. I am surprised that Turaki with his sympathy for Kuyperian thought does not recognize the underlying religious drive as the basic force. Turaki's confusion emerges in his reference to sharia as "a two-pronged and double-edged sword with both religious and political warheads." Here religion comes out not as a servant to politics but as its partner. That is undercutting his earlier thesis of politics being the driving force. He should have taken it one step further, but thanks for meeting me halfway! Elsewhere he writes, "Rulers in Islamic States see themselves first and foremost as Muslims, who must defend the cause of an Islamic state. Their allegiance is first and foremost to Islam. Everything about them in matters of government is Islamic."¹¹ It is true that Sani and company deny they have established Islamic States, but it is also true that Christians insist that they have. In that light, the above quotation from Turaki asserts the primacy of religion in Islam over politics. Turaki is in good company: This confusion is typical of Nigerian heirs of semi-secular dualistic Christianity.

Turaki is a prolific writer and lecturer. He has published a number of books as well as numerous articles. Considerations of book length forced me to select just two. An important but very lengthy lecture on the subject delivered in 2003 at the University

of Bayreuth, Germany, is really too important to leave out, but since it is likely to be published by that university, I chose to “exile” it to the *Companion CD <Misc Arts/Turaki>*. Be sure to get hold of it there along with other relevant articles of his.

In ending this introduction, I thank Turaki for his kind permission to use his papers any way I judged fit. Turaki, I hope I have not betrayed your trust in me. I am not sure I did justice to your outlines, but, let’s face it, that was a bit of a challenge! Herewith I offer you my edited version of these two of your papers. Thank you for sharing them via this chapter with the rest of the world.

As to you, Reader, you may already have met Turaki in earlier volumes.¹² This time you will have the chance to hear from him in much greater depth—almost in person. You will enjoy meeting him. So, introducing....

▲ DOCUMENT I

GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT AND LEGISLATION OF SHARIA ENDANGERS AND THREATENS THE POLITICAL UNITY AND STABILITY OF NIGERIA¹³

I. Introduction

If sharia pertains to Islamic religion, then Government’s involvement and legislation of sharia is indeed an incorporation of Islamic religion as part of government administrative practice and policy making. This very act of Government sponsorship of Islamic religion and sharia within the Nigerian Constitution endangers and threatens the political unity and stability of Nigeria. Muslim governors of some states in Northern Nigeria are, first and foremost, elected politicians. They have taken it upon themselves to use democratic government institutions to wage a fierce war against the wishes of their citizens who elected them and to impose upon these citizens the Islamic religion and sharia by whatever political

and other means available to them.¹⁴ These governors are the very ones that are sponsoring the sharia agenda and crusade in the Northern states. These politicians have reincarnated themselves into Islamic States and are using state machinery to establish the Islamic religion and sharia within their domains at all costs. They have taken religion from the hands of religious leaders as the new emergent “prophets” and “apostles” of Islam.¹⁵ The rush of these new Islamic revolutionaries in implementing sharia and Islam reflects a hideous, heinous and hidden political agenda which is not good for Nigeria, except for its demise. It is not a hidden fact that some Muslim governors in the Northern states are sponsoring sharia and Islam with the political force and might of the state. These governors should be held responsible for any adverse implications for their state’s institutionalisation of sharia and Islam. These arrogant and boastful governors have vowed to ensure the success of mixing sharia and Islam with politics and, in consequence, sow the seeds of religious war, political instability and chaos in Nigeria. These governors have a very strong disposition towards arrogance and discord and are seriously bent on destabilising Nigeria. They are a threat to the political unity and stability of Nigeria. But who dares challenge them? Their political friends and foes alike can only stand and watch hopelessly in view of their political paralysis and fear of the consequences of challenging these new Islamic *Mahdis*.

As a result of their Islamic and sharia activities, they have introduced a novel interpretation of the Nigerian Constitution. It is characteristic of these revolutionaries that they have only one way of understanding and interpreting, and that they are the only ones that are right. They may even claim that their understanding and interpretation are from God Himself. Their arrogance and self-pride leave them with potent weapons of *lies* and *intimidation*. They are master strategists armed with the fatal weapons of deception and coercion. They eradicate and kill any opposition. They

inflict fear and cause confusion if they cannot have their way. They boast of their success and victory even before the test of their prowess in the battlefield. Are these not the true qualities and characteristics of the revolutionaries? What do we have in the North, governors or Islamic *Mahdis*? Governors or Islamic revolutionaries? Governors or Islamic pundits? They have drawn their battle lines and no one in Nigeria can claim ignorance of that.

With these facts in mind, it is foolhardy for anyone to blame religious leaders for the religious crisis in the Northern States. The sowing of the seeds of religious conflict and the fanning of the embers of religious intolerance and crisis in the Northern States have been institutionalised by these so-called Islamic *Mahdis*. It will be a miscarriage of justice for religious leaders to be blamed for the sharia and Islamic activities of these new Islamic *Mahdis* who are the actual source and cause of religious tension and unrest in the country.

Are Nigerian politicians afraid to confront each other with the truth? Since October 1999 up to date, the atmosphere of religious lies, hypocrisy, sharia and Islam has dominated the national political scene, unchallenged because of political cowardice and paralysis of the Nigerian politicians. What is the meaning of this uncomfortable silence on the part of the Executive, the Legislature and the Judiciary?¹⁶ The rest of Nigerians have been doing all the talking, except for this political class. Why this odious and haunting silence by the political class? The revolutionaries will have no choice but to draw blood from them and force them into the arena of political gladiators. It will be an awful sight if our politicians by no choice of theirs are forced to become the gladiators in the Nigerian political arena.

On seeing and sensing this haunting political silence, shouldn't Christians speak up? Shouldn't Christians express their democratic rights and demonstrate peacefully? Don't Muslim provocative demonstrations and attacks on Christians point to Government

political attempts at entrapping Christians and blaming them for the exercise of their civic rights? How can Christians get a fair treatment and a fair say in a state dominated by Islamic instruments of sanctions against them? For this reason, Christians in Nigeria must rise up to the challenge and defend themselves against the use of the state machinery, which robs them of their religious, cultural, and human rights.

Will Islam not blame Christians for responding to their political and religious provocation? Will Islam not blame Christians for fomenting trouble and causing religious riots in Nigeria? Will it surprise any one if the already established bias of Islamic Northern governments leads to the institution of probe panels to vindicate themselves and rein in those Christians that are opposed to their Islamic and sharia agenda and blame them for fomenting religious riots?

But who in Nigeria is not aware of this calculated religious bigotry and hypocrisy? Would anyone believe the reports of these so-called probe panels? Should any religious riot break out in any Northern state on sharia agenda, isn't it the Islamic *Mahdis* who would set up the probe panels? Probe panels are only instruments of justifying the fanatical violent activities of the Islamic *Mahdis*. The FG should probe the manner by which these Islamic revolutionary governors have conducted the sharia agenda within their domains. Are these governors above the Nigerian laws in that they cannot be probed and brought to book?¹⁷ Miscarriage of justice is bound to happen if the *Mahdis* are allowed to set up probe panels on those opposed to their sharia and Islamic agenda. Can non-Muslims be punished for being drawn by force into the calculated stratagem of the Islamic revolutionaries? As usual, the Islamic vandals would have successfully accomplished the Islamic assignment on the non-Muslims before the police and soldiers are released to take stock of the dead, the wounded and loss of property. Those who occupy the Government Bench are aware of these facts, but

their lips are sealed and sense of justice numbed. To whom then do they point their accusing fingers? Is it the provoked Muslim and Christian communities as they have been made to handle *the sensitive and volatile irreconcilable deep gulf between sharia and Christian rights and freedom*? Are the sponsors of sharia legislation within the Nigerian Constitution of a multi-ethnic, religious and cultural society? Is it true that the Islamic *Mahdis* who parade themselves as governors are going to escape being blamed? Are we going to charge instead their political victims in Christian and Muslim riots? Of course, the victims of both religious and political manipulation of the sharia pundits must be blamed, even when they might have been set up against each other without knowing it. The wrath of Northern governors must burn over the foolish executioners of the spirit of sharia and those who foolishly defended themselves against the unleashed wrath of Islamic sharia.

The only reasons for the possible escape of the governors is that they did not directly get themselves involved in the pogrom and mayhem, because they are the governors of the people, the chief executives of their states. Who will dare bring them to book?¹⁸ Herein lies both the religious and political hypocrisy of the political class in Nigeria. And this can make or unmake Nigeria.

The following facts are crucial to those who are still asking questions regarding the constitutionality of sharia.

II. Constitutionality Of Sharia

The Islamic *Mahdis* have succeeded as governors in raising doubts in the minds of some Nigerians on their understanding and interpretation of the constitutionality of sharia in the Nigerian Constitution. In Islam such a question does not arise, because sharia cannot be placed side by side with or under any human constitution. Sharia is always above and supreme. Those who amended the phrase “Islamic Personal Law” to read “sharia” between 1984–1999 inserted it. Though they were ignorant of its true

Islamic interpretation, politically they were aware of its future implications in Nigeria. It is un-Islamic for a secular state to establish sharia. Only Islam can establish sharia. If the Nigerian Constitution establishes sharia, then sharia is answerable to the Nigerian Constitution. Putting it in that position is un-Islamic. Sharia is by itself a supreme law only under God.

The Nigerian sharia experiment of Zamfara and subsequent moves in Niger, Sokoto, Kano, Kaduna, Katsina, Yobe, Borno, Adamawa and Bauchi states are loaded with un-Islamic issues. Whatever sharia might have been instituted, the Islamic purists must overthrow this “infidel” experiment and replace it with “pure” sharia. This is the task that lies ahead for the Islamic purists to accomplish. That is what the Islamic Front of Algeria, the Muslim Brotherhood of Egypt, the Hamaaz of Lebanon, the Mujahadeen of Iran of the Shah, the Taliban of Afghanistan are fighting for. They want “pure” Islam to replace “impure” Islam. How Islamic is the Nigerian experiment of sharia in Zamfara and the other states? This in itself is the institution of a perpetual Islamic conflict within the Islamic sects of the Northern States. The political and traditional Islamists will have to contend with the challenge of the Islamic purists. One of them must win the Islamic battle. The spirit of Usman Dan Fodio lives on and will inspire the Islamic purists.

Sharia has in history been an instrument of Islamic and political conflict within homogeneous Islamic states. These homogeneous sharia states have no peace, but have had serious political and religious conflicts.¹⁹ A case study of all Islamic countries in the world attests to these facts. Nigeria is a multi-religious and multicultural country. It is therefore impossible for sharia to instill unity, stability and peace. Rather, sharia has been an instrument of crisis within Islamic states and, if introduced in Nigeria, it will do even worse.

The constitutionality of sharia is not to be questioned as far as Islam is concerned. Within the Nigerian Constitution, only Islamic Personal Law is constitutionally viable, but not sharia as a legal sys-

tem. The word “sharia” as used in the Constitution is an amendment inserted by the Military Government of “Islamic Personal Law” and the description of it in the 1999 Constitution remains as that. If the introduction of the word “sharia” represents the apex of the Military Government’s contribution in the 1999 Constitution, then Nigeria must go back to the democratically designed Constitution of 1979. Of course, Muslim Commanders-in-Chief dominated the military during the years of 1984 to 1999. What could not be done under a democracy was achieved under a military dictatorship that was highly pro-Islam, except for that of General Abubakar. This fact serves as a litmus test of the question of the constitutionality of Islamic Personal Law in the 1979 Constitution on the one hand and Sharia Court of Appeal in the Military Constitutions of 1989 and 1999 on the other.

The constitutional tenets of religious and human rights as prescribed in the Nigerian Constitution make the insertion of sharia impossible. *The social, cultural and religious rights of Nigerians are diametrically opposed to the social, cultural and religious sanctions of sharia.* The obvious fact that fanatical Muslims have consistently refused to accept is that Nigeria is not an Islamic state, but a multi-religious, multicultural and multi-ethnic one.²⁰ This fact alone makes sharia an impossibility in Nigeria. In this modern world, sharia has not worked successfully even in homogeneous Islamic states. How much more difficult it will be in a heterogeneous Nigeria.

Is the Muslim cry for sharia relevant to Nigeria or it is just a fad? Is it true that Muslim rights are denied them, given the legal and practical impossibility of sharia existing within another supreme legal system? What do you do in a case where someone’s rights transgress another man’s rights? *Not legalising sharia does not in any way deny Muslims the right to apply sharia over their private lives. In fact a devoted Muslim does not need the Government of Nigeria to legalise his application of sharia upon himself.*

III. Sharia for Muslims Only?

Why should a Muslim be denied his constitutional right of sharia? According to Muslims, sharia is of God and from God. It does not come from mortal beings. It is not made by any state's constitution. Can a mortal man give the holy sharia to Muslims? Why should Muslims ask for sharia from Nigerians and not from God? Has sharia ceased to be divine?

The whole approach to sharia in Nigeria is un-Islamic. There is no country in the history of Islam where Muslims demand the rights of sharia from Christians or non-Muslims. This strange phenomenon is among the unique characteristics of Nigerian Islam. Islam usually takes a country by revolution and as a result will then establish sharia by an Islamic fiat action. It is quite unusual for a Muslim to beg an "infidel" for sharia. It is only in Nigeria that Muslims beg for the legality of sharia, while elsewhere it is only by Islamic revolution.²¹ This demand then makes the quest for sharia a political and not a religious one.

True and faithful Muslims do not need legal sharia, as it is only a tool for sanctions. A holy Muslim needs no legal sharia sanctions. Actually and in practice, legal sharia is meant for the non-Muslims whose un-Islamic beliefs, practices and behaviour must be sanctioned and reformed. For a true and practicing Muslim, sharia has nothing to regulate in him, for his entire life is already in total conformity to the tenets of Islam. Sharia is an instrument of sanctions and of making un-Islamic practices conform to Islam. Who then needs sharia most, Muslims or others? Historically, it has been the non-Muslim who receives the wrath and burdens of sharia sanctions, rather than a Muslim.

Sharia regulates the social, cultural, religious, public acts, practices and behaviour of the Muslims but even more so the un-Islamic way of life of the non-Muslims. The regulatory jurisdiction of Islam is coterminous with the Islamic state boundary. It is the Islamic territory or land that legitimises the scope and application

of sharia with all its sanctions upon every mortal being that resides within an Islamic territory.

The statement that sharia is for Muslims only is un-Islamic and deceptive. If a non-Muslim resides within an Islamic state, Islam demands that sharia must be applied to such a one without partiality or favour. It is un-Islamic for a Muslim with the powers to enforce sharia within an Islamic state to refuse to do so.

The primary objective and the spirit of Islam is to sanction the public behaviour of every human being, whether Muslim or non-Muslim, who is residing in an Islamic state. Once any government has declared sharia, its scope and sphere of jurisdiction must cover its territory or land. For example, Zamfara State, where sharia has been legally instituted, has been turned into an Islamic state. It is therefore the duty of “*Al Amir*,” now the Governor or any other so appointed, to oversee the strict implementation of sharia within the boundaries of Zamfara State. If the present Governor says that his sharia will only apply to Muslims and not non-Muslims, his posture is un-Islamic. Such a situation will not deny a Muslim purist of tomorrow to ensure the full implementation of sharia upon non-Muslims. Islamic conflicts might have been instituted in the state between the Muslim purists and liberal Muslims. It is possible that the present Governor of Zamfara is a liberal Muslim who might have to give way to a more puritanical Muslim tomorrow.

The Islamic *Mahdism* of some Muslim governors of today may become the liberal Muslim school tomorrow who could be introducing the un-Islamic sharia as of now. However, he could also be overthrown by the likes of the Islamic Salvation Front, the Muslim Brotherhood, the Hamaaz, the Mujahadeen, the Taliban or any other.

IV Sharia Fights Immorality, Corruption And Irreligion

The statistics of the Nigerian Breweries are available to Nigerians to see for themselves where in Nigeria we have the great-

est consumption of alcohol. Similarly the statistics of prostitution, adultery, fornication, divorce, corruption, dehumanization and neglect of the plight of humanity can give a picture of the state of morality in the regions of Nigeria. Neither Islam nor Christianity condone these acts of moral decadence. However, *the moral arguments for sharia seem to overlook our common knowledge of the sinful, wicked and hypocritical nature of man.* There is nothing like legislated morality, for it only succeeds in turning human beings into religious fanatics and hypocrites. Every Nigerian knows that the apostles of sharia have no moral and Islamic basis for claiming Islam as their cure for social ills. Only those who are devoted to God and His tenets and do not seek man's favour can pass the moral test, not those who are morally bankrupt. *The moral argument for sharia is based upon the defective and illusive definition of morality as an external phenomenon.* The inner being, the disposition and the motive of being religious or pious constitute true religion, not religion by eye-service and externals. The moral argument for sharia falls under externals and this is not the best basis for judging morality.

If sharia were a curative for the Muslim heart and morality, we would be having fewer Arab and Nigerian Muslims who fly from Saudi, Iran, Egypt, Nigeria and many other Islamic States for gambling and sexual prostitution of all kinds to Las Vegas, Monte Carlo, etc. Morality is never measured by the external severity of law or its stipulated sanctions,²² but by the inward purity that is motivated by love of God, not by the external sanctions of law. What we hear about the emphasis on sharia by its self-professed apostles, are its externality and sanctions. What is the moral score mark for a Muslim who refuses to drink alcohol in Mecca, but goes to drink alcohol in Las Vegas? What about prostitution? Not in Zamfara, but in Lagos. What if the streets are cleansed of prostitutes, brothels, drinking parlours, but the same are being practiced in private homes and offices in far-away

places? Not to speak of rampant pen robbery and embezzlement of government funds in offices.

Given the volatile and conflict-ridden nature of Islamic States in the Middle East, North Africa and, since the early 1980s to date, in Nigeria, who can be tricked or deceived into believing that sharia brings morality, ethics, peace (*salama*), stability and unity to a multi-religious, multicultural and multi-ethnic country such as Nigeria? It is a historical fact that any one who refuses to submit to Islam must face the wrath of Islamic violence and annihilation.

The fundamental *human* basis for judging morality and ethics is the preservation, promotion and protection of human rights and freedoms. Any religion that cannot do so across its borders shows that its nature is exclusive and sectarian. It is unimaginable to think of the exclusive, sectarian and discriminatory nature of sharia against non-Muslims and still claim that sharia can embrace religious tolerance, harmony and peaceful coexistence in Nigeria with non-Muslims.

The moral argument for sharia in a multi-ethnic/religious/cultural setting becomes un-Islamic and deceptive. *Having been born and bred in Northern Nigeria and seen it all happen, for me these moral arguments are bankrupt. They are mere political and religious gimmicks.*

It has been predicted and hoped that sharia is going to rid our society of prostitution, bribery, adultery, fornication, drinking, smoking and all other forms of human vices, but history records a different picture of moral decadence and indiscipline in the so-called Islamic societies of Nigeria. The fruits of sharia which we have observed in history are violence, corruption, dominance, segregation, discrimination, preferential treatment, slavery, and subjugation on the part of strong Muslims towards the “*talakawa*” (the poor, the masses) and the non-Muslims.

In the history of Islam, there has been no period when non-Muslims have enjoyed full and complete human, religious and cultural

rights. The experience of non-Muslims within Islamic States and societies is one long and consistent history of immoral and unethical testimony of dehumanization, slavery and subjugation of the non-Muslims. When Christians and other non-Muslims point out these facts of history to the apostles of sharia, they often cover these up by fabricated lies and falsification of truth and realities.

The sad thing about this is that many Christians and other non-Muslims believe and have faith in the apostles of sharia. They do so at the expense of their own religious freedom and human rights as well as at the expense of the unity and stability of their countries.

V. Application of Sharia on Nigerian Muslims

It will be very difficult to find a Nigerian Muslim who is willing to allow sharia to be fully applied to him or her. The application of sharia has always been by the strong upon the weak, by rulers upon *talakawa* and by Muslims upon non-Muslims. Those who always suffer the wrath and sanctions of sharia are the *talakawa* and the non-Muslims. Historically, this is how it has always been and will ever be.²³ Sharia in history is an Islamic club and sword meant for the scum of the society. Who in Northern Nigeria does not know of these facts and truths?

Sharia in history has been a potent instrument of tearing Muslim states and societies apart. This is as a result of its interpretation and application. Islam has various sharia schools with conflicting interpretations and applications. There is not one single interpretation of sharia agreed upon by all Muslims. If there were, we would not have serious sharia conflicts in Islamic States. Examples of such conflicts abound. They include the Islamic Salvation Front that butchers and slaughters Muslims in Algeria; the Muslim Brotherhood that kills, bombs and terrorises Egyptians and Christians in particular; the Mujahadeen that waged a guerrilla warfare against the Iranian state and Afghanistan; or the religious

war of Lebanon, where Muslims were fighting Christians. In Nigeria, there is the burning of Christian churches since early 1980s, the prohibition to teach CRK in schools, the refusal to grant permission for burial grounds and for the building of churches. All those in addition to many other forms of social, cultural, religious discrimination and denials of human rights in some Northern States.

VI. The Test Case of Zamfara's Experiment

The Zamfara sharia experiment was done in a manner that violates the religious, cultural and human rights of Christians and other non-Muslims in Zamfara State. The argument of "majority Muslim" in Zamfara is in itself a violation of the fundamental human rights of the minority that is non-Muslim. The principles of human rights are not determined by a political concept of majority. Human, religious and cultural rights are not merely political or religious concepts. They are inherently inalienable. The fact that the State House of Assembly legislated the sharia with total disregard for the rights of the non-Muslim, is indeed a clear testimony of the discriminatory and differential nature of Islam, which recognizes no one except Muslims.

The non-Muslims living in Zamfara have been dispossessed of their rights of state or land and have become "protected citizens." Zamfara is now an Islamic state by the legislation of sharia. If Zamfara has the constitutional right to institute sharia as claimed by its Islamic *Mahdi* and that it is a must for the majority Muslims, then it behooves Zamfara to institute a Bill of Rights for Christians and other non-Muslims to ensure their legal protection from the application of sharia. This is needed to ensure that no provision of sharia shall be used against the religious, cultural and human rights of the non-Muslim living within the state. The fact that the State Assembly instituted no such complementary Bill of Rights makes Zamfara an Islamic state and legalises state discrimination against

the non-Muslims. On account of this, sharia in Zamfara violates the constitutional rights of all the non-Muslims. If Christians and others cannot have full rights in Zamfara as stipulated in the Nigerian Constitution, then the making of this sharia excises Zamfara from legally being part of Nigeria. Can a Christian take a Muslim to court of law for a Muslim violation of his human rights? Can a Muslim drag a Christian to a Muslim court? Does sharia regulate the public behaviour of a Christian and force him to comply with sharia moral externalities? Whether our answers are “yes” or “no,” Christians and other non-Muslims must have legal backing in the form of a Bill of Rights in Zamfara State.

Since it was only Muslims who drew up the Zamfara sharia provisions, in like manner it must be only Christians who will draw up the Christian Bill of Rights. Both provisions must be regulated and sanctioned by the Nigerian Legislature and Constitution. This provision becomes necessary only if Nigeria opts to operate both the Nigerian Constitution and sharia. This option will only spell conflict for Nigeria. Two sovereign laws cannot coexist under the same roof.

Zamfara can only be seen to be impartial and still remain as part of Nigeria if the State Assembly also institutes a Bill of Rights for non-Muslims. The fact that this did not occur makes every claim of the Islamic *Mahdi* empty rhetoric, cynical and hypocritical. All Nigerians must therefore reject Zamfara sharia, since in principle it violates the true nature of Nigerian society and the Constitution.

The National Assembly has failed Nigerians by not providing legal guidelines for the establishment of any state laws that will not infringe on human rights as stated in the Nigerian Constitution. With sharia firmly in the hands of an Islamic *Mahdi*, this is a mockery of the Nigerian Constitution and religious freedom.

If Zamfara must live under sharia, then Nigerians must be prepared for perpetual social and religious conflict as the religious rights of

both Muslims and Christians are irreconcilable. Over the years, Nigerians have found the best compromise in "Islamic Personal Law" and not in sharia.

The claims of the apostles of sharia that it will not be applied upon the non-Muslims is un-Islamic. The best alternative for full application of sharia within Nigeria is the "religious one." If a Muslim wishes to apply full sharia upon himself or the Muslim *Umma*, that can be done through the voluntarily-constituted Muslim Forum established by the Muslim *Umma*. A Muslim does not need a state or a constitution for his application of sharia upon himself or upon a Muslim *Umma*. What Muslims are asking for can only be obtained in an Islamic state. It is impossible to make Nigeria or any state within Nigeria an Islamic state. The state, which is not Islamic and has a large population of non-Muslims, has no right to institute for itself a perpetual sharia conflict and violations of others' rights. For sharia to function fully in Nigeria, it must become the only supreme law. Christian and other non-Muslim rights cannot but be violated if sharia is to be instituted.

The cry for sharia by Nigerian Muslims is purely a political one. Sharia is a political tool for carving out a political state for Muslims and also as means of controlling the populace and land or territory. It is only Government that has that power. Muslims have turned sharia into a constituted government. It is this nature of sharia that makes the non-Muslims oppose it so vehemently.

Muslims do tell us that sharia is purely religious, but in practice, sharia is government in itself. It is this political nature of sharia that renders it an impossible legal system within the Nigerian legal system.

VII. The Islamic Nature of Zamfara's Experiment

No matter how you look at it, the Zamfara experiment is un-Islamic. On gaining political power and state machinery, the newly elected Muslim governors of some Northern states became the self-

appointed Islamic *Mahdis*. And whatever sharia they institute will definitely fall short of what the Islamic purists of tomorrow will establish.

What then is the driving force behind these new Islamic Mahdis? This force is definitely political, not religious. The Northern Muslim Mafia is solidly behind them. By their calculations, sharia would be a political means of uniting all Muslims of the Northern states. Sharia provides them with that platform and forum. But they picked a wrong political tool as sharia is a divisive and crisis-ridden instrument. Sharia will definitely divide Northern society and will institute perpetual war and religious conflict in the North. It is an impossible political task to unite the Northern society, as the Middle Belt is largely Christian, non-Muslim and non-Hausa-Fulani. With the enforced imposition of sharia on Christians and non-Hausa-Fulani, politics in the North can never be the same again. This is bound to affect the rest of Nigeria.

This political miscalculation of the sharia die-hards and the Northern Muslim Mafia is very costly to the peaceful coexistence of Muslims and CNOs. The sooner the Muslim North recognises this and changes its sharia agenda, the better it is for Northern political unity. But as it is, it is the nature of Islamic revolutionaries never to submit to reason or change of heart, except by death.

It is quite evident that the driving force behind the sharia agenda is purely political and not religious. Nigerian politicians are all aware of this fact. These fanatical Islamic revolutionaries among Northern Muslim governors are only responding to the Obasanjo factor. The Northern Muslim Mafia has turned sharia into a political tool to challenge the Obasanjo factor and ethnic politics in Nigeria. The new Islamic revolutionaries and the Mahdis are reactions to these challenges. Nigerian politicians must address the current sharia debates and ethnic politics from this political perspective. *Religion is just a cover up. It is a scapegoat. It distracts. But their dabbling in religion cannot hide the real political agenda of these Islamic pundits.*

Sure enough, sharia is their powerful and potent weapon for destabilising the Nigerian polity. Sharia is the surest instrument of whipping, raising and fanning the embers of religious violence and conflict, much quicker than any other means. Are Nigerians blind to this political fact? Then why should politicians play around with these agents of anarchy and chaos?

From our foregoing submission, the whole subject of sharia must be addressed and looked at differently. From A-Z, it is damned political and very sensitive and volatile. Is sharia not a time bomb for Nigeria? Is sharia not capable of tearing Nigeria apart? Are we not sensing the heat of the forces of balkanization? Are not the clouds of doom gathering over the horizon? Why are Nigerian politicians playing with this dangerous and explosive political and religious bomb? Sharia is a lethal weapon that has a two-pronged and a double-edged sword with both religious and political war-heads that can shatter the Obasanjo factor and set this great country ablaze. If this time bomb is not nipped in the bud, no one will be alive to gather the debris of its fall-out.

▲ DOCUMENT 2

March 29, 2000

The Secretary

Judicial Commission of Inquiry into Religious Riots in
Kaduna State

Zaria Lodge, General Hassan Usman Katsina House
Kawo, Kaduna

Dear Sir,

A MEMORANDUM TO THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION OF
INQUIRY INTO RELIGIOUS RIOTS IN KADUNA STATE²⁴

I write Your Honour to submit my memorandum to the

Judicial Commission of Inquiry into Religious Riots in Kaduna State on *The State of the Fundamental and Inalienable Rights of CNOs in the Islamic States of Northern Nigeria*. This is to state to you the serious consequences and implications of the sharia on CNOs as it is practised in the Northern states and what it portends for Christians if Kaduna State should adopt the Zamfara Islamic model of sharia. Find attached to this letter the Memorandum as stated, please.

It is my earnest prayer that this memorandum will issue well with your Judiciary Commission and may God attend all your deliberations. I am wishing you God's blessings and a fruitful and successful completion of this great assignment and service to Kaduna State and the nation. May you champion the cause of Christian Human Rights in the midst of religious bigotry and hypocrisy in the Northern states.

Your Humble and Obedient Servant,

Rev. Prof. Yusufu Turaki.

THE STATE OF FUNDAMENTAL AND INALIENABLE RIGHTS OF CHRISTIANS OF NORTHERN ORIGIN IN THE *ISLAMIC STATES* OF NORTHERN NIGERIA WITH REFERENCE TO THE KADUNA SHARIA RIOTS

FEBRUARY 2000

PREAMBLE

The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord. His delight is in the fear of the Lord. He shall not judge by the sight of His eyes, nor decide by the hearing of His ears, but with righteousness He shall judge the poor, and decide with equity for the meek of the earth. He shall strike the earth with the rod of

His mouth, and with the breath of His lips He shall slay the wicked. Righteousness shall be the belt of His loins, and faithfulness the belt of His waist (Isaiah 11:2-5).

The above is my prayer for all the members of the Judicial Commission of Inquiry. I thank God for each one of you and may God use each one of you and the entire Judicial Commission of Inquiry to bring about His kindness, justice and righteousness in Kaduna State.

I. Introduction

My presentation is in four parts. Part I presents the predicament of Christians in the Northern states of Nigeria. These facts are primary to our understanding of the subject of sharia riots in Kaduna State and the cry for sharia in the Northern states of Nigeria.

Part II defines the implications of sharia for Christians. In brief, it explains how sharia, when legalised and instituted in a given state, takes away the most valuable human rights of CNOs. *At the heart of the sharia debate is the issue of the fundamental and inalienable rights of Christians.* What are these Christian rights which sharia takes away? We do not have to go far into Islamic history to search and find answers. The contemporary historical facts are here with us in Nigeria. We live with them everyday. They are our valid testimony to prove that sharia is an enslaving instrument that Muslims use on Christians as is the case in Sudan, Egypt and other Islamic States.

Part III addresses the historical question of the application of sharia in the former Northern Region of Nigeria. This sudden cry for sharia on which you are now deliberating must be placed in the context and history of our experience of sharia in Nigeria. I am presenting to you the true facts of the denial of CNOs' fundamental and inalienable rights as is now being practised in the Northern States of Nigeria. These denials of Christian rights are based upon

nothing else but upon the application of Islamic sharia in the Northern States. This catalogue of vices and crimes against CNOs have been instituted against them even before sharia had not yet been formally legalised and instituted by any state in the North. What do you think will follow for Christians once sharia has been accorded full legal recognition?

The primary purpose of this presentation is to bring to the fore what is at stake in the sharia riots in Kaduna and in the general sharia debates. It is nothing less than the cherished rights of Christians. Therefore, it is important for Nigerians to know the why and wherefore behind the present calls of sharia and that in this modern time we are now being asked to go back to the *jahiliyya* [Arabic for “ignorance”] period and relive the primitive and crude life of centuries ago. We are currently in a very sad episode in our history in that we have ignored reason, common sense and history. The fathers of Northern Nigeria are now opting for a commitment to suicide and anarchy. The Kaduna sharia riots are a testimony to that. The Northern States of Nigeria are currently being run and managed by irresponsible, insensitive and reckless fanatical religious leaders who do not cherish and value our peace, unity and stability. They move from state to state, sowing the seeds of discord, violence and conflict. Are we, the good people of Kaduna State, going to succumb and fall prey to the wind of sharia politics of our new *Mahdis*? Some of our reckless governors in the North may not be far from the likes of Rev. Jim Jones and the leaders of the Domsday Cult of Uganda.

Part IV presents some comments, suggestions, solutions and recommendations.

I. The Plight and Provocation of CNOs

What the Constitutions of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1979 and 1999 state about the governance and the fundamental human rights of Nigerians in Chapters I, II, III and IV does not conform by a long shot to the experience of CNOs in their respec-

tive states. We have observed with great distress and disgust how the fundamental human rights of Northern Christians have not been preserved, promoted, protected and defended by Northern state governments. Historically, CNOs did enjoy some relative fundamental human rights from 1900 up to 1973, that is, from the inception of the British Colonial Administration through to the Government of the Northern Peoples Congress (NPC) under Sir Ahmadu Bello, the Sardauna of Sokoto and, relatively, under General Gowon, until the take-over of mission schools and hospitals by various states of the Federation in 1973.

The serious erosion of their fundamental human rights started in 1973 and increased year after year right up to 2000. This loss of Christian rights was the result of increasing Islamisation, including the application of the sharia in the Northern states. CNOs began to lose their fundamental human rights during the era of military regimes, a process that reached its peak in this democratic dispensation of the sharia governors in the Northern States.

Since 1973, CNOs have been subjected to all kinds of religious, cultural, social, political and economic discrimination, alienation, persecution and marginalisation. The primary reasons for this loss of fundamental human rights are simply (1) their status as Christians and (2) the increasing drive for Islamization and application of sharia in the Northern States. On account of these, there is a very strong aversion against CNOs by state governments and some Muslim groups in the Northern States of Nigeria, but the strongest manifestation of this aversion is in this present so-called democratic dispensation. What an irony! CNOs have consistently suffered terribly from the cruel hands of some state governments and Muslim groups. The primary reason for Christian persecution by state governments in Northern Nigeria is that these state governments see themselves as exclusively Islamic and in consequence have taken up a jihadist posture of denying Christians their God-given inalienable rights by meting out all kinds of dis-

criminary administrative practices against them. The persecution of Christians is seen not only as coming from some Muslims, but also from state governments that are supposed to provide them with solace and succour and to protect, preserve and defend their human rights. It is important that we list the acts of deliberate and systematic denial of the fundamental human rights of CNOs from 1973 to 2000.

II. Discriminatory and Religious Practices against CNOs by State Governments and Muslims from 1973–2000:²⁵

1. State Government Actions and Attitudes Towards Christians:

- a. Refusal to grant Certificates of Occupancy for the building of churches
- b. Refusal to grant and assign burial grounds to Christians
- c. Refusal to grant radio and TV programming fairly and justly to Christians in contrast to Muslim privileges
- d. Refusal to allow the teaching of CRK in Government Institutions
- e. Discrimination against Christians in state appointments and promotions
- f. Use of government media houses to propagate Islam as against Christianity
- g. Use of government funds to promote Islam and Islamic institutions as against those of Christians
- h. State government judicial application of sharia against Christians
- i. High-handedness of government on inter-religious conflict and riots involving Christians and Muslims

2. Muslim Actions and Attitudes Towards Christians:

- a. Attitude of differential and preferential treatment
- b. Incessant killing of Christians and burning of Christian

- churches, institutions and houses from 1980 to the present
- c. Practice and application of sharia as a tool to persecute and subjugate Christians
 - d. Instituting acts of violence and conflict against Christians
 - e. Disregard and lack of respect for Christians who are their kith and kin
 - f. Intolerant and arrogant attitude towards Christians in public matters

To all CNOs, sharia means all of the above. Sharia will no doubt strengthen the hands of the Northern States and Muslims to do to Christians even worse than the above. Sharia, because of their practical experience of it, evokes fear and dread in Christians. It is a matter of life and death. It is a matter of freedom and human rights versus servitude and bondage. *Our memories of the pre-colonial slave trade and raiding of our people by Northern Muslim rulers are still fresh. There is still Islamic slavery in Sudan and Islamic persecution of Christians in the Middle East.* When you want to impose this historical thing called sharia upon our land, it is bound to meet stiff resistance. The blowup of the Kaduna sharia riots stems from this unwillingness of CNOs to be recolonised in these modern times under the guise of sharia. We not only know what sharia is historically, but also have experienced it through our forefathers, our fathers and, in fact, our very selves, even right now at this very moment.

In the Nigeria of today, it is very difficult to ascertain why state governments and Muslims in some of the Northern States have singled out and targeted Northern Christians for religious, social and political discrimination, persecution and marginalisation. The potent tool which state governments and Muslims use to discriminate, subjugate and marginalise Christians is the state *machinery* and the *sharia*, the Muslim legal system. Because of their nasty and dehumanising experience of the incessant application and torment

of sharia on Christians in the Northern States, CNOs are more vocal and stronger critics of sharia than any other group in Nigeria. They are vehemently opposed to sharia because of what sharia meant to their forefathers, their fathers and to themselves in their experience of being second class citizens and the scum of a Muslim society in the Northern system. Nothing can erase or change their dreadful experience, fear and memory of the enslaving and dehumanising effects of the application of sharia upon the lives of Northern Christians. Nothing. No amount of lectures and persuasions by well-meaning Muslims and state governments; no amount of extolling the virtues of sharia by any learned Islamic scholar. Northern Christians can never and will never believe the lies which state that (1) Christians will not be affected by sharia; (2) Sharia is for Muslims only; and (3) Sharia is a fundamental right of Muslims. Far from it. CNOs see sharia from Islamic history and their own experience of it as a lethal weapon which state governments and Muslims use against the fundamental rights of Christians. *We have heard and read all the arguments of the proponents of sharia, but these can only persuade or convince the ignorant outsiders who have not tasted the baptism of sharia.* We have historical facts and experiences that substantially void such arguments for sharia. Southern Christians may not know what sharia is all about and may hear about it only through the polished interpretations of Northern Muslims. For this reason, we cannot use southern ignorance and inexperience of what sharia is in practice as a valid verdict for Christians who are presently under Islamic servitude and chains in the Northern States. What Nigerians need to know is the *dehumanising experience* of sharia by CNOs and the hypocrisy and religious bigotry of the sharia apostles and the new *Mahdis*.

Permit therefore, CNOs to speak for themselves. Who can help Northern Christians to remove this deadly and poisonous cup of suffering from them? The FG and well-meaning Nigerians must step in and rescue CNOs from the clutches and the fangs of sharia

strangulation as it has been used and will be used continuously by the state governments and Muslims in the Northern States. Sharia has clearly drawn the battle lines as exhibited by the Kaduna sharia riots.

Whose interest is being protected when state governments and some Muslims in the Northern States deny the reality and the truth of religious discrimination, persecution and marginalisation of CNOs? Who can explain why CNOs have in these modern times, especially in the year 2000, entered into a period of darkness, gloom, despair and abandonment? They feel very strongly that they have no constitutional and state protection and have no human rights in the Northern States. By what means can the fundamental human rights of Christians be protected, preserved, promoted and defended in the Northern States of Nigeria? The national House of Assembly must step in here or else the lions will finish the sheep in the Northern pens.

At this very point in time Northern Christians do not have any protection against the atrocities of state governments and Muslims under the present 1999 Constitution. The provisions of the Constitution are not strong enough to protect them from the persecution and discriminatory practices of self-declared Islamic States and sharia in the Northern States. For this reason, if CNOs are to enjoy the provisions of human rights in the Constitution as it is the privilege of their Muslim counterparts, their plight and provocation in the Northern States must be redressed and corrected by justice through the Federal House of Assembly. There must be constitutional provisions as statutes for protecting, preserving, promoting and defending the fundamental human rights of CNOs. The FG must set up a human rights commission to study and monitor thoroughly the case and condition of CNOs in the Northern States.

It is a historical fact that the entire North, including the predominantly Muslim areas, benefited from mission education, medical work and literature work. The beneficiaries of mission

and Christian humanitarian services are the very ones leading an unfortunate sharia war against CNOs. Nobody can deny the historical and substantial contributions of missionaries and Christianity to the growth and development of the vast Northern Region of Nigeria. Just a few decades ago, missionaries did their work all over Northern Nigeria, but today, these Christian freedoms and rights have been taken away by state governments through the systematic implementation of sharia. Consequently, these Christian rights are being replaced by discrimination, persecution, Islamization and marginalisation. How can Nigerians and the Nigerian Constitution protect CNOs from the discriminatory, persecuting, Islamizing and marginalising policies, administrative practices and attitudes of state governments and Muslims?

Some Muslims and state governments in Northern Nigeria have refused to recognise the fact that there are Hausa and Fulani Christians as well as the vast majority of Middle Belterers that are Christian. There are Northern indigenes that are Christian. As indigenes, they have the right of full citizenship in the Northern States. There is the blatant deception accepted by many that Christians in the North are all southerners who have migrated to the North. It is a blatant lie. We are asking for the constitutional and legal rights of CNOs. By virtue of birthright and birthplace and by religious preference and freedom, the state governments belong to both Christians and to the Muslims who are their kith and kin. They deserve to have the rights of state government and to practice their Christianity anywhere in the Northern States, unhindered and unmolested. They were made Christians not by southerners but by European missionaries just as Arabs converted our kith and kin to Islam.

The truth is, both Islam and Christianity are foreign religions in the North. Our forefathers practised ATR before they became converts to Islam and Christianity. If Christianity is a foreign religion in the North, so is Islam. If Northern Muslims claim the

rights of citizenship, so do Christians. If Muslims claim the rights of sharia, so do Northern Christians claim their Christian rights. If Nigeria must give Muslims in the North their religious rights, they must also give Christians in the North their religious rights. The religious rights of CNOs must not and should not be taken away from them by the destructive and parochial politics of sharia. Christians are neither dependent upon sharia nor inferior to Muslims. Human rights are matters of and derivatives of equality, dignity and self-worth, freedom and justice. They are not matters of and derivatives of numbers and territory.

There cannot be peace, unity and stability where there is no justice. Sharia imperils them all.

III. History of Sharia

A. How the Application of Sharia Tramples on Christian Rights

The previous section discusses the plight and provocation of Northern Christians in the Northern States. It also describes how the processes of Islamization and imposition of sharia affect them. This section describes the Islamic foundations, beliefs, interpretations and practices which trample upon Christian rights within Islamic States. It describes clearly the religious, theological and theocratic nature of Islam and sharia. It addresses and explains the roots of Islamic foundations, which deny Christians their rights within Islamic States.

1. *What Sharia Does to a State or Government*

a. Sharia Turns a State or Government into a Theocratic State or Government.

In Islam, the state or government defines its existence, role, status and functions in terms of Islam. Thus the state or government is ruled, controlled and guided by Islam. This is what sharia accomplishes: It creates a theocratic state or government. Once that is done, it makes

the state exclusively Islamic and turns it into a property belonging exclusively to Muslims. When sharia does that to the state or government, it denies Christians the rights of state, because the state is now religiously Islamic and theocratic. On account of this, the Christian is denied the right of having a Christian theocratic and theological state.

b. Sharia Turns a State or Government into a Theocratic Territory or Land.

In Islam, the state or government defines its juridical scope in terms of territory or land. Thus, the territory or land becomes Islamic. Sharia can only be applied within a given territory or land and that territory or land must be Islamic. This is what sharia accomplishes: It takes the ownership of the land or territory away from the people and gives it to a theocratic state or government. The theocratic state or government administers the territory or land through sharia. Sharia cannot function in a land or territory that is not Islamic. By possessing the land or territory, Islam takes that right from Christians. In Islamic States, no Christian owns land or territory. Ownership of land or territory is the supreme function of an Islamic state. When land or territory is the exclusive possession of Islam, what is left for Christians? On account of this, Christians are dispossessed of land or territory. Christians have been denied land to build churches or burial grounds in the Northern States simply because of this Islamic theology of land and territory. In Islamic States, Christians are dispossessed of the ownership and theology of land, property and territory. Islamic property laws, laws of inheritance and business transactions are applied to all people who reside within an Islamic territory or land.

c. Sharia Takes an Islamic Territory or Land and Creates out of It Territorial and Regulatory Morality and Ethics.

In Islam, once a territory or land has been declared Islamic, then Islamic territorial morality and ethics must be applied and

imposed. The religious and social behaviour, practices and attitude of the people residing in a given Muslim state must be prescribed, regulated and be in conformity with the injunctions of sharia. Any person, Muslim or not, is bound to live by Islamic territorial morality and ethics. So long as a person is within an Islamic state and within the confines of Islamic territory, he must comply with the state regulatory policies and laws that govern behaviour, practice and attitude. In an Islamic state, there is no liberty of conduct, behaviour and practice, for all behaviour must conform to Islamic morality and ethics.²⁶

A Christian is not allowed to act according to his conscience. He must comply with Islamic territorial morality and ethics. All un-Islamic social practices of both Muslims and non-Muslims must be regulated according to sharia. Within an Islamic state, morality and ethics are primarily not personal, but public and territorial. In an Islamic society, one is given a set of rules and regulations for one to follow publicly, a breach of which incurs the wrath of the Islamic state. The “sword” must be used on sinners. It is a deterrent to the unrighteous and sinners.

This is the area where Christians find it very difficult to practice their Christianity and their religious freedom. In Islamic States, Christians are not allowed to preach, convert, build churches and hold services, except with an Islamic permit. The issuance of religious permits is the most powerful weapon that Islam uses against Christianity in Islamic States. Muslims do not need permits for Islamic activities, but Christians must obtain them and if not, the state must use the “sword” against them for violating state laws. CNOs have suffered immensely from these sharia practices against their religious freedom and activities. Permits have been denied them and thus the right to do exactly what Muslims are doing freely and unhindered. The states usually condemn Christian actions for not having state permits. Christian activities have been subjected to state regulation, control and security surveillance in

the Northern States. No doubt, sharia will further strengthen the hands of the states in regulating and controlling the activities of Christians.

d. Sharia Turns an Islamic State or Government into a Legitimate Theocratic Institution of an Islamic Government and Rulers.

In Islam, a class of legitimate rulers of a theocratic state is created that governs the rules of government practice and succession. A non-Muslim cannot be the head of state in an Islamic setting. Non-Muslims can only occupy serving positions. They can also be appointed to run or head a government administration. This Islamic principle has been used to define and determine the position of Christians in politics in the Northern States.

Rulers in Islamic States see themselves first and foremost as Muslims who must defend the cause of an Islamic state. Their allegiance is first and foremost to Islam. Everything about them in matters of government is Islamic. With this definition of governance and leadership, a Christian is eliminated from state matters. Islamic loyalists and inheritors must hold all sensitive political posts. A careful study of how Christians have fared in the Northern states will reveal their disadvantaged position vis-à-vis that of their Muslim kith and kin.

2. *What Sharia Does to Christians*

This section explains how a Christian fares within an Islamic state. The experience of CNOs must be brought to bear on this crucial matter of Christian rights under sharia.

a. Sharia Takes Away from Christians Their Rights of State or Government and Denies Them Access to the State or Government, which Is an Islamic Theocracy.

Once the state is Islamic by instituting sharia, the state

becomes theocratic in nature and principle. As an Islamic theocratic state, a Christian loses out. By virtue of his religion, he does not rightly belong to or have the rights of state. He cannot make claims of the state. Rather, he is now being defined by the Islamic state. He is given a secondary, protective position as a *dhimmi*. He cannot himself define his position within an Islamic state, but must have it defined for him by Islam. Sharia in principle and in practice takes away from Christians both their political rights and their citizenship rights. CNOs have already suffered immensely from these Muslim practices.

Governmental, political and religious discrimination against CNOs abound everywhere in the North. This is as a result of Islamization and the application of sharia. What right of ownership or belonging to an Islamic state or Government does a Christian have? Christian concepts of theocracy are quite different from that of Islam. The fact is that the state which governs a Christian is both in principle and in practice Islamic. This situation rules out any fair and just religious rights for Christians. The massive discrimination of the Northern States against Christians is the result of these states defining themselves as Islamic. The denial of land, burial grounds and the burning of Christian churches as well as the high-handedness of state governments attest to this Islamic theocratic denial of Christian rights in the Northern States.

b. Sharia Takes Away from Christians Their Territorial or Land Rights.

Once an Islamic state or government has been declared and instituted, the land or territory becomes Islamic and a Christian loses the rights of land or territory.²⁷ Islam regulates the use of land and may not grant any piece of land for Christian use. CNOs have already suffered persecution in this area since the inception of colonialism in Northern Nigeria.

The policy of religious cleansing is being practised in Kaduna

State. Some parts of Kaduna are now declared either Islamic or Christian, so that there are two sets of territories and land rights.

Christians are finding that they are denied their rights of land or territory. Sometime in the past some fellows wandered into what is now Kaduna State. They were foreign to the area but had the temerity to take over local land, considered it their own and are now calling it their “indigenous” land, all of this in broad daylight.²⁸ Sharia is taking our indigenous and cultural land in Kaduna State and giving it to strangers, the Muslims residing in our midst. Sharia is a quest for land or territory. Sharia has in the past and will continue to take indigenous and tribal land and convert them into Muslim land. Territorial conversion is a living reality in Islam. A Christian born and bred in Northern Nigeria is denied the right to use his father’s land to build a church by some state governments. Sharia is indeed both a political and religious declaration of our lands and territories as Islamic.²⁹

The question of land or territorial rights of Christians and all Northerners is a very serious matter as it is being fanned and inflamed presently by the sharia issue.

c. *Sharia Takes Away from Christians Their Legitimate and Just Participation in State and Government Affairs and Their Rights of Citizenship.*

In an Islamic state, a Christian can only hold an inferior status and inferior socio-political role. His subordinate position defines also his second-class citizenship. What rights does a Christian have in an Islamic state? Only Muslims or the Islamic state may define these, not Christians themselves.

Throughout the thirty-four-year history of Kaduna State, its citizens in Southern Kaduna³⁰ have never been able to watch Kaduna Television! They are grateful they can access Plateau State TV, no thanks to their own state. Things of this nature are glaring and provocative. If there is any part of Nigeria that deserves to have

a state of its own, it is Southern Kaduna. Those who today are advocating the imposition of “primitive” sharia at all costs upon unwilling “renegade” Christians are the same people who have denied these Christians their human rights ever since the imposition of British colonial rule. See the human and material destruction that engulfed Kaduna during the sharia riots! In spite of these tragedies, some sharia apostles are still arrogant and pompous, instead of being remorseful and repentant.

d. Sharia Regulates the Social and Religious Practices of All Those Who Reside in an Islamic State.

Since morality and ethics in Islam are territorial, sharia regulates and defines a prescribed moral and ethical code for all who reside in an Islamic state, whether Muslims or non-Muslims. Non-Muslims within such a state are forced to conform to Islamic territorial morality and ethics. They *must* practice Islamic rules and regulations as prescribed by the sharia. Failure to conform means receiving Islamic penalties. In principle and in practice, sharia is meant to deal with and check the un-Islamic practices of those who are not practising Muslims. In actuality, true Muslims have no need of sharia, because they are already seasoned Islamic conformists. They have no need for [legal] sharia sanctioning.

3. *Miscellaneous Sharia Issues*

a. The Zamfara Sharia Model

If what Zamfara is doing is a reflection of what sharia is going to be in Nigeria, then we have every reason to resist it even to the point of martyrdom. The Zamfara model will not help the cause of Islam; it is a deterrent and a terror that is both sadistic and barbaric. I cannot advocate this type of “primitive” sharia for my Muslim kith and kin.

For suicidal, selfish and parochial political reasons, the *Mahdis*

have chosen sharia as bait for pursuing their agenda of political and religious anarchy for Nigeria. It is wrong for Muslims to believe and accept this as an Islamic model, because, from every indication, it is a political agenda aimed at provoking President Obasanjo and at creating confusion and anarchy in Nigeria. This model does not have to prove that it is indeed Islamic, for in trying to do so it is going to destroy our Muslim kith and kin in the name of Islam. We must be aware of the counterfeit cultic religious leaders. We know the characteristics of cultic leaders! They preach a religion of suicide and doomsday. The simpleton follows them by a religious lure and a magic wand.

The greatest worry is the serious divisions amongst Muslim groups in Nigeria that are bound to develop as a result of this sharia debacle. Sharia is known to have wrecked and made Islamic States ungovernable. Observe what has happened in Algeria, Afghanistan, Sudan and other countries. The development of antagonistic groups of purists versus the liberals in Islam is indeed a cause for alarm. For example, El-Zakzaky rejects Mahdi Sani Ahmed's brand of sharia. This brand of "primitive" sharia will no doubt inaugurate a state of conflict amongst Muslim sects and groups.

b. Sharia Politics, Riots and Punishments Are Not Helpful to the Political Cause of the North.

The North is already divided on the sharia question. Sharia has resurrected the latent ethnocentrism of Northern ethnic nationalities. A war may start as a religious one in Nigeria, but it will end up ethnic. We have already started hearing the rumblings of cultural and tribal revival of Northern ethnic nationalities. The cry for sharia amounts to a cry for the political death of Northern Nigeria. Sharia cannot unite the North; it is already tearing the North apart. Sharia is a wrong political horse for Northerners. If this horse is meant for President Obasanjo, then it has failed to make him ride it.

Sharia is definitely breaking the North into a number of hos-

tile and divisive parties: the far North of Hausa-Fulani Muslims, the factions of Muslim sects among them and the Middle Belt. Sharia will cause Northerners to have no political future and relevance in Nigeria. We have already seen the simmering signs of our doom. Sharia is also tearing the whole of Nigeria apart. Who are the greatest losers if Nigeria breaks apart along religious and tribal lines? Foolhardy arrogance and blind fanaticism leads only to ruination.

Do we have governors or Islamic *Mahdis* presently in the North? The greatest needs of the North are education, health, industrialisation, peace and unity; definitely not “primitive” sharia. It has been said that “Religion is the opium of the masses.”³¹ Certainly, “primitive” sharia is the opium of the Northern illiterate, poor youths and a brand of new political opportunists.

c. Sharia Politics Is Bigger than Kaduna State

We know those who do not belong to us and who go about the North hawking and selling their sharia wares. Some of these hawkers have been detected by Northern communities and dealt with. Do they think that Kaduna State indigenes cannot identify such peddlers and reject their gospel of hatred and violence? Or do such peddlers serve the interest of some groups in Kaduna State who do in fact buy their services and wares? Who brought the sharia matter to Kaduna State? Who took it to the House of Assembly? Who set up the sharia committees in the House and in the state? Do such people have no self-interest in the on-going sharia politics? Or are we now going to prosecute those who opposed sharia? Sharia must have *proposers* and it must also have its *opposers*. *Who are the proposers of sharia? Who are the opposers of sharia?* Who initiated the sharia riots? Is it the opposers? Or the proposers? Why do they turn their anger on the illiterate, jobless, poor wandering youths that should have been in school? Did the powerful and the influential not conscript them? If I were the Governor of Kaduna State or a

member of the House of Assembly, I would have set up committees on how to get our youth off the streets instead of continuing as aimless, wandering vagabonds. These youths need education, not “primitive” sharia. Nigerians have been held captive for many months now, feeding on nothing productive but only on what consumes, destroys and tears the nation apart. “Primitive” sharia will not lead Nigerians into paradise but into a sure hell. Kaduna had a taste of this hell.

The sharia issue and debate must be properly placed within the context of Northern Nigeria. Many who handle this volatile and lethal weapon often do so out of context, without any historical background and without any experience of sharia itself. On account of this, we need to state briefly the history of sharia in Northern Nigeria.

B. Brief History of Sharia in Northern Nigeria³²

1. Educational Reforms

During the 1950s the NPC government gradually removed the colonial policies of separate development and religious segregation of schools between the Muslims and the non-Muslims. The integration of Muslim and non-Muslim students in schools began to replace the old colonial educational and social policies. The colonial restrictions on missionary education were gradually abolished. The government and Christian missions became partners in education and medical services. Substantial grants-in-aid were given to mission schools and hospitals.

The government gesture of partial integration and willingness to support mission education and health services helped alleviate some earlier fears of what might become of the non-Muslim groups in the Northern system after independence. It lessened the fear of Islamic influence, since social interaction was now possible between the two groups.

Government takeover of mission primary schools in the late

1950s and the takeover of mission secondary schools and mission hospitals in 1973 renewed fears of the Christian communities in the North, for they regarded this move as a calculated attempt at curtailing Christian influence and growth. The impact of this Government takeover confirmed the fears of the Christian community as in some Northern States Christians were denied the teaching of CRK in the schools. In Islamic States, only IRK was allowed. The Northern States witnessed a phenomenal rise of Islamic schools and institutions after the Government takeover of mission schools in 1973. The educational policies of most Northern States reflected a very strong bias towards Islam. Anti-Christian policies were promulgated and thus CNOs suffered intense discrimination.

2. Religious Tolerance

Between 1950 and 1960, the Northern leaders, particularly of the NPC Government, on several occasions let Christians and other non-Muslim groups of the Middle Belt and their missionaries know that their religion would be tolerated in Northern Nigeria. The theme "religious freedom" was frequently emphasized. One of the major reasons for the demand for a Middle Belt Region was the fear of the possible Muslim religious intolerance and enforced Islamisation and application of sharia.

Colonial Governor Bryan Sharwood Smith had always advised the Muslim leaders to exercise religious tolerance, to emphasize religious freedom and to accept the diversity of cultures of the peoples of Northern Nigeria.

Aliyu Makaman Bida addressed the Northern Regional Medical Advisory Board on "Christians and Moslems Can Work Together." He stated: "You and I, Christians and Moslems, 'People of the Book,' share many common beliefs. It should not be difficult for us to sink our differences and to work out in unison a joint attack on the evils which beset us, poverty, misfortune, and ill-

health.” He was also convinced that there were great opportunities for fruitful cooperation between the missions and government. This cooperation must be based on mutual esteem and understanding between Christians and Muslims.

On the 4th of February 1956, Sir Ahmadu Bello, the Premier of Northern Nigeria,³³ stated:

The people of the Northern Region vary in character, in background and in religion. Whatever the difference in religious beliefs, I would ask you to remember that these beliefs form the background of national standards of integrity and morality. I am sure that the Government of the Northern Region will always allow men freedom to worship God in the way that the conscience of such dictates. Tolerance is necessary not only in religious matters but also towards those whose views and traditions differ. It is by this spirit of understanding that peoples of varied races and tribes will be brought together.

The premier repeated almost the same theme of religious tolerance in his Christmas broadcast of December 1957. “Here in the Northern Region, as elsewhere in the Commonwealth, we have people of many different races, tribes and religions that are knit together by common history, common interests, common ideals. Our diversity may be great, but the things that unite us are stronger than the things that distinguish us.”

The premier went on to explain the policy of his Government: “Our policy in this region was firmly rooted in religious tolerance and this year the Regional Government has again made public this assurance: We have no intention of favouring one religion at the expense of another.” He gave special thanks to the work of Christian missions and pledged a continued partnership with missions. He closed his broadcast by stating that Islam and Christianity are two different religions, but Muslims and Christians can and do live together peacefully all over the world.

Let us forget the difference in our religions and remember the common brotherhood of man before God and dedicate ourselves afresh to the great tasks that lie ahead of us.

In November 1958, the premier visited the Northern Mission Council in Jos. In this conference, the Premier reiterated his earlier views on religious tolerance. He stated, "Firstly, our Government is a Government of Northerners, both Muslims and Christians. We wish to allow all men to practice their religions as they wish. I think that you will all agree that the passages relating to rights concerning religion are comprehensive and that they will be conducive to tolerance and goodwill." He stressed the fact that differences of religion should not bar us from working together for the good of our people.

Again, in January 1959, the premier conferred in Kaduna with the Catholic bishops. He praised the work of the Catholic mission and assured them of the government's continued cooperation with missions.

Thus, it was certain that NPC Government had developed a policy of religious tolerance and freedom of worship in the 1950s. This policy served to alleviate the fears of the CNOs regarding their religious status. This policy shows that social and religious tolerance were possible within the Northern system. The assurances of the NPC government in this area also weakened the demand for an independent Middle Belt Region.

But things changed soon after independence in 1960. This religious tolerance and liberty that was preached in the 1950s only served for the moment and was soon replaced by an Islamisation agenda of the Northern establishment that was led between 1960 and 1966 by the Premier of Northern Nigeria, Alhaji Sir Ahmadu Bello himself.

From 1973 onwards, religious intolerance between Islam and Christianity kept on increasing so that by 1980 the burning of Christian churches had become a common phenomena in the

Northern States. The trends and patterns in this area have shown that religious intolerance is seriously on the increase. If this continues, it means that earlier concepts of Christian-Muslim relations had moved away from the traditional religious tolerance from 1900 to 1960. We are today witnesses of the worst stage of Christian-Muslim relations in the history of Nigeria as manifested in the Kaduna sharia riots.³⁴

3. *Sharia*

Governor Sharwood Smith knew that the non-Muslim communities were afraid of the sharia being imposed upon them in the 1950s. “But non-Muslims, alarmed by the threats of reactionaries, were wondering what could preserve them from the full rigidity of sharia after the departure of the British.” The Governor voiced his concern for the need of reforms but reported, “The most I could get them (Northern Ministers) to concede was the need, before long, to grant non-Muslims the right to be tried by a court other than a Muslim court.”

In the Northern States and especially in the Middle Belt, stories abound about the injustices of imposing sharia upon non-Muslims. Acts of cruelty and atrocities were perpetrated against these innocent people by the sharia judges (*alkalai*) and Muslim rulers. The dread and the fear of sharia are still alive in the people. From the records of the Hansards of the Northern House of Assembly, both Muslims and Christians of the House voiced their displeasure against the unjust application of sharia generally in the North and especially as it was applied to Christians. It is a historical fact that both Muslims and Christians of the Northern Region called for the reforms of sharia. And today some misguided Muslims are calling for the return to what the fathers of Northern Nigeria rejected for the sake of unity and peaceful coexistence between Christians and Muslims.

The NPC Government gradually accepted the need for judi-

cial reforms. In 1956, the Native Courts Bill was passed. It made a distinction between Muslims and non-Muslims, and also provided the procedures of dealing with cases involving these two categories of people. In 1957, the Northern Muslim Court of Appeal was established. Still broader reforms were needed. In 1958, a Northern Government mission was sent to the Muslim countries in the East to study the relationship between English and Muslim laws. With the coming of self-government (1959), the Government was anxious to assure all sections of the community of its determination that the people receive full justice and that the CNOs should not live under the fear of sharia as was the case in the past.

A joint panel, composed of the Chief Justice of the Sudan, Sayed Mohammed Abdul Rannat (Chairman), Professor J. N. D. Anderson of London University (Christian) and Mr. Justice Mohammed Sherif, Judge of Pakistan Supreme Court, was appointed to study the report of the 1958 government judicial mission to the Muslim countries.

The Penal Code Law 1959 of the Northern Region was modeled after the Sudan Penal Code, which, in turn, was based on the Indian Penal Code of 1937 drafted by Lord Macaulay. The resulting code represents a compromise between Muslim law and English common law. The "primitive" and "crude" application of sharia was modified and modernised. The criminal aspects of sharia were removed or modified. What was left of the Penal Code was the Islamic Personal Law.

These judicial reforms served to allay the fears of the non-Muslim groups over the possibility of the imposition of sharia upon them after independence. The NPC Government, under the guidance of Governor Sharwood Smith, made great efforts to win the confidence of the non-Muslim groups and also to weaken their demand for a Middle Belt Region.

But their promises were short-lived. Soon after independence in 1960, religious and social intolerance, political oppression, alienation and occupation were becoming the norm of the power-

ful politicians. In 1965, Sir Ahmadu Bello made extensive evangelistic campaigns in the non-Muslim areas. His missionary tours included Muslim preaching campaigns and the call to all non-Muslims to become Muslims. These evangelistic campaigns gripped the non-Muslim groups with great and legitimate fear and dread of what might become of them. Stories started to circulate that after this peaceful Islamisation, the next round would be the *jihad* upon those who rejected the call of Islam. By this time, political opposition had been successfully suppressed in the North. The NPC Government successfully crushed the Tiv rebellion and riots against its integration within the Northern system in 1964.

The gains of ethnic integration, religious and social tolerance of the 1950s had been lost by 1965. The socio-political conditions were characterized as follows:

1. The socio-political norms and “rules of the game” in the Northern system reflected the political culture of the dominant ethnic group (Hausa-Fulani).
2. The socio-political institutions of the Northern system reinforced the dominance of the Muslim Hausa-Fulani and the subordinate position of the non-Muslim groups who were at a disadvantaged position.
3. The socio-political rewards, such as wealth, prestige, services and power available within the Northern system, were dominated by the Muslim Hausa-Fulani, and other Muslim groups, while the non-Muslim groups were given secondary and subordinate positions.

Thus, in independent Nigeria, the non-Muslim groups and Christians found out that there had been no substantial change in their socio-political role and status from that of the colonial era. An independent Nigeria was characterized by ethnic politics and politics of inequality that eventually led to today’s politics of “primitive” sharia.

Can we learn something from this history, especially from

what Alhaji Sir Ahmadu Bello and his honourable colleagues did in producing the Penal Code of Northern Nigeria? The Penal Code is in two parts: Muslim Law and Customary Law. The Northern Region of Nigeria owned both Laws. What this means is this: If we want to go back to the Northern Penal Code, then we are calling for going back to two complementary laws, that is Muslim Law and Customary Law. Justice here calls for historical precedence. The neglect of CNOs in matters of law is a very serious act of discrimination and injustice done to them. Today no sharia state is concerned to establish Christian Law or Customary Law. The two complementary laws must be legalised and instituted together. Why did Zamfara establish a Muslim Law without also establishing a Christian Law or Customary Law?³⁵ This historical neglect and injustice to Christians cannot be accepted.

Here in Kaduna, we are discussing sharia but refuse to discuss its complementary equivalent, the Christian law. If people of Kaduna State are discussing sharia today, it is a historical injustice that amounts to the denial of Christian rights, if its equivalent of Christian law is not on the platform of discussion. If Kaduna must have sharia, then it is equally important that she have Christian law. Why is it that the Kaduna Government or House of Assembly is seeking to table only Muslim Law while it ignores tabling Christian law? This is where Kaduna, Zamfara, Niger and Kano have erred by only seeking and fighting for Muslim interests and ignoring the interests of Christians who are bona fide citizens of these states. The truth is, they have disowned their kith and kin that are Christians and pretend they do not exist in their states. Why should these states fight for the rights and interests of only Muslims and refuse to fight for Christian rights and interests?

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Note from Boer : The recommendations that Turaki lists here

are included in Volume 8, the one dealing particularly with that subject.

END OF TURAKI DOCUMENTS

▲ CLOSING INVITATION TO THE NEXT CHAPTER —

I now invite you to check out the unique Plateau situation with me. Plateau State is not a sharia state, but it has recently been embroiled in terrible violence between the two religions. The majority of the state's indigenes, including the Church of Christ in Nigeria, known best as COCIN, see themselves as a bulwark against the Muslim push southward towards the Atlantic. It is a story of bitter tragedy, much confusion and great courage. It is a *must* story. I encourage you to proceed.