

Violence in Islam! – Violence in Islam?

Attempt at explanatory patterns based on the history of Islam as a religion by **Gernot Galib Stanfel**

1. Islam – Emergence from Two Perspectives

In general, Islam is understood as one of the major world religions, which is undoubtedly the case for most people, including most Muslims. However, this definition alone does not do justice to the comprehensive definition of the word "Islam." There is an external definition based on historical arguments, which is the most widely accepted and recognized as "scientific." According to this definition, monotheism first manifested itself with the Jewish religion, found a kind of continuation in the Christian religion, and Islam would thus be the last of the three major monotheistic religions. Anthropologists argue, following this definition, that the idea of monotheism found its respective form in each religion according to the cultural conditions. It follows that there was a kind of copying process of content from Judaism through Christianity to Islam, and Prophet Muhammad was, in a spiritual sense, a good plagiarist. Numerous studies explore what content Muhammad might have received from which Jewish or Christian source.

However, like any religion, there is also an internal view of the emergence, which, as with any other religion, deviates partly significantly from the "historical" and "anthropological" definition. This is also the case in Islam. According to this perspective, Islam, in its literal meaning as "submission" to God, who prefers to be called "Allah," has been inherent in humans since their creation – the original belief with which humans were created as an attribute. This belief, "Din," corresponds to the Latin "Religio" only in the sense that it means the "reconnection" to Allah, manifested in the primordial contract of souls before their creation. This primordial contract is described in the Quran as a dialogue between Allah and the as-yet-uncreated souls, wherein they accept that Allah is "their Lord." Throughout human history, people have repeatedly turned away from Allah and their connection to Him, prompting Allah to send prophets and messengers "to every people" to restore this connection and reference to the Creator in the lives of people. Some peoples misunderstood this, leading to the creation of their own religions, namely Judaism or Christianity. The latter, from this perspective, is the youngest of the three major monotheistic religions. In the course of these resulting deviations and, from the Islamic perspective, necessary clarifications, Allah sent Muhammad as the last of the prophets to finally present the belief "Din," the original Islam, in its completed form.

So, where the historical and anthropological definition of Islam begins, the internal Islamic definition essentially ends. All further developments leading to the institutionalized religion – now the term is no longer meant in terms of content as reconnection but as a system in the Greek-Latin sense – are purely theological analogies and concretizations of the final and comprehensive revelation. Another understanding problem arises from the previously mentioned Greek-Latin definition of religion and its socio-cultural context, in which Islam, like

Judaism, was never integrated. Therefore, the terms that have emerged in this context for the assimilated and institutionalized Christianity are very fitting and precise, but in the context of Islam, they are often not suitable and are always associated with a great imprecision in "translations." This introduction is important to approach the further issues with understanding.

2. The Establishment of Institutionalized Religion

In the tribal system of the Arabian Peninsula, questioning traditional structures, as in any pre-modern society, was a fundamental attack on their identity. An attempt to change faith, as the people of Mecca experienced the appearance of Prophet Muhammad, was, for them, the greatest possible attack on their society. Accordingly, they resisted him and his followers. He proclaimed that he would restore the original belief, the monotheistic belief in the one God, in contrast to the prevailing polytheistic belief in Mecca. Monotheism had always existed on the Arabian Peninsula, apart from Judaism and Christianity, but it was not widespread or well-formulated. Ultimately, the Prophet and his followers, still following the commanded non-violence of Allah, were expelled from Mecca and welcomed in Medina. This was because there was no consensus among the diverse inhabitants of the oasis about their coexistence and social leadership in Medina at that time.

Now, the Prophet Muhammad was offered the acceptance of him and his followers, on the condition that he would take over the leadership of the inhabitants and restore social peace and order. In this context, the so-called Treaty of Medina was concluded, in which the coexistence of the inhabitants of Medina with each other was regulated by Muhammad. Thus, Islam was involved for the first time as a guiding idea in a concrete political context. This is not entirely comparable to the development of Christianity into the state religion under Constantine in the Roman Empire, because the oasis of Mecca was not a state in the Greek-Latin sense but rather a coexistence of different tribes, which was renegotiated repeatedly, and now happened under Islamic auspices. According to tribal traditions, belonging to a tribe obligated loyalty, and the tribe, in turn, was obliged to protect individuals. In the Treaty of Medina, the coexistence of individual groups in Medina was now regulated, ultimately corresponding to the founding of a new tribe, but based on religious affiliation rather than blood lineage. Thus, Islam had become a coequal community among the tribes of the region and had also regulated the relationship with those who did not belong to this religion but were under its protection. This primarily refers to the Jews of Medina, who were integrated into this community by contract but retained their Jewish religion.

To return to the comparison with the establishment of the Christian state religion: This process, which developed from the lifetime of Jesus over 700 years to Constantine and then had broad legislative development and socio-cultural consequences, occurred within Islam in the span of 30 years during the lifetime of Prophet Muhammad.

3. Regulation of Coexistence

Like any agreement, there is an authority for sanctions for non-compliance, and this was also the case for the community in Medina. The highest authority was Prophet Muhammad, who had been brought there by the people of Medina for this purpose. Accordingly, in case of necessity, he had to make decisions where he followed both the usual way of dealing with problems and disputes and the new impulses from Islam. It should be explicitly noted that he held this function not as a prophet but as the leader of the community, similar to other tribal leaders, in a secular sense. However, one cannot ignore that he, in his person, united three functions: that of the prophet who conveys divine words, that of the interpreter of these words as the one who implemented them most purely, and that of the leader of the community. Even though these functions did not all have the dimension of prophecy, the possibility that he could exercise these positions is seen as part of the divine plan to establish Islam.

With the death of Muhammad, this union of functions disappeared, and only the leadership of the community was continued in the form of the Caliphs (representatives, Sunni) or Imams (highest authority from the Prophet's family, Shiite) and, to a limited extent, depending on the later-developed Islamic direction, that of the interpreter. The purely religious authority was, apart from certain possibilities of the Caliphs or Imams, no longer exercised by a single person, as Muhammad was the last prophet. From now on, the knowledge, understanding, and practice of religion rested with each believer individually. However, personalities quickly emerged as religious and substantive authorities, to whom great knowledge in understanding and interpreting was attributed. With them and their students, the Islamic theology of various Mazahibs ("legal schools") ultimately began to develop, whose highest authorities today are the countless Islamic scholars, none of whom holds a higher position than others based on their function.

This laid the groundwork for the great diversity of Islamic understandings, their followers, and individual paths. The approach to handling disputes, crimes, and legal decisions between individuals, in the interest of the community, was also established, attempting to align with the Prophet's actions in this regard.

4. The Authority Guided by Allah, Prophet Muhammad

During all the developments described above, the Quran was being revealed to Prophet Muhammad. With this revelation, the message was increasingly completed, and the interpretation and living implementation by the Prophet were involved in this dynamic process. As a prophet, Muhammad was in direct dialogue with Allah, which should not be understood as conversations or correspondence, as classical Islamic theology assumes that Muhammad could not write. The revelation was never manifested in writing but always orally. However, when faced with a question arising from the three functions of the Prophet and his fourth as a "public" private individual, husband, father, etc., Allah answered such questions in the form of Quranic verses. Here lies the greatest root of interpretive diversity, misunderstandings, and even misuse. The words of the Quran are, according to Islamic belief, pure words that were conveyed to the Prophet and thus elude any human origin. However, this means that they are fundamentally valid for all believers.

To truly understand the meaning of individual verses, one needs the Islamic theological science of interpretation, Tafsir. Scholars of this science know the position of individual verses, which, unlike the continuous text of a non-fiction book, are not read together, their significance, for example, in whether they have been abrogated by another verse or complement another, etc. Many verses refer, as mentioned above, to specific questions of the Prophet in his functions. In theology, it has always been important to know the circumstances, occasions, etc., under which the individual verses were revealed. Thus, a verse may primarily refer to a specific situation of past events, the repetition of which is not possible today, and the content of the corresponding verses may therefore have little applicable validity in today's situations. However, there are, of course, a multitude of verses, the majority at least, that have timeless universality. Knowledge of this is, as mentioned, the task of the Tafsir science. Without this background, one can arrive at a relatively incorrect understanding of individual verses.

Especially verses that mention sanctions against certain actions or those that arose in the context of a wartime conflict must be understood in the corresponding context. If they are not, it can result in the exercise and application of violence, where one supposedly relies on "God's word" but, in reality, disregards it, as other truly universally understandable verses are ignored. However, an important aspect is also present: The word of Allah, like Himself, is too complex in its comprehensive truth to be truly understood by humans. In the tradition of mystics, the tradition that seeks to understand Islam in its spiritual depth, it is said that the Quran can be understood on seven levels, where the words themselves and their contextual relevance play a significant role only in the lower levels of understanding. This viewpoint is controversial within Islam today, but it shows how complex the understanding of each individual verse of the Quran is. It ultimately demonstrates that there may be no contradiction between literal, exemplary, allegorical, etc., understanding, but it is necessary to know in which situation it can be understood on which level. On the contrary, it is likely that all these aspects apply simultaneously as a level of understanding, for only because human capacity cannot understand or accept such a paradox does not mean that the Word of God cannot have this multidimensionality. People who have sought understanding over the centuries with their approaches seem to confirm this repeatedly.

Of the 6,236 verses of the Quran, two contain an imperative to kill. The digital concordance lists a total of 47 verses with the term "kill, death, or killed," in which the term mostly occurs in the context of a story or as an explanation of what happens after death. The following verse is one of the two mentioned above and is often cited as exemplary for the legitimization of violence:

"And kill them wherever you find them, and expel them from where they expelled you, for persecution is worse than killing! But do not fight them at the Sacred Mosque unless they fight you there. If they fight you, then kill them. Such is the recompense of the disbelievers." (2:191)

Muhammad Assad, Muhammed Rassoul, both widely available Quranic commentaries (Tafsir) in German, and newer interpretations such as Hamideh Mohagheghi are, like the majority of scholars, in agreement that this verse should not be understood as a justification for violence against non-Muslims but refers to a specific situation in which the Muslim community was under attack. They also agree that the situation referred to in the verse occurred at a time when Mecca was not yet under the control of Muslims but during the period when Muslims

had to flee to Medina due to threats to their lives, and the Meccans sought to destroy the "tribe" of Muslims to maintain their old order.

The factors in this verse are, therefore, so clearly situation-specific that no universality towards non-Muslims can be derived from it. Muhammad Assad assigns actual universality to only one point among the three interpretations quoted, namely, the obligation to keep the holiest place, Mecca, free from combat under all circumstances. However, if it were to come to the extreme, it should be defended as described in the verse. All three commentators also agree that the fight mentioned in the verse and the resulting killing can only take place when it is a matter of defense, i.e., when the fight is already in progress. In this situation, the "disbelievers" were definitely those who sought the destruction of the Islamic community; in this situation, "believers" and "disbelievers" were defined as "for or against the destruction" of the Muslim community, with "disbelievers" being enemies who rejected faith and fought violently. Again, it must be emphasized that no universality can be inferred from this situation regarding non-Islam believers; it describes the self-defense of the community against an existential threat. Such self-defense is also regulated, for example, in the Catholic Catechism (2308 ff) or in international law (Briand-Kellogg Pact 1929).

A similar situation exists with verse 9:5, the second one often attributed to general legitimation of violence:

"And when the sacred months have passed, then kill the polytheists wherever you find them and capture them and besiege them and sit in wait for them at every place of ambush. But if they should repent, establish prayer, and give zakah, let them [go] on their way. Indeed, Allah is Forgiving and Merciful."

The first part of this verse has historically been cited by some commentators as a justification for violence against non-Muslims and is referred to by outsiders as the "Sword Verse." However, the majority of contemporary scholars, including Muhammad Asad and Muhammad Rassoul mentioned above, agree that it must be understood in the context of the preceding verses. The central theme here is not killing, but dealing with hostile tribes that had repeatedly violated the treaties with the Muslim community in Medina, posing an existential threat by actively seeking conflict. The theological essence of this verse is the mandatory truce during the sacred three months. Ultimately, the verse concludes with an emphasis on forgiveness and the imperative of nonviolence towards these tribes if they also pray and pay the alms tax. The verse addresses the first possibility of ending violence and ends with one of Allah's most important attributes, that of the Merciful. Even in such a dramatic verse, the final words are those of forgiveness and mercy. Thus, the fundamental principle of the Quran is highlighted, and every verse must be read through the filter of mercy, compassion, which stands at the beginning of each surah (except one).

Using this verse as a justification for violence and killing is, therefore, incorrect when considering all other relevant parameters.

Due to the absence of a central religious authority for all Muslims since the death of Prophet Muhammad, the Quran as a source of revelation is not protected from misuse or reinterpretation. Unfortunately, it doesn't take much, and the less knowledge there is about the overall context, the easier such abuse can occur. This doesn't even delve into other aspects,

such as who has the legitimacy to order a war or battle, or the socio-cultural conditions necessary for it.

As another example of incorrect legitimization of violence, some verses in the Quran may be understood as antisemitic, potentially leading to violence against Jews. While some verses may be read in such a way, it is crucial to consider their context of origin. In the community of Medina, there were Jewish tribes that maintained their faith but repeatedly attempted to break the agreements they had made for coexistence, even conspiring to assassinate Muhammad. Many of the verses addressing these events were specific to the circumstances and did not have universal applicability to all Jews. Moreover, some verses critical of Jews were interpreted in early Islamic theology as criticism of all people, using "Jews" as a synonym for "humankind" in specific narratives.

The significance lies in understanding the role Prophet Muhammad was assigned as the restorer of the original faith, aligning with monotheistic traditions like Judaism and Christianity. He wasn't establishing a new religion but serving as the ultimate corrective to the existing faith. This is evident in his handling of the rebellion of Jewish tribes against him. When consulting the elders of these tribes about the punishment for breaking a treaty and attempting murder, their response was "the death penalty." As the highest authority, Prophet Muhammad, not merely as a prophet, enforced this punishment. The crucial aspect here is not that these tribes were Jewish, but that they committed specific offenses. Unfortunately, this historical event is sometimes misused to justify anti-Semitic violence by some Muslims, ignoring the correct interpretation of the sources.

5. Hadiths – What did Prophet Muhammad say and do?

The second fundamental source for Muslims after the Quran is the practical implementation of its teachings by Prophet Muhammad. The sayings and actions attributed to him are known as Hadiths. These were systematically collected and recorded by scholars of the third generation after the Prophet. Three classifications were established:

Sahih (authentic)

Hasan (good)

Daif (weak)

Only the first category can be unquestionably used for normative statements and interpretations. The criteria are stringent, requiring a specific number of known and reliable narrators and multiple independent chains of transmission for a Hadith to be classified as Sahih. The other two classifications have less strict criteria and are limited in their normative applicability.

Despite the rigorous classification, attempts have been made throughout history to bypass it. Rulers commissioned forged Hadiths to suit their agendas. In recent times, this classification is often deliberately ignored to justify various forms of violence. Similar to the Quranic interpretation, misuse can occur easily, especially with the internet facilitating the rapid dissemination of such interpretations globally.

It would be beyond the scope to describe and discuss all possible or already occurred misinterpretations or falsified sources within this framework. However, it is a historical fact that misuse has occurred repeatedly, driven by rulers, groups, sects, or individuals. A religion without a central authority and with a vast number of believers worldwide, representing different orientations and traditions, cannot prevent such misuse. What can be done, though, is to confidently advocate interpretations and exegeses that are theologically and scientifically sound and highlight the complex contents in line with the basic orientation of Islam: peace, justice, and comprehensive divine love. The necessary consideration of the circumstances of individual Quranic verses and Hadiths, as well as the reliability of the latter, has been common in traditional theology and is not a recent invention. Muslims today are called upon to become aware of these theological traditions.

6. Historical, sociological, and psychological parameters: The last 200 years – a time of radical changes and setbacks

Broadly speaking, from the 19th century onwards, the relationship between Muslims and the states where they predominantly lived began to undergo radical changes concerning other contemporary world powers, which were mostly organized into nation-states or in the process of forming such entities. With Napoleon's campaign in Egypt, European colonialism extended its reach to regions with Muslim-majority populations. Muslims, both economically and militarily, proved inferior in the ensuing conflicts and perceived themselves as such.

The leading Islamic power, the Ottoman Empire, was systematically dismantled and first expelled from Europe. New states, drawing inspiration from the medieval era, were defined, and German noble houses, having lost their original power due to the unification of Germany, were made their new ruling houses. The non-Muslim population, not associated with state power, perceived this as liberation in the newly formed national context closely linked to their respective Christian churches. Muslims, on the other hand, as the previously state-supporting group, perceived it as a collective assault on their existence. The same sentiment applied to the Maghreb, Egypt, and the Levant, with experiences related to various colonial conquests or occupations. The result was the creation of a racist two-class society, where Muslims, except for cooperating elite classes, mostly belonged to the second class and felt the impact of it. This can be considered a kind of collective primal trauma for Muslims, where historical facts cannot be fully discussed here, but the self-perception of Muslims is being described.

This feeling of being losers and second-class citizens, despite belonging to what they considered the "right" religion, needed an explanation. People tried to make sense of it as punishment from God for neglecting their religion, similar to how Europeans in the Middle Ages and the early modern period tried to explain the superiority of "Muslims" over "Christians" from their perspective. In response, they turned to a religious understanding that focused on the essential aspects related to their survival and identity: they emphasized the foundational pillars of the religion, supported by structures of spiritual communities. A comparative analogy between Bernard of Clairvaux, the spiritual Cistercian monk and founder of the Crusades, and Hassan al-Bana, the Sufi and founder of the Muslim Brotherhood, is presented here, recognizing that any comparison has its limitations. However, both aimed to

achieve the same goal through their respective movements: the resurgence of territorial sovereignty over the areas they believed were rightfully theirs, taken away by the other, whether Muslims or Christians. Although the Crusades were largely not spiritually motivated, organizations like the Muslim Brotherhood and similar ones, as religiously inspired groups, were intended to activate significant numbers of believers, living the faith and autonomy in what they perceived as better times. Both the Crusades, the colonialism acting with questionable religious arguments for the "salvation of the heathens," and the new Islamic organizations resisting colonialism restricted the respective religions to the existential domain and a few fundamental points, ignoring the vast diversity of spirituality, knowledge, interpretations, traditions, etc., in their religion. This approach was probably even more pronounced among Muslims at the time, as they were not invaders on foreign territory but in a defensive position on their traditional land.

Now, differentiations and considerations of prerequisites, which are actually necessary for interpreting and understanding individual Quranic verses and Hadiths, began to play less of a role. The traditional, self-evident sense for this was gradually lost. Added to this were modern political movements entering the previously Islamic countries, often with interests derived from ideologies and states, attempting to create approaches derived from religion. In the process, they handled traditional criteria of interpretation and understanding carelessly. Consequently, numerous new Islamic movements emerged, rejecting traditions because they deemed them outdated and unsuccessful. This applied to both modernist and technocratic currents and revolutionary and puritanical movements. The latter rejected tradition because they saw too many innovations that, from their perspective, distorted the religion and led to the Muslims' subordinate situation (Salafists, Wahhabis). These groups claim to revive the true original Islamic community and its spirit.

All these groups attempted to give themselves an Islamic-theological legitimacy, with some, but not all, justifying violence in a manner that would not have been possible in the traditional theology and spirituality of the Muslim majority if their guidelines had been considered. Hybrid thought patterns developed, such as homosexuality, which did not exist in the traditional Islamic theology in this form and was rarely actively addressed. This reluctance was mainly due to the Islamically respected right to protect the privacy of one's own home and bedroom. However, the homophobic view, especially in puritanical Britain where Oscar Wilde had virtually invented the dandyish homosexual, led to an Islamically-theologized homophobia, legitimizing violence, even state-sanctioned, and influencing discourse in many areas, both within and outside the Muslim context. These various neo-Islamic groups that emerged at the time, some of which operate cadre-style, still significantly shape the external perception of Islam today, as well as internal Muslim perceptions, with many traditional Islamic fields of knowledge, art, and awareness still under-reflected.

The collective trauma of inferiority and external control repeated itself as a kind of re-traumatization after World War I with events surrounding the partition of the Ottoman Empire in the Middle East, leading to the creation of new states like Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, or Jordan, and eventually to the declaration of the State of Israel. Once again, various groups were formed, as described above, or existing ones were activated or intensified.

In contemporary times, these groups are offered collaborations by external ideological and state interests, most of which they willingly accept to secure their existence or expand their sphere of influence. As a result, originally small, relatively new fringe groups in the Islamic spectrum can suddenly emerge as large dominant organizations. Externally, Islam is now often classified only through these groups (in broad terms, "Wahhabis vs. Muslim Brotherhood vs. revolutionary Shiites," or locally, for example, "Turkish Sunnis vs. Turkish Alevi"). The latter is worth remembering when calling for "renewals" for Islam from outside—most of these were not positive developments.

7. The Seduction

The presented image makes it clear how fragmented the already fundamentally diverse religion of "Islam" is at present, and how little a unified line can be discerned in many aspects. This goes hand in hand with attempts by some to legitimize the handling of violence in various ways, with neo-Islamic groups playing a particularly strong role compared to the traditional majority. Certain summations of specific "arguments" emerge, such as "against the West," "against the Jews," "against immorality," or to support one's nationalism. Each of these lines of argumentation follows its own theological legitimacy, leading to a proliferation of interpretations with specific tendencies and agendas. Many of these "legitimations" are available and consumable in various media, whether print publications, videos, or websites. If people in a vulnerable life phase or fundamental psychological instability encounter such media and/or disseminating groups, they become potential new members of such ideas and groups. In the most extreme cases, under the influence of such groups, they can become individuals acting with terrorism.

However, such a person does not emerge without a corresponding history. A stable, emotionally resilient personality rarely becomes a brutally acting assailant. It is evident that every relevant assailant has a backstory involving severe childhood traumas and often a further retraumatization in late adolescence or early adulthood. Similar to the collectively traumatized state of Muslims in the 19th century and the retraumatization after World War I, these individuals are particularly susceptible to views that can compensate for and even rebuild their disturbed self-image and self-awareness for a certain period. Similar to historically collectively traumatized Muslims, these individuals largely ignore the traditional complex guidelines for understanding and interpreting the Quran and Hadiths. Instead, they selectively choose elements that can legitimize their views, strongly supported by relevant groups, in their understanding. This self-legitimization or manipulation by the groups goes so far that the vast majority of Muslims who orient their lives and views according to traditional guidelines are considered unbelievers and apostates, legitimizing violence against them. This gives rise to organizations such as the Taliban, ISIS, and others. Notably, most victims of the violence perpetrated by these groups are Muslims themselves.

While in the past few decades, youth cultures like the Hippie movement, Punk, and somewhat foolish pseudo-Nazism (not to be confused with actual ideological Nazis) served as provocative niches for youthful rebellion, today, pseudo-Islamism often fulfills this role. Recently in Vienna's Favoriten district, a group of bored and perhaps frustrated non-Muslim youths

vandalized a church while shouting "Allah Hu akbar." The corresponding hysterical reactions in various media and among politicians, some of whom may unfortunately welcome it, bear witness to this. However, parallels can also be drawn with truly terrorist violence and earlier terrorist and violent groups, such as left-wing extremists in the 1970s in Italy and Germany or right-wing extremists in Germany, Austria, and worldwide. Both various Islamist assailants and individuals like the Austrian Franz Fuchs, the Norwegian Breivik, or the attacker in New Zealand were unstable personalities who compensated for traumatic childhood experiences with ideologies and religions they pieced together. They self-legitimized their violence. They had support and contact with relevant groups beyond national borders, such as the Islamist assailant in Vienna with connections to Germany and Switzerland, or the right-wing extremist attacker in Christchurch linked to the Identitarians in Austria.

8. What Lies Ahead?

As mentioned earlier, the idea of "reforming" or "renewing" Islam is strongly discouraged. Attempts in this direction have often led to serious problems and, at times, violence. It is necessary for Muslims to once again reflect on the depth and complexity of traditional Islamic theology, embracing its diversity and putting it into practice. The great traditions of spirituality and mysticism must also reclaim their necessary place in the canon of lived Islamic diversity.

Efforts from external sources to adapt Islam to contemporary political-ideological systems, perhaps even with pressure and regulations, and reduce it to their principles, do not seem advisable. Demanding the rephrasing or removal of Islamic sources because they did not originate in the spirit and context of 21st-century society is not constructive. While no religion needs to have exactly the same guiding principles as the current prevailing societal majority, they should have a harmonious place in a democratic, diverse rule-of-law state. Muslims, thanks to the depth and diversity of the Islamic religion, have enough theological and social potential to naturally occupy and fill this place without having to make substantive theological compromises. Such compromises should also not be demanded from them.

Islamic theologians and spiritual teachers are called upon to confidently advocate a doctrine based on traditions that align with the command of individual self-responsibility in our time and societies. Maintaining the diversity of Islamic teaching traditions and traditional spiritual experiential spaces alongside each other is essential. Young people must be accompanied by society in their process of self-discovery without restricting them. However, if they encounter problems, society must take more decisive responsibility for them and provide support. In this regard, Muslims, both individually and institutionally, must assume significantly more responsibility, offer structures, and provide resources. It is not the fate of the Islamic religious community alone that they are also dependent on the constructive, and lately, financial support of the broader society.

Sources and Literature:

Assad, Muhammad; die Botschaft des Koran; Patmos, 2009

Bahners, Patrick; Die Panikmacher; C.H.Beck, München,2011

Bowersock, Glen; Die Wiege des Islam; C.H. Beck, München, 2019

Elsässer, Jürgen; Terrorziel Europa; Residenz, St. Pölten-Salzburg, 2008

Heine, Susanne / Özoy, Ömer / Schwöbel,Christoph, Takim, Abdullah (Hg); Christen und Muslime im Gespräch, Gütersloh, München, 2016

Ghandour, Ali; Liebe, Sex und Allah, C. H. Beck, München, 2019

Hentschel, Yunus Valerian; Blick in den Spiegel des Koran – Sufische Zugänge zum Koran in der Gegenwart; Dissertation, Universität Wien, 2021

Ibn Ishaq; Das Leben des Propheten; Sphor, Kandern im Schwarzwald 1999

Ibn Rassoul, Abu Rida Muhammad Ibn Ahmad; Tafsir Al-Qura'an Al-Karim; Arcelmedia, keine Angaben

Kathechismus der Katholischen Kirche, Oldenburg, München, 1993

Kepel, Gilles; Die Rache Gottes; Piper, München, 1991

Kreiser, Klaus und Neumman Christoph K.; Kleine Geschichte der Türkei, Reclam, Stuttgart, 2009

Le Gai Eaton, Charles; Der Islam; Diederichs, München 1994

Lings, Martin; Muhammad; Sphor, Kandern im Schwarzwald 2013

Lohlker, Rüdiger; Islam Eine Ideengeschichte; Facultas, Wien, 2008

Milger, Peter; Die Kreuzzüge, Orbis, München, 2000

Mazower, Mark; Der Balkan; BVT, Berlin, 2007

Schulze, Reinhard; Geschichte der Islamischen Welt von 1900 bis zur Gegenwart; C.H. Beck, München, 2016