

Jews and Christians under Islam

Dhimmitude and Marcionism*

BAT YE'OR

Sheikh Yousef al-Qaradawi, spiritual leader of the Muslim Brotherhood, explained in a December 1997 interview that Islamic law classifies the People of the Book—Jews and Christians—in three categories: non-Muslim protégés, *dhimmis*, living in Islamic countries (*dar al-islam*); non-Muslims in countries of temporary truce; and non-Muslims in the lands of war, *harbis*.

Explaining that Islamic law establishes different rules for each of these categories,¹ the sheikh summed up in a few words the theory of *jihad* that governs relations between Muslims and non-Muslims.

Jihad

According to the theory of *jihad*, inhabitants of the lands of war (*dar al-harb*) are infidels to be combated because they oppose the establishment of Islamic law in their countries. As enemies of Allah they have no rights: they themselves and their property become licit (*mubah*) for all Muslims. As the opportunity arises they can be taken as slaves, kidnapped for ransom, robbed or killed. War is waged against them to Islamize their territory which, according to the will of Allah, must belong to the Islamic community. If they resist, Islamic law provides for the deportation or massacre of the men and the enslavement of women and children.

Infidels in the lands of truce are in respite between wars. In principle, the truce must not last more than ten years, after which *jihad* should resume. Two reasons can motivate the truce granted to infidels by the Islamic authority:

Bat Ye'or (www.dhimmitude.org) is the author of *The Dhimmi: Jews and Christians under Islam* (1985/2003); *The Decline of Eastern Christianity under Islam. From Jihad to Dhimmitude* (1996/2002); *Islam and Dhimmitude. Where Civilizations Collide* (2002/2003).

* Original title : « Juifs et chrétiens sous l'Islam. Dhimmitude et marcionisme, » published in *Commentaire* (97) Spring 2002, Paris: 105-116. (*Commentaire* is a quarterly review founded by Raymond Aron. Editorial director: Jean-Claude Casanova) Translated by Nidra Poller.

1) The Muslims are too weak to vanquish the infidels and the truce allows them to become stronger.

2) Infidel states pay a tribute to the Muslims or contribute by numerous services to the advancement of Islam.

In other words the truce is authorized only if it helps improve the Muslim's situation and weakens the infidels. Truce is not a natural condition; it is bought by tribute. If the infidels cannot provide economic advantages in exchange for the truce, hostilities are resumed. Furthermore, only treaties that conform to Islamic prescriptions are valid; if these conditions are not fulfilled the treaty is worthless.

Protected infidels, *dhimmis*, in Muslim countries are former *harbis* who gave up their territory without resistance in exchange for peace under Islamic "protection" (*dhimma*). This should be understood as protection against the permanent laws of *jihad* that would threaten them again if they revolted. This is what I call "dhimmitude": the submission-protection condition of infidels obtained by surrendering their territory to the Islamic authority. Submission because infidels submit in their own country to the Islamic law that expropriates them, and protection because the same law protects them from *jihad* and guarantees their rights. Dhimmitude is the direct consequence of *jihad*.

Westerners know little or nothing about *jihad*, the Islamic war of conquest. In some progressive circles *jihad* is considered an exotic term, sometimes graced with a pleasant connotation. Misled by apparent similarities, intellectuals confuse *jihad* with the Crusades. In fact the first Crusade set out in 1096; *jihad* started in 624. The first phase, 7th century proto-*jihad*, was followed by the theological, theoretical, and legal conceptualization starting in the 8th century. The first phase encompasses Muhammad's military activities after he emigrated to Medina in 622 and the inscription of these exploits in the form of commentaries and commandments in the Qur'an. The second phase begins after Muhammad's death in 632 when the Arab armies set out to conquer Asia and the Christian Mediterranean Empire. It was during this second phase (8th-9th centuries) that Muslim jurisconsults elaborated the theological concept of *jihad* and its institutions based on the example of Muhammad, his biographies (written between the 8th and 9th centuries), and his alleged words and deeds (*hadiths*) recorded by supposed witnesses. The distinction between these two periods shows that *jihad* as it developed cannot be attributed to Muhammad because the institutions were established after his death.

There are many differences between the concepts of *jihad* and Crusade as they emanate from two profoundly different religions and civilizations. We can only mention a few here.

Starting from the 8th century, Muslim theologians professed that *jihad* originates in and is inseparable from Islamic doctrine because it is expressed in the military

campaigns led by Muhammad. *Jihad*, which is a complex notion, manifests the struggle of Muslims to live according to the precepts of Allah as revealed to Muhammad. Muhammad embodies the supreme mediator between humanity and the divinity whose binding and normative commandments are proclaimed in the Qur'an by his words and deeds. The Arab prophet illustrates the normative model of the Good that must be imposed *nolens volens* on all humanity (Qur'an II, 189), and *jihad* elaborates the military, political, and economic tactics to achieve that goal.

From its origins and to this day *jihad* occupies an important place in the thought and writings of Muslim theologians and jurists. The regulations defined in the 8th century are still considered immutable today by the majority of Muslims. Whereas *jihad* is inherent to the sacred immanence of the Qur'anic revelation, the Crusade is an episodic historical event subject to criticism.

First we should note that the Crusade has no foundation in the constituent texts of Christianity—the First and Second Testaments of the Bible. The conquest of Canaan by the Israelites concerns a limited territory, not the whole earth in an eternal war to submit all of humanity to one same law. Likewise, practices of warfare are inscribed in periodicity, in the context of a particular time. Further, the Bible and the Qur'an do not take the same position on paganism. The Bible condemns the bloody inhumane practices of pagan cults; it never ordained eternal war against pagans. Historically the Crusade was a circumstantial reaction to a configuration of events all of which were integral to the concept of *jihad*. The Muslim armies encircled Christendom in a pincer movement. In the east, after the Byzantine defeat at Manzikert (1071), the Turkish Seljuq tribes put Armenia to fire and the sword and ravaged the Byzantine territory. In the west the Almoravid Berber tribes penetrated into Spain and advanced northward, massacring Christians as they went. In the Holy Land pilgrimages were interrupted because of forced conversions, kidnappings and murder of Christian pilgrims, and general insecurity for non-Muslims. The Crusades cannot be separated from the recurrent anti-Christian *jihad* wars that provoked them.

Ignorance of *jihad* doctrine is so profound in the West that the term Crusade is often abusively used in a context of *jihad*, leading to absurd misconstructions implying that Muslims fight for the cross when in fact the cross was forbidden in their empire (*dar al-islam*) by Caliph Abd al-Malik from the late 7th century. Effacing the history of *jihad* automatically effaces the history of dhimmitude which is its aim and its finality. The historical sphere that I call dhimmitude is a portion of human history stretching over more than a millennium and covering all the countries conquered by Muslim armies on three continents—Africa, Asia, and Europe. And in fact the concept still exists today in the customs and laws of all countries where *shari'a* is practiced. Ignorance keeps people from perceiving dhimmitude just as illiteracy keeps a person from grasping the meaning of a text, but neither ignorance nor illiteracy changes the unperceived reality. Because *jihad* is eternal, being considered an expression of the

divine will, so is dhimmitude, its direct consequence, enhanced with the same eternal and sacred qualities. The characteristics and scope of dhimmitude are, precisely, governed by *jihad*.

Dhimmitude

Dhimmitude is the type of existence developed by non-Muslim populations and civilizations subject to a special status under Islamic law—*shari'a*—when their lands were conquered by *jihad*. The uniformity of status for Jews and Christians alike gives the civilization of dhimmitude a structured homogeneous typology determined by specific features. Territories Islamized by *jihad* stretched from Spain to the Indus and from the Sudan to Hungary. We will limit ourselves here to the dhimmitude of Jews and Christians, defined as the People of the Book (*ahl al-khitab*), the Bible.

The laws enacted by *shari'a* for these populations are numerous and touch on all spheres of existence. As we saw, the *dhimmi* was formerly a *harbi*, an inhabitant of a country of war and consequently deprived of all rights. It is the Islamic authority that confers religious and civil rights and security when the *harbi* becomes a *dhimmi*. Thus, it is Islamic law alone that defines and guarantees the rights conceded to non-Muslims solely in virtue of the protection inherent to dhimmitude. These rights and responsibilities meticulously consigned by Muslim jurists and theologians define the status of the *dhimmi*; we will limit ourselves to a brief summary here. This status is governed by both military and religious considerations: military because the *dhimmi* is defeated in war, religious because this war is of divine order. These two axes totally determine the *dhimmi's* condition.

The military aspect is derived from warfare customs of Arabian tribes, some of which were modified by the first caliphs after the conquest of a vast empire. For example, the *dhimmis* were not all enslaved and shared out as requested by the different tribes, but their countries were integrated into the *dar al-Islam* and they were collectively expropriated. Thus the *dhimmis* were considered as booty (*fay*) belonging to the Islamic community and managed by the caliph. Possession of land was forbidden to non-Muslims but also to immigrant Muslim colonists in the lands of booty. However, the caliph could make temporary grants of domains to military chiefs who had to provide and fit out troops for the pursuit of *jihad*. These conditions established in the 7th century remained unchanged in the Ottoman Empire up to the agrarian reform announced in the mid-19th century, but rarely applied. Christian *dhimmis* in the Ottoman Balkan provinces could not own land in their countries until they won back their independence.

Millions of *Muhagir* (émigrés), Muslims fleeing the new Christian states in the Balkans after defeats in the 19th century, abandoned the former Ottoman provinces of Serbia, Greece, Bulgaria, Rumania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Thessalia, Epirus, and

Macedonia. The sultan resorted to the traditional policy of Islamic colonization and, determined to counter the Zionist movement, settled the refugees in Judea, Galilee, Samaria and Transjordan. These were the same Muslims who had combated the rights, emancipation, and independence of Christian *dhimmis* in Europe. The sultan had sent some of them to Anatolia, Syria, Lebanon, and Palestine where they were given collective land grants under favorable conditions according to the principles of Islamic colonization imposed on natives ever since the beginning of the Arab conquest. Circassian tribes fleeing the Russian advance in the Caucasus were sent into the Levant at the same time; most of them were settled around Armenian villages in Mesopotamia where they soon began to massacre the local people. Other Circassian colonists settled in historic Palestine—today's Israel, Cisjordan and Jordan—establishing villages in Judea, and near Jerusalem such as Abou Gosh, or in Kuneitra on the Golan. Today their descendents intermarry. In Jordan they make up the king's guard. Up until the First World War 95% of the land in Palestine was in the Ottoman sultan's domain.

The concept of *fay* lands, lands of booty taken from infidels and then given to the Muslim community, remains valid today for the Arab league, especially the PLO, which contests the legitimacy of Israel on "Arab" land. It is strange to find this notion, which underlies the Arab-Israeli conflict, defended by Arab Christians and Europeans because it applies not only to Israel but to all countries that have ever been Islamized. What's more, this principle is a correlate of the general concept of universal *jihad* and consequently rejects all non-Islamic legitimacy. Islamic law establishes an essential difference between Arabia, the homeland of the Arabs and cradle of the Qur'anic revelation, and the lands of booty conquered from infidels, meaning all countries outside of Arabia. Infidels are tolerated within the limits of dhimmitude in the lands of booty but not in Arabia.

The military aspects of dhimmitude are based on the categories of *harbi* and *dhimmi* within the rules of warfare that authorize enslavement, massacre, pillage, and sharing the spoils and booty of the infidels. These laws are intrinsic to dhimmitude because *dhimmis* may become *harbis* again if they liberate their land from Islamic occupation, in which case the stipulations of *jihad* are reactivated, as in the 19th and 20th centuries against rebellious Serbs, Greeks, Bulgarians, Armenians, Israelis and Sudanese. The ordinances, supplemented by the modalities of treaties of protection (*dhimma*) or truce—because peace is forbidden—are covered by precise laws, repeated identically and up to this day in writings on *jihad*.

The economic and social spheres that apply to vanquished non-Muslim populations (*dhimmis*) integrate modified forms of pre-Islamic laws of conquered lands. The laws are thereafter transposed in an innovative system of differentiation between Muslims and non-Muslims, the obligatory basic principle of Islamic government. Jurists justify this differentiation, which applies to all spheres, by Qur'anic verses and

hadiths. For example, the taxation imposed on infidels by the dhimmitude system is governed by Qur'anic verse IX, 29:

“Fight against those who do not believe in Allah nor in the Last Day, and do not make forbidden what Allah and His messenger have made forbidden, and do not practice the religion of truth, of those who have been given the Book, until they pay the jizya off-hand, being subdued.”

The tribute, originally collective, became a capitation imposed on *dhimmis* in exchange for limited religious and civil rights, security, and immunity against enslavement or death as prescribed by *jihad*.

Moreover, the *dhimmi* community had to pay other taxes in money or goods and perform duties to provide for the needs of the Muslim occupants, initially limited to members of the military contingent. Despite modifications in the demographic ratio between Muslims and non-Muslims that arose in the course of history these charges were maintained in certain regions up to the 20th century. This brief summary shows the complementarity of the military and economic aspects of dhimmitude. Though the taxation of *dhimmis* derives partly from pre-Islamic regimes, the specificity of dhimmitude lies in placing the economic sphere within an all-encompassing military and religious context of discriminatory differentiation. This principle introduced humiliating distinctions between Muslims and *dhimmis* down to the smallest details of daily life, dictating what kind of shoelaces, clothes, and hairstyles *dhimmis* could wear, what animals they could mount, how they should behave, etc.

On the level of civil rights the Muslim authority adopted the full range of anti-Jewish laws stipulated in the codes of the Byzantine emperors Theodosius II (5th century) and Justinian (6th century). From the 8th century, Muslim jurisconsults reinterpreted these laws within an Islamic conception and imposed them on both Jews and Christians. These anti-Jewish laws adopted in Islamic jurisprudence, and often harshened, were considered an expression of the divine will. They conferred on dhimmitude an immutable juridical structure that generated humiliations, debasement, and extreme vulnerability. Together with the aforementioned military factors this led to the reduction or—in some places—total disappearance of Jewish and, even more so, of Christian communities. After the order banishing Jews and Christians from the Hijaz in 640, Christianity was totally eliminated from Arabia, while Judaism survived in Yemen under the most precarious conditions.

Under the caliphate of Abd al-Malik (685-705) the Christian Arab tribes were forced to convert or flee to the Byzantine regions. Others accepted the Islamization of their children in exchange for an exemption from the *jizya*. In less than a century Islam had brought an end to Arab Christianity. Today's Christian populations—Greek Orthodox, Uniate, and Catholic—are those *dhimmis* Arabized under the mantle of a French colonial policy started in the 1830s, which aimed at constituting a great Arab empire from Algiers to Antioch under French hegemony.

The Islamic conquests could not have been maintained without the help of countless Christian princes, military officials, and patriarchs willing to betray and collaborate. This collusion was fostered by inter-Christian dynastic and religious rivalries and personal ambitions. As these defections took place at the top of the hierarchy involving the highest responsibilities of the state, the army, and the Church, they determined the Islamization of multitudes of Christians.

The *dhimmi* status was at times less severe and at times more constrictive than the status of the Jews in Christendom, but dhimmitude legislation was profoundly connected to anti-Judaism. Many of these laws—the prohibition against constructing, expanding, or restoring churches and synagogues; the obligatory humility of religious practice; the inadmissibility of a *dhimmi*'s testimony; capital punishment for marriage with a Muslim woman or proselytizing; exclusion from honorific functions and positions conferring authority over a Muslim; prohibition against holding Muslim slaves or servants—have their equivalents and origins in the anti-Jewish laws enacted and recorded in the early centuries of Christianity, from Byzantium to Visigoth Spain.

Dhimmitude in inter-Christian relations

Conflicts between the patriarchates of Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, and later Rome led to ethno-religious divisions within Eastern Christianity, facilitating Christian alliances with the Arab-Islamic and later with the Turkish armies of invasion, and the Islamization of the Eastern Christian empires. The motivations for these conflicts were as much political as theological. Alliances with caliphs liberated patriarchs from the burdensome oversight of a Christian sovereign, thus giving them undivided power over their religious communities. The system of dhimmitude, based on the destruction of all non-Muslim political power, favored the exclusive domination of Churches over their flocks.

In the early period of Muslim conquest, a privileged Christian class functioned within *dhimmi* society: ecclesiastics and notables acting as financiers handled the caliph's assets; political advisers and scholars from these circles disseminated the pre-Islamic culture. In exchange for services rendered to the *umma* a class of notables, religious officials, bankers, scholars, and intellectuals administered the Christian *dhimmi* majority in the interests of the dominating warrior minority. However, this situation did not develop instantly and its perverse effects were not immediate; they grew out of a conjunction of multiple factors of which we will mention only three:

- 1) The constant erosion of resistance in societies targeted by *jihad*, not yet conquered but economically weakened by the tribute demanded from them as inhabitants of the

lands of truce, and then demographically reduced by slavery and deportation practiced extensively in the course of conquest.

2) The insecurity inherent in a steady immigration of non-indigenous tribes hostile to the native inhabitants.

3) The buildup of collaborationist parties economically and politically tied to the Muslim regimes. Thus, the whole system of Christian dhimmitude developed within the Christian world in the political, economic, intellectual, and religious fissures created by a culture of surrender, where passive submission was imposed by leaders driven by personal and financial interests who rallied to offer “service to the *umma*.”

After the Islamic colonization of Christian lands in Asia, the Levant, Africa, and Europe, inter-Christian divisions set in for centuries, with every Church calling for help from the caliph to crush its rival. These animosities hardened in the 18th century with the Uniate movement that divided every Oriental congregation by the attachment to Rome of a dissident Church separating from the autocephalous Mother Church. Nationalist uprisings of Christian *dhimmis* in the Balkans during the 18th century were crushed with massacres and enslavement, further terrifying *dhimmis* throughout the Ottoman Empire and encouraging betrayals. European powers aggravated and manipulated these millenary inter-Christian divisions, using the Ottoman Christians to promote their rival economic and political interests. France Arabized the Levantine Christians from the 1830s and used them as agents to advance its anti-Ottoman and anti-British politics and to destroy the dawning proto-Zionist movement with a “secular” nationalist Arab counter-claim manipulated through its Christian *dhimmis*.

The tensions that prevailed during thirteen centuries of confrontation and collaboration in Christian-Islamic relations persist today because the systems of *jihad* and dhimmitude that generated them have been deliberately obscured in modern times. This results from a complex interplay of political, religious and economic interests and collusions that we cannot elaborate here. But it is clear that Europe, from the 1970s, assumed a status similar to the lands of truce in past centuries, with many countries offering a laxist immigration policy in exchange for fragile security. They chose to look the other way as terrorist networks and underlying financial infrastructures developed on their territory, and hoped to buy security with development aid to countries that had never revoked the demonizing inherent to a *jihad* culture. As a fundamental “service to the *umma*” Europe is committed to delegitimizing the State of Israel and bringing the United States into the anti-Israeli *jihad* camp. “Dhimmitude service” is manifest in the exoneration of Palestinian and Islamist terrorism and the incrimination of Israel and the United States, blamed for motivating the attacks perpetrated against them. Further, we can observe deep-seated subconscious symptoms of dhimmitude sustained by the total repression of historical realities required for the pursuit of policies based on the negation of

historical evidence. A complete study of the evolution of these attitudes would be beyond the scope of this article, but they can be briefly illustrated by three examples.

The first example is the aforementioned concealment of the ideology and history of *jihad*, and of the full extent of Christian-Islamic relations based on Islamic legal and religious principles that apply to this day because they have never been revoked. This evidence is hidden behind a thick curtain of apologies—self-flagellation for the Crusades, guilt for economic disparities—and the incrimination of Israel. Christians and Jews are accused of evil in order to protect the susceptibilities of a Muslim world that refuses all criticism of its past practices of conquest and colonization. This relationship is typical of dhimmitude; the *dhimmi* is forbidden under penalty of death to criticize Islam or an Islamic government. Under Islamic authority *dhimmi* notables had to impose self-censorship on their religious communities. This system of dhimmitude conditioned by insecurity, humility, and servility as a means of survival is being reconstituted in Europe at present.

The second example is the refusal to recognize the Judeo-Christian foundation of Western civilization for fear of humiliating the Muslim world; this is similar to the attitude of the *dhimmi* who must renounce his own history and disappear into non-existence so that his oppressor can exist. This rejection of the Judeo-Christian heritage, a culture based on the Bible, is upheld by recurrent declarations by European government ministers accrediting the determinant contributions of Arab and Islamic cultures to the development of European civilization. These declarations comply with resolutions passed at the second session of the fourth conference of the Academy of Islamic Research (September 1968) at Cairo's Al-Azhar; for example, the resolution calling for a historical study "explaining the impact of Muslim civilization and teachings on the movements of political, social, and religious reform in the West, since the European Renaissance."² Such affirmations which proclaim the eminent supremacy of Muslim civilization over European civilization are in conformity with the Islamic world view. European ministers think they are helping Muslim immigrants integrate into the Judeo-Christian West by attributing an Islamic origin to Western science and institutions. In fact, Muslim theologians teach that the Qur'an forbids the adoption of infidel ideas and customs.³

The third example of this dhimmitude is the reaction provoked by Italian president Silvio Berlusconi in September 2001 when he publicly asserted the superiority of European political institutions. The speech provoked outrage from Berlusconi's European Union colleagues and indignation from Arab League Secretary-General Amr Moussa who demanded a formal apology. Moussa is a former Foreign Minister of Egypt, a country with a long history of persecution of Jewish and Christian *dhimmis*, currently pursued with a culture of hatred. In fact the Arab League countries are precisely the most faithful to the values of *jihad* and dhimmitude, which they apply in varying degrees to their non-Muslim subjects. Berlusconi's apologies to these countries, some of which still practice slavery and keep eunuchs and harems,

recall the condition of the Christian *dhimmi* who had to dismount his donkey in front of a Muslim or, as in Ottoman Palestine up until the 19th century, to walk in the gutter as proof of deference. That such attitudes of humble servility can be demanded of European officials is a measure of the failure of policies that have not only led their nations to dishonor but subjected them to a demand for tribute to suspend the threat of terrorism while rendering services and paying ransom as did the *dhimmis* in past centuries.

Among the many complex factors of dhimmitude stated above, we will mention anti-Zionism, which picks up where antisemitism leaves off. We will examine here the development of theologies of substitution/destitution that this common anti-Jewish terrain favors today—in its Christian version with regard to the people of Israel, and its Islamic version with regard to Jews and Christians—as well as the Marcionist deviations in Christianity.

Dhimmitude in Judeo-Christian relations

If we evaluate dhimmitude as a singular category in human history and experience, whose legal and theological articulations spread across vast stretches of time and space, we should be able to discern in the transitory present the axes, agents, and bases of its projections into the future. We saw how the pagan-Christian Churches played a crucial role in formulating the foundations of dhimmitude with its substitution/destitution principle materialized in a discriminatory legal corpus. Likewise, the collusion of certain clerical currents with Islamic powers in the course of history activated the destruction of Christian political power.

The emergence of Zionism cemented an opposing Islamic-Christian alliance, though the motivations and consequences of anti-Zionism are, despite similarities, different for each party. We will cite here the Marcionist deviations and the networks of diffusion of dhimmitude generated by anti-Zionism in Christendom. Their essential features are apparent in the campaign of the Arab-Palestinian Churches against Israel and the denial of Israel's historic patrimony to the land and to Jerusalem.

The politics of the Arab-Palestinian Churches toward Israel are oriented in three distinct directions:

- 1) Marcionism: the Church rejects its roots in Judaism and adopts the Islamic vision of an Arab-Palestinian Jesus.
- 2) Gnosticism which resembles the Islamic vision of an eternal Qur'an, preexisting humanity.
- 3) The destitution of a demonized Israel whose heritage and history fall to an Arab Palestine cast in a fusional Christique image of Islamo-Christianity. This fusion is so

ardently desired that Christian Palestinians refuse to be considered as a religious minority within the Islamic majority. They proclaim total adherence to the majority, a characteristic attitude of the *dhimmi* syndrome, based on fear (mimetism with the oppressor so as to pass unseen). Effectively, one of the clauses that cancels the *dhimmi's* protection resides in any aid solicited from foreign powers. This was one of the accusations invoked in the massacre (1895-1896) and subsequent genocide (1915-1917) of the Armenians. In succeeding decades the same accusations of affinities with the enemy justified pogroms against the Jews and their expulsion from Arab countries. Christian *dhimmis* are particularly sensitive to this danger that befell them during more than a thousand years of Islamic-Christian confrontations.

This explains the extreme caution of Arab Christians, including the Copts, and their refusal of outside help. The only way they can improve their condition is by leading the West to satisfy the demands of the *umma*; they themselves become the conduits of dhimmitude and its ambassadors in Western countries. The submission of certain ecclesiastics to Islamic policies is a known historical fact appreciated in Muslim circles. Zanjani, an Iranian jurist, praises the collaboration of prelates in the propagation and strengthening of Islam. He also emphasizes the utility of *dhimmi* minorities for the promotion of Islamic interests among the nations.⁴

Marcionism and dhimmitude are two different processes but they become complementary in the context of Palestinian Arabism. The Marcionist procedure is to detach Christianity from its Jewish roots by a total rupture with the First Testament. In a lecture given in Paris in 1987 Father Youakim Moubarak called for the restoration of the Church of Antioch which he defined as a claim in the universal Church of “our vocation as Christians born out of the nations and liberated from Judaism and its law... This is what our Fathers called ‘the Economy of the mystery.’ It replaces the theology known as ‘the history of salvation,’ confined in the procrustean bed of the ‘Judeo-Christian tradition.’”⁵

Speaking at the same colloquium Mgr. Georges Khodr, Greek Orthodox Metropolitan of Mount-Lebanon, said that the Church of Antioch continued to affirm that the evangelical message cannot be reduced “to any confusion with the Old Testament and its contemporary Zionist deviations.” He declared: “no word of salvation will come from our mouths without a boundless love for the Muslim man.”⁶

Dhimmi prelates proclaimed that the liberation of the Gospels from their Jewish matrix would bring to the universal Church a love for the Arab man and for his liberation. This Antiochan Marcionism inflamed with love for Arabs developed among Arab-Palestinian clergy within a process of grafting Christianity to Arab roots. Father Raed Abusahlia, chancellor of the Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem, profusely expounds these arguments in his review *Olive Branch from Jerusalem* launched after the resumption of the Palestinian *jihad* war in October 2000. For

Father Abusahlia the origins of Palestinian Christianity and consequently of all Christianity are founded in the Arabism of a Palestinian Jesus. Christianity is in Palestine by rights because Christianity—and not Israel—is the heir to the prophets, apostles, and saints. This Arab Christian origin is rooted in Epiphany: the pious men gathered for Pentecost in Jerusalem, each speaking his own language, including Arabic.⁷ But these pious men were all Jews who had come from many places, including Arabia, for the annual celebration of Israel's renewal of the Alliance. The affirmation of Christianity's historical rights in the Holy Land, coupled with the refusal of Israel's rights, is a clear demonstration of an enduring destitution/substitution theology.

Since this theology was abolished by Vatican II (1965) the *dhimmi* Churches, remaining faithful to the Church of Antioch, have concocted a theology of Christianity from Arab and non-Jewish sources. For the chancellor of the Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem the local Church is embodied in an Arab tent and a Palestinian identity. This Arabism is draped in the mystical features of the Savior of Christianity against Israel, the symbol of Evil.

This attachment of Christianity to Arab-Palestinian roots has induced the mechanism defined by Alain Besançon—though in a different context—as *perversa imitatio*, perverse imitation: a duplicate of Jewish history is reconstructed on an Arab-Palestinian version that constitutes what Besançon describes as a “pedagogy of lies.”⁸ The Arab Palestinians, heirs and symbols of the Arab Palestinian Jesus, substitute themselves for the Jewish people, who are expelled into non-existence. Arab Palestinians operate the Islamic-Christian Christique fusion of a Palestine crucified by Israel, a concept repeated constantly in their war against the Jews. Christian anti-Zionists apply terms like *colonists*, *colonization*, *occupation* to Israelis in their own country, implying that the natural rights of Jews in their historic homeland are transferred to the Arab people of Palestine according to the destitution/substitution principle. The restoration of Israel in its own land is “an injustice” precisely because it transgresses this principle. We will note here the desynchronization and ineptness of Western concepts of colonization when transferred to the Islamic context of *dhimmi* peoples dispossessed of their land and identity by an imperialistic *jihad*. Moreover, it is appropriate to mention that Palestine was subjected during certain periods to the Hanbalite rite of Muslim law, the law of the Taliban. In fact differences between the four Sunnite rites are minimal where *jihad* and *dhimmis*, that is, infidels, are concerned.

The destitution/substitution principle does not have the same implications for Christianity as for Islam because Islam applies this same principle to Christians. According to Muslim theologians Islam did not come into the world with Muhammad in the 7th century, after Judaism and Christianity; Islam goes back to the origins of creation. In this theological context, Adam and Eve, Abraham, Moses, the prophets and kings of Israel, Jesus, Mary, and the apostles were all Muslims. Jesus, a

Muslim prophet, is said to have professed Islam. In other words, Jewish and Christian sacred history prior to Muhammad is really Islamic history related correctly in the Qur'an. The Bible of the Jews and Christians is dismissed as an amalgam of falsified folklore; the only truthful original version is in the Qur'an. The destitution principle is materialized in the obligation of *jihad* against infidels and their subjection to the laws of dhimmitude—identical for Jews and Christians—until they convert.

History prior to Muhammad

The Islamization of humanity, the Hebrew prophets, and other wise men, not only Islamizes history prior to Muhammad, it robs Jews and Christians of all their historical references. Their religions are as if suspended in a stagnant time without reference points or evolution. Obviously the Islamization of the Bible, Jesus, and the evangelists deprives Christians as much as Jews. Further, the Islamization of Jesus results in the Islamization of all Christian theology and Christendom. And the delegitimation of Israel is not without consequences on Christian theology and sense of identity. Are the origins of Christianity in the Bible or in the Qur'an? Were the apostles and the historical Jesus Jews or were they the Muslim prophets of the Qur'an, barely related to the biblical originals? The Judeo-Christian conflict entails a parallel Islamic-Christian conflict played out around the restoration of Israel because the Christian version of the destitution/substitution principle implies confirmation of the same principle for Christians in its Islamic version.

It is clear that as long as the Arab—and notably the Palestinian—Churches continue to reject the legitimacy of Israel and its history in its land, by transferring this legitimacy to the people of the *jihad* who eliminated both Judaism and Christianity by the aforementioned methods, these Churches and the populations they represent will justify the entire nonegalitarian system of their own dhimmitude and destruction. In other words, the Christian destitution/substitution principle with respect to Jews generates a corresponding Islamic policy in the *jihad* system with respect to Christians. It is not rare today to read pro-Palestinian propagandists claiming that Palestine is the cradle of the three religions. This affirmation is absurd. Islam originated in Arabia and developed in Mecca and Medina; no city in the Holy Land, not even Jerusalem, is ever mentioned in the Qur'an. If Palestine were the cradle of Islam, no infidel would have been allowed to live there. It is not in the interest of Christians to spread these lies because no church would be tolerated there. This falsification is motivated solely by the intention to counter Israel's legitimacy with a fictive legitimacy which, in the context of dhimmitude, turns against its Christian protagonist. For Muslims this proposition confirms the Islamization of biblical characters.

The *dhimmi* Palestinian Churches rendered considerable services to the *umma*—services, it should be recalled, that are the essential function of the *dhimmi* and guarantee his survival. These Churches sapped the biblical base of Christianity, weakening it in the face of an Islam ever more convinced of its moral irreproachability. They reinforced the genocidal legitimacy of dhimmitude by justifying its application against the Jewish people to whom Christianity is connected. If Israel is an occupant in its own land then Christianity, which draws its legitimacy from the history of Israel, is also an occupant, like any other infidel state in the world.

Two strategic axes

Two strategic axes are determined in this context: a political axis on the European level, and a theological axis championed by none other than Mgr. Michel Sabbah, Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem and advocate of Arafat's *jihad*. In the autumn of 1999 when Arafat was planning his rejection of the Oslo Agreements Mgr. Sabbah was elected president, in Amman, of the powerful NGO Pax Christi International, which is close to the Vatican. This election opportunely brought international resonance for anti-Zionism, provoking criminal antisemitic attacks in Europe reminiscent of the 1930s.

The theological axis, as we have seen, consists of tearing Christianity out of its original Jewish matrix and implanting it in an Arab-Palestinian womb. This theological feature confers on Palestinian *jihad* the saintliness of the combat for “peace and justice” as interpreted by Mgr. Sabbah, a great defender of the Palestinian cause in the world. Addressing the Bishop's Synod in Rome (October 2001) Mgr. Sabbah declared:

*“The Church must stand on the side of truth and justice. And at this time truth and justice say that the Palestinian people is oppressed, deprived of its land, reduced to misery.... Europeans should remember that they were once subject to German occupation and they opposed the invaders with force until they threw them out. Europeans should understand why the Palestinians take up arms and will continue to fight until they recover their freedom.”*⁹

This “peace and justice” is a consecration of the Islamic system of *jihad*, the system of Arafat who denies the historical legitimacy of Israel and seeks its destruction. This interpretation of justice disguises the Israelis as Nazis and the Palestinian terrorists as victims when the truth is that the Palestinian leader Haj Amin al-Husseini, Mufti of Jerusalem, actively participated in the genocide of the Jews alongside Hitler in Berlin during the Second World War. As Alain Besançon writes concerning the Nazi falsification of the Good: “What makes these acts [the genocide of the Jews]

diabolical to our eyes is that they were accomplished in the name of the Good, under cover of morality.”¹⁰

Iranian president Muhammad Khatami also calls for “building a world of justice and peace” while condemning the American riposte to the September 11 terrorist attacks. It is true that dhimmitude does not tolerate a *dhimmi* defending himself against an attack by a Muslim, and excludes the execution of Muslims for the death of Christians because the talion, meaning equal punishment, applies only to relations between Muslims, who are equals, but not between Muslims and infidels whose blood is inferior. This is why the Iranian penal Code establishes discrimination against non-Muslims.¹¹ The words “justice and peace” must be interpreted according to the ethics of *jihad* in a relationship of inequality that demands the submission of the infidel based on his inferiority.

The political axis of dhimmitude is linked to a theological remodeling undertaken with the collaboration of European Churches. It aims at relieving Europe of a Judeo-Christianity that is rejected in favor of Euro-Arabism through Islamic-Christian ecumenism aimed at a planetary symbiosis and globalization with an Islamic-Christian Euro-Arab Palestine as heart and focal point of Israel’s elimination. “Palestine” is an artificial European construct concocted in the 1970s to destroy Israel, considered to be an empty shell fated to disappear once the construct had achieved its function, which is to liberate Christianity from its Jewish trunk and create an Islamic-Christian fusion, bringing Europe back into the Holy Land and to Jerusalem via the PLO. The premises of this strategy go back to the 19th century; its avatars, which include Nazism, are adapted to the inexorable will to destroy Israel exercised by a Christian current powerfully structured by political and economic forces.¹²

This Euro-Palestine already exists on the ground in the anti-Jewish synergies and culture of corrosive hatred financed by a European Union that dictates Israel’s frontiers and capital—Tel-Aviv—removing bits of an already cramped territory. European Union defamations propagated loudly in international medias have justified and encouraged Arab terrorism not only in Israel but also in the wave of criminal antisemitism pouring over Europe with no resistance from political and religious circles, while the mythologies of *perversa imitatio* bury Christianity in the amnesiac swamps of dhimmitude.

Islam and Islamism

Untruths and taboos form a psychological net of lies and traps. For the past thirty years Europe has refused to see the global *jihad* in action at the four corners of the earth and to recognize the sources of Islamist terrorism. Bin Laden’s declarations emerge from an exclusively religious context and fit in with narratives of wars

against the infidels to impose Islamic supremacy. It is not Israel and the West that is humiliating the Arab-Muslim world; what is humiliating is the very existence of these nations, their freedom and sovereignty that contradict the Islamist view of the natural order in which Islam must dominate and not be dominated. It is the frustration of this will to power that feeds the humiliation and violence, and not poverty or economic disparities which exist all over the world without provoking this type of hatred and terrorism. This *jihad* is nothing but nostalgia for the mental universe of the dhimmitude of infidels, fashioned by insecurity, debasement, and servility as means of survival. The *dhimmi* is guilty of existing; he has to pay for his existence by tributes, services, and flattery. The expressions of his identity must be secret and humble; he has no history, no culture, no civilization and must be pardoned for his accomplishments by putting them in the service of his oppressor.

The anti-American terrorist attacks of September 11 2001 exposed the hiatus between soothing declarations of admiration for Islam from European leaders and hate-filled demonstrations against the West by Muslim masses that support Bin Laden's crimes. The reactions of European politicians illustrate their *dhimmi* behavior: they never miss an occasion to laud the superiority of Islamic civilization over their own, to flagellate themselves for the Crusades and debase themselves to spare Arab susceptibilities. Western taxpayers attacked on their own soil by insecurity and uncontrollable illegal immigration, threatened and terrified by human missile terrorism, are reduced to buying a tentative security that they have been unable to defend by more dignified means.

The incrimination of Israel actualizes the same old millenary reflex of Christians attacked in their own lands by *jihad* and spewing out impotent hatred against Jewish minorities for want of attacking a more daunting enemy.¹³ Just as Muslim Slavic minorities in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Macedonia pushing secessionist demands poisoned relations between Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox Christians, Arab countries have turned the West's war against Islamist terrorism into a combat against Israel, blamed as its cause. Since the 1960s the West has built itself an imaginary Islam, a civilization of love, peace, and tolerance. This immaculate image protected by strict censorship facilitates policies of cynical collusion and shameful concessions. Today the mask is torn away, revealing the face of Bin Laden, the demonstrations of bloodthirsty hatred of Christians and Jews.

Soon after September 11 a controversy over Islam developed in the United States. According to Professor David Forte, a fervent Catholic who allegedly influenced President Bush, Islam is a religion of love, peace, and tolerance. Islam was kidnapped by Bin Laden, who supposedly represents an insignificant minority sect of Islam.¹⁴ Forte called on the West to fly to the rescue of the true Islam that they must save from Bin Laden's fiends. Though one cannot presume the individual feelings and opinions of millions of Muslims or generalize on the totality of Islamic civilization, it must be admitted that Bin Laden's concepts are expounded in all the

classical writings of Muslim jurists going back to the 8th century, constantly repeated and taught over the centuries. These precepts were the basis of relations with non-Muslims and they are still studied and reproduced today. As Father Henri Boulad, an Egyptian Jesuit and specialist of Islam wrote: “Islamism is Islam.”¹⁵

An article in *al-Muhajiroun*, an Islamist newspaper published in London in January 2001, tells us “How Islam classifies countries”:

*“Once the Islamic State is established, anyone in Dar Al-Harb will have no sanctity, neither for his life or wealth, hence a Muslim in such circumstances can then go into Dar Al-Harb and take the wealth from the people unless there is a treaty with that state. If there is no treaty individual Muslims can even go into Dar Al-Harb and take women to keep as slaves.”*¹⁶

Even if these outrageous statements might well be considered as a provocative manipulation that would make many Muslim’s storm with indignation, we quote them here because they correctly describe the theory of *jihad* and its historical reality.

Discussions in the Christian world of these fine points—neither Indians nor Buddhists raise such questions—apply solely to Western political problems; they have no influence on the evolution of Muslim religious and political thought. Whether or not Professor Forte thinks he must rescue his imaginary Islam, that does not modify the Qur’anic verses calling for the destruction or the humiliation of infidels, including Christians. It is precisely this passionate devotion to Islam that serves as the vector of dhimmitude in the West and, furthermore, encourages the torpor of Muslim intellectuals. Analogies do exist between religious extremisms, but we must acknowledge the development within both Judaism and Christianity of exegetic instruments able to master extremists by rational critique within their faiths. This evolution, which is particularly remarkable in Christianity, is nonexistent in Islam because it doesn’t have the same religious structure as the religions of the Bible. Forte’s approach encourages the abysmal rarity of Muslim self-criticism. Why should Muslim intellectuals worry themselves to modify the ethics of a religion whose values are praised by the very people they oppress? Since Islamic religion and civilization are so perfect, the evil must come from an outside source: infidels. Such are the consequences of Forte’s teachings.

Despite official denials by Western governments, we are in the heart of a conflict of civilizations. Irreconcilable interpretations of history and irreconcilable systems of values of justice and human rights will confront each other as long as the ideology of *jihad* is maintained along with its corollary, the demonizing of infidels as justification for the *jihad* wars waged against them.

- (1) Sheikh Yousef al-Qaradawi, *Saut al-Haqq wal-huriyya*, 9 January 1998, see MEMRI (The Middle East Media and Research Institute, Washington, D. C.), “Special Report: The Meeting between the Sheik of al-Azhar and the Chief Rabbi of Israel,” December 1997, trans. from the Arabic, 8 February 1998: 15.
- (2) Al-Azhar (Academy of Islamic Research) ed., *The Fourth Conference of the Academy of Islamic Research*, General Organization for Government Printing, Cairo, 1970: 927.
- (3) Abbasali Amid Zanjani, *Minority Rights According to the Law of the Tribute Agreement, A Survey of Some Purports of the International Rights from the Viewpoint of the Islamic Jurisprudence*, International Publishing Co., Teheran, 1997: 250-62.
- (4) Ibid: 263-71.
- (5) *Actes du Colloque des CMA à Paris*, September 1987, « Les Chrétiens du monde arabe. Problématiques actuelles et enjeux, » préface de Pierre Rondot . Quotation marks in the original text. Maisonneuve et Larose, Paris, 1989 : 34
- (6) Ibid: 28-9.
- (7) *Olive Branch from Jerusalem*, Newsletter from the Holy Land, 9 October 2000.
- (8) Besançon, Alain. *Le Malheur du siècle. Sur le communisme, le nazisme et l'unicité de la Shoah*, Fayard, Paris, 1998: 68, 108. See also by the same author a pertinent analysis of political thought in the Church: *Trois Tentations dans l'Église*, Calmann-Lévy, Paris, 1996.
- (9) Missionary Service News Agency (MISNA), 5 October 2001.
- (10) Besançon, *Le Malheur du siècle*, op. cit.: 45.
- (11) Penal law of the Islamic Republic of Iran establishes differences between Muslim and non-Muslim in murder cases. See the Report of Maurice Copithorne, Special Reporter for the UN Commission on Human Rights (Geneva) for the year 1998, E/CN.4/1999/32 § 35-39; see Annex 4 of this report that cites, concerning these discriminations, the Iranian Civil code 121, 297, 300, 881 and Constitution (163).
- (12) Bat Ye'or, « L' antisionisme euro-arabe, » Collective of authors : *[Nouveaux] Visages de l'antisémitisme, haine passion – ou haine historique?* NM 7 éditions, Paris, 2001: 23-70.
- (13) Bat Ye'or, *Juifs et Chrétiens sous l'islam, les dhimmis face au défi intégriste*, Berg International, Paris, 1994. This theme is developed in Bat Ye'or, *Jihad and Dhimmitude. Where Civilizations Collide*, Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, Cranbury, NJ / Associated University Presses, 2002.
- (14) Forte, David D., “Religion is not the enemy,” *National Review Online*, 19 October 2001 (<http://www.nationalreview.com/comment/comment-forte101901.shtml>).
- (15) Boulad, Henri, « À propos de l'islamisme et de l'islam, » *Choisir*, Geneva, April 1997: 26-8.
- (16) Al-Muhajiroun, *The Voice, the Eyes, the Ears of the Muslims*, London, 27 January 2001 http://www.onlyam.com/islamicstotics/foreign_policy/land_classification.html.