

PROCEEDINGS FROM THE **CORDOBA SEMINARS** SERIES
1ST FEBRUARY 2010, LONDON MUSLIM CENTRE

**THE SOCIO-POLITICAL AND CULTURAL
IMPLICATIONS OF MONOTHEISM IN A
CONFLICT-RIDDEN WORLD**

MAJOR LEON "BOGO" CORNWALL

VOL 1 • ISSUE 1 • FEBRUARY 2010



مؤسسة قرطبة

The Cordoba Foundation

CORDOBA
PAPERS

FOUNDED in 2005, The Cordoba Foundation (TCF) is an independent Public Relations, Research and Training unit, which promotes dialogue and the culture of peaceful and positive coexistence among civilisations, ideas and people. We do this by working with decision-making circles, researchers, religious leaders, the media, and a host of other stakeholders of society for better understanding and clearer comprehension of inter-communal and inter-religious issues in Britain and beyond. Our activities include:

- Face-to-face interaction with decision-makers and figures of authority
- Workshops, seminars and debates on pertinent issues
- Structured consultation and advisory services
- Training and capacity-building
- Periodicals and journals
- In-house research
- Resourceful website

© The Cordoba Foundation 2010
Title: The Socia-Political and Cultural Implications of Monotheism in a Conflict-Ridden World

Published by The Cordoba Foundation, London

Typeset by RedAspect, London



مؤسسة قرطبة

The Cordoba Foundation

Level 7, Westgate House
Westgate Road, Ealing
London W5 1YY
United Kingdom

Telephone +44 (0) 20 8991 3370

Telephone +44 (0) 20 8991 3372

Facsimile +44 (0) 20 8991 3373

info@thecordobafoundation.com

www.thecordobafoundation.com

Cultures in Dialogue.

THE SOCIO-POLITICAL AND CULTURAL IMPLICATIONS OF MONOTHEISM IN A CONFLICT-RIDDEN WORLD

Major Leon “Bogo” Cornwall

Member of the People’s Revolutionary Government, Grenada (1979 – 1983)

THIS PAPER is essentially about the relationship between the eternal God and the created world; and consequentially, the relationship between monotheistic believers, who are themselves created beings, and the said world. The underlying assumption is that there are two realms, distinct but related, namely, the divine realm and the earthly realm. How is that divine realm constituted? Is it a plethora of gods or is there only one God? Monotheistic believers take the latter view: there is only one God.

In the light of the existence of one God, the question is: How should the world, the earthly realm, be arranged? What socio-political and cultural form and content should the world have that would be consistent with a monotheistic view? To hold that there is no bearing between the two is to espouse a deistic view of the relationship between God and the world, a view in which God created the world but from thence has no further dealings with it.

MONOTHEISM: A CONCEPT OF INCLUSIONS

While it is easy to give a definition of monotheism based on its etymology, nevertheless it is not that easy to determine which religions to classify as monotheistic. This is because even in religious systems one would consider polytheistic, the people within that system tend to magnify and give such devotion to one of the gods that eventually this god becomes to them supreme. This happened at certain stages in Vedic polytheism. It seems that the inner logic of religious devotion tends towards that.

Moreover, some people have struggled with the question of whether monotheism was the original view of man or whether it became his belief at a certain point in history. There is no settled view on this. Karen Armstrong, in *The History of God*, holds that human beings’ initial belief was monotheistic, a belief in one big sky God who was distant and remote; but because of that remoteness that belief faded and was replaced later by belief in the existence of many “of-this-world” gods; hence the rise of polytheism.

The assumption of the Bible is the existence of one supreme God, the Creator and Lord of the world, whom human beings, created by this one God, knew from the dawn of creation. If this biblical view is taken, it would mean that polytheism is a human falling away from the divine revelation of one God. Indeed, Christianity’s explanation for polytheism is that it is the consequence of the Fall of man, not his original state. It is man’s faulty attempt to interpret nature by the light of unaided reason and because of a lack of scientific understanding of secondary causes to account for observable striking natural phenomena, superstitious man attributed these to separate personalized living beings.

Islam it seems would hold that monotheism came with Abraham who is considered to be the first *hanif*¹.

Did human beings go through a degeneration in terms of their belief in God? Or was there an elevation from belief in many competing gods to that of one supreme God? The difficulty in our topic is that God as reality's ultimate principle, which is what any theist would hold, is necessarily a mystery. Thus there cannot be an exhaustive, comprehensive understanding and rendering of the mystery of God. There must be room for multiple understanding of this mystery, none of which would be complete. If this view is taken, this might probably cause us to be more tolerant and seek to understand what is it people are really doing when, through their particular religious system, they seek to approach the divine mystery. It might cause us to acknowledge the truth in the Baha'i faith, explicitly monotheistic, but nevertheless allowing for people having different concepts of God and His nature, and calling Him by different names, to be yet speaking of the same entity who is too great for humans to fully understand or to create a complete and accurate image of.

One of the mistakes we often make, and has led to lots of pain, conflict, death and destruction in history is that we equate our conception of God with God Himself. But God, the Ultimate, the Supreme, is greater than and beyond our conception of Him, even though as human beings we need some conception of this inconceivable God so as to relate to Him. Nevertheless, we often fail to make a distinction between the notion of the supreme God needed for religion and the highly metaphysical conception demanded by right philosophy. If the two were the same, then simple, unphilosophic minds would have no hope for salvation. But belief in a God who is great and faithful, loving and merciful, and whose ear is ever open to the prayers of His needy and penitent creation is sufficient for all to be grasped.

While the concept of monotheism has been dominated by the concept of God in the Abrahamic faiths, I will nonetheless say that monotheistic views are found everywhere, in every culture and there are various types or forms of monotheism. While in Judaism and Islam, God's oneness is unquestionable and there is no room for the plurality of God, nevertheless, in Christianity, which, as an Abrahamic faith, would be readily placed in the category of monotheism, its monotheistic concept is Trinitarian, admitting some concept of plurality though not division of the divine.

Thus far I have assumed that monotheism is the more exalted theistic view than polytheism and I do hold so, because if God is reality's ultimate principle, as theists of every hue would agree, then there can be only one such ultimate principle; hence one God. It has been argued that in recognition of this what the Abrahamic monotheistic religions have done is to elevate one of the gods to the unchallengeable status of being the one supreme, uncreated God, Creator and Lord of all, and that the others were relegated to the status of angels, divine though created and hence not ultimate and not worthy of worship. This would be a rationalistic approach to the matter and would be rejected by the monotheistic believers of these religions who would state that monotheism is the result of divine revelation, not human rationalism.

However, my view is that we should broaden our understanding of monotheism beyond an exclusive monotheistic view which actively opposes polytheism so as to take an inclusive monotheistic stance, in which all the deities are either different names or different forms of the single supreme God. Indeed, in some indigenous African religions there is this inclusive understanding referred to as Substance monotheism where what was considered to be many gods are now understood as different forms of a single underlying Substance. Or a trend in Hinduism, Shri Vaishnavas, in which Brahman is the supreme person, Creator and Lord who leads souls to salvation; the sum of all the noble attributes, without rival (*advitya*), and those worshipped as gods are really Brahman's agents or means of relating to the world. This is not the strict monotheism of the Abrahamic religions or the Platonic concept of God;

... monotheistic views are found everywhere, in every culture and there are various types or forms of monotheism.

1. *Hanif* is an Arabic term that refers to pre-Islamic, non-Jewish or non-Christian Arabian monotheists. Islamically, it refers to Arabs during the Jahiliyya ("Ignorance") pre-Islamic period, who rejected polytheism in favour of the monotheist religion of Abraham.

however, for the purpose of this discussion I would include it in an expanded category of monotheism. The one God is the big, all-embracing God of inclusion. As the Vedic scripture says, God is the one Truth that sages know by many names. Indeed, Islam speaks of the 99 beautiful names of God (*Asma Allah al-Husna*).

In passing, I would also hold that monotheism is a more rational view than atheism, since the latter claims that there is no ultimate principle to reality, no absolute Truth to which our truths are an approximation and which judges and corrects our truths.

THE SOCIO-POLITICAL & CULTURAL IMPLICATIONS

What we have said thus far is that reality has one underlying ultimate principle, one God, a mystery which, *ipso facto*, can be understood and expressed in various ways. What we must address ourselves to is the implications of this in socio-political and cultural terms. In addressing this we ask ourselves what is God's relationship to the world? And secondly, as believers of this one God, what should be our relationship to the world?

In the monotheistic worldview, God is the Creator and Lord of the world. That is the essence of the divine – world relationship: Creator and created, Lord and ruled over. What is the meaning and implication of “being created by one God”? In the biblical tradition, the narrative of creation is told in a quite subtle way that is not really meant to conflict with the modern scientific understanding of the mechanism of the emergence of the world and all creaturely existence. In the Genesis narrative, God creates a human pair, Adam and Eve. There is a play on the word “Adam” because at one and the same time Adam is an individual personality and man in the generic sense, that is, humankind. Adam sounds like and seems to be related to the Hebrew word *adamah*, meaning “ground”; thus, indicating that man has an essential relationship to the earth. Eve is the mother of the living. Thus in the biblical vision, all of humanity is one and an intrinsic part of the creation. Thus, created by this one God, all human beings are related to each other as brothers and sisters, related to the nonhuman environment as “environorganisms”, and related to God as children of God. That is the radical implication of monotheism! Such an anthropological view puts us in a different mode of thinking, fosters a different consciousness, in which racism and various other forms of discrimination, and the abusive, irresponsible exploitation of the environment are outlawed. Moreover, part of the Genesis account of creation is what has been called the “Cultural Mandate.” The one supreme God says to the created human beings: “Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it...” It is the mandate to fill and to rule. This mandate to fill and to rule is what transforms the created order into a habitable place, giving rise to culture and socio-political forms.

In Islam, the indivisibility of God implies the indivisibility of God's sovereignty which leads to the conception of the universe as just, coherent, and moral rather than as an existential and moral chaos as one would have if one were to take seriously polytheism and its implications. In Judaism and Christianity, basing themselves on the Hebrew Scriptures, the view is similar. The ancient Hebrew prophet Isaiah pronounced: “For thus says the Lord, who created the heavens (he is God!), who formed the earth and made it (he established it; he did not create it a chaos, he formed it to be inhabited!): I am the Lord, and there is no other” (Isaiah 45: 18, NRSV).

Richard Niebuhr referred to culture as the artificial, secondary environment, which human beings superimpose on the natural world. This superimposed environment comprises language, habits, ideas, beliefs, customs, social organisation, inherited artefacts, technical processes, and values. And these make it possible for human beings to live their lives in relationship with each other, with the natural environment, and with God (for those who choose to do so).

For a monotheist, while culture is the work of man, nonetheless it is in response to God. This dual

aspect to culture, namely, its being a human product and its being related to God as a response to His command behoves us to be very thoughtful on the matter. As the work of man, it would reflect just where human beings are in their self-understanding, their understanding of the world, in which they live, and their understanding of and relationship to God. As such, there is not and cannot be a single monolithic culture. Human culture would always be diverse and varied. As such, the various cultures would require of all human beings understanding, respect, tolerance and a willingness to learn from each other. But as a human response to God, human culture in its diversity must be measured by the yardstick of God, for it can be and should be a vehicle for human relationship with God. In this regard, there ought to be on the part of monotheistic believers a continual separatist impetus which challenges the prevailing culture with the values of faith. The work of human hands and minds is always tainted with sin, self-glorification, and self, group, class, racial and national interests. So there must always be amongst monotheists a paradoxical attitude of “Yes-and-No,” an affirmation and a negation. This conserves what is best, noble, uplifting and edifying in all forms of human culture while at the same time being open and welcoming to change, further development and enrichment of human life for all peoples. Humanity cannot do without culture and any enrichment of human life and amelioration of human conditions can only come via cultural advancement.

A criticism often levelled at early polytheistic religions is that they did not enjoin on the worshippers sound moral values and high ethical standards. These were religions of rituals aimed at the appeasement of the gods because the dominant emotion was one of fear. But in monotheism ethics come to the fore with the primary values of justice, love and mercy.

Critical to monotheism is the belief in a righteous God, a God of moral values and ethical standards. This has led to the coinage of the phrase “ethical monotheism”, which describes the belief in a single supreme God who guides humanity through ethical principles. Thus the moral values and ethical principles are common and universal. The true worshippers of God must live righteous lives in every sphere of their endeavours – in the private and public spheres. The God of monotheism is not a Friday or Saturday or Sunday God but rather is a 24/7/365 God.

The ethics of the monotheists are not rationally-derived but are divinely revealed and even imparted. God is the fount of this righteousness. Righteousness is an attribute of God. The Greek word *dikaiosune* literally means “equity of character”. To have equity of character is to possess all good qualities in perfection and perfect balance. God’s communicable attributes, that is, those that are revealed and can be imparted to humanity, are love, justice, holiness, truth, mercy, wisdom, and power. These attributes God possesses in perfection and perfect balance; thus God is righteous. But because these attributes are communicable or can be imparted to humanity, the believers can become loving, merciful, just, truthful, wise, etc. In others words, the believers can themselves be made righteous by God. And if righteous, such believers cannot but seek to affect their culture with these values, seeking to establish institutions that would maintain, transmit, and further these values.

We should also note that our working definition is that culture is the secondary, superimposed environment which makes this earth habitable for human beings. It has both a material dimension and a spiritual dimension. The material dimension of social, economic and political organisations and technical processes is the embodiment of the spiritual dimension of ideas, habits, beliefs, customs and values.

The danger here is something often raised by people of a critical mind, namely, the danger of imposition, of coercion, of intolerance, of violence, in which one group, fanatical about its way of seeing things, seeks to make its vision that of everyone by use of force. Throughout human history, this use of force to impose on others the belief system of one religion seems to go hand in hand with religious conversions and the spread of some religions. The religions of exclusive monotheism, because of the stubborn belief that

the God as they conceive Him and worship Him is the only God, and hence their strong missionary element, have been most at fault in this regard. Two things can be said in response here. *Firstly*, such an approach of coercion is foreign to true religion. Jesus radically eschewed the use of force in his famous and often problematic statement of turning the other cheek. The *Book of James* defined true religion in this vein: "Religion that is pure and undefiled before God, the Father, is this: to care for orphans and widows in their distress, and to keep oneself unstained by the world." The orphans and widows are representative of the powerless, vulnerable and often oppressed in the social order. True religion looks out for the oppressed and seeks to empower them. True religion is liberative, not oppressive.

Secondly, we must not lose sight of the need for balance in the concept of righteousness. Justice must be tempered by mercy. In a dialectical way, change must also conserve. Challenge must be accompanied with respect. "There is no compulsion in religion" is a passage from the Qur'an (Sura 2, Verse 256).

When considering culture and social and political institutions, there is a problem that must be considered, that of idolatry. Monotheism brings to the fore the problem of idolatry. In the monotheistic tradition, the worship of idols is associated with death and destruction. The idols are burdensome, enslaving; they even destroy their own worshippers. In the culture in which the three Abrahamic faiths emerged, because of the low level of scientific and technical development and the general superstition of the people, idolatry was identified with the making of animal or human figures and the open worship of these as divine beings. But this early form in which idolatry appeared could cause us to lose sight of the essence of idolatry and thereby fail to identify idolatry in our age.

In essence, idolatry is the projection of human power in the world in a manner that causes people to give these forms of human power first place in their lives. The creation of human beings, which is what culture is in its various dimensions, is absolutized. So while there might not be worship in a traditional religious sense, since worship means to sacrifice to, one would be able today to see the various ways people are really worshipping the created forms rather than the Creator. The socio-political implication of these modern forms of idolatry is that they get people to buttress up the prevailing power structures of society which often are based on the domination of one powerful class or powerful nation over others.

The real world is not a monolithic whole but a composite of differences.

Idolatry is therefore conservative, even reactionary and does not admit to change and transformation of the social order, since the prevailing social order is absolutized. Because God alone is absolute and hence transcending the created order, it means that no form of human creation is final but that all forms are open to change and transformation so as to better embody and reflect the noble values of love, justice and mercy that spring from this righteous God. When the relative, that is, whatever human beings have made, is absolutized, this inevitably leads to cultural ossification, social domination of others by one class, and political oppression by a political group. This is what we saw in Socialist bloc countries where a noble process designed to bring justice and well-being for all became stagnant and even reactionary because it was not open to questioning and dissent from its people and hence further transformation by them. This is what we see everyday in the West where the great power of one nation has assumed the idolatrous status of a global empire and thus, like in John's vision in Revelation, all nations and peoples must give allegiance to it and if any should fall away they would be brought in line by unrighteous wrath.

The world is currently ridden with human conflicts; some are open while others are hidden. The real world is not a monolithic whole but a composite of differences. There are different nations, races, ethnic groups, genders, religions, political philosophies, social classes. Because of these existing differences, there is the potential for human conflict and, throughout history including today, conflicts have broken out along these various lines. Some of these conflicts are currently ongoing. Therefore, God's

relationship, and monotheistic believers' relationship, is with a world that is not a monolithic whole but a composite of differences which often flares up in frightening and painful conflict.

Of the range of existing differences, some are naturally occurring. Theologically speaking, God made them so. God created different races, two genders, and dispersed the habitable landmass by having created seas. The puny mind trying to be logical would ask why God didn't make us to look exactly the same and to live in one big closed locality. This would have made for peace, wouldn't it? But the puny mind glorying in its rationality is an arrogant mind. Monotheistic believers have to contend with this fact that the infinite and wise God in creating one earth and one humanity thought it wise to create the differences, thereby indicating that the unity must be sought and found in the diversity, that somehow it is more enriching to live with differences.

While the differences make for the potentiality of conflict, nevertheless, the actuality of conflict is due to human sin. Sin is idolatry. It is human self-interest and power being projected and elevated in a way to replace the interest of God and contend with his power. There is therefore both individual sin and collective sin, the latter being the more disastrous. Collective sin would be the projection and elevation of the interests and power of the group such as the race or class or nation in a way that abrogates what God stands for. The biblical story of the Tower of Babel, in which human power is projected in arrogant defiance to God, is a picture of collective sin and its consequences in creating human confusion and conflict. When one nation projects its power in the world without regard for justice, and hence in defiance to the God who is the fount of justice, this selfish projection inevitably creates conflict. And if several nations were to act in similar fashion simultaneously then this would be a model for multiple conflicts and worldwide upheavals. Racism and racial violence are similarly due to the projection of the interests and power of one race to the detriment of others, thus rejecting the wisdom of the one God who created the diversity of races in the oneness of humanity. Gender discrimination and gender oppression would also be the elevation of the power of one gender over another in disregard to the creative wisdom of the one being two and the two being one.

There are differences which are not rooted in the order of creation but come out of the process of history. Here we have different religions, political philosophies, and social classes. Even if one might argue that God is involved in any one of these, nevertheless the human and historical aspect of these must be recognised. They form part of what we have called culture. They must be examined whether, in part or in whole, they are the embodiment of selfish human power or the reflection of the communicable attributes of God. If any religion or political philosophy in its practice is the embodiment of selfish human power then it would thwart the cause of justice in society and foster human conflict. If on the other hand it is the reflection of God's goodness then it will promote and seek the social embodiment of the virtues of love, mercy and justice and would do so through education and moral persuasion.

The situation can become very messy and complex if we were to take on board the Marxist view that the prevailing culture is the embodiment of class interests. From the point of view of monotheism how is this to be navigated? If the class analysis approach is correct, and for the purpose of this paper it will be so assumed, then it would mean that the dominant forms of culture will be the embodiment of the interest of the ruling classes. We will have what Antonio Gramsci called "cultural hegemony" in which society is culturally-diverse rather than monolithic and it is ruled and dominated by one of its social classes, namely, its ruling class. Thus the socio-political forms of the society seen as the norm and to the benefit of everyone are really ruling class-based and benefiting that class. It means that in pursuit of the cultural mandate, the interests of a dominant social class have prevailed. What is monotheism's answer to this?

In the Abrahamic religions, while God has created all human beings and love them all, nevertheless, because the process of history has created social classes, God in his relationship with a class-divided

world is revealed as having a preferential love for the classes that are under subjection. Justice in the world is to be established by finding ways to free the oppressed and establishing social and political forms that would maintain freedom and expand justice.

*Is not this the fast that I choose:
to loose the bonds of injustice,
to undo the thongs of the yoke,
to let the oppressed go free,
and to break every yoke?*

*Is it not to share your bread with the hungry,
and bring the homeless poor into your house;
when you see the naked, to cover them,
and not to hide yourself from your own kin?*

Isaiah 58: 6 – 7, NRSV

*“Monotheism. [is]
to discover through
dialogue that which
is common and
universal in all of the
religions and pursue
them through
respectful debate and
cooperation”*

Here a religious practice of fasting is reinterpreted in socio-political terms of liberation and dignity for the oppressed. God is the God of the oppressed and despised. In the prophetic tradition, it is not good enough to carry out pious activities without seeking to bring into being their socio-political implications. Indeed, to worship God in the cultic sense without fleshing such worship out in socio-political terms that highlight the social option of God is to treat the eternal God as if he were an idol.

*I hate, I despise your festivals,
and I take no delight in your solemn assemblies.
Even though you offer me burnt offerings
and grain offerings,
I will not accept them...
Take away from me the noise of your songs;
I will not listen to the melody of your harps.
But let justice roll down like waters,
and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream.*

Amos 5: 21 – 24, NRSV

Thus the sociopolitical and cultural implications of monotheism suggest the ongoing search for those forms that would effect and maintain the freedom and dignity of all peoples and groups of people from every form of oppression and indignity. It must be an ongoing, paradoxical search in which affirmation and negation stand in dialectical relationship, since human sin would forever seek to undermine and sabotage every human project. Such cannot be undertaken by human beings standing in opposition to God but rather by human beings open to and submissive to God, since they too like all else stand under the dialectical affirmation and negation of God, which in theological terms is referred to as God's Judgment.

In a conflict-ridden world, how is that to be done? One would be naïve to think that the power and interests of the ruling classes which have been institutionalized would be relinquished at the drop of a hat. Should it be violently overthrown and the changes effected by coercion? The logic of doing so would be to increase the violent conflict in the conflict-ridden world. But we must go beyond mere logic so as to plumb the theological significant of violence.

One of the temptations Jesus faced throughout his ministry was that of using force and violence to effect radical change, to usher in the Kingdom of God, which would be the socio-political and cultural

forms that would reflect the will of God in his times. This temptation to violence experienced by Jesus can be missed, because of the style of biblical writing. But it is there. It is depicted as Jesus fasting in the wilderness and being approached by Satan who asks Jesus to worship him in exchange for all the kingdoms of the world, which Satan says are his to give. Jesus rejects that temptation, thereby establishing that force and violence is satanic and cannot effect the sort of changes that would reflect the will of God, since force and violence are the very basis of the oppressive kingdoms of the world. This is why Satan says that the kingdoms of the world are his.

In a conflict-ridden world, all those who would like to see a radically different culture embodying the values of justice, love and mercy ought to take the way of peaceful resistance, since radical and lasting change can only spring from the transformed hearts of human beings. In the Eastern religions, it is the way of *Ahimsa*, which in the Jain scripture means: "Do not injure, abuse, oppress, enslave, insult, torment, torture or kill any creature or living being." Mahatma Gandhi who was no armchair theorist but a militant political leader facing the might of British imperial power said: "Ahimsa, non-violence, comes from strength, and the strength is from God, not man. Ahimsa always comes from within."

In a conflict-ridden world, we need the power that is not of ourselves but of God within. This power is the power of love that would seek out the oppressed and powerless so through their unity they can empower themselves.

The necessity for an approach today that is radically different to the bulldozing approaches of the past should be seen in the context of the worldwide breakdown of former certainties and the fragmentation of the collective consciousness. The breakdown of former certainties has been due to, on the one hand, the progress of science in investigating and understanding nearly every area of life and, on the other hand, the seemingly apocalyptic events of past fifty years. Investigations in the physical sciences have given us a cosmology, which unites the physics of the largest structures in the universe with the physics of the smallest structures, thereby substantially changing our understanding of the universe from being fixed and rigid to being dynamic and in process. From the life sciences, we have evolutionary biology and psychology, which have revolutionized our understanding of human beings in two main senses: one, as being an inseparable part of life's processes and, two, as having a vast and complex inner life that is not easily explained and attended to in the traditional way.

In the area of the social sciences, we have social, economic and political theories that have seriously challenged our traditional understanding of human society as divinely given and immutable. The seemingly apocalyptic events of the holocaust, Hiroshima, the widespread hunger and poverty covering about two-thirds of the world population, the collapse of the socialist bloc, and the current-day world economic crisis, sparked by the 2007 financial crisis and severely affecting food, energy, housing and employment, have undermined the arrogant belief in the automaticity, inevitability and sustainability of human progress. Not only are today's realities a testimony of the collapse of the pre-modern realities in which the monotheistic religions were born but they also have called into question modernity's project of Enlightenment in which man is god, rationalism the religion and a society of rational development and inevitable progress the goal.

Today's realities often referred to as postmodernism have given rise to postmodernist theories which not only speak of the cultural diversity of today's societies but hold that meta-narratives are impossible. A meta-narrative is an overarching framework of explanation and evaluation of the world. Accordingly, this gives us a world in which every major group has its own little story or narrative by which the world is explained and evaluated. If this is taken to be so, it would mean that we would have no agreed criteria for evaluating human experiences and actions in a world that, through science and technology, has become a global village. In this way, we would have, as it were, a fragmented, divisive and even conflictive world. It would be like a modern form of a polytheistic world.

The implications of monotheism in such a world be to discover through dialogue that which is common and universal in all of the religions and pursue them through respectful debate and cooperation. It would mean seeking to strengthen the institution of international law and bolstering up what has been referred to as the “Second Superpower” – a global civil society of world opinion, protest and dissent to promote and protect peace and justice in the world. It would mean interpreting these common and universal values from the standpoint of the powerless and vulnerable of the world. Ironically, the challenge of postmodernism will show us what it truly means to be monotheistic, because thus far most monotheistic believers have operated in a henotheistic way. They have operated as if the God they worship is the God of only their religion and not the only God of all peoples. Thus it is like having many gods but they have chosen to believe in and worship the god of their religion. The implications of monotheism in a postmodern world of conflict call for a culture of peace, cooperation, love, mercy, and justice and the sociopolitical institutions and policies that would facilitate that.

In closing it would be wise if we would take the counsel of the Rig Veda:

*Come together, talk together,
Let our minds be in harmony.
Common be our prayer,
Common be our end,
Common be our purpose,
Common be our deliberation,
Common be our desires,
United be our hearts,
United be our intentions,
Perfect be the union among us.*

Major Leon ‘Bogo’ Cornwall, a teacher by profession, was member of the People’s Revolutionary Government, Grenada between 1979 – 1983. Between 1982-1983, Major Cornwall served as Grenada’s Ambassador to Cuba, Mexico, Nicaragua & Panama. He endured 26 years in prison between 1983-2009, following the US invasion of Grenada.





مؤسسة قرطبة

The Cordoba Foundation

Level 7, Westgate House
Westgate Road, Ealing
London W5 1YY
United Kingdom

Telephone +44 (0) 20 8991 3370
Telephone +44 (0) 20 8991 3372
Facsimile +44 (0) 20 8991 3373

info@thecordobafoundation.com
www.thecordobafoundation.com

Cultures in Dialogue.